

СРЯДА 7 ОКТОМБРИ 2009 Г.  
 MIÉRCOLES 7 DE OCTUBRE DE 2009  
 STŘEDA, 7. ŘÍJNA 2009  
 ONSDAG DEN 7. OKTOBER 2009  
 MITTWOCH, 7. OKTOBER 2009  
 KOLMAPÄEV, 7. OKTOOBER 2009  
 TETAPTH 7 OKTΩBPIOY 2009  
 WEDNESDAY, 7 OCTOBER 2009  
 MERCREDI 7 OCTOBRE 2009  
 MERCOLEDI' 7 OTTOBRE 2009  
 TREŠDIENA, 2009. GADA 7. OKTOBRIS  
 2009 M. SPALIO 7 D., TREČIADIENIS  
 2009. OKTÓBER 7., SZERDA  
 L-ERBGHA, 7 TA' OTTUBRU 2009  
 WOENSDAG 7 OKTOBER 2009  
 ŚRODA, 7 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2009  
 QUARTA-FEIRA, 7 DE OUTUBRO DE 2009  
 MIERCURI 7 OCTOMBRIE 2009  
 STREDA 7. OKTÓBRA 2009  
 SREDA, 7. OKTOBER 2009  
 KESKIVIHKKO 7. LOKAKUUTA 2009  
 ONSDAGEN DEN 7 OKTOBER 2009

---

**PRZEWODNICZY: JERZY BUZEK**  
*Przewodniczący*

*(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 15.00)*

## **1 - Wznowienie sesji**

**Przewodniczący.** – Ogłaszam wznowienie sesji Parlamentu Europejskiego przerwanej w czwartek, 17 września 2009 r.

## **2 - Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego**

**Przewodniczący.** – Szanowne Koleżanki i Koledzy! Otwierając dzisiejszą sesję plenarną chciałbym powiedzieć kilka słów o referendum, które odbyło się w zeszły piątek. Jestem bardzo zadowolony z jego wyniku. Był to wielki dzień dla Irlandii i wielki dzień dla Europy.

*(Oklaski)*

Chciałem Państwu powiedzieć, że byłem akurat w momencie, gdy ogłaszano wyniki, na drugim końcu Europy, na Sycylii. I tam wynik został podobnie przyjęty jak przez Was – oklaskami! Tak, że w wielu miejscach Europy cieszą się z

wyniku w Irlandii. Irlandczycy wysłali jasny sygnał, że pragną pozostać w sercu zjednoczonego kontynentu. *Mile buíochas do mhuintir na hÉireann*. Tysięczne dzięki i gratulacje za wynik referendum. Ja powiedziałem to po irlandzku, może niezbyt dokładnie, ale tak to mniej więcej brzmi.

Unia Europejska udowodniła, że potrafi słuchać uzasadnionych obaw swoich obywateli i odpowiednio na nie reagować. Gwarancje dla Irlandii okazały się satysfakcjonujące i przekonały głosujących, że Traktat Lizboński przyniesie korzyści ich krajowi. Było to zwycięstwo społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i dobry argument w toczącej się w pozostałych krajach członkowskich debacie.

Chciałbym podkreślić duże zaangażowanie ze strony środowisk pracodawców, związków zawodowych, organizacji rolników i rybaków, a także Kościoła i liderów społecznych. Pomogło ono wygrać to referendum.

Pragnę też pogratulować irlandzkiemu rządowi oraz opozycji, a także jednemu z moich poprzedników Patowi Coxowi, który przeprowadził kampanii „Irlandia dla Europy”. *Congratulations to Pat Cox!*

*(Oklaski)*

Wierzę, że proces ratyfikacji będzie kontynuowany i zakończy się sukcesem w pozostałych dwóch krajach członkowskich. Otrzymałem zapewnienie polskiego Prezydenta, że teraz, kiedy referendum w Irlandii dało pozytywny wynik, złoży on swój podpis pod Traktatem z Lizbony niezwłocznie.

*(Oklaski)*

Mam nadzieję, że kiedy tylko czeski Trybunał Konstytucyjny wyjaśni wszelkie pozostałe wątpliwości Prezydent Vaclav Klaus uczyni to samo.

Celem Traktatu Lizbońskiego jest przygotować Unię Europejską do wyzwań XXI wieku. Musimy sprostać obawom naszych obywateli dotyczącym zagadnień energetycznych, rosnącemu bezrobociu, imigracji i zmianom klimatycznym. Będziemy musieli działać wspólnie, tak jak robiliśmy to już wielokrotnie w przeszłości. I nie wolno nam zapominać, że kluczem do sukcesu jest zasada europejskiej solidarności.

Wiele pracy przed nami. Dziś dysponujemy już niezbędnymi narzędziami. Nie wahajmy się, więc z nich korzystać.

Jeszcze jedna ważna uwaga na temat irlandzkiego referendum. Nie możemy zapominać o tych, którzy głosowali na „nie”. Jest już naszą tradycją by myśleć o wszystkich Europejczykach, szanując ich poglądy i prawo do odmiennego zdania. Ci, którzy mówią „nie”, także chcą nam coś powiedzieć, chcą nas do czegoś przekonać, a najważniejsze, że chcą nas przed czymś ostrzec. I my przyjmujemy to ostrzeżenie i będziemy także ich głos brali pod uwagę, ale cieszymy się ogromnie, że tak zdecydowana większość Irlandczyków odpowiedziała „tak”, że jest za wspólną Europą. Jestem osobiście zdeterminowany ciężko pracować, abyście czuli Państwo, że nasza wspólna Europa, jest również waszą Europą. A jej przyszłą historię będziemy pisać razem.

\* \* \*

Chciałem przejść jeszcze do dwóch innych spraw. To są sprawy smutne.

Chciałbym przypomnieć o wielkiej tragedii i uczcić w ten sposób pamięć ofiar lawin błotnych w okolicach Messyny na Sycylii. W imieniu Parlamentu Europejskiego wydałem już oświadczenie wyrażające nasze kondolencje dla rodzin, dla bliskich. Ja byłem w tym czasie we Włoszech i złożyłem także kondolencje publicznie, na sali wobec naszych przyjaciół, partnerów, Włochów.

\* \* \*

Zanim rozpoczniemy, pragnę również przypomnieć o przypadającej dziś pierwszej rocznicy śmierci, walczącej o prawa człowieka, rosyjskiej dziennikarki Anny Politkovskiej. Jej mordercy nie trafili jeszcze przed oblicze wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Anna nie była jednak jedyną ofiarą; wspomnijmy również przy tej okazji pamięć innych działaczy społecznych, zamordowanych w ciągu ostatnich trzech lat.

3-007

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD).** – Mr President, when you spoke to us presenting your candidacy as President of the European Parliament, you said that you were going to be a very objective figure and an objective chair. I have to say that you have just made a speech on the Irish referendum – I did stand up when you were speaking, but you were locked into your text – that was one of the most subjective, partisan speeches I have ever heard, and inappropriate from an objective chairman.

*(Mixed reactions)*

3-008

**President.** – You probably did not listen to the whole of my speech!

*(Applause)*

3-009

**3 - Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes**

3-010

**4 - Transfers of appropriations: see Minutes**

3-011

**5 - Texts of agreements forwarded by the Council: see Minutes**

3-012

**6 - Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes**

3-013

**7 - Documents received: see Minutes**

3-014

**8 - Oral questions and written declarations (submission): see Minutes**

3-015

**9 - Request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity : see Minutes**

3-016

**10 - Composition of committees and delegations: see Minutes**

3-017

**11 - Corrigendum to a text adopted (Rule 216): see Minutes**

3-018

**12 - Order of business**

3-019

**Przewodniczący.** – Otrzymali Państwo ostateczny projekt porządku obrad zatwierdzony przez Konferencję Przewodniczących na posiedzeniu w dniu 17 września 2009 r. zgodnie z art. 137 Regulaminu.

Informuję, że sprawozdanie pani Bauer w sprawie organizacji czasu pracy osób wykonujących czynności w trasie w zakresie transportu drogowego zostało odrzucone w wyniku głosowania w komisji.

Ponadto następujące sprawozdania nie zostały przyjęte w odpowiednim czasie:

– sprawozdania pana Böge

w sprawie uruchomienia Funduszu Solidarności Unii Europejskiej: Włochy, trzęsienie ziemi w Abruzzji oraz

w sprawie uruchomienia Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji: Niemcy – sektor telekomunikacji

– sprawozdanie pani Haug – Projekt budżetu korygującego 9/2009: trzęsienie ziemi we Włoszech

Te cztery sprawozdania zostają więc wykreślone z porządku obrad.

3-020

**Alain Lamassoure, Président de la commission BUDG.** – Monsieur le Président, en ce qui concerne les deux rapports relatifs à l'utilisation du Fonds d'ajustement à la mondialisation en faveur de l'industrie des télécommunications en Allemagne et, d'autre part, du Fonds de solidarité pour la tragédie survenue en Italie dans les Abruzzes, la commission des budgets a adopté les quatre rapports en début de semaine, mais pas à temps pour que les traductions soient disponibles. Je voulais simplement rectifier ce que vous aviez indiqué: ces rapports ont bien été adoptés en commission. Il n'y a aucun obstacle juridique. Ils ont même été adoptés à l'unanimité.

3-021

**Przewodniczący.** – Bardzo dziękuję za tę uwagę. To jest słuszna uwaga. Tak czy owak, te sprawozdania nie znajdują się w porządku obrad ze względu na brak tłumaczeń. Czasu było za mało. Całkowicie popieram Pańską opinię. Przepraszam, moja wypowiedź była zbyt daleko idąca.

Ja zgłosiłem przesunięcia przed wypowiedzią przewodniczącego Lamassoure. Zgłosiłem dwa przesunięcia. Jedno – oświadczenie Rady w sprawie sytuacji w Gwinei – jako drugi punkt porządku dziennego. Oraz drugie – głosowanie nad ewentualnymi projektami rezolucji w sprawie odszkodowań dla pasażerów. Chciałem zapytać, czy w sprawie tych dwóch spraw są jakieś zgłoszenia? Żebyśmy nie mylili punktów obrad.

3-022

**Barbara Matera (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prendo brevemente la parola anche a nome dell'onorevole La Via, in quanto titolare della commissione per i bilanci, semplicemente per esprimere il nostro disappunto per lo slittamento di questa votazione per il Fondo di solidarietà alla regione Abruzzo, votazione che è stata spostata di due settimane e avrà luogo in plenaria a Strasburgo.

Pur comprendendo che vi sono state delle motivazioni tecniche, capiamo anche che vi sono persone che vivono ancora nelle tende e L'Aquila e la sua regione, l'Abruzzo, sono fra le zone più fredde d'Italia.

Noi vogliamo semplicemente sottolineare l'importanza di modificare e snellire le procedure di mobilitazione di questo fondo.

3-023

**Przewodniczący.** – Musimy działać zgodnie z regułami. Trudno było wykonać tłumaczenia w tak krótkim czasie. I regułą, którą stosujemy takim przypadku, jest przesunięcie sprawy. Mnie również bardzo przykro, ja chciałbym jednak, żebyśmy procedowali i prowadzili nasze obrady punkt po punkcie, bo inaczej mamy ogromne zamieszanie.

Ja pytałem Państwa w tej chwili o dwie rzeczy: oświadczenie Rady w sprawie sytuacji w Gwinei i głosowanie nad ewentualnymi projektami rezolucji w sprawie odszkodowań dla pasażerów. Czy w tej sprawie są jakieś pytania?

Nie ma. Zamykamy dyskusję.

*(Parlament przyjął obie propozycje.)*

3-024

**Gianni Pittella (S-D).** – Signor Presidente, chiedo scusa se torno sull'argomento Abruzzo. È vero che noi tutti abbiamo rispetto nei confronti di persone che hanno subito un terremoto, ma non possiamo soltanto fare celebrazioni nel momento in cui le cose avvengono e non dare risposte quando è nelle nostre possibilità darle.

Concordo con la collega Matera e chiedo che l'Aula, che è sempre sovrana, autorizzi l'approvazione dello sblocco del Fondo di solidarietà anche senza traduzione. Non credo che vi siano problemi di questo tipo di fronte a situazioni di tragedia.

*(Applausi)*

3-025

**President.** – Colleagues, those remarks were very important. We must overcome these difficulties. I will ask the services whether it is possible to deliver some crucial translations by tomorrow, and then we can vote tomorrow as well. It is a very urgent decision.

*(Applause)*

It is of course against our rules, but I think this time we should do it, so it will be organised.

\* \* \*

3-026

W związku z oświadczeniem Komisji w sprawie swobody informowania we Włoszech otrzymałem wniosek grupy PPE o wykreślenie tego punktu z porządku obrad.

3-027

**Joseph Daul, au nom du groupe PPE.** – Monsieur le Président, au nom du groupe PPE, je demande que le Parlement se prononce sur le retrait du débat sur la liberté de presse en Italie puis sur le vote d'une résolution sur le même sujet. Toute personne de bonne foi sait que mon groupe, le PPE, est profondément attaché à la défense de la liberté d'expression et à la liberté de la presse.

(Protestations)  
(Applaudissements)

Chers amis, respectez la liberté de la parole. Je l'ai toujours respectée dans ce Parlement et j'ai toujours respecté les concitoyens au niveau du Parlement.

(Applaudissements)

C'est la raison pour laquelle nous avons tout fait pour que la Charte des droits fondamentaux acquière avec le traité de Lisbonne une valeur contraignante. Mais le débat prévu demain ne vise qu'un seul pays et ne porte pas sur la question – sur laquelle nous sommes prêts à faire un débat de fond – de la liberté de presse en Europe. Le PPE n'accepte pas que ce Parlement devienne un lieu de règlement de comptes politiques et purement nationaux, ce à quoi nous assisterions demain si ce débat était maintenu.

(Protestations)  
(Applaudissements)

Oui, donc, à la défense de la liberté de la presse en Europe, mais non à une instrumentalisation de notre Parlement à des fins purement partisans et nationales. Je reprendrai aussi demain, vous verrez, ce qu'a dit le président Napolitano, qui est un homme que je respecte beaucoup car j'ai beaucoup travaillé avec lui, mais je vous dirai cela demain.

3-028

**Francesco Enrico Speroni, a nome del gruppo EFD.** – Signor Presidente, non ho molto da aggiungere alla proposta del collega Daul nel suo intervento. Tutti noi amiamo la libertà nelle sue varie forme, comprese libertà di espressione e la libertà di stampa in senso lato, quindi non solo stampa scritta, ma anche televisione e altri mezzi di comunicazione. È giusto quindi che noi la difendiamo e sosteniamo.

Non è giusto invece puntare il dito solo su una situazione in maniera strumentale perché in Italia chiunque, collegandosi a Internet, andando in un'edicola o guardando la televisione, può vedere che la libertà di stampa non è assolutamente in pericolo. In conclusione, se si vuole veramente accusare qualcuno, si usi l'articolo 122 del regolamento e l'articolo 7 dei Trattati, avendo il coraggio di andare fino in fondo.

3-029

**Martin Schulz, im Namen der S-D-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident! Es ist ein richtiger Satz von meinem Kollegen Joseph Daul gesagt worden. Ja, es stimmt, Joseph Daul ist jemand, der die Meinungsfreiheit in jeder Hinsicht respektiert. Dafür ist er bekannt. Aber es gibt in Europa offensichtlich Leute, die die Meinungsfreiheit nicht in dem Maße respektieren, wie Joseph Daul das tut, sondern die von Meinungsfreiheit ein anderes Verständnis haben. Das ist der Grund, warum es diese Diskussion geben soll.

Aus diesem Grund denken wir, dass das angesichts der Debatte, die es in einem Mitgliedstaat der Europäischen Union gibt, nämlich in Italien, schon angemessen ist. Aber nicht nur wegen der italienischen Situation, sondern wegen der Frage, ob die Meinungsfreiheit aufgrund der Verquickung von medialer, ökonomischer und politischer Macht in einem Maße, wie wir das bis dato in Europa nicht kannten, nicht eine Gefahr für die demokratische Entwicklung in Europa ist. Das ist genau der Punkt, worüber wir diskutieren wollen. Deshalb sollten wir das tun und den Antrag des Kollegen Daul ablehnen.

(Beifall)

3-030

(Parlament odrzucił wniosek.)

3-031

**Przewodniczący.** – Oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie swobody informowania we Włoszech pozostaje w porządku obrad.

Otrzymałem także inny wniosek grupy PPE o nieskładanie projektów rezolucji na zakończenie tej debaty.

3-032

**Daniel Cohn-Bendit, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, lieber Herr Daul! Wir sind ein Parlament, das mit Recht abstimmen soll und verantwortlich dafür ist, dass wir auch für die Abruzzesen so schnell wie möglich Gelder zur Verfügung stellen.

Genauso sind wir ein Parlament mit Verantwortung: Wenn wir etwas diskutieren, dann müssen wir nachher über eine Entschließung abstimmen, damit diese Diskussion auch einen Sinn hat. Deswegen sind wir dafür, dass wir nachher eine Entschließung verabschieden.

(Beifall)

3-033

**Mario Mauro**, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signor Presidente, intervengo a favore della proposta di voto tesa a evitare la risoluzione perché ho colto, nelle parole dell'onorevole Schultz, un passaggio, a mio avviso, molto importante: se c'è veramente l'intenzione che questa discussione arrivi sul tema "Europa" e non voglia limitarsi all'Italia, non ha senso poi votare una risoluzione intitolata "Libertà d'informazione in Italia".

Teniamo pure la discussione domani: ci daremo tempo e modo per affrontare il tema europeo e votare una risoluzione sulla libertà d'informazione in Europa.

3-034

*(Parlament odrzucił wniosek.)*

\* \* \*

*(Porządek prac został ustalony.)*

3-035

## 13 - Głosowanie

3-036

**Przewodniczący**. – Kolejnym punktem porządku jest głosowanie.

*(Wyniki i inne szczegóły głosowania: zobacz protokół.)*

3-037

### 13.1 - Projekt decyzji (B7-0079/2009) - Utworzenie i określenie uprawnień, składu i czasu działania specjalnej komisji ds. kryzysu finansowego i gospodarczego (głosowanie)

3-038

– *Przed rozpoczęciem głosowania*

3-039

**Eva Joly (Verts/ALE)**. – Monsieur le Président, nous souhaitons que soit ajouté au point A l'élément de phrase suivant:

3-040

‘as well as on the developing countries’, so that this reads ‘to analyse and evaluate the extent of the social, economic and financial crisis, its impact on the Union and its Member States, as well as on the developing countries’.

3-041

*(Poprawka ustna nie została przyjęta.)*

3-042

**Eva Joly (Verts/ALE)**. – Mr President, we also want to include a reference to ‘development cooperation’ so the sentence reads: ‘To analyse and evaluate the current implementation of Community legislation in all the areas concerned, including development cooperation’. We thought that the developing countries’ point of view was not reflected within the mandate.

3-043

*(Poprawka ustna nie została przyjęta.)*

3-044

## 14 - Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania

3-044-500

– *Pisemne wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania:*

3-045

Projekt decyzji: Utworzenie i określenie uprawnień, składu i czasu działania specjalnej komisji ds. kryzysu finansowego, gospodarczego i społecznego (B7-0079/2009)

3-046

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)**, *in writing*. – The Governor of the Bank of England (Mervyn King) has stated, and I believe correctly, ‘Banks are international in life but national in death...’. It is national governments and national taxpayers who pay when banks have to be bailed out. It follows therefore that banking supervision must be carried out on a national basis and not via the EU. This is why I voted against the setting-up of an EU special Committee on the financial and economic crisis.

3-046-500

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A constituição da Comissão Especial sobre a crise financeira e económica é fundamental enquanto órgão que analisa e avalia a coordenação das acções realizadas pelos Estados-

Membros de apoio ao crescimento sustentável e qualitativo. É imperioso analisar e avaliar a dimensão da crise social, económica e financeira, mas também propor medidas que facilitem a reconstrução a longo prazo de mercados financeiros sólidos e estáveis que permitam apoiar um crescimento económico capaz de combater o desemprego e de responder aos desafios demográfico e climático.

É fundamental a aposta no envolvimento das Universidades, de representantes da comunidade científica e de investigadores como parceiros estratégicos. Esta parceria deve ser dinamizada, pois será decisiva para que possamos, simultaneamente, combater a crise económica e os problemas de desemprego a curto prazo bem como encontrar soluções a longo prazo de resposta ao problema das alterações climáticas através do desenvolvimento e utilização de energias limpas.

3-047

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A constituição da Comissão Especial para a Crise Financeira e Económica pode revelar-se fundamental para preparar o futuro da UE. Isso mesmo poderá ser alcançado não só através da discussão e apresentação de medidas, mas também através da determinação de mecanismos que poderão ser colocados para evitar que, num futuro mais ou menos próximo, nos deparemos com uma situação semelhante. Assim, é fundamental aprender as lições desta crise através da análise das suas causas e consequências. É também relevante corrigir as falhas do sistema financeiro que levaram à actual situação, através da adopção de melhor legislação devidamente justificada.

Não podemos correr o risco de criar um ambiente regulamentar tão estrito que possa levar a que a retoma venha a demorar mais, nem que a UE se venha a tornar, num clima de grande concorrência, num mercado financeiro pouco atractivo.

Esta Comissão poderá ainda manter-se para além dos 12 meses previstos, de modo a permitir um acompanhamento e apreciação das medidas que serão adoptadas no contexto da actual crise.

3-048

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Sustin acest demers si am toata increderea ca aceasta comisie va face o analiza pertinenta a dimensiunii crizei financiare care a afectat toate statele membre si ca va veni cu recomandari competente pentru redresarea economica a Uniunii Europene. Nu am reusit insa sa votez acest text deoarece am avut o problema cu cartela de vot.

3-049

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Die aktuelle Finanzkrise und deren Auswirkungen auf ökonomische und letztlich soziale Bereiche der EU-Mitgliedsstaaten erfordern intensive gemeinsame Anstrengungen zu deren Bewältigung. Der Beschluss der Konferenz der Präsidenten vom 17. September 2009 mittels eines Sonderausschusses strukturiert zu analysieren und Vorschläge für geeignete Maßnahmen zur Erhaltung tragfähiger, krisenresistenter Finanzmärkte zu erarbeiten ist zu unterstützen. Allerdings muss kritisch angemerkt werden, dass seit dem Auftreten der ersten Krisensymptome im vergangenen Jahr sowie der Realisierung selbiger zu Beginn dieses Jahres mittlerweile mehr als zwölf Monate verstrichen sind. Die in der Zwischenzeit eingeleiteten Maßnahmen müssen vorwiegend als Symptombekämpfung und Akutmaßnahme zur Arbeitsplatzsicherung gewertet werden. In Unterstützung dieses Antrages ist festzuhalten, dass besondere Aufmerksamkeit auf koordinierte und abgestimmte Maßnahmen gelegt werden muss, da bei aller Berücksichtigung des Subsidiaritätsprinzips Individuallösungen letztlich wieder zu Verzerrungen der Wettbewerbslage führen würden.

3-050

## 15 - Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół

3-051

## 16 - Wyniki referendum w Irlandii (debata)

3-052

**President.** – The next item is the Council and Commission statements on the outcome of the referendum in Ireland.

I should like to welcome the Prime Minister of Sweden to the House today, who is representing the Swedish Presidency. We are very happy to have you with us, but there was a problem of formalities. I am very sorry about that.

President Barroso, it is great that you too are with us at such an important moment for our European Union. Thank you very much.

You can see how difficult it is sometimes to go through all the formalities, but we are a very democratic institution, as you can see. It is always necessary to go through everything in order. Then everything is OK and we can agree.

We shall now go to the main item on this afternoon's agenda. It is very important for us to have you in the Chamber to discuss such an important topic.

3-053

**Fredrik Reinfeldt, *President-in-Office of the Council*.** – Mr President, I am very grateful to be here today and to have the opportunity to address the European Parliament so soon after the positive result in the referendum in Ireland. I pay tribute to Brian Cowen and his associates; I also say to all of those who have been engaged in the campaign, whatever their party or background, who contributed to this successful outcome: thank you for all your efforts. This was a good decision for Ireland; it is a good decision for Europe.

I think that we can say that Europe has listened to the criticism; I know that the legal guarantees offered by the European Council were decisive in the referendum campaign; I can also say that the French and the Czech Presidency made efforts that were crucial to find a way to meet the concerns of the Irish people. I think we should also say that it was very positive to have the very strong majority that was shown in the referendum, a convincing majority of 67.1% and with a high turnout, as high as 59%. So, all of this is very good news for Europe.

And of course I do not have to explain to this Parliament the need to put the Lisbon Treaty in place; it will allow you to be more democratic, to be more efficient, and to be more transparent. It will in fact increase the influence of the EU in the international arena and make us stronger in meeting global challenges, and I know that you in this Parliament will also be given a more significant role in the overall decision-making process; I welcome this development. Therefore it is very important to put this Lisbon Treaty into force.

The European Council is united in its wish for the Treaty to enter into force by the end of this year and the end of the Swedish Presidency. With the number of countries that have ratified it – we are now at 24 with full ratification – country number 25 might actually be Poland, given the signals that we are now getting from the Polish President. I spoke on Saturday, after the referendum result from Ireland was known, with the Taoiseach Brian Cowen, who said they would need a couple of weeks to secure full parliamentary ratification, and therefore we can also say that country number 26 will finally be Ireland. That leaves us just the Czech Republic to have the full 27 ratifications. To that end, we have had a meeting with the three institutions here in Brussels today: the Presidency, the head of the Commission, Jose Manuel Barroso, and the President of the European Parliament, Jerzy Buzek. The Czech Prime Minister, Jan Fischer, was also with us and we tried to assess this situation; you might know that 17 senators have appealed to the Constitutional Court in the Czech Republic with a complaint concerning the Lisbon Treaty, to see if it is in accordance with the Czech Constitution. Jan Fischer told us that this is an independent court which is now working quickly to take the decision whether or not to bring up this petition. We do not foresee today an exact date when they will give this decision, and we are of course awaiting that signal; we hope to see it in just a week or a couple of weeks. That is the message from the Czech Republic today: an independent court taking a decision in maybe a week's time, or it may be two weeks before we know how they will proceed.

As President of the European Council, I am responsible for moving the work of the Union forward. I strongly feel that we have no time to lose. Therefore I have decided that while awaiting the clarifications in the Czech Republic, firstly we will continue the preparations for the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and secondly, when there is clarity on when the Lisbon Treaty will come into force, when there is clarity, I will begin consultations on the nominations of the new President of the European Council and the High Representative and Secretary-General of the Council. Preparing this will not only be a matter for the Presidency: this is a matter for three institutions at the same time. I will therefore say that it is very important for us to work closely and constructively together with the Commission and the European Parliament in this process. I will again renew my offer to this Parliament to cooperate when we are making our efforts to get the Lisbon Treaty finally in place.

Let us also remember that despite these institutional matters this Swedish Presidency – and this autumn – is, of course, very much influenced by the need to move on climate change, the need to move on the financial crisis, the worry in Europe that we need a policy for job creation – a lot of important matters that need to be addressed. That sums up for us the need to be active, to put in place the Lisbon Treaty, as I have just said, and to stay active as a Presidency on these very important matters for our voters.

3-054

**President.** – Prime Minister, thank you for your very clear message regarding all that is going on after the vote in Ireland, and also for the very clear message on cooperation between the European Parliament and the Presidency of the European Council. We have just started discussions with Mrs Malmström, a former Member of the European Parliament, whom we remember very well. Thank you very much for your proposal and very clear message.

3-055

**José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*.** – Mr President, the Irish people took a very important and historic decision last weekend: a very important decision for Ireland; a very important decision for Europe. The Irish people, by a resounding majority, recognised the importance of the Lisbon Treaty, a Treaty that offers a more democratic and effective Europe, a Treaty that gives us the right platform to deliver the modern, successful European Union our citizens wish to see.



The Treaty now has the democratic endorsement of all 27 Member States. All the Member States of the European Union, by parliament or by popular vote, have approved the Treaty.

This is indeed a major achievement. It shows how the enlarged Europe is able to share a vision for our future and a determination to move forward. It was decided democratically. Now what we need is the ratification procedures to be concluded.

I am pleased to see that President Kaczyński of Poland will be signing very soon. As he has always said to me, he will be ready to do it when the Irish have voted 'yes'. This is indeed very good news.

Of course we have to see the completion of the process in the Czech Republic. We need to respect the constitutional proceedings in that country, as we have done in other countries, but once these procedures are concluded I see no reason why proceedings cannot be concluded swiftly.

This is important for Europe as a whole, but it is particularly important for the Commission. I want to see the new Commission in place, a Commission in accordance with the Lisbon Treaty, and I want to see it in office as quickly as possible. A long period with a caretaker Commission is in nobody's interest. I am ready to start the formation of the next Commission as soon as the Council is ready to clarify the legal basis definitively, and also to nominate the High Representative who will become Vice-President of the Commission.

I appreciate all the efforts made by the Swedish Presidency, and personally by Prime Minister Reinfeldt, to reach a swift conclusion to all these processes. The initiative that Prime Minister Reinfeldt took today at a meeting with me and with you, President Buzek, and the video-conference with Prime Minister Fischer was a very good and useful initiative.

I know also that this Parliament has worked tirelessly to promote the Lisbon Treaty. Parliament and Commission have worked hand in hand to explain why it is the right treaty for Europe. I am proud of the role that the Commission played in giving the Irish people the information they needed to make up their minds.

Now that we have a real probability of having the Lisbon Treaty finally ratified and the whole process completed, we can turn our attention to the work to implement the Treaty. I would like to take this occasion to highlight four areas where we are working hard to ensure that we can hit the ground running when the Treaty comes into force.

One of the most important and the most complex has to be the innovations regarding the European External Action Service. We have been working hard to think through some of the practical details of how we can make the European External Action Service a real success. This work will now accelerate and, in the same spirit as the remarks made just now by the Swedish Presidency, I want to state the European Commission's determination to work with Parliament to achieve that objective.

I know that Elmar Brok has been leading on this subject here in Parliament. I understand that you will debate this at the next plenary. This is excellent timing since this will take place shortly before the same question is discussed at the European Council. I think that report is an excellent basis for discussions between our institutions, and I welcome the strong Community spirit that inspires the report. This is exactly the spirit that I will uphold in the preparation for the important innovation that is the European External Service.

Another point is comitology. It is an important aspect of how the European Union does its business. The Treaty of Lisbon introduces new rules making the system more rational and transparent. We need to fix exactly how the new system should work. But let me be clear: many of these decisions are of great political importance and deserve proper democratic scrutiny and real political ownership. So we need to maintain the strong role played by Parliament today.

Another important democratic element is the new mechanisms to allow national parliaments a direct say on subsidiarity. We need to put these mechanisms in the broader context of the excellent relations with national parliaments built up by the Commission, and indeed the European Parliament, over the last few years.

Finally, I would like to mention the European Citizens' Initiative. This is one of the most striking innovations on the Treaty's democratic agenda and one on which this Parliament has already worked in detail. Margot Wallström has been leading our work in developing a green paper to launch a consultation as soon as possible, with the goal of seeing this opportunity in citizens' hands within a year of entry into force.

When I spoke to this Parliament last month, I set out what I saw as the greatest challenges and the great opportunities facing Europe today. With the Lisbon Treaty we will have the right springboard to help us make those goals a reality, and I am sure that with this constructive partnership between our institutions we will make it a success. That is the commitment of the European Commission.

3-056

**President.** – President Barroso, thank you for your speech, and for your readiness to cooperate in the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty.

The cooperation between Parliament and the Council during the videoconference with Prime Minister Jan Fischer of the Czech Republic was also excellent, so thank you once again, Prime Minister Fredrik Reinfeldt, for organising that video conference.

3-057

**Joseph Daul, au nom du groupe PPE.** – Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Présidents, chers collègues, en exprimant vendredi dernier un oui franc et massif, les Irlandais ont non seulement dit oui au traité de Lisbonne, ils ont surtout dit oui à une Europe perçue comme un espace de solidarité et de valeurs communes. Ils ont dit leur attachement profond à une Europe qui influence la mondialisation sans la subir, à une Europe qui partage avec ses partenaires ses choix de société, son choix d'une économie sociale de marché.

Au nom du groupe PPE, je me réjouis de ce vote qui montre bien que, quand un peuple est consulté sur de vrais enjeux, comme le principe de l'appartenance à l'Union européenne, il répond à la question qui lui est posée et il le fait avec conviction.

Vendredi, nos amis irlandais ont répondu à la question "Êtes-vous favorables au traité de Lisbonne et, si non, êtes vous prêts à remettre en question l'adhésion de votre pays à l'Union?" À cette question, ils ont répondu de façon non équivoque, avec un oui retentissant. Cela ne prouve qu'une seule chose: que l'Europe est perçue pour ce qu'elle est, à savoir un élément protecteur, une zone de stabilité, de paix et d'état de droit qui rassure.

Chers collègues, je crois que le vote irlandais aura un impact important sur notre façon de construire l'Europe, surtout dans les mois à venir, dans la mesure où il prouve l'attachement profond de nos peuples aux valeurs dont l'Europe est porteuse. Le vote irlandais nous encourage dans notre action européenne et, en même temps, il nous lie. Il nous encourage, car c'est la première fois depuis longtemps qu'un peuple européen exprime avec une telle force sa volonté de participer à l'aventure européenne malgré, ou plutôt en raison de la crise. Mais il nous lie aussi dans la mesure où l'exigence de solidarité, qui a largement motivé le oui irlandais, nous nous devons de la satisfaire.

C'est justement, pour en revenir aux institutions européennes, ce que le traité de Lisbonne nous permettra de faire. Ce traité permettra à l'Europe d'être plus efficace en faisant du vote à l'unanimité, souvent paralysant, l'exception, et du vote à la majorité, la règle.

Il lui permettra aussi d'être plus identifiable en créant une Présidence permanente du Conseil au lieu de la Présidence tournante actuelle et il donnera plus de poids à notre haut représentant pour la politique étrangère. L'Europe doit en effet avoir un visage, que ce soit pour nos concitoyens ou pour nos partenaires internationaux.

Et enfin, le traité de Lisbonne rendra l'Europe plus démocratique en donnant un poids beaucoup plus important à ce Parlement, mais aussi en donnant aux parlements nationaux ainsi qu'aux citoyens davantage leur mot à dire dans les affaires européennes. Les Irlandais étaient vendredi le dernier peuple européen à avoir exprimé un avis positif sur le traité de Lisbonne. Tous les autres pays l'ont déjà fait, soit directement, soit par la voix de leurs parlements respectifs, y compris en Pologne et en République tchèque.

Je demande donc aux présidents de ces deux pays de procéder, sans tarder, à la signature formelle du traité afin de permettre aux Vingt-sept d'aller de l'avant et de le mettre en œuvre début 2010 au plus tard.

Et je veux dire en particulier au président Klaus que le vote des Irlandais à 67 % doit le motiver à signer, le moment venu, ce traité. Et, au nom du PPE, je lui demande de se conduire – et je n'en doute pas – de façon responsable.

Messieurs les Présidents, chers collègues, le temps est venu pour l'Europe de mettre de côté les questions institutionnelles pour se consacrer aux vrais enjeux pour les 500 millions d'Européens: économie sociale de marché, énergie, climat, sécurité.

Merci Monsieur Reinfeldt et Monsieur Barroso pour vos propositions. Vous pouvez compter sur le PPE pour que le travail avance assez vite.

3-058

**Martin Schulz, im Namen der S-D-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident! Wir diskutieren über das Ergebnis dieses Referendums. Vieles wurde über die institutionellen Aspekte gesagt. Ich habe dem, was Herr Premierminister Reinfeldt gesagt hat, nichts hinzuzufügen. Ich finde es gut, dass er nicht hastig vorgeht, sondern sagt „Wir warten ab, denn noch ist nichts gewonnen, noch brauchen wir die letzten Schritte dieses Ratifizierungsverfahrens, bevor wir institutionelle Fragen beantworten können.“

Sie, Herr Kommissionspräsident, haben sich – wie wir alle – gefreut. Ihre Freude wird sicher am Sonntagabend etwas getrübt gewesen sein, denn die 382 Stimmen, die Sie für Ihr Votum bekommen haben, bestanden zu 55 Stimmen aus Abgeordneten einer Fraktion, deren Ziel es ist, den Lissabon-Vertrag zu Fall zu bringen. Sie müssen darüber nachdenken, wenn Sie über Lissabon jubeln, dass Sie von den Leuten gestützt werden, die genau das Gegenteil von dem wollen, was Sie anstreben. Denken Sie darüber nach, und stützen Sie Ihre Mehrheiten auf eine pro-europäische Mehrheit in diesem Haus!

*(Zwischenrufe)*

Wenn wir über die Resultate dieses Referendums reden, Herr Präsident, dann geht es aber um etwas ganz anderes. Es geht nicht um die Frage von institutionellen Spielchen, die jetzt gespielt werden sollen. Es geht nicht um die Frage, wie sich Mehrheiten in diesem Parlament zusammensetzen, sondern es geht um etwas viel Fundamentaleres, und das ist es, was man dem Staatspräsidenten der Tschechischen Republik sagen muss: Die 27 Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union haben zusammen 500 Millionen Einwohner. China hat 1,3 Milliarden Einwohner. Indien hat 1,1 Milliarden Einwohner. Diese beiden Länder zusammen stellen ein Drittel der Erdbevölkerung! In den G20-Runden sitzen diese Staaten zwischenzeitlich mit am Tisch. Das größte europäische Mitgliedsland, das bei der G20 dabei ist, sitzt dort und vertritt gerade einmal die Wirtschaftskraft von 82 Millionen Einwohnern.

Wir haben zwei Optionen: Es geht beim Lissabon-Vertrag nicht darum – wie Vaclav Klaus das behauptet –, dass die Union gegen die Mitgliedstaaten stark gemacht werden soll, sondern es geht um etwas ganz anderes. Es geht darum, dass die Union stark gemacht werden soll als ein weltweiter Partner, um die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten zu stärken. Das ist ausdrücklich das Ziel des Lissabonner Vertrags! Ganz umgekehrt: Dieser Vertrag dient den Interessen gerade der kleinen Mitgliedstaaten der EU. Ein Land mit 10 Millionen Einwohnern – nehmen wir Ihres, Herr Kommissionspräsident – wie Portugal ist im Verhältnis zu Brasilien heute nicht mehr in einer Situation wie im 19. Jahrhundert, sondern im 21. Jahrhundert ist es klar, dass Brasilien das stärkere Land ist. Portugal braucht, wie alle europäischen Staaten, die Union, um gemeinschaftlich stark zu sein. Wenn es um Klimawandel geht, wenn es um die Finanzkrise geht, wenn es um die weltweite Seuchenbekämpfung geht, wenn es darum geht, den Hunger in der Welt zu bekämpfen, Frieden zu sichern, um wegen Ressourcen geführte Kriege zu vermeiden, dann wird Europa nur als einheitlicher Block bestehen können, und es wird untergehen, wenn es sich in seine Einzelteile zerlegt.

Deshalb ist die Frage, die man an Staatspräsident Klaus richten muss: Kann man als Einzelner – der zugegebenermaßen von seinem verfassungsmäßigen Recht Gebrauch macht, das will ich ihm nicht abstreiten – in der Abwägung der Verantwortung, die man übernimmt, diese Verantwortung ganz alleine schultern, wenn alle anderen Regierungen und Parlamente und jetzt auch 67 % der Iren, die zugestimmt haben, anderer Meinung sind?

Man wird Herrn Staatspräsident Klaus eine Frage stellen müssen. Ist er sich darüber im Klaren, dass dieser Kontinent vor einer entscheidenden Weichenstellung steht, nämlich vor der Weichenstellung, ob Einigkeit stark macht, oder ob Einzelgängertum uns alle gemeinsam schwächt. Das ist die entscheidende Frage!

Deshalb: Ja, das war ein guter Tag für Europa, und der Tag, an dem dieser Vertrag endgültig ratifiziert sein wird, wird ein noch besserer Tag sein. Herr Klaus sollte sich seiner historischen Verantwortung stellen und diesen Vertrag unterschreiben.

3-059

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, last Friday was a really historic step: 67% of the votes. You can change all the constitutions in Europe with a two-thirds majority; I think a two-thirds majority is also necessary in Sweden.

We have to thank Brian Cowen. I also especially thank Pat Cox, who did a great job, and all pro-Lisbon Irish MEPs because they conducted a tremendous campaign in favour of the Treaty. So I am happy. The reason is that we started this whole exercise in the aftermath of the Nice Treaty, with a declaration in Laeken, and it has taken eight years – so I promise not to restart this whole process, Mr President.

With this Irish 'yes', all the citizens of Europe, directly or indirectly, by a referendum or by their parliaments, have said 'yes' to the Lisbon Treaty. That was also a message to the Eurosceptics who were always saying 'no – the people are against Europe, against the European institutions'. Sixty-seven per cent of the Irish population: what we saw on Friday is a clear message to the Eurosceptics.

We have to ask everyone to take his or her responsibility so the Lisbon Treaty can enter into force as quickly as possible. Now is the time to bring this process finally to an end. With this Irish 'yes' we know that the Lisbon Treaty will be brought into effect; we know that, because it was the last hurdle. But we do not know when it will come into effect, and I think that is the problem we have to discuss this afternoon. What do we do in the mean time?

We know that we have to wait until the Constitutional Court of the Czech Republic has spoken. As you said yesterday in *Le Monde*, in the worst-case scenario we still have a few months to wait and I think that nobody in this House can tolerate the fact that the Union will be a lame duck in the months to come. We can accept that the Commission will be dealing with current affairs because after 31 October it should be dealing with current affairs. We need action and we need action urgently. Therefore, Mr Reinfeldt, President of the Council, my invitation to you is to initiate, as fast as possible, the procedure for the nomination of the Commission.

Three weeks ago we voted for the President of the Commission with the argument that the current crisis does not allow us to postpone a decision. That was your argument. So the same argument applies now to the nomination of the Commission. It is not necessary to wait: a new Commission is possible with the present treaty, with the present status for the High Representative and then, once the Lisbon Treaty is ratified, you can smoothly install a High Representative with another statute and a President of the Council. There is really no reason to wait to proceed with the Commission.

This was also the aim of the President of the Commission if I understood him correctly when he spoke a few minutes ago. I fear that I hear you saying 'No, I am waiting; I am waiting because I want a global package, a global package including the President of the Council'. I say that is not a problem: prepare your global package. Prepare it now, and the decision on the Council President can be as political as the decision that you took on Mr Barroso the first time. You presented him as a candidate by a political decision, not a formal decision, because we asked to formalise it afterwards. You can do exactly the same with the President of the Council and then, once the Treaty is ratified, you can formalise the whole package. Then you change the statute of the High Representative: he becomes Vice-President of the Commission. At the same time the political decision that you take on the President of the Council now can be put into practice; you can then formalise it.

That is the best way, the best pressure that you can put on those other countries that have to sign: formalise it, because they know that we want to go forward. And we do not still have to wait for several weeks and months. In any case, you have said that there is no time to waste. I agree with you: there is no time to waste with this current economic and financial crisis.

Put the Commission together now, as fast as possible. Convince your colleagues in the Council and take your decision on the High Representative on the basis of the present Treaty. Pick one of the candidates – I have seen there are enough candidates – for the President of the Council and go forward with it.

3-060

**Daniel Cohn-Bendit**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je crois qu'il faut tirer les leçons lucides de ce qui s'est passé en Irlande.

Les Irlandais ont voté, et Guy Verhofstadt a raison, à 67 % – donc à une grande majorité – parce que la réalité a imposé une vision claire. La réalité de la crise, d'abord, où ils ont senti que l'Europe leur était nécessaire. Mais ils ont aussi senti que ce vote impliquait, en fait, – et cela, Joseph Daul l'a dit et il a raison – que, soit ils disaient oui, soit ils entraient dans un processus de sortie. Ce qu'il faut donc comprendre, c'est que les référendums en Europe n'ont de sens que s'ils ont des conséquences. Si c'est un jeu, une humeur, vous pouvez dire non, mais de toute façon, ça continuera comme avant. Alors, on réagit selon son humeur.

Et je crois qu'il faudra continuer dans le débat sur l'Europe. Il faudra arriver à un référendum européen, où tous les Européens votent à la majorité qualifiée, et ceux qui disent non devront dire s'ils respectent le vote et restent dedans, ou s'ils sortent. Si les Anglais croient que cette remarque s'adresse à eux, ils n'ont pas tort. Parce qu'il faut arrêter de toujours avoir une Europe qui puisse être victime de chantage. Un espace démocratique ne peut pas vivre avec le chantage, et si nous n'arrivons pas à régler ce problème, je crois que l'espace démocratique européen ne fonctionnera pas.

La deuxième chose qu'il faut comprendre avec lucidité, c'est la situation dans laquelle nous sommes. Guy Verhofstadt a dit deux ou trois choses à ce sujet. Mais ce qui me fait peur, c'est que, pour M. Barroso, il y a eu un débat public. On n'a pas gagné, on a perdu, c'est la vie. Mais il y a eu un véritable débat public. Ensuite, il y a eu une confrontation. Vous avez réussi, la majorité!

Martin Schulz, il ne faut pas toujours pointer le doigt sur les autres. Si tous les socialistes avaient voté avec nous contre M. Barroso, il n'aurait pas eu de majorité. Cela aussi, il faut le dire, et pas simplement dire ceci ou cela. C'est la vie, c'est comme ça. Oui, c'est vrai, Martin, tu es toujours à dire "les autres, les autres". Il faut aussi, quelquefois, que les sociaux-démocrates apprennent à prendre leurs responsabilités dans les défaites. Sans cela, on ne gagnera jamais.

Je voudrais maintenant dire une chose sur le processus. Et là, je ne suis pas d'accord avec vous, Monsieur Reinfeldt. Nous allons avoir un président du Conseil européen. Je ne veux pas que ce soit un coup d'État. Tout d'un coup, au dernier moment, vous allez proposer quelqu'un. En une semaine, la décision aura été rendue. Je trouve que l'Europe a le droit d'avoir un débat public, que les opinions publiques de tous les États doivent avoir le droit de se prononcer sur vos propositions. Qu'il s'agisse de M. Blair, de M. Balkenende, de M. Jean-Claude Juncker ou de M. Guy Verhofstadt, je crois

que nous avons le droit d'avoir un débat public. Il ne faut pas que ce soient les gouvernements qui, en catimini, décident du président de l'Europe au dernier moment.

Pourquoi est-ce que je dis cela? Parce que tout le monde sait que, aujourd'hui, les opinions publiques ne sont pas favorables à M. Blair. Parce que tout le monde sait qu'il est inadmissible que Jean-Claude Juncker n'ait aucune chance parce que Mme Merkel et M. Sarkozy sont tout simplement contre. Ce n'est pas un débat public démocratique. Il faut mettre tout sur la table et après, vous déciderez. La même chose s'applique pour le haut représentant. Mettez les propositions sur la table.

Je vais vous dire une chose. Là, M. Barroso a raison, M. Verhofstadt a raison. Vous nous avez fait élire M. Barroso en disant qu'il y avait urgence. Et maintenant, vous allez avoir une Commission "*lame-duck*" qui va suivre les choses jusqu'à ce qu'une décision soit possible. Cela dépend des Tchèques.

Mais il y a autre chose. Nous avons proposé de prolonger toute la Commission, y compris M. Barroso, justement pour qu'elle soit capable de mener les négociations à temps plein pour Copenhague. Je trouve inadmissible de ne pas lancer le processus de la Commission tout de suite, en mettant les noms sur la table. Et M. Verhofstadt a fait la bonne proposition: si les Tchèques ne se prononcent pas, eh bien, les Tchèques n'auront pas de commissaire, puisqu'il faudra réduire, en vertu du traité de Nice, le nombre de commissaires. Et si les Tchèques se prononcent avant la fin, les choses se passeront dans le cadre du traité de Lisbonne et ils auront un commissaire. Il faut mettre tout sur la table.

Pour en finir, je voudrais dire simplement une chose. Nous devons continuer les débats après le traité de Lisbonne. Le traité de Lisbonne, ce n'est pas la fin de l'histoire. La constitutionnalisation de l'Europe ne peut pas s'arrêter avec le traité de Lisbonne. Si nous n'avons pas la force de continuer ce débat une fois le traité de Lisbonne en place, je crois que nous manquerons un grand rendez-vous avec l'histoire, le rendez-vous de l'Europe.

3-061

**Timothy Kirkhope**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I spent most of my early political years fighting against dangerous individuals like Mr Cohn-Bendit. I really was quite alarmed a moment ago that I was actually agreeing with one or two bits of his speech, and I was only saved by the fact that in his final remarks I was able to be totally opposed to him again. I want to be quite consistent about my position, speaking as leader of the British Conservatives in the European Parliament. For those of us who support the principle of the nation states coming together to cooperate freely in Europe, the progress of the Lisbon Treaty perhaps should not be such a cause for celebration today.

The tragedy of our Union is that, through too many people's eyes, it has become an elitist project, pushing its ideology onto an increasingly sceptical public, according to Eurostat information. You lose one referendum so you call another to get the result you want. If the term 'constitution' proves unpopular and unacceptable it is given a fresh wrapping so that past rejections can be ignored. If the promised referendum looks unwinnable it is cancelled without apparent shame or embarrassment. In the UK, all political parties, including a government in office, pledged the British people that they would be consulted on the future of Europe. The Socialists and the Liberals reneged on their promise. Such political tricks may secure short-term advantages but we should regret the fact that the peoples of Europe have hardly had their faith in their politicians enhanced by such cynical manoeuvres.

We in the ECR want a Europe built on the secure foundations of popular support and the democratic legitimacy offered by the institutions of its nation states. But the Lisbon Treaty is, in our view, still a step in the wrong direction. By opening the door to a supranational foreign and security policy, by giving more power to European institutions and abolishing national vetoes in policy areas crucial to our states, the Treaty takes a dramatic step towards the superstate feared by many. The peoples of Europe do not want a Union of ever closer centralisation, a Union that increases its powers at the expense of its Member States, a Union which is remote from their daily concerns. However, they do want a Europe of diversity, a Europe where the different cultures and ways of life combine, where added value can be achieved. They want a reformed Union, a more accountable, transparent, democratic Union which delivers value for money in those areas in which it has delegated responsibility, a Europe closer and more relevant to the people.

The Lisbon Treaty has therefore been a missed opportunity. I served in the Convention following the Laeken Declaration, which I much supported, a Convention which drafted the original constitutional text. I know the details well, the good points as well as the bad. The UK Conservatives have been consistent. We believe that the Treaty as it has turned out will not take things forward in the interests of the people. And we in the ECR will continue to fight for our vision of the European Union, a vision in tune with the hopes and aspirations of the peoples of Europe. We will continue to argue for a European Union fit for the purposes of the future, not the past, and for a European Union which rests securely on the support of its peoples and not only the priorities of any elite. We should all reflect on that.

3-062

**Lothar Bisky**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Meine Fraktion hat sich immer für verbindliche Referenden zum Reformvertrag in ganz Europa ausgesprochen. Die Wählerinnen und Wähler in

Irland hatten als einzige die Möglichkeit, ihre Entscheidung schon vor anderthalb Jahren direkt zu treffen. Wenn man Bürgerentscheide will, muss man ihr Ergebnis akzeptieren, auch wenn einem das Ergebnis nicht gefällt.

Die Regierung in Irland hat gegen dieses Demokratieprinzip verstoßen und ein zweites Referendum durchgeführt, auch auf Druck anderer Mitgliedstaaten. Nun haben sie ihr gewünschtes Resultat. Wir Linken halten am Demokratieprinzip fest, aber unsere Sorge über die politische Ausrichtung in der EU bleibt bestehen. Dass wir nicht die Einzigen sind, zeigt übrigens auch die Zahl der Neinstimmen in Irland.

Hier drei Schwerpunkte unserer Kritik: Erstens haben die bisherige Politik der Liberalisierung von Finanzmärkten, der Steuerwettbewerb, die Abkoppelung der Finanzpolitik von der Wirtschaftspolitik und der Rückbau des Sozialstaates zur Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrise beigetragen. Diese Politik hat damit zur Ausweitung von Armut und Ungleichheit in Europa geführt. Außer Absichtserklärungen hat sich in Richtung Finanzmarktregulierung bislang wenig bewegt. Im Gegenteil, während die Arbeitslosenzahlen steigen, erwarten die Großbanken schon wieder kräftige Gewinne. Der Lissabon-Vertrag schreibt diese Politik der Marktwirtschaft mit freiem Wettbewerb fort. Dem können wir nicht zustimmen.

Wir fordern stattdessen ein grundsätzlich anderes Herangehen an soziale Herausforderungen. Unser Ziel ist die Einführung einer sozialen Fortschrittsklausel, mit EU-weit gültigen Mindestlöhnen. Gleiches Entgelt für gleiche Arbeit am gleichen Ort. Lohndumping muss bekämpft werden.

Die zweite Kritik: Die Forderung an die Mitgliedstaaten, ihre militärischen Fähigkeiten schrittweise zu verbessern, ist unvereinbar mit linken Zielen, genauso wie die Verankerung einer Rüstungsagentur im EU-Primärrecht. Weltweiten militärischen Missionen zur Interessendurchsetzung werden wir nicht zustimmen. Einen solchen Vertrag wollen wir nicht, wir wollen einen Vertrag der Abrüstung, nicht der Aufrüstung. Es ist schon paradox, deshalb als Europagegner bezeichnet zu werden. Wer in Europa für Aufrüstung wirbt, gilt als Freund Europas, wer in Europa für Abrüstung wirbt, gilt als Feind Europas. Das ist politisch absurd!

Das Referendum in Irland hat also stattgefunden, und auch wenn es nicht allen unseren Wünschen entspricht, sagen wir: Wir werden als Linke weiterhin für mehr direkte Demokratie in Europa eintreten.

3-063

**Nigel Farage, on behalf of the EFD Group.** – Mr President, well, it is all terribly simple really, isn't it? We have had one vote against the Treaty in Ireland and one vote for the Treaty in Ireland, so if we have we got any sort of sporting sense we ought to make this the best of three; but the difference is that with a third referendum let's make it a free and a fair referendum. Because what has happened in Ireland most certainly is not that! In fact, I hope you are all very proud of yourselves because what you have done is you have taken the littlest boy in the playground, got him into the corner and given him a good kicking. This is a victory for the bully boys; it is a victory for big money and a victory for bureaucrats. The whole thing was a travesty!

*(Heckling)*

Oh, so you respect this vote, do you? You did not respect the last vote, did you? The European Commission poured in millions of pounds of taxpayers' money – well, pounds or euros, it doesn't matter, though it does in our case because we have still got the pound, thank God! – you poured in millions. Something like a factor of between 10:1 and 20:1 was the outspending of the 'yes' side to the 'no' side. The Referendum Commission in Ireland did not do its job, did not tell the Irish people that of course the Lisbon constitutional treaty has profound impacts on their own constitution; and, perhaps worst of all, the Broadcasting Commission in Ireland changed the rules, so there was not equal coverage for the 'yes' and the 'no' sides. The whole thing was an outrage. But what they did campaign on, what you all campaigned on, was 'Vote "yes" for jobs'. That was what it was all about. Well, hot off the press, folks: Aer Lingus have laid people off today and Intel, the people who put EUR 400 000 into the 'yes' campaign, have laid off 300 people today. One thousand, five hundred and fifty jobs have gone since Saturday; the only jobs that were preserved by the 'yes' vote were the jobs of the political class.

I suspect that it is all over. I suspect that for Ireland their period of independence will be a very brief one in their history. I do not think that President Klaus will be able to hold out, I hope that he does; he is a fine and brave man. But it looks like we have got the victory of bureaucracy over national democracy. In historical terms, I think Britain now finds herself very alone, perhaps as she was back in 1940, but...

*(Mixed reactions)*

...there is a real debate, there is a real debate here. What is the point of having a Conservative Prime Minister if Mr Blair becomes the overlord? What is the point of a Foreign Secretary if we have got an EU foreign secretary with his own diplomatic service? What is the point of any of it? As far as I am concerned, this Irish referendum begins the real debate.

There is no more pretending: if you want national democracy you cannot remain a member of this European Union, and we will campaign for Britain to leave and to leave as soon possible.

3-064

**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI).** – Mr President, yesterday I asked Mrs Wallström, the Vice-President of the Commission, whether the Lisbon Treaty was essentially the same as the Constitutional Treaty that it replaced. She said the changes were those required by the British Government and they involved changes in names and symbols. She did not use the word ‘only’ but she might easily have done.

The Constitutional Treaty had already been rejected by the electorates of France and the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom was due to hold its referendum. It would certainly have resulted in a rejection. It is clear that the replacement of the Constitutional Treaty by the European Reform Treaty was carried out at the request of the British Government to enable them to renege on their pledge to hold a referendum.

The substance would remain the same, but the names and symbols would be changed as part of a thoroughly dishonest claim that the treaties were different and a referendum would not be necessary. How can anybody dare to call this trickery and this dishonesty any kind of democracy?

3-065

**Fredrik Reinfeldt, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank the group leaders for their comments. I see that many of them want to see some haste in this process, and I can understand that.

I think we should be clear that we are moving into more or less unknown territory. If you look at the legal ground, it was actually foreseen that the Lisbon Treaty should already have been in place from 1 January this year. We are now trying to act flexibly in a new situation arising from the situation in Ireland but also in other countries.

It is often true in Swedish debates that when you make your point you make a reference to democracy. That is good. That is also what I am trying to achieve here. If a new Treaty is to come into force, it is very clear that it has to be ratified by the 27 Member States. That is what we need to have in place and that is why I am so precise in saying that we are now at number 24. There are three countries still outstanding, and the longest wait will probably be for the Czech Republic.

Once the 27th country has ratified, we will move on. Ireland has not ratified. It needs parliamentary ratification before the process is complete. You might say this is easy but you have to be thorough, so you never know. When we have all 27, then the package is clear and we will move over to the Lisbon Treaty.

In doing so, it is also very important to say that all the Treaties we have been discussing have come about by balancing different views, and it is pretty clear that I and others here present need to follow these Treaties. It happens very often that you do something else that is not in line with the Treaties. That is what we are trying to achieve here with the Swedish Presidency.

That is why I am telling you we will try to act quickly on a situation which at the moment actually lies in the hands of a Constitutional Court in Prague, Czech Republic. When they give their say as to whether they are going to take up this complaint or not, that is when the Swedish Presidency will give its next reaction to this process. That is democracy at work, because we are following exactly the Treaties and the reactions from these different countries.

My message to you is that with this clear majority we have to get the Lisbon Treaty in as soon as possible because we believe this will get us a better functioning Europe, but I will do this thoroughly. I will follow the Treaties and also respect the fact that all 27 Member States must ratify before we can make that move.

Thank you very much for your comments, and thank you for your support.

3-066

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I will just make some comments on the comments made by the group leaders, and I thank all of them for their contributions. These institutional issues of transitions between two treaties are very difficult from a legal and political point of view, and they require wisdom from all institutions. Of course, we would like to have the new Treaty approved as soon as possible. The majority of Members of this Parliament want it, all the governments want it, and the Commission certainly wants it.

The point is, as the Prime Minister has just pointed out, that the Treaty will not be approved before the end of the mandate of this Commission. The Commission’s mandate lasts until the end of this month, so we will inevitably have a period where the Commission is a ‘caretaker’ Commission. That is why I think Parliament took the right decision some time ago in already deciding on the President of the Commission, because that gives the President of the Commission the authority, the political authority, to represent the Commission in very important international obligations. That was a wise decision of the European Parliament.

The important point now is to see how to deal with this transition. Today we have discussed this in the Commission, and our opinion in the College is that we should, if possible, already bring in the new Commission under the Lisbon Treaty. That is our opinion because this is the Treaty we want; this is the Treaty which gives you, Parliament, more rights in terms of the formation of the Commission itself. For instance, the High Representative will be Vice-President of the Commission, and so you will vote on the High Representative. That will not happen if we implement the Nice Treaty, and so it is our opinion that we should if possible bring in the new Commission under the Lisbon rules. But that, of course, is a question of wisdom and of timing as well. We have in the past, namely in the first Commission that I took part in, also started with a prolongation of the previous Commission for three weeks.

So the question is: how long does it take? And that is why I stated very quickly – and Prime Minister Reinfeldt knows what I think about it – that it is one thing to wait for some weeks and another thing to be waiting we do not know until when. That is a question of judgement, political judgement, and I hope the European Council will take the right decisions based on the information we get from our Czech partners. This is the question which has to be decided in the European Council at the end of this month.

Certainly we do not want – I think it is in nobody's interests – to have a Commission that is without full legal competences. It is not in the interests of the Commission and I am sure it is also not in the interests of the European Parliament. That is why I have said I am ready: I am ready to start the formation of the new Commission as soon as we have the legal clarity and the European Council starts the process. For that I need the Council to take some decisions. I need the European Council to propose a High Representative because the High Representative, according to the Lisbon Treaty, has to be approved by the President of the Commission as Vice-President of the Commission.

Regarding some comments, I want to underline certain points, and to reassure some Members of Parliament. Some of you said that there will be a 'President of Europe'. I am sorry: there will not be a 'President of Europe'. If we have the Lisbon Treaty, there will be a President of the European Council: it is different. There is a President of Parliament, there is a President of the Commission, and there will be a President of the European Council. It is important to underline that point because sometimes I think there are ideas about certain *dérives institutionnelles*, and I will not accept, and the European Commission will not accept, the idea that the President of the European Council is the President of Europe, because it is not in the Treaties.

*(Applause)*

It is not in the Treaties and we will have to respect the Treaties. We have to respect the institutions. There is a President of the European Parliament; there is President of the Commission. If we have Lisbon, there will be a President of the European Council.

It is very important to understand that all our decisions have to be taken in the framework of the current treaties. That is why I now believe that, as soon as the Czechs verify their situation, we should move forward. That is why I think we should work on those points I made before, from the Citizens' Initiative to the External Services, with that spirit of cooperation between all institutions so that, when the decisions are formally taken, we can implement with determination everything that the Lisbon Treaty brings, which I believe is more accountability, more democracy and more efficiency for our Union.

3-067

**Gay Mitchell (PPE).** – Mr President, as the first Irish person to speak in this debate, may I thank colleagues for their kind comments about the Irish electorate. I also note the people who have been thanked here so far. I would like to point out that two people who played a stalwart part in this campaign in the 'yes' vote and put their countries' interest before their own party political interests – Mr Enda Kenny TD, leader of Fine Gael, and Mr Eamon Gilmore TD, leader of the Labour Party – have not been thanked. They did more than anybody else selflessly to ensure that this campaign was carried and I want that acknowledged on the record here today.

The Lisbon Treaty process in Ireland demonstrates that when we make the effort to bring people with us, they are prepared to respond to leadership. The European project remains the best hope for the people of Europe and elsewhere for a peaceful and prosperous future. We cannot assume that people will appreciate its benefits. We have to be as open and as inclusive as possible while explaining these benefits to them. Enlargement has not blunted the project. Rather it has enabled us to let others share in its benefits. There is indeed unity in diversity.

Some people in Ireland were unsure of the contents of the Treaty; others were concerned about abortion being forced on a Member State, about neutrality, about the loss of the Commissioner and about the potential for the country to lose control over its own direct taxation policy. The Irish Parliament, through a special committee, identified the concerns of the people following the first referendum and the Government got guarantees on these matters from our partners and crucially the change in relation to the future composition of the Commission.



That was democracy in action at every level. The reason the Irish Parliament had a right and a duty to do what they did is that the sovereign people of Ireland gave them that right and duty. From the high turnout and overwhelming 'yes' vote, it is clear that the democratic will of the people was served.

Mr President, I support what you said about concerns among some of our peoples. Let me now raise one issue which I feel needs to be raised. Some people in Ireland and elsewhere believe that the EU is becoming a cold place for Christianity in particular, and religion in general. I have to say that I personally have experienced disrespect from people here who see themselves as fair-minded and liberal, but who are anything but that when it comes to trying to see things from the point of view of people who have religious belief. I respect those who do not have religious belief, but I fully expect them to reciprocate that respect. That is what the whole EU project is about. I repeat: unity in diversity. The second Irish referendum shows what can be achieved when we are truly inclusive. I put these words out there for those who have ears to hear, and for posterity.

Let us now move to complete the ratification and then to deliver on the promises that Lisbon contains of greater democracy and transparency, a coherent role in the world, applying the same tolerant and inclusive principles in our dealings with other regions of the world, especially the poorest parts, as we must apply internally.

3-068

**Proinsias De Rossa (S-D).** – Mr President, when we last debated this issue, I predicted that the Irish electorate would reject the political circus comprising Gerry Adams, Nigel Farage and Joe Higgins. I am happy to say that I called it correctly.

The Nigel Farage bombast, it has to be said, did add to the gaiety of the Irish nation for a while, but of course the contempt that he holds for Irish democracy oozed from every pore of his body here today. His manoeuvrings to get the Irish electorate to get Britain to leave the EU demonstrated, I believe, his poor grasp of the shared British and Irish history.

More importantly, the Irish electorate have overwhelmingly declared that our future is with Europe, that Europe is good for Ireland and that Ireland has a positive contribution to make to the development of the Union. I am hopeful that all Member States will have ratified the Treaty within a short while and that the institutional and democratic and social reforms can be implemented without further delay. The world needs a more effective Union to ensure that we can vigorously pursue the objectives of a sustainable development economically, environmentally and socially.

I want to make it clear to you, President Barroso, and to you, Mr President-in-Office, that the peoples of Europe are demanding action from the Union. They no longer need to be persuaded that we need global as well as domestic solutions to the problems we face. What they want to see is the action to actually begin to deal with these crises. They want tangible action, not rhetoric.

I do hope that we get a Commission which is effective, which is able, and capable in particular of shaking off the dead economic ideology which has brought us to the brink of disaster in Europe and indeed around the rest of the world. We must put in place the objective that we have outlined in the Lisbon Treaty: a social market economy which will bring jobs, which will bring prosperity and which will bring a decent standard of living to all of our peoples.

3-069

**Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE).** – Mr President, last week the Irish people, by a victory of 619 000 votes, gave a resounding vote of confidence in the European Union project. I would like to thank the other 26 governments in Europe and the political groups in this Parliament who worked very closely with the Irish Government over the past 15 months so that the concerns expressed by the Irish people in the Lisbon Treaty I were comprehensively addressed.

This was a victory for the Irish people, not necessarily for the Government or political parties. The Irish people overwhelmingly said that Ireland's place lies at the heart of the European Union.

3-070

Bhí na páirtithe polaitíochta a bhí ar son an chonartha ag obair as lámh a chéile an iarraidh seo, níos mó ná mar a bhí le linn an reifrinn dheireanaigh.

Bhí ról lárnach ag grúpaí cathartha, ar nós *Ireland for Europe* agus *We Belong*, i léiriú a dhéanamh don phobal nach an córas polaitíochta amháin a bhí ag iarraidh go nglacadh pobal na tíre leis an reifreann. Bhí grúpaí feirmeoireachta láidir ar son an chonartha agus bhí siad iontach gníomhach san fheachtas seo.

Athrú suntasach atá ann ón reifreann deireanach, agus bhí sé sin le feiceáil.

3-071

The legally binding guarantees for Ireland in the policy areas of taxation, neutrality and socio-ethical issues clarified key concerns of the Irish people. I hope that the Treaty will now be ratified shortly, and I am pleased to hear the news from you, Mr President, about your country.

But I would have to say that the remarks made here this afternoon by Mr Farage from the UKIP party were insulting to the Irish people and we will not accept that. The Irish people are an intelligent, discerning electorate and they knew the difference between the last Treaty and this Treaty, that the protocols have legally binding agreement. Mr Farage, you and your colleagues will be pleased to know that your intervention in the Treaty meant about 3 or 4% extra for the 'yes' side. That is the respect that the Irish people have for you and your group.

3-072

**Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Auch ich war letzten Samstag sehr erfreut und erleichtert, dass die irische Bevölkerung mit Zweidrittelmehrheit Ja gesagt und damit eindeutig die falschen Aussagen und Schreckensmärchen wie von einem Mindestlohn von 1,84 Euro nicht mehr geglaubt hat, und dass sie zu diesem gemeinsamen Europa Ja gesagt hat.

Endlich gibt es die Chance, in der Außenpolitik gemeinsam für mehr Konfliktprävention einzutreten, für mehr Menschenrechte und Demokratie in allen Teilen der Welt, also diese globale Verantwortung, die die Europäische Union hat, stärker wahrzunehmen. Aber damit das wirklich in Kraft treten kann – und das haben einige ja schon gesagt –, braucht es die Unterstützung von allen europäischen Staats- und Regierungschefs, damit auch Präsident Klaus dazu bewegt wird, den Vertrag zu unterzeichnen. Ich meine tatsächlich alle. Ich war heute früh sehr empört, dass ein Regierungschef – nämlich der österreichische Bundeskanzler, Werner Faymann – in einem Interview erklärt hat, dass er, wenn Präsident Klaus nicht unterschreibt, auch für Österreich die Chance sieht, hier eine neue Volksabstimmung durchzuführen. Das ist europapolitische Verantwortungslosigkeit! Ich ersuche in diesem Zusammenhang den Herrn Ratspräsidenten, gegenüber dem österreichischen Regierungschef klarzumachen, dass es hier um unsere gemeinsame europapolitische Verantwortung geht. Ich ersuche auch die Kolleginnen und Kollegen der Sozialdemokraten, das klarzustellen.

Es geht darum, dass alle, die für dieses gemeinsame Europa sind, jetzt klarmachen, dass auch Präsident Klaus unterschreiben soll, dass wir keine irgendwie geartete Unterminierung dieses Prozesses, der zur Erfüllung des Lissabon-Vertrags führt, brauchen können. Auch keine „Spompanadln“, wie wir auf Österreichisch sagen, also schnell mal das zu machen, was vielleicht in der Bevölkerung populär ist. Ich halte das für europapolitisch wirklich verantwortungslos und hoffe, dass es hier einen Rückzieher des österreichischen Regierungschefs gibt.

3-073

**Jan Zahradil (ECR).** – Dámy a pánové, není mým úmyslem se vměšovat do vnitřních záležitostí Irska a uznávám právo irské politické reprezentace nechat hlasovat o této smlouvě tolikrát, kolikrát uzná za vhodné, a samozřejmě respektuji výsledek toho referenda, stejně jako jsem respektoval výsledek loňského referenda, které dopadlo opačně. Nevím, který výsledek je hodnotnější nebo platnější, možná že by mi v tom mohli irští kolegové být nápomocni radou, nicméně jediné, co mohu hodnotit, je, jak to působí navenek a jak celá atmosféra okolo ratifikace Lisabonské smlouvy působí navenek, a bohužel musím říci, že ten dojem je ořesný. Já jsem žil prvních 26 let svého života v režimu, který nepřipouštěl svobodnou volbu a kde žádné svobodné volby nebyly možné a kde byl možný pouze jeden jediný výsledek. Já se velmi obávám, že mnozí v této místnosti i jinde v Evropské unii se domnívají, že jediný možný a myslitelný výsledek, pokud jde o ratifikaci Lisabonské smlouvy, byl a je „ano“ a žádný jiný výsledek pro ně není přijatelný a není pro ně přípustný.

A já se ptám, proč je tolik povyku a tolik politického tlaku kolem Lisabonské smlouvy, když přece bez této smlouvy by se Evropská unie ani nerozpadla, ani nezhroutila, ale fungovala by dále na stávajícím smluvním základě. A odpovídám si, že v tomto případě jsme svědky úplně exemplárního příkladu realpolitik, mocenské politiky, kdy nejde o demokratičtější Evropu nebo lépe fungující či transparentnější Evropskou unii, ale jde o nové překreslení mocenských poměrů v Evropské unii. Já to říkám bez hořkosti, já jsem v politice dost dlouho na to, abych věděl, co to je realpolitik, ale alespoň si tady nelžeme do kapsy.

Kdo vydělá na Lisabonské smlouvě? Bude to Evropská komise, takže se nedivím, že Evropské komise je jejím velkým zastáncem, bude to Evropský parlament, takže se nedivím, že mnozí v této místnosti jsou zastánci této smlouvy, a bude to několik silných států Evropské unie a budou to také federalisté ve všech frakcích, ať je to Evropská lidová strana nebo Strana evropských socialistů nebo Strana evropských liberálů. Já se ale nejvíce obávám toho, že tento přístup, přístup ve stylu účel svěť prostředky, se obrátí proti nám všem, že budeme svědky protireakce, která přijde v příštích letech, a že tento tlak na schválení Lisabonské smlouvy vyvolá protitlak v podobě nárůstu podpory pro skutečné antievropany, pro extremistické, xenofobní a antievropské síly a že toto vítězství bude vítězstvím Pyrrhových.

3-074

**Zoltán Balczó (NI).** – A képviselő úrnak rövid kérdést szeretnék föltenni. A kérdés a következő: Ön a demokráciával összetartozónak véli, hogy az ír kormány annyiszor ír ki népszavazást, ahányszor akar? Hogyan ítéli meg azt, hogy az osztrák kormányfő úgy gondolja, hogy most először népszavazást szeretne kiírni ebben a kérdésben? Elfogadja ezt is demokráciának vagy ezt kekeckedésnek nevezi, mint az előtte felszólaló? Erre szeretném a válaszát kérni.

3-075

**Jan Zahradil (ECR).** – Já tady nejsem od toho, abych hodnotil postupy irské vlády nebo rakouské vlády nebo jakékoli jiné vlády, neudělal jsem to, nedělám to a dělat to v žádném případě nebudu.

3-076

**Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL).** – A Uachtarán, labhair muintir na hÉireann. Glacaim leis sin. Maíonn iad siúd a deir gur vóta 'Tá' a bhí sa vóta seo don Eoraip, gur vóta 'Níl' don Eoraip a bhí ann anuraidh. Níorbh ea. Ní raibh tacaíocht na hÉireann don Eoraip i gceist anuraidh ná i mbliana.

Rinne Coimisiún na hEorpa cinneadh méid ollmhór acmhainní a chaitheamh go díreach roimh an reifreann ar fheachtas bolscaireachta ar bhuntáistí an Aontais Eorpaigh. Chuir sin leis an smaoineamh gur vóta faoi 'Tá' nó 'Níl' don Eoraip a bhí ann seachas 'Tá' nó 'Níl' do Chonradh Liospóin. Is oth liom é sin.

Tá dúshlán righin agus soiléir roimh gach duine sa seomra seo anois chun aithint gur gá dul i ngleic go fóill le cuid mhór de na himní a tháinig chun cinn le linn fheachtas an reifrinn. Tá imní ar leith ar dhaoine faoi thuarastail, faoi chearta oibrithe agus faoi sheirbhísí poiblí, chomh maith le neamh-mhíleatú agus glór na stát beag.

Dúradh le muintir na hÉireann an t-am seo dá gcaithfeadh siad 'Níl' mar vóta an dara huair go mbeadh Éire fágtha ina haonar, fágtha leithlisithe in aghaidh na géarchéime eacnamaíche.

Ba chóir dóibh siúd a thacaigh leis an Chonradh mar chonradh do phoist agus d'infheistíocht, na poist agus an téarnamh a sholáthar anois.

Níor chóir dearmad a dhéanamh ar na gealltanais a rinneadh a luaithe a bhí an toradh a d'iarr rialtas na hÉireann agus ceannairí AE bainte amach.

3-077

**Morten Messerschmidt (EFD).** – Hr. formand! Hvis der er én ting, man kan udlægge af den afstemning, der har fundet sted i Irland, så er det, at har man en tilstrækkelig ubalance i fordelingen mellem ja- og nej-siden, har man en tilstrækkelig ubalance i mediernes dækning af sagen, og spørger man tilstrækkeligt mange gange, så kan det godt lade sig gøre at få et ja. Men hvis en af disse forudsætninger brister, så får man ikke europæerne til at afgive mere suverænitet til disse institutioner, som vi befinder os i. Det er den virkelighed, som vi alle sammen må forholde os til.

En anden del af virkeligheden - som i hvert fald for dem, der støtter traktaten, må være en meget ubehagelig del af virkeligheden - det er den måde, som er den eneste måde, hvorpå denne traktat kan realiseres, nemlig i en stemning af frygt. En stemning af frygt for, at man internt i Storbritannien får en ny situation, som gør, at man må spørge den britiske befolkning. Det må være meget ubehageligt alene at kunne realisere sine visioner i en stemning af frygt for, at endnu et lands befolkning skal blive spurgt - at demokratiet endnu en gang skal få lov til at tale.

Vi hørte tidligere i dag formanden for Parlamentet sige, at man vil respektere nej-siden. Men det er helt ærligt meget svært at få øje respekten for nej-siden. Vi har fået at vide, at symbolerne ville blive fjernet fra traktaten - alligevel er hele huset her plastret til med flag. Vi har fået at vide, at hymnen ville blive taget ud af traktaten - alligevel fejrede man det nye Parlament ved at afspille Beethovens 9. symfoni. Der er ikke meget tillid tilbage til de garantier, som man har givet de irske vælgere eller os skeptikere. Vi ville gerne have tillid, men den kan ligge på et meget lille sted.

3-078

**Proinsias De Rossa (S-D).** – Mr President, I would appeal to those who do not like the outcome of the Irish referendum to stop questioning the democratic procedures in Ireland. Ireland is a democratic state. It is an independent democratic state. The Parliament of the Irish Republic made a decision to hold a referendum; that referendum has been held. It was supported by 95% of the elected representatives in the Irish Parliament. So, please, you can have your criticisms of the European Union, but you have no right to question the democracy of my State.

3-079

**President.** – Under the 'blue card' rule you must ask a question, not make a statement. The wording is very strict, and it is very important that this rule is respected.

3-080

**Morten Messerschmidt (EFD).** – Hr. formand! For mig at se betyder demokrati, at man stiller et spørgsmål. Man får et svar. Demokrati er ikke, at man bliver ved med at spørge, indtil man får det svar, som man på forhånd havde forventet. Hvis ikke medlemmerne af dette Parlament, og hvis ikke medlemmerne af Kommissionen og Rådet var så bange for befolkningen, hvorfor er det så kun i ét land, at det ikke er lykkedes at forhindre afholdelsen af en folkeafstemning? Det lykkedes regeringerne og EU's institutioner at forhindre afholdelsen af folkeafstemninger i de andre 26 lande. Det er ikke demokrati.

3-081

**Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI).** – Señor Presidente, este Parlamento es el palacio de la quimera, el palacio de los sueños.

El pueblo irlandés, con su voto tan fuerte, nos da ánimos y fuerzas para seguir prosperando y construir una Europa fuerte y, sobre todo, una Europa federal.

Solo así mereceríamos el título de legítimos herederos de los padres de Europa por cuya labor todos nosotros estamos aquí.

3-082

**Othmar Karas (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Die Mehrheit freut sich, ist erleichtert. Von der Minderheit erwarte ich, dass sie das Ergebnis respektiert!

27 Völker und das Europäische Parlament haben mehrfach mehrheitlich Ja zur Weiterentwicklung der Europäischen Union gesagt. Wir stellen fest, dass es eine demokratische Mehrheit gibt und eine blockierende Minderheit. Dieses Ja der demokratischen Mehrheit war ein Ja der Vernunft, ein Ja zu einer demokratischeren, transparenteren und bürgernäheren Europäischen Union, ein Ja der proeuropäisch positiv denkenden und handelnden Menschen, ein Ja zur Stärkung der Europäischen Union in der Welt, ein wichtiger Schritt in die richtige Richtung.

Wir sind noch lange nicht fertig, weil wir eine gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik benötigen, um ein *global player* zu werden. Wir müssen die Demokratie weiterentwickeln, z.B. durch die Möglichkeit einer europäischen Volksabstimmung, durch ein einheitliches europäisches Wahlrecht und vieles mehr. Wir haben jetzt einiges zu tun, wir dürfen keine Zeit verlieren. Von der Kommission erwarte ich, dass sie rasch die Reform der Dossiers vorantreibt und die Gespräche mit den Mitgliedstaaten über die Kommissare beginnt. Vom Rat erwarte ich, dass er Klarheit schafft, wie er zu diesem Ergebnis steht. Und von uns selbst erwarte ich, dass wir uns der Information, der Kommunikation und dem Dialog mit dem Bürger verstärkt stellen.

Wir haben doch deutlich gesehen: Je besser Information, Kommunikation und der Dialog sind, umso größer ist die Mehrheit. Politiker, die sich das nicht zutrauen, sind fehl am Platz, genauso wie Politiker, die sich hinter Volksabstimmungen verstecken, weil sie selbst nicht auf den Bürger zugehen und Verantwortung übernehmen wollen. Je europäischer die Debatte war, umso größer war die Mehrheit. Wir sagen Nein zu einer Nationalisierung der Europapolitik, nein zu nationalen Volksabstimmungen in europäischen Angelegenheiten, außer beim Beitritt des eigenen Landes!

3-083

**Hannes Swoboda (S-D).** – Herr Präsident! Der Kollege Zahradil hat gefragt, wer den Nutzen trage. Er meinte, wir als Parlamentarier. Mag sein. Es ist ja auch nicht so schlecht, wenn in einer parlamentarischen Demokratie die Parlamente – es handelt sich ja nicht nur um das Europäische Parlament, sondern auch um die nationalen Parlamente – etwas davon haben. Aber in Wirklichkeit profitieren die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, wenn wir deren Interessen stärker und besser vertreten können.

Kollege Schulz hat bereits darauf hingewiesen: Wir leben in einer veränderten Welt, in einer Welt, in der es ein starkes China, ein stärker werdendes Indien, ein stärker werdendes Brasilien und nach wie vor starke Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika gibt.

Wenn wir heute nach Washington schauen, sehen wir, dass gerade auch die neue Regierung fragt: Was sagt denn Europa zu den verschiedenen Themen, von Afghanistan bis zu anderen Fragen? Gibt es da eine klare Aussage und eine klare Sprache? Wenn wir die nicht haben, werden wir nicht ernst genommen.

Russland versucht immer wieder, die EU-Mitgliedstaaten gegeneinander auszuspielen, weil das natürlich angenehmer ist für unsere Partner. Wer heute diesen Vertrag nach wie vor bekämpft, weil er fälschlicherweise meint, das sei ein Vertrag, der die Europäische Union stärkt, dem sei gesagt: In Wirklichkeit stärken die, die diesen Vertrag bekämpfen, eigentlich unsere so genannten Partner, wenn man so will auch unsere Gegner.

Es ist bereits angekommen: Ja, wir haben noch einige institutionelle Fragen zu lösen, insbesondere im Zusammenhang mit dem Auswärtigen Dienst. Aber versuchen wir jetzt nicht, weiter institutionelle Debatten zu führen. Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger wollen eine klare inhaltliche Antwort haben. Sie wollen, dass wir eine starke Sprache sprechen, wenn es um den Klimaschutz, um Sicherheitsfragen, um die Finanzregulierung geht. In jedem einzelnen Fall können wir beweisen: Mit Lissabon geht es besser. Aber wir müssen inhaltlich argumentieren, sodass der Bürger das Gefühl hat, dass die Europäische Union sich nicht nur um sich selbst kümmert, sondern um die Interessen ihrer Bürgerinnen und Bürger.

3-084

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Ich hätte gerne auch Herrn Karas eine Frage gestellt, die ich vielleicht noch anbringen werde. Herrn Abgeordneten Swoboda stelle ich die Frage – nachdem Frau Lunacek bereits unseren Bundeskanzler Faymann und seinen Parteikollegen kritisiert hat –, wie er als Sozialdemokrat sich nun zum Vorschlag seines Bundesparteiobmanns bzw. Bundeskanzlers stellen wird, eine Volksabstimmung in Österreich herbeizuführen.

3-085

**Hannes Swoboda (S-D).** – Herr Präsident! Ich glaube nicht, dass wir eine innerösterreichische Debatte führen sollten, aber es ist ganz klar festzuhalten: Über den Vertrag von Lissabon gibt es keine Volksbefragung, auch in Österreich nicht! Das ist ganz klar und eindeutig! Der Vertrag von Lissabon ist ratifiziert und muss möglichst bald in Kraft treten. Das ist meine und unsere Meinung!

3-086

**President.** – Thank you for answering the question, but, colleagues, I will read you the Rule because we must know about it.

‘The President may give the floor to Members who indicate, by raising a blue card, their wish to put to another Member, during that Member’s speech’ – not later – ‘a question of no longer than half a minute’s duration’ – a question only – ‘where the speaker agrees and where the President is satisfied that this will not lead to a disruption of the debate.’

If blue cards are raised too often, then I will not give you the floor because it will lead to disruption of our debate. You must be aware of that.

Raise your card in time and only for questions that take half a minute; answers must not exceed one minute. These are our rules, and we must keep to them very strictly.

3-087

**Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE).** – Herr Präsident! Eine Sache wurde heute hier noch nicht richtig gewürdigt, das ist die Tatsache, dass das positive Referendum in Irland keineswegs das erste positive Referendum zum Verfassungsprozess war, den Guy Verhofstadt hier erwähnt hat. Wir hatten positive Referenden in Luxemburg und in Spanien. Es ist also keineswegs so, dass das hier das erste gewesen wäre.

Es ist immer lustig, Herrn Farage zuzuhören. Aber heute war es nicht lustig. Die Antieuropäer sind wirklich schlechte Verlierer. Der Schock eines Zweidrittel-Ergebnisses sitzt wirklich tief in den Knochen, das ging bis ins Mark. Heute war es ausnahmsweise einmal nicht amüsant, Ihnen zuzuhören. Es war auch interessant zu sehen, wie Timothy Kirkhope sich da in seinem Sitz wand, weil die Tories in ihren europapolitischen Positionen so nahe an dieser komischen Partei dran sind. Ich hoffe sehr, dass sich das irgendwann ändert.

Wir haben festgestellt, dass es demokratische Unterstützung für den europäischen Integrationsprozess aus Irland gibt. Gibt es genug Demokratie in Europa, ist die Demokratie in Europa perfekt? Sicher nicht, aber das war ein guter Tag für die Demokratie in Europa.

Jetzt gibt es manche, die beschwerten sich, Irland sei unter Druck gesetzt worden. Kollege de Rossa hat es ganz klar gesagt: Es war eine souveräne irische Entscheidung, noch einmal abstimmen zu lassen. Denken wir bitte einmal daran, wie die Europäische Union versucht hat, Österreich zu boykottieren, als Jörg Haider an die Regierung kam. Das klappt einfach nicht. Wir können unsere Mitgliedstaaten nicht unter Druck setzen. Unsere Mitgliedstaaten entscheiden in diesen Dingen souverän.

Andere klagen, nur wegen der Krise habe Irland jetzt zugestimmt. In der Krise hat Irland europäische Solidarität erfahren. Das ist doch etwas Positives! Wir erwarten ja auch europäische Solidarität, wenn in Bulgarien oder in Ungarn die Wohnungen kalt bleiben, weil Russland und die Ukraine sich wieder einmal über das Gas streiten. Europäische Solidarität ist etwas Positives. Wenn es zu diesem Ergebnis führt, finde ich das sehr gut.

Der Vertrag eröffnet neue Chancen. Hier gibt es einige Felder – die Haushaltspolitik, die Politik im Justizbereich, im Inneren –, aber am wichtigsten ist für mich die Außenpolitik. Auch wenn Kollege Swoboda sagt, wir sollten keine institutionellen Debatten führen, muss die Debatte über den Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst ernsthaft geführt werden. Wir müssen mit einer Stimme sprechen! Dieses Parlament – und ich sage das deutlich an die Kommission, aber auch an den Rat gerichtet – will einen starken Hohen Vertreter und einen effizienten Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst. Wir wollen einen breit aufgestellten EAD, wir wollen ihn nah an der Kommission, und wir wollen, dass er Zugriff auf alle Dienststellen hat, auch auf die Dienststellen des Ratssekretariats. Das wird der Lackmustest – auch in den Anhörungen der Kommission. Und das wird der Lackmustest für die Zukunft der europäischen Außenpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert, dass wir mit einer Stimme sprechen können.

3-088

**PRESIDE: MIGUEL ANGEL MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ**  
*Vicepresidente*

3-089

**Hélène Flautre (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, il va se passer une chose très simple pour notre Parlement européen, avec la ratification du traité de Lisbonne, c'est que nous allons avoir dix-huit députés européens en plus, issus de douze États de l'Union européenne.

Nous avons été prévoyants car, en mars de cette année, le Parlement européen avait demandé à tous les États d'anticiper sur ce résultat en déclarant comme mode de désignation que les élections du 7 juin seraient la base démocratique qui permettrait d'envoyer ces dix-huit députés supplémentaires.

Certains États l'ont fait, comme l'Espagne et comme votre pays, Madame la Présidente du Conseil. D'autres pays, qui se disent pourtant très contents – comme moi-même d'ailleurs – du résultat du référendum irlandais et très pressés de voir mis en œuvre le traité de Lisbonne, n'ont toujours pas fait ce qui est de leur devoir et qui ne tient qu'à leur propre volonté, c'est-à-dire faire connaître ce mode de désignation.

Pouvons-nous compter sur vous, Madame la Présidente du Conseil, pour que, au Conseil européen des 29 et 30 octobre, vous exigiez de chaque État membre qu'il fasse connaître les modes de désignation de ces députés supplémentaires issus de Lisbonne?

La deuxième chose qui vraiment me choque, c'est que tout le monde parle des grandes ambitions du traité de Lisbonne, mais il nous oblige en particulier sur une chose très simple: l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes. C'est un objectif contraignant de la Charte des droits fondamentaux du traité de Lisbonne. Or j'entends que, pour les deux postes supplémentaires qui restent à pourvoir, le haut représentant, vice-président de la Commission, et le président du Conseil, il n'y a que des noms d'hommes qui circulent.

Vous êtes un pays, la Suède, assez exemplaire sur cette question. J'attends de vous que vous la preniez très très au sérieux. Il n'est pas possible que, pour les quatre grands postes de responsabilité européens, on n'entende et on n'ait que des hommes. C'est indigne du traité de Lisbonne, c'est indigne de l'Europe. Je compte sur vous pour faire respecter l'égalité entre l'homme et la femme, à ce niveau aussi.

3-090

**Peter van Dalen (ECR).** – Voorzitter, de Nederlandse voetballegende Johan Crujff zei het al: elk voordeel heeft zijn nadeel. Het voordeel van het Verdrag van Lissabon is dat de lidstaten iets meer te zeggen krijgen en de nationale parlementen meer invloed krijgen. Het nadeel is dat het zwaartepunt van de macht meer opschuift naar Europa. Dat nadeel, mijnheer de Voorzitter, moet juist in dit parlement niet worden onderschat. In de afgelopen dertig jaar hebben we immers gezien dat de toename van macht in Europa omgekeerd evenredig is geweest met de opkomst van onze burgers bij de Europese verkiezingen. Meer macht naar Brussel ging gepaard met een lagere opkomst bij de Europese verkiezingen. Als Lissabon van kracht wordt, moet dit de les zijn voor Europa: laat de Unie pragmatisch opereren en telkens opnieuw zijn toegevoegde waarde bewijzen. Alleen dan kunnen we de steun van de kiezers in Europa winnen.

3-091

**Joe Higgins (GUE/NGL).** – Mr President, I oppose the Lisbon Treaty from a Left and Socialist perspective and reject the intervention of xenophobes and right-wing forces. What happened in Ireland in the referendum was not a victory for democracy. The Irish people were threatened by a major coalition – the political establishment, big business, most of the capitalist press and the EU Commission – that if they voted 'no' they would be economically isolated, they would be punished by the European Union and there would be a flight of capital and investment, and they were told that if they voted 'yes' there would be jobs, investments and recovery. All falsehoods.

The Irish Government's duplicity was shown by the fact that it asked the management of Aer Lingus to postpone until today, after the referendum, the announcement of 700 savage job cuts in Aer Lingus. The EU Commission intervened continually: interfered in the process. The three Presidents are not here, but I want their representatives to ask them for a reaction to the following scandal. Mr Tajani, EU Commissioner for Transport, spent a full day travelling around Ireland on a Ryanair jet with the Chief Executive of that multinational, campaigning for a 'yes' vote. He is the regulator of transport, supposed to protect consumers and workers. He is hopelessly compromised by going around with the chief executive of one of the biggest corporations supplying transport. What is your answer to that?

Finally, there is speculation that Mr Tony Blair will be the new President of the EU Council. Let us be clear. Mr Tony Blair is a war criminal. Under no circumstances can he be –

*(The President urged the speaker to conclude as he had exceeded his speaking time.)*

I was interrupted unnecessarily, Mr President. I think you are in the chair, not the honourable Member here.

The point I wanted to finish with was that Mr Blair must not be appointed as the President of the EU.

*(The President cut off the speaker.)*

3-092

**El Presidente.** – Veo una tarjeta azul. Quiero indicarle a la diputada que la muestra que cada vez que muestran ustedes la tarjeta azul impiden hacer uso de la palabra a un diputado cuyo nombre figura en la lista de oradores. En la reunión de la Mesa voy a intervenir para tratar de cambiar esta disposición, porque lo que no puede ser es que diputados cuyo nombre figura en la lista de oradores se queden sin hablar porque otros interrumpen con preguntas, lo cual es legítimo.

3-093

**Nessa Childers (S-D).** – Mr President, I should like to ask Mr Higgins what would have enabled him to support the Treaty.

3-094

**Joe Higgins (GUE/NGL).** – Mr President, the Lisbon Treaty provides for an intensification of the neoliberal economic agenda that has caused economic disaster throughout Europe with 21 million unemployed, an intensification of militarisation and the armaments industry, and more pressure for privatisation. There is nothing in the Treaty in that sense that a committed socialist could support.

We will support genuine initiatives that will stand for workers' rights within Europe, but when the Lisbon Treaty and the Charter of Fundamental Rights itself in fact institutionalise the judgments of the European Court of Justice whereby they find in favour of the exploitation of migrant workers by contractors supplying businesses across borders, how can we support that?

3-095

**Timo Soini (EFD).** – Arvoisa puhemies, elin lapsuuteni ja nuoruuteni kommunisti-diktatuuri Neuvostoliiton naapurissa, ja pelko oli läsnä. Pieni Suomi oli siinä. Selvittiin, oltiin itsenäisiä. Nyt olen tyrmistynyt, että Euroopan unionissa sallitaan vain yksi lopputulos. Mielipiteitä saa olla, saa olla jopa eri mieltä, saa olla jopa euroskeptikko, mutta lopputuloksen pitää olla sama.

Jos voittaa väärin keinoin, on jo hävinnyt. Muistakaamme jalkapallotermein Diego Maradonan käsimaalia. Kuka muistaa, miten kävi ottelussa Argentiina–Englanti, mikä oli lopputulos? Muistetaan, että voitettiin väärällä keinolla. Katsokaa, missä on Maradona nyt, kun hän voitti väärällä keinolla.

Lopuksi haluan sanoa puheenjohtajamaa Ruotsille, että te olette vieläkin kunnioittaneet Ruotsin kansan päätöstä, kun se äänesti eurosta ei. Te ette tuoneet sitä vuoden, kahden, ettekä edes viiden vuoden päästä uuteen käsittelyyn. Tämä tuotiin heti vuoden päästä. Tässä on EU-demokratia ja se saa sellaisen palkan aikanaan kuin sen saada pitää.

3-096

**Liisa Jaakonsaari (S-D).** – Arvoisa puhemies, minäkin olen elänyt ja elän vieläkin pienessä maassa. Haluaisin kysyä Soinilta, että eikö juuri tässä tapauksessa Irlanti näyttänyt pienen maan suuren voiman, koska se pisti melkein koko Euroopan polvilleen. Nyt pitkällisen keskustelun jälkeen pieni Irlanti, aivan niin kuin pieni Suomi, haki turvaa Euroopan unionista ja haluaa omalta osaltaan vahvistaa Euroopan unionia. Eikö niin, että Euroopan unioni ja Lissabonin sopimus on nimenomaan pienen maan turva?

3-097

**Timo Soini (EFD).** – Arvoisa puhemies, tämä on pienten maiden kannalta huono sopimus. Irlannin äänivalta laskee, Tanskan äänivalta laskee ja Suomen äänivalta laskee ministerineuvostossa. Suurten maiden voima nousee.

Minä rakastan Irlantia, olen käynyt siellä 20 kertaa. Olen kääntynyt katoliseksi Irlannissa. Siitä ei ole kysymys. Olen vain pahoillani siitä, että tapahtui tällainen valtava vyörytys. Ensin oli 53 prosenttia vastaan ja 47 prosenttia puolesta. Nyt tulos oli 67 prosenttia puolesta ja 33 prosenttia vastaan. Mitä tapahtui ja miksi? Väitän, että pelko oli läsnä. Toivon Irlannille ja irlantilaisille kaikkea hyvää ja runsasta siunausta.

*(Liisa Jaakonsaari kommentoi ilman mikrofonia.)*

3-098

**Csanád Szegedi (NI).** – Tisztelt Hölgyeim és Uraim! Először is köszönetet szeretnék mondani az ír embereknek. Köszönet mindannak a 600 000 bátor írnek, aki nemet mondott a diktatórikus Lisszaboni Szerződésre és harcba szállt a demokrácia Európájáért. Aki ennek a megismételtetett népszavazásnak örül, az a demokrácia halálának és a globalizmus diktatúrájának örül. Az európai politikusoknak nem a globalizmus diktatúráját kellene kiszolgáltatni, hanem a valódi problémákkal foglalkozni: munkanélküliséget felszámolni, tömeges bevándorlást megállítani, a diszkriminatív, emberellenes Benes-dekrétumokat és szlovák nyelvtörvényt visszavonadni, és megkérem minden kollégámat, minden képviselőtársamat, hogy támogassák Európa legnagyobb jogfosztott kisebbségének, a határon túli magyaroknak az autonómiaörekvésüket. A Jobbik képviselői csak egy olyan Európai Uniót tudnak támogatni, amely a nemzeti tradíciókon alapul. Köszönöm szépen.

3-099

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE).** – Ne bucurăm de victoria categorică a susținătorilor Tratatului de la Lisabona, conșfințită de referendumul din Irlanda. Trebuie să felicităm, și să le mulțumim în același timp, pe cei care au militat pentru rezultatul pozitiv din Irlanda.

Cetățenii irlandezi au decis, prin votul lor, continuarea procesului de dezvoltare a Uniunii Europene. Au permis să ne gândim în viitor, la un moment când Uniunea Europeană va constitui o voce puternică în discuția cu marile puteri ale lumii și această voce va vorbi în numele celor 27, sau mai multe, state membre.

Discuțiile asupra unui nou tratat de bază au început în 2002. Vineri, vinerea trecută, s-a încheiat procesul de adoptare a noului tratat. Spun că s-a încheiat, pentru că eu consider că cetățenii Europei și-au exprimat punctul de vedere, direct sau indirect. Polonia a anunțat că va ratifica imediat. Mai rămâne o singură persoană care consideră că trebuie să blocheze ratificarea acestui tratat, și asta în condițiile în care parlamentul țării pe care o conduce a ratificat tratatul. Sper ca președintele să țină cont de dorința cetățenilor din toate cele 27 de state membre, inclusiv din Republica Cehă, și să semneze ratificarea tratatului.

Stimați colegi, viitoarea punere în vigoare a tratatului aduce în fața Parlamentului European noi responsabilități. Este nevoie ca Parlamentul să se pregătească pentru a putea îndeplini aceste responsabilități cât mai rapid, fără a provoca întârzieri în procesul legislativ. Exemplul de astăzi, cu scoaterea de pe agendă a celor două rapoarte referitoare la Fondul de solidaritate pentru cutremurul din Italia, este un exemplu concludent. Chiar și exemplul ecranului de astăzi este alt exemplu în acest sens.

Sper că serviciile administrative vor acorda acestui aspect cel puțin aceeași atenție pe care au acordat-o Statutului deputaților.

3-100

**El Presidente.** – Quiero explicar otra vez a sus señorías que, en primer lugar, el Reglamento dice que el Presidente «podrá conceder el uso de la palabra». Por lo tanto, «podrá conceder el uso de la palabra» quiere decir que puede concederlo o no concederlo. Este Presidente prefiere conceder el uso de la palabra a los diputados que están inscritos en la lista que dar la palabra a diputados que la toman y que de ese modo están impidiendo intervenir a diputados inscritos según los minutos de intervención que corresponden a cada Grupo. En segundo lugar, lo que dice el Reglamento es que la tarjeta azul se muestra durante la intervención de aquel al que se quiere formular una pregunta, no después.

3-101

**Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, quería expresar, en primer lugar, que yo estoy alarmado por este debate, porque lo que debería ser un día de celebración para Europa está resultando ser un debate en el que se ha llegado a cuestionar la intervención del Presidente del Parlamento felicitándose por los resultados.

Ha habido más de diez intervenciones contrarias abiertamente, no ya a Europa —lo cual puede ser legítimo—, sino inclusive al propio resultado democrático del referéndum en Irlanda.

Yo creo que es hora, es momento de decir en esta Cámara que aquí, donde reside la soberanía popular de la ciudadanía europea, nueve de cada diez ciudadanos aquí representados están a favor de Europa, que hay una corriente de fondo de los grandes partidos democráticos de Europa a favor de Europa. Y es también conveniente decir y recordar a sus Señorías que el Tratado de Lisboa es una condición necesaria para hacer más Europa, para hacer una Europa más unida y más fuerte, pero no es una condición suficiente, desgraciadamente.

Yo querría dirigirme a todas sus Señorías para expresarles que, si hace 60 años los padres fundadores pensaron probablemente que Europa era la necesidad de construir un espacio común de paz después de la tragedia de la guerra, después de la pretensión de imposición de ideas o de hegemonías políticas de unos sobre otros en Europa, hoy Europa se justifica de otra manera. Hoy estamos ante el inicio de una gobernanza del mundo y, o estamos ahí, o no estamos. El debate es un debate shakesperiano, es ser o no ser para Europa.

Hace muy pocos días he tenido la oportunidad de hablar con gente que estuvo en Pittsburgh, y la reflexión que me trasladaban era que el mundo no mira a Europa, mira a Asia. Europa tiene que estar unida y ser fuerte para hacerse presente en las mesas de la gobernanza del mundo. Y si no estamos ahí, no seremos, no pintaremos, no tendremos capacidad de influencia. Por eso, Lisboa es un camino, pero hay que recorrerlo.

3-102

**Andrew Duff (ALDE).** – Mr President, frankly we should thank Mr Farage for his contribution to the Irish campaign. His singular style of post-colonial jingoism certainly served to recruit several of the Irish republicans to the pro-Treaty cause.

Stranger still, though, is the complete absence from that campaign of the British Tory Party, who were skulking behind the petticoats of Declan Ganley and President Klaus. The fact is that the Conservative Party stands all on its own as a prospective party of government that is still opposing this great qualitative step forward in European integration.

Consider the absurdity of the Eurosceptics, because opposing Lisbon means sticking with the current Treaty of Nice and the present rather clumsy and opaque – and too often ineffective – Union that fails to respond to public demand and to global challenges. Britain deserves much better than the Conservative Party, and Europe certainly needs more.

3-103

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident! Wie viele, die vor mir gesprochen haben, bin ich froh über das irische Ja, und ich will all denen gratulieren, die dafür gekämpft haben, insbesondere auch den irischen Grünen *Comhaontas Glas*. Aber wenn es wahr ist, dass das ein Feiertag ist, dann ist es jedenfalls ein schwer erkämpfter Feiertag.



Es wäre ein Fehler, wenn wir uns jetzt voller Selbstzufriedenheit wieder ganz auf den gewöhnlichen Gang der institutionellen Prozesse zurückziehen würden, als wäre eigentlich gar nicht viel gewesen.

Der Präsident des Parlaments hat in seiner ersten Äußerung dazu darauf hingewiesen, dass wir auch die Nein-Stimmen deutlich hören sollen. Ich möchte hinzufügen: Wir sollen auch die schwer hörbaren Stimmen derer hören, die es im Juni bei der Europawahl nicht für nötig gefunden haben, an der Wahl teilzunehmen und damit diesen Prozess mit zu befördern. Was meine ich damit? Ich meine damit, dass wir zur Kenntnis nehmen müssen, dass ein engagierter Weg nach vorne nur gelingen kann, wenn wir uns in ernsthafterer Weise als bisher darum bemühen, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger einzubeziehen.

Sicherlich haben wir Zeit verloren. Wir haben Jahre verloren. Europa ist international zurückgefallen. Man muss nur die G20-Treffen anschauen, um das zur Kenntnis zu nehmen. Aber stärkere Dynamik bekommt Europa nur mit einem stärkeren Engagement der Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Ich bin nicht der Meinung, dass man wegen der störrischen Haltung des tschechischen Präsidenten das tschechische Volk jetzt unter Druck setzen soll mit der Ankündigung: Im Zweifelsfall bekommt ihr keinen Kommissar!

Aber etwas anderes ist noch wichtiger: Es wäre ein schwerer Fehler, Tony Blair oder irgendeinen anderen möglichen Kandidaten für die Präsidentschaft des Rates hinter verschlossenen Türen auszukungeln. Darüber sollte vielmehr offen mit den europäischen Völkern diskutiert werden. Ich schlage vor, dass wir im Parlament eine Anhörung aller Kandidaten für dieses Amt durchführen.

*(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)*

3-104

**Ashley Fox (ECR).** – Mr President, I was elected in June to represent the South West of England and Gibraltar and during the election campaign I was saddened by the large number of people I met who no longer support Britain's membership of the EU. It saddened me because I believe that the EU has been a force for good in the world. It has promoted peace and reconciliation amongst the peoples of Europe; I hope it will continue to do so. The single market promotes trade and prosperity; world-leading companies such as Airbus in my constituency have shown what we can achieve when we pool our industrial resources.

When I was a student I lived in France for 12 months and I came home a Francophile. I want Britain to enjoy warm and friendly relationships with all our European neighbours. My concern is that the current march towards political union without the support of the peoples of Europe threatens to undermine the good work that the EU has done. I respect the fact that the Irish people have now voted in favour of the Lisbon Treaty, though I think it disgraceful that they were pressurised into holding a second vote by countries which had not even held one referendum. The conduct of Gordon Brown is particularly reprehensible. His legacy to Britain will be not only to leave us bankrupt but also to deny the British people a vote on this latest transfer of power from Westminster to Brussels. Breaking his promise to hold a referendum threatens to undermine British support for the EU and I deeply regret that. I cannot understand why those in favour of political union seem determined to build this structure on the worst possible foundations. Do they not understand that a political union built without popular support is likely to end in failure?

3-105

**Jiří Maštálka (GUE/NGL).** – Kolegyně a kolegové, v tomto sále cítím z mnoha tváří a projevů uspokojení a někdy i radost z výsledku opakovaného irského referenda. Přestože ratifikační proces Lisabonské smlouvy ještě není dokončen, chtěl bych podotknout, že uspokojení a radost budeme moci pocítit teprve tehdy, pokud občané Evropského společenství potvrdí, například i v dalších volbách do Evropského parlamentu, že Lisabonská smlouva byla především v jejich prospěch, zlepšila sociální podmínky, snížila nebezpečí ozbrojených konfliktů a výrazně přispěla k moderní demokratické Evropě. Přiznávám, že výsledek opakovaného irského referenda pro mě nebyl překvapením. Všichni jsme byli svědky výrazného zájmu ze strany evropských struktur, který hraničil až s nátlakem na Irsko a byl odpovídajícím způsobem podpořen i finančními prostředky.

Svým hlubokým přesvědčením jsem byl federalistou, a to ještě v době společného státu Čechů a Slováků. Federalistou v nejlepším slova smyslu jsem a zůstávám. Vadí mi ale – a nejsem sám – že o tak důležitém dokumentu nemohli občané Evropské unie rozhodnout ve všech státech v referendu. Prosadit dokument, který především dává možnosti posílit úlohu finančních institucí bez ohledu na sociální Evropu, považuji za chybu. Opakované referendu v Irsku považuji za precedent, který je nebezpečný pro celé Evropské společenství. Čas bude naším soudcem a myslím, že ukáže, že výsledek druhého irského referenda je Pyrrhovým vítězstvím. Chtěl bych požádat, aby byl respektován ústavní pořádek České republiky a nebyl činěn nátlak ani na české orgány, a zejména na prezidenta, při rozhodování ...

*(vystoupení řečníka bylo přerušeno)*

3-106

**El Presidente.** – Perdonen, Señorías, pero, además de no funcionar los ascensores, tampoco funciona el botón que tiene el Presidente para cortar la palabra al orador que está excediéndose de su turno y robándole tiempo a otros colegas que están en la lista para intervenir. O dejan de hablar cuando yo les pida que lo hagan o, como no disponemos en la presidencia de botón para cortar el micrófono, la mitad de los colegas que están en la lista de oradores en tan importante debate no podrán tomar la palabra, lo que me parece indignantemente insolidario.

3-107

**Fiorello Provera (EFD).** – Signor Presidente, cercherò di rispettare i tempi. La Lega Nord, partito che rappresento, ha votato a favore del Trattato nel Parlamento italiano e io stesso sono stato relatore. Riguardo al referendum, abbiamo accettato con molto rispetto l'opposizione degli irlandesi al Trattato, e accettiamo con uguale rispetto il loro favore nella misura rilevante del 67 per cento. La volontà dei popoli attraverso un referendum è diretta e inequivocabile.

Ho apprezzato l'intervento di questa mattina del Presidente del Parlamento, dicendo che "bisogna ascoltare anche le ragioni di chi ha detto no" e soprattutto "chiediamoci perché molti non hanno neppure votato" Credo si tratti di una riflessione intelligente e acuta, perché la democrazia in Europa non si costruisce con decisioni dall'alto ma attraverso la coscienza politica e la crescita della coscienza politica dei popoli europei.

Credo che i popoli vogliano più democrazia...

*(il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)*

3-108

**Andreas Mölzer (NI).** – Herr Präsident! In all den Debatten in den vergangenen Jahren über den Vertrag von Lissabon hat es auch von Seiten der Befürworter immer wieder geheißen, dass dieser Vertrag nicht optimal ist, dass er sehr viele Schwächen hat, dass er eigentlich kein besonders gelungener Kompromiss ist.

Nun freuen sich diese Befürworter, da dieser Vertrag der Realisierung nahe gekommen ist, und das ist legitim. Wenn wir nun aber hören, dass diese Befürworter sagen, die Mehrheit habe demokratisch gesprochen und die Minderheit möge das doch akzeptieren, so haben sie zwar Recht, doch hätte ich diese Aussage auch schon nach dem ersten Referendum in Irland erwartet. Denn eines ist klar: Wir wissen nicht, ob sich dieser Vertrag segensreich für die Europäische Union auswirken wird oder ob er – wie ich glaube – verhängnisvoll sein wird. Ich glaube, dass er zu einem zentralistischen Superstaat führen wird.

Aber eines ist klar: Dieses Europa wird nur ein gutes Europa sein, wenn es ein demokratisches Europa ist. Eine Demokratie, die darin besteht, dass man so oft abstimmt, bis das Establishment jenes Ergebnis hat, das es wünscht, ist keine Demokratie. Darum hoffe ich, dass man jetzt nicht versucht, auf den tschechischen Präsidenten Druck auszuüben, um dieses Ergebnis möglichst schnell zu komplettieren.

*(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort)*

3-109

**Elmar Brok (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Frau Vizepräsidentin der Kommission! Es tut mir furchtbar leid, dass diejenigen, die beim ersten Referendum mit Lügenkampagnen in die irische Kampagne gegangen sind, jetzt feststellen müssen, dass die Parlamente in 26 Ländern den Vertrag ratifiziert haben, dass Irland den Vertrag in einem Referendum ratifiziert hat und dass bisher alle Entscheidungen von Verfassungsgerichten für den Vertrag von Lissabon positiv ausgefallen sind. Dieses Faktum kann hier nicht wegdiskutiert werden.

Zweitens müssen wir sagen: Der Vertrag von Lissabon ist verglichen mit dem Vertrag von Nizza ein Vertrag der Parlamente und der Bürger und damit ein Vertrag für mehr Demokratie.

Drittens möchte ich mich bei den irischen Kolleginnen und Kollegen bedanken, bei dem irischen Volk und auch ihrem Oppositionsführer Enda Kenny, der in der genannten Liste mit aufgeführt werden muss.

Zum Schluss möchte ich zum Ausdruck bringen, dass ich davon überzeugt bin, dass der Ratifikationsprozess weitergeht, denn alle Parlamente haben ratifiziert. Ich glaube nicht, dass der tschechische Präsident eher dem Brief des Oppositionsführers eines Landes folgt, das den Vertrag bereits ratifiziert hat, als den Vorstellungen des eigenen Parlaments und des eigenen Verfassungsgerichts! Es wäre so, als ob ein französischer Oppositionsführer an die Queen schreiben würde, sie möge bitte ein Gesetz des Unterhauses nicht unterschreiben.

Eine letzte Bemerkung: Frau Malmström, ich möchte Sie bitten, die Ansichten, die wir gestern in den Ausschüssen zum Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst geäußert haben, ernst zu nehmen. Die Papiere, die ich bisher aus ....

*(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)*

3-110

**Libor Rouček (S-D).** – Dámy a pánové, dovoďte, abych i já nejprve popřál Irům, popřál irskému lidu k úspěšnému provedení referenda o Lisabonské smlouvě. Jasně irské „ano“ je dobrou zprávou pro Irsko, dobrou zprávou pro celou Evropu. Evropská unie potřebuje po svém historickém rozšíření novou, posílenou smluvní základnu. Jen tak totiž bude Evropa schopna v době světové hospodářské krize i v době všestranné globální konkurence úspěšně čelit výzvám a nástrahám 21. století. Své „ano“ Lisabonské smlouvě řekli i Češi. Český parlament, obě jeho komory, jasnou ústavní většinou Lisabonskou smlouvu podpořily.

Česká veřejnost Lisabonskou smlouvu schvaluje, stejně jako již předtím, v roce 2003, v referendu jasnou většinou schválila vstup do Evropské unie. Češi si jsou dobře vědomi, že desetimilionový národ stejně jako celá Evropa má svoji svobodu, nezávislost, bezpečnost, hospodářskou i sociální prosperitu zajištěnou pouze existencí demokratické, silné a výkonné Evropské unie. Česká republika je parlamentní demokracií. Pravomoci jejího prezidenta se odvíjejí od vůle parlamentu. Český prezident není absolutistický monarcha ani nejvyšší představitel v politickém systému bývalého Sovětského svazu.

Chtěl bych proto vyzvat Václava Klause, aby respektoval vůli českého lidu a po vyjasnění situace v českém Ústavním soudu Lisabonskou smlouvu bezodkladně podepsal. Jsem přesvědčen, že zdržování a obstrukce nejsou důstojné roli a postavení českého prezidenta.

3-111

**Olle Schmidt (ALDE).** – Herr talman, fru minister, fru kommissionsledamot! För de allra flesta Europavänner var resultatet från Irland ett glädjens besked. Vi får nu, som många har sagt, ett mer demokratiskt och öppet EU. Nu har irländarna gjort sitt för att EU ut ur en konstitutionell kris. Nu handlar det om oss andra.

Jag tror att det var flera skäl som denna gång talade till EU:s fördel. Ensam är inte stark när det blåser stormar i världen. Det tror jag att vi alla kan enas om. Tveksamheterna kring fördraget har undanröjts, men jag tror också att det var ett gammalt, historiskt argument som fanns med i bilden. Irland vill inte förknippas med den brittiska EU-kritiken. Dublin är inte London!

En del har sagt att man inte kan folkomrösta mer än en gång. Med den logiken borde man väl säga att man inte kan ha val mer än en gång. För de flesta av oss här är det bra att människor – kanske till och med en del av kollegerna här – kan ändra uppfattning om förutsättningarna ändras. Det är därför man har demokrati och röstar flera gånger.

Nu står Polen och Tjeckien på tur för att godkänna fördraget. Polen är nog inget problem. Värre kan det bli det med herr Klaus i Prag – han verkar envis. Hans misstro mot Lissabonfördraget uttryckte han ju mycket tydligt här i kammaren i våras – om inte med svavel, så i varje fall salvelsefullt.

Vi vet nu att denna fråga är mycket känslig i Storbritannien. Blir det ett regeringsskifte i London nästa vår – vilket ju en del talar för – så riskerar EU att ställas inför en ny duvning om fördragets godkännande, om den tjeckiska processen blir längre eller om man vill ha en folkomröstning.

Nu hade jag tänkt vända mig till den svenske statsministern, men han finns inte här. Han har goda relationer med David Cameron. Jag hoppas att han utnyttjar de relationerna och ser till att vi får en bättre EU-debatt inte bara i Europa utan också i Storbritannien. Vi behöver ett starkt...

*(Talmannen avbröt talaren.)*

3-112

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Podwójne referendum w Irlandii w sprawie tzw. traktatu lizbońskiego stworzyło niebezpieczny precedens. Pojawiły się sygnały, że jeśli Irlandia nie przyjmie tego dokumentu, to będzie musiała głosować do skutku. W trakcie kampanii sięgnięto do pełnej gamy środków nacisku, poczynając od ustępstw, takich jak gwarancje nieingerencji Unii w wewnętrzne prawodawstwo dotyczące etyki, religii i ekonomii, poprzez groźby, jak na przykład utrata własnego komisarza, aż do szantażu zmarginalizowania i wyrzucenia Irlandii ze struktur UE.

Wszystkie te zabiegi w kontekście podsycanych obaw związanych z kryzysem doprowadziły do znanego wyniku. Wykorzystując ogromne środki finansowe wielu unijnych agitatorów w zamian za przyjęcie traktatu obiecywano nawet miejsca pracy, nie koncentrując się na jego meritum. Komentatorzy polityczni zwracają uwagę na niedemokratyczne metody i arogancję unijnej elity politycznej. W świetle stosowanej praktyki podwójnych standardów apeluję o ponowne, trzecie referendum w Irlandii oraz o możliwość ponownego głosowania nad tym dokumentem w parlamentach krajowych państw członkowskich UE.

3-113

**Gerard Batten (EFD).** – Mr President, an earlier speaker accused my colleague Nigel Farage of not respecting Irish democracy. Can I assure them that he does. What he has no respect for is the unfair and biased way in which the

referendum campaign was conducted. Indeed, such is his and our party's respect for democracy that we would like to see referenda in the 26 countries that have so far been denied them.

Another speaker said that it was not the first 'yes' vote that there had been and there had been 'yes' votes in Luxembourg and Spain, but surely those referenda were on the Constitution and not the Lisbon Treaty? We are told that Lisbon is different from the Constitution, so which is it? Have we had the same referenda in six countries, or have we had referenda in four countries on the Constitution and referenda in two countries on Lisbon? If it is the first case, then it is a 3-3 score draw. If it is the second case, it is a 2-2 score draw and a 1-1 score draw. Hardly a ringing endorsement for the Lisbon Treaty.

*(The President cut off the speaker.)*

3-114

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Es ist eine demokratiepolitische Schande, dass die herkömmlichen Politiker in ihren Mitgliedstaaten ihren eigenen Bürgern ein Referendum verwehren, aber gleichzeitig in Irland zwei Referenden fordern. Es ist auch eine Schande, dass diese Politiker das Ergebnis des ersten Referendums eigentlich nicht akzeptiert haben, aber jetzt gleichzeitig einfordern, dass man das Ergebnis des zweiten Referendums akzeptiert.

Ganz gleich, ob dieser Verfassungsreformvertrag von Lissabon in Kraft tritt oder nicht, wir brauchen einen neuen Grundlagenvertrag. Dieser neue Grundlagenvertrag sollte beinhalten: echte Gewaltenteilung, einen wirklich unabhängigen Gerichtshof für Subsidiaritätsfragen, volle Transparenz und Sparsamkeit und vor allem bindende Volksentscheidungen. So können wir der Europafalle noch entkommen. Darauf sollte sich unsere ganze Kraft richten.

3-115

**Mario Mauro (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, non c'è alcun dubbio: la vittoria del sì al referendum sul Trattato di Lisbona in Irlanda costituisce un fatto estremamente positivo per il rilancio dell'Unione, anche per le importantissime riforme politico-istituzionali che il Trattato prevede. Gioisco con i cittadini irlandesi, che con responsabilità hanno votato "sì", evitando una vera e propria paralisi del progetto europeo. Spero che se ne convincano anche i Presidenti Klaus e Kaczynski, perché è auspicabile che la procedura di ratifica irlandese per via referendaria possa aiutare la prosecuzione degli sforzi per rendere possibile l'entrata in vigore del Trattato al 1° gennaio 2010.

Il "sì" irlandese indica però che quello dell'Europa unita è l'unico progetto politicamente credibile, che può portare vantaggi ai paesi e soprattutto ai cittadini. Nessuno oggi nella classe politica irlandese, come in tutti gli altri Stati membri, sa proporre una strategia di sviluppo del proprio paese al di fuori dell'Unione europea, o partecipandovi magari in modo più limitato.

Occorre ora procedere speditamente e con più coraggio da parte della Commissione attraverso iniziative pilota coraggiose su più fronti; ad esempio, avere più coraggio per il lancio degli Eurobond, avere più coraggio per la gestione comune del problema immigrazione, avere più coraggio per le questioni energetiche. Ma soprattutto occorre che si faccia tesoro degli errori gravi commessi negli ultimi anni. L'involuzione del progetto politico che chiamiamo "Unione europea" è riconducibile a un fattore ben preciso: è avvenuto nel momento in cui abbiamo preteso che questo progetto non fosse più nel sentimento dei popoli ma nell'iniziativa delle burocrazie.

È per questo dunque che quando dico "più coraggio", intendo prima di tutto dire più coraggio da parte di chi ha la *leadership* della Commissione, in modo tale che possiamo conseguire gli obiettivi che ci siamo prefissi.

3-116

**Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S-D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Irlandczycy powiedzieli Unii Europejskiej „tak”. Teraz czas na dwa największe hamulce, które mamy w Europie i których tak naprawdę Irlandczycy już skompromitowali. Panowie prezydenci Polski i Czech: dość lekceważenia Europejczyków! Nie marnujmy czasu, którego mamy tak mało, a w którym powinniśmy tak wiele zrobić! Chcę zaapelować do Donalda Tuska, premiera polskiego rządu, aby z oczywistych powodów wprowadził w naszym kraju Kartę Praw Podstawowych.

Do tej pory my, politycy, mówiliśmy, że nie ma wystarczających instrumentów, przepisów, które pozwalają nam działać. Teraz stoimy w tej sali przed wielkim zadaniem. Mając już za chwilę do dyspozycji nowy traktat, musimy ukierunkować Unię Europejską na tory wspólnego i szybkiego wyjścia z kryzysu, działania na rzecz obywateli i wzmocnienia pozycji Unii Europejskiej w świecie. Musimy walczyć z nierównymi wynagrodzeniami, o lepszy i równy dostęp do edukacji, kultury i służby zdrowia. Nowe przepisy mają nam pomóc w zachowaniu różnorodności w Unii Europejskiej, ale musimy wprowadzić więcej równości, której dzisiaj tak bardzo brakuje obywatelom Unii Europejskiej. Naszym celem powinno być również udowodnienie tym wszystkim, którzy byli na nie, że potrafimy pracować również dla nich, a ich „nie” było i jest dla nas większą motywacją do pracy.

Panie i panowie posłowie, mam 35 lat i oczekuję większej dynamiki działania. Oczekuję, że szybciej porozumiemy się z Komisją Europejską i z Radą Europejską zarówno w kwestiach proceduralnych, personalnych, ale też merytorycznych.

Będziemy przedstawiać wielkie projekty europejskie. Pytam też przewodniczącego Parlamentu Europejskiego, Prezydium, przewodniczących grup: na jakim etapie przygotowań jesteście? Czy i kiedy będziemy gotowi do wdrożenia traktatu lizbońskiego?

3-117

**Riikka Manner (ALDE).** – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, Irlannin kansanäänestyksen tulos oli selkeä ja tämä äänestystulos oli erinomainen signaali niin Euroopalle kuin Irlannille. Irlantilaisia täytyy onnitella tästä tuloksesta monestakin eri syystä. Olen kuitenkin itse erityisen tyytyväinen siihen, että Irlannin kansanäänestys nosti Euroopan unionin ja sen tulevaisuuden jälleen otsikoihin. Aitoa keskustelua tarvitaan, koska todelliset visiot Euroopan unionin tulevaisuudesta ovat olleet viime vuosina kutakuinkin niukkoja.

Täytyy myös muistaa, että Lissabonin sopimus on kompromissi sitä edeltäneestä EU:n perustuslakiluonnoksesta. Mikäli sopimus olisi nyt irlantilaisten toimesta hylätty, olisimme vakavasti joutuneet pohtimaan ja keskustelemaan siitä, mihin suuntaan olemme todella unionina menossa. Kuin myös pohtimaan sitä, olemmeko ehkä viime vuosina jossain määrin edenneet liian nopeasti ja hallitsemattomasti.

Mielestäni nämä ratifioinnissa ilmenneet ongelmat kielivät siitä, että Euroopan unioni koetaan jossain mielessä kaukaiseksi ja vaikeasti hallittavaksi asiakokonaisuudeksi. Tämän ongelman ratkaisemiseksi toivon osaltani, että keskustelu EU:n tulevaisuudesta ei todellakaan jää tähän, vaan että sopimusuudistuksen myötä keskustelu jatkuu avoimena.

Meidän on luotava yhtenäistä Eurooppaa, emmekä voi myöskään jättää huomioimatta syitä, jotka johtivat alun perin tähän sopimuksen hylkäämiseen. Uskon, että tässä mielessä Lissabonin sopimus ja sen toimeenpano ovat varmasti oikea ja suuri askel solidaarisemman ja demokraattisemman unionin puolesta. Tämän saavuttaminen vaatii kuitenkin meiltä edelleen avointa keskustelua.

Olen myös tyytyväinen siihen, että Lissabonin sopimus lisää osaltaan yhteistyötä kansallisten parlamenttien ja Brysselin välillä. Nyt on aika siirtää katseet Irlannista Tšekkeihin. Toivon, ettei Euroopan tarvitse pidättää enää hengitystään pitkään. On tärkeää, että Lissabonin sopimus saatettaisiin käytäntöön nopeasti ja saisimme...

*(Puhemies keskeytti puhujan.)*

3-118

**James Nicholson (ECR).** – Mr President, the decision is made. Much as I regret that the first decision was not respected, we will have to wait and see what outgoings there will be from this decision. And it is now up to others to decide and I hope they are given the space to make that decision. I just hope that the high percentage that voted ‘yes’ in the Republic of Ireland do not live to regret it in the longer term. I wish to say no more about it.

There is now a very heavy burden and responsibility on the shoulders of those who wish and desire an even deeper centralisation of the decision-making process here in Brussels. I urge them not to get so far in front of the people that the people have no idea where they are heading or what their destiny may ultimately be. I am not anti-European, but I do want a Europe content within itself and able to allow those who disagree the right to put forward an alternative view, and we do not always get that any more in this House.

3-119

**Philip Claeys (NI).** – Elke euforie over het tweede referendum in Ierland is totaal misplaatst. De overwinning van het ja-kamp is een gestolen overwinning, want het oorspronkelijke referendum is perfect legaal en volgens de regels verlopen. Bij de meerderheid van de kiezers die in 2008 neen hebben gestemd, leefde het begrijpelijke gevoel dat het officiële Europa toch nooit rekening zou houden met hun oordeel, indien dat niet in de kraam van de EU paste. Veel van die kiezers zijn dus thuis gebleven. De EU-democratie werkt maar in één richting. Er was geen eerlijke campagne. De overmacht van het ja-kamp in de media werd nog vergroot door een katern van 16 bladzijden van de Europese Commissie in alle zondagskranten, een illegale besteding van belastinggeld waarover het laatste woord nog niet gezegd is. Men heeft de kiezers bang gemaakt. Men heeft de economische crisis als hefboom gebruikt om de mensen tot een ja-stem te dwingen. Ik voorspel u, dames en heren van de Europese Commissie, dat uw hocus-pocus-propaganda u vroeg of laat als een boemerang in het gezicht terugslaat.

3-120

**Íñigo Méndez de Vigo (PPE).** – Señor Presidente, Señorías, imaginemos que esta noche, cuando acabe este interminable debate, salimos y nos encontramos veintisiete colegas abajo y tenemos, por unanimidad, que decidir a qué restaurante vamos. Y si salvamos ese obstáculo, imagínense ustedes que tenemos los veintisiete que tomar el mismo menú. Y los veintisiete tenemos que tomar o no tomar vino.

Esta metáfora, que surge de alguien que está en régimen de adelgazamiento, señor Presidente, ilustra bien lo que es, en estos momentos, la Unión Europea y lo que hace el Tratado de Lisboa: lo más importante a mi juicio, que es suprimir la unanimidad.

Porque si todos los que hemos hablado aquí queremos que la Unión Europea funcione, que sea eficaz, que tenga valor añadido para la gente, lo primero que hay que hacer es sustituir la unanimidad por unos requisitos de mayorías supercualificadas. Y eso es lo más importante que hace el Tratado de Lisboa.

Oponerse al Tratado de Lisboa es querer que Europa no funcione y no tenga un papel importante en el mundo.

No entiendo, señor Presidente, y me apena, que algunos colegas que han accedido libremente a este Parlamento tengan más confianza en el Consejo de Ministros que en el Parlamento Europeo. Además, gente que no va a estar nunca en el Consejo de Ministros. Pero, ¿por qué creen que se defienden mejor sus intereses desde el Consejo de Ministros y no desde este Parlamento, donde ellos están presentes y pueden votar?

Tampoco entiendo, señor Presidente, por qué algún colega ha dicho que lo que quiere es sacar a su país —y es legítimo— de la Unión Europea. Porque, entonces, hay que estar a favor del Tratado de Lisboa, Señorías, porque el Tratado de Lisboa es el que establece, por vez primera, la cláusula de salida. Ahora, eso sí, hay que tener la valentía y la ambición de decirle a su pueblo que hay que salir de la Unión Europea. Y eso también me gustaría verlo.

En suma, señor Presidente, yo creo que con el resultado del referéndum irlandés estamos completando el proceso.

Y quiero decir al señor Rouček y al señor Brok —que están preocupados por la actitud del Presidente de la República Checa— que yo no tengo ninguna duda, señor Presidente. Y no tengo ninguna duda porque el que se negara a firmar lo que han aprobado las Cámaras que le han elegido, el que se negara a firmar el Tratado, equivaldría a que la Reina de Inglaterra dejara de firmar una ley de Westminster. Eso no es posible. Y yo estoy seguro, además, de que alguien tan patriota como el señor Klaus no quiere ver a su país en una crisis constitucional interna.

Yo, por tanto, señor Presidente, creo que este momento es un momento de aunar fuerzas, de darnos cuenta de que el mundo no nos espera a los europeos y de que, o los europeos nos unimos y mantenemos posturas constructivas en torno a los problemas que tienen en estos momentos nuestros ciudadanos, o Europa, como potencia, desaparece del mapa.

Es esto, señor Presidente, lo que en estos momentos creo que tenemos que hacer unidos los europeos y esta Cámara.

3-121

**Glenis Willmott (S-D).** – Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate colleagues from Ireland on such a fantastic result. In Britain we have the UKIP and the Tories who, as you will all know, have been arguing for a ‘no’ vote in the Irish referendum. UKIP constantly tells us that we should not interfere in national matters, but they certainly interfered in the vote in Ireland, there is no doubt about it. I would like to say thank you to Nigel Farage. I think he did a fantastic job because I understand that his interference actually helped the ‘yes’ campaign. That is what is known as unintended consequences, but we are grateful for his intervention.

The Tories, on the other hand, are in total disarray. They have divisions over Europe and it is overshadowing their conference which is taking place this week in Manchester. David Cameron’s position on the Lisbon Treaty is quite untenable. He keeps promising that if he wins a general election he is going to have a referendum if the Treaty has not been ratified by 27 Member States. At best, he can be accused of dithering. At worst, I think he can be accused of being less than honest with the British people, because I do not know how he is going to do that.

And just when the major issues of the day need more cooperation, not less, issues such as climate change, how we tackle the financial crisis and how we deal with rising unemployment, just then the Tories have decided that Britain is going to be isolated and at the margins of the EU. They would like us spectating rather than influencing.

And we have heard their plans this week: how they are going to cut public services and to increase pension ages, and how they will help the wealthy by cutting inheritance tax. Once again they are fighting like rats in a sack, as we say in the UK, over Europe. They pretend they have changed but they clearly have not. No, they are the same old Tories, still helping the privileged few at the expense of the many, still putting dogma before the interests of the British people.

The people of Ireland have clearly voted for a more democratic, effective and dynamic EU and the EU is now a better place to deal with the real challenges of today. The British Tories now need to come clean and tell us if they are intent on putting the future of the British people in the EU at risk, with all the serious consequences that has for jobs and prosperity. So come on, Mr Cameron, come clean and tell us the truth.

3-122

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ ΛΑΜΠΡΙΝΙΑΗΣ**  
*Αντιπρόεδρος*

3-123

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Minister! Pani Przewodnicząca Komisji! Zamiast używać wielkich słów – a mam wrażenie, że jest inflacja wielkich słów w Parlamencie Europejskim – warto jest zastanowić się, dlaczego Irlandczycy powiedzieli „tak”, choć w zeszłym roku powiedzieli „nie”.

Myślę, że bardzo upraszczają sprawę ci, którzy mówią, że to kryzys wepchnął Irlandczyków w ramiona traktatu z Lizbony. Wydaje się, że głównym powodem, dla którego Irlandczycy, obywatele Zielonej Wyspy, poparli traktat, jest to, co uzyskali w międzyczasie od Unii Europejskiej. Irlandia zagwarantowała sobie i wszystkim krajom członkowskim własnego, narodowego komisarza. Za to właśnie należy dziękować Irlandii.

Unia zagwarantowała również, że nie będzie się wtrącać do podatków w Irlandii. I za to dziękujemy Dublinowi. Oby stanowiło to ostateczną rezygnację Niemiec i Francji z planów ujednolicenia podatków w ramach Unii.

Wreszcie Bruksela obiecała, że nie będzie wtrącać się do ustawodawstwa Republiki Irlandii dotyczącego spraw moralno-obyczajowych, w tym ochrony życia dzieci poczętych. Tej skuteczności negocjacyjnej należy pogratulować irlandzkiemu rządowi i irlandzkiemu narodowi.

A swoją drogą zabawna jest radość tych, którzy cieszą się z wyniku referendum w Irlandii. W wielu wypadkach ci sami ludzie byli przeciwnikami organizowania referendum w ich krajach członkowskich.

3-124

**Diane Dodds (NI).** – As I have said on a previous occasion in this House, I stand before you as one keen to see a Europe of cooperating nations. I have consistently opposed the federalism of the Lisbon Treaty and the ceding of powers from nation states. The result of the second referendum in the Irish Republic on the Lisbon Treaty changes nothing for the United Kingdom. A document harmful to British national interests on 2 October 2009 is equally as harmful on 2 October 2010. Ratification in Poland will not change that; ratification in the Czech Republic will not change that; the date of the UK general election will not change that; and therefore I want to use this opportunity in this House to call for the British people to be given a referendum, just as each and every European nation should be, on the full and complete text of the Lisbon Treaty.

3-125

**Paulo Rangel (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, eu queria apenas manifestar, não apenas em nome do PPE, como já foi feito por muitos deputados, mas em particular em nome dos deputados portugueses do PPE, a grande satisfação com o resultado do referendo na Irlanda.

Julgamos que isto reforça claramente as perspectivas de desenvolvimento e de evolução da União Europeia e que cria condições para uma nova etapa. Queríamos, naturalmente, cumprimentar todos aqueles que contribuíram para o Tratado de Lisboa, em particular, a Comissão e a Comissária aqui presente e, também, naturalmente, a Presidência portuguesa da União Europeia que teve aqui um papel muito importante e, por isso, queríamos dizer também que é com agrado que verificamos que, apesar de todas estas vicissitudes e de ainda aguardarmos com expectativa a posição da República Checa, será com grande alegria que os portugueses verão o nome da sua capital ligada a um passo decisivo da evolução da União Europeia e queria dizer que poderemos também contar, nesta perspectiva, com outra bandeira, que será uma bandeira também sempre dos deputados portugueses do PPE, que é a bandeira dos parlamentos nacionais.

Nós julgamos que o Tratado de Lisboa dá um passo decisivo no sentido de incorporar na democracia europeia também a presença dos parlamentos nacionais. E, por isso, julgamos que essa dimensão, que é a dimensão mais importante da democracia, que é a dimensão representativa e não, como às vezes ouvimos nesta câmara, a dimensão referendária, aquilo que é fundamental e essencial na democracia é a representação e não o voto directo, também o Tratado de Lisboa é um grande passo no sentido de aumentar a participação das democracias representativas nacionais no processo europeu. Por isso, estamos muito satisfeitos com esta decisão do povo irlandês.

3-126

**Stéphane Le Foll (S-D).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je vais sûrement répéter des choses qui ont déjà été dites et me satisfaire, en tout cas, du résultat du vote irlandais sur le traité de Lisbonne.

Je voudrais simplement attirer l'attention des collègues qui restent sur les raisons du changement, parce qu'on se satisfait du oui et, il y a un an, il y avait un non. Qu'est-ce qui a changé? Le texte? Très peu. Le contexte? Beaucoup. C'est ça l'enjeu. On peut discuter, ici, des questions institutionnelles. Ce qu'attendent les citoyens, ce sont d'abord des réponses politiques de la part de l'Europe.

Voilà, à mon sens, l'analyse que nous devons faire de ce double vote. Il n'y en a pas qu'un seul. Il y en a deux. Le non d'abord, le oui après. Les Irlandais ont dit qu'ils avaient besoin de l'Europe dans la crise, et c'est à souligner de manière très forte, parce qu'ils demandent que l'Europe les protège, et ça c'est important.

Je vais répéter ce qu'ont dit beaucoup mes collègues. Je pense que, maintenant, il faut aller vite. Alors on se tourne vers la Présidence suédoise du Conseil, on se tourne vers la Commission. Si on veut répondre à ce qu'ont demandé les Irlandais, il faut apporter des réponses concrètes.

Crise économique: est-ce que l'Europe est capable de relancer sa croissance à l'échelle européenne? Crise sociale: est-ce que l'Europe est capable d'avoir une politique de l'emploi? Ce sont ces sujets-là qui, pour moi, sont au cœur du débat. Et je suis satisfait d'une autre chose apportée par le traité de Lisbonne. C'est que le Parlement verra son pouvoir accru et, dans le débat politique, je pense qu'il a un rôle essentiel à jouer: montrer qu'il y a différents choix possibles, débattre de ces choix.

Mais maintenant, pour que ce débat soit démocratique, pour que l'Europe arrive à apporter des réponses, il faut rapidement désigner une Commission, faire en sorte que la ratification soit rapide au niveau des Tchèques et faire en sorte que l'Europe reprenne la voie de la croissance et de l'espoir.

3-127

**Simon Busuttil (PPE).** – Jien ukoll nilqa' bil-ferħ ir-rizultat tar-referendum fl-Irlanda u nixtieq nagħmel dan il-punt, min qed isegwina minn daru jghid: "Issa dan ir-rizultat kif se jaffettwa lili?". U jiena nixtieq nagħti eżempji konkreti ta' kif dan ir-rizultat se jaffettwa liċ-ċittadini li qed isegwuna mid-dar tagħhom, u nuża eżempji fil-kamp li nsewgi jien, tal-ġustizzja u l-intern.

Il-Karta tad-Drittijiet tal-Bniedem – din hija karta tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem li għandna nkunu kburin biha bħala ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea u mhux bħala ċittadini biss tal-pajjiż li ġejjin minnu. Id-drittijiet ċivili tagħna, bħala ċittadini, li se jissahhu b'dan it-Trattat, inkluz f'oqsma pereżempju dwar il-protezzjoni tad-data privata dwarna. Is-sigurtà tagħna, għaliex l-Unjoni Ewropea se ssahha il-ġlieda tagħha kontra t-terroriżmu u kontra l-kriminalità grazzi għal dan it-Trattat. Id-drittijiet legali tagħna, jekk ikollna każ, pereżempju ta' adozzjoni internazzjonali jew ta' manteniment b'implikazzjonijiet internazzjonali, każ legali l-qorti fejn għandna trattat li se jsahha aktar tad-drittijiet legali tagħna. U l-immigrazzjoni – l-interessi tagħna f'kamp daqstant sensittiv fejn dan it-trattat se jsahha pereżempju l-kuncett ta' solidarjetà bejnietna lkoll.

Jiġifieri t-trattat, b'mod konkret, jaffettwa liċ-ċittadin. Għaliex? Għaliex se jagħti aktar poteri lil dan il-Parlament u dan il-Parlament se jara li dawn il-poteri jużahom b'responsabilità izda fl-istess ħin b'entuzjażmu biex iħaddimhom favur iċ-ċittadin. Ahna f'dan kollu, bħala rappreżentanti taċ-ċittadin, irridu nkun fuq in-naħa taċ-ċittadin.

3-128

**Adrian Severin (S-D).** – Mr President, the overwhelming Irish 'yes' was not due only to a better understanding of the Lisbon Treaty, but also to the understanding of the fact that true respect must be mutual and compassionate. Our Irish fellow-citizens also realised that the European train does not wait indefinitely for those who miss their appointment with history.

The Czech case is a different one. The Czech people signalled in an appropriate way its support for a more political and social, more efficient and more democratic Europe. The Government also supported the ratification of the Treaty, and Parliament ratified the Treaty. It is therefore not for us to show respect for the Czech people, but for the President of the Czech Republic to show respect for his people and its Parliament.

For us, it is important to draw the right line between what is right and what is abuse and to proceed in such a way as to show, and to prove, that for us the right ends where and when the abuse starts. We cannot accept being prisoners of filibusters. We should acknowledge that the Lisbon Treaty was duly ratified by all Member States and start the establishment of the institutions on that basis. Parliament should be fully involved in this process.

3-129

**Carlo Casini (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, mi era stato detto di disporre anch'io di tre minuti, ma cercherò di stare nei due minuti. Condivido la soddisfazione già espressa da molti miei colleghi e credo che adesso sia giunto il momento di mettere in pratica, di attuare, il Trattato di Lisbona appena effettuate le ratifiche che, auspichiamo, avvengano davvero prossimamente.

La commissione che presiedo sta facendo tutto il possibile già da un pezzo ma è importante, soprattutto, che il Parlamento prenda coscienza delle sue nuove responsabilità: non si lasci portar via, in linea di fatto, nessun pezzo della sua più ampia funzione legislativa.

Vorrei però sottolineare un particolare, che non mi sembra sia finora emerso: i motivi per cui il popolo irlandese in precedenza aveva respinto il Trattato erano molti ma tra questi motivi vi era anche il timore, di una parte degli elettori, che



l'ordinamento giuridico europeo potesse violare in Irlanda alcuni valori fondamentali inerenti al diritto alla vita e al concetto di famiglia.

Questi timori sono stati fugati mediante dichiarazioni adottate dai Consigli europei del dicembre 2008 e del giugno 2009. Questo a me pare che sia importante per tutta l'Europa, non solo per l'Irlanda: si è chiarito infatti che l'*acquis* comunitario non tocca la sfera del diritto alla vita e della famiglia. È una precisazione che non vale solo per l'Irlanda ma per tutti gli Stati membri. In realtà non c'era bisogno di questa precisazione perché la Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo, in diverse sentenze riguardanti la Francia, l'Inghilterra e la Polonia, aveva già statuito che in queste materie – il campo della vita, il valore della vita, il rispetto della vita, e la famiglia – bisogna lasciare agli Stati membri la possibilità di decidere secondo la loro storia, la loro tradizione e la loro cultura.

Ma lo scrupolo irlandese ha avuto il merito di ottenere una formale chiarezza su questo punto, che ora riguarda appunto tutta l'Unione europea. Mi sembra che questo sia un fatto positivo che rende utile l'effettuazione del doppio referendum. Naturalmente sappiamo bene che la cultura europea è fatta della somma della cultura di tutti i paesi che ne fanno parte e noi tutti desideriamo che l'Europa non sia soltanto uno spazio economico, ma anche e soprattutto una comunità di valori. Ritengo dunque doveroso esprimere insieme soddisfazione e anche gratitudine all'Irlanda, per ciò che essa porta nell'Europa con la sua storia e con i suoi ideali.

L'Europa aveva bisogno dell'Irlanda, non solo per ragioni tecniche inerenti ai meccanismi e alla struttura organizzativa, ma anche per l'apporto che l'Irlanda consegna a quella che stiamo cercando tutti: l'anima dell'Europa.

3-130

**Edite Estrela (S-D).** – A vitória do *sim* na Irlanda é uma boa notícia para a Europa e para mim, enquanto portuguesa e europeísta convicta. Representa a vitória do bom senso e da racionalidade contra a demagogia e a manipulação. Os irlandeses disseram claramente que confiam no projecto europeu. Com a vitória do *sim* foi vencido o principal obstáculo à entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa.

A partir de agora o Presidente Klaus não tem mais desculpa e tem de respeitar a Democracia e o Parlamento que o elegeu e que já aprovou o Tratado de Lisboa. Com o Tratado de Lisboa inicia-se um novo ciclo. A União Europeia será mais eficiente na tomada de decisão e mais eficaz nas relações externas. Mais democrática e mais transparente, mais próxima dos cidadãos e menos dependente dos governos. Com o novo Tratado a União Europeia estará mais apta a combater as alterações climáticas e a responder aos desafios da globalização.

3-131

**Mairead McGuinness (PPE).** – Mr President, it has been a long debate but not very dramatic. Can you imagine if it had been 'no', this Chamber would be full and heaving with emotion and I suppose the fact that it was 'yes' and we are now very calm here in the European Union speaks volumes. Of course I welcome the outcome of the referendum in Ireland along with my Fine Gael colleagues here in Parliament. I worked very hard to achieve that 'yes' and I would say that the Irish people rose above national problems and other domestic issues and looked at the European question and the Lisbon Treaty and at the past and our associations with the European Union and overwhelmingly said 'yes' to the European Union, and that is a fantastic result.

On the other hand, Commissioner Wallström, who very kindly came to Ireland on a number of occasions, will have picked up a strong undercurrent, which I believe exists in all Member States, of people who are disconnected from what the European Union is about. I think we are all of us to blame for that. I believe that we do not speak enough about the project, about the European Union, about solidarity, about what it really means; we speak more of what we can get or what we give and what is wrong with a directive or what is bad about a regulation. So in our politics we need perhaps to rise above some of those issues because when you are at the referendum stage, as we were, it involves explaining to people on the streets and in shops and in schools about what Europe is, how it works, what I do, what the Commission does, and that is a great exercise. It really is a very powerful exercise to talk to people directly about the European Union. People in Ireland know it better now than they did for the last while because we have engaged so well with them.

So I would urge us all here in this House to do more of that at home in our own countries. And to avoid knocking the European Union where it is not appropriate. Criticise by all means where it is needed, and to those, like Nigel Farage, who worry about the Irish being bullied, I would say: we are not easily bullied. It did not happen. It will never happen. And can I say, Commissioner, that if I am not here for the end of this debate, it is not out of any disrespect to you or to the President or to the Presidency; it is other commitments, but thank you all for your support throughout the last while.

3-132

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S-D).** – Tisztelt képviselőtársaim! A Lisszaboni Szerződést elsőként ratifikáló Magyarország európai parlamenti képviselőjeként üdvözlöm az írországi referendum eredményét, de nagyon szeretnék már túl lenni a ratifikáción, és hogy arról beszéljünk, hogyan valósítsuk meg a Lisszaboni Szerződést, amely óriási előrelépés a politikai unió, egy értékközösség irányába, hiszen nagy mértékben kitágítja a szociális jogokat, az Alapjogi Charta pedig jogilag

kötelező érvényével védi, uniós normává teszi a nyelvi és a kulturális sokszínűséget. De van egy nagyon fontos újdonsága is ennek a Lisszaboni Szerződésnek.

Az Unió történetében először beszél a kisebbségekhez tartozó személyek jogairól. A nemzeti és etnikai kisebbségek, a bevándorló kisebbségek az Unió lakosságának 15 százalékát képezik. Végre elindulhatunk egy uniós kisebbségvédelmi rendszer kiépítése érdekében. Köszönöm a figyelmet.

3-133

**Lena Barbara Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Przyjęcie traktatu lizbońskiego kończy historyczny proces dużego rozszerzenia Unii Europejskiej o dziesięć nowych państw członkowskich. Proces ten zaczął się w latach dziewięćdziesiątych, a kończy się zgodą na zmiany instytucjonalne, które dostosowują Unię do nowej rzeczywistości.

Przyjęcie traktatu to nowy etap i okazja, aby Unia zrobiła krok do przodu. Instytucje, które będziemy mogli powołać, to tylko szansa i od nas samych zależy, jak tę szansę wykorzystamy. To też dobry moment, aby udowodnić obywatelom sceptycznie nastawionym do projektu europejskiego, że Unia żyje, zmienia się, a przede wszystkim, że reaguje na problemy ludzi. Najważniejsze wydaje się więc zaproponowanie nowej polityki odpowiadającej na wyzwania, przed którymi stoimy. Istnieje jednak obawa, że zamiast skupić się na tym, zdominuje nas dyskusja na temat rozwiązań formalnych i personalnych: kogo wybrać na jakie stanowiska? Nie wolno teraz pozwolić, aby egoizm narodowy, który w dobie kryzysu może się nasilać, podważył szansę, którą ma obecnie Unia. Trzeba przede wszystkim przekonać obywateli, że Unia to nie tylko elity, stanowiska i nadmierna biurokracja, ale również nowe i bardziej skuteczne sposoby rozwiązania ich problemów.

3-134

**Alan Kelly (S-D).** – Mr President, I stand here today as a proud Irish MEP. It took the blood, sweat and tears of public representatives, athletes, business groups, farmers and trade unionists to secure a historic 'yes' vote. I am also proud that last Friday I was in my home area of Tipperary, watching a landslide victory come through, which showed something that I have always believed in, that Ireland is a huge supporter of Europe, and we fully intend to play our role in the future.

Now I know that the leprechauns in UKIP, who attended the House last year following the previous referendum, have disappeared. Many of you will be glad to know that I firmly believe that the Irish people have banished them forever from here. The Lisbon Treaty verdict was a victory for truth over the damned lies and myths perpetrated in some cases by extremists on the 'no' side who tried to take advantage of people's genuine concerns. Those extremists met their match last Friday.

However, it is a lesson we have to learn. All of us who support progressive politics and a progressive Europe need collectively to provide citizens with a greater incentive to engage with our European institutions. We can never take them for granted.

3-135

**Damien Abad (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, le peuple irlandais a clairement fait le choix de se placer au cœur de l'Europe en approuvant le traité de Lisbonne à une très large majorité. En tant que benjamin des eurodéputés français, je me félicite de ce choix qui nous permet enfin de nous occuper des préoccupations concrètes de nos citoyens.

Je voudrais quand même faire deux remarques. La première, c'est que personne ne doit négliger le fait que c'est la crise qui a rendu en grande partie les Irlandais europhiles. Et ce oui irlandais traduit donc un vrai besoin d'Europe, d'une Europe politique, qui protège et qui propose, le besoin d'une Europe qui soit capable de répondre aux crises et qui assure à ses citoyens la sécurité qu'ils demandent.

En second lieu, l'échec du premier référendum en Irlande doit nous servir d'exemple et de leçon. Nous ne pouvons pas, à chaque fois que nous voulons faire avancer l'Europe, nous retrouver à la merci de procédures inadaptées dans une Europe à 27. Mes chers collègues, avec le système actuel, un État membre a finalement parfois davantage intérêt à dire non à un traité plutôt que de dire oui. Cette prime au non doit nous inciter à mettre en place une véritable procédure au niveau communautaire de manière à éviter une nationalisation des débats.

Aujourd'hui, la dynamique européenne est à nouveau en marche et nous, parlementaires européens, nous aurons enfin la main sur des dossiers aussi sensibles que la crise du secteur laitier ou encore la crise gazière de l'hiver dernier. Et permettez-moi juste un instant d'attirer l'attention de mes collègues et amis parlementaires sur ce qui sera le seul enjeu du budget communautaire 2010, à savoir le financement de la seconde tranche du plan de relance européen à hauteur de deux milliards d'euros. Je suis de ceux qui pensent que nous devons veiller à ce que ce plan ne soit pas exclusivement financé à travers les crédits agricoles, car ce serait un mauvais signal adressé à nos agriculteurs dans un contexte de crise et cela constituerait un risque également pour l'avenir de notre sécurité alimentaire et de nos territoires.

Pour terminer, je tiens à remercier une fois encore nos amis irlandais et à leur adresser mes plus vives et chaleureuses félicitations pour ce choix clairement européen. J'appelle désormais nos amis polonais et tchèques à se mobiliser afin que

l'Europe dispose de cette boîte à outils qui lui permettra de relever les défis de la mondialisation dans les prochaines décennies.

3-136

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, telegráficamente, tres mensajes:

En primer lugar, como tantos oradores que me han precedido, me congratulo del sí rotundo expresado en el referéndum irlandés.

En segundo lugar, como Presidente de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, subrayo la importancia que tiene la verosimilitud de la entrada en vigor del Tratado de Lisboa para reforzar un espacio de legitimación de la construcción europea como es el que tiene que ver con la ciudadanía, con los derechos, con las libertades y con nuestra capacidad de luchar juntos contra el crimen organizado y contra el terrorismo, y, en el ámbito del Tratado de Schengen, para ser eficaces a la hora de tratar asuntos delicados como el asilo, la inmigración, la extranjería y el control de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión.

Pero, en tercer lugar, recuerdo, como otros antes que yo, que no es el fin de la historia. No solamente porque todavía queda la ratificación de la República Checa, sino porque debemos extraer las lecciones necesarias de las dificultades experimentadas para ratificar el Tratado de Lisboa. No ha sido fácil, han sido diez años de debates y esto va a hacernos mucho más exigentes, no solo para con nosotros mismos, sino para con las futuras ampliaciones a la hora de exigir lealtad, cooperación y responsabilidad a todos los que suscriban las nuevas reglas de que nos vamos a dotar a partir de la entrada en vigor del Tratado de Lisboa.

3-137

**Anne Delvaux (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, quelques jours après le référendum positif en Irlande, j'ai vraiment l'impression que nous pouvons dire que nous sommes aujourd'hui plus européens qu'auparavant. Je m'en réjouis vraiment, pleinement, sereinement. Malheureusement, nous sommes encore essentiellement dépendants de la décision de la cour constitutionnelle, mais aussi du bon vouloir du président tchèque.

Il faut lancer un signal clair de responsabilisation à ceux qui détiennent entre leurs mains l'avenir de ce traité capital pour l'Union, pour nos institutions et pour les 500 millions d'Européens que nous représentons. Nous ne pouvons plus être otages de quelques-uns dont l'unique but est de contrecarrer l'intérêt général européen. S'il est légitime que certains souhaitent ne pas aller plus loin dans l'intégration européenne, s'il est légitime de faire part de ses réticences, il est aussi légitime de laisser progresser ceux qui le souhaitent.

D'une manière générale, les processus de ratification des traités européens prennent trop souvent l'allure de sagas ou de victoires à la Pyrrhus. Sommes-nous condamnés à constamment devoir faire le forcing pour garantir la mise en œuvre d'un traité et de ses réformes institutionnelles?

Nous devons tirer les enseignements de ce processus de ratification chaotique et aussi, évidemment, de cet engagement de négociations en vue de l'organisation d'un second référendum en Irlande, comme s'il était normal de refaire voter un peuple qui s'est exprimé de manière souveraine, et comme s'il était normal qu'un assentiment à un traité puisse être une monnaie d'échange. Il y va de la cohérence et de l'équilibre institutionnels de l'aventure européenne.

Ratifier un traité est une exigence minimale de loyauté et de cohésion à partir du moment où l'on choisit que son pays adhère à l'Union européenne. Nous voulions donner un signal fort aux citoyens en obtenant que le traité soit ratifié pour les élections européennes de juin 2009. Que croyez-vous que le citoyen pense aujourd'hui du traité de Lisbonne et, au-delà, de notre cohérence interne et de notre légitimité?

3-138

**Zoran Thaler (S-D).** – Jasen *yes* za lizbonsko pogodbo na Irskem je pomemben korak za združeno Evropo in manjši udarec za evroskeptike.

Ta odločitev je še toliko bolj pomembna, saj so jo sprejeli ljudje na referendumu potem, ko so imeli leto dni časa premisliti, ali je bil prvotni *no* res koristen za Irsko.

Sedaj je ob Češki na kocki kredibilnost tudi naše članice, države članice EU, Velike Britanije, v kateri vodi opozicije gospod David Cameron obljublja referendum o pogodbi, če zmaga na volitvah leta 2010. In to ne glede na to, da sta oba domova britanskega parlamenta lizbonsko pogodbo že ratificirala sredi leta 2008.

Kaj bi bilo s kredibilnostjo odločitev in mednarodnih zavez države članice Velike Britanije, ki je pogodbo ratificirala in preti, da bo morda dve leti po tem svojo odločitev, zavezo, suspendirala?

3-139

**Enikő Győri (PPE).** – Tisztelt képviselőtársaim! Amikor Magyarország polgárai 2003 tavaszán közel 84 százalékos arányban támogatták hazánk csatlakozását az Európai Unióhoz, úgy érezték, visszatérnek oda, ahova mindig is tartoztak, az európai népek közös családjába, ahonnan a több mint 40 éven át tartó kommunista diktatúra kitaszította őket. Nemcsak egy jogszabályokon alapuló gazdasági együttműködési formaként tekintettek tehát a magyarok az Unióra, hanem egy olyan közösségként, mely értékek mentén működik. A Lisszaboni Szerződés írszági jóváhagyása öröm számunkra, mert általa értékeink méltó helyre kerülnek az alapító szerződésben, és ezen értékek közé immár kimondottan is bekerül a kisebbségekhez tartozó személyek jogainak elismerése.

Ezért emeltem fel a kék kártyámat, elnök úr, az előbb, amikor Szegedi képviselő úr hozzászólt. Azt szerettem volna akkor megkérdezni tőle, hogy vajon olvasta-e a Lisszaboni Szerződést, mert ha olvasta volna, akkor valószínűleg ismeri ezt az általam idézett cikket a kisebbségekről. Magyarország polgárai abban bíznak, hogy az Unió a szerződés hatályba lépésétől fogva fogékonyabbá válik a kisebbségekkel kapcsolatos problémákra és egyszer s mindenkorra elfogadhatatlanná válnak a szlovák nyelvtörvényhez hasonló esetek. Nem csak a jog betűje miatt, hanem az Unió szellemiségéből fakadóan is éreznie kell mindenkinek: minden európai polgár közös ügye, hogy a kisebbségek szabadon, korlátozásoktól mentesen használhassák anyanyelvüket s otthon érezhessék magukat szülőföldjükön.

Meggyőződésem, a Lisszaboni Szerződés abban is segítségünkre lesz, hogy az Unió intézményei jobban megértsék, az értékeinket az Unión belül is meg kell védeni, s megsértésük esetén automatikusan fel kell lépni. Nem lehet kettős mérce, kedves szocialista, liberális és független képviselőtársaim: értékekre hivatkozunk, ha az érdekeink úgy diktálják, elfelejtjük őket, ha az az előnyösebb. A Néppárt nem ilyen Európát akar.

3-140

**Ivari Padar (S-D).** – Härra president! Viibisin eelmisel nädalal Iirimaal, toetades seal oma Iiri Tööpartei sõpru. Olen rõõmus, et tuli tugev jah-sõna, sest tegemist on väga vajaliku otsusega nii Iirimaa kui ka Euroopa Liidu jaoks. Põllumehele on mul eriti hea meel, et Iiri põllumehele toetasid seekord lepingut referendumikampaania algusest peale. See oli väga õige otsus, sest lepingu kehtima hakkamisega saab ka europarlament juurde nõukoguga võrdse sõnaõiguse põllumajandusküsimustes, sealhulgas kaasotsustamismenetluse ühises põllumajanduspoliitikas, mis kindlasti on Euroopa põllumehele hea uudis.

3-141

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – A Uachtaráin, mar Fheisire nuathofa, ba mhaith liom a rá go bhfuil mé bródúil as ucht an toraidh dhearfai gh a thug muintir na hÉireann do Reifreann Liospóin Dé hAoine seo caite. Táim bródúil freisin as ucht na díospóireachta bríomhara atá againn anseo inniu.

3-142

People have asked why Ireland changed its mind. There were perhaps four key factors. One, I think, was the fact that we gained a commissioner; two, the guarantees; three was that we had a proper debate and people were properly informed this time, not like the last time. Also the economic crisis was a factor. But the key one was that the 'yes' campaign got mobilised this time and it did not last time. Civil groups and politicians got together and, for the first time that I could recall, political parties – mainstream political parties – put their differences aside and campaigned for the good of Ireland. The Irish people responded.

The 'no' campaign was also well organised and everyone had their say, including the United Kingdom Independence Party, who ensured that this document – *The truth about the Treaty: Stop the EU bulldozer* – was distributed widely in Ireland. Well, the Irish people decided that they much preferred to be on the EU train than the UKIP bulldozer.

Last weekend was a triumph for communication. You have often heard about communication deficit. This was a triumph for communication and if we continue in this way we will bring Europe closer to the people.

Now it is up to the Czech President to sign the agreement and bring it into being because, if he does not do so, it would be I think the greatest act of dictatorship in the history of the world and a complete negation of democracy.

Thank you very much for all your support, and we look forward to being positive Europeans from Ireland long into the future.

3-143

**Jo Leinen (S-D).** – Herr Präsident! Nach acht Jahren mit vielen Debatten und Verhandlungen gibt es jetzt wirklich die Chance, dass wir diesen Reformvertrag bekommen, auch dank der intensiven Arbeit vieler hier im Haus, die dieses Projekt von Anfang bis zum Ende im Konvent begleitet haben und später in den Regierungskonferenzen.

Ich glaube, das Parlament hat bei dem Reformvertrag eine gute Rolle gespielt. Ich meine, dass es, wenn das Verfassungsgericht in Prag in Tschechien ein positives Urteil fällt, keinen legalen Grund mehr für Präsident Klaus gibt, die EU weiter zu blockieren. Und die anderen Verfassungsorgane in der Tschechischen Republik werden Wege finden, um eine solche illegale Blockade zu überwinden.

Wir hören ja, dass dann aus Großbritannien neues Ungemach drohen kann. Sollte eine britische Regierung jedoch ein Referendum durchführen lassen, dann aber nicht über den Vertrag von Lissabon, sondern über die Frage: Sind die Briten für die EU oder wollen sie aus der EU austreten? Darum muss es gehen, nicht um einen Vertrag, der ratifiziert worden ist. Das wäre völlig unzulässig. Ich meine, dass wir eine Lehre daraus ziehen müssen: Die Bürger brauchen mehr Information. Deshalb hoffe ich, dass wir auch in der neuen Kommission eine Vizepräsidentin oder einen Vizepräsidenten für Kommunikation und für Information bekommen werden, vielleicht sogar einen Kommissar für Unionsbürgerschaft. Das wäre die Antwort auf diese Kontroversen zur Europapolitik.

3-144

**Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Dzięki traktatowi lizbońskiemu Europa może podjąć wyzwania, które wykraczają daleko poza wewnętrzne problemy krajów członkowskich. Czy będzie gotowa to uczynić? Jeszcze trudno powiedzieć. W tej sprawie z pewnością wiele zależeć będzie od obywateli Europy.

Jednak poza traktatem Unia musi mieć jeszcze wolę działania, obecności w świecie, poczucia odpowiedzialności za świat, jego stabilność i rozwój. Od tego zależy również bezpieczeństwo i rozwój jej samej. Musimy przeciwstawić się często pojawiającej się metaforze Europy jako kraju bezpiecznego, dostatniego, demokratycznego, miłującego prawa człowieka, ale zwróconemu ku swoim wewnętrznym sprawom, odwracającego się plecami do świata.

Traktat z Lizbony zmusza nas do lepszego zrozumienia wyzwań, które przed nami stoją. Po irlandzkim „tak” zjednoczona Europa patrzy teraz na Polskę i Czechy. Nie mam najmniejszych wątpliwości, że już wkrótce Traktat z Lizbony wejdzie w życie. Czekając na podpisy prezydentów Kaczyńskiego i Klause zastanówmy się jednak nad tym, w jaki sposób przebiegała dyskusja podczas obecnej reformy, wyciągnijmy wnioski z tego, co się działo. Przygotujmy się na przyszłość! Przygotujmy się na kolejne reformy, bo wspaniały projekt, który tworzymy – Unia Europejska – to pomysł niedokończony. I na koniec chciałbym powiedzieć jedno: dziękuję Irlandio!

3-145

**Paolo De Castro (S-D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 2 ottobre è stato un grande giorno per l'Europa, grazie agli irlandesi che hanno detto "sì" al Trattato di Lisbona. Per la politica agricola comune, in particolare, l'entrata in vigore della codecisione sarà una vera e propria rivoluzione democratica: finalmente il Parlamento avrà i poteri per decidere al pari del Consiglio dei ministri dell'Agricoltura; e questo grazie al consenso degli irlandesi e al voto favorevole espresso nei parlamenti nazionali, compreso il parlamento della Repubblica ceca.

Ogni ritardo costituirebbe un problema per gli agricoltori di tutti gli Stati membri. Il settore agricolo, infatti, si trova in uno dei momenti tra i più delicati e difficili degli ultimi anni, che vede un crollo dei prezzi nella maggior parte dei prodotti, e non solo dei prodotti lattieri, come abbiamo visto in questi giorni.

In attesa che il Trattato entri in vigore formalmente, ci aspettiamo sin da oggi, signor Presidente, che Consiglio e Commissione prendano in seria considerazione le decisioni di questo Parlamento – democraticamente eletto da tutti i cittadini europei – anche in materia agricola, a partire dalle misure per fronteggiare la crisi del settore lattiero.

3-146

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE).** – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, sunt și eu foarte mulțumit de faptul că irlandezii au aprobat în final Tratatul de la Lisabona, deoarece sunt convins de importanța acestui document pentru construcția europeană.

Avem nevoie de un nou tratat care să pună la dispoziția Uniunii Europene instrumente moderne și metode de lucru optimizate pentru a face față în mod eficient provocărilor lumii contemporane. Acest tratat este în primul rând un pas înainte pentru democratizarea procesului decizional la nivelul Uniunii, iar noi, în Parlamentul European, suntem printre primii care vom beneficia de schimbările pozitive prevăzute în cadrul acestui tratat.

Prin extinderea procedurii de codecizie, Parlamentul European devine un legiuitor aflat pe picior de egalitate cu Consiliul pentru 95% din legislația comunitară. De exemplu, în Comisia pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne, în care activez, vom extinde procedura codeciziei de la 40 de arii de competență la 80, ceea ce crește legitimitatea democratică a legislației europene.

Consider că noua bază legală va contribui la accelerarea procesului de dezvoltare economică și la adaptarea sistemelor juridice în statele membre. Sunt de asemenea convins că în acest fel vom realiza mai ușor unul dintre principalele obiective ale Uniunii Europene, și anume acela de a realiza coeziunea economică, socială și teritorială.

Aștept cu mult interes finalizarea procesului de ratificare și sunt nerăbdător să începem implementarea acestuia.

3-147

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE).** – Caros Colegas, minhas Senhoras e meus Senhores, congratulo-me com o expressivo *sim* que o povo irlandês manifestou no passado domingo, no referendo do Tratado de Lisboa. Espera-se que o longo calvário das ratificações do Tratado tenha, finalmente, chegado ao fim.

Estou certo de que a ratificação do Tratado pela República Checa também acontecerá. Seria incompreensível, seria inadmissível que o futuro da Europa ficasse manietado, ficasse bloqueado, diria eu, por uma opinião pessoal e em total desrespeito, em total desacordo com a maioria do respectivo Parlamento. Todos queremos que o impasse institucional em que nos encontramos e que tem quase 10 anos, tenha chegado, finalmente, ao fim.

Obrigado, portanto, ao povo irlandês, pois a vontade que manifestou dá-nos esperança para uma Europa mais forte, mais próspera, mais solidária e acrescenta, em simultâneo, a responsabilidade, a obrigação de todas as instituições europeias agirem de forma a não traírem essa mesma vontade. Aliás, vontade partilhada pela larga maioria dos cidadãos europeus.

Faço votos de que todos estejamos à altura de uma Europa cada vez mais liderante, mais coesa e impulsionadora no mundo dos valores democráticos, dos direitos sociais e fundamentais, do crescimento económico e, em simultâneo, da preservação ambiental.

3-148

**Mário David (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhora Comissária, caros Colegas, uma breve intervenção para saudar o histórico e amplo resultado do referendo na Irlanda e realçar o papel decisivo que o Fine Gael e o seu líder e próximo Primeiro-Ministro da Irlanda, Enda Kenny, tiveram ao assumir a liderança deste processo. Um processo em que ficou bem patente a necessidade de aproximar muito mais a União Europeia dos seus cidadãos. São eles, somos todos nós os destinatários principais de toda a acção da União. É fundamental que todos estejam conscientes do impacto e dos benefícios que a Europa tem diariamente nas nossas vidas.

A Europa é o nosso espaço vital. O que é bom para a Europa é bom para cada Estado-Membro, é bom para os seus cidadãos. É seguramente o caso do Tratado de Lisboa. Com este Tratado torna-se muito mais evidente que se pode ser, simultaneamente, um orgulhoso e empenhado cidadão nacional e um acérrimo defensor do projecto europeu. E a União Europeia, encerrado um demasiado longo debate sobre a sua organização e funcionamento, poderá concentrar-se muito mais, e com novos instrumentos bem mais eficazes, nos verdadeiros problemas que enfrentam os europeus: a competitividade, o crescimento e o emprego.

Termino, Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, com uma proposta destinada às futuras gerações. Considerando o défice de informação sobre os valores, as competências, os objectivos e o modo de funcionamento da União Europeia, o Parlamento Europeu deveria propor, no fim da escolaridade obrigatória em cada Estado-Membro, uma nova disciplina de estudos europeus de carácter obrigatório. De uma forma objectiva, verdadeira e concreta, os jovens europeus ficarão a saber, efectivamente, os nossos princípios, quem somos, o que fazemos e para onde queremos ir.

É pelo conhecimento, desde jovens, que compreenderão, ao longo da vida, o potencial e a enorme utilidade da identidade europeia deste projecto único de partilha voluntária de soberania à escala continental.

3-149

**David Casa (PPE).** – Iva, dan huwa mument storiku, u mhux għax l-Irlandizi aċċettaw dan it-Trattat b'vot verament b'saħħtu, imma anke llum għandna dikjarazzjoni mill-Polonja li anke l-Polonja issa se ttrattat dan it-Trattat.

Trattat li kellu mixja twila hafna. Jien ilni hawn biss hames snin, però hawn deputati fosthom il-kollega tiegħi Méndez de Vigo, li ilhom hafna jahdmu sabiex jaslu għal dan il-mument storiku li għandna quddiemna. Mument storiku li issa jiffa' r-responsabilitajiet fuqna l-politici anke fuq il-President tar-Repubblika Ċeka. L-opinjoni personali tiegħu tiswa', però imbagħad ma jistax pajjiz shih u l-Unjoni Ewropea kollha jibqgħu ostaġġi għaliex għandna opinjoni personali ta' politiku.

Ahna l-politici għandna responsabilitajiet kbar x'ingorru, għandna x'nirrispondu, u nirrispondu biss lejn iċ-ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea, għaliex fl-ahhar mill-ahhar ahna nirrappreżentaw lilhom. L-Ewropa għandha sfidi kbar. Għandna l-kriżi finanzjarja, il-bidla fil-klima, il-problema tal-immigranti, kif se noholqu aktar xogħol fl-Ewropa, u allura l-opinjoni personali tal-President tar-Repubblika Ċeka ma tistax iżomm lill-Ewropa milli tibqa' taħdem biex jintlahqu l-livelli li ahna qeghdin nahdmu biex nilhqu. U jiena naqbel ma' min tkellem qabli fejn qal li l-Kummissjoni għandha tigi mahtura. Għandna l-President u jiena ma nabsibx li għandna nistennaw l-eżitu tal-Qorti Kostituzzjonali tar-Repubblika Ċeka biex ikollna l-Kummissjoni mwaqqfa. Għandna xogħol urgenti x'nagħmlu u l-Kummissjoni għandha tibda' taħdem immedjatament biex dan ix-xogħol nilhqu nagħmluh.

3-150

**Júliu Winkler (PPE).** – Csatlakozom az előttem szóló képviselőtársak hosszú sorához, akik üdvözltek az ir választópolgárok döntését, hogy megszavazták a Lisszaboni Szerződést és ezzel optimistán tekinthetünk a ratifikáció véglegesítésének irányába. Ez viszont nem egyéb, mint egy első lépés egy olyan úton, amelyen véleményem szerint három célt kell elérni. Mélyíteni kell az új tagállamok integrációját, le kell bontani azokat a korlátokat, amelyek kétsébségű Európát hoztak létre és folytatni kell az Unió bővítési folyamatát a Balkán felé.

A Lisszaboni Szerződés az európai szolidaritáson alapul és remélem, hogy a szolidaritás valóban működni fog és nem marad csupán a különböző európai intézmények fórumain elhangzott szándéknyilatkozat. Úgy vélem, a gazdasági válság is

azt mutatja, hogy csupán szolidaritással lehet megfelelni a kihívásoknak, és valamennyien az erős Unió révén lehetünk a globális világ fontos tényezői.

Hosszú és fáradtságos utat tettünk meg eddig. Nem engedhetjük meg magunknak, hogy most gyengítsük az európai építkezés alapjait. Szilárd meggyőződésem, hogy a valóság bebizonyítja az euroszeptikusoknak, hogy együtt erősebbek vagyunk, és azt is, hogy semmit sem nyerhetünk azzal, hogyha a 20. század elejének geopolitikájához térünk vissza.

3-151

**Diogo Feio (PPE).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhora Comissária, com o resultado da passada sexta-feira espero que a Europa possa vir a sair de uma crise relativa aos Tratados e que, assim, seja possível a existência de um corpo institucional estável e adequado a uma organização que tem 27 Estados, bem diferente daquela que esteve na base de Nice.

É que, Senhor Presidente, um Tratado não é propriamente uma obra de arte, uma obra jurídica, que sirva apenas para se admirar. Tem que ser útil, tem que ter efeitos. E é por isso que, por muito relevante que seja, do plano político, a discussão sobre, por exemplo, quem vai ser o Presidente do Conselho, mais relevante é que o processo de ratificação termine e que o Tratado entre, de facto, em vigor. Até por que, com este resultado na Irlanda, fica claro que a Europa não se constrói contra os povos. Seja pela via representativa, seja pela via dos referendos, essa aproximação é real.

E, já agora, é importante relevar que, tão democrático é o voto *não* como o voto *sim*. E alguns parecem confundir essa mesma realidade. Espero que, com a ratificação da Irlanda, da República Checa e da Polónia, se possa criar uma situação de solidariedade *de facto* entre os Estados. E que se caminhe para uma situação em que se junte a este grande passo a sequência daquilo que é a Europa de Schuman: uma Europa feita de pequenos passos, feita de dia-a-dia e, fundamentalmente, de engrandecimento dos ideais europeus.

3-152

**Csaba Sógor (PPE).** – Elnök úr! Az ír referendum sikere az európai gondolat sikere. Minek köszönhetően? Egy: az írek garanciát kaptak, azaz a többség figyelembe vette a kisebbség óhaját. Az igazi demokrácia nem csupán a többség véleményének a megszavazása, hanem a kisebbség óhajainak figyelembevétele is. Eerre lenne szükség Európában a kisebbségeinek a védelme érdekében is.

A siker másik oka abban rejlik, hogy az igent támogatók jobban kampányoltak, mint a múltkor, amikor a referendumot lezavagták. Az Unió nem a tagadások, hanem az igenek uniója. És végül, de nem utolsósorban a sikeres szavazásban a gazdasági válság is szerepet játszott. Írországra az Uniót kívül Izland sorsa várt volna. Válságban derül ki, hogy együtt erősebbek vagyunk, az összefogás és a szolidaritás jobb, mint az egymásnak feszülés.

3-153

**Ioan Mircea Paşcu (S-D).** – Mr President, the new Irish vote, this time approving the Lisbon Treaty, is indeed very good news. However, there are at least two aspects that require caution. The first is that the Treaty still needs the signature of President Klaus, whom we have only embittered with our reaction to his open scepticism and anti-Europeanism when he spoke in this Chamber last spring. I only wish that we were smarter than that.

The second aspect where caution is required is the high expectation we place on the restart of integration, including enlargement, once the Lisbon Treaty is in place. The truth is that if we slow down it is not because of the absence of the Lisbon Treaty, which is only an alibi for it, but because of the negative effects of the current crisis, encouraging renationalisation of certain Community policies and the centrifugal tendencies within the Union. Those have to be dealt with separately and properly if we want the Lisbon Treaty to be what we expect it to be.

3-154

**Íñigo Méndez de Vigo (PPE).** – Señor Presidente, yo creo que una de las conclusiones de este debate es que cuando se explican las cosas, cuando se habla con la gente, cuando se comunica, cuando se rechazan falsedades, se logra una mayor participación y una mayor adhesión al proyecto europeo.

Y, por ello, me atrevo, en la línea de lo que han dicho muchos intervinientes, a hacer una aportación positiva y constructiva, y pedirle a la Comisión Europea que reflexione acerca de si, en la composición de esa nueva Comisión, el cargo de Comisario de Derechos Humanos no lo debemos incluir en una cartera más global como sería la del Comisario para la Ciudadanía, incluyendo en ella la comunicación, que es absolutamente necesaria para poder comunicar bien, para poder explicar bien, para poder entablar un verdadero diálogo sobre nuestro proyecto europeo.

3-155

**John Bufton (EFD).** – Mr President, the result of the referendum in Ireland at the weekend on the Lisbon Treaty is living proof that this Parliament is not democratic, honest or accountable. But who in here really cares? Well, I do. The fact that the Irish were made to vote twice proves that the EU has now become a dictatorship. If the vote does not go the way of the EU dictators, then they simply vote again and again until the right result is achieved.

This is not fair and is in my view morally wrong. The Lisbon fanatics in this Parliament will now go full steam ahead to create a new European superstate of 500 million people. The injustice is that people in my country, the United Kingdom, were promised a referendum but denied one. The irony is that under the Lisbon Treaty there will be a full-time President. It is quite likely to be Tony Blair. The new President of the EU will be the head of state.

You cannot have two heads of state and, since the EU takes precedence over national bodies, the EU President – perhaps Tony Blair – will take precedence over our Queen. The people of my country will not accept an unelected failure or anybody else taking precedence over our Queen. God save our Queen!

3-156

**Corneliu Vadim Tudor (NI).** – Așa după cum știți, România cunoaște în această perioadă o criză politică fără precedent, care se adaugă la criza economică și socială. În aceste zile se pregătește o mare fraudă electorală. E vorba de alegerile pentru funcția de președinte al României, care urmează să se desfășoare la 22 noiembrie. Toate alegerile din România au fost fraudate, dar jaful care se pune la cale acum e inimaginabil.

Eu nu acuz pe nimeni, dar au fost create și perfecționate mecanisme ale fraudei absolut scandaloase: sondaje de opinie mincinoase, turism electoral, liste suplimentare, voturi anulate ale oamenilor vii și voturi valabile ale morților, imense sume de bani și produse pentru mituirea cetățenilor săraci, convingerea părinților prin mituirea copiilor din școli, fraudă pe calculator și multe alte ilegalități. Salvați România! SOS poporul român!

Instituțiile Consiliului Europei și în primul rând Parlamentul European au datoria morală să ajute o țară membră să nu iasă de pe orbita civilizației. Nu lăsați mafia din Balcani să dinamiteze proiectul generos al Uniunii Europene. Trag acest semnal de alarmă fiindcă instituțiile Uniunii Europene reprezintă ultima speranță a poporului român.

3-157

**Zoltán Balczó (NI).** – A Lisszaboni Szerződés támogatói nem egyszerűen győzelmet ünnepelnek, hanem a demokrácia győzelmét, arra hivatkozva, hogy most egy kieroszakolt népszavazás mondott igent. Az eredmény azonban 3:1 a nemek javára. Nem felejtethjük el, hogy a tartalmilag teljesen azonos alkotmányos szerződésről a francia nép és a holland nép nemet mondott. Ekkor jött a kreatív ötlet, de cinikus: ha nem fogadja el Európa népe ezt az alkotmányt, nevezzük reformszerződésnek, majd a politikai elit a parlamentekben megszavazza. Sajnos a magyar parlament volt az első, amelyik ezt megtette.

Én elhiszem, hogy sokan úgy gondolják, hogy Európa népeinek a Lisszaboni Szerződés a boldogulás útja, de egyre semmiképpen nincs jogalapjuk, hogy azt mondják: ez Európa népeinek akarata volt.

3-158

**Cristian Dan Preda (PPE).** – Vroiam doar să intervin pentru a-i aminti domnului Vadim Tudor că discuția de aici este despre referendumul din Irlanda și lucrurile cu totul și cu totul neadevărate pe care le-a spus nu au nicio legătură cu subiectul. Aș vrea, în același timp, să salut victoria taberei pro-europene în Irlanda.

3-159

**Cecilia Malmström, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, I see that the debate from the Irish referendum still lives in this plenary and there is a lot to say about democracy. Is it democratic to let the Irish people vote once again? Well yes, it is. It is very democratic. If you listen to the people, you ask them: Why did you vote 'no'? You find out the reasons. You clarify these things by giving legal guarantees to the Irish people on taxation, on neutrality, on certain ethical issues and also making a guarantee that all Member States, including Ireland, will have a commissioner when the new Treaty comes into force. With this clarification you have a new referendum. The people answered 'yes' with a two-thirds majority and with a higher turnout than last time. This is democratic, and I think we should rejoice and congratulate the Irish people for this.

I also see that there is a clear domestic debate from the UK in here; it would be tempting to go into that, but I will not do so. I just want to say that, independently of who is in Downing Street next year, Britain needs Europe and Europe does need Britain.

I also sense a certain frustration in here about the timetable now. I can understand that and I share it, but I want to assure the House that we move as swiftly as we can. We have guarantees or promises that the Polish President will sign within a few days. The timetable in Prague is still a little bit unclear. I will go there tonight, if I catch the plane, and will meet with lots of people tomorrow in order to get a clearer picture of the different scenarios, the different timetables that we can expect. We need a few days to grasp and to assess the situation in the Constitutional Court. The Treaty is in the Constitutional Court and, until it has left there, the President cannot sign. I am quite optimistic: I think this will be ready within a short time, but we need to wait a few days for this clarification.

Meanwhile, the Presidency is working, of course. There are lots of working groups going on in order to prepare for the full implementation of the Treaty. There are discussions going on with the European Parliament, with the Commission, in order to put everything in place that we need to do so that the Treaty can enter into force very swiftly.



I received a question from Madame Flautre about the extra MEPs; that is an issue that will have to be dealt with as soon as the Treaty enters into force, and I want to assure her, if she is listening now, that we are doing whatever we can to ensure that the decision can be made as soon as possible. I want to thank Parliament for having decided to give these MEPs observer status while we wait for the formalities once the Treaty is adopted. She also named many men who are being mentioned for the top jobs, but those are men named in the media, in the press; there are no official candidates from the Council yet. There will be. But all those names mentioned are named in the media. I would very much welcome if one of those top jobs could go to a woman. I cannot guarantee you that we will succeed with that because a Presidency has to listen to all the capitals and find candidates who can achieve a consensus among the 27 Member States, but I would very much welcome the candidacy of a woman; it would make Europe much more representative than today.

I also feel, Mr President, a very strong sensation in this House that Europe should move on to be a stronger, bigger player in the world and to show resolve when it comes to the economy, the fight against unemployment, tackling the challenges of globalisation and the climate issue. We need to do that. The Lisbon Treaty is an important tool for us to do so; but we also need to move on independently of what Treaty we have, to show concrete results and to deliver. Only when we do that, when we deliver what the citizens expect of us – and this goes for the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament – will we gain legitimacy and the confidence of our citizens. I can assure you that the Presidency is doing everything it can to move the processes on on all these issues, with the help of the European Parliament. Thank you very much for an interesting debate, Mr President.

3-160

**IN THE CHAIR: Libor ROUČEK**  
*Vice-President*

3-161

**Margot Wallström, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, it has been an interesting debate, which I am sure to some extent repeats the discussions that have been held in Ireland and elsewhere.

Could I just start with some facts. It is the Member States' governments who decide on the method for ratification. There is no way that the EU institutions can force a Member State to choose either a referendum or a parliamentary ratification. I think it is very important to say this. It is interesting that those who speak very strongly in favour of independent nation states are also the ones who would be willing to impose a referendum on all other Member States, which I find a bit strange.

Now Ireland decided to carry out a second referendum. Let us be very honest, this always carries a political risk, but it was the Irish Government which decided that they were willing to do so. And why did they do that?

Incidentally, it is not unusual to repeat referenda: that has been done previously on domestic issues, and in certain Member States you can come back several times on a domestic issue too, so let us be intellectually honest about this whole procedure.

I think we have heard a very good analysis from the Irish MEPs themselves, from Mr Kelly, from Mary MacDonald, from Mr De Rossa: they offered an explanation on why there was a change among the Irish population, on why they moved towards a 'yes' vote, and I think we have had good answers.

I think some MEPs have a very strange way of looking at democracy as very static and absolute. They maybe prefer to forget that this is a discussion about a reform. It is a process that started in Laeken many years ago and has involved different democratic bodies and discussions over the years to try to find a common way of taking decisions in a more modern, more democratic and efficient way. Member States and their leaders have of course invested a lot of time and energy in this procedure and this is why it is not static: it cannot be compared with a football match. I am sorry, you cannot count scores in the same way as in a football match, because we also have to listen to each other.

And this is what was done. The concerns of the Irish people were listened to and they did it themselves in Ireland. Why do we have to explain? The Irish themselves, their national parliament, debated in a subcommittee the reasons why there was a 'no' vote – because this came as a surprise to many there. So they looked at the reasons.

I was there myself. I was at the fashion fair in Dublin, I was at the fish market in Cork, I was at the public meeting in Donegal, and what many people said first of all was: Well, we have not actually read the full text of the Treaty, it is a very complex legal text and it is difficult to understand exactly what this is all about.

Some said they were very afraid that what was on the posters might be true, that the EU will decide on a minimum wage which is EUR 1.48: can that really be true? Or is it true that the EU will impose conscription to a European army and send very young people to Afghanistan in a European army: can this be true? What kind of statements are these? Should I believe in them? So there were a lot of worries and a lot of real concerns and mainly, I would say, a lack of information and a need for their concerns to be taken seriously.

This is what happened. Civil society also engaged, as I think Mr Kelly explained very well. I am not ashamed of the fact that we made a citizens' summary of the Lisbon Treaty which was then published in the big newspapers – uncontested by anybody I may add – so that citizens could themselves read a summary in understandable language of the full Treaty, so that they could judge by themselves what was in there, what was true or not.

I think the legal guarantees helped, because then it was clarified that they did not have to worry about neutrality or abortion or any of the other concerns. So this was clarified and they got legal guarantees and they got a Commissioner – and thank you, Ireland, because it means that there will be a Swedish Commissioner also from now on, also a German one, and one from Greece etc., so I think we also have to thank the Irish for setting that straight.

Of course, we do not debate these things in a political vacuum. The reality will also influence how we think about these issues, and there is nothing wrong with that. But I think we should always, in the analysis that follows after a referendum, think very carefully about any fear factors on both sides, because fear is a very strong emotion and it might be misused. So I think that the debate that will follow in Ireland should also address how to avoid using or misusing any fear factor. But the reality showed that the Irish people believe that they have a place in the centre of Europe, and that they will be helped by belonging fully to Europe and not being questioned about whether this is true or not.

I also hope that the Commission can continue to play this role of providing factual objective information, but the debate will go on because, remember, the upside of a referendum is that you have to engage with citizens. You have to provide information and a debate and a discussion. The downside is that it also divides the population. You are forced to say 'yes' or 'no' and that can stay for a long time in the hearts and minds of the Irish as well. We have a duty, an obligation democratically, to also take the concerns of the 'no' side seriously, to continue the debate and make sure that the EU issues are integrated into the normal political debate, including by civil society in Ireland from now on, and in the rest of Europe in the same way. This is part of the reason why we did not have a higher voter turnout: that it is not part of the daily discussions about politics in each and every Member State.

That has to be done and I hope that there will be a Commissioner responsible for both citizenship and communication from now on and hopefully under the new Lisbon Treaty.

3-162

**President.** – Thank you, Commissioner, and my thanks to all of you who took part in this very important debate on the outcome of the Irish referendum.

The debate is closed.

#### *Written statements (Rule 149)*

3-163

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), în scris.** – Votul irlandez este un vot decisiv pentru Europa. Intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului de la Lisabona va reprezenta depășirea unui impas în care Europa se regăsește de câțiva ani.

S-a vorbit mult despre deficitul de democrație de care suferă Europa, de distanța care există între Uniunea Europeană și cetățenii săi. Se vorbește despre incapacitatea instituțiilor europene de a mai face față realităților unei Europe formate din 27 de state membre, o Europa eterogenă, în care multe țări nou intrate au un nivel de dezvoltare și o tipologie economică diferită.

Insuficiența sistemului instituțional comunitar, necesitatea creșterii legitimității Uniunii față de cetățenii săi și nevoia de a avea instrumente specifice, care să-i permită Uniunii să-și asume responsabilități mondiale într-un context economic dificil, justifică determinarea statelor membre de a susține trecerea către o Europă mai democratică.

Intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului va deschide calea către reformarea blocului european, oferind capacitate instituțională de a acționa, însă abordarea acestor provocări ține de existența voinței politice. De aceea, un aspect esențial rămâne implementarea cu succes a Tratatului de la Lisabona.

3-164

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE), în scris.** – Uniunea Europeană se îndreaptă cu pași rapizi spre momentul implementării celei mai importante reforme din istoria sa: intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului de la Lisabona. Irlanda i-a spus „Da”, la 16 luni de la marele „Nu” care a îngrijorat în egală măsură toate cancelariile Europei.

Uniunea așteaptă acum ca președintele Poloniei să ratifice tratatul rapid, așa cum a promis, iar Curtea Constituțională a Cehiei să facă ceea ce președintele ceh refuză. Uniunea va deveni o instituție mai suplă și rapidă în reacție dar, în plus de asta, Tratatul oferă o gură de oxigen statelor care aspiră să devină membre ale blocului comunitar. Statele din Balcanii de vest au salutat energic ratificarea de către Irlanda a Tratatului.

Vocea Uniunii va deveni mai puternică pe plan internațional odată cu înființarea și reformarea instituțiilor sale. Uniunea nu o să mai fie numai o piață comună ci o putere în relațiile internaționale. Puterea este dată de cele 27 de state membre, care ar putea deveni mai multe în viitorul nu prea îndepărtat. Anul 2010, când sperăm că va intra în vigoare Tratatul, ar putea fi un an de renaștere pentru Uniune, care a știut, de-a lungul istoriei sale, să se reinventeze în permanență.

3-165

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O resultado do referendun na Irlanda sobre o Tratado de Lisboa constitui um passo fundamental na construção europeia e no reforço do papel da Europa. O Tratado de Lisboa permite à UE intensificar o papel Europeu nas políticas de Energia, Alterações Climáticas, Ciência e Cooperação com os países em desenvolvimento.

Com o Tratado de Lisboa, a luta contra as alterações climáticas torna-se um objectivo específico da política ambiental da UE, reconhecendo que esta tem um papel de liderança a nível internacional na luta contra as alterações climáticas.

Pela primeira vez, será incluído um capítulo sobre energia que atribui à política da UE os objectivos de garantir a segurança energética, a promoção da eficiência energética e o desenvolvimento de energias renováveis.

O Tratado de Lisboa estabelece bases para a criação do Espaço Europeu de Investigação, reforçando a actuação europeia numa área fundamental para o crescimento económico e emprego.

O Tratado de Lisboa introduz, pela primeira vez, uma base jurídica específica para a ajuda humanitária e define a redução e erradicação da pobreza nos países em desenvolvimento como objectivo principal da política de cooperação para o desenvolvimento da UE.

3-166

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – O resultado do segundo referendo ao Tratado de Lisboa, realizado na Irlanda, não apaga a natureza anti-democrática de um processo que, desde o seu início, foi desrespeitador da vontade dos povos. Não deixaremos que se apague da memória o "Não" dos povos francês e holandês ao "Tratado Constitucional" e o embuste que constituiu a transmutação deste em Tratado de Lisboa.

Ficará também para a História o desrespeito pelo "Não" do povo irlandês no primeiro referendo, bem como a inaceitável chantagem e ingerência que se lhe seguiram, culminando numa campanha de colossal dimensão que incluiu a despudorada utilização de meios do Estado Irlandês e da União Europeia. Nem o processo de ratificação, nem o conteúdo deste Tratado, legitimam o prosseguimento de políticas que estão na origem da grave crise económica e social que se vive na UE, nomeadamente em Portugal, e que este Tratado aprofundará.

Pela nossa parte, continuaremos, com inabalável determinação, o combate contra o neoliberalismo, o federalismo e o militarismo na União Europeia. Prosseguiremos com grande confiança a luta por uma outra Europa, dos trabalhadores e dos povos, e contra as renovadas ameaças aos direitos sociais e laborais, à democracia, à soberania, à paz e cooperação, com que agora nos confrontamos.

3-167

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**, *par écrit*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, De qui se moque-t-on ? La satisfaction assez méprisante affichée ici devant le "oui" arraché aux Irlandais après des mois de harcèlement, de campagne de culpabilisation, de mensonges et de demi-vérités, est une honte pour la démocratie et une insulte à la volonté des peuples. En matière de justice, les aveux obtenus par la contrainte sont nuls : il devrait en être de même pour ces ratifications truquées où il ne peut y avoir qu'une seule réponse possible, que l'on est prêt à obtenir en faisant voter et revoter les citoyens ad nauseam quand on ne les "zappe" pas carrément en passant par la voie parlementaire. Il ne reste aujourd'hui que Vaclav Klaus, Président de la République Tchèque, pour tenter de résister à ce texte liberticide qu'est le Traité de Lisbonne. Tous les patriotes d'Europe, tous ceux qui refusent le super-Etat européen, tous ceux qui pensent que les peuples ont le droit de déterminer eux-mêmes leur avenir, doivent aujourd'hui lui manifester leur soutien et l'aider à tenir face aux pressions dont il fait l'objet et va faire encore plus l'objet dans un proche avenir.

3-167-500

**Livia Járóka (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Ezúton szeretném üdvözölni az írországi népszavazás eredményét, amely megnyitja az utat a Lisszaboni Szerződés hatályba lépése és ezen keresztül egy demokratikusabb és szolidárisabb Európai unió kialakítása előtt. Szeretném kiemelni, hogy a szerződés egyrészt nagyobb befolyáshoz juttatja a nemzeti parlamenteket, másrészt utal az Európai Unió Alapjogi Chartájára, fenntartva és megerősítve az emberi és kisebbségi jogokat rögzítő dokumentum kötelező erejét. Különösen fontos ez Magyarországnak, hiszen a nemzeti kisebbséghez tartozó személyek diszkriminációjának a Charta által rögzített tilalma mind a határon túli magyarok, mind a magyarországi kisebbségek szempontjából igen jelentős jelzés. A globális gazdasági megtorpanás idején különösen fontos felismerni, hogy egy közepes méretű ország - mint Írország, vagy Magyarország - számára a cselekvőképes és hatékony európai összefogás jelenthet kiutat a válságból.

3-169

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), în scris.** – Intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului de la Lisabona va simplifica mult procedurile legislative, cele mai importante progrese în această privință fiind extinderea domeniilor în care deciziile sunt adoptate de Consiliul UE cu majoritate calificată (în loc de unanimitate) și extinderea domeniilor în care Parlamentul European deține rolul de co-legislator, alături de Consiliul UE. Aceste noutăți vor simplifica mult adoptarea deciziilor la nivel european, mai ales în domenii cum ar fi fondurile structurale și fondul de coeziune, foarte importante pentru România, care are nevoie de acești bani pentru a se dezvolta. În plus, fapt salutar, Parlamentul European va dobândi competențe mai mari, de exemplu în domeniul fondurilor pentru agricultură, un domeniu atât de puternic afectat de criza economică pe care o traversăm și, în același timp, un domeniu în care sunt necesare măsuri concrete și cu efecte rapide pentru îmbunătățirea vieții agricultorilor și pentru asigurarea securității alimentare a cetățenilor noștri.

3-170

**Joanna Senyszyn (S-D), na piśmie.** – Prezydent Lech Kaczyński, wbrew publicznie złożonej obietnicy, dotychczas nie podpisał Traktatu z Lizbony. Zwłoka trwa już ponad półtora roku. Jest niczym nieuzasadniona, naganna, a nawet bezprawna.

Dnia 1 kwietnia 2008 roku prezydent został upoważniony przez Sejm do ratyfikowania traktatu z Lizbony. Zgodnie z Konstytucją Rzeczypospolitej, prezydent podpis złożyć musi. To nie kwestia jego dobrej woli czy chęci, ale obowiązku. Nie wykonując go, łamie prawo. Uzależniając złożenie podpisu pod Traktatem od decyzji obywateli innego kraju, prezydent Kaczyński postawił Polskę w roli kraju niezdolnego do podjęcia suwerennej decyzji i obraził uczucia patriotyczne Polaków. W Irlandii wygrali zwolennicy silnej, solidarnej Unii. W Polsce na drodze do zwycięstwa stoi prezydent, który nie ma już prawie żadnego poparcia w społeczeństwie.

Czyżby ociągał się z powodów osobistych, w obawie przed utratą twardego antyunijnego elektoratu, w tym związanego z Radiem Maryja? Jeśli tak, najwyższy czas wszcząć procedurę impeachmentu. Zgodnie z Konstytucją RP możliwe są dwie drogi. Trybunał Stanu albo zastosowanie art. 131 pkt 4 Konstytucji RP („Uznanie przez Zgromadzenie Narodowe trwałej niezdolności Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej do sprawowania urzędu ze względu na stan zdrowia”). Polacy nie chcą hamować rozwoju Unii Europejskiej. Przeciwnie. Pragną inicjować korzystne przemiany w Europie. Prezydent Kaczyński nie ma prawa w tym przeszkadzać.

3-170-002

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), na piśmie.** – Pomimo, że Unia i jej instytucje na codzień sprawnie funkcjonują bez Traktatu Lizbońskiego, to jego nieprzyjęcie stworzyłoby obraz Wspólnoty, która nie jest w stanie uzgodnić i przyjąć ważnych rozstrzygnięć. Traktat ten wprowadza nowe zasady głosowania, gdzie siła głosu państw jest wyraźnie zależna od liczby mieszkańców. W porównaniu do obecnego, nicejskiego systemu głosowania zyskują państwa duże, w tym Niemcy, a tracą państwa średnie, w tym Polska, dla której podział głosów z Nicei był bardzo korzystny. Pewne obawy co do podziału kompetencji budzi powołanie nowej instytucji Przewodniczącego Rady Europejskiej, popularnie określanego jako prezydent UE. Pamiętajmy, że są już: przewodniczący Komisji Europejskiej i prezydent Parlamentu, a także przywódca kraju, który przewodniczy Unii - sprawuje tzw. prezydencję, a powołany będzie Wysoki Przedstawiciel do spraw Polityki Zagranicznej. Oprócz wprowadzenia stanowiska Wysokiego Przedstawiciela popularnie zwanego unijnym Ministrem Spraw Zagranicznych traktat wzmacnia politykę zagraniczną Unii poprzez powołanie wspólnej dyplomacji. Ponadto określono możliwość wystąpienia z Unii, czy obywatelską inicjatywę ustawodawczą, zapisano w nim także potrzebę stworzenia unijnej polityki energetycznej, co jest bardzo ważne dla przyszłości Europy. Z nadzieją czekamy na końcowe ratyfikacje traktatu!

3-170-003

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S-D), în scris.** – Prin tratatul de la Lisabona parlamentele nationale introduc pe agenda dezbatelor nationale subiectele europene. Practic, fiecare propunere legislativa a Comisiei Europene va fi analizata de parlamentele nationale pentru a se valida respectarea principiului subsidiaritatii. Daca 1/3 din parlamentele nationale sesizeaza Comisia incalcarea acestui principiu, Comisia este obligata sa isi revizuiasca propunerea. Daca 1/2 din parlamentele nationale considera ca le este incalcata subsidiaritatea, Parlamentul European si Consiliul sunt obligate sa se pronunte asupra respectarii sau incalcarii acestui principiu. Dupa adoptarea unui act legislativ european, intr-un interval de doua luni de la publicare, parlamentele nationale pot solicita Curtii Europene de Justitie anulara sa. Avand in vedere durata procesului legislativ la nivel european, includerea subiectelor europene pe agenda dezbatelor nationale permite statelor membre sa primeasca la timp semnalele si directiile de dezvoltare si sa poata construi in acelasi timp cu UE. Tratatul de la Lisabona reafirma ca economia UE este o economie sociala de piata si acorda noi competente Uniunii in domenii precum schimbarile climatice si politica energetica. Aceste competente devin deosebit de importante mai ales pe fondul dependentei energetice a UE de terte tari.

3-170-004

**Rafał Kazimierz Trzaskowski (PPE), in writing.** – Irish 'yes' to the Lisbon Treaty is a good news for Europe. There is no doubt that the Treaty will serve for the benefit of the European Union by simplifying its decision making process and creating a better field for its effectiveness. In contrary to what its opponents say the Treaty does not bring any major revolution. Never before however so much has depended on the process of implementation. The devil is in the detail. With its innovations the Treaty can increase for instance visibility of the EU on the international scene. Much depends however

on the final arrangements that will determine the character of the new instruments, like the European External Action Service. It is therefore essential that the European Parliament takes its due role in the process of creating new institutional setting foreseen by the Lisbon Treaty, wherever possible. It will make this process more transparent, increase its legitimacy and finally it will serve, I believe, for its better outcome.

3-171

## 17 - Situation in Guinea (debate)

3-172

**President.** – The next item is the Council statement on the situation in Guinea.

3-173

**Cecilia Malmström, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, we move from one item to the next. This is a very serious and important subject which the honourable Members have raised and chosen to put on the agenda.

On Monday 28 September more than 100 people were killed in Conakry, Guinea, when members of the Guinean security forces shot into crowds of demonstrators. Guinean citizens had gathered in a stadium in the capital to demonstrate against the presumed intention of the Guinean military interim leader, Captain Moussa Dadis Camara, to run for President. The final death toll is still unknown, as the soldiers also collected the bodies rather than allow them to be counted at public morgues. At this stage we do not know the real dimension of these tragic events. The number of injured people is said to be at least 1 200, and eye witnesses have reported that soldiers raped women on the streets of Conakry.

During the violent repression, several opposition leaders were wounded and temporarily arrested. The number of protestors still under detention is also unknown; the houses of opposition leaders were ransacked and shops looted by uniformed men. In a TV statement the following day, Captain Camara expressed his condolences with the families of those killed and visited some of the injured. He proclaimed two days of national mourning and pledged to investigate the violence. He distanced himself from the killings by saying that he was not in control of the elements of the military responsible for the atrocities.

The European Union immediately and forcefully condemned these brutal and shocking events. A Presidency declaration, a statement by High Representative Solana and a statement by EU Commissioner De Gucht were issued the following day. We will have to insist on the liberation of the arrested prisoners and a thorough investigation of the events.

The violence in Guinea received worldwide condemnation. The UN Security Council was briefed last Wednesday on the situation in the country. The African Union condemned the events and decided to prepare a report on possible measures to be taken. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) called for a full international inquiry into the matter. Parliament, as you know, condemned the unconstitutional change of power, and in its resolution of 15 January 2009 called for respect for human rights and a rapid return to constitutional order. The EU decided to open consultations under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement, and EU development aid – apart from humanitarian aid and support for democratic transition – was frozen.

We have not been alone; our international partners have acted in line with us. The African Union and ECOWAS decided to suspend Guinea until it established a democratically elected parliament or government. An international contact group on Guinea co-chaired by the African Union and ECOWAS, and with participation by the European Union, was put into place. In March, the military junta agreed with the opposition to have elections before the end of 2009, which gave reasonable hope for a peaceful and democratic transition. Captain Camara gave his assurances that none of the coup leaders would stand for political office. A national transitional council was to guide the transition process and prepare the necessary modification of the constitution in order to help elections.

What can we do, then, to prevent further violence, and how can we help the people of Guinea in their legitimate desire for democracy, the rule of law, peace and development? Well, there are three main areas of action. First of all we should maintain and reinforce political pressure on the regime in Conakry, notably in the context of the international group. Captain Camara's decision not to run could allow calm to return. The nomination of the President of Burkina Faso, Mr Blaise Compaoré, as facilitator in the crisis on behalf of ECOWAS and the International Contact Group is a very positive sign, and the European Union has welcomed this appointment via the Presidency. We hope that his mediation will contribute to a secure, peaceful and lasting solution to the situation in Guinea.

Secondly, the option of targeted sanctions against individuals responsible for violence could be further explored. We will need to coordinate this approach with the African Union and other international and bilateral partners. The upcoming EU-African Ministerial Troika in Addis Ababa and the meeting on Guinea on 12 October in Abuja will be important in this respect.

Thirdly, we should continue to provide humanitarian aid to the civilian population and support the democratic transition process. The latter will nevertheless depend on the credible willingness of the transitional authorities of Guinea to re-

engage in a peaceful and constructive dialogue with a clear commitment to refraining from further violence and to respecting the human rights and political freedoms of its citizens. We will spare no efforts to help the people of Guinea in this critical moment and we are determined to support a return to civilian, constitutional and democratic government through free and transparent elections. We encourage all stakeholders in Guinea to refrain from violence and to make a peaceful and democratic transition.

3-174

**Filip Kaczmarek**, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Minister! Kryzys w Gwinei jest, moim zdaniem, przejawem szerszego problemu występującego niestety w wielu krajach afrykańskich. Problem ten to słabość demokratycznych instytucji i niedorozwój lub okresami nawet brak mechanizmów charakterystycznych dla dojrzałych społeczeństw obywatelskich. Dla Europy jest to ważne nie tylko z powodu przywiązania do naszych wartości – jest to ważne również z powodów czysto pragmatycznych.

Dość często dyskutujemy o skuteczności współpracy rozwojowej. Nie jest to dziwne, dlatego że jesteśmy największym dawcą tej pomocy i musimy być zainteresowani jej efektywnym wykorzystaniem. Musimy jednak pogodzić się z faktem, że nie osiągniemy postępu w zakresie efektywności, jeżeli kraje korzystające ze współpracy rozwojowej nie będą w stanie dać minimalnych gwarancji dobrego wykorzystania tej pomocy. A tak się składa, że gwarancje takie trudno jest budować bez demokracji i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

Pan Camara zarzucił wczoraj Francji, że zrywając z nim stosunki poniżyła Afrykanów. To nieprawda. Francja nie poniżyła Afrykanów. To sam pan Camara poniżył własnych rodaków i Afrykanów. Poniżył, bo pozwolił na zabijanie, pozwolił na gwałty. Reakcja Francji i rządu francuskiego była uzasadniona i słuszna. I nasze stanowisko powinno być równie zdecydowane i twarde.

To jest paradoks, ale sytuacja jest dość prosta. My nie możemy nie reagować na takie brutalne działania, jakie miały miejsce w Gwinei. Musimy żądać zaprzestania stosowania przemocy. Tak jak Pani Minister uważam, że bardzo dobrze jest, że jest misja prezydenta Burkina Faso i życzymy mu powodzenia. Miejmy nadzieję, że będzie skuteczna. Powinniśmy też poprzeć Unię Afrykańską, która zapowiedziała nałożenie sankcji, jeżeli władza nie zostanie oddana w ręce cywilne.

Wiemy o zaangażowaniu Szwecji w proces budowania demokracji. Wiemy, że akurat jest to rzeczywisty priorytet prezydencji w zakresie polityki rozwojowej. Wiemy też, że rząd szwedzki ma i doświadczenie, i sukcesy w tej dziedzinie. Chcę mieć zatem nadzieję i wierzę, że to zaangażowanie w przypadku tak trudnym i skrajnym jak Gwinea będzie skuteczne i przyniesie dobre owoce.

3-175

**Patrice Tirolien**, au nom du groupe S-D. – Monsieur le Président, les développements inquiétants de la situation politique et de la sécurité en Guinée demandent une réaction ferme de l'Union européenne. En effet, comme vous le savez, le 28 septembre 2009, des militaires du gouvernement guinéen ont réprimé dans le sang une manifestation pacifique regroupant tous les partis d'opposition, faisant 157 victimes et plus d'un millier de blessés, dont des viols et des mutilations particulièrement odieux. La République de Guinée est un pays qui n'a connu que deux régimes dictatoriaux depuis son indépendance en 1958. Il est temps que cette spirale infernale s'arrête.

L'Union européenne, ses États membres et ses institutions avaient déjà condamné le coup d'État de Moussa Dadis Camara le 28 décembre 2008. Comme la procédure le prévoit, le Conseil avait alors utilisé l'article 96 des accords de Cotonou afin d'établir avec les autorités guinéennes une feuille de route censée encadrer la transition démocratique. Cette liste de mesures prévoyait notamment l'organisation d'élections libres et transparentes dans un délai d'un an et l'engagement que les membres du CNDD, notamment Moussa Dadis Camara, ne se présentent pas à ces élections.

Or, la décision du capitaine Camara de repousser l'organisation du scrutin au printemps 2010 et son refus d'évoquer la question de sa candidature à la présidentielle guinéenne présageaient de l'escalade actuelle. Ainsi, la manifestation qui a été écrasée dans le sang le 28 septembre avait justement pour but de demander à la junte de tenir ses engagements. La réaction du pouvoir en place à Conakry montre clairement ses intentions: éliminer toute forme d'opposition démocratique pour rester au pouvoir.

En réponse, la communauté internationale a condamné de façon unanime ces exactions et le régime guinéen. Scandalisée par ces massacres, la commission de la pêche de notre Parlement a refusé récemment, et avec raison, de voter en faveur de l'accord de pêche entre l'Union européenne et la Guinée.

Aujourd'hui, et à la lumière des derniers événements, le Parlement européen souhaite connaître les décisions que compte prendre le Conseil face à cette situation. Tout d'abord, le Conseil entend-il pousser à la création d'une commission d'enquête internationale sur les événements du 28 septembre? Par quels moyens le Conseil entend-il agir pour assurer le respect des engagements du CNDD, à savoir l'organisation d'élections libres et transparentes dans les plus brefs délais, et ce sans la participation du président Moussa Dadis Camara ou d'un autre membre du CNDD? Au vu de l'article 96 de l'accord de Cotonou, quelles mesures le Conseil entend-il prendre face à la junte guinéenne? Enfin, quels sont les

engagements concrets pris par le Conseil pour appuyer les différentes initiatives menées par la CEDEAO, l'UA et le groupe international d'action sur la Guinée?

3-176

**Niccolò Rinaldi**, *a nome del gruppo ALDE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Ministra e cara Cecilia, in primo luogo esprimo il cordoglio per le vittime di Conakry, sia da parte del gruppo ALDE che dei trenta parlamentari africani che fanno parte della rete liberaldemocratica all'interno dell'Assemblea ACP, con i quali ci siamo riuniti la scorsa settimana per discutere anche della situazione della Guinea, insieme – tra l'altro – al presidente del Partito liberale della Guinea, partito che è stato purtroppo direttamente toccato dalle violenze.

Per quanto riguarda le cose da fare: rispetto ad alcuni temi già citati dalla Presidenza svedese, la nostra richiesta è la seguente: innanzitutto, insieme ai partner dell'Unione africana, insistere per il rilascio dei prigionieri e dei dirigenti politici tuttora detenuti. In secondo luogo, insistere per l'indizione di elezioni libere e democratiche, senza la partecipazione dei membri del Consiglio nazionale per la democrazia e lo sviluppo. In terzo luogo, invito ad adottare, senza troppa prudenza, sanzioni mirate, nel senso che noi dobbiamo comunque dare un segnale molto chiaro, tenendo conto delle atrocità che sono state commesse. In quarto luogo, solleviamo anche noi il problema dell'accordo di pesca: quale gruppo ALDE, abbiamo votato contro, in seno alla commissione per la pesca, contribuendo così a raggiungere questa maggioranza necessaria a bloccare, per quanto possibile, l'accordo. Crediamo che questa sia un'altra decisione importante che ci aspettiamo dal Consiglio.

In quinto luogo, procedere a programmi di assistenza mirati alle vittime, soprattutto alle donne che sono state vittime di stupro e che hanno senz'altro bisogno di un aiuto dedicato particolare. Infine, vi è la questione della giustizia: per noi è cruciale non soltanto una commissione d'inchiesta internazionale ma anche il pieno coinvolgimento del Tribunale penale internazionale. Riteniamo che se c'è un significato che possono dare le vittime di Conakry, esso è quello di sancire una volta di più che giustizia deve essere fatta e che persone che compiono crimini di questo genere in Africa o altrove non possano farla franca.

3-177

**Eva Joly**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Messieurs les Présidents, Mesdames les Ministres et chers collègues, nous ne pouvons rester silencieux face aux dramatiques événements survenus la semaine dernière en Guinée. La violence avec laquelle les opposants, et surtout les femmes, ont été traités est proprement révoltante et inacceptable.

Je souhaiterais ici exprimer mon soutien aux victimes ainsi qu'à leurs familles qui, pour nombre d'entre elles, attendent encore la restitution des dépouilles de leurs proches, confisquées par la junte afin d'effacer les traces d'un véritable massacre.

Outre les interventions de ce jour à l'initiative du Conseil et de la Commission, l'actualité parlementaire nous permet de réagir à ces exactions et d'envoyer un signal fort au gouvernement guinéen en rejetant le rapport sur l'accord de partenariat de pêche avec la Guinée, qui sera soumis à notre vote lors de la prochaine session plénière.

La commission du développement avait déjà, en septembre dernier, rendu à l'unanimité un avis défavorable sur cet accord de pêche entre l'Union européenne et la Guinée, émettant des doutes quant à l'usage des fonds alloués par l'Union européenne. Outre qu'il paraît inadéquat d'allouer des fonds en fonction des prises de pêche par les navires européens sans tenir compte, ni des ressources halieutiques, ni des effets sur les populations locales, les récents événements nous font craindre une utilisation à des fins militaires contre la population guinéenne.

Chers collègues, le Parlement européen ne peut pas rendre un avis positif sur les accords de pêche avec la Guinée alors même que les plaies des victimes sont encore béantes. Il s'agirait d'un mauvais signal envoyé au gouvernement guinéen, il s'agirait d'un scandale auquel je ne peux me résoudre.

3-178

**Marie-Christine Vergiat**, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames, Messieurs, chers collègues, nouvelle parlementaire comme beaucoup d'autres ici, j'ai été frappée par la place faite aux droits de l'homme dans les discours tenus dans cet hémicycle, et notamment dans ceux de notre Président Buzek. J'y souscris tout à fait car, si je suis ici, si j'ai conduit une liste aux élections européennes en France, c'est avant tout parce que je suis une militante associative et, justement, une militante des droits de l'homme.

À ce titre, les événements de Guinée ne peuvent me laisser indifférente car ce sont les militants des droits de l'homme, et plus généralement les représentants de la société civile, qui se sont fait arrêter, violer quand c'étaient des femmes, massacrer le 28 décembre dernier: plus de 150 personnes tuées par balles, plus de 1 250 personnes blessées – vous nous l'avez dit Madame la Ministre – dans cette seule journée. La répression a continué dans les jours qui ont suivi, et continue encore, alors que ces personnes – cela a été dit aussi – venaient pacifiquement rappeler M. Camara à ses propres engagements. Il ne fait aucun doute, selon les témoignages qui affluent, que ce sont des proches du pouvoir, contrairement aux déclarations faites par le capitaine, qui ont perpétré ces exactions.

Là-bas la situation est confuse, mais les organisations de la société civile, regroupées au sein du Conseil national des organisations de la société civile guinéenne, appellent à l'aide la communauté internationale. Ces derniers mois, ce Conseil national a organisé un large processus pour la population guinéenne, exemplaire dans ces pays d'Afrique, en s'appuyant sur les engagements pris par M. Camara.

Les informations qui nous viennent de Guinée sont alarmantes. Nous ne pouvons ici, au Parlement européen, nous contenter de discours. Ce débat a lieu à notre demande, à la demande de la Gauche unitaire européenne/Gauche verte nordique, mais il faut aller plus loin. Nous demandons la condamnation expresse de la répression de la manifestation.

Vous nous avez parlé de sanctions ciblées, Madame la Ministre. Pourriez-vous nous en dire plus? S'agissant de l'arrêt immédiat des persécutions, de la libération de toutes les personnes arrêtées et de l'établissement d'une commission d'enquête internationale sur ces événements, j'ai cru comprendre, Madame la Ministre, que nous étions en bonne voie. Mais, là aussi, pourriez-vous nous en dire plus?

Vous nous avez également dit que toute aide avait été gelée en dehors de l'aide humanitaire et alimentaire. Cela nous semble un minimum, mais comment peut-on concrètement appuyer la transition démocratique?

Nous voulons, Monsieur le Président, qu'une résolution soit votée à la prochaine session de Strasbourg pour que le Parlement européen ne se contente pas de discours mais prenne, dans ses actes, une décision, comme il a su le faire en janvier dernier. Je le redis encore une fois, il y a urgence. Les organisations sur place nous alertent sur les risques de conflits ethniques. N'attendons pas un nouveau Rwanda pour réagir, les droits de l'homme doivent être défendus en Afrique comme partout ailleurs à travers le monde.

3-179

**Licia Ronzulli (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il ministro Mallström ha descritto molto bene la situazione guineana. Da alcune settimane, la Guinea è teatro di violenti scontri, nel corso dei quali liberi cittadini che scendono in piazza per manifestare le loro idee politiche sono oggetto di un'inaudita violenza. Il governo guineano perseguita e sopprime chiunque abbia idee politiche differenti dai loro governanti, privando in tal modo il popolo di qualsiasi forma di libertà che, come ben sappiamo, è ovviamente un diritto inviolabile per ogni essere umano.

Si sta consumando un ennesimo massacro, che rischia di tramutarsi in genocidio, senza l'adozione immediata e concreta di misure urgenti. La scorsa settimana l'Assemblea parlamentare paritetica ACP-UE, di cui sono vicepresidente, ha ritenuto opportuno adottare una risoluzione di condanna all'uso della forza da parte delle autorità guineane, intimando al governo locale il rispetto immediato dello stato di diritto e la tutela dei diritti fondamentali.

Dopo la morte di 157 persone, negli scontri di piazza, e il tentativo di Camara di coprire il fatto, i membri dell'opposizione si sono rivolti alla comunità internazionale nella speranza di ricevere aiuti e maggiore protezione. Ma lo scorso 5 ottobre Camara si è opposto alla presenza di una forza di pace straniera nel paese, rifiutando qualsiasi tipo di interferenza estera nelle vicende interne.

Ritengo quindi che alle parole di condanna sia necessario dare riscontro mediante l'adozione di azioni concrete e immediate, come appena detto dal mio collega Rinaldi: dinanzi a violazioni e negazioni del diritto alla vita – dove ancora una volta a pagare il prezzo sono donne e bambini – non è possibile non intervenire esigendo il ritorno allo stato di diritto. Rivolgendomi quindi a voi colleghi e a tutti i rappresentanti istituzionali, auspico un consenso unanime – e sottolineo unanime – nell'adozione di misure immediate che permettano ai cittadini guineani di ristabilire nel proprio paese valori fondamentali e irrinunciabili, come quelli di democrazia e libertà. Esprimo ovviamente anch'io la mia personale vicinanza a tutte le famiglie colpite da questi tragici eventi.

3-180

**Isabella Lövin (Verts/ALE).** – Herr talman, ärade ledamöter, minister Malmström! Jag är medlem i fiskeriutskottet och besökte själv Guinea förra året i december, så jag har följt denna fråga mycket nära.

Först och främst finner jag det anmärkningsvärt att Europeiska unionen vidhåller sitt fiskeriavtal med Guinea, eftersom man träffade avtalet med den tidigare regimen två veckor före statskuppen. Vi har faktiskt hållit fast vid ett avtal som vi har träffat med en laglig regim, men nu så har vi en militärdiktatur. Under hela året har vi hållit fast vid detta.

USA:s utrikesminister Hillary Clinton gick i går ut och uppmanade öppet Moussa Dadis Camara och hans regim att avgå. Jag kan bara instämma i detta minimikrav och vill dessutom påpeka att det vore en skam för Europaparlamentet om vi om två veckor röstar för ett fiskeriavtal med Guinea som skulle förse denna regim med över en miljon euro i slutet av november. Fiskeriavtalet berör tonfiskfiske för 25 europeiska båtar. Jag anser att det är helt självklart att dessa båtar får se sig om efter andra fiskevatten. EU kan nämligen inte göra affärer med diktaturer, som slaktar sitt eget folk på öppen gata.

Argumentet att fiskeriavtalets pengar skulle komma folket till del, vilket kommissionen hävdade inför utvecklings- och fiskeriutskottet, är helt falskt. Det visar en utvärdering som kommissionen gjorde av det tidigare avtalet. Man har ingen



aning om var pengarna från dessa fiskeriavtal hamnar. Det gällde den tidigare regimen. Att den nuvarande regimen skulle använda pengarna på ett bättre sätt anser jag knappast troligt.

Jag undrar därför vad ministerrådet tänker göra åt fiskeriavtalet. Tänker EU gå ihop med USA och kräva regimen avgång?

3-181

**Cristian Dan Preda (PPE).** – Aș vrea să spun și eu că consider violențele din Guineea absolut condamnabile. Văd că acum două ore, ministrul de externe francez a declarat că Dadis Camara este bănuțat a fi participat la decizia masacrului, ceea ce este foarte grav.

Sigur că originea tensiunilor, dincolo de violențele care sunt condamnabile, originea tensiunilor se află în faptul că Dadis Camara vrea să se eternizeze la conducerea Guineei și nu vrea să-și țină promisiunea de a nu participa în niciun fel la viața politică și cred că presiunea internațională în această privință trebuie să fie foarte clară. De altfel, eu salut faptul că președintele din Burkina Faso, Blaise Compaoré, care are o mare experiență în negocierea, în medierea conflictelor africane, a fost mandatat să intervină în acest caz și cred că trebuie susținut de diplomațiile noastre.

3-182

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – Mr President, I must correct Mrs Joly when she said that the Committee on Fisheries voted unanimously to reject this proposed partnership agreement with Guinea. In fact it voted by just one vote to do so. Quite astonishingly, the PPE Group voted solidly to retain the agreement. This is an agreement which puts some hundred of thousands of euros into the hands of this regime in order that we can take tuna from the coast. Like many of these agreements it is a shabby deal at the best of times, and in the present circumstances it is utterly unacceptable.

The Minister mentioned possible sanctions to be taken against Guinea. Will she now add this to her list and give us an undertaking that she will fight to try and ensure that this partnership agreement is suspended?

3-183

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** – Mr President, as a human rights lawyer with almost a quarter of a century of experience internationally and at home in Hungary, I take every opportunity to emphasise the need for the European Union to defend human rights, preferably across the world. But it is extremely important to do it in a credible way and, in order to do so, we have to defend human rights within our borders as well, within the European Union system.

As I have mentioned to you several times during the last three months, Mrs Kinga Göncz, a member of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs in this Parliament, used to be a member of a government which we call in Hungary the 'eye-shooter' government, who were shooting at people on the streets of Budapest on 23 October 2006. Ever since then there has been a human rights crisis in Hungary, and this European Union does not do anything about it. We have a Vice-Chair of the Committee on Civil Liberties who was a member of the government at that time. Until we look seriously into this matter, nobody will think that anything we do in the human rights fields is credible.

3-184

**Cecilia Malmström, President-in-Office of the Council.** – Mr President, again my thanks to the European Parliament for putting this on the agenda. It is a very serious subject and, as I hope you understood from my introduction, we share your concerns about the horrible breach of human rights that has happened in Conakry. There are concerns and worries about people still being detained, and we have asked for a complete investigation of what has happened and the release of the prisoners.

I think we can say that the European Union has been extremely clear. The events have been condemned by Mr Solana, Mr De Gucht, the Presidency and now, as I know, also by a declaration of the ACP Group in the European Parliament. It is very good that the European Union is unanimous, concrete and concise in its condemnation of these horrible events. We are also acting in very close cooperation with other actors in this, so that the international community can condemn and act in a very coherent way. That is the only way we can really exercise pressure.

We have the international contact group. There has been the appointment of the mediator, the President of Burkina Faso, which is very good, and he is a member of the contact group. Together with the contact group, of which the EU and the US are members, we have – in answer to your question, Mrs Lövin – called for Captain Camara's resignation. The whole world community has asked for that to happen.

We are also open to answering other questions and to discuss sanctions. We think it will have more effect if we do it together with the international community. There are different options on how you can target individuals and so on in this, and we need in the coming days to further discuss with international actors how we can coordinate those sanctions in order for them to have the maximum effect: with the African Union, with the contact group, with the US, etc.

We have also, as I said, opened consultations under Article 96 of the Cotonou Agreement, and we have frozen all EU development aid, apart from the humanitarian aid and the assistance to the democratic transition.

On fisheries – whether that can be part of it or not – I hear very clearly what you say. I can only encourage you to continue the discussions with the Commission. It is the Commission which is responsible for EU fishery policy. We are also discussing this with the Commission, and I am sorry they are not here right now. But you can be assured that we will keep on working with the international community to continue with the pressure and to push for a full investigation and, hopefully, also one day for free and fair elections in Guinea. My thanks to you and to the Members for this debate.

3-185

**President.** – Thank you very much, Mrs Malmström. You have had so much patience spending the whole afternoon and part of the evening here. One can see that not so long ago you were a Member of this House and so you like this environment very much!

The debate is closed.

3-186

## 18 - One-minute speeches on matters of political importance

3-187

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

3-188

**Elena Băsescu (PPE).** – Salutăm semnarea acordului privitor la proiectul Nabucco la data de 13 iulie la Ankara. Gazul nu reprezintă însă singura resursă energetică pentru statele europene. Trebuie să avem aceeași abordare în ceea ce privește alimentarea cu țiței a Europei, prin promovarea unui coridor sudic.

Avem pe masă un proiect care poate căpăta aceeași importanță strategică ca și Nabucco. Este vorba despre conducta petrolieră paneuropeană Constanța - Trieste. Această conductă va lega resursele de țiței din Marea Caspică, prin terminalul georgian de la Supsa și apoi mai departe, prin portul Constanța, pe conductă, până la Trieste.

Asigurarea securității energetice a statelor și a cetățenilor noștri se poate realiza numai prin diversificare surselor și a căilor de aprovizionare cu hidrocarburi. Din acest punct de vedere, România și-a asumat dezvoltarea unui terminal portuar la Constanța, capabil să preia gaz natural lichefiat, pe care să-l distribuie apoi altor consumatori europeni.

3-189

**Marc Tarabella (S-D).** – Monsieur le Président, je profite de l'espace d'expression qui nous est donné dans cette minute pour attirer l'attention sur les conséquences positives – tout le monde le sait dans cette assemblée – du vote positif des Irlandais sur le traité constitutionnel, qui fait que, notamment dans une commission comme celle de l'agriculture, ainsi que dans ce Parlement, dans sa plénière, nous aurons la codécision. Le Parlement sera donc sur un pied d'égalité avec le Conseil, ce qui est évidemment, en termes démocratiques, un progrès énorme.

Je voudrais profiter de l'occasion pour faire remarquer, puisqu'aujourd'hui nos amis irlandais ont dit oui massivement au traité constitutionnel et que le président polonais – selon les propos tenus tout à l'heure par le Président de notre Parlement – s'apprête également à signer le traité, qu'il ne manquera que le oui du président tchèque. Je voudrais donc que tous nos collègues de différents groupes politiques puissent, dans le cadre de nos compétences respectives, essayer de faire passer à leurs homologues tchèques l'idée qu'il faut vraiment signer ce traité, d'autant que le parlement tchèque a déjà dit oui. Il ne reste plus au président qu'à signer ce parchemin et à faire ainsi droit à la voie démocratique dans son pays, de manière à faire progresser notre démocratie en Europe.

3-190

**Luigi de Magistris (ALDE).** – Signor Presidente, vorrei parlare della tragedia di Messina – che oggi il Presidente del Parlamento europeo ha ricordato – con le sue decine di morti. Un'altra tragedia annunciata in Italia: il Presidente del Consiglio italiano ha addirittura affermato che era una tragedia prevista. Prevista ma nulla è stato fatto per evitarla. Nulla è stato fatto perché in quel territorio governa il cemento, la mafia del cemento, la mafia dei boschi con gli incendi boschivi.

Ma ciò che deve interessare soprattutto questo Parlamento europeo è come vengono investiti sia il denaro pubblico che i contributi destinati dall'Unione europea alla realizzazione di un assetto territoriale diverso, affinché si costruisca in modo corretto e si risolvano i gravi danni ambientali che sono stati fatti. Ebbene, questi fondi pubblici il più delle volte finiscono nelle tasche di comitati d'affari, nelle tasche di politici corrotti, nella tasca delle mafie.

Questa legislatura si deve pertanto preoccupare di dove vanno a finire i soldi pubblici, che devono servire invece a ripristinare la natura, a difendere le risorse naturali, a produrre uno sviluppo economico compatibile con l'ambiente e a dare lavoro. Non ci devono più essere tragedie allucinanti come quella di Messina.

3-191

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Zabieram głos w obronie mniejszości polskiej na Litwie, która w ostatnim czasie poddawana jest dyskryminacji. Bolesny paradoks polega na tym, że Polacy na Litwie, którzy w niektórych

regionach stanowią większość obywateli, mieli lepszą sytuację przed wejściem Litwy do Unii niż teraz, kiedy kraj ten jest członkiem Unii Europejskiej.

Do 14 października samorząd regionu sołecznickiego ma usunąć tablice z polskimi nazwami ulic, co jest wbrew europejskim standardom i Europejskiej Karcie Samorządowej. Opierając się na litewskim prawie, w marcu 2008 r. ograniczono możliwości działania szkolnictwa polskiego. W ciągu półtora roku zlikwidowano 4 szkoły, 45 klas, a likwidacja grozi następnym 107 klasom. Na siłę zmienia się polskie nazwiska tak, aby wyglądały one jak litewskie. Wreszcie ciągle nie oddano wielu Polakom mienia, własności zagrabionej przez komunistów, przez Związek Sowiecki po 1939 i 1944 r.

Zwracam się z apelem do Parlamentu Europejskiego o obronę Polaków na Litwie zgodnie z europejskimi standardami praw człowieka i praw mniejszości.

3-192

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, sucedem-se as declarações de optimismo quanto ao anunciado princípio do fim da crise. Infelizmente, estas declarações são todos os dias desmentidas pela realidade. A situação no Norte de Portugal é disso elucidativa. Só no distrito de Braga, nas últimas semanas encerraram, pelo menos, dez empresas, lançando mais de três centenas de trabalhadores no desemprego. Muitas outras estão em risco de fechar.

A situação é particularmente grave no sector do têxtil e vestuário: um dos sectores da União Europeia que mais afectado está a ser pela crescente liberalização do comércio mundial. Perante este quadro dramático urge soluções distintas das orientações políticas que o geraram.

É urgente aplicar medidas de salvaguarda, nomeadamente, em categorias a indicar pelos Estados-Membros para permitir manter e promover o emprego e a actividade destas empresas, bem como avançar com a criação - assunto que foi já objecto de uma resolução deste Parlamento - de um programa comunitário de apoio ao sector têxtil com meios adequados especialmente destinado às regiões mais desfavorecidas e dependentes deste sector.

3-193

**Paul Nuttall (EFD).** – Mr President, I would like to draw your attention to the underhand and undemocratic way in which the incandescent light bulb has been banned across the European Union. The initial directive handed implementing measures to the European Commission, which in effect meant that the regulation was allowed to pass without the consent of this farce of an Assembly or of my real parliament at Westminster. The ban was a stitch-up by the political elite and was done on a nod and a wink.

The people have been bypassed, but then the European Union is very good at bypassing the people. Just take a look at what has happened with the Lisbon Treaty. It was allowed to happen, unfortunately with the collusion of the British Conservative Party, who are the Jekyll and Hyde of British politics when it comes to the European issue. They say one thing in Britain and they come out here and they do completely the opposite in committee.

To conclude, on the eve of World War One the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, feared that the lights would go out all over Europe. Well done to the European Union, because, with your obsession with the unscientific cult of man-made climate change, what you are doing is proving Sir Edward's unfortunate prophecy to be correct.

3-194

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** – Mr President, there was a lot of talk today about the Lisbon Treaty and how it strengthens solidarity among Europeans. On behalf of the Hungarian people, I would like to call for your solidarity now because, according to reliable information from human-rights-sensitive, high-ranking members of the Hungarian police, on the third anniversary of so-called Bloody Monday in 2006 (23 October), the Hungarian police will again use massive violence against the Hungarian people during our demonstrations or commemorations.

I would like to call on Members of the European Parliament to come to our aid and to come to Budapest on that day as human rights observers. I would like your constituencies to ask you to do that, too. Please do your research on the Internet about the human rights abuses and mass police brutalities in Hungary and make sure that it can never happen again. Please come and exercise the solidarity that has so often been mentioned today.

3-195

**György Schöpflin (PPE).** – Szlovák nyelvtörvény. A szlovák nyelvtörvény komoly aggodalmakat ébresztett megszavazásától fogva. Az elmúlt pár hét megmutatta, hogy az aggályok jogosak voltak, mert a törvényben előírt bírságokat eddig nem alkalmazták, az állami szervek hatáskörében dolgozók megkapták az utasítást, hogy kizárólag szlovákul szólalhatnak meg. Szolgálati időben a magyar anyanyelvű postás, a tűzoltó, illetve a rendőr nem használhatja anyanyelvét.

Tehát, ha én Szlovákiában magyarul megszólítok egy rendőrt, neki kötelező szlovákul válaszolnia, hiába magyar az anyanyelve, és teljesen függetlenül attól, hogy én a választ nem értem meg. Mellesleg ugyanez a helyzet, ha én az

angollal próbálkozok. Új hirdetés javaslok a szlovák vendéglátóiparnak: külföldi turista, szeretettel látjuk Szlovákiában, de tanuljon meg szlovákul, mielőtt országunkba beteszi a lábát. Éljen Abszurdisztán!

3-196

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S-D).** – Predpokladala som, alebo očakávam viacej takýchto útokov na Slovenskú republiku, pretože inštitút jedinomínutových vystúpení je už akosi predurčený na to, aby kolegovia z Maďarska, respektíve kolegovia maďarskej národnosti útočili práve na Slovenskú republiku.

Musím povedať, že ma to veľmi mrzí, pretože ja očakávam od Európskeho parlamentu, že bude skutočne riešiť tie problémy, ktoré Európska únia má. My sme niekoľkokrát, aj tu kolegom v pléne Európskeho parlamentu, či boli z Fideszu alebo z ktorejkoľvek inej strany, podávali priateľskú ruku a chceli sme spolu s nimi diskutovať o problémoch alebo o otázkach, ktoré sú otvorené. Toto sme urobili aj v prípade jazykového zákona a musím povedať, že mi je veľmi ľúto, pán predseda, že ani jeden z kolegov z Maďarska alebo maďarskej národnosti na túto našu ponuku nereagoval a dokonca moji kolegovia z SMK (čo je strana, ktorá pochádza zo Slovenskej republiky) radšej z takéhoto stretnutia odišli, keď sme o tom chceli diskutovať.

Takisto som poslala odkaz na stránku Národnej rady Slovenskej republiky, kde je možné prečítať si plné znenie tohto zákona, a tento zákon v žiadnom prípade neohrozuje práva národnostných menšín na používanie vlastného jazyka.

3-197

**Ramon Tremosa i Balcells (ALDE).** – Mr President, the Spanish Government has decided that the Barcelona to Perpignan high-speed train line should run just under the Sagrada Família Cathedral, putting at risk a monument that was designated a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1984 and was visited by three million tourists last year. The construction of a new tunnel extremely close to the foundation of the Sagrada Família Cathedral may lead to irreparable damage to that building.

The Spanish Government says that there is no problem, but this year the tunnelling machines of a new metro line in Barcelona have experienced multiple incidents in similar land conditions. One tunnelling machine has been blocked near the Llobregat River for some months without anyone knowing how to solve the situation. I wish to report the risk of the collapse of the Sagrada Família to the European institutions. To preserve this European masterpiece of general interest please examine the matter, stop the work being carried out by the Spanish Government and change the route of the tunnel.

3-198

**Oldřich Vlasák (ECR).** – Vážený pane předsedo, dámy a pánové, dovoluji mi, abych upozornil na problém zdržování přizvání Autonomní odborové organizace strojířů Evropy (ALE) do Výboru pro sociální dialog na úseku železnice. Již od roku 2005 tento orgán sdružuje více než 100 000 členů 16 evropských členských organizací strojířů a usiluje o to, aby byl uznán jako plnohodnotný sociální partner na úseku sociálního dialogu na železnici. Přes dlouhá vyjednávání s Evropskou federací zaměstnanců dopravy, která dnes v tomto výboru jako jediná zastupuje zájmy zaměstnanců, se dosud nepodařilo najít kompromis, který by ALE zajistil možnost přímo hájit zájmy svých členů. Tuto situaci považuji za velmi nešťastnou. Sociální dialog, tak jak byl Evropským parlamentem schválen, by totiž podle mého názoru měl umožňovat pluralismus. Jsem přesvědčen, že žádná organizace, byť zastupuje 80 % zaměstnanců v sektoru evropských železnic, nemá právo na monopol a vyzývám proto všechny zúčastněné včetně Evropské komise k odblokování dalších jednání.

3-199

**Γεώργιος Τούσσας (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι οδηγίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και οι νόμοι στα κράτη μέλη για το οκτάωρο, γενικότερα οι αντιδραστικές αναδιαρθρώσεις διαμορφώνουν συνθήκες εργασιακού μεσαίωνα προκαλώντας την οργή και τις κινητοποιήσεις των εργαζομένων. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή κατακλύζεται καθημερινά από διαδηλώσεις οργισμένων αγροτών και αγανακτισμένων εργαζομένων.

Χαρακτηριστικά, το ωράριο εργασίας του προσωπικού καμπίνας και των πιλότων στις αερομεταφορές, που προβλέπεται από τον κανονισμό 1899/2006, υπερβαίνει τις 14 ώρες εργασία την ημέρα, θέτοντας σε κίνδυνο τη ζωή των εργαζομένων και των επιβατών, όπως αποδεικνύεται από πολυάριθμες επιστημονικές μελέτες.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αρνείται να λάβει υπόψη τις επιστημονικές μελέτες γιατί υπακούει στις εντολές των μονοπωλιακών επιχειρηματικών ομίλων που δεν δέχονται να θυσιάσουν ούτε ένα ευρώ από τα κέρδη τους για την υγεία των εργαζομένων και την ασφάλεια των πτήσεων.

Ζητάμε να μειωθεί ο χρόνος εργασίας των πιλότων και των πληρωμάτων καμπίνας στις αερομεταφορές και να ικανοποιηθούν τα δίκαια αιτήματα των εργαζομένων. Άλλωστε, είναι δεσμευμένη η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή τόσο απέναντι στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο όσο και στους εργαζόμενους.

3-200

**Martin Ehrenhauser (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Der gesamte Ratifizierungsprozess des Verfassungsreformvertrags von Lissabon war eine Tragödie für die Demokratie und auch für die Europäische Union. Lassen Sie mich vielleicht als jungen, neuen Abgeordneten sagen: Wir hatten mit Volksabstimmungen für alle Bürger in der Europäischen Union die historische

Möglichkeit, dass wir das sehr elitäre Reißbrettprojekt Europäische Union mit den Menschen in Europa verschmelzen. Sie hatten die Möglichkeit, dass Sie dem emotionalen Wrack Europäische Union mit Volksabstimmungen Geist und Leben einhauchen. Doch Sie haben die Chance nicht genutzt. Ganz im Gegenteil. Sie haben klipp und klar gesagt: Nein zu mehr direkter Demokratie, nein zu Bürgerbeteiligung.

Da kann ich nur sagen: Demokratie ist etwas anderes. Denn Demokratie bedingt Gewaltenteilung, eine klare Abgrenzung zwischen Opposition und Regierung. Dafür stehen wir, dafür treten wir ein.

3-201

**László Tőkés (PPE).** – Elnök úr, előrebocsátom, hogy Beňová képviselőasszony valótlanságokat állított. Immár öt esztendeje raboskodik öt magyar fiatal Szerbiában a délvidéki Temerinben történt korcsmai verekezés következtében. Tíz évtől tizenöt évig terjedő büntetéssel sújtották őket. Összesen 61 évre ítélték el őket nacionalista választási propaganda céljaira használva esetüket. Ilyen súlyos büntetéseket a balkáni háborúban elkövetett háborús bűnökért sem róttak ki senkire. Ugyanebben az időszakban mintegy 300 magyart vertek meg Szerbiában jogkövetkezmény nélkül. Az arány háromszáz az egyhez.

2005 januárjában az Európai Parlament tényfeltáró bizottságot küldött Szerbiába. A brutális magyarverések kivizsgálásáról szóló jelentés megvitatása az Emberi Jogi Bizottságban, azóta is várat magára. Kérem a Parlamentet, Jerzy Buzek elnök urat, szabadítsák ki a börtönből a temerini fiúkat. Az EU Szerbia csatlakozásának előfeltételeként szabja meg a diszkriminációmentes igazságszolgáltatás érvényesítését, a megfélemlítő hatású célzatos ítéletek helyett pedig a valódi vétkesek, a szerb háborús bűnösök kézre kerítését.

3-202

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S-D).** – Mr President, my country, Lithuania, is very similar to Ireland in many ways and the yes of its people for the Lisbon Treaty has clearly demonstrated the will of all our citizens for a stronger and more effective Europe. It has clearly shown that we are unable to act on our own in times of crisis and to ensure prosperity for our people.

More than ever the Community must speak with one voice, and solidarity among the Member States is the basis for that. Europe is undergoing difficult times, and the reforms proposed by the Lisbon Treaty will give an impetus for a more effective institutional structure which will undoubtedly lead it to more coherent policies in many areas. It is indeed a great achievement both for Europe and for every one of us.

Once again I congratulate the Irish people for their determination to have a better and more prosperous Union.

3-203

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE).** – Monsieur le Président, ce lundi, et ça n'aura échappé à personne, les producteurs de lait venus des quatre coins de l'Europe ont à nouveau manifesté à Bruxelles pour dire, pour crier leur désespoir et leur détresse face à l'effondrement du prix du lait qui les empêche de poursuivre leur activité. Plus que cela même, c'est leur avenir qui est en jeu ici.

L'appel à une nouvelle forme de régulation est aujourd'hui soutenu par une grosse majorité des États membres, le G20 laitier comme on l'appelle désormais. Je pense que, plus que jamais et d'extrême urgence, l'heure maintenant est à la prise de décision, et très certainement lors du prochain Conseil – formel cette fois – des ministres de l'agriculture qui aura lieu le 19 octobre prochain à Luxembourg. On "n'encommissionne" pas, comme on l'a fait il y a deux jours, une crise de cette ampleur-là.

Très rapidement, deux questions au Président Buzek, que, j'espère, vous lui transmettez. J'ai appris qu'il avait rencontré ce matin Cecilia Malmström, la ministre suédoise des affaires européennes, et j'aurais aimé savoir si elle avait pu lui confirmer l'engagement de la Présidence pour trouver une solution d'urgence à cette crise, dans la ligne de la résolution que nous avons votée à Strasbourg lors de la dernière session.

Enfin, j'en viens à ce groupe de haut niveau, ce groupe de réflexion qui a été lancé avant-hier également. Avant la prochaine et dès la prochaine entrée en vigueur du traité de Lisbonne, on le sait, notre Parlement deviendra codécideur, colégislateur. Je pense qu'il serait cohérent que nous soyons associés aux travaux de ce groupe de haut niveau.

3-204

**Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE).** – Marijus Ivanilovas, Lietuvos pilietis, 35 m. amžiaus dienraščio „Respublika“ spaustuvės direktorius, t. y. žmogus, turintis pastovų darbą ir pajamas, šių metų rugpjūčio mėnesį buvo sulaikytas Baltarusijoje, netoli Minsko, ir štai jau 2 mėnesius be teismo ir jo kaltės įrodymų yra laikomas kalėjime Žodino mieste Baltarusijoje. Prieš keletą dienų M. Ivanilovo suėmimo terminas pratęstas, nes per du mėnesius jokių kaltės įrodymų režimo vykdytojams surinkti nepavyko. Svarbu pažymėti ir tai, kad M. Ivanilovas nuo vaikystės serga bronchine astma. Jo tėvams žinoma, kad jis laikomas kameroje, kurioje yra 26 kaliniai ir tik 6 lovų, kameroje nuolat rūkoma. Marijus kenčia nuo astmos priepuolių, tačiau jam neleidžiama perduoti vaistų, neleidžiama susitikti ir su artimaisiais, net su Lietuvos konsulu. Pirmininke, tai vyksta mūsų kaimyninėje šalyje. Taip elgiamasi su ES valstybės narės – Lietuvos – piliečiu! Prašau Jūsų imtis priemonių, kurios yra Jūsų galioje, kad Marijus Ivanilovas, būtų nedelsiant paleistas, kadangi nėra jo

kaltės įrodymų ir kaltinimas nepagrįstas. M.Ivanilovui turi būti leista vykti į Lietuvą, jam nedelsiant reikalinga medikų pagalba.

3-205

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S-D).** – Anul trecut, în decembrie, Uniunea Europeană și-a luat un angajament istoric pentru reducerea emisiilor de carbon, confirmându-și astfel statutul de lider în eforturile de combatere a schimbărilor climatice.

Putem fi mândri de rolul jucat de Parlamentul European prin adoptarea unei legislații care conține nu numai reducerea nivelului de poluare, ci și măsuri concrete prin care pot fi atinse aceste angajamente, având drept rezultat stabilirea creșterii temperaturii globale.

În cazul negocierilor de la Copenhaga, din luna decembrie, trebuie să obținem angajamente ferme în vederea reducerii emisiilor și a suportului financiar acordat țărilor din lumea a treia pentru atenuarea și adaptarea la schimbările climatice. Dar o legislație referitoare la schimbările climatice nu poate fi adoptată în Statele Unite înaintea Conferinței de la Copenhaga, deci administrația Obama va lupta pentru a conduce negocierile, însă fără un mandat clar.

Poziția comună a Uniunii Europene nu trebuie irosită. Este crucial pentru noi să acționăm printr-o singură voce și să-i încurajăm pe ceilalți să ne urmeze în procesul de reducere a emisiilor.

3-206

**Sergej Kozlík (ALDE).** – Maďarská reprezentácia zavádza európsku verejnú mienku mnohými klamstvami: napríklad, že občania môžu byť pokutovaní za používanie menšinového jazyka, že lekári maďarskej národnosti budú smieť vykonávať prax len v štátnom slovenskom jazyku, alebo že bohoslužby budú možné taktiež len v štátnom jazyku.

Od maďarského kolegu sme teraz počuli nezmysel o policajtovi, ktorý nemôže odpovedať v maďarčine alebo angličtine turistovi. Nič z toho nie je pravda. Novela zákona naopak rozširuje možnosti používania jazykov národnostných menšín v porovnaní s predošlým stavom. Novela nezasahuje do súkromnej komunikácie občanov a neumožňuje pokutovanie jednotlivcov. Súlad novely zákona s medzinárodnými štandardmi potvrdili európske authority pre oblasť menšín – Vysoký komisár OBSE Knut Vollebæk a eurokomisár Leonard Orban. Myslím si, že maďarská komunita sa touto kauzou snaží zakryť rastúci extrémizmus a vraždy Rómov v Maďarsku.

3-207

**Joanna Senyszyn (S-D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Z przykrością informuję, że w Polsce łamane są prawa osób występujących z Kościoła katolickiego. Wbrew woli apostatów ich dane osobowe nie są usuwane z parafialnych archiwów, przeciwnie są w dalszym ciągu przetwarzane. Tak stanowi instrukcja dotycząca ochrony danych osobowych w działalności Kościoła katolickiego w Polsce. W omawianej części opiera się nie na obowiązującej ustawie o ochronie danych osobowych, ale – uwaga! – na przepisach kodeksu prawa kanonicznego.

Jak to możliwe, że w Polsce, która mieni się państwem prawa, prawo kanoniczne jest nadrzędne w stosunku do prawa stanowionego przez parlament? Dlaczego kodeks prawa kanonicznego reguluje uprawnienia obywateli nie będących katolikami? Jak to możliwe, że generalnemu inspektorowi ochrony danych osobowych nie przysługują żadne uprawnienia kontrolne w odniesieniu do archiwów kościelnych. Wyjaśnienie jest jedno: Polska jest państwem wyznaniowym. Parlament Europejski powinien na to zareagować.

3-208

**Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE).** – Subiectul intervenției mele de astăzi se leagă de cel mai important eveniment care a avut loc în ultima perioadă în Uniunea Europeană, și anume rezultatul pozitiv al referendumului organizat de Irlanda în vederea ratificării Tratatului de la Lisabona.

Doresc să mă alătur și eu colegilor mei care au avut șansa astăzi să felicite poporul irlandez pentru acest semnal foarte clar pentru a-și decide opțiunea de a continua integrarea europeană pe plan politic. Nu a căzut pradă discursurilor populiste care atrăgeau atenția asupra unor consecințe negative pentru că, e foarte clar, acest tratat va aduce un plus de eficiență și democrație în funcționarea instituțiilor europene.

Cred, de asemenea, că președintele Cehiei are obligația de a respecta angajamentele luate atunci când s-a negociat acest tratat și să nu obstrucționeze în mod nejustificat punerea lui în aplicare. Avem nevoie de acest tratat pentru a închide capitolul instituțional, cel puțin pentru o perioadă, și pentru a ne ocupa mai mult de politicile Uniunii. E nevoie de ratificarea cât mai rapidă de către cele două state, Polonia și Cehia, pentru a putea face numirile în noile funcții prevăzute de tratat, atât în ceea ce privește Comisia cât și la nivelul Consiliului.

3-209

**Edít Bauer (PPE).** – A legutóbbi parlamenti ülésen és most is több szó esett a szlovák nyelvtörvényről. Nem véletlenül. Ez a törvény mindenféle állításokkal szemben korlátozza a kisebbségek nyelvhasználatát, igaz, hogy nagyon kis területen meg is engedi. Az sem igaz, hogy kitérünk a vita elől, mert ha 10 újságíró előtt próbál valaki 5 percben megállapodni erről a témáról, az valószínűleg sikertelen lesz. Arra szeretném fölhívni a figyelmet, hogy ez a törvény minekutána rosszul van

megfogalmazva, rosszindulatúan van megfogalmazva, újabb jogbizonytalanságot teremti, mert 2 nap alatt a kulturális minisztérium 3 különböző magyarázatot ad a törvény egyes paragrafusaihoz.

Félelmet kelt az emberekben. Már ma több olyan esetről tudunk, amikor a munkaadó utasítja az alkalmazottakat, hogy szlovák nyelvet használjanak. Nagyon sajnálom, hogy ezt itt kell fölhoznunk. Remélhetőleg, a Lisszaboni Szerződés lehetőséget ad arra, hogy az emberi jogokkal, a kisebbségi jogokkal érdemben tudjunk foglalkozni.

3-210

**Josefa Andrés Barea (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, la piratería es un problema que preocupa a este Parlamento, a sus Estados y, desde luego, a España, porque en este momento hay un pesquero español secuestrado en aguas del Índico con 36 tripulantes a bordo.

En principio, lo primero que quisiera expresar es mi solidaridad con los tripulantes, con sus familias y, desde luego, el apoyo al Gobierno de España para su pronta liberación.

Pero no estamos hablando de un problema de la flota atunera de España específicamente, sino que afecta a tres países — Francia, Italia y España—, que están faenando en aguas internacionales y fuera de la zona exclusiva de Somalia. Y ante esto, se necesitaría una respuesta internacional y medidas conjuntas europeas de prevención y de reacción. Es decir, más y mejor Operación Atalanta, que ya existe y que ha sido un éxito por el número y la reducción de secuestros que se han producido en 2009 con relación a 2008.

Por último, quisiera incidir en el apoyo que se debe prestar a una cumbre internacional sobre la piratería en Somalia, porque hay que mejorar las relaciones internacionales para allanar estos problemas en tierra, y porque hay que mejorar el diálogo internacional.

3-211

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – Mr President, many in the House have today congratulated the Irish people on their good sense in rejecting the appeals of Nigel Farage and the UK Independence Party and voting overwhelmingly in favour of the Lisbon Treaty.

Members should perhaps also commiserate with the British people, because we have to put up with Mr Farage on a daily basis. He calls a two-to-one majority in Ireland a ‘victory for bully boys’. I am afraid his words are all too typical of a man who uses distortions and deceit, and sometimes downright lies, about the European Union. All too often those words are unchallenged by journalists.

However, hyperbole can turn to insanity. Now he is comparing the campaign in Ireland with the brutality of the latest elections in Zimbabwe. He describes the Treaty that gives every Member State the right to withdraw from the Union as an end of independence. Nevertheless, we should be compassionate. Parliament has a medical service. Mr President, I invite you to ask the men in white coats to offer their services to our colleague. Nonsense about Europe may pour from his lips but at least they can help ensure that he does not choke on it.

3-212

**Czesław Adam Sikiński (PPE).** – Chciałbym tu, w Parlamencie Europejskim, nawiązać do oświadczenia biskupów polskich i niemieckich z okazji 70. rocznicy wybuchu II wojny światowej. W tym szczególnym czasie, kiedy myśli wielu ludzi kierują się w stronę tamtych bolesnych wydarzeń, zwrócona została nam uwaga na to, by objąć specjalną troską młode pokolenia, aby potrafiły one we właściwy i rzetelny sposób poznać prawdę historyczną i na niej budować wspólną przyszłość.

Nie sposób nie przypomnieć przy tej okazji o pierwszym liście biskupów polskich do niemieckich z roku 1965, w którym to zachęcono do pojednania i budowy partnerskich relacji między naszymi państwami.

Dziś, tak samo jak wtedy, troszczymy się o budowę zaufania i przyjacielskich stosunków między naszymi narodami. Ale jesteśmy na tej wspólnej drodze pojednania już w innym miejscu. Razem tworzymy wspólną Europę, Europę współpracy, przyjaźni, Europę wartości, które opierają się na chrześcijańskich korzeniach, które były postawą tworzenia Europy przez ojców założycieli Wspólnoty Europejskiej. Kierując się zatem dobrem naszej wspólnej przyszłości należy zwrócić szczególną uwagę na ostrzeżenia i wskazania, jakie płyną ze wspólnego polsko-niemieckiego oświadczenia biskupów.

3-213

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S-D).** – Kedves képviselőtársaim! Ma már sok minden elhangzott a kisebbségi problémákról. Én egy pozitív példát szeretnék említeni, mert az egész Európai Unió számára, egész Európa számára pozitív, hogy Szerbiában elfogadtak a kulturális autonómiáról egy olyan törvényt, amely egész Európában páratlan.

Hogy a tizenhárom kisebbség, szlovákok, románok, magyarok és mások közvetlenül megválaszthatják a maguk nemzeti tanácsát, ezt a költségvetés finanszírozza és ezek a nemzeti tanácsok a kulturális autonómia jegyében kézbe vehetik, maguk tarthatják fent az intézményeket. És az is tanulság, hogy a kisebbséget bevonták ennek a kidolgozásába. Szerbia

példaként szolgálhat számos uniós ország, Franciaország, Szlovákia és mások számára, hogyan kell a kisebbségek jogait törvényben garantálni, és Szerbia nagyot lépett az európai integráció útján.

3-214

**Iuliu Winkler (PPE).** – Mr President, being a Hungarian MEP coming from Romania I will not speak today about the Slovak language, even though I am afraid I would have good reason to do so. Instead I want to speak about our decision today to set up a special committee on the economic crisis.

This decision proves the responsibility of our Parliament in the biggest challenge currently confronting Europe. The special committee will reaffirm the European Union position concerning the new global financial governance, but will also interact with the Member States, aiming at best implementation of Community measures meant to generate sustainable economic growth.

It is vital for the new Member States in the central and eastern part of Europe to receive necessary support for economic recovery. Coordination of recovery efforts should be more efficient, and enhanced coordination is not only the responsibility of the governments but also the responsibility of Brussels.

We are facing a most complicated economic perspective accompanied by the imminence of serious social unrest. That is why the European Union has to put forward the most efficient response to the deteriorating situation in the region and this House must show leadership on this issue.

3-215

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** – Señor Presidente, hace unos días treinta y seis personas fueron secuestradas mientras pescaban en aguas del Índico al amparo de un acuerdo aprobado por la Comisión Europea.

El 15 de septiembre denunciaba la situación de riesgo y de desamparo e indefensión en la que estaban realizando su trabajo. Proponía algunas medidas concretas y no se ha hecho nada.

Desgraciadamente por eso, hoy tenemos que estar hablando de las personas que se encuentran secuestradas en manos de los piratas.

Por eso, pido a la Comisión Europea que insista y que recomiende a los Estados miembros la incorporación de militares en los barcos pesqueros, y que dirija esta recomendación al Gobierno español porque ha resultado ser una medida eficaz, Francia lo está haciendo y así lo estamos viendo.

Este Parlamento ha reconocido en una resolución que el sector pesquero está indefenso porque se ha dado prioridad a la marina mercante. Así lo reconoció en la víspera del secuestro también el responsable de la Comisión Europea y, por tanto, pedimos que se extienda esta protección a los barcos pesqueros.

Pido igualmente al Presidente que demuestre y transmita la solidaridad y el apoyo a estas personas secuestradas, así como a sus familias, y que invite al patrón de este pesquero, cuando sea liberado, a este Parlamento.

3-216

**Ádám Kósa (PPE).** – Korábban sok szó esett a kisebbségekről és szeretném felhívni a figyelmet az Európai Unió belül 50 millió fogyatékos személy él. Én őket tekintem a legnagyobb kisebbségnek. Az anyagi válság őket sújtja leginkább és szeretném hangsúlyozni, hogy ők azok az emberek, akik mindig először veszítik el az állásukat, csökken a jövedelmük, az életlehetőségük, -színvonaluk és az őket képviselő társadalmi szervezetek is egyre inkább csökkenő támogatást kapnak.

A jelen válság legnagyobb tanulsága, hogy érdemes az emberekbe befektetni, és külön, más befektetések helyett is. Politikai vagy gazdasági döntéshozóknak felelőssége van abban, hogy figyelniük kell a fogyatékos emberekre. Kérem Önöket, hogy mindent tegyenek meg az ő érdekükben, hogy egyenlőbb bánásmódot kapjanak Önöktől is, és ezt azért hangsúlyozom, mert 50 millió ember nagyon nagy erővel tud bírni az Európai Unió belül, és érdekünk a társadalmi esélyegyenlőség.

3-217

**Nessa Childers (S-D).** – Mr President, of course I am delighted that the Lisbon Treaty has passed in my country. However, it has been seen this afternoon that the debate on the Reform Treaty has been poised between a reality and a distraction, and we must not stand still in its wake. The reality is that the world has changed fundamentally over recent decades, as a much greater proportion of it is now competing with us in a global market.

Quite simply, Europe must behave more coherently if it is to prosper. The Treaty now obliges the European institutions to be more democratic and more responsive to individual European people. The Charter of Fundamental Rights insists on this. We do not have the luxury of acting only in the interests of our own nations; we need to strengthen the Union which every one of us represents. As we did in our referendum, we need to continue to communicate who and what we are.



3-218

**Iosif Matula (PPE).** – Fondurile europene constituie, în contextul crizei economice actuale, elemente esențiale în vederea atingerii obiectivelor de convergență pentru regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate din statele membre.

De la acest enunț până la absorbția efectivă a fondurilor de către beneficiari există o cale lungă și nu tocmai simplă, fiind îngreunată de o serie de norme birocratice europene. Într-o perioadă în care noi, parlamentarii europeni, semnalăm efectele crizei economice și luăm măsuri de urgentare și simplificare a normelor de accesare a fondurilor, statele membre nu beneficiază rapid și pe deplin de aceste măsuri.

Doresc să aduc în acest sens un semnal concret din România. Proiecte finanțate prin Fondul social european, privind ameliorarea condițiilor de muncă ale lucrătorilor, precum și creșterea numărului de angajați în cadrul unor companii, încă se derulează cu dificultate.

Vreau să solicit urgentarea punerii în aplicare a măsurilor de simplificare a procedurilor de accesare a fondurilor care facilitează crearea locurilor de muncă în regiunile Europei.

3-219

**Alan Kelly (S-D).** – Mr President, it is with extreme urgency that I call on Parliament to see that the EUR 14.8 million promised to the workers in the mid-west of Ireland in areas like Limerick, Kerry and Tipperary who worked for Dell Computers and its suppliers is allocated as soon as possible. This money was promised by the Commission President under the Globalisation Adjustment Fund in a recent visit to Limerick. There is no going back on it and, whatever the issues relating to protocol and how this Fund is administered may be, these need to be overcome immediately. Parliament should not delay this money, which would give the region a much-needed economic stimulus. It was estimated at one stage that Dell and its suppliers employed one in every five people throughout the mid-west of Ireland, so this area has been hard hit.

That is why I urge the Commission to review the rules on state aid support. These were drawn up in 2006 before the massive shock that the loss of Dell and the other industries created. I urge the Commission to include the mid-west of Ireland as an area of serious unemployment in the review of state aid rules next year, so that it can qualify for the now much-needed EU funding.

3-220

**Csaba Sógor (PPE).** – Elnök úr, az Európai Parlament szerepe - idézem a Ház elnökét - ha kell, közvetíteni vitás felek, országok között. A Parlament ne csak a tüztöltés szerepét vállalja fel, hanem vegyen részt a tűz megelőzésében is.

Fogadjon el például olyan kisebbségi kerettörvényt, mely garantálja a kisebbségek jogait. A kisebbségeknek joguk van ahhoz, hogy biztonságban érezzék magukat. Egy ilyen kerettörvény segít abban, hogy a kisebbségek ne legyenek kitéve kormányok, szélsőséges szervezetek kénye-kedvének, olyan jelenségeknek, mint a szlovák államtörvény, mely bünteti az anyanyelv használatát. Megengedhetetlen, hogy az Unió területén kisebbségi szervezeteket tiltanak be, lefestik a kétnyelvű helységnevtáblákat, szélsőséges szervezetek kisebbségellenes, provokatív tüntetéseket szerveznek.

Az EP szerepe olyan törvényhozás megvalósítása többek között, mely védi az emberi jogokat, megakadályozza a diszkriminációt, garantálja, hogy a kisebbségek szülőföldjükön teljes értékű emberként élhessenek.

3-221

**Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, ante el secuestro del pesquero español *Alakrana* por piratas en el océano Índico, quiero destacar la firme determinación del Gobierno español, con el apoyo de la Unión Europea, para liberar a los 36 tripulantes —16 de ellos españoles— sanos y salvos, y entregar a la Justicia a los secuestradores.

Gracias a la operación europea Atalanta, puesta en marcha en diciembre de 2008 por iniciativa francoespañola —a la que se han sumado otros países de la Unión Europea—, hoy contamos con un considerable despliegue de fuerzas en la zona. Pero la extensión del área de protección no abarca donde faenan los pescadores, por lo que hacemos un llamamiento a los armadores para que no salgan del área de seguridad e instamos a la Unión Europea y a sus Estados miembros a que acuerden una extensión al sur de la cobertura de Atalanta y más medios para asegurar la libre circulación de los 20 000 buques que transitan por un océano cuya superficie es tres veces superior a la del mar Mediterráneo.

Si bien el despliegue ha garantizado el acceso de los mercantes que llevaban 227 000 toneladas del Programa de Alimentos de las Naciones Unidas a Somalia, ahora tenemos que hacer un esfuerzo para cubrir la labor de las decenas de pesqueros europeos que faenan en la zona.

Por último, instamos a los Estados miembros a que pongan sus servicios de información e inteligencia en acción para la búsqueda y detención de los intermediarios que dan pistas a los piratas y cobran los rescates, y que actúen desde suelo europeo.

3-222

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, there has been much talk in the last two hours and the last couple of weeks in Ireland about a communications deficit and the need to bring Europe closer to the people.

I have a suggestion to make: I think that we should discuss this at some future time in this Parliament, particularly to get the views of MEPs on how the Commission and the MEPs themselves can be involved in this whole area, because national governments have proven reluctant in the past to give credit to the European Union for what it does, and as a result the people are not aware of it.

We now, with our increased powers and increased opportunities, should take that opportunity to discuss this issue here in Parliament and come up with ways and proposals on how we can actually help to clear that deficit and bring Europe closer to its people. It would be an exercise well worth doing.

3-223

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S-D).** – Consiliul European din iunie 2009 a solicitat Comisiei Europene să elaboreze și să prezinte o strategie pentru regiunea Dunării până la sfârșitul anului 2010.

Comisia Europeană și statele membre ar trebui să adopte o strategie europeană comună, care să unifice inițiativele existente privind Dunărea și să mărească importanța acestui fluviu în cadrul politicilor Uniunii Europene. Strategia pentru regiunea Dunării ar trebui să se concentreze pe obiective și proiecte comune în domeniul transportului, energiei, mediului și al cooperării culturale.

Anul trecut, Comisia de transport și turism a Parlamentului European a organizat o delegație în regiunea Dunării, pentru a cunoaște și promova potențialul acestui fluviu în cadrul politicilor europene. Una dintre principalele concluzii ale acestei delegații a fost aceea de a crea în Parlamentul European un inter-grup pentru promovarea Dunării. Prin crearea acestui inter-grup, Parlamentul European își reafirmă angajamentul de a participa și sprijini, în mod activ, atât elaborarea strategiei pentru regiunea Dunării, cât și implementarea acesteia.

3-224

**Teresa Riera Madurell (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, quiero llamar la atención de esta Cámara para recordar que el pasado 27 de septiembre se celebró el Día Mundial del Turismo en su 30ª edición bajo el lema «El turismo, consagración de la diversidad», en un momento en que todos esperamos la pronta entrada en vigor del Tratado de Lisboa, que incorpora el turismo como nuevo ámbito de acción de la Unión Europea.

De entre los retos del sector está el de mejorar la oferta de experiencias turísticas para todo el mundo sin discriminación.

Como señala la Declaración de Montreal, el acceso al ocio turístico para todo el mundo lleva necesariamente a la lucha contra las desigualdades y contra la exclusión de aquellos que tienen una cultura diferente, poseen menos medios económicos, sufren alguna discapacidad física o viven en un país en desarrollo.

El Parlamento ha traducido esta ambición en un proyecto piloto sobre turismo social que la Comisión desarrollará este año. Y lo ha hecho también porque el turismo social refuerza la tasa de empleo al combatir la estacionalidad — uno de los grandes problemas del sector— y crea una mayor igualdad, más puestos de trabajo y durante más tiempo.

Este es, Señorías, nuestro objetivo.

3-225

**María Paloma Muñiz De Urquiza (S-D).** – Señor Presidente, hace apenas unas horas ha resultado muerto en Herat (Afganistán) Cristo Ancor Cabello, un soldado español integrante de la Fuerza Internacional de Asistencia para la Seguridad, la fuerza desplegada por mandato de las Naciones Unidas en la que soldados de muy distintas nacionalidades llevan a cabo una durísima labor, merecedora de nuestro reconocimiento, para mejorar las condiciones de vida y de seguridad de la población civil afgana.

Le pido, señor Presidente, que transmita las condolencias del Parlamento Europeo a su familia, así como nuestro apoyo y solidaridad a sus compañeros, entre los que hay cinco heridos.

Quiero añadir también, señor Presidente, que el Gobierno español mantiene su firme compromiso con la seguridad de todas las tropas en misiones de paz desplegadas en el exterior, no solamente en Afganistán, sino también en otros lugares del mundo.

3-226

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S-D).** – Ultimele două valuri de extindere a Uniunii Europene au adus numeroase beneficii, atât vechilor cât și noilor state membre, dar a ridicat, în același timp, o serie de provocări.

La doi ani de la aderarea la Uniunea Europeană, România este printre țările cu cele mai reduse rate de succes în accesarea fondurilor europene. Procedura de accesare a banilor europeni este destul de stufoasă și complicată. Fondurile structurale și de coeziune sunt pârgii financiare, care pot duce la relansarea economiei, mai ales în condițiile actualei crize.

În acest context, consider că avem nevoie de reguli simple de accesare a fondurilor structurale, pentru ca banii europeni să ajungă cât mai rapid la beneficiari. O atenție deosebită trebuie acordată eliminării tuturor acestor dificultăți, care blochează accesul la banii comunitari și descurajează oamenii în scopul obținerii de sprijin financiar european.

Este necesar de a încuraja eforturile la nivel european, în vederea simplificării procedurilor de accesare a fondurilor destinate României, pentru a accelera punerea în aplicare și absorbția rapidă a acestora.

3-227

**President.** – That concludes the item.

*(The sitting was suspended at 20.40 and resumed at 21.00)*

3-228

**VORSITZ: SILVANA KOCH-MEHRIN**  
*Vizepräsidentin*

3-229

## **19 - Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**

3-230

## **20 - Nominations dans la commission spéciale sur la crise financière, économique et sociale (Fristen für die Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**

3-231

## **21 - Vermeidung und Beilegung von Kompetenzkonflikten in Strafverfahren (Aussprache)**

3-232

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt folgt der Bericht von Renate Weber im Namen des Ausschusses für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres über die Initiative der Tschechischen Republik, der Republik Polen, der Republik Slowenien, der Slowakischen Republik und des Königreichs Schweden, im Hinblick auf die Annahme eines Rahmenbeschlusses 2009/.../JI des Rates zur Vermeidung und Beilegung von Kompetenzkonflikten in Strafverfahren (08535/2009 - C7-0205/2009 - 2009/0802(CNS)) (A7-0011/2009).

3-233

**Antonio Tajani, Vice-président de la Commission.** – Madame la Présidente, comme c'est la première fois que j'interviens devant ce nouveau Parlement, je souhaiterais vous féliciter pour votre élection à la vice-présidence.

En ce qui concerne la question de Mme Weber, je parle au nom du Vice-président Barrot et je souhaiterais tout d'abord remercier la rapporteure et les membres de la commission LIBE pour l'excellente qualité de leur travail. La Commission se réjouit du rapport et appuie certains des amendements proposés. La Commission est globalement favorable à la proposition présentée par cinq États membres, bien que le texte ne soit pas aussi ambitieux qu'elle l'aurait souhaité. Plus précisément, la Commission déplore le fait que le champ d'action de la décision-cadre ait été limité au cas où une même personne est soumise à des procédures pénales parallèles pour le même fait. La Commission regrette également que l'obligation de renvoyer un cas de conflit de juridictions à Eurojust ait été limitée et que la liste des critères à prendre en compte pour déterminer la juridiction la mieux placée ait été éliminée de la partie opérative du texte. Ces amendements ont affaibli le texte de la proposition, lui ôtant la plus grande partie de sa valeur ajoutée.

Du point de vue de la Commission, la proposition ne devrait être considérée que comme une première étape vers la prévention et la résolution des conflits de juridictions dans le cadre des procédures pénales et devrait être remplacée ultérieurement par une proposition plus exhaustive. La Commission y réfléchira également à la lumière des changements apportés par le traité de Lisbonne dans ce domaine, dont j'espère l'entrée en vigueur dans les meilleurs délais.

3-234

**Renate Weber, rapporteur.** – Madam President, the positive result of the Irish referendum on the Lisbon Treaty brings us one step closer to that moment in time when the European Parliament will not only be consulted by the Council, but will have codecision powers on matters which are now under the third pillar.

The question then is: why is the Council so keen to adopt legislation a few months before that date when, moreover, that legislation does not represent a step forward in establishing a genuine European area of freedom, security and justice? The truth is that this proposal does not help prevent any conflicts of jurisdiction, and does not provide for any settlement when

such situations arise. This could be done, for example, by reducing multiple jurisdiction and by allocating jurisdiction to Member States, as was done through various regulations on civil law, with the obligation to mutually recognise the decisions that followed from that allocation of jurisdiction. Instead, this Framework Decision is limited to a duty of Member States to inform one another and to enter into direct consultation in order to reach 'consensus on any effective solution aimed at avoiding the adverse consequences arriving from parallel proceedings'.

That is why I was not surprised when, during the exchange of views in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs a few weeks ago, the Commission – although supporting the current proposal – mentioned it would come up with a new proposal at a later stage. That is also why I am not surprised by what the Commissioner has said this evening. I thank the Commission for being so honest about the proposal, but have to say that I consider this proposal and the entire procedure for its adoption a good example of how we should not legislate within the European Union. I strongly believe that what is important is to protect our citizens' rights and not just to tick boxes. By the way, the Council is not present today, although the Presidency was one of the initiators of the proposal. I have to stress that within the European Parliament we took our work very seriously. We worked in good faith during the last mandate and this one, and would hope to be sending a message on our views on having more effective legislation.

What I welcome about this proposal is that the current text explicitly refers to the principle of *ne bis in idem*. This was due to the exchange of views we had with the Council and the Commission, as the original text proposed did not mention it at all. The report I drafted pays particular attention to three aspects.

Firstly I believe that the protection of persons formally charged must receive the highest attention and consistent procedural safeguards have to be provided for. These should include the right of the formally charged person to receive enough information for him or her to have a basis upon which to challenge any solution which does not appear to be reasonable. Secondly, with regard to the details concerning the person formally charged, which national authorities exchange through the notifications, I support the idea that it is important to ensure an adequate level of data protection and that it should be specified in this Framework Decision what kind of personal data is exchanged.

Last but not least, I strongly believe that the involvement of Eurojust in the decision on the choice of jurisdiction is of the utmost importance. In my opinion, Eurojust should be involved from the earliest stage because of its coordinating role and because of its more and more relevant tasks. I am among those who consider that we created this Agency not only to show that we are concerned with combating transborder crime, but because we need strong instruments. Eurojust has already proved in the years since its establishment that it deserves our trust. That is why I am surprised by the reluctance shown by the Council and by some colleagues in the European Parliament. Having said that, I would like to call on the European Commission to present at the earliest opportunity a proposal completing this Framework Decision on the conflicts of jurisdiction. I will finish by thanking the shadow rapporteurs for the way they worked on this report.

3-235

**Monica Luisa Macovei, on behalf of the PPE Group.** – Madam President, I would also like to start by thanking the rapporteur for the very good cooperation we have had in this matter. As the shadow rapporteur for the PPE Group, I would like to present the PPE position on the Framework Decision as it is, and of course on the amendments.

The PPE position differs from that of the rapporteur on two matters. The first is the degree of involvement of Eurojust in direct communication between the domestic authorities. While the rapporteur asks for mandatory involvement of Eurojust in every case from the initial stage of communication, we believe that the referral to Eurojust should only take place when national authorities fail to reach consensus because, after all, as it is now this initiative is about direct communication.

We too would like to strengthen Eurojust and its part in the judicial cooperation. Our position on this matter only seeks to prevent bureaucracy. If there is a possibility of the two parties reaching consensus, why introduce another body and procedure? We do believe and agree that Eurojust must play a role when the parties fail to reach consensus, but where there is not a problem we give the national authorities the flexibility to have direct bilateral contacts, which also boosts public trust.

The second matter relates to another proposed amendment which extends the competence of Eurojust beyond that provided in Article 4 of the Eurojust decision. We believe that this matter, if it is to be discussed, should be approached in relation to the Eurojust decision via the main door. This is why we will vote against these amendments.

However, there are no key points, so we will vote for the report as we want to encourage the exchange of information between national authorities. We also support the oral amendment tabled today.

Finally I would like to stress that the PPE is keen to see judicial cooperation enhanced, and supports a European policy which should help citizens have the same guarantees and procedures in all Member States.

3-236

**Monika Flašíková Beňová, za skupinu S-D.** – Trestnoprávna politika a zabezpečenie základných ľudských práv subjektov v trestnoprávnom procese je jednou z priorit Európskeho spoločenstva.

Návrh rámcového rozhodnutia, ktoré vyšlo z iniciatívy českého predsedníctva, poskytuje právny rámec na ochranu subjektov trestných konaní, a hlavne na posilnenie a dodržiavanie zásady *ne bis in idem*. Prijatie takéhoto legislatívneho návrhu teda považujem za nevyhnutné nielen z dôvodov ochrany subjektov trestných konaní, ale takisto aj posilnenia právnej istoty občanov členských štátov Európskej únie.

Mechanizmus vyriešenia konfliktu jurisdikcií by mal byť spôsobom, ktorý eliminuje situácie, keď viaceré členské štáty trestne stíhajú jednu a tú istú osobu pre jeden a ten istý trestný čin. Rovnako by sa tým vyšlo aj možnému vydaniu viacerých rozhodnutí v tej istej veci.

Rámcové rozhodnutie ukladá členským štátom len povinnosť vzájomne sa informovať o existencii paralelných trestných konaní, avšak nestanovuje komplexný právny mechanizmus na ich riešenie. Nedostatok vidím hlavne vo vágnosti právneho textu, ktorý vo väčšine prípadov neurčuje žiadne fixné lehoty na splnenie stanovených povinností. Rovnako aj pozícia Eurojustu nie je jednoznačná a takisto sa nevyužíva potenciál, ktorý by táto inštitúcia mohla poskytovať pri riešení konfliktov jurisdikcií.

Dôraz je nevyhnutné klásť najmä na zachovanie základných ľudských práv subjektov, teda obvineného a obžalovaného, vo všetkých štádiách trestného konania a rovnako aj na zabezpečenie zodpovedajúcej úrovne ochrany osobných údajov. Dôležité bude následne obrátiť pozornosť na legislatívnu iniciatívu Komisie „Transfer of Proceedings in Criminal Matters“, ktorá túto problematiku, zdá sa, bude riešiť podstatne kompletnejšie. Podporiť tento návrh je nevyhnutné aj vzhľadom na praktické problémy pri riešení kompetenčných sporov v trestnom konaní. Pokroková aliancia socialistov a demokratov preto tento návrh podporí, avšak trváme na poskytnutí dostatočnej ochrany subjektom trestných konaní a takisto aj na posilnení pozície Eurojustu a zefektívnení celého mechanizmu.

3-237

**Louis Bontes (NI).** – Voorzitter, de Partij voor de Vrijheid ziet geen heil in dit voorstel. Nederland, en alleen Nederland, dient de beslissing te nemen ten aanzien van het uitoefenen van jurisdictie. Het lijkt erop dat steeds meer voorstellen worden gedaan, die uiteindelijk neerkomen op harmonisatie van het strafrecht van de lidstaten. Voorbeelden daarvan zijn: accreditatie van gerechtelijke laboratoria, harmonisatie van het beleid inzake tolken en overdracht van strafdossiers. De PVV, de Partij voor de Vrijheid, vraagt zich af wat het uiteindelijke doel hiervan is. Een Europees wetboek van strafrecht en een Europees wetboek van strafvordering kunnen niet onze instemming hebben. Het lijkt op een salamitactiek waarbij je iedere keer een plakje door de strot geduwd krijgt en uiteindelijk de hele worst hebt opgegeten.

3-238

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señora Presidenta, quisiera comenzar mi intervención agradeciendo y felicitando a mi amiga la señora Weber por el gran trabajo realizado en este informe.

Como Sus Señorías saben, la cooperación judicial pasará a formar parte de competencias legislativas del Parlamento Europeo en un futuro bien próximo.

Ya el pueblo irlandés se ha pronunciado mediante referéndum y, a mi juicio, lo ha hecho en la dirección positiva y correcta.

Los ciudadanos europeos esperan que el espacio de seguridad, libertad y justicia sea una realidad en la que sus derechos procesales sean respetados y garantizados por igual, sin importar el lugar del territorio comunitario en el que se encuentren.

Nuestra obligación, por tanto, es procurar que dichas garantías procesales se respeten en todos los Estados miembros.

Cuando se produce un conflicto positivo entre jurisdicciones de distintos Estados miembros, es preciso resolverlo con la mayor celeridad posible, para proteger al ciudadano y evitar cualquier riesgo de vulneración del principio jurídico *non bis in idem*.

Para ello, es fundamental la cooperación y la comunicación entre los órganos judiciales implicados en el conflicto de competencias.

En el informe se debate también cuál es el papel de Eurojust y qué papel debe jugar cuando se produzca este conflicto de competencias.

La ponente defiende la idea de que Eurojust debe ser informada de cualquier conflicto que se produzca, aun en el caso de que este haya sido resuelto de forma bilateral entre los órganos judiciales implicados.

Por el contrario, la ponente alternativa de mi grupo, la señora Macovei, considera que, en aras de la economía procesal, Eurojust solo debería ser informada en aquellos casos en los que no ha sido posible llegar a un acuerdo ante los tribunales involucrados.

Desde mi punto de vista, la razón está de la parte de la señora Macovei.

Por otra parte, y en otro orden de cosas, la señora Weber insta a la Comisión a que presente cuanto antes una propuesta complementaria a la decisión marco en la que se establezcan normas para la resolución de conflictos negativos de jurisdicción.

3-239

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S-D).** – În primul rând, aş dori să o felicit pe colega raportor pentru munca depusă şi să subliniez faptul că, la nivel european, acţiunile comune pentru consolidarea libertăţii, securităţii şi justiţiei sunt esenţiale. Salut prezenta iniţiativă, menită a soluţiona conflictele de competenţă, pentru că statele membre sunt confruntate adesea cu probleme în ceea ce priveşte recunoaşterea reciprocă a hotărârilor judecătoreşti în materie penală.

Nu trebuie să existe diferenţe între ţările membre, referitoare la protecţia persoanelor inculcate, iar noi ar trebui, în demersurile noastre, să ne asigurăm că oriunde în Europa, orice acuzat poate beneficia de garanţii procedurale solide. În schimburile de informaţii dintre ţări, trebuie luată în considerare necesitatea protejării datelor cu caracter personal şi a stabilirii în mod clar a naturii datelor care pot fi transmise.

Subliniez importanţa consultărilor directe dintre autorităţile din ţările Uniunii Europene, pentru a elimina procedurile paralele şi pentru a evita situaţii în care instituţiile competente dintr-un anumit stat să fie subiective în elaborarea de sentinţe cu privire la acuzaţiile aduse unui cetăţean, de cele mai multe ori din lipsă de informaţii. De asemenea, ar trebui să propunem în viitor o întărire a rolului jucat de Eurojust în soluţionarea eventualelor conflicte şi să punem în aplicare o cooperare mai strânsă între statele membre şi benefică pentru cetăţeni.

3-240

**Cristian Dan Preda (PPE).** – Aş vrea să încep prin a felicita raportoarea şi co-raportoarele pentru munca pe care au făcut-o şi, în intervenţia mea, aş vrea să subliniez două din chestiunile pe care shadow-raportorul din grupului meu politic, doamna Macovei, le-a menţionat.

În primul rând, chestiunea încrederii publice în justiţie, care mi se pare foarte importantă, în condiţiile în care democraţiile noastre, democraţiile statelor membre, nu pot fi gândite în afara acestei încrederi în justiţie şi cred că trebuie făcut ce se poate pentru ca ea să fie întotdeauna o prezenţă în viaţa noastră publică.

În al doilea rând, aş vrea să subliniez nevoia de debirocratizare a administrării justiţiei; sigur că schimbul de informaţii între autorităţi este important, dar este la fel de important să nu se ajungă la o birocratizare a actului de justiţie, pentru că aceasta diminuează protecţia de care trebuie să beneficieze orice libertate individuală.

3-241

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE).** – O felicit pe doamna raportoare şi pe doamna co-raportoare pentru munca depusă, salut iniţiativa referitoare la o decizie-cadru privind prevenirea şi soluţionarea conflictelor de competenţă în cadrul procedurilor penale. Aş dori să fac o remarcă importantă: această propunere de decizie-cadru vizează exclusiv conflictul pozitiv de competenţă. Nicio dispoziţie nu vizează conflictele negative de competenţă.

Consider că implicarea Eurojust-ului ar trebui să urmeze doar acolo unde părţile nu ajung la un acord comun. Principiul acestei directive este să instituie comunicarea directă între autorităţile competente din statele membre. În plus, este interesul persoanei în cauză ca procedura să fie cât mai scurtă pentru a nu fi investigat pentru aceeaşi faptă în două ţări.

3-242

**Antonio Tajani, Vice-Président de la Commission.** – Madame la Présidente, est vrai, comme je l'ai déjà rappelé, que la proposition n'est pas aussi ambitieuse que la Commission l'aurait souhaité, ce que la rapporteure a d'ailleurs bien souligné dans son intervention.

Cependant, la Commission la soutient comme une première étape dans la prévention et la résolution des conflits de compétences dans le cadre des procédures pénales. Pour l'instant, il est bien sûr impossible de dire quand la deuxième étape sera engagée. La décision sera prise ultérieurement, en fonction des développements concernant l'entrée en vigueur du traité de Lisbonne, que je souhaite de tout mon cœur, bien entendu.

Le contenu de cette nouvelle initiative potentielle dépendra du résultat de l'étude d'impact que la Commission devra réaliser. Bien sûr, je transmettrai tous vos commentaires au Vice-président Barrot. Je vous remercie encore une fois d'avoir tenu ce débat.

3-243

**Renate Weber, rapporteur.** – Madam President, the political groups in this House have made it pretty clear what their position is on this report and on the sensitive issues surrounding it, and particularly Eurojust. Indeed, it seems that the most important and most sensitive issue concerns where we stand on Eurojust.

However, I feel much more confident now about the future of this Framework Decision after hearing Commissioner Tajani speaking, on his own behalf and on behalf of Vice-President Barrot, about providing us with something more powerful that would clearly address not only positive conflicts of jurisdiction but also negative conflicts of jurisdiction.

3-244

**Die Präsidentin.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen. Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 8. Oktober 2009, statt.

### *Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149)*

3-245

**John Attard-Montalto (S-D), in writing.** – The Hague Programme addresses the case of conflicts of jurisdiction in criminal matters. This is important when a cross-border criminal activity takes place. Four EU Member States tabled specific proposals with the aim of preventing and settling conflicts of jurisdiction in criminal proceedings. The issue relates to when the same person or persons are subject to criminal proceedings in different Member States in respect of the same facts. This may lead to the infringement of the judicial principle *ne bis in idem* (a person cannot be tried again if he has been already tried). The measures proposed are commendable and consist of:

- a procedure for establishing contacts between the competent authorities of the Member States. This will confirm or otherwise the existence of parallel criminal proceedings;
- rules governing the exchange of information between the authorities of the Member States conducting such criminal proceedings;
- avoiding adverse consequences by reaching consensus between the Member States.

3-246

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S-D), raštu.** – Šiuo pamatiniu sprendimu neturėtų būti sukurta nereikalingų biurokratinių procedūrų, kai šiame sprendime nagrinėjamos problemoms spręsti jau turima tinkamesnių priemonių. Todėl tais atvejais, kai valstybės narės turi lankstesnių priemonių ar susitarimų, jie turėtų būti viršesni už šio pamatinio sprendimo nuostatas; bet kuriuo atveju pagal šias priemones ar susitarimus nemažinama įtariamiesiems ar kaltinamiesiems užtikrinama apsauga. Taip pat laikinai sulaikius įtariamąjį ar kaltinamąjį reikia būtinai siekti kuo greitesnio sutarimo tiesioginių konsultacijų pagrindu. Visais konsultacijų lygmenimis įtariamojo ar kaltinamojo duomenų apsauga turi atitikti Europos Sąjungos pagrindinių teisių chartijoje bei Europos žmogaus teisių ir pagrindinių laisvių apsaugos konvencijoje nustatytus principus.

3-247

## **22 - Entschädigung von Fluggästen im Fall einer Insolvenz der Fluglinie (Aussprache)**

3-248

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Aussprache über die mündliche Anfrage an die Kommission über die Entschädigung für Fluggäste im Fall des Konkurses einer Fluggesellschaft von Brian Simpson im Namen des Ausschusses für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr (O-0089/2009-B7-0210/2009).

3-249

**Brian Simpson, author.** – Madam President, I would like to thank Commissioner Tajani for being with us this evening. This question was submitted by me on behalf of Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism, as Members had become very concerned over the summer months by the collapse of SkyEurope airline, and approached me to take this initiative on their behalf.

It is worth noting that we have had 77 airline bankruptcies in the European Union since 2000 and, in the sad but likely event that some more may follow in this tough economic climate, we believe it is imperative that we use this question tonight to at least open up the debate now about how we can best protect consumers and air travellers in the European Union.

In the case of SkyEurope, it was an airline based in Slovakia. We saw passengers being left stranded at destinations, without accommodation or even a flight home. We also had the problem that many of those people were told that compensation, or even refunds, would not be possible as they had not purchased their ticket with a credit card or booked through a travel agent. These were passengers who had booked online through their own accounts, a practice that has been increasing over many years.

It is not an isolated case. We saw similar scenes in my home country, the United Kingdom, last year when Excel Airways went bankrupt, leaving over 200 000 people out of pocket, without compensation and stranded at a whole host of airports throughout Europe, with it costing them even more money to find accommodation and flights home.

Many of these people are not regular business flyers or regular flyers like ourselves, and they do not have the financial means to deal with this sort of upheaval. They are normally from those families who spend their savings on a family holiday, only to see their hard-earned money go down the drain through little fault of their own.

The status quo here is clearly not acceptable. Here in the European Union and the European Parliament we should be proud of our record on passenger rights. We have seen the introduction of denied boarding compensation – although we know there are still issues to resolve with that. We have seen the introduction of rights to assistance and tougher laws on ticket pricing transparency, as well as tough compensation measures in the package travel directive. In fact, I believe we have covered most of the bases when it comes to consumer protection in aviation, but there is clearly a loophole here that needs to be closed.

If you book a charter with a holiday company you are covered by the package travel directive. If you book with a scheduled airline you are covered by their system, but if you book online your seat only – the airline flight – then you are not covered. It is an anomaly. It is a loophole which Parliament, with the assistance of the Commission, is seeking to close.

In this question we have also floated the idea of establishing a reserve compensation fund, but this must not be seen as a demand on our part or by the Commission. We merely wish to open up the debate as to what mechanisms might be possible to help us best solve this problem, so the idea of the question is to start the dialogue with the Commission in the hope that we can close this loophole and find a solution to what is a serious problem, particularly for those people who find themselves victims of an airline insolvency.

I look forward to working with the Commission to try and find a solution to this problem with my committee, and to hearing the views of the other Members.

3-250

**Antonio Tajani, Vicepresidente della Commissione.** – Signora Presidente, ringrazio l'onorevole Simpson e tutta la commissione per i trasporti per aver portato all'attenzione del Parlamento un problema così delicato. Questa interrogazione mi permette di ribadire in forma solenne quanto affermato in queste ultime settimane a seguito dei disagi provocati dal fallimento di alcune compagnie aeree a molti cittadini europei, a molti passeggeri.

Come questo Parlamento sa, la difesa dei passeggeri in tutti i settori dei trasporti rappresenta per me una vera e propria priorità. L'ho detto nel corso dell'*hearing*, quando il Parlamento decise di concedermi la fiducia, e desidero ribadirlo questa sera. Credo che sia necessario mobilitarci tutti quanti nella ricerca di una soluzione normativa concreta, anche per evitare che – come sostenuto dal presidente Simpson – si verifichino disparità tra un passeggero che ha acquistato un biglietto di semplice trasporto aereo da una compagnia che poi fallisce e un passeggero che l'ha acquistato nel contesto di un pacchetto vacanze più ampio.

Penso pertanto che la prima cosa da fare sia quella di utilizzare gli strumenti di cui già disponiamo. Quindi tutte le normative, anche se incomplete e anche se causano disparità, devono in ogni caso essere utilizzate nel modo migliore dai cittadini. Sempre al fine di ottimizzare gli strumenti a nostra disposizione, in occasione del fallimento della compagnia *Sky Europe*, ad esempio, si è fatto ricorso alla Rete dei centri europei per la protezione dei consumatori per dare consigli ai consumatori in merito ai loro diritti e per raccogliere i reclami. Bisogna però anche proteggere meglio i passeggeri quando si trovano di fronte a un fallimento. I passeggeri in possesso di prenotazioni che poi decadono dovranno avere diritto a un rimborso e, in alcuni casi, al rimpatrio. È un problema complicato, che ci impone di valutare attentamente le misure da adottare.

La Commissione ha già avviato i lavori per dare una risposta concreta a tali questioni. Su nostra richiesta, è già stato quindi realizzato uno studio importante sulle conseguenze dei fallimenti nel settore del trasporto aereo, soprattutto per quanto riguarda i passeggeri. È uno studio dettagliato, che illustra in concreto le conseguenze dei fallimenti e il loro impatto su oltre 700 milioni di passeggeri trasportati ogni anno nell'intera Unione europea.

Lo studio presenta diversi scenari possibili per definire le soluzioni più adeguate ai vari problemi sollevati dai fallimenti, in particolare in termini di rimborso e di rimpatrio, come detto poc'anzi. Tanto per il rimborso quanto per il rimpatrio è stato possibile così elaborare vari scenari, che vanno dalla costituzione di fondi di garanzia, alla messa a punto di regimi di assicurazione obbligatori per i passeggeri o per le compagnie aeree o, infine, all'ipotesi di introdurre modifiche mirate nei diritti fallimentari nazionali.

Nel febbraio di quest'anno ho trasmesso lo studio all'onorevole Costa, allora presidente della commissione TRAN. Sulla base di tale studio, la Commissione adesso continua l'analisi delle varie opzioni possibili e si concentra in modo particolare sull'impatto sui consumatori e sul settore del trasporto aereo. Nel corso dell'analisi terremo conto di tutti gli elementi del dibattito e sfrutteremo i contributi di tutte le parti interessate. Su questa linea, nelle prossime settimane la Commissione avvierà un'ampia consultazione pubblica sui diritti dei passeggeri nel settore del trasporto aereo.



In questo contesto e senza sottovalutare le differenze e le specificità dei viaggi "tutto compreso", la Commissione terrà conto anche della valutazione d'impatto attualmente in corso sulla revisione della direttiva 90/314 relativa, appunto, ai viaggi "tutto compreso". Questo perché uno dei principali obiettivi della consultazione pubblica sarà proprio quello di definire le conseguenze dei fallimenti delle compagnie aeree per i passeggeri e le eventuali soluzioni per porvi rimedio. Naturalmente, oltre alla consultazione pubblica, sarà effettuato – come ho accennato prima – uno studio per analizzare l'impatto delle varie soluzioni ipotizzabili.

Naturalmente, il contributo del Parlamento sarà per me determinante e – visto anche l'impegno con il quale la commissione per i trasporti si è mobilitata oggi con questa interrogazione orale – credo che nelle prossime settimane potremo cooperare proficuamente per individuare insieme la soluzione più adatta per rispondere alle esigenze dei passeggeri e per garantire, nel modo migliore, i loro diritti in caso di fallimento di compagnie aeree.

3-251

**Marian-Jean Marinescu, în numele grupului PPE.** – În condițiile crizei economice mondiale, ale fluctuației prețurilor carburanților, precum și ale înăsprii concurenței, operatorii aerieni, în special cei *low-cost*, întâmpină mari dificultăți. Creșterea prețurilor biletelor nu este, în situația actuală, o opțiune, iar creșterea tarifelor de servicii practicate de unele companii *low-cost* poate determina scăderea și mai accentuată a numărului de pasageri.

Pierderile financiare ale companiilor aeriene în anul 2009 vor fi de aproximativ 11 miliarde de dolari, situația urmând să se redreseze abia în următorii 3 ani. În acest context, deși nedorită de nimeni, există situația în care companiile aeriene intră în faliment. În situația unui faliment din cauza lipsei unei legislații adecvate, nu există nicio modalitate practică de a recupera contravaloarea biletelor sau de a obține repatrierea unor pasageri rămași în afara țării de rezidență. Sprijinul contra-cost, deși cost modic, oferit de către companiile aeriene europene pasagerilor unei companii aflate în situație de faliment, manifestat în cazul Sky Europe, deși meritoriu în sine, nu oferă decât o soluție temporară de depășire a unei crize punctuale. Pe de altă parte, nici criza economică în sine nu poate fi considerată permanent o scuză, deoarece falimente ale companiilor aeriene s-au înregistrat și înainte de declanșarea acesteia.

Controalele mai stricte asupra situației financiare a transportatorilor aerieni, în special în ceea ce privește companiile *low-cost*, controlul mai strict al fuziunilor și preluărilor, precum și înființarea unui fond solid de garantare sunt câteva soluții care, pe termen lung, ar putea oferi protecție pasagerilor în cazul falimentului unei companii aeriene.

3-252

**Saïd El Khadraoui, namens de S-D-Fracție.** – Mevrouw de Voorzitter, mijnheer de commissaris, collega's, we hebben als fractie aangedrongen op een debat over het probleem van de faillissementen in de luchtvaartsector, omdat het inderdaad niet meer gaat om een uniek geval. De voorzitter van onze commissie, collega Brian Simpson, heeft er al naar verwezen: 77 faillissementen, weliswaar vooral kleinere maatschappijen sinds het jaar 2000. Dat betekent dus ook vele duizenden mensen die op een of andere manier het geld van de aankoop van een ticket in rook zagen opgaan of ergens aan hun lot werden overgelaten. Het valt te vrezen dat er in deze moeilijke economische tijden voor de luchtvaartsector misschien in de toekomst nog wel andere zullen volgen. Bijgevolg moeten we iets doen.

Het klopt natuurlijk dat de lidstaten ook een rol moeten spelen bij de controle van de kredietwaardigheid en de financiële gezondheid van de luchtvaartmaatschappijen. Dat is juist, maar het is aan ons om op Europees niveau een beschermingsmechanisme uit te werken waardoor de gestrande reizigers niet in de kou blijven staan. We roepen de Commissie dan ook op om versneld werk te maken van een concreet voorstel, te meer er inderdaad - u heeft ernaar verwezen - via allerlei andere wetgeving al systemen bestaan - onder meer voor mensen die pakketreizen bestellen - in de vorm van een garantiefonds, enz. Er bestaat in zekere zin dus een ongelijkheid tussen mensen die een vlucht via een touroperator bestellen en anderen die online een ticket bestellen. Het lijkt mij ook iets dat we moeten oplossen.

U bent bezig, heb ik gehoord, met het horen van de belanghebbenden. U wilt in de loop van volgend jaar een voorstel indienen. Ik denk dat we echt wel iets sneller moeten proberen te handelen en niet moeten wachten tot eind volgend jaar, maar misschien wat vroeger op zoek moeten gaan naar een oplossing. Laten we dus snel over een concreet wetgevingsvoorstel spreken zodat we een discussie kunnen organiseren over de concrete modaliteiten van een vorm van faillissementsverzekering.

Ik wil tenslotte zeggen dat ik heel blij ben te horen van de commissaris dat er een soort algemene mededeling zal komen over het passagiersrecht in de luchtvaartsector. We weten dat de huidige wetgeving niet volledig noch overal op dezelfde manier en op een goede manier wordt toegepast, dus dat vraagt om onze aandacht en we gaan daar zeker op terugkomen.

3-253

**Gesine Meissner, im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion.** – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank für Ihre Antwort, Herr Kommissar. Ich bin auch Mitglied im Verkehrsausschuss und finde es sehr wichtig, dass wir diese Frage jetzt auf der Tagesordnung haben. Brian Simpson hat sie ja bereits für uns vorgestellt.

Es gibt im Verbraucherschutz, wie er derzeit besteht, tatsächlich eine Lücke, was Flugreisende angeht. Diese Lücke betrifft die Insolvenzen von Flugunternehmen, das wurde bereits thematisiert. Aus meiner Sicht ist es ganz wichtig, Verbraucherrechte hochzuhalten. Das tun wir auch. Wir versuchen, die Verbraucher zu schützen, soweit es geht.

Ich möchte noch einen Aspekt aus der Sicht unserer Fraktion hinzufügen, der bisher hier keine Rolle gespielt hat, den ich aber bei den Überlegungen auch für wichtig halte. Denn wir wollen natürlich, dass die Verbraucherrechte geschützt werden, dass die Verbraucher aber auch Wahlmöglichkeiten haben. Bei den Überlegungen, wie man diese Lücke schließen kann, kann es durchaus sein, dass, ein Vorschlag, den Sie in der Kommission erarbeiten, zu einer Überregulation führt, die vielleicht dann Innovationen bei Angeboten in diesem Bereich behindern könnte.

Verbraucherrecht heißt ja auch, dass man eine Auswahl zwischen verschiedenen Angeboten haben sollte, die es bei Fluglinien zum Beispiel gibt. So gab es ja beispielsweise die Entwicklung, dass jetzt statt Pauschalreisen teilweise sehr günstige Flugreisen angeboten und von den Verbrauchern auch gerne angenommen werden.

Damit Sie mich nicht missverstehen: Ich möchte auf keinen Fall die Verbraucherrechte schmälern! Mir ist auch der Schutz dieser Rechte sehr wichtig, und wir brauchen ein passendes Instrument dafür. Wir sollten aber schon sehen, welche Gesichtspunkte wir berücksichtigen müssen, damit auch tatsächlich im Bereich der Angebote im Flugverkehr weiterhin eine große Vielfalt bestehen bleibt und auch neue Angebote auf den Markt kommen können, die Verbraucher aber trotzdem geschützt werden und nicht auf irgendwelchen finanziellen Problemen sitzenbleiben, wenn tatsächlich eine Fluggesellschaft bankrottgehen sollte oder Insolvenz anmelden muss.

In diesem Sinne freue ich mich, dass Sie gesagt haben, Sie arbeiten an einer Antwort. Die Richtung war ja klar, es könnte auch einen Hilfsfonds geben. Ich bin sehr gespannt auf die Diskussion im Ausschuss, vielleicht sogar noch in diesem Jahr.

3-254

**Eva Lichtenberger**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die finanziellen Voraussetzungen für den Marktzutritt von Fluglinien wurden ja schon im Verkehrsausschuss diskutiert. Und damals war die Frage von Garantiefonds schon auf dem Tisch. Diese Frage wurde damals offensichtlich von der Mehrheit als nicht genügend wichtig oder bedeutend angesehen.

Jetzt gibt es Fälle, die wirklich Anlass geben, nachzudenken und nachzuregeln. Denn nachgeregelt muss hier werden. Erstens erfordert es unsere ständige Aufmerksamkeit, dass Fahrgastrechte, die wir hier zum Schutz der Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten beschließen, eingehalten werden.

Die Frage des *denied boarding* und die vielen Fälle von *denied boarding*, die wir leider verzeichnen müssen, zeigen, dass jedes existierende Schlupfloch sofort genützt wird. Das braucht unsere Beobachtung, das braucht das Nachregeln. Wir werden also wahrscheinlich auf die Lösung eines Garantiefonds oder einer Versicherung kommen müssen, um Passagiere hinreichend gegen solche Geschäftspraktiken abzusichern. Denn man muss sich ja nur die Geschichte dieses letzten Falles genau anschauen: Da gab es am letzten Tag noch Meldungen, dass ohnehin alles in Ordnung sei, und viele Leute haben sich dann darauf verlassen.

Bei so einer Lösung muss allerdings garantiert sein, dass alle Beteiligten einen fairen Beitrag leisten und es nicht zu einer Situation kommt, wo wenige Fluglinien, unter anderem *Low Cost Airlines* sich gemütlich zurücklehnen und das Risiko von den anderen tragen lassen. Denn ein fairer Markt schützt nicht nur Passagiere, sondern er schützt auch die Mitbewerber vor unlauteren Praktiken.

3-255

**Ryszard Czarnecki**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! W ciągu ostatnich 9 lat na obszarze Unii Europejskiej zbankrutowało blisko 80 linii lotniczych. Była tu mowa, że ostatnio w czasie wakacji zbankrutowały tanie linie SkyEurope, zostawiając tysiące klientów z wykupionymi już biletami. Ta sytuacja powtarza się. Nie cierpią na tym oczywiście posiadacze prywatnych samolotów, tylko ludzie często mniej zamożni, którzy przez wiele miesięcy odkładają pieniądze na zakup biletu na lot za granicę. Myślę, że w tej sytuacji, Parlament Europejski jako członek Komisji Transportu i Turystyki musi bardzo mocno nalegać, aby Komisja Europejska przyjęła zasady prawnej ochrony pasażerów - klientów, a więc ochrony również finansowej. Stworzenie specjalnej rezerwy na odszkodowania dla pasażerów klientów bankrutujących linii może zapobiec sytuacjom takim jak w ostatniej dekadzie, kiedy pieniądze definitywnie straciło co najmniej kilkanaście tysięcy ludzi. To jest konkret, którego oczekują od nas obywatele państw członkowskich Unii Europejskiej.

3-256

**Jaromír Kohlíček**, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Děkuji panu kolegovi Brianu Simpsonovi za hezký úvod do problematiky. V poslední době zkrachovalo v rychlém sledu několik leteckých společností. Nejedná se pouze o ty nízkonákladové, ale jsou to zejména tyto společnosti. Pokud by se nejednalo o stovky cestujících v destinacích, odkud návrat domů není nijak jednoduchý, nic zásadního by se nedělo. Čas od času mívají jednotlivé sektory průmyslu problémy a řešení se nakonec většinou najde. V tomto případě šlo o tisíce osob, často s malými dětmi, bez odpovídajících finančních prostředků. Je tedy

nutné dát jasný signál, že řešení známe. Jde o kapitálovou přiměřenost a pojištění na návrat. Věřím, že Komise i členské státy Evropské unie jsou schopny problém cestujících urychleně vyřešit. Problémy leteckých společností ovšem bude nutno řešit jiným způsobem. Krize odvětví vyžaduje odpovídající instrumenty a já věřím, že budou použity.

3-257

**Juozas Imbrasas, EFD frakcijos vardu.** – Ekonomikos kritimo laikotarpiu įmonių, o ir skrydžių bendrovių bankrotai – ne išimtis. Lietuvoje šiais metais vykdoma bankroto procedūra Lietuvos skrydžių bendrovei „FlyLAL“. Tai yra viena iš dešimčių Europos skrydžių bendrovių, kurios bankrutavo šiais metais. Nors Europos Parlamento priimtuose teisės aktuose ir numatytos pakankamos garantijos ir kompensacijos keleiviams, jeigu jie dėl oro bendrovės kaltės negali laiku išvykti numatytu maršrutu arba turi problemų dėl bagažo, tačiau tai gali būti užtikrinta tik jeigu oro bendrovė neturi finansinių problemų. Tačiau bendrovei iškelus bankroto bylą, bilietus įsigiję keleiviai paprastai visai praranda savo lėšas. Todėl, kadangi oro linijų bendrovių veiklą stebi ir licencijuoja bei skrydžiams leidimus išduoda nacionalinių vyriausybių institucijos, oro bendrovės bankroto atveju, Komisijai rekomendavus, vyriausybės galėtų ir privalėtų nedelsdamos grąžinti bendrovės keleiviams pinigus už įsigytus bilietus, o vėliau regresu tvarka juos atgautų iš bankrutuojančios bendrovės. Galima diskutuoti ir dėl pasiūlymo, kurį pateikė ponas B. Simpsonas dėl rezervinių kompensacijų fondo. Problema aktuali, galima diskutuoti, ieškoti geriausio sprendimo, papildant Europos Parlamento ir Tarybos priimtą reglamentą dėl oro susisiekimo paslaugų teikimo Bendrijoje bendrųjų taisyklių. Taip prisidėtume prie keleivių, kurie naudojasi oro linijų paslaugomis, apsaugos.

3-258

**Artur Zasada (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Jest oczywiście i należy przyjąć to jako punkt wyjścia w tej tak potrzebnej dyskusji zainicjowanej przez pana Briana Simpsona, że zobowiązania linii lotniczych wobec pasażerów nie wygasają nawet w przypadku bankructwa operatora.

Dlatego ze zdumieniem wysłuchałem wyjaśnień rzecznika SkyEurope. Ronald Schranz wyraził ubolewanie z powodu powstałych niedogodności dla podróżnych. Podkreślam słowo „niedogodności”. Jednocześnie oświadczył, że oczekujący w zagranicznych portach lotniczych klienci bankrutującego przedsiębiorstwa muszą sami poszukać alternatywnych możliwości powrotu. Według rzecznika sprawa dotyczyła kilku tysięcy osób, ale nie był on w stanie podać ich dokładnej liczby. Dla przedstawiciela SkyEurope była to tylko statystyka. Zapomniał on jednak, że w tej liczbie zawartych było wiele tysięcy osobistych dramatów pasażerów nie mogących dotrzeć do swoich domów, rodzin czy miejsc pracy. Powyższy przykład pokazuje, że trzeba jak najszybciej uregulować tę sprawę. SkyEurope była spółką giełdową, więc mieliśmy na jej temat więcej informacji. W przypadku innych tanich linii bywa różnie. Być może niedawny koszmar z Bratysławy powtórzy się na innym europejskim lotnisku.

Aktualnie toczy się gorąca dyskusja, w ramach której proponowane są różne rozwiązania tego ważnego problemu. Jest mowa o specjalnym funduszu utworzonym z dopłat do biletów lotniczych, czy też tzw. ubezpieczeniu od upadłości. Są to cenne inicjatywy, nie pozostające jednakże bez wpływu na ceny biletów. W czasach kryzysu potrzebujemy procedury, która z jednej strony pomoże pasażerom, z drugiej zaś nie będzie komplikować i tak trudnej sytuacji finansowej linii lotniczych.

Dlatego zwracam się do pana Komisarza z pytaniem i propozycją: czy częściowym rozwiązaniem nie mogłaby być idea *sky solidarity*, w której zawarta byłaby zasada współodpowiedzialności wszystkich linii lotniczych za pasażerów? Właśnie solidarność – idea mi, jako Polakowi, szczególnie bliska powinna być odpowiedzią i wyzwaniem możliwym do natychmiastowego zastosowania. Moja propozycja polega na tym, aby pasażerowie bankrutującego operatora znajdujący się na lotnisku mieli możliwość skorzystania z samolotu innej linii lotniczej udającego się w tym samym kierunku, oczywiście pod warunkiem, że na pokładzie byłyby wolne miejsca. Ewentualne rozliczenia następowałyby pomiędzy zainteresowanymi operatorami. Bardzo proszę pana Komisarza o odpowiedź.

3-259

**Olga Sehnalová (S-D).** – Vážený pane komisaři, dámy a pánové, krach letecké společnosti SkyEurope poukázal na obecný problém nízké spotřebitelské ochrany pasažerů leteckých společností. Není to problém virtuální, měla jsem možnost se s několika klienty postiženými krachem této letecké společnosti setkat osobně. Byli jimi shodou okolností hosté z partnerského francouzského města Chateau d'Ain, kteří přijeli na setkání do města mého působení Kroměříže na východě České republiky. Jejich zpáteční cesta byla opravdu frustrujícím zážitkem s nucenou jednodenní přestávkou strávenou na pražském letišti.

Hovořím o této zkušenosti proto, abych zdůraznila, že SkyEurope nebyla standardní low cost leteckou společností. Poskytovala svým pasažerům obdobné služby jako klasické aerolinie a létala na významná letiště. Jejich služeb proto využívali zákazníci širokého spektra. Pro klienty, kterým nejde primárně o termín cesty, ale zejména o cenu letenky, byla SkyEurope v České republice přednostní volbou. Společnost SkyEurope byla také jedním z nejvýznamnějších klientů největšího českého letiště Praha-Ruzyně. Krachem SkyEurope však nebyli postiženi pouze lidé na letištích, ale také 280 000 dalších klientů, kteří si zakoupili letenky. Podle dostupných informací se letenky prodávaly ještě těsně před vyhlášením bankrotu.

Lidé, kteří si nekoupili letenky prostřednictvím kreditní karty, nemají prakticky šanci na vrácení peněz. Letecké společnosti nemají povinnost se ze zákona pojistit proti úpadku, a tak některé z nich toto pojištění neuzavírají. Pasažér tak musí přihlásit svoji pohledávku jedinečně do konkurzního řízení. Šance na vrácení peněz touto formou je mizivá. Je tedy čas s tím něco dělat. Já bych chtěla poděkovat Výboru pro dopravu, že tento podnět přijal za svůj, i Komisi, že se bude tímto problémem zabývat. Věřím, že navrhne takové řešení, které posílí důvěru klientů v sektor letecké dopravy, který byl tak dramaticky postižen ekonomickou krizí ve světě.

3-260

**Oldřich Vlasák (ECR).** – Vážená paní předsedající, dámy a pánové, letošní velké krachy leteckých společností nás nutí se opětovně zamyslet, zda je jednotný vnitřní trh leteckých dopravců v pořádku. Přestože zkrachovalo několik významných přepravců a situace v tomto sektoru se bude vzhledem k růstu cen paliv a zpomalení ekonomického růstu i nadále spíše zhoršovat, není podle mého názoru rozhodně důvod k panice. Než se proto překotně pustíme do svazující regulace, měli bychom si připomenout, že díky liberalizačním opatřením Evropské unie došlo v letecké přepravě k velkému rozmachu nízkonákladových dopravců a zesílení konkurence mezi všemi leteckými společnostmi v Evropské unii.

Dříve vysoce regulované odvětví s drahými letenkami se tak proměnilo v dynamický sektor, jehož služby díky přijatelným cenám v Evropské unii využívá stále více cestujících, kteří by si to dříve nemohli dovolit. Pečlivě proto přemýšlejme, jak posílit ochranu spotřebitelů, v tomto případě klientů leteckých společností, aniž bychom ohrozili fungující trh leteckých dopravců. Návrh na zavedení povinného pojištění leteckých společností proti úpadku byl již jednou v nedávné minulosti Evropským parlamentem navržen. Je proto namístě se zamyslet, jak tento návrh uvést v život.

3-261

**Christine De Veyrac (PPE).** – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président de la Commission, chers collègues, la question orale dont nous débattons ce soir révèle, et beaucoup l'ont dit, l'existence d'un véritable vide juridique qui laisse les passagers sans garantie en cas de faillite d'une compagnie aérienne.

Certes, la législation européenne protège les personnes ayant acheté leur billet dans le cadre d'un voyage à forfait, mais elle ne protège pas celles qui achètent leur billet sur internet. Comme Saïd El Khadraoui l'a dit, les habitudes des consommateurs ont évolué avec le développement d'internet et le législateur doit suivre cette évolution afin de protéger nos concitoyens européens. Un grand nombre de voyageurs achètent désormais leurs billets d'avion par internet. Sachant que les compagnies *low cost* vendent leurs billets presque exclusivement en ligne, ce sont particulièrement les jeunes et les personnes aux revenus les moins élevés qui sont concernés par ce phénomène. Il n'est pas acceptable que ces passagers ne disposent d'aucun recours si la compagnie auprès de laquelle ils ont acheté leur billet fait faillite. Et ce d'autant plus que, ces derniers mois, le secteur du transport aérien vit une crise sans précédent entraînant une forte baisse de la fréquentation des avions. Nous savons tous que cette crise est plus importante que celle qui avait touché le secteur après le 11 septembre, et que de nombreuses compagnies ont fait faillite.

Il est donc nécessaire que la Commission européenne – et je sais, Monsieur le Vice-président, que vous en êtes conscient – nous propose, dès que possible, de véritables solutions qui permettent de protéger les passagers dans le cas où la compagnie sur laquelle ils devaient voler fait faillite, et ce quel que soit le mode de réservation des billets.

3-262

**Magdalena Álvarez (S-D).** – Señora Presidenta, señor Comisario, expreso mi satisfacción por la pregunta sobre la que hoy estamos debatiendo, pero entiendo que solamente contempla uno de los casos posibles de cierre de una empresa: el de quiebra o insolvencia financiera.

Existen, sin embargo, otro tipo de situaciones por las que las compañías aéreas pueden cerrar o cesar en sus actividades. Me refiero a los casos de suspensión de licencia por motivos de seguridad, cierre voluntario o cierre por cualquier otro motivo que no sea económico. Estas situaciones acarrearán idénticos problemas a los que hoy estamos comentando de indefensión del pasajero, ya que o no se le reembolsa el billete, o si se hace, en algunas ocasiones este reembolso conlleva importantes gastos.

Entiendo que el Reglamento sobre indemnizaciones a los pasajeros, en caso de retraso y anulación, podría ser uno de los instrumentos, pero creo que no es suficiente.

En este contexto me gustaría pedir que la Comisión considere la posibilidad de proponer medidas legislativas para otros casos —estos casos que he comentado— que van más allá de la quiebra y que no están contemplados en la legislación comunitaria en vigor. De otra forma, corremos el riesgo de que con toda buena intención nos quedemos cortos y solo demos cobertura jurídica a una situación particular, dejando fuera a numerosos pasajeros que también pueden sufrir por el cierre de una compañía aérea, aunque el motivo del mismo no sea económico o financiero.

3-263

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S-D).** – O piață internă eficientă necesită o politică de protecție a consumatorilor la nivel comunitar. De-a lungul anilor, Uniunea Europeană a acționat și, prin măsurile luate, a asigurat creșterea nivelului de siguranță al consumatorilor și în domenii precum pachetele de servicii turistice și drepturile călătorilor.

Cu toate acestea, o mare majoritate din plângerile primite de la consumatorii europeni se referă la nerespectarea drepturilor pasagerilor care călătoresc cu avionul. Multe dintre aceste plângeri provin de la pasageri ale căror zboruri au fost anulate datorită falimentului operatorilor aerieni sau al operatorilor de turism. În aceste cazuri, pentru consumatori, problemele apar atunci când zborul nu este operat conform planificării.

Deși Directiva 90/314 a Consiliului Uniunii Europene privind pachetele turistice protejează pasagerii în cazul insolvenței operatorului de turism, aceasta nu îi protejează în cazul biletelor de avion ce sunt vândute individual. De asemenea, în caz de refuz la îmbarcare, compensațiile sunt excluse în cazul circumstanțelor extraordinare, printre care se numără și falimentul companiilor aeriene. Conform unui studiu recent, în Uniunea Europeană, pentru perioada 2000-2008, numărul falimentelor operatorilor aerieni s-a ridicat la 79. 41% dintre operatorii aerieni care au dat faliment în perioada 2005-2008 sunt operatori aerieni care efectuau zboruri regionale, iar 17% erau operatori aerieni *low-cost*.

Cum am putea, deci, acționa pentru o mai bună protecție a pasagerilor în astfel de situații? Poate un sistem de asigurare a pasagerilor care să acopere aceste situații, un sistem de supraveghere mai riguros, elaborarea unor prevederi legislative care să asigure compensații pentru pasageri în astfel de situații.

3-264

**Zita Gurmai (S-D).** – Madam President, passengers' compensation in the case of airline bankruptcies is not only a question of money. It is related to even more serious issues such as safety, accessibility of services and competitiveness. In times of crisis, every economic field is in a precarious situation, and airline transport is no exception to that. It is crucial not to let people's confidence in the operators waver, because this would lead to a considerable decrease in demand and thus would weaken even more the financial situation of airlines. This may influence Europe's whole economic situation and competitiveness.

Passengers' compensation is also in relation to the accessibility of services. I believe that every person in Europe must have the choice to travel by air if he or she so wishes. For this you must admit that we need safe but low-cost airlines that are affordable for everyone. These airlines should have a stable financial background, because safety does not only mean safety in case of an accident but also implies that, if I purchase an air ticket, I should be confident that by the time of the trip there will actually be an aeroplane to take me to my destination.

All this gives our oral question its importance, and the fact that there have been almost 80 airline bankruptcies Europe since 2000 gives it urgency. The need for a clear regulation in this field is evident. Therefore, I would kindly ask the Commissioner to seriously consider this matter and come up with a viable solution as soon as possible.

3-265

**Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Przewodniczący Komisji! Około miesiąc temu doszło do bankructwa jednej z nisko kosztowych linii lotniczych. Wniosek o upadłość zgłosiły wtedy linie SkyEurope. Pomimo że analitycy rynku lotniczego już od dłuższego czasu zapowiadali bankructwo tej firmy, to jednak SkyEurope jeszcze w przeddzień złożenia wniosku o upadłość sprzedawała bilety na swoje loty, w efekcie czego setki pasażerów linii zostało pozbawionych nie tylko możliwości odbycia zaplanowanych podróży, ale przede wszystkim zostało też narażonych na wymierne straty finansowe spowodowane upadkiem linii. Firma bowiem wprost poinformowała swoich klientów w oficjalnym komunikacie, że mogą się liczyć z utratą pieniędzy zainwestowanych w bilety.

Przykład SkyEurope jednoznacznie wskazuje na to, że w naszej wspólnej Europie nie dopracowaliśmy się jeszcze przepisów chroniących konsumentów usług lotniczych przed negatywnymi konsekwencjami upadku linii lotniczych. Problem jest o tyle istotny, że od 2000 r. na świecie zbankrutowało 77 linii lotniczych. Na przykład w 2004 r. zbankrutowała polska linia Air Polonia, dlatego oczekuję, że Komisja przedstawi zasady ochrony konsumentów przed negatywnymi skutkami możliwych bankructw linii lotniczych.

3-266

**Antonio Tajani, Vicepresidente della Commissione.** – Signora Presidente, gli onorevoli De Veyrac, Vlasák e Gurmai hanno posto l'attenzione sulla causa del fallimento, cioè la crisi economica e le difficoltà che il settore del trasporto aereo in questo momento affronta, siano esse compagnie *low cost* o grandi compagnie.

Il Parlamento europeo e la Commissione, in perfetta sintonia, hanno varato una serie di iniziative per rispondere alla crisi. Pensiamo alla questione del congelamento degli *slot*, votata a stragrande maggioranza da questo Parlamento, o alla riforma del *Single European Sky*, che è una grande riforma del sistema del trasporto aereo, che permette alle compagnie di risparmiare sul costo del carburante perché abbiamo ridotto le tratte che collegano un aeroporto a un altro.

Proprio per dare una risposta concreta a tutte le compagnie aeree, siano esse *low cost* siano esse compagnie non *low cost*, ho sollecitato i 27 ministri dei Trasporti dell'Unione europea affinché facciano entrare in vigore prima del previsto la riforma del *Single European Sky*, che è un buon modo per permettere alle compagnie di risparmiare carburante e di evitare quindi situazioni negative per il loro assetto economico. Il mancato fallimento di compagnie aeree non soltanto non

provocherebbe danni ai passeggeri ma sarebbe oltretutto straordinariamente importante per difendere i posti di lavoro. Non dobbiamo dimenticare che questa crisi finanziaria ed economica non deve trasformarsi in una crisi sociale allarmante.

Sappiamo che nel settore del trasporto aereo esistono problemi a livello mondiale: si pensi a cosa è successo con *Japan Airlines* qualche settimana fa, quando sono stati annunciati tagli del personale. Il nostro dovere deve essere non solo quello di tutelare i cittadini ma anche fare in modo che delle buone compagnie aeree possano essere operative, salvaguardando quindi posti di lavoro.

La Commissione europea – e scusate se mi dilungo – e il Parlamento hanno lavorato in questa direzione. Posso affermare che, grazie al nostro lavoro, abbiamo permesso la nascita di un nuovo modello di compagnia aerea completamente privato: si pensi al caso di *Olympic Airways*, al caso di Alitalia e al caso – che mi auguro si risolva – di *Austrian Airlines*. Per cui non ci sono più compagnie di Stato che, in caso di difficoltà, fanno pagare i loro debiti dai cittadini ma i debiti devono essere pagato da chi ha eventualmente sbagliato.

Voglio anche rispondere alla domanda dell'onorevole Magdalena Alvarez, che ha posto un tema sicuramente interessante: credo di poter accogliere la sua proposta aggiungendo, nel lavoro che stiamo portando avanti, il suggerimento di tutelare anche i passeggeri di compagnie che chiudono la loro attività non per fallimento ma perché non rispettano i criteri di sicurezza. Nella fattispecie, il passeggero è danneggiato come quello che aveva acquistato un biglietto presso una compagnia poi fallita. Il principio deve essere quello di tutelare il cittadino passeggero quando subisce un danno, cioè quando non viene imbarcato. E questa è la filosofia che ispira – e continuerà a ispirare – la mia azione fino a quando sarò Commissario, perché possano essere tutelati i passeggeri in tutti i settori del trasporto e nella stessa maniera.

Ecco perché anche domani e dopodomani, in occasione del Consiglio Trasporti che si svolgerà a Lussemburgo, affronteremo la questione dei diritti dei passeggeri del trasporto marittimo e fluviale, che è una scelta della Commissione, sostenuta dal Parlamento, che va nella direzione della tutela del cittadino europeo. Se vogliamo davvero conquistare la fiducia dei cittadini e ottenere risultati positivi come quelli ottenuti in Irlanda, dobbiamo legiferare dimostrando ai cittadini che le istituzioni comunitarie sono dalla loro parte, che questi non sono i regni della burocrazia ma sono luoghi dove si lavora per tutelare e difendere i diritti dei cittadini europei.

3-267

**Die Präsidentin.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen. Die Abstimmung über eventuelle Entschließungsanträge findet während der nächsten Tagung statt.

### *Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149)*

3-268

**Edít Herczog (S-D), írásban.** – Az utazási szokások megváltozása magával hozta, hogy egyre többen utaznak saját maguk szervezte keretek között, elkerülve az utazási irodák szolgáltatásait. A fapados légitársaságok ennek köszönhetően mind a bevétel, mind a piaci részesedés tekintetében az elmúlt évtized nyertesei voltak. Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Korábban Magyarországon is komoly gondot okozott az utazási irodák sorozatos csődje, a televízióban rendszeresen találkozhattunk külföldön „ott felejtett” családok képeivel. Ne engedjük, hogy a következő csődhullám a fapados cégeken söpörjön végig, milliós károkat okozva a gazdaságnak és az utasoknak is. Arról nem is beszélve, hogy biztonsági szempontból is kockázatos, ha egy vállalat nem rendelkezik biztos anyagi háttérrel a működéshez.

Éppen ezért a következő célokra kell koncentrálnunk: meg kell fontolni a cégalapítás szigorítását: a repülőtársaságok esetében további tőke- és szervezeti garanciák megkövetelését; gondoskodni kell arról, hogy szigorítsák a pénzügyi és a működésre vonatkozó beszámolók rendjét, a szűrőpróbaszerű ellenőrzések gyakoriságát; a szektor mérete indokolja, hogy rendszeres európai adatfelvételek vizsgálják a társaságok járatpolitikáját, panaszkezelési mechanizmusát, a pénzvisszatérítések egyszerűségét; még egyszerűbbé kell tenni a határokon átnyúló panaszok kezelését a hasonló ügyekben a jövőben. Ahhoz, hogy valóban fogyasztóközpontú közös piacot építsünk Európában, hatékonyabbá kell tennünk a határokon átnyúló panaszok és kártérítési igények kezelését!

3-269

### **23 - Bericht über die Durchführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2157/2001 des Rates vom 8. Oktober 2001 über das Statut der Europäischen Gesellschaft (SE) (Aussprache)**

3-270

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Aussprache über die mündliche Anfrage an die Kommission über den Bericht über die Durchführung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2157/2001 des Rates vom 8. Oktober 2001 über das Statut der Europäischen Gesellschaft (SE) von Klaus-Heiner Lehne im Namen des Rechtsausschusses (O-0092/2009 - B7-0211/2009).

3-271

**Klaus-Heiner Lehne, *Verfasser*.** – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Der Europäische Rat hat im Jahr 2001 einen Beschluss über das Statut der europäischen Aktiengesellschaft gefasst. Dieser ist aus verschiedenen Gründen in dieser Form erst am 8. Oktober 2004 in Kraft getreten. Und wie es bei der Gesetzgebung in der Europäischen Union üblich ist, bittet man die Kommission, nach Ablauf eines bestimmten Zeitraums einen Bericht über die Anwendung und die Umsetzung vorzulegen, um daraus dann gegebenenfalls Schlussfolgerungen über die Frage der Notwendigkeit von Änderungen dieses Rechtsaktes zu ziehen.

Der 8. Oktober 2004 war vor ziemlich genau fünf Jahren. Die Frist war fünf Jahre, es liegt aber kein Bericht der Europäischen Kommission vor. Da wir uns alle gesetzestreu verhalten und die Kommission als Hüterin der Verträge in einem besonderen Maße dazu berufen ist, sich gesetzestreu zu verhalten, war dies Anlass, im Rechtsausschuss nachzufragen, was es denn damit auf sich hat, dass dieser Bericht noch nicht vorliegt und auch nicht entsprechend vorbereitet ist. Wir wollen der Kommission ganz einfach die Gelegenheit geben, das uns gegenüber begründen zu können. Jedenfalls wird dadurch deutlich, dass das Parlament und insbesondere der Rechtsausschuss seiner Kontrollverpflichtung gegenüber der Kommission in vollem Umfang nachkommt.

Ich werde meine fünf Redeminuten nicht in Anspruch nehmen, sondern würde mich freuen, wenn die Kommission jetzt auf der Basis dieser kurzen, von mir interpretierten mündlichen Anfrage antworten würde.

3-272

**Antonio Tajani, *Vicepresidente della Commissione*.** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli parlamentari, vorrei innanzitutto ringraziare a nome del Commissario McCreevy, che sostituisco stasera in quest'Aula, la commissione giuridica e il presidente Lehne per aver sollevato tali questioni. A titolo personale – essendo stato per quasi quindici anni membro di questa Assemblea – sono ben lieto che il Parlamento eserciti la sua funzione di controllo, perché è un giusto stimolo che spinge la Commissione a lavorare meglio.

Per quanto riguarda le prime due domande che sono state poste, sono lieto di informarvi che i lavori per la preparazione della relazione richiesta sono in fase avanzata. La Commissione ha richiesto uno studio esterno, che dovrebbe essere pronto entro la fine di quest'anno e che costituirà una base fattuale solida per l'elaborazione della relazione. La Commissione analizzerà in modo approfondito questo studio e ascolterà con attenzione i pareri delle parti interessate. La relazione potrebbe quindi essere pubblicata nella seconda metà del prossimo anno e sarà inoltrata al Parlamento europeo e al Consiglio.

Ovviamente, i tempi e il contenuto esatti saranno decisi dalla prossima Commissione. La relazione conterrà un'analisi delle quattro possibilità di modifica previste espressamente dall'articolo 69 del regolamento e, in questa fase, la Commissione non ha ancora una posizione né su questa né su altre possibili modifiche allo statuto. Dobbiamo aspettare i risultati dello studio esterno e delle ulteriori consultazioni e controllare attentamente ogni fattore e, se necessario, anche gli eventuali risultati dei negoziati sullo statuto della società privata europea.

Per quanto riguarda la terza domanda, la tempistica e il contenuto delle eventuali ulteriori azioni da adottare in futuro alla luce dei risultati dell'analisi realizzata, dovranno essere però decisi dalla nuova Commissione, la quale – ne sono convinto – sarà molto attenta e interessata ad ascoltare il punto di vista del Parlamento prima di adottare eventuali ulteriori nuovi provvedimenti.

3-273

**George Sabin Cutaș, *în numele grupului S-D*.** – Ideea unei societăți europene datează încă din anii '50 și a fost reluată după intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului de la Roma, în cadrul obiectivului de piață comună.

Actualul statut al companiei europene are valoare simbolică, a unei întreprinderi europene și beneficiază de o anumită libertate de stabilire și de mobilitate. Numeroase companii folosesc statutul companiei europene pentru a-și arăta caracterul unic european, aceasta reprezentând totodată și un instrument esențial pentru companiile care caută să-și dezvolte strategiile de fuziune transfrontalieră.

Astfel, unul din principalele avantaje ale unei societăți europene este acela că sediul social al acesteia poate fi transferat din statul membru în care a fost înmatriculat într-un alt stat membru, fără ca desființarea societății sau crearea unei noi persoane juridice să fie necesară. Cu toate acestea, societatea europeană este departe de obiectivele inițiale ale unui statut autonom dirijat de o legislație unică. Funcționarea practică este, prin urmare, deficentă. Legislația nu este uniformă și depinde de particularitățile legislațiilor naționale, iar mobilitatea societății europene este restricționată de prevederile care interzic stabilirea sediului social sau sediului central în state membre diferite.

Astfel, una din libertățile fundamentale comunitare este restricționată, și anume, cea privind libertatea de mișcare a companiilor. Raportul Comisiei Europene privind aplicarea regulamentului, pe care l-a menționat dl comisar, cred că va trebui să includă un studiu cu privire la posibilitatea amplasării administrației centrale și a sediului social al unei societăți

europene în state membre diferite și va trebui să ia în considerare o revizuire a regulamentului, pentru a merge mai departe în sensul creării unui statut autonom pentru acest tip de companie.

3-274

**Antonio Tajani, Vicepresidente della Commissione.** – Signora Presidente, ho ascoltato attentamente gli interventi del presidente Lehne e dell'altro parlamentare che ha partecipato alla discussione. È vero che il regolamento sullo statuto della società europea è completato da una direttiva riguardante il coinvolgimento dei lavoratori e che il termine di attuazione scadeva l'8 ottobre 2004, data di entrata in vigore del regolamento della società europea.

Tuttavia, soltanto otto Stati membri hanno adottato le misure necessarie entro il termine previsto e il recepimento della direttiva sul coinvolgimento dei lavoratori è stato completato in tutti gli Stati membri solo all'inizio del 2006. Siamo stati pertanto obbligati a rinviare la relazione per consentire che il regolamento della società europea fosse effettivamente in vigore in tutti gli Stati membri per un periodo sufficiente a rendere possibile l'elaborazione di una relazione indicativa sulla sua applicazione.

Queste sono le ragioni del ritardo. Per quel che mi riguarda, non posso che concordare con il presidente Lehne, auspicando che si possa recuperare il tempo perduto e dare risposte concrete all'Unione europea sul tema della società europea, a partire dalla metà del prossimo anno, con delle indicazioni concrete che possano veramente dare delle risposte alle istanze provenienti non soltanto dal Parlamento ma anche dal mondo economico e del lavoro dell'intera Unione europea.

3-275

**Die Präsidentin.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

#### *Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149)*

3-276

**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S-D), na piśmie.** – Sprawne funkcjonowanie rynku wewnętrznego jest zależne nie tylko od wyeliminowania barier handlowych między państwami, ale także od reorganizacji struktury produkcji w wymiarze wspólnotowym. W tym celu, już w latach 70'tych Komisja Europejska wystąpiła z propozycją stworzenia ram prawnych dla Spółki Europejskiej. W 2001r. zostało przyjęte rozporządzenie 2157/2001 w sprawie statutu Spółki Europejskiej. Pomysł nie przyniósł oczekiwanych rezultatów, do dzisiaj niewiele ponad 100 firm przekształciło się w Spółkę Europejską. Idea ta ewoluowała jednak w kierunku uwzględnienia w ramach Spółki Europejskiej również małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw, czego owocem jest propozycja Komisji z marca 2008r. dotycząca Statutu Europejskiej Spółki Prywatnej. Biorąc pod uwagę negatywne doświadczenie ze Spółką Europejską, bardzo ważne jest, aby Komisja miała stały nadzór nad stosowaniem rozporządzenia 2157/2001. W tym właśnie celu samo rozporządzanie przewiduje, że najpóźniej pięć lat po jego wejściu w życie, Komisja przedstawi sprawozdanie z jego stosowania. Rozporządzenie weszło w życie w 2004r. W związku z tym chciałabym zapytać, kiedy Komisja zaprezentuje stosowne sprawozdanie oraz jakie działania podejmie w oparciu o powstałą analizę?

3-277

#### **24 - Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**

3-278

#### **25 - Schluss der Sitzung**

3-279

*(Die Sitzung wird um 22.20 Uhr geschlossen.)*