

СРЯДА 4 ФЕВРУАРИ 2009 Г.
MIÉRCOLES 4 DE FEBRERO DE 2009
STŘEDA, 4. ÚNORA 2009
ONSDAG DEN 4. FEBRUAR 2009
MITTWOCH, 4. FEBRUAR 2009
KOLMAPÄEV, 4. VEEBRUAR 2009
TETARTH 4 ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2009
WEDNESDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2009
MERCREDI 4 FÉVRIER 2009
MERCOLEDI' 4 FEBBRAIO 2009
TREŠDIENA, 2009. GADA 4. FEBRUĀRIS
2009 M. VASARIO 4 D., TREČIADIENIS
2009. FEBRUÁR 4., SZERDA
L-ERBGHA, 4 TA' FRAR 2009
WOENSDAG 4 FEBRUARI 2009
ŚRODA, 4 LUTEGO 2009
QUARTA-FEIRA, 4 DE FEVEREIRO DE 2009
MIERCURI 4 FEBRUARIE 2009
STREDA 4. FEBRUÁRA 2009
SREDA, 4. FEBRUAR 2009
KESKIVIIKKO 4. HELMIKUUTA 2009
ONSDAGEN DEN 4 FEBRUARI 2009

VORSITZ: HANS-GERT PÖTTERING
Präsident

1 - Eröffnung der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 9.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

2 - Weiterbehandlung der Entschlüssen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

3 - 2050: Die Zukunft beginnt heute — Empfehlungen für eine künftige integrierte EU-Klimaschutzpolitik (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt der Bericht von Karl-Heinz Florenz im Namen des Nichtständigen Ausschusses zum Klimawandel über 2050: Die Zukunft beginnt heute – Empfehlungen für eine künftige integrierte EU-Klimaschutzpolitik (2008/2105(INI)) (A6-0495/2008).

Karl-Heinz Florenz, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Insbesondere guten Morgen den lieben Kollegen, die seit Monaten an diesem Klimabericht gearbeitet haben! Ich bin Ihnen sehr dankbar, dass Sie in sehr fairer und kooperativer Weise diesen Bericht mit mir zusammengestellt haben.

Die Vorgehensweise in einem horizontalen Ausschuss war neu. Wir haben nicht mit Fachleuten in einer Gruppe diskutiert, sondern wir haben mit Leuten aus dem Verkehrsbereich diskutiert, wir haben richtigerweise mit Leuten aus dem Wirtschaftsbereich diskutiert und natürlich auch mit Leuten aus dem Energiebereich. Da war ganz klar, dass die ersten Stunden und Tage der Debatte etwas rauer waren, weil das ein neues Thema war. An dieser Stelle möchte ich nochmals unserem Vorsitzenden und meinem guten Freund, Guido Sacconi, danken, der das immer sehr exzellent und fair gemanagt hat.

Im Grunde ist das heutige Ergebnis, dass wir gemerkt haben, dass diese horizontale Zusammenarbeit eine ganz große Chance ist, und wir sollten bei der nächsten Zusammensetzung des Parlaments darauf achten, dass Menschen mehr miteinander sprechen und nicht einzelne Gruppen gegeneinander.

Das ist der größte Vorteil dieses Ausschusses gewesen. Wir hatten ganz hochrangige Experten eingeladen – Friedensnobelpreisträger Pachauri, die Wissenschaft, die Forschung, die Politik natürlich – und am Ende haben wir heute ein Ergebnis in der Hand, das uns zeigt, dass der Bericht sehr positiv ausgefallen ist.

Wir wissen sehr genau, dass mit Verboten, mit Sanktionen und mit Verzichten relativ wenig zu erreichen ist. Wir müssen vielmehr Bewusstseinsänderungen, Innovation und Motivation fördern. Unser Ziel muss sein, dass die Ingenieure in Europa jeden Morgen mit großer Freude aufstehen und versuchen, effizientere Maschinen in dieser Welt zu bauen, um die Rohstoffe unserer Kinder besser und wesentlich effizienter zu nutzen.

Der Bericht ist auch ehrlich. Wir haben geschrieben, dass es keine Wunderwaffe gibt. Es gibt nicht den Schalter, den man umstellen kann, weder in Brüssel noch in Bali noch im Dezember in Polen, sondern es ist eine Vielzahl von Maßnahmen. Genau darin liegt die Chance: die Chance nämlich, dem Bürger klar zu machen, dass er selbst auch mit einem Drittel an diesem Klimawandel beteiligt ist, zum Beispiel mit seiner Heizung im Haus. Wir sind als Bürger aber auch aufgrund der Mobilität und all dessen, was sich darum herum rankt, zu einem Drittel beteiligt, und auch die Industrie ist mit einem Drittel beteiligt. Wir sind also alle angesprochen. Das ist das Schöne. Wir brauchen nicht einen Bösewicht zu suchen, sondern wir sind alle aufgefordert, in eine innovative Richtung zu diskutieren. Das freut mich ganz besonders.

Es ist auch klar, dass dieser Bericht ausgewogen ist – das möchte ich noch einmal ausdrücklich sagen –, weil er eben keine Parteiprogramme darstellt. Er verdammt auch keine Bereiche, sondern wir weisen darauf hin, dass es in bestimmten Bereichen mehr Möglichkeiten gibt, es gibt aber auch Bereiche, in denen wir weniger Möglichkeiten haben. Deswegen sagt der Bericht auch letztlich, dass er wegweisend ist und Wege aufzeigt – gerade auch für Europa, denn wir haben in Europa eine riesengroße Umwelttechnologie, deren Volumen mit dem der europäischen Automobilindustrie vergleichbar ist. Dieser Anteil wird steigen, und über Innovation müssen wir daran arbeiten.

Ich hatte gerade gesagt, dass wir die Bürger beteiligen sollten, damit sie an ihren eigenen Häusern etwas tun können. Da kann die lokale Politik, da können die Industrie- und Handelskammern und die Handwerksverbände eine Menge an Motivation und Informationsarbeit leisten.

Lassen Sie mich zum Schluss kommen. Die vielen Vorteile, die wir in diesem Bericht aufgezeigt haben, sollten uns das Bewusstsein geben, dass Innovation die Chance ist und nicht Depression. Wenn wir das verstehen, dann hat sich diese Aufgabe gelohnt.

3-009

Der Präsident. – Herzlichen Dank für die Arbeit, Karl-Heinz Florenz, die Sie geleistet haben, für Ihren Bericht.

3-010

Martin Bursik, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it is a pleasure to be here and share with you some thoughts on the important year ahead. Firstly, let me congratulate the Temporary Committee on Climate Change for all the work it has accomplished since its creation in April 2007: hearings, conferences, reports, resolutions, exchanges with third parties. Its tireless efforts have greatly contributed towards shaping the EU position on climate change.

The latest resolution, ‘2050: The future begins today – Recommendations for the EU’s future integrated policy on climate change’, which was adopted by the Temporary Committee on Climate Change on 2 December 2008, and which you will adopt at this part-session, will again provide a very useful basis when discussing the options for a post-2012 climate agreement and for further deepening the EU’s climate policies.

As you know, the work during the Presidency will focus on the international negotiation process. By the way, I am leaving Strasbourg today and flying to Delhi to have discussions with the Indian Government and Indian representatives. Two

weeks later we have an EU-Africa meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, and we have already made contact with the US Administration, which I will mention later.

By adopting the climate and environment legislative package at the end of 2008, the EU is sending a very strong political signal to all our partners in the world. With the adoption of this package in a few months' time, the EU will demonstrate that its commitment, as well as its leadership, in the global fight against climate change is as strong as ever. Indeed, the EU will be the first region in the world to commit unilaterally to a reduction of its greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2020.

As you know, the climate and energy package will, as of 2013, enable the reform of the EU-ETS (Emissions Trading Scheme), set limits for the emissions outside the Emissions Trading Scheme, stimulate CO₂ capture and storage technology, as well as boost the deployment of renewables.

As far as the ETS is concerned, a single EU cap with a linear downwards trajectory will be set, auctioning will be gradually introduced as the method of allocating allowances and monitoring reporting, and verification will be strengthened. But, of course, the EU has repeatedly said that it will not settle for 20% – we want to go for 30% – and, therefore, we hope for an ambitious global and comprehensive agreement in Copenhagen.

The Copenhagen Conference is now only 10 months away. The December 2008 Poznań Climate Conference agreed on a work programme for 2009, with clearly identified steps towards Copenhagen. The decision in Poznań on the operationalisation of the Adaptation Fund represents an important step forward in the negotiations on the financing building block – one of the key elements of any comprehensive global agreement.

The ministerial round table in Poznań also confirmed the shared willingness of both the developed and the developing countries to find an effective globally agreed response to dangerous climate change for the post-2012 period. This encompasses further mitigation efforts, adaptation actions and finance and technology means to make that response operational.

Poznań has also sent the message that the current financial crisis is not to be seen as an obstacle to further action on climate change, but, instead, as yet another opportunity for profoundly transforming our economic system and moving firmly towards a low-carbon economy.

The Czech Presidency intends to build on such important achievements and to pursue efforts at international level towards a successful agreement in Copenhagen in December 2009.

On 2 March 2009 the Environment Council, and later the ECOFIN Council and the spring European Council, will be the first opportunities for further developing the EU position in this respect, on the basis of the Commission communication towards a comprehensive climate change agreement in Copenhagen, which we received a week ago, and on the basis of your input.

In addition to the shared vision for long-term action for mitigation technology and adaptation, the identification of appropriate means for financing effective and long-term climate policies will be key in future EU deliberations. In this context, I can only reiterate the Climate Change Committee's call on the Commission and the Member States 'to adopt, at bilateral level in the negotiations towards a post-2012 agreement, a mediating role between the positions of developed countries, in order to ensure by means of a balance of interest the success of the climate negotiations involving all major greenhouse gas emitters'.

The EU will also continue to engage in active outreach with key negotiating partners and main emerging economies, but also with a new US Administration. I have spoken on the phone to Carol Browner, the President's assistant for energy and climate change. I have made a preliminary proposal to her for a high-level meeting with US representatives and the EU Commission – Commissioner Dimas – the Czech Presidency and the upcoming Swedish Presidency (i.e. the Troika) in early March, probably 2 or 6 March.

I said that the EU would like to work as closely as possible with the United States on the evolution and linkage of carbon markets. We gather that Congressman Waxman has indicated that he will try to get the legislation from his committee on the cap-and-trade system to be implemented at the end of May. This is quite an encouraging response from the United States as a reaction to the activities of the European Union.

We also count on the European Parliament to ensure that the EU voice is more widely heard, and we appreciate very much the outreach efforts that you have made in the past. I can only encourage you to continue along this path and wish you all good luck for the year ahead.

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αξιότιμα μέλη του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου. Η τελική έκθεση της προσωρινής επιτροπής για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές με εισηγητή τον κ. Florenz έχει φιλόδοξους στόχους και καλύπτει ένα ευρύτατο φάσμα θεμάτων, επιβεβαιώνει δε τη μεγάλη σημασία που αποδίδει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο στο ζήτημα των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την προσωρινή επιτροπή και ιδιαίτερα τον εισηγητή κ. Florenz για την εξαιρετική εργασία τους.

Πέρσι, προτεραιότητά μας απετέλεσε η δέσμη μέτρων για το κλίμα και την ενέργεια. Οι προσπάθειές μας απέδωσαν καρπούς και μπορούμε πλέον να είμαστε υπερήφανοι γι' αυτή την πολύ σημαντική δέσμη νομοθετημάτων. Φέτος, στο εσωτερικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης θα ασχοληθούμε ιδιαίτερα με την προετοιμασία των μέτρων υλοποίησης αυτής της δέσμης. Στο διεθνές πεδίο, προτεραιότητά μας θα αποτελέσουν οι διαπραγματεύσεις για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές που θα εντατικοποιηθούν ενόψει της Διάσκεψης των Ηνωμένων Εθνών στην Κοπεγχάγη και, όπως ακούσατε προηγουμένως, η Προεδρία της Τσεχικής Δημοκρατίας αποδίδει μεγάλη σημασία σε αυτές τις διαπραγματεύσεις και έχει προγραμματίσει σειρά διμερών και πολυμερών συναντήσεων και διαπραγματεύσεων. Η έκθεσή σας λοιπόν έρχεται στην κατάλληλη στιγμή. Στον δρόμο για την Κοπεγχάγη πρέπει να ενεργοποιήσουμε όλες τις δυνάμεις μας και να συνεργαστούμε ώστε, με δεδομένο τον ιδιωτικό ρόλο της Ευρώπης, να πετύχουμε το καλύτερο δυνατό αποτέλεσμα.

Χαίρομαι που η έκθεσή σας συμβαδίζοντας με την ανάλυση της Επιτροπής τονίζει ότι η χρηματοπιστωτική και η οικονομική κρίση δεν θα πρέπει να χρησιμοποιηθεί ως πρόφαση για να καθυστερήσει η ανάληψη δράσης για την αντιμετώπιση των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Συμφωνούμε ακόμη ότι η ανάληψη δράσης για την αντιμετώπιση των κλιματικών αλλαγών αποτελεί μέρος της λύσης του προβλήματος της οικονομικής κρίσης που αντιμετωπίζουμε σήμερα.

Με τη δέσμη μέτρων για το κλίμα και την ενέργεια, η Ευρώπη κινείται πλέον στην τροχιά της οικονομίας χαμηλών εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα. Συγχρόνως, θα συμβάλει ώστε να περιοριστεί η εξάρτηση της Ευρώπης από την εισαγόμενη ενέργεια πράγμα που αποτελεί εξίσου σημαντικό όφελος όπως πρόσφατα διαπιστώσαμε με την κρίση του φυσικού αερίου. Υλοποιώντας πλέον τον στόχο της μείωσης κατά 20% των εκπομπών αερίου του θερμοκηπίου και κατά 30%, εφόσον στο πλαίσιο της διεθνούς συμφωνίας και οι υπόλοιπες αναπτυγμένες χώρες δεχθούν ανάλογες μειώσεις, έχουμε αναμφισβήτητη την πιο φιλόδοξη θέση από οποιαδήποτε χώρα ή ομάδα χωρών. Αποτελούμε παράδειγμα για τον υπόλοιπο κόσμο, πράγμα το οποίο θα προσδώσει θετική δυναμική στις διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις.

Πριν εστιάσουμε τη συζήτηση μας στις διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ σύντομα σε ένα θέμα το οποίο πολύ σωστά επισημαίνεται στην έκθεση. Συγκεκριμένα, η έκθεση περιέχει αξιολογες προτάσεις για το τί πρέπει να γίνει σχετικά με την πιο αποτελεσματική και αποδοτική αξιοποίηση των φυσικών πόρων ώστε να μειωθούν οι εκπομπές αερίου του θερμοκηπίου και να εξοικονομηθεί ενέργεια.

Η Επιτροπή έκανε πέρσι ένα πρώτο βήμα προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή εγκρίνοντας το πρόγραμμα δράσης για την αειφόρο παραγωγή και κατανάλωση. Πιο πρόσφατα, με μέτρα συμπληρωματικά της δέσμης μέτρων για το κλίμα και την ενέργεια, ενίσχυσε τις δράσεις για την εξοικονόμηση και την πιο αποδοτική χρήση της ενέργειας. Πάντως, απομένουν πολλά να γίνουν στον τομέα της βιώσιμης χρήσης των φυσικών πόρων και, βέβαια, εξακολουθούν να υπάρχουν μεγάλες δυνατότητες πιο αποτελεσματικής αξιοποίησης και χρήσης της ενέργειας. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα αποτελεί η πρόταση που πρόσφατα κατέθεσε η Επιτροπή σχετικά με την ενεργειακή απόδοση των κτιρίων. Πρόκειται για έναν τομέα με πολλαπλή στόχευση αφού έχει σημαντικά οφέλη τόσο στην εξοικονόμηση ενέργειας όσο και στην προστασία του κλίματος, αλλά δημιουργεί συγχρόνως απασχόληση και συμβάλλει στην ανάπτυξη της τεχνολογικής καινοτομίας.

Σήμερα, περισσότερο από ποτέ, είναι αναγκαία η τόνωση και η ενίσχυση των οικονομιών μας μέσω της λήψης μέτρων για την πιο γρήγορη υιοθέτηση και χρήση καθαρών τεχνολογιών που θα συμβάλουν στη δημιουργία πράσινων θέσεων εργασίας. Συγχρόνως, θα δημιουργηθούν σημαντικές ευκαιρίες για το εξωτερικό μας εμπόριο αφού διευρύνονται με ταχύτατο ρυθμό οι αγορές για τις καθαρές τεχνολογίες. Με το σκεπτικό αυτό, η Επιτροπή, μεταξύ άλλων, πρότεινε συγκεκριμένες δράσεις στο πλαίσιο του σχεδίου ανάκαμψης της ευρωπαϊκής οικονομίας τον περασμένο Δεκέμβριο.

Όσον αφορά τώρα τις διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές, η δέσμη μέτρων για το κλίμα και την ενέργεια αναμφίβολα έχει ενισχύσει τα επιχειρήματά μας και την προσπάθειά μας να πείσουμε τους διεθνείς εταίρους μας ότι η λήψη αποτελεσματικών μέτρων είναι όχι μόνο αναγκαία αλλά και εφικτή. Βεβαίως, δεν υπάρχει καμία αμφιβολία ότι οι διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις θα είναι πολύ δύσκολο και λόγω του πολύπλοκου χαρακτήρα τους. Παρόλα αυτά, πιστεύω ότι στην Κοπεγχάγη θα επιτευχθεί συμφωνία. Η επίτευξη συμφωνίας είναι δυνατή και αναγκαία. Δεν έχουμε χρόνο για χάσιμο. Είναι θέμα πολιτικής βούλησης και θεωρώ ότι βούληση υπάρχει.

Τώρα, ενώ αρχίζουν να εντατικοποιούνται οι διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις, η Επιτροπή, την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα, υιοθέτησε ανακοίνωση η οποία περιλαμβάνει τις θέσεις της για τα πιο σημαντικά θέματα των διαπραγματεύσεων. Οι αναπτυγμένες χώρες είναι κατ' αρχάς εκείνες που καλούνται να συνεχίσουν να διαδραματίζουν ηγετικό ρόλο. Έρχονται θετικά μηνύματα από τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες διότι, όπως ανέφερε προηγουμένως και ο Τσέχος υπουργός, ο Πρόεδρος Ομπάμα δεσμεύτηκε να υπάρξει ενεργός συμμετοχή των ΗΠΑ στις διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις, εξήγγειλε ότι θα υπάρξει ένα σύστημα εμπορίας των αερίων θερμοκηπίου στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, εξήγγειλε επίσης μειώσεις κατά 80% για το 2050 σε σύγκριση με το 1990.

Όλα αυτά είναι θετικά, αλλά θέλουμε να τα δούμε να πραγματοποιούνται γρήγορα και μάλιστα φέτος, γιατί πρέπει να έχουμε συμφωνία στην Κοπεγχάγη στο τέλος αυτού του έτους και οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες έχουν χρέος και, σύμφωνα με αυτά που έχει ανακοινώσει ο Πρόεδρος Ομπάμα, πρέπει να συμβάλουν αποφασιστικά, από κοινού με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ώστε να πετύχουμε όλοι μαζί τη συμφωνία στην Κοπεγχάγη. Προσβλέπουμε βεβαίως και στη σχετική συζήτηση που βρίσκεται υπό εξέλιξη εντός των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών η οποία θα οδηγήσει στη λήψη των διάφορων άλλων αποφασιστικών μέτρων για την καταπολέμηση των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Χαρακτηριστικό στοιχείο είναι και τα μέτρα που ανακοινώθηκαν πρόσφατα για τα αυτοκίνητα.

Η ανακοίνωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής επιβεβαιώνει τον στόχο για τη μείωση των εκπομπών κατά 30% συλλογικά στις αναπτυγμένες χώρες και ορίζει την έννοια της συγκρισιμότητας των προσπαθειών. Η συγκρισιμότητα θα έχει αποφασιστική σημασία τόσο για την επίτευξη των περιβαλλοντικών στόχων όσο και για την εξασφάλιση ισότιμων όρων ανταγωνισμού. Η Επιτροπή προτείνει μια σειρά κριτηρίων για τον ορισμό της συγκρισιμότητας.

Όσον αφορά τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και, μολοντί δεν απαιτούνται προσπάθειες ανάλογου χαρακτήρα και κλίμακας με τις αναπτυγμένες χώρες, είναι εντούτοις σημαντικό να εξασφαλιστεί η ανάληψη περαιτέρω δράσης από πλευράς τους ώστε η απαραίτητη για αυτές οικονομική ανάπτυξη να είναι χαμηλότερης έντασης διοξειδίου του άνθρακα. Για να επιτευχθεί ο στόχος της μη υπέρβασης των 2 βαθμών Κελσίου το 2050, είναι απαραίτητο οι αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες να περιορίσουν τον ρυθμό αύξησης των εκπομπών τους σε επίπεδα κατά 15% με 30% χαμηλότερα εκείνων που έτσι και αλλιώς θα σημειώνονταν εάν δεν έκαναν καμία προσπάθεια μείωσης έως το 2020. Φυσικά, οι προσπάθειες που θα πρέπει να καταβληθούν από κάθε αναπτυσσόμενη χώρα χωριστά εξαρτώνται από το επίπεδο της οικονομικής τους ανάπτυξης και τις δυνατότητές τους. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι αναμένουμε σαφώς περισσότερα από τις ταχέως αναπτυσσόμενες οικονομίες παρά από τις υπόλοιπες.

Γνωρίζουμε όλοι ότι δεν θα πετύχουμε το αποτέλεσμα που θέλουμε στην Κοπεγχάγη εάν δεν κατορθώσουμε να γίνουν ακόμη περισσότερες επενδύσεις και να εξασφαλίσουμε μεγαλύτερη χρηματοδότηση για τη μείωση των εκπομπών για την προσαρμογή. Ένα μέρος φυσικά από τις αναγκαίες επενδύσεις, ακόμη και στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες, θα προέλθει από τον ιδιωτικό τομέα στο εσωτερικό των διαφόρων χωρών ενώ περίπου το ένα τρίτο κατά τις εκτιμήσεις της Επιτροπής θα προέλθει από την αγορά διοξειδίου του άνθρακα. Επιπλέον, ένα μέρος χρειάζεται να είναι δημόσια χρηματοδότηση και πρέπει να μελετήσουμε τρόπους εξασφάλισης αυτών των δημόσιων πόρων. Σήμερα, στο μέσο της οικονομικής ύφεσης, η σχετική συζήτηση δεν θα είναι εύκολη. Πρέπει παρόλα αυτά να είμαστε έτοιμοι και να διαθέτουμε επιχειρήματα για τη σχετική συζήτηση έχοντας υπόψη πάντοτε ότι το κόστος της αδράνειας θα είναι κατά πολύ υψηλότερο από το κόστος των οποιωνδήποτε μέτρων.

Τέλος, η ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής τονίζει τη σημασία μιας παγκόσμιας αγοράς διοξειδίου του άνθρακα όπως και της δημιουργίας, μεταξύ των χωρών του ΟΟΣΑ, συμβατών συστημάτων εμπορίας έως το 2015, ενώ για τις οικονομικά πλέον προηγμένες των αναπτυσσόμενων χωρών προτείνει κάτι τέτοιο να συμβεί σε μεταγενέστερο χρόνο, μέχρι το 2020.

Αυτά είναι τα κύρια μηνύματα της ανακοίνωσης της Επιτροπής και με μεγάλο ενδιαφέρον θα ακούσω τις απόψεις σας επ' αυτών. Οι διεθνείς διαπραγματεύσεις θα προχωρήσουν με πολύ ταχύ ρυθμό και θα χρειαστεί έντονη διπλωματική δραστηριότητα από πλευράς μας κατά τη φετινή χρονιά. Προσβλέπω στη συμβολή σας σε αυτή τη μεγάλη προσπάθεια.

3-012

Romana Jordan Cizelj, v imenu skupine PPE-DE. – Podnebne spremembe so široko področje in strinjam se s tem, kar je dejal poročevalec, da smo morali biti v našem začasnem odboru inovativni, če smo želeli zares dobro pokriti vso horizontalnost in vsebine, ki jih to področje zajema. Ampak lahko zdaj ob koncu našega dela potrdim, da smo imeli zares možnost za izmenjavo različnih stališč, pogledov, da smo imeli možnost podati različne predloge za ukrepanje in da so bile te naše razprave včasih, ravno zaradi teh različnih pogledov, tudi zelo udarne. Tak pristop pa zagotavlja, da je poročilo zares pestro, polno dobrih predlogov, omogoča pa tudi usklajenost pri oblikovanju raznih sektorskih politik potem v nadaljevanju v stalnih odborih. In menim, da bi bilo dobro s tako obliko dela tudi nadaljevati.

Seveda se je izkazalo, da so največje možnosti ukrepanja na področjih, ki smo jih že pred tem omenjali, kot so energetika, transport, promet, industrija, vendar pa so se dodatno kot pomembna pokazala tudi druga področja, tako recimo področje kmetijstva, živinoreje, trajnostna raba gozdov, informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije, potem razvojna politika EU s tretjimi državami.

Razvoj v nizkoogljično družbo je seveda mogoč z vlaganjem v raziskave, s pospeševanjem razvoja in inovacij, vse to, o čemer že govori lizbonska strategija. Vendar pa tudi to ne bo dovolj. Doseči moramo tudi spremembo življenjskega stila. To pa lahko dosežemo le, če bo skrb za okolje postalo tudi vrednota, dejansko vrednota, ki jo bodo ljudje sprejeli. Tu pa moramo veliko več narediti še na področju obveščanja in izobraževanja.

Strinjam se tudi s tem, kar je bilo rečeno o povezavi s finančno krizo in podnebnimi spremembami. To je priložnost in strahovi, da bomo pozabili na podnebne spremembe, so neupravičeni, kajti ukrepi za oživitev gospodarstva morajo biti pripravljeni tako, da pospešujejo trajnostni razvoj, ne pa zgolj samo trošenje.

Ker je cilj omejitev višanja globalne temperature, moramo seveda delovati tudi mednarodno, in tu mora Evropa najti in še poglobiti skupen jezik z razvitimi državami, kajti skupaj moramo dvigniti in odnesti to naše breme zgodovinskih izpustov, hkrati pa seveda prisluhniti državam v razvoju in tistim najrevnejšim ter jim omogočiti sicer dražji, vendar trajnostni razvoj.

Ob koncu še čestitke našemu odličnemu poročevalcu Karl-Heinzu Florenzu za njegovo odprtost pri našem delu.

3-013

Dorette Corbey, *namens de PSE-Fractie*. – Ik wil allereerst mijn grote en oprechte dank aan collega Karl-Heinz Florenz uitspreken. Met grote inzet en vastberadenheid heeft hij zijn verslag geschreven. Het is volgens mij een compleet verslag geworden met bijna 200 aanbevelingen en echt de moeite waard. Het bevat veel goede aanbevelingen die een bron van inspiratie kunnen zijn voor het volgende Parlement, de nationale parlementen en lokale overheden.

Ik noem vijf hoofdlijnen die voor onze fractie echt essentieel zijn. Allereerst wordt in dit verslag erkend dat de klimaatverandering veelomvattend is. De klimaatverandering raakt aan alle sectoren, niet alleen industrie, transport en energie, waarvoor wij al regels hebben vastgesteld, maar ook landbouw, gezondheid, wetenschap en technologie, ICT, onderwijs, de bodem, het water en landgebruik. Al deze zaken verdienen volle aandacht en een effectieve aanpak.

De tweede hoofdlijn is voor ons dat het klimaatbeleid ook sociaal en solidair moet zijn. Wij moeten aandacht hebben voor de werkgelegenheid, voor inkomensaspecten en voor energiearmoede. Wij moeten weten hoe en door wie de nieuwe technologie bekostigd gaat worden. Wij willen weten hoeveel banen gecreëerd worden en of er banen verloren gaan. Wij willen omscholingsprogramma's voor de nieuwe *green poll workers*. Zonder een duidelijke sociale inzet is het ontzettend moeilijk om politieke steun voor een klimaatbeleid te handhaven.

Onze derde hoofdlijn heeft te maken met de economische crisis. Ook hier hebben wij een integrale aanpak nodig. De *Green New Deal* is inmiddels een begrip geworden. Wij steunen deze van harte. Er zijn forse investeringen nodig. Steunoperaties aan banken en bedrijven moeten op zijn minst een duurzame component hebben. Investerings in woningen en appartementsgebouwen in Oost-Europa moeten meer prioriteit krijgen. Dat is goed voor de werkgelegenheid, goed voor de energiezekerheid en goed voor het klimaat.

Ons vierde hoofdpunt betreft de landbouw. Daar hebben wij het meestal niet over als wij over het klimaat praten. Vandaag laten wij zien dat het wel nodig is en het bleek ook een controversieel thema te zijn. Wij hebben lang gediscussieerd over de vraag of de landbouw bindende doelen moet hebben en wij zijn het erover eens dat wij dat serieus moeten overwegen. Duidelijk is ook dat de landbouw niet alleen een probleem vormt, maar ook oplossingen biedt. Goede landbouw, goed landgebruik en een goed gebruik van biomassa kunnen een bijdrage leveren aan de vermindering van broeikasgassen.

Onze vijfde hoofdpunt tenslotte is mensen erbij betrekken. Hiervoor zijn voorlichting en transparantie nodig. Willen wij ons consumptiegedrag aanpassen, dan moeten wij precies weten welke producten veel broeikasgassen veroorzaken en vervolgens moeten wij onze consumptiepatronen misschien aanpassen. Dat is natuurlijk niet gemakkelijk, maar het probleem van de klimaatverandering - Karl-Heinz Florenz zei het net al - kan niet met een paar technische handgrepen opgelost worden. Wij zullen alleszins ons best doen om zoveel mogelijk mensen te betrekken bij de grote uitdagingen waarvoor wij staan. Lokale initiatieven zijn daarbij zeer waardevol. Gratis energie-audits voor huizen, beter openbaar vervoer, lokale en regionale voedselproductie. Samen kunnen wij veel bereiken.

Collega's, met dit maatregelenpakket hebben wij ook reden tot optimisme. Broeikasgassen kunnen verminderen en dit draagt bij aan innovatie, economische groei, betere energievoorziening, betere voedselproductie, meer werkgelegenheid en een stabiel klimaat. Ik dank alle collega's en medewerkers die hieraan een bijdrage geleverd hebben.

3-014

Chris Davies, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, an elephant lurks in the wings of this debate that we seem reluctant to identify. There is virtually no reference to it in this report and only a passing mention in the Commission's comprehensive strategy for achieving a climate change agreement in Copenhagen. It is the fact that human population is growing at unprecedented and unsustainable levels. In the lifetimes of many of us here, population on this planet will have trebled. It continues to grow at the rate of 200 000 every day: 80 million a year.

Why does China need a new coal-fired power station every week? Because its population has more than doubled in 50 years, it is continuing to grow fast, demand for energy grows with it, and Chinese people want what we have in the West, and they have every right to that. The Minister is flying to India today. Population growth is even faster there and again they are turning to coal for energy.

But this planet has finite resources. We need to slow and reverse our population growth. We must do so entirely through non-coercive means, and we must never arrogantly forget that those of us in the developed countries contribute vastly more to climate change than those in developing countries.

The UN population fund says that 380 women in the world become pregnant every minute of the day, and half of that number do not plan to do so. Contraception must be available for all. Women must have control over their reproductive lives: it is so preferable to the alternative of unsafe abortion.

Medical resources need improvements so that women can safely delay giving birth until a later age, but above all the issue must be on the political agenda. Our refusal to place it there is the greatest folly. Families everywhere should be talking about this. Governments should be setting targets for population stability or reduction. Admitting the central importance of population growth is key to addressing it, and we will not succeed in tackling climate change or achieving sustainable development if we fail to do so.

3-015

Liam Aylward, *on behalf of the UEN Group*. – Mr President, I would also like to compliment Mr Florenz on his effort and commitment in producing this report and, of course, on his ability to listen to, and understand, the many varied and different opinions.

As legislators, it is paramount, in the midst of a massive economic downturn, that we work on results for green energy technology. We can become world leaders in our diverse renewable energy fields, which should create a tight, effective and coordinated strategy – including governments, NGOs, academia, business, forward-thinkers – seeking not to talk but to solve. We need to reduce bureaucracy and support SMEs and technology developers.

The market is there. The regulatory framework is clear. We have set the targets for renewable energy. Although funding is scarce, it is crucial to technology development and to maintaining expertise. Banks and funders will have to take risks on green technology start-ups. There will be long-term gain if we step up to the mark. The jobs and wealth will flow. If, on the other hand, we dilly-dally during this precious time, we will lose out and other countries will be only too ready to fill the gap.

For example, Ireland could become to ocean wave technology what Finland is to mobile phone technology. We have the undisputed potential due to weather and location in the Atlantic. We have the technology patented. We have the expertise in situ and we have the legal target framework. The market is clear, so it is a magnificent opportunity for job creation, electricity price reduction, energy security and carbon emission reduction, not to mention patent revenues.

We now need to get behind our companies, who have been working for over a decade to come to this point. They have taken the risks, and we need to support them through increased funding. Delays at this point would be detrimental. Green technology is our future. We have the opportunity now, so let us use it.

3-016

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte mich auch beim Kollegen Florenz bedanken, insbesondere für seine Geduld in den Verhandlungen. Die Länge des Berichts macht ja deutlich, dass da sehr viele Themen auf den Tisch gekommen sind.

Ich möchte aber gleichzeitig die Frage stellen, wie weit die Einigkeit, die dieser Bericht jetzt zu Beginn dieses Jahres signalisiert, tragfähig ist. Ich erinnere mich sehr gut an die internationale Klimakonferenz in Posen und die sehr schwache Rolle, die die Europäer in Posen gespielt haben, weil sie damit beschäftigt waren, ihre ehrgeizigen Versprechen und ehrgeizigen Ankündigungen aus der internationalen Verhandlungsrunde in Bali nach unten zu korrigieren, und wie sie angesichts der anbrechenden Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise damit beschäftigt waren, die Klimapolitik in die zweite Reihe zu rücken.

Ich glaube, dass im nächsten Jahr die Entscheidung getroffen werden wird, ob wir tatsächlich bereit sind, wegen der Erkenntnisse über den Klimawandel unsere Art des Wirtschaftens, an die wir uns in den Industrieländern gewöhnt haben, so zu korrigieren, wie wir das jetzt immer wieder versprechen. Ich glaube, dass die Entscheidung darüber, ob wir uns in Richtung Nachhaltigkeit entwickeln oder nicht, noch nicht getroffen ist.

Ban Ki-Moon und Achim Steiner haben in Posen in sehr eindringlicher Weise appelliert, jetzt alle Maßnahmen, die die Staaten mit ihren Konjunkturprogrammen, mit ihren Bankenrettungspaketen ergreifen, mit der Programmatik gegen die Armut in den Entwicklungsländern und gegen die schrecklichen Folgen des Klimawandels in den Entwicklungsländern, aber auch mit Maßnahmen für einen wirklich ehrgeizigen Klimaschutz und eine neue Energiepolitik zu verbinden.

Ich stelle fest, dass in jeder Gesetzgebung auf europäischer Ebene, die damit zu tun hat, der Weg neu entschieden wird. Es ist keineswegs ausgemacht, dass Europa sich auf den Weg in die moderne Gesellschaft der Energieeffizienz und erneuerbaren Energien befindet. Es geht nach wie vor um die Entscheidung: Machen wir weiter mit dem alten Mix Kohle und Atom oder gehen wir ehrgeizig neue Wege? Ich hoffe, dass wir uns weiter so konstruktiv darüber auseinandersetzen wie im Klimaausschuss, aber sicher bin ich da nicht.

3-017

Jens Holm, för GUE/NGL-gruppen. – Äntligen ska vi efter mer än ett och ett halvt års arbete fatta beslut om den här klimatresolutionen. Jag skulle särskilt vilja nämna tre saker.

De långsiktiga minskningsmålen: i artikel 3 kräver vi minskningar av utsläppen i EU med mellan 25 till 40 procent till 2020 och minst 80 procent till 2050. Det är bra och det innebär att vi går längre än vad EU:s klimatpaket från i fjol kräver.

Vi kräver också åtgärder mot köttindustrin. Enligt FAO-rapporten *Livestock's long shadow* står köttindustrin för 18 procent av världens utsläpp. Det är något som vi tar fasta på i det här betänkandet och vi kräver att köttkonsumtionen ska minska. Det är ett modigt och smått historiskt beslut av detta parlament som annars gärna ställer sig bakom subventioner till denna industri, men det är tråkigt att särskilt PPE vill rösta bort de kraven. På samma sätt som vi måste minska bilismen borde vi också säga att det inte är hållbart med dagens skenande köttkonsumtion.

Låt mig också påminna om att köttindustrin faktiskt är den främsta orsaken till skövlingen av regnskogen i Amazonas i form av mark till betande djur men också till foderproduktion. En stor del av fodret exporteras som soja till Europa. Det är inte hållbart.

Bilindustrin är ett annat växande problem. Mellan 1990 och 2005 har utsläppen från den europeiska transportindustrin ökat med 32 procent. Det behövs massiva satsningar i kollektivtrafik och andra miljövänliga transporter. Bilar med fossilt bränsle måste ersättas med elbilar och kanske i framtiden också med vätgasfordon. Vi måste fråga oss om det är hållbart med alla dessa transporter. Borde vi inte stimulera lokal produktion och konsumtion i stället?

Avslutningsvis så vill jag varna för ändringsförslagen 12 och 28 som kräver mer kärnkraft. Om de går igenom kommer inte min grupp att kunna stödja den här resolutionen. Rösta därför emot ändringsförslagen nummer 12 och 28. Tack så mycket.

3-018

Johannes Blokland, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Het is wellicht een ongelukkig moment om nu, terwijl een groot deel van West-Europa een erg koude winter beleeft, te praten over de opwarming van de aarde. Wij echter kijken, zoals de titel van het verslag al aangeeft, in dit debat naar de lange termijn. Wij moeten ons dus niet te veel laten afleiden door de kortetermijgebeurtenissen. Het eindverslag van collega Karl-Heinz Florenz is een goed doordacht en gedegen verslag geworden, waarmee wij als Europees Parlement een duidelijk signaal afgeven.

Om de negatieve effecten van de klimaatverandering in te perken of te voorkomen is harde actie noodzakelijk op een breed gebied. Harde doelstellingen voor de periode tussen 2020 en 2050 zijn nodig. Geen enkel segment van de samenleving mag ontkomen aan spanningen. In de aanloop naar de klimaatconferentie in Kopenhagen zullen wij onze ambitie moeten handhaven, geflankeerd door een breed scala aan maatregelen. Dit verslag levert daaraan een bijzonder waardevolle bijdrage.

3-019

Roger Helmer (NI). – Mr President, 500 years ago there was a consensus amongst learned men that the world was flat. They were wrong. In the 1970s, after three decades of global cooling, there was a consensus amongst scientists that we were facing a new ice age. They were wrong. In 1999 everybody believed that the millennium bug would create a global disaster by closing down computer systems across the world. Weapon systems would fail, commerce would stop, aircraft would fall out of the sky. They were wrong. Nothing at all happened.

Today we are told there is a consensus around catastrophic man-made global warming. It, too, is wrong. Nor is it a consensus. The myth of consensus is a propaganda triumph for the alarmists, but repeated surveys both of the scientific literature and of working climate scientists show a wide range of views on both sides of the debate, with many believing that the jury is still out.

It is true that the world has warmed slightly, although slowly and intermittently, over the last 150 years, but this is entirely consistent with well-established long-term natural climate cycles that gave us the Roman Optimum, the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age. There is clear evidence that, while the world has warmed slightly, other bodies in the solar system have also warmed. Ice caps have shrunk on Mars, yet nobody imagines that industrial emissions or 4x4s are to blame.

We are now planning to spend unimaginable sums of money on mitigation measures which simply will not work and which, by damaging our economies, will deny us the funds we need to address real environmental problems. As a British journalist, Christopher Booker, has remarked, global warming alarmism is the greatest collective flight from reality in human history.

3-020

Pilar del Castillo Vera (PPE-DE). – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar, agradecer a nuestro colega Florenz el trabajo realizado, al presidente de la comisión, naturalmente también, y a todos los coordinadores y miembros de la misma.

Este informe es una expresión más de lo que ha sido la preocupación permanente de la Unión Europea respecto del cambio climático y sus consecuencias.

El último conjunto de medidas fue el recientemente aprobado paquete energético y este informe que hoy debatimos se inserta por tanto en esa línea para combatir el cambio climático y en esa sensibilidad mostrada por la Unión Europea.

El informe que tenemos delante es un conjunto — en realidad, como ya se ha dicho— de recomendaciones. Es un universo comprensivo de distintas medidas y recomendaciones, pero que, a su vez, tienen «hojas de ruta» distintas —sectorialmente en relación con la pesca, la agricultura, las aguas, el bosque, etc. Todas esas «hojas de ruta» conducen al mismo horizonte, pero a través de cada una de ellas es necesario desarrollar medidas.

Pero yo me voy a quedar con lo que a mí me parece el principio fundamental para ser eficaces. Y es que, frente al cambio climático, no cabe nada más que mejorar a través de la eficiencia y éste tiene que ser el principio de referencia, a mi modo de ver, de todas las medidas que se tomen.

Mejorar a través de la eficiencia significa primar la innovación tecnológica; significa primar por objetivos de eficiencia a la hora de conceder ayudas y subvenciones; significa primar por objetivos de eficiencia a la hora de conceder determinadas ventajas fiscales, etc. etc. Por tanto, la única solución para que realmente seamos eficaces es mejorar a través de la eficiencia.

3-021

Guido Sacconi (PSE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i colleghi che sono intervenuti prima di me hanno dimostrato efficacemente quanto il nostro lavoro sia riuscito a fondere e a portare a sintesi sensibilità molto diverse che sono confluite in un progetto comune.

La relazione Florenz, al quale va riconosciuto il merito di essere riuscito appunto a operare questa sintesi con grande capacità d'ascolto, è in ultima analisi, diciamo, un progetto di riconversione energetica, di cambiamento generale dei sistemi di produzione e dei modelli di vita e di consumo. Non è una cosa facile, non è un proclama filosofico, prevede anche delle tappe d'avvicinamento. Per esempio, in questa specie di eredità che noi consegniamo al prossimo Parlamento sono anche indicate quelle che secondo noi dovranno essere le priorità d'azione nella prossima legislatura, verso Copenaghen e oltre Copenaghen.

Ma io voglio soffermarmi sui contenuti. Io credo a me spetti l'obbligo prima di tutto di ringraziare chi è stato il protagonista principale di questo lavoro, il segretariato. Io ho qui una statistica dei nostri lavori, cito solo le otto sessioni tematiche che abbiamo organizzato con sessanta dei massimi esperti mondiali; solo organizzare questo traffico, diciamo, dà conto di quanto sia stato importante il loro lavoro.

E poi soprattutto volevo rivolgere un appello, diciamo un auspicio, per il nuovo Parlamento. Lei Presidente Pöttering, in prima persona, ha dimostrato di crederci alla scommessa di questa commissione che – diciamo la verità – quando un anno e mezzo fa è nata non era vista da tutti molto bene in questo Parlamento. Lei ci è venuto due volte a trovare, segnalando così la sua personale sensibilità per il tema e per il nostro lavoro. Allora mi rivolgo anche a lei direttamente, se me lo consente. Sarebbe un peccato se il prossimo Parlamento non si dotasse di un analogo strumento nella prossima legislatura, anche perché nel frattempo in molti parlamenti nazionali e in molti governi ci si è ristrutturati proprio assumendo il clima come uno specifico settore di lavoro. Ecco, io spero che nel prossimo Parlamento non torneranno a prevalere i compartimenti stagni, le logiche separate delle diverse commissioni, ma appunto che, secondo modalità che abbiamo suggerito, ci si attrezzi allo scopo per questo lungo cammino verso un'economia a basso contenuto di carbone.

3-022

Vittorio Prodi (ALDE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il collega Florenz per questo lavoro.

Finalmente noi arriviamo a votare per questo lavoro, che è durato un anno e mezzo di commissione sul cambiamento climatico, che personalmente ritengo un successo anche se modesto. Successo perché il Parlamento ha dimostrato di essere fra le istituzioni quella più sensibile al cambiamento, dotandosi di uno strumento ad hoc – la commissione temporanea, appunto – per raccogliere dati ed elementi di riflessione su una questione che ci tocca tutti e i cui effetti sono e saranno un problema da risolvere collettivamente. Modesto perché, nonostante tutti gli sforzi e l'alto livello degli interventi e degli studi effettuati, il risultato manca ancora del mordente che dovrebbe avere una risoluzione su questo tema.

Il cambiamento climatico, come ho più volte ripetuto, è una questione urgente e grave e va trattata con strumenti specifici ed efficaci. L'abbiamo voluta questa commissione proprio per avere la possibilità di una trasversalità fra le politiche che sono state sempre trattate in modo troppo disperso. Mi auguro che questo possa continuare nel futuro Parlamento e che il Parlamento continui ad essere coinvolto anche per quanto riguarda i negoziati per Copenaghen.

Abbiamo bisogno di un consenso globale e per questo noi dobbiamo dare delle offerte soprattutto ai paesi in via di sviluppo e qui mancano ancora delle condizioni di equità che portino con convinzione i popoli in via di sviluppo in questa

politica. E' un po' troppo eurocentrica, è un po' troppo anche così compartimentalizzata. Noi siamo di fronte a un cambiamento di civiltà e dobbiamo politicamente dare delle proposte che sono prima di tutto questa e poi anche, diciamo, una progressiva smaterializzazione della nostra civiltà, perché altrimenti non sarà sostenibile.

3-023

Alessandro Foglietta (UEN). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, complimenti al presidente Florenz. Quando lo chiamo presidente lo chiamo con la stima e la considerazione per l'impegno che ha sempre avuto nel nostro Parlamento.

Grazie all'approvazione del pacchetto clima-energia l'Unione europea si è dotata di un quadro legislativo che le permette di avere le carte in regola per assumere un ruolo leader. Le recenti aperture annunciate dalla nuova amministrazione americana fanno sperare in un futuro impegno condiviso anche dagli Stati Uniti per arrestare le conseguenze del cambiamento climatico.

Tuttavia, per un pieno successo della trattativa sarà determinante il coinvolgimento di tutte quelle economie dei paesi in sviluppo, come la Cina e l'India, e sarà possibile, come ha evidenziato il ministro dell'Ambiente cinese durante l'incontro che abbiamo avuto con la delegazione della commissione clima, soltanto con il contributo solidale dei paesi più ricchi che garantiscono adeguate risorse finanziarie per promuovere uno sviluppo sostenibile.

Un passo avanti in questo senso è stato compiuto con la conferenza di Poznan e con la decisione di rendere operativo il Fondo di adattamento, nonché la dotazione di 50 milioni di euro per la ricerca e lo sviluppo tecnologico, stanziati in favore dei paesi in via di sviluppo quale sostegno al progresso delle tecnologie verdi a livello globale.

Dobbiamo fare in modo che Copenaghen segni la svolta decisiva in un impegno comune e concreto dei paesi economicamente più forti per la creazione di un fondo che garantisca un flusso finanziario costante per il finanziamento dello sviluppo sostenibile nei paesi emergenti. Soltanto mediante impegni concordati a livello internazionale e con il coinvolgimento dei paesi emergenti riusciremo a salvaguardare l'ambiente da effetti irreversibili e, nello stesso tempo, a preservare la competitività delle imprese europee dagli effetti e dai costi socioeconomici di *dumping* ambientale sul mercato globale.

3-024

Caroline Lucas (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I add my thanks to Mr Florenz for his report but I think, amidst all the congratulations to the rapporteur and to the committee for its work, we need to face some cold facts: the EU is still doing too little, too late.

I do not expect to be popular for saying so, but we need to be measuring the EU's progress not against what other countries are doing, but against what needs to be done. Against that measure we are still failing.

We are failing in not bringing sufficient ambition to this debate. The latest science tells us we need to be reducing emissions by around 9% year on year. The targets set out in this report and in the EU's climate package are simply not ambitious enough.

We are failing in not bringing enough urgency to this debate. If we are not well on the way to a zero-carbon economy in the next eight to ten years we will have lost the opportunity to have halted the worst of climate change.

We are failing in not being consistent. Today we speak of renewables and energy efficiency. Yesterday a majority in this House adopted the Laperrouze report which proudly upheld the role of coal in Europe.

We are failing in giving the impression that the climate change debate is all about giving things up, about doing without things. We need to get much better at showing real political leadership and demonstrating that action on climate change will bring us a better quality of life. It is not about shivering around a candle in a cave: it is about a future that can be more positive and attractive than today's.

So I commend to you the idea of adopting a green new deal for Europe, a way of addressing both the economic crisis and the climate crisis, with a major investment in energy efficiency and renewables, to create millions of new green jobs in Europe.

But that is not about kick-starting economic growth in a 'business as usual' direction. It is about an urgently-needed transition not to a Europe based on the ever-increasing consumption of natural resources, but to a steady-state economy for Europe; not more aggregate quantitative growth, but real qualitative development. That debate urgently needs to be begun, and the EU is very well placed to start it.

3-025

Roberto Musacchio (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio dare atto al collega Karl-Heinz Florenz di avere svolto un buon lavoro, frutto di una presenza, di un'attenzione, di una partecipazione costanti.

La sua relazione è frutto appunto del contributo che egli ha dato al lavoro della commissione, che è stata così ben presieduta dal collega Sacconi, e che ha svolto approfondimento, dibattito, ma soprattutto ha contribuito al ruolo che questo Parlamento ha avuto nell'approvazione del pacchetto clima. Presidente Pöttering, anch'io le consegno il tema di come questo nostro lavoro possa e debba continuare verso Copenaghen.

Per quanto riguarda adesso la relazione di Florenz, troverei sbagliato alterarne l'equilibrio con emendamenti che a questo punto hanno un carattere ideologico sulla questione del nucleare. Non sono condivisibili, sono fuori contesto al di là del pensiero di chi li propone, alterano il lavoro comune. Mentre pregherei i colleghi di valutare l'inserimento di un emendamento che ho proposto sul rapporto tra il cambio climatico e l'acqua, che mi pare copra uno spazio utile anche alla luce del crescere dell'attenzione degli organismi internazionali, l'IPCC e l'UNEP, che indicano questo tema come decisivo per il futuro e anche in vista dell'appuntamento ad Istanbul del *World Water Forum*.

3-026

Jim Allister (NI). – Mr President, I want to raise a voice of concern and caution in this frenzied debate about climate change, particularly as it could affect food production. We are told that the world population will spiral to nine billion by 2050, thus food production must correspondingly increase. Yet within this proposed climate change package we have emission-reduction demands which, if met, would reduce food production when we need it most.

I refer in particular to the targets on methane and nitrous oxide, and the assault on meat and dairy consumption. These reduction targets cannot be met without serious diminution in food production. Faced with the choice of feeding the world or ticking climate change correction boxes, I am afraid I am on the side of common sense and necessity.

3-027

John Bowis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, we head now to Copenhagen, and my honourable friend's excellent report is a good – if I dare say it – road map, or rail map, on how we should get there.

Twenty per cent by 2020 was a start – but only a start. The package of climate measures that we have taken perhaps could have been better, but they were a start – they were a step forward. Now, with the changes in administration in the United States, we can no longer hide behind the United States' refusal to cooperate. With the Obama presidency, we have the opportunity to stop exchanging words and start exchanging ideas. We hear that a meeting will take place on 6 March 2008. The following week we are back here and I hope we will have a statement from the Council on the result of its meetings in Washington. With the United States, we can now move to that 30% target and beyond.

We are moving on now to ecodesign, realising here, as elsewhere, that it means tremendous new opportunities in innovation and jobs. We need to move on to shipping and to agricultural emissions. The Commissioner has referred to the urgent need to talk to the low-income countries in the developing world. They will be devastated, but they did not cause this problem. Islands will sink beneath the waves; malaria, respiratory disease, skin cancer and eyesight problems are already happening. Devastation will come to agriculture. They must take action, but they need our help.

Scientists, of course, can be wrong and so can politicians, as we saw with Mbeki and AIDS. I may be wrong about the possible flu pandemic. I may be wrong about the probable impact of global warming. However, the majority of scientists may be right; the majority of politicians may be right. I and we will be culpable on both issues if I and we fail to take action to ensure that neither happens.

3-028

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME MARTINE ROURE
Vice-présidente

3-029

Riitta Myller (PSE). – Arvoisa puhemies, sosiaalidemokraattien aloitteesta keväällä 2007 perustettu tilapäinen ilmastonmuutosvaliokunta on kantamassa tänään hyvää hedelmää. Ryhmien välisten neuvottelujen ja keskustelujen lopputuloksena on syntymässä kunnianhimoinen pitkän tähtäyksen toimintaohjelma ilmastonmuutoksen hillitsemiseksi. Tästä parhaimmat kiitokset esittelijä Karl-Heinz Florenzille ja kaikkien ryhmien varjoesittelijöille, jotka ovat tehneet hyvää yhteistyötä.

Monet olivat skeptisiä siinä, tuoko ilmastonmuutosvaliokunta lisäarvoa parlamentin työlle. Tänään voimme nähdä voiman, joka on siinä, kun eri näkökulmista asioita tarkastelevat parlamentin jäsenet tekevät yhteistyötä ja kuuntelevat yhdessä maailman huippuasiantuntijoita. Siitä syntyy lopputulos, joka on uskottava, niin kuin näemme.

Olen varma, että valiokunnan olemassaolo sinällään ja sen työ erikseen mahdollisti omalta osaltaan myös ilmastopakettien intensiivisen ja nopean läpiviennin viime joulukuussa. Tuen myös voimakkaasti valiokunnan puheenjohtajan Guido Sacconin vetoamusta siitä, että vaalien jälkeinen parlamentti tarttuu tähän asiaan ja järjestää ilmastonmuutosasioiden hoitamisen parlamentissa mahdollisimman järkevällä tavalla.

Euroopan unionissa on ollut jo kauan tahtotila siitä, että tarvitsemme toimia ilmastonmuutoksen torjumiseen. Meiltä on kuitenkin puuttunut rahoitusvälineet. Nyt ehdotettu ilmastorahasto, johon varat kerätään päästökaupan huutokauppatuloista, on merkittävä aloite, ja toivon sille erinomaista jatkoa tulevaisuudessa. Me tarvitsemme sitä, jotta saamme aikaan muutoksen teollisessa rakenteessamme ja jotta todella pääsemme tähän uuteen vihreään diiliin.

3-030

Lena Ek (ALDE). – Det här betänkandet lovar väldigt mycket. Det innehåller i stort sett varje ämne som har nämnts i klimatkussionen under drygt två år. Ändå saknar det, tycker jag, den spets och den drive och det tryck i det här arbetet som faktiskt behövs för att fullfölja den politiska linje som vi har startat i Europa när det gäller klimatfrågorna.

När det gäller skydd av mark och jord finns det inga åtgärder. När det gäller vattenresurser finns det ett helt paket med förslag i World Water Forum som hade kunnat lyftas in. När det gäller energieffektivitet finns det möjligheter som inte finns med där vi förfogar över beslutsmöjligheter i parlamentet. Alternativa bränslen behandlas också alldeles för återhållsamt. På det stora viktiga området om hälsa fokuserar man på insamling av fakta och kontroll av myggbett där vi i stället behöver stora strategiska beslut i Europa för att klara klimateffekterna vad gäller människors hälsa.

Det är också så att här finns möjligheter. Här hade vi behövt utveckla mer när det gäller tillväxt och jobb. Det finns ju möjlighet att skapa jobb i Europa. De behövs här.

Vi behöver förankra åtgärderna i den ekonomiska politiken. Om några veckor samlas ministerrådet för att diskutera finansiering av de beslut som ska tas i Köpenhamn. Oerhört viktiga beslut där vi i parlamentet hade kunnat påverka väldigt mycket. Utan den här förankringen i den ekonomiska politiken och i en politik för arbete och tillväxt riskerar det här betänkandet att bli ”like a candle in the wind”, ett trevligt dokument, men utan det driv och den beslutsamhet som vi behöver i de här frågorna.

3-031

Bogdan Pęk (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Czuję się tu jak na kongresie założycielskim nowej religii, religii fałszywej, pełnej fałszywych proroków i fałszywych idei.

W obliczu tego kryzysu, za który odpowiedzialność ponoszą te same siły polityczne, które zmierzają do radykalnego ograniczenia emisji dwutlenku węgla kosztem zmniejszenia rozwoju cywilizacji ludzkiej, bez podstaw naukowych, należy obciążyć tych, którzy na drodze tej cywilizacji zmierzają do tworzenia rządu światowego złożonego z tych samych gremiów, które zarobią ogromne pieniądze na handlu emisjami, a jednocześnie będą mogły ludzi maluczkich groźbami zmian klimatycznych.

Musimy tworzyć podstawy rozwoju energii. Ludzkości do przetrwania i rozwoju potrzebne są nowe, potężne źródła energii, a Europie równowaga energetyczna i samowystarczalność. Czy Wy tego nie pojmujecie? Jeżeli stworzycie to, co dzisiaj zostało uchwalone, zmniejszycie szanse Europy na konkurowanie ze światem.

3-032

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση Florenz στηρίζεται στις εκτιμήσεις των επιστημόνων και συμμερίζεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό τις ανησυχίες των πολιτών. Είναι ένα βήμα πιο μπροστά από το ενεργειακό πακέτο που ενέκρινε το Συμβούλιο τον Δεκέμβριο, είναι ανάγκη όμως να φύγουμε από τις εκτιμήσεις και να περάσουμε στα συγκεκριμένα μέτρα, τις κανονιστικές ρυθμίσεις, τα χρονοδιαγράμματα, γιατί οι κλιματικές αλλαγές και οι συνέπειές τους είναι εδώ και δεν χωρούν νέες αναβολές.

Πρέπει να προσέξουμε να μην επιτρέψουμε σε αυτή την έκθεση να μπει, με πονηρές τροπολογίες από την πίσω πόρτα, το άσχετο σε αυτή την έκθεση θέμα της πυρηνικής ενέργειας όπως επιδιώκουν μερικές κυβερνήσεις. Πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε ότι αυτή η έκθεση, χωρίς αλλαγές που αλλοιώνουν την ισορροπία της, θα πιέσει το Συμβούλιο και την Επιτροπή να κάνουν ένα βήμα πάρα πέρα και να μην υπονομευθούν οι προσπάθειες που έχουν γίνει μέχρι τώρα στο όνομα της οικονομικής κρίσης. Οικονομική κρίση και περιβαλλοντικές πολιτικές μπορούν να συμβαδίσουν και να έχουμε θετικό αποτέλεσμα και στο περιβάλλον και στη δημιουργία θέσεων απασχόλησης.

3-033

Urszula Krupa (IND/DEM). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Z polityki ochrony klimatu, podobnie jak z pakietu energetyczno-klimatycznego z drastyczną redukcją gazów cieplarnianych, wyłania się przewodni cel, jakim jest kontrola i przekształcenie narodowego charakteru gospodarek, w stronę znanej nam z przeszłości gospodarki sterowanej centralnie. Abstrakcyjna koncepcja wpływu człowieka na klimat ma przebiegać poprzez ograniczenie możliwości rozwoju, w tym korzystania z paliw kopalnych, wprowadzanie niebezpiecznych technologii CCS, co w Polsce utrudni korzystanie z naturalnych bogactw, w tym z bogatych źródeł energii geotermalnej.

Po likwidacji polskiego przemysłu w ramach dostosowań do Unii Europejskiej próbuje się nie tylko zmusić Polaków do emigracji, ale resztę zubożyć poprzez wymuszenie najwyższych cen energii spośród wszystkich państw Unii Europejskiej. Pozostaje retoryczne pytanie: czy głównym celem polityki unijnej jest bankructwo moich rodaków wraz z wymazaniem Polski z mapy Europy?

3-034

Irena Belohorská (NI). – Vážené dámy a vážení páni, najskôr mi dovoľte poďakovať sa pánu Florenzovi ako spravodajcovi za túto excelentnú a obsiahlu správu. Zachytáva všetky dôležité oblasti života spoločnosti smerom k dramaticky postupujúcej zmene klímy. Je najvyšší čas, aby sme aj v rámci Európskej únie pripravili potrebné opatrenia.

Ako lekára ma zaujímajú predovšetkým zmeny, ktoré sa premietnu do oblasti zdravotníctva, ako napríklad nástup ochorení, ktoré sú typické pre tropické pásma. Na tento fakt by sme mali myslieť pri podpore farmaceutického priemyslu, pri plánovaní nemocníc a lôžkových zariadení, ale aj pri príprave zdravotníckeho personálu a predovšetkým pri dôslednom informovaní obyvateľstva. Keďže ide o diagnózy v našom pásme raritné, dá sa predpokladať aj podstatne dramatickejší priebeh.

Veľmi závažná situácia nastane aj v poľnohospodárstve a pri zabezpečovaní dostatku potravín pre obyvateľstvo. Pevne verím, že táto správa, daleko významnejšia ako sú ostatné iniciatívne správy, bude dobrým základom pre budúci Parlament, ktorý bude musieť riešiť konkrétne dosahy zmeny klímy.

3-035

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Madam President, the time for talking is over and we know what needs to be done – at least those of us who accept the peer-reviewed science on the causes of the unprecedented rate of global warming and its critical impacts on all aspects of biodiversity, particularly on the poorest and most populated regions of our world. To my climate-sceptic friends, could I say that the precautionary principle should be considered. I would recommend it to them.

I should like to thank Karl-Heinz Florenz for his report. It adds to our sum of knowledge, representing, as it does, the horizontal views across a range of committees in this House, with one serious omission – that of the Committee on Fisheries, given the critical importance of the increasing acidification of our seas and oceans from increased CO₂ emissions in the atmosphere.

I have one question for Commissioner Dimas: following our first-reading agreement on my report on the revised EU-ETS six weeks ago, could the Commissioner put on record today exactly what work programme is in train for preparing the comitology decisions, particularly the timing and involvement of this Parliament and the stakeholders?

In conclusion, our target must be at least a 30% decrease in CO₂ emissions by 2020 as part of a post-2012 global agreement, with at least an 80% decrease by 2050 – and that is the more important target. The result of the next eight months of climate diplomacy will write the text of our history books for generations and, as political leaders in our own communities and collectively, we cannot renege on our responsibility.

Commissioner, our climate and energy package must be accompanied by realistic funds, and we look to the summit in March – in six weeks' time – for our 27 leaders of state and government to be on-message and not to let us, the citizens of the EU, and the poorest and most climate-vulnerable communities in our world, down.

3-036

Linda McAvan (PSE). – Madam President, as this is the end of the work by the Temporary Committee on Climate Change, I want to thank, firstly, Karl-Heinz Florenz for his work, but also – from my own group, the Socialist Group – Riitta Myller, Dorette Corbey and our Chair, Guido Sacconi. They have all done an excellent job and provided a good basis for the work in the future Parliament.

The report before us is long; it makes many points. I would just like to highlight one point, which some people have already touched upon, and that is the important link that we need to make between jobs and tackling climate change, and between getting out of the economic crisis and tackling climate change. Because, if we do not make that link and we do not get the economic recovery programmes right, people will start to say – and they are already saying it – that this climate change stuff was all very well when there was economic growth but we cannot afford to make all these investments now.

We have to argue very strongly, as people have here, that we cannot afford *not* to make those investments. I think those who talked about bankrupting their countries by doing this are very wrong. Their countries will become bankrupt unless we invest in renewable energies and unless we reduce our energy dependency on insecure sources of fossil fuels. So we have to get this package of measures right.

President Obama has already made this link in his talk about the economic recovery programme for the United States, and we need to do it here. Dorette Corbey talked about what can be done in the way of energy efficiency measures. If I look around my own constituency, Yorkshire, I can already see considerable investments in renewable technologies, in energy-efficiency measures in different companies. Now we have plans to develop carbon capture and storage in many of our power plants and major industries. This will create jobs and it will also help us cut our emissions, which of course is the object of all the work we have been doing.

3-037

Johannes Lebech (ALDE). – Fru formand! Forebyggelsen af klimaforandringer skal, som betænkningen også lægger op til, være en del af hele vores tankegang, når vi arbejder med relevante lovområder som landbrug, fiskeri, byggeri, udviklings- og udenrigspolitik. Klimapolitikken kan ikke stå alene, den skal integreres i hele vores lovgivning.

EU's stats- og regeringsledere besluttede for snart to år siden, at EU skulle tage lederskabet for at sikre en global klimaaftale i København. Der er ikke længe til. Vi har nu vedtaget vores klimapakke her i Parlamentet i EU. Den kunne have været mere ambitiøs, men den er der, og vi må nu støtte de europæiske forhandlere, for at de kan nå et ambitiøst mål i København. Pakken fører os frem til 2020, men med denne betænkning understreger vi, at det allerede nu er nødvendigt at planlægge, hvad der skal ske efter 2020. Det må EU's regeringer tage til efterretning. Der er behov for at tænke langsigtet. Finanskrisen gør det ikke lettere, men vi må se finanskrisen som en dynamisk udfordring. Lad os bruge krisen som en mulighed for at sætte gang i den hårdt tiltrængte udvikling af vedvarende energi og energibesparende teknologier. Lad os skabe nye jobs i fremtidens grønne industrier frem for at beskytte jobs i gårdsdagens industrier.

Endelig er jeg glad for, at behovet for at ratificere Lissabontraktatens understreges, da kampen mod klimaforandringerne på internationalt plan ifølge Lissabontraktaten skal være en specifik målsætning for EU.

3-038

Inese Vaidere (UEN). – Godātie kolēgi! Klimata politikas izstrādei ir liela nozīme gan no vides viedokļa, gan arī nepieciešamības modernizēt enerģētiku. Pozitīvi vērtējama Kioto progresā ņemšana vērtā valstīm, kam ir vairāk nekā 20% emisiju samazinājums no 1990. gada, arī Ignalinas slēgšanas ietekme uz Lietuvas un Latvijas energoapgādi, paredzot kompensācijas iespēju, taču katrai dalībvalstij jāizstrādā skaidra energoefektivitātes stratēģija. Papildu kvotas rūpniecībai, veicinot tās konkurētspēju, tomēr apgrūtinās finansējuma iegūšanu. Pozitīvi, ka paredzēts vienkāršot Eiropas Savienības fondu saņemšanas procedūras, palielināt Eiropas Investīciju bankas aizdevumu apjomu – īpaši maziem un vidējiem uzņēmumiem. Lai tiktu sasniegti 2020. gada mērķi, jāizveido efektīva Eiropas Savienības mēroga stimulēšanas sistēma, atbalstot uzņēmumus un personas, kuri kā enerģijas avotus izmanto vai ievieš atjaunīgos energoresursus. To varētu izdarīt, centralizēti sedzot daļu no izmaksām. Komisijai enerģiski jāstrādā, lai arī pārējā pasaule sekotu mūsu paraugam, lai mūsu tehnoloģijas būtu pieejamas attīstības valstīm. Paldies!

3-039

Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, cuirim fáilte roimh an tuarascáil chinntitheach chríochnúil ón Uasal Florenz agus ón choiste um Athrú Aeráide.

Tá an t-athrú aeráide ag tabhairt dúshláin dár ndearcadh maidir le hiompar, le húsáid talún, le bainistíocht dramhaíola, le hobair tógála agus le húsáid fuinnimh. Níor chruthaigh an domhan i mbéal forbartha na coinníollacha atá á dtarraingt i dtreo damáiste dho-iompaíthe, ach is iad féin is mó atá ag fulaingt. Caithfidh an Eoraip a bheith ina ceannródaí agus dul i gceannas ar na beartuithe réadúla, riachtanacha ar bhonn idirnáisiúnta.

Rinne fórsaí nach bhfuil comh forásach sin iarracht an laghdú eacnamaíoch a úsáid mar leithscéal ar mhaithe le gan na gealltanais aeráide riachtanacha a chomhlíonadh. Tá sé seo gearr-radharcach ar fad.

Ar an drochuair, i mo dháilcheantar féin, tá an tAire Comhshaoil, Sammy Wilson, ar dhuine de na polaiteoirí gearr-radharcacha seo atá gan tuiscint ar na réaltachtaí eolaíocha agus praiticiúla a théann le hathrú aeráide. Tá súil agam go dtiocfaidh an tAire ar a chiall agus go dtabharfaidh sé faoin cheist, rud atá an chuid eile don Eoraip ag brú chun tosaigh cheana féin.

3-040

Kathy Sinnott (IND/DEM). – Madam President, we have here an ambitious plan. A plan to do nothing less than save the world: a big job at the best of times. When the draft report was first presented by Mr Florenz to the committee, its first call to action was that we bear in mind that we humans are protectors of creation. This simple statement was the first to be attacked and removed. What was so objectionable to the committee? The word ‘creation’. Why? Because creation has a creator.

It does not matter to me how the universe was created, or in what time frame. What is important to me is that there is a God and that we are stewards who must, as Amendment 22 puts it, safeguard creation. So, as I say, we are here today setting ourselves the task of saving the world, setting a course of action that will require the cooperation and sacrifice of everyone everywhere, a task which, to be successful, will also require the cooperation of the winds, water and the sun. But, even knowing this, we are at the same time making it clear, as we have done in the past with other great challenges, that we think we can take on the enormous and urgent challenges that face mankind without help from above. Well, all I can say is: good luck with it, and may God spare us.

3-041

Jerzy Buzek (PPE-DE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałem dołączyć do gratulacji i podziękowań dla Karla-Heinza Florenza za dobre sprawozdanie. Nie chciałbym wchodzić w szczegóły tego sprawozdania. Dla mnie jest ono po prostu przyjęcia.

Chciałbym jeszcze wrócić do pakietu klimatycznego, który uchwaliliśmy w grudniu i podkreślić, że Unia Europejska ma rzeczywiście pakiet bardzo zrównoważony, który nie zagraża gospodarce. W ciągu kilkumiesięcznej dyskusji dokonaliśmy w tym pakiecie daleko idących zmian. To jest nasz wielki sukces. Chciałem teraz sformułować dwa najważniejsze, według mnie, zadania dla Unii Europejskiej. Pierwszym zadaniem jest odpowiednie finansowanie tego, co uchwaliliśmy, czyli pakietu, a także finansowanie, które wynika ze sprawozdania Florenza.

W zeszłym roku byłem sprawozdawcą *SET-Planu* i mówiliśmy przede wszystkim o tym, że nowe technologie, które mogą dać gospodarce europejskiej innowacyjność i nowy napęd ekonomiczny, muszą być na początku finansowane na poziomie Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego chciałem bardzo pogratulować Komisji, a gratulacje składam na ręce pana komisarza Dimasa, decyzji o przeznaczeniu 3,5 mld euro z niewykorzystanych środków właśnie na inwestycje i na badania w zakresie technologii energetycznych, służących także ochronie klimatu. Panie komisarzu, to jest bardzo dobra decyzja. Teraz musimy szybko rozpatrzyć ją w Parlamencie. Zwracam się do pana ministra Bursika: także Rada powinna szybko rozpatrzyć tę wstępną decyzję Komisji Europejskiej.

Drugą bardzo ważną sprawą jest to, że musimy oprzeć się na światowym porozumieniu. Przy takim założeniu pisane było sprawozdanie Florenza. Nie wystarczą negocjacje dwóch krajów – Polski i Kopenhagi – odpowiedzialnych za COP 14 i COP 15. Musimy włączyć się my wszyscy – dyplomaci europejscy, a nie tylko przedstawiciele prezydencji czeskiej. Nasi dyplomaci powinni na całym świecie negocjować, bo bez tego porozumienia światowego nasz pakiet i sprawozdanie Florenza mają małe znaczenie. To jest dla nas dzisiaj najważniejsze.

3-042

Catherine Guy-Quint (PSE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le président en exercice du Conseil, mes chers collègues, le rapport de notre collègue Florenz précise parfaitement les résultats de nos longs travaux sur ce problème majeur du réchauffement climatique.

Nous savons tous que les dispositifs à mettre en œuvre sont colossaux et que, plus que tout, nous devons nous donner les moyens de changer notre culture de développement débridé, en stimulant l'évolution de notre économie.

Le problème maintenant est de savoir comment nous pouvons mettre toutes les recommandations de ce rapport en œuvre. Nous devons rapidement trouver les moyens pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique. Or, le budget actuel de l'Union est insuffisant pour atteindre les objectifs en la matière. Ce n'est pas non plus en faisant appel aux budgets nationaux et aux fonds privés que nous ne pourrions résoudre ce problème majeur du financement.

La Commission européenne estime à 175 milliards d'euros par an les investissements nécessaires pour lutter contre le réchauffement climatique. Avec un budget de 76 milliards, nous sommes loin du compte. La Commission va donc dresser l'inventaire de tous les instruments existants, mais l'élaboration des propositions pour le futur cadre financier sera un gros travail.

Pour optimiser toutes nos actions face à cette crise climatique, il faut de nouvelles ressources pour créer un Fonds européen sur le changement climatique qui pourra être financé par le système d'échange de quotas d'émission et qui sera utilisé pour soutenir l'adaptation, l'atténuation, la consommation durable, l'efficacité énergétique, et dont une grande partie doit être consacrée aux pays les plus pauvres.

Cela nécessite du courage politique de la part du Conseil, de la Commission et des parlementaires, mais c'est la condition nécessaire, indispensable, pour que la planète relève ce défi.

Il n'y aura pas d'avenir à notre civilisation si nous, Européens, nous ne prenons pas les moyens de nous imposer une discipline pour conserver le climat. C'est l'acte politique majeur, l'acte politique vital pour donner un avenir équilibré à notre continent et aux autres....

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'orateur)

3-043

Holger Krahmer (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich danke dem Kollegen Karl-Heinz Florenz sehr für seinen Bericht, der leider nicht der große Wurf geworden ist, was wohl auch damit zu tun hat, dass er sehr im Schatten des Gesetztespakets zum Klimawandel diskutiert wurde.

Wir müssen uns den Folgen des Klimawandels stellen, keine Frage, nur bei der Wahl der Mittel kann ich dem Bericht nicht in allen Punkten zustimmen. Erstens ist es richtig, dass die EU die ersten Schritte beim Klimaschutz macht, aber es ist nicht konstruktiv, einsam voranzueilen, ohne Partner mit einzubeziehen. Europas Vorreiterrolle allein wird den Rest der Welt nicht überzeugen. Ein tragfähiger Ansatz muss die Industriestaaten sowie mindestens China, Indien und Brasilien einbeziehen. Sonst bleibt Europas Wirtschaft einseitig belastet, ohne dass es messbare Auswirkungen auf die globale CO₂-Emission gibt. Zweitens können erneuerbare Energien nach heutigem Kenntnisstand die fossilen Energieträger nicht vollständig ersetzen. Es mag politisch motivierend sein, das zu fordern, realistisch ist es dennoch nicht. Der politische

Wille, und sei er auch noch so groß, setzt keine physikalischen Gesetze außer Kraft. Drittens werden biologische Kraftstoffe als umweltschonende Alternative gepriesen. Bislang sind deren negativen Nebeneffekte auf Nahrungsmittelpreise, die dadurch steigen, oder Regenwälder, die abgeholzt werden, nicht unter Kontrolle. Viertens ist eine langfristig Ressourcen schonende Mobilität ein sinnvolles Ziel. Anreize zu setzen kann helfen, dieses Ziel zu erreichen. Nur sollten wir uns überlegen, wann staatliche Eingriffe zu weit führen und ab welchem Punkt wir uns Wissen anmaßen, das wir heute nicht haben.

Heute weiß niemand, welche Technologien das Bedürfnis nach individueller Mobilität in 50 Jahren am besten erfüllen werden. Schon gar nicht wissen es Politiker besser als Ingenieure.

Begonnen mit guten Absichten ist nun leider ein Bericht übrig geblieben mit viel niedergeschriebenem Wunschdenken, mit moralischen Appellen und erhobenem Zeigefinger. Die Zustimmung der deutschen Liberalen kann das so leider nicht finden.

3-044

Bogusław Rogalski (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Uplynie jeszcze wiele czasu, zanim politycy przekonają się, że to nie spalanie węgla, a słoneczna aktywność leży u podstaw zjawisk klimatycznych. Jeszcze dłużej będzie trwało przekonywanie o tym społeczeństw oślepianych natrętną propagandą ekologiczną.

Skoro klimat ziemski zależy od zjawisk rozgrywających się w kosmosie, to trzeba zgodzić się z tym, że ludzkie próby wpływania na klimat są skazane na niepowodzenie. Wielokrotnie na ziemi bywały okresy ocieplenia i podwyższonego stężenia dwutlenku węgla w powietrzu, ale ocieplenie pojawiało się zawsze kilkanaście wieków wcześniej niż wzrost stężenia dwutlenku węgla. W czasie intensywnych zlodowaceń oziębieniu klimatu nie przeszkadzało, że powietrze zawierało wtedy do kilkunastu razy więcej dwutlenku węgla, niż obecnie.

Gdyby ten fakt został uznany, ludzkość mogłaby zaoszczędzić miliardy dolarów poprzez rezygnację z działań, które nie mają sensu. Te pieniądze można przeznaczyć na walkę z ubóstwem i nowe technologie. Jeśli nie wiadomo, o co chodzi, to chodzi o pieniądze, o handel emisjami. Brawo! Cóż za klimatyczny majstersztyk!

3-045

Derek Roland Clark (IND/DEM). – Madam President, a mystique bordering on a religious creed has grown up around this alleged global warming. The environmental scientist has had a field day, but the natural world obeys the laws of physics and chemistry, subjects which I taught for 39 years.

The global warming theory has cast CO₂, a natural constituent of the atmosphere, as a demon gas. It does have the effect – slightly – of trapping heat around the world, but how? You need to draw a graph showing how CO₂ perhaps causes warming.

Is it an arithmetic graph – I must become technical – where equal rises in CO₂ cause equal rises in warming? Is it an exponential graph – a runaway – where CO₂ in extra amounts causes an ever-increasing rise in global warming? Or is it a logarithmic graph, where extra amounts of CO₂ cause less and less extra warming, eventually becoming a flat line?

I suspected it to be the last, and the Hadley Centre, the UK's leading authority on this subject, confirmed that it is the last graph. We are nearly on the flat line, if not already there. Extra CO₂ will have no more effect. There is no problem.

3-046

Anders Wijkman (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I would like to thank Mr Florenz. This is a rich report with a great number of concrete proposals. A specific call is made to use the stimulus packages all over the world to promote clean energy and green technologies, stressing thereby that the financial crisis and the climate crisis have the same roots – unsustainable use of resources.

While I support the report, like Caroline Lucas I would have liked to see more attention paid to the most recent signs, which tell us that climate change is both more rapid and serious than we thought just a couple of years ago – contrary to what some colleagues here have said, in particular Mr Helmer. By the way, a recent screening of more than 900 climate articles in scientific journals – peer review – showed that not one of them questioned the main thrust of the IPCC.

What I am particularly concerned about is not CO₂ emissions per se, but the positive feedback mechanisms that are now happening in the planetary system, like the acidification of the oceans, reduced albedo and the possible leaking of methane from thawing tundra. All these factors will accelerate warming. We can control emissions but we cannot control these factors.

This is the main reason why, in my opinion, emission reductions have to be much more ambitious in the near future than what is currently being discussed in the EU and by the UN.

This means, by the way, that the 2°C target has to be revisited and that greenhouse gas concentrations have to be lowered, rather than continuing to increase. That is why some of us advocate very strongly the 350 ppm target. This dimension of the problem is referred to in the report but only in passing. I would have liked it to be at the core of the report. My guess is that, only a few years from now, the feedbacks I mentioned will be at the centre of the debate.

Finally, let me just endorse what Guido Sacconi said. In spite of its shortcomings, a temporary committee has been the right way to deal with a horizontal issue like this. I hope the next Parliament will build on our experience and deal with climate change and sustainability in a similar way.

3-047

Κατερίνα Μπατζελή (PSE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, θα συμφωνήσουμε όλοι ότι η Κοπεγχάγη πρέπει να στεφθεί με επιτυχία, διότι δεν διακυβεύεται μόνο η αξιοπιστία του πολιτικού κόσμου αλλά η αξιοπιστία και η επιβίωση των επόμενων γενιών. Οι προστάσεις μας πρέπει να στοχεύουν στην Ανάπτυξη, στην Απασχόληση, στην Αλληλεγγύη: τρία άλφα που θα σημαδεύουν το μέλλον των επόμενων γενιών. Τι χρειάζεται εκ μέρους μας σήμερα; Χρειάζεται υπευθυνότητα και αποφασιστικότητα για την επαρκή χρηματοδότηση του μεγάλου αυτού σχεδίου ανάπτυξης των κλιματικών αλλαγών και νέες δυναμικές αναπτυξιακές συμφωνίες πέρα και έξω από εμπορικές περιοριστικές συμφωνίες.

Υπάρχει όμως και ένας προβληματισμός για την τακτική μας και πρέπει πρώτα να πείσουμε την ευρύτερη κοινωνία και μετά να προχωρήσουμε δυναμικά στην ένταξη ορισμένων παραγωγικών τομέων στο μεγάλο αυτό άλμα της γεωργίας: γι' αυτό θα πρέπει να υπενθυμίσουμε ότι η γεωργία εντάσσεται ήδη στις εθνικές δεσμεύσεις για μείωση των εκπομπών κατά 10% μέχρι το 2020, ότι ήδη υπάρχουν σημαντικές προτάσεις από την ΚΑΠ για γεωργικές πρακτικές φιλικές προς το περιβάλλον και ότι οι διεθνείς συμφωνίες για τη γεωργία θα πρέπει να είναι αμοιβαίες για όλους τους διεθνείς εταίρους.

Κύριε Επίτροπε, το διατροφικό μοντέλο συνδέεται άμεσα με το κλιματολογικό μοντέλο, αρκεί να πείσουμε συνειδητά την ίδια την κοινωνία. Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι κλιματικές αλλαγές εισάγουν πλέον με διευρυμένο τρόπο τη συμμετοχική δημοκρατία της κοινωνίας. Μίας κοινωνίας που ζει με διαφορετικές πολιτιστικές αξίες.

3-048

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE-DE). – Met veel plezier heb ik in de tijdelijke commissie met de heer Florenz en alle anderen samengewerkt. Aldus hebben wij toch het broodnodige fundament gelegd voor een beleid dat in de toekomst meer geïntegreerd en ambitieus is en op een brede consensus berust, ook hier in het Parlement in het kader van de twintig-twintig-doelstelling.

Het antwoord ligt in een vergroening van de economie en een verduurzaming in de bedrijven, de huishoudens en bij de overheid. Ondernemers die steun willen voor een dergelijke aanpak - het ontplooiën van duurzame initiatieven voor die groene technologie - lopen nog tegen een heleboel hindernissen aan. Als zij kwalificatie voor een medewerker willen, lopen zij aan tegen de verkokering in het beleid. In dit verslag wordt nu juist aangedrongen op een geïntegreerde en ook territoriaal samenhangende aanpak. Als je dat niet doet ben je op termijn ook duurder uit.

Mijn amendement over de inzet van regio's en steden is gelukkig overgenomen. Volgende week zullen in de gebouwen van het Parlement 150 steden met de Commissie een burgemeestersconvenant tekenen. Zij pakken de conclusies van dit verslag op, dichtbij burgers en dichtbij de bedrijven. Dat is volgens mij een goede benadering. Steun dus van mijn kant. Wel ben ik tegen de ongenueanceerde benadering van de landbouwsector in paragraaf 189. De EVP is terecht niet tegen de consumptie van vlees. Wij zullen ons dan ook tegen deze paragraaf verzetten.

Tenslotte vraag ik de Commissie om ook in de komende periode meer geïntegreerd te werken en veel minder verkokering toe te passen. Daar kan in samenwerking met het Parlement een belangrijke slag worden binnengehaald, in de combinatie tussen wetgeving, stimulerend beleid en activering op decentraal niveau. Op dat punt is nog veel winst te behalen.

3-049

Inés Ayala Sender (PSE). – Señora Presidenta, en primer lugar, agradecerle al señor Florenz el ejercicio de generosidad y amplitud de miras que ha tenido y a todos los grupos que realmente hemos participado en un ejercicio político y de debate de fondo y de futuro que ha tenido la virtud de acompañarnos, clarificarnos y darnos el coraje y la prudencia necesarios para otras acciones legislativas en paralelo y punteras, y también de alto riesgo, como el paquete del cambio climático, la política para los vehículos, la Estrategia de Lisboa o sectores como la energía, el transporte, la industria, el turismo.

Creo que ha sido un buen ejercicio y una forma de avanzar de manera irreversible, y esto es lo importante, hacia el siglo XXI y de demostrar, como ha dicho el Comisario, ese ejemplo que queremos dar de futuro.

También ha sido un ejemplo de confrontación y también de generosidad y llega en el momento oportuno, en un momento de crisis con altos riesgos sociales y también de proteccionismo y de vuelta atrás y con incertidumbres muy fuertes que necesitan seguridad. Necesitan elementos de futuro también.

También una nueva era para los Estados Unidos —como aquí se ha dicho— y esperamos que también para la Unión Europea tras la aprobación del Tratado de Lisboa que esperamos en breve.

Y también una nueva época, y esto es lo importante, donde hay riesgos, pero donde hay enormes oportunidades para grandes áreas y políticas nuevas como son Brasil, China o Rusia, las grandes potencias emergentes, pero también grandes zonas como América Latina o los países en desarrollo y África en particular.

Creo que es un paso definitivo hacia un nuevo modelo de desarrollo, de crecimiento económico y social, pero con la exigencia de sostenibilidad y de reducción del impacto. Ahora nos queda, señor Comisario, para nosotros también, señora Presidenta, el reto de la comunicación a los ciudadanos.

Simplemente querría terminar destacando los avances en todo lo relativo a la adaptación a los aspectos de agua y de sequía y también los de movilidad sostenible, que creo que hemos ...

(La Presidenta interrumpe a la oradora)

3-050

Markus Pieper (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin! Der Bericht Florenz enthält wirklich viele gute Anregungen. Ein Gutes der Klimadiskussion ist, dass sie als Katalysator für den Übergang ins Zeitalter der erneuerbaren Energien wirkt. Das ist im Bericht auch mit vielen Chancen für neue Technologien und Wirtschaftsentwicklung sehr gut herausgearbeitet.

Schade finde ich aber, dass wir große Teile der Wissenschaft ausgegrenzt haben. Studien und Wissenschaftler, die sich dem Thema Klimawandel mit weniger düsteren Szenarien oder vielleicht sogar positiv nähern, wurden im Ausschuss einfach nicht gehört. Entsprechende Anträge wurden mehrheitlich abgelehnt, basta! Wissenschaft ist nur das, was politisch ins Konzept passt. Das geht schief, weil Wissenschaft sich nicht manipulieren lässt. So bekommt der Bericht am Ende leider eine Schiefelage.

Wer auf dieser Basis eine CO₂-Reduzierung von 80 % und mehr fordert, der stellt Wirtschaft und soziale Errungenschaften grundsätzlich in Frage. Wer gleichzeitig den Ausstieg aus der Kernkraft fordert, verschließt bewusst die Augen vor der Realität. Wer Rechnungslegungsgrundsätze für alle Bereiche des menschlichen Lebens fordert, steht mit dem freiheitlichen Grundgedanken auf Kriegsfuß. Wer neue Gesetze für den Boden und die Landwirtschaft fordert, der missbraucht die Klimadebatte für Maßregelungen, die er oder sie schon immer durchsetzen wollte, die aber mit dem Schutz des Klimas nichts zu tun haben. Und wer gar Schutzanzüge gegen Klimaauswirkungen fordert, der will bewusst Ängste schüren.

Ich hoffe, dass diese radikalen und zweckfremden Ideologien in dem Bericht keinen Platz finden. Dann kann ich dem Bericht auch zustimmen, weil mir der Umweltschutz am Herzen liegt – am besten, wenn er sich mit sozialen Errungenschaften und wirtschaftlicher Wettbewerbsfähigkeit verbinden lässt.

3-051

Matthias Groote (PSE). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Klimaausschuss hat gute Arbeit geleistet. Heute liegt uns der Abschlussbericht zur Abstimmung vor, wie wir uns als Europäisches Parlament die zukünftige Klimapolitik vorstellen, welche Maßnahmen in Sachen Anpassung an den Klimawandel ergriffen werden müssen.

Ich hoffe, dass, wenn die nächsten Gesetzgebungsverfahren anstehen, wir hier im Parlament auch eine so große Einigkeit haben, dass das aufgegriffen wird, was wir in diesem Bericht dokumentiert haben. In dem Bericht ist es durch die Arbeitsweise des Ausschusses gelungen, eine horizontale Sichtweise hinzubekommen. Ich muss sagen, die Arbeitsweise dieses Ausschusses sollten wir uns auch in der nächsten Legislaturperiode bewahren, so wie Guido Sacconi das gerade schon angemahnt hat.

Der Kampf gegen den Klimawandel kann nicht nur alleine durch Europa geführt werden, sondern andere Kontinente und andere Länder müssen mit ins Boot geholt werden. Hier hat der Ausschuss auch sehr gut gearbeitet, weil wir als Parlament in Sachen Klimadiplomatie zum ersten Mal sichtbar geworden sind, und das möchte ich hier an dieser Stelle noch einmal unterstreichen.

Wenn wir über Anpassungsmaßnahmen sprechen, dann sind wir auch beim Thema Finanzen. Hier möchte ich noch einmal an die anderen beiden Institutionen, an die Kommission und an den Rat, den Appell richten, bei der nächsten Finanziellen Vorausschau diesem Thema oberste Priorität einräumen.

Wir können hier die schönsten Berichte beschließen, aber wenn kein Geld für Maßnahmen zur Verfügung steht, dann wäre dieser Bericht umsonst. Auch sollten wir einmal überprüfen, inwieweit die finanziellen Maßnahmen, die wir jetzt schon ergreifen, Wirkung zeigen, und das bitte einmal in einem Audit zusammenfassen.

3-052

Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE). – Vážení kolegovia, keďže Európska únia má ambíciu stať sa lídrom v medzinárodnom boji proti celosvetovému otepľovaniu, musí ciele na ochranu klímy nielen formulovať, ale ich aj prostredníctvom politických opatrení realizovať. Prierezová správa pána Florenza potvrdzuje, že boj proti klimatickým zmenám je nutné založiť na horizontálnom prístupe a zohľadňovať ho vo všetkých právnych predpisoch.

Voda zohráva ústrednú úlohu v zmene klímy. Musíme si uvedomiť, že následky zmeny klímy na vodný režim môžu vyvolať domino efekt a postihnúť rôzne sektory hospodárstva. Celosvetové rastúce problémy s vodou si vyžadujú koordinovanú vodohospodársku politiku v členských štátoch a zavádzanie environmentálnych princípov do integrovaného manažmentu povodí.

Musíme naštartovať programy vytvárania plošnej akumulácie dažďovej vody v lesnej, poľnohospodárskej a urbánnej krajine prostredníctvom legislatívnych nástrojov, neinvestičných a investičných opatrení, ktoré dokážu zásadným spôsobom akumulovať dažďovú vodu v krajine. Doteraz sa dažďová voda považovala za odpadovú vodu, ktorej bolo potrebné sa čo najrýchlejšie zbaviť. Nová vodná paradigma je založená na princípe, že dažďová voda je kľúčom k životu. Teším sa, že nám ju prináša expertná skupina českých a slovenských vedcov. Pán minister Bursík, je to zaujímavý prístup. Verím, že si získa vašu podporu.

Trvalo udržateľný spôsob života nie je možný bez prínosu hospodárstva, vedy, médií, organizovanej občianskej spoločnosti a občanov. Je dôležité nekapitulovať pred komplexnosťou problému. Stojíme pred výzvou a musíme konať už dnes, pretože svojím dnešným konaním určujeme budúcnosť. Naším životným cieľom je: už nesmieme ďalej oberať nasledujúce generácie o podstatu života, ktorý sme dostali od Boha.

V globálnej súťaži zvíťazíme iba vtedy, ak transparentne a bez byrokratických prekážok umožníme efektívnym, inovatívnym a inteligentným technológiám prístup na trh. Zvíťazíme iba vtedy, ak v Európe dáme všetkým progresívnym riešeniam „zelenú“.

3-053

Justas Vincas Paleckis (PSE). – Sveikinu pranešėją ir visus bendraminčius, metusius iššūkį klimato kaitos grėsmei. Lietuvos ir kitų Baltijos šalių gyventojai tiesiog ištroškę europinio elektros energijos tinklo. Nesukūrus jo per keletą metų, kalbos apie energetinį saugumą taip ir liks kalbomis. Labai svarbus raginimas padidinti struktūrinių fondų lėšas, naudojamas daugiabučių gyvenamųjų namų apšiltinimui. Stebuklai pasitaiko retai. Tačiau Ignalinos AE darbo pratęsimo stebuklas, kurio vis dar tikimasi Lietuvoje, mažintų taršą ir leistų išsaugoti kasmetinius 4-5 procentus BVP, taip reikalingus ekonominės krizės ypač paliestai ir pažeistai valstybei. Krizės akivaizdoje vis daugiau ES piliečių galvoja apie išgyvenimą, o ne apie klimato kaitos stabdymą, tačiau jeigu sugebėsime atsisakyti švaistūniško gyvenimo būdo, pereiti prie taupymo, o ne tik išsaugosime aplinką ir neperkaitusią planetą, bet ir papildysime savo kišenes. Griežtai taupant buityje, naudojamas išteklius, atsisakant trumpų kelionių automobiliu, galima sutaupyti ir 1000 eurų per metus.

3-054

Françoise Grossetête (PPE-DE). – Madame la Présidente, on aurait pu dire que ce rapport était redondant, après le vote du paquet énergie-climat au mois de décembre dernier. Mais non, ce rapport a le mérite de faire une très bonne synthèse de ce que nous devons envisager pour la lutte contre le changement climatique, et j'en profite pour féliciter le rapporteur, Karl-Heinz Florenz, qui a eu un esprit très visionnaire dans la rédaction de ce rapport.

N'en restons pas au stade des discours. Veillons à ce que les États membres s'engagent concrètement. Je soutiens mes collègues qui ont attiré notre attention sur la nécessité d'avoir un budget conforme à nos ambitions. Après la *success story* du paquet énergie-climat, sous la Présidence française, nous devons tout faire pour aboutir à un bon accord international à Copenhague.

Or, il y a de quoi s'inquiéter. L'année 2009 est une année d'élections européennes, avec le changement de la Commission européenne. L'inquiétude est à son comble quand on lit les déclarations du président de la République tchèque, qui affirme que le réchauffement climatique n'existe pas.

Eh bien, même s'il avait raison, tout notre dispositif pour lutter contre le changement climatique est une réponse à la grave crise économique que nous vivons. La raréfaction de nos ressources énergétiques, le besoin de sécurité énergétique, la déforestation, l'asphyxie de nos grandes métropoles, dans lesquelles se concentre la plus grande partie de la population, la nécessité, donc, de recourir aux transports durables, la famine inexorable dans le monde et la nécessité de nourrir la planète, tout plaide en faveur des solutions proposées pour lutter contre le changement climatique.

Nous rentrons dans l'ère de la croissance durable, cette troisième révolution industrielle qui est un formidable atout pour la recherche, l'innovation, l'emploi, la compétitivité de nos entreprises. Quant à l'efficacité énergétique, elle devrait déjà faire partie de tous les plans de relance, puisqu'elle s'appuie sur des technologies innovantes. Ainsi, en diminuant la facture énergétique, le consommateur est satisfait. En diminuant la consommation énergétique fossile, l'Union européenne retrouve plus d'indépendance et émet moins de carbone, et ce sont des milliers d'emplois nouveaux à la clé.

Oui, la lutte contre le changement climatique est une des réponses à la crise économique. Elle se fera par le développement d'une économie sobre en carbone, avec l'adhésion des collectivités locales, des entreprises, des chercheurs, l'adhésion de tous les citoyens.

3-055

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Raportul prezintă atât date științifice, cât și recomandări pentru lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice, referindu-se atât la adaptare, cât și la reducerea cauzelor care conduc la acestea. Lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice nu este doar o obligație pentru a asigura viitorul generațiilor viitoare, ci și o oportunitate pentru relansarea economiei mondiale.

Solicit ca importanța eficienței energetice să fie reflectată și în bugetul comunitar și în instrumentele financiare disponibile. Eficientizarea transportului prin utilizarea sistemelor inteligente de transport, promovarea transportului feroviar și naval, asigurarea intermodalității și investiții în mașini mai ecologice vor permite reducerea emisiilor produse de acest sector.

Am recomandat dezvoltarea tipurilor de turism mai ecologice, cum ar fi turismul sportiv sau turismul cultural și subliniez faptul că destinațiile turistice de excelență ar trebui să fie acelea care respectă și protejează mediul. Consider că trebuie avută în vedere crearea unui fond internațional pentru plantarea arborilor pe suprafețele de pământ neutilizate.

Închei spunând că este nevoie de activități de cercetare în cadrul științei medicale și sectorului farmaceutic în vederea fabricării de medicamente și vaccinuri ce vor fi disponibile pentru toată populația afectată de anumite boli, la un preț accesibil.

3-056

Etelka Barsi-Pataky (PPE-DE). – Elnök asszony! Az éghajlatváltozás és a közlekedés ma már nem választható el egymástól, ugyanakkor a megszerzett és félve őrzött mobilitásunkat, a személyek, áruk és javak szabad mozgását csak akkor tudjuk a jövőben megtartani, ha változtatunk és határozott lépésekre szánjuk el magunkat. Mint a klímaváltozással foglalkozó ideiglenes bizottságban az ötös kulestémának, a közlekedésnek a felelőse, átfogó csomagot és ennek egyszerre történő megvalósítását szorgalmazom.

Mire van szükség? Elsőként a gazdasági környezetet kell átalakítanunk kettős céllal: egyrészt, hogy az adókon, a közbeszerzéseken keresztül támogassuk az ökoinnovációt, másrészt, hogy valóban alkalmazzuk a „szennyező fizet” elvet. Ökoinnovációra van szükség a gépjármű-technológiában, a kapcsolódó alternatív üzemanyagokban, az intelligens közlekedési megoldásokban, a logisztikai irányítási rendszerekben. A „szennyező fizet” elvet pedig alkalmazzunk kell minden jármű vonatkozásában, továbbá az emissziókereskedelemben és a külső költségek beépítésében.

Minden elindított kezdeményezésünket fel kell gyorsítanunk. Nem elég beszélni ezekről, meg kell valósítanunk. Például mit? A közös európai légteret, az egységes európai égboltot, az irányítási rendszereinket. Nos, ezeket ténylegesen meg kell valósítani, mert akkor szabályozhatjuk sikeresen az ipart, a fogyasztást, ha a saját feladatainkat elvégeztük.

Kiemelten kell foglalkoznunk a városainkkal, a szenzitív egyéb területekkel, végül is talán ez a legnehezebb. A közlekedés új kultúráját kell elterjesztenünk és a rendelkezésre álló eszközeink sokkal optimálisabb használatára kell törekednünk. Köszönetet kell mondanunk Karl-Heinz Florenznek, mert most már van egy hiteles, sokrétű road map-ünk, ez a riport, amelynek mentén elindulhat a megvalósítás és bátran ülhetünk tárgyalóasztalhoz Koppenhágában, felkérve mindenkit, hogy csatlakozzanak.

3-057

Adam Gierek (PSE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W preambule omawianego sprawozdania pan Florenz powołuje się na swoje wcześniejsze sprawozdanie w sprawie naukowych faktów dotyczących zmian klimatu, w którym niestety nie znalazłem żadnych faktów poza wiarą w nieomyślność sprawozdań IPCC. Zarówno obecna rezolucja jak i ta z maja 2008 r. nie mogą więc w żaden sposób legitymizować politycznych decyzji Komisji Europejskiej, jako że brak w nich obiektywnego podejścia naukowego. Jedynie bowiem spójny model zmian klimatycznych uwzględniający wszystkie czynniki zmienności, tj. wpływ gazów cieplarnianych, pyłów zawieszonych, a przede wszystkim aktywności słońca, tłumaczyłby celowość tych decyzji.

Zawarte w sprawozdaniu treści jednostronnie akcentują hipotetyczny mechanizm ocieplenia, tj. emisje CO₂, pomijając konieczność międzynarodowej walki z faktycznymi skutkami zmian klimatu. Komisja tymczasowa do spraw zmian klimatu w sposób jednostronny skoncentrowała się na problemie ograniczania emisji gazów cieplarnianych, zaś marginesowo potraktowała walkę z rzeczywistymi skutkami zmian klimatycznych.

3-058

Agnes Schierhuber (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zuerst einmal möchte ich auch dem Berichterstatter meinen Dank aussprechen, der hier wirklich versucht hat, das Mögliche für uns alle zu erreichen.

Die Landwirtschaft ist besonders vom Klimawandel betroffen, da unter freiem Himmel produziert wird. Man denke an Dürre und Wüstenbildungen, wie wir es zum Beispiel in Süditalien beobachten, oder an andere extreme Wetterphänomene, wie unerwartete Regen- und Hagelschauer oder Überschwemmungen, die oftmals die Existenzgrundlage unserer Bauern betreffen.

Die Landwirtschaft wird oft als großer Verursacher des Klimawandels hingestellt. Ca. 10 % der globalen Treibhausgase werden in der Landwirtschaft produziert, die meisten davon sind aber Gase natürlichen Ursprungs, wie zum Beispiel Methan.

Die Landwirtschaft nimmt meiner Meinung nach vielmehr eine Vorreiterrolle im Kampf gegen den Klimawandel ein. Ich möchte hier anhand einer Studie aus Österreich aus dem Jahr 2008 Folgendes dokumentieren: Die Land- und Forstwirtschaft verbraucht durch Pflanzen wie Gras, Mais, Getreide und den Boden wesentlich mehr Klimagase und bindet sie, als sie erzeugt. Nach der Studie von 2008 steht den Emissionen der Land- und Forstwirtschaft von ca. 8 Mio. t CO₂-Äquivalent im Jahr insgesamt etwa eine Bindungswirkung von 58 Mio. t CO₂ bzw. CO₂-Äquivalent gegenüber. Das zeigt, dass die Landwirtschaft nicht als Umweltsünder hingestellt werden darf. Im Gegenteil – noch eine Zahl: Seit 1990 hat die Landwirtschaft in Österreich die CO₂-Emissionen um 1,3 Mio t reduziert.

Der Bereich Energie ist ein weiterer wichtiger Beitrag der Landwirtschaft gegen den Klimawandel. Zum Beispiel verbraucht die Landwirtschaft in Österreich ca. 2,2 % der Energie, die erzeugt wird. Der Anteil von erneuerbarer Energie ist 23 %, woran auch wieder die Landwirtschaft einen großen Anteil hat.

Abschließend darf ich Folgendes sagen. Großer Wert muss...

(Die Präsidentin entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

3-059

Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE). – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, lämmin kiitos Karl-Heinz Florenzille erittäin hienosta työstä esittelijänä. Nyt suurin haasteemme on seuraavan kansainvälisen ilmastopimeyden aikaansaaminen. Sen kaksi vaikeinta kysymystä ovat eri maiden päästövähennystavoitteet ja se, miten teollisuusmaat osallistuvat kehitysmaiden ilmastoinvestointien rahoittamiseen. Molemmissa näissä asioissa EU:n pitää nostaa tavoitetasoa, vaikka sinänsä voimme olla ylpeitä siitä, että olemme koko ajan olleet johtamassa maapallon ilmastonsuojelua.

30 prosentin päästövähennys vuoteen 2020 mennessä ei uusimpien tutkimusten valossa riitä, vaan päästövähennystavoitteita pitää tiukentaa. Mitä tulee kehitysmaiden ilmastotoimien rahoitukseen, valitan sitä, että komissio tuoreessa tiedonannossaan edelleen pitäytyi varsin yleisellä tasolla eikä esittänyt tarpeeksi konkreettisia malleja.

Parlamentti on eri yhteyksissä, muun muassa ilmastopakettien käsittelyssä, osoittanut valmiutensa siihen, että tuemme merkittäväällä tavalla kehitysmaiden päästövähennyksiä. Tämä on yksi niistä asioista, joissa EU:n tulee rohkaista myös Yhdysvaltojen uutta presidenttiä ottamaan uusi linja. Yhdysvallathan ei ole tähän mennessä sanonut mitään valmiudestaan tukea kehitysmaiden päästövähennystavoitteita. Ilmastonsuojelu on toteutettavissa, mutta toimien pitää olla ripeitä ja johdonmukaisia.

3-060

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur. I shall be very specific in relation to agriculture and to two paragraphs in the report which I think are not necessary. The report would perhaps be better without them. They are very specific in relation to meat consumption and I do not think there is a place for these paragraphs in the report.

The following paragraph on feed rations ignores the reality of research that has been going on for a long number of years in many Member States seeking to do exactly what it says in this paragraph, which is therefore out of date with reality.

One of the areas that I think needs to be enhanced is the communication of how farmers and those who use the land can farm in a way that is more 'climatically friendly'. I think there has been a failure of the researchers to work with the farmers, and we need more effort in relation to extension services to get the message across, to encourage and not to coerce.

3-061

Маруся Иванова Любчева (PSE). – Колеги, очевидно климатичните промени събират във фокус много от акцентите на европейската политика и не само на европейската.

Нито една стара, нито един съюз поотделно и независимо не могат да се справят с предизвикателствата на климатичните промени. Затова са необходими интегрирани политики в хоризонтален и вертикален план. Политика, законодателство и финанси трябва да работят заедно. Докладът е чудесна платформа за това.

Бих искала да обърна внимание на два факта, без който не можем да работим в полза на борбата с климатичните промени. Науката: в доклада е отделено внимание на нови технологии, но ние трябва да говорим повече за наука и целеви инвестиции в науката, чрез които трябва да се търсят решения. Без това оставаме в полето на тривиалността и ежедневието.

Наша основа са научните изследвания, нашето бъдеще са новите технологии, разработени в сътрудничество между науката и бизнеса. Аз апелирам към инвестиране в науката и определяне на климатичните промени като важен приоритет за всички научни програми на Съюза.

3-062

Danutė Budreikaitė (ALDE). – Didele svarbą kovoje su klimato kaita turime skirti transporto sektoriui, kuris šiuo metu išmeta beveik trečdalį visų ES išmetamų CO₂ išlakų. Transporto sektorius iki 2020 m. turi sumažinti CO₂ išlakas 20 procentų. Siekiant šių tikslų būtina įgyvendinti tvaraus transporto politikos priemonių paketą, kuris apimtų ekologiškas naujoves, CO₂ išlakų apmokestinimą, važiavimo ir automobilių naudojimo įpročių pokyčius bei kitas priemones. Norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį į tai, kad kai kuriose valstybėse narėse dėl finansinės krizės ir ekonomikos nuosmukio didinant PVM šiuo metu yra susiklosčiusi tokia situacija, kad dėl aukštų viešojo transporto kainų žmonės yra pigiau keliauti automobiliu. Tad norėčiau paraginti valstybes taikyti mokesčių lengvatas ir skatinti žmones naudotis viešuoju transportu. Taip pat svarbu skatinti naudojimąsi traukiniais, skiriant investicijų traukinių infrastruktūros plėtrai. Priminsiu, kad traukinys viename kilometre išmeta vidutiniškai 3 kartus mažiau CO₂ nei automobilis ir net 8 kartus mažiau nei lėktuvas.

3-063

Marie Anne Isler Béguin (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, nous pouvons nous autocongratuler ici sur le grand consensus, mais nous restons quand même en vase clos: commissaire à l'environnement, ministres de l'environnement, quels sont les poids de l'environnement à la Commission et dans les Conseils, dans les gouvernements? Nous le savons.

Moi-même, je n'étais pas du tout favorable à la mise en place de cette commission parce que je pense que, pour isoler quelque chose, il n'y a rien de tel que de créer une nouvelle commission. En France, on dit "une commission Théodule".

Je m'interroge sur la question de l'avenir de ce rapport du point de vue de son intégration dans les politiques européennes? Je rappellerai seulement, pour certains collègues qui étaient là 1992, qu'il y eut un excellent rapport sur le développement durable. À peine voté, à l'unanimité d'ailleurs, cet excellent rapport a été totalement enterré. Peut-être que si nous l'avions introduit dans les politiques européennes, nous n'en serions pas ici actuellement.

Je tiens à m'adresser à M. le rapporteur, qui se défend de présenter un projet politique. Mais si, Monsieur le rapporteur, c'est un projet politique que vous présentez, puisque c'est une réorientation totale des politiques européennes, au niveau agricole, au niveau de la pêche, au niveau des transports. Alors, oui, il faut être plus ambitieux, et nous attendons des résultats.

3-064

Herbert Reul (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Folgen des Klimawandels ernsthaft zu behandeln bedeutet, dass man sich alle unterschiedlichen Positionen, auch der Wissenschaft, anhört. Wir hatten im Ausschuss viele Experten, das ist richtig. Aber sie waren leider einseitig besetzt. Wir hatten nicht die Chance, alle Seiten kennenzulernen. Ich halte das für einen Fehler.

Wir hatten mit dem Bericht des Kollegen Florenz einen ersten Berichtsentwurf, der wesentlich besser war als das, was uns heute zur Entscheidung vorliegt. Viele der Vorschläge, die heute vorliegen, sind in Ordnung, aber viele davon halte ich für falsch. Es macht keinen Sinn, sich ständig in neue Vorschriften und neue Maßnahmen zu flüchten, sondern die Lösung kann nur heißen: Ja zu Innovation, Ja zu Forschung. Die Verantwortung des Einzelnen, das ist die Lösung, und nicht immer mehr staatliche Vorschriften. Es gibt eine Reihe von unsinnigen Vorschriften, wie Rechnungslegungspflicht, Verhinderung und Maßregelung von Fleischkonsum, Diffamierung der Landwirtschaft und vieles andere mehr. Nach meiner Auffassung ist das der falsche Weg, und deshalb habe ich Probleme mit diesem Bericht, so wie er jetzt vorliegt.

3-065

Martin Bursík, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I have realised that the distinguished Members of the Parliament are using their native languages. I have no doubt that the interpreters speak one thousand per cent better English than me, so, if you will allow me, I will speak Czech and try to react to this debate in the European Parliament.

3-066

Mohu-li si to dovoľit, tak bych veľmi rád ocenil hľoubku diskuze v Evropském parlamente, její věcnost a také odpovědnost poslankyň a poslanců Evropského parlamentu. Dovolil bych si reagovat asi v sedmi bodech na tuto diskuzi. Nejprve bych rád podtrhl roli mezivládního panelu pro klimatickou změnu, jelikož v některých příspěvcích byly závěry mezivládního panelu zpochybňovány. Já si myslím, že určitá nevýhoda je v tom, že čtvrtletní zprávy, které mezivládní panel vydal jak k fyzikální podstatě klimatické změny nebo k adaptacím, k mitigacím, mají zhruba 1200 až 1400 stránek a je to skutečně precizní vědecká práce s odkazy na impaktovanou vědeckou literaturu. Poté je však z těchto zpráv je udělán souhrn a

nakonec je to tzv. summary for policy makers, souhrn pro politiky, ten už má kolem dvaceti stránek, tam už ty odkazy nejsou a myslím si, že řada nedorozumění plyne právě z toho, že my, politici – omlouvám se, někteří z nás možná ano – nemáme čas číst těch 1200 či 1500 stránek. Je důležité zdůraznit, že mezivládní panel pro klimatickou změnu byl nejen oceněn Nobelovou cenou, ale na konferenci o klimatu na Bali se 192 států, které se konference účastnily, shodlo na tom, že se jedná o nejkomplexnější, nej kvalitnější vědecký základ, nej konzistentnější informace, které máme k dispozici při rozhodování o tom, zda a jak reagovat na klimatickou změnu. 192 reprezentantů států se vyjádřilo tímto způsobem a je to i moje reakce na některá vyjádření zmiňující alarmismus argumentace, na kterou jsem zvyklý z domova.

Podle mého názoru je rok 2009 rokem, kdy máme velmi dobrou startovní pozici. Jednak zase opět hovoříme jako Evropská unie jedním hlasem. Na Bali jsem si ověřili, že tohle je velmi cenné. Dokázali jsme hodně posunout jednání společně s partnery s G77 a s dalšími ekonomikami a jsme vlastně jedinou velkou světovou ekonomikou, která je nasměrována k tomu, aby přijala cíl snížení emisí skleníkových plynů o 30 % do roku 2020. Ta druhá naděje začátku tohoto roku je změna ve Spojených státech, kterou zde řada z vás zmínila. Já se na ten problém dívám tak, že někde v Kodani existuje místnost, k níž dveře mají zhruba 200 zámků. A když se nám podaří otevřít všechny tyto zámky, tak uzavřeme novou globální dohodu o ochraně klimatu od roku 2013. Podle mého názoru ten první zámek, ten už jsme otevřeli. To je zámek se jménem Evropská unie. Tím druhým zámekem v pořadí jsou Spojené státy, a proto klademe takový důraz na co nejrychlejší kontakt s novou americkou administrativou, proto plánujeme tu návštěvu společně v Trojce s budoucím švédským předsednictvím a společně s komisařem pro životní prostředí Stavrosem Dimasem a to je také moje odpověď na poznámku Jerzyho Buzka, totiž to že my v žádném případě nehodláme ta mezinárodní jednání vést sami. Vůbec ne, hodláme koordinovat ta jednání. Dánsko samozřejmě má enormní zájem na tom, aby kodaňská konference byla úspěšná. Jarní neformální Evropskou radu také zaměříme v té části, která bude uzavřena pro ministry, na předání si zkušeností z dosavadních bilaterálních jednání o mezinárodní dohodě o klimatu, a také se pokusíme definovat společně strategii jak dále, jakým způsobem koordinovat tato mezinárodní jednání samozřejmě včetně zapojení diplomatů. A vedle toho budeme jednat o adaptacích, to bude hlavní téma jarní neformální Rady v Praze.

Ten další bod mé reakce souvisí s tím, že jsme se dostali do zajímavého momentu, protože úsilí Evropské unie o ambiciózní aktivní politiku ochrany klimatu se najednou střetlo s dopady finanční a hospodářské krize. A já tady považuji za velmi pozitivní to, že hlasy, které vyzývají k odkladu našich dlouhodobých cílů, které by nás měly odvést od té cesty k ochraně klimatu, jsou velmi sporadické, a naopak v drtivé většině – a i tady v Evropském parlamentu a děkuji za to – zní hlasy, které říkají, pojďme této koincidenci využít jako příležitosti, protože je to strategie, která obsahuje šestkrát „win“, je to „win, win, win, win, win, win“ strategie, protože jestliže v reakci na hospodářskou a finanční krizi jednotlivé ekonomiky, a i ti nej konzervativnější ekonomové jsou připraveni povolit kohouty, investovat do ekonomiky, tak je to příležitost investovat do toho, abychom transformovali naši dnešní ekonomiku v nízkouhlíkovou ekonomiku a podpořili moderní environmentální technologie. Proč šestkrát „win“? Protože ušetříme finanční prostředky za energie úspornými opatřeními. Protože snížíme naši závislost na dovozech energií, protože snížíme spotřebu neobnovitelných přírodních zdrojů, protože vytvoříme nová pracovní místa – a podívejme se na to, že různé plány v Evropě, které reagují na finanční a hospodářskou krizi, ve významné části přinášejí nová pracovní místa právě v té oblasti green jobs a v oblasti nových environmentálních technologií obnovitelných zdrojů energií a energetických úspor – a zároveň snížíme emise skleníkových plynů.

Proto vnímá české předsednictví tuto situaci jako mimořádnou příležitost k tomu, abychom vlastně změnili vzorce chování a nastavili naši ekonomiku směrem k vyšší udržitelnosti. Tou největší příležitostí jak vlastně změnit ekonomiku je globální trh s uhlíkem. Když porovnáme environmentální politiku v 70. letech, kdy jsme se opírali o zákazy a příkazy a především jsme používali tzv. end of pipe politiku, tak jsme v roce 2009 v situaci, kdy využíváme daleko více ekonomické nástroje ve prospěch životního prostředí a myslím si, že to, že součástí klimaticko-energetického balíčku je nový systém emisního obchodování, který se opírá o aukce, je vynikající předpoklad pro to, abychom vytvořili globální trh s uhlíkem. Podívejme se na ambice. V roce 2013 začnou fungovat postupné aukce v elektroenergetice a již v roce 2015 si přejeme mít globální trh s uhlíkem na úrovni OECD, a proto tak velmi sledujeme vývoj ve Spojených státech a to, jak bude vypadat proces přijímání toho „Cap and Trade“ systému v Kongresu Spojených států.

Další moment, který bych chtěl zmínit, je role obnovitelných zdrojů energie a také energetických úspor. My totiž při jednání s rozvojovými zeměmi musíme něco nabídnout, musíme nabídnout těm zemím hospodářský rozvoj, ale zároveň jim musíme nabídnout rozvoj takový, aby zajistil plnění těch cílů, o kterých hovoří mezivládní panel pro klimatickou změnu a které jsme jako politici přijali. A tady ta role obnovitelných zdrojů bude naprosto klíčová, protože máme v podstatě dvě možné cesty. Buď to bude tak, že ty miliardy lidí, kteří nemají přístup k elektřině, kteří touží po tom mít elektřinu, protože ten magnet konzumu, ta atraktivita konzumu je nepřekonatelná a nelze toto nikomu vyčítat, budou muset jít za elektřinou do měst a elektřina bude distribuována tím dnešním konvenčním způsobem – velké centrální zdroje, distribuční přenosová soustava, zátěž životního prostředí – anebo elektřina přijde za nimi do míst, kde jsou oni po generace zvyklí a vedou tam tradiční způsob života v harmonii s přírodou, ale toto může být pouze forma decentralizované obnovitelné elektřiny. Takže my, když rozvíjíme technologie obnovitelných zdrojů v Evropě, tak to neděláme jenom kvůli vyspělým zemím, ale děláme to také proto, aby tím, že se rozšíří počet instalací ve světě, se snížily investiční a provozní náklady a aby tyto technologie byly dostupné pro občany v rozvojových zemích, čili tohle je ohromný politický úkol, který je před námi ve vztahu k rozvojovým zemím.

Rád bych nakonec ubezpečil, že české předsednictví má skutečně velké ambice posunout vyjednávání v oblasti klimatické změny dopředu. Velmi intenzivně budeme vést mezinárodní vyjednávání. Také bych vás rád ubezpečil o konzistentnosti českého předsednictví a jestliže jsem zde zaznamenal zmínku a padlo zde slovo „prezident České republiky“, tak jakkoli premiér České republiky se zde v debatě v Evropském parlamentu českého prezidenta Klause zastal, tak v oblasti ochrany klimatu a politiky ochrany klimatu mně nezbývá, než-li se zde určitým způsobem distancovat od vyjádření a od pozice českého prezidenta, a rád bych vás ubezpečil, že české předsednictví a jeho pozice formuluje česká vláda a že veškerá vyjádření, která můžete po dobu českého předsednictví ještě očekávat – protože pan prezident se také chystá navštívit Spojené státy – berte prosím s prizmatem toho, že klimatická politika je formulována českou vládou a my jsme zde naprosto konzistentní a spolupracujeme s Evropskou komisí a s nadcházejícím švédským předsednictvím v Trojce. Čili tolik mé vyjádření. Ještě jednou velmi děkuji za velmi plodnou, věcnou a především odpovědnou diskuzi tohoto ctihodného shromáždění.

3-067

Stavros Dimas, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, we are also looking forward to continuing to work closely with the Czech Presidency, the Czech Government and specifically with Minister Martin Bursík. I am sure that during the first semester of 2009 we will advance the negotiations considerably.

I would like to thank all the speakers in today's discussion for their positive contributions.

As the title of your report indicates, what happens to the world's climate in 2015 and beyond will depend on what action the international community decides now. Building on the solid scientific advice at our disposal, and insisting that negotiations must be guided by science, remains vital. We need to communicate the scientific findings to a broader public, and enhance consumer awareness of greenhouse gas impacts on lifestyles and consumption patterns.

Such increased awareness, however, needs to be accompanied by strong economic incentives for business to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the goods and services they provide. A transition to a low-carbon economy is needed at a global scale, and can only be achieved through comprehensive and integrated action to address emissions in all sectors.

Only by being ambitious now can we keep the door open to stabilising concentrations of greenhouse gases at lower levels, should the IPCC in future indicate that this is necessary. Together with the Commission, I am convinced that you also have an important role in echoing these important messages.

2009 will be a crucial year for the global climate change negotiations. For the Commission, 2009 will be a year of implementation: we are working on an implementation road map. There are about 15 measures that we need to take through comitology; there is a list of deadlines in the revised ETS that we are going to meet: for example, the list of sectors for carbon leakage should be ready by December 2009. There will be a big stakeholders' meeting on 30 March 2009. The bulk of the work will be done during the summer and, by the end of 2009, we shall have this list dealt with.

The harmonised rules on auctioning should be ready by June 2010. There will be a big stakeholders' meeting in February, and all these deadlines and work programmes are available to you. But 2009, as I said, is going to be a crucial year for the global climate change negotiations.

The world is expected to agree on further international action to tackle climate change at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference in December. However, a deal in Copenhagen is by no means a given: much work remains to be done.

The climate change and energy package gave us a head start in this transition and provided an excellent basis to prove that ambitious climate policy is not only possible but also broadly beneficial to our economies and societies. The Copenhagen Communication is the basis for further elaborating the European Union's positions on those key elements, enabling us to maintain our leadership and help lead the negotiations to a success in Copenhagen.

It is clear that the climate change challenge cannot be solved without significantly stepping up the financing of, and investment in, clean technology, as well as measures to adapt to the inevitable climate change impacts. Required amounts for developing countries are estimated to go up to EUR 120-150 billion annually in 2020.

Until 2020, this financing can, for a large part, come from the private-sector households in developing countries. For instance, the major part of reductions in the energy sector will come from efficiency improvements that will pay for themselves. These may partly be supported by international loan arrangements in order to mobilise international private finance.

Another significant part of additional financing and investment will be mobilised through the carbon market, both from the proceeds of the future auctioning of carbon allowances and via carbon credits under the CDM. The European Union in its climate and energy package has created significant demand for CDM credits until 2020. This is likely to spur the deployment of clean technologies in developing countries.

However, the poorer the developing countries are, the more they will require further public financial assistance from developed countries. Without this assistance they will not be able to sufficiently reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Without this assistance the poorest and most vulnerable will suffer the consequences of climate change. Without this assistance there will be no deal in Copenhagen.

The question is: how can we make sure that these additional public financial flows will be predictable, be spent transparently and effectively, and that the contributions to those flows will be shared internationally?

In addition to our contributions to the United Nations negotiations, we see that, following the success of the European Union's emissions trading system, carbon markets are being established in many parts of the world. Australia has announced the core elements of its system. In autumn 2008, shortly after his election, US President Obama reaffirmed his goal to create a US-wide carbon market.

Together, these trading systems could form the nucleus of an evolving future global carbon market. As I have already stressed, the European Union's challenge now is to facilitate the development of such linked carbon markets, in particular among OECD countries by 2015.

In the Copenhagen Communication, the Commission has addressed these questions by putting forward concrete proposals – proposals that are not only ambitious but also realistic, and will make a significant contribution to the success in Copenhagen that our planet so desperately needs.

Let me conclude by taking this opportunity to thank the Temporary Committee on Climate Change, Mr Florenz and Parliament for their strong support for our proposals and for the seriousness and speed with which they have handled the package.

(Applause)

3-068

Karl-Heinz Florenz, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Ratspräsident! Ich freue mich ganz besonders, dass in der Schlussrunde dieses nichtständigen Ausschusses dieses Thema auf so ausgeprägtes Interesse stößt. Dafür möchte ich mich sehr herzlich bedanken. Ich bedanke mich auch bei allen Diskutanten und bei allen, die mitgearbeitet haben. Wir haben eine *Roadmap* nach Kopenhagen entwickelt, und dieser Fahrplan hat natürlich Verkehrszeichen zum Inhalt, auch Stoppzeichen, auch Freie-Fahrt-Zeichen, aber auch Zeichen, bei denen man weiß, dass es schwierige Wegstrecken gibt. Das haben wir hier diskutiert.

Ich habe mich gefreut, dass es kritische Anmerkungen gab, die man teilweise übernehmen kann. Der Vorschlag meines Kollegen Jens Holm an die europäischen Bürger, das Fleischessen abzuschaffen, ist – Verzeihung – Unsinn. Aber jeder hat so seine Meinung. Am Ende werden wir zu einem guten Erfolg kommen, und dazu haben alle beigetragen. Von meiner Seite aus nochmals herzlichen Dank.

3-069

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu aujourd'hui.

Déclarations écrites (article 142)

3-070

Constantin Dumitriu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Stimați colegi, în ultimele luni am văzut ce înseamnă o economie globală afectată de o criză fără precedent, criza creditelor. În egală măsură, se fac simțite însă și criza climatică, cea alimentară și socială.

În România ne-am confruntat în ultimii ani cu scăderi ale producției datorită unor cauze externe precum inundațiile, seceta, gripa aviară, la care s-au adăugat în ultimele luni problemele de natură economică. În contextul crizei financiare ne va fi din ce în ce mai greu să acoperim de la bugetul de stat pagubele produse de inundații sau secetă. Pe tot parcursul activității mele în Comisia de Agricultură, am susținut ideea constituirii unor mecanisme de intervenție la nivel comunitar de sine stătătoare, independente de valoarea plafoanelor naționale.

Cred, de asemenea, că într-o confruntare de asemenea proporții trebuie să acordăm prioritate investițiilor în tehnologiile curate și în energia regenerabilă. Acestea sunt o soluție pentru criza climatică și, în același timp, pentru relansare economică prin crearea de noi locuri de muncă. Ca parte a mandatului nostru european, avem datoria de a convinge guvernele noastre să investească mai mult în inovație și în tehnologii noi legate de mediu.

3-071

Gábor Harangozó (PSE), in writing. – Tackling climate change at this moment of deep financial turmoil and decreased confidence in economic systems may seem for many a mistake in terms of priorities. Going ‘green’ is costly, and the efforts necessary for the fundamental restructuring of many sectors in order to achieve ambitious targets are tremendous.

Nevertheless, there are many opportunities to be seized in ‘green’ investments and policies as elements favouring economic recovery and stability. The development of a low-emission economy is a genuine challenge we cannot afford not to deal with. We need ambitious but still feasible targets and we need not be afraid to walk the path of an inevitable industrial revolution. In order to secure economic recovery and better living conditions for our citizens, a complex and ambitious approach is required, fostering innovation and the development of new jobs and businesses in the framework of ‘green’ technologies.

Finally, sufficient financial means are of course necessary to make the required investments in ‘green’ innovation and, obviously, these costs cannot simply be made at the expense of other vital Community policies which cannot bear the burden of climate change without additional financial resources.

3-072

Gyula Hegyi (PSE), írásban. – A klímaváltozás hosszú távú következményei közül az egyik legsúlyosabb az édesvíz források szűkülése, az egészséges ivóvíz fokozódó hiánya. Nem túlzás azt állítani, hogy a huszonegyedik század elsőszámú stratégiai kincse a víz lesz. Az európai környezetvédelmi politikának ezért az eddiginél határozottabban kell szolgálnia a vízbázisok védelmét, a víz- és talajszennyezés megelőzését, a természetes és mesterséges vízi élőhelyek megfelelő kezelését.

Az árvizek és az aszályos időszak váltakozása, a szélsőséges időjárás megköveteli a csapadékvízzel való jobb gazdálkodást, nincs felesleges víz, csak rosszul kezelt víz! Az Európai Uniónak a következő parlamenti ciklusban és az új költségvetésben komoly összegeket kell biztosítani az árvizek megelőzésére, a vízbázisok védelmére, a városi élővizek növelésére és a víztisztasági programokra. Magyarország vízügyi adottságai kiválóak, a magyar vízépítő mérnökök közel kétszáz éve nagyszerű munkát végeznek. Ezért biztos vagyok benne, hogy hazánk aktív és konstruktív szerepet játszik majd az egységes európai vízpolitikában.

3-073

Zbigniew Krzysztof Kuźmiuk (UEN), na piśmie. – Zabierając głos w debacie poświęconej polityce ochrony klimatu do 2050 roku, chcę zwrócić uwagę na następujące kwestie.

1. Jeżeli Stany Zjednoczone i kraje Azji Południowo-Wschodniej nie przystąpią do programu ograniczenia emisji CO₂ z równym zaangażowaniem jak Unia Europejska, to ogromny wysiłek finansowy i nieuchronne spowolnienie rozwoju gospodarki Unii Europejskiej okażą się bardzo wysoką ceną za znikome ograniczenie emisji CO₂. Unia Europejska odpowiada bowiem za zaledwie 14% emisji światowej, a USA i kraje Azji Południowo-Wschodniej aż za blisko 80% tej emisji.

2. Zobowiązanie się przez poszczególne kraje członkowskie do redukcji CO₂ o 20% do roku 2020, z jednoczesną koniecznością kupowania praw do emisji, będzie oznaczało znaczące podwyżki cen energii elektrycznej i ciepłej dla ludności, a także jeszcze wyższe podwyżki cen energii dla przemysłu, szczególnie w nowych krajach członkowskich, jak np. Polska, w których energetyka oparta jest na węglu. Może to spowodować, że wiele energochłonnych dziedzin przemysłu w tych krajach zostanie zlikwidowanych ze wszystkimi tego negatywnymi skutkami społecznymi.

3. Powinny zostać dostrzeżone osiągnięcia w ograniczeniu emisji CO₂ w nowych krajach członkowskich, a w szczególności w Polsce, gdzie na skutek głębokiej restrukturyzacji gospodarki w latach 1990- 2005 nastąpiła redukcja CO₂ o ok. 30%, co wiązało się z ogromnymi kosztami społecznymi i bezrobociem sięgającym przez wiele lat tego okresu poziomu ponad 20%.

3-074

Adrian Manole (PPE-DE), în scris. – Consider că raportul dlui Florenz „2050: viitorul începe azi – recomandări pentru o viitoare politică integrată pentru protecția mediului în UE” era oportun și necesar, având în vedere efectele observate și anticipate aduse de către schimbările climatice.

România este una dintre primele țări europene care a semnat Protocolul de la Kyoto, prin care și-a asumat angajamentul său de a sprijini lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice prin reducerea emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră, cu 8% până în anul 2012.

Sunt convins de necesitatea acestor măsuri, deși, în comparație cu multe alte țări europene, România are emisii scăzute de gaze cu efect de seră. Atât agricultura, cât și fondul forestier românesc pot juca un rol important în lupta cu schimbările climatice, puternic resimțite în ultimii ani mai ales prin inundații și prin temperaturi ridicate și secete prelungite. Aceste fenomene afectează atât productivitatea agricolă și forestieră, cât și valoroase habitate și ecosisteme.

Este de așteptat ca agricultura și silvicultura să continue să aducă o importantă contribuție la combaterea efectelor produse de schimbările climatice, prin realizarea împăduririlor în vederea absorbției și a retenției gazelor cu efect de seră, și utilizarea biomasei ca sursă de energie regenerabilă.

3-075

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Uniunea Europeană și-a asumat un rol major în efortul de găsire a unui compromis pentru adoptarea unui acord global post-Kyoto și este posibil ca, împreună cu noua administrație americană, să se găsească o modalitate concretă de realizare a acestui acord.

Măsurile concrete de combatere a efectelor schimbărilor climatice reprezintă tot atâtea oportunități de dezvoltare socio-economică durabilă și de creare de noi locuri de muncă. Ele se adresează în special sectoarelor noi și dinamice, cu potențial major de creștere, în care nu s-au făcut suficiente investiții până în prezent. Aceste măsuri, pe lângă efectul benefic în lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice, vor avea efecte pozitive și în atenuarea efectelor crizei economico-financiare și vor putea determina, pe termen lung, scăderea dependenței Uniunii Europene de importurile de energie.

Vorbim aici despre investiții accelerate și noi în infrastructurile de transport, în energiile regenerabile, în biotehnologii, în colectarea și reciclarea deșeurilor, în energia nucleară, în reabilitarea termică a locuințelor.

Reîmpăduririle și măsurile împotriva fenomenului de deșertificare pot determina rezultate spectaculoase pe termen mediu.

3-076

David Martin (PSE), in writing. – I welcome the Florenz Report on climate change which aims to formulate policies for keeping global warming below 2° compared to pre-industrial times. I particularly welcome the call for a 20% improvement in energy efficiency, the call for binding targets for agriculture and the demand for the creation of a European Climate Fund.

These proposals plus the measures already adopted by the EU put us in a strong position to argue for global action on climate change at the Copenhagen summit.

3-077

Péter Olajos (PPE-DE), írásban. – Gratulálok Florenz úrnak a jelentéséhez, kiváló anyag az év végi koppenhágai tárgyalások előkészítéséhez.

Nagyon fontosnak tartom a megállapítást, hogy a gazdasági és pénzügyi válságnak azonos a gyökere, mint az éghajlatváltozási válságunknak. Így a válságokból kivezető út is azonos. A válságok következményeinek mérsékléséhez, megállításához átfogó innovációra és paradigmaváltásra van szükség az élet minden területén.

Egyetértek Dimas biztos úrral, hogy a költségek fedezése egyrészt a szén-dioxid kereskedésből, másodrészt magán cégek befektetéseiből, harmadrészt pedig állami ösztönzésből kell álljon.

Mindenki a kitörési pontokat keresi, hogyan lehet a foglalkoztatást élénkíteni, mielőbb beindítani a világgazdaság motorját, az éghajlatváltozást megállítani. A „zöld New Dealnek” nevezett koncepciót Ban Ki Mun ENSZ Főtitkár fogalmazta meg. Lényege, hogy a globális gazdasági ösztönzőknek részévé kell válnia a környezetbarát technológiákba való befektetéseknek. A környezeti technológia innovációira épülő és a nemzetközi tőkepiacok támogatását élvező új gazdaságszervező logika az új amerikai elnök Barack Obama programját is alapvetően meghatározza.

A zöld- és jövőipari technológiai innovációk növelnék az állami és a gazdasági hatékonyságot, erősítenék a gazdasági szereplők érdekeltiségét, növelnék a fogyasztók ár- és költségérzékenységét a felkínált termékekkel, szolgáltatásokkal szemben.

3-078

Rovana Plumb (PSE), în scris. – Raportul reprezintă, prin cele 12 puncte, un ghid clar de acțiune în viitor. Dar pentru a putea acționa la nivel local, național, regional, global trebuie să avem sprijinul cetățenilor bine informați.

Conform Eurobarometrului special din primăvara 2008 privind „schimbările climatice”, cca. 41% dintre europeni se declară slab informați cu privire la cauzele, consecințele și modalitățile de combatere a schimbărilor climatice. În România, peste 65% dintre cetățeni nu sunt informați.

Sensibilizarea populației prin campanii de educație și conștientizare desfășurate în domeniile vieții cotidiene reprezintă un pas esențial în această direcție. Comisia și statele membre trebuie să finanțeze campanii de conștientizare a cetățenilor, să creeze condiții pentru formarea de noi cariere adaptate provocărilor specifice pieței muncii determinate de schimbările economice structurale, care sunt accelerate prin schimbările climatice și efectele acestora.

În contextul crizei economice, UE trebuie să se angajeze politico-financiar în domeniile-cheie de susținere și dezvoltare de tehnologii „curate” pentru combaterea schimbărilor climatice, susținerea măsurilor de adaptare transfrontaliere, creșterea

eficienței energetice și asistența în caz de dezastre, conform principiului UE al solidarității. Toate acestea înseamnă crearea de locuri de munca „verzi” în întreprinderi noi și competitive.

3-079

Flaviu Călin Rus (PPE-DE), în scris. – Domnilor colegi, orice dezbatere despre climă, ecosistem, energie, este extrem de importantă, deoarece orice schimbare majoră a acestora poate afecta viața pe pământ. Indiferent de tipurile de cauze sau de argumentele științifice ale diferitelor grupuri de cercetători, un lucru este cert, și anume acela că ne confruntăm cu un fenomen de încălzire globală. Acest raport amplu și consistent, alături de toate informațiile utile și valoroase pe care le oferă, ne îndeamnă la formularea următoarei întrebări: Ce putem face pentru noi și pentru generațiile viitoare?

În acest context referitor la modificările climatice, consider că există trei tipuri de proiecte, pe care statele membre ale UE ar trebui să le dezvolte și să le susțină cu prioritate:

1. proiecte referitoare la politici unitare de gestionare cât mai eficientă a energiei și de găsire a unor soluții de diminuare a poluării, în special în ceea ce privește zonele și parcurile industriale.
2. proiecte referitoare la finanțarea cercetării științifice, în măsură să dezvolte tehnologii nepoluante.
3. proiecte care să sprijine imediat acțiuni concrete de refacere a ecosistemului atât la nivel european, cât și în orice altă zonă a lumii.

3-080

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE), în scris. – Uniunea Europeană și-a asumat rolul de lider în lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice, iar o strategie pe termen lung de gestionare eficientă a resurselor naturale va asigura o economie globală cu emisii reduse de dioxid de carbon.

Această strategie trebuie să se bazeze pe principiul solidarității pentru a obține un echilibru între țările bogate și cele în curs de dezvoltare care au nevoie de susținere în reducerea vulnerabilității față de efectele negative ale schimbărilor climatice. Încălzirea globală se traduce prin sărăcie, produse alimentare insuficiente și resurse energetice limitate. Este bine știut faptul că petrolul nu mai reprezintă o sursă de energie suficient de puternică pentru a acoperi cererea care se estimează să crească cu cel puțin 60% până în anul 2030. Găsirea de surse alternative și utilizarea rațională a resurselor existente este o provocare cu care Uniunea se va confrunta pe viitor. Agricultură este unul dintre domeniile cele mai expuse la schimbările climatice din cauza dependenței sale de condițiile meteorologice.

Ținând cont de faptul că acest sector asigură resursele de hrană ale populației globului, gestionarea durabilă a solului și a resurselor de apă, precum și protejarea pădurilor și a biodiversității, vor trebui să se afle pe agenda strategiei pe termen lung de contracarare a efectelor încălzirii globale.

3-081

Richard Seeber (PPE-DE), schriftlich. – Europa und die Welt stehen aktuell vor großen Herausforderungen. Nicht nur die Kapitalmarktkrise ist ein drängendes Problem. Wir müssen auch schnellstmöglich die Weichen für einen nachhaltigen Klimaschutz stellen. Ein so großer wirtschaftlicher und politischer Zusammenschluss wie die Europäische Union kann sich als führender Partner im Kampf gegen den Klimawandel etablieren.

Der erste Schritt ist dabei schon getan – die Union hat sich auf verbindliche Klimaziele geeinigt und mit der Verabschiedung des Klimapakets im Dezember 2008 viele sinnvolle Maßnahmen zum Klimaschutz auf den Weg gebracht. Oberste Priorität muss nun der Abschluss des internationalen Abkommens in Kopenhagen haben. Deindustrialisierung und unnötige Belastung der europäischen Wirtschaft müssen dabei vermieden werden. Vielmehr sollten vermehrt Investitionen und Forschungsanstrengungen in grüne Technologie unternommen werden. Europa kann so nicht nur im Umweltbereich, sondern auch wirtschaftlich nach vorne gebracht werden.

3-082

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE-DE), în scris. – Uniunea Europeană a devenit principalul actor care face pași concreți în adoptarea de politici care răspund provocării globale generate de schimbările climatice.

Politica europeană în acest domeniu poate deveni mai eficientă la nivel global și în interiorul UE în măsura în care: a) efortul european este susținut de efortul celorlalte țări puternic industrializate din afara UE, precum cel al unor țări cum sunt China, India, Brazilia, Rusia etc.; b) dezvoltarea energiei nucleare este încurajată și nu descurajată, cel puțin în următorii 30-40 de ani, până când tehnologiile privind valorificarea resurselor regenerabile vor fi puse la punct, iar costurile vor permite comercializarea fără subvenții; c) Comisia Europeană va susține mai puternic proiectele pentru economisirea energiei și obținerea de energie din biomasă, inclusiv transferul de tehnologii, în țările membre ale UE mai puțin dezvoltate și cu un potențial agricol ridicat.

România va continua dezvoltarea programului nuclear de producere a energiei electrice. Totodată, va moderniza termocentralele pe cărbune și va intensifica eforturile pentru producerea de energie pe bază de biomasă. În acest sens,

avem nevoie de parteneriate cu statele membre și solicităm accelerarea demersului Comisiei Europene pentru simplificarea procedurilor de angajare a fondurilor europene.

3-083

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (PSE), írásban. – A gazdasági világválság negatív hatásait ellensúlyozó állami gazdaságélénkítő csomagokban hangsúlyos szerepet kell szánni a zöld beruházásoknak. Azok a beruházások, amelyek a megújuló energiaforrások hatékonyabb kihasználását, az energifogyasztás mérséklését, a széndioxid és más üvegházhatású gázok kibocsátásának csökkentését szolgálják a gazdasági előnyök mellett jelentős társadalmi hasznot hoznak. Magyarország érdeke, hogy ezeket az erőfeszítéseket az európai tagállamok egymással koordinálva, egymást erősítve végezzék. A környezeti célkitűzések során figyelemmel kell lenni az uniós tagállamok gazdasági és szociális teljesítőképességére is. Csak olyan célkitűzést szabad vállanunk, amelyet teljesíteni tudunk, figyelemmel a gazdasági válság hatásaira is. A célkitűzések csak társadalmi összefogással teljesíthetők, ehhez nem elegendő a kormányzati cselekvés, fokozatos társadalmi szemléletváltásra van szükség. A Florenz jelentésben tett konkrét cselekvési javaslatok, például a nulla energia felhasználású, ún. „passzív házak” építésének támogatása, a megújuló források kutatására létesítendő európai alap, az energiahálózatok európai szintű összekapcsolása, és az uniós polgárok, különösen a gyermekek tájékoztatása, mind ezt a társadalmi szemléletváltást segítik elő.

Emellett arra kell törekednünk, hogy a XXI. században is megőrizzük Európa technológiai előnyét környezetvédelmi fejlesztések terén és ezt gazdasági-, társadalmi előnnyé formáljuk. Magyarországnak kiváló mezőgazdasági adottságaira támaszkodva komoly lehetőségek nyílnak a biomasszából történő energia-előállításra, vagy a növényi- és állati eredetű melléktermékek –egyébként hasznosításra alkalmatlan hulladékok- biogázként való felhasználására.

3-084

IN THE CHAIR: Diana WALLIS

Vice-President

3-085

4 - Priorities in the fight against Alzheimer's disease (written declaration): see Minutes

3-086

3-087

Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL). – Nu hoppas jag att hela parlamentet lyssnar! Under sammanträdesperioden i januari antog vi enhälligt en resolution om Afrikas horn. Den innehöll en specifik punkt om att Dawit Isaak skulle friges. Dawit Isaak är nu väldigt sjuk och jag vill be talmannen att skriva till de eritreanska myndigheterna.

Nyheten om hans sjukdom har konfirmerats av flera källor och finns i svenska medier i dag. Situationen är väldigt akut och desperat, och jag vill bara påminna om att Dawit Isaak är en svensk-eritreansk journalist som suttit fängslad utan rättgång sedan 2001. Nu är hans hälsoproblem så allvarliga att han hålls i ett militärsjukhus, och jag fruktar för hans liv.

Jag väddar om stöd för en frigivning av Dawit Isaak.

(applåder)

3-088

President. – Mrs Svensson, I can confirm that the President will write accordingly.

3-089

5 - Voting time

3-090

President. – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details on the vote: see Minutes.)

3-091

5.1 - 2050: The future begins today - Recommendations for the EU's future integrated policy on climate change (A6-0495/2008, Karl-Heinz Florenz) (vote)

3-092

(The sitting was suspended at 11.55 pending the formal sitting.)

3-093

VORSITZ: HANS-GERT PÖTTERING
Präsident

3-094

6 - Feierliche Sitzung - Palästinensische Autonomiebehörde

3-095-500

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit großer Freude und bewegt begrüße ich heute unter uns Mahmud Abbas, den Präsidenten der Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde. Herr Präsident, seien Sie sehr herzlich willkommen im Europäischen Parlament!

(Beifall)

Wir haben auch den Staatspräsidenten Israels, Shimon Peres, eingeladen. Wegen der Feiern zum sechzigjährigen Bestehen des Staates Israel konnte der vereinbarte Termin leider nicht eingehalten werden. Wir hoffen, dass der Besuch von Staatspräsident Peres bald nachgeholt werden kann.

Herr Präsident, Sie kommen nicht zum ersten Mal ins Europäische Parlament. Wenn ich Sie heute hier in Straßburg zu einem für den Nahen Osten und insbesondere für Ihr Volk, das palästinensische Volk, äußerst schwierigen Zeitpunkt begrüße, erinnere ich mich an unsere letzte Begegnung im Nahen Osten, die vor fast zwei Jahren – Ende Mai 2007 – in Gaza stattfand. Sie empfingen mich am offiziellen Sitz der Palästinensischen Autonomiebehörde. Unser Treffen werde ich niemals vergessen, die Situation war sehr, sehr angespannt. Sie führten seinerzeit heikle Vermittlungsgespräche mit dem Ziel, die Regierung der nationalen Einheit zu retten, die Sie mit Energie und Weitblick gebildet hatten. Bedauerlicherweise machte zehn Tage später ein unrühmlicher Staatsstreich diesen Bemühungen ein Ende.

Heute kommen Sie direkt aus Kairo, nach einem Zwischenstopp in Paris beim französischen Staatspräsidenten. In Kairo haben in den letzten Tagen vielversprechende Gespräche über die Bildung einer palästinensischen Regierung des nationalen Konsenses stattgefunden.

Angesichts der Tragödie im Gaza-Streifen hat das Europäische Parlament das Leiden des palästinensischen Volkes nicht teilnahmslos hingenommen. Das Europäische Parlament hat nicht geschwiegen. Wir haben einen sofortigen Waffenstillstand gefordert. Wir haben die unverhältnismäßige Reaktion verurteilt, die nicht nur die bewaffneten Kräfte der Hamas, sondern auch die Zivilbevölkerung sowie internationale humanitäre Organisationen traf. Ebenso haben wir entschieden die Provokationen und den Abschuss von Raketen durch die Hamas verurteilt, die bedauerlicherweise – und wir verurteilen das – auch trotz des Waffenstillstands weiterhin auf Israel abgefeuert werden. Dieses muss aufhören!

(Beifall)

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich möchte die Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter der United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) für den beispielhaften Mut und die vorbildliche Aufopferung würdigen, mit denen sie ihren Auftrag ausgeführt haben und weiterhin ausführen. Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments sei diesen Frauen und Männern der Vereinten Nationen aufrichtig gedankt!

(Beifall)

Wir rufen zu einer zügigen Wiederaufnahme der Friedensverhandlungen auf, denn wir sind davon überzeugt, dass es nicht bloß eine militärische Lösung des israelisch-palästinensischen Konflikts geben kann. Wir als politisch Handelnde stehen nun in der Pflicht und in der Verantwortung, alles daran zu setzen, dass die Menschen im Nahen Osten friedlich zusammenleben können. Voraussetzung für einen Frieden zwischen Israel und Palästina ist die innerpalästinensische Wiederaussöhnung. Das Europäische Parlament unterstützt vorbehaltlos die laufenden, insbesondere von Ägypten geführten Vermittlungsgespräche, die den Weg für die Bildung einer palästinensischen Regierung des nationalen Konsenses ebnen; nur eine solche Regierung ist in der Lage, die erforderliche Einheit des palästinensischen Volkes zu gewährleisten.

(Beifall)

Wir verlangen und erwarten, dass eine solche Regierung die Grundprinzipien des Friedensprozesses achtet, auf Gewalt verzichtet und engagiert Friedensverhandlungen mit Israel führt. Die Europäische Union ist bereit, mit einer solchen Regierung zusammenzuarbeiten.

Das Engagement des neuen amerikanischen Präsidenten Barack Obama, die Berufung von George Mitchell zum Sondergesandten für den Nahen Osten sind hoffnungsvolle Zeichen. Die Entschlossenheit der Europäischen Union – und ich freue mich, dass die zuständige Kommissarin, Frau Benita Ferrero-Waldner, zusammen mit ihrer Kollegin unter uns ist

–, ihr gesamtes politisches und wirtschaftliches Gewicht in die Waagschale zu legen, sowie der politische Wille zahlreicher arabischer Partnerländer zeigen, dass eine Wiederbelebung und ein erfolgreicher Abschluss des Friedensprozesses auf der Grundlage der Resolutionen der Vereinten Nationen und der arabischen Friedensinitiative möglich sein sollte.

Herr Präsident Abbas, wir sind Ihnen dankbar, dass Sie heute hier sind, und ich sage für das Europäische Parlament, besonders aber für mich persönlich: Wir haben große Achtung und Anerkennung für das, was Sie unter schwierigsten Bedingungen tun. Wir vertrauen Ihnen, weil Sie ein Mann des Ausgleichs, der Versöhnung und damit auch des Friedens sind. Wir wünschen Ihnen Erfolg!

Ich darf Sie nun bitten, Ihre Botschaft an das Europäische Parlament zu richten. Herzlich willkommen, Herr Präsident Mahmud Abbas, im Europäischen Parlament!

(Beifall)

3-096

Mahmoud Abbas, *President of the Palestinian Authority (transcription of the English interpretation from the original Arabic)*. – In the name of God, most gracious, most merciful. Your Excellency, Mr Pöttering, President of the European Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, Members of the European Parliament, first and foremost I should like to extend my thanks to His Excellency Mr Pöttering, President of the European Parliament, and to you for giving me this opportunity to speak before this august Assembly.

I have come to you from Palestine, whose people are suffering from one of the longest military occupations in modern history. Palestine has been deeply wounded by the most violent, dire and horrific military aggression, an aggression that has targeted the lives of children, women and the elderly, as well as their houses, livelihoods, farms, plants and schools. It has targeted drinking water, sewage systems and electricity, as well as hospitals, facilities, roads and bridges.

Yes, the Israeli war has targeted first and foremost the livelihoods of my people, its infrastructure and its future, as well as the future of its Palestinian state for which we have long worked together and for the establishment of which we are still working.

You have witnessed, along with the rest of the world, the burnt and scattered remains of children. You have heard the calls of men, the appeals of children and women who lost most of their family members. Yes, you have seen the mother who was murdered while holding her babies in her arms. You have seen the father who lost the lives of his five children because of rocket attacks, and the girl Balousha who slept next to her sisters and woke to the sound of explosions that killed them all, and the hundreds of children whose houses collapsed and fell on their heads.

You have also seen the Al-Fahura school, which was considered to be safe by the people of Jabalia, who took refuge in it, and how bombshells claimed the lives of those innocent refugees, with the result that over 40 people perished. These people had families, they had names, they had stories, ambitions and hopes. In addition, over 100 people were wounded.

Along with those innocent victims fell the values of human conscience, the principles of the United Nations and its duties to protect international peace and security. You may also recall that the headquarters of the United Nations, its schools, clinics, food and medical warehouses were not spared this insane war against our peaceful and resilient people in Gaza.

I have come to you, ladies and gentlemen, from Palestine bearing a question by a boy named Luay who lost his eyesight because of bombs. He asked me who would give back to his eyes the light of hope, the light of life and to his people the light of freedom and peace.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, those were terrible scenes and pictures. This was the aftermath of this war which led to the deaths of over 1 400 martyrs, with over 5 000 injured, the majority of whom were innocent civilians, and a high percentage of whom were children, women and the elderly. About 500 of the wounded are still in a critical condition and are dying by the day, in addition to a total destruction of over 4 000 homes, buildings, and about 20 000 other homes.

This means that about 90 000 people became homeless and were displaced. In addition to wide-ranging destruction of electricity systems, water systems, sewage systems, in addition to roads and vital facilities, public and private buildings, this Israeli war has claimed the fruit of the blood and sweat of our Palestinian people, hundreds of thousands of Palestinian people who worked all their lives and lost the fruit of this work. It has also destroyed what the Palestinian National Authority has established over 15 years.

Much of this infrastructure and many of these facilities were thanks to the contributions of your countries and other friendly countries.

This is the scene of the aftermath of this war. This is in parallel to another type of aggression against our lands, our farmers and our national economy that happens on a daily basis in the West Bank.

The Israeli settlement has not stopped at all. The policies of settlement led to the continuation in building the wall of separation, as well as to an increase in roadblocks, checkpoints and barriers besieging the cities, villages and little towns and refugee camps in the West Bank, including Jerusalem.

On the contrary, bids for settlement units have increased 17-fold in the last year in comparison with the year that preceded Anapolis. The checkpoints have increased from 580 to 660.

Military incursions have not stopped, nor have the daily arrests and sometimes assassinations of citizens; the bullying by settlers and their armed incursions and burning of homes which happened in Hebron, Nablus and other areas; and the terrorist attacks conducted by settlers against farmers in the olive season, which is considered by our people the symbol of peace and life, and not just the livelihood for tens of thousands of Palestinian families.

This tragic scene of Israeli incursions and aggressions in the West Bank, including Eastern Jerusalem, confirms to us and to the world that what is going on is an aggression against the entire Palestinian people, its future and its legitimate national rights. It is an aggression and a war against the future of peace and dedicated international efforts that have been deployed for its establishment.

This unjust embargo on our people in Gaza and the war against it was but an episode in a continuous series of measures aiming at separating Gaza from the rest of the Occupied Palestinian lands, and also at marginalising Gaza and marginalising all of our people, and preventing our people from attaining their ultimate goal: an end to occupation, gaining freedom and the right to self-determination and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state on the lands that were occupied in 1967, with Eastern Jerusalem as its capital.

This is confirmed by the escalating settlement policies, despite all the efforts and agreements, including the George Mitchell report in 2001, the last of which was the Anapolis Agreement, which promised the Palestinian people a state at the end of 2008. However, the culmination of this Anapolis Agreement was a destructive war in Gaza and a settlement war in the West Bank, including Jerusalem.

The world declared in Anapolis the failure of unilateral and military solutions. We also declared that Israel should be committed to putting an end to settlement activities in order to pave the way towards a political process that will put an end to occupation and will be the fulfilment of the right of a two-state solution – a Palestinian state and an Israeli state. However, reality proves to us that Israel is still governed by a military and settlement mentality, even though its leaders speak about the two-state solution.

We must not deal with Israel as if it were a state above accountability, above international law. We must put an end to such practices and we must hold the leaders of Israel accountable for their violations of international and humanitarian law.

(Applause)

At the same time, we should like to stress that the success of relief and aid operations, as well as resettling families whose homes were destroyed, necessitates the lifting of embargoes, opening checkpoints and crossings, as well as holding Israel accountable to its commitment in the Agreement on Movement and Crossing of 2005, which would lead to the flow of aid, equipment and materials necessary for reconstruction and the normal movement of goods and individuals. This applies to all crossings in Gaza – not just the Rafah crossing – and also applies to the freedom of movement in the West Bank and the security corridors between the West Bank and Gaza to stress the unity of the Palestinian land and its economy.

Here I should like to commend the efforts of UNRWA for its continuous work, in spite of all obstructions and obstacles, to help our people. I call upon your organisation and other organisations to support its efforts in all fields.

National reconciliation and the establishment of a national reconciliation government constitute one of our priorities. We have opened the door for this reconciliation that will put an end to divisions and upheaval, and also to calls for separation between Gaza and the West Bank. We warned against falling into this trap that Israel wants us to fall into.

Therefore, at the beginning of June we called for an unconditional dialogue. We accepted the Egyptian working paper. Our doors are still open; we will not allow the division of our people and of its geographical unity; we shall continue our dedicated efforts to deal with any attempt at separation.

We know the intentions and the plans of the regional forces and tendencies which support separation and encourage it. These forces obstruct the Egyptian solution that will put an end to internal disputes and divisions. This solution is

seconded at an Arab level by the Arab League and by Security Council resolution 1860, in the drafting of which I personally participated, together with Arab and European ministers.

I should like to stress that we shall continue deploying our efforts towards reaching our most noble aim, which is to find a solution for the Arab-Palestinian cause, because the status quo leaves the future unknown and leaves our people victims of the policies of war, aggression and extremism.

Once we achieve a government of national reconciliation, based on a programme that is supported by Arab and international parties, that will allow us to oversee crossings, as well as reconstruction efforts, to the benefit of our people and of preparations for presidential and legislative elections.

I hope that will receive your support, and I also hope you will help us in organising such elections and overseeing them, as was the case in 1996 and 2006. We also hope to be able to count on your support in order to release the President of the Palestinian Legislative Council and all MPs who were arrested and are still prisoners of Israel.

(Applause)

The essence of the conflict in our region is the Israeli occupation. It is a conflict between the hopes and aspirations of our people to rid themselves of this occupation and the attempt by Israel to destroy these aspirations, as well as obstructing international efforts that aim towards establishing a Palestinian state by peaceful means.

Our people look to you and to all peace- and justice-loving nations and call upon you: the time has come for the international community to assume its legal, political and moral responsibilities in order to provide adequate international protection for it and enable it to get rid of this occupation and to live in peace and freedom. Here I should like to stress again our request and your request to send international forces in order to protect our people.

We have heard about international and Arab efforts to reconstruct Gaza. It is true that these efforts should be deployed as soon as possible in order for our people to regain hope and trust, but we wonder how long Israel will be given a free hand to destroy the assets and infrastructure of Arab people.

Therefore the international community must prevent the repetition of those past events, and should also call on Israel to stop its destructive policies. I should like to repeat my thanks to the European Commission for its help in reconstructing the establishments and the institutions of the Palestinian Authority. I should like to stress that serious and comprehensive negotiations cannot be continued without a complete halt to settlement – including what is known as natural extension – and to all settlement blocks and all types of embargo.

I should like to confirm to you that the achievements of the Palestinian Government with regard to strengthening peace, public order and stability cannot be ignored by any party. Israel should be committed to its deadlines and also should stop undermining the efforts of the Palestinian Government by means of incursions and arrests. It should also respect the legal and security status of the Palestinian authority, in addition to enabling the Government to implement its vital economic projects, without using pretexts such as the G areas and other examples.

We can no longer negotiate about the end of occupation. What we need is a complete end to occupation – i.e. of the land that has been occupied since 5 June 1967, as was stated by the road map. We cannot go back to negotiating over partial and ancillary issues, while a solution to the main cause – the end of occupation – remains absent and there is an escalation in settlement seeking to strengthen and deepen this occupation, as well as the arrest of 11 000 Palestinian prisoners. This, and only this, will enable the peace process to regain its credibility with regard to our people and the people of the area as a whole.

What we need, ladies and gentlemen, is the reconstruction of Gaza, but also the reconstruction of the peace process. This is our collective responsibility. Europe, which upheld in the past – and is still upholding – the principles of security and justice in our region and in the world, must stress today, more than at any time, its role in a comprehensive and clear partnership with President Obama's Administration, the Quartet and the international community. The election of President Obama and his declared stances, in addition to his initiative in appointing Mr George Mitchell as his special envoy, are encouraging initiatives that will smooth the path of negotiations and the entire political process.

I should like to say, in all honesty, that our Arab decision is to implement the Arab peace initiative – the Arab peace initiative which is part of the road map, and has become an Islamic peace initiative including 57 Muslim countries. This initiative should be fully complemented.

As I said before, this initiative is part of the road map that was adopted in the Security Council, according to resolution 1515. We cannot pick and choose and negotiate about its foundations that are based on international law. This is the last

opportunity we have for true and just peace in our region. All parties, especially Israel, and the Quartet, should be loud and honest about this.

We must point out that the Arab peace initiative has become an Islamic initiative as well. It is an initiative that calls for land for peace. As soon as Israel withdraws from all occupied territories, 57 Arab and Muslim countries will be willing to normalise their relationships with Israel. This is an historic opportunity that must not be wasted.

Ladies and gentlemen, the scenes of death and destruction shook the conscience and the feelings of millions of people around the world, including European friendly countries. Our people appreciate this lively human conscience, but we must stress in this regard that the people of Palestine will not lose its will for freedom and life. They look forward to your support in their struggle to achieve their right to freedom and independence, to be able to build their future and to be able to give to their children their right to a safe life, a developed school and a bright future in their homeland – this homeland that deserves life and security.

Ladies and gentlemen, our great Palestinian poet, Mahmoud Darwish, said time and again, ‘This land is worth living for’. In this regard, I should like to extend my deep thanks and gratitude to you, on behalf of the people of this great poet, for hosting the activities of his commemoration. This poet is the symbol of Palestinian patriotism. He is the poet of humanity.

To Mahmoud Darwish I say: ‘Your poem, that has yet to be written, about the children of Gaza, their suffering and their hopes, will be written by a poet from among those children who upheld your spirit, just as you upheld their cause and their little dreams’. Thank you for listening.

(Sustained applause)

3-097

Der Präsident. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident Abbas! Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments möchte ich Ihnen sehr herzlich danken, dass Sie zu uns hier ins Europäische Parlament nach Straßburg gekommen sind und dass Sie zu uns gesprochen haben. Es ist jetzt unsere gemeinsame Aufgabe, am Frieden zu arbeiten. Wir in der Europäischen Union, das Europäische Parlament, wir wollen ehrlicher Makler sein. Wir wollen, dass die Menschen in Israel in sicheren Grenzen leben, und wir wollen, dass die Menschen in Palästina in sicheren Grenzen leben. Wir gehen von der Würde des Menschen aus. Ein palästinensisches Mädchen ist so fleißig in der Schule wie ein israelisches Mädchen. Ein israelischer Junge spielt so gerne Fußball wie ein palästinensischer Junge. Es muss die Zeit kommen für das, was wir in Europa erreicht haben: friedlich miteinander zu leben. Das ist unser Wunsch für den Nahen Osten.

Wir wünschen Ihnen, Herr Präsident Abbas, Erfolg bei Ihren großen Bemühungen für den Frieden. Ein sicherer palästinensischer Staat, aber auch – und das sagen wir an die Adresse Israels gewandt – ein sicherer israelischer Staat darf keine Vision bleiben! Es muss Wirklichkeit werden, und es muss Wirklichkeit werden in unserer Generation! Wenn wir es wollen, dann kann man das erreichen

(Beifall)

Herr Präsident, ich danke Ihnen. Wenn die Umstände es erlauben, werden wir uns am 23./24. Februar sehen. Der Vorstand der Euromediterranen Parlamentarischen Versammlung hat mich beauftragt, Palästina und Israel zu besuchen. Wir werden mit einer Delegation unter meinem Vorsitz nach Gaza reisen. Wir werden aber auch die Gebiete im südlichen Israel besuchen. Wenn Ihr Terminplan es erlaubt – und ich hoffe, das ist möglich –, werden wir uns in Ramallah sehen. Ich werde natürlich auch in Jerusalem sein.

Wir wollen dabei helfen – wir sagen das mit unserem Verstand und mit unserem Herzen –, dass der Friede möglich wird im Nahen Osten zwischen Israel und Palästina, zwischen Palästina und Israel.

Herr Präsident Abbas, wir danken Ihnen für Ihre Arbeit und ermutigen Sie, auf diesem Weg der Versöhnung, des Ausgleichs und des Friedens weiterzugehen. Wir danken Ihnen für Ihren Besuch hier im Europäischen Parlament.

(Beifall)

3-098

IN THE CHAIR: Diana WALLIS *Vice-President*

3-099

Urszula Gacek (PPE-DE). – Madam President, four months ago a Polish engineer was kidnapped in Pakistan. He is being held by his Taliban captors, who threaten to execute him today if their demands are not met. I appeal to this House to support the Governments of Poland and Pakistan in their efforts to secure the release of my countryman.

3-100

7 - Voting time (continuation)

3-102

7.1 - Sanctions against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals (A6-0026/2009, Claudio Fava) (vote)

3-103

– *Before the vote:*

3-104

Claudio Fava, relatore. – Signora Presidente, con il suo permesso vorrei chiedere al Consiglio, col sostegno degli altri gruppi, di allegare alla direttiva la seguente dichiarazione formale e quindi di posporre il voto sulla risoluzione legislativa. Leggo la dichiarazione che credo sia allegata:

3-105

‘The European Parliament and the Council state that the rules on subcontracting agreed upon in Article 9 of this Directive shall be without prejudice to other provisions on this issue to be adopted in future legislative instruments.’

3-106

Martin Bursík, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, the Presidency takes note of the proposed declaration. However, it has to inform the Members of the European Parliament that it cannot make commitments on behalf of the Council without consulting it.

3-107

Claudio Fava, relatore. – Signora Presidente, so che il Consiglio dovrà riunire formalmente il Coreper. Chiedo alla Presidenza di proporre questa dichiarazione da aggiungere formalmente e per questa ragione le chiedo di posporre alla prossima plenaria il voto sulla risoluzione, in modo da dare al Consiglio il tempo di consumare questa consultazione formale.

3-108

(Parliament agreed to postpone the vote.)

3-109

7.2 - Challenge of energy efficiency through information and communications technologies (vote)

3-110

7.3 - Resettlement of Guantánamo prisoners (vote)

3-111

8 - Explanations of vote

3-112

3-113

Reinhard Rack (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe das letzte Mal bei der feierlichen Sitzung darum gebeten, den Einsatz der Kamera dadurch zu erleichtern, dass man einen Sitz frei lässt. Heute war das wieder nicht der Fall: die Kamera war nicht bei mir, sondern bei General Morillon und anschließend beim Kollegen Grosch. Vielleicht könnte man dafür sorgen, dass sowohl die Arbeit des Kameramanns als auch unsere Arbeit ermöglicht werden.

3-114

President. – Thank you Mr. Rack, we will remind the services.

3-115

Oral explanations of vote

3-116

- Report: Karl-Heinz Florenz (A6-0495/2008)

3-117

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I did, in the end, vote for this report because, as a whole, we are all in favour of preserving our environment. That is a noble tradition of my party – the Conservative Party in Britain – but I think I have to put two riders to it.

The first rider is that we can only have a proper policy on climate change if everybody joins in. It is simply a waste of time for the European Union, or an individual country, to have a policy. So we have to involve the countries of Asia.

The second rider is that, in the uncertain times in which we live, a policy of climate change has to be tempered with the need for energy security. We face a situation in the world today where all of our countries need a ready supply of energy. That must be predominant because, without it, the economies and the welfare and the well-being of our people will not be sustained.

3-118

Bogdan Pęk (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chcę również wypowiedzieć się w kwestii tej dyrektywy. Głosowałem przeciw, gdyż jestem głęboko przekonany, że jest to dokument niesłychanie groźny i szkodliwy dla rozwoju Europy. Miesza on bowiem oczywistą kwestię potrzeby racjonalnej ochrony środowiska z totalnie zakłamaną koncepcją, iż człowiek może wpływać na cykliczne zmiany klimatyczne.

Właśnie ta część, tj. zmniejszenie emisji dwutlenku węgla, stanowi najważniejszą część tego dokumentu. Ogromne pieniądze, szacowane na setki miliardów, wydane na ten cel będą całkowicie zmarnowane, a mogłyby posłużyć do zbudowania prawdziwego bezpieczeństwa ekologicznego i energetycznego Unii Europejskiej. To jest bardzo złe i tragiczne rozwiązanie.

3-119

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Madam President, several paragraphs and sections of the Florenz report, especially paragraph 190, relate to agriculture's contribution to climate change. While low or conservation tillage is an option in most EU states and has economic as well as climate change benefits – and deserves far more support, in my view – the agricultural debate and research concentrate largely on the methane and nitrous oxide contributions of ruminant livestock.

While progress is being made, I do not support Member States having to meet their non-trading sectors' targets for emissions reductions by the compulsory reduction of Europe's cattle herds. Let us not forget that what we do not produce here in Europe we will import. One kilo of beef produced in Brazil results in six times the carbon dioxide emissions of one kilo of beef produced in Ireland.

3-120

Leopold Józef Rutowicz (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Gospodarka europejska jest największym importerem węglowodorów. Wzrost ich cen, wynikający z popytu i wzrostu kosztów ich pozyskania, może w znacznym stopniu wpłynąć na obniżenie stopy życiowej obywateli oraz obniżyć konkurencyjność gospodarki Unii.

W tej sytuacji mogą przeciwdziałać temu prace w zakresie oszczędności energii oraz uruchomienie czystych źródeł energii, które wytwarzają już energię po stabilnych i względnie niskich cenach. Skorzystanie z badań naukowych i techniczne ich wykorzystanie automatycznie ograniczy emisję CO₂. Natomiast głoszenie kontrowersyjnych teorii i straszenie CO₂ nie nadaje żadnej dodatkowej wartości i utrudnia techniczny i rzeczowy proces gwarantujący ograniczenie CO₂ i węglowodorów użytych do celów energetycznych.

Popieram wszelkie działania techniczne i naukowe, które ograniczają zużycie węglowodorów. Nie mogę niestety zgodzić się z filozofią wyrażoną w sprawozdaniu pana Florenza. Nie popieram sprawozdania.

3-121

Zuzana Roithová (PPE-DE). – Paní předsedkyně, chci poděkovat Karlu Florenzovi za nasazení a demokratický způsob, jakým řídil mimořádný výbor Evropského parlamentu pro klimatické změny. Jeho původní zpráva však byla lepší než tento kompromis, ale i tak jsem jej podpořila. V dnešní věcné diskuzi se objevila celá řada, celá škála názorů včetně těch kritických, ale jedno měly společné. Klimatické změny jsou nastartovány a není pochyb, že je při dnešní úrovni civilizace dokážeme ovlivnit, a naší odpovědností vůči budoucím generacím je tedy najít shodu na účinných opatřeních. Žádné není samospasitelné a všechna se musí týkat všech kontinentů. Věřím, že české předsednictví nehledě na extrémní názory prezidenta dokáže přimět USA k novým závazkům.

3-122

Hynek Fajmon (PPE-DE). – Vážená paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, hlasoval jsem proti zprávě poslance Florenze. Přijetí této zprávy je špatnou zprávou pro občany v Evropské unii. Klima na Zemi se měnilo, mění a bude měnit bez ohledu na to, zda si to přejeme nebo nikoliv. Nic na tom nezmění jakékoliv nesmyslné závazky, které si Evropská unie v této oblasti klade. Florenzova zpráva tvrdí, že klimatické závazky, které EU přijala v roce 2007, jsou nedostatečné a je nutné je dále zvýšit. S tím nesouhlasím. Pokud bude EU jedinou částí světa, která snižuje své emise, tak se cíle snížení globálních emisí nemůže nikdy podařit dosáhnout. Dosáhneme pouze toho, že se velká část evropského byznysu odstěhuje pryč a nám zde zaniknou pracovní místa. Autoři zprávy hodlají změnit v Evropě úplně všechno, počínaje jídelníčkem a konče turismem, kde se oficiálním cílem stává sociální turistika. Za takovou kulturní revoluci, kdy je vše staré odvrženo a nahrazeno novým přístupem, by se nemusel stydět ani Mao Ce-tung. S takovým přístupem nemůže žádný racionální člověk souhlasit. Proto jsem hlasoval proti.

3-123

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chociaż 70% powierzchni globu stanowi woda, to jej zasoby, zwłaszcza te, które zdadne są do picia, kurczą się w zastraszającym tempie. Coraz większe obszary naszego globu

zagrożone są hydrologicznym ubóstwem. Im szybszy rozwój, tym większe zapotrzebowanie na wodę. Badania dowiodły, że bogacenie się społeczeństw powoduje większe zapotrzebowanie na wodę. Bez wody nie ma postępu.

Wiele rejonów świata znajduje się na skraju katastrofy, a utrzymanie aktualnej sytuacji w zakresie gospodarki wodnej może doprowadzić do stanu, w którym o dostęp do wody toczyć się będą nie tylko spory, ale wojny. O sukcesie przeważa sytuacja materialna państw, a nie ich zdolność militarna. Niedobory wody w bardzo krótkim czasie doprowadzą do kryzysu żywnościowego.

Konieczna jest odpowiednia, zintegrowana polityka, która przyczyni się do zachowania i odbudowania zasobów wody. Potrzebna jest racjonalizacja eksploatacji wody.

3-124

Ivo Strejček (PPE-DE). – Madam President, allow me to explain why I voted against the Florenz report on climate change.

Policies relating to climate change are based to a large extent on alarmist ideologies. The evidence for climate change is controversial. Hypotheses blaming man for this change are also, to say the least, disputable. Man is seen as a creature who is harmful to the environment without making a beneficial contribution. I do not share this view.

The content of the report is a direct consequence of an ongoing fashionable green ideology stating that we must put nature and the planet first, that we cannot take care of people, their needs and interests.

The few amendments to the report calling for further progress on nuclear energy, and supporting headway on nuclear fusion, can hardly mitigate its negative impact on the whole European economy and agriculture.

I voted against the report because it is a blueprint for substantial political problems. Instead of bringing forward ideas that nobody is interested in, we should take care of people and their needs.

3-125

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I supported this report mainly because the paragraphs I had some concern about were either deleted or modified in a way which I felt was appropriate. They related specifically to agriculture livestock production. I would reinforce the point that the European Union has considerably reduced its livestock production due to CAP reforms in the past, that we are now net importers of beef and that beef is produced elsewhere with the climate change concerns attached to it.

This really shows us how important it is that there is global consensus on it and that, while Europe might lead the way, we must try to insist that others follow us because we will only do ourselves harm if we are seen to be the only ones stepping up to the mark.

Finally I support the idea in this report of a specific year targeted towards providing information and dealing with the issue of climate change in a way which brings people along with us. There is already good work being done in this area.

3-126

Nirj Deva (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I voted for this report because I feel, for the first time, that the European Union is in synchronisation with the United States. President Obama has been elected to office saying that he is going to put the environment first in his programmes.

But I do not know whether my constituents will accept that we are actually going to make any difference. Even if the United States and the European Union act in concert to limit the emission of carbon, we must consider what will happen if we do not do enough to encourage the emerging India and China to do the same – by transfer of technology and by helping the Chinese and the Indians to find the most modern low-carbon technology that we can export and help them to partner. The fact is that, as we speak, China is making the production of carbon-intensive coal-fired power stations come on stream every two weeks. So how are we helping ourselves limit this thing without helping the transfer of technology?

3-127

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Madam President, once again we see the European Union inhabiting a virtual world – a world that exists only in Parliament resolutions, in Commission communiqués and in Council press releases.

We condemn global warming, yet our monthly peregrination between Brussels and Strasbourg generates hundreds of thousands of tons of greenhouse gases. We cant about sustainable land use, yet the common agricultural policy encourages the felling of hedgerows, the use of chemical-based fertilisers and the dumping of surpluses on vulnerable Third World markets. We preach conservation, yet the common fisheries policy has created an ecological calamity, wiping out what ought to have been a great, renewable resource.

Colleagues, do you not think our voters have noticed? Do you imagine that, like Descartes's malicious demon, you can manipulate their reality by controlling their perception? The fact is that our voters saw through us long ago, which is why, at every opportunity, they vote 'no'. If you think I am wrong, prove me wrong. Put the Lisbon Treaty to a referendum: *Pactio Olisipiensis censenda est*.

3-128

- Report: Claudio Fava (A6-0026/2009)

3-129

Zuzana Roithová (PPE-DE). – Zprávu kolegy Favy jsem sice podpořila, ale mám zásadní výhrady k názvu směrnice „postihy zaměstnavatelů státních příslušníků třetích zemí s nelegálním pobytem“. Je to pokrytectví, vždyť práce na černo se týká také milionů evropských dělníků, řemeslníků, pomocníků v domácnostech a dalších a harmonizace sankcí se přece musí týkat práce na černo neohledně na to, odkud zaměstnanec pochází.

3-130

Emine Bozkurt (PSE). – De PvdA-delegatie ondersteunt het doel van deze richtlijn, namelijk het strafbaar stellen van de tewerkstelling van illegalen, enerzijds om zwartwerk als een van de aantrekkende factoren van illegale migratie tegen te gaan, anderzijds om uitbuiting van migranten te voorkomen en te bestrijden.

Ondanks een aantal positieve elementen in dit compromis zagen wij ons toch genoodzaakt om tegen te stemmen, en wel om een aantal redenen. Eerst was er nog sprake van aansprakelijkheid vanuit de hele keten tot aan de hoofdaannemer. Helaas is dit in het compromis tussen Raad en Parlement gesneuveld. Nu is deze beperkt tot de eerste schakel in de uitbesteding of onderaanneming. Dit werkt contraproductief en zet ertoe aan verder aan en uit te besteden om sociale aansprakelijkheid te ontlopen.

Verder zijn er onvoldoende garanties dat migranten beschermd worden en werknemers die de fout ingaan, gestraft worden. Migrantten krijgen niet het recht achterstallig loon te ontvangen voordat zij uitgezet worden noch de tijd om binnen de Europese Unie te wachten op het geld. De kans dat dit na uitzetting alsnog lukt, is nihil. Een illegaal die slachtoffer wordt van uitbuiting en zich hiertegen wil verzetten, is hiermee nagenoeg kansloos.

3-131

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I abstained on this important vote in this Parliament. I am, of course, not in favour of illegal immigrants coming into our countries and taking the jobs of those who have paid their taxes and paid their way over time, but I think the responsibility here should rest not principally with employers but with the national governments of the individual countries.

It gives me the chance, by that abstention, to put on record my view that our present British Government has failed lamentably to have a proper immigration policy in our country – an immigration policy that tracks those coming in as well as those going out, that ensures there is fairness between those who are entitled to come in and those who are not, and, above all, a policy which will maintain good race and community relations, based on the fact that the people of Britain feel there is a right and proper balance between those who come in, those who are here and those who go out.

3-132

3-133

Francesco Enrico Speroni (UEN). – Signora Presidente, sul regolamento volevo intervenire, perché mi sembra che la relazione Fava non sia stata votata. Non riesco a capire come si possano fare dichiarazioni di voto su qualcosa che non è stato votato.

3-134

President. – We voted on the report, we did not take the final vote, so people may well wish to express themselves on the earlier votes.

3-135

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jednym z najważniejszych wyzwań, z jakimi musi zmierzyć się w najbliższym okresie Unia Europejska, jest kryzys demograficzny. Niska liczba urodzeń i dłuższa średnia życia sprawiają, że nasze społeczeństwo staje się coraz starsze, a koszty jego utrzymania musi ponosić coraz mniej liczna grupa obywateli.

Brak osób do pracy w niektórych zawodach powoduje, że sięga się do zatrudniania nielegalnych imigrantów, których koszty pracy są znacznie niższe. Nielegalne zatrudnianie powinno być karane, a jego negatywne skutki ponosić powinni przede wszystkim pracodawcy, a w dalszej dopiero kolejności pracownicy.

Dyrektywa nakłada na pracodawców odpowiednie wymogi administracyjne. Nie powinny być one jednak nadmierne, gdyż mogą wpłynąć negatywnie na sytuację osób przebywających legalnie na terytorium Unii i mających pozwolenie na pracę. Obowiązki pracodawcy związane z badaniem przedstawionych dokumentów mogą zniechęcać ich bowiem do zatrudniania cudzoziemców, a w konsekwencji prowadzić do spadku stopy zatrudnienia i przyczyniać się do osłabienia rynku pracy.

3-136

Philip Claey's (NI). – Ik was van plan om voor het verslag-Fava te stemmen, ook al is dat verslag natuurlijk verre van volmaakt. Ik wil in elk geval mijn steun uitspreken voor de richtlijn die de tewerkstelling van illegale vreemdelingen wil aanpakken.

Dit is natuurlijk maar één aspect in een problematiek die veel complexer is dan dit, want men zou tegelijkertijd ook moeten optreden tegen mensenhandelaars, tegen de netwerken van steun aan illegalen en natuurlijk ook tegen regeringen van lidstaten die massaal illegale vreemdelingen regulariseren. Het is namelijk juist die straffeloosheid die een van de grootste aantrekkingspolen vormt in die ganse problematiek van illegale immigratie. Illegalen kunnen zomaar betogingen organiseren, eisen stellen, petities opstellen, zonder dat zij het risico lopen om opgepakt te worden en naar hun landen van herkomst teruggestuurd te worden. Men moet ook een terugstuurbeleid voeren dat effectief is en dat ook effectief plaatsvindt.

3-137

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Madam President, the right to determine who may cross your borders and settle on your territory is a defining attribute of statehood. For years this Parliament has been seeking to bestow that attribute of statehood on the European Union, doing so without the consent of the voters and, in so far as one can judge from the results of the French, Dutch and Irish referendums, in the face of active opposition from the voters. The question of illicit migration ought to be a national prerogative and the question of sanctions against employers of illicit entrants ought certainly to be reserved to the Member States.

If the European Union wants to extend its jurisdiction into this field it ought first to secure the wholehearted consent of the people for the legal basis on which it intends to do so. That means putting the Lisbon Treaty to a referendum. *Pactio Olisipiensis censenda est!*

3-138

Nirj Deva (PPE-DE). – Madam President, this is a dreadful piece of legislation. It is dreadful, because it criminalises the employer and does not criminalise the illicit immigrant. It is nonsense. This will create a sense of foreboding among all employers whenever they have to employ somebody. Can you imagine what will happen when a potential employer looks at a potential employee and starts asking questions which are of a very intrusive nature?

In addition, this has nothing at all to do with the European Union. This ought to be a matter for national legislation and national governments – for the national parliaments of individual Member States to decide whom they want and do not want in their countries. To criminalise national employers at a time of deepening recession is absurd. This piece of legislation should never see the light of day.

3-139

- Motion for a resolution: B6-0062/2009 (Energy efficiency)

3-140

Zuzana Roithová (PPE-DE). – Evropská unie má již za sebou první výsledky společné energetické politiky. V roce 2015 začnou aukce s emisemi, jsou nastartovány programy obnovitelné energie. Teprve přijetí Lisabonské smlouvy umožní efektivnější management evropských priorit v oblasti energií a ty se nyní mění. To nejdůležitější je politická nezávislost. Dodávky energií nesmí být zdrojem politického vydírání. Druhou prioritou je zvyšování podílu čisté energie a obnovitelných zdrojů, proto tyto technologie, ale i jádro a jeho bezpečný provoz a likvidace odpadu musí být cílem investic do výzkumu. To nejpodstatnější, co tato diskuse přináší, je také hledání způsobu, jak omezovat spotřebu a chovat se ke zdrojům přírody s úctou. Ovšem to začíná u výchovy dětí.

3-141

Syed Kamall (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I remember a lecturer once saying to me, when I was a young master's student, that technology offers many solutions, but, if you want to achieve things, you often need political and managerial will to achieve your goals.

Here it is once again in the European Parliament. We talk about climate change. We talk about energy efficiency. Yet, let us remember that 12 times a year we move this House from Brussels to Strasbourg, not to mention the extra buildings that we have in Luxembourg. Not only does that cost the taxpayers of Europe an extra EUR 200 million a year, but it emits 192 000 tonnes of CO₂ – equivalent to 49 000 hot air balloons. So it is time for politicians in this Chamber to stop emitting their own hot air over energy efficiency and climate change, cut out the hypocrisy and close down the Strasbourg Parliament.

3-142

Francesco Enrico Speroni (UEN). – Signora Presidente, io sono un'automobilista ed essendo un'automobilista sono sempre costantemente incassato come una bestia per tutte le vessazioni nei confronti della categoria, come quelle proposte in alcune parti della relazione, ed è questa la motivazione per cui ho votato contro.

3-143

Nirj Deva (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I reluctantly supported this, though I would have preferred not to have voted for it. The reason is that we cannot create efficiency without competition. Competition is the prime driver of efficiency in any market – energy or whatever – and here we are using a tool – technology – across the European Union to drive an energy efficiency market.

Surely we should drive energy efficiency through competition in the European Union. Had we done so and had we looked at how we can compete with each other to increase our energy efficiency, we would have the best efficient energy market in the world. That is why I said I voted for this reluctantly.

3-144

- Motion for a resolution: RC-B6-0066/2009 (Guantánamo prisoners)

3-145

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Madam President, before we bid goodbye to Guantánamo by a combination of a resolution of this Parliament and the executive decision of the President of the United States – a wicked combination of naked power – let me just put on record two facts.

First of all, Guantánamo was set up in order to protect all of our citizens. As far as the United States was concerned, it worked. Since 9/11 there has not been one single act of terrorism on the United States mainland. As he goes into retirement, let us salute the record of President George W. Bush as far as that is concerned. I realise I have spoken the ultimate heresy in this House by saying it, but it is true.

Secondly, let us remember too that, although we have been pretty free with our advice to the Americans, let us see what Europe does now to take the burden-sharing of some of these prisoners and protecting our people from future terrorist attack. I will not be holding my breath.

3-146

Jim Allister (NI). – Madam President, ever eager to jump on any passing bandwagon, today the European Parliament demanded that Member States throw open their doors to Guantánamo detainees, on the very day when security services reveal that Mullah Sakir, who was released last year, is now in the high command of al-Qa'ida and directing attacks on British and NATO troops in Afghanistan. On that very day, we declare the EU is an open house for such terrorist activists. Are we mad? Remember, once admitted and regularised as citizens, such people can move freely through every Member State in the EU. I trust those who voted for this madness will stand over it when it all goes wrong.

3-147

Zuzana Roithová (PPE-DE). – Paní předsedkyně, dovoluji mi vysvětlit, proč jsem se zdržela hlasování o usnesení, které je věnováno problému uzavření věznice na Guantánamu. Včerejší diskuse ukázala, že všichni tento populární nebo populistický plán amerického prezidenta vítají, ale to je tak všechno, co můžeme. Usnesení obsahuje hodnocení, pro které nemáme dostatek ověřených hodnocení a ověřených podkladů. Včera jsme věnovali tři hodiny bouřlivé diskusi o tom, kde mají být umístěni vězni a ti, kterým zločiny nebyly prokázány. Řešení je samozřejmě na americkém Kongresu a případně na jednotlivých vládách některých evropských zemí, nikoli na Evropském parlamentu. Proto jsem pro usnesení nehlasovala.

3-148

Philip Claeys (NI). – De resolutie over Guantánamo bevat een paar elementen die de fundamente van de rechtsstaat bevestigen. Anderzijds ben ik natuurlijk niet gelukkig met de onderliggende teneur van die tekst, dat gedetineerden van Guantánamo op een of andere manier slachtoffers zouden zijn, die onze sympathie verdienen. Het gaat niet om kerstenkinderen. Het gaat om mensen die van terrorisme verdacht worden, maar waartegen geen duidelijke bewijzen bestaan.

De lidstaten moeten zich opmaken voor de opvang van Guantánamo-gevangenen, zo stelt de resolutie. Welnu, dit is op zijn minst problematisch. Het probleem van het radicaal-islamitische fundamentalisme is volgens mij al groot genoeg in Europa en het getuigt van een zekere kortzichtigheid om een strijd tegen het terrorisme te willen voeren en tegelijkertijd de deuren open te zetten voor mensen tegen wie een vermoeden bestaat dat zij bindingen hebben met al-Qaida, de taliban en aanverwante groeperingen.

3-149

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Madam President, for years this House has criticised the United States over the suspension of civic freedoms inherent in the maintenance of the secure facility at Guantánamo. Mine was among the voices raised in concern.

I accepted – unlike some in this Chamber – that these were difficult and sensitive issues. A number of detainees were released only to be recaptured on the battlefields of Afghanistan. One blew himself up in a market in Iraq, killing dozens of people. Nonetheless, some principles are absolute and ought not to be sacrificed to expediency. One such is the principle that no one should be detained without being accused of an offence.

Colleagues, we prefaced each of our resolutions on Guantánamo with protestations of goodwill. We spoke, we insisted, as friends of the United States. Well, here is our chance to vindicate that boast. The US Administration, in doing what we have long urged, asks our assistance. Not to tender it would be mean, inconsistent, hypocritical and self-defeating.

3-150

Syed Kamall (PPE-DE). – Madam President, those of us who believe in freedom, individual liberty and the rule of law have for years sought to persuade our American friends to close Guantánamo Bay, or the detention there. So the country that calls itself the leader of the free world cannot put aside those values for its convenience, albeit understandable security concerns.

Now that President Obama has announced the closure of Guantánamo Bay, we should be helpful in any way we can. However, it is not for the European Union to determine who enters the European Union countries. It should be for Member States, and let us call upon the Member States of the European Union to do their bit to help our American friends at this time. They have shown the will. They have listened to us. It is about time we listened to them, just as the European political élite should listen to the voters when, in referendum after referendum, they have rejected the Lisbon Treaty. It is time for us to listen to the voices that count.

3-151

Nirj Deva (PPE-DE). – Madam President, Magna Carta and habeas corpus are the bedrocks upon which the American Constitution was written. They are also the bedrock upon which the laws of my country have been written. You cannot charge someone and lock him up without accusing him and having a trial. However, year after year in this Parliament, we condemned President Bush for what he did with Guantánamo Bay. Now we have a situation where President Obama has, quite correctly, decided to do away with it.

When the American executive President has listened to what we have had to say, surely it is up to us to encourage Member States to take on the burden of our American allies. However, that is not a matter that this Parliament can dictate to other parliaments. It is for the national parliaments to decide that it is in their interests to help the Americans in their time of need.

3-152

Written explanations of vote

3-153

- Report: Karl-Heinz Florenz (A6-0495/2008)

3-154

Šarūnas Birutis (ALDE), raštu. – Europai reikia vieningos strateginės energetikos politikos, kuri užtikrintų veiksmingą išteklių naudojimą ir poveikio klimatui minimizavimą.

ES ir valstybės narės turi užtikrinti Europos energijos infrastruktūros plėtrą, kuri yra būtina siekiant diversifikuoti ES energijos šaltinius ir mažinti priklausomybę nuo iškastinio kuro.

Šiandien pastatams apšildyti ES sunaudojama daugiausia energijos ir išmetama daugiausia CO₂ – maždaug 40 proc. viso išmetamo CO₂ kiekio. Būtent šioje srityje yra daug galimybių taupyti energiją.

Pritariu pranešėjo siūlymui nacionaliniu lygiu organizuoti piliečių informavimo kampaniją, skirtą didinti energijos naudojimo efektyvumui, kurios metu namų ir butų savininkams būtų padarytos jų nuosavybės termonuotaukos ir pateikiama informacijos apie jos energetinį efektyvumą bei teikiamos rekomendacijos dėl galimų modernizavimo darbų finansavimo pasitelkiant mikrokreditus. Mažas pastatų energetinis efektyvumas yra posovietinės erdvės pastatų opi problema ir daugelis savininkų nežino kaip ir kokiomis priemonėmis galima taupyti energiją. Manau, kad būtina iki 15 proc. (dabar 3 proc.) didinti paramą iš struktūrinių fondų būstų renovavimui.

3-155

John Bowis (PPE-DE), in writing. – British Conservatives welcome the broad thrust of the report of the Temporary Committee on Climate Change. We believe that the report offers a significant contribution to the debate, which will lead to an effective international agreement on climate change in Copenhagen in 2009. We support in particular the aim of ambitious medium and long-term emission reduction targets, the promotion of renewable energy and increased energy efficiency, and the call for a sustainable approach to forestry, rainforests and deforestation. We also believe that a low-carbon economy will trigger greater innovation, which will create new and competitive businesses and new jobs in the fields of clean technology, renewable energies and green enterprises.

However, we cannot support the concept that the European Security Strategy and the European Security and Defence Policy have a role to play in tackling the effects of climate change.

We also strongly oppose references to the Lisbon Treaty, in particular those which suggest that the competences of the European Union in the field of climate change are not already sufficient. We believe that the EU has all the powers that it needs to help the peoples of Europe work together to succeed and lead by example on climate change.

3-156

Nicodim Bulzesc (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat favorabil raportul Florenz deoarece sunt de acord cu recomandările făcute pentru viitoarea politică integrată a protecției mediului.

Acest raport solicită Comisiei să monitorizeze îndeaproape și să analizeze cele mai recente rezultate ale cercetărilor științifice în scopul de a aprecia, în special, dacă obiectivul UE de 2°C și-ar atinge cu adevărat scopul de a evita schimbările climatice periculoase.

Totodată, subliniază importanța stabilirii, de către UE și celelalte state industrializate ca și grup, a unui obiectiv pe termen mediu de reducere a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră cu 25%-40% până în 2020, precum și a unui obiectiv pe termen lung de reducere a emisiilor cu cel puțin 80% până în 2050, comparativ cu anul 1990, continuând să se acorde atenție scopului de a limita creșterea temperaturii globale medii la 2°C peste nivelurile preindustriale, obținând, astfel, o probabilitate de 50% de a realiza acest obiectiv.

3-157

David Casa (PPE-DE), in writing. – This is a report that shows the way forward and sends a clear message to all to take action now, before it is too late. We cannot take risks where the prevention of nature and humanity is concerned. We need an integrated policy so as to avoid overlaps in work and we need to harmonize our aims and strategies. The European Union should take the leading role in the battle against climate change and this report is a huge step towards that direction. The rights to life, security, health, education and environmental protection are fundamental and it is our duty to safeguard them for the generations to come. We are already aware of the huge damage that climate change is causing and we are duty bound to minimize this damage as much as possible.

3-158

Charlotte Cederschiöld, Christofer Fjellner, Gunnar Hökmark och Anna Ibrisagic (PPE-DE), skriftlig. – Vi har i dag röstat för betänkandet om framtiden för EU:s integrerade politik i klimatfrågan. Vi vill i detta sammanhang däremot understryka att de intäkter som kommer från handeln med utsläppsrätter ska tillfalla medlemsstaterna.

3-159

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat în favoarea raportului „2050: viitorul începe azi – recomandări pentru o viitoare politică integrată pentru protecția mediului în UE” deoarece schimbările climatice pot produce dezastre ireversibile, iar epoca energiei fosile ieftine este pe cale de a lua sfârșit.

De aceea, UE în colaborare cu partenerii săi strategici trebuie să facă toate eforturile pentru a reduce dependența actuală de combustibili fosili și pentru a spori semnificativ ponderea energiei regenerabile.

Prin investiții corespunzătoare, eficiența energetică a economiei europene trebuie să crească, iar emisiile de gaze poluante cu efect de seră trebuie reduse cu peste 25%, în următorii 12 ani.

UE trebuie să aplice cu hotărâre acțiunile necesare pentru realizarea obiectivelor pentru 2050: mai puține emisii de gaz cu efect de seră, 60% energii regenerabile și eficiență energetică.

Anul European al Creativității și Inovării poate constitui un reper major în acest sens, subliniind importanța fundamentală a investițiilor în cercetarea științifică și în noile tehnologii.

3-160

Κωνσταντίνος Δρούτσας (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Οι κλιματικές αλλαγές είναι αποτέλεσμα της ασύδοτης εκμετάλλευσης των φυσικών πόρων από το κεφάλαιο με στόχο το κέρδος.

Η ΕΕ θεωρεί ένοχους τους εργαζόμενους, τον τρόπο ζωής τους και τις καταναλωτικές τους συνήθειες. Θέλει να βάλει το λύκο να φυλάει τα πρόβατα, αναθέτοντας την ευθύνη για τον μετριασμό της κλιματικής αλλαγής ακριβώς σε αυτούς που την προκαλούν: τα μονοπώλια και τις πολυεθνικές. Η ενέργεια, το νερό, τα δάση, τα απόβλητα, η γεωργική παραγωγή, ιδιωτικοποιούνται και συγκεντρώνονται σε ελάχιστες πολυεθνικές, τώρα και στο όνομα του περιβάλλοντος. Η απρόσκοπτη λειτουργία της "ελεύθερης αγοράς", η απελευθέρωση των αγορών, οι καπιταλιστικές αναδιαρθρώσεις αποτελούν τον κορμό των προτεινόμενων από την έκθεση του ΕΚ μέτρων.

Οι συμφωνίες της ΕΕ με τρίτες χώρες απαιτούν την απελευθέρωση των αγορών, των δημόσιων υπηρεσιών σε όλους αυτούς τους τομείς. Μπαίνουν στόχοι όπως πχ για βιοκαύσιμα που καταστρέφουν τεράστιες εκτάσεις δασών. Προωθούνται τα μεταλλαγμένα και στηρίζεται η μονοκαλλιέργεια καταστρέφοντας τη βιοποικιλότητα.

Η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος χρησιμοποιείται ως πρόσχημα ακόμα και για ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις σύμφωνα με το "δόγμα Σολάνα".

Η πράσινη οικονομία που προωθούν ΕΕ και ΗΠΑ, αποτελεί διέξοδο για την υπερσυσσώρευση κεφαλαίου, την εξασφάλιση κερδών για τα μονοπώλια, με ένταση της εκμετάλλευσης, των εργαζομένων και των φυσικών πόρων. Όχι μόνο δεν επιλύει αλλά, αντίθετα, οξύνει το πρόβλημα των κλιματικών αλλαγών.

3-161

Edite Estrela (PSE), por escrito. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório Karl-Heinz Florenz sobre o tema "2050: O futuro começa hoje - Recomendações para a futura política integrada da UE sobre as alterações climáticas", uma vez que apresenta uma série de propostas à União Europeia, aos Estados-Membros e aos seus cidadãos, tendo em vista objectivos ambiciosos de redução das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa na União Europeia.

Gostaria de sublinhar que o problema das alterações climáticas necessita de uma abordagem transversal a todos os níveis de elaboração de políticas públicas e que o investimento em tecnologias "verdes" constitui, também, uma exigência da actual crise económica que permitirá criar mais empregos.

Considero o documento final da Comissão CLIM, da qual fiz parte, um contributo muito positivo na luta contra as alterações climáticas e que demonstra claramente a necessidade de se alcançar um acordo internacional na Conferência de Copenhaga, no final do ano.

3-162

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O relatório não aborda o essencial da questão sobre as causas de abusos ambientais: o carácter predatório do capitalismo. Apenas procura repartir responsabilidades por todos para justificar propostas que, fundamentalmente, assentam na liberalização dos mercados, na assunção dos custos por parte dos utilizadores e dos trabalhadores.

Embora o texto final aprovado na sessão plenária seja mais contido do que a proposta inicial, e haja alguns aspectos positivos, não concordamos com outros pontos, designadamente quando utilizam a capa de defesa do ambiente para mais uma oportunidade de intensificação da ofensiva ideológica, para a responsabilização das populações e dos trabalhadores, para mercantilizar e tornar rentável toda a actividade ambiental.

Assim, acompanhámos a votação favorável de algumas propostas apresentadas pelo nosso grupo e outras que visaram dar um conteúdo mais correcto ao relatório, mas não pudemos deixar de mostrar a nossa discordância com as tentativas de mercantilizar tudo o que é essencial à vida humana, incluindo o próprio ar.

3-163

Glyn Ford (PSE), in writing. – Climate change is one of the biggest challenges facing the world today. I am in favour of energy-efficient light bulbs, but frankly it is not enough! We will all have to make and put up with changes to our lifestyle and lives that are far more drastic and dramatic.

I was recently asked at a public meeting in Cheltenham in my constituency what I thought was the most important thing that could be done to combat global warming and climate change. My response was clear: ratify the Lisbon Treaty. Without a strong powerful EU with competence in Common Foreign and Security Policy I do not believe we will get the US and Japan, China and India, to take the necessary measures.

The backing and encouragement of a powerful EU speaking with a single voice will do more to combat climate change than millions of energy-efficient lightbulbs.

3-164

Duarte Freitas (PPE-DE), por escrito. – Este relatório congrega posições de vários partidos políticos e de várias sensibilidades sectoriais, compilando os mais recentes e fiáveis dados científicos. É, por isso, um documento de inegável rigor, abrangência, actualidade e pertinência.

Concordo com o relatório na sua globalidade, mas votei desfavoravelmente as referências mais directas ao impacto da pecuária nas alterações climáticas por as considerar excessivas. A agricultura não deve ser ostracizada, pelo contrário, deve ser potenciada a produção e o consumo de produtos locais, com menos emissões de gases com efeito de estufa resultantes do seu transporte.

Por outro lado, votei favoravelmente as referências aos problemas do sector agrícola resultantes dos impactos das alterações climáticas, considerando que as regiões mais adversamente afectadas deverão ser devidamente compensadas. Ainda no que concerne a adaptação às alterações climáticas, concordo com a urgência da aplicação da nova Directiva-quadro para a protecção dos solos e com a necessária adaptação da política de coesão, de protecção da água e da Rede Natura 2000, face aos impactos esperados.

Finalmente, votei favoravelmente as referências à necessidade de se evitar uma utilização desmesurada dos mecanismos de flexibilidade do Protocolo de Quioto, visto que a Europa deve, efectivamente, reduzir as suas emissões se quiser continuar a liderar as negociações internacionais e que se obtenha um acordo mundial em Copenhaga.

3-165

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), v písemné formě. – Změna klimatu je faktem. Přesto ji někteří vědci kvalifikovaně zpochybňují. Podobně vliv lidské činnosti, o kterém i tato zpráva hovoří jako o hlavním důvodu klimatických změn, je určitou částí vědecké veřejnosti zpochybňován. Každopádně zpráva ve svých 22 kapitolách poskytuje dobrý přehled problematiky z pohledu většinového názoru světové odborné veřejnosti. Pokud jde o jednotlivé kapitoly, potom poněkud neúplná je kapitola Energetika. Správně konstatuje omezenost zdrojů fosilních paliv, ale vůbec neřeší klíčovou otázku, kterou je zajištění dostatečného množství energie v situaci, kdy do roku 2030 se má její světová spotřeba zvýšit o 60 %.

Je tedy zřejmé, že již v nejbližší době bude nutné intenzivně začít výstavbu jaderných elektráren. Tento dnes jediný uznávaný zdroj čisté energie vyrobitelné ve velkých objemech má své ideologické odpůrce i v EP. Přesto od doby zvládnutí termojaderné fúze nemá jaderná energetika při hledání zdroje čisté energie alternativu. S touto výhradou se zprávou souhlasím.

3-166

Marie-Noëlle Lienemann (PSE), par écrit. – Le rapport Florenz établit une liste très détaillée des actions à mener pour combattre le changement climatique et développer des politiques d'accompagnement. Il souffre toutefois de faiblesses structurelles révélatrices de l'indispensable et souhaitable réorientation de l'Union européenne.

Les grands manques sont financiers.

Si la création d'une taxe carbone est envisagée, son étude et sa mise en œuvre, comme celui d'un bilan carbone systématique par produit ne sont pas retenues dans le programme d'action 2009- 2014! C'est pourtant un élément essentiel.

Aucun montant budgétaire n'est évoqué pour des actions et projets ciblés et concrets, tant pour les infrastructures publiques que pour des politiques industrielles innovantes, que pour le développement régional, l'aide aux collectivités locales ou la recherche/développement.

En matière industrielle, la référence aux "instruments législatifs" ne saurait suffire.

De même, la création d'un Fonds européen pour le climat est soumise à l'impératif "de laisser au marché le soin de déterminer quelles technologies devraient être employées..."

Il ne portera donc ni une vision à long terme, ni l'intérêt général ... C'est absurde.

Il est donc indispensable que l'UE se penche très rapidement sur la question de la taxe carbone, des aides publiques pour soutenir un *New Deal* vert, et sur le budget communautaire au service de la prévention du changement climatique.

3-167

Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Att klimatet förändras råder det inga tvivel om. Däremot är det inte klart huruvida detta i huvudsak eller i väsentlig grad beror på mänsklig påverkan eller om det i huvudsak eller i väsentlig grad är en del av en naturlig process. Osäkerheten är betydande både om vad som pågår och om vad som bör göras. Men just osäkerheten talar för att vi t.ex. bör ta de första stegen för att bromsa koldioxidutsläpp i atmosfären. Jag har därför tidigare röstat för förslaget att minska dessa med 20 procent fram till 2020.

Europaparlamentets tillfälliga utskott för klimatförändringar har nu lagt fram ett betänkande om hur EU bör arbeta i klimatfrågan. Betänkandet är mycket spretigt. Det förefaller som om de inblandade ledamöterna ägnar sig åt att blidka sårintressen, till exempel jordbruk och turism. Samtidigt kräver man också mer finansiering och nya mekanismer och föreslår i praktiken stora steg mot en centraliserad planekonomi med Brysselstyrda propagandakampanjer i skolor och fritidshem.

Betänkandet avlägsnar sig så långt från kärnfrågorna att jag har sett mig tvungen att rösta emot det. Vi kan inte hålla på och säga ja till allt som läggs fram för att demonstrera vår berättigade oro, osäkerhet och handlingsvilja i klimatfrågan.

3-167-500

David Martin (PSE), *in writing*. – I support this report which reinstates the EU's short-term commitment of reducing emissions by 30% by 2020 if there is an international agreement. It also reinstates the target included in the Bali roadmap, that industrialised countries should reduce emissions by 80% by 2050. I welcome this report which urges the Commission and Council to adopt a leadership role in the upcoming post-Kyoto talks in Copenhagen and calls for minimum EU energy-efficiency standards for new and refurbished buildings. The report calls on ECONFIN to introduce reduced VAT rates for renewable energy and energy-saving products.

I support the call for economic incentives such as a carbon trading system for countries to protect their tropic rainforests, and a call for energy efficiency measures to be adopted at local and regional level to combat energy poverty.

3-168

Ioşif Matula (PPE-DE), *în scris*. – Prin adoptarea acestui raport, Uniunea Europeană dovedeşte că se implică activ în combaterea efectelor negative pe care le generează schimbările climatice. Încălzirea globală reprezintă una dintre cele mai delicate probleme cu care se confruntă întreaga planetă şi de aceea necesită un efort comun din partea tuturor ţărilor. Cele peste 150 de recomandări incluse în acest raport acoperă majoritatea ariilor care pot fi îmbunătăţite pentru atingerea obiectivului european de reducere a creşterii temperaturii la 2 grade C.

Pentru asigurarea atingerii acestui obiectiv, este necesară implicarea activă a tuturor oamenilor şi educarea corectă a acestora în spiritul protejării mediului şi responsabilităţii faţă de generaţiile viitoare.

Planul european de redresare economică susţine lupta împotriva încălzirii globale prin alocări de fonduri pentru dezvoltarea de tehnologii inovatoare, dar şi prin modalităţi de îmbunătăţire a eficienţei energetice. Prin investiţii în cercetare şi inovare se pot dezvolta tehnologii curate, ca răspuns la provocările pe care le ridică schimbările climatice.

Consider că măsurile propuse sunt realizabile şi pot fi implementate pe termen mediu şi lung. Chiar dacă majoritatea ţărilor se confruntă cu o serie de probleme economice şi financiare, o atenţie deosebită trebuie acordată stopării efectelor negative ale schimbărilor climatice.

3-169

Mary Lou McDonald (GUE/NGL), *in writing*. – I was happy to support the final report from the Temporary Committee on Climate Change.

Today's report from Mr Florenz is based on scientific principles and maps out the challenges that face our society in various fields like transport, land-use, energy and waste management. The current economic crisis should not be used as an excuse to row back on our climate commitments. Some less progressive forces have tried to use the economic downturn as an excuse to renege on the necessary climate commitments. This should be seen not only as the cynical ploy it is, coming from forces not in the least bit interested in facing up to the realities of climate change, but also as short-sighted in the extreme.

I specifically reject the notion that nuclear power has any role to play in the green economy of tomorrow and beyond. Ireland must remain a nuclear-free island. Clean and renewable energy sources should be the basis of our energy supply, not the dangerous short-term folly of nuclear power.

3-170

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE-DE), *písomne*. – Dobrý deň prajem všetkým. Správu plne podporujem a ďakujem Vám, pán Florenz, za podrobné zdokumentovanie budúcej politiky Európskej únie ohľadom klimatických zmien. Je strašné, že globálne zmeny klímy ovplyvňujú a budú ovplyvňovať naše životné prostredie, a tým naše zdravie a spoločnosť. Je preto povinnosťou pokračovať na našej ceste zhodujúcej sa s politikou, ktorá pomôže spomaliť vplyvy vyvolania budúcej katastrofy.

Od rozhodnutia Parlamentu v apríli o vytvorení dočasnej Komisie o klimatických zmenách boli rokovania o pomoci integrácie európskych reakcií do svetového kontextu úspešné. Musíme však kontinuálne prehodnocovať naše výhrady vzhľadom na redukčné ciele, energetickú spotrebu a úlohy poľnohospodárstva. Spoluprácou snád' môžeme byť schopní zredukovať uhlíkové emisie a spomaliť proces globálneho otepľovania v Európe a na celom svete.

Ako pán Florenz spomenul, nie je jediný spôsob, ako zápasit' s klimatickými zmenami, ale vieme, že je správne začať so zvýšením efektívnosti a s lepším riadením zdrojov. Globálne klimatické zmeny sú škodlivé pre naše životné prostredie, pre náš súčasný spôsob života a pre príležitosti budúcich generácií. Musím spraviť to najlepšie, aby sme tento proces spomalili, ak nie aj zastavili. Ďakujem vám všetkým.

3-171

Jan Mulder (ALDE), *schriftelijk*. – Bij de eindstemming over dit verslag heb ik voor gestemd. Dit weerhoudt mij er echter niet van grote bezwaren te hebben tegen bepaalde onderdelen. Ik denk niet dat de teelt van voedergewassen voor de intensieve veeteelt nadelig is voor het klimaat. Evenmin denk ik dat er een Europese bodemrichtlijn dient te komen in verband met de klimaatverandering.

3-171-500

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE), în scris. – Investițiile în tehnologii curate și energie verde, atât de necesare în lupta împotriva încălzirii globale, sunt tot mai greu de finanțat în contextul economic actual. De aceea, mă alătur colegilor mei deputați care, susținând acest raport, propun măsuri pentru creșterea investițiilor „inteligente”, o soluție nu numai pentru criza climatică, ci și pentru actuala criză a creditelor, prin faptul că au un mare potențial de a genera noi locuri de muncă.

O astfel de măsură este propunerea de regulament a Comisiei, în dezbatere în Parlament, care prevede ca statele membre să poată finanța, din fondurile structurale și de coeziune, programe de lucrări publice la scară largă pentru reabilitarea locuințelor. Beneficiile sunt multiple: familiile cu venituri reduse pot beneficia de un sprijin financiar pentru modernizarea sistemelor de încălzire și pot beneficia de economii substanțiale la facturile de întreținere. În plus, măsura va contribui și la scăderea dependenței energetice a Europei, o prioritate în contextul recente crize energetice pe care a traversat-o Europa.

3-171-750

James Nicholson (PPE-DE), in writing. – This report tackles key issues relating to climate change, such as a call to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy sources and improve energy efficiency.

We are currently facing a situation where the effects of climate change and global warming are creeping up on us faster than we had previously imagined. For this reason, it is imperative that environmental policy remains a top priority for the EU and individual Member States.

Along with the Climate and Energy Package adopted in December, the EU clearly now leads the way in terms of environmental legislation and is in a position to encourage countries outside of Europe to follow suit and promote policies which seek to tackle climate change.

We simply cannot afford to ignore this issue and wait fifty years to see what the consequences may be.

3-172

Rovana Plumb (PSE), în scris. – Am votat acest raport deoarece el constituie „foaia de parcurs în 12 puncte de acțiune” a viitoarei politici integrate pentru protecția mediului.

În raport se subliniază importanța de a stabili de către UE și celelalte state industrializate ca și grup, a unui obiectiv pe termen mediu de reducere a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră (GES) cu 25-40% până în 2020 și, pe termen lung, cu 80% până în 2050 comparativ cu anul 1990.

Pentru a atinge aceste obiective și pentru adaptarea la schimbările climatice trebuie asigurate fonduri de cca. 175 milioane euro/an la nivelul UE. Aceasta impune crearea unui fond climatic, alimentat din veniturile provenite din schema de comercializare a emisiilor și/sau a unor fonduri private corespunzătoare în statele membre pentru asigurarea finanțării unei politici viitoare referitoare la climă, investițiile și solidaritatea pe care le va presupune.

O atenție deosebită trebuie acordată cercetării pentru a se asigura suport științific dezvoltării și implementării tehnologiilor „curate”. Trebuie folosită politica de mediu, ca șansă a strategiei de adaptare la efectele schimbărilor climatice, aplicată corect și intersectorial, la contracararea efectelor crizei, prin crearea de noi locuri de muncă „verzi” în întreprinderi competitive.

3-173

Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański (UEN), na piśmie. – Zmiany klimatyczne były przedmiotem jak dotychczas 13 rezolucji Parlamentu Europejskiego w różnych okresach legislacyjnych. Pomimo starań zarówno Komisji jak i Parlamentu sprawa ta nie przestała być kontrowersyjna. Sprawozdanie Karla-Heinza Florenza nie poprawia sytuacji tych, którzy nie są przekonani o decydującym wpływie działalności człowieka na zmiany klimatyczne, które od milionów lat podlegały tylko i wyłącznie prawom natury.

Kolejną kwestią jest sama idea zintegrowanej polityki krajów Europy. Biorąc pod uwagę fakt, że w tekście sprawozdania nie ma odniesienia do specyficznej sytuacji nowych krajów Unii Europejskiej, ani tym bardziej uznania poczynionych przez nich wysiłków na rzecz redukcji zanieczyszczeń i emisji gazów cieplarnianych począwszy od 1989 roku, to nie może być mowy o zintegrowanym podejściu. Cele różnych krajów mają prawo być rozbieżne. Kraje muszą mieć prawo wyboru co do technologii pozyskiwania energii. W kontekście zalecenia dla Komisji dotyczącego ustanowienia wiążącego celu 20-procentowego wzrostu wydajności energetycznej, wydają się uzasadnione podejrzenia o zakamuflowaną promocję drogich, zagranicznych technologii służących temu celowi.

3-174

Lydie Polfer (ALDE), par écrit. – J’ai voté pour le rapport Florenz. C’est un excellent travail, car ce rapport définit de manière très détaillée un large éventail de mesures qui devront être prises dans des domaines aussi divers que l’énergie, les biocarburants, l’efficacité énergétique, la mobilité, le tourisme, l’agriculture et l’élevage, la protection des sols et la gestion des eaux, de même que la gestion des déchets et des ressources, des thèmes d’avenir, l’éducation et la formation.

L'excellent travail de la commission temporaire sur le changement climatique, créée le 25 avril 2007, est porté par un esprit visionnaire et ses propositions contre le changement climatique méritent d'être soutenues par tous les acteurs de la vie politique, économique et sociale.

3-175

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), *por escrito*. – A abrangência dos temas incluídos no debate da futura política integrada europeia sobre as alterações climáticas é enorme e deve levar-nos em busca de soluções razoáveis, realizáveis e cientificamente sustentadas. Um debate inquinado, que recusa a ciência para lá do oficial, que ignora a necessidade de investigação, que abandona a perplexidade da investigação científica, transforma a ciência em dogma, e os dogmas servem de pouco aos decisores políticos.

A nossa prioridade deve, pois, ser a de nos concentrarmos numa produção e num consumo energético que seja diversificado, eficiente, capaz de reduzir dependências e capaz de garantir a qualidade de vida que desejamos para todos (europeus e não europeus).

Temos, assim, pela nossa frente um enorme desafio científico, em que cabe às autoridades públicas sinalizar a prioridade do investimento na investigação e desenvolvimento, mas também, nomeadamente, na medida em que são agentes no mercado, incentivar a criação de mercados rentáveis para os produtos energeticamente mais eficientes. As alterações climáticas pedem um passo em frente no desenvolvimento, não um passo atrás. Façamos esse esforço.

3-176

Peter Skinner (PSE), *in writing*. – The targets set by the EU to reach a coordinated reduction are vital if there is to be corresponding change for the better in our environment.

I voted to improve the structure of this coordination by use of a variety of sources – including the beneficial effects of safe nuclear energy production – all of which needs to be reviewed in the light of advice from national inspectorates and changes in technology.

Given that funding is necessary I voted too in favour of ETS auctioning revenue to be used to meet the costs of any changes needed. This includes investment in new technology.

An Emissions Trading Scheme for aviation, whilst it may have only a marginal effect, is still an appropriate way ahead.

3-177

Catherine Stihler (PSE), *in writing*. – The debate on an integrated policy on climate change is vital if we want a 50% cut in carbon emissions by 2050.

3-177-500

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), *na piśmie*. – Głosowałem za przyjęciem sprawozdania Florenza zatytułowanego „2050: przyszłość zaczyna się dziś - zalecenie dla przyszłej zintegrowanej polityki ochrony klimatu UE”. Sprawozdanie zostało opracowane przez powołaną w czerwcu 2007 roku tymczasową Komisję do spraw zmian klimatycznych.

Sprawozdanie jest swoistą listą zaleceń dotyczących redukcji emisji dwutlenku węgla, które powinny zostać zrealizowane przez organy wspólnotowe (głównie Komisję Europejską) oraz państwa członkowskie. By osiągnąć cele, niezbędne będą także działania na szczeblu lokalnym.

Zmiany klimatu są gwałtowne i mają poważne negatywne skutki. UE i grupa krajów uprzemysłowionych powinny przyjąć cel redukcji gazów cieplarnianych o 25% do 40% do 2020 r., a w perspektywie długoterminowej dążyć do obniżenia emisji o 80% do roku 2050 w porównaniu do roku 1999.

Pozostałe rekomendacje zawarte w sprawozdaniu to m.in. współpraca partnerska z krajami trzecimi basenu Morza Śródziemnego w zakresie produkcji energii słonecznej, osiągnięcie zerowego zużycia energii netto w nowych budynkach mieszkalnych do 2015 roku, a w nowych budynkach do 2020 roku, z możliwością rozszerzenia tego celu w dłuższej perspektywie i objęcia nim budynków remontowanych. To także utworzenie europejskiej wspólnoty energii odnawialnej w celu wspierania działań badawczo-rozwojowych zmierzających do opracowania przełomowych technologii.

3-177-750

Thomas Ulmer (PPE-DE), *schriftlich*. – Ich habe mich beim Bericht zum Klimawandel der Stimme enthalten. Das heißt nicht, dass ich den gesamten Bericht für schlecht halte, aber es wurden wissenschaftlich korrekte Daten mit polemischen falschen Äußerungen gemischt. Die gesamte Ausschussarbeit war einseitig, die Vielfalt der wissenschaftlichen Meinungen wurde nicht berücksichtigt. Auf dieser Basis kann kein ausgewogener Bericht zustande kommen. Leider ist diese Vorgehensweise im Vorfeld der Europawahlen häufiger geworden.

3-179

- Report: Claudio Fava (A6-0026/2009)

3-179-500

Guy Bono (PSE), par écrit. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport Fava sur le projet de directive qui prévoit des sanctions à l'encontre d'employeurs d'immigrés clandestins.

D'après les chiffres de la Commission, entre 4,5 et 8 millions de ressortissants des pays tiers vivent clandestinement au sein de l'Union européenne et sont donc les cibles privilégiées d'employeurs peu scrupuleux qui vivent du travail clandestin.

Il est fondamental pour nous de mettre davantage l'accent sur ces pratiques qui sont indignes d'une Europe où le respect des Droits Fondamentaux doit s'appliquer à tous. Le temps est venu de souligner enfin la responsabilité de ceux qui profitent de cette population particulièrement vulnérable. Nous devons cesser de criminaliser ces exploités en stigmatisant les immigrés illégaux. Avec les mesures que nous préconisons ici, il ne s'agit pas seulement de sanctionner des patrons abusifs mais aussi de défendre un certain nombre de droits sociaux comme celui d'être défendu par un syndicat.

Cependant, il ne faut pas crier victoire trop tôt car la menace de sanction ne suffit pas, encore faut-il disposer des instruments juridiques de contrôle qui vont avec. C'est seulement à cette condition que nous pourrions mettre en place une politique commune efficace de l'immigration.

3-179-750

Charlotte Cederschiöld, Christofer Fjellner, Gunnar Hökmark och Anna Ibrisagic (PPE-DE), skriftlig. – Europaparlamentet har idag röstat om Claudio Favas (PSE, IT) betänkande (A6-0026/2009) som gäller påföljder för arbetsgivare som anställer tredjelandsmedborgare som vistats olagligt i EU.

Eftersom rapporten ålägger medlemsstaterna att vidta straffrättsliga sanktioner har vi moderater valt att inte stödja rapporten.

3-180

Gérard Deprez (ALDE), par écrit. – Je soutiens le rapport Fava, par lequel nous allons punir plus sévèrement les employeurs ayant recours à de la main-d'œuvre illégale.

Les amendes devront désormais inclure frais de retour et paiement des impayés (salaires, impôts et cotisations de sécurité sociale). Les autres sanctions prévues vont de l'exclusion des subventions publiques à la fermeture, temporaire ou définitive.

Soulignons trois points clés du dispositif: d'abord, le signal envoyé aux employeurs peu scrupuleux, voire crapuleux, en instaurant des sanctions pénales pour les cas les plus graves d'exploitation de main-d'œuvre clandestine, comme l'emploi de mineurs, des conditions de travail particulièrement abusives, ou lorsque le travailleur est victime de traite d'êtres humains. Ensuite, la possibilité de dispositions allégées pour les particuliers, si les conditions d'emploi à titre privé sont correctes. Enfin, l'engagement de la responsabilité des entreprises impliquées dans la chaîne de sous-traitance, s'il peut être démontré qu'ils étaient au courant de l'emploi d'irréguliers par le sous-traitant.

N'oublions pas, enfin, qu'il s'agit de normes minimales (chaque État est libre de renforcer les sanctions aux employeurs et les protections accordées aux illégaux) et qu'il y a une clause de révision tous les 3 ans, nous permettant d'ajuster le tir sur base de l'expérience.

3-181

Constantin Dumitriu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Raportul elaborat de colegul nostru este un prim pas spre combaterea angajărilor ilegale și reducerea unuia din cele mai grave fenomene ale criminalității transfrontaliere. Dacă până acum politicile statelor s-au axat mai degrabă pe cum să împiedici emigranții ilegali să pătrundă pe piața muncii, de data aceasta atacăm problema la rădăcină prin sancționarea angajatorilor care profită de vulnerabilitatea emigranților ilegali.

Mare parte din acești angajați activează în sectorul agricol și sunt nenumărate cazuri în care condițiile pe care aceștia trebuie să le suporte sunt inumane, de multe ori fără a fi plătiți. Reglementările pe care le propunem nu doar că vor sancționa angajatorii, ci vor asigura și că muncitorii își primesc plățile restante. Aveam nevoie de astfel de prevederi care să stabilească norme unitare la nivel comunitar pentru penalizarea angajatorilor întrucât, în cele mai multe cazuri, acest fenomen este alimentat de rețele transnaționale ale traficantilor de carne vie.

Nu trebuie să interpretăm acest raport ca pe o închidere a granițelor Uniunii, ci doar ca pe o întărire a principiului preferinței comunitare. Având în vedere profilul demografic al majorității statelor membre, trebuie să menținem deschise granițele pieței muncii cu condiția însă ca fluxul de muncitori să fie unul legal și adaptat nevoilor comunitare.

3-182

Patrick Gaubert (PPE-DE), par écrit. – Je me réjouis de l'adoption, à une très large majorité, du projet de directive, qui est d'une importance primordiale dans la lutte contre l'immigration illégale et qui est indispensable à la mise en place d'une politique commune globale de l'immigration.

L'emploi clandestin est la principale source d'attraction de ces milliers d'hommes et de femmes qui franchissent chaque jour nos frontières en pensant y trouver un emploi décent pour nourrir leur famille. En réalité, ils ne font que devenir les esclaves de certains employeurs qui usent et abusent de leur situation de fragilité et de méconnaissance de leurs droits pour les exploiter et les utiliser comme main-d'œuvre bon marché.

Cette directive lance un double signal: l'un à l'égard des employeurs frauduleux, qui ne pourront plus abuser de la situation dans l'impunité, et l'autre à l'égard des candidats à l'immigration clandestine, qui seront dissuadés par les conditions plus strictes d'accès à l'emploi légal.

Le compromis négocié avec le Conseil est satisfaisant et l'on ne peut qu'espérer la mise en œuvre rapide de cette directive par les États membres pour mettre fin à cette situation de vulnérabilité que subissent des milliers de personnes en Europe.

3-182-500

Bruno Gollnisch (NI), par écrit. – On ne peut qu'approuver l'interdiction générale d'emploi de travailleurs en situation irrégulière pour dissuader l'immigration clandestine. Comme on ne peut qu'approuver les sanctions contre les employeurs qui recourent, souvent pour en abuser, à cette main d'œuvre et qui ne sont rien d'autre que des négriers des temps modernes.

Quelques bémols cependant. Une fois de plus, l'Union européenne profite d'un dossier reposant sur une base juridique communautaire (1er pilier) pour étendre ses compétences quant à l'harmonisation du droit pénal des États membres. À l'exception notable toutefois de l'Irlande et du Royaume-Uni qui ont fait valoir leur possibilité dites d'« opt out » reconnue par les traités.

Ensuite, je garde à l'esprit ce qu'il est advenu, en France, à la suite d'un mouvement de grève dans un restaurant branché de la ville de Neuilly chère à Sarkozy : patrons qui se posent en victimes d'un marché du travail trop rigide ou protecteurs d'une main d'œuvre qu'ils payent au minimum légal ; ouverture de larges possibilités de régularisation par le travail, que la directive va encore renforcer par la possibilité d'une régularisation moyennant seulement délation de l'employeur par le clandestin !

Je crains que dans les faits, dans des pays aussi laxistes que la France en la matière, tout ceci ne limite pas les appels d'air à l'immigration illégale.

3-183

Carl Lang (NI), par écrit. – Ce rapport a différents mérites.

Le premier est d'avoir un but pédagogique. Il établit l'alarmant constat de l'augmentation de l'immigration illégale en Europe, une immigration estimée selon les propres chiffres de la Commission entre 4,5 millions et 8 millions, et il désigne les secteurs de l'économie dans lesquels le travail illégal est le plus concentré: le bâtiment, l'agriculture, le nettoyage, l'hôtellerie et la restauration.

Le deuxième mérite est celui d'intensifier la lutte contre le travail au noir, notamment par la possibilité de sanctionner financièrement et pénalement les employeurs de clandestins.

Malheureusement les limites à ce rapport sont aussi nombreuses. Rien n'est dit quant aux mesures à prendre pour stopper ces flux discontinus d'immigration illégale. Le rétablissement des contrôles aux frontières intérieures n'est même pas envisagé.

Par ailleurs, en temps de crise tant sociale qu'économique et de forte hausse du chômage la première nécessité pour les pays de l'Union consiste à protéger leurs emplois. Pour cela il est indispensable de mettre en place des politiques nationales et européennes de protectionnisme social. Il faut réserver les emplois aux Français en France et aux européens en Europe. C'est l'application des principes de préférence et de protection nationale et européenne comme conditions essentielles du renouveau économique et social des pays de l'Union européenne.

3-184

Jörg Leichtfried (PSE), schriftlich. – Ich stimme für den Bericht von Claudio Fava zu den Sanktionen gegen Personen, die Drittstaatenangehörige ohne legalen Aufenthalt beschäftigen.

Man muss der Beschäftigung von illegalen Einwanderern einen Riegel vorschieben, sowohl um sie vor Ausbeutung zu schützen, als auch um der Wirtschaft im eigenen Land nicht zu schaden.

Der wichtigste Aspekt besteht darin, nicht die illegal beschäftigten Drittstaatenangehörigen zu bestrafen, sondern die Arbeitgeber, die sich in der weitaus stärkeren Position befinden.

3-184-500

David Martin (PSE), *in writing*. – I support the introduction and enforcement of sanctions against employers of illegally resident immigrants. This report includes minimum rules for criminal sanctions against employers, and inspections are to be made in the sectors of activity most open to abuse, though in Scotland we are already protected by the Immigration, Asylum and Nationality act 2006.

3-185

Lydie Polfer (ALDE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté pour le projet de directive, qui s'attaque à un fléau répandu, l'immigration illégale, qui donne souvent lieu à l'exploitation. Il y a en effet dans l'Union européenne entre 4,5 et 8 millions de sans-papiers travaillant dans le bâtiment, l'agriculture, l'hôtellerie et dans d'autres secteurs. Il faut renforcer la lutte contre l'immigration illégale en prévoyant différentes sortes de sanctions au niveau européen contre les employeurs de ces immigrants illégaux.

Il s'agit en effet de responsabiliser les entreprises et de contribuer ainsi à renforcer la lutte contre l'immigration illégale.

3-186

Frédérique Ries (ALDE), *par écrit*. – Je me félicite que le Parlement européen ait aujourd'hui adopté, à une large majorité, le projet de directive visant à sanctionner les employeurs d'immigrés clandestins.

Cette directive "sanctions" s'inscrit dans la stratégie de l'UE ("carte bleue" favorisant l'immigration choisie et la directive "retour") pour lutter contre l'immigration illégale.

Le travail au noir est un fléau pour l'économie européenne, a fortiori dans le contexte de crise économique actuel.

L'UE apparaît encore comme un eldorado aux yeux de nombreux immigrants clandestins; ils y trouvent bien souvent un travail et une qualité de vie dont ils ne bénéficient pas dans leur pays.

L'UE compte entre 4,5 et 8 millions de ressortissants des pays tiers vivant clandestinement dans l'UE, trouvant du travail en général dans les secteurs de la construction, de l'agriculture, des travaux domestiques et de l'hôtellerie. Ils y exercent des métiers mal payés, le plus souvent à la limite de l'exploitation.

Des employeurs peu scrupuleux profitent de cette main d'œuvre illégale, prête à travailler à des coûts très faibles et dans des conditions précaires.

Grâce au vote d'aujourd'hui, employer des travailleurs clandestins pourra désormais coûter très cher aux employeurs, voire même les conduire en prison.

3-186-500

Luca Romagnoli (NI), *per iscritto*. – Voto favorevolmente la relazione presentata dal collega Fava e riguardante le sanzioni contro i datori di lavoro di cittadini di paesi terzi il cui soggiorno è illegale. Sono d'accordo con il relatore quando si manifesta la preoccupazione in merito alle conseguenze sociali di questo fenomeno e alle condizioni di sfruttamento in cui versano questi migranti.

I datori di lavoro senza scrupoli, infatti, sfruttano gli immigrati illegali per i lavori che nessuno vuole fare, ovvero quelli mal pagati e poco qualificati. Inoltre, il lavoro illegale è da considerarsi una vera e propria piaga sociale perché esso può portare alla riduzione delle retribuzioni e al peggioramento delle condizioni di lavoro, oltre che alla distorsione della concorrenza tra le imprese. Pertanto, plaudo all'iniziativa dell'onorevole collega, volta a proteggere i diritti di queste persone che si trovano in una posizione vulnerabile.

3-187

Γεώργιος Τούσσας (GUE/NGL), *γραφώς*. – Η πρόταση Οδηγίας της Επιτροπής και η σχετική έκθεση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου για την επιβολή κυρώσεων στους εργοδότες που απασχολούν παράνομα διαμένοντες μετανάστες αποτελούν μνημείο υποκρισίας και παραπλάνησης. Ο πραγματικός στόχος δεν είναι η επιβολή κυρώσεων στους εργοδότες που εκμεταλλεύονται βάρβαρα τους εργαζόμενους μετανάστες αλλά, αντίθετα, η τιμωρία, η σύλληψη και η βίαιη απέλαση των μεταναστών στις χώρες καταγωγής τους. Εντάσσεται στο σύνολο των μέτρων της αντιμεταναστευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, όπως αυτή εκφράζεται με το "Σύμφωνο Μετανάστευσης" και αποτελεί συνέχεια της περιβόητης Οδηγίας της "ντροπής", που προβλέπει την 18μηνη κράτηση των "παράνομων" μεταναστών, την απέλασή τους και την απαγόρευση εισόδου τους στο έδαφος της ΕΕ για 5 χρόνια.

Στην πραγματικότητα η πρόταση οδηγίας και η έκθεση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, που κινείται ακριβώς στην ίδια κατεύθυνση, εντείνουν τη καταστολή εναντίον των μεταναστών, μεθοδεύουν τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό τους, ενώ ουσιαστικά διευκολύνουν την ακόμη πιο άγρια εκμετάλλευσή τους από το κεφάλαιο.

Το ΚΚΕ καταψηφίζει τόσο την έκθεση, όσο και την πρόταση οδηγίας της Επιτροπής.

Στηρίζει τα δίκαια αιτήματα των μεταναστών, για νομιμοποίησή τους, κατάργηση της μαύρης και ανασφάλιστης εργασίας, αύξηση μισθών και ημερομισθίων, ίση αμοιβή για ίσης αξίας δουλειά, πλήρη κατοχύρωση των κοινωνικών και πολιτικών δικαιωμάτων.

3-188

- Motion for a resolution: (B6-0062/2009)

3-189

Edite Estrela (PSE), *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente a proposta de resolução sobre o desafio da eficiência energética e tecnologias da informação e da comunicação (TIC) porque considero que as TIC desempenham um papel essencial na melhoria da eficiência energética, estimando-se que a sua utilização possa proporcionar uma poupança de mais de 50 milhões de toneladas de CO₂, anualmente.

O potencial proporcionado pelas TIC deve ser plenamente utilizado pelos Estados-Membros, no sentido de se alcançarem os objectivos fixados pelo pacote clima-energia, de uma redução das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa em, pelo menos, 20%, de um aumento, para 20%, da quota-parte das energias renováveis, e de uma melhoria, em 20%, da eficiência energética na União Europeia, até 2020.

3-190

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Votámos favoravelmente este relatório de um Deputado checo do nosso grupo político por considerarmos que trata um tema da maior importância: o desafio da eficiência energética através das tecnologias de informação e comunicação. Estas tecnologias podem ser forças motoras de mais produtividade, crescimento e reduções de custos, sem prejuízo da competitividade, do desenvolvimento sustentável e da qualidade de vida dos cidadãos da UE. Daí que estejamos de acordo com a proposta de solicitar às futuras presidências do Conselho que elejam como um dos seus temas prioritários as tecnologias de informação e comunicação, bem como o seu significado para travar as alterações climáticas e na adaptação às mesmas.

Também nos parece importante que se redobrem esforços a todos os níveis do processo de tomada de decisão a fim de utilizar os instrumentos financeiros disponíveis para o desenvolvimento e a implantação de novas soluções tecnológicas, baseadas nas TIC, que incrementem a eficiência energética.

De igual modo, dado o atraso na abordagem sistemática às soluções TIC inteligentes, é importante que haja uma maior sensibilização que confira particular ênfase à redução das emissões no desenvolvimento dos centros urbanos, nomeadamente através do desenvolvimento de edifícios e de redes de iluminação, transmissão e distribuição inteligentes, bem como através da organização dos transportes públicos.

3-191

Mieczysław Edmund Janowski (UEN), *na piśmie*. – Poparłem rezolucję dotyczącą poprawy efektywności energetycznej poprzez zastosowanie technologii informacyjno-komunikacyjnych.

ITC powinny bowiem stać się rozwiązaniem przyszłościowym w praktycznie wszystkich urządzeniach zużywających energię, pozwalającym na olbrzymie oszczędności w zakresie konsumpcji energii. Zaniechanie takich działań może prowadzić do znacznego wzrostu zapotrzebowania na energię już w najbliższych latach (ok. 25% w ciągu 4 lat).

Największe oszczędności możliwe są w sektorze wytwarzania i przesyłania energii elektrycznej. Wydajność wytwarzania tej energii winno się poprawić o ok. 40%, zaś jej dystrybucji o ok. 10%. ITC przyczynią się zarówno do lepszego zarządzania siecią energetyczną, jak i do ułatwienia integracji odnawialnych źródeł energii. Dzięki zastosowaniu ICT pojawią się również duże oszczędności w zakresie ogrzewania, klimatyzacji i oświetlenia budynków. Wszystko to przyczyni się do istotnego ograniczenia emisji CO₂ tak w odniesieniu do jednostki energii, jak i w wymiarze globalnym.

Technologie te, obejmując same komponenty oraz systemy mikro- i nanoelektroniczne, jak również wiele nowoczesnych technik (np. fotonika), zwiększą konkurencyjność i stworzą nowe możliwości dla biznesu oraz rynku pracy.

Pamiętając o tym, że poprawa efektywności energetycznej to obniżenie zużycia energii w fazie wytwarzania, przesyłu, dystrybucji i końcowej konsumpcji energii, spowodowane zmianami technologicznymi, zmianami zachowań i zmianami ekonomicznymi, zapewniające taki sam poziom komfortu, jak i usług, należy jak najszerzej stosować nowoczesne ITC.

3-191-500

Luca Romagnoli (NI), *per iscritto*. – Comunico il mio voto favorevole in merito alla proposta di risoluzione relativa alla sfida dell'efficienza energetica e tecnologie dell'informazione e della comunicazione.

Ritengo, infatti, che, parallelamente all'obiettivo della riduzione (-20%) delle emissioni di gas a effetto serra entro il 2020, si debba procedere a migliorare l'efficienza energetica del 20% nell'arco dello stesso periodo. Per questo motivo, concordo con la proposta presentata, che mira ad accrescere, ad esempio attraverso progetti di dimostrazione, la consapevolezza

dell'importanza che le TIC rivestono ai fini del miglioramento dell'efficienza energetica nell'economia dell'Unione europea e in quanto forze motrici di una produttività e di una crescita maggiori, nonché di riduzioni dei costi che favoriscono la competitività, lo sviluppo sostenibile e il miglioramento della qualità di vita dei cittadini dell'UE.

3-192

Flaviu Călin Rus (PPE-DE), *în scris*. – Am votat rezoluția Parlamentului European referitoare la soluționarea problemei eficienței energetice prin tehnologiile informației și comunicațiilor, deoarece sunt convins că aceste tehnologii pot oferi soluții viabile la această problemă.

Eficiența energetică e o temă foarte importantă, deoarece știm bine că rezervele naturale, pe baza cărora se obține energie, sunt din ce în ce mai puține, urmând a se epuiza la un moment dat. Prin urmare consider că orice tehnologie prin intermediul căreia se obține eficiență energetică este un aspect benefic, de care poate profita întreaga societate.

3-193

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE), *na piśmie*. – Wielokrotnie na forum Parlamentu Europejskiego podnoszona była, zwłaszcza przez przedstawicieli nowych państw członkowskich, sprawa bezpieczeństwa energetycznego Unii Europejskiej.

Kryzys, jaki dotknął w ostatnich tygodniach wiele unijnych krajów, ukazał nam dostatecznie jaskrawo, jak realne jest zagrożenie odcięcia dostaw gazu i jak słabo jesteśmy przygotowani, aby radzić sobie z jego skutkami.

Europa musi w końcu zacząć myśleć i działać solidarnie! Konieczne jest stworzenie odpowiedniej infrastruktury przesyłowej, mechanizmów wsparcia dla państw, które zostaną pozbawione dostaw surowców, dywersyfikacji źródeł ich pochodzenia, poszukiwanie alternatywnych źródeł gazu, a także stworzenie systemu oszczędzania i poprawy efektywności wykorzystania gazu.

Mam świadomość, że każdy z tych postulatów był już wielokrotnie podnoszony, ale cóż z tego, skoro wszystko wciąż pozostaje w sferze planów.

3-194

Catherine Stihler (PSE), *in writing*. – The importance of energy efficiency and its contribution to meeting our climate change targets cannot be underestimated. Energy efficiency programmes have the potential to create jobs.

3-195

- Motion for a resolution: (RC-B6-0066/2009)

3-195-500

Guy Bono (PSE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution sur le retour et la réintégration des détenus du centre de détention de Guantanamo.

Il me semble que l'Europe ne peut que se féliciter de la décision du Président américain Barak Obama de fermer le centre de détention, chose que nombre d'entre nous réclame depuis plusieurs années. Il me paraît donc opportun de répondre maintenant à l'appel des USA pour mettre en avant une position commune qui va dans le sens des valeurs de l'Union Européenne.

Il est fondamental que nous soyons capables de faire le ménage également au sein de nos propres frontières et que les pays européens qui ont laissé la CIA transférer secrètement des prisonniers soient à leur tour mis devant leurs propres responsabilités.

3-196

Niels Busk, Anne E. Jensen og Karin Riis-Jørgensen (ALDE), *skriftlig*. – Ventres medlemmer stemte imod punkt 4 i beslutningsforslaget om tilbagelevering og genbosættelse af indsatte fra tilbageholdelsesfaciliteten i Guantánamo, da vi mener, at det suverænt er op til den enkelte medlemsstat at tage stilling til, om man vil modtage fanger fra Guantánamo, skulle den amerikanske administration bede om det.

Vi går selvsagt ind for, at medlemsstaterne konsulterer hinanden om mulige indvirkninger på den offentlige sikkerhed i hele EU, i fald medlemsstater ønsker at modtage fanger.

3-196-500

Martin Callanan (PPE-DE), *in writing*. – For many MEPs the existence of the Guantanamo Bay prison became a stick with which to beat America. Personally, I am grateful that the United States yet again took on a disproportionate responsibility for protecting Europe from terrorism.

Nevertheless, I accept that Guantanamo Bay prison should close. That's not because I think that violent terrorists don't need to be locked up; quite the opposite, in fact. But clearly the legal issues surrounding the detention of enemy combatants need to be resolved, and the best way of doing so is by closing Camp X-Ray.

Much as I admire and support America, it must be said that the inmates of Guantanamo are essentially America's responsibility, not ours. They were captured or arrested under American command and should therefore be prosecuted for and detained for alleged offences against America, under American law and on American territory.

I don't support the idea of EU Member States taking responsibility for these extremely dangerous terrorists. However, nor do I think the EU should tell Member States what to do in this regard.

I therefore voted to abstain on this resolution.

3-197

David Casa (PPE-DE), in writing. – We have to be very careful when taking decisions like those proposed in this resolution. We cannot just open our arms and welcome everyone released from Guantanamo. Whilst assuring that the ex-detainees are treated with dignity we have to ensure that they are innocent beyond reasonable doubt before taking any decisions. Any haphazard decisions may be fatal if we do not pay the utmost attention.

3-198

Chris Davies (ALDE), in writing. – While welcoming the decision to close Guantanamo, I am concerned by the willingness of European countries to admit former detainees who may maintain terrorist links. Given the policy of free movement of people within the EU, the actions of one European country may have repercussions for others at a time when we already face complex terrorist problems. Furthermore, our ability to deport a terrorist suspect is constrained by international conventions (such as ECHR) whose revision is overdue.

3-198-500

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE), in writing. – I support this resolution which welcomes President Obama's closure of the detention facilities at Guantánamo Bay and his other important and related executive orders; Recalls that the United States must bear the primary responsibility for the closure of these facilities including the future of its inmates; However, calls on EU Member States, in the spirit of providing fair and humane treatment for all and reinforcing international law, to respond positively to any request from the United States to aid the resettlement of Guantánamo Bay inmates within the European Union.

However, I am deeply concerned by reports that the Obama administration is to retain the practice of rendition.

3-199

Edite Estrela e Armando França (PSE), por escrito. – Votámos favoravelmente a resolução do Parlamento Europeu sobre a possibilidade de acolher reclusos de Guantánamo sem culpa formada, por considerar que a cooperação da União Europeia é fundamental para reforçar o direito internacional e o respeito pelos direitos humanos e para assegurar aos detidos de Guantánamo um tratamento justo e imparcial.

Consideramos, por isso, que a iniciativa e a disponibilidade do Governo português em colaborar com a Administração norte-americana no processo de encerramento da prisão de Guantánamo constitui um exemplo a seguir pelos outros Estados-Membros, no sentido de apoiar os Estados Unidos a resolver este problema complexo, num quadro de respeito dos direitos humanos e das regras do direito internacional.

3-200

Vasco Graça Moura (PPE-DE), por escrito. – Votei contra esta resolução por me parecer inadmissível, face aos seus considerandos D (terceiro ponto) e F, que a UE defenda que os seus Estados-Membros se disponham a acolher prisioneiros libertados de Guantánamo no seguimento de uma sugestão infeliz e demagógica do Ministro dos Negócios Estrangeiros português.

Na verdade, em caso algum é de aceitar que os Estados-Membros da UE acolham detidos que sejam considerados "potenciais ameaças" (considerando D), nem de esquecer o precedente dos 61 ex-reclusos que, após a libertação, se envolveram em actividades terroristas (considerando F).

Não sendo possível distinguir com segurança entre aqueles que constituem e os que não constituem potenciais ameaças, é evidente que o chamado "princípio de precaução" não deve vigorar apenas no âmbito do REACH.

3-201

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Apesar de a resolução integrar alguns aspectos que consideramos positivos, nomeadamente que "cabe aos Estados Unidos a responsabilidade principal por todo o processo de encerramento do centro de detenção da Baía de Guantánamo e pelo futuro dos seus reclusos", não clarifica os termos em que, quantos a nós, deveria ser considerada a gravíssima situação humanitária em causa.

Como temos salientado, opomo-nos a qualquer acordo entre Estados ou entre os EUA e a UE relativamente à "transferência de prisioneiros" detidos em Guantánamo. Tal não significa que não sejam considerados, no quadro do respeito da soberania nacional, da Constituição da República Portuguesa e do direito internacional, decisões e pedidos livremente expressos por cada cidadão, designadamente de asilo em Portugal.

Por outro lado, a resolução:

- não denuncia que a detenção e o transporte ilegal de cidadãos não foram postos em causa pela recente Administração norte-americana, e
- faz "tábua rasa" do apuramento de toda a verdade quanto às violações do direito internacional e dos Direitos do Homem cometidos no âmbito da chamada "guerra contra o terrorismo", incluindo das responsabilidades de diversos governos de países da UE quanto à utilização do espaço aéreo e do território dos seus países para a prisão e o transporte de prisioneiros ilegalmente detidos.

3-202

Ona Juknevičienė (ALDE), raštu. – Nuoširdžiai sveikinu ir palaikau JAV Prezidento Baracko Obamos sprendimą pradėti Gvantanamo įlankos sulaikymo centro uždarymą. Tai svarbus žingsnis į naujos JAV politikos pradžią. Esu tikra, kad visos ES šalys narės palaikys tokią JAV politiką ir atsilieps į Prezidento B. Obamos prašymą bendradarbiauti, ar padėti sprendžiant paleistų kalinių klausimus, jeigu jis to paprašys. Tačiau aš balsavau prieš rezoliucijos straipsnį, kuriuo valstybės narės raginamos "būti pasirengusios priimti Gvantanamo kalinius", nes manau, kad ši klausimą turi spręsti kiekviena Bendrijos šalis savarankiškai. Neabejoju, kad kiekviena iš jų, esant konkrečiam atvejui, teigiamai atsilieps ir suteiks paramą JAV administracijai. Tačiau tai bus jų pačių pasirinkimas ir gera valia bei pagarba humanitarinėms ir tarptautinėms teisės normoms

3-203

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Οι Ευρωβουλευτές του ΚΚΕ καταψήφισαν το κοινό ψήφισμα των πολιτικών ομάδων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, ζητώντας την άμεση απελευθέρωση όλων των κρατουμένων που αυθαίρετα συνέλαβαν και κρατούν οι ΗΠΑ στη βάση του Γκουαντάναμο και το άμεσο και οριστικό κλείσιμο της βάσης που διατηρούν επίσης παράνομα σε Κουβανικό έδαφος, παρά την θέληση του λαού της Κούβας και της κυβέρνησής του.

Αντ' αυτού, το ψήφισμα ζητάει την διεξαγωγή "δίκαιης δίκης" για όσους κρίνουν οι ΗΠΑ ότι έχουν στοιχεία εναντίον τους, ενώ καλεί τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ να δεχτούν κρατουμένους στις δικές τους φυλακές, στα πλαίσια της αντιτρομοκρατικής συνεργασίας ΕΕ-ΗΠΑ. Αποτελεί πράγματι εμπαιγμό και συνενοχή η αποδοχή δίκης και καταδίκης κρατουμένων, όταν είναι γνωστά τα μεσαιωνικά βασανιστήρια που υπέστησαν και επομένως η αξιοπιστία που μπορεί να έχουν τέτοια στοιχεία μετά από πολλά χρόνια απάνθρωπης φυλάκισης.

Οι πανηγυρισμοί και τα χαιρετιστήρια προς τον Ομπάμα καλλιεργούν αυταπάτες στους λαούς για την πολιτική του ιμπεριαλισμού. Σε ό,τι δε αφορά το συγκεκριμένο θέμα, το σχετικό διάταγμα για το Γκουαντάναμο διατηρεί τη δυνατότητα της CIA να προβαίνει σε "απαγωγές υπόπτων για τρομοκρατία" και να τους μεταφέρει σε μυστικές φυλακές.

3-204

Tobias Pflüger (GUE/NGL), schriftlich. – Ich habe dem Bericht „Entschließung des Europäischen Parlaments zu der Rückkehr und Aufnahme der Insassen des Gefangenenlagers Guantánamo“ zugestimmt, weil ich die Aufnahme von Guantánamo-Häftlingen in die Staaten der EU grundsätzlich begrüße. Viele EU-Staaten hatten sich im Zusammenhang mit Guantánamo z.B. durch die Gewährung von Überflugrechten für die illegalen Gefangenen Transporte mit schuldig gemacht.

Dennoch enthält der Bericht einige Punkte, die eine Zustimmung nicht leicht machten:

Werden im Bericht die Folterpraktiken in Guantánamo, insbesondere das „water-boarding“ nicht explizit als Folter benannt, sondern als „harte Verhörmethoden“, „die Folter und grausamer, unmenschlicher oder erniedrigender Behandlung gleichkommen“.

Wurden die Änderungsanträge der Linken (GUE/NGL) und der Grünen (Verts), die die Auflösung aller geheimen Gefangenenlager, ein Wiedergutmachungsrecht für die Opfer und eine Untersuchung der Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Zusammenhang mit Guantánamo einforderten, alle abgelehnt.

3-205

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. – A dificuldade da Europa em lidar com a decisão de encerramento de Guantánamo revela bem a distância que vai entre as intenções assentes em princípios válidos e a realidade, plena de dificuldades.

O encerramento de Guantánamo é uma boa notícia, tanto em si mesma, como enquanto símbolo. Mas este encerramento não resolve o problema para o qual aquela foi criada - e que ela também não resolveu: como lidar com uma ameaça à segurança nacional e internacional que se apresenta com características inteiramente distintas dos tradicionais combatentes inimigos, para quem o direito internacional foi pensado e está preparado?

Mais do que cooperar no eventual acolhimento de ex-detidos de Guantánamo - que pode ser necessário mas deve ter em conta diversas limitações - a Europa, os Estados Unidos e a sociedade internacional devem cooperar no sentido de procurar

uma solução jurídica estável e duradoura que responda a este desafio dos combatentes terroristas internacionais. Sem ela, a Guantánamo suceder-se-á uma outra má solução.

Quanto ao acolhimento de ex-detidos, para além do dever de coordenação a nível europeu, seria avisado não acolher aqueles a quem, noutras circunstâncias, não se concederiam vistos por razões de segurança. Boa vontade e cautela devem ser os critérios.

3-205-500

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto negativo in merito alla proposta di risoluzione sul rimpatrio e reinsediamento dei detenuti di Guantanamo. In particolare, sono fermamente convinto che la responsabilità per l'intero processo di chiusura del centro di detenzione di Guantanamo e il futuro dei suoi detenuti spetta solo ed esclusivamente agli Stati Uniti d'America.

Non concordo, infatti, sul punto della risoluzione ove si afferma che la responsabilità del diritto internazionale e dei diritti fondamentali spetta a tutti i paesi democratici e in particolare all'Unione Europea. Non si può interferire in una materia dove la competenza è esclusivamente del governo degli Stati Uniti d'America. Infine, non sono d'accordo sull'eventualità di accettare in Unione Europea i detenuti di Guantanamo per i motivi citati sopra.

3-206

Catherine Stihler (PSE), in writing. – All EU Member States must play their part in making possible the closure of the Guantánamo Bay prison. It is no good calling on the Americans to close the place, which the new President is doing, if we cannot shoulder some responsibility.

3-206-500

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), na piśmie. – Z zadowoleniem przyjąłem wiadomość o decyzji prezydenta USA – Baracka Obamy – o zamknięciu więzienia w zatoce Guantánamo. Obama jeszcze w trakcie swojej kampanii wyborczej podkreślał, że zamknięcie cieszącego się złą sławą więzienia jest jednym z priorytetów.

Sprawa powrotu i przesiedlenia więźniów z Guantanamo może stanowić świadectwo ważnej zmiany polityki USA w słusznym kierunku – poszanowania praw podstawowych, prawa humanitarnego i międzynarodowego. Teraz każdy więzień powinien zostać osądzony, a w przypadku uznania za winnego odbywać karę więzienia w Stanach Zjednoczonych. Osoby, którym nie przedstawiono oskarżeń i które dobrowolnie zgodzą się na repatriację, powinny zostać jak najszybciej odesłane do krajów pochodzenia. Więźniom, których nie można odesłać do kraju pochodzenia ze względu na ryzyko tortur lub prześladowania, należy przyznać prawo pobytu w Stanach Zjednoczonych, ochronę humanitarną oraz odszkodowanie. Obecnie w Guantanamo przebywa około 242 więźniów. Część z nich tylko dlatego, że nie ma kraju, do którego mogliby bezpiecznie powrócić. Są to osoby, wobec których nigdy nie wniesiono żadnych oskarżeń.

Walka z terroryzmem była i jest jednym z priorytetów zarówno polityki zagranicznej Unii Europejskiej, jak i Stanów Zjednoczonych. Jednak trzeba wyraźnie podkreślić, iż bezwzględnie zawsze musi się ona odbywać z poszanowaniem praw podstawowych i zasad państwa prawa.

3-207

9 - Corrections to votes and voting intentions: see Minutes

3-208

(The sitting was suspended at 13.20 and resumed at 15.00.)

3-209

VORSITZ: MECHTILD ROTHE
Vizepräsidentin

3-210

10 - Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung

3-211

(Das Protokoll der vorangegangenen Sitzung wird genehmigt.)

3-212

Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM). – Madam President, on a point of order, I refer to Rule 142(2)(a) and (b) on the allocation of speaking time. Yesterday when we were discussing the Guantánamo prison, here in the Chamber, I and several other speakers were interrupted without mercy when we had exceeded our speaking time by a few seconds. That harsh treatment was meted out by Mr Pöttering and Mr Siwiec, the Vice-President replacing him later in the afternoon.

Mr Schulz, the Socialist Group leader, on the other hand, was permitted by Mr Pöttering to exceed his time limit by far more than a minute. Now, I would not dream of insinuating that this was because Mr Pöttering and Mr Schulz are buddies – *alte Kameraden* as one might put it in German – but I do spot a recurring pattern here. Colleagues from big groups

elaborating the political message the Chair wants to hear are treated with great generosity. Colleagues from smaller groups elaborating the political message the Chair does not want to hear are treated with great meanness. Now that is in breach of the Rules of Procedure, where it is clearly stated how speaking time should be allocated.

I want to remind Mr Pöttering and all his Vice-Presidents –

(The President informed the speaker that he had exceeded his speaking time.)

I was sent here to defend subsidiarity and the sovereignty of member countries and the President and the Vice-Presidents of this Parliament have no right whatsoever to try and silence the voice of 15% of the Swedish electorate.

3-213

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Kollege, ich entziehe Ihnen jetzt das Wort. Sie haben jetzt Ihre Redezeit um mehr als die Hälfte überschritten. Ich nehme zur Kenntnis, was sie gesagt haben; ich glaube, es ist allen klar geworden.

3-214

Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM). – Madam President, can I remind you that this would not have happened to Mr Schulz. He would not have been interrupted by you. This is the great difference. But you prove my point – thank you very much.

3-215

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Kollege, ich bin sicher, dass Sie sich irren. Ich nehme das auf – es kommt zum einen ins Protokoll, und sicherlich wäre es auch angebracht, dass über die Frage unterschiedlichen Verhaltens, was auch zum Teil an der Zeit liegt, die zur Verfügung steht, im Präsidium beraten wird.

3-216

11 - Kosovo (Aussprache)

3-217

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt folgen die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Kosovo.

3-218

Hannes Swoboda (PSE). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir diskutieren heute den Kosovo auf der Grundlage eines sehr ausführlichen Berichts des Kollegen Joost Lagendijk, der Berichterstatter ist, natürlich verbunden mit Erklärungen von Kommission und Rat.

Der Berichterstatter hat in diesem Fall keine offizielle Redezeit. Das finde ich eigentlich katastrophal. Wenn der Berichterstatter verzichten und nur den Initiativbericht am Montagabend präsentieren würde, hätte er vier Minuten. Das finde ich eigentlich nicht gerecht. Ich bitte das Präsidium daher, zu überlegen, ob jemandem, der wirklich über Monate als Berichterstatter des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten arbeitet, nicht auch eine offizielle Redezeit gegeben werden sollte.

Jetzt hat die Kollegin Gisela Kallenbach ihm aus Solidarität als Abgeordnete der Grünen ihre Minute abgetreten. Vielleicht wäre es möglich, Frau Präsidentin – wenn das in Ihrer Macht steht – Frau Kallenbach beim *Catch the eye* eine Minute zu geben. Ich möchte Sie aber bitten, sich hierzu grundsätzlich Gedanken zu machen. Wir müssen da eine andere Regelung finden.

3-219

Die Präsidentin. – Es ist sicherlich richtig, dass das grundsätzliche Problem behandelt werden sollte. Was die konkrete Situation jetzt anbelangt, empfehle ich einfach der Kollegin Kallenbach – weil es das erheblich vereinfachen würde –, dass sie unter dem Punkt *Catch the eye* genau die Minute bekommt.

3-220

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I am grateful for this opportunity to take stock of the latest developments in Kosovo. In two weeks' time – on 17 February 2009 – Kosovo will celebrate the first anniversary of its declaration of independence, and this debate is certainly timely. Since then, Kosovo has adopted a constitution and a completely new legal and institutional framework. The declaration of independence created a new situation and new challenges for the international community and for the EU in particular.

The differing views of the Member States in reaction to the declaration of independence in no way undermine the Union's overall policy objectives. We remain committed to assisting in the economic and political development of Kosovo within the overall objective of ensuring long-term stability for the Balkans as a whole.

In the case of Kosovo, that means contributing in particular to strengthening of the rule of law, respect for human rights and the protection of minorities, as well as encouraging economic development and working for the protection of Kosovo's rich cultural and religious heritage.

It also means continuing to see Kosovo within the wider framework set for the Western Balkans at the Thessaloniki Summit in 2003. The policy of supporting a European perspective for all the Western Balkan countries, agreed on that occasion, has since been reaffirmed, most recently by the Council at its meeting of 8 December 2008.

Proof of our continued commitment lies in the rapid appointment early last year of Pieter Feith as EU Special Representative, who is based in Priština, and you will have a chance to meet him in the Committee on Foreign Affairs very soon. His task, and that of his team, is to provide valuable support on the ground in order to help us collectively meet all our political objectives.

More recently, EULEX, the most ambitious civilian ESDP mission to date, began its mandate in early December 2008. Its main aim is to assist and support the Kosovo authorities in the area of the rule of law, specifically in developing the police, judiciary and customs administration.

Our main challenge over the coming months will be to intensify our engagement in Kosovo, most importantly by moving to full deployment of EULEX. We are realistic enough to know that 2009 will present its fair share of difficulties and obstacles.

Kosovo institutions will also face many challenges in the implementation of their commitments to develop a stable multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo. The international community's assistance is crucial if Kosovo is to succeed in integrating fully with the rest of the region.

The Commission has announced that later this year it will present a study examining ways of furthering Kosovo's political and socioeconomic development. This has been welcomed by the Council. It should offer new opportunities and build on what has already been achieved, adjusted in the light of our experience over the next few months.

The situation in the north of Kosovo will certainly continue to be difficult over the months to come, and will require particular attention. The most recent outbreaks of ethnic violence in Mitrovica in early January this year were potentially serious but were contained. It is particularly encouraging that the authorities in Priština acted with reasonable restraint. However, these incidents are a constant reminder of the constant risk of destabilisation there. We will continue to monitor closely the situation in the north of the country in particular.

The Presidency is grateful for the continuing interest of Members of Parliament and for your support for the role of the Union in the region. I particularly welcome the proposed resolution which has been tabled at this part-session. It is encouraging that Parliament is able to give its broad support to our efforts in the region, and to the Union's commitment to the stability of Kosovo within the wider region.

This Presidency is committed to keeping you informed, both through regular discussions here in the plenary, as well as more detailed briefings through the committees. We are planning various activities this spring, *inter alia* to dedicate the Gymnich meeting in late March to the Western Balkans. I also know that Pieter Feith will be meeting with the AFET Committee next week, and he will be able to provide a comprehensive update on the latest developments on the ground.

3-221

Meglena Kuneva, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, just one year after the declaration of independence, the situation in Kosovo, and in the whole Western Balkans region, is overall stable and under control, in spite of some incidents.

The European Union presence in Kosovo is progressively materialising, taking over from the United Nations. The EU special representative is residing in Priština, and the EU's Rule of Law Mission (EULEX) is deployed throughout Kosovo and will be fully operational at the end of March.

A stable and multi-ethnic Kosovo is a key priority for the European Union. The best way for Kosovo to move towards European integration is by creating a democratic and multi-ethnic society, with full respect for the rule of law, cooperating peacefully with its neighbours and contributing to regional and European stability. This includes extensive measures to safeguard the future of all communities in Kosovo, thereby creating a basis for sustainable economic and political development.

The Commission's progress report of November 2008 was considered by the authorities to be an objective and fair assessment of what was achieved and of the challenges ahead. The Kosovo authorities have committed themselves to working and cooperating with the Commission in meeting these challenges. We allocate significant funding to Kosovo under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (EPA), as part of the overall pledge of EUR 1.2 billion reached at the July 2008 donors' conference.

In 2008, the Instrument for Pre-Accession supported projects worth EUR 185 million in Kosovo, a three-fold increase compared to the previous year. We will allocate a further EUR 106 million in 2009. The management of this funding is the exclusive responsibility of our Commission Liaison Office in Priština, which is now fully operational with all relevant control systems in place, and takes over from the European Agency for Reconstruction.

The Commission welcomes the draft resolution being discussed here today in the European Parliament. It touches on many issues that we agree are of crucial importance, such as the preservation of Kosovo's cultural heritage, the improvement of its public administration capacity, better integration among its communities, the importance of multi-ethnic education, and the plight of Roma families in lead-contaminated refugee camps in the north.

The Commission takes all these issues very seriously. Perhaps I can say a few words on each of them in turn.

Since 2004, the Commission has financed the reconstruction of religious and cultural heritage sites – its programme with a budget of EUR 10 million – with the close involvement of the Council of Europe. In 2008 and 2009 funding is continuing, with EUR 2.5 million more for further projects. We consider this a very important aspect of reconciliation and have supported the establishment of Kosovo's cultural heritage database. Graveyards could also be included in this debate so as to ensure their proper restoration and preservation.

I would like to express our gratitude to the European Parliament for the additional amount of EUR 3 million, within the 2008 EU budget, for cultural heritage reconstruction in the war-affected areas in the Western Balkans. The Commission has allocated half of this amount – EUR 1.5 million – to Kosovo, in a joint project with the Ministry of Culture, in the multi-ethnic town of Prizren.

We are grateful for the additional amount under this heading which is also allocated in this year's budget. Under the 2007 Instrument for Pre-Accession, the Commission is implementing projects to facilitate the return and reintegration of internally displaced people and refugees in Kosovo, for a total of amount of EUR 3.3 million. We have envisaged further funding –EUR 4 million under the 2008 Instrument for Pre-Accession, and EUR 2 million under the 2009 Instrument for Pre-Accession. This money will also contribute to improving the local capacity to reintegrate returnees into the local social and economic environment.

Gender equality is high on our agenda as well. The Commission has provided technical assistance to the Kosovo Gender Equality Agency. It has also supported the activities of several local NGOs working in the field of gender equality and women's rights through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights.

As regards public administration capacity, the Commission monitors the implementation of Kosovo's public administration reform strategy and action plan. We have stressed with the authorities the urgency of adopting the Civil Service Law. Through our involvement in setting up the regional school for public administration we also cooperate with the Kosovo Institute for Public Administration. Special attention is paid to the Ministry of Local Government and Administration, with a support project for almost EUR 1 million.

The Commission is making significant efforts to help reform the education system in Kosovo. Our financial assistance is comprehensive. It aims at improving both material conditions and the quality of teaching at primary, secondary and tertiary levels and in the vocational sector, as well as strengthening the multicultural aspects as a basic condition for reconciliation.

Following the July donors' conference, a multi-donor trust fund was set up by the World Bank for the broader social sector, including education. With EUR 5 million, the Commission is among the main contributors to the fund. Altogether, EU assistance to education in Kosovo, over the period 2006-2010, amounts to EUR 30.5 million. The opening of a multi-ethnic European university college will receive our support once all local stakeholders reach an agreement to make this effort a sustainable project.

The plight of Roma families in lead-contaminated refugee camps in the north is an issue of serious concern. The Commission is actively assisting in finding a swift and sustainable solution acceptable to all. We have repeatedly called on all parties to refrain from politicising the issue, and to act only with the best interests of the Roma families in mind.

Finally, Kosovo also benefits from our multi-beneficiary programmes, covering the Western Balkans and Turkey, which fund the process of civil registration of Roma people. Our support for Roma in Kosovo also includes education. Together with the Council of Europe, we support quality education for Roma children, including in their mother tongue.

In my view, all this is very much in line with your proposals. I thank all honourable Members of this Parliament very much for their attention and look forward to your questions.

Doris Pack, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich darf dem Berichtersteller und auch dem Schattenberichtersteller gratulieren, weil ich glaube, dass wir gemeinsam hier eine sehr gute Entschliebung verfasst haben.

An Rat und Kommission appelliert diese Entschliebung, dass man im Kosovo gemeinsam handelt, dass EULEX gemeinsam mit dem Hohen Vertreter der EU handelt, dass man im Interesse eines wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Lebens, das im Kosovo wirklich angereichert werden muss, Synergieeffekte schafft.

Die EULEX-Mission muss außerdem dafür sorgen, dass die Gerichtsverfahren, die schon über Jahre dort liegen, endlich aufgegriffen und zu Ende gebracht werden. Es gibt noch so viele Gräueltaten, die nicht aufgedeckt sind und nicht vor einen Richter gekommen sind. Auch die Korruption dort muss bekämpft werden. Es laufen noch sehr viele Straftäter ungestraft im Kosovo herum.

Die Europäische Union sollte auch zusätzlich zu dem, was wir gerade gehört haben, daran denken, dass nicht nur großräumig etwas getan werden muss, sondern dass auch das tägliche Leben, die örtlichen Möglichkeiten von Projekten mehr angegangen werden müssen, von Mensch zu Mensch. Diese Arbeit ist sehr wichtig.

An die Regierung im Kosovo müssen wir appellieren, dass die praktische Umsetzung ihrer Verfassung, die ja eigentlich den Matti Ahtisaari-Plan beinhaltet, wirklich endlich angegangen werden muss. Die Menschen im Kosovo müssen in ihrem täglichen Leben merken, dass sie wirklich gemeinsam dort leben, dass Serben und Albaner und alle anderen Minderheiten im Kosovo als gleichberechtigte Bürger angesehen werden.

Die Kosovo-Regierung muss auch die Dezentralisierung vorantreiben. Ich bin natürlich sehr dafür, dass ein europäisches College eingerichtet wird, ein multiethnisches, damit neben der Universität von Priština und der Universität von Mitrovica noch etwas zusammen gebaut werden kann, was auf eine gemeinsame Zukunft ausgerichtet ist.

Außerdem wünsche ich mir natürlich, dass Serbien endlich daran denkt, dass die Serben im Kosovo nicht angehalten werden wollen, sich nicht an der Regierung zu beteiligen. Sie müssen sich an der Regierung, an der Parlamentsarbeit und am zivilen Leben beteiligen dürfen. Nur dann kann das Kosovo blühen.

3-223

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi, au nom du groupe PSE. – Madame la Présidente, je m'exprime au nom du groupe socialiste. On peut constater que la situation au Kosovo s'améliore. Nous devons être reconnaissants à la Présidence tchèque et à la Commission pour leur bonne coopération. Je suis tout à fait d'accord avec Mme Pack pour affirmer que la mission EULEX est un très grand défi pour la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense, un des plus grands défis de toute l'histoire de l'Union européenne en tant que Communauté de droit.

C'est une bonne chose qu'il y ait déjà une base juridique à la suite de la déclaration du président du Conseil de sécurité, que le gouvernement serbe a accueillie positivement. Il y avait un accord tacite du côté de la Chine et de la Russie, qui avaient auparavant rejeté tout règlement du conflit.

Il est primordial que l'EULEX coopère bien avec les parties concernées au Kosovo. Il ne faut pas répéter les fautes commises par la MINUK, qui a gaspillé beaucoup d'argent et qui s'est aliéné la population du Kosovo. Mme Doris Pack a évoqué ce sujet aussi. Il est très important de clarifier la répartition des compétences entre, d'une part, le gouvernement et le Parlement du Kosovo, et l'EULEX, d'autre part.

Nous ne pouvons pas prendre la responsabilité du développement du Kosovo. La présence de l'EULEX dans le nord du Kosovo est très importante afin d'éviter la partition de ce territoire. Enfin, la mise en œuvre complète des dispositions de la constitution conformément au plan Ahtisaari est une question primordiale pour les minorités.

3-224

Johannes Lebech, for ALDE-Gruppen. – Fru formand! Indledningsvis vil jeg udtrykke min store tilfredshed med beslutningsforslaget og takke hr. Lagendijk for hans store indsats. Resultatet er blevet en tekst, der er velafbalanceret og pointeret, og den formår samtidig at berøre alle væsentlige problemstillinger. Med denne beslutning sender vi i Europa-Parlamentet først og fremmest et signal til befolkningen i Kosovo og til befolkningerne i de øvrige lande på Vestbalkan: "I er ikke glemt, I er en del af Europa". Det er ikke blot en tom hensigtserklæring uden reelt indhold. EULEX-missionen, den største mission under den fælles europæiske sikkerheds- og forsvarspolitik til dato, er allerede sat i værk. Det er glædeligt, at missionen støttes af FN, og at den dækker hele landet.

Vi i Europa-Parlamentet støtter i vores beslutning op om Kosovo med denne mission. Yderligere påpeger vi områder, hvor EU-landene kan bistå Kosovo. Det gælder særlig støtte til opbygning af den offentlige administration, uddannelsesprojekter og styrkelse af civilsamfundet. Når vi påpeger områder, hvor Kosovos ledere skal blive bedre, f.eks. med hensyn til mindretalsbeskyttelse, er det fordi, vi mener det alvorligt, når vi siger, at vi vil stå Kosovo bi i bestræbelserne på at skabe et demokratisk samfund. Et demokratisk samfund med respekt for mindretal og i fredelig sameksistens med landets naboer. Det her gælder ikke kun Kosovos fremtid, men hele Balkans og Europas fremtid. Vejen

frem er lang, og den bliver vanskelig. Der er kun en vej, og den vej går mod EU og mod fuld og hel integration i det europæiske samarbejde for Kosovo såvel som for det øvrige Vestbalkan.

3-225

Ryszard Czarnecki, *w imieniu grupy UEN*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Grzechem pierworodnym przy narodzinach nowego państwa w Kosowie było poczucie panujące wśród serbskiej mniejszości w Kosowie i w Metochii, a także w samej Serbii jako takiej, że nowa państwowość jest skierowana, jak cała muzułmańska większość zresztą, przeciwko Serbom. Musiało to wpływać na stosunki Belgradu z Prisztiną i z całą pewnością również na stosunki między Kosowarami a Serbami z etnicznych serbskich enklaw.

Jeżeli nie będą przestrzegane prawa kulturalne, edukacyjne i religijne serbskiej mniejszości, nie tylko utrudni to sytuację w bilateralnych relacjach między Kosowem a Serbią i szerzej na Bałkanach, ale też z całą pewnością wydłuży drogę Prisztiny do Unii Europejskiej.

Zgadzam się z tym, co mówił mój szanowny przedmówca, pan poseł Lebec. Władze tego państwa muszą zrozumieć, że przestrzeganie praw mniejszości to europejski standard. Musimy tego bardzo przestrzegać i w tym zakresie patrzeć na ręce naszym partnerom z Kosowa.

3-226

Joost Lagendijk, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Het heeft bijna een jaar geduurd voordat EULEX in staat was om haar oorspronkelijke mandaat uit te voeren. Het is goed om er vandaag nog even aan te herinneren hoe dat oorspronkelijke mandaat eruitzag.

Het mandaat hield in dat EULEX, zoals gezegd de grootste Europese missie tot nu toe, zich zou ontplooiën, actief zou zijn in heel Kosovo, ten noorden en ten zuiden van de rivier de Ibar. Het betekende ook dat EULEX de leiding zou nemen op drie gebieden: douane, politie en rechtspraak en - heel belangrijk - dat er geen - ik onderstreep - géén onduidelijke relatie zou ontstaan tussen EULEX aan de ene kant en UNMIK, de VN-organisatie, aan de andere kant. Laat staan dat EULEX actief zou worden en dit ertoe zou leiden dat het land eigenlijk in tweeën zou worden opgedeeld, tussen het noorden en het zuiden. Dat was allemaal niet de bedoeling.

Heel lang leek het erop dat het oorspronkelijke mandaat niet zou kunnen worden uitgevoerd vanwege de bekende blokkade in de Veiligheidsraad. Eigenlijk ziet het er pas sinds november vorig jaar naar uit dat het gaat lukken. Het is dan ook goed nu - twee, drie maanden nadat men werkelijk is begonnen - te zien dat het werkt of, laat ik voorzichtig zijn, dat het lijkt te werken.

De Kosovaarse politie is blij met de prima samenwerking met de mensen van EULEX. De douane functioneert eindelijk weer, ook en vooral in het noordelijke gedeelte van Kosovo, met name bij die douaneposten die vorig jaar nog door Kosovo-Serviërs werden platgebrand. Eindelijk is er een begin gemaakt met het aanpakken van de achterstand in een hoop rechtszaken op het gebied van interetnisch geweld en corruptie, hetgeen nog een keer laat zien dat de activiteiten van EULEX in het belang zijn van alle gemeenschappen, niet alleen van de Albaniërs en niet alleen van de Serviërs.

Wat ik werkelijk hoop is dat deze ontwikkeling van EULEX in de laatste paar maanden zich op een positieve manier voortzet. Ik hoop ook werkelijk dat Servië, dat Belgrado inziet dat de huidige manier van constructief samenwerken met de Europese Unie veel en veel effectiever is dan blijven proberen de geschiedenis te herschrijven. Ik hoop ook en vooral dat de Kosovaarse autoriteiten eindelijk erin slagen om die grote stapel problemen die er nog steeds is, op te lossen. Eindelijk eens een aanpakken van de corruptie en van de georganiseerde criminaliteit die nog veel en veel te sterk aanwezig is in Kosovo is. Eindelijk het zorgen voor energievoorziening op een duurzame manier, gebaseerd op de EU-regelgeving, en eindelijk het van de grond tillen van de Kosovaarse economie.

Kosovo is een onafhankelijke staat en of iedereen in dit Parlement dat nu leuk vindt of niet, die situatie zal niet meer worden teruggedraaid. Wij, de Europese Unie, hebben er belang bij dat Kosovo zich ontwikkelt tot een levensvatbare staat. Daarom zitten wij daar en daarom moeten wij daar ook blijven.

3-227

Tobias Pflüger, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Meine Fraktion GUE/NGL lehnt die vorgelegte Resolution zum Kosovo ab. Die Mehrheit der EU-Staaten, aber nicht alle, haben den Kosovo völkerrechtswidrig anerkannt. Die Linksfraktion pocht darauf, dass jede Regelung für den Kosovo dem Völkerrecht entsprechen und einvernehmlich mit allen Beteiligten – also auch mit Serbien – erfolgen muss. Mit der Anerkennung des Kosovo ist ein fataler Präzedenzfall geschaffen worden. Andere ahmen dies inzwischen nach – siehe Südossetien und Abchasien.

Die EU hat im Kosovo die Mission EULEX gestartet. Diese Mission lehnt die Linksfraktion ab, da sie auf der völkerrechtswidrigen Anerkennung des Kosovo basiert und so etwas wie ein EU-Protectorat schafft. EULEX hat – Zitat – „Exekutivbefugnisse in einigen Bereichen.“ So können EULEX-Beamte einfach Beschlüsse kosovarischer Behörden annullieren. Im Rahmen von EULEX gibt es auch 500 Polizisten zur Aufstandsbekämpfung. EULEX und KFOR führten

am 26. Januar eine gemeinsame Übung zur Aufstandsbekämpfung durch. Das zeigt auch die bedauerlicherweise sehr enge Zusammenarbeit zwischen der EU und NATO im Kosovo.

Die EU und andere treiben zugleich den neoliberalen Wirtschaftsumbau im Kosovo voran. Das ist nicht im Sinne der Menschen vor Ort. Deshalb fordern wir: Lösungen nur im Sinne des Völkerrechts und ein klares Votum gegen die EU-Mission EULEX. Wenn wir uns wirklich für die Menschen vor Ort einsetzen wollen, ist das mit dieser EULEX-Mission so nicht möglich.

3-228

Bastiaan Belder, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Toen ik twee maanden geleden op werkbezoek in Kosovo was, begreep ik waarom velen het moeilijk vinden de internationale aanwezigheid in dit land te doorgronden. Daarbij kreeg ik niet de indruk dat deze verschillende niveaus altijd even goed met elkaar samenwerkten.

De Europese instellingen mogen daar niet de schouders over ophalen. Wij zijn daar partij. Door middel van de EULEX-missie is Europa verantwoordelijk voor de situatie op de grond. EULEX moet zich assertiever opstellen en de Kosovaarse autoriteiten met raad en daad bijstaan, gevraagd en ongevraagd.

Ik wil twee zaken graag onderstrepen. In de eerste plaats roep ik die lidstaten die Kosovo nog niet erkend hebben, op dit besluit te heroverwegen. Er is geen weg terug meer voor Kosovo binnen de grenzen van Servië. In de tweede plaats pleit ik voor een *masterplan* voor de westelijke Balkan. Hierin moet met alle landen op concreet niveau gewerkt worden aan het klaarmaken van deze landen voor toetreding tot de Europese Unie. Dat is Europees engagement voor de westelijke Balkan.

3-229

Bernd Posselt (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin! Als EVP-Schattenberichterstatter begrüße ich den ausgezeichneten Text des Kollegen Lagendijk. Wir unterstützen den Reformkurs Serbiens, und wir respektieren selbstverständlich die winzige Minderheit von EU-Mitgliedstaaten, die den Kosovo noch nicht völkerrechtlich anerkannt hat.

Aber wir warnen vor der Illusion, man könnte diese Entwicklung noch zurückdrehen. 75 % dieses Hauses waren für die Anerkennung des Kosovo. Die Kommission hat sich dafür ausgesprochen, 23 von 27 Mitgliedstaaten, alle G7-Staaten, vier von sechs ehemaligen jugoslawischen Republiken, drei von vier Nachbarstaaten des Kosovo.

Das zeigt, dass diese Entwicklung unumkehrbar ist. Deshalb ist es wichtig, in die Zukunft zu schauen, und da drohen eine Menge Gefahren. Die erste große Gefahr ist die einer Teilung des Kosovo. Bisher ist die Aufteilung des ehemaligen Jugoslawien entlang der alten Republiksgrenzen oder der alten innerjugoslawischen Grenzen der autonomen Gebiete erfolgt. Sollte hier jetzt neu an der Landkarte gezeichnet werden, etwa in Mitrowitza, hätte das zur Folge, dass z.B. auch die Albaner im Preševo-Tal in Serbien, die Menschen im Sandschak von Novi Pazar und andere die Frage stellen würden, wo hier die Grenzen verlaufen sollen. Das würde eine Entwicklung auslösen, die ausgesprochen gefährlich wäre.

Deshalb ist es vernünftig, den Weg des Ahtisaari-Plans zu gehen, nämlich Respektierung der alten innerjugoslawischen Grenzen bei gegenseitigem extrem weitgehenden Minderheitenschutz. Und der Minderheitenschutz des ehemaligen Ahtisaari-Plans, der heute in der kosovarischen Verfassung verankert ist, ist der weitestgehende Minderheitenschutz der Welt. Die Serben im Kosovo sollten diese Chance ergreifen und diesen Minderheitenschutz nutzen.

Herr Ratspräsident, Sie wissen, ich entstamme selbst einer Minderheit, die einmal für Zwecke anderer missbraucht wurde, und das sollten die Serben im Kosovo vermeiden. Die andere Gefahr, die droht, ist die von Chaos und Korruption. Da kann ich nur sagen, wir müssen EULEX stärken, denn UNMIK war nicht Lösung sondern Teil des Problems.

3-230

Hannes Swoboda (PSE). – Frau Präsidentin! Dem Kollegen Joost Lagendijk geht es wie dem Kosovo, er existiert, wird aber nicht von allen als Berichterstatter anerkannt, obwohl er es de facto ist. In dem Sinn möchte ich ihm – so wie auch mein Kollege Tabajdi – sehr herzlich für seinen Bericht danken.

Natürlich sind wir noch nicht so weit in der Entwicklung, was die Anerkennung des Kosovo betrifft, wie sich das manche – auch im Kosovo – gewünscht haben. Es ist auch – und das müssen wir anerkennen – eine schmerzliche Situation für Serbien gewesen. Wir sollten kein Öl ins Feuer gießen, sondern wir sollten uns bemühen, dass die Entwicklung in einem friedlichen Prozess vorangeht. Ich bin sehr froh, dass Serbiens Verantwortliche, trotz manch scharfer Worte am Anfang, doch versucht haben, die Sache zu legalisieren und zu neutralisieren, so dass die EULEX-Mission eine Chance bekommen hat. Alle, die gegen die EULEX-Mission sind, frage ich, wie wäre denn eigentlich die Situation der serbischen und anderer Minderheiten im Land, wenn es keine EULEX-Mission gäbe?

Es ist doch unsinnig, aus der Warte der serbischen Minderheit oder von Serbien, die EULEX-Mission abzulehnen. Dass hier im Parlament jemand die EULEX-Mission ablehnt, die sogar Serbien befürwortet, halte ich geradezu für grotesk. Es gibt allerdings noch offene Fragen. Das ist richtig. Auch die politisch Verantwortlichen im Kosovo müssen sich bemühen,

die Dinge umzusetzen. Den Ahtisaari-Plan in all seinen Aspekten umzusetzen, das ist eine unserer wesentlichen Aufgaben und Forderungen, über die wir hier mit dieser Entschließung morgen abstimmen werden.

Der letzte Punkt: Wir sollten die Integration der gesamten Region vorantreiben. Natürlich müssen alle Länder ihre Hausaufgaben machen. Aber je mehr Serbien auch im Integrationsprozess voranschreitet, je mehr Mazedonien im Integrationsprozess voranschreitet, desto eher ist es auch möglich, dass wir diese Kosovo-Frage und die damit zusammenhängenden offenen Fragen lösen. Nur die Integration aller Länder dieser Region schafft die Voraussetzungen dafür, dass auch der Kosovo eine friedliche Entwicklung nimmt.

3-231

Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck (ALDE). – Allen die het woord hebben gevoerd, zijn goed tot zeer goed en bijzonder goed vertrouwd met de situatie in Kosovo. Het is dus overbodig om daar verder nog zeer diep op in te gaan in een poging elkaar ervan te overtuigen hoe goed wij deze situatie wel kennen.

Laten wij ons eerst verheugen over het feit dat het eerste jaar van de onafhankelijkheid van Kosovo uiteindelijk vrij goed is verlopen en beter dan velen hadden kunnen vrezen. Ik wil vervolgens mijn vreugde en tevredenheid uitspreken over het feit dat de EULEX-missie eindelijk ten volle van start is kunnen gaan dankzij de goede wil van velen en de handigheden binnen de VN-Veiligheidsraad. Van het welslagen van die EULEX-missie zal heel veel afhangen, want Kosovo is vóór zijn onafhankelijkheid tien jaar lang een protectoraat geweest. Waar het nu op aan komt is dat wij allen Kosovo naar zijn volwassenheid begeleiden.

3-232

Sylwester Chruszcz (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Serbska prowincja Kosovo została jednostronną decyzją społeczności albańskiej oderwana od Serbii. Osobiście uważam to za bezprecedensowy przykład łamania prawa międzynarodowego, który w dodatku pociąga za sobą dalsze konsekwencje, co mogliśmy zobaczyć w zeszłym roku na Kaukazie.

Przypominam, że Organizacja Narodów Zjednoczonych nie uznała decyzji kosowskich Albańczyków. Wciąż obowiązuje rezolucja 1244 Rady Bezpieczeństwa ONZ. Dlatego przestrzegam przed podejmowaniem jakichkolwiek decyzji, zanim Międzynarodowy Trybunał w Hadze nie wypowie się w tej kwestii. Dopiero wówczas będziemy znali stan prawny prowincji, która według prawa międzynarodowego wciąż jest integralną częścią Serbskiej Republiki.

Pragnę zwrócić uwagę na wciąż dramatyczną sytuację społeczności serbskiej w samowwłażczej Republice Kosovo. Powiedzmy sobie otwarcie, że jej uznanie przez niektóre państwa Unii Europejskiej było fatalnym błędem. Kosovo jest po prostu serbskie.

3-233

Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL). – Sinds Kosovo bijna een jaar geleden de onafhankelijkheid uitriep is de Europese Unie daarover hopeloos verdeeld. Griekenland twijfelt, terwijl Spanje, Roemenië, Slowakije en Cyprus deze onafhankelijkheid om binnenlandse redenen afwijzen. Het gezamenlijke EULEX-project waarmee de Europese Unie invloed hoopt te kunnen krijgen binnen Kosovo lijkt vooral een middel om die interne verdeeldheid te verbergen.

Misschien is EULEX goed voor de Europese Unie, maar is zij ook goed voor Kosovo? De inwoners van Kosovo zijn geïnteresseerd in spoedige toetreding tot de Europese Unie om daarbinnen een gelijkwaardige lidstaat te zijn. Na bijna een eeuw onderwerping aan Servië willen zij vooral geen nieuwe extra bemoeienis van buitenaf. Een project als EULEX had misschien kortstondig, in de eerste maanden van 2008, een nuttige rol kunnen vervullen om eventuele chaos te voorkomen. Die fase is voorbij. De late komst van EULEX wekt nu vooral de indruk dat de Europese Unie van Kosovo een protectoraat wil maken met militaire aanwezigheid en bestuurlijke invloed, net als eerder zonder succes gebeurde in Bosnië-Herzegovina.

Voor een vreedzame en harmonieuze toekomst in Kosovo is het nodig dat daarbij niet alleen de huidige regering en de regeringspartijen worden betrokken. Belangrijke krachten zijn de zelfbeschikkingsbeweging Vetëvendosje in het zuiden, die het optreden van de Europese Unie als nutteloos kolonialisme ziet, en de vertegenwoordigers van de Serviërs in de gemeenten ten noorden van de rivier de Ibar, die er alles aan doen om duurzaam met Servië verbonden te blijven. Zonder deze critici van EULEX komt er geen duurzame oplossing. Een goede toekomst voor Kosovo vereist breed aanvaarde binnenlandse compromissen in plaats van demonstratief machtsvertoon door de Europese Unie.

3-234

Patrick Louis (IND/DEM). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il y a dix ans, certainement pour célébrer les cinquante ans et redéfinir son champ de compétence borné par la Convention de Washington, l'OTAN pilonnait militairement Belgrade. Ces bombardements étaient effectués en violation du droit international, c'est-à-dire sans aucun accord préalable de l'ONU.

Il y a un an, l'indépendance du Kosovo est déclarée unilatéralement par Pristina, au plus grand mépris de la souveraineté de la République fédérale de Yougoslavie, dont la souveraineté et l'intégrité territoriale avaient pourtant été réaffirmées par la résolution 1244 du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU.

Aujourd'hui, la mission européenne EULEX, associée à des experts américains, espère que le Kosovo puisse devenir un État de droit. Si la situation n'était pas si dramatique, il y aurait un certain humour à se demander comment, avec de telles origines, on puisse obtenir un tel fruit.

En attendant, nous demandons à cette mission de veiller à ce que la minorité nationale serbe soit respectée et valorisée sur la terre de ses ancêtres. Ceci nous semble être un bon commencement pour le rétablissement du droit.

3-235

Anna Ibrisagic (PPE-DE). – Jag är född på Balkan. Jag följde oroligheterna i Kosovo på nära håll i slutet av åttiotalet. Jag har sett Slovenien och Kroatien bli självständiga stater och uppleva krig i början av nittiotalet. Jag har själv upplevt kriget i Bosnien och slutligen lämnat landet som flykting. Jag vet att det är så oerhört lätt att starta ett krig, men jag vet också att det är långt svårare att skapa fred och återställa människornas förtroende för varandra.

Kosovo befinner sig i dag i en situation som kommer att vara avgörande för de framtida generationerna i Kosovo i fråga om just återskapandet av förtroendet mellan olika folkgrupper. Jag är glad att herr Lagendijk har varit mycket tydlig i sin resolution om att vi bör lämna diskussionerna om Kosovos självständighet och konflikterna kring detta bakom oss.

Tid och kraft borde nu ägnas åt dialogen kring hur vi ska stärka alla människors lika rätt att leva i fred, att arbeta och skapa sig en bättre framtid i Kosovo. Vi måste koncentrera oss på ett välfungerande skydd av minoriteter, förbättring av den ekonomiska situationen, kampen mot den utbredda korruptionen och den organiserade brottsligheten.

Alla människor i Kosovo borde göra det till sitt eget uppdrag att bidra till att våld mellan etniska grupper upphör. Domstolarna bör se till att krigsförbrytelser tas upp till behandling. En del av ledamöterna i detta parlament beklagar EU:s närvaro och engagemang i Kosovo, men vi som har upplevt Balkankrigen beklagar att EU inte har engagerat sig både tydligt och mer.

Arbetet som återstår är enormt och det kommer att ta tid, men det handlar till syvende och sist om att återskapa förtroende mellan människor så att de nya generationerna får en chans att utbilda sig, leva och arbeta tillsammans i fred och med respekt för varandras olikheter. Det är ju det hela den europeiska idén handlar om. (*Applåder*)

3-236

Libor Rouček (PSE). – Dovolte, abych ve svém krátkém příspěvku vyzvedl především roli Srbska. Srbská vláda navzdory složité domácí situaci zaujala velmi konstruktivní a zodpovědný přístup při rozmístění mise EULEX v Kosovu. Ve shodě s OSN umožnila rovněž, aby byl k policejní službě Kosova přiřazen vysoký policejní úředník srbské národnosti. Jsem přesvědčen, že toto je cesta a způsob, jak postupně začlenit kosovské Srby a koneckonců i příslušníky ostatních menšin do politického, ekonomického a společenského života Kosova. Chtěl bych v této souvislosti také vyzvat vysokého představitele Evropské unie, aby zajistil, že kosovské úřady věnují dostatečnou pozornost všestrannému rozvoji oblasti Mitrovice. A podobně jako Anna Ibrisagic jsem též toho názoru, že nyní je potřeba věnovat se mnohem více než doposud bezpečnostní, ekonomické situaci, ekonomickému rozvoji Kosova.

3-237

Nicholson of Winterbourne (ALDE). – Madam President, I should like to thank Mr Lagendijk, whose great political skills have produced a wonderful resolution for us to work from.

I thank him particularly for accepting paragraph 26, to which I wish to draw the Minister's and the Commission's attention. Here we note the exceptional ill-health of 1 500 Roma people, who are sitting on the edge of a lead mine and have been there through UN misjudgement for nine years. I fully accept that, as Minister Vondra has said, this is perhaps not quite the mission of the European Union. Nonetheless, I thank the Commission team for picking up this topic immediately I raised it and for visiting and for seeing the damage that the lead levels have caused. These people have monstrous lead levels in their blood, irreversible damage, and need immediate and urgent relocation and medical treatment.

Minister Vondra, you promised that you would keep this Parliament fully briefed. May I ask you, as President-in-Office, to give this matter your profoundest attention and to tell me what you do.

3-238

Alojz Peterle (PPE-DE). – Iskrene čestitke poročevalcu in poročevalcem v senci za dobro poročilo. Z njim želimo prispevati k nadaljnji stabilizaciji in normalizaciji Kosova.

Uspehi v zadnjem letu krepijo upanje, da je na Kosovu mogoče multietnično in multikulturno sožitje. In samo pod tem pogojem je uresničljiva evropska perspektiva Kosova kot tudi celotnega zahodnega Balkana.

Dosegli smo napredek, pomemben napredek, in sedaj je treba graditi naprej. Pozdravljam posebej dejstvo, da se stanje na Kosovu normalizira tudi po zaslugi Eulexa. Pozdravljam nedavno ustanovitev kosovskih varnostnih sil in sodelovanje nekaterih predstavnikov srbske skupnosti v policijskih silah. Če hočemo hitrejši napredek, je treba delati na varnostni, politični, gospodarski, socialni in še na drugih frontah in posebej je treba biti pozoren na lokalno raven, kjer je vprašanje sožitja najbolj občutljivo. Podpirati je treba projekte, ki krepijo medetnično sožitje in sodelovanje. V tem duhu pozdravljam namero Evropske komisije, da bo uporabila za napredek vse razpoložljive instrumente. To Kosovo tudi potrebuje.

3-239

Richard Howitt (PSE). – Madam President, I welcome today's debate and resolution as the next step in the normalisation of relations between the European Union and Kosovo one year after independence.

It is important to stress that those, like Mr Van Orden and Mr Tannock of the British Conservatives, who oppose the move, have been proved wrong, with now 54 countries – including 22 of our own European Member States – offering legal recognition, and our own EU Rule of Law Mission has been deployed with the assent of Serbia. Indeed, all along we have argued that a resolved Kosovo helps Serbia's EU aspirations, and today we repeat that we want them to succeed.

Yesterday, the EU Justice Mission opened its first war crimes trial in Kosovo. Today, Her Royal Highness Princess Anne of Britain is visiting a school for disabled children in Gjilan, Kosovo. Surely, both together demonstrate Europe's commitment never to forget past injustices but to work today towards a better future for all.

3-240

Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE-DE). – Allereerst wil ik Joost Lagendijk feliciteren met de werkelijk zeer uitgebalanceerde resolutie. Als ik toch dankzeg, wil ik ook Doris Pack bedanken, want Doris verzet met haar delegatie veel en goed werk in het gebied.

De doelstellingen van de Europese Unie zijn duidelijk: Kosovo mag geen zwart gat worden. De verantwoordelijkheid daarvoor ligt allereerst bij de Kosovaarse autoriteiten. De bevolking moet vertrouwen krijgen in het bestuur, maar ook in het juridisch apparaat. Corruptie en criminaliteit ondermijnen de staat. Ook vrouwen en minderheden moeten voluit kunnen meedoen.

Een tweede verantwoordelijkheid ligt mijns inziens bij de buurlanden en dan met name bij de Servische autoriteiten. Een constructieve dialoog en regionale samenwerking zijn in het belang van eenieder in de regio.

Tenslotte heeft ook de Europese Unie een grote verantwoordelijkheid. Met EULEX heeft de Europese Unie zwaar ingezet. Het is goed dat men nu met het echte werk is begonnen. De komende twee jaar zullen moeten uitwijzen of EULEX op termijn daadwerkelijk het verschil kan blijven uitmaken. Ik hoop dat van harte.

Stabiliteit, verzoening en de ontwikkeling van de rechtsstaat in Kosovo zijn van groot belang voor de Kosovaren en alle etnische minderheden in Kosovo, maar zij zijn ook in het belang van de Europese Unie. De effectiviteit van de hulp moet voorop staan. Ik ben met mevrouw Pack niet zo lang geleden ter plekke geweest. Het ontbreekt niet aan hulp, maar deze zou misschien nog meer en nog beter gecoördineerd kunnen worden.

3-241

Adrian Severin (PSE). – Madam President, how many recognitions are necessary for a state to be independent? This is not the question, since the quality of the recognitions matters more than the quantity. A declaration of self-determination does not lead to independence if the state in question is not recognised by those from which it wants to self-determine.

The independence of a state is not real as long as the United Nations Security Council does not accept it. Moreover, a state is not independent if it is not able to offer to all communities living on its territory a fair prospect of organic integration into a civic and multicultural society, and if it is not self-sustainable and self-governable.

For all these reasons, the Athisaari Plan failed. Asking for the *status quo ante* is not a solution either – one should move further. To this end, the European Union and the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council must convene an international conference which should find a sustainable solution for democratic security, geo-strategic equilibrium and social economic stability in the Western Balkans. Within this framework Kosovo should be put back on the track of international legality, and the region should receive a clear road map for its EU integration.

Unfortunately, the Lagendijk report does not explore such ways thus abandoning any realistic drive towards a better future. Therefore, Romanian Social Democrats will be obliged to vote against this report.

3-242

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE-DE). – În conformitate cu prevederile dreptului internațional și având în vedere rezoluția Consiliului de Securitate al ONU 1244 din 1999, Kosovo nu poate fi considerat un stat. Sunt cinci state membre ale

Uniunii care nu au recunoscut independența unilateral declarată a Kosovo. Dar Kosovo este o realitate și trebuie să o tratăm ca atare.

Stabilitatea în Balcanii de Vest, regiunea cu cele mai multe șanse de a se alătura Uniunii în viitorul apropiat este vitală. De aceea, Uniunea trebuie să joace rolul principal în gestionarea situației delicate din zonă. Misiunea EULEX care și-a atins deja capacitatea inițială de operabilitate este un prim pas important în această direcție, deoarece este nevoie de asistență și coordonare pentru a asigura, în primul rând, un climat de cooperare interetnic care să permită reîntoarcerea la un nivel de viață normal.

Trebuie asigurată protecția tuturor minorităților din Kosovo, inclusiv a minorității sârbe, trebuie întărite instituțiile pentru a evita haosul și a asigura o dezvoltare stabilă, trebuie restituite proprietățile și asigura dreptul la întoarcere al refugiaților. Instrumentele financiare de care Uniunea dispune, în special instrumentul de preaderare, trebuie folosite pentru a facilita dezvoltarea socio-economică, creșterea transparenței și reconcilierea între comunitățile etnice. Kosovo nu trebuie, în niciun caz, să fie izolat de procesele europene. Trebuie să se bucure de perspectiva europeană în context regional. Trebuie să aplicăm aceleași standarde în toată regiunea. Ceea ce se cere altor țări din zonă trebuie să se aplice și pentru Serbia și Kosovo.

Este nevoie ca Uniunea Europeană să insiste pentru reluarea dialogului dintre Pristina și Belgrad. Consider că actuala formă a rezoluției nu reflectă tot spectrul de poziții din toate cele 27 de state membre ale Uniunii Europene față de Kosovo. De aceea, delegația României din Grupul PPE-DE, cu excepția reprezentanților de naționalitate maghiară, va vota împotriva acestei rezoluții.

3-243

Csaba Sógor (PPE-DE). – Bombázni kellett Szerbiát, hogy megértse: a kisebbségek jogait tiszteletben kell tartania. Kemény lecke volt. Ahelyett, hogy autonómiát adott volna Koszovónak, el kell fogadnia Koszovó függetlenségét. Koszovó figyelmeztetés az EU tagállamainak is. Biztosítania kell minden tagállamnak, hogy országa területén a hagyományos nemzeti kisebbségek biztonságban, és otthon érezhessék magukat. Az elégedett kisebbségek egy ország biztonságának, szuverenitásának, gazdasági fejlődésének legbiztosabb alapjai. 2008. február 17-én személyesen vettem részt Pristinában Koszovó függetlenségének kikiáltása alkalmával megtartott hivatalos ünnepségeken. Remélem, hogy meggyőződhetem arról is: a szerb kisebbség kulturális és területi autonómiája Koszovó területén megvalósul. A koszovói albánok lehetőséget kaptak egy európai színvonalú megoldásra. Szerbiának van még egy esélye: a Vajdaság. Az EU tagállamai is igyekezhetnek kulturális vagy területi autonómiát adni az országaik területén élő nemzeti kisebbségeknek. Kínos lenne az EU egyes tagállamainak Koszovó és Szerbia után kullogni.

3-244

Victor Boștinăru (PSE). – Ca parlamentar, membru al Delegației pentru Europa de sud-est, mă așteptam să aud, în numele valorilor noastre comune, pe care cu mândrie le numim „valori europene”, că, Parlamentul European și Comisia Europeană cer cu toată forța și autoritatea, partidelor politice din Kosovo să se deschidă pentru reprezentarea multietnică și că orice progres viitor în relațiile Kosovo cu Uniunea Europeană depinde de o asemenea evoluție.

Mă așteptam ca acest raport să ne spună că modelul pe care UE, cu banii contribuabililor europeni, de altfel, urmărește să-l construiască în Kosovo, este unul cu adevărat, multietnic, multicultural, multiconfesional și nu unul segregat. În discuțiile noastre cu parlamentarii din Kosovo ni s-a spus că, deocamdată, acest model nu poate fi aplicat.

Vă întreb și închei, dacă acest model nu poate fi aplicat în Kosovo, dacă valorile noastre europene nu au loc în Kosovo, care este atunci modelul pe care Comisia Europeană îl aplică?

3-245

Gisela Kallenbach (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich danke Joost Lagendijk, aber auch den Kollegen von AFET, dass sie mit dieser Entschliebung und mit dieser Diskussion dafür Sorge tragen, dass das Thema Kosovo auf unserer Tagesordnung bleibt. Ich finde, das haben die Menschen dort einfach verdient, nachdem die EU in den neunziger Jahren da tatsächlich versagt hat.

Wir haben eine Bringschuld, nämlich die, dass wir die Menschen im Kosovo und in der gesamten Region ganz intensiv auf ihrem Weg in die EU begleiten. Dazu gehören an allererster Stelle auch die Voraussetzungen für eine verbesserte wirtschaftliche Entwicklung. Denn sonst sind soziale Unruhen nicht mehr auszuschließen.

Ich möchte die Kommission bitten, dass sie Einfluss nimmt, dass die CEFTA-Abkommen von allen Beteiligten tatsächlich umgesetzt werden. Eine Bitte an den Rat: Sorgen Sie bitte dafür, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die zwangsweise Rückführung von Asylbewerbern sehr sensibel behandeln!

3-246

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE). – EULEX este cea mai mare operațiune civilă lansată prin politica europeană de securitate și apărare. Aș vrea să subliniez faptul că dintre cei 1900 de angajați internaționali, 200 sunt jandarmi și polițiști români.

România participă astfel la EULEX pentru că este de datoria Bucureştiului să sprijine partenerii din Uniunea Europeană, chiar dacă uneori nu e de acord cu deciziile unei majorităţi a acestora.

România nu a recunoscut independenţa statului Kosovo din motive care țin, printre altele, de evitarea legitimizării oricăror mișcări separatiste. O soluție negociată între Belgrad și Pristina, eventual confederativă, ar fi fost preferabilă situației actuale. Cu toate acestea, în condițiile date important este ca Uniunea Europeană să-și ducă la capăt cu succes misiunea. Trebuie, însă, evitată situația în care implicarea Uniunii se prelungește la nesfârșit. Kosovo nu trebuie să devină un protectorat al Uniunii Europene, ci trebuie ajutat să se autosustină.

Acest lucru este important atât pentru Kosovo, cât și pentru Uniunea Europeană, mai ales în contextul crizei economice actuale și a resurselor limitate de care dispunem.

3-247

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. LUIGI COCILOVO
Vicepresidente

3-248

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE). – Sunt de acord cu multe din ideile exprimate aici, dar problema este mult mai complexă. România are dreptate când apreciază că temeiul juridic al declarării unilaterale a independenței Kosovo este foarte îndoielnic întrucât, în dreptul internațional, minoritățile nu au drepturi colective, nu au dreptul la autodeterminare și la secesiune. Drepturi au persoanele, subliniez acest lucru, aparținând minorităților naționale.

Secesiunea Kosovo și recunoașterea statalității sale de către alte țări a creat un precedent periculos care a fost urmat, după doar câteva luni, de recunoașterea unilaterală de către Rusia a independenței regiunilor separatiste Oseția de Sud și Abhazia. În aceste două cazuri, premierul Putin a invocat clar modelul Kosovo. Mișcările separatiste din regiuni precum Kashmir, Nagorno-Karabah, Transnistria, Crimeea, nordul Ciprului etc., au afirmat, imediat, că aceste regiuni sunt la fel de îndreptățite la independență ca și Kosovo.

Consider că, pe viitor, Uniunea Europeană și statele sale membre trebuie să susțină cu consecvență principiul integrității teritoriale a tuturor statelor și să descurajeze activ tendințele separatiste. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să facă eforturi deosebite pentru stabilizarea întregii regiuni a Balcanilor de Vest și pentru concretizarea perspectivelor europene.

3-249

Miloš Koterec (PSE). – Kosovo je tu ako fakt, ktorý niektorí akceptovali, niektorí nie. Aj keď väčšina členských štátov EÚ je za jeho nezávislosť, alebo nezávislosť uznala, päť členských štátov tak neurobilo – o Bezpečnostnej rade OSN ani nehovoriac.

Ak chceme, aby rezolúcia mala v zahraničnej politike Európskej únie účinok, musí byť zjednocujúca. Ak sa budeme tváriť, že spoločnú zahraničnú politiku pretlačí väčšina, či už v Rade, alebo v Európskom parlamente, tak je to kontraproduktívne pre jednotu Únie. Hľadáme zjednocujúce riešenia a nepresadzujeme rozhodnutia, ktoré sú minimálne vo svojej textácii viacznačné alebo dokonca konfúzne či nedôsledné.

3-250

Charles Tannock (PPE-DE). – Mr President, the international rush to recognise Kosovo was, in my view, hard to understand. There were plenty of older disputes to resolve that were worthier of the EU's efforts: Kashmir, for example, or Taiwan, or even Somaliland in the Horn of Africa.

Kosovo's declaration of independence has also exposed a schism amongst Member States. There is no way Kosovo can be part of the European Union or the United Nations while some Member States do not recognise its sovereignty. The precedent of Kosovo also provoked Russia's indignation and recognition of the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia as states last summer.

The people of the various parts of former Yugoslavia clearly have a right to live in peace and prosperity. We in the European Union have a moral duty to help, but this assistance should never be open-ended. We need to see real reform in Kosovo, genuine efforts to combat organised crime and people-trafficking, and proper protection and equality for minorities, such as the Serbs.

The Commission and the Council must remain vigilant and insistent on tangible progress.

3-251

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Die Haushaltskontrolle erlaubt sich, der hohen Außenpolitik einige Sätze mit auf den Weg zu geben. Wir haben festgestellt, dass es im Kosovo – dem Drittstaat, der die meiste Hilfe von der Europäischen Union bekommt – äußerst Besorgnis erregende Fälle von Korruption mit gravierenden Folgen für die Sicherheit unseres Budgets und die finanziellen Interessen der Gemeinschaft gibt.

Es gibt einen Abschlussbericht einer Taskforce der Vereinten Nationen, dem Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung der Kommission und der *Guarda di Finanza*. Dieser Abschlussbericht ist bis heute nicht umgesetzt. Er datiert von Ende Juni 2008. Dieser Abschlussbericht stellt gravierende Korruptionsfälle mit EU-Geldern fest. Wir erwarten hier Aufklärung.

Dieser Abschlussbericht ist wirklich ein Abschlussbericht. Es gibt keine Follow-up-Organisation. Es gibt im Moment niemanden, der dort unsere Interessen vertritt. Auch hier ist die Kommission aufgerufen, endlich einmal jemand zu benennen. EULEX selbst kann diesen Job nicht machen. Ich bin auch dagegen, dass wir uns weiter mit dem unsicheren Status dieses Staates herausreden.

3-252

Alexandr Vondra, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like first of all to thank you for initiating this debate. I think it was the right move, to use the momentum of the upcoming first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Kosovo. I think it is a timely move, especially with regard to the current economic crisis, because there is the potential danger that it will somehow disappear off our radar screen, while we still bear a lot of responsibility for completing the work: not just in Kosovo, but also in the broader area of the Western Balkans. I guess that what has been said here by many of you – like Hannes Swoboda and others – deserves a lot of attention. I think that the position of the Council is exactly the same.

We have a lot of challenges ahead of us. I would like to stress the three most important pillars of our policy towards Kosovo. The first is the indivisibility and stability of Kosovo. The second is decentralisation and equal opportunities for all minorities there. The third – and probably the most important and the most challenging – is the involvement of Kosovo in regional and European mainstreaming: regional cooperation in the Western Balkans. Certainly, one day we should bring Kosovo closer to the stabilisation and association process, but still a lot of work remains to be done, and it is no secret that on certain issues, unity in the Council will be difficult to attain.

I think our goal should be to concentrate on the future rather than on the past, and I really appreciate the statements of those who did so. Of course, dialogue with Serbia on the outstanding practical issues must be conducted with full transparency and a lot of intensity, but I think that realism should be the guiding principle for us.

The economic situation and its improvement is of paramount importance for achieving stability, so the effective management and mobilisation of Kosovo's own resources is a condition *sine qua non* there, as is sound administration and mobilisation of international resources. Also, fighting corruption and having transparent privatisation is an important element.

I think that Parliament's support for EULEX is very important here. Let me congratulate Joost Lagendijk on the work which he did. It was excellent. When I read the text, I personally had no complaints about it, though I would probably be a bit careful: we all know the economic situation in Kosovo and the energy shortages in Kosovo, as well as in the Balkans in general. Lignite and power generation is one of the few opportunities for them somehow to build a sustainable economy and to integrate this economy into the region. Yes, environmental concerns are important, but the booming of future economic stability is no less important.

Some of you mentioned the situation of the Roma families in the Trebca mines. We all know that this is a disastrous situation, and you are certainly aware of the Commission of work on this subject. There was a delegation led by Pierre Morel which visited the area in December, and they offered to meet with the Roma camp leaders in Trebca. There is no easy solution. We know there is an offer for them to move outside this area, but for the time being they are not ready to do that. In fact they are declining to do that, so a lot of work also remains to be done here. I think the meeting next week with Pieter Feith, who is also involved in this, will be an opportunity to discuss this further.

Once again, thank you very much. I think we had a very fruitful debate, and I hope that Parliament will continue to support all our efforts in Kosovo, as well as in the region.

3-253

Meglena Kuneva, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission congratulates Mr Lagendijk and welcomes his resolution: it provides for the further involvement of Kosovo in the ongoing process of bringing the region closer to Europe.

The Commission has established an effective mode of cooperation with all local actors working in Kosovo, including EULEX and the EU's Special Representative. We will continue this cooperation. It is the only way our work in Kosovo can bear fruit. Good cooperation so far has proved essential to maintain peace in this area.

The Commission financed a EUR 7 million project on the rule of law, including a component of EUR 1 million to fight corruption. To be more specific, in December 2008 we provided detailed and comprehensive answers to all the questions raised, both orally and in writing, to Mr Bösch, Chair of the Committee on Budgetary Control. They clarified the issues

raised regarding EU funding and the way this has been managed in Kosovo. They also informed members on the financial management and control systems that the Commission has currently in place.

Since then, we have received no further requests for information. We can provide Members with copies of the material sent to the Committee on Budgetary Control, should they be interested.

I would like to refer to the remark of Ms Kallenbach concerning the Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA). We hope that an improvement in relations between Serbia and Kosovo may permit the integration of Kosovo in CEFTA. The Commission will do its best to facilitate it.

There are many important issues outlined in the resolution, such as the preservation of Kosovo's cultural heritage, the improvement of public administration capacity, the better integration of all communities in Kosovo, the necessity for multi-ethnic education and the plight of Roma families in lead-contaminated refugee camps in the north. The Commission intends to follow up these issues through existing instruments and in cooperation with other donors.

We will issue our study on Kosovo as part of our enlargement package in the autumn. I am confident it will include plenty of ideas to ensure that Kosovo remains firmly anchored in the European outlook it shares with the Western Balkans as a whole.

3-254

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto una proposta di risoluzione¹ conformemente all'articolo 103, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 5 febbraio 2009.

3-255

12 - Impatto della crisi finanziaria sull'industria automobilistica (discussione)

3-256

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sull'impatto della crisi finanziaria sull'industria automobilistica.

3-257

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I think that we are now moving into a really important issue. Under the current circumstances, this is something that must be discussed. Once again, we are grateful for this timely opportunity to discuss the effect of the current economic and financial crisis on the automobile industry.

As many of you are following very closely in your constituencies, the automobile industry is a key factor for the whole of the European economy. Over the years, we have promoted the competitiveness of the sector by establishing a single European automobile market and calling for fairer competition in trade with third countries. More recently, we have focused on reducing car emissions in order to combat air pollution and climate change. In all these areas this Parliament has given us its consistent support.

Thanks to these efforts, and in particular to the resilience and adaptability of the European automobile industry, European cars are today among the best, the most innovative and the most competitive, as well as the safest, most fuel-efficient and environmentally sustainable in the world. We should be proud of Europe's record.

Nevertheless, despite its resilience, and as a result of factors largely outside its control, the European automotive sector has been particularly badly hit by the global economic crisis. These difficulties were already apparent in November last year, when the Council agreed on an approach based on promoting even more sustainable and fuel-efficient cars, realistic targets for manufacturers, and effective incentives for stimulating demand.

In the short time since then, the situation has become more serious. The industry has reported that 8% fewer cars were sold in the Union last year than in the previous year, to compare 2008 with 2007. The situation is likely to remain as bad – if it does not get worse – in 2009, hitting not just the automotive constructors, but also the whole automotive industry supply chain.

Ministers met my friend, Günter Verheugen, the Commissioner and the Vice-President of the Commission, on 16 January to discuss the specific problems facing the automobile industry. They expressed particular concern that the current

¹ Vedasi processo verbale.

difficulties would put at risk a significant number of jobs and underlined the importance they attached to the future of the industry.

Of course, the primary responsibility for responding to these challenges rests with the industry itself. The industry must be encouraged to take all necessary steps to address structural problems such as overcapacity and lack of investment in new technologies.

However, the importance of this industry for the European economy, and the fact that the sector is hit particularly hard by the current crisis, means that some sort of public support is required. This is reflected in the European Economic Recovery Plan agreed by the European Council last December, as well as in the Member States' national programmes. Of course, we cannot allow short-term support for the industry to undermine its long-term competitiveness. This means focusing clearly on innovation.

Member States agree that public support for the automotive industry needs to be both targeted and coordinated. It also needs to respect some key principles, such as fair competition and open markets. It should not be about a race for subsidies, and it should not result in market distortions. In order to achieve this, Member States have confirmed their willingness to cooperate closely with the Commission on both supply-side and demand-side measures taken nationally. The Commission has, in turn, undertaken to provide a swift response in cases where it is required to react.

More generally, the Council's Presidency fully supports the Commission on the need to advance rapidly with the implementation of the European Economic Recovery Plan. The Commission has also been invited to explore, together with the European Investment Bank, how the utilisation of the loans envisaged for this sector can be further improved in terms of rapid availability, project financing and frontloading of the loans, without discriminating between manufacturers and Member States.

With regard to the global environment, we clearly need to engage in an early dialogue with the new US Administration as well as with our other global partners.

The Czech Presidency is determined to push forward with this overall policy of support for the industry, whilst respecting the principles and parameters to which I have referred. There is already a wide range of Community instruments which can play their part in providing support, not least in the area of new technology, for example in the development of clean cars. The full potential of innovative and environmentally sustainable propulsion technologies – fuel cells, hybrid, electrical, solar power – needs to be fully explored and put into operation.

On the other hand, there are also more ready-made and rapidly available instruments, such as, for example, the scrapping scheme for old cars. These instruments could combine the demand impulse for new cars with positive externalities in terms of transport security, reduction of emissions and others. There are now several Member States which already use this instrument. Therefore, the Presidency would like to ask the Commission immediately to put forward a proposal on how to encourage, in a coordinated manner, European car fleet renewal in the area of vehicle recovery and recycling, based on the analysis of the impact of these schemes in different Member States. Our aim is to have a proposal from the Commission some time ahead of the Spring European Council, in the context of the evaluation of the Recovery Plan, and to be able to discuss the issue during the Competitiveness Council in March. This will be headed by my colleague Martin Říman and Vice-President of the Commission, Günter Verheugen. Such schemes may provide an important demand stimulus for the automotive industry at Community level and should also ensure a level playing field within the internal market. I would like to underline the second half of the sentence, also in the current context.

To summarise: this is not just about supporting a key sector of our economy but is an approach from which we all stand to benefit in the long run.

3-258

Günter Verheugen, Vizepräsident der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Alexandr Vondra hat Ihnen gerade dargestellt, was aus der Besprechung, die ich mit den für die Autoindustrie zuständigen Ministern am 16. Januar durchgeführt habe, herausgekommen ist. Ich kann das alles nur bestätigen, möchte aber gleichwohl zur Vorsicht raten. Wir müssen jetzt auch darauf achten, dass wir keine Erwartungen oder Hoffnungen wecken, die wir gar nicht erfüllen können. Lassen Sie mich darum etwas präziser zur Lage der europäischen Automobilindustrie sprechen.

Autos sind erfahrungsgemäß ein Frühindikator für die konjunkturelle Entwicklung. Es war daher nicht überraschend, dass dem schweren Einbruch in der Nachfrage bei Automobilen, den wir ab Sommer letzten Jahres erlebt haben, ein konjunktureller Einbruch in allen anderen wirtschaftlichen Sektoren gefolgt ist. Warum ist das so?

Der Nachfragerückgang ist ein Ausdruck mangelnden Vertrauens in die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung. Die Verbraucher verhalten sich da nicht anders als Unternehmen auch. In wirtschaftlich unsicheren Zeiten, wenn man nicht weiß, was auf

einen zukommt, hält man das Geld zusammen. Im privaten Haushalt ist die Anschaffung eines neuen Autos über mehrere Jahre die größte Investition. Sie kann aber verschoben werden, weil natürlich ein europäisches Auto immer auch noch ein Jahr länger fahren kann.

Jeder muss wissen, dass sich die Lage erst dann wieder grundlegend verbessern wird, wenn ganz generell Vertrauen und Zuversicht in die gesamtwirtschaftliche Entwicklung zurückgekehrt ist. Darum sind die Maßnahmen, die wir gemeinsam in Europa ergreifen, um insgesamt die Krise zu bekämpfen, das Allerwichtigste.

Ich will noch ein paar Zahlen nennen, damit man die Bedeutung erkennt: Die europäische Automobilindustrie beschäftigt direkt und indirekt 12 Millionen Menschen, das sind 6 % aller Arbeitsplätze in der Europäischen Union. Sie ist der wichtigste ökonomische Sektor, was unseren Export angeht. Der größte Exportüberschuss, den wir überhaupt erzielen, ist bei Autos.

Wir haben im Jahr 2007 19,6 Million Autos in Europa produziert, im vergangenen Jahr fast eine Million weniger und in diesem Jahr wird es noch einmal deutlich nach unten gehen. Es stehen zur Zeit etwa 2 Millionen unverkaufter Autos auf Halde. Die Automobilindustrie ist in Europa die Industrie mit dem höchsten Forschungs- und Entwicklungsanteil. Im Durchschnitt geben die Unternehmen für Forschung und Entwicklung 4 % aus, während wir im Durchschnitt der europäischen Unternehmen nur 2 % haben. Also ganz eindeutig: es ist eine europäische Schlüsselindustrie.

Die Krise hat diese Industrie gleichzeitig in allen Sektoren voll erwischt. Das passiert zum ersten Mal, das hatten wir noch nie, und ich muss Sie darauf aufmerksam machen, dass die Öffentlichkeit sich ja nur mit der Lage bei Personenkraftfahrzeugen befasst. Viel dramatischer ist die Situation bei den Nutzfahrzeugen, wo der Auftragseingang in der gesamten europäischen Union praktisch auf Null geschrumpft ist – bei einer Produktionskapazität von fast 40 000 Nutzfahrzeugen im Monat.

Die negativen Beschäftigungsauswirkungen werden nicht ausbleiben, und das im Hinblick vor allem auf zwei Faktoren. Wir haben eine deutliche Überkapazität an Kraftfahrzeugen in der Europäischen Union. Die Industrie selbst räumt ein, dass es 20 % sind. Es gibt Leute, die sagen, dass es wesentlich mehr ist. Aber 20 % ist schon eine sehr hohe Zahl, und wenn Sie das in Vergleich setzen zur Beschäftigtenzahl, dann reden wir jetzt über 400 000 Arbeitsplätze. Es gibt überhaupt keinen Zweifel daran, dass die europäischen Automobilunternehmen die Strukturmaßnahmen, die bereits seit längerem geplant sind, im Jahr der Krise beschleunigt durchführen werden. Ich sage das in aller Klarheit und Deutlichkeit. Es gibt keine Garantie dafür, dass wir am Ende dieses Jahres noch alle Produktionsstandorte in Europa haben werden, die wir heute haben. Die Wahrscheinlichkeit ist hoch, dass wir am Ende dieses Jahres eine ganze Reihe von Produktionsstandorten nicht mehr haben werden. Es gibt noch nicht einmal eine Garantie dafür, dass am Ende dieses Jahres noch alle europäischen Hersteller auf dem Markt sein werden.

Der internationale Wettbewerbsdruck in der Automobilindustrie ist sehr stark. Wir hier als europäischer Gesetzgeber haben ihn noch dadurch verstärkt, dass wir der europäischen Automobilindustrie erhebliche Leistungen in den kommenden Jahren abverlangen werden. Sie müssen eine erhebliche Innovationsleistung erbringen. Damit Frau Harms mich nicht gleich wieder kritisiert, möchte ich festhalten: Frau Harms, ich kritisiere das nicht, ich halte das für richtig. Werfen Sie mir nicht gleich vor, dass ich Tatsachen feststelle. Ich kritisiere das nicht, ich stelle nur fest. Wir haben mit unserer Gesetzgebung das europäische Auto erheblich teurer gemacht, und es wird in den nächsten Jahren noch sehr viel teurer werden. Das hat vor allem den Effekt: es erhöht den Wettbewerbsdruck, es erhöht den Kostendruck und es erhöht die Notwendigkeit bei den Unternehmen, Produktivitätssteigerungen zu erzielen. Das ist die einzige Möglichkeit, in dieser Wettbewerbssituation zu bestehen.

Was Produktivitätssteigerung im Automobilsektor heißt, weiß hier jeder. Sie führt jedenfalls nicht zu einem positiven Beschäftigungseffekt. Das ist die Lage, die wir haben.

Unsere Politik verfolgt jetzt gleichzeitig zwei Ziele. Erstens, die europäische Industrie durch diese Krise zu bringen und – ich betone jetzt jedes einzelne Wort – dabei nach Möglichkeit keinen einzigen europäischen Hersteller zu verlieren. Keinen Einzigen. Das zweite ist, langfristig die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der europäischen Automobilindustrie zu stärken und Europa als führende Automobilregion der Welt dauerhaft zu etablieren.

Was die Maßnahmen zu Teil I angeht, so haben wir das getan, was getan werden konnte. Wir haben der europäischen Automobilindustrie, die besonders unter der Kreditklemme leidet, den Zugang zu Finanzen eröffnet. Die Europäische Investitionsbank stellt in diesem Jahr allein für diese Industrie neun Milliarden Euro zur Verfügung, und ich muss Ihnen sagen, es hat keinen Sinn, hier mehr zu verlangen. Angesichts der Eigenkapitalausstattung der Europäischen Investitionsbank ist nicht mehr möglich. Neun Milliarden stehen zur Verfügung.

Wir haben die Beihilfenkontrolle dank der Arbeit meiner Kollegin Neelie Kroes so flexibel gestaltet und die Regeln so verändert, dass die Mitgliedstaaten wesentlich mehr Möglichkeiten haben, schnell und gezielt zu reagieren, wenn im Einzelfall geholfen werden muss. Die Kommission übernimmt dabei die Rolle, die ihr gesetzlich zugewachsen ist, nämlich

dafür zu sorgen, dass bei diesen Maßnahmen keine Wettbewerbsverzerrungen entstehen und unsere Politikziele nicht gefährdet werden. Ich will dazu nur ein Beispiel nennen: Es ist vollkommen klar, dass Beihilfen an die europäischen Töchter amerikanischer Unternehmen nur dann genehmigt werden können, wenn klar ist, dass diese ausschließlich der Erhaltung von Arbeitsplätzen in Europa dienen.

Wir haben eine Reihe von Maßnahmen ergriffen, um die Erneuerung der Flotte voranzutreiben, und damit gleichzeitig das Ziel verfolgt, einen positiven ökologischen Effekt zu erzielen. Nicht alle Mitgliedstaaten werden das System anwenden, Abwrackprämien zu bezahlen, aber diejenigen, die es tun, folgen dabei Grundsätzen, auf die wir uns bereits verständigt haben, nämlich dass diese Maßnahmen gegenüber anderen Herstellern nicht diskriminierend sein dürfen. Um noch einmal ein Beispiel zu nennen: Ein Mitgliedstaat kann nicht sagen: Ich gebe dir eine Prämie, wenn du dein altes Auto verschrottet, aber das neue Auto muss ein deutsches sein, wenn du in Deutschland lebst, oder ein französisches oder ein tschechisches. Das ist nicht möglich.

Es ist aber z. B. möglich – und ich würde das sehr begrüßen –, solche Abwrackprämien mit ökologischen Zielen zu verbinden. Zu sagen, sie wird nur dann gezahlt, wenn das neue Auto, das angeschafft wird, ein Auto ist, das bestimmte Emissionsstandards erfüllt. Soweit wir das sehen können, wirkt diese Prämie durchaus und hat also den gewünschten positiven Effekt.

Um den Nutzfahrzeugmarkt in Gang zu bringen, gibt es nur eine einzige Möglichkeit. Hier sind Abwrackprämien, wie Sie sich vorstellen können, nicht möglich. Hier geht es darum, vorwiegend kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen in diesem Sektor den Zugang zu Finanzen zu ermöglichen. Das tun wir. Und es geht darum, bei öffentlichen Investitionen dafür zu sorgen, dass die Beschaffung von umweltfreundlichen Nutzfahrzeugen, beispielsweise im öffentlichen Personenverkehr oder bei anderen öffentlichen Dienstleistungen, für die man Fahrzeuge benötigt, vorgezogen wird. Das haben wir alles schon getan.

Langfristig – das haben wir in diesem Hause bereits öfters besprochen – geht es um die Empfehlungen im Prozess Cars-21, nämlich die Zukunft der europäischen Automobilindustrie durch verstärkte Anstrengungen in Innovation, Forschung und Entwicklung dadurch zu sichern, dass das europäische Auto der Zukunft nicht nur in Bezug auf den Standard der Technik, den Standard der Fertigung und den Sicherheitsstandard das führende Auto der Welt ist, sondern eben auch in Bezug auf Kraftstoffeffizienz, also Verbrauchsarmut, und Umweltfreundlichkeit, also Emissionsarmut. In diese Richtung geht auch die europäische Industrie gemeinsam, und wir fördern diese Projekte im Rahmen des europäischen Konjunkturprogramms, wie Sie alle wissen.

Lassen Sie mich zum Schluss noch sagen, dass das wichtigste Ergebnis in der Absprache mit den Mitgliedstaaten war, dass wir uns gegenseitig fest versprochen haben, keinen protektionistischen Wettlauf in Europa zuzulassen. Bei diesem protektionistischen Wettlauf würden die finanzschwächeren Mitgliedstaaten verlieren, und wir würden das Gebot der sozialen Solidarität in Europa in schwerster Weise verletzen.

Was wir noch tun können, um den Verbrauch anzuregen und um die Automobilindustrie durch diese Krise zu führen und ihr durch diese Krise zu helfen, ist, dafür zu sorgen, dass auch die internationalen Wettbewerbsbedingungen nicht verletzt werden. Das ist eine Frage, die insbesondere an die Vereinigten Staaten zu richten ist. Wir werden sehen, welche Maßnahmen Präsident Obama trifft, um der Krise der amerikanischen Automobilindustrie zu begegnen. Dazu möchte ich Folgendes sagen: Wir haben aus europäischer Sicht kein Interesse am Bankrott der amerikanischen Automobilhersteller. Die Folgen für Europa wären verheerend, wenn das passieren würde. Wir haben aber auch kein Interesse an einer amerikanischen Politik, die die amerikanische Automobilindustrie zu Lasten der Wettbewerber aus anderen Teilen der Welt begünstigen würde. Ich hoffe, dass das mit unseren amerikanischen Freunden in Ruhe erörtert werden kann.

Die europäische Automobilindustrie steht nicht am Abgrund. Sie ist in einer schwierigen Situation, aber unsere feste Überzeugung ist, dass sie leistungsfähig und stark genug ist, um mit dieser schwierigen Situation fertig zu werden und einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Schaffung und Sicherung von Arbeitsplätzen und Wohlstand in Europa auch in Zukunft zu leisten.

3-259

Jean-Paul Gauzès, au nom du groupe PPE-DE. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, je crains, malheureusement, que le message qui vient d'être délivré ne soit certainement pas un message d'espoir destiné à rétablir la confiance. J'approuvais, Monsieur le Commissaire, votre avant-dernier paragraphe sur ce que devrait être l'industrie automobile. Je crains, malheureusement, que les propositions qui sont faites ne soient pas à la hauteur de l'enjeu et, surtout, qu'elles incitent certains États membres à se débrouiller tout seuls lorsque l'Europe n'arrive pas à coordonner.

Or, qu'attendent aujourd'hui nos concitoyens? Ils attendent beaucoup de l'Europe, certainement beaucoup trop, mais ils attendent qu'on fasse autre chose. L'industrie automobile, vous l'avez dit, c'est 12 millions d'emplois dans l'Union européenne, c'est 10 % du PIB. En France, c'est 2,5 millions d'emplois, soit 10 % de l'emploi salarié. C'est 15 % des dépenses de recherche et de développement.

La filière automobile connaît aujourd'hui une crise sans précédent, caractérisée par une baisse conjoncturelle de la demande, par un besoin de financement, tant des constructeurs que des sous-traitants, mais aussi des consommateurs, et par un défi structurel de compétitivité des entreprises dans une concurrence mondiale de plus en plus pressante. Si je ne craignais pas d'être politiquement incorrect, j'ajouterais que les exigences que l'on fait peser sur l'industrie automobile et la dissuasion que l'on applique pour ne pas utiliser les véhicules contribuent également à cette situation.

Une réponse coordonnée à l'échelle européenne est indispensable et urgente pour relayer et amplifier les actions que divers États ont déjà engagées. Il est indispensable, en premier lieu, que le système bancaire finance normalement l'industrie automobile, c'est-à-dire à des taux et à des conditions normaux, et avec des volumes qui correspondent aux besoins de cette industrie. Et, malgré les efforts de la BEI, on sait qu'aujourd'hui le crédit n'a pas redémarré. À défaut, une réponse importante devra être apportée par l'Europe.

En second lieu, il ne s'agit pas seulement de limiter l'impact de la crise, mais de donner un nouvel avenir à l'industrie automobile. Une véritable politique industrielle est indispensable. Il faut se projeter dans le monde de demain et accélérer les évolutions nécessaires au regard, notamment, de la protection de l'environnement et des exigences du développement durable. Nous devons développer une culture d'anticipation. Il est primordial que l'effort d'innovation ne se fasse pas au détriment de la crise et que les aides publiques permettent d'agir dans ce domaine.

3-260

Guido Sacconi, *a nome del gruppo PSE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il ministro Vondra e il Commissario Verheugen per la prontezza con cui ci hanno fatto questa comunicazione. Devo dire condivido largamente la preoccupazione e il realismo che è stato proposto.

Insomma, sappiamo di cosa parliamo. Ho visto una stima che prevede che potenzialmente nel corso di quest'anno potrebbero essere due milioni i posti di lavoro persi nell'intera filiera automobilistica, la maggior parte dei quali nella componentistica. E viviamo una straordinaria contraddizione. Da un lato abbiamo un parco veicolare – come lei diceva giustamente – privato e pubblico molto obsoleto, con alti livelli di emissioni e, dall'altro lato, una domanda che è rallentata, fortemente rallentata, se non addirittura crollata.

Quindi io ho apprezzato molto il piano di rilancio deciso dalla Commissione che ha cercato di sfruttare tutti gli strumenti che ha a disposizione e che sono però limitati, come sappiamo e per le ragioni che sappiamo. Bisogna davvero intervenire sulla domanda, una vera manovra anticiclica per sostenerla fortemente, anche in funzione degli obiettivi ambientali per cui ci siamo tanto impegnati nei mesi scorsi.

E cosa succede? Succede che ogni paese si muove per conto suo. Chi fa e chi non fa. Per esempio il mio paese finora non ha fatto niente. Chi fa in un modo, chi fa in un altro. Io però sono d'accordo con lei: facciamo uno sforzo da qui al Consiglio "Competitività" della prossima primavera perché ci sia il massimo di coordinamento, almeno sui criteri, per esempio quello di collegare i piani di rottamazione a precisi obiettivi di emissioni. Mi sembra che in Francia è venuta avanti una soluzione intelligente: variare l'entità del bonus messo a disposizione dell'acquirente a livello di emissioni della vettura che si acquista, diciamo. A me sembrerebbe un sistema "win-win", ci guadagnerebbero tutti: l'occupazione, l'innovazione, la competitività e anche l'ambiente.

3-261

Patrizia Toia, *a nome del gruppo ALDE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la crisi del settore auto è diventata crisi di un intero comparto, dell'indotto, di altri settori collegati, delle reti commerciali e quindi dei servizi e ha prospettive drammatiche sotto il profilo dell'occupazione.

Io penso che anche il calo drammatico di queste ultime immatricolazioni – per questo mese si dice, per alcuni paesi membri, meno 33%, meno 20%, ecc. – dimostra che non è una crisi di un settore tecnologicamente obsoleto, non nasce all'interno del settore, dall'interno di questa o quell'azienda, per errori manageriali. E' una crisi di sistema e come tale va affrontata urgentemente e decisamente proprio dalle istituzioni europee.

Alcuni rimedi sembrano identificati, ma è importante come realizzarli, con quali risorse e con quali prospettive di innovazione. Occorre certo sostenere la domanda, i consumi sono l'unico volano della ripresa. Ma intanto che questa risposta a sostenere i consumi si fa, che è una risposta di medio termine, io penso che dobbiamo dire che occorra subito un sostegno creditizio per riprendere la produzione, pagare i materiali, sostenere l'occupazione, anche di fronte a un calo degli ordinativi e della domanda.

Dunque l'ambito creditizio. Ma dicevamo è importante il come. Anch'io qui richiamo a un ruolo più forte dell'Europa. E' importante che le istituzioni europee diano un segno. L'America sta intervenendo, alcuni paesi europei lo stanno facendo, spero anch'io che il mio paese passi dalle proposte generiche alle iniziative concrete, ma auspico che ci sia una più forte azione europea nel piano di rilancio e anche oltre il piano di rilancio, perché penso, e l'ha detto per qualche verso anche il nostro Commissario, che il destino delle grandi case europee è un destino comune e i grandi produttori europei non devono trovare concorrenza all'interno del mercato comune sotto forma di diverse forme di aiuti di Stato o di agevolazioni, ma

devono trovare una risposta dell'Europa forte, incisiva e coordinata, perché le sorti del mercato europeo dell'auto si misurano nella capacità di affrontare insieme la concorrenza mondiale.

E c'è l'altro punto che è stato richiamato, lo diceva Sacconi e lo riprendo: il sostegno non sia un aiuto, peggio un soccorso, che lascia tutto com'è, ma un incentivo per una capacità competitiva futura del settore sotto il profilo delle innovazioni, di produzioni compatibili con l'ambiente e anche di tecnologie più rispettose dell'ambiente e della sicurezza dei viaggiatori e dei trasporti.

3-262

Guntars Krasts, *UEN grupas vārdā*. – Paldies priekšsēdētājam! Autobūvē, gluži tāpat kā būvniecības nozarē, resursi bija sakoncentrēti straujai nākotnes izaugsmei, bet tās attīstība bija un ir cieši saistīta ar kredītu pieejamību, tāpēc finanšu krīze autobūvi skārusi īpaši smagi. Stabilizācija nozarē iespējama tikai pēc banku kreditēšanas normalizēšanās, kas savukārt saistāma ar finanšu krīzes pārvarēšanu. Nav šaubu, ka finanšu krīze būtiski koriģēs nākotnes autotirgus struktūru. Šī brīža uzdevums ir nevis esošo darbavietu saglabāšana, bet Eiropas autonomas nākotnes konkurētspējas saglabāšana, tāpēc publiskais atbalsts autonomai saistāms ar diviem galvenajiem mērķiem: atkarības samazināšanu no naftas un ar to saistītajām cenu svārstībām un ekoloģisko rādītāju būtisku uzlabošanu, emisiju samazināšanu – uzdevumi, kas savstarpēji pārklājas. Šie uzdevumi ir arī principiāli nozīmīgi Eiropas tautsaimniecībai kopumā, lai mazinātu risku, ka naftas cenu pieaugums pēc krīzes pārvarēšanas arī atjaunotā autopatēriņa rezultātā nekavētu kopējo tautsaimniecības atlabšanas procesu. Paldies!

3-263

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Meiner Ansicht nach kommt es in erster Linie darauf an, in der Wirtschaftskrise das Krisenmanagement mit der globalen Herausforderung der Klimakrise zu verbinden. Wir würden einen großen Fehler machen, wenn wir mit unseren Konjunkturmaßnahmen erneut so wenig ehrgeizig Klimaschutzziele und Energieversorgungssicherheitsziele verfolgen würden wie wir das bei der CO₂-Regulierung für Automobile gemacht haben.

Man darf nicht den Fehler machen, noch einmal falschen Einflüsterungen aus der Automobilbranche zu viel Raum zu geben. Den Irrtum, der da im letzten Winter begangen wurde, kann man ja jetzt überall besichtigen. Dieselben Konzerne, die uns gehindert haben, die ehrgeizige CO₂-Regulierung für Automobile durchzusetzen, haben jetzt ihre großen Spritschlucker auf Halde stehen und können sie nicht mehr verkaufen. Meiner Meinung nach muss es wirklich unser Ziel sein, gegenüber den Konzernen deutlich zu machen, dass die Zukunft den Automobilen gehört, die klein, effizient und klimafreundlich sind, und dass alle Anstrengungen im Zusammenhang mit Fördermaßnahmen diese Modelle durchsetzen müssen. Es muss auch geklärt werden, wie weit tatsächlich Innovationen wie Elektroantriebe berücksichtigt werden. Das geht aber nur in einem abgestimmten Konzept auch mit der Energiepolitik.

Was ich unbedingt von einem Vorredner aus der konservativen Fraktion aufgreifen und unterstützen möchte: Ich bin fest davon überzeugt, dass, wenn man sich nur auf die Autos konzentriert und jetzt nicht insgesamt im Blick hat, wie wir den Verkehrsbereich umbauen müssen, wie in zehn Jahren der öffentliche Sektor des Transports aussehen muss, wir viel zu kurz springen. Auch da können viele Arbeitsplätze gesichert und geschaffen werden. Herr Kommissar Verheugen hat mit dem Hinweis darauf, dass ja nicht nur Pkw produziert werden, sondern auch Busse, Bahnen usw., einen wichtigen Hinweis gegeben.

Also: Über den Tag hinaus denken und zukunftsfähige Verkehrssysteme jetzt entwerfen und fördern!

3-264

Roberto Musacchio, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è ormai evidente che la crisi finanziaria è diventata economica e ora sociale, drammatica.

Lo dimostra la situazione dell'auto, dove mi pare, concordo con il collega Sacconi, si possa presumere siano a rischio oltre due milioni di posti di lavoro. C'è il rischio che con la crisi vengano espulsi in particolare i soggetti più deboli: i lavoratori anziani e quelli precari. Occorre agire con rapidità e forza. Aiuti ci sono ma bisogna decidere – e questo lo dico al Commissario con chiarezza – se devono essere coordinati a livello europeo, oppure no, come sembra proporre qualche paese peraltro assai grande.

Io penso che occorra il coordinamento europeo e che occorra che ci siano coordinamenti che vadano in due direzioni: quello dell'innovazione in rapporto al pacchetto clima e, se lo posso citare ancora, al regolamento Sacconi sulle emissioni, e quello sociale. Io penso che nessun lavoratore, a partire da quelli anziani e da quelli precari, debba essere espulso. Non si può fare l'innovazione cacciando i lavoratori.

Occorre in tal senso anche adeguare il Fondo sulla globalizzazione e riadeguare, perché no, quel Fondo sociale che ora parla di lavoro nuovo da creare ma in modo che risponda anche all'esigenza di non espellere un lavoratore. Ma poi serve che il lavoro in Europa torni ad essere centrale, ad avere quel ruolo che spetta ad esso come fondatore di democrazia.

3-265

Patrick Louis, *au nom du groupe IND/DEM*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous connaissons les causes structurelles de la crise du secteur automobile et de ses sous-traitants. Cette filière, comme ce fut le cas pour l'agriculture et le textile, souffre des délocalisations et des dumpings social, environnemental et fiscal.

Qu'allons-nous faire quand les Américains vont vendre leurs 4x4 énergivores, subventionnés et dopés et par un dollar en baisse, sur notre marché, qui est également agressé par des véhicules bas de gamme, provenant de Turquie, d'Inde ou de Chine?

Il reste une solution. Il faut rétablir les tarifs extérieurs communs, abandonnés par les accords de Maastricht. Seuls les droits compensateurs aux frontières de l'Union peuvent rétablir un échange international véritable et loyal. Osons, avant qu'il ne soit trop tard, ce que le bon sens commande. Mais, vous le savez, le protocole 27 du traité de Lisbonne et son article 63 interdisent fermement toute protection douanière du marché européen.

Alors, chers collègues, soyons conséquents. Ne chérissons plus les causes qui nous font si mal. Enterrons définitivement ce traité malfaisant et cessons de jouer aux pompiers pyromanes.

3-266

Karsten Friedrich Hoppenstedt (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Ich bedanke mich zunächst bei der Präsidentschaft, aber auch bei der Kommission für die sehr klaren Äußerungen zur Situation. Ich teile, wie auch Herr Kommissar Verheugen, den Optimismus, dass die Automobilindustrie die Zeichen der Zeit im Augenblick erkannt hat und zukunftssträngige Lösungen für viele Bereiche finden wird.

Aber wir leben natürlich in der Realität, und nach einer Verringerung der Fahrzeugproduktion um 5 % im letzten Jahr rechnet die Industrie 2009 mit weiteren 15 %. Das ist der stärkste Rückgang, den wir seit 1993 in der Europäischen Union erlebt haben, gleichbedeutend mit 3,8 Millionen weniger Fahrzeugen im Vergleich zu 2007. Man muss wissen, dass von jedem Arbeitsplatz direkt in der Automobilindustrie fünf weitere in verwandten Bereichen und Branchen abhängen. Deshalb wirkt sich die Finanzkrise natürlich besonders stark auf die Autobranche aus, weil sie sowohl die Hersteller selbst als auch ihre Kunden betrifft. Beide brauchen unbedingt besseren Zugang zu Krediten. Es wurde bereits gesagt: die Automobilindustrie hat Zugang zu 9 Milliarden der Europäischen Investitionsbank. Aber sie brauchen eben auch andere Kredite – die Hersteller und Zulieferer, um ihren Betrieb zu finanzieren, und die Kunden, um den Autokauf zu finanzieren. Wir müssen also aufs Gas drücken, um die Nachfrage zu stützen, denn die Pkw-Zulassungen in Europa sind im letzten Quartal 2008 um 19 %, die der Nutzfahrzeuge um 24 % zurückgegangen.

Die Banken sind im bisherigen Verlauf der Krise in Milliardenhöhe unterstützt worden, um das gesamte System zu retten. Dabei sind aber im Großen und Ganzen ausgerechnet die Autobanken vergessen worden. Sie haben bisher keinen Zugang zu den staatlichen Hilfen. Europaweit mussten, wie in den USA bereits geschehen, von der Automobilindustrie für nicht gedeckte Leasing-Restwerte schon mehrere Milliarden Euro zurückgestellt werden. Diese Verluste beruhen darauf, natürlich mit Blick auf die 2 Millionen Fahrzeuge, die auf Halde stehen, dass der Buchwert der Leasingfahrzeuge deutlich sinkt und hier deshalb auch Probleme entstehen. Das heißt also, hier muss sehr schnell gehandelt werden, um diese Banken auch dem Rettungsschirm zu unterwerfen, wie dies bei anderen Banken im System auch passiert ist.

3-267

Stephen Hughes (PSE). – Mr President, Nissan has announced the loss of 1 200 jobs at its Sunderland plant in my North-East England constituency. That is about a quarter of its workforce, and to that will be added an as yet unknown number of jobs in its supply chain.

Nissan's Sunderland plant is widely acknowledged as the most productive in Europe. If the plant with the highest productivity in Europe needs to lay off a quarter of its workforce, then heaven help us when this crunch fully hits the less productive.

A recovery task force has been set up in my area involving all major regional actors. The measures they are planning – assisting job search, training and retraining, starting small companies, assisting self-employment – are all ideally suited for support from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund. I welcome the Commission proposals to simplify that fund. It needs to be urgently simplified and mobilised on a massive scale as part of a coordinated European response to the crisis in the car industry.

Only a tiny fraction of that fund was used last year. Let us not hoard it. Let us put it to work to put our people to work.

3-268

PRESIDE: MIGUEL ANGEL MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ
Vicepresidente

3-269

Josu Ortuondo Larrea (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, el sector del automóvil no es especulativo, a diferencia de tantos otros, y funciona con unos reducidos márgenes comerciales unitarios, que sólo se transforman en beneficio si venden muchas unidades.

Se podrá decir que los coches son una importante fuente de emisión de gases de efecto invernadero —esto es verdad—, pero no es menos cierto que esta industria, junto con los sectores auxiliares, supone el 10 % del PIB de la economía europea, proporciona doce millones de puestos de trabajo y representa el 6 % del empleo de toda la Unión.

Por tanto, es un sector muy importante para el bienestar de nuestros ciudadanos, al que no podemos abandonar a su suerte, a las reglas de la oferta y la demanda pura y dura, que son las que nos han traído la crisis financiera y, después, todas las demás, incluida ésta del automóvil.

Por ello, debemos buscar soluciones de apoyo, respetuosas del principio de libre competencia en la Unión Europea, que den la ayuda necesaria para salvar este sector productivo, para lo cual se precisa un marco armonizador europeo que se aplique en todos los Estados. Ya sabemos las ayudas supermillonarias que se han dado en los Estados Unidos y otros lugares y, también, cómo juegan determinados países con la paridad de sus monedas y otros mecanismos para resultar competitivos en nuestros mercados.

Por tanto, no nos preocupemos por lo que digan en el exterior y adoptemos las medidas que se necesitan ya, sin más dilación.

3-270

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Die Bekämpfung des Klimawandels und die Neuordnung der Weltwirtschaft werden wir nur meistern, wenn wir sie gemeinsam anpacken. Wir brauchen den grünen *New Deal*.

Die Krise der Automobilindustrie ist keine reine Wirtschaftskrise. Der Einbruch bei den Autokonzernen ist auch die Quittung für ihre Größer-Schneller-Schwerer-Philosophie der letzten Jahre. General Motors, Daimler und Co. haben noch bis vor wenigen Monaten auf Spritschleudern gesetzt, sie haben in ihrem Marketing den Geländewagen zum neuen Stadtauto erklärt. Sie haben den Klimawandel schlicht und einfach ignoriert. Das rächt sich jetzt!

Wenn wir nun Milliarden an Steuergeldern bereitstellen, dann müssen die Bedingungen klar sein: Mit dem Geld müssen die Autokonzerne umsteuern hin zu einer kleineren, sparsameren Produktpalette, hin zu alternativen Antrieben – nicht nur für die Umwelt, nicht nur für das Klima, sondern auch für die langfristige Sicherung hunderttausender Arbeitsplätze.

Ich gebe Ihnen ein Beispiel aus meinem Heimatland Deutschland, wie man es falsch machen kann: Wenn dort, sagen wir, der Chef der Deutschen Bank, Josef Ackermann, seinen neun Jahre alten Dritt-, Viert- oder Fünftwagen verschrottet und sich einen neuen Porsche Cayenne kauft, kriegt er 4 000 Euro geschenkt. Das ist weder sozial noch ökologisch, das ist einfach bescheuert! Das darf man nicht nachmachen.

3-271

Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL). – Sverige som jag kommer ifrån är, liksom flera andra länder, starkt beroende av fordonsindustrin. Volvo och Saab är kända varumärken. Svensk fordonsindustri har, liksom övrig fordonsindustri, drabbats hårt av krisen. Flera faktorer har bidragit till krisen, men en särskild faktor är bristen på en tidig och nödvändig omställning av fordonsproduktionen. En omställning till mindre, energisnålare och mer miljöanpassade fordon är nödvändig.

EU har länge krävt en ensidig flexibilitet från arbetstagarnas sida. Jag och enade vänstern kräver att vi också måste ställa krav på flexibilitet hos storföretagens ledning. Bristen på flexibilitet och nytänkande har alltså bidragit till den kris vi ser i fordonsindustrin och annan industri.

Till sist: fordonsindustrin är en viktig arbetsplats, en ofta övervägande manlig arbetsplats, och den har allt vårt stöd. Jag utgår därför från att EU visar samma engagemang när vi har kris och konjunkturnedgång inom så kallade kvinnliga arbetsplatser.

3-272

John Whittaker (IND/DEM). – Mr President, you could have guessed what these reports would say. We have got a problem and the European Union has got to give its opinion. It has got to give the impression that it is in the driving seat to solve the problem. So we have a European economic recovery plan of which the car industry is a part. But in reality each manufacturer is going to look after itself as best it can, and each country will look after its manufacturers as best it can.

There is of course a possible case for some support, some financial support to the car industry and other sectors to keep capital intact and to keep skills intact. But this can only be decided at the national level because the support – apart from the European Investment Bank mentioned by Mr Verheugen – can only be provided by national taxpayers.

But there is one thing that the European Union could constructively do here, at least until the recession is over, and that is to give car manufacturers a break from environmental restrictions. The industry is already in serious trouble. These environmental and other standard restrictions make cars more expensive. You are helping to kill off an industry which is already in serious bother.

3-273

Malcolm Harbour (PPE-DE). – Mr President, yesterday in my home city of Birmingham we held a car crisis summit. I was sorry I was unable to be there because I started work in the automotive industry 40 years ago. I have been through many crises, but nothing like this.

There has never been a situation where sales have collapsed so quickly. I want to say to my Green colleagues that if they go and look at the unsold cars they will find that the smaller, lighter, greener models are of a higher proportion sitting out there. This is not a failure of business models: it is a failure of the whole economic system.

One of the statistics from our summit – from Professor David Bailey in our Birmingham Business School – estimates that 300 000 consumers in the United Kingdom were refused a car credit application over the last six months. Now some of them would probably have been refused any way, but that is the nature of what we are facing.

As regards some of the things we have talked about – and I agree entirely with what Stephen Hughes said about Nissan, and he knows them very well – we can do things at a national and a European level to help the industry through this restructuring. It is much better to help the industry keep those core people on the payroll and retrain them than to let them go and then to hire them back again later.

We have the incentives to invest in those new cars that Ms Harms and others want. The fact that the Greens are talking about electric cars as being a solution shows simply how out of touch they are with the real world – those are 10 or more years away, and we all know that.

The problem is actually getting buyers and demand back into the economy. We need to tackle credit; we need to help public buyers back into the market to buy the green buses, the green trucks, the green cars – after all, there will be things following through there. We do not want a competitive race between businesses. Mr Vondra was absolutely clear that this is a single market, and we do not want competitive activities there.

But, above all, we need to face up to the fact that the car dealers have to be out there selling and looking after cars.

My final point is to you, Commissioner, and you talked about Ms Kroes working on this earlier: please tell Ms Kroes to take off the table this entirely unwanted and destabilising proposal to change the whole structure of dealer contracts. Nobody has asked for it, and we do not want it.

3-274

Monica Giuntini (PSE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo sentito gli impegni del Consiglio e della Commissione, ma voglio ricordare che il calo complessivo delle vendite di questo settore è stato nel 2008 dell'8%. I lavoratori che hanno perso il lavoro o sono in cassa integrazione sono ormai migliaia. I dati li ricordava prima l'on. Sacconi.

Tutto ciò non riguarda soltanto le grandi aziende automobilistiche, ma tutte le imprese dell'indotto. Penso alla Toscana dalla quale provengo. Come peraltro ho avuto modo di ricordare recentemente, secondo l'associazione europea dei fornitori un'azienda su dieci si troverà a rischio fallimento nei prossimi mesi. Allora io credo che sia necessario un intervento rapido, certo, realista e so di trovare attenzione e sensibilità da parte del Commissario Verheugen.

Non c'è tempo, signor Commissario. Si rende indispensabile un coordinamento delle azioni dei paesi europei che altrimenti rischiano di andare in ordine sparso e di non sortire risultati efficaci per l'economia dell'Unione europea e per il sostegno ai lavoratori. Si rendono indispensabili incentivi coordinati a livello europeo, come quelli che ricordava Sacconi, che consentano investimenti in auto pulite, il sostegno alla ricerca, alle nuove tecnologie. Occorre intervenire da subito sulla revisione dei criteri del Fondo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione da utilizzare a sostegno dei lavoratori europei e credo che servano ulteriori finanziamenti da parte

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

3-275

Ivo Belet (PPE-DE). – Mijnheer de commissaris, de redding van de Europese auto-industrie dreigt te ontaarden in een anti-Europees verhaal. Elke lidstaat gaat zijn eigen weg en lanceert nationale steunmaatregelen. Er zijn lidstaten - u weet het beter dan wij - die goedkope leningen voor autoconstructeurs in het vooruitzicht stellen op voorwaarde dat die autoconstructeurs onderdelen aankopen bij hun eigen nationale lokale leveranciers. Dat is natuurlijk totaal *crazy* en het is goed dat u hier een paar minuten geleden heel duidelijk gezegd heeft dat u dat niet tolereert en dat u daaraan paal en perk stelt.

Wat de constructeurs vandaag nodig hebben - zoals Malcolm Harbour al zei - zijn maatregelen vandaag en investeringssteun voor de toekomst voor nieuwe milieuvriendelijke en hybride auto's. Dat is heel goed, maar dat lost de problemen van vandaag niet op. Daarom is het zeer positief en een lichtpunt dat de Tsjechische voorzitter hier vandaag een nieuw initiatief aankondigt voor de komende lentetop, een voorstel om in heel Europa een maatregel te nemen om de aankoop van milieuvriendelijke auto's drastisch te stimuleren.

Daarnaast - daarmee trap ik een open deur in - is er nood aan verse kredieten en kredietgaranties voor de autoconstructeurs. De Europese Investeringsbank heeft al heel wat geld vrijgemaakt, maar er is veel meer geld nodig om door dit diepe dal te gaan. Het gaat in veel gevallen om KMO's in de toeleveringsbranche, die vandaag ook kredieten nodig hebben om te overleven.

Dan nog dit, mijnheer de commissaris, collega's, wij moeten deze crisis ook aangrijpen. Dit is een *window of opportunity* om eindelijk een doorbraak te forceren op het vlak van de autobelasting. Wij bakkeleien nu al jarenlang over het voorstel van de Europese Commissie om de autobelasting bij te sturen. Het moment is rijp om in de hele Europese Unie eindelijk de bocht te maken en de autobelasting definitief om te vormen tot een stelsel waarbij dié consumenten die kiezen voor milieuvriendelijke auto's, daarvoor ook worden beloond.

3-276

Mia De Vits (PSE). – De autosector is een zeer belangrijke sector voor de tewerkstelling in België. In en om Opel Antwerpen België staan vandaag 2700 directe jobs op de helling. De beslissingen worden genomen in Detroit en alle Opel-vestigingen kampen met overproductie. Natuurlijk staan de betrokken overheden klaar met een hulppakket aan staatssteun en met bankgaranties. Opdat die steun ook effectief is, roep ik de Europese Commissie vandaag op om via u, commissaris Verheugen, en via uw collega Kroes vóór 17 februari, de dag dat de beslissing in Detroit valt, met de betrokken overheden en de betrokken vestigingen rond de tafel te gaan zitten om erover te waken dat er een maximaal behoud aan tewerkstelling op Europees niveau is en dat er een gecoördineerde aanpak op Europees niveau is. Dit om te voorkomen dat er, zoals u zelf zei, een protectionistische wedloop tussen de lidstaten ontstaat.

3-277

Marie-Noëlle Lienemann (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, nous devons renouer avec les grandes politiques industrielles qui ont fondé l'Union européenne. Ce fut le cas pour le charbon et l'acier.

La force de ces politiques, c'était d'être à la fois des outils de modernisation – et là, cela doit être la décarbonisation de la filière automobile – et, en même temps, des politiques à caractère social, d'accompagnement, de défense des salariés, de leur formation et de leur protection. Donc, je fais quatre propositions.

La première, la création d'un fonds européen de soutien aux salariés de l'industrie automobile qui aille au-delà du fonds de modernisation, car ce qui est important, c'est de maintenir les salariés dans les entreprises dans ces périodes clés, en accompagnant leur niveau de rémunération en cas de chômage partiel et en accompagnant leur formation au sein de l'entreprise. On ne peut pas se contenter d'une hypothétique reconversion des salariés qui sont licenciés.

Deuxièmement, il faut créer une agence pour l'innovation et accélérer le financement de la recherche et du développement pour aller très vite et faire ce *gap* technologique des véhicules propres et des véhicules sûrs.

Troisièmement, accélérer le renouvellement du parc. Les primes à la casse peuvent être efficaces. Elles doivent être harmonisées au niveau de l'Union européenne pour éviter des effets de concurrence malsaine.

Mais je vais terminer sur ce point. J'entends bien la concurrence, mais il faut aussi.

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

3-278

El Presidente. – Entramos ahora, señorías, en el punto de solicitudes incidentales de intervención al Presidente y nos encontramos con un problema, pues son muchos los diputados que han pedido la palabra. Voy a aplicar, por lo tanto, de manera absolutamente rigurosa, la decisión de la Mesa de que se concederá la palabra a cinco diputados y se cortará la palabra automáticamente cuando se cumpla el minuto de intervención asignado a cada uno de ellos.

3-279

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE-DE). – Din dezbaterile privind criza industriei de automobile și din deciziile care vor urma nu trebuie să lipsească problemele producătorilor de componente auto. Aceștia au fost, la rândul lor, atinși de criză ca urmare a efectului de domino, pentru că depind de întreruperile de producție ale beneficiarilor.

În România există, de exemplu, peste 400 de companii care produc componente auto și care au avut în 2008 o cifră de afaceri cumulată de 8 miliarde de euro. Trei sferturi dintre aceste companii sunt mici și produc, de obicei, pentru un singur beneficiar. Așadar, resimt extrem de dur efectele crizei. În aceste condiții, sunt nevoite să recurgă la concedieri sau să găsească soluții ca reducerea timpului de lucru sau concedii fără salarii. La fel de grav afectați sunt și producătorii de anvelope.

Ținând cont de numărul mare de angajați din cadrul acestor companii, consider că se impune includerea producătorilor de componente auto și anvelope în orice viitoare formulă de susținere economică în contextul crizei.

3-280

Matthias Groote (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar Verheugen hat uns hier gerade geschildert, wie dramatisch die Zahlen sind und wie es zur Zeit auf dem Automobilmarkt aussieht. Dramatische Ereignisse erfordern dann auch ein einheitliches Handeln. Wir haben 2006 im Europäischen Parlament einen Initiativbericht auf den Weg gebracht: Harmonisierung der Kraftfahrzeugsteuer – und das dann bitte CO₂- und verbrauchsorientiert. Ich glaube, das wäre ein Konjunkturprogramm, bei dem der Rat in Geschlossenheit – denn das muss ja einstimmig entschieden werden – zeigen könnte, wie verbrauchsorientierte Kraftfahrzeugsteuern auf den Weg gebracht werden können.

In Bezug auf das, was die Kollegin Mia De Vits angesprochen hat, nämlich General Motors, hätte ich gerne an die Kommission die Frage gestellt, ob es von Seiten der Kommission Vorkehrungen für den Fall gibt, dass es zum Kollaps des Mutterkonzerns kommt. Wird die Kommission dann einheitlich vorgehen, um eine europäische Lösung für die Tochterunternehmen von General Motors zu finden?

3-281

Zbigniew Krzysztof Kuźmiuk (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chcę w tej debacie zwrócić uwagę na trzy kwestie.

Rządy państw europejskich udzielają firmom motoryzacyjnym znaczącego wsparcia finansowego, idącego w dziesiątki miliardów euro. Rząd niemiecki, oprócz wsparcia dla niemieckich producentów, zdecydował się na udzielenie wsparcia użytkownikom aut. Każda osoba, która zdecyduje się zezłomować swoje stare auto, otrzyma 2,5 tys. euro.

Komisja Europejska, która do tej pory rygorystycznie pilnowała przestrzegania reguł udzielania pomocy publicznej dla przedsiębiorstw, we wszystkich tych przypadkach bardzo szybko wyraża zgodę na te posunięcia, z reguły dostosowując swoje decyzje do wcześniejszych postanowień rządów państw członkowskich w tych sprawach.

Nie kwestionując zasadności tego rodzaju posunięć dotyczących przemysłu samochodowego w Europie jeszcze raz chcę przypomnieć jak, rażąco niesprawiedliwa była decyzja Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie konieczności zwrotu pomocy publicznej udzielonej przemysłowi stoczniowemu przez polski rząd. W wyniku tej decyzji ulega właśnie likwidacji około 50 tys. miejsc pracy bezpośrednio w polskim przemyśle stoczniowym, a w przyszłości zniknie kilkadziesiąt tysięcy u kooperantów.

3-282

Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE). – Vážený pán komisár Verheugen, Európska komisia musí konkrétnymi opatreniami prispieť k znovu oživeniu automobilového priemyslu. V prvom rade je potrebné zabrániť deformácii vnútorného trhu. Ochranné opatrenia, ktoré avizovali niektoré štáty, nie sú odpoveďou na súčasnú krízu. Vyzývam Komisiu, aby čím skôr predložila opatrenia k európskej šrotovacej schéme.

Vážený pán Vondra, od Rady očakávam, že počas marcového zasadnutia Európskej rady členské štáty schvália túto šrotovaciu schému, ktorou priamo podporíme kúpyschopnosť spotrebiteľov zamýšľajúcich kúpiť nový automobil.

Som presvedčená, že ak EÚ chce byť najväčším vývozcom automobilov a zároveň chce byť globálnym lídrom v boji proti klimatickým zmenám, musí pomôcť svojmu automobilovému priemyslu, ktorý je najväčším súkromným investorom do výskumu a vývoja. Financovaním výskumu a vývoja, podporou investícií ...

3-283

Ivo Strejček (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I was listening to the debate quite carefully and I am not going to bring forward anything new. I would just like to stress a few remarks that were made, which in my opinion should be overarching the whole debate.

I refer to Mr Vondra's words that we should take care to take into account fair competition and we should avoid market distortion, and the Commissioner's remarks that we should be fair and not raise false expectations. Above all, Commissioner, thank you for saying that we should allow our manufacturers to be more flexible through less regulation, less law and less exorbitant bureaucracy.

3-284

El Presidente. – Quiero dedicar treinta segundos a explicar a sus señorías cuál es la norma que ha sido establecida por la Mesa de la Cámara, porque yo entiendo que es muy desagradable, para los que piden la palabra, no tenerla.

Lo que decidió la Mesa es que el tiempo fundamental de debate es el tiempo asignado a aquellos diputados que intervienen utilizando el tiempo repartido entre los distintos grupos parlamentarios y, después, en este turno de «solicitud incidental de intervención», se da la palabra a cinco diputados, a razón de un minuto cada uno, con un orden de mayor a menor por grupo, de manera que si lo solicitan seis, si hay seis minutos, se puede hacer. Y se puede alargar hasta seis minutos, quizás hasta siete. Pero, en este caso, había 12 diputados que habían pedido la palabra y, por lo tanto, sólo se les ha concedido a cinco, que es lo que ha establecido la Mesa para este punto del debate. Lo digo para que lo tengan también en consideración en ulteriores momentos.

Tiene ahora la palabra el Ministro Wondra para responder a las distintas intervenciones en nombre del Consejo. Señor Ministro, tiene usted la palabra.

3-285

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I should like to thank Members for a very useful debate. The Council appreciates all your contributions to the debate and will try to do its best to play its part, with the Commission, in fixing as many problems as we can in the automotive industry.

There is no doubt that there should be some short-term measures, and they are already happening at Member State level. So I think we are in agreement that those measures must be realistically sustainable financially, as well as in other respects. They should be targeted, effective and, most of all, must be carried out in a way that would be compatible with the strict state aid rules under Community law. I informed you, for example, of our initiatives regarding the scrapping scheme; so it is really important that the steps being taken are in conformity with the competition and state aid rules and avoid distortion of the single market.

My second point is that we should still bear in mind that the European automobile industry leads the world – we are exporters, those who are producing the cars – and, in this light, we should bear in mind the need for maintaining the long-term effectiveness, as well as the competitiveness of this industry. So the measures being taken must fulfil certain criteria regarding the long-term viability and competitiveness of the European industry, including investment in innovation and clean cars etc.

So the Council is making all the necessary efforts to ensure that all those efforts for RTD and innovations in the automotive industry, but also short-term measures in this report, are fully coherent with the overarching goals of the Lisbon Strategy.

My third point is that we must follow developments outside Europe. We are certainly aware that the crisis in the US automotive sector is structural and deep, and US producers are in a much worse position than European car makers. So it is obvious – and Günter Verheugen mentioned this – that the US cannot allow its automotive industry to simply die, because it would not be beneficial for us.

But we still have to work politically with our international partners, in particular through the WTO, in order to ensure that a level playing field is maintained as far as possible. The same applies to the other automobile makers and industries in Asia. We are also watching developments in Korea and Japan etc.

We are now in the run-up to the Competitiveness Council, which will take place in early March, and we hope to produce a high-quality and, of course, consensual decision for the European Spring Council, which will deal mostly with economic issues.

3-286

Günter Verheugen, Vizepräsident der Kommission. – Herr Präsident! Ich stimme dem zu, was viele Redner gesagt haben, insbesondere Frau Harms. Die kurzfristigen Maßnahmen, die wir jetzt ergreifen, dürfen in keinem Widerspruch zu unseren langfristigen Zielen stehen. Das ist das absolut Entscheidende.

Weil Sie so nett waren, will ich jetzt auch einmal nett sein und einen Satz sagen, der Ihnen ganz bestimmt gefallen wird und den ich schon im Jahr 2006 hier gesagt habe: Die Zukunft der europäischen Automobilindustrie wird grün sein, oder diese Industrie wird keine Zukunft in Europa haben, damit das völlig klar ist. Man kann darüber streiten, ob die Modellpolitik der europäischen Hersteller, insbesondere der deutschen, verantwortlich war für die Krise, die wir jetzt haben. Ich weiß es nicht. Es hat in der Vergangenheit umweltfreundliche Autos gegeben, auch kraftstoffarme – denken Sie an den Smart von Mercedes, mit dem Mercedes sich Milliarden an Verlusten eingefahren hat. Also, ganz so einfach ist das Bild nicht. Ökologisch gesehen war die Modellpolitik eindeutig falsch, und dass die Umstellung jetzt – in einer Krise – erfolgt, macht die Sache nicht einfacher, ändert aber nichts daran, dass diese Umstellung erfolgen muss und dass sie schnell erfolgen muss. Wir sind uns da vollkommen einig.

Einen Zollschutz gegenüber amerikanischen Autos, Herr Louis, werden wir ganz bestimmt nicht einführen. Wenn wir etwas nicht tun sollten, dann ist es das. Amerikanische Autos spielen auf dem europäischen Markt nun wirklich keine Rolle, wohingegen europäische Autos auf dem amerikanischen Markt eine große Rolle spielen. Wenn jemand im Europäischen Parlament verlangt, wir sollten unseren Markt vor amerikanischen Autos schützen, fürchte ich, wird sich im Kongress in Washington jemand finden, der sagt, wir sollten unseren Markt vor europäischen Autos schützen. Dann sähen wir nicht besonders gut aus. Ich bitte Sie wirklich, diesen Gedanken nicht weiter zu verfolgen.

Herrn Groote kann ich nur vollkommen unterstützen in dem, was er über die Kraftfahrzeugsteuer gesagt hat. Und auch die spitzen Anmerkungen, die es hier spezifisch zu diesem Thema gegeben hat, haben mir gut gefallen. Die Umstellung der Kraftfahrzeugsteuer auf eine CO₂-basierte Grundlage wird von der Kommission seit langem verlangt, und ich bin traurig darüber, dass der Fortschritt in dieser Frage so schleppend verläuft.

Herr Groote, Sie werden verstehen, dass ich mich nicht öffentlich zu der Frage äußern kann, die Sie zu General Motors und Opel gestellt haben. Es muss Ihnen jetzt genügen, wenn ich sage, wir behalten diese Entwicklung sehr sorgfältig im Auge und sind mit allen, die da in Frage kommen, im Gespräch.

Ich möchte noch diejenigen, die sich mit Recht besonders mit der Beschäftigungsproblematik auseinandergesetzt haben, darauf aufmerksam machen, dass die Kommission ja bereits einen Vorschlag gemacht hat, wie der Fonds zur Anpassung an die Globalisierung flexibler und wirkungsvoller gemacht werden kann. Wenn das, was die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, schnell geschähe und schnell realisiert würde – und ich bitte Sie dringend darum, das zu tun –, würden wir insbesondere den Zeitarbeitnehmern in der Automobilindustrie und den ungelernten Arbeitnehmern, die ja diejenigen sind, die jetzt als erste auf der Kippe stehen, helfen können.

Die Regeln für die Abwrackprämie – das ist mehrfach angesprochen worden und ich will es noch einmal sagen – sind klar. Es kann hier nicht eine europäische Vorschrift geben, dass das alle zu machen haben, das ist völlig ausgeschlossen. Es kann auch keine europäische Vorschrift geben, dass es überall in gleicher Höhe sein muss. Die Eckwerte müssen europäisch festliegen, und das ist der Fall. Darauf haben wir uns ja bei dem Treffen am 16. Januar in Brüssel verständigt.

Als letzten Punkt möchte ich nochmals sehr unterstützen, was von mehreren gesagt wurde: Wir müssen über die Kraftfahrzeugindustrie hinaus denken, wenn wir über die derzeitige Krise reden. Es ist in der Tat vollkommen richtig, wenn gesagt wird, dass intelligente Verkehrssysteme, intelligente Verkehrsleitsysteme, ganz moderne, innovative Lösungen für den Individualverkehr und für den Massenverkehr der Zukunft gefunden werden müssen und dass die Krise vielleicht eine Chance bietet, das stärker voranzubringen. Ich jedenfalls würde es mir sehr wünschen.

3-287

Christoph Konrad (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Sie haben gerade eine Erklärung zur Entscheidung des Präsidiums abgegeben und erläutert, warum das System bei der *Catch the eye* Debatte verändert worden ist. Ich will unter diesem Aspekt formell gegen diese Änderung protestieren. Dieses Verfahren ist eingeführt worden, um die Debatten zu beleben, um einen Dialog mit der Kommission herzustellen, um die Debattenkultur zu verstärken. Was das Präsidium jetzt beschlossen hat, ist komplett kontraproduktiv, und ich möchte Sie sehr herzlich bitten, im Rahmen der Konferenz der Präsidenten diesen Punkt anzusprechen und diesen Protest entgegzunehmen.

3-288

El Presidente. – Sí, señor Konrad, naturalmente, tiene usted todo el derecho y tomamos nota de su protesta. Pero usted, que pertenece a un Grupo muy responsable de esta Cámara, comprenderá que lo que no puede ser es que los distintos parlamentarios dispongan de más tiempo que los grupos, que son los que tienen la responsabilidad estatutaria de participar en los debates.

La Mesa tomó esa decisión por unanimidad. Es una decisión que yo considero de sentido común, para evitar, efectivamente, que la gente que no se apunta por el Grupo, porque su Grupo no le da la palabra en ese momento, pues intervenga después, por lo que se recortó el tiempo: cinco minutos para cinco intervenciones, por orden de Grupo, de mayor a menor, procurando asimismo que no sean todos de la misma nacionalidad.

Eso es lo que se decidió. Naturalmente, esa norma puede cambiarse. Si la Conferencia de Presidentes sugiere a la Mesa un cambio en el procedimiento, la Mesa lo considerará con todo cariño.

Muchas gracias, señor Konrad, por su intervención de la que tomamos buena nota.

Se cierra el debate.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 142 del Reglamento)

3-289

John Attard-Montalto (PSE), in writing. – I would like to draw attention to the fact that the economic crisis in the car industry in the Maltese Islands is being compounded because of a serious administrative blunder. Cars in Malta are subject to a heavy registration tax, on which the Government was also collecting VAT. It has now been established that the Government was appropriating money from thousands of car owners which was not due. The Government is refusing to reimburse thousands of vehicle owners who have paid substantial amounts when these were not due.

The Government of Malta is claiming that reimbursement will amount to millions of Euros. It is exactly because of this that the Government has a duty and an obligation to return taxes irregularly imposed. This is such a serious blunder that if it happened in any other member state of the EU, the Government would have been forced to resign. In Malta the Government has not even had the decency to accept responsibility and apologize to the thousands of Maltese and Gozitans who have been affected. Solutions could be found by offering rebates to the owners of these vehicles on such issues as annual licences. It appears that the Government is completely deaf to any such suggestions.

3-290

Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Dacă privim Uniunea Europeană ca pe un organism viu, atunci industria europeană a autovehiculelor este coloana sa vertebrală. Reprezintă 3% din PIB-ul UE și generează un surplus comercial de 35 miliarde de euro. 2008 a fost însă un an greu pentru aceasta industrie, în condițiile în care în prima jumătate a anului vânzările de mașini au scăzut datorită creșterii prețului la carburanți, iar în a doua jumătate au scăzut cu 19,3% ca urmare a crizei financiare.

Nu sunt singurele dificultăți cu care se confruntă acest sector. În perioada 2009 – 2015, sectorul auto trebuie să îndeplinească noi standarde pentru emisiile poluante, economia carburantului ș.a.m.d., iar toate acestea adaugă miliarde de euro la costurile industriei.

Cifrele de mai sus sunt relevante și pentru că industria auto asigură veniturile a peste 12 milioane de familii. O slujbă la o companie auto ține încă 4 la furnizori și alte 5 în sectoarele conexe și vânzări. Este deci limpede că sănătatea acestui sector al economiei europene este vitală pentru economia UE în general. În aceste condiții, intervenția rapidă și coordonată a guvernelor și instituțiilor europene este absolut necesară (programele de returnare a mașinilor vechi contra unei reduceri consistente la achiziționarea uneia noi, ajutoare financiare etc.).

3-290-250

Elisa Ferreira (PSE), por escrito. – A crise financeira provocou a paralisia do crédito; afectou as empresas e as famílias; numa bola de neve a procura reduziu-se com gravíssimas consequências no crescimento económico e emprego.

Neste contexto, justificam-se medidas excepcionais nomeadamente no caso de sectores estratégicos como o automóvel, representando 6% do emprego.

Contudo, a quase totalidade do programa de relançamento da economia europeia do qual tenho a honra de ser relatora em nome deste parlamento, baseia-se totalmente em iniciativas nacionais.

No concreto, como garante a comissão que está no terreno a verificar coordenação e que os países não lançam uma guerra de apoios?

Que mecanismos estão no terreno para salvaguardar o emprego em países que não têm arcaboço financeiro para garantir os postos de trabalho que lhe são vitais?

Para alguns países, a têxtil ou a electrónica têm tanta importância como o automóvel! Que intervenção se pode prever?

Considera que a Comissão vai estar mais alerta ao papel da indústria europeia na sobrevivência da Europa?

Há limites para o que se espera do Banco Europeu de Investimento - teremos o orçamento adequado aos desafios europeus?

3-290-500

Krzysztof Holowczyc (PPE-DE), na piśmie. – Gospodarka Unii Europejskiej uchodzi za największą siłę ekonomiczną świata. Z jednej strony stawia nas w sytuacji szczególnej odpowiedzialności za działania podejmowane w ramach rynku wewnętrznego. Z drugiej, globalna gospodarka, której Unia jest liderem, rodzi ściśle określone konsekwencje. Jedną z nich jest trudność w zdefiniowaniu, który koncern samochodowy jest tym prawdziwie europejskim. Liczne mariaże koncernów, tworzenie globalnych grup producenckich oraz obecność, od dziesiątków lat, na rynku wewnętrznym koncernów amerykańskich czy azjatyckich, stworzyły podwaliny różnorodności i konkurencyjności sektora samochodowego Europy.

Wydaje się słusznym, że naczelną zasadą, którą musimy się kierować, w tworzeniu pakietu pomocowego dla gospodarki UE musi być dbałość o zachowanie zasad wolnego rynku oraz jego konkurencyjności. Należy też pamiętać, że przemysł motoryzacyjny, który w tak poważnym stopniu został dotknięty kryzysem finansowym, jest jednym z wielu w łańcuchu połączonych ogniw gospodarki europejskiej. To skłania do przyznania słuszności linii proponowanej przez Prezydencję, o wypracowanie ogólnego podejścia, skierowanego do wszystkich graczy rynku wewnętrznego.

Efektom takiego podejścia powinno być pobudzenie strony popytowej rynku, której jakość stanowi o kondycji gospodarki. Mechanizm pomocowy powinien też skutkować wykorzystaniem wsparcia do celowych inwestycji w innowacje technologiczne, zgodne z wytycznymi ponoszenia efektywności bezpieczeństwa ruchu drogowego oraz środowiskowymi.

3-290-750

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE), *in scriis*. – Criza economică a afectat puternic industria auto, un domeniu care contribuie semnificativ la PIB-ul multor state europene. Chiar dacă UE nu are mecanisme directe de a interveni, statelor membre trebuie să le fie permis să ia măsurile necesare pentru a preveni colapsul unei industrii de care depind slujbele a mii de cetățeni europeni. Industria auto românească este și ea grav afectată de criză. Menționez aici doar cazurile Dacia Renault, care își restrânge activitatea, și Ford care a cerut sprijinul statului român.

Situația gravă la nivel european solicită introducerea imediată a unor măsuri adecvate. Nu mă refer aici la măsuri protecționiste care să distorsioneze piața, ci măsuri care să dea șanse egale industriei europene și să le permită angajaților din această industrie să își păstreze slujbele.

Nu este suficient să acționăm pe plan intern, ci avem nevoie de acțiune la nivel european. Planul de redresare economică permite acest lucru, pentru că propune noi reguli de creditare în sistemul bancar european care să faciliteze accesul la credite. Este de asemenea important ca schemele de ajutor de stat pentru care aplică statele membre să poată fi accesate rapid și cu ușurință. Acest este un aspect esențial pentru investitorii strategici cum sunt cei de pe piața auto.

3-291

13 - Protección consular de los ciudadanos de la UE en terceros países (debate)

3-292

El Presidente. – El siguiente punto son las declaraciones del Consejo y de la Comisión sobre la protección consular de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea en terceros países.

3-293

Alexandr Vondra, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, this debate on consular protection is, once again, a timely one. A series of events over the last few years have highlighted the importance of consular cooperation among the EU Member States. From Lebanon in 2006, through Chad to the recent tragic events in Mumbai – all have demonstrated the growing risks to citizens of the Union when travelling abroad. The extent of these risks is even greater as increasing numbers of people take advantage of low-cost travel to visit more remote regions of the world.

Cooperation between Member States in this area is therefore important. It offers a better service and an enhanced level of consular assistance. This is of direct benefit to EU citizens.

The Treaties provide us with a basis for this cooperation. Article 20 states clearly, and I quote: ‘Every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which he is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State, on the same conditions as the nationals of that state. Member States shall establish the necessary rules among themselves and start the international negotiations required to secure this protection.’

The rules mentioned in this article are set out in a decision which was adopted in 1995. This decision specifies that assistance within a third country may be requested from a Member State other than one’s own, on condition that there is no accessible permanent representation or accessible Honorary Consul competent for such matters.

In practice that means that a consul who is asked by a citizen of another Member State for assistance should refuse such assistance if that citizen’s authorities (consulate or embassy) are also represented.

The 1995 decision is a decision between the Member States, reflecting the fact that consular assistance and protection is an exclusive national responsibility and that consular relations are governed mainly by the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

The rules on cooperation in this area also reflect the fact that consular assistance and protection are viewed differently in different Member States. Some, for example, consider it to be a fundamental right of all citizens. Others consider it to be a service provided by the state. That is why the Treaty refers to consular protection as an ‘entitlement’ and not a ‘right’.

Since the Jolo crisis in 2000, consular cooperation has been further developed to include aspects of crisis management. The terrorist attacks in the US showed that even third countries with sophisticated infrastructure can find it difficult to cope under extreme circumstances.

Member States subsequently drew up guidelines to handle such crises. Although non-binding, they have been used effectively on a number of occasions and have been refined in the light of experience.

The Council has recently developed the 'Lead State' concept. This means that, in the case of a significant incident, particularly in a country where few Member States are represented, one or two Member States can take the lead in coordinating action in matters of protection and evacuation.

There has also been increased cooperation with some countries outside the Union, for example the US, with which we have annual consultations on consular issues. Norway, Switzerland and Canada have also cooperated with the EU on specific incidents, for example during the Lebanon, Chad and Mumbai crises.

The Commission and Council Secretariat are also part of European Consular Cooperation. Several years ago the Council Secretariat set up a secure internet forum through which consular authorities exchange information on issues such as updating travel advice. The Council has also put at the disposal of Member States a sophisticated teleconferencing system which has been widely used during consular crises.

About three years ago, a platform for exchange of information and political coordination of action at EU level was established. This platform is called Crisis Coordination Arrangements (CCA). The two main actors of CCA are as follows: first, the Presidency, assisted by the Council Secretariat and the Commission, decides whether to trigger the CCA; second, COREPER II is the 'action platform' responsible for coordinating Member States' action or preparing any decisions that may need to be taken at EU level.

The main operational tool is the EU Joint Situation Centre (SITCEN) of the Council Secretariat. SITCEN provides logistical and information support.

In addition, successive presidencies have organised regular consular crisis management exercises which have proved particularly valuable. A European Consular Training Programme was launched at the end of 2008 with the aim of improving cooperation between consular officials, both from capitals and in the field. The co-location of consular facilities is also under consideration.

There is certainly more that could be done. Many other issues, for example prison conditions, parental child abduction and consular information policy, are discussed regularly. But we also have to accept the reality that, whilst expectations and demands from citizens grow continually, resources for consular authorities are always limited. Support for improved cooperation in the consular field is not always matched by adequate budgets at the national level. Squaring this circle will remain a challenge.

Experience shows that cooperation in the consular field is valued, and there are a number of cases where we can be pleased with the results. The successful evacuation of over 20 000 EU citizens from Lebanon in 2006 is just one example. The Presidency is committed to taking this work forward, and I would like to thank Parliament for its support.

3-294

Günter Verheugen, Vizepräsident der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich vertrete heute meinen Kollegen Jacques Barrot, der gerne selber hier gewesen wäre, aber eine andere institutionelle Verpflichtung hat.

Nach Artikel 20 des Vertrags zur Gründung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft genießt jeder Unionsbürger in einem Drittland, in dem der Mitgliedstaat, dessen Staatsangehörigkeit er besitzt, nicht vertreten ist, den konsularischen Schutz eines jeden Mitgliedstaats unter denselben Bedingungen wie Staatsangehörige dieses Staates. Artikel 20 sieht ebenfalls vor, dass die Mitgliedstaaten untereinander die notwendigen Regeln vereinbaren, um dieses Recht zu gewährleisten. Darüber hat Herr Vondra gerade berichtet. Deshalb haben die Mitgliedstaaten insbesondere mit den 2006 und 2008 festgelegten Leitlinien für den konsularischen Schutz Koordinierungsmechanismen eingeführt, die rechtlich nicht verbindlich sind, aber dazu beitragen, dass die Vertretungen vor Ort ihre Zusammenarbeit ausbauen können.

Außerdem sind die diplomatischen Vertretungen und Konsulate der Mitgliedstaaten und die Delegationen der Kommission gemäß Artikel 20 des Vertrags der Europäischen Union verpflichtet, ihre Zusammenarbeit zu vertiefen.

Der Rat hat sich im Dezember 2008 auf Leitlinien für die Umsetzung des Konzepts des so genannten federführenden Staates bei der konsularischen Zusammenarbeit verständigt. Danach soll bei einer größeren Krise mit Auswirkungen auf den konsularischen Schutz in dem betreffenden Drittland ein Mitgliedstaat als „federführender Staat“ bestimmt werden, der im Namen der anderen Mitgliedstaaten den Schutz der Unionsbürger übernimmt. Der federführende Staat koordiniert

die Maßnahmen der Mitgliedstaaten vor Ort und sorgt dafür, dass alle Unionsbürger Unterstützung erhalten. Jede Person, die konsularischen Schutz ihres Mitgliedstaats in Anspruch nehmen kann, kann den federführenden Staat um Hilfe bitten.

Das soll also die Zusammenarbeit der Mitgliedstaaten vor Ort erleichtern, zusätzliche Ressourcen in Form von Personal, Finanzmitteln, Ausrüstung und medizinischen Teams sollen zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Der federführende Staat hat außerdem die Aufgabe, Maßnahmen der Unterstützung, Zusammenführung und gegebenenfalls Evakuierung an einen sicheren Ort mit Unterstützung der übrigen betroffenen Mitgliedstaaten zu koordinieren und zu leiten. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen sich allerdings noch darüber einigen, was genau unter der Formulierung in Artikel 20 EG-Vertrag zu verstehen ist, wo es heißt „nicht vertretener Mitgliedstaat“. Damit sollen auch Situationen erfasst werden, in denen ein EU-Bürger, aus welchem Grund auch immer, keine erreichbare Vertretung seines Heimatstaats vorfindet. Die Mitgliedstaaten arbeiten momentan daran, dafür gemeinsame Kriterien zu erarbeiten.

Soweit steht das auf dem Papier. Dass die Praxis etwas anders aussehen kann, können einige Mitglieder des Europäischen Parlaments bestätigen. Ich habe auf der Rednerliste gesehen, dass Herr Guardans Cambó, Herr Sajjad Karim und Frau Erika Mann sich äußern wollen. Sie werden uns sicher etwas darüber erzählen, was sie im vergangenen Dezember in Mumbai erlebt haben. Ich habe den Eindruck gewonnen, dass – obwohl nur drei Mitgliedstaaten keine Botschaft in Neu-Delhi haben und nur sieben kein Konsulat in Bombay unterhalten, dass es trotzdem sehr schwierig war, einen adäquaten Schutz – ich drücke mich sehr vorsichtig aus – der betroffenen europäischen Bürger zu finden.

Ich sage das jetzt deshalb, weil man aus solchen Erfahrung ja auch etwas lernen soll. Nach dieser Erfahrung ist die Europäische Kommission der Ansicht, dass noch viel zu tun ist, um sicherzustellen, dass die Bürger der Europäischen Union das ihnen in Artikel 20 EG-Vertrag gewährleistete Recht auch wirklich in vollem Umfang in Anspruch nehmen können. Die Bürger erwarten sich für ihren Schutz in einem Drittland einen Mehrwert von der Europäischen Union. Der Schutz seitens der diplomatischen und konsularischen Vertretungen beschränkt sich schließlich nicht auf Krisensituationen, sondern umfasst auch Hilfeleistungen in Alltagssituationen.

Die Kommission schlägt unter anderem eine bessere Information der EU-Bürger vor – wir haben bereits empfohlen, den Wortlaut von Artikel 20 in alle Pässe drucken zu lassen, in den Flughäfen und Reisebüros wurden Poster verteilt, die Kommission arbeitet zusammen mit dem Generalsekretariat des Rates an einer Website zum konsularischen Schutz, auf der eine aktuelle Liste der Botschaften und Konsulate der Mitgliedstaaten in Drittländern zu finden sein wird.

Im Rahmen ihrer Aufgabe, den EU-Bürgern besser zu vermitteln, was die Unionsbürgerschaft für sie bedeutet, ist die Kommission bereit, sich in diesem Bereich mit jedem Problem auseinander zu setzen, das ihr von den Bürgern zur Kenntnis gebracht wird, und alles, was sie kann, zu tun, um den Schutzrechten, auf die sich die Unionsbürger kraft Artikel 20 berufen können, Wirkung zu verleihen.

Mit Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon würde eine klare Rechtsgrundlage für EU-Rechtsvorschriften in diesem Bereich zur Verfügung stehen. Der neue Wortlaut von Artikel 20 EG-Vertrag (Artikel 23 des Vertrags über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union) ermöglicht die Annahme von Richtlinien „zur Festlegung der notwendigen Koordinierungs- und Kooperationsmaßnahmen zur Erleichterung dieses Schutzes“. Die Kommission könnte daher für diesen Bereich in naher Zukunft Legislativvorschläge vorlegen.

3-295

Ιωάννης Βαρβιτσιώτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE-DE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χαιρετίζω τη συζήτηση αυτή και ευχαριστώ τόσο το Συμβούλιο όσο και την Επιτροπή για την παρουσίαση και την ενημέρωση που μας παρείχαν. Υπήρξε ο εισηγητής από την Επιτροπή Ελευθεριών στο θέμα σχετικά με την Πράσινη Βίβλο για την προξενική και τη διπλωματική προστασία του Ευρωπαίου πολίτη σε τρίτες χώρες και, για τον λόγο αυτό, εξακολουθώ να έχω ιδιαίτερο ενδιαφέρον γύρω από τις εξελίξεις στον τομέα αυτό.

Είχα υποστηρίξει τότε ότι το άρθρο 20 πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί ευρύτερα και να περιλαμβάνει περισσότερα δικαιώματα του Ευρωπαίου πολίτη διότι έτσι ενισχύεται η έννοια της ευρωπαϊκής ιθαγένειας και εμπράκτως αποδεικνύονται τα πλεονεκτήματα που προσφέρει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στην καθημερινότητα και, τέλος, ενισχύεται και η ευρωπαϊκή αλληλεγγύη.

Τα πρόσφατα γεγονότα της τρομοκρατικής επίθεσης στη Βομβάη απέδειξαν τη χρησιμότητα αλλά και την ανάγκη ενισχυμένου συντονισμού της προστασίας των υπηκόων κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης σε παρόμοιες συγκυρίες. Η δημοσίευση του περασμένου Δεκεμβρίου από το Συμβούλιο των κατευθυντηρίων γραμμών σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της αρχής του επικεφαλής κράτους σε προξενικά θέματα, σε περίπτωση πάντοτε κρίσεως, αποτελεί ένα πρώτο θετικό βήμα και έχει σημαντικές ιδέες. Περιμένουμε όμως με μεγάλο ενδιαφέρον τις νομικά δεσμευτικές προτάσεις.

Αντιλαμβάνομαι ότι υπάρχουν τεράστιες πρακτικές δυσκολίες. Όμως, θεωρώ ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό να είναι σαφές με ποιον τρόπο θα γίνεται η ενημέρωση του Ευρωπαίου πολίτη, ο οποίος βρίσκεται στον τόπο της κρίσεως, ως προς το ποιο είναι

το επικεφαλής κράτος. Όσα ελέγχθηκαν έως τώρα δεν νομίζω ότι ικανοποιούν. Χαιρετίζω πάντως τη σημασία που έδωσε η Γαλλική Προεδρία στο θέμα αυτό και περιμένω τη συνέχιση των πρωτοβουλιών από την Τσεχική Προεδρία.

3-296

Martine Roure, au nom du groupe PSE. – Monsieur le Président, le droit à la protection consulaire et diplomatique est l'un des piliers de la citoyenneté européenne. Vous avez cité, Monsieur le Ministre, l'article 20 du traité. Il est très clair. Chaque citoyen a droit à la protection consulaire. Ce n'est pas une option, c'est un droit.

Or, les faits dramatiques de Bombay nous montrent, en effet, que ce droit est très loin d'être garanti. Les niveaux de protection varient selon les États membres, donnant lieu à des discriminations dans le traitement des citoyens, qui ne sont jamais informés sur le consulat à contacter en cas de besoin. La solidarité financière fait visiblement défaut entre les États membres. Des citoyens européens qui ont tout perdu doivent souvent faire face à des bureaux consulaires très réticents à se charger des coûts financiers.

Les États membres ont le devoir de mettre fin à cette situation. Il est nécessaire de rendre les lignes directrices contraignantes et de prévoir une information aux citoyens. L'Union doit entamer des négociations avec les États tiers afin d'assurer la protection diplomatique nécessaire.

Mais, vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire, les faits de Bombay ont aussi montré l'absence inacceptable d'une garantie de protection diplomatique pour les membres du Parlement européen. L'Union européenne, et notamment la Commission, doit sans délai négocier – et nous avons entendu ce que vous nous avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire – et le Conseil doit conclure des accords ad hoc avec les pays tiers pour assurer une protection diplomatique spécifique pour les députés du Parlement européen. C'est le moins que l'on puisse faire.

3-297

Ignasi Guardans Cambó, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Señor Presidente, hoy, en Europa, los ciudadanos viajan sin fronteras, pueden votar en un Estado distinto del propio, pueden cobrar su pensión, tener seguridad social en cualquier Estado en el que decidan residir..., no sólo eso: las policías cooperan entre sí o un fiscal de Estocolmo puede arrestar, gracias a la Euroorden, a una persona que viva en Sevilla sin ninguna necesidad de tramitar nada, directamente.

Cuando se trata de reprimir conductas de los ciudadanos bien han sabido los Estados dejar pasar su soberanía. En cambio, cuando se trata de salir de la Unión Europea y proteger a los ciudadanos, esos mismos ciudadanos europeos, como si usaran una máquina del tiempo, ven que el tiempo se detiene en cuanto salen de la Unión.

Y fuera de la Unión tenemos veintisiete Estados, veintisiete administraciones, veintisiete banderas, veintisiete sistemas consulares o, en algunos casos, ni eso. Y cuando hay una situación de crisis el ciudadano europeo deja de serlo. No existe la ciudadanía europea.

Y esos ciento ochenta millones de europeos que viajan por el mundo notan que sólo podrán ser protegidos si se convierten de nuevo en alemanes, españoles, polacos o italianos. Porque como europeos no existen fuera de la Unión Europea. Y eso es un incumplimiento grave del Tratado y convierte en ciencia ficción —lo digo con todo el respeto— la Declaración del Consejo de hace un momento.

Todo lo que nos ha contado el Consejo sobre la supuesta implementación del artículo 20 del Tratado, «Lead State», videoconferencias, centros conjuntos, es pura ciencia ficción cuando uno se encuentra en una situación de emergencia y —como ha dicho el Comisario— algunos hemos tenido la ocasión de vivir eso en la práctica.

El artículo 20 del Tratado es papel mojado: no hay protocolos de actuación; no hay reglas jurídicas; no hay información alguna para el ciudadano; no hay responsabilidad para quien decida incumplir eso.

En el mejor de los casos, hay caridad entre los cónsules. Hay buena voluntad, como la podía haber en el siglo XIX, como la podía haber en Pekín en mil ochocientos y pico. Ésa es la situación: la complicidad entre cónsules que comen y cenan juntos y no la obligación de servir conjuntamente a los ciudadanos en virtud de una disposición de Derecho europeo.

Y, por eso, la Comisión Europea tiene la obligación, antes incluso de que entre en vigor el Tratado de Lisboa y, obviamente, después, de implementar el artículo 20, de hacer sentirse a los ciudadanos europeos orgullosos de su pasaporte y de hacer sentir a algunos funcionarios que el siglo XIX terminó y que Europa también existe como tal, en Nueva Delhi, en Beirut y donde haga falta, y donde haya un ciudadano europeo con problemas.

3-298

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy UEN. – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym powiedzieć, że nie podzielam takiego bardzo krytycznego tonu wobec tego, co przedstawiła dzisiaj Rada i w jej imieniu pan wicepremier. Myślę, że tak naprawdę nie chodzi tutaj o traktat czy o brak traktatu, lecz o to, czy solidarność europejska jest pojęciem używanym tylko

w deklaracjach politycznych, czy jest pewną praktyką polityczną, praktyką dotyczącą obywateli różnych krajów członkowskich. Jeżeli to drugie, to traktat nie jest tutaj warunkiem niezbędnym.

Gdy trwała prezydencja Słowenii w Unii Europejskiej, to w wielu krajach, np. w Azji, Afryce i Ameryce Łacińskiej, Francja reprezentowała Unię, ponieważ Słowenia nie miała tam ambasad. Jestem ciekaw, czy teraz, gdyby obywatele Słowenii, a także obywatele innych mniejszych krajów członkowskich, zgłosili się właśnie w tych krajach do Konsulatu Francji, uzyskaliby stosowną pomoc. To dobre pytanie.

Trzeba rozszerzyć pojęcie solidarności europejskiej. Wydaje mi się, że naprawdę Traktat Lizboński nie jest tutaj warunkiem *sine qua non*.

3-299

Irena Belohorská (NI). – Podľa článku 20 Zmluvy o Európskych spoločenstvách o diplomatickej a konzulárnej ochrane má každý občan Únie právo na území tretej krajiny na ochranu diplomatických alebo konzulárnych orgánov za rovnakých podmienok ako občania tohto členského štátu. Je dôležité zdôrazniť potrebu Únie rozvíjať spoluprácu v konzulárnych službách na tieto účely.

Európania patria medzi najmobilnejšie spoločenstvá na svete a približne 9 % občanov cestuje do krajín, kde ich materská krajina nemá toto zastúpenie. Slovensko, ktoré v Európskom parlamente zastupujem, má napríklad veľmi slabé konzulárne zastúpenie v oblasti Strednej a Latinskej Ameriky, kam cestuje množstvo našich občanov. Musím podotknúť, že aj napriek povinnosti, ktorou je viazaná konzulárna služba, väčšina Európanov o svojom práve nevie a je smutné, ak o tom nevedia ani pracovníci týchto úradov.

Zabezpečiť lepšiu informovanosť občanov v oblasti konzulárnej ochrany by sme mohli dosiahnuť, ak by jednotné európske pasy obsahovali aj citáciu článku 20. Dôležitosť konzulárnej ochrany v tretej krajine sa ukázala práve počas krízových situácií, ako boli cunami v 2004, alebo konflikt v Libanone v roku 2006. Vzhľadom na nejednotnosť konzulárnych predpisov majú teda občania Európskej únie do činenia s toľkými systémami, koľko je členských štátov, a tieto systémy môžu mať rozdielnu právnu silu a rozsah.

Práve nedávne udalosti v Mumbai naznačujú, že v oblasti konzulárnej služby máme ešte značné rezervy. Zriadením spoločných európskych úradov by sa mohla zabezpečiť spojitosť funkcií a zároveň by sa mohli ušetriť náklady na štruktúry diplomatických a konzulárnych sietí členských štátov.

3-300

PRESIDÊNCIA: MANUEL ANTÓNIO DOS SANTOS

Vice-Presidente

3-301

Sajjad Karim (PPE-DE). – Mr President, it has been stated already that citizens of the Union travel widely. Well, there are approximately 180 million trips made outside of the European Union every year, and – in theory – they are protected under Article 20, as the Commissioner and indeed the Council Presidency have already provided for in this debate.

Under Article 20 there is a requirement for Member States only to provide consular assistance to unrepresented EU nationals on the same terms as their nationals. This difference in approach between Member States is recognised within the action plan of 2007 and 2009.

Of course, there needs to be a criterion as to when and how other consular services should become involved, and these break down basically into three. I am not going to go through them, but the first two are perfectly sensible. The third puts forward a requirement for that citizen to provide proof of his or her nationality, either by means of passport, identity card or other document, for the diplomatic or consular representation to be provided.

There is a real problem here, because for any European citizen who is fleeing a situation, it is perfectly feasible that they may not actually be in possession of such documentation.

Assistance is provided in the event of death, serious accident, serious injury, arrest, detention, assistance to be provided to victims of violent crime, and relief and repatriation of distressed citizens of the Union. It is extensive but not exhaustive. More work needs to be done there.

To make all this happen, we have heard about the concept of a lead state, which will endeavour to ensure that all EU citizens are assisted and that it will coordinate between Member States.

That is all very good in theory, but in practice I certainly did not see this happen in Mumbai. There was no real sharing of information and intelligence, not the sort of cooperation I expected to see. Instead I saw only competition between

Member States, and further centralisation or consolidation of consular services will risk taking away the flexibility missions require on the ground in rapidly changing circumstances.

3-302

Erika Mann (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Mein Kollege Karim hat völlig Recht. Das Problem liegt einfach in der Formulierung, in den Grundlagen von Artikel 20 selber begründet. Man muss sich ja auch die Realitäten vor Ort anschauen. Erstmal haben nicht alle Mitgliedstaaten einen Konsularschutz, und in vielen Fällen ist dieser Konsularschutz eben sehr begrenzt, und die Sicherheitsstrukturen sind noch nicht einmal für die Konsule selber ausreichend.

Ich habe das im Fall des deutschen Konsuls erlebt, der dann in der Nacht herumgefahren ist, um Kollegen einzusammeln, ohne Sicherheitsschutz, mit seinem Fahrer, unterwegs auf Straßen, die absolut unsicher waren. Das sind einfach Bedingungen, die nicht akzeptabel sind. Man kann nicht in Länder wie Indien oder in lateinamerikanische Länder gehen – es gibt viele andere Länder, wo man in einem so kritischen Umfeld wie Mumbai vor Ort präsent sein muss – und dann vor Ort kleine Stäbe ohne ausreichende Sicherheitsstrukturen. Nachrichtendienstliche Informationen werden überhaupt nicht übermittelt, Zugang zu den Daten liegen den Mitgliedstaaten nicht vor, usw. Das heißt, die Begrenzungen sind unendlich, und man braucht sich nicht zu wundern, dass die Mitgliedstaaten ihren Schutz für ihre Bürger oder für ihre Abgeordneten gar nicht in dem Umfang ausüben können, wie sie es vielleicht sogar wollen.

Deshalb ist es wichtig, dass Sie im Rat und auch in der Kommission eine sorgfältige Analyse vornehmen. Man kann nicht predigen, immer weltweit präsent zu sein und Europa als globalen Partner zu sehen, und dann nicht einmal eine Sicherheitsstruktur haben und über keine intelligenten Informationssysteme verfügen. Wir machen uns einfach lächerlich, wenn wir unsere eigenen Strukturen nicht sauber analysieren und den entsprechenden Schutz, den wir dann noch brauchen, gewährleisten.

Ich würde also dringend raten, dass Sie die Strukturen wirklich noch einmal sauber analysieren, dass Sie eine Simulation durchführen, wie das auch andere Staaten machen, und dass Sie sich nicht nur auf die zentralen Hauptstädte, also die Metropolen konzentrieren, sondern in solchen Mega-Ländern und Mega-Cities sich einfach auch einmal vergegenwärtigen, dass sie eben auch in den anderen großen Städten dieser Welt entsprechende Vertretungen brauchen.

Mumbai ist nicht zum letzten Mal passiert. Es wird ein neues Mumbai geben, genau wie es andere Katastrophen gegeben hat. Vergegenwärtigen Sie sich das und stellen Sie sich bitte darauf ein!

3-303

Sarah Ludford (ALDE). – Mr President, Mr Guardans Cambó and others such as Mr Karim and Mrs Mann have illustrated the gap between rhetoric and reality. We cannot even actually agree on what Article 20 means. The minister, speaking in English, said that it was only an ‘entitlement’ and not a right, whereas Mrs Roure cited the French, which says ‘*un droit*’. But it is certainly in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, where it is enshrined as a right.

We will surely not make progress, unless it is legally confirmed that it is a right with binding EU decisions and common standards and the right to challenge a refusal of protection in the courts.

The minister talked about co-location being under consideration of consular officials. My experience in the field of visa policy is that it is like pushing a boulder uphill trying to get Member States to co-locate.

Commissioner Verheugen referred to practical measures as being in development. But these were promised in the action plan in 2007: a reference in passports, posters, a website in development. Where are these? I searched consular protection on the Europa website and found nothing.

On the Council travel website it says ‘under construction’, which I think is a metaphor for the fact that we are failing our citizens in failing to put flesh on the bones of the promise of European citizenship.

3-304

Eoin Ryan (UEN). – Mr President, I think it is very important – and I agree with many of the previous speakers – that EU citizens need to feel secure, and I think it is a priority that we look after the security of our citizens when they are outside the European Union, especially in crisis situations such as we had in Mumbai.

I think it is absolutely essential for European citizens to be able to get information in any crisis situation, whether it be a general crisis or a crisis for themselves, and there needs to be an awful lot more clarity in the situation.

Mumbai is a good example of how it does not work. I welcome the idea of a lead state which was announced recently. I think that is very important, but it is very clear at the moment that the system is not working. I think it should be seen as a priority by all of us to get the system working because, as somebody else said, you really would feel far more European if a Member State embassy looked after you if you were in trouble when you were in the Far East or in South America or somewhere outside the European Union, and I think that that feeling of Europeaness is very important.

(The President cut off the speaker.)

3-305

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, certo la maggior mobilità dei cittadini europei in continua crescita obbliga ad un'implementazione della collaborazione consolare.

Quanto proposto dalla Commissione è condivisibile soprattutto per quanto attiene la semplificazione delle procedure per la concessione di anticipi pecuniari ai cittadini in difficoltà. Oggi il diritto alla protezione consolare è indubbiamente frammentario e disomogeneamente distribuito. All'estero spesso la cittadinanza europea non esiste e si torna magari a desiderare di essere cittadini di un altro Stato, seppure dell'Unione. Vorrei che non si utilizzasse il richiamo all'orgoglio di essere europeo solo quando serve alle istituzioni, ma anche quando serve al cittadino che, magari in difficoltà, spera che la sua europeità gli torni finalmente utile.

3-306

Javier Moreno Sánchez (PSE). – Señor Presidente, señorías, la protección consular es parte fundamental de la ciudadanía europea. Los ciudadanos quieren sentirse europeos dentro de la Unión, pero también fuera de la casa europea; quieren que la Unión responda a sus necesidades, especialmente cuando se encuentran en caso de emergencia.

En Bombay, la Unión no respondió correctamente, como ya ha ocurrido en otras situaciones de crisis. Señorías, permítanme exponer en un minuto una idea, una idea que no será la panacea pero que sí ayudará concretamente a los ciudadanos europeos que se encuentran en países terceros.

Quiero reiterar hoy aquí la propuesta de crear un número europeo de emergencia gratuito. Este número, que figuraría también en el pasaporte, junto al artículo 20, les permitirá acceder en su idioma a la información necesaria sobre los consulados de los Estados miembros de la Unión, que —insisto— deberán atenderles.

Los ciudadanos esperan de la Unión hechos y no sólo palabras.

3-307

Gay Mitchell (PPE-DE). – Mr President, when we become Members of Parliament, we are issued with a laissez-passé – as are a lot of other people who work for the institutions of the Union. I wonder whether the Presidency and the Council understand the worthlessness of this document in Member States.

I had an extremely difficult situation in the Netherlands, when travelling back on the business of this Parliament from Africa. I know of another Member – a British Member – who had difficulty in Dublin. We really need to bring home to our own Member States that this is a travel document of Parliament, the Commission and of the Union and should be fully respected. Those dealing with travel arrangements at airports and ports should be fully briefed as to the worthiness of this document.

I would ask you to take that up with each of the Member States and ensure that it is implemented, because that sort of protection should extend to officials and to Members of Parliament travelling on the business of Parliament.

3-308

Kathy Sinnott (IND/DEM). – Mr President, as an MEP I have had several occasions to contact embassies and consuls because someone was injured, lost, robbed or abducted, or because, tragically, someone died. I am sure this has been the experience of many other MEPs. I am happy to say that, where I was able to deal with an Irish embassy, the work and the cooperation have been excellent. But my own country was not represented in every country, and we had to rely on the embassies of other European countries.

I would just say from experience that, without going into stories, I would like to see more coordination, more help between embassies in the bigger countries where they do have embassies and consuls in almost every country, so as to help all other Member State embassies with their constituents.

3-309

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I think it was, again, a very useful debate. I have a considerable understanding of how important this is for you as Members of the European Parliament because this is an extremely sensitive issue, where you are confronted with the expectations of your citizens, who are going to elect you in the next few months. So I have a full understanding of the issue that you are considering with care and that you are approaching with such critical insight.

The second reason why I have an understanding is that I come from a medium-sized state, the Czech Republic, which is not a former imperial power so it does not have an embassy or a consulate in every corner of the world. So what the Irish and others are expecting from the European Union here is, I think, very logical.

But now I have to speak here on behalf of the Council so you need to respect certain legal grounds which are available to us, and the fact is that the budget and all those issues are important. And we also have to be able to recognise and to differentiate what is the real problem on the one hand and what is the question or issue which needs more clarification.

I was not in Mumbai, and I was listening very carefully to the critical remarks of Mr Guardans Cambó and some others who took part in the European Parliament mission to India at the time that this tragic attack happened. When I was getting ready for the special hearing yesterday, my first question was: is there a Spanish consulate in Mumbai? I have never been there so I do not know this personally. I was repeatedly assured that the Spanish have a consulate in Mumbai and those that were there know this. I think it was simply a matter of a formal obligation for the Germans to assist Mr Guardans Cambó and his delegation, if we are quoting Article 20 and the decision as a whole.

The Spanish sent a plane, as I was informed, to help evacuate its citizens, as did the French and the Germans. For some reason, which I do not understand, Mr Guardans Cambó refused the offer to fly back on the Spanish plane but instead subsequently returned on the French plane.

So I do not know. I just have the information which is available to me. In general I think we all share the opinion that any improvement within the legal framework is certainly desirable, so let me inform you about at least some partial activities of the Czech Presidency to strengthen the consular protection within the current legal framework.

For example, there is a project on including a message in national passports which would inform the holders that they can ask for consular protection from any other Member State embassy or consulate in a third country, provided their country is not represented there. So that is at least an attempt to clarify the situation on the ground.

Second, the Presidency is to intensify and unify the use of emergency travel documents, the ETDs which can be issued by any Member State representation to any Member State citizen who has lost his passport or had it stolen.

Third and finally, the Presidency will also organise the two consular seminars or training courses in order to contribute to this consular protection team in a very practical and effective way.

These events will deal with the CCA system, simulating a real consular crisis. The training will define and carry out practical testing of all relevant mechanisms in the CCA cadre, including cooperation between all authorities and institutions involved. The experience will even, by means of field work, teach the participants how to behave and promptly react in a situation of extreme psychological and time pressure. I do not know whether this will amuse us enough before the elections, but at least it is a contribution which we are bringing to this important issue.

3-310

Günter Verheugen, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, the Treaties do not confer any power of initiative on the Commission in the field of consular protection. Within its limited powers, the Commission is trying to boost, as much as it can, the effectiveness of the citizenship rights European citizens are entitled to – see, for example, the Commission Action Plan 2007-2009.

I repeat that the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty would certainly very much improve this situation. I hope that Mrs Sinnott, who shared her experience with us, will use the fact that the Lisbon Treaty would change the situation and her experience to help to organise support for the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland.

The deplorable events in Mumbai show that, already today, there is a clearly a huge margin for improvement if we are to fulfil the legitimate expectations of EU citizens.

3-311

Erika Mann (PSE). – Mr President, I have just a short recommendation to the Council. I appreciate very much what you said, but can you make sure that, once you foresee this kind of simulation today, that you invite some of the people who were actually in Mumbai, because it could give you some insight?

3-312

Presidente. – O debate é encerrado.

Declarações escritas (artigo 142º)

3-313

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (PSE), na paśmie. – Rosnąca mobilność obywateli UE wymaga dostosowania dotychczasowych zasad ochrony konsularnej do nowej sytuacji. Obywatelom UE musi być zapewniona ochrona i pomoc ze strony własnego kraju, poprzez jego misje dyplomatyczne i placówki konsularne (art. 3 Konwencji wiedeńskiej o stosunkach dyplomatycznych i art. 1 Konwencji wiedeńskiej o stosunkach konsularnych) oraz na mocy Traktatu z Maastricht - wynikająca z obywatelstwa Unii Europejskiej - dodatkowa ochrona dyplomatyczna i konsularna obywateli UE poza Wspólnotą. W praktyce oznacza to, iż każdy obywatel Unii korzysta na terytorium kraju trzeciego, gdzie państwo członkowskie, którego jest obywatelem, nie ma swojego przedstawicielstwa, z ochrony dyplomatycznej i konsularnej każdego z pozostałych państw członkowskich na takich samych warunkach jak obywatele tego państwa.

Niestety, ubiegłoroczna sytuacja kryzysowa w Bombaju spowodowana zamachami bombowymi dowiodła nieudolności wielu placówek dyplomatycznych w praktycznym stosowaniu wspólnych postanowień dotyczących bezpieczeństwa obywateli Unii. Napotkane przez dziesiątki Europejczyków, w tym przebywającą na miejscu delegację Parlamentu Europejskiego, problemy proceduralne oraz nieproporcjonalnie długie terminy oczekiwania na duplikaty utraconych dokumentów pokazały, iż realizacja idei solidarności europejskiej jest niełatwa do osiągnięcia!

Prawo do ochrony konsularnej w krajach trzecich jest jednym z głównych wyznaczników obywatelstwa europejskiego. Państwa członkowskie powinny dołożyć wszelkich starań w celu właściwego jego wdrażania, zapewniając równe traktowanie i opiekę wszystkim obywatelom Wspólnoty.

3-314

Toomas Savi (ALDE), in writing. – According to Article 20 of the Treaty Establishing the European Community ‘every citizen of the Union shall, in the territory of a third country in which the Member State of which he is a national is not represented, be entitled to protection by the diplomatic or consular authorities of any Member State, on the same conditions as the nationals of that State’.

At the end of November last year, our colleague, Ignasi Guardans Cambó was in Mumbai during the terrorist attacks and he witnessed several violations of the Treaty by diplomats of some Member States, as citizens of the European Union were differentiated and discriminated against on the basis of their nationalities.

The conduct of the diplomats of some Member States in Mumbai did not only violate the rights of the EU citizens, but also pointed out deficiencies in the EU integration process. Therefore, it is crucially important for the EU to investigate this particular case and take action to ensure that such a situation does not occur again.

I would appreciate it, if the Council and the Commission could assure that the implementation of Article 20 of the Treaty is closely monitored and that every deviation is investigated thoroughly.

3-315

14 - Turno de preguntas (preguntas al Consejo)

3-316

Presidente. – Segue-se o período de perguntas (B6-0006/2009).

Foram apresentadas as seguintes perguntas ao Conselho.

3-317

Pergunta n.º 1 do Marian Harkin (H-1034/08)

Assunto: PME

Uma vez que a economia é um dos 3 "E" definidos como prioridades pela presidência checa, quais as medidas específicas que o Conselho tenciona tomar para reforçar a confiança das pequenas e médias empresas na economia de mercado à luz da actual situação económica?

3-318

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Let me begin by saying that I appreciate the question on SMEs, because during this current economic crisis the big businesses and the big companies are always strong enough to lobby for some relief, but it is much more difficult for SMEs and it certainly requires a systemic approach.

On 1 December 2008, as you know, the Council endorsed the European Economic Recovery Plan, which was presented by the Commission on 26 November 2008. As a response to the financial crisis, the Council supported a stimulus which is equivalent to about 1.5% of the EU's gross domestic product to restore business and consumer confidence. Furthermore, the plan contains specific measures to support SMEs, the most important of which are those aimed at improving access to finance for SMEs and reducing the administrative burden.

The Council also agreed that improvements in the framework conditions for European businesses, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises, was essential to counter the effect of the crisis on competitiveness and to support and enhance job creation.

The Council also adopted two sets of conclusions related to providing support for SMEs, in the context of overall competitiveness. Firstly, conclusions endorsing proposals to support SMEs presented in the Commission Communication entitled, as you probably know, ‘Think Small First: a Small Business Act for Europe’, this so-called SBA, including an action plan outlining the priority measures requiring particular attention.

Secondly, conclusions from the Commission communication entitled ‘Towards world-class clusters in the European Union – implementing the broad-based innovation strategy’. Although clusters are not exclusively meant for the SMEs, they play an important role in many clusters that have been set up throughout the EU.

At its meeting in mid-December 2008, the European Council approved this European Economic Recovery Plan and supported the full implementation of the Action Plan for the Small Business Act. It has specifically supported an increase in the intervention by the European Investment Bank to the tune of EUR 30 billion for the years 2009-2010, especially for loans to SMEs, which amount to an increase of EUR 10 million over the EIB usual lending in this sector.

The Council also supported a temporary exemption for two years beyond the *de minimis* threshold for state aid in respect of an amount of up to EUR 50 000 and the adaptation of the state aid framework as required to increase support for enterprises, especially the SMEs.

The Council also called for the use of accelerated procedures for awarding public contracts provided for EC legislation, as well as for reducing the administrative burden on businesses.

The Czech Presidency will continue to pursue this effort, because our economy is broadly based on SMEs, so we have our own experience with that. Therefore, both of the forthcoming Competitiveness Councils under the Czech Presidency – one will take place very soon in early March, as well as the informal one which will take place in Prague – will tackle the question of reducing the administrative burden, since we believe that better regulation is an important factor for improving competitiveness, in particular for SMEs, and it plays an even more important role in times of economic crisis.

Moreover, the Presidency will try to make progress in the implementation of the action plan and put this SME policy at the forefront of society as well as linking the implementation of the action plan to the national reform programmes of all the Member States.

The Presidency will also continue with the increased effort of discussing legislative proposals related to SMEs, such as the regulation on the Statute for a European Private Company, which would offer SMEs a form of business enabling them to take advantage of their potential and develop cross-border activities.

Another legislative proposal I should mention is the proposed directive for reduced VAT rates for labour-intensive services, which will be discussed at the upcoming ECOFIN Councils.

In addition, the Council will be concerned with the review of the Late Payment Directive, which is now being prepared and which is to ensure that small and medium-sized enterprises are paid in time for all business transactions. Again, that is pretty important in the current situation.

3-319

Presidente. – Uma vez que estamos bastante atrasados, proponho que o Conselho responda conjuntamente a todas as perguntas complementares. Como sabem, só posso aceitar duas perguntas complementares para além da do autor inicial. Assim sendo, escolhi duas entre as cinco perguntas apresentadas com base no critério de diferenciação de grupo político e de nacionalidade. Escolhi nomeadamente o Senhor Deputado Philip Bushill-Matthews e a Senhora Deputada Silvia-Adriana Ticău.

3-320

Olle Schmidt, author. – Normally I use my own mother tongue but, as I am replacing Marian Harkin, I will try in broken English. This is a common language in this Parliament.

You mentioned, Minister, the administrative burden and the goal of reducing it by 25% by 2012. Do you really think that is an ambitious goal? Could we not do more, and could you perhaps be more specific about what has been done so far? What are your aims? Could you not say 25% by 2010, for instance? That would be rather ambitious.

3-321

Philip Bushill-Matthews (PPE-DE). – You mentioned the review of the Late Payments Directive, which I think is extremely important. I was concerned, though, that the consultation period for that finished at the end of August, just before the real financial crisis hit. Had the consultation period been extended I think we might have got much more robust answers as a basis for a better review of the Directive. Is it worth considering whether we should open a further short period of consultation, so that we get the most up-to-date information possible, on which a review could then be based?

3-322

Silvia-Adriana Ticău (PSE). – Aş dori să întreb Consiliul referitor la planul european de redresare economică. Acest plan prevede o sumă de 30 de miliarde de euro pentru întreprinderile mici şi mijlocii. Comisia ne-a informat că se vor acorda pe principii „primul venit, primul servit”.

Doresc să întreb Consiliul ce măsuri ia pentru ca toate statele membre să-și dezvolte programe naționale pentru sprijinul întreprinderilor mici și mijlocii, ca să poată accesa aceste fonduri?

3-323

Alexandr Vondra, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – I will try. On the first question on the targets for the reduction of the administrative burden, my country, with some other like-minded countries, has already started with the process somewhat in advance. Along with the Netherlands and some other countries, we have a national goal of a 20% reduction by 2010. We will have to see whether we can do more by 2012.

The Commission has announced a road map for the end of January 2009 showing how it will ensure that all the proposals needed to achieve the 25% reduction in the administrative burden at Community level are tabled before the end of 2009. Proposals tabled during the first half of this year in this area will be responded to by the Council under the incumbent Presidency, so we will certainly be dealing with that. We will evaluate the process during the Spring European Council. I hope that we will be able to act as thoroughly as we can. Certainly this is what the Presidency wants to do.

On the Late Payment Directive, the Commission intends to publish the proposal at the end of February 2009. The Presidency will start discussing the issue at the Council's preparatory bodies.

The last question – which I missed – was related to the European Recovery Plan. It was specifically about the amount of the possible EIB loan. I hope that SMEs will be able to compete with those other big industries. We had a substantial debate on the automotive industry just an hour ago, so certainly I think that the general wish is that the SMEs would be able to benefit from that.

3-324

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 2 do Manuel Medina Ortega (H-1035/08)

Assunto: Bases para um novo acordo comercial mundial

Após a interrupção, no passado Verão, das negociações comerciais multilaterais no âmbito da Ronda de Doha e após os acordos do Grupo dos 20 na Cimeira de Washington do passado mês de Novembro, considera o Conselho que existem elementos para que a União Europeia lance novas propostas em matéria comercial que sejam satisfatórias para os países em desenvolvimento?

3-325

Alexandr Vondra, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – In response to Mr Medina Ortega's question, which relates to the WTO, I think it is an important issue. We have all read the reports of – some of us even took an active part in – the Davos World Economic Forum, and have listened to the recent comments by Pascal Lamy and others. There is no doubt that there is a fear of rising protectionism, so we are all very well aware of the challenges ahead of us.

I would like to point out that on 15 November last year the members of the G20 emphasised the importance of establishing the modalities for an agreement by the end of 2008, which has already passed. In this context the delegations of the WTO members, including the European Commission on behalf of the EU, intensified their work in Geneva with a view to providing a political impulse.

A lot of work has been done, and the effort led to the new revision of the AGRI and NAMA texts. Moreover, in the light of the current political and economic development, the European Council in mid-December last year stated in its conclusions that it endorsed the objective of arriving this year, within the WTO, at an agreement on the modalities leading to the conclusion of the Doha Round with an ambitious global and balanced report and result.

The Council and Commission stood ready for constructive EU participation at the ministerial talks, if and when convened. However, on 12 December 2008, the WTO Director-General, Pascal Lamy, at an informal meeting of the heads of delegation, indicated that he would not convene the ministers to finalise modalities by the end of the year, because the conditions did not yet exist for a successful ministerial meeting, despite intensive consultation.

The aim of the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) is to achieve transparent liberalisation of trade at multilateral level which will bring about long-term advantages and a major boost for the world economy, in particular for developing countries, due to the development-oriented character of this round.

Therefore, despite the fact that no conclusion was possible by the end of 2008, the Council remains fully committed to the multilateral trade system, as well as to the conclusion of an ambitious, balanced and comprehensive outcome of the WTO Doha Round. This is even more important given the current economic and financial situation.

Although the Presidency is well aware of the obstacles that exist on the way toward successful completion of the whole process, it will undoubtedly seek to give an effect to these commitments by working on the renewal of discussions on the

DDA as soon as the conditions allow. It will also support more intensive work within the framework of other WTO agendas, in particular in the areas of services and TRIPS.

3-326

Manuel Medina Ortega (PSE). – Gracias señor Presidente del Consejo por la contestación que me ha dado —creo que bastante completa—, pero yo querría recordar al Presidente del Consejo que en el pasado verano, verano del 2008, las conversaciones de Doha estuvieron a punto de concluirse y no se llegó a un acuerdo porque algunos de los países BRIC no estuvieron dispuestos a hacer ningún tipo de concesión.

Teniendo en cuenta que en la reunión de Washington los países BRIC han tenido mayor protagonismo, es posible que la falta de disposición de estos países fuera debido a considerar que ocupaban un papel secundario, pero en la reunión de Washington se les ha dado un papel preferente en la situación. ¿Tiene la Presidencia del Consejo noticias de que los países BRIC, a raíz de los compromisos asumidos en Washington, estén dispuestos a adoptar un papel más activo y a contribuir de hecho al éxito de esta Ronda de Doha?

3-327

Syed Kamall (PPE-DE). – I just wondered, as a supplementary to this question, if, looking at the European Union's new proposals, or if the European Union were to come forward with new proposals, he agrees that any such proposals should include moves to remove the inequities of the common agricultural policy so we can unlock the negotiations in NAMA and then unlock the negotiations on services, which account for about 70% of the EU's GDP. Would he also agree that it is time for the EU to show a true commitment to free trade?

3-328

Gay Mitchell (PPE-DE). – I would like to ask the Minister if his attention has been drawn to the protectionist elements in the plan for recovery in the United States, particularly as put forward by members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and if he has, on behalf of the Council, communicated the concern of the European Union to the American Administration about this.

This does not augur well for a new Doha Round. Would he ensure that our concerns are communicated before the necessary legislation passes through the US Congress?

3-329

Alexandr Vondra, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – I think we all know where the problem lies. It does not lie in the European Union. I think the European Union is very much in favour of completing the Doha Round and we did all that was necessary for it in the course of the last year and we almost, almost made it.

Where, then, is the problem? First we have to wait for the US Administration, and, while some appointments have already been made, some others are still to come, and it remains to be seen whether the current US Administration will remain committed to trade liberalisation. We may have some doubts about a fast-track approach under the current circumstances. Another country to discuss this with is India, which, as we know, is expecting elections in the spring.

So as a representative of the Council who is coming from a small or medium-sized country which traditionally has an open economy, I would like to promote this, and would like to tell you that our primary goal is to finish the talks successfully, as soon as possible, but I am afraid we also have to be realistic, and I cannot promise you castles in the air.

The optimistic scenario is this: a clear favourable message from the G20 meeting which will take place in London early in April, and then the fulfilment and implementation of the commitment, which could be followed by a ministerial meeting in Geneva in June or July. There agricultural and NAMA (non-agricultural market access) modalities could be concluded. So we are all hoping for that. We will be working hard to do that, but we will see when we meet here at the end of our Presidency whether we have been successful or not.

3-330

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 3 do Silvia-Adriana Ticau (H-1038/08)

Assunto: Medidas destinadas à melhoria da eficácia energética dos edifícios

O Conselho propôs uma redução, até 2020, de 20 % das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa e uma melhoria da eficácia energética na mesma proporção. Propôs ainda que de 20% da energia consumida na União Europeia fosse proveniente de fontes renováveis. Ora, 40% do conjunto das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa provêm dos edifícios. A melhoria da eficácia energética nos edifícios pode, por conseguinte, contribuir significativamente para a redução destas emissões. Em Novembro, a Comissão propôs uma revisão da directiva relativa à eficácia energética neste sector.

Tendo em conta a importância de que esta questão se reveste para os cidadãos pelo seu potencial contributo para a redução das facturas de electricidade e de aquecimento, pode o Conselho indicar a prioridade que tenciona dar ao problema da eficácia energética dos edifícios durante o período de Janeiro a Abril de 2009?

3-331

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would like to thank Mrs Țicău for her question, which is also timely. Housing, or the issue of increasing energy efficiency and the commitment to increase energy efficiency by 20% by 2020, has to be taken seriously.

The Council shares the view that the draft revised directive on the energy efficiency of buildings is of fundamental importance for the achievement of the Community's targets on increased energy efficiency, renewable energy and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. The recent gas crisis has once again unveiled the vulnerability of the EU vis-à-vis energy dependency. Should we succeed in meeting an ambitious reduction goal, while not increasing energy security risks, we must adopt a series of short-, medium- and long-term measures that will decrease our energy dependency.

Increasing the energy efficiency of buildings is definitely among the most important of them. As a result, the Presidency is beginning to examine this draft directive at working party level. The aim of the examination is to explore difficulties in the proposal. We expect that the question of the scope of the directive will be put on the table first. This question of scope is the most important, not only in relation to possible energy savings, but also regarding the administrative burden of households. Therefore, the Czech Presidency will ensure that work continues intensively over the coming months. I have regular discussions with Martin Bursík, my colleague in the Government and the Minister of the Environment, who chairs the respective Council.

The Council will also follow closely the work on this issue in the ITRE Committee. For your information, I am meeting the Chair of the Committee after this Question Time. The Presidency is committed to making as much progress as possible, with a view to the early adoption of the directive. To that end, it plans to submit a progress report to the TTE Council in mid-June. The adoption of the Council conclusions on the Second Strategic Energy Review is envisaged for the first TTE Councils, which will be held on 19 February, and which will form the input for the March European Council meeting.

Adequate attention will also be paid to the recent Ukraine-Russia gas dispute and its consequences. A policy debate will be held on the draft Council directive on the oil stock. So, in general, the Council considers it important that the highest priority be given to the finalisation of the negotiations with the European Parliament on the third internal energy market legislative package over the coming months. The Council also recalls that energy efficiency will be addressed in relation to the wider question of energy security, the protection of the environment and, indeed, the context of the examination of the Second Strategic Energy Review.

3-332

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Vreau să știți că în raportul meu voi propune înființarea unui Fond european pentru eficiență energetică și pentru energii regenerabile, care să ajute la mobilizarea fondurilor private, dar și a fondurilor publice, pentru implementarea proiectelor de eficiență energetică pe teritoriul Uniunii Europene și doresc să am din partea Consiliului sprijin pentru această inițiativă importantă.

3-333

Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE). – Energetická účinnosť budov môže priamo viesť k úsporám pre európskych spotrebiteľov. Riešenie vidím v celoplošnom zavedení automatizovaných spotrebiteľských inteligentných meracích systémov a systémov poskytujúcich prehľad okamžitej energetickej spotreby vrátane domácností.

Čo môže Rada urobiť pre realizáciu tohto riešenia? Aký časový plán je podľa vás reálny? Mohla by Rada inšpirovať Európsky technologický inštitút v Budapešti, aby sa angažoval v problematike energetickej účinnosti budov?

3-334

Colm Burke (PPE-DE). – Has there been any discussion in Council about trying to get Member States to provide financial incentives for increasing energy efficiency, in particular for elderly people? On the one hand it would increase energy efficiency, and on the other hand it would provide employment.

3-335

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – I fully share the view that energy efficiency is an important instrument for handling both environmental concerns and energy security needs.

In fact, we have just been discussing this at home – now I will just step out of my Presidency role – and in Prague we consider two measures to be really important. The others are also important, but either in the long term or without such a huge impact. One is housing and energy efficiency. The second one is nuclear energy, but I know this is a sensitive issue for some Member States. Those are the most important in combating climate change and dealing with energy security. Therefore, finding the proper instruments to promote energy efficiency and housing is the challenge of our time.

I would like to deal with the questions on financing. The European Regional Development Fund, as was proposed by the Commission, could be used to find resources for investment in housing and energy efficiency, so this is one instrument which will be available now, also within the framework of the recovery plan.

Another possibility for countries like Romania – I know this from my own country – is just to use the emissions trading scheme, which is within the current Kyoto, so it is possible to use the income from that.

I think we have the instruments. With regard to this new directive, we will consider the debate about the scope to be the most important. Certainly, we in the Czech Presidency, in cooperation with the upcoming Swedish Presidency – for them it is a priority – will try to do our best and not to waste too much time.

3-336

Presidente. – Pergunta n° 4 do Colm Burke (H-1040/08)

Assunto: Energia, relações externas e economia durante a Presidência checa

À luz das prioridades anunciadas pela Presidência para o seu mandato, pode esta indicar o modo como tenciona integrar as três prioridades em termos de iniciativas concretas? O autor da pergunta refere-se especificamente aos debates com os parceiros de Leste sobre os corredores energéticos estratégicos susceptíveis de garantir a segurança energética e a competitividade económica da UE no futuro.

3-337

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – I want to thank Mr Burke for his question concerning the southern corridor plans and the meetings during the upcoming Czech Presidency. We will ensure that these are the three priorities – energy, external relations and the economy – which are fully integrated and interconnected and focus on the concrete initiative; this is one of them. It will in particular concentrate on the objective of ensuring reliable supplies of energy through the development of a range of energy relationships with third countries and regions and by working towards greater diversification of energy resources, as well as the transit routes.

The Presidency intends to take this work forward on the basis of the elements contained in the Commission communication on the Second Strategic Energy Review. The Council is expected to adopt a conclusion on this communication in February and energy security will be of particular focus in the spring 2009 European Council.

As part of its work, a large number of meetings with third countries or third-country organisations are planned. These meetings will deal either exclusively with energy-related themes or will cover energy among the other issues. As regards the specific discussion on energy strategic corridors to which the honourable Member refers, the Presidency is organising the following meetings. The most important are, first, the international investment conference on the Ukrainian gas transit network, which will take place in Brussels on 23 March 2009. Second, the so-called Southern Corridor Summit meeting, which we plan to organise together with the Eastern Partnership event; that will take place in Prague in early May. The aim of that meeting is to launch a mutually beneficial dialogue between the EU and both the transit and producing countries from the Caspian region. This should lead to a greater diversification of energy supply routes, suppliers and sources, and will thus strengthen the energy security of the EU. One of the specific purposes is to promote the Nabucco project.

The issue of the strategic energy corridor is also likely to be addressed during the meeting of the EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council on Energy, which will also be organised under the Czech Presidency, probably in May, just to create a run-up to the summit meeting between the EU and Russia, which we are planning for 22 May 2009. So the importance of the strategic energy corridors referred to by the honourable Members has been clearly underlined by the Ukrainian-Russian gas dispute in early January.

The Council, at its extraordinary session of 12 January 2009, which was devoted to this subject, adopted conclusions outlining a number of measures to be taken in the short, medium and long term. So the Presidency will work to ensure that appropriate and concrete follow-up is given to these measures as a part of the high priority it attaches to the issue of energy security.

3-338

Colm Burke (PPE-DE). – I would like to thank the President-in-Office for his very comprehensive reply. In fact this question was tabled before the Russia-Ukraine dispute arose. I had a feeling that it might arise at the time it did. I would like to ask him this: under Lisbon, we were talking about a common energy policy; maybe he could outline, in his capacity as President-in-Office, his opinions on the improved tool kit which Lisbon provides to address these challenges in the future and the advantages of adopting the whole Lisbon approach and Treaty.

3-339

Justas Vincas Paleckis (PSE). – Ačiū už jūsų paaiškinimus labai svarbia tema. Aš norėčiau paklausti, kaip Čekija, prezidentaujanti šalis, žiūri į *Nordstream* projektą, kuris turi ir teigiamų, ir neigiamų pusių, ir žinome, kad yra tam tikrų abejonių dėl ekologinių jo pasekmių. Taigi kaip jūs pradėdami, prezidentavimą, šį projektą vertintumėte? Ačiū.

3-340

Paul Rübig (PPE-DE). – Mich würde interessieren, ob es im ECOFIN und von Kommissar Kovács eine Initiative gibt, um bei Energieprojekten, die jetzt unmittelbar anstehen, wie Nabucco oder der Neubau von Kraftwerken, europaweit eine

progressive steuerliche Abschreibung zu initiieren, oder auf der anderen Seite Freibeträge zur Verfügung zu stellen, um so Anreize zu schaffen und diese strategischen Initiativen dementsprechend voranzutreiben.

3-341

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – All these questions are about issues which we are discussing almost on a daily basis now. On the Lisbon Treaty, we all know that it contains solidarity formulas which should help us to enforce the legal framework for better cooperation in the area of energy within the EU. That is one part of the story.

At the same time I think we have learnt some lessons during the current crisis. One thing is the solidarity as a political slogan. The other one is the need to react quickly in a time of crisis and to respond, for example, to a difficult situation which we had in Bulgaria or Slovakia during the crisis. So we need to have some improvement of the interconnections in particular in Central and Eastern Europe in the area of gas supplies. We need to have a compressor on the pipeline to be able to reverse the flow. For example, my country has it because it modernised and invested, but the Slovaks did not.

So that brings me to your question as to whether there is some investment programme to cover short- or medium-term needs – there is. In fact, today I had some meetings with the respective chairs of the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy as well as the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, because EUR 5 billion remains, which was not spent last year, and it has been agreed within the European Economic Recovery Plan to allocate that for some infrastructure projects. As far as the Commission has proposed late last month, EUR 3.5 billion out of those five should be allocated to the interconnection projects which can be realised in the next two years, 2009 to 2010, in the area of gas connections, electricity grid interconnections and connecting gas with the offshore wind turbines in the north of Europe.

So, yes, there is a plan and my view on Nord Stream is that there is a debate, we all know that. I think one lesson of the current crisis between Moscow and Kiev is this: that we should have the means to make it possible to solve these problems if they are repeated, both regarding Russia and Ukraine.

There is the Nabucco project, which should be able to bring gas to Europe from countries other than Russia, in other words the Caspian Basin. But we also should be able to diversify the transit route of gas to Europe so that this is not just one country. I think, in this respect, Ukraine is serving us as the only terrestrial supplier.

So there are some concerns about the possible environmental impact. Some Member States are raising the question, so there is no secret about that, but I think that at the end of the day we need to have diversification of both routes and suppliers.

3-342

Presidente. – Pergunta n.º 5 do Avril Doyle (H-1044/08)

Assunto: Controlo do tabaco e abandono do tabagismo

A Convenção-Quadro da OMS sobre a luta antitabaco é a primeira convenção internacional, no domínio da saúde, assinada e ratificada pela União Europeia e todos os Estados-Membros, à excepção da República Checa. Uma vez que a República Checa vai assumir a liderança dos debates respeitantes à Convenção-Quadro da OMS sobre a luta antitabaco, que planos tem a Presidência checa para ratificar a dita Convenção?

3-343

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – I see Avril Doyle and I am asking myself whether I am the other side of this question: the last time we discussed this was in the only place in this building where I as a heavy smoker can smoke! I guess that you observed that, and that is one of the reasons why I now have the obligation to answer your question. My mother was always advising me to speak truthfully at every opportunity so now I have a dilemma: to read this or to speak my mind.

But I shall use this opportunity to start at the personal level. I am a member of the 30% minority in Europe: I am a heavy smoker, and I feel terribly discriminated against in this building. I appeal to you as a person, not on behalf of the Council, to provide better conditions for appeasing our habit. But now I have to respond to this question.

The question is about the state of the ratification process in the Czech Republic. I can assure you that the ratification process of the framework convention in the Czech Republic is in progress. It has been in progress since 2003, and the new attempt to find approval in the Czech Parliament is ongoing. The new Czech Minister for Health – who, like her predecessor, smokes – has the new proposal aimed at renewing ratification and will send it to the inter-agency process, so it will reach Parliament pretty soon.

The ratification process should be concluded if we find enough votes in Parliament. In the Senate I can assure you that this is not easy when our senators are travelling in Europe and are facing the same problem as I do in this building. But I think one thing is important: that the legislation is fully implemented so all laws abide by those commitments which are part of the convention.

Regarding our approach as the Presidency: the next formal meeting in the framework of the FCTC will be the third meeting of the international negotiating body on a protocol on illicit trade in tobacco products. Here my country, as well as the Presidency, is fully committed to fighting the illicit trade in tobacco products. That will take place from 28 June to 5 July in Geneva, so we will share this somehow with our friends the Swedes, because that is the time when we, the Czechs, will hand over the Presidency to our friends in Stockholm. That is the substance of my response.

3-344

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – I would like to thank the President-in-Office. I do not mean to make him paranoid with my question. It was tabled, after all, last December.

I am anti-smoking, not anti-smokers. We all agree they need all the help they can get: nicotine replacement therapies etc. But we must recognise the damage that passive smoking does to those who do not enjoy smoking, so please do not feel personally under the spotlight here.

Could you guarantee me then that, before the end of the Czech Presidency, you will have ratified the framework convention – yes or no? It would be extremely important if you could give me guarantees on that. After all, cigarettes are the only legal product on our shop shelves that, if used by consumers according to instructions, kills one in two of the consumers. They are amazing really.

3-345

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Thank you, President-in-Office, for your honesty. You quoted your mother – well, as a mother, can I urge you to stop smoking, while sympathising with your plight in the building? If you were in Ireland, you would be completely out in the cold.

My question is: have you ever considered giving some leadership and quitting the bad habit and encouraging your senators to follow suit?

3-346

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – To conclude this rather unusual evening's debate, my mother smoked when she was pregnant, and here I am as the Deputy Prime Minister of the Czech Republic, and my brother and sister are both in very good condition. My wife smoked as well and she still smokes. We have three nice, very intelligent, kids – so those are my private views.

I notice that this issue attracts particular interest in Ireland, and I know that you have adopted the measures. The date of our ratification is in the hands of the Members of the Czech Parliament and the Senate. Parliament is sovereign.

I am now fighting in my country for the earliest possible ratification of the Lisbon Treaty. During the debate on Lisbon, I am often asked by the members of the Senate whether the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty will lead to keeping their freedom of smoking in some public spaces.

So I have a dilemma. What is more important: the Lisbon Treaty or this? But I can assure you that the Government will do whatever it can to obtain ratification of both Treaties. We signed both Treaties, and the responsibility of the Government is to do the best it can.

3-347

Presidente. – As perguntas que, por falta de tempo, não obtiveram resposta, obtê-la-ão ulteriormente por escrito (ver Anexo).

3-347-500

Presidente. – O período de perguntas ao Conselho está encerrado.

(A sessão, suspensa às 19h15, é reiniciada às 21h00)

3-348

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. GÉRARD ONESTA
Vice-président

3-349

15 - Les conséquences dramatiques du passage de la tempête "Klaus" dans le sud de l'Europe (débat)

3-350

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la déclaration de la Commission sur les conséquences dramatiques du passage de la tempête "Klaus" dans le sud de l'Europe.

3-351

Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the European Commission wishes to express its sadness at the number of lives claimed by storm Klaus and sends its condolences to the French, Italian and Spanish families that have lost loved ones. This is indeed a human tragedy, which has had a devastating impact on people's lives, homes and businesses. It is also an ecological disaster.

While this storm was extremely powerful, it only affected a narrow band of territory, and national resources have been able to cope with the immediate disaster response.

For this reason, the Community Civil Protect Mechanism was not activated. However, the Commission's Monitoring and Information Centre has been in close contact with the concerned Member States from the first moments when the storm was forecast.

Other Member States were aware of the situation and were getting prepared to provide support to the affected regions. For example, the Czech Republic spontaneously offered its assistance.

The Commission is now cooperating with the authorities of the Member States affected in order to identify options for EU support. Possibilities may include through the EU Solidarity Fund or a reprogramming of the structural and rural development funds.

Storm Klaus is an unpleasant reminder that natural disasters are a growing threat for all EU Member States. Devastating floods hit Central Europe in 2000 and 2002, the UK in 2007, and Romania and EU neighbours last year. The 2003 heatwave claimed tens of thousands of lives. In 2003 and 2007 forest fires ravaged Portugal and Greece. These events give us an idea of how climate change is likely to affect the EU's future because, as the climate changes, we can expect more extreme weather events.

The Member States and the Community need to combine their strengths to prevent disasters, to limit their impacts and to improve the Union's disaster response capacity.

The Commission will shortly adopt a Communication on 'a Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters'. We look forward to receiving feedback from the Parliament on the ideas that are set out.

The Commission would also stress the importance of moving forward on the revision of the Solidarity Fund regulation. The proposal helps to accelerate the rate of response by allowing for advance payments, and it contains simpler criteria for an activation of the Fund in less time. While the Parliament largely supported the Commission proposal, there has been no progress in the Council.

These initiatives are contributing to shape a genuine European disaster management policy, and the Commission hopes that the European Parliament will continue to support its efforts to reinforce the EU's capacity to deal with natural and man-made disasters.

3-352

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΡΟΔΗ ΚΡΑΤΣΑ-ΤΣΑΓΚΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ
Αντιπρόεδρος

3-353

Christine De Veyrac, au nom du groupe PPE-DE. – Madame la Présidente, je m'exprime également au nom de notre collègue Alain Lamassoure. En novembre 1999, j'étais intervenue dans ce même hémicycle à la suite, déjà, de la tempête qui avait sévi dans le sud-ouest de la France, pour faire appel à la solidarité européenne quand des catastrophes naturelles de grande ampleur dévastaient nos pays. Il y a dix ans, on m'avait répondu qu'il n'existait aucun fonds européen pour venir en aide à nos concitoyens dans le malheur.

Depuis 1999, si malheureusement les catastrophes naturelles continuent de faire des morts en Europe et de provoquer des dégâts matériels importants, l'action européenne, elle, s'est heureusement renforcée avec la création en 2002, à l'initiative de la Commission et du commissaire Barnier, du Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne, un fonds qui nous permet d'intervenir rapidement, efficacement et dans un cadre souple.

Dans les circonstances actuelles, il me semble nécessaire d'actionner ce fonds pour venir en aide aux régions touchées, et je rejoins en ce sens la demande exprimée par le gouvernement français de l'activer dans les plus brefs délais. J'ai noté, Madame la Commissaire, la volonté de la Commission d'accélérer les choses. En effet, il y a une urgence concernant les infrastructures endommagées.

Il y a également une urgence pour la forêt. Je voudrais insister sur ce sujet, parce que la tempête a ravagé entre 60 et 70 % de la forêt dans le sud de la Gironde et des Landes, alors que cette forêt, qui est une des premières d'Europe, se remettait à peine des dégâts de 1996 et de 1999. Vous savez qu'il n'y a pas d'assurance pour ce genre de dommage, et les sylviculteurs,

aujourd'hui, se trouvent totalement démunis face à ce désastre. Nous devons leur prouver notre solidarité et aider à la reconstruction du patrimoine naturel de ces régions.

Avant de conclure, permettez-moi d'avoir une pensée pour les victimes de la tempête Klaus, en France, en Espagne et en Italie et permettez-moi d'apporter mon soutien à leurs familles.

3-354

Kader Arif, *au nom du groupe PSE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, les images de la tempête de 1999 – cela vient d'être rappelé – qui s'était abattue sur le sud-ouest de la France, causant de terribles dégâts, sont encore gravées dans la mémoire collective.

C'est peu dire que de souligner que l'Europe n'était pas préparée à revivre, si peu de temps après, un tel drame. Certains y voient un coup de la fatalité, j'y vois plutôt une illustration macabre du dérèglement climatique que vous venez d'évoquer, Madame la Commissaire, auquel nous n'apportons que des ébauches de solution alors qu'il y a pourtant urgence. C'est une réalité à laquelle nous devons faire face avec responsabilité. Nous devons malheureusement nous préparer à affronter encore bien d'autres catastrophes naturelles.

Les 24 et 25 janvier derniers, la tempête Klaus, qui s'est abattue sur le sud de l'Europe, a fait onze morts en France, quatorze en Espagne, trois en Italie. Elle a causé des dégâts considérables, détruisant des écoles, des lycées, de nombreux logements, privant des milliers de personnes d'électricité, de chauffage, d'eau potable, de téléphone, et laissant certains secteurs économiques dans une situation critique, à l'image de la filière bois.

Si je tiens ici à exprimer ma solidarité avec les familles des victimes ainsi qu'avec toutes les personnes sinistrées, de même que mon soutien aux élus locaux, je profite de cette tribune pour lancer un appel à la Communauté européenne car, il faut le dire, une telle situation impose une réponse européenne et d'abord une solidarité européenne.

Certes, en France, le statut de catastrophe naturelle a été reconnu, ce qui facilitera le soutien aux personnes sinistrées, mais cela n'enlève rien à la nécessité de mettre en œuvre une action européenne coordonnée, afin de compléter les efforts des États membres pour protéger les personnes, l'environnement et les biens dans les communes et les régions sinistrées.

Très concrètement, cela implique d'abord de centraliser les informations au niveau européen afin d'obtenir une évaluation précise des dégâts. Ensuite, il est indispensable de débloquer les fonds nécessaires à l'accompagnement des collectivités locales qui font face à d'immenses défis, notamment soutenir les services publics, qui ont fait un travail exceptionnel et dont nous avons grand besoin afin de remettre en état les infrastructures et les équipements dans les domaines de l'énergie, de l'approvisionnement en eau, des eaux usées, des transports et des télécommunications, de la santé et de l'enseignement.

Les catastrophes précédentes ont révélé l'urgence d'une action européenne et ont permis d'intégrer la prévention des risques naturels comme l'un des objectifs du FEDER. L'Europe doit désormais faire la preuve de sa capacité de réaction et de traduction concrète de sa solidarité. J'espère donc, mais vous venez de l'exprimer, que la Commission entendra ce message et qu'elle saura mobiliser tous les moyens nécessaires pour répondre à cette situation d'urgence, notamment via le Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne et l'instrument financier pour la protection civile.

Enfin, pour conclure, je souhaiterais rappeler que, comme les incendies en Grèce en 2007, cette violente tempête a révélé la nécessité d'une force de protection civile mobilisable sur tous les terrains de crise. Je souhaiterais entendre, Madame la Commissaire, votre avis sur ce sujet ainsi que votre réponse à la demande du Parlement européen qui, dans sa résolution du 27 avril 2006, avait demandé la création d'un observatoire européen sur les catastrophes naturelles afin d'assurer une réponse européenne plus efficace lorsque surviennent ces malheureux événements.

3-355

Jean Marie Beaupuy, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, le 18 novembre dernier, je disais ceci à cette même place: "Nous ne savons pas quelle sera la prochaine catastrophe, ni quelle sera son ampleur, mais nous sommes certains d'une chose, c'est qu'il y aura bientôt une nouvelle catastrophe. Et, à ce moment-là, nos concitoyens, qui sont, depuis cinquante ans, habitués à voir construire une Europe qui se veut solidaire, nous poseront la question: 'Qu'avez-vous fait?'". Je répète, je disais cela, ici dans cette enceinte, en novembre dernier.

Dans ce même hémicycle, en novembre 2006, deux ans avant, je disais à peu près la même chose. S'il y a bien un domaine pour lequel tous nos concitoyens européens attendent une réponse communautaire efficace, c'est celui des réponses à apporter aux catastrophes naturelles.

Chacun a pu le constater lors du tsunami, etc., disais-je, c'est pourquoi, avec mon groupe, je soutiens la mise en place d'actions préventives et d'une capacité à réagir très vite à l'issue d'un drame. À ce titre, je tiens à souligner la qualité du rapport Barnier, qui a bien posé le problème et qui apporte de bonnes réponses en termes d'efficacité et aussi en termes de subsidiarité. Madame la Commissaire, ce rapport, nous l'avons tous conservé avec un grand intérêt parce qu'il est éminemment pratique et éminemment concret. Il contient même des éléments budgétaires et explique qu'avec 10 % du

Fonds de solidarité, le financement est assuré. Il explique de manière très pragmatique comment opérer avec les forces vives de chacun des États.

Avec les douze propositions contenues dans ce rapport Barnier, nous avons tout pour mettre en œuvre une action européenne qui, à quelques semaines des élections du mois de juin prochain, aurait montré, s'il le fallait, l'utilité et l'efficacité d'une véritable solidarité opérationnelle européenne.

Vous venez de nous dire, Madame la Commissaire, que vous attendiez l'appui du Parlement européen. Vous l'avez eu, cet appui. Vous l'avez encore. Que fait le Conseil, puisque vous nous dites que c'est le Conseil? Le Conseil n'est pas là ce soir. Nous espérons qu'au-delà de ce débat, il entende parfaitement notre appel, non pas un appel au secours, non pas une nouvelle exclamation surprise sur la tragédie qui vient de survenir, mais qu'il entende bien la question que je posais récemment: "Qu'avez-vous fait?"

3-356

Gérard Onesta, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, j'aimerais qu'on s'interroge un petit peu sur la nature de l'exercice que nous faisons ce soir. J'ai l'impression qu'on fait cela souvent, trop souvent. Chaque fois qu'il y a une catastrophe, on se retrouve ici, dans cet hémicycle, et commence le chœur des pleureuses où l'on dit, bien évidemment, que c'est dramatique ce qui vient d'arriver, que nous nous inclinons devant les victimes.

Bien sûr, je fais cela comme tout le monde, mais j'ai l'impression que notre rôle ne s'arrête pas là. Notre rôle, c'est peut-être, comme le disait notre collègue à l'instant, d'envisager la suite, car d'autres catastrophes environnementales vont venir. Nous l'avons encore dit ce matin, à travers notre vote sur le rapport Florenz. Nous savons que le climat est de plus en plus dérangé. Les tempêtes du siècle arrivent maintenant chaque décennie et bientôt chaque année. Quand ce n'est pas une tempête, c'est une inondation, quand ce n'est pas une inondation, ce sont des feux de forêt dramatiques.

Face à cela, que fait l'Europe? Je sais très bien que le Conseil ne voit pas plus loin que son nombril national. La juxtaposition de vingt-sept nombrils ne fait pas encore un grand projet continental. Nous en souffrons malheureusement à chaque drame. On nous dit "appel à la solidarité", mais sur la base de quels fonds? Je me rappelle, à la commission des budgets, quand on discutait des fonds, justement pour le climat, on parlait de quelques dizaines de millions d'euros. Cette seule tempête a coûté 1,4 milliard! Combien faudra-t-il payer d'ardoises au niveau des assurances pour qu'on se rende compte que protéger l'environnement et le climat, ce n'est pas une charge, c'est un investissement sur l'avenir.

On nous reparle, encore aujourd'hui, des besoins de mobiliser les forces vives européennes quand il y a un drame. Mais on disait cela déjà, je m'en souviens, dans cet hémicycle, après l'explosion d'AZF dans ma ville, en 2001. On disait qu'il fallait envisager ce corps d'intervention européenne pour, en cas de drame humain, montrer qu'en Europe, le mot "solidarité" n'est pas seulement un concept vide, mais que nous intervenons concrètement. Où est, tant d'années après, cette force d'intervention européenne?

Vraiment, je vous assure, chers collègues, j'étais chez moi à Toulouse quand la tempête est passée. Je sais ce qu'est maintenant un drame majeur au niveau environnemental. Si j'avais besoin de le savoir, maintenant je l'ai vécu dans la chair de ma maison, dans les tuiles qui ont été arrachées, dans les arbres qui ont été couchés. Donc, je sais maintenant ce qu'ont souffert ces populations, des gens qui ont vu, en une nuit, le travail d'une vie complètement détruit.

Mais, tant que nous, ici, dans ce Parlement, vous, Madame la Commissaire, à la Commission, et les absents de ces bancs désespérément vides du Conseil ce soir, tant que tous nous n'aurons pas compris qu'il faut se doter de vrais moyens budgétaires pour lutter contre les catastrophes, et ne pas se contenter de discours creux, tant qu'on ne mettra pas en œuvre une solidarité européenne à travers la mise en place concrète d'une force d'intervention civique, rapide et de taille continentale, nous continuerons ici, drame après drame, à faire, une fois de plus, uniquement le chœur des pleureuses.

La vraie réponse à Klaus, la tempête, c'est peut-être ce matin que nous l'avons donnée en préparant Copenhague, et c'est peut-être demain, Madame la Commissaire en débloquant enfin des fonds et en créant enfin ce service civique qui nous manque tant au niveau européen.

3-357

Jean-Claude Martinez (NI). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, la tempête appelée "Klaus" en allemand, soit "Nicolas" en français, a dévasté huit départements de mon sud-ouest de la France, et plus spécialement les Landes, d'où la première conséquence sur la forêt. L'équivalent de six années de récolte de bois sont par terre, soit 50 millions de mètres cubes de bois chablis ou volis sur 300 000 hectares.

La première des choses à faire, c'est de dégager la forêt pour éviter le pourrissement du bois. Il faut 5 à 10 euros de prime par mètre cube de bois sorti, c'est-à-dire de l'ordre de 500 millions, soit le montant de l'aide française à la presse. Après, il va falloir réensemencer, replanter, ce qui représente un trou de vingt ans dans la filière bois. Or, cette filière va du bûcheron au café où il prend un pot, en passant par les transporteurs, les pépiniéristes, les vendeurs, etc.

Deuxième économie touchée: celle des éleveurs aviaires, ovins, bovins. Ce sont les toitures arrachées, les animaux perdus, les réserves d'aliments détruites. On voit là la nécessité d'avoir un fonds européen d'assurance agricole contre les risques climatiques et sanitaires. La Présidence française en a parlé; la Présidence tchèque devrait le faire.

Troisièmes victimes silencieuses, car n'en parle jamais: les personnes âgées et isolées dans des villages qui, en France, n'ont toujours pas l'électricité. Il faut créer une stratégie européenne "Climat quatrième âge", comme "Climat énergie", c'est-à-dire traiter des conséquences du climat sur les millions de personnes de plus de 80 ans ou 85 ans. Il y a là une quatrième économie moderne à créer pour sortir de la crise et éviter le Rwanda gériatrique européen où nous allons, une économie avec du bâtiment moderne, avec une recherche pharmaceutique, médicale, un nouveau maillage pour éviter le Gabon médical continental. Et surtout, surtout, il faut éviter que ces accidents climatiques soient l'occasion de faire du Darwin et de l'élimination naturelle, alors qu'il faut construire une Europe de la vie.

3-358

Maria Badia i Cutchet (PSE). – Señora Presidenta, señora Comisaria, señoras y señores diputados, antes que nada querría agradecer las palabras de solidaridad de la señora Comisaria.

Hemos dicho ya, aquí, lo que ocurrió los días 24 y 25 de enero, en que muchos países del sur de la Unión sufrieron las inclemencias de una importante tormenta de vientos, con velocidades cercanas a los doscientos kilómetros por hora en gran parte de la Península Ibérica, y lluvias, ya que en pocas horas cayó el 30 % de la lluvia de todo un año.

Esto dejó como resultado importantes daños materiales en bienes, servicios y espacio público, tanto en núcleos rurales como urbanos, graves cortes de electricidad y lo más irreparable: la pérdida de once vidas humanas en el conjunto de España por derrumbes y accidentes causados por las fuertes rachas de viento.

Uno de los sucesos más trágicos fue la muerte de cuatro niños, de entre nueve y doce años, en la localidad catalana de Sant Boi de Llobregat, cuando el viento arrasó un pabellón en el que jugaban al béisbol.

Al margen de lamentar la pérdida de numerosas vidas humanas, irrecuperables, y de solidarizarnos con el dolor de sus familias, la Unión Europea debe implicarse, como ha hecho en otras ocasiones, movilizándolo, sea el Fondo de Solidaridad o el fondo que crea más oportuno, en la reparación de los daños materiales causados por esta catástrofe natural.

En Cataluña, veinte mil hectáreas de masa forestal se han visto afectadas, un 75 % de las cuales tiene afectaciones graves o muy graves, sobre las que es necesario actuar para reducir el futuro riesgo de incendio, a sabiendas también de que esta tarea se debe completar antes del verano.

Del mismo modo, muchos lechos de río, torrentes y otros cursos de agua han acumulado residuos vegetales y de otro tipo que pueden crear barreras o tapones con el riesgo de producir inundaciones a escala local.

A la vista de estos y muchos otros efectos y conscientes de que no disponemos aún de la cuantificación total de los daños materiales, que, por supuesto, mi país facilitará a través de una solicitud de intervención del fondo, consideramos que la Comisión Europea debe implicarse en la recuperación de la normalidad en estos territorios, complementando el enorme esfuerzo público de los Estados afectados, y conceder prioridad a la reparación de los graves daños causados con el fin de recuperar cuanto antes las condiciones de vida y la estabilidad económica de estos territorios, porque supone un freno a la actividad económica y un riesgo para el medio natural, pérdida de producciones agrícolas, paro de la actividad de muchas empresas, caída masiva de árboles, etc.

Y por ello, a la vista de las características y los efectos de esta tormenta, pido a la Comisión que ponga cuanto antes a disposición estos fondos, pensados principalmente para los casos de catástrofes naturales con repercusiones graves en la vida, el medio natural o la economía de un Estado miembro o de regiones de la Unión. El restablecimiento del funcionamiento de las infraestructuras, el equipamiento de los sectores de energía y aguas potables y la limpieza de las zonas siniestradas serían parte de los objetos de las operaciones subvencionables.

Es por ello, señora Comisaria, le pido que, cuanto antes, cuando reciban toda la información que necesiten, pongan en marcha la posibilidad de movilizar esos fondos.

3-359

Anne Laperrouze (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, le bilan, après le passage de cette tempête, est lourd, comme l'ont rappelé mes collègues. Il y a des victimes en France, en Espagne, et ce soir nous pensons à elles et nous pensons à leurs familles. 200 000 hectares de forêts ont été détruits dans le sud-ouest de la France.

En fait, cette tempête a ravagé 60 % de la forêt landaise. 1,7 million de foyers ont été privés d'électricité au plus fort de la tempête, 3 200 en sont encore privés dans les Landes. Nous avons été des milliers à souffrir aussi de coupures de téléphone, mais aussi de ruptures d'approvisionnement en eau. Nombreux sont encore les points de blocage liés à des

encombrements de la route par des arbres, des lignes électriques, des inondations ou des affaissements de terrain. Les services s'acharnent pour remettre tout en état le plus rapidement possible.

Si je me félicite que le gouvernement français se soit engagé formellement à soumettre un dossier pour que les régions françaises sinistrées puissent bénéficier de ce fonds, je déplore que la Présidence française n'ait pas jugé nécessaire de faire avancer la révision de ce fonds.

Ce fonds, vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Commissaire et mes collègues aussi, est toujours bloqué au Conseil des ministres. Pour le Parlement, il s'agit de couvrir tout grand événement naturel dévastateur provoquant des dommages graves pour la population et pour l'environnement, comme des inondations, des incendies et des sécheresses. Mais nous allons plus loin en incluant également des phénomènes déclenchés par l'homme, comme des catastrophes causées par des attaques terroristes.

Notre Parlement s'est aussi prononcé en faveur de l'abaissement du seuil d'intervention. Or, si nous nous demandons si ce Fonds de solidarité fonctionne pour nos régions touchées, nous constatons qu'on risquerait d'être en dessous du seuil de dommage. Or, c'est une situation où, finalement, plusieurs pays sont concernés. Donc je crois que ce seuil, devrait être revu également pour montrer vraiment que la solidarité européenne peut exister.

Vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Commissaire, et mes collègues ont souligné que cela va se répéter avec les effets du changement climatique. La Commission a déjà aussi fait part d'une communication sur l'adaptation au changement climatique.

Il est important que ce Fonds de solidarité soit désormais un véritable instrument européen de protection des citoyens. Il est temps que l'Europe montre que, dans des situations dramatiques, elle est là pour protéger les citoyens.

3-360

Gilles Savary (PSE). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais d'abord, évidemment, m'associer à l'expression des condoléances et de la compassion que l'on doit aux familles qui ont été endeuillées d'abord, et à toutes celles qui sont sinistrées, en particulier à de nombreuses personnes isolées qui manquent encore aujourd'hui d'électricité, d'eau ou de services publics.

Je vous ai entendue, Madame la Commissaire, nous promettre – et je crois que vous avez eu raison – de renforcer les dispositifs de prévention des crises, mais ce dont il est question, s'il vous plaît, ce soir, c'est de la réparation de la dernière.

C'est la troisième tempête catastrophique en vingt ans. La première, on l'oublie, c'était en juillet 1988, en Bretagne. Elle détient toujours le record de vitesse des vents: plus de 250 km/heure. La seconde, elle était d'une ampleur inouïe, c'était celle du 27 décembre 1999. Elle a mis à bas l'essentiel de notre massif forestier, une première fois. Et la troisième, c'est celle du 24 janvier 2009. Si j'en ai la mémoire, c'est que j'habite en Gironde, tout près du massif forestier girondin.

La première des choses à faire, c'est de se poser la question de savoir quelle peut être la plus-value de l'Union européenne. Dans la filière bois, la situation est catastrophique, et ce qui nous menace, c'est que les forestiers arrêtent de faire de la forêt. C'est-à-dire qu'aujourd'hui, certains d'entre eux considèrent que ce métier est devenu intenable.

Nous devons donc mettre en place un plan, et moi je suis de ceux qui pensaient qu'il était possible d'envisager – c'était déjà il y a dix ans – une organisation commune de crise, de façon à ce qu'on puisse écouler tout le bois qui est aujourd'hui mis sur le marché bien involontairement, sans nuire au prix, c'est-à-dire en bloquant les approvisionnements d'autres régions européennes, en finançant le transport et en faisant en sorte que ces parcelles puissent être replantées très vite, sinon, je pense qu'elles feront l'objet de spéculations, voire d'abandon. Il y a là un problème qui intéresse très directement l'Union européenne.

Deuxièmement, je pense aussi aux ostréiculteurs. C'est une profession qui, aujourd'hui, est sinistrée. Elle l'a déjà été en 2002 après une autre catastrophe qui n'était pas naturelle du tout, celle du naufrage du *Prestige*, et, à présent, les ostréiculteurs du bassin d'Arcachon désespèrent eux aussi de pouvoir remonter la pente.

Enfin, je voudrais que l'on mobilise le Fonds de solidarité de l'Union européenne. Je m'associe, évidemment, à ce qu'a dit Mme Laperrouze. Aujourd'hui, le Conseil n'est pas là. Il n'aura ni mal aux oreilles, ni mal au cœur, mais je trouve qu'il est extrêmement dommage qu'il ait refusé de modifier le règlement et que ce fonds soit aujourd'hui si difficile à mobiliser.

Je vous pose la question de savoir, d'ailleurs, si le gouvernement français lui-même l'a mobilisé. Je suis de ceux qui œuvreront pour qu'il le fasse, parce que pense qu'il est très important, à quelques mois des élections, que nos concitoyens sachent que l'Europe de la solidarité existe, et que ce n'est pas simplement l'Europe du marché.

3-361

Rosa Miguélez Ramos (PSE). – Señora Presidenta, señora Comisaria, el pasado 23 de enero yo estaba en Galicia cuando vientos de casi doscientos kilómetros por hora asolaron mi región: más de cuarenta mil hectáreas, señora Comisaria, de masa forestal.

Galicia es la zona de mayor densidad boscosa de la Unión Europea y, tras el paso del ciclón, cientos de miles de árboles cortaron carreteras y tumbaron más de quinientos kilómetros de líneas eléctricas de alta y baja tensión que aún no están totalmente reparadas.

Más de trescientos mil clientes, entre los que yo misma me encontraba, sufrimos cortes, en algunos casos de varios días, en el suministro eléctrico y también en el servicio telefónico.

La tempestad produjo daños a las personas y produjo graves destrozos en viviendas, infraestructuras, explotaciones agrícolas y ganaderas, en comercios y en industrias, en instalaciones deportivas y también en dotaciones públicas, en dotaciones municipales.

La respuesta del Gobierno de mi región, de Galicia, a este temporal, que es históricamente el de mayor impacto conocido, permitió aprobar rápidamente ayudas por un importe de diecisiete millones de euros para compensar, en un primer momento, a los afectados y subvencionar la reparación de los daños.

Pero ya hemos sabido, y algunos lo han mencionado aquí, que, el pasado 26 de enero, los dos Estados miembros más afectados, Francia y España, solicitaron ayuda europea para hacer frente a los daños causados por este temporal. Puesto que la definición de los daños que hemos sufrido responde a la de catástrofe extraordinaria que recoge el Reglamento del Fondo de Solidaridad en vigor, los Gobiernos de los dos Estados miembros anunciaron que habían iniciado los trabajos para tramitar las solicitudes de ayuda para acogerse al Fondo.

Pero, una vez más, nos encontramos, como en el caso reciente de las inundaciones en Rumanía, con que los requisitos que exige el reglamento son tan restrictivos que impiden *de facto* que esta catástrofe, señora Comisaria, se considere grave.

Quiero simplemente recordar aquí, como usted lo ha hecho ya, como lo han hecho otros de mis honorables colegas, que la Comisión presentó su propuesta en el año 2005, que el Parlamento emitió su dictamen para reformar el Reglamento del Fondo en 2006 y que, desde entonces, este asunto está bloqueado en el Consejo, que lleva más de dos años sentado encima de esa propuesta de reforma.

Por todo ello le pido, señora Comisaria, puesto que las circunstancias son excepcionales y la catástrofe ha tenido repercusiones graves en las condiciones de vida y la estabilidad económica de las regiones afectadas, que active el fondo como prueba de solidaridad hacia los Estados miembros afectados, pero, sobre todo, hacia los ciudadanos afectados, dándoles asistencia financiera, porque yo creo que ésta es, si bien no muy significativa por su monto económico, la expresión directa y urgente de la solidaridad europea.

3-362

Flaviu Călin Rus (PPE-DE). – Înainte de toate, doresc să îmi exprim solidaritatea față de familiile care au avut de suferit de pe urma acestui dezastru. Am văzut cu toții care au fost consecințele dramatice rezultate în urma trecerii furtunii Klaus și, de asemenea, am văzut care au fost și primele intervenții la fața locului, atât din partea statelor afectat, cât și din partea altor state europene.

Deoarece vorbim mai mult despre efecte și despre fonduri de ajutorare, doresc să întreb Comisia care sunt, de fapt, proiectele concrete în măsură să pună în aplicare mecanisme de prevenție pentru astfel de cazuri pentru ca, cel puțin în viitor, să nu mai avem pierderi de vieți omenești?

3-363

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Madam President, can I just add my sympathy, as others have this evening, to the families who are deeply and sadly affected by this storm, and offer my support for calls for greater flexibility in the Solidarity Fund.

But there is a wider question as well to which I would draw your attention. It is not as grave as what you are discussing here but in all Member States there are occasional natural disasters and I think of counties that I represent – Offaly, Laois and Louth – where there was very unnatural and unseasonal flooding. A small number of families were deeply affected by it, not enough for anyone to notice, but they will suffer serious consequences. Perhaps we need to look at funding under rural development or the common agricultural policy and establish a hardship fund to look after cases like this which are there and which need assistance.

3-364

Kathy Sinnott (IND/DEM). – Madam President, the Commissioner mentioned several disasters in her opening speech, and among them the heatwave in France several years ago which claimed the lives of between 12 000 and 14 000 people.

Just to set the record straight on this, it was not a storm or a flash flood, or anything like the other natural disasters. That heatwave lasted five to six weeks, and the deaths came over a period of five to six weeks. Almost all of the people who died were either disabled or elderly and in nursing homes or residential care, or in respite while their families were on holiday. The French Government at no time recalled the families or recalled staff from their holidays, nor did it call in the army or any other rescue services. They just allowed people to die, week after week.

I have spoken to many people in France about this incident, as I am involved in the Commission-funded project on rescuing people with disabilities in disasters. It was a scandal, and a scandal that no one has put their finger on or identified. I would ask the Commission to investigate that heatwave, investigate the level of deaths and realise that France did nothing about it, and yet when the autumn came and all those people had been buried, there were 14 000 fewer people on their social services register.

3-365

Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, let me say that all of us have at some time experienced environmental, natural or man-made disasters in our respective countries. That is why I fully share both your sentiments and your concerns.

The Solidarity Fund has to date offered assistance to 20 Member States, including four times to France, to Germany, Greece, Cyprus, Portugal and many others – 20 altogether – but I know, and I share your view, that we should improve. We should make it even more practical and give greater assistance to Member States. We shall continue our efforts to have those improvements approved by the Council. I am glad that we have Parliament's approval for this, and your support will be a great help in our efforts.

As I said in my introduction, the Commission is fully committed to assisting France and Spain, which were hit by winter storm Klaus, and will mobilise all relevant European instruments to express European solidarity towards them. The Commission is ready to examine the possibility of mobilising the Solidarity Fund but, as a first step, we need an application for this from France and Spain. They have 10 weeks to apply for that assistance.

I was asked whether we have in the pipeline other measures to improve the system of solidarity to Member States for natural disasters, and so would also like to mention that, apart from the review of the Solidarity Fund, we have an upcoming communication whose objective is to identify measures that could be included in a Community strategy for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters.

To sum up, it is the view of the Commission that the Solidarity Fund is already a very useful instrument but, of course, there is scope for improvement, and we shall continue our efforts to that end.

3-366

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 142 του Κανονισμού)

3-367

Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE), písomne. – Búrka Klaus, ktorá sa 23. – 25. januára prehnala juhozápadnou Európou, po sebe zanechala obrovské škody. Vietor počas búrky dosiahol v nárazoch rýchlosť až do 194 km/h. Búrka si vyžiadala 18 obetí v Španielsku, Francúzsku a Nemecku. Počet obetí by bol ešte vyšší, keby nefungoval systém včasného varovania.

S pocitom spolupatričnosti sme v našich televíznych vysielaniach na Slovensku sledovali strašnú tragédiu, keď v obci Sant Boi de Llobregat prišli o život štyri deti po tom, ako sa zrútila strecha športovej haly. Chcela by som vysloviť úprimnú sústrasť všetkým rodinám, ktoré stratili svojich členov rodiny.

Fond solidarity je užitočným nástrojom. Bol založený v EÚ po záplavách v auguste 2002. Jeho pomoc je určená členským a prístupujúcim štátom, ktoré boli postihnuté veľkou prírodnou katastrofou. Ide o katastrofy, pri ktorých sú odhadované škody vyššie než 0,6 % HDP postihnutého štátu. Aj Slovensko po víchrici v novembri 2004, ktorá zničila 2,5 milióna kubíkov ihličnatého dreva, dostalo 5.667.578 € z tohto fondu.

Mnohé katastrofy, ktorých počet sa v dôsledku klimatických zmien v Európe neustále zvyšuje, nás nútia prijať také pravidlá, ktoré zabezpečia, aby sme dokázali poskytnúť finančnú pomoc veľmi rýchlo a flexibilne, okamžite po katastrofe, ale rovnako aj na realizáciu preventívnych opatrení proti rôznym prírodným katastrofám.

3-368

16 - Χρήση παλαιών ελαίων με PCB σε εργοστάσιο ανακύκλωσης τροφών στην Ιρλανδία (συζήτηση)

3-369

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο είναι η δήλωση της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τη χρήση παλαιών ελαίων με PCB σε εργοστάσιο ανακύκλωσης τροφών στην Ιρλανδία.

3-370

Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission is fully aware of the high risks of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) for human health and the environment.

Incidents like those in Belgium in 1999, and in Ireland last year, have demonstrated once again that even small amounts of PCBs can cause severe contamination of the feed and food chain.

Over the past three decades, the EU has established legislation to decrease the release of PCBs and dioxins into the environment, with the objective of reducing human exposure and protecting human health and the environment.

Nevertheless, as equipment containing PCBs typically has a long life expectancy, even after the ban of PCBs in 1985 significant amounts remain in use and are one source of possible human exposure.

In particular, the Directive on the disposal of PCBs, Directive 96/59/EC of September 1996, provides the appropriate tools to ensure the disposal of equipment and waste containing PCBs as soon as possible, and for large equipment before the end of 2010.

However, there remain significant gaps in the full implementation of this legislation. The Commission had to launch infringement procedures against most Member States concerning the obligation to establish inventories of large PCB-containing equipment and PCB disposal plans.

As a result of these infringement procedures, the overall situation has improved. Currently only two such cases are still open, but are about to be closed.

All Member States have communicated their plans for the decontamination and/or disposal of inventoried equipment and the PCBs contained therein, and for the collection and subsequent disposal of equipment containing less than five cubic decimetres of PCBs (as required by Article 11 of the Directive).

Nevertheless, additional efforts are needed. In order to ensure the efficiency of PCB disposal plans, Member States have to further improve the implementation of existing legislation on PCBs and of European waste legislation in general.

The Commission is placing increasing importance on the proper implementation of EU waste legislation, and is actively supporting Member States in enhancing the implementation of their national waste legislation.

The feed hygiene Regulation No 1831/2003 lays down minimum requirements for feed hygiene which apply from the primary production of feed (at farm level), through the production, the processing and the distribution, to the point of feeding the animals.

Feed business operators (FBOs) should put in place, implement and maintain procedures based on the HACCP principles. This means the identification of critical control points and the identification of, *inter alia*, possible chemical contamination when using the direct heating process to dry feed materials.

The responsibility for compliance with these requirements rests with feed business operators, although the adequacy of the measures put in place by FBOs must be verified by the competent authorities of the Member States. In most cases, this must be done by an on-the-spot visit.

Furthermore, general principles on the organisation of official controls laid down in the Official Control on Food and Feed Regulation require Member States to ensure that controls are carried out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency. These official controls must include controls on feed businesses.

The role of the Commission is set out in Article 45 of the Official Control on Food and Feed Regulation (EC) No 853/2004. Commission experts carry out audits of the competent authorities in the Member States to verify that controls take place in compliance with Community law.

A general audit of Ireland under this article was carried out across a number of sectors in 2008 and a report will be available shortly. The list of establishments to be audited is jointly decided between the national competent authorities and the auditors from the FVO.

The plant mentioned in the question was not one of those subjected to inspection in the 2008 general audit.

In the Irish dioxin contamination incident, the use of contaminated breadcrumbs as animal feed was identified to be the source of contamination. The breadcrumbs were produced from bakery waste (out-of-date biscuits), which are dried using a direct heating process. In a direct heating process the combustion gases are in direct contact with the feed material to be dried. The fuel used was apparently contaminated with PCB transformer oil. The relevant responsibilities of the different actors, from the breadcrumb producer to the fuel supplier, and so on, will be identified by an ongoing legal investigation.

I would like to stress the major importance of a comprehensive approach to be adopted for the risk classification, which includes possible risks related not only to the nature of the incoming material, in this case breadcrumbs, but also to the process itself.

3-371

Mairead McGuinness, *on behalf of the PPE-DE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commission for that very detailed statement on this subject.

I think the reason we are debating this tonight is because we want to learn lessons and ensure that it does not happen again. The difficulty is that, back in 1999, when we discovered a problem in Belgium, we thought then that we had tightened up our rules sufficiently so that there would not be another incident. However, we are where we are now, and we know the consequences of the system's failure, in terms not just of money – although that is hugely significant for the European Union, for the Irish Exchequer, for taxpayers – but of the loss of confidence among consumers, and the damage done generally to the Irish food producing sector in terms of markets.

I am happy that we have made progress now and are restoring our name on the international marketplace, but I am also acutely aware that farmers throughout the European Union also face problems because of the Irish difficulty. That is why I think that tonight's debate is not just about Ireland. In my view, it is clear from your statement that this problem that occurred in Ireland has the potential to happen in other Member States. So that is, I suppose, where the starting point for this debate must be.

We know that this oil should not have got into the animal feed chain. What we are trying to find out is how that happened and – as you rightly say – that is the subject of a police investigation with a cross-border dimension to it. We will, I hope, find out the exact trail of events so that we can avoid a similar occurrence.

But it also raises another question, which you have alluded to, and that is how we handle waste or surplus food. Recycling is now 'the thing to do'. Everybody is in favour of it because we all want to be environmentally friendly and sustainable. So there are two issues here: first of all the issue of recycling of oils – to which you have alluded – and I think that needs more careful attention in relation not only to PCBs but more generally to the collection, distribution, handling etc. of waste oils, though obviously there is a particular worry about PCBs.

Regarding surplus food – or waste food as it is sometimes called – my own view is that it is appropriate that we use this product in the animal feed chain, but I want to say very clearly that, if we cannot guarantee its safety and how it is processed and handled, then I am afraid we may need to look at banning this in the food and feed chain.

I would not like to see that happen, but then again I would not like to see happen again what occurred in Ireland and the subsequent consequences of it. What we want is for this surplus or waste food to be used because it is good quality, not because the animal feed chain is a dumping ground for it – I think that is an important point.

We need to talk, too, very openly about the whole issue of the mixing of animal feeds. Farmers like to buy ingredients and to mix their own rations, and generally larger farmers do this. That is appropriate if we have tight controls on it. I understand that there are regular checks carried out, but in this case there were clearly some gaps in the checks on that market. Indeed, those farmers who were caught and suffered consequences because they used this product were saying to me, 'Why was somebody not coming and checking what was coming into our yards?'

On the issue of regulation, I believe that there are very tight controls on licensed animal feed operators – the compound feed industry of the European Union – and they came in because of practices in the past which we needed to tighten up on.

I have a sense that, in Member States, we regulate the compliant particularly tightly and we do not keep a lookout for the potentially non-compliant. We do not think outside the box. There is perhaps a tendency, once the paper trail is correct and the boxes are ticked, to put it all to bed and not look underneath the surface.

I think we need to look again at regulation. We are looking at it again in the financial sector, and we also need to look at it in the food sector. I also think that, at farm level, inspectors are sometimes regarded as the devil incarnate coming on to farms. Why do farmers not welcome inspectors in, seeing them as protectors of their businesses?

I think we need to change the mindset now in the entire food chain, based on this experience. I welcome very particularly the announcement of the Irish Farmers' Association that they are setting up a food taskforce. It is high time that farmers took some control of the food chain that they are the first step on.

Lastly, the issue of low-cost ingredients is not one for now, but the pressure on producers to produce ever more cheaply is part of this issue and needs to be addressed.

3-372

Proinsias De Rossa, *on behalf of the PSE Group*. – Madam President, I have a number of points to make in relation to this issue and of course I would disagree slightly with Mrs McGuinness in relation to 'this is not about Ireland'. Of course, this is about Ireland. This is the most recent scandal in relation to food risks.

The protection of human health has to be the primary concern on this issue and what we are talking about here is the implementation of a 1996 directive. Indeed, unfortunately, Ireland was one of those Member States which had to be forced by threats of legal action to actually implement this directive, five years later, in 2001. Of course, the process of implementing it is still, it would appear, under way, and the inspection procedures for ensuring that it is being complied with appear to be quite weak. From what I understand from what I have read about it, one of the surprising things is the lack of information about what precisely occurred in this particular instance with regard to the contamination of pork. It would appear that the factory concerned which produced the feed had not inspected for some time.

I also have to say – and I am sure the Government would be surprised to hear me say this – I do believe they took the right decision in clamping down immediately on the distribution of pork and indeed the withdrawal of pork from the shop shelves. Of course it hurt many innocent and compliant producers and butchers and so on: 90% or more of products were not contaminated at all. The factory concerned was only supplying something like 10 outlets, so it was a big move to make, but it was the right move to make. The most important thing is that we try and ensure that the public and the consumer can be certain that the food they are buying in the supermarkets, in their local corner shops is safe to eat. If we do not take immediate and drastic steps to guarantee that, then I think we are failing in our responsibility.

I have two questions for the Commissioner. One is, as I say, we are talking about the implementation here of the 1996 directive. Is there not an argument now for that directive to be reviewed? Are the standards that were set in that directive not now adequate or inadequate? Should we not be looking more seriously at taking these PCBs out of circulation much more quickly than is envisaged, particularly because of the late way in which many Member States actually implemented the directive?

My other question relates to the management plan which the Environmental Protection Agency in Ireland is belatedly putting in place in 2008 where it talks about the code of practice, which the plan also includes, for the in-use management of PCBs and PCB containing equipment. What I want to know is whether a code of practice is in fact compliant with the directive. Should we not be looking for a more stringent application of the rules in terms of the management of PCBs? I am not in favour of charging everybody who breaks a rule here and there, but I do think that, where food safety is concerned, there should be criminal sanctions for those who carelessly abuse their position.

3-373

Liam Aylward, *on behalf of the UEN Group*. – Madam President, the Irish pigmeat industry plays a vital role in the Irish agri-foods sector. That industry is valued at approximately EUR 1 billion and is responsible, directly and indirectly, for the employment of 10 000 people.

Against the backdrop of the current economic climate and the rising cost of food prices, it is critical that we do our utmost in Ireland to defend the Irish pigmeat sector, which operates to the highest European Union and international standards.

The detection of dioxins above the minimum threshold in a sample of pork fat under the National Residue Monitoring Programme enabled the source of the contamination to be quickly traced to an individual feed manufacturing plant. While any contamination of our food is always regrettable, what this incident shows is the very high level of food safety controls which the Irish authorities have in place to guarantee the integrity of the food chain. In other words, those controls worked.

I would therefore like to acknowledge the competence and swiftness of the action taken by the Irish Government and the Department of Agriculture regarding the decision taken for a total product recall. This was very well received by European and international markets, and indeed by the European Commission. It highlighted how seriously we as a country view food safety matters, and helped maintain our reputation at home and abroad as a quality food-producing nation.

Irish consumers continued to buy pork as it became available on the supermarket shelves, and there was an early resumption in trading in most European and international markets. Obviously, additional work needs to be carried out to resume full trading, such as enhanced marketing campaigns etc.

I would like to commend the Oireachtas Agriculture Committee for its comprehensive investigation of the dioxin incident, which involved a series of hearings that involved government departments, state agencies and representatives of the pork industry. I am glad also that the Department of Agriculture is carrying out a further investigation, under the chairmanship of a very well-known individual in European circles, Professor Patrick Wall.

3-374

Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! In Irland ist es durch Kontrollen wenigstens aufgefallen. Vor zehn Jahren in Belgien sind noch die Hühner von der Stange gefallen. In beiden Fällen spricht man von Unfällen, die passiert sind, aber die Unfälle sind nie belegt worden. Nach zehn Jahren ist in Belgien jetzt der Prozess abgeschlossen. Es hat jemand anderthalb Jahre auf Bewährung bekommen. Aber wie das hereingekommen ist, ist nicht klar. Also müssen wir weiterhin davon ausgehen, dass hier toxische Stoffe bewusst untergemischt werden, dass Futtermittel dazu gebraucht werden, die Entsorgungskosten zu sparen. Man verschneidet dann das Öl und bringt es in die Futtermittel. Beide Male geht es um Transistorenöl.

Solange die Unfälle nicht nachgestellt sind und bewiesen ist, dass es tatsächlich an der Verbrennung lag, muss man auch in Irland davon ausgehen, dass wieder ein krimineller Akt vorgenommen wurde, bei dem diese toxischen Stoffe, dieses PCB, eingemischt wurde. Das heißt, wir müssen die Kontrolldichte erhöhen, damit sich die kriminelle Energie nicht auf diese Futtermittel konzentriert, dass man meint, man könne hier Kosten sparen.

Von daher ist die offene Deklaration, die wir morgen hier verabschieden, eine weitere Möglichkeit, zwar nicht gegen kriminelle Energie, aber diese Kontrolldichte zu verschärfen. Und man muss Risiken nicht nur daran messen, um welche Fabriken es sich handelt, sondern man muss diese Risiken auch daran messen, wer bitteschön diese Fabriken führt und aus welchen dunklen Kanälen dieses Öl stammt. Man kennt seine Pappenheimer, und dies muss dann auch bei den Kontrollen klar sein, bei den Institutionen, dass diese ein höheres Risiko darstellen und damit schärferen Kontrollen unterworfen sein müssen.

3-375

Bairbre de Brún, thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL. – Cruthaíonn teagmhas na leibhéal ard déocsaineach i monaracha in Éirinn deacrachtaí móra eacnamaíocha d'fheirmeoirí sa Tuaisceart agus sa Deisceart. Is drochscéal é seo sa tréimhse dheacair eacnamaíoch atá ann faoi láthair. Toisc gníomhú chomh gasta sin a bheith déanta is féidir leis an mhargadh a bheith ar a suaimhneas go bhfuil muiceoil na hÉireann slán. Biodh sin mar atá, níor chóir go mbeifí ag dúil leis go mbeadh orthu siúd a imríodh tionchar orthu déileáil leis na hiarmhairtí seo leo féin. Tá a fhios agam go mbaineann cuid de na ceisteanna eacnamaíocha seo le coimisinéirí eile ach tá sé tábhachtach go n-ardófaí na pointí seo a leanas.

Ba í aidhm na Scéime Athghairme Muiceola (SAM) a d'fhógair rialtas na hÉireann i mí Nollag 2008 ná muiceoil thruaillithe na hÉireann a bhaint ón margadh. Biodh sin mar atá, ach níl an chuma ar an scéal go bhfuil an scéim seo ag freastal ar na 4 000 muc thruaillithe a cuireadh chuig monarcha phróiseála muc Vion, ar an Chorr Chríochach, Contae Thír Eoghain, i mo dháilcheantar, idir an 1 Méan Fómhair agus an 6 Nollaig 2008.

Ar an dea-uair, is féidir linn a rá gan chuntar go bhfuil muiceoil na hÉireann go hiomlán slán. Mura bhfuil an mhonarcha seo i dteideal cúitimh faoi scéim tacaíochta an AE, mar sin de, tá fíorbhaol ann nach mbeidh sí in ann leanúint ar aghaidh.

Caithfidh an AE a chinntiú nach bhfágfar an mhonarcha phróiseála seo chun déileáil leis na hiarmhairtí mar gheall ar 4 000 muc thruaillithe a glacadh.

Mura mbeidh siad i dteideal cúitimh faoin Scéim Athghairme Muiceola a aontaíodh idir an Coimisiún agus rialtas na hÉireann, is gá scéim den chineál céanna a aontú idir an Coimisiún agus An Roinn Talmhaíochta agus Forbartha Tuaithe sa Tionól i mBéal Feirste.

I spiorad na dlúthpháirtíochta, ba chóir don Choimisiún Eorpach cómhaoiniú den chúiteamh riachtanach a cheadú dóibh siúd a ndeachaigh sé i bhfeidhm orthu. Beidh 2009 ina bhliain dheacair do chách – ná déanaimis dearmad ar na fíorchúinsí speisialta a d'fhág cuid mhór san earnáil bia i gcruachas nár chruthaigh siad féin.

Soláthróidh Airí sa Tionól i mBéal Feirste agus i rialtas na hÉireann straitéis shláinte ainmhithe uile-oileáin gan mhoill.

Tá gá le cur chuige uile-Éireannach a bheith againn a théann níos faide ná sláinte ainmhí agus a chuireann san áireamh cur chuige rialúcháin aonair don oileán. Is é sin le rá gur chóir go mbeadh rialacháin an AE á mbainistiú agus á gcur i

bhfeidhm ar bhonn uile-oileáin. Ghnóthódh gach feirmeoir Éireannach i gcás mar seo agus mhéadódh easpa dúblála an éifeachtacht lena ndéanfaí monatóireacht ar rialacháin AE.

3-376

Kathy Sinnott, *on behalf of the IND/DEM Group*. – Mr President, my colleague mentioned the murky channels by which PCBs came into the food chain in Ireland. I think maybe it is worse, sometimes looking back at the history of PCBs. Polychlorinated biphenyls are almost 100 years old. They are man-made and from the very beginning it was obvious they were very dangerous.

They were used for many years in capacitors, hydraulic fuels, wood floor finishes: clearly not something we want in the food chain. But almost from the early 1900s until 1966, when a Swedish scientist actually established their danger, people looked the other way and allowed them to be used, even though numerous industrial accidents happened over and over and over again.

But even once the science was in place it was really not until the 1970s – 1972 – before PCBs in public areas were banned; even then, they were still allowed to be used and their use was not fully banned until 2000. So there are a lot of PCBs out there and they were left out there almost 100 years after we knew there was a problem.

So, despite the Commission's directive of 1996 which required the disposal of PCBs, we find them coming up again and again, in particular in Belgium and in Ireland recently.

But I have found that one thing really confused people in Ireland. I remember visiting a butcher around that time and he just could not understand. He said, we have put into place so much traceability. We can know exactly where this egg comes from, what day it was laid and if we really want to delve a little bit further we can find out exactly what farm etc. And yet, even after we knew the source of the PCBs, this butcher, who sources all his own pork, who had all the code numbers etc. was still being forced to throw away and destroy pork.

I do not understand how that happened, because we have really worked so hard on the Committee on the Environment; you have worked so hard to achieve traceability, and yet when the chips were down, those systems were not used. Maybe they were used to find the farms, but they were not used to clear the reputations of the innocent and this cost people an awful lot – and it cost my country an awful lot, for it was not these particular supply chains, it was the whole country that was blackened.

And there is confusion about other things. We are talking today about PCBs and dioxins and rightly so, but are we going to spend 100 years before we realise the connection between dioxins and incineration? This is something that I am also constantly trying to do, namely to keep dioxins from incineration out of the food chain.

3-377

Jim Allister (NI). – Madam President, several farmers and a processing business in my constituency face millions of pounds of loss through no fault of their own because contaminated feed bought in good faith was supplied from a food mill where wanton disregard – never mind good practice – was shown. It is no surprise that there is considerable anger amongst those affected constituents.

I have a series of questions for the Commissioner. If they are not answered tonight, I would like them to be answered in writing if that is possible.

Firstly, what is the history of the culpable recycling feed mill in terms of compliance with EU regulations? Is it a law unto itself as has been suggested?

Secondly, did Millstream have a licence to use the oil in question? If not, was it not the responsibility of the Member State to ensure that such defiance of basic regulatory requirements was discovered and dealt with?

Thirdly, was Millstream implementing an HACCP-based risk analysis and an auto-control plan as required by the food hygiene regulation?

Fourthly, is the Commission satisfied with the level and frequency of inspections and supervision imposed by the Member State on this plant and its produce, given the Member State's obligation to have a risk-based official control plan? Was there negligence on the part of the Irish authorities in enforcing with rigour the feed law and food safety requirements?

Fifthly, in my constituency legitimate food mills have to comply with rigorous controls and standards under quality assurance schemes. Why was there no equivalent scrutiny of the Millstream recycling?

Sixthly, was there any reliance upon self-certifying of safety of feed mills and, if so, why – since that should only be permissible on small-scale operators – was it allowed to apply here?

Finally, if I might, what is the precise legal basis upon which the Commission agreed a large payout to the Irish state, as initially the Commission spokesman said that no such basis existed? Will there be a follow-up in terms of infringement if that Member State is found to be in breach of its requirements?

3-378

Maria Petre (PPE-DE). – E bine că putem dezbate în această seară pe baza declarației pe care Comisia, dna comisar, deja a făcut-o privind folosirea uleiurilor uzate în prepararea nutrețurilor în Irlanda.

Aș vrea să extind un pic dezbaterea și să vă spun că foarte multe state membre, și voi vorbi acum despre România, au fost afectate de acest incident, sau mai corect spus, incidentul a afectat industria cărnii dar, mai ales, consumatorii. A afectat industria care a înregistrat pierderi importante într-un interval de timp foarte scurt și consumatorii într-o perioadă care, cel puțin în România, este caracterizată de consumul important de carne de porc, ca urmare a modului tradițional de celebrare a Crăciunului.

Singurul lucru care a funcționat foarte bine a fost informarea autorităților sanitar-veterinare prin sistemul rapid european de alertă. Dincolo, însă, de această etapă toate informațiile au intrat într-o cutie neagră. Ce cantitate de carne infestată a intrat, unde a fost distribuită, unde sunt preparatele, au fost întrebări cu răspunsuri parțiale, uneori chiar inexistente. Efectul? O reacție de panică în rândul consumatorilor și foarte multe pierderi ale producătorilor și, în egală măsură, o capacitate destul de slabă a autorităților responsabile de a gestiona eficient asemenea incidente.

Avem, din punctul meu de vedere, cel puțin două probleme. Prima dintre ele, infestarea cu dioxină, ca urmare a utilizare a reziduurilor de uleiuri, dioxina fiind o substanță care, știm cu toții, reprezintă un mare pericol fiind foarte toxică pentru organismul uman, chiar în cantități foarte mici. Ce facem ca asemenea incidente să nu se mai repete?

A doua problemă: cum creștem capacitatea de reacție și de acțiune a autorităților responsabile din statele membre în asemenea situații periculoase?

Sper, și cu asta închei, că dezbaterea ne va oferi răspunsuri cel puțin la aceste două întrebări.

3-379

Петя Ставрева (PPE-DE). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, уважаеми колеги, проблемът с употребата на отпадъчни масла, съдържащи полихлорирани бифенили, в завод за рециклиране на хранителни отпадъци отново поставя въпроса за необходимостта от гарантиране безопасността на храните в Европейския съюз.

На първо място, трябва да подчертаем, че проблемът не идва от някаква болест по животните, а от недостатъчен контрол по изпълнението на мерките, предвидени относно хигиената и безопасността на фуражите в Европейския съюз. Въпреки предвидените мерки за контрол, завишеното ниво на диоксин е било засечено, едва когато е достигнало до свинското месо. Логичният въпрос е защо това не се е случило по-рано?

Много европейски граждани днес се питат дали Европейският съюз разполага с необходимото законодателство, което да изисква прилагането на адекватен контрол от страна на държавите-членки върху безопасността на фуражите, с които се изхранват животните. Отговорът на този въпрос е наложителен, имайки предвид факта, че неизпълнението на нормите за безопасност от един-единствен завод за преработка на хранителни продукти може да има фатални последици и да нанесе щети за стотици милиони евро.

Бих искала да призова Европейската комисия да предприеме необходимите мерки за завишаване на контрола, който е неразделна част от политиката на Европейския съюз за опазване здравето на потребителите. Свинско месо със завишено съдържание на диоксин от Ирландия достигна и до България, както и до много други европейски държави. Но подобен род инциденти не трябва да бъдат допускани в бъдеще, тъй като финансовата и социалната цена, която трябва да се заплати след това, е прекалено висока.

И накрая, бих искала да приветствам г-жа McGuinness за инициативата да постави въпроса на обсъждане пред Комисията.

3-380

Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Wir reden heute Abend über die Verwendung von PCB-haltigem Altöl in einer Anlage zur Speiseresteverwertung in Irland. Morgen werden wir über das Inverkehrbringen und die Verwendung von Futtermitteln reden. Morgen werden wir feststellen, dass wir gemeinsam schon eine Reihe wichtiger und zielführender Vorgaben in diesem Sektor gemacht haben. Und trotzdem gibt es in diesem Bereich immer wieder Probleme. Deswegen sind die fünf Fragen, die Frau McGuinness in ihrer mündlichen Anfrage gestellt hat, ernst zu nehmen und auch ernst zu beantworten.

Frau Kommissarin, Sie selbst sprachen von Lücken, die bei der Umsetzung unserer Gesetzgebung in manchen Mitgliedstaaten noch nicht geschlossen sind. Richtig ist, dass der Futtermittelsektor im Ganzen in den letzten Jahren seine Zuverlässigkeit durchaus bewiesen hat, aber einige Betriebe sind sich entweder der Risiken nicht bewusst, oder sie wollen diese Risiken nicht sehen. Und die Kontrolle auf entsprechender Risikobasis ist wohl in manchen Mitgliedstaaten durchaus noch verbesserungsbedürftig.

Wir alle – wir hier, die abnehmenden Landwirte und ebenso die Verbraucher – erwarten eine korrekte Anwendung der EU-Gesetzgebung mit den entsprechenden Kontrollen. Da denke ich, dass das allgemeine Lebensmittelrecht, Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelhygiene und ebenso die Bedingungen zur Zulassung von Lebensmittelverwertungsbetrieben betrachtet werden müssen.

Ja, wir wollen überschüssige Lebensmittel verwenden. Ich zumindest will, dass wir das können und dass wir diese nicht vernichten. Aber die Rückverfolgbarkeit muss gewährleistet werden, unerwünschte Stoffe und Erzeugnisse müssen sicher und kontrolliert ausgeschlossen werden können. Die berufliche Befähigung des Betriebspersonals im Bereich Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelsicherheit muss gegeben sein, wenn Futtermittelunternehmen zugelassen werden sollen.

Futtermittel sind die Grundlage von Lebensmittelsicherheit, und die Landwirte müssen die Sicherheit haben, damit der Verbraucher sichere und gute Nahrungsmittel hat.

3-381

James Nicholson (PPE-DE). – Madam President, first of all can I say I welcome the opportunity for this debate. It has been brought home to farmers how vulnerable they are to what others do.

This is something that occurred in the Republic of Ireland, but the ironic thing is that the waste oil which was the supposed cause of the problem originally came from Northern Ireland. But it manifested itself in the compound feed from the Republic of Ireland.

The problem that has arisen as far as I am concerned is that the farmers in the Republic of Ireland, be they of pig or beef, have been compensated, aided and assisted by Europe. Farmers in Northern Ireland at this time stand high and dry with no help and no support. Northern Ireland farmers have been destroyed and many of them stand to lose their farms and be put out of business through no fault of their own. They have done nothing wrong, committed no offence, and I have to state straightforwardly to this House tonight, and to the Commissioner, as far as I am concerned the farmers in Northern Ireland have been seriously let down, not only by our own Department of Agriculture, the DARD as it is known in Northern Ireland, and most especially by the Minister, who seems incapable, weak and unable to solve the problem.

The Minister of Agriculture in the Republic of Ireland has shown clearly that he takes care of his own first. That I understand. Can I ask this question to the Commissioner: are you going to receive any information from an inquiry that is supposed to be carried out by the police both sides of the border? Will you be prepared to act on the information that you receive, and will you be prepared to ensure that Northern Ireland producers have the same support as farmers in the Republic of Ireland and that they are not disenfranchised in any way financially? And, above all, and this is my last point, will you ensure that such a problem can never again occur? All this achieves is a loss of confidence for the consumer and above all else the destruction of the producer.

3-382

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Madam President, one source of human exposure to PCBs is through the food chain, as the Commissioner says. However, open fires and cigarette smoke are far greater sources to a far greater number of people. Let us be proportional and let us keep the hysteria out of this debate, and more light and less heat on it.

Minimum requirements for feed hygiene are indeed very important and must be rigorously enforced, but they must also be accompanied by full identification and traceability for all meat products – not just beef but also poultry, pigmeat and sheepmeat. I have put down amendments to current legislation to that effect, and we will be discussing these in this House shortly.

The pig feed concerned was indeed contaminated by breadcrumbs because, inadvertently, Millstream Recycling used fuel to dry the breadcrumbs after buying this in good faith from a company it had dealt with for years and with which it had had no previous problems. There is an ongoing police investigation and the company concerned is cooperating fully with them.

I would like to refute completely Mr Allister's claim that the company showed wanton disregard. That will be proven not to be the case, so let us be careful what we say here.

The biggest problem was that we had to have 100% withdrawal of all pigmeat products, and their destruction, albeit only in the short term. The livelihoods of many Irish farmers, and indeed the reputation of Irish food products abroad suffered because we had to have such a disproportionate response, when only six to seven per cent of our pig farms were contaminated, since the Irish system of identification and traceability failed at the point of the slaughter-house. All pigs are

supposed to be eartagged in Ireland, or slap marked, but somehow, at the slaughter-house level, we could not differentiate those pigs that had had the contaminated feed from the vast majority of other pigs that had not.

We need to look at that issue. The Commission needs to look at the whole role of identification and traceability, and above all let us wait for the police investigation, which I think will surprise people.

The companies concerned are extremely sorry, and have said so publicly, for the damage caused to the food chain and Ireland's reputation, and indeed for the economic damage caused to the many farmers who have purchased their excellent feed products up to this point. They are now back in business and again producing, I might say, an excellent feed ration for farmers to mix.

This has been an appalling episode. No one would have wished it to happen.

3-383

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Madam President, I have tried not to be judge and jury on this Irish case, because that is not why we are here tonight, but I would like to ask the Commissioner three questions: what volume of PCBs is still in circulation; can you guarantee that none of these will contaminate the food chain in the next 23 months, when they are still in the process of disposal; and would the Commission present a report on the status of implementation of the Feed Hygiene Regulation, which this House would like to hear?

I would also like to point out to Jim Allister that this *is* a cross-border issue. The contamination, as we understand it, came – as Jim Nicholson rightly pointed out – from across the border. That is why I do not agree with Proinsias. This *is* a European issue because it has a cross-border dimension. What happened in Ireland could happen in any Member State because there are – as I understand it – thousands of tonnes of PCBs in circulation. Perhaps the Commissioner could clarify that point.

3-384

Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin, hat die Kommission den Unfallhergang geprüft oder nachgestellt? Ich halte es für geradezu lächerlich zu glauben, dass man durch das Verbrennen von Altöl und den Rauch, der dann durch ein paar Brotkrümel zieht, eine derartige Dioxinkontamination auslösen kann, bei der zweihundertfache Dioxinwerte im Schweinefleisch – nicht im Futter, sondern im Schweinefleisch – aufgetaucht sind! Ich gehe weiterhin davon aus, wenn das Gegenteil nicht bewiesen wird, dass es hier zu einer bewussten Beimischung gekommen ist.

Jeder Verkehrsunfall wird nachgestellt, und man prüft dann, wie es denn zu diesem Unfall kommen konnte. Also muss man diesen Unfall – wenn es denn einer war – nachstellen und prüfen, ob da über diese Art der Verbrennung und den durchziehenden Rauch tatsächlich überhaupt so viel Dioxin hineinkommen kann. Ich als Praktiker sage: Das ist alles Quatsch, was da geredet wird! Es hat sich um eine bewusste Untermischung gehandelt, und wir werden zu Endlagerstätten für dieses Gift gemacht, das sich nicht abbaut, und sich dann über Generationen in den Menschen fortsetzt.

3-385

Jan Mulder (ALDE). – Het was een buitengewoon interessant debat. Ik vrees dat zich dit soort gevallen in de toekomst toch zullen voordoen. Wij kunnen nooit uitsluiten dat mensen misdadig zijn en het systeem willen misbruiken.

Een van de punten die vanavond niet aan de orde zijn gekomen, is het systeem van privé-keurmerken. Waarom moedigt de Commissie niet meer aan dat de industrie zichzelf controleert? Dat men zegt: wij moedigen aan dat u zichzelf controleert en dat privé-kwaliteitskeurmerken worden ontwikkeld. Aan het eind zullen wij dan controleren, maar het is in de eerste plaats aan u om ervoor te zorgen dat u uw vakgenoten controleert en dat het niet voorkomt. Als u een redelijk systeem ontwikkelt, zullen wij dat stimuleren en erkennen. Het lijkt mij dat wij aan de basis moeten aanmoedigen dat dit soort praktijken in de toekomst niet meer voorkomen.

3-386

Jim Allister (NI). – Madam President, there is no dispute about the fact that the oil apparently came from Northern Ireland. That is not the issue.

The pertinent point is that Millstream chose to buy in that oil, knowing it was looking for oil to use in dryers – to deal with feedstuff, to dry the breadcrumbs – so why was it buying oil of that sort, no matter where it came from?

Why was it not checked by state inspectors and by the company itself? The use of oil in that circumstance is, as I understand it, illegal, a breach of the food and hygiene regulations. So where it came from is not the issue – it is why it came there and why it was used for the purpose for which it was used.

3-387

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Madam President, Mr Graefe zu Baringdorf's allegation of deliberate mixing of this contaminate into feed is contemptible and unworthy of any professional politician. Let us allow the due process of the legal investigation to take its course.

The company concerned, Millstream Recycling, are cooperating fully. They have a full paper trail to prove they bought this oil from a licensed company in Dublin that supplies oil. They bought it as a recycled light fuel oil which would have been the correct oil to use in this particular drying process. They were sold it by a licensed company and, as far as they were concerned, it was recycled light fuel oil they bought; they accept, however, that they were given transformer oil which caused the dioxins.

There is a legal and police investigation. Let us let due process take its course and stop these allegations flying because this is a very serious issue, which is not helped by hysterical and over-the-top reaction.

3-388

James Nicholson (PPE-DE). – Madam President, everybody agrees – no one denies – that, yes, the oil came from Northern Ireland. We cannot deny that. But, while we argue, there are eight farmers in Northern Ireland going out of business, and in the Republic as well. They have suffered as well, I accept that. This is not political. This is ordinary people suffering, and it is our farmers who are suffering financially.

The truth is – and we have to face up to this, and you, Commissioner, have to face up to this – there were tonnes of pigmeat that were untraceable. Nobody knew where it had come from, what pigs it came from or where it came from. Commissioner, it is time, long past time, that you brought in straight, clear labelling of origin of where this comes from. At least if that had been the case, we would have known where we stood and where it is.

I do not want to make this political because for me this is not political. I talk to my farmers every day, and some of these people are most probably going to lose their farms. So this is serious stuff. If we have to follow the legal investigation to its ultimate conclusion, I want to see that happen – but I want to see my farmers protected, and I do not want to see them sold down the river. I want to see them properly protected by you so that they get the same position and protection as farmers in the Republic of Ireland.

3-389

Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, this discussion has been really lively, and many questions have been put. Many assumptions have also been made, and I would agree with Mrs Doyle that we have to be patient and wait for this investigation to finish. Then we can draw our conclusions and take decisions for the future. One thing I have to say – I was not involved at the time but have heard about it – is that similar incidents happened in Germany and in Belgium, and there was wide information about those incidents in all the Member States. So I would have thought that a prudent Member State would have taken more stringent control measures. But even with the most stringent control measures such a thing may happen, either because of fraud, or because of negligence, or whatever. Our responsibility is to see to it that we have legislation – which I believe is now satisfactory – and to see that Member States comply with that legislation. Our duty as the Commission is to have controls and to see that Member States do their duty.

FVOs make their inspections, and FVO reports are open to the public, so the extent to which there is a compliance with our laws can be implied from those reports, which are even prepared on a country by country basis.

A number of you raised the issue of traceability, which is indeed one of the main pillars of general food law and is the responsibility of the food business operators, who must be able to indicate from whom they have purchased and to whom they are selling. However, the level of detail or specificity of internal traceability chosen by the food business operator determines the final economic loss to be borne by food business operators in the case of recall. In this particular case, what the traceability rule in Ireland required was simply the date of production, and not the farm where the meat came from. That was why it was necessary to recall all the meat produced in those two months. If stricter traceability rules were applicable (which would have costed more, of course) only the meat which was identified as originating from that particular farm would have been recalled. So one has to decide: pay more and have better traceability rules or pay less and, in the final analysis, bear the loss.

It was mentioned that we have provided aid, as a Commission – although the payment of compensation is not my responsibility, but that of Commissioner Fischer Boel – and I must say that what was paid in this case was paid on the same basis both in the Republic of Ireland and in Northern Ireland. I have here some figures. The Commission has introduced a private storage aid scheme for Northern Ireland, and under this scheme up to 15 000 tonnes can be stored for a maximum of six months. The budget for that measure is EUR 6.9 million. A similar private storage scheme was also adopted in the Republic of Ireland. Under that scheme, up to 30 000 tonnes can be stored for up to six months, with a maximum budget of EUR 13.9 million. In the Republic of Ireland there was also a disposal scheme which was cofinanced by the Community and which cost EUR 20.6 million. No payments were made by the Commission directly to farmers either in the Republic of Ireland or Northern Ireland, because there is no legal base for such compensation.

Summing up, I would say that we have good laws, but in the future we have always to be vigilant. We must make sure that those laws are applicable by the Member States, and we need the cooperation of the Member States. On the Commission side, we have to keep up our controls and make sure that Member States comply with our regulations.

Moreover, once we receive the results of the inquiries and investigations, we can then think about the future. If we believe that there is scope for improving our regulations, we shall have no hesitation in doing so.

3-390

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

3-391

17 - Ημερήσια διάταξη της επόμενης συνεδρίασης: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

3-393

18 - Λήξη της συνεδρίασης

3-392

(Η συνεδρίαση λήγει στις 10.45 μ.μ.)