

ЧЕТВЪРТЪК 2 АПРИЛ 2009 Г.
JUEVES 2 DE ABRIL DE 2009
ČTVRTEK, 2. DUBNA 2009
TORSdag DEN 2. APRIL 2009
DONNERSTAG, 2. APRIL 2009
NELJAPÄEV, 2. APRILL 2009
ΠΕΜΠΤΗ 2 ΑΠΡΙΛΙΟΥ 2009
THURSDAY, 2 APRIL 2009
JEUDI 2 AVRIL 2009
GIOVEDI' 2 APRILE 2009
CETURTDIENA, 2009. GADA 2. APRĪLIS
2009 M. BALANDŽIO 2 D., KETVIRTADIENIS
2009. ÁPRILIS 2., CSÜTÖRTÖK
IL-HAMIS, 2 TA' APRIL 2009
DONDERDAG 2 APRIL 2009
CZWARTEK, 2 KWIETNIA 2009
QUINTA-FEIRA, 2 DE ABRIL DE 2009
JOI 2 APRILIE 2009
ŠTVRTOK 2. APRÍLA 2009
ČETRTEK, 2. APRIL 2009
TORSTAI 2. HUHTIKUUTA 2009
TORSdagEN DEN 2 APRIL 2009

4-002

PRESIDE: MIGUEL ANGEL MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ
Vicepresidente

4-003

1 - Apertura de la sesión

4-004

(Se abre la sesión a las 9.00 horas)

4-005

2 - Presentación de documentos: véase el Acta

4-006

3 - Evaluación semestral del diálogo UE-Belarus (propuestas de resolución presentadas): véase el Acta

4-007

4 - Conciencia europea y totalitarismo (propuestas de resolución presentadas): véase el Acta

4-008

5 - Papel de la cultura en el desarrollo de las regiones europeas (propuestas de resolución presentadas): véase el Acta

4-009

6 - Etiqueta ecológica comunitaria - Participación voluntaria en el EMAS (debate)

4-010

El Presidente. – El siguiente punto es el debate conjunto sobre

- el informe de Salvatore Tatarella, en nombre de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria, sobre la propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativo a un sistema de etiqueta ecológica comunitaria (COM(2008)0401 - C6-0279/2008 - 2008/0152(COD)), y

- el informe de Linda McAvan, en nombre de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria, sobre la propuesta de Reglamento del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo relativo a la participación voluntaria de organizaciones en un sistema comunitario de gestión y auditoría medioambientales (EMAS) (COM(2008)0402 - C6-0278/2008 - 2008/0154(COD)).

4-011

Salvatore Tatarella, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volevo innanzitutto ringraziare tutti coloro che hanno collaborato efficacemente alla stesura della presente relazione: i colleghi relatori ombra della commissione Ambiente; la Presidenza ceca; i funzionari della Commissione europea e, non per ultimi, i preziosi funzionari di tutti i gruppi politici per l'ottimo lavoro svolto. Grazie alla loro preziosa collaborazione è stato possibile l'accordo in prima lettura.

Assumendomi per conto del Parlamento europeo la responsabilità della revisione del dossier sul marchio di qualità ecologica Ecolabel, mi sono mosso nella direzione di imprimere un'accelerazione a questo sistema che, attraverso l'aggiornamento costante dei requisiti ambientali per i prodotti che se ne fregiano, spinge le imprese a un continuo sforzo virtuoso finalizzato a elevare complessivamente gli standard di qualità ecologica dei prodotti immessi sul mercato. Incrementando la produzione, la diffusione di prodotti e servizi col marchio Ecolabel, otterremo nei prossimi anni significativi benefici ambientali, permanenti e crescenti, in termini di risparmio energetico, di riduzione dell'inquinamento atmosferico e di risparmio di acqua. Ecolabel è un marchio di qualità ecologica, a partecipazione volontaria, che intende promuovere la diffusione di prodotti e servizi che presentino un ridotto impatto ecologico durante tutto il ciclo di vita, offrendo ai consumatori informazioni accurate, non ingannevoli e scientificamente corrette.

La revisione del presente regolamento si inserisce nel più ampio piano di azione europea per la produzione e il consumo sostenibile ed è strettamente connessa alla revisione di EMAS e alla direttiva su Ecodesign. La revisione del regolamento era stata già prevista dal legislatore comunitario: il sistema deve essere rivisto alla luce dell'esperienza acquisita e va modificato in modo da accrescerne l'efficacia, migliorarne la pianificazione e semplificarne il funzionamento. Scopo del marchio è quello di orientare i consumatori verso prodotti in grado di ridurre l'impatto ambientale. Ad oggi, l'esperienza Ecolabel mostra luce ed ombre: da un lato, un numero sempre maggiore di imprese chiede di ottenere la certificazione di qualità e nei settori più diversi, riconoscendone quindi il valore selettivo e trainante – trattasi infatti, di una certificazione molto apprezzata dai consumatori più attenti alla responsabilità sociale delle imprese; dall'altro, vanno rilevati alcuni problemi: la scarsa conoscenza del marchio presso il grande pubblico; la rapida obsolescenza dei criteri rispetto all'evoluzione dei mercati; le lungaggini burocratiche che rallentano la partecipazione degli operatori. Il nuovo marchio Ecolabel assumerà una nuova veste, non solo grafica ma anche di contenuti. Diventerà più attraente, vedrà esteso il suo ambito di applicazione a nuovi prodotti: contiamo entro il 2015 di passare dagli attuali 25 gruppi a un numero doppio di 40-50 gruppi. Sono state previste campagne di promozione; è stato implementato un *budget* per il marketing di 9.500.000 euro e sarà fatto un sito internet per il quale sono previsti 15.000 euro.

Il principio che più ha interessato i relatori ombra e che ha trovato concordi le altre istituzioni è stato che Ecolabel deve non solo essere una certificazione di un risultato raggiunto ma piuttosto uno strumento dinamico in continua evoluzione, una molla propulsiva che spinga costantemente i produttori e i prodotti verso standard più alti di qualità ambientale, valutando di continuo le eccellenze sul mercato e stabilendo in base ad essi nuovi criteri. Quello che vogliamo garantire è un controllo sull'intero ciclo di vita del prodotto, che consenta di tenere in massima considerazione l'impatto ambientale in tutte le fasi della produzione e consenta a tutti gli operatori del settore, come anche alle ONG, di partecipare attivamente al processo di revisione dei criteri sul compromesso.

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

4-012

El Presidente. – Señor Tatarella, ¿me puede escuchar? Usted tiene cinco minutos ahora y dos minutos al final del debate; si usa usted los siete minutos ahora, no tendrá usted ningún tiempo al final del debate, pero le toca a usted elegir si quiere utilizar los siete ahora o si quiere utilizar los cinco o los seis que lleva ya y dejarse un minuto para responder a las intervenciones de los colegas.

4-013

Salvatore Tatarella, relatore. – Accolgo il suo invito.

4-014

Linda McAvan, rapporteur. – Mr President, like Mr Tatarella, I would like to begin by thanking the people closely involved with helping us reach first-reading agreement today on the EMAS report. I would like to thank the shadows, who are here today, the Commission, who have been very helpful in getting agreement, and to the Czech Presidency, who are not here to hear my thanks. Thanks also go to the staff in Parliament and the groups, and to my own assistant, Elizabeth, who played a big role in making sure we were here today. It all went very fast, from the time we started discussing it to today, so we now have agreement before the election.

EMAS is a voluntary scheme, which provides a framework to assist businesses and organisations to improve their environmental performance. It started 14 years ago and has had some modest success with about 4 000 participants – which, if you think about it, is not such a huge number in the overall European Union. The Commission set a target of increasing that to 35 000 participants. That is a very ambitious target. It is almost a 10-fold increase.

I think it is right that we should try and improve the take-up of EMAS, because otherwise its impact is going to remain limited. But if we are to increase the impact, we also have to retain the environmental integrity of the programme. I think the agreement we reached today does achieve that balance between, hopefully, making it more attractive to people, while at the same time retaining the environmental integrity.

We have made some changes which we have agreed with the Commission, and I think they are important. Firstly, corporate registration, so that a company or organisation with more than one site can actually register once in one country, which is very important. This Parliament had to register three times – in Luxembourg, France and Belgium – in order to get EMAS. From what I hear from the staff, it was not an easy thing to do. So that kind of change is important. Also, cluster registration for organisations involved in the same sector; reduced fees, and lighter reporting requirements for SMEs – I think EMAS is a bit too burdensome for small organisations, so it does need to change – and better alignment with ISO 14001. Particularly important to me is the introduction of sectoral support documents. I think the Commission is going to work very hard at this, and this will help organisations to benchmark themselves against similar organisations. Core indicators will also be introduced. These are very important to improve the programme and help people on the outside look at organisations and see how they are doing.

I do hope these will encourage people to take part in EMAS, not because I want to play a numbers game and see EMAS competing with ISO, but because I think the scheme is a good one and could help us to meet our sustainability criteria.

Today the eyes of the world are very much on London, where world leaders are gathered to talk about the financial downturn and the global banking crisis. There will be some, no doubt, who are wondering why we are sitting here talking about environmental auditing at a time when organisations and companies are feeling the financial strain. They will see this kind of initiative by the Commission as a distraction. But I think that is wrong. For me and my Socialist colleagues, the green agenda is very much part of the solution to emerging from the financial crisis that we are in. We need to invest in energy and renewables, and we need to be cutting our environmental footprint. Although EMAS is a very modest programme in the big scheme about climate change which the Commissioner has worked so hard on, I think it nevertheless plays a role in helping the European Union and the rest of the world to cut our environmental footprint.

4-015

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα κατ' αρχάς να ευχαριστήσω και να συγχαρώ τους εισηγητές, κυρία McAvan και κύριο Tatarella, για τις εξαιρετικές εκθέσεις τους σχετικά με τις προτάσεις αναθεώρησης του οικολογικού σήματος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του συστήματος οικολογικής διαχείρισης και οικολογικού ελέγχου.

Πρόκειται για δύο σημαντικά μέτρα περιβαλλοντικής πολιτικής που αποτελούν αναπόσπαστο τμήμα του σχεδίου δράσης για την αιεφόρο κατανάλωση και παραγωγή. Είναι θετικό ότι μπορεί να επιτευχθεί συμφωνία σε πρώτη ανάγνωση. Η συμβολή των μελών του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου ήταν καθοριστική· πέτυχε να διατηρήσει ακέραιη την περιβαλλοντική στόχευση της πρότασης της Επιτροπής, αλλά και να θέσει ακόμη πιο φιλόδοξους στόχους σε αρκετά και μάλιστα σημαντικά σημεία.

Η επίτευξη συμφωνίας σε πρώτη ανάγνωση επιβεβαιώνει τη θέληση των θεσμικών οργάνων να αντιμετωπίσουν άμεσα τα προβλήματα που δημιουργεί η μη αιεφόρος κατανάλωση και παραγωγή. Η αναθεώρηση του συστήματος οικολογικής διαχείρισης και οικολογικού ελέγχου, του καλουμένου EMAS, παρέχει σε οργανισμούς και επιχειρήσεις απ' όλον τον κόσμο, τη δυνατότητα πιο αποτελεσματικής διαχείρισης των περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων των δραστηριοτήτων. Το EMAS συντελεί στη διαρκή βελτίωση των περιβαλλοντικών επιδόσεων των οργανισμών και επιχειρήσεων, συμπεριλαμβανομένης βεβαίως και της τήρησης της σχετικής περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας. Προσφέρει επίσης στους οργανισμούς και επιχειρήσεις πρόσθετα οφέλη, όχι μόνο μέσω της άμεσης εξοικονόμησης χρημάτων, αλλά και μέσω του περιορισμού γραφειοκρατικών διαδικασιών κατά την υποβολή εκθέσεων, καθώς και της παροχής κινήτρων από τις αρμόδιες αρχές των κρατών μελών.

Με την αναθεώρηση του συστήματος ήμασταν σε θέση να ανταποκριθούμε στην αυξανόμενη ζήτηση των καταναλωτών για αντικειμενικές, αμερόληπτες και αξιόπιστες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις των προϊόντων που αγοράζουν. Το αναθεωρημένο σύστημα θα μας δώσει τη δυνατότητα να αυξήσουμε την ποικιλία προϊόντων με οικολογικό σήμα στην αγορά, και να ενθαρρύνουμε τις επιχειρήσεις να βελτιώσουν τις περιβαλλοντικές επιδόσεις τους. Εξάλλου, ο λογότυπος του οικολογικού σήματος θα τους προσφέρει πολλά ανταγωνιστικά πλεονεκτήματα. Για παράδειγμα: μείωση των τελών, επιβολή αυστηρότερων πρότυπων για το περιβάλλον, αποκλεισμό των επικίνδυνων ουσιών, απλούστευση των κριτηρίων και σύνδεσή τους με την πολιτική δημοσίων συμβάσεων και άλλες πολιτικές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Επίσης, διευρύνεται το πεδίο εφαρμογής του αναθεωρούμενου κανονισμού για το οικολογικό σήμα. Ο κανονισμός γίνεται πιο ευέλικτος και ικανός να ανταποκριθεί στις νέες περιβαλλοντικές προκλήσεις και προτεραιότητες. Δεδομένου ότι αποτελεί νομοθετική πράξη-πλαίσιο, ο κανονισμός για το οικολογικό σήμα δεν ορίζει συγκεκριμένα κριτήρια για τα προϊόντα. Αντ' αυτού, προβλέπει τον καθορισμό περιβαλλοντικών κριτηρίων για επιλεγμένες κατηγορίες προϊόντων, με στόχο να μπορεί ο λογότυπος να απονέμεται στα καλύτερα προϊόντα ανά κατηγορία.

Σήμερα, βρισκόμαστε ενώπιον μιας ευρύτατης διάδοσης στην αγορά περιβαλλοντικών σημάτων, εικόνων, κειμένων, τα οποία μπορεί να προκαλέσουν σύγχυση στον καταναλωτή. Από τις εικόνες δασών πάνω σε δοχεία που περιέχουν επικίνδυνες ουσίες, μέχρι τους ισχυρισμούς για φαγητά με ουδέτερο ισοζύγιο εκπομπών άνθρακα ή ακόμη και για οικολογικά αυτοκίνητα. Έτσι ο καταναλωτής δεν ξέρει ποιον να εμπιστευτεί. Η συμβιβαστική πρόταση κανονισμού για το οικολογικό σήμα συντελεί στην άρση των αμφιβολιών.

Πριν από τον καθορισμό κριτηρίων και κατηγοριών προϊόντων για τα τρόφιμα και τα ποτά, θα προηγηθεί μελέτη σχετικά με την προστιθέμενη αξία που μπορεί να προσφέρει το σήμα. Μετά την μελέτη αυτή και την έκδοση απόφασης της Επιτροπής μέσω της διαδικασίας της κοινοβουλευτικής εξέτασης, θα μπορεί να απονεμηθεί το λογότυπο του οικολογικού σήματος στα προϊόντα που έχουν τις καλύτερες περιβαλλοντικές επιδόσεις.

Ελπίζω ότι το Κοινοβούλιο θα υποστηρίξει πλήρως αυτή τη θετική δέσμη προτάσεων. Το οικολογικό σήμα είναι μια από τις λίγες περιπτώσεις πραγματικής και άμεσης επικοινωνίας ανάμεσα στους πολίτες και την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στα θέματα του περιβάλλοντος. Χάρη στο οικολογικό σήμα οι πολίτες λαμβάνουν καλύτερα τις αποφάσεις τους σχετικά με τις αγορές τους και, κατ' επέκταση, συμμετέχουν άμεσα και ενεργά στην καταπολέμηση της μη αειφόρου κατανάλωσης.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή είναι σε θέση να αποδεχθεί τις συμβιβαστικές δέσμες προτάσεων στο σύνολό τους, ώστε να επιτευχθεί συμφωνία σε πρώτη ανάγνωση και για τους δύο κανονισμούς.

Ευχαριστώ και πάλι τους εισηγητές για την εξαιρετική εργασία τους.

4-016

Νικόλαος Βακάλης, *Εισηγητής της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας, Έρευνας και Ενέργειας*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα κατ' αρχήν να συγχαρώ τον εισηγητή και όλους όσους συμμετείχαν στις διαπραγματεύσεις με το Συμβούλιο. Θεωρώ πολύ ισορροπημένο το κείμενο που προέκυψε από τη συμφωνία μεταξύ Κοινοβουλίου και Συμβουλίου. Μ' αυτό, ενισχύουμε περαιτέρω το οπλοστάσιό μας στον αγώνα κατά της κλιματικής αλλαγής.

Δεν σας κρύβω, ότι το αρχικό κείμενο, η πρόταση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, με είχε ελαφρώς απογοητεύσει, όχι μόνο διότι δεν ήταν αρκετά φιλόδοξο αλλά διότι αδυνατούσε και να διορθώσει ακόμη αδυναμίες που είχαν προκύψει από την μέχρι τώρα εφαρμογή του συστήματος οικολογικής σήμανσης.

Όμως, το κείμενο που καλούμαστε να ψηφίσουμε ακυρώνει τους αρχικούς μου φόβους. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, με ικανοποιεί το γεγονός ότι ένας ευαίσθητος τομέας προϊόντων, όπως αυτός των τροφίμων και των ζωοτροφών, δεν θα συμπεριληφθεί εάν δεν ολοκληρωθεί προηγουμένως μια μελέτη σκοπιμότητας για τη θέσπιση αξιόπιστων κριτηρίων. Κριτηρίων που να καλύπτουν τις περιβαλλοντικές επιδόσεις σ' όλη τη διάρκεια κύκλου ζωής αυτών των προϊόντων.

Με ιδιαίτερη χαρά διαπίστωσα, ότι η Επιτροπή πλέον θα υποχρεούται να θεσπίζει μέτρα για τον καθορισμό ειδικών κριτηρίων χορήγησης οικολογικού σήματος για κάθε κατηγορία προϊόντων εντός εννέα μηνών από την έναρξη των διαβουλεύσεων για την οικολογική σήμανση με το Συμβούλιο.

Η προθεσμία αυτή είναι υψίστης σημασίας διότι έχουν παρατηρηθεί μέχρι τώρα μεγάλες καθυστερήσεις κατά το στάδιο αυτό. Προσυπογράφω τον αποκλεισμό από το σύστημα οικολογικής σήμανσης προϊόντων που είναι καρκινογόνα, τοξικά ή επιβλαβή για το περιβάλλον, αλλά και την αναφορά στη μείωση των πειραμάτων σε ζώα.

Θετική εξέλιξη αποτελεί και το γεγονός ότι η διαδικασία συμμόρφωσης δεν εγκαταλείπεται, αλλά γίνεται πιο ευέλικτη. Με χαροποιούν επίσης και οι συχνές αναφορές στις μικρομεσαίες επιχειρήσεις οι οποίες, όπως όλοι γνωρίζουμε, είναι η ραχοκοκαλιά της ευρωπαϊκής οικονομίας. Ιδιαίτερα σήμερα, που βρισκόμαστε αντιμέτωποι με τη μεγαλύτερη οικονομική κρίση των τελευταίων ετών.

Τελειώνοντας κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν θα ήθελα να σας κρίνω ότι, όσον αφορά τις δημόσιες προμήθειες, προσδοκούσα να κρατήσουν μια πιο τολμηρή, πιο θαρραλέα στάση. Φοβάμαι ότι ο συμβιβασμός που προέκυψε είναι κατώτερος των περιστάσεων. Παρόλα αυτά, θα τονίσω για μια τελευταία φορά ότι το αποτέλεσμα είναι ικανοποιητικό.

4-017

Anders Wijkman, on behalf of the PPE-DE Group. – Mr President, we have been waiting quite a long time for the Commission's plan on sustainable production and consumption. We received the proposal a few months ago. Although it is comprehensive, unfortunately I have to say that the overall content is rather limited and poor. Having read some of the early drafts of the Commission proposals, I know that, in the Environment DG in particular, there were much more ambitious plans to start with. So it is obvious that work on these issues has to continue and be more in-depth in the future.

Today we are discussing the Ecolabel scheme. The revision offers a good opportunity for this label to move away from the margins of the market, to capture a much larger share of the market and to help push demand for eco-friendly products. The new rules represent a significant improvement. They are more dynamic, will apply a life-cycle approach and should be able to attract significantly more attention and interest among both companies and consumers. As Mr Dimas said, they will be able to help consolidate eco-labelling and do away with a number of voluntary schemes that are very often confusing to consumers.

However, we still have a problem, namely how to inform consumers and the markets about the label. Marketing support for this label has been very limited in the past. The resources allocated have been minuscule compared to the resources behind a lot of branding in the market in general. I hope this will change, first of all by businesses seeing the Ecolabel as an important instrument in the future. I also hope, as Mr Vakalis said, that public procurement will in the future expand in green areas and use the Ecolabel as a platform.

I also hope that the Commission will be more proactive in its support for the scheme. I thank all those who have been involved in the work. I think we have done quite a good job in a few weeks. We managed to clear up some of the confusion around food products, in particular fishery products, in the final hours.

Finally, I would like to refer back to Ms McAvan, who made a reference to the financial crisis and the meeting in London today. I think that reference is very relevant. We are facing at least three parallel crises today – the financial crisis, the climate crisis and what I would call the ecosystem crisis, or overuse of natural resources. It is only by tackling the root causes together – that is to say, unsustainable use of resources – through investing in low-carbon and eco-friendly production and products, that we will be able to build a better future. I think this Ecolabel scheme is one of many instruments that can help us to do that.

4-018

Gyula Hegyi, on behalf of the PSE Group. – Mr President, there are different tools to sanction environment-conscious behaviour in our societies. There are regulations, directives, resolutions. We can forbid certain materials and activities. We can have a ban on dangerous substances and subsidise green technology.

But in a market economy there are other tools as well. We can target consumers through the products they buy, recommending those products which are environmentally friendly and fit the requirement of sustainable development.

This directive takes an important step in the right direction by simplifying the passage toward getting the Ecolabel. The Socialist Group supports the report. My comrades and I have tabled many amendments to it, and those amendments are either favoured by the Committee on the Environment or their spirit is built into the compromise package. So our group will vote in favour of the report at the final vote today.

We think that the environmental effect of products must be a very important issue in the EU, and the whole idea of an Ecolabel gives a very useful orientation for consumers.

Of course the Ecolabel should be given to the most environmentally friendly products, and the information should be clear and correct. In these hard times of the economic crisis, we should respect the interests of producers as well, and I am sure that this report balances the interests of the consumers and industry.

It is very important to involve small and medium-sized enterprises in the Ecolabel process and, therefore, the cost of the authorisation cannot be too high. I, as a shadow rapporteur of the Socialist Group, pushed the report in the direction of even lower costs, and I thank the rapporteur for accepting our arguments.

For the SMEs I mentioned, it is obvious that we should have to abolish the bureaucratic difficulty of the authorisation. We have to simplify the procedure for getting the Ecolabel because, in its present form, the decision procedure is very slow and bureaucratic.

Mostly the smaller enterprises do not have enough money, time and energy for the slow process of getting an Ecolabel. It is very important to analyse the whole life cycle of a product, from production to destruction. It is not enough to judge the environmental characteristics of the ready-made product; the substances of the product, the process of production, the transport of the goods and the method for its destruction or decomposition should also be studied before an Ecolabel is given.

It is obvious, at least to us Socialists, that the products which have gained an Ecolabel must not contain dangerous substances. It was a very difficult question during our debates, but finally we were able to reach a very good compromise about dangerous substances.

The main rule is that Ecolabelled products must not contain dangerous substances, but there can be some very few exceptions. Specific goods which do not have equivalent alternatives, and which have a higher overall environmental performance compared with other goods of the same category, may get exceptions. The best and most well-known example is the energy-saving light bulb, which has many environmental advantages but contains mercury.

The issue of foodstuffs has also been widely debated. In this case the criteria should be further developed. The Ecolabel has a real added environmental value. It considers the whole life cycle of the product, and the use of the Ecolabel should not cause confusion in the minds of consumers when compared with other food labels. The Commission shall adopt measures to establish specific Ecolabel criteria for each product group, including foodstuffs. Not later than three months after the final report and the draft criteria, the Commission shall consult the European Union Ecolabel board on a draft proposal on this issue.

As I have already said, the Ecolabel shall be based on environmental performance throughout the life cycle of the best products on the internal market. That is why the report allows for setting the ambition level of Ecolabel criteria on a case-by-case basis between 10% and 20% of the best performing products on the market, thus ensuring that the scheme rewards only the most environmentally friendly products but offers sufficient choice to consumers.

4-019

Johannes Lebech, for ALDE-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Først og fremmest tak til ordføreren og skyggeordføreren for et godt samarbejde. Jeg synes, at vi har nået et rigtigt godt resultat. Sidste efterår udgav Verdensnaturfonden en rapport, der viste, at vi bliver nødt til at have to planeter, når vi når frem til midten af 2030'erne, hvis vi fortsætter med at bruge jordens ressourcer, som vi gør lige nu. Vi bruger simpelthen for meget her på kloden. Vi bruger det hurtigere, end det kan nå at regenerere sig selv. Det må vi lave om på, hvis vi vil forhindre en økologisk krise. Måden, vi bruger ressourcerne på, skal omlægges, og det er ikke kun politikerne, der har et ansvar her, det gælder også producenten og forbrugeren.

Det miljømærke, vi nu reviderer, er et værktøj, der skal fremme produktionen og salget af varer, der er fremstillet på en bæredygtig måde. Et af mærkets svagheder er, at det ikke er særlig kendt blandt forbrugerne (og her er jeg i øvrigt enig med Wijkman), og derfor er det heller ikke særlig attraktivt for producenter. Hvis ikke producenten kan bruge mærket til at markedsføre en god vare, hvorfor så forsøge at fremstille den mest bæredygtige inden for en varegruppe? Det er også en problemstilling, vi har forsøgt at ændre med de nye ideer. Der bliver nu stillet et klart krav til medlemslandene og Kommissionen om, at de skal komme med en handlingsplan, der fremmer kendskabet til miljømærket gennem forskellige kampagner.

Vi har haft en stor diskussion om fødevarer, og jeg synes, at vi er kommet frem til en fornuftig løsning. Kommissionens forslag om kun at se på forarbejdede fødevarer og kun at se på transport, emballage og forarbejdning - det bliver ikke enden. I stedet har vi bedt om en omfattende undersøgelse omkring, hvordan vi bedst får fødevarer med ind under miljømærkeordningen, der så kan sikre, at vi får gjort tingene på den rigtige måde fra starten af og ikke får forvirring med hensyn til økologisk mærkning i øvrigt.

Til slut vil jeg gøre opmærksom på, at mærket nu også belønner varer, der er fremstillet til at holde længe, og som kan genanvendes. Vi er nemlig nødt til at ændre vores måde at fremstille og forbruge varer på, hvis vi ønsker, at vores økonomier skal være bæredygtige. Det kræver, at vi kigger på hele varens livscyklus, så vi kan forbedre, hvordan råvarerne behandles under produktionen af en vare, og ikke mindst hvordan vi skiller os af med et produkt efter brug. Jeg håber, at det værktøj, vi her har forbedret, vil blive et godt værktøj til fremme af en mere bæredygtig klode.

4-020

Liam Aylward, on behalf of the UEN Group. – Mr President, I too would like to congratulate the rapporteur and the shadow rapporteur. Climate change is one of the top priorities for Europe, as well as for the rest of the world. We sometimes feel helpless as individuals against this massive global challenge but, at the end of the day, people need to be encouraged to do their bit, as little contributions such as the 'Power of One' do add up. And the Power of One is perhaps something we have not promoted enough.

Today we are voting on a voluntary scheme which certifies companies to label their products as environmentally friendly. This enables people to help the environment directly and to reduce emissions in their everyday living and buying.

Labelling is a clear and simple measure to promote energy efficiency, ethical production and development of greener technologies. Also, from a health perspective, this scheme would protect people from potentially carcinogenic, mutagenic, reprotoxic or biocumulative products which can sometimes be traced in textiles.

The scheme categorises products and services that range from tissue paper to footwear to campsites. It also provides means to reduce animal testing and child labour. I emphasise child labour because I was recently involved in a report in that area and I am very conscious of that.

Ireland and Europe can benefit by further promoting and using the scheme. There are currently 13 companies in Ireland, mostly from the accommodation sector, that are Ecolabelled but we need to encourage further participation. And we also need a very serious information campaign sponsored by the European Union.

4-021

Satu Hassi, Verts/ALE-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, kiitoksia molemmille esittelijöille aivan erinomaisesta työstä. Olen hyvin iloinen siitä, että saamme näistä molemmista asioista nyt lopullisen lainsäädäntöpäätöksen ennen vaaleja.

Ekomerkin osalta pidän keskeisimpinä kahta periaatetta. Ensinnäkin sitä, että merkki on dynaaminen eli sen kriteerit tiukkenevat sitä mukaa, kun tieto ja taito ja tekniikka kehittyvät ja saamme ympäristön kannalta yhä parempia tuotteita. Toinen keskeinen asia on se, että merkki annetaan vain ympäristön kannalta parhaille tuotteille. Erityisesti kemianteollisuushan on ajanut sellaista linjaa, että ekomerkki pitäisi myöntää tuotteille, jotka vain noudattavat tämänhetkisiä lakeja. Esimerkiksi jokin aika sitten yritettiin ajaa ekomerkkiä tekstiileille, joissa on sellaisia palonestokemikaaleja, jotka on jo kielletty sähkölaitteissa. Onneksi tämä yritys silloin torjuttiin ja nyt saamme lainsäädännön, joka on selkeä tässä asiassa.

Saamme lainsäädännön, jonka nojalla kuluttaja voi luottaa siihen, että tuotteessa ei ole esimerkiksi syöpää aiheuttavia tai lisääntymiskykyä haittaavia kemikaaleja. Poikkeus voidaan myöntää vain tiukoin kriteerein, mikäli kyseisessä tuoteryhmässä ei ole vaihtoehtoa tai jos tällaista terveydelle haitallista ainetta tarvitaan tuotteeseen, jonka kokonaisympäristövaikutukset ovat merkittävästi pienemmät kuin muiden saman tuoteryhmän tuotteiden. Tämä on tärkeää ekomerkin uskottavuudelle. On myös tärkeää, että merkin kriteerit ovat dynaamiset, eli sitä mukaa kun pystytään tekemään ympäristön kannalta parempia tuotteita, kriteereitä tiukennetaan.

Tärkeä keskustelun aihe oli myös se, ulotetaanko ekomerkki koskemaan ruokaa. Olen iloinen siitä, että nyt on tehty ratkaisu, jolla vältetään se, että kuluttajien keskuudessa aiheutettaisiin hämmennystä ekomerkin ja luomumerkinnän, luonnonmukaisesti tuotetun ruoan, välillä eli että tehdään käytettävyyss- ja toteutettavuustutkimus ennen kuin ekomerkkiä sovelletaan ruokaan. Jos ja kun ekomerkki joskus tulevaisuudessa ulotetaan ruokaan, esimerkiksi kalaan, silloin on tärkeää, että kriteerit eivät kata vain ruoan tuotantotapaa, vaan myös muita ympäristövaikutuksia, esimerkiksi kuljetukset.

Hyvät ystävät, vähän samantapainen keskustelu kriteerien dynamisuudesta kuin tämän ekomerkin kohdalla on ollut käynnissä myös energiamerkinnän kohdalla. Mielestäni on hyvin tärkeää, että sekä ekomerkki että energiamerkki noudattavat samaa periaatetta, eli kriteerit tiukkenevat sitä mukaa, kun tietomme ja taitomme ja tekniikka paranevat.

4-022

Roberto Musacchio, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio anch'io i relatori. Marchio ecologico ma anche sostenibile: questa è la sfida del nuovo regolamento quadro sull'Ecolabel. Il regolamento è un primo passo. Parlamento europeo e Consiglio hanno svolto un negoziato proficuo e costruttivo, almeno per gli aspetti concernenti le sostanze chimiche. Spetta ora alla Commissione, in termini operativi, entro un anno, sviluppare i criteri stabiliti, attuare un piano di lavoro e definire una prima lista di prodotti. I singoli Stati membri devono organizzare l'autorità competente nazionale, il raccordo con l'organismo europeo e devono adottare i criteri di sostenibilità come vincolanti.

Ma che cos'è la sostenibilità ambientale per l'Ecolabel? Significa applicare i criteri di produzione innovativi all'intero ciclo del prodotto, dalla riduzione delle emissioni nelle tecniche produttive, alla riduzione del consumo di energia di beni primari come l'acqua, alla localizzazione delle produzioni in prossimità del consumatore finale, che rappresenta una vera e propria rivoluzione. Questa è la sfida che ci viene richiesta da una lotta coerente al cambiamento climatico ma anche a una vera innovazione del modo di produrre. Per lo sviluppo di questi criteri, la Commissione e il nuovo organismo comunitario sono invitati a coinvolgere attivamente i protagonisti attivi e le migliori esperienze, avvalendosi delle innovazioni da loro sperimentate nei propri cicli produttivi, rendendole quindi accessibili e trasparenti.

Il rispetto delle norme sociali sul lavoro è parte integrante di questi criteri, anche se il regolamento ancora mantiene, per una incomprensibile pressione da parte del Consiglio nel negoziato finale, un termine legislativamente inaccettabile. Si dice "se del caso": nello sviluppo sostenibile le clausole sociali, il lavoro regolare non possono essere un'opzione da applicare solo se è il caso. Chiare ed efficaci sono invece le esclusioni a concorrere al marchio di qualità ecologica per quei prodotti che

contengono comunque sostanze chimiche tossiche, pericolose per l'ambiente, cancerogene o dannose per la riproduzione. Attenzione: su questo il controllo del Parlamento europeo sarà particolarmente inflessibile.

4-023

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, indispensabile la relazione Tatarella sulla marchiatura comunitaria di qualità ecologica: mi complimento con il relatore e la commissione e ritengo che chiare e certe debbano essere le modalità e l'originalità dei prodotti. Questo sia per la produzione del consumatore, senz'altro, ma anche per rendere giustizia alle imprese ed evitare che la falsa e sleale concorrenza, che spesso viene fatta da chi non rispetta gli stessi parametri sociali ed ecologici nella produzione dei prodotti, continui a fare danni ed distorsioni del mercato, così come avviene.

Quindi, rispettare le stesse regole di protezione ambientale, e ovviamente gli stessi diritti sociali dei lavoratori: il compito delle istituzioni dovrebbe essere quello di vigilare su questo. Mi complimento ancora con il relatore per l'ottima relazione.

4-024

Martin Bursík, úřadující předseda Rady. – Pane presidente, vážený pane komisaři, vážené poslankyně, vážení poslanci a hosté, předně dovolu, abych se omluvil za to, že jsem se nedostavil včas a poděkoval za příležitost, že mohu hovořit hned po prvním kole příspěvků frakcí.

Velmi si vážím diskuze, protože se ukazuje, že příspěvky, které zatím zazněly, oceňují práci zpravodajů, Komise a Rady. Zdá se, že je zde v principu nad těmito dvěma návrhy, které předpokládáme v prvním čtení, konsenzus, a to mě velmi těší. Tyto návrhy jsou součástí šestého akčního programu Společenství a balíčku k němu, které zveřejnila Komise v červenci roku 2008, a z toho návrhu akčního programu zcela jednoznačně vyplývá, že je potřebné změnit vzorce chování, vzorce spotřeby a vzorce výroby, že způsob, kterým vyrábíme a spotřebováváme, je neudržitelný. Poškozujeme klima, poškozujeme životní prostředí, poškozujeme zdraví obyvatel a neudržitelně vyčerpáváme přírodní zdroje.

Tato problematika je jednou z priorit českého předsednictví a já věřím, že schválením a revizí stávajících nařízení k ekoznačení a k EMAS se podaří z velké části tuto prioritu předsednictví naplnit. Rád bych poděkoval za práci na těchto předpisech Evropské komisi a členským státům, velkým dílem také Evropskému parlamentu, zpravodajce Lindě McAvan za EMAS a zpravodaji Salvatore Tatarellovi za ecolabel a všem dalším, kteří jste se podíleli na této práci.

Co se týče ekoznačení, tak byl díky společné práci Rady a Parlamentu společně s Komisí vytvořen kompromisní text, který vylepšuje dobrovolný systém značení produktů především tím, že zjednodušuje systém k udělování ekoznačky. Co je velmi důležité, že pro spotřebitele by ekoznačka měla být více atraktivní. Umožňuje se rozšíření na další výrobky, podařilo se vyřešit i problém, který se týká možného označování potravinových produktů, a tím pádem spotřebitel bude mít možnost při spotřebitelské volbě zvážit a vzít v úvahu dopady výrobků a služeb na životní prostředí a tohle je velmi důležité.

Pokud jde o kompromisní text, který se týká EMAS, ten zase umožní větší zviditelnění organizací, které se dobrovolně tohoto systému zúčastňují, tím zvýší i atraktivitu. Myslím, že je velmi důležité, že se snižuje administrativní zátěž pro velké, malé a střední podniky. Byla velká debata o nákladech na tento systém a myslím, že jsme našli rozumný kompromis minimálních nákladů, které ale pokryjí transakční náklady na zavedení této značky.

Myslím, že je důležité zdůraznit, že revidovaný systém EMAS se rovněž otevře organizacím, které jsou mimo Evropskou unii, čímž by se měla také zvýšit autorita tohoto systému, což je dáno tím, že se bude směřovat k většímu, globálnějšímu využití tohoto systému.

Jsem přesvědčen, že schválení těchto předpisů bude skutečně přínosem pro evropské podniky, že vytvoří nové příležitosti, které souvisí se současnou krizí i současně s řešením největšího globálního ekologického problému, kterým jsou globální klimatické změny.

Ještě jednou bych rád poděkoval Evropskému parlamentu, zpravodajům, poslancům za plodnou spolupráci na kompromisu a těším se na pokračování této rozpravy.

4-025

Amalia Sartori (PPE-DE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ritengo che il dibattito che c'è stato questa mattina fino a questo momento ha messo in evidenza, come attorno a questo tema ci sia stato grande lavoro e grande condivisione. Il fatto che, probabilmente, EMAS, dopo aver sentito anche il Consiglio si possa chiudere con un accordo in prima lettura e con un solo trilogio, significa proprio questo. E allora, cosa dobbiamo dire e aggiungere a quello che è già stato detto? EMAS ed Ecolabel sono sicuramente strumenti per promuovere le scelte consapevoli, da un lato delle imprese, delle associazioni, delle istituzioni e, dall'altro, dei consumatori. Si deve però migliorare la comunicazione, l'hanno detto molti colleghi che hanno parlato prima di me; lo ribadisco anch'io, perché penso che questo sia il passaggio essenziale.

Abbiamo difatti un sistema internazionale ISO che è conosciuto da tutti, lo testimonia il numero dei registrati. Come Unione europea dobbiamo far capire alle imprese perché scegliere il sistema europeo invece di quello internazionale. Aumentare la consapevolezza ambientale di tutti attraverso il coinvolgimento di sole 4.000-5.000 imprese nell'Unione europea come è avvenuto finora, non è un buon risultato e noi dobbiamo migliorarlo e per migliorarlo serve soprattutto informazione, informazione, informazione.

I comuni, per esempio, non lo sanno che potrebbero essere certificati EMAS dando un grande esempio; oppure forse sicuramente le comunicazioni sono arrivate negli uffici ma non sono ancora penetrate nella mente e nella consapevolezza dei nostri amministratori. Quindi EMAS prevede più partecipazione. I dipendenti di un'organizzazione con EMAS partecipano tutti al miglioramento delle *performance* ambientali: usare meno acqua, usare meglio l'energia, differenziare i rifiuti. Questo dovrebbe diventare un obiettivo da raggiungere, in primis, per coloro che possono essere esempio per gli altri, e poi secondo, per chi ritiene che dall'usare questo metodo può trarre vantaggi per se stessi, le aziende, per la comunità, i nostri consumatori che si sentono più garantiti.

4-026

Richard Howitt (PSE). – Mr President, can I support my colleague, Linda McAvan, and congratulate the members of the Committee on the Environment for bringing forward this report? As Parliament's rapporteur on corporate social responsibility I wanted to make a contribution to this debate by putting the debate on Ecolabelling and EMAS, in terms of reporting by companies, into the wider context of what we are trying to do on corporate responsibility and accountability, and in particular to address the issue of whether voluntary schemes, as against statutory schemes, are the right way forward and whether we should have Europe-focused schemes or a global approach.

The problem from a corporate responsibility point of view is that a proliferation of voluntary schemes can be more costly and less clear, and can actually lead to competition that is wasteful for businesses, consumers and, indeed, for all stakeholders. There is, of course, a temptation for some companies to use the least onerous and least costly – but also least effective – tool.

The problem of voluntarism may also be that it is just not going to be enough in terms of climate change today. I was struck, when the Climate Change Bill went through the domestic Parliament in my own Member State, the United Kingdom, by how the British employers' federation, the CBI, actually said it wanted binding statutory reporting on climate change by business. Given what we are saying in the European Union about what needs to happen on climate change, the question is whether voluntarism will be enough, even with the changes we are agreeing in this report.

Lastly, the issue of global versus European. There are 4 000 companies in EMAS and 35 000 in ISO 14001. Is this because ISO is less onerous, or is it because our companies work in global – and not just European – markets and want a global approach?

I invite the Commission not simply to promote and apply EMAS, which I want to be successful, but also to look outward to establishing and strengthening global initiatives on carbon emission reporting by companies and other aspects of corporate responsibility, so that we get strong global mechanisms and that we then can apply and promote them on our own continent. Let us try both tracks.

4-027

Mojca Drčar Murko (ALDE). – Mr President, European legislation was set to encourage enterprises to improve their products and obtain higher standards of energy efficiency and environmental compliance.

Ecolabelling as a part of the EU action plan on sustainable production, consumption and industrial policy is such a tool. And so is EMAS, the eco-management and audit scheme. It is about striking a balance between regulatory and market-based instruments, with the aim of developing voluntary standards for various products and services or helping to optimise production processes and make more effective use of resources.

Now, the problem is how modern technologies can be used for environmental protection, and how industry or services should be helped in promoting the environmental value of the production. The goal of ecological certificates is to engage synergies with other legal acts that are tackling environmental aspects of the products. EMAS is saving resources: among them, water.

From past experience we know that certificates at various levels were not sufficiently coordinated. Existing voluntary and regulatory instruments were not linked to each other in order to establish synergies. First revision of the EMAS scheme was not encouraging. It was initially expected that EMAS-registered companies would have performed better, since the EMAS environmental requirements are tougher as compared with older and better-known certificates such as ISO 14001. Yet EMAS-registered companies were not performing better, and the system of environmental excellence was weaker as compared with the ISO 14001.

The Commission found reasons for the lack of success – the system is too tough, too expensive and too complex – and has proposed acceptable simplifications.

The rapporteur, Mrs McAvan, added valuable additional modifications. Among them is a line in the definition of EMAS which I saw as particularly important. It would help organisations to proceed more easily from ISO to EMAS standards.

I am confident that our amendments have made the Commission proposal for the regulation better and that we have brought it closer to users. An impartial system of certification will be, we suppose, appreciated also by consumers.

I hope that this will help organisations to choose the most rational systemic approach in order to interconnect different fields of environmental protection.

4-028

Roberta Angelilli (UEN). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto mi congratulo con il relatore per l'ottimo lavoro svolto. Ne sono certa: darà una spinta ulteriore alla diffusione dei prodotti Ecolabel in Europa. In un'epoca in cui i temi ambientali sono all'ordine del giorno e in cui cresce la domanda di prodotti verdi anche in paesi extraeuropei, come per esempio gli Stati Uniti o la Cina, l'Ecolabel sarà uno degli strumenti per rendere i prodotti europei sempre più competitivi sul mercato internazionale. Infatti, il fiore Ecolabel non è solo un contrassegno di qualità ambientale: ma attraverso una revisione continua verso l'alto dei criteri di eccellenza ambientale dei prodotti stessi, l'Ecolabel diventerà un incentivo al continuo miglioramento e all'innovazione.

Il presente testo consentirà una maggiore diffusione dei prodotti Ecolabel, promuovendone la conoscenza, senza tuttavia diminuire le garanzie di tutela della salute dei consumatori. In conclusione, il mio Paese, l'Italia, è ai primi posti in Europa, per il numero di licenze concesse e un gran numero di queste è espresso dal settore del turismo, che proprio da un marchio europeo di riconoscimento della qualità ambientale può ricavare un plusvalore apprezzato e garantito dai cittadini europei.

4-029

Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL). – Herr talman! Den frivilliga miljöledningsordningen Emas innebär i princip att ett företag eller en organisation gör en miljöutredning, tittar på verksamhetens miljöpåverkan, tar fram en miljöpolicy, sätter upp mål och utarbetar handlingsprogram. Tyvärr har Emas hittills inte varit så framgångsrikt, i det att endast 4 200 organisationer har registrerat sig sedan starten 1993, vilket är lågt i jämförelse med de 35 000 organisationer inom EU som har registrerat sig till ISO 14001. En revidering av Emas är därmed berättigad för att helt enkelt göra det mer attraktivt och mindre byråkratiskt för företagen och organisationerna.

I förhandlingarna mellan rådet och parlamentet har flera skärpningar av Emas skrivits in. Exempelvis ska kommissionen ta fram omfattande referensdokument för så många sektorer som möjligt enligt ett prioritetsprogram. Texten innehåller också tydliga skrivningar om att Emas logo inte under några som helst omständigheter får blandas samman med andra produktrelaterade miljömärken. Detta är en klar förbättring.

För ett tag sedan ställde min kollega Jens Holm en fråga till kommissionen, om huruvida alla kommissionens generaldirektorat är anslutna till Emas, vilket Europaparlamentet är. Man skulle ju kunna tycka att EU-institutionerna ska föregå med gott exempel. Men svaret blev att kommissionen inte har något eget internt utsläppsmål och att det bara är fem av kommissionens GD som har anslutit sig till Emas. Det tycker jag är under all kritik och därför vill jag härmed passa på att upprepa frågan till kommissionen: När tänker kommissionen se till att kommissionens alla generaldirektorat ansluter sig till Emas?

4-030

Roberto Fiore (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, capisco perfettamente le buone intenzioni del relatore, ma penso che questo Ecolabel vada contro quelli che sono i grandi problemi oggi dell'agricoltura e della produzione, soprattutto in un momento di crisi. Innanzitutto, io ritengo che sia indispensabile proteggere la produzione nazionale dalla concorrenza sleale – penso a paesi come la Cina, dove addirittura c'è ancora produzione in schiavitù; penso ai *laogai*, i campi di concentramento dove vi è sia produzione agricola che manifatturiera; penso anche a note bibite molto consumate nel mondo, ma di cui addirittura non si conosce la composizione – quindi, proteggere la produzione dalla concorrenza sleale e poi fare in modo che la produzione risponda al fabbisogno nazionale. Noi sappiamo che in questo momento l'Europa ha una bassa produzione di grano e di altri prodotti agricoli e in generale, soprattutto in un momento di crisi, sono preoccupato che questo si possa risolvere in un aumento dei costi per i nostri produttori e non attacchi quello che è il grande problema della crisi e, in realtà, dell'economia nazionale europea, che è la concorrenza sleale.

4-031

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I would like at the outset to congratulate both rapporteurs, Ms McAvan and Mr Tatarella, on the EMAS and Ecolabel reports respectively. These deal with very important areas of eco-management and ecolabelling, the whole area of reduction of waste, reduction of water use and hopefully the reduction of food waste.

If I can be allowed to make particular mention of something which irritates me greatly: in the EU 30% of all food is actually wasted. So-called 'best-before dates' are often far too conservative, resulting in wanton waste through the

discarding of otherwise perfectly edible products. This is part of labelling; let us sort it out and see where we are going on that.

I also have increased reservations that, in our rush to better inform consumers' choice, we may in fact have the opposite effect from that intended by the Health Claims Directive, GM labelling, food information to consumers – that issue is yet to be resolved. And then there is the whole story surrounding ecolabelling. With everyone rushing for front-of-pack status – but even for the back – how will all this information, all worthy in its own right, be put on a product label in legible font and end up actually helping to inform the choice of Joe and Mary Citizen? I have my concerns.

If I may put on my hat as Vice-Chair of the Committee on Fisheries for the moment, I should like to put on the record what appear to be two parallel processes for the ecolabelling of fishery products. In 2005 the Commission adopted a communication to launch the debate on a Community approach regarding the ecolabelling programmes for fishery products. Following this, in 2006 the European Parliament adopted my colleague Carmen Fraga Estévez's report, which urged the Commission to present a proposal for a Community ecolabelling system for fishing products. In 2008 the Maritime Affairs and Fisheries DG announced a proposal for a regulation for a Community ecolabel for fishery products, the adoption of which was foreseen for March 2009. This proposal is still in the pipeline though I now believe we are promised it before the end of the year.

In the mean time, the Environment DG sent the European Parliament a horizontal proposal on the Community Ecolabel scheme covering all products including fishing and aquaculture products, as well as processed agricultural products. Despite the written protests of the chairs of both the Committee on Fisheries and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, these committees were not involved.

But I am pleased to acknowledge on the record today that only recently the Council, Parliament and the Commission have agreed on a declaration on the way forward, which states that, independently of the adoption of the Ecolabel Regulation, the Commission confirms it intends to propose a regulation on ecolabelling of fishery products before the end of the year. It continues that the study foreseen in Article 6(5)(a) of the Ecolabel regulation, dealing with additional aspects such as processing, pre-packaging, packaging and transport, which will examine the feasibility of the extension of the scope of the Ecolabel Regulation to food, including products of fishing and aquaculture, will not influence or pre-judge the adoption of this regulation. This declaration also clarifies that the Ecolabel will be complementary to the Specific Fishery Products Regulation.

4-032

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE). – Reducerea de energie consumată și gestionarea eficientă a resurselor sunt astăzi principii fundamentale pentru un număr considerabil de actori socio-economici. Astfel, din 1993, de la introducerea sistemului comunitar de management de mediu și de audit, aproximativ 4 200 de organizații au fost înregistrate în acest program. Consider necesară consolidarea acestui sistem prin extinderea numărului de organizații care îl aplică și recunoașterea lui ca sistem de mediu etalon.

Palatul Parlamentului din România consumă energie cât un oraș de 20.000 de locuitori. Am propus deja conducerii instituției să adere la acest sistem cât mai repede. Atenția specială acordată organizațiilor mici, precum IMM-uri și autorități locale, este, în opinia mea, un demers important în direcția extinderii la o scară cât mai largă a performanțelor de mediu.

Încurajez Comisia și statele membre să depună eforturi pentru a promova EMAS în special prin acordarea de stimulente în schimbul participării. În ceea ce privește monitorizarea progreselor înregistrate de EMAS, aceasta va conduce la acceptarea sistemului și la crearea de premise pentru o evoluție pozitivă în domeniu.

Cred că propunerea raportoarei de a introduce un manual al utilizatorului este salutară în condițiile în care limbajul și cerințele exprimate vor deveni mai accesibile prin acest instrument. În prezent este în vigoare un ciclu de raportare anual pe care îl găsesc suficient și nu văd de ce ar fi nevoie de introducerea unui nou ciclu de trei ani care s-ar dovedi derutant. Deși sistemul EMAS trebuie să-și dovedească încă viabilitatea și eficiența, susțin continuarea acestuia pe perioada de timp necesară, cu scopul principal de a menține integritatea mediului. Vă mulțumesc.

4-033

IN THE CHAIR: DIANA WALLIS
Vice-President

4-034

Holger Krahmer (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kollegen! Grundsätzlich begrüße ich das Europäische Umweltzeichen. Es ist richtig, dass wir einen neuen Anlauf unternehmen, um dieses Umweltzeichen der Gemeinschaft weiter zu verbreiten. Ich finde es auch richtig, dass wir in Zukunft an der Freiwilligkeit festhalten.

Das Zeichen wird sich künftig nur dann durchsetzen, wenn es klare Kriterien und Maßstäbe gibt, die den Erwerb dieses Zeichens voraussetzen. Hier appelliere ich an die EU-Kommission, vernünftige, klare und verständliche Kriterien zu erarbeiten. Der Anreizgedanke muss dabei im Vordergrund stehen. Es wäre bedauerlich, wenn die Etablierung des Umweltzeichens an Bürokratiehürden scheitert.

Über Erfolg oder Misserfolg des Zeichens entscheidet am Ende der Verbraucher, denn bei ihm muss es auf Akzeptanz stoßen. Auch wenn ich persönlich sehr am blauen Engel, den wir in Deutschland haben, hänge, darf es am Ende keine Geschmacksfrage sein, sondern es kommt darauf an, dass dem Verbraucher auf einen Blick vermittelt wird, welche besonderen Eigenschaften ein Produkt hat. Ein Mehrwert für den Verbraucher entsteht nur dann, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten auf ihre jeweiligen eigenen Zeichen verzichten, und es am Ende ein einheitliches Zeichen auf europäischer Ebene gibt. Ein Wirrwarr an Symbolen verunsichert den Verbraucher und informiert ihn nicht. Ein Zeichen, eine Aussage – dafür sollten wir gemeinsam arbeiten.

4-035

Antonio De Blasio (PPE-DE). – Az önkéntesen alkalmazható ökocímke jelölési rendszer kiemelkedő fontosságú, hiszen a korlátozott környezeti hatású termékek európai szintű elterjedését hivatott elősegíteni mind a termelés, mind a fogyasztás terén. Szeretném felhívni a figyelmet az ökocímke rendszer reformjának fontosságára, a rendszer egyszerűsítésének a címke használatával járó adminisztratív terhek csökkentésének, illetve a rendszerben résztvevő termékkategóriák szélesítésének szükségességére. Úgy vélem azonban, hogy mindez önmagában még nem garantálja a reform sikerességét.

Amennyiben az intézkedések hatására a virág emblémával ellátott termékek csakúgy, mint a biotermékek magasabb árkategóriába kerülnek, úgy ezen termékek fogyasztásának ösztönzése sikertelen lesz.

Úgy vélem, el kell kerülni, hogy az ökocímke európai szintű használatának többletértéke a termékek drágulását vonja maga után. Hosszú távon ezen termékek forgalmának széleskörű biztosítása és növelése csupán ármérséklítő intézkedések, adó, illetve egyéb kedvezmények biztosítása mellett valósítható meg.

Az árak szintentartásán túlmenően a fogyasztók és a termelők széleskörű tájékoztatásáról sem szabad megfeledkeznünk, tehát az uniós intézményeknek és a tagállami hatóságoknak tájékoztatást kell nyújtaniuk a címke által biztosított előnyökről, illetve a rendszerben résztvevő termékek jegyzékéről. Ahhoz, hogy a fogyasztók változtassanak vásárlási szokásaikon, elengedhetetlen a széleskörű, ösztönző, tudatosító kampányok.

Mindezek mellett szeretném felhívni a figyelmet az új célkitűzések megvalósítására vonatkozó részletes munkaterv elkészítésének fontosságára oly módon, hogy ezen munkaterv kidolgozásában való részvétel lehetősége az összes érdekelt fél számára biztosított legyen. A szolgáltatások folyamatosan változó környezete következtében azokat szükséges rendszeresen, évente felülvizsgálni.

Meg kell értenünk, állampolgárságtól, nemzeti elkötelezettségüktől függetlenül valamennyiünknek egyaránt feladata, hogy megóvjuk környezetünket, lehetőséget teremtve ily módon azoknak a céloknak és értékeknek a kiteljesedésére, melyekre az Európai Unió magáénak vall, és amelyek meggyőződése szerint egy teljes értékű emberi életnek elengedhetetlen előfeltételei. Ezen kötelezettségünkhöz pedig az is hozzátartozik, hogy lehetőségünk legyen az azonos árkategóriájú termékek közül a környezetkímélő módon előállítottat választani.

Köszönöm a jelentéstevőnek együttműködését a módosító indítványaim tekintetében. Köszönöm, hogy elkészítette a jelentést, s köszönöm Önöknek, hogy meghallgattak.

4-036

Justas Vincas Paleckis (PSE). – Sveikinu pranešėjus, gerai atlikusius savo darbą. Manau, kad kolegė Linda McAvan, o taip pat Salvatore Tatarella paruošė pranešimus, kurie padės Europos Sąjungai išlikti vienu iš labiausiai ekologija ir aplinkosauga besirūpinančiu regionu. Ne veltui ir pajuokaujama, ir rimtai pasakoma, kad svarbiausias ES eksportas – tai griebti ir aiškūs standartai. Įvairių kontinentų kompanijos, prisitaikiusios prie aukštesnių europinių reikalavimų, dažnai jais vadovaujasi ir kitose pasaulinėse rinkose.

Šiuo metu nacionaliniai ekologiniai ženklai labiau paplitę ir žinomi už ES ekologinius ženklus. Todėl sutinku su pranešėju – reikia dėti daugiau pastangų, kad šis ženklas būtų kuo geriau atpažįstamas visiems Europos vartotojams ir plačiau. Čia daugiau iniciatyvos turėtų rodyti Europos Sąjungos institucijos, nacionalinės vyriausybės, atskiros kompanijos. Vis giliau integruojantis ES šalių rinkoms, europinio ženklo sukūrimas, reikalavimų harmonizavimas yra neišvengiamas procesas, naudingas visiems rinkos dalyviams.

Sveikintinas ir ekologiškos vadybos ir audito reglamento (EMAS) atnaujinimas. Jo populiarumas kol kas atsilieka nuo tarptautinio ISO 14001 standarto. Pritariu nuomonei, kad suderinus EMAS ir ISO reikalavimus, būtų galima pritraukti daugiau organizacijų, jie taptų ne tarpusavyje konkuruojančiais, bet vienas kitą papildančiais standartais.

Esu tikras, kad ateityje aplinkosaugai, o ir besaikio vartojimo apribojimui bus skiriama dar daugiau dėmesio. Abu pranešimai, mano manymu, prisideda prie judėjimo šia kryptimi.

4-037

Dorette Corbey (PSE). – Voorzitter, dank aan collega Linda McAvan en collega Tatarella voor hun uitstekende werk op het terrein van de milieukeuren en het EMAS-regime. De milieubewuste consument kan kiezen uit verschillende keurmerken en veel van deze keurmerken hebben betrekking op biologische producten. Het Europese keurmerk heeft betrekking op alle producten en is hierop een zeer waardevolle aanvulling.

Maar de Europese milieukeur leidt al jarenlang een kwijnend bestaan. Ik ken het bloemetje met sterrencirkel slechts van een merk toiletpapier. Goed dus dat er nieuwe regels komen om het keurmerk beter en bekender te maken. De lidstaten moeten ervoor zorgen dat het milieukeurmerk bekender wordt bij het grote publiek.

De Europese milieukeur moet duidelijke criteria hebben en kan een eind maken aan de wildgroei van allerlei goed bedoelde keurmerken. Een breed gedragen en goed herkenbaar keurmerk kan een stimulans zijn voor producenten om hun producten te verbeteren en minder materiaal en energie te gebruiken en veel meer te recyclen. Daarvoor zijn natuurlijk eenduidige criteria nodig. Producten zullen terecht aan nieuwe en strenge criteria moeten voldoen om aanspraak te maken op het milieukeur. De criteria zullen gebaseerd zijn op een wetenschappelijke analyse van de hele levenscyclus van producten, en dat is heel goed. Uiteindelijk kunnen slechts de beste 10 à 20% van de producten per categorie de milieukeur toegekend krijgen.

De rapporteur en de schaduwrapporteurs stellen verder voor om te onderzoeken of ook voedingsmiddelen en dranken onder het keurmerk kunnen vallen. Het lijkt mij noodzakelijk om dat snel te doen, niet alleen voor de visserijsector, maar ook voor aantal andere sectoren. Want voeding en voedselindustrie vormen een belangrijke belasting van het milieu en het milieukeur kan daar in ieder geval een oplossing in brengen.

Ik ben het ook eens met wat door de collega's McAvan en Wijkman is gezegd aan het begin van dit debat: het is belangrijk om juist nu stimulansen in te bouwen voor milieuvriendelijke productie voor energiezuinig gebruik en deze wetgeving zal daaraan een bijdrage leveren.

4-038

Martí Grau i Segú (PSE). – Señora Presidenta, la apuesta por la producción sostenible tiene la ventaja de que revierte a la vez en favor de la competitividad de las empresas y en favor de los intereses de los consumidores por lo que se refiere a la calidad de vida y al compromiso individual con el medio ambiente.

La etiqueta ecológica es un buen instrumento en este sentido y, por lo tanto, cabe congratularse por las medidas de refuerzo que hoy discutimos aquí. La etiqueta ecológica incluye un número de productos todavía muy limitado, es todavía poco conocida por los consumidores y, sin embargo, a menudo es copiada sin una verdadera acreditación detrás. Confío, por lo tanto, en que en la revisión que estamos abordando desde las instituciones europeas se contribuirá a atajar estos problemas.

Debemos tener en cuenta otro hecho fundamental: la etiqueta ecológica no debe reflejar la norma general dentro de la producción sostenible; la etiqueta ecológica debe reflejar la excelencia dentro de la producción sostenible, que debe de ser cada vez más mayoritaria. El reto que tenemos delante es hacer de nuestra economía una economía verde; la etiqueta ecológica, por lo tanto, debe ser la expresión máxima de esta generalización de las buenas prácticas en el respeto del medio ambiente.

En la Comisión de Mercado Interior, esta semana, hemos tenido un primer intercambio de puntos de vista sobre el informe sobre denominaciones de productos textiles y el etiquetado relacionado, del cual soy ponente. El sector textil me parece un buen ejemplo de que no sólo debemos hacer más ágiles los procedimientos de aprobación de nuevos productos, en este caso de nuevas fibras, sino que debemos esforzarnos, además, por consolidar la etiqueta ecológica, junto con medidas de más amplio alcance, para que el conjunto del sector se pase a la sostenibilidad. Sólo así podremos competir con otros mercados de producciones más indiscriminadas y sólo así podremos satisfacer las demandas de los consumidores, que, por suerte, son cada vez más exigentes.

4-039

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Aktualnym zadaniem ustawodawstwa unijnego jest jego uproszczenie i uczynienie prawa przejrzystym i zrozumiałym dla każdego obywatela. Eko-oznakowanie to informacje dla konsumentów o sprawach środowiskowych, w tym także informacje o produkcji, co ułatwia podjęcie decyzji o jego zakupie. Wprowadzenie tego systemu przyczyni się do poprawy stanu środowiska i będzie przeciwdziałać zmianom klimatycznym, przyczyni się także do zmniejszenia zużycia wody.

Informacje zawarte na produktach ekologicznych – ilościowe oraz inne – powinny być jasne i czytelne. Większa konsumpcja żywności ekologicznej, naturalnej, produktów regionalnych przyczyni się do poprawy stanu zdrowotności naszego społeczeństwa.

4-040

Reinhard Rack (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin! Da ich heute eine Besuchergruppe aus der Steiermark hier auf der Besuchertribüne habe, werde ich versuchen, in der österreichischen Variante der deutschen Sprache zu beginnen.

Was drin ist, muss drauf stehen, und was drauf steht, muss stimmen. Das ist etwas, das für uns alle nicht nur in dieser Debatte wichtig ist. Wir wollen zeigen, dass sich Europa um bestimmte Anliegen bemüht und sich dafür verdient macht. Wir wollen auch sicherstellen, dass wir nicht eine Unzahl von Pickerln auf jedem Produkt draufhaben, und es ist an der Zeit – nicht nur jetzt vor den Europawahlen – den Menschen zu Hause und draußen zu zeigen, dass sich die Europäische Union für sinnvolle Dinge einsetzt, die die Bürger betreffen, und dass sehr viele der Unsinnigkeiten, die man tagtäglich lesen und hören kann, so nicht stimmen.

4-041

President. – Thank you, Mr Rack. Your visitors will know that they are well represented.

4-042

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Informațiile privind etichetarea ecologică a produselor trebuie să fie ușor de înțeles, iar eticheta ecologică trebuie să fie amplasată în așa fel încât să iasă în evidență și să definească produsul în cauză. Informațiile privind etichetarea ecologică trebuie să se refere la performanța energetică a produselor și să fie ușor de înțeles și ar trebui să se bazeze pe dovezi științifice.

Comisia și statele membre ar trebui să asigure angajarea fondurilor necesare pentru campaniile de sensibilizare și promovare a etichetei ecologice. Solicit Comisiei Europene să creeze o pagină de internet oficială a Uniunii Europene care să cuprindă toate informațiile și practicile privind etichetarea ecologică în Uniunea Europeană.

Revizuirea criteriilor privind etichetarea ecologică pentru diferite produse la 18 luni este însă un proces birocratic. Dacă vrem ca acest sistem să fie eficient, el nu trebuie să fie însoțit de creșterea sarcinii administrative. Consider însă că un plan de lucru comunitar pe o perioadă de minim trei ani care să stabilească obiective comune și o listă neexhaustivă de grupuri de produse care vor fi considerate prioritare este necesară.

La stabilirea criteriilor de etichetare ecologică trebuie evitată introducerea unor măsuri a căror implementare poate impune IMM-urilor prevederi administrative și economice disproporționate. Vă mulțumesc.

4-043

Martin Bursík, úřadující předseda Rady. – Děkuji za mimořádně pozitivní a zajímavou debatu na toto téma. Já myslím, že základní charakteristikou konzumu a konzumní společnosti je spotřeba. Já jsem měl příležitost projít společností, která 40 let žila v totalitě a měla nedostatek zboží a ten konzumní potenciál byl ohromný. Prošli jsme si vývojem a myslím, že je to zajímavá zkušenost i pro další rozšiřování Evropy a modernizaci rozvojových zemí. Prošli jsme si obdobím ohromné vůle po konzumu, po spotřebě. Přesto se ukazuje, že když se najednou objeví ta možnost, ta široká škála produktů a zboží, že se rozšiřuje podíl lidí ve společnosti, kteří jsou citliví ke kvalitě potravin, kvalitě produktů, kvalitě vody, kvalitě ovzduší, a že je velmi podstatné, jestli dokáže Evropa poskytnout těmto spotřebitelům informaci o tom, jaké dopady na životní prostředí, zdraví, klima, na udržitelný vývoj v dalších oblastech, např. kromě Evropské unie, má spotřeba těch kterých produktů, toho kterého zboží.

A proto si myslím a věřím, že jestli Evropský parlament schválí tato dvě nařízení, tak to bude velmi hezký dárek pro občany Evropské unie, protože budou mít možnost z daleko širšího výběru. Věřím, že se rychle podaří zařadit i výrobky a potraviny tolik diskutované v debatě, a věřím, že vlastně tohle umožní občanům Evropské unie, aby vlastní spotřebitelskou volbou přispěli aktivně k ochraně životního prostředí, a že tím dáme občanům možnost cítit se lépe a mít lepší pocit z toho, že se také aktivně sami, každý jeden z nich, podílí na ochraně životního prostředí. Velmi rád bych všem – znovu opakuji zpravodajům, Radě, Parlamentu, Komisi – poděkoval za tento návrh a také za velmi dobrou spolupráci s českým předsednictvím a za to, že se nám podařilo, věřím, dovést tuto materii v prvním čtení k úspěšnému finále.

4-044

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα πρώτα απ' όλα να ευχαριστήσω όλους τους ομιλητές της σημερινής συζήτησης για τις πολύ εποικοδομητικές και θετικές παρεμβάσεις τους.

Με βάση το κείμενο που συμφωνήθηκε για το EMAS, οργανισμοί και επιχειρήσεις, ιδίως οι μικρομεσαίες από όλον τον κόσμο, θα έχουν πρόσβαση σ' ένα απλό και αποτελεσματικό σύστημα οικολογικής διαχείρισης.

Με το αναθεωρημένο αυτό EMAS, οι επιχειρήσεις που συμμετέχουν, θα έχουν καθαρό όφελος, καθώς μέσω των περιβαλλοντικών τους εκθέσεων θα μπορούν να προβάλλουν στους καταναλωτές, στο κοινό, καθώς και στις άλλες επιχειρήσεις και στους επιθεωρητές και ελεγκτές, τις περιβαλλοντικές τους επιδόσεις.

Το κείμενο του κανονισμού για το οικολογικό σήμα, χάρη και στις τροπολογίες που έχει προτείνει το Κοινοβούλιο, έχει βελτιωθεί ακόμη περισσότερο από περιβαλλοντικής απόψεως και γίνεται πλέον πιο προσιτό στις επιχειρήσεις. Επίσης, οι τροπολογίες του Κοινοβουλίου έπαιξαν ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό ρόλο ώστε να διασφαλιστεί η αξιοπιστία του σήματος μεταξύ των καταναλωτών και των περιβαλλοντικών οργανώσεων.

Το αναθεωρημένο οικολογικό σήμα θα είναι πιο ευέλικτο, θα επιτρέψει σε μεταγενέστερο στάδιο τη διαμόρφωση κριτηρίων για την ένταξη ακόμη περισσότερων προϊόντων και υπηρεσιών, ιδίως δε από κατηγορίες προϊόντων με σημαντικές περιβαλλοντικές επιπτώσεις και, συνεπώς, με μεγάλες δυνατότητες βελτίωσης.

Με την έγκριση του κειμένου αυτού σε πρώτη ανάγνωση, θα αυξηθεί ο αριθμός προϊόντων με οικολογικό σήμα και έτσι οι καταναλωτές θα έχουν πολύ μεγαλύτερη επιλογή κατά τις αγορές τους. Στόχος μας είναι ασφαλώς να υπάρξει ευρεία αναγνώριση καθώς και διασφάλιση του κύρους και της αξιοπιστίας του ευρωπαϊκού συστήματος σήμανσης και στο διεθνές επίπεδο.

Ενδιαμέσως όμως, πρέπει να αναγνωριστεί πρώτα το οικολογικό αυτό σήμα από τους καταναλωτές και τις επιχειρήσεις σ' όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Γι' αυτό θα ήθελα να τονίσω ότι είναι πολύ σωστή η επισήμανση του κυρίου Wijkman, ότι πρέπει να ενισχύσουμε ακόμη περισσότερο την εμπορική προώθηση, το μάρκετινγκ, του οικολογικού σήματος. Γι' αυτόν ακριβώς τον λόγο άλλωστε η Επιτροπή έχει διαθέσει πόρους και μέσα, περισσότερο από κάθε άλλη φορά για την ενδυνάμωση αυτού του μάρκετινγκ του οικολογικού σήματος.

Επίσης, συμμεριζόμαστε πλήρως την άποψη του κ. Howitt για τις προοπτικές του EMAS στο διεθνές επίπεδο. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, στο EMAS έχουν ήδη συμπεριληφθεί και ενσωματωθεί διεθνείς προδιαγραφές ISO. Το EMAS θα είναι πλέον ανοικτό σε υποβολή αιτήσεων από διεθνείς επιχειρήσεις εκτός Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Θέλουμε να περιορίσουμε τη γραφειοκρατία και να εξασφαλίσουμε ότι τα διάφορα κείμενα που αναφέρονται στα σχετικά κριτήρια, θα είναι απλά και εύχρηστα, καθώς και ότι το οικολογικό σήμα θα είναι όσο το δυνατόν πιο εναρμονισμένο με άλλα διεθνή και εθνικά σήματα.

Το κείμενο της πρότασης μας προσφέρει αυτή τη δυνατότητα, καθώς περιέχει αναφορά στη σύνταξη ειδικών επεξηγηματικών εγγράφων και στη θέσπιση ειδικών κανόνων για την προώθηση της εναρμόνισης με τα εθνικά σήματα.

Καταθέτω στη γραμματεία του Κοινοβουλίου τρεις δηλώσεις της Επιτροπής για τα πρακτικά της σημερινής συνεδρίασης:

- η πρώτη αφορά τον τρόπο αντιμετώπισης των παραπλανητικών ισχυρισμών στα προϊόντα αλιείας· η Επιτροπή σκοπεύει να προτείνει κανονισμό ο οποίος θα απαγορεύει τη σήμανση με παραπλανητικούς ισχυρισμούς που δεν ανταποκρίνονται στα δεδομένα της αειφόρου αλιείας·
- η δεύτερη δήλωση αφορά την πρόθεση της Επιτροπής να διασφαλίσει ότι ο αναθεωρημένος κανονισμός οικολογικού σήματος δεν αντιβαίνει άλλους κανονισμούς που αφορούν χημικά προϊόντα, όπως συγκεκριμένα ο κανονισμός REACH·
- η τρίτη δήλωση αφορά το σχέδιο της Επιτροπής να επανεξετάσει το επίπεδο των τελών που αντιστοιχούν στο οικολογικό σήμα.

Κλείνοντας, θέλω να αναφέρω ότι τόσο το EMAS όσο και το οικολογικό σήμα αποτελούν εξαιρετικές πρωτοβουλίες. Μέχρι σήμερα όμως, δεν έχει αξιοποιηθεί πλήρως το δυναμικό ούτε του ενός, ούτε του άλλου, και θα συμφωνήσω με την κυρία Svensson, ότι όχι μόνο στις πέντε Γενικές Διευθύνσεις και επιτροπές αλλά και στις υπόλοιπες Γενικές Διευθύνσεις πρέπει να εφαρμόζεται όπως γίνεται τώρα, και αυτό κάνουμε με απόφαση την οποία ετοιμάζουμε. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο έχει λάβει την απόφαση να εφαρμόσει το EMAS και αναμένουμε και το Συμβούλιο.

Με τη σημερινή πρόταση αναθεώρησης, το EMAS και το οικολογικό σήμα μπορούν να εξελιχθούν σε σημεία αναφοράς χρηστής περιβαλλοντικής διαχείρισης και καλών περιβαλλοντικών επιδόσεων των προϊόντων.

Θα ήθελα λοιπόν να τονίσω για μια ακόμη φορά τη σημασία που έχει η επίτευξη συμφωνίας σε πρώτη ανάγνωση. Έχουν γίνει πολύ χρήσιμες αλλαγές στα κείμενα και το αποτέλεσμα είναι πολύ ισορροπημένο. Γι' αυτό σας προσκαλώ να υποστηρίξετε το κείμενο αυτό στο σύνολό του χωρίς άλλες αλλαγές.

Πριν κλείσω, θα ήθελα και πάλι να ευχαριστήσω τους εισηγητές για την εξαιρετικά χρήσιμη συνεισφορά τους και, πραγματικά, νομίζω ότι με τη δική τους σκληρή εργασία, αλλά και με τη συνεργασία της Τσεχικής Προεδρίας, είμαστε σε θέση να συμφωνήσουμε σε πρώτη ανάγνωση, κάτι το οποίο είναι πολύ σημαντικό.

*Commission's statements**1) In relation to the Ecolabel Regulation's relationship to upcoming fisheries legislation*

Independently of the adoption of the Ecolabel Regulation, the Commission confirms that it intends to propose a Regulation on eco-labelling of fishery products before the end of this year to be mainly based on criteria for sustainable fishing.

The study foreseen in article 6(5)a of the Ecolabel regulation dealing with additional aspects such as processing, pre-packaging, packaging and transport, which will examine the feasibility of the extension of the scope of the Ecolabel Regulation to food, including the products of fishing and aquaculture, will not influence or prejudge the adoption of this Regulation.

2) In relation to coherence with chemicals legislation

The Commission will ensure that the implementation of the Ecolabel Regulation will be coherent with the other relevant Community legislation addressing substances, preparations and mixtures.

3) In relation to fees review

The Commission confirms it intends to review the level of fees for the Ecolabel within 18 months of entry into force of the Regulation, taking into account the cost incurred by Member States in administering the scheme, and propose a revision of the fee levels as appropriate.

4-045

Salvatore Tatarella, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevole Ministro, onorevole Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, sia consentito anche a me di ringraziare tutti gli intervenuti nel dibattito che ha dimostrato una larga convergenza sul lavoro fatto in commissione Ambiente. Il dibattito ha anche offerto ulteriori spunti di arricchimento, ulteriori stimoli, ulteriori suggerimenti, dei quali mi auguro la Commissione e gli Stati membri sappiano far tesoro nei prossimi adempimenti.

Il Parlamento, con questo dibattito e con il voto di oggi, ha chiuso praticamente il suo impegno su questi due importanti problemi. Ora la parola passa alla Commissione: registro con grande soddisfazione le tre dichiarazioni messe a verbale dal Commissario. Noi ci aspettiamo dalla Commissione una puntualità sullo studio sugli alimenti, in modo che possa essere eliminata ogni possibilità di equivoco fra questo marchio e i prodotti biologici. Ci aspettiamo il regolamento sui prodotti ittici – se lo aspetta in modo particolare la commissione Pesca. Ringrazio la commissione Pesca per averci aiutato a superare questo che era un grande momento di difficoltà.

Richiamo l'attenzione della Commissione sulle deroghe per i prodotti tossici: utilizzare molta attenzione e molta cautela. Sulla campagna promozionale, noi ci auguriamo che le campagne promozionali della Commissione siano efficaci e puntuali in modo da raggiungere il grande pubblico e soprattutto il pubblico giovanile. Ci auguriamo che i tempi certi che abbiamo cercato di stabilire vengano rispettati e anche che sia rispettata la riduzione dei test animali. Un'unica piccola perplessità e rammarico: in materia di appalti forse avremmo potuto fare di più. Sarà per un'altra volta.

4-046

Linda McAvan, rapporteur. – Madam President, I just want to pick up on what Avril Doyle spoke about when she said we have a plethora of initiatives and labels which are ethical and sustainability labels, to say that I think the Commission needs to look at this to make sure that people are not being misled. The Commissioner just spoke about the fisheries labelling and making sure people know what they are buying. With a different hat I have been involved in fair trade and protecting the fair trade label, and what we have seen in recent years is alternative labels being developed. Some are OK, but some are attempting to look as if they are ethical labelling, look as if they are fair trade, but they are attempting to be fair trade on the cheap, without having the independent verification which you need to have a proper labelling system. So I hope that the Commission will make sure that all these systems of labelling and ethical labelling do continue to have some integrity and are not undermined to simply become marketing tools of organisations who want to make the public think they are being green and ethical when in fact they are nothing but fig leaves.

So I hope that can be looked at by the Commission, and it does need a cross-departmental look from the Commission. Every time I talk about this I get told, 'Oh it's not us, it's the other department', and each one seems to offload the burden onto the other.

Finally, just to thank everybody again for their contributions. I look forward to the vote, which I hope will be a very simple, straightforward one.

4-047

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at 11.00 today.

Written statements (Rule 142)

4-048

Alin Lucian Antochi (PSE), în scris. – Susțin în întregime raportul dnei Vălean referitor la aplicarea Directivei 2004/38/CE, cu atât mai mult cu cât evenimentele recent petrecute în anumite state membre au atras atenția asupra încălcării flagrante a uneia dintre cele patru libertăți fundamentale, și anume dreptul la libera circulație și sedere a cetățenilor pe teritoriul statelor membre.

De asemenea, transpunerea ineficientă sau chiar lipsa de transpunere a acestei directive în legislația națională a statelor membre a generat o serie de abuzuri în aria formalităților administrative și a interpretării restrictive a dispozițiilor legislative privind noțiunea de „ședere ilegală”, culminând cu detenția și expulzarea injustă a cetățenilor europeni. Cu toate acestea, soluția nu este o închidere a granițelor, ci ea trebuie căutată mai degrabă în măsuri concrete care să faciliteze integrarea cetățenilor în diversitatea societăților europene.

Consider că raportul în discuție va avea o contribuție semnificativă la monitorizarea transunerii normelor prevăzute de această directivă, dacă statele membre și Comisia vor reuși să conlucreze și să coopereze în acest sens.

Azi, dorința tuturor cetățenilor europeni este de a trăi într-o Uniune Europeană în care valorile fundamentale, precum libera circulație a persoanelor, să fie respectate, însă nu trebuie să uităm că pentru atingerea acestui scop noi toți trebuie să ne aducem propria contribuție.

4-049

Rovana Plumb (PSE), în scris. – Etichetarea ecologică este voluntară, menită să promoveze, la nivel european, răspândirea de produse cu o eficiență ridicată și cu un impact ecologic redus pe toată durata ciclului de viață.

Experiența acumulată prin punerea în aplicare timp de aproape un deceniu a acestei certificări - 26 de categorii de produse, 622 de licențe și peste 3000 de produse și servicii (detergenți, hârtie, îmbrăcăminte, încălțăminte, produse textile, turism, produse de camping) - sugerează necesitatea unei intervenții mai hotărâte pentru a aborda anumite aspecte esențiale ale sistemului.

Deoarece mulți agenți economici sunt nemulțumiți de durata lungă a procedurii de aprobare a criteriilor și rapida uzură morală a acestora, odată aprobate, s-au introdus modificări privind aprobarea lor (interval maxim 180 zile între finalizarea evaluării și aprobare, o procedură de revizuire simplificată și scurtată pentru modificări neesențiale ale criteriilor) precum și un nou sistem de acordare a etichetei.

Mentținerea credibilității sistemului de certificare prin eticheta ecologică impune:

- aplicarea principiului general de protecție a sănătății consumatorilor și a mediului chiar și în cazul produselor etichetate;
- activități de promovare: îmbunătățirea informării consumatorilor, inițierea de campanii de sensibilizare pentru mentținerea încrederii în eticheta ecologică, utilizând fonduri europene;
- acordarea unei atenții speciale IMM-urilor.

Susțin raportul și felicit raportorul.

4-050

Esko Seppänen (GUE/NGL), kirjallinen. – Haluan kiinnittää huomion siihen, että yhteisön ympäristömerkillä luodaan sen käytölle yhteinen perusta, mutta se ei saisi olla esteenä myös muunlaisille merkinnöille. Pidän tärkeänä, että tuotteen kotimaisuus pitää saada merkitä, ja paheksun komission kantaa sen kieltämisessä yhteisön rahoittamissa kampanjoissa. Esimerkiksi lähiruoassa kotimaisuuden ilmoittaminen on paras ympäristömerkki.

4-051

(The sitting was suspended at 10.35 and resumed at 11.00.)

4-052

VORSITZ: HANS-GERT PÖTTERING
Präsident

4-053

7 - Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

4-054

4-055

Marco Cappato (ALDE). – Signor Presidente, il *Bureau* di questo Parlamento ci aveva ufficialmente informato del fatto che le presenze dei parlamentari in commissione e in plenaria sarebbero state rese pubbliche sul sito Internet del Parlamento europeo; così facendo del resto si adempieva un preciso voto di questo Parlamento della seduta di gennaio, quando noi abbiamo esattamente votato questo, cioè che queste informazioni fossero rese pubbliche.

Allora, Presidente, io le chiedo: mancando ormai probabilmente soltanto una o due riunioni massimo in tempo utile del *Bureau*, perché la volontà di questo Parlamento sia rispettata, io le chiedo formalmente di prendere l'impegno di confermare il rispetto di questa volontà e di questo voto dell'Assemblea. Non vorrei che per ragioni del tutto burocratiche venissimo meno a questo dato di trasparenza per il quale abbiamo preso un impegno anche nei confronti degli elettori e dei cittadini europei.

4-056

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank. Der Wille des Parlaments ist immer Befehl. Wir werden Ihre Wortmeldung in der nächsten Sitzung des Präsidiums zum Anlass für eine Erörterung nehmen.

4-057

Anna Záborská (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, une loi sur les droits des femmes, pire, selon la sénatrice afghane Humeira Namati, que celle applicable à l'époque des talibans, a été signée par le président Hamid Karzaï.

Ce texte légalise le viol sur sa conjointe et interdit aux femmes de sortir, de travailler ou d'aller chez le médecin sans la permission de leur mari. Par ailleurs, la loi n'accorde la garde des enfants qu'au père et au grand-père.

Je vous demande, Monsieur le Président, de prendre immédiatement toutes les mesures nécessaires pour exprimer la totale désapprobation de notre Assemblée et de bien vouloir inscrire ce point à l'ordre du jour des urgences de notre prochaine session.

(Applaudissements)

4-058

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin Záborská. Wir werden uns darum kümmern.

4-059

8 - Begrüßung

4-060

Der Präsident. – Ich begrüße im Europäischen Parlament eine Delegation aus Ruanda unter Führung der Ministerin für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten und Zusammenarbeit, Frau Rosemary Museminali.

Frau Museminali wird begleitet vom Vorsitzenden des Ausschusses für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten des Senats, Herrn Valence Munyabagisha, vom Vizepräsidenten der Abgeordnetenkammer, Herrn Jean Damascène Ntawukuriryayo, und vom leitenden Direktor für Europa, Amerika, die UNO und internationale Organisationen im Außenministerium, Herrn Balthazar Rutzinga.

Im Namen des gesamten Parlaments heiße ich die Delegation herzlich willkommen!

(Beifall)

4-061

9 - Abstimmungsstunde

4-062

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Abstimmungsstunde.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll)

4-063

9.1 - Informationen im Veterinär- und Tierzuchtbereich (A6-0141/2009, Neil Parish) (Abstimmung)

4-064

9.2 - Gemeinschaftsstatistiken zur Informationsgesellschaft (A6-0128/2009, Angelika Niebler) (Abstimmung)

4-065

9.3 - Handel mit landwirtschaftlichen Erzeugnissen: Abkommen EG/Schweiz (A6-0122/2009, Béla Glattfelder) (Abstimmung)

4-066

9.4 - Gegenseitige Anerkennung auf Entscheidungen über Überwachungsmaßnahmen als Alternative zur Untersuchungshaft (A6-0147/2009, Ioannis Varvitsiotis) (Abstimmung)

4-067

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-068

Ιωάννης Βαρβιτσιώτης, Εισηγητής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θεωρώ καθήκον μου να ευχαριστήσω τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές και όλους όσους συνέβαλαν στη διαμόρφωση του κειμένου που σήμερα ψηφίζουμε. Είναι ένα κείμενο που βασικός του γνώμονας είναι η προστασία των ατομικών δικαιωμάτων. Είναι ένα ακόμη βήμα, θετικό θα έλεγα, για την περαιτέρω ανάπτυξη της αμοιβαίας εμπιστοσύνης των κρατών μελών κατά τη συνεργασία τους σε ποινικές υποθέσεις. Είναι ένα βήμα για μια ενοποίηση του ποινικού δικαίου αλλά, παράλληλα, είναι ένα βήμα που οδηγεί στην ισονομία μεταξύ των πολιτών των κρατών μελών, όπου και αν αυτοί βρίσκονται, εντός του εδάφους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως.

Θα ήθελα να παρακαλέσω τους συναδέλφους να τύχω της εμπιστοσύνης τους στην Οδηγία αυτή.

4-069

9.5 - Aufnahme weiterer Kosten, die für eine Beteiligung des ESF in Betracht kommen (A6-0116/2009, Karin Jöns) (Abstimmung)

4-070

9.6 - Europäischer Fonds für regionale Entwicklung, Europäischer Sozialfonds und Kohäsionsfonds: Vorschriften zur Finanzverwaltung (A6-0127/2009, Iratxe García Pérez) (Abstimmung)

4-071

9.7 - Bildung und Erziehung von Kindern mit Migrationshintergrund (A6-0125/2009, Hannu Takkula) (Abstimmung)

4-072

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-073

Christa Prets (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte folgende mündliche Änderung vorschlagen, und zwar, dass wir in den Ziffern 5, 8 und 16 das Wort „legal“ streichen, da es den Anschein erweckt, dass Kinder, die nicht gemeldet sind, das heißt in einem laufenden Asylverfahren sind, aus den Bildungsprogrammen ausgeschlossen werden könnten. Dagegen möchten wir uns verwahren. Ich bitte um die Streichung des Wortes „legal“, denn jedes Kind hat Anspruch auf Bildung, wenn es in einem Land gemeldet ist.

4-074

Der Präsident. – Wenn es keinen Widerspruch zu dem gibt, was Frau Prets gesagt hat, werden wir auf dieser Basis den Text natürlich nochmals sehr sorgfältig überprüfen.

4-075

Stavros Lambrinidis (PSE). – Mr President, I am not sure if the interpretation missed it. I heard paragraphs 5 and 16; paragraph 8 also states that only the children of ‘legal’ migrants would receive education. I want the word deleted there as well.

4-076

(Die mündliche Änderungsanträge werden nicht übernommen.)

4-077

9.8 - Anwendung der Richtlinie 2004/38/EG über das Recht der Unionsbürger und ihrer Familienangehörigen, sich im Hoheitsgebiet der Mitgliedstaaten frei zu bewegen und aufzuhalten (A6-0186/2009, Adina-Ioana Vălean) (Abstimmung)

4-078

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-079

Adina-Ioana Vălean, rapporteur. – Mr President, in order to remove any misunderstanding and to comply with the requests made by Italian colleagues from the new Partito della Libertà belonging to the PPE-DE and UEN Groups, I propose an oral amendment to footnote 1 to recital S, first indent, to delete the last two sentences and insert 'IT' (Italy) in the sequence at the beginning of the paragraph. You have this in your voting list.

4-080

Stefano Zappalà (PPE-DE). – Signor Presidente, apprezzo la proposta della relatrice, tuttavia questa risoluzione fa troppo riferimento, non soltanto in questo punto e in questa nota dell'emendamento orale proposto, ma in tante altre parti della risoluzione, fa riferimento a tutti gli Stati membri per motivazioni diverse e fa riferimento anche alla stessa materia che lei chiede che sia cancellata dalla nota, per le stesse materie ad altre parti della risoluzione. Per cui, Presidente, io credo che sarebbe opportuno che la collega, e questo propongo, chieda che la risoluzione possa essere emendata ulteriormente e quindi ritorni in commissione per poter essere riesaminata.

4-081

(Das Parlament lehnt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung des Berichts in den Ausschuss ab.)

4-082

Roberta Angelilli (UEN). – Signor Presidente, sulla ricevibilità dell'emendamento dell'onorevole Vălean: l'onorevole Vălean ha fatto bene a fare marcia indietro e correggere il testo eliminando il riferimento generico ed equivoco alle terze e quarte mogli, che ha ingenerato dubbi sulla legittimità della poligamia.

Però bisogna precisare che, purtroppo, il questionario inviato agli Stati membri conteneva questa erronea terminologia; cioè si chiedeva agli Stati membri un giudizio sul diritto di circolazione delle seconde, terze e quarte mogli.

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratrice)

4-083

Der Präsident –. Frau Kollegin Angelilli! Wir haben hier keine Debatte mehr. Wer dem Antrag von Frau Vălean nicht zustimmen will, kann aufstehen. Es müssten sich 40 Leute erheben, wenn sie dagegen sind, und keine Erklärung hier abgeben.

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

4-084

9.9 - Probleme und Perspektiven der Unionsbürgerschaft (A6-0182/2009, Urszula Gacek) (Abstimmung)

4-085

9.10 - Gemeinschaftsstatistiken des Außenhandels mit Drittländern (A6-0126/2009, Helmuth Markov) (Abstimmung)

4-086

9.11 - Festsetzung von Höchstmengen für Rückstände pharmakologisch wirksamer Stoffe in Nahrungsmitteln tierischen Ursprungs (A6-0048/2009, Avril Doyle)

4-087

9.12 - Investitionen in Energieeffizienz und erneuerbare Energien im Bereich Wohnungsbau (EFRE) (A6-0134/2009, Emmanouil Angelakas) (Abstimmung)

4-088

9.13 - Visakodex der Gemeinschaft (A6-0161/2008, Henrik Lax) (Abstimmung)

4-089

9.14 - Regelung für das Umweltzeichen der Gemeinschaft (A6-0105/2009, Salvatore Tatarella) (Abstimmung)

4-090

– *Vor der endlichen Abstimmung:*

4-091

Miroslav Ouzký (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I would like to ask you to include the following Commission statement on the record, with the text as agreed and adopted.

‘Independently of the adoption of the Ecolabel Regulation, the Commission confirms that it intends to propose a regulation on ecolabelling of fishery products before the end of this year, to be mainly based on criteria for sustainable fishing. The study foreseen in Article 6(5)(a) of the Ecolabel Regulation, dealing with additional aspects such as processing, pre-packaging, packaging and transport, which will examine the flexibility of the extension of the scope of the Ecolabel Regulation to food, including the products of fishing and aquaculture, will not influence or prejudice the adoption of this regulation’.

4-092

Stavros Dimas, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I fully agree.

(Applause)

4-093

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag an.)

4-094

9.15 - Freiwillige Teilnahme von Organisationen an einem Gemeinschaftssystem für Umweltmanagement und Umweltbetriebsprüfung (EMAS) (A6-0084/2009, Linda McAvan) (Abstimmung)

4-095

9.16 - Gleichbehandlung ungeachtet der Religion oder der Weltanschauung, einer Behinderung, des Alters oder der sexuellen Ausrichtung (A6-0149/2009, Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg) (Abstimmung)

4-096

9.17 - Interimshandelsabkommen EG/Turkmenistan (Abstimmung)

4-097

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-098

Daniel Caspary (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kollegen! Nach Artikel 170 Absatz 4 beantrage ich die Verschiebung auf die April-II-Plenartagung. Wir haben gestern während der Fraktionssitzungen von Kommission und Rat Dokumente zugestellt bekommen, in denen Kommission und Rat auf uns zugehen. Wir hatten leider keine Zeit, diese Dokumente in unseren Fraktionen ausreichend zu beraten. Deswegen wäre ich für eine Verschiebung dankbar.

Ich bitte jedoch nochmals alle Kollegen in allen Fraktionen: Bitte nutzen Sie dieses Interims-Abkommen mit Turkmenistan nicht als Geisel dafür, damit wir als Parlament unsere Parlamentsrechte gegenüber Rat und Kommission stärken. Es wäre sehr schade, wenn das Dokument unter diesem Problem zu leiden hätte.

4-099

Stavros Dimas, *Member of the Commission*. – We do not object to the postponement.

4-100

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag auf Verschiebung der Abstimmung an.)

4-101

9.18 - Interimshandelsabkommen EG/Turkmenistan (Abstimmung)

4-102

(Der Bericht in den Ausschuss zurücküberwiesen.)

4-103

9.19 - Halbjährliche Bewertung des Dialogs EU-Belarus (Abstimmung)

4-104

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-105

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I would like to propose that it be mentioned that any plans to build a new nuclear power station on non-Western lines at the border with the EU should not be included in these talks – in positive talks on how to support Belarus, but not in this case.

4-106

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 4:*

4-107

Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE-DE). – Mr President, this will be a very short oral amendment, which has been proposed at the request of Alexander Milinkevich and the Amnesty International representatives who took part in the conference on Belarus two days ago at Parliament. They asked to extend the demand to release political prisoners who have recently been arrested also to people who face other kinds of restrictions and harassment. That is why I propose – and I have consulted other political groups – to add to paragraph 4: ‘as well as a review of the “restricted freedom” sentences imposed on 11 persons who participated in a demonstration which took place in January 2008;’.

4-108

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 7:*

4-109

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, when three young activists are mentioned as being subject to forcible army conscription, one of them at least is the son of the opposition leader, Mr Viačorka. So it is worth mentioning that it is tantamount to state-practised hostage-taking: ‘Look, be calm in your position because your son is in our army and something may happen to him.’ That would be a little warning, maybe giving more security for those young men forcibly conscripted into the army.

4-110

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 13:*

4-111

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, when the suggestion is made that the European Humanities University should go back to Belarus, it is worth mentioning that it should be on the basis of genuine guarantees that it will be able to operate freely and not be taken back under the control of the regime.

4-112

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

4-113

Hannes Swoboda (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Wir sind ja gerne bereit, auf mündliche Anträge jeweils einzugehen. Aber ich würde den Kollegen Landsbergis bitten, uns vorher zu informieren, damit man, auch wenn er fern ist, darüber reden kann. Man kann nicht immer nur mündliche Anträge ohne Information stellen.

4-114

Der Präsident. – Ich sehe an der Gestik des Kollegen Landsbergis, dass er – sollte er in Zukunft überhaupt noch dazukommen, mündliche Anträge zu stellen, – das so machen wird.

4-115

9.20 - Europas Gewissen und der Totalitarismus (Abstimmung)

4-116

Der Präsident. – Ich weise Sie darauf hin, dass die Kollegen Nassauer und Szájer den Gemeinsamen Entschließungsantrag im Namen der Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei und europäische Demokraten mit unterzeichnet haben.

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 3*

4-117

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, let me recall our significant resolution of 2005 about the end of the Second World War in Europe, which stated that ‘there cannot be reconciliation without truth and remembrance’.

I would not like to delete the truth now. Please agree that ‘truth’ be inserted: reconciliation with truth and remembrance. Please vote for truth.

4-118

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 4:*

4-119

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE-DE). – Mr President, the text refers to crimes against humanity that were still happening ‘as late as July 1995’. It would be better to say ‘were still taking place in July 1995’, because nobody can be sure that there were no more such crimes in 1996.

(Interjection from the floor)

Yes, indeed – that would be softer; ‘took place as late as’ should be replaced with ‘were still taking place in’.

4-120

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 20:*

4-121

Tunne Kelam (PPE-DE). – Mr President, this is a minor correction. The text now reads ‘whereas the Central European countries had the added experience of Communism’. I would like to change ‘Central European countries’ to ‘Central and Eastern European countries’, because everywhere else the text reads this way, and to replace ‘had the added experience of Communism’ with ‘have experienced both Communism and Nazism’, because, to Eastern European nations, nothing was ‘added’ by Communism: most of them had Communism first, then Nazism, and then Communism again.

4-122

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

4-123

Bogusław Sonik (PPE-DE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja chciałem tylko dodać, że ja również podpisałem tę rezolucję.

4-124

Monsieur le Président, j'ai signé aussi cette résolution et je ne me trouve pas sur la motion de résolution. Alors je vous demande de mettre mon nom.

4-125

9.21 - Rolle der Kultur bei der Entwicklung europäischer Regionen (Abstimmung)

4-126

9.22 - Das neue Abkommen EU-Russland (A6-0140/2009, Janusz Onyszkiewicz) (Abstimmung)

4-127

9.23 - Aufnahme von Verhandlungen im Hinblick auf die Annahme eines internationalen Vertrags über den Schutz der Arktis (Abstimmung)

4-128

– *Vor der Abstimmung*

4-129

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I rise to ask colleagues to consider the referral of this motion for a resolution back to committee. I do so on foot of what Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner said here last night in the debate. I do not do so lightly, because I share the concerns of all colleagues who have spoken in this debate and as expressed in this resolution.

But I would like to say, to be fair to the Commissioner, that it is not our intent to cause her any problems at a critical stage in the negotiations she is having at the moment with the Arctic Council. She has specifically stated that ‘such a proposal would at this stage’ – and I am quoting from the transcript of what she said in plenary – ‘not only be ineffective, but could prove to be detrimental to the EU’s role and credibility in overall Arctic cooperation’.

In her conclusion, she specifically referred to the timing of our motion. The Commission has submitted an application to the Norwegian Chair of the Arctic Council to extend the international Convention on the Law of the Sea. That has to be accepted by unanimity, and the vote is on 29 April – in three or four weeks’ time. So she very clearly asked for a postponement, even though she fully shares our sentiments. On that basis, could I suggest we consider referring it back to committee?

4-130

Diana Wallis (ALDE). – Mr President, could I say on behalf of the ALDE Group that we would support Mrs Doyle’s proposition? I think it has much merit. The House had a resolution on this issue in October of last year. To a certain extent we are repeating what we said then, but we are also saying some things that are rather stronger and, as Mrs Doyle said, they come at a critical moment when most of us in this House would want to see the EU take up a seat on the Arctic Council, and we would not wish to compromise that.

It would be much better to refer this back to committee and have a full and considered report in the new mandate.

4-131

Der Präsident . – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Damit Sie wissen, worüber wir jetzt abstimmen: Wir können das nicht in einen Ausschuss zurücküberweisen, weil es nicht aus einem Ausschuss kommt, sondern wir können die Abstimmung vertagen. Das ist die Geschäftsordnungslage.

4-132

Véronique De Keyser (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, excusez-moi, vous n'avez pas donné la voix à la partie adverse.

Je trouve extraordinaire que nous ayons débattu hier de cette résolution et que, au contraire, au moment où nous la déposons et où nous demandons un moratoire de cinquante ans sur l'exploitation des richesses pétrolières, au moment où nous demandons une charte contraignante, et alors que nous savons que les pays ont jusqu'à la fin du mois d'avril pour réclamer, au niveau de l'ONU, la souveraineté des fonds sous-marins et donc, effectivement, cette idée de souveraineté, accompagnée d'un déploiement militaire, c'est pour le moment que ça se joue.

Si nous ne marquons pas la différence et faisons entendre notre voix, c'est un pas en arrière, et nous ne serons pas proactifs et je ne suis absolument pas d'accord avec ça.

(Applaudissements)

4-133

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag auf Verschiebung der Abstimmung an.)

4-134

9.24 - Die Gesundheitsproblematik in Zusammenhang mit elektromagnetischen Feldern (A6-0089/2009, Frédérique Ries) (Abstimmung)

4-135

9.25 - Bessere Schulen: eine Agenda für die europäische Zusammenarbeit (A6-0124/2009, Pál Schmitt) (Abstimmung)

4-136

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. GÉRARD ONESTA
Vice-président

4-137

10 - Explications de vote

4-138

Explications de vote orales

4-139

– Rapport: Hannu Takkula (A6-0125/2009)

4-140

Tomáš Zatloukal (PPE-DE). – Vážený pane předsedo, přítomnost výrazného počtu migrujících žáků má významné důsledky pro vzdělávací systém. Existují jasné a jednoznačné důkazy, že mnoho dětí z rodin migrantů má slabší vzdělanostní úroveň než jejich vrstevníci. Školy se musí jejich přítomnosti přizpůsobit a systematicky ji zahrnout do svého tradičního programu zaměřeného na poskytování vysoce kvalitního vzdělání. Vzdělání je klíčem k zajištění toho, aby se z těchto žáků mohli stát plně začlenění, úspěšní a produktivní občané hostitelské země, tedy k tomu, aby se migrace stala přínosem jak pro migranty, tak pro hostitelskou zemi. Vítám zprávu kolegy Takkuly, a proto jsem jí také podpořil.

4-141

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, un enseignement multilingue, des professeurs polyglottes s'adressant à chaque enfant dans sa langue maternelle, des professeurs étrangers recrutés exprès pour eux, le respect et même la valorisation des cultures d'origine par l'école, une connaissance minimale de la langue du pays d'accueil, pas même considérée comme véritablement obligatoire, ce type de recette ne mène pas à l'intégration des migrants. Elle mène en même temps, et de façon paradoxale, à la communautarisation de nos sociétés, au brouillage des identités, à l'acculturation de tous, aussi bien les migrants que les habitants de souche du pays d'accueil.

Je conseille au rapporteur d'aller voir dans les ZEP – les zones d'éducation prioritaire – françaises de banlieue où mène ce type de bons sentiments qui ne manifeste en fait que la renonciation à imposer dans nos propres pays le respect de nos cultures, de nos coutumes et de nos mœurs à ceux qui viennent en solliciter l'hospitalité.

Nos systèmes éducatifs n'ont pas à s'adapter aux cultures des autres. C'est aux populations migrantes à s'adapter à nos cultures si elles entendent rester dans nos pays.

4-142

– **Rapport: Adina-Ioana Vălean (A6-0186/2009)**

4-143

Mario Borghezio (UEN). – Signor Presidente, volevo soltanto sottolineare la necessità di sostenere fortemente l'affermazione che ha avuto sostegno questa mattina da una decisione provvida. Non è possibile che in un documento dell'Unione europea, in particolare in un documento al voto del Parlamento europeo, sia anche soltanto sfiorata la possibilità del riconoscimento del matrimonio poligamico.

Questo non appartiene alla cultura dell'Unione europea. Nello spazio giuridico dell'Unione europea non deve esserci posto per posizioni di questo genere, che sono in contrasto con la nostra tradizione, che è la tradizione dell'Europa cristiana, e che esprimono tra l'altro un principio di sopraffazione dei diritti della donna. Quindi molto importante la decisione di questa mattina ma molto preoccupante il fatto che, con grave senso di irresponsabilità, in un documento del Parlamento europeo sia stata inserita una nota di questo genere.

4-144

Ewa Tomaszewska (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nie mogłam poprzeć sprawozdania pani Vălean. Dopuszcza ono sytuację sprzeczności prawa, naruszając zasadę pomocniczości, promując łączenie rodzin z państw trzecich o innej kulturze, także zezwalających na poligamię. Stwarza zamęt prawny. Jak wiadomo definicje „rodziny” i „członka rodziny” są w naszych krajach różne. Różne też są uprawnienia, np. do dziedziczenia, czy prawo rodzinne, a także prawo do świadczeń z pomocy społecznej. Stworzenie prawa do roszczeń socjalnych bez zgody i uwzględnienia sytuacji ekonomicznej kraju przyjmującego może prowadzić do poważnych konfliktów społecznych. Protestuję przeciw stałemu naruszaniu w tej Izbie zasady subsydiarności.

4-145

– **Rapport: Urszula Gacek (A6-0182/2009)**

4-146

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I am very privileged this morning to be sitting next to Mr Daniel Hannan, my very good colleague, whose speech a few weeks ago has revolutionised the transmission of information and political thought and will change it for the future. The power of the Internet is supremely important, but is even more important over the regular media.

I voted against this report for one simple reason, which is that I am not in favour of promoting European citizenship. I am a British citizen and am proud to be so, and what we should be about is promoting the individual citizenship of our individual countries and saying, yes, we are members of the European Union as countries, but we are not European citizens. We are citizens of the countries which gave us our birth and infant nurture, which protect us and which have given many of us sanctuary over the years. That is the pride which I have and will continue to have in the years to come.

4-147

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, les anciens Grecs avaient déjà discuté des questions qui nous occupent. Dans leurs associations de cités, ils discutaient des mérites respectifs de l'*isopoliteia*, c'est-à-dire de la citoyenneté identique, qui donnait à chacun les mêmes droits d'une ville à l'autre, ou de la *sympoliteia*, c'est-à-dire de la citoyenneté commune.

Cela ne vous surprendra pas que je sois résolument en faveur de la première de ces dispositions. En effet, la citoyenneté européenne a un caractère très largement artificiel. Le rapporteur regrette surtout la méconnaissance dans laquelle sont les citoyens eu égard aux droits qu'elle peut leur accorder. Mais je constate que, lorsqu'on consulte ces citoyens sur leur opinion, par exemple relativement à la constitution européenne ou à son illisible avatar qu'est le traité de Lisbonne, et qu'ils répondent non, à ce moment-là on ne tient aucun compte, et ceci de façon délibérée, de leur opinion.

C'est pourquoi ces constructions prétendument généreuses sur la citoyenneté commune me paraissent largement hypocrites et je préférerais y substituer la reconnaissance mutuelle des droits entre nations alliées, mais demeurant souveraines.

4-148

Jim Allister (NI). – Mr President, citizenship defines who we are. It is the bedrock of our identity. I am a British citizen and I am proud of that, not least because of the vicious campaign of the IRA to try and coerce me and my constituents out of that citizenship – something which, thankfully, they have failed to do.

Citizenship lies in Member States. It should not be diverted and it should not be shared. Thus I reject this contrivance of European citizenship, which of course is a complement to the ongoing efforts to be advanced by the Lisbon Treaty to build the statehood of the EU and thus this notion that we all have to be, whether we like it or not, want it or not, EU citizens first and foremost. I reject that philosophy as I reject the Lisbon Treaty.

4-149

Martin Callanan (PPE-DE). – Mr President, this is becoming a bit of a familiar refrain, to agree with my colleagues.

I voted against this report because, of course, I also completely reject the whole concept of European citizenship. I believe that citizenship is unique to nation states, and I believe that all of the efforts that are behind this attempt to construct a European citizenship are related to the same attempts to conduct a European superstate.

Many of my constituents and myself are also unhappy about being forced to become, effectively, European citizens. They see citizenship as something to be affirmed or rejected, based on a common set of values and ideals built up over the centuries. None of us have been given any say, any referendum or any consultation whatsoever on whether we wish or do not wish to become European citizens.

Of course there should be a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty. But we should also be asked whether we wish to be European citizens in addition to our nation citizenship. We have no right to renounce European citizenship, even if we completely reject – as I do – the whole concept of such a thing.

4-150

Gay Mitchell (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I am not, first and foremost, a European Union citizen. I am an Irish citizen and, as a complementary adjunct to that, I am a European citizen.

I have learned a lot here today. I did not realise our British colleagues were citizens. I thought they were subjects. But I have no difficulty with the words ‘subjects’ and ‘citizens’. You can be Scottish, Welsh or English, but you have to be Scottish, Welsh or English, or one of those people in Ireland who take on the British citizenship, to be British. There is no such thing as a British citizen if you are not Irish from Northern Ireland, Scottish, Welsh or English.

I really do not understand the point that has been made here today. These are complementary adjuncts to our national citizenships and I certainly have no difficulty whatsoever with that. People are making a mountain out of a molehill because we are in the run-up to the elections, and are using this constant anti-European rhetoric to put forward their own interests rather than the interests of the countries they are supposed to serve.

4-151

Richard Corbett (PSE). – Mr President, may I concur with the last speaker. Some of our colleagues seem to have a very narrow, unidimensional, view of citizenship and, indeed, of identity. Yet we are all multifaceted: I support England in football, because I am English and that is part of my identity; I support Britain at the Olympic Games in athletics, because that is a wider dimension to my identity; and I support the European golf team in the Ryder Cup against the United States – and I suspect that even the honorable Member who made the remarks just now does too.

These are different dimensions to our identity and our citizenship. They are not contradictory but complementary. Of course, no citizenship of that kind has been attributed by referendum. There was never a referendum for me to be English or to have British citizenship – which has been changed from being a subject – nor has there been a referendum on the treaties which, nearly two decades ago, created the notion of European citizenship, linking it specifically to certain rights that we have and that we enjoy throughout Europe, nothing more and nothing less.

4-152

– **Rapport: Emmanouil Angelakas (A6-0134/2009)**

4-153

Neena Gill (PSE). – Mr President, I supported this report because I believe it continues the crucial work done by this House in linking our commitment to the environment to our need to deliver Member States out of the current financial crisis. But also, because every aspect of our economy and society is affected, we need to take a holistic approach to economic and environmental recovery.

I worked in housing for 18 years and I am concerned that sufficient attention has not been paid to housing and energy, especially at construction time, as housing contributes significantly to carbon emissions. Focusing on cohesion policy is a sensible way for us to fulfil our obligation to communities and economies. Change, as much else, begins at home. Using the European Development Fund monies to complement regional and local authorities’ schemes for double glazing, insulation and solar panels or for replacing old boilers for more energy-efficient ones is an excellent example of how the European Union can help Member States to meet targets which will be of benefit to all European citizens.

4-154

Syed Kamall (PPE-DE). – Mr President, when I saw the title of the report, ‘Investment in energy efficiency and renewable energy for housing’, I was impressed. No one could disagree with that in these times of concern over climate change, whatever one thinks about that. We all agree that there should be better energy efficiency and better energy conservation.

But surely the European Parliament should be setting an example. How can we talk about energy efficiency, how can we talk about conservation, when we continue to have three European Parliament buildings? We have a building in Strasbourg that is only used for 12 weeks in the year and continues to emit CO₂ and waste energy when we are not there, an office building in Luxembourg that Members never visit (and we are now building another building in Luxembourg) and we have this Chamber here in Brussels. It is time to stop the hypocrisy on energy efficiency, to lead by example and to only have one Parliament building.

4-155

– **Rapport: Henrik Lax (A6-0161/2009)**

4-156

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mając na uwadze trudności dotyczące procedur wizowych, niezbędne jest ich uproszczenie m.in. poprzez zmniejszenie kosztów ponoszonych przez wnioskodawców. Pomoże to lepszemu wymianom kulturowej i współpracy Unii z krajami trzecimi. Uważam, że istotne jest uproszczenie procedur wizowych dla ludzi, którzy posiadają rodzinę w państwach członkowskich. Podam przykład Polski, której historia przez setki lat przeplatała się z historią takich krajów jak Ukraina czy Białoruś, w których żyje znacząca mniejszość polska nieposiadająca polskiego obywatelstwa, jednak często przekraczająca granice Unii w celu odwiedzenia swoich bliskich.

Jest więc niezbędne maksymalne uproszczenie procedur wizowych dla ludzi, którzy zdobyli zaufanie urzędu wydającego wizę poprzez niełamanie żadnych praw wizowych. Uważam za istotne, że wprowadzenie identyfikatorów biometrycznych ułatwi wymianę danych i pomoże przyszłemu scaleniu systemu wizowego, ułatwiając tym samym proces wizowy, jak również poprawiając bezpieczeństwo w całej Unii. Sprawozdanie to jest ważne dla rozwoju kontaktów Unii z krajami trzecimi.

4-157

– **Rapport: Salvatore Tatarella (A6-0105/2009)**

4-158

Neena Gill (PSE). – Mr President, once again, I voted in favour of this report because I believe, if we are to make strides in fighting climate change, we need to make choosing green products easier for the consumer.

Although my region – the West Midlands – is one of the only landlocked areas of the UK, we are, of course, consumers of fish and fish products, which this report refers to.

By introducing a voluntary scheme such as ecolabels, we can encourage a market in more energy-efficient and ecologically kinder goods. This will fit in with other market-based solutions to climate change, such as tax reductions on eco-friendly goods.

My constituents tell me that they are happy to make different choices if buying them and buying green products makes it easier for them. We will need to publicise the scheme better if it is to have the desired effect, and it will require better marketing but also standardisation and harmonisation of the information it displays if it is to be of real use to consumers.

A good model is the report on energy efficiency of tyres, which I have been working on and which presents similar details in a clear, concise manner.

4-159

– **Rapport: Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg (A6-0149/2009)**

4-160

Anja Weisgerber (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Wir, die CDU/CSU-Fraktion, haben gegen den Bericht Buitenweg gestimmt. Wir sind gegen Diskriminierung jeder Art, aber wir halten eine umfassende Rahmenrichtlinie auf europäischer Ebene nicht für den richtigen Weg, die Betroffenen tatsächlich zu schützen. Zehn Mitgliedstaaten haben die bestehende Antidiskriminierungsrichtlinie noch gar nicht umgesetzt. Trotzdem hat eine einfache Mehrheit des Parlaments – nicht die qualifizierte Mehrheit – heute für diese Ausweitung gestimmt. Sie würde erhebliche zusätzliche Bürokratie und unnötige Kosten verursachen – das verstehen die Bürger nicht.

Zwar konnten Verbesserungen im Versicherungsbereich und zu den baulichen Anpassungsmaßnahmen bezüglich eines behindertengerechten Zugangs erreicht werden. Auch die Forderung nach einem Verbandsklagerecht konnte abgewendet werden. Wir sehen aber erhebliche Probleme auf die Mitgliedstaaten zukommen, wenn beispielsweise die Weltanschauung in die unzulässigen Diskriminierungsgründe aufgenommen werden müsste. Die Folge wäre, dass sich auch Extremisten und Sekten, wie beispielsweise Scientology, auf den Schutz der Richtlinie berufen könnten.

Wir wenden uns auch gegen eine absolute Gleichstellung der traditionellen und der gleichgeschlechtlichen Ehe. Nach Auffassung der Kommission erfordert die Umsetzung der Richtlinie, dass gleichgeschlechtliche Partner, sofern diese rechtlich in einem Mitgliedstaat anerkannt werden, dann auch dieselben Rechte wie Ehepartner erhalten sollten. Hiergegen

wenden wir uns. Deswegen haben wir gegen den Bericht und für die Rücküberweisung des Vorschlags der Kommission gestimmt.

4-161

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I abstained on this matter for two reasons. First of all, we all accept some discrimination. In all our countries we have religious schools – Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, Jewish – and there is an element of discrimination in those schools because the people who are primarily accepted there are of that faith. I support that. I support faith schools.

But the principal reason why I abstained was because this turns the whole principle of jurisprudence upside down. We are innocent until we are proved guilty. That is a cardinal principle, certainly of English law, and I dare say of law in many other European Union countries. This turns the burden of proof the other way round, and that, frankly, is unacceptable. Of course we are all against discrimination. We are all in favour of equal treatment, but we have to recognise that the principles of law which have guided us throughout the ages remain in place. That is why I abstained.

4-162

Erna Hennicot-Schoepges (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, je fais partie des membres du PPE qui ont voté pour le rapport. Je l'ai fait parce que je pense que le Parlement doit envoyer un signal fort, avec ce vote, pour la non-discrimination et il existe certainement d'autres éléments beaucoup plus importants que ceux qui viennent d'être énumérés.

En effet, il subsiste des situations, dans les États membres, où il est refusé aux enfants d'être scolarisés dans leur langue maternelle, où il est défendu de parler cette langue. Nous sommes à mille lieues de la situation réelle. Il convient donc d'envoyer un signal, ce que le Parlement a fait et je l'ai appuyé. Il reste certainement beaucoup à faire dans cet effort visant à acquérir une meilleure connaissance de l'autre, et nous sommes loin du dialogue des cultures, que nous avons formulé le vœu de faire progresser en 2008, et je regrette toute la polémique qui a été faite autour de ce rapport.

4-163

Richard Corbett (PSE). – Mr President, in the 27 countries of the European Union we have a proud tradition, developed over the last decades, of fighting together against discrimination, and of making discrimination illegal and something to be discouraged.

What this report does is to correct an anomaly. We have legislation on our statute book which rightly prohibits discrimination on grounds of race and gender in the workplace and elsewhere, but discrimination on grounds of disability or age or sexual orientation is prohibited only in the workplace but not elsewhere – not in consumer protection and not in other situations which citizens can find themselves in and being discriminated against.

It is right that we correct that anomaly. The large majority today sends a powerful signal to the Council, and I look forward to adoption in the near future.

4-164

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Voorzitter, ik heb gisteren in het debat al een pak argumenten aangehaald waarom de amendementen en voorstellen van het verslag Buitenweg voor mij onaanvaardbaar waren, zo mogelijk nog meer dan het oorspronkelijke Commissievoorstel van de antidiscriminatie richtlijn zelf. Het blijft hoe dan ook, zelfs met de amendementen waarover vandaag gestemd is, een onduldbare schending van het subsidiariteitsbeginsel. Het organiseert opnieuw een enorme administratieve rompslomp, die bijzonder veel centen kost en moeilijkheden creëert voor de lidstaten. En het getuigt vooral van een bijzonder groot wantrouwen tegen de lidstaten zelf.

Het probleem met dat soort teksten waar van alles in staat, is natuurlijk dat er ook een paar goede dingen in staan. Ik maak van de stemverklaring gebruik om, voor zover nodig, te bevestigen dat ik uiteraard gewonnen ben voor grote inspanningen van de gehele Gemeenschap ten voordele van bijvoorbeeld mindervaliden. Maar ook hier ben ik ervan overtuigd dat dit het best op het niveau van de lidstaten wordt georganiseerd.

4-165

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Mr President, this report rests on a conceptual misunderstanding. Outside this Chamber, equality means the right of people to be treated the same. Here in this Chamber, we are using it to mean the right of people to be treated differently.

That is a critical point. Anti-discrimination legislation of this kind is not a refinement of the principle of equality under the law. It is an opposing principle. When we pass such reports as this, we take power away from people that one can vote for – and vote against – and give it arbitrarily to jurists. If this report were applied literally, it would prohibit an opera company from declining to hire men in soprano roles, it would prohibit a Labour politician from declining to have a Conservative as their press spokesman, and it would prohibit a Catholic school or hospital from preferring to employ its own co-religionists.

When I made these points, the answer from the report's supporters was that it would not be used that way, and that everyone knows what it really means. I have to say that it strikes me as very bad jurisprudence to criminalise everything in theory and then rely on the courts arbitrarily to disapply the law.

4-166

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, le grand philosophe catholique Chesterton disait que le monde moderne était plein d'idées chrétiennes devenues folles.

Je crois que ce rapport Buitenweg en est l'illustration absolue. C'est un texte qui part de bons sentiments afin d'éviter des discriminations dont pourraient souffrir, par exemple, les personnes handicapées, et qui arrive à un véritable totalitarisme en faisant une erreur conceptuelle fondamentale, c'est-à-dire en ne distinguant pas les différences légitimes des discriminations qui sont injustes.

Il est, par exemple, naturel qu'un enfant ait droit à un papa et à une maman, même s'il est adopté. Ce droit doit prévaloir sur celui de personnes du même sexe à adopter un enfant. Il est naturel que s'exercent des distinctions en fonction de la nationalité. Il est naturel que les Français chez eux, les Britanniques chez eux, les Tchèques, les Litوانيens soient préférés dans leurs propres pays aux étrangers, comme il est naturel que ces étrangers soient préférés dans le leur aux citoyens européens.

Ce sont des distinctions qui sont parfaitement légitimes, que méconnaît ce texte qui, de surcroît, détruit la présomption d'innocence. C'est un véritable pas vers le totalitarisme mou qu'est cette nouvelle doctrine du politiquement correct.

4-167

Martin Kastler (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Während sich zehn der 27 Mitgliedstaaten wegen Nichtumsetzung der ersten Richtlinie in einem laufenden Gerichtsverfahren befinden, haben wir heute erlebt, dass eine einfache Mehrheit die zweite Richtlinie noch darüber gestülpt hat.

Ich persönlich – und auch die Mehrheit meiner Fraktion – hat dazu Nein gesagt. Warum? Ich möchte zwei Beispiele anführen. Aus Erfahrung aus meiner fränkischen Heimat weiß ich von Bemühungen politischer Extremisten, Neonazis und Linksradike, die versuchen, Immobilien zu erwerben, und damit eine breite Öffentlichkeitswirkung zu ihren Gunsten zu erzielen. Eigentümer und unsere Vermieter müssen nun, wenn das umgesetzt wird, solche Geschäfte unter Umständen dank der Gleichbehandlungsrichtlinie machen, was sie bisher ablehnen konnten.

Aus diesem Grund habe ich heute den Bericht Buitenweg abgelehnt. Der andere Grund ist, dass wir heute in dem Änderungsantrag die Beweisumkehr und damit einen Grundsatz in unserem Rechtsstaat umgekehrt haben. Das halte ich für völlig illegitim. Der dritte Punkt waren die Zeitungen und Verleger, die durch diese Richtlinie in ihrer Freiheit beschnitten werden, Anzeigen von Extremisten nicht zu veröffentlichen. Dies ist meines Erachtens ein klarer Eingriff in die Pressefreiheit, den ich ablehne.

4-168

Neena Gill (PSE). – Mr President, I was delighted to support this report because I have always fought against all types of discrimination. I think it is vital that we have a framework to prevent exploitation of people because of their religion, age, disability, education or marital status. Without protection against discrimination on these grounds, our ambitions for a social Europe will be meaningless. This will particularly be the case during the current economic situation. There is always a temptation during these difficult times to exploit those who are less able to defend themselves, to cut corners when it comes to regulation designed precisely to protect against such exploitation.

In my constituency, the West Midlands, we are threatened with the rise of far-right politics. I believe Europe has a key role to play in ensuring people know they are protected in the face of aggression and exploitation.

4-169

Martin Callanan (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I voted against this report for the fundamental reason that I believe these subjects have nothing at all to do with the European Union. I do not believe there is any need for European legislation in these matters. I think very sensitive, traditional matters such as this are much better handled at Member State level, where individual national parliaments can take account of the fundamental culture, traditions and legal systems that are in their own particular countries.

A number of other Members have raised issues about the particular problems that will be caused by this – the problems for religious groups being forced to employ somebody from a different religious base, the problem in faith schools, and the problem of different political parties wanting to employ people of their own beliefs and values. Essentially, the fundamental problem with this is that it takes power away from us, as elected politicians or national politicians, and puts it in the hands of unelected judges to interpret and re-interpret the legislation in ways that were never envisaged at all by the very well-meaning sentiments of some of the authors of this report. But I believe that, fundamentally, we are opening a huge can of worms.

4-170

Ewa Tomaszewska (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Głosowałam przeciw sprawozdaniu w sprawie równego traktowania osób, mimo, a może właśnie dlatego, że jestem przeciwnikiem dyskryminacji. Przyjęcie tego dokumentu w szczególności oznacza zgodę na równy dostęp pedofilów do miejsc pracy w bezpośrednim kontakcie z dziećmi gwarantowany prawnie, co oznacza zagrożenie dla dzieci, zgodę na wydawnictwa i publiczne wystąpienia faszystowskie i sekt religijnych, zakaz funkcjonowania ośrodków edukacyjnych lub charytatywnych prowadzonych przez kościoły w swych wspólnotach, co bardzo okaleczy działalność społeczną, a także otwarcie szerszych możliwości dyskryminacji chrześcijan. Dokument narusza zasadę pomocniczości, co jest coraz częstszą praktyką w Parlamencie Europejskim.

4-171

Μαρία Παναγιωτοπούλου-Κασσιώτου (PPE-DE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να μεταφέρω την μεγάλη έκπληξη και απογοήτευση των αναπήρων και των ανθρώπων με ειδικές ανάγκες, που περίμεναν να τους δοθεί η δυνατότητα, ήδη από τη δική μας κοινοβουλευτική περίοδο, να έχουν μια οδηγία-πλαίσιο, έτσι ώστε τα κράτη μέλη να προσαρμόσουν τη νομοθεσία τους και να μη γίνεται διακριτική μεταχείριση σ' αυτή την κατηγορία ανθρώπων, οι οποίοι εκπροσωπούνται μεν από μεγάλες ευρωπαϊκές συνδικαλιστικές οργανώσεις αναπήρων, δεν μπορούν όμως να εκφράσουν οι ίδιοι την πρόθεσή τους να προστατευθούν.

4-172

Gay Mitchell (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I had concerns relating to the wording of the Commission proposal – but no legislation is perfect. I voted for both parts of recital 17, Amendment 28. It was my intention to vote for the original text, but I did not wish to vote against the amendment wording which, though not as strong as the original text in relation to rights of Member States, did address my concerns sufficiently, and it was clear it would be overwhelmingly carried. I therefore would not have had the opportunity to vote for the original text, which would have fallen in those circumstances, I could, therefore, have appeared to vote against a principle, and that I did not wish to do.

Having examined the text in depth, I am satisfied that the proposal will serve to improve the access to goods and services for people with disabilities without making any unnecessary references to text that can be inferred as abortion.

I firmly believe that it is vital to put in place mechanisms that allow the disabled to travel within the European Union on an equal footing as every other citizen. Europe has over 50 million disabled citizens, and it is therefore imperative that we make every measure to improve their well-being. It is for that reason that I voted for the report.

4-173

– **Proposition de résolution: B6-0177/2009 (Dialogue UE-Belarus)**

4-174

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I supported the resolution on the evaluation of the EU-Belarus dialogue. I voted 'yes' because I welcome the increased high level EU-Belarus dialogue, including bilateral contacts, and the intensified technical cooperation initiated by the Commission.

At the same time, I would like to point out that the political dialogue between the EU and Belarus must be conditional on, and directly connected to, the lifting of restrictions on freedoms and cessation of the repression of participants in peaceful demonstrations and human rights activists.

I insist that the democratic opposition in Belarus and civil society be included in the dialogue between the EU and Belarus.

Last but not least, I hope that the Government of Belarus will use the next nine months to achieve substantial progress in a number of areas, including freedom of association and the granting of political rights and freedoms.

4-175

Toomas Savi (ALDE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this resolution as it provides a balanced and realistic overview of the relations between the European Union and Belarus.

President Lukashenko seems to be seeking better relations with both the European Union and the Russian Federation. The release of political prisoners a year ago was the first sign of the Lukashenko regime's willingness to meet the demands of the EU and engage in serious dialogue.

Although the palliation of the regime's oppression can be considered an improvement, a true regime transition has not started yet. I believe that the involvement of the democratic opposition in Belarus, as well as civil society, is vital for a meaningful dialogue between the European Union and Belarus and eventually the key to the successful process of democratisation.

4-176

– **Proposition de résolution: RC-B6-0165/2009 (Conscience européenne et totalitarisme)**

4-177

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Voorzitter, in de gezamenlijke ontwerpresolutie die wij vandaag hebben aangenomen, staan heel wat behartigenswaardige dingen. Ik ben het bijvoorbeeld eens met het feit dat de offers die heel veel mensen hebben gebracht in de strijd tegen de totalitaire regimes van de 21e eeuw in Europa, niet mogen worden vergeten.

Maar toch een paar opmerkingen. Het is spijtig dat er een paragraaf ontbreekt over de bondgenoten van die totalitaire regimes, die tot heel recent bijna heel Oost-Europa onder de knoet hielden. Het is waar dat zogenaamde rechtse politici bijzonder weinig inspanningen deden om democratisering in Oost-Europa te eisen, maar het nog veel meer waar dat er heel wat linkse politici die communistische regimes actief hebben gesteund, ook al spelen zij vandaag de vermoorde onschuld, ook in dit Parlement.

Een tweede bedenking. We zouden eigenlijk de moed moeten hebben om hier met dit verslag stelling te nemen tegen de muilkorfwetten. Historisch onderzoek, hoe moeilijk ook, moet delicaat gebeuren met respect voor de slachtoffers, maar in volkomen vrijheid. Het is jammer dat we deze beide kansen gemist hebben.

4-178

Siiri Oviir (ALDE). – Ma toetasin kõnealuse resolutsiooni vastuvõtmist, mis sündis nelja fraktsiooni koostöös. See dokument on tasakaalus ja selle kohta võiks öelda: parem hilja kui mitte kunagi. Tegelikult on see enim, mida me siin saalis üheskoos õigluse nimel teha saame.

Me oleme oma vanematele ja vanavanematele võlgu kindla parlamentaarse sõnumi ja täna me seda tegime. Samas on meie kohus meie käsutuses olevate vahenditega ära hoida käsitletu kordumist. Tõel ja mäletamisel on seejuures oluline koht. Meie kohus on tagada õigusriigi põhimõtete austamine.

4-179

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Mr President, this resolution recalls the horrors of Fascism and of Soviet Communism. No European, no child of Western civilisation, no civilised human being could disagree. But it then goes on to posit the European Union as an alternative or antidote to such totalitarianism. It reads: ‘the European Union has a particular responsibility to promote and safeguard democracy, both inside and outside the European Union’.

It is here, my friends, that you make your bloomer. The European Union is not safeguarding democracy, either internally or externally. Abroad it is doing business with Castro’s Cuba, with the Ayatollahs in Tehran; it is demanding the right to sell arms to Communist China. At home it is striking down referendum results when they go against closer integration.

Now of course, one has to be careful making such parallels. No one is arguing that the European Union is a Soviet system that takes away people’s passports or runs Gulags or operates show trials. But it should deeply worry us when any system claims that the ruling ideology is too important to be subjected to the ballot box.

4-180

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, il est heureux, en effet, que le national-socialisme soit mis sur le même pied que le communisme et englobé dans une réprobation générale des totalitarismes qui ont ensanglanté le XXe siècle et qui, cependant, ont été très en faveur parmi beaucoup d'intellectuels, auxquels on n'a jamais demandé de comptes et dont beaucoup, d'ailleurs, siègent parmi ces rangs dans les personnalités les plus en vue.

Il est heureux qu'un certain nombre d'amendements qui tendaient à polluer ce texte aient été retirés. Je ne crois pas, cependant, que l'on puisse, par exemple, accorder une valeur absolument irréfragable à l'histoire officielle de cette période sombre de notre histoire, ni condamner les esprits hétérodoxes.

Il est absolument stupéfiant qu'en France, ce soit une loi d'inspiration communiste, la loi Guessot, qui encadre encore le débat historique sous de lourdes sanctions pénales. Notre collègue Jacques Toubon l'a qualifiée de stalinienne lors de son adoption. Eh bien son ami, M. Barrot, commissaire à la justice, propose de l'étendre à tous les pays de l'Union qui ne l'ont pas et même de tripler les sanctions et les peines de prison qui l'assortissent. Ce n'est pas avec des méthodes totalitaires que l'on peut combattre le totalitarisme.

4-181

Katrin Saks (PSE). – Ma pean vajalikuks selgitada, miks ma toetasin seda resolutsiooni erinevalt mitmetest oma fraktsioonikaaslastest ja just seda, mitte oma fraktsiooni varianti. Ma ei saa nõustuda retoorikaga, et katse on ajalugu ümber kirjutada. Suur osa Ida-Euroopa ajalugu on kirjutamata või vähemalt teadvustamata ja eriti just see osa, mis puudutab kommunismi kuritegusid.

Ma ei saa ka toetada lähenemist, et me peame jätma ajaloolastele selle otsustamise, millea oli tegemist. Ma pean seda meie moraalseks kohuseks ja mul on hea meel, et täna see resolutsioon vastu võeti.

4-182

Syed Kamall (PPE-DE). – Mr President, thank you for giving me this opportunity to explain how I voted on this issue.

There were two interesting sentences in the report that merit further attention. The first recognised that Communism and Nazism have a common legacy and called for an honest and thorough debate to be conducted on all the totalitarian crimes of the past century.

The other sentence which stuck out was ‘calls for a pan-European public academic debate on the nature, history and legacy of totalitarian regimes on the basis of an international legal framework’.

I really wonder whether there is need for such a debate. It is quite clear what the common thread is between Soviet socialism and National Socialism. The clue is in the phrase, and the answer is ‘socialism’.

When Socialist MPs try to ban an MEP from chairing the first session of the next Parliament, no matter how vile his views are, that is an attack on free speech. When the British socialist Government refuses to honour its manifesto commitment to hold a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty, that is an act of intolerance. We should be careful it is not the first step towards totalitarianism.

4-183

Mario Borghezio (UEN). – Signor Presidente, il totalitarismo sovietico non ha solo imprigionato le persone. Purtroppo ha imprigionato anche la storia e i suoi documenti. Milioni di pagine di storia sono state tenute nascoste negli archivi segreti e tuttora di Mosca. Treni interi di documenti hanno trasferito milioni di documenti storici, in parte sottratti ai tedeschi ma in gran parte depredati direttamente o, come in Italia, attraverso i partigiani comunisti.

Noi vorremmo che la nostra storia potesse essere accessibile. L'Europa deve chiederlo, deve ottenerlo. Documenti non consultabili: per esempio, sull'olocausto dei prigionieri militari italiani, sottoposti a tentativi di lavaggio del cervello, tenuti senza cibo, molto peggio che nei campi nazisti, morti fra mille sofferenze e sotto le torture, anche psicologiche, degli *agit-prop* comunisti sovietici ma purtroppo anche comunisti italiani.

4-184

Ιωάννης Βαρβιτσιώτης (PPE-DE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ομάδα των ευρωβουλευτών της Νέας Δημοκρατίας, που ανήκει στο Ευρωπαϊκό Λαϊκό Κόμμα, καταδικάζει απερίφραστα κάθε μορφή ολοκληρωτισμού και, παράλληλα, υπογραμμίζει τη σημασία που έχει να διατηρηθεί η μνήμη για το παρελθόν, κάτι που άλλωστε αποτελεί σημαντικό στοιχείο της Ιστορίας μας. Όμως, πιστεύουμε ότι οι όποιες αποφάσεις πλειοψηφίας του Κοινοβουλίου δεν είναι αρμόδιες να ερμηνεύσουν ιστορικά γεγονότα. Η αποτίμηση ιστορικών γεγονότων είναι αποκλειστικό έργο των ιστορικών και μόνο. Γι' αυτούς τους λόγους καταλήξαμε στην απόφαση να απόσχουμε από την ψηφοφορία του κοινού ψηφίσματος των τεσσάρων πολιτικών ομάδων, στις οποίες ήταν και το ΕΛΚ, για την ευρωπαϊκή συνείδηση και τον ολοκληρωτισμό.

4-185

– **Proposition de résolution: RC-B6-0166/2009 (Rôle de la culture)**

4-186

Daniel Hannan (NI). – Mr President has this House no sense of self-awareness? We pass a resolution condemning totalitarianism and then, seconds later, we pass a resolution calling on Brussels to fund cultural policy in the regions.

My friends, culture cannot be created by bureaucratic fiat. It grows organically; it develops naturally within a people and, in its way, this report precisely demonstrates the structural flaw at the heart of the European project. The Brussels institutions are not rooted in any nation, in any demos, in any cultural unit. But rather than accepting that and trying to suit our institutions to public opinion, we attempt to suit public opinion to our pre-existing institutions.

If we really want to win our publics over, we cannot do it by subsidising folk dancing. The way of doing it is by treating their opinions with respect and that means – as you see I have not yet said it today – putting the Lisbon Treaty to a vote. *Pactio Olisipiensis censenda est!*

4-187

– **Rapport: Janusz Onyszkiewicz (A6-0140/2009)**

4-188

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of the resolution, and there are at least two important issues in the document I would like to clarify my position on.

At the beginning of his term in office, President Medvedev made a public commitment to strengthen the rule of law in Russia and raised concerns over the independence of Russia's judiciary and legal system. This is pointed out in our resolution, and I support the position. It is time for action. It is time to prove the President's words were not just pure rhetoric the international community wanted to hear.

In our resolution we also raised concerns with the Russian Government regarding its decision to recognise Abkhazia and South Ossetia as sovereign states, to sign military assistance and cooperation agreements with the de facto authorities of those two provinces and to establish military bases there. Those steps undermine the territorial integrity of Georgia as

insisted upon in the relevant United Nations resolutions. So we should call on Russia once again to reverse its decision and to maintain that Russia cannot be regarded as an impartial moderator in the peace process.

4-189

David Sumberg (PPE-DE). – Mr President, thank you very much indeed for calling me, and I apologise for being missing when you called me earlier. It is kind of you to bring me on now.

I just want to use the opportunity of this vote, in which I voted in favour, to express a warning about the rising power of the Soviet Union and the atmosphere in that country.

We all had high hopes when Communism fell, but in parts of the former Soviet Union, and particularly in Russia, there is now an atmosphere of fear, an atmosphere of nationalism – an atmosphere that is, I am afraid, unacceptable. Although the European Union has to have relations with the Russian Government, we must remind that Government at all times that we demand that the democratic state and the democratic ethos should always prevail, and that attempts to censor views that are not acceptable to the Government, or to put politicians under unfair pressure, will not be acceptable to the European Union. That is something we should make clear at all times.

4-190

– **Rapport: Frédérique Ries (A6-0089/2009)**

4-191

Brigitte Fouré (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, j'ai voté en faveur du rapport de Mme Ries relatif aux préoccupations quant aux effets des champs électromagnétiques sur la santé.

Les champs électromagnétiques existent, certes, à l'état naturel, mais la demande en électricité et surtout le développement des technologies sans fil ont conduit à augmenter rapidement l'exposition des citoyens aux ondes électromagnétiques. Il nous faut donc être vigilants et le Parlement européen l'a bien compris.

En tant qu'élue de la circonscription Nord-Ouest de la France, je peux témoigner du danger que présentent certaines lignes électriques à très haute tension installées dans ma circonscription, à proximité des écoles et des établissements de santé, notamment celles situées dans le département français de la Manche, qui exposent fortement les travailleurs et résidents locaux aux ondes émises.

Les scientifiques n'étant pas d'accord sur les conséquences des champs électromagnétiques pour la santé de nos concitoyens, il convient d'être responsables et d'appliquer le principe de précaution. Les valeurs limites devraient donc être régulièrement actualisées afin de garantir aux citoyens un niveau de protection adéquat.

Le Parlement européen a ici voulu attirer l'attention de la Commission européenne sur ce sujet qui préoccupe, à juste titre, les citoyens. L'Union européenne se doit de faire plus en la matière en établissant une politique claire dans le domaine des ondes électromagnétiques, en informant davantage les citoyens sur cette question et en adoptant une législation communautaire contraignante.

4-192

– **Rapport: Pál Schmitt (A6-0124/2009)**

4-193

Tomáš Zatloukal (PPE-DE). – Jedním z cílů, které jsme si v roce 2000 vytyčili v Lisabonu, byla i společnost založená na znalostech. Ačkoliv již nyní víme, že z našich cílů budeme muset ustoupit, či spíše, že je dosáhneme později, nesmíme v aktivitách k nim vedoucím polevit. Proto jsem také podpořil zprávu kolegy Schmitta, která se snaží nastítnit možné problémy v oblasti vzdělávání, kterými je zapotřebí se zabývat. Právě vzdělání je totiž nejčastěji tím základním kamenem, kterého je potřeba k dosažení záměrů. Úroveň dosaženého vzdělání má přímý vliv na možnost zaměstnání mladých lidí, tudíž také na jejich zapojení do společnosti a my si i navzdory nynější hospodářské krizi nemůžeme dovolit plynout tímto potenciálem.

4-194

Siiri Oviir (ALDE). – Ka mina hääletasin selle raporti poolt, sest teema on väga oluline. Probleeme selles vallas on väga palju. Me ei saa tegevusetult pealt vaadata, kui igal aastal langeb Euroopa koolidest välja vähemalt kuus miljonit õpilast. Mida see tähendab neile? See tähendab tulevast või tuleviku eluvaadete nurjumist.

Siin saabki appi tulla 21. sajandi kool, mida iseloomustaks hea sotsiaalne kliima, erinevate pedagoogiliste meetodite kasutamine, avatus ja paindlikkus. Loomulikult ka järjepideva õppetava kujundamine.

Euroopa vananeb. Me ei ole nii rikkad, et võime antud teema käsitlemist tulevikku lükata. Kõik lapsed peavad saama hariduse, mis annab neile tänapäeva maailmas õiglasel võimalusel. Meie noored peavad olema konkurentsivõimelised ja mitte ainult konkurentsivõimelised: hariduspoliitika peab aitama kaasa isiksuse väljakujunemisele.

4-195

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Voorzitter, dank aan de tolkdiensten die overuren maken. Ik wou alleen nog zeggen dat ik met bijzondere overtuiging tegen het verslag Schmitt gestemd heb, in de eerste plaats omdat ik vind dat onderwijs een bevoegdheid van de lidstaten moet blijven en het Europees niveau daar eigenlijk weinig mee te maken heeft. Dat is een fundamentele kwestie.

Maar ik heb ook andere bezwaren tegen het verslag-Schmitt, bijvoorbeeld dat dit verslag uitgaat van de gedachte dat de onderwijssystemen in de diverse Europese landen zich maar moeten aanpassen aan de aanwezigheid van niet-Europese immigranten in plaats van omgekeerd. Hoe deze stelling te rijmen valt met integratie, laat staan met assimilatiebevordering, begrijp ik niet, want het exacte tegendeel zal het resultaat zijn. Natuurlijk is er ook in dit verslag zoals altijd de obligate Roma-paragraaf, ook deze keer opnieuw zonder dat de vraag gesteld wordt wie eigenlijk waarvoor verantwoordelijk is. Ik lees onder meer ook dat de lidstaten ervoor moeten zorgen dat de kinderen van immigranten onderwijs krijgen in hun moedertaal en dat het lerarenkorps per se de multiculturele samenleving moet weerspiegelen. Excuus, maar dit is een politiek correct verslag dat meer problemen schept dan het oplost.

4-196

Explications de vote écrites

4-197

– **Rapport: Neil Parish (A6-0141/2009)**

4-198

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto favorevole in merito alla relazione del collega Parish, sulla proposta di decisione del Consiglio recante rettifica della direttiva 2008/73/CE del Consiglio che semplifica le procedure di redazione degli elenchi e di diffusione dell'informazione in campo veterinario e zootecnico.

4-199

– **Rapport: Angelika Niebler (A6-0128/2009)**

4-200

Nicolae Vlad Popa (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat în favoarea raportului privind statisticile comunitare referitoare la societatea informațională deoarece tehnologiile informației și comunicațiilor reprezintă o parte importantă a productivității în Uniunea Europeană și a creșterii produsului intern brut.

Scopul acestui regulament este garantarea continuității cadrului comun existent, în vederea producerii sistematice de statistici comunitare fiabile, armonizate, transmise la timp și de înaltă calitate privind societatea informațională și în vederea transmiterii de date statistice anuale referitoare la utilizarea TIC în întreprinderi și în gospodării.

Susțin acele prevederi care au în vedere simplificarea procedurilor administrative în sarcina autorităților publice (comunitare sau naționale), cât și a persoanelor private.

Consider că la nivel european există o nevoie permanentă de transmitere anuală a unor informații statistice coerente din domeniul societății informaționale.

Susțin punerea în aplicare a strategiei i2010. Aceasta promovează o economie digitală deschisă și competitivă și subliniază rolul esențial al tehnologiilor informației și comunicațiilor pentru incluziune și calitatea vieții.

Strategia aceasta este considerată un element fundamental al parteneriatului de la Lisabona reînnoit pentru creștere și locuri de muncă.

4-201

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Voto favorevolmente la relazione della collega Niebler, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (CE) n. 808/2004 relativo alle statistiche comunitarie sulla società dell'informazione.

Considero fondamentali gli emendamenti presentati, perché utili all'elaborazione di statistiche comunitarie sulla società dell'informazione armonizzate, affidabili, tempestive e di elevata qualità.

4-202

– **Rapport: Béla Glattfelder (A6-0122/2009)**

4-203

Bogusław Liberadzki (PSE), na piśmie. – Głosuję za przyjęciem sprawozdania w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego decyzji Rady w sprawie zawarcia Umowy między Wspólnotą Europejską a Konfederacją Szwajcarską zmieniającej załącznik 11 do Umowy między Wspólnotą Europejską a Konfederacją Szwajcarską dotyczącej handlu produktami rolnymi.

Zgadzam się ze spostrzeżeniami sprawozdawcy dotyczącymi dalszej integracji obydwu rynków. Istotnie, umowa przyczyniłaby się do zwiększenia produktywności sektora rolnego obu stron oraz ukształtowania cen żywności na uczciwym i względnie stabilnym poziomie z punktu widzenia obywateli.

Tym niemniej zgadzam się z przekonaniem, iż obie strony powinny ostrożnie negocjować pełną liberalizację wymiany handlowej. Wartość dwustronnej wymiany handlowej jest znacząca, a usunięcie barier miałooby bardzo duży wpływ, w szczególności na gospodarkę rolną krajów UE sąsiadujących ze Szwajcarią oraz szwajcarskich rolników.

4-204

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto favorevole alla relazione del collega Glattfelder, sulla proposta di decisione del Consiglio relativa alla conclusione dell'accordo tra la Comunità europea e la Confederazione svizzera recante modifica dell'allegato 11 dell'accordo tra la Comunità europea e la Confederazione svizzera sul commercio di prodotti agricoli.

4-205

– **Rapport: Ioannis Varvitsiotis (A6-0147/2009)**

4-206

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Voto a favore della relazione presentata dal collega Varvitsiotis sul reciproco riconoscimento delle misure cautelari. Ritengo, infatti, che la custodia cautelare debba essere considerata una misura eccezionale che debba essere attentamente soppesata rispetto al diritto di libertà e alla presunzione di non colpevolezza.

Purtroppo, mi trovo d'accordo con il relatore quando afferma che finora non è stato tuttavia possibile riconoscere misure alternative alla custodia cautelare al di là delle frontiere, poiché non esiste uno strumento specifico di riconoscimento reciproco, un aspetto che ostacola la tutela giudiziaria dei diritti individuali. Questo è un aspetto che va necessariamente ridiscusso.

4-207

– **Rapport: Karin Jöns (A6-0116/2009)**

4-208

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat în favoarea raportului doamnei Karin Jöns, deoarece susțin adăugarea de noi tipuri de costuri eligibile pentru o contribuție din partea Fondului Social European.

Consider că modificările propuse în raport vor duce la aplicarea accelerată a fondului, la simplificarea gestionării, administrării și controlului operațiunilor care beneficiază de cofinanțări în cadrul FSE.

Subliniez necesitatea de a realiza o simplificare a procedurilor legate de alocarea finanțărilor provenite din fondurile structurale.

S-a constatat că întârzierile înregistrate în aplicarea politicii de dezvoltare regională sunt cauzate, printre altele, de procedurile prea stricte impuse de legislația europeană. În concluzie, o simplificare a acestora este esențială.

4-209

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE), in writing. – I support this regulation which will allow faster and more efficient access to European funds in order to prevent unemployment and fight social exclusion during the crisis.

The aim of the proposal is to add a further, simpler, method of spending the European Social Fund, so that its contribution to addressing the economic and social challenges facing Europe during the crisis can be faster and more effective. The proposal is limited to introducing a simplification into the operations of the European Social Fund to encourage the effective, efficient and fast uptake of available resources, without compromising the principles of sound financial management.

4-210

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto favorevole in merito al lavoro svolto dalla collega Jöns sui nuovi tipi di costi che possono beneficiare di un contributo del FSE. Sono d'accordo con la proposta della Commissione, che mira a introdurre un metodo aggiuntivo, più semplice, per utilizzare gli stanziamenti del Fondo sociale europeo, affinché la sua capacità di reazione alle difficoltà economiche e sociali con cui l'Europa si confronta sia più rapida ed efficace. Inoltre, mi compiaccio del fatto che l'FSE continuerà a sostenere azioni intese ad ampliare e a migliorare gli investimenti nel capitale umano, soprattutto potenziando i sistemi d'istruzione e di formazione, e azioni finalizzate a sviluppare la capacità istituzionale e l'efficienza delle pubbliche amministrazioni a livello nazionale, regionale e locale.

4-211

– **Rapport: Iratxe García Pérez (A6-0127/2009)**

4-212

Šarūnas Birutis (ALDE), rakstiski. – Europos Parlamentas sveikina Komisijos greitus veiksmus siūlant šiuos teisės aktų pakeitimus, kurie neabejotinai padės įveikti neigiamą netikėtos finansų krizės poveikį, bet jis labai apgailestauja, kad nebuvo numatyta kitų svarbių pakeitimų.

Pakeitimų paketas buvo suprantamas kaip atsakymas į laikiną, tačiau išskirtinai kritinę padėtį; nepaisant to, jis iš tikrųjų visiškai patenkina prašymą labiau supaprastinti procedūras ir lanksčiau taikyti esamas taisykles pagal struktūrinių fondų reglamentus, kurį pakartotinai teikė Europos Parlamentas pastaraisiais metais.

Būtent leidus lanksčiau skirstyti Bendrijos ir šalių finansavimo dalis viso programavimo laikotarpiu, į nacionalines ekonomikas nedelsiant bus nukreiptas pinigų srautas, būtinas reaguojant į jų dabartinius biudžeto apribojimus

4-213

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Dopo aver attentamente letto la raccomandazione di Garcia Perez concernente le disposizioni relative alla gestione finanziaria di FESR, FSE e Fondo di coesione. Non penso che la l'economia europea possa ricevere una seria spinta dalla pubblicazione da parte della Commissione Europea di una comunicazione dal titolo "Un piano europeo di ripresa economica", contenente una serie di misure specifiche tese a stimolare gli investimenti e a stanziare fondi pubblici supplementari alle economie nazionali, chiamate a far fronte a gravi restrizioni di bilancio.

4-214

– **Rapport: Hannu Takkula (A6-0125/2009)**

4-214-500

Adam Bielan (UEN), na piśmie. – Sprawozdanie Pani Takkula porusza istotny problem społeczny. Uważam, że należy ułatwić dzieciom z państw trzecich naukę języka kraju, w którym przebywają, tak aby zapewnić im równe szanse w zdobywaniu wyższych kwalifikacji. Jest to pierwszy i podstawowy krok do pełnej integracji w społeczeństwie.

4-215

Šarūnas Birutis (ALDE), rakstiski. – Siekiant, kad migrantai integruotųsi, itin svarbu labiau remti kalbų kursus; integracija – tai dvejopas procesas, kuriame dalyvauja migrantai ir priimančioji šalis. Migrantų noras išmokyti priimančiosios šalies kalbą ir tvarkyti savo gyvenimą nereiškia, kad jie atsisako savo kilmės šalies kalbos ir kultūros.

Kalbų mokymasis (gimtosios ir gyvenamosios šalies kalbų) turi būti skatinamas labai anksti, dar iki pradinio ugdymo etapo, visų pirma siekiant skatinti migrantų ir tautinių mažumų, kaip antai romų, įtrauktį į Europos visuomenes.

Mokymasis visą gyvenimą yra svarbus migrantams, etninėms mažumoms ir nepalankioje socialinėje bei ekonominėje padėtyje esančioms grupėms, nes tai yra integravimo procesas, o dalyvavimas mokymo programose ir mokymasis visą gyvenimą suteikia galimybę naujai atvykusiems imigrantams.

Ypatingą dėmesį reikia skirti paprastai prastesniems migrantų, etninių mažumų ir nepalankioje socialinėje bei ekonominėje padėtyje esančių grupių veiklos rezultatams, o kuo greičiau ir geriau jie bus integruojami į mokyklas, tuo geriau jiems seksis mokykloje ir įgyjant tolesnį išsilavinimą bei darbo rinkoje.

4-216

Catherine Boursier (PSE), par écrit. – Chaque enfant a droit à l'éducation. L'intégration des migrants, qu'ils soient en situation régulière ou irrégulière, est une priorité pour nous socialistes. Nous n'acceptons pas la hiérarchie que la droite parlementaire souhaite créer entre migrants. C'est pourquoi je me suis abstenue sur l'excellent rapport Takkula sur l'éducation des enfants des migrants parce que, s'agissant d'un rapport d'initiative, il ne nous a pas été possible de présenter des votes séparés pour demander la suppression des paragraphes 5, 8 et 16 qui ne me satisfont absolument pas.

C'est par l'éducation des enfants de migrants que nous contribueront fortement à l'intégration de tous, quel que soit leur statut. C'est en mettant en place des conditions socioéconomiques favorables que nous pourrions aider au mieux les migrants, qu'ils résident légalement en Europe, qu'ils soient voués à être régularisés ou encore à retourner finalement dans leurs pays. On ne peut créer ainsi un statut de non-éducation et de ghettoïsation pour des enfants du simple fait que leurs parents sont en situation irrégulière. C'est purement contraire aux conventions internationales.

4-217

Lena Ek (ALDE), skriftlig. – "Innehållet i och organisationen av utbildning och yrkesutbildning tillhör ländernas nationella behörighet." Detta slås fast i en av de första paragraferna i Takkulas initiativbetänkande om "utbildning för barn till migranter". Men det dröjer inte länge innan det börjar talas om vilka saker som ska vara med på läroplanen, hur lärarutbildningen ska se ut eller att medlemsstaterna "måste få invandrare att engagera sig i många olika fritidsaktiviteter". Även om det är viktigt att säkerställa att alla barn, inklusive barn till migranter, får en så bra skolgång som möjligt, ställer jag mig frågan om detta verkligen hör hemma på EU-nivå? Svaret finner jag i ovan återgivna paragraf. Jag röstar för ett smalare men vassare EU. Jag röstade därför nej till initiativbetänkandet, även om jag tycker att den berör ett mycket viktigt ämne som vi måste titta närmare på på nationell nivå.

4-218

Glyn Ford (PSE), *in writing*. – I abstained on this report as a response to our Christian Democrat and Conservative colleagues blocking the oral amendment that would have made it clear that a right to education extends to all migrant children whether or not their parents are in the Union legally or not.

The notion that we punish children for the sins of the parents is one we rightly oppose around the world, but apparently it is now OK within Europe.

I can only admire the opportunistic hypocrisy of my Tory colleagues.

4-219

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), *skriftlig*. – Vi påpekar än en gång att i EU-samarbetet av idag är det bestämt att medlemsstaterna har ett exklusivt ansvar för undervisningens organisation.

Förslaget till uttalande innehåller åtskilliga goda tankar, men med all respekt för själva sakfrågan menar vi att detta betänkande går utanför den Europeiska unionens kompetensområde. Subsidiaritetsprincipen säger att detta ska hanteras av medlemsländerna själva.

Av denna princip följer att Europaparlamentets utskott för kultur och utbildning bör läggas ned, då det behandlar frågor som ligger utanför EU-samarbetet.

Av dessa skäl har vi röstat nej till betänkandet.

4-220

Malcolm Harbour (PPE-DE), *in writing*. – I and my British Conservative colleagues are supportive of a number of the suggestions in this report, including training of teachers and pupils learning the languages of the host country.

However, we believe that education policy is and should remain a Member State competence, and that any improvements and measures with regard to the education of children of migrants should be developed by Member States themselves. For these reasons, we have abstained on this report.

4-221

Jens Holm, Søren Bo Søndergaard and Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL), *in writing*. – We fully support the notions of anti-discrimination and equality in access, and strongly believe in creating inclusive school systems and inclusive schools. We believe that actions should be taken to assist all vulnerable pupils. However, we believe that Member States are best suited for ensuring accessible and inclusive schooling for its citizens and residents alike. We believe that democratic control of the school system by the people it serves can only be ensured if the Member States formulate and implement education policy.

4-222

Anne E. Jensen og Karin Riis-Jørgensen (ALDE), *skriftlig*. – Vi stemte for betænkningen om uddannelse af børn af immigranter, da betænkningen vedrører et aktuelt og relevant problem. Det er dog begges holdning, at det skal være medlemsstaterne, der bestemmer omfanget af modersmålsundervisning. I Danmark er beslutningen lagt ud til kommunerne, og det mener vi, at man bør respektere.

Vi mener, at det er afgørende, at børnene først og fremmest behersker værtslandets sprog, så de ikke senere forhindres i at videreuddanne sig og få fodfæste på arbejdsmarkedet.

4-223

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Schon seit Jahren warnen die nationalen und patriotischen Kräfte in der EU vor den Folgen einer ungebremsten Massenzuwanderung. Ausländeranteile von 20, 50 oder gar 90 Prozent zeigen, dass die Multi-Kulti-Vision gescheitert ist. Schulversuche mit „reinen Ausländerklassen“ haben sich als fruchtlos erwiesen und auch intensive Sprachkurse stoßen an ihre Grenzen, wenn die Eltern ihr Kind nicht unterstützen. In Österreich werden seit Jahren Sprachkurse für Eltern angeboten, aber auch hier lässt der Erfolg zu wünschen übrig. Die Bildungsneigung wird nun einmal von einer Generation an die nächste weitergegeben, und wenn die Eltern Bildung als nutzlos ansehen, dann laufen wir gegen Mauern, das haben wir in Frankreich gesehen.

Die einzige Lösung ist Null- und Minuszuwanderung, ein Stopp des Familiennachzugs, und es muss endlich Integrationswille eingefordert werden. Der Lösungsvorschlag der EU, dass mehr Lehrer mit Migrationshintergrund an den Schulen unterrichten sollen, geht an der Realität vorbei, weshalb ich den Bericht auch abgelehnt habe.

4-224

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE-DE), *în scris*. – Acest raport aduce o contribuție extrem de valoroasă pentru rezolvarea problemei acute a copiilor cetățenilor europeni care locuiesc și lucrează în alt stat membru decât cel de origine - mulți dintre copiii emigranților români, de exemplu, se confruntă cu dificultăți în această privință. La fel de important este accesul la educație în limba țării gazdă, în vederea unei integrări facile, cât și asigurarea învățământului în limba maternă, mai ales în ipoteza unei eventuale reîntoarceri în țara de origine. România, de exemplu, traversează chiar în această

perioadă o experiență relevantă: mulți elevi români, copii de emigranți în Spania sau Italia, se întorc acasă și sunt reînscși de părinți în școlile românești. Este în interesul acestora și al viitorului lor ca reintegrarea să fie lipsită de dificultăți inerente unei schimbări a mediului școlar. Cazul României nu este singular. Alte state membre din Est s-au confruntat și se confruntă cu același fenomen, ceea ce face necesară punerea în aplicare, în termen cât mai scurt, a propunerilor conținute în acest raport.

4-225

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Το ΚΚΕ καταψηφίζει την Έκθεση. Η ΕΕ των ιμπεριαλιστικών επεμβάσεων, της νεοαποικιοκρατικής εκμετάλλευσης, του κυνηγιού των μεταναστών, της επίθεσης στα εργατικά, κοινωνικά και δημοκρατικά δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων, δεν μπορεί να εφαρμόσει ισότιμη κοινωνική ένταξη των μεταναστών, μέρος της οποίας αποτελεί η ισότιμη παροχή εκπαίδευσης στα παιδιά τους.

Η εκπαίδευση των παιδιών των μεταναστών δεν είναι ξεκομμένη από το σύνολο της μεταναστευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ. Πολιτική που χαρακτηρίζεται από σκληρά μέτρα σε βάρος εκείνων που δεν χρειάζονται στο μεγάλο κεφάλαιο και αποκαλεί λαθρομετανάστες, επιλεκτική νομιμοποίηση και ένταξη στην εργασία, με όρους βέβαια πολύ δυσμενέστερους, των μεταναστών που ανταποκρίνονται στις ανάγκες των μονοπωλίων. Είναι χαρακτηριστικό και απαράδεκτο ότι η έκθεση αναφέρεται μόνο στα παιδιά των νόμιμων μεταναστών. Όπως οι γονείς μετανάστες είναι τα πρώτα θύματα της ταξικής εκμετάλλευσης, έτσι και τα παιδιά τους είναι τα πρώτα θύματα των ταξικών διακρίσεων στην εκπαίδευση. Είναι χαρακτηριστικά τα στοιχεία που δείχνουν τη σχολική διαρροή των μεταναστών στις υψηλότερες βαθμίδες της εκπαίδευσης. Το σχολικό έτος 2004-2005, ενώ το ποσοστό των μεταναστών στην υποχρεωτική εκπαίδευση ήταν το 10,3 % του συνόλου, στο Λύκειο ήταν μόλις το 4 %.

Οι μετανάστες, μέσα από το ταξικό εργατικό κίνημα, πρέπει να αγωνιστούν μαζί με τους ντόπιους εργάτες, ενάντια στην εκμετάλλευση, τους ταξικούς φραγμούς στην εκπαίδευση.

4-226

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Decido di astenermi dal votare la relazione di Hannu Takkula sull'istruzione per i figli dei migranti. Non penso, infatti, che ci siano i presupposti per poter votare positivamente o negativamente il lavoro del collega.

4-227

Martine Roure (PSE), par écrit. – Chaque enfant a droit à l'éducation. L'intégration des migrants, qu'ils soient en situation régulière ou irrégulière, est une priorité pour nous socialistes. Nous n'acceptons pas la hiérarchie que la droite parlementaire souhaite créer entre migrants. C'est pourquoi je me suis abstenue sur l'excellent rapport Takkula sur l'éducation des enfants des migrants parce que, s'agissant d'un rapport d'initiative, il ne nous a pas été possible de présenter des votes séparés pour demander la suppression des paragraphes 5, 8 et 16 qui ne me satisfont absolument pas.

C'est par l'éducation des enfants de migrants que nous contribuerons fortement à l'intégration de tous, quel que soit leur statut. C'est en mettant en place des conditions socioéconomiques favorables que nous pourrions aider au mieux les migrants, qu'ils résident légalement en Europe, qu'ils soient voués à être régularisés ou encore à retourner finalement dans leurs pays. On ne peut créer ainsi un statut de non-éducation et de ghettoïsation pour des enfants du simple fait que leurs parents sont en situation irrégulière. C'est purement contraire aux conventions internationales.

4-228

Anna Záborská (PPE-DE), písomne. – Aj keď toto uznesenie sa mi vo všeobecnosti javí ako pozitívne, musím vysloviť niekoľko vážnych pripomienok:

Predovšetkým s poľutovaním konštatujem, že uznesenie nespomína rámec medzinárodného roka na poznávanie ľudských práv, ktorý vyhlásila OSN.

Ďalej v tomto uznesení vidím ďalšiu nebezpečnú politickú tendenciu v rámci európskych politík, ktorou je vytrhnutie dieťaťa s prirodzeného prostredia, ktorým je jeho prirodzená rodina. Rodina je tým najprirodzenejším miestom pre vývoj dieťaťa a takou vždy zostane. Mama a otec sú pre dieťa tie najdôležitejšie osoby. To rovnako platí aj v tých najchudobnejších rodinách a v rodinách imigrantov. Miesto vytrhávania detí z ich rodín by sme mali rozmyšľať na tým, ako podporovať rodičov a rodinu v ich vzájomnej zodpovednosti.

Na záver vyslovujem poľutovanie, že táto správa úplne mlčí o úlohe otca dieťaťa. Aj v rodinách imigrantov matka a otec sú rôzni, ale komplementárni. Nemali by sme podporovať matku bez toho, aby sme nerobili to isté aj pre otca rodiny.

Nechcem tu presadzovať nič inšie ako Všeobecnú deklaráciu ľudských práv. Táto vyslovene predpokladá právo dieťaťa žiť v rodine a právo rodičov vyberať si vzdelanie, ktoré uznajú za vhodné pre svoje dieťa.

Rodiny imigrantov majú na toto tiež právo.

4-229

– **Rapport: Adina-Ioana Vălean (A6-0186/2009)**

4-230

Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE-DE), per iscritto. – Nonostante il raggiungimento di alcune posizioni di compromesso tra i vari gruppi politici in sede di commissione LIBE su molti punti chiave della relazione Vălean, e ferma restando la convinzione e posizione politica, che esprimo a nome del gruppo PPE-DE in quanto relatore ombra della relazione, che la libera circolazione dei cittadini comunitari sia un diritto fondamentale dell'UE, tuttavia il testo finale della relazione contiene una serie di riferimenti inappropriati, riportati in alcune note a piè pagina del "considerando" S, che ci costringono, come delegazione italiana del PPE-DE, a votare contro la relazione in Aula, a causa del voto unico in blocco previsto per questo tipo di relazione.

I riferimenti che sono contenuti nella relazione sono ritenuti dalla Delegazione italiana del PPE-DE inopportuni ed assolutamente fuori contesto, in quanto si riferiscono a tematiche che esulano dal campo di applicazione della direttiva, trattandosi di questioni di competenza degli Stati membri, quali pubblica sicurezza, legalità e diritto di famiglia.

4-231

Philip Claeys (NI), schriftelijk. – Ik heb tegen dit verslag gestemd omdat de mogelijkheden van de lidstaten om baas te zijn over hun territorium en de gepaste maatregelen te nemen om hun openbare orde te beveiligen door dergelijke richtlijnen wordt ondermijnd. Ik denk dan bijvoorbeeld aan Italië dat fel werd bekritiseerd op basis van deze richtlijn omdat het aanstalten maakte om forse maatregelen te nemen om de openbare orde te handhaven. Ik denk dan aan het arrest Mettock van het Hof van Justitie dat op basis van deze richtlijn het immigratiebeleid van de lidstaten ondermijnt. Maar ik denk ook aan België dat aan de lopende band vreemdelingen naturaliseert op basis van de meest lakse nationaliteitswetgeving ter wereld, vreemdelingen die dan ongeremd en vrij de Europese grenzen kunnen oversteken.

4-232

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Junilistan är anhängare av den fria inre marknaden, som inte bara ger ekonomiskt välstånd utan dessutom vidgar medborgarnas frihet genom göra det möjligt att fritt röra sig mellan länderna inom Europas gränser. Vi delar föredragandens syn att det bristande införlivandet av det aktuella direktivet i vissa medlemsstater, överlag är en besvikelse och uppmanar medlemsstaterna att genomföra direktiv 2004/38/EG fullt ut, så att rätten till fri rörlighet blir verklighet.

Dock motsätter vi oss skarpt en ökning av medel och avsättning till en särskild budgetpost till stöd för nationella och lokala projekt som syftar till att integrera medborgare och deras familjemedlemmar när dessa uppehåller sig i en annan medlemsstat. Sådana frågor ankommer det på varje medlemsstat att ta ansvar för.

Betänkandets klara ställningstagande för den fria inre marknadens förverkligande överväger emellertid och vi har därför valt att rösta ja.

4-233

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), in writing. – I supported the Vălean report on EU citizens' rights. The right of EU citizens and their families to move and reside across the Unions relates to the fundamental freedoms and it is essential that all Member States apply the law without discrimination. Speaking as a representative of Scotland I know that the EU has offered countless opportunities for Scots abroad, whilst Scotland has welcomed many newcomers who have played a valuable role in our economic and cultural lives. At this time of economic crisis it is essential that the benefits of free movement are recognised and that economic hardship is not used as an excuse for discrimination.

4-234

Dan Jørgensen, Poul Nyrup Rasmussen, Christel Schaldemose og Britta Thomsen (PSE), skriftlig. – Vi har stemt imod betænkningen om anvendelsen af opholdsdirektivet. Selvom betænkningen handler om anvendelsen og implementeringen af opholdsdirektivet, så henvises der i betænkningen også til Metock-dommen, der tillader, at udlændinge, som ikke har legalt ophold i EU, gennem ægteskab kan opnå opholdstilladelse og således rejse rundt i Unionen med sin ægtefælle. Omend vi grundlæggende støtter princippet om unionsborgeres frie bevægelighed, så mener vi ikke, at mennesker, der er kommet illegalt ind i Unionen, skal kunne fremme sine rettigheder gennem ægteskab.

4-235

Anne E. Jensen og Karin Riis-Jørgensen (ALDE), skriftlig. – Venstres medlemmer stemte imod. Vi går ind for arbejdskraftens fri bevægelighed og for sikring af, at medlemsstaterne overholder direktivet. Men vi er imod muligheden for at lovliggøre ulovligt ophold gennem ægteskab med en vandreende arbejdstager, som afspejlet i Metock-dommen. Medlemslandene skal gennem deres administration have reel mulighed for at sikre, at regler om fri bevægelighed ikke misbruges til at omgå udlændingelovgivningen.

4-236

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Voto contro la relazione presentata dalla collega Vălean inerente all'applicazione della direttiva 2004/38/CE sul diritto dei cittadini dell'Unione e dei loro familiari di circolare e di soggiornare nel territorio degli Stati membri. Non mi trovo d'accordo sul punto in cui si afferma la richiesta, agli Stati membri, di adottare documenti personali d'identità dello stesso formato sia per i propri cittadini che per i cittadini dell'Unione provenienti

dagli altri Stati membri, fatte salve le differenze rilevabili all'interno dei documenti. Trovo questa soluzione inutile e superficiale.

4-237

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), *na piśmie*. – W świetle Artykułu 18 Traktatu ustanawiającego Wspólnotę Europejską każdy obywatel ma prawo do swobodnego przemieszczania się i przebywania na terytorium państw członkowskich. Dyrektywa 2004/38/WE określa szczegółowo możliwości prawne dotyczące przemieszczania się w granicach Unii jej obywateli, ich najbliższej rodziny bądź partnera określonego aktem prawnym.

Swoboda przemieszczania się powinna być jednak rozpatrywana łącznie z uregulowaniami odnoszącymi się do swobody przepływu pracowników i swobody świadczenia usług.

Jak wiemy, cztery z krajów Unii nadal nie otworzyły swoich rynków pracy dla pracowników z państw, które przystąpiły w 2004 roku. Aż 11 krajów Unii Europejskiej w dalszym ciągu stosuje ograniczenia na swoich rynkach pracy dla obywateli Rumunii i Bułgarii.

Uważam, że zjawisko to nie tylko negatywnie wpływa na proces integracji. Powinniśmy dążyć do tego, by istniejące bariery zostały jak najszybciej zlikwidowane.

Zgodnie z Artykułem 20 Traktatu każdy obywatel korzysta na terytorium państwa trzeciego, gdzie państwo członkowskie, którego jest obywatelem, nie ma swojego przedstawiciela, z ochrony dyplomatycznej i konsularnej każdego z pozostałych państw członkowskich na takich samych warunkach jak obywatele tego państwa.

Zapowiedziane działania w zakresie wzmocnienia ochrony konsularnej w krajach trzecich powinny zostać jak najszybciej wdrożone, a negocjacje z krajami trzecimi w sprawie ruchu bezwizowego kontynuowane.

4-238

– **Rapport: Urszula Gacek (A6-0182/2009)**

4-239

Alin Lucian Antochi (PSE), *în scris*. – Raportul dnei Gacek aduce în prim plan un aspect important: odata cu extinderea Uniunii Europene s-a remarcat o creștere considerabilă a numărului de cetățeni europeni rezidenți în afara statului de origine în contextul în care cetățenia europeană este complementară cetățeniei Statelor Membre, fiecărui dintre acestea fiind responsabilă cu reglementarea acestui aspect.

În ciuda implicării active a cetățenilor în inițierea de propuneri legislative cât și a încercării de a transparentiza sistemul legislativ comunitar, europenii se confruntă încă cu o serie de probleme legate de încălcarea și nerespectarea dreptului la liberă circulație și rezidența a persoanelor pe teritoriul Statelor Membre. Discrepanțele constatate între Statele Membre privind reglementarea obligativității vizei sau a exercitării dreptului de a vot atât în țara de origine cât și în țara de adopție, pun sub semnul întrebării egalitatea în drepturi a tuturor cetățenilor europeni.

De aceea, consider necesar ca Statele Membre să ia toate măsurile necesare în vederea transpunerii eficiente a normelor destinate armonizării drepturilor cetățenilor europeni, iar în acest caz, trebuie să ținem cont că punctul de plecare îl reprezintă parteneriatul, fie el între Statele Membre și UE sau între instituțiile regionale, locale și civile.

Nu în ultimul rând, Statele Membre trebuie să garanteze dreptul la vot tuturor cetățenilor UE care rezidă într-un stat membru, altul decât cel de origine în momentul alegerilor legislative.

4-240

Charlotte Cederschiöld (PPE-DE), *skriftlig*. – Den moderata delegationen i Europaparlamentet har idag röstat för Urszula Gaceks (PPE-DE, PL) betänkande (A6-0182/2009) om problemen med och framtidsutsikterna för unionsmedborgarskapet.

Vi delar betänkandets övergripande idé om ett förbättrat unionsmedborgarskap och en förbättrad fri rörlighet. Däremot anser vi inte att lösningen på de problem som lyfts fram ligger i ytterligare informationskampanjer. Vi vill också understryka att frågan om rösträtt i kommunalval är en fråga för medlemsstaterna.

4-241

Carlos Coelho (PPE-DE), *por escrito*. – Têm sido dados passos concretos no sentido de tornar a cidadania Europeia uma realidade, de que beneficiam de forma especial os emigrantes Portugueses noutros Países comunitários passando a gozar de um amplo leque de direitos e obrigações, onde se inclui uma igualdade de tratamento em relação aos nacionais do Estado de acolhimento.

O desenvolvimento mais significativo foi, sem dúvida, a adopção da Directiva da cidadania que estabeleceu um direito incondicional de residência permanente para os cidadãos da UE e as suas famílias que residam no Estado de acolhimento durante um período de 5 anos.

Porém, ainda há muito a fazer, uma vez que ainda existem obstáculos, na maior parte dos casos, resultantes de uma incorrecta implementação desta Directiva por parte dos EM.

Aplaudo a iniciativa da Comissão de publicação de um Guia sobre esta Directiva de forma a que a informação sobre os Direitos que os cidadãos podem usufruir possa estar ao alcance não só dos cidadãos, mas também das autoridades ao nível regional e local nos EM.

É essencial que se continuem a reforçar os laços sociais e políticos que ligam os cidadãos da UE. O Tratado de Lisboa deverá contribuir de forma significativa para tal, nomeadamente através da "Iniciativa da cidadania" que permitirá aos cidadãos, sob certas condições, terem um direito de iniciativa.

4-242

Lena Ek (ALDE), *skriftlig*. – Vi behöver stärka unionsmedborgarskapet eftersom det utgör grundstommen i den fria rörligheten. Detta betänkande tar upp en rad områden där människors möjligheter att dra nytta av EU:s fria rörlighet kan bli bättre. Eftersom nedmonterade gränser och större rörlighet är grundtanken bakom samarbetet valde jag att stödja detta betänkande trots att det fanns mindre bra skrivelser om främjandet av "europeisk identitet" och inrättande av en "europeisk dimension" i skolorna.

4-243

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Apesar de integrar um conjunto de pontos que, naturalmente, merecem o nosso acordo, assim como outros, que o mínimo que se poderá dizer é serem “politicamente correctos”, esta resolução do PE denominada “os problemas e as perspectivas ligadas à cidadania da União” seria caso para rir se não fosse assunto sério. Senão vejamos. O PE:

- “congratula-se com o facto de o Tratado de Lisboa tornar possível, para um milhão de cidadãos da União dos diferentes Estados-Membros, convidarem colectivamente a Comissão a apresentar propostas legislativas e está convicto de que esse direito legal contribuirá para aumentar, de forma significativa, a sensibilização para a cidadania da União entre os europeus”;

- “recorda que a transparência e a participação democrática devem ser conseguidas através de várias formas de parceria entre a UE e os Estados-Membros, as instituições regionais e locais, os parceiros sociais e a sociedade civil”;

Enfim, uma lenga-lenga que nos faz pensar que esta coisa da “cidadania da União” é muito bonita desde que os cidadãos sejam impedidos de decidir o que realmente importa, nomeadamente impossibilitando-os de referendar o “tratado de Lisboa”, ou se tal não for possível, obrigá-los a realizar referendos, tantos quantos os necessários, para que digam Sim...

A hipocrisia no seu melhor...

4-244

Jean-Marie Le Pen (NI), *par écrit*. – Le rapport de notre collègue Gacek sur la citoyenneté de l'Union est une véritable supercherie.

Sous couvert de renforcer la liberté de circulation et de séjour des ressortissants communautaires dans l'Union européenne, il instaure une véritable égalité de traitement entre ces derniers et les citoyens des pays tiers.

Le rapport utilise à dessein le terme général de citoyenneté qui englobe de manière parfaitement illégitime les concepts de nationalité d'un État membre et de citoyenneté de l'Union.

L'objectif, au-delà de la confusion volontaire, est très clair: élargir la possibilité d'acquérir la nationalité d'un État membre à toute personne résidant légalement dans cet État en vertu du droit dérivé de la citoyenneté de l'Union. C'est la raison pour laquelle le rapporteur introduit un nouveau concept de migrant intracommunautaire, espèce en voie de multiplication. Il est vrai que le Parlement européen est maintenant composé de représentants des citoyens de l'Union et non plus des peuples des États. C'est une atteinte grave à l'identité nationale et à sa cohésion.

Prenez garde, mes chers collègues, en tant que représentants des citoyens indifférenciés de l'Union européenne, vous allez bientôt devenir des députés apatrides. Mais, au fond, c'est peut être ce que vous souhaitez.

4-245

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), *γραφώς*. – Η Έκθεση συνιστά προπαγανδιστική προσπάθεια των πολιτικών δυνάμεων του "ευρωμονόδρομου", να πείσουν τους λαούς για τα δήθεν οφέλη της ΕΕ. Προβάλλοντας την κατασκευασμένη, ουσιαστικά ανύπαρκτη ευρωπαϊκή ιθαγένεια, που δεν συνδέεται πρακτικά με κανένα δικαίωμα,

επιδιώκουν να καλλιεργήσουν την ιδέα του "ευρωπαίου πολίτη", την "ευρωπαϊκή συνείδηση". Στόχος τους η ιδεολογική χειραγώγηση των εργαζομένων, ιδιαίτερα της νεολαίας. Στην κατεύθυνση αυτή επενδύουν στα "ευρωπαϊκά πολιτικά κόμματα", καλούν την ΕΕ να τους προσφέρει μεγαλύτερη πολιτική και κυρίως οικονομική ενίσχυση, ώστε να παίξουν αποτελεσματικότερα το ρόλο τους σαν παράγοντες εξωραϊσμού και στήριξης της ΕΕ, αποπροσανατολισμού και χειραγώγησης. Προσπαθώντας να αντιμετωπίσουν το διαρκώς αυξανόμενο ρεύμα αμφισβήτησης της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, του ίδιου του ευρωενωσιακού οικοδομήματος, καλούν την ΕΕ να εντείνει την ψεύτικη προπαγάνδα και την προβολή των ανύπαρκτων πλεονεκτημάτων της ευρωπαϊκής ιθαγένειας.

Οι εργαζόμενοι βιώνουν καθημερινά τις οδυνηρές συνέπειες της Συνθήκης του Μάαστριχτ, της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής της ΕΕ. Από την πείρα τους μπορούν να κρίνουν ότι η ΕΕ δεν έγινε για τα λαϊκά συμφέροντα, αλλά για να υπερασπίζει και να υπηρετεί ανάγκες, συμφέροντα και κέρδη των ευρωπαϊκών μονοπωλίων.

Ανυπακοή, αντίσταση, ρήξη με την ΕΕ είναι ο δρόμος που συμφέρει τους λαούς. Αυτό το μήνυμα μπορούν και πρέπει να στείλουν οι εργαζόμενοι και μέσα από τις κάλπες των ευρωεκλογών του Ιουνίου.

4-246

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Decido di votare negativamente il lavoro svolto dalla collega Gacek sui problemi e le prospettive della cittadinanza europea. Non ritengo, infatti, che bisogni esprimere troppa preoccupazione per la scarsa attuazione delle direttive in vigore, con particolare riferimento alla direttiva sulla libera circolazione, da cui derivano numerosi problemi relativi alla libertà di circolazione e ad altri diritti dei cittadini dell'Unione, poiché non credo che la situazione reale nella quale ci troviamo corrisponda al quadro descritto dalla collega.

4-247

– **Rapport: Helmuth Markov (A6-0126/2009)**

4-248

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Voto a favore della relazione presentata dal collega Markov sulle statistiche comunitarie del commercio estero con i paesi terzi. Penso che, per ottenere i risultati sperati, sia necessario ridurre il cosiddetto effetto Rotterdam, foriero, secondo la Commissione e il Consiglio, di una sovrarappresentazione nelle statistiche del commercio estero degli Stati membri che fanno rilevare un elevato volume di esportazioni o di sdoganamenti, ma che svolgono soltanto il ruolo di paesi di transito, a scapito degli Stati membri di destinazione effettiva o di spedizione delle merci.

4-249

– **Rapport: Avril Doyle (A6-0048/2009)**

4-250

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O objectivo da proposta é limitar a exposição dos consumidores a substâncias farmacologicamente activas utilizadas em medicamentos veterinários para animais destinados à alimentação humana e aos respectivos resíduos em géneros alimentícios de origem animal. Estão abrangidos os géneros alimentícios importados de países terceiros.

Depois de um longo processo, foi obtido o texto da posição comum, que reflecte o compromisso alcançado através das negociações entre as três instituições.

Os pontos principais acolhidos no novo texto referem-se, designadamente, ao seguinte:

- valores de referência para a tomada de medidas: são agora definidos como o nível de resíduos de uma substância farmacologicamente activa estabelecido por motivos de controlo no caso de determinadas substâncias para as quais não foram fixados limites máximos de resíduos nos termos do presente regulamento;

- importação: os Estados-Membros proíbem a importação e a colocação no mercado de alimentos de origem animal que contenham resíduos resultantes da administração ilegal de substâncias farmacologicamente activas que não estejam sujeitas a uma classificação em conformidade com o texto. Por conseguinte, as importações de produtos alimentares de países terceiros que contenham resíduos resultantes da administração ilegal de substâncias cuja utilização é proibida na União Europeia devem ser banidas, a fim de preservar a saúde pública.

4-251

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto contrario in merito alla relazione presentata dalla collega Doyle sulla determinazione di limiti di residui di sostanze farmacologicamente attive negli alimenti di origine animale. Ne condivido lo scopo, ma non i metodi. Infatti, per perseguire gli obiettivi sperati, non ritengo che limitare l'esposizione dei consumatori alle sostanze farmacologicamente attive dei medicinali veterinari per animali destinati alla produzione di alimenti e ai residui di tali sostanze presenti negli alimenti di origine animale sia una buona soluzione. Si aggirerebbe la radice del problema, insita in realtà in altre questioni.

4-252

– **Rapport: Emmanouil Angelakas (A6-0134/2009)**

4-252-500

Adam Bielan (UEN), na piśmie. – Poparłem sprawozdanie Pana Angelakas dlatego, że kładzie nacisk na wykorzystanie konkretnych kwot pieniężnych na współfinansowanie regionalnych i lokalnych programów związanych z energią odnawialną w budownictwie mieszkaniowym. Poza tym, bardzo dobrze, że to państwa członkowskie będą ustalały kryteria i decydowały które budynki mieszkalne kwalifikują się do uzyskania dofinansowania zgodnie z przepisami krajowymi. Jest to znak, że te pieniądze przekazane zostaną na obiekty najbardziej tego potrzebujące w każdym z państw członkowskich.

4-253

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE), in writing. – I support this Report which modifies the European Regional Development Fund in order to permit and facilitate energy efficiency and renewable energies interventions in the housing sector in all Member States. Interventions should target low-income households, as defined by the national legislation in force. Indeed, I have proposed in Ireland that vat on labour for such work should be reduced from 13.5% to 5% to encourage retention of jobs and demand for these renovations.

The "European economic Recovery Plan" put as priority areas the Lisbon strategy and energy (with a special attention of energy efficiency in buildings). Therefore Member states are encouraged to reprogramme their Structural Funds Operational Programmes in order to devote a better balance to energy efficiency investments, including where they fund social housing.

Under the current regulatory framework, European Regional Development Fund supported interventions in the housing sector, including energy efficiency, but it was reserved only for Member States acceded to the European Union on or after 1 May 2004. The modification to the regulation seeks to permit and extend this possibility targeting low income households in all Member States.

4-254

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Föredragandens lovsång till EU:s sammanhållningspolitik tycks inte veta några gränser. Detta trots att denna politik är ett skrämmande exempel på vad ökad centralstyrning innebär.

Bristande kontroll och otillfredsställande uppföljning av de medel som varje år beviljas inom ramen för EU:s fondprojekt, leder till att betydande penningbelopp hamnar i fel fickor. Detta är nu allmänt känt. Så sent som i november 2008 kunde Europeiska revisionsrätten konstatera att 11 procent av de 42 miljarder euro som 2007 godkändes inom ramen för EU:s sammanhållningspolitik aldrig borde ha betalats ut.

Detta omnämns emellertid inte i betänkandet. Det är beklagligt, men knappast förvånande. Vi har naturligtvis röstat nej till betänkandet.

4-255

Sérgio Marques (PPE-DE), por escrito. – A crise económica e financeira que a Europa atravessa deve ser vista como uma oportunidade de tomar medidas que ajudarão não só à recuperação dos Estados-Membros, mas também à sensibilização das populações para comportamentos mais sustentáveis.

A possibilidade de melhorar a Eficiência Energética dos imóveis de habitação através da alocação de fundos até 4% do FEDER para cada Estado-Membro contém em si um duplo benefício: se por um lado reduz as despesas fixas das famílias com energia, por outro reduz o consumo nacional, contribuindo para a segurança energética e para a redução das importações de combustíveis fósseis e a emissão de gases com efeito de estufa.

Aplauzo este Relatório, na esperança que os Estados-Membros saibam integrar esta verba nos seus Planos de Acção Nacional para a Eficiência Energética, e que a apliquem de forma responsável e pragmática.

Espero que, com esta verba, as pequenas regiões insulares sejam particularmente beneficiadas, dado que é nestas que a produção energética possui menos formas de ser concretizada, exigindo assim uma utilização responsável da energia por todos. O investimento na Eficiência Energética é uma das ferramentas mais importantes para esse efeito, e deverá ser uma aposta prioritária dos Governos dos Estados-Membros.

4-256

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto favorevole alla relazione dell'Onorevole Angelakas riguardante gli investimenti nell'efficienza energetica e nelle energie rinnovabili nell'edilizia abitativa a titolo del FESR. Mi associo, infatti, alla relatrice nel ritenere che gli strumenti di finanziamento a disposizione dell'Unione Europea debbano essere modificati nella maniera più pronta ed efficace possibile per far fronte alle sfide emergenti legate all'attuale crisi economica. L'Unione Europea come fondamentale attore globale non può permettersi di rimanere a rimanere un passo indietro nel campo dell'efficienza energetica e delle energie rinnovabili nell'efficienza abitativa. Per far ciò è necessario che tutti gli Stati membri e tutte le regioni dell'Unione, non solo quelle appartenenti ai nuovi Stati membri siano messi nelle condizioni

di poter effettuare investimenti e realizzare progetti in tali settori, anche considerando i chiari vantaggi in termini di creazione di posti di lavoro, assolutamente necessaria nella gravissima congiuntura che stiamo attraversando.

4-257

– **Rapport: Henrik Lax (A6-0161/2009)**

4-258

Carlos Coelho (PPE-DE), por escrito. – Concordo com uma Política Comum de Vistos que facilite as deslocações legítimas e implemente medidas tendentes a facilitar o processo de requerimento e de tratamento de pedidos de visto (redução dos custos, simplificação do procedimento de emissão, utilização de vistos para entradas múltiplas, prazos de validade mais longos).

Urge também combater a imigração ilegal através de uma maior harmonização das legislações nacionais e das práticas de actuação ao nível dos consulados.

Reconheço a necessidade e a urgência de dar maior coerência à Política Comum de Vistos, nomeadamente através da integração de todas as disposições que regulam a emissão de vistos e as decisões de recusa, prorrogação, anulação, revogação e redução dos vistos num único Código.

Cumprimento o Relator Lax, pelo excelente compromisso que conseguiu obter, mas lamento que o fraco compromisso obtido no Relatório relativo às Instruções Consulares Comuns (que deverá ser inserido nesta proposta) acabe por prejudicar o mérito desta proposta. Exemplo disso é a isenção e redução do valor dos vistos para crianças que aqui foi conseguida, mas que acaba por não produzir os efeitos esperados devido às taxas adicionais a serem cobradas quando o serviço for efectuado por empresas externas.

Por todas as razões que me levaram já a votar contra esse Relatório, não poderei apoiar totalmente o presente Relatório, daí a minha abstenção.

4-259

Andreas Mölzer (NI), schriftlich. – Es ist schon vielsagend, wenn man illegale Einwanderung durch verstärkte Harmonisierung der nationalen Vorschriften und Verfahrensweisen bei Visa erreichen will. Die Visa-Skandale der Vergangenheit zeigen ja, wie locker mit der Visa-Erteilung seitens einiger Staaten vorgegangen wird. Diesen Fällen wurde zu wenig nachgegangen und es wurden nicht ausreichend Konsequenzen daraus gezogen.

Auch die Massenlegalisierungen der letzten Jahrzehnte lassen an der Sinnhaftigkeit einer Harmonisierung Zweifel aufkommen. Solange nicht alle Mitgliedstaaten für strenge Visa-Bestimmungen und rigorose Zuwanderungspolitik bis hin zu Nullzuwanderung sind, kann das Resultat nur eine Nivellierung nach unten sein. Damit der Zuwanderung nicht möglicherweise über die Hintertür Tür und Tor geöffnet wird, habe ich gegen den Bericht Lax gestimmt.

4-260

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Η πρόταση της Επιτροπής για τον Κανονισμό περί Κοινοτικού Κώδικα Θεωρήσεων εντάσσεται στα μέτρα της ΕΕ για την ένταση της καταστολής απέναντι στους μετανάστες, στη δημιουργία της "Ευρώπης-Φρούριο" απέναντι στους λαούς των τρίτων χωρών, αλλά και για τους λαούς της ίδιας της ΕΕ. Με τον Κώδικα Θεωρήσεων η ΕΕ θεσπίζει ενιαίους, για όλα τα κράτη μέλη της, σκληρότερους κανόνες για τη χορήγηση θεώρησης εισόδου στην ΕΕ σε υπηκόους τρίτων χωρών. Επιβάλλει την ενσωμάτωση στις βίζες βιομετρικών δεδομένων (δακτυλικά αποτυπώματα και των δέκα δακτύλων) ακόμη και στα παιδιά 12 ετών! Τα στοιχεία αυτά μαζί και με σειρά άλλων προσωπικών δεδομένων θα καταχωρούνται στο Σύστημα Πληροφοριών VIS που έχει ήδη θεσπίσει η ΕΕ και φιλοδοξεί να αποτελέσει την μεγαλύτερη βάση προσωπικών δεδομένων - απροκάλυπτου φακελώματος - όλων των πολιτών τρίτων χωρών. Οι όποιες επιμέρους βελτιώσεις επιφέρει η Έκθεση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, δεν αλλάζουν την ουσία, την κατεύθυνση και την λογική του Κώδικα Θεωρήσεων, ο οποίος αποτελεί ακόμη ένα εργαλείο ελέγχου και σκληρότερης καταστολής των μεταναστών, στα πλαίσια της συνολικής αντιμεταναστευτικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ, όπως εκφράζεται με το Σύμφωνο για τη Μετανάστευση. Γι ακόμη μια φορά αποδεικνύεται ότι η ΕΕ είναι εχθρός των λαών, των μεταναστών και των προσφύγων, παραδίδοντάς τους ομήρους στην άγρια εκμετάλλευση του κεφαλαίου.

4-261

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Intendo esprimere il mio voto contrario alla relazione dell'Onorevole Lax concernente il codice comunitario dei visti. Credo che gli obiettivi che la Commissione si propone nel contesto del programma dell'Aia, ossia quelli di istituire un sistema di facilitazione dei viaggi legittimi e di combattere contro l'immigrazione clandestina non possano essere raggiunti tramite l'armonizzazione delle legislazioni nazionali e delle prassi per la gestione delle domande presso le rappresentanze consolari locali. Molto ancora deve essere fatto a livello di dialogo e di cooperazione tra gli Stati membri e si dovrebbe piuttosto procedere su questa strada e non su quella di un'incorporazione in un unico codice dei visti di tutte le disposizioni riguardanti il rilascio dei visti e le decisioni di rifiuto, proroga, annullamento, revoca e riduzione del periodo di validità dei visti rilasciati, provvedimenti per i quali questa Unione Europea non è assolutamente pronta e in grado di gestire. Per questo non ritengo che il sistema proposto debba essere approvato e portato avanti.

4-262

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), *na piśmie*. – Komisja Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych przygotowała wniosek na podstawie programu haskiego. Jego celem jest wprowadzenie uproszczeń w polityce wizowej poprzez stworzenie wspólnotowego kodeksu wizowego. Ma ono na celu ułatwienie procesu ubiegania się o wizę, jej przedłużenia, unieważnienia, cofnięcia oraz ograniczenia okresu ważności wizy. Kodeks będzie ujednolicał i określał dokładne zasady wydawania wiz, ich rodzaj i okres ważności. Ponadto zostaną dokładnie określone dokumenty potrzebne do uzyskania odpowiedniego rodzaju wizy.

W skutek ujednoliconego prawa wizowego Unii Europejskiej zostaną uchylone przepisy prawne, które niejednokrotnie utrudniały proces otrzymania wizy. Wspólnotowy kodeks wizowy ułatwi nie tylko poruszanie się obywateli Unii, ale przede wszystkim obywateli państw spoza Unii Europejskiej. Zostanie w ten sposób ułatwiona komunikacja zarówno obywatelska jak i zawodowa między państwami wspólnoty i spoza niej.

W związku z powyższą zmianą należy zwrócić szczególną uwagę na ciągłe doszkalanie pracowników urzędów celnych, w szczególności zaś tych, którzy pracują na granicach Unii Europejskiej.

Polityka wizowa UE powinna odzwierciedlać podstawowe priorytety jej polityki zagranicznej. Uważam, że stworzenie wspólnotowego kodeksu wizowego to dobry pomysł służący harmonizacji prawodawstwa państw członkowskich.

4-263

– **Rapport: Salvatore Tatarella (A6-0105/2009)**

4-264

Edite Estrela (PSE), *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o regulamento relativo a um sistema comunitário de rótulo ecológico, uma vez que considero de extrema importância incentivar a produção e o consumo sustentáveis de produtos. O rótulo ecológico é adequado para orientar os consumidores para os produtos ecologicamente recomendados entre os existentes no mercado e encorajar a produção e o consumo de produtos que têm um bom desempenho ambiental.

4-265

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Como se pode ler no relatório, o rótulo ecológico é uma marca voluntária cujo objectivo é promover, a nível europeu, a divulgação de produtos de elevada eficiência com um baixo impacto ambiental em todo o seu ciclo de vida.

Para esse efeito, foram criadas normas de qualidade ecológica (a que chamamos "critérios") para cada categoria específica de produtos. Actualmente, existem 26 categorias de produtos, 622 autorizações e mais de 3000 produtos e serviços – detergentes, papel, vestuário (incluindo calçado e têxteis), turismo, parques de campismo, etc. - aos quais foram atribuídos rótulos ecológicos.

Esta marca, e a flor que a simboliza, pode ser considerada um elementos dinamizador que, graças à constante actualização dos critérios ambientais para os produtos que a ostentam, incentiva as empresas a operarem num círculo virtuoso de esforços com vista ao aumento global da qualidade ecológica dos produtos colocados no mercado.

Mas parece haver várias lacunas no sistema existente, tendo em conta a experiência adquirida ao longo dos quase dez anos de existência desta certificação, o que aponta para a necessidade de uma intervenção mais decisiva visando colmatar certas lacunas do sistema.

É neste contexto que se insere a proposta da Comissão de novo regulamento, que os deputados pretendem que seja melhorado.

4-266

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), *γραπτώς*. – Το οικολογικό σήμα αποτελεί ακόμα μία παραπειστική μέθοδο διαφήμισης προϊόντων αμφιβόλου ποιότητας, αλλά και οικολογικής συνεισφοράς. Τα προϊόντα αυτά θα αποκτούν «προστιθέμενη» αξία λόγω της κατοχύρωσης του σήματος, του οποίου το κόστος θα μετακυλύεται στον τελικό αγοραστή, αυξάνοντας ακόμα περισσότερο τα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων.

Το σήμα αποτελεί επίσης ακόμα μία μέθοδο συγκέντρωσης και συγκεντροποίησης του κεφαλαίου και μονοπώλησης της αγοράς από λίγες πολυεθνικές επιχειρήσεις που θα διαθέτουν τα μέσα, την οργάνωση και κυρίως τα απαραίτητα κεφάλαια για να κατοχυρώσουν το σήμα στα προϊόντα τους.

Όποιες και αν είναι οι ασφαλιστικές δικλίδες για την διαδικασία απονομής του σήματος με διαφανή, αξιόπιστο και αμερόληπτο τρόπο, όλοι γνωρίζουν ότι προκειμένου να αυξηθούν τα κέρδη το κεφάλαιο και οι μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις βρίσκουν πάντοτε τρόπους να τις ξεπεράσουν, όπως αποδεικνύεται από τα επαναλαμβανόμενα διατροφικά σκάνδαλα αλλά και από τα «τοξικά» προϊόντα της ίδιας της καπιταλιστικής κρίσης.

Η ΕΕ είναι ανίκανη να εξασφαλίσει την οικολογική προστασία γιατί επιδιώκει και υπηρετεί το κεφάλαιο που με την ασύδοτη εκμετάλλευση φυσικών και ανθρώπινων πόρων και την αξιοποίηση της σύγχρονης τεχνολογίας στην ίδια κατεύθυνση καταστρέφει το περιβάλλον. Και αυτός που καταστρέφει το περιβάλλον δεν μπορεί να οριστεί ταυτόχρονα και προστάτης του.

4-267

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Mi dichiaro in favore alla relazione del collega Tatarella concernente il sistema per il marchio comunitario di qualità ecologica o Ecolabel. Credo che tale proposta si inquadri perfettamente nel Piano di azione europeo per la produzione e il consumo sostenibile e, di conseguenza, nel generale obiettivo di crescita di un sistema volontario e integrato che stimoli le imprese a migliorare i propri prodotti in un'ottica di miglioramento della loro qualità sotto il punto di vista alimentare e di tutela dei consumatori, ma anche di impronta ecologica, attraverso il raggiungimento di più alti standard di rispetto ambientale e di efficienza energetica. Mi congratulo dunque con il relatore per l'ottimo lavoro in un contesto tanto importante e cruciale per i nostri produttori, anche per i più piccoli, perché proprio tramite l'accento sulla qualità e il rispetto di canoni alimentari ed ecologici essi riescono a distinguersi e a resistere in un contesto sempre più globale e competitivo.

4-268

– **Rapport: Linda McAvan (A6-0084/2009)**

4-269

Liam Aylward, Brian Crowley, Seán Ó Neachtain and Eoin Ryan (UEN), in writing. – The European Parliament practises what it preaches in terms of eco-friendly behaviour! Voluntarily, we have taken it upon ourselves to improve our environmental performance on a day-to-day basis. In February 2007, I personally asked the President to initiate EMAS in the Parliament. Today, we have voted in favour of the EMAS scheme, which requests other companies across the EU to do likewise.

By reducing our environmental footprint in ways such as turning the lights off, smart metering, sensor lights, and less paper use, the European Parliament works to be environmentally sound. As a result of an audit in Parliament, we have received an EMAS logo.

A yes vote today for the extension of EMAS means a yes for more environmental awareness in the Member States. This plan looks to recognise and reward proactive organisations that go beyond what environmental laws expect of them and that are constantly improving the way they interact with the environment. Now it is important to set a harmonised system throughout the European Union with a single set of rules; ensuring the usefulness and exposure of this plan not only for buildings, but for the Member States as well. For these reasons, it is essential to vote yes on this legislation.

4-270

Edite Estrela (PSE), por escrito. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório relativo à participação voluntária de organizações num sistema comunitário de ecogestão e auditoria (EMAS), uma vez que ajuda as organizações a identificar, monitorizar e medir o seu impacto ambiental e a prestar informações sobre o mesmo.

O EMAS foi introduzido pela primeira vez em 1995 e alargado em 2001 às organizações do sector público e privado. Esta nova revisão é uma oportunidade de tornar o sistema mais atractivo e simples para pequenas e médias empresas e também uma tentativa de conseguir que o EMAS tenha o mesmo nível de participação que tem neste momento a Norma ISO 14001 (que é o Sistema de Gestão Ambiental líder na Europa).

É também importante referir que o reconhecimento do EMAS como uma marca de referência nos Sistemas de Gestão Ambiental está de acordo com o objectivo da UE respeitante ao combate às alterações climáticas.

4-271

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Mi congratulo con l'Onorevole McAvan per l'ottimo lavoro svolto e dichiaro di sostenere la sua relazione sull'adesione volontaria delle organizzazioni a un sistema comunitario di ecogestione e audit (EMAS) con il mio voto favorevole. L'obiettivo del miglioramento delle prestazioni ambientali di organizzazioni sul lungo termine è certamente da sostenere, così come tutti gli strumenti che su piccola e grande scala siano volti al suo raggiungimento. Mi associo, inoltre, alla relatrice nell'accogliere favorevolmente le modifiche proposte dalla Commissione, in particolare quella relativa alla previsione di tariffe più basse e obbligo di relazioni meno frequenti da parte delle PMI, per le quali l'adesione a tale sistema sarebbe maggiormente onerosa ma non meno importante. Credo sia anche da sostenere l'allineamento delle definizioni di EMAS con quelle già esistenti dell'ISO 14001, che agevolerebbe il passaggio dal primo al secondo, nonché una semplificazione del linguaggio che potrebbe rivelarsi molto utile specie per le piccole organizzazioni.

4-272

– **Rapport: Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg (A6-0149/2009)**

4-272-500

Alexander Alvaro, Jorgo Chatzimarkakis und Holger Krahmer (ALDE), schriftlich. – Die angewandte Rechtsgrundlage, Artikel 13 Absatz 1 EGV ist nicht einschlägig, zumal nach Auffassung der FDP das Subsidiaritätsprinzip nicht eingehalten wurde. Es fällt nicht in die Kompetenz des EU-Gesetzgebers, die vorliegenden Regelungen zu treffen und dabei weit in die Selbstbestimmung der Mitgliedstaaten einzugreifen.

Die Bekämpfung von Diskriminierungen aller Art sowie die Teilhabe von Behinderten am öffentlichen Leben sind wichtige Aufgaben. Die vorgesehene Ausdehnung der Antidiskriminierungsvorschriften auf nahezu alle Lebensbereiche ist aber realitätsfremd. So führt die in der Richtlinie verankerte Beweislastumkehr dazu, dass Beschuldigungen ohne hinreichende Beweise ausreichen, um ein Verfahren zu eröffnen. Betroffene müssten dadurch Entschädigungen leisten, obwohl sie nicht diskriminiert haben, aber ihre Unschuld nicht nachweisen können. Derart pauschal definiert ist die Umkehr der Beweislast daher rechtsstaatlich bedenklich. Hierdurch wird Unsicherheit geschaffen und Missbrauch Vorschub geleistet. Das kann nicht Sinn und Zweck einer fortschrittlichen Antidiskriminierungspolitik sein.

Außerdem ist zu berücksichtigen, dass die Europäische Kommission gegenwärtig gegen zahlreiche Mitgliedstaaten Vertragsverletzungsverfahren wegen mangelhafter Umsetzung der bisherigen europäischen Richtlinien zur Antidiskriminierungspolitik eingeleitet hat. Es fehlt bisher jedoch eine Übersicht der umgesetzten Vorschriften, um den reklamierten Bedarf neuer Vorschriften feststellen zu können. Insbesondere Deutschland ist hier bereits erheblich über frühere Vorgaben aus Brüssel hinausgegangen. Aus diesem Grund haben wir gegen diesen Bericht gestimmt.

4-274

Philip Bradbourn (PPE-DE), in writing. – I and my British Conservative colleagues can agree with much of this report and abhor discrimination in all its forms and are wholeheartedly supportive of providing equal opportunities for people regardless of their disability, race, religion, or sexuality. However, we do have serious misgivings on the issue of the reversal of the burden of proof from the plaintiff to the accused. UK Conservatives believe that in *prima facie* cases of discrimination and under the British legal system it must remain up to the plaintiff to supply conclusive evidence of such cases of discrimination. That is why we have decided to abstain on this report.

4-276

Philip Claeys (NI), schriftelijk. – Ik heb met volle overtuiging tegen dit verslag gestemd. Natuurlijk zijn we met z'n allen gekant tegen discriminatie van mensen op grond van hun handicap, seksuele geaardheid enzovoort. De vraag is alleen of Europa zich daarmee te moeien heeft. Ik vind van niet. Maatregelen tegen discriminatie moeten de exclusieve bevoegdheid van de lidstaten blijven. Ik heb dan ook voor amendement 81 gestemd dat het betreffende voorstel van richtlijn beschouwt als een fundamentele aantasting van het subsidiariteitsbeginsel. Los daarvan bevat dit verslag ook tal van aanbevelingen die indruisen tegen elementaire democratische beginselen en principes van een rechtsstaat. Om maar één voorbeeld te noemen. Terwijl dit verslag oproept om personen niet te discrimineren omwille van hun overtuiging laat het tegelijk expliciet discriminatie op basis van politieke overtuiging toe.

4-277

Koenraad Dillen (NI), schriftelijk. – Ik heb tegen dit zoveelste van politieke correctheid druipende rapport gestemd, al was het maar omdat dit voorstel het subsidiariteitsprincipe van de EU schendt en een enorme administratieve rompslomp met zich brengt. Natuurlijk ben ik ook tegen elke vorm van discriminatie op grond van handicap, leeftijd of seksuele geaardheid. Maar dit verslag bevat tal van aanbevelingen die haaks staan op de meest elementaire beginselen van de rechtsstaat. Want discriminatie mag voor de rapporteur plots wel wanneer het discriminatie op grond van politieke gezindheid betreft. Dan moet het gelijkheidsbeginsel niet meer gelden. Dit is al te zot.

4-278

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE), in writing. – This report aims to protect those who are unjustly marginalised and ensure that they have proper and adequate means to address their situation. I was pleased to support it. It has broad support from social platforms and civil society. I am satisfied that it does not interfere with Member States competences in the following domains:

- education
- access to religious institutions
- matters of marital or family status
- the relationship between church and state
- the secular nature of the state and its institutions
- the status of religious organisations and
- the wearing of religious symbols at school.

Ireland had, until recently, a very active National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI) and a well funded Equality Authority. Despite the importance of the work that these bodies were charged with, including, among other issues, equality proofing legislation, these bodies have ceased to be, given the drastic cuts in funding available to them. It is important that we continue to support these groups and their work.

Ms Buitenweg's report clearly demarks certain areas to remain part of the competency of each Member State, but progress on a European scale is important to achieve a social and more just Europe.

4-279

Edite Estrela (PSE), *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o Relatório sobre a "igualdade de tratamento entre as pessoas", que inclui várias alterações à proposta da Comissão Europeia, reforçando a protecção dos cidadãos, entre os quais as pessoas com deficiência, vítimas de discriminação.

De acordo com dados do Eurobarómetro de 2008, 15% dos cidadãos europeus afirmam ter sido discriminados no ano passado. Trata-se de uma situação inaceitável, pelo que me congratulo com a aprovação deste texto pelo Parlamento Europeu, apesar do incompreensível voto contra da direita.

Considero fundamental que a legislação proíba a discriminação directa e indirecta, a discriminação múltipla ou por associação, em razão de sexo, raça ou origem étnica, religião ou crença, deficiência, idade, orientação sexual ou género, e em domínios como a protecção social, a educação e o acesso a bens e serviços, como, por exemplo, habitação, transportes, telecomunicações e saúde.

4-280

Glyn Ford (PSE), *in writing*. – This Parliament has played a key role in promoting equal treatment of people across the Union on grounds of sex, race, religion, belief, disability, age and sexual orientation.

I therefore welcome this report, which urges a further strengthening of provisions to enforce such equality.

My only reservation is with regard to Amendment 39, part of which argues that freedom of speech should not be compromised, even in cases of harassment. We rightly have restrictions on freedom of speech covered by the laws of libel and slander. Equally you cannot with impunity shout 'fire' in a cinema. On that basis I have to vote against this particular amendment with the threat it would pose to minorities.

4-281

Patrick Gaubert (PPE-DE), *par écrit*. – La défense des droits et la protection des personnes victimes de discriminations doit être une priorité pour l'UE, mais elle ne peut être efficace et utile que si elle assure une sécurité juridique pour les personnes concernées tout en évitant une charge disproportionnée pour les acteurs économiques visés.

Dans ce domaine sensible, il était primordial de rester vigilant quant au respect de la répartition des compétences entre l'Union européenne et les États membres et de veiller à ce que le Parlement s'en tienne strictement à ce que permet la base légale.

Or le texte tel qu'adopté aujourd'hui, s'il apporte satisfaction à certains égards –notamment en ce qui concerne la lutte contre les discriminations vis-à-vis des personnes handicapées –, les notions floues qu'il contient, les incertitudes juridiques qu'il maintient, les exigences superflues qu'il introduit le rendent juridiquement impraticable et donc inefficace dans son application.

Estimant que la surréglementation ne peut être une solution, j'ai défendu l'amendement de rejet de la proposition de la Commission dans la mesure où les textes existants en la matière ne sont pas appliqués par un certain nombre d'États membres qui font l'objet de procédures d'infraction.

Dans ces conditions, solidaire de l'objectif de cette directive mais partiellement insatisfait, j'ai préféré m'abstenir lors du vote final.

4-282

Louis Grech (PSE), *in writing*. – I will be voting in favour of this report especially since it promotes in a very forceful and concrete way the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, age or sexual orientation. Having said that however my delegation feels that national realities and national concerns in the various Member States have to be taken into consideration (Amendment 28) before implementing the amendment. Furthermore we have to ensure that legislation enacted would not lead to a perverse situation where, instead of ensuring freedom of expression, freedom of expression is curbed.

4-283

Françoise Grossetête (PPE-DE), *par écrit*. – J'ai toujours adopté une approche positive dans la lutte ferme et efficace contre toutes les formes de discrimination et contre l'homophobie dans le respect des valeurs fondamentales de l'Union européenne.

La défense des droits et la protection des personnes victimes de discriminations doit être une priorité pour l'UE, mais elle ne peut être efficace et utile que si elle assure une sécurité juridique pour les personnes concernées tout en évitant une charge disproportionnée pour les acteurs économiques visés.

Dans ce domaine sensible, il est primordial de rester vigilant quant au respect de la répartition des compétences entre l'Union européenne et les États membres et de veiller à ce que le Parlement s'en tienne strictement à ce que permet la base légale au niveau européen.

Or le texte tel qu'adopté aujourd'hui, s'il apporte satisfaction à certains égards –notamment en ce qui concerne la lutte contre les discriminations vis-à-vis des personnes handicapées –, les notions floues qu'il contient, les incertitudes juridiques qu'il maintient, les exigences superflues qu'il introduit, le rendent juridiquement impraticable et donc inefficace dans son application. Dans ces conditions, et si je partage l'objectif de la directive, j'ai néanmoins choisi de m'abstenir sur ce texte lors du vote final.

4-284

Ian Hudgton (Verts/ALE), in writing. – I congratulate my colleague Ms Buitenweg in gaining majority support for her report in this House. Discrimination on the basis of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation has no place in European society. It is right that legal protection is extended beyond the labour market and this proposed Directive will be a valuable tool in the fight against intolerance.

4-285

Carl Lang et Fernand Le Rachinel (NI), par écrit. – Depuis 2000, l'Union européenne n'a cessé de promouvoir l'égalité au sens de plus en plus large possible: l'égalité entre hommes et femmes, entre nationaux et étrangers, entre malades et bien portants, entre catholiques, musulmans, bouddhistes ou autres religions, égalité dans l'accès à l'éducation, à la santé, dans son orientation sexuelle... Bref, la liste est évidemment non exhaustive et les prochaines directives européennes en préparation concernent l'égalité devant l'accès aux services sociaux et au logement.

Voilà donc une nouvelle directive qui, sous couvert de la légitime lutte contre les discriminations envers les personnes handicapées, entend réglementer, si ce n'est cadenasser, pratiquement tous les domaines où la liberté de choix, contractuel ou non, existe encore.

Les écueils d'une telle réglementation coercitive sont nombreux. En effet, ces nouvelles mesures européennes vont non seulement accroître la bureaucratie et les lourdeurs européennes, mais constituent un réel danger pour les autres libertés et droits fondamentaux, comme notamment la liberté de religion, d'association ou d'expression et la liberté de la presse.

Au nom de l'égalité, les censeurs et les dictateurs sont bien là.

4-286

Astrid Lulling (PPE-DE), par écrit. – C'est avec beaucoup de regret que je me suis résolue à m'abstenir au sujet du rapport de Mme Buitenweg sur l'égalité de traitement.

Ce principe d'égalité de traitement des personnes, qu'il touche aux convictions politiques ou religieuses, à l'âge, au sexe, à l'orientation sexuelle, ou au handicap est un des principes fondateurs de l'Union européenne. La réalité quotidienne montre effectivement que de nombreux progrès restent à faire dans les États membres. Les commentaires désobligeants qui continuent de fleurir sur les personnes âgées en sont une illustration éloquent.

Cependant je ne puis souscrire aux voies et aux options décrites dans ce rapport. Je crains fort que les bonnes intentions n'aboutissent à des litiges inextricables et des excès bureaucratiques allant à l'encontre de l'objectif recherché.

4-287

Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Junilistan tycker att EU är en värderingsunion och därför är jag en stark förespråkare för ett brett direktiv mot diskriminering. Jag anser det vara en självklarhet för en fungerande inre marknad och för respekten av okränkbara mänskliga rättigheter. Det är mycket viktigt för mig att ingen diskrimineras p.g.a. funktionsnedsättning.

Att jag stöder ändringsförslag 87 beror på att jag anser att skattebetalare i varje land ska se till att funktionshindrade har sådan ekonomi att de räknas som fullvärdiga låntagare på kreditmarknaden. Jag har även röstat ja till betänkandet i dess helhet.

4-288

Maria Martens (PPE-DE), schriftelijk. – Het CDA heeft zich altijd sterk gemaakt voor regels voor de gelijke behandeling van personen ongeacht godsdienst, overtuiging, handicap, leeftijd of seksuele geaardheid. Het CDA is dan ook voor de geest van deze richtlijn.

Zo'n wet moet dan wel goed in elkaar zitten. Het CDA acht vele rechtsdefinities in de tekst buitengewoon onduidelijk en verwacht -net als vele anderen- dat de tekst aanleidingen zal geven voor allerlei procedures bij het Hof.

Het CDA is tegen het voorstel van omkering van de bewijslast. Voor ons is iemand onschuldig tenzij het tegendeel bewezen wordt. Het CDA kan zich niet vinden in het voorstel dat het aan degene is die wordt aangeklaagd om zijn onschuld te bewijzen.

We betreuren bovendien dat socialisten en liberalen kennelijk onder druk van de verkiezingen de tekst met tal van nieuwe elementen of bij gesplitste stemmingen het evenwicht nog verder uit balans heeft gebracht. Om die reden heeft het CDA het rapport niet kunnen steunen.

4-289

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE), in writing. – This is a major report with important consequences for EU citizens.

It is difficult to argue against the principle of equal treatment, yet this report has proven hugely contentious in this House, not just between groups, but indeed within political groups too.

I voted against Amendment 81 to totally reject this report. I have met with and been lobbied by many disability interest groups who asked for consideration of their position. The European Disability Forum, in particular strongly argues that we need EU legislation to protect people with disabilities against discrimination.

At Council many Member States have also voiced concerns about the proposal. Those concerns range from the legal base to be used, the scope of the proposal and fears that it may impinge on areas of national competence, such as education, social security and healthcare.

We must also make clear that adoption and reproductive rights (including assisted human reproduction) are not within the scope of the directive.

I voted against Amendment 28 in order to secure the reference to national law on family or family status, including reproductive rights. This amendment was rejected by the House and therefore I abstained in the final vote.

4-290

Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL), schriftelijk. – Vandaag heb ik, samen met het eurokritische deel van mijn fractie, gestemd voor het rapport Buitenweg over gelijke behandeling van personen. Met haar voorstellen zijn wij het inhoudelijk zeer eens en dus betreuren we de vele tegenstemmen van diegenen die meer Europa willen. Het is jammer dat andere partijen vooraf twijfel hebben gezaaid over de vanzelfsprekendheid van onze voorstem

In nationale parlementen en nationale regeringen van de EU-lidstaten komt vaak de vraag aan de orde of de EU meer bevoegdheden naar zich toe moet halen. Die uitbreiding van bevoegdheden gaat veelal ten koste van de besluitvorming op lager niveau, die de betrokkenen de meeste invloed garandeert. In zulke gevallen maakt mijn partij, de Socialistische Partij in Nederland, bezwaar. In het Europees Parlement gaat het daarentegen vooral om de vraag hoe de EU haar bevoegdheden uitoefent, met nadruk op de inhoud dus. In dat geval stemmen wij altijd voor wat wij als een verbetering zien en tegen wat wij als een verslechtering zien. Die keuze neemt niet weg dat we dit soort onderwerpen liever niet overlaten aan de Raad, die een Europees gemiddelde kan vaststellen dat slechter is dan hetgeen we inmiddels in Nederland en in een aantal andere lidstaten hebben bereikt.

4-291

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – La parità di trattamento delle persone indipendentemente dalla religione o le convinzioni personali, la disabilità, l'età o l'orientamento sessuale è un principio che va ben al di là del diritto comunitario: esso è un principio inalienabile della persona umana. Pertanto, debbo esprimere il mio voto contrario alla relazione della collega Buitenweg, su proposta di direttiva del Consiglio. La presente direttiva è a mio parere volta esclusivamente a calmierare degli aspetti sui quali l'Unione Europea dovrebbe già essere ben attiva e ben presente.

4-291-500

Toomas Savi (ALDE), in writing. – I voted in favour of Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg's report on equal treatment of people irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. I find it absolutely outrageous that in the 21st century in the European Parliament there are still disagreements about something as natural as equal treatment of people. The fact that 226 MEPs voted against the report was a negative surprise and a clear sign of danger, which cannot be ignored.

Tolerance is one of the cornerstones of the European Union and combating discrimination of any kind must be our top priority. The European Union's motto "united in diversity" does not only stand for different nationalities of the EU, but first and foremost involves the citizens of the European Union with their individual differences. All EU citizens are equal and must be treated that way, only then can the European Union live up to its motto.

4-292

Margie Sudre (PPE-DE), par écrit. – La défense des droits et la protection des personnes victimes de discriminations doit être une priorité pour l'UE, mais elle ne peut être efficace et utile que si elle assure une sécurité juridique pour les personnes concernées, en évitant une charge disproportionnée pour les acteurs économiques visés.

Dans ce domaine, il est primordial de rester vigilant quant au respect de la répartition des compétences entre l'Union européenne et les États membres et de veiller à ce que le Parlement s'en tienne strictement à ce que permet la base légale.

Le texte adopté aujourd'hui apporte satisfaction à certains égards, notamment en ce qui concerne la lutte contre les discriminations vis-à-vis des personnes handicapées, mais les notions floues qu'il contient, les incertitudes juridiques qu'il maintient, les exigences qu'il introduit le rendent juridiquement impraticable et donc inefficace dans son application.

La surréglementation ne pouvant être une solution, la délégation a défendu l'amendement de rejet de la proposition de la Commission dans la mesure où les textes existants ne sont déjà pas appliqués par certains États membres qui font l'objet de procédures d'infraction.

De fait, la délégation française, solidaire de l'objectif de cette directive mais partiellement insatisfaite, a préféré s'abstenir lors du vote final.

4-293

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), na piśmie. – Dyskryminacja to problem, który w dobie jednoczenia się Europy jest tematem jak najbardziej aktualnym, który nie może zostać przez nas w żadnym wypadku zignorowany. Mimo że temat ten był już przez nas niejednokrotnie poruszany, to jego efekty w dalszym ciągu nie są zadowalające.

Istotnym problemem jest różnorodność dyskryminacji. Dyskryminacja ze względu na pochodzenie etniczne bądź rasowe jest zakazana zarówno na rynku pracy, jak i poza nim. Nierówne traktowanie ze względu na religię, światopogląd, niepełnosprawność, wiek czy orientację seksualną jest obecnie zakazane tylko w sferze zawodowej.

Uważam, iż należy zwrócić uwagę na zwalczanie dyskryminacji nie tylko w obrębie życia zawodowego, ale i poza nim. Dyskryminacja powinna być definiowana w taki sam sposób niezależnie od rodzaju.

Prewencja w temacie nierównego traktowania to kwestia najistotniejsza, nie możemy jednak zapominać o osobach dyskryminowanych. Musimy zadbać o możliwość egzekwowania praw oraz dążyć do konsekwentnego karania osób dyskryminujących.

Dyskryminacja to bardzo poważny temat zarówno w związku z życiem prywatnym obywateli, jak i z procesem integracji w Europie. W pełni zgadzam się ze sprawozdawcą, panią poseł Kathalijne Maria Buitenweg i dziękuję jej za bardzo dobre i wyczerpujące sprawozdanie.

4-294

Marianne Thyssen (PPE-DE), schriftelijk. – Het op Europees niveau opleggen van de omkering van de bewijslast zoals bepaald in de nieuwe anti-discriminatierichtlijn, kan ik als juriste niet aanvaarden. Het is immers vrijwel onmogelijk om te bewijzen wat niet is en veel makkelijker om te bewijzen wat wel is.

Het is echter nodig dat de EU ervoor zorgt dat haar mooie uitgangspunten en waarden die verwoord zijn in het EU-Verdrag, ook door haar burgers in de praktijk beleefd kunnen worden. Hierover horizontale wetgeving maken is een goede zaak. Daarom heb ik voor het verslag Buitenweg in zijn geheel gestemd.

4-295

Anna Záborská (PPE-DE), písomne. – Hlasovala som s EĽS-ED proti nediskriminačnej direktíve pre jej negatívne dôsledky na občanov EÚ. Ľavicová väčšina dnes ukázala, že európske inštitúcie nechcú zmenšovať byrokraciu platenú z daní občanov. Uznesenie prináša dôkaz, že EÚ chce rozširovať pravidlá vo všetkých oblastiach života občanov v členských štátoch. Je to zlý signál.

Avšak toto uznesenie nemá žiaden dopad v legislatívnom procese. Až Rada musí rozhodnúť jednomyselne.

Som proti akejkoľvek diskriminácii. Pôvodne direktíva predpokladala potláčať diskrimináciu voči handikepovaným a starším. Aj ja som sa vždy angažovala za ochranu týchto osôb. V kalných vodách sa však najlepšie loví a táto direktíva mi to pripomína.

Lobby si spravila rukojezníka zo skutočnej diskriminácie, keď k nej pridala sexuálnu orientáciu, náboženstvo alebo presvedčenie. Tieto formy diskriminácie neboli nikdy definované v žiadnom dokumente EÚ. Dôsledky môžu byť dramatické.

Nikto nemôže upresniť obsah formulácie sexuálna orientácie a diskriminácia na jej základe. To je potenciálne nebezpečenstvo pre vysvetľovanie direktívy.

Nediskriminácia z dôvodu „presvedčenia“ je tiež problematická. Sekty alebo politickí extrémisti môžu využívať túto direktívu a masmédiá ich nemôžu odmietajúť. Cirkevné školy nemôžu vyberať profesorov s prihliadnutím na svoje

náboženstvo. Poist'ovne nebudú môcť zohľadňovať informácie na upresnenie poist'ovacích rizík. Výška poistenia bude narastať.

Okrem toho je niekoľko direktív a medzinárodných dokumentov, ktoré chránia starších a postihnutých, ktoré nie sú aplikované členskými štátmi.

4-296

– **Proposition de résolution: B6-0177/2009 (Dialogue UE-Belarus)**

4-297

Koenraad Dillen (NI), schriftelijk. – Deze resolutie is vrij kritisch en we mogen het toejuichen dat de politieke dialoog uitdrukkelijk afhankelijk wordt gemaakt van vorderingen qua mensenrechten en interne vrijheid. Op dat vlak schiet het regime ter plaatse nog steeds enorm te kort, met name voor wat betreft de vrijheid van meningsuiting, de persvrijheid en de vrijheid van de democratische oppositie en de media.

Maar teveel wijst erop dat de recente toegevingen van het regime slechts kaderen in een cosmetische operatie ten opzichte van het buitenland vanwege president-dictator Loekashenko. Het is nog veel te vroeg om een normale dialoog met Wit-Rusland aan te gaan.

4-298

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Mais uma resolução profundamente arreigada numa visão de interferência e de estigmatização para com a Bielorrússia, assumindo um carácter de ingerência grosseira nos assuntos internos desse país.

Para além da linguagem mistificadora e maniqueísta, o objectivo é claro: o que a UE não aceita e procura ultrapassar é a afirmação da soberania da Bielorrússia e a definição de uma política autónoma, não subjugada aos interesses da UE/NATO/EUA.

Por isso a UE recorre à chantagem e à aplicação de sanções, as quais afirma poder levantar se esse país tomar as medidas que lhe exige, por exemplo: “o imperativo de incluir a oposição democrática da Bielorrússia e a sociedade civil no diálogo entre a UE e a Bielorrússia”, “utilizar plena e eficazmente as possibilidades de apoio à sociedade civil e à evolução democrática na Bielorrússia através da Iniciativa Europeia para a Democracia e os Direitos do Homem (IEDDH)” ou o “apoio financeiro ao canal de televisão bielorrusso independente Belsat”.

Será que algum dos países da UE aceitaria tais condições? A hipocrisia desta postura é evidente, sobretudo quando a "família europeia" das ditas "nações democráticas" nem uma palavra de condenação teve para com o autêntico massacre perpetrado pelo exército israelita contra o povo palestino em GAZA ou para com os criminosos voos da CIA, dos quais, aliás é cúmplice.

4-299

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE-DE), na piśmie. – Szanowni Państwo! Głosowałem za przyjęciem rezolucji w sprawie oceny dialogu UE i Białorusi. Cieszę się, że oprócz ogólnej oceny politycznej rezolucja mówi o konkretnych oczekiwaniach wobec władz białoruskich. Dialog nie jest przecież prowadzony dla samego dialogu. Powinien on prowadzić do poprawy sytuacji w tych sytuacjach, które z różnych przyczyn wymagają poprawy. Nikt nie ma wątpliwości, że sytuacja na Białorusi jest idealna.

Oczekujemy zatem zrewidowania decyzji w sprawie poboru do wojska młodych działaczy: Franaka Viacorka, Ivana Syl'a i Zmitera Fedoruka. Nie mogą oni być swoistymi „zakładnikami” władz. Franak Viacorka jest synem znanego działacza opozycji. Pobór do wojska nie powinien stanowić instrumentu uprawiania polityki. Wzywamy też do uznania wybranych w dniu 15 marca 2009 r. władz Związku Polaków na Białorusi i jej przewodniczącej Angeli Borys. Chcielibyśmy, aby władze białoruskie doprowadziły do rewizji wyroków wydanych na 11 uczestników demonstracji, która odbyła się w styczniu 2008 r.

To bardzo konkretne przykłady, które pozwalają władzom Białorusi na pokazanie dobrej woli i chęci prowadzenia rzeczywistego dialogu. Mam nadzieję, że Białoruś skorzysta z tej szansy. Będzie to korzystne dla samej Białorusi, Białorusinów, Unii Europejskiej i relacji między Białorusią a Europą. Dziękuję.

4-300

– **Proposition de résolution: RC-B6-0165/2009 (Conscience européenne et totalitarisme)**

4-300-500

Adam Bielan (UEN), na piśmie. – Jeśli zależy nam na budowaniu przyszłości Europy to nie możemy dopuszczać do ignorowania faktów historycznych i zaniedbywania pamięci o tragicznych momentach w naszej historii. Pamięć o ofiarach zbrodni przeciwko ludzkości powinna być jednym z podstawowych elementów nauczania historii i kształtowania świadomości młodych ludzi w Europie. Nieznajomość historii nie tylko prowadzi do jej zakłamywania, ale również do tworzenia się różnego rodzaju niebezpiecznych nacjonalizmów. Chciałbym także, aby społeczeństwo europejskie

dowiedziało się więcej o polskich bohaterach takich jak rotmistrz Witold Pilecki. Musimy pamiętać, że zrozumienie przeszłości całej Europy, nie tylko jej zachodniej części, jest kluczem do budowania wspólnej przyszłości.

4-301

Koenraad Dillen (NI), *schriftelijk*. – Ik heb voor deze evenwichtige resolutie gestemd, waarin elke vorm van totalitarisme wordt veroordeeld. De twintigste eeuw was de eeuw van de grootste massamoorden in de geschiedenis. Nazi-Duitsland, Sovjet-Rusland, Cambodja, China, Rwanda zijn er om ons eraan te herinneren tot welke absolute waanzin en wreedheid de mens tegenover zijn gelijke in staat is wanneer tirannie het haalt van de vrijheid. Maar één bedenking: ik weiger een hiërarchie in het lijden op te stellen. Elk lijden is uniek en verdient onze eerbied. Of het nu om lijden van joodse mensen, tutsi's, koelakken, Russische krijgsgevangenen of Poolse priesters gaat. Daarom heb ik mij bij amendement 19 onthouden.

4-302

Edite Estrela (PSE), *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente a Resolução sobre regimes totalitários. Considero que a Europa não estará unida, enquanto não for capaz de lograr uma visão comum da sua História e de levar a cabo um debate honesto e aprofundado sobre os crimes cometidos pelo nazismo, o estalinismo e os regimes fascistas e comunistas, no século passado.

Penso que o processo de integração europeia é um êxito, na medida em que permitiu a construção de uma União Europeia que abarca hoje os países da Europa Central e Oriental que viveram sob regimes comunistas desde o final da Segunda Guerra Mundial até ao início dos anos 1990, e contribuiu para garantir a democracia no Sul da Europa, em países como a Grécia, a Espanha e Portugal, que sofreram com regimes fascistas de longa duração.

4-303

Glyn Ford (PSE), *in writing*. – While I am in favour of the maximum objectivity in analysing Europe's history, and while I recognise the horrific nature of the crimes of Stalinist Russia, I am afraid that this resolution has elements of a historical revisionism that flies in the face of a demand for objective analysis.

I am not willing to equate the crimes of the Nazis, the Holocaust and the genocide that saw six million Jews, along with Communists, Trade Unionists and disabled die, with those of Stalinist Russia. This political relativism threatens to dilute the unique nature of the Nazi crimes, and in doing so provides an intellectual underpinning to the ideologies of today's neo-Nazis and fascists, some of whom are with us here today.

4-304

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), *skriftlig*. – Förslaget till resolution från de fem största grupperna innehåller många viktiga synpunkter på den europeiska historien de senaste hundra åren. Tilläggsförslagen från bland annat UEN-gruppen är också lovvärda, men av redaktionella skäl passar inte allt som föreslås in i resolutionstexten. Det finns många tragedier och enskilda personers hjältemod som skulle kunna beskrivas i en resolution om det europeiska samvetet och totalitära diktaturer. Men tyvärr finns det inte plats för allt och därför har vi tvingats att rösta nej till en del tilläggsförslag till resolutionen.

Vi har dock röstat ja till resolutionen i dess helhet.

4-305

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Esta vergonhosa resolução aprovada pelo PE insere-se na operação de distorção da verdade histórica, levada a cabo pelas forças reaccionárias e revanchistas, as derrotadas na Segunda Guerra Mundial – as mesmos que, por exemplo, reabilitam nos seus países os colaboracionistas com a barbárie nazi.

O objectivo é branquear o nazi-fascismo e condenar o comunismo, isto é, branquear o carrasco e o opressor, condenando as suas vítimas e os seus oprimidos. O seu objectivo é apagar o contributo decisivo dos comunistas e da União Soviética para a derrota do nazi-fascismo, o seu papel nos avanços nas condições de vida dos trabalhadores, o seu contributo para a libertação dos povos do jugo colonial, o seu papel contra a exploração e a guerra, após a Segunda Guerra Mundial.

Em Portugal, ninguém como o PCP lutou pela liberdade, pela democracia, pela paz, pelos direitos do homem, por condições de vida dignas para o povo português, pela liberdade dos povos colonizados pelo fascismo, pelas conquistas consignadas na Constituição da República Portuguesa, que hoje assinala 33 anos.

No fundo, o seu intento é a criminalização dos comunistas, da sua acção e dos seus ideias.

Uma resolução tanto mais grave quando atravessamos um momento de aguda crise do capitalismo, que coloca como grande exigência do nosso tempo a luta pela paz, democracia e o progresso social.

4-306

Jens Holm and Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL), *in writing*. – We of course regret the victims of all aggressive and authoritarian regimes, regardless of the atrocities that have been carried out in Europe or for example in the former European colonies. We are however deeply concerned about all direct or indirect efforts by politicians or

parliaments trying to influence the general perception of historical facts. This task should be left to independent academic research and public debate. Otherwise there is a risk that every new majority in Parliament will try to change history by describing the worst enemies of society, and that the discussion on European history will be used for short-term campaign purposes. We therefore chose to abstain in the final vote.

4-307

Μαρία-Ελένη Κοππά (PSE), γραπτώς. – Η Κοινοβουλευτική Ομάδα του ΠΑΣΟΚ ψήφισε εναντίον διότι το ψήφισμα αυτό προχωράει σε ανεπίτρεπτη εξομοίωση ναζισμού και κομμουνισμού.

Καταδικάζουμε τις αγκυρότητες τόσο του ναζισμού όσο και του σταλινισμού.

Θεωρούμε ότι η εξομοίωση που γίνεται δεν βοηθά στην κατανόηση της ιδιαιτερότητας καθενός από τα δύο ολοκληρωτικά αυτά καθεστώτα.

4-308

Erik Meijer (GUE/NGL), schriftelijk. – Ik heb gestemd voor de resolutie over het totalitarisme, in afwijking van het stemadvies van mijn fractie, die deze resolutie overbodig vond. Ik kies voor een markering van de radicale breuk met alle pogingen om politieke doelen te verwezenlijken door middel van geweld, vrijheidsberoving, intimidatie en andere vormen van onderdrukking. De 20e eeuw was de eeuw van grote volksbewegingen die verblind waren door de gedachte dat zij aan het eind van de geschiedenis stonden. Om de voor hen ideale wereld te organiseren, en die voor eeuwig te beschermen tegen verandering, was elke misdaad geoorloofd. Voor de één bestond die ideale wereld uit de gelijkwaardigheid van alle mensen, een sterke publieke dienstverlening, de productiemiddelen in handen van het volk en afschaffing van alle oude voorrechten voor bevoorrechte groepen. Voor de ander ging het om behoud van tradities, ongelijkheid, machtsposities en voorrechten. Met de eerste groep ben ik het eens en met de tweede niet.

Met hun geweld hebben beide groepen zich voor altijd gehaat gemaakt. Niemand herinnert zich meer wat hun doeleinden waren, maar ieder weet wel welke middelen zij gebruikten. Dat tijdperk behoort definitief voorbij te zijn. Hoewel ik het oneens ben met sommige formuleringen vind ik deze resolutie nodig.

4-309

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Κανένα κοινοβούλιο, καμία κοινοβουλευτική πλειοψηφία που αποτελείται από τους εκπροσώπους και υπηρέτες του βάρβαρου καπιταλιστικού συστήματος, δεν μπορεί με τη συκοφαντία, το ψέμα και την πλαστογραφία να διαγράψει την ιστορία των κοινωνικών επαναστάσεων. Την έχουν γράψει και υπογράψει οι λαοί με το αίμα τους. Κανένα μαύρο αντικομμουνιστικό μέτωπο δεν μπορεί να σβήσει την μεγάλη προσφορά του σοσιαλισμού, τις πρωτόγνωρες κατακτήσεις του και την κατάργηση της εκμετάλλευσης ανθρώπου από άνθρωπο.

Το κοινό ψήφισμα του Λαϊκού Κόμματος, των Φιλελευθέρων, των Πρασίνων, της Ένωσης για την Ευρώπη των Εθνών, που ψηφίστηκε και από τους Σοσιαλιστές, με έναν χυδαίο και ανιστόρητο τρόπο ταυτίζει το φασισμό με τον κομμουνισμό, τα ναζιστικά φασιστικά καθεστώτα με τα σοσιαλιστικά.

Με έναν άθλιο συμψηφισμό προτείνουν κοινή ημέρα ευρωπαϊκής μνήμης για τους θύτες και τα θύματα. Έτσι αθρώνουν τον φασισμό, συκοφαντούν το σοσιαλισμό και εξαγνίζουν τον ιμπεριαλισμό από τα εγκλήματα που διέπραξε και διαπράττει και σήμερα. Ιδεολογικά αναδεικνύουν τον καπιταλισμό σαν το μόνο "δημοκρατικό" σύστημα.

Τεράστιες ευθύνες για την αντικομμουνιστική υστερία έχουν και όσες πολιτικές δυνάμεις τηρούν ίσες αποστάσεις, δίνοντας έτσι άλλοθι στη σκοταδιστική αυτή πολιτική.

Το ΚΚΕ καλεί την εργατική τάξη και κάθε προοδευτικό άνθρωπο να καταδικάσουν τον αντικομμουνισμό και τους φορείς του.

4-310

Zita Pleštinšká (PPE-DE), písomne. – 20. storočie bolo poznačené zločinmi totalitných komunistických a nacistických režimov brutálne spáchanými na miliónoch nevinných ľudí. Európska integrácia bola priamou odpoveďou na vojny a teror spôsobené totalitnými režimami na európskom kontinente.

Som presvedčená, že Európa nebude nikdy zjednotená, ak sa nedokáže spojiť v názore sa svoje dejiny, preto som hlasovala za uznesenie o svedomí Európy a totalitných režimoch. Musíme uznať komunizmus a nacizmus ako spoločné dedičstvo a viesť odbornú diskusiu o všetkých zločinoch totalitných režimov minulého storočia. Dlížime to našej mladej generácii, ktorá už v týchto režimoch nevyrastala a jej vedomosti o totalitách všetkého druhu sú aj po piatich rokoch po rozšírení v roku 2004 alarmujúco povrchné a nedostatočné. Mnohí ani dnes nevedia o režimoch, ktoré terorizovali ich spoluobčanov v strednej a východnej Európe vyše 40 rokov a oddeľovali ich od demokratickej Európy železnou oponou a berlínskym múrom.

V roku 2009 oslávime 20.výročie pádu komunistických diktatúr v strednej a východnej Európe a pádu berlínskeho múru, preto verím, že práve pri tejto príležitosti všetky vlády EÚ vyhlásia 23.august za Európsky deň spomienky na obeť stalinizmu a nacizmu.

Bude to zadost'účením pre všetky obeť totalitných režimov a silnou a jednoznačnou zárukou, že tieto udalosti sa už nikdy v Európe nezopakujú.

4-311

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Intendo esprimere il mio voto a favore della proposta di risoluzione su coscienza europea e totalitarismo.

Sono fermamente convinto che sia necessario rafforzare la consapevolezza europea dei crimini commessi da regimi totalitari e non democratici, poiché ritengo che non si possa consolidare l'integrazione europea, senza promuovere la conservazione della memoria storica, purché si riconoscano tutti gli aspetti del passato europeo.

Approvo, inoltre, la proposta di proclamare una "Giornata europea del ricordo" delle vittime di tutti i regimi totalitari e autoritari.

4-312

Peter Skinner (PSE), in writing. – For many across the EU and indeed wider Europe, the consequences of totalitarianism, with its millions of deaths, is a crucial historical point. It has helped to form many minds of later generations, but for those who lived during this period of time it represents a terrible scar in European development. Extremism is still a current threat and these extremists have an unwitting friend in the ballot box – lethargy. As politicians, awareness of the danger to our freedoms and our very lives is something we must all strive to remind current and future generations. This is why I can support this motion for a resolution.

4-313

Ιωάννης Βαρβιτσιώτης (PPE-DE), γραπτώς. – Καταδικάζουμε απερίφραστα κάθε μορφή ολοκληρωτισμού και παράλληλα υπογραμμίζουμε τη σημασία που έχει να διατηρηθεί η μνήμη για το παρελθόν που άλλωστε αποτελεί σημαντικό στοιχείο της ιστορίας μας.

Όμως πιστεύουμε ότι οι όποιες αποφάσεις της πλειοψηφίας του κοινοβουλίου δεν είναι αρμόδιες να ερμηνεύουν ιστορικά γεγονότα.

Η αποτίμηση των ιστορικών γεγονότων είναι αποκλειστικό έργο των ιστορικών και μόνον.

Γι'αυτούς τους λόγους καταλήξαμε στην απόφαση να απόσχουμε από την σημερινή ψηφοφορία του κοινού ψηφίσματος των τεσσάρων πολιτικών ομάδων, συμπεριλαμβανομένου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος, για την Ευρωπαϊκή συνείδηση και τον ολοκληρωτισμό.

4-314

Francis Wurtz (GUE/NGL), par écrit. – Nous avons eu à plusieurs reprises l'occasion de nous exprimer au sujet de déclarations répétées sur le thème de "tous les totalitarismes".

Notre groupe condamne radicalement tout totalitarisme. Il condamne radicalement le stalinisme. Dans le même temps, il récuse profondément toute tentative de banaliser le nazisme en le noyant dans une réprobation des totalitarismes comme le fait, une fois de plus, la résolution commune qui nous est soumise.

C'est pourquoi notre groupe refuse de participer au vote de ladite résolution.

4-315

Anna Záborská (PPE-DE), písomne. – Odsúdenie totalitných režimov, ktoré prijali ideológiu nacizmu alebo komunizmu, má byť iba prvým krokom k úplnému odsúdeniu všetkých foriem neznášanlivosti, fanatizmu a ignorancie, ktoré potláčali a potláčajú základné práva a slobody jednotlivcov a národov. Každá ideológia, ktorá nerešpektuje dôstojnosť a život ľudskej osoby, je odsúdenia hodná a zásadne nepripustná.

Nacizmus a komunizmus sú ideológie, ktoré boli predsa inšpirované staršími ideológiami. Tieto sa formovali v 19. storočí a etablovali sa aj ako štátoprávne zásady a princípy vtedajších európskych štátov. Tieto ideológie ako militarizmus, šovinistický nacionalizmus, imperializmus, radikalizmus a neskôr aj fašizmus boli vo svojej podstate nehumánne a zhubné a preto si zasluhujú explicitne odsúdenie rovnako ako ideológie, ktoré sa objavili následne vo forme komunizmu a nacizmu.

Zvlášť to musíme zdôrazňovať v dnešnej dobe, ktorá je dobou neistou a mimoriadne zložitou. Nedovoľme teda, aby vznikali nove politické prúdy inšpirované rovnakými protiludskými myšlienkami, ktoré stali za nacizmom a komunizmom. Proti netolerancii sa dá bojovať jedine nekompromisne bez výnimiek a preto žiadame, aby sa text "boja

proti totalitarizmu" zmenil na text "boja proti všetkým štátnym režimom, ktoré viedli k potláčaniu ľudskej dôstojnosti, slobody a výnimočnosti každého jednotlivca".

4-316

– **Proposition de résolution: RC-B6-0166/2009 (Rôle de la culture)**

4-317

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat în favoarea rezoluției comune referitoare la rolul culturii în dezvoltarea regiunilor europene, deoarece cred că UE trebuie să susțină mai puternic proiectele culturale.

Consider că strategiile de dezvoltare regională și locală care încorporează cultura, creativitatea și artele contribuie în mare măsură la îmbunătățirea calității vieții în regiunile și orașele europene prin favorizarea diversității culturale, a democrației, a participării și a dialogului intercultural.

Rezoluția invită Comisia să prezinte Cartea Verde conținând o serie de măsuri în domeniul activităților culturale contemporane care să vizeze consolidarea dezvoltării în regiunile europene.

Consider că spiritul cultural al Europei este un mijloc important de apropiere între europeni într-o manieră plină de respect față de identitățile lor culturale și lingvistice diferite. Culturile din Europa reprezintă factori strategici în dezvoltarea Europei la nivel local, regional și național, precum și la nivelul instituțiilor UE.

4-318

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Kulturfrågor är ett politiskt område som faller under medlemsstaternas politiska ansvar att besluta över. Denna resolution behandlar frågor som ligger utanför den Europeiska unionens kompetensområde. Vi som tar subsidiaritetsprincipen på allvar menar därför att EU-parlamentets utskott för kultur och utbildning bör lägga ned.

Vi har följaktligen röstat nej till betänkandet.

4-319

Zita Pleštinská (PPE-DE), písomne. – Kultúra je dôležitým prvkom trvalo udržateľného rozvoja európskych regiónov, preto koncepcia rozvoja každého regiónu musí obsahovať aj kultúrny rozmer. Stratégia, ktorá zahŕňa kultúru, tvorivosť a umenie významnou mierou prispieva ku skvalitňovaniu života obyvateľov v mestách aj na vidieku.

Na relatívne malom priestore aký predstavuje moja krajina Slovensko máme rôznorodé a vnútorné diferencované kultúrne regióny. Kultúrne tradície, ktoré tu počas stáročí vznikali spočívajú v neobyčajnej pestrosti foriem, typov a variantov prejavov ľudovej kultúry.

Napríklad v mojom regióne Stará Ľubovňa na severovýchode Slovenska nájdete kultúru slovenskú, nemeckú, rusínsku, goralskú aj rómsku. Každá obec si každoročne organizuje svoje kultúrne slávnosti, ktoré prilákajú do nášho regiónu veľké množstvo návštevníkov. V pestrosti krojov, piesní a tancov sa utužuje partnerstvo medzi európskymi regiónmi. Kultúrne projekty vychádzajú z iniciatív občianskej spoločnosti a zaslúžia si pozornosť a hlavne podporu aj Európskej Komisie. Žiaľ, že finančné prostriedky sa každým rokom na kultúrne projekty znižujú, preto miestne samosprávy majú vážny problém si tieto obdivuhodné a jedinečné kultúrne tradície udržať.

Som presvedčená, že Komisia by mala predložiť zelenú knihu s možnou paletou opatrení na podporu kultúrnych aktivít zameraných na posilňovanie kultúrneho rozvoja európskych regiónov, preto som v hlasovaní podporila uznesenie o úlohe kultúry v rozvoji európskych regiónov.

4-320

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio parere contrario alle proposte di risoluzione in merito al ruolo della cultura nello sviluppo delle regioni europee.

Ritengo che le iniziative proposte, pur animate dalla condivisibile finalità di favorire lo sviluppo regionale e locale nell'UE, non siano sufficienti a garantire il raggiungimento di tali scopi; in particolare dubito dell'efficacia che tali iniziative hanno sulla promozione delle identità linguistiche e culturali, considerando che non sono affiancate da ulteriori iniziative e politiche di più ampio respiro.

4-321

– **Rapport: Janusz Onyszkiewicz (A6-0140/2009)**

4-322

Martin Callanan (PPE-DE), in writing. – Russia remains an important strategic partner for the EU. We have common interests like fighting nuclear proliferation and building peace in the Middle East. Russia also has an important diplomatic role, not only as a permanent member of the UN Security Council but as a major influence on Iran. We therefore need Russia's help to persuade Iran not to build nuclear bomb.

There are, however, areas of concern about our relationship with Russia: and if we share common interests, I am not convinced that we share common values. The state of democracy and the rule of law in Russia remains of concern. The freedom of the press is also not of the standard that we would expect.

Our partnership with Russia must therefore be strong and durable, but it cannot be unconditional. In particular Russia needs to know that we will not tolerate the annexation and recognition of the sovereign Georgian territories seized in last summer's war.

4-323

Bruno Gollnisch (NI), par écrit. – Il n'y a décidément qu'une nation qui ne trouve jamais grâce aux yeux de ce Parlement, d'habitude si prompt à approuver n'importe quel accord économique, commercial, ou de coopération avec Cuba, la dictature communiste chinoise ou encore la Turquie de M. Erdogan.

La majorité de ce Parlement, qui a accueilli avec enthousiasme la déclaration unilatérale d'indépendance du Kosovo, pourtant berceau historique de la nation serbe, recueille les fruits amers de sa politique, avec l'indépendance de l'Abkhazie et de l'Ossétie, soutenues par la Russie.

De plus, comment peut-on imputer à la seule Russie le malentendu sur les questions de sécurité, quand l'extension de l'OTAN jusqu'à ses frontières est naturellement vécue par elle comme une provocation et une menace?

Certes, des difficultés subsistent. Mais la Russie, contrairement à la Turquie, appartient culturellement, spirituellement, géographiquement à l'espace européen. C'est avec elle, en priorité, que nous devrions avoir des liens privilégiés.

4-324

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A resolução agora aprovada torna claros os propósitos e objectivos que a maioria do PE pretende para as relações UE-Rússia: que as mesmas "assentem nos princípios dos mercados liberalizados e abertos e da reciprocidade dos direitos de investimento entre os parceiros, e exigir, por conseguinte, que, em troca de laços económicos estreitos e benéficos, o Governo russo garanta os direitos de propriedade dos investidores estrangeiros".

Ou seja, o que se pretende é pressionar esse país, por exemplo, a ceder as suas imensas riquezas naturais - nomeadamente o gás natural e o petróleo -, a condicionar a sua capacidade produtiva e a disponibilizar a sua mão-de-obra à exploração e aos interesses das grandes potências e do grande capital na UE, que quer ter acesso ao que ao povo russo deve pertencer.

A resolução coloca toda a pressão sobre a Rússia, mas nem uma referência é feita ao alargamento da NATO para Leste e à instalação do novo sistema míssil dos EUA na Europa.

Pela nossa parte rejeitamos liminarmente este tipo de relações. Defendemos o estabelecimento de relações equitativas e de respeito mútuo entre as partes, com base no interesse dos seus povos, no respeito pelos princípios da não ingerência, do desarmamento e do desanuviamento.

4-325

Carl Lang (NI), par écrit. – À la différence de la Turquie, la Russie fait partie de la sphère géographique, culturelle, spirituelle, donc civilisationnelle européenne. À ce titre, elle devrait être un partenaire stratégique idéal en bien des domaines, notamment énergétique. Mais c'est aussi une nation-sœur qu'il faut soutenir et non critiquer sans cesse, comme le font les bien-pensants européistes, notamment dans ce rapport, qui qualifie le sauvetage des minorités russophones de Géorgie comme une "contre-attaque disproportionnée" qui mettrait "en question la volonté de la Russie de construire avec l'Union européenne un espace commun de sécurité"

Les européistes toujours prêts à s'aligner sur les États-Unis et leur guerre en Irak n'ont pas de leçons à donner aux Russes. Ces mêmes européistes "droits-de-l'hommes" qui, il y a 10 ans, n'ont pas hésité à soutenir l'OTAN dans l'inqualifiable agression dont a été victime la Serbie.

Nous appelons à la construction d'une nouvelle Europe, d'une Europe libre des nations souveraines qui établisse des relations de statut privilégié avec la Russie.

4-326

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto contrario in merito alla relazione presentata dal collega Onyszkiewicz recante una proposta di raccomandazione del Parlamento europeo destinata al Consiglio sul nuovo accordo UE-Russia.

Non sono, infatti, d'accordo con il relatore circa le raccomandazioni rivolte al Consiglio e alla Commissione in vista del proseguimento dei negoziati con la Russia, poiché ritengo che non siano sufficienti a garantire una giusta intesa, rispettosa dei diritti e delle prerogative dell'Unione Europea, che possa favorire lo sviluppo di buone relazioni tra gli attori in causa.

Ritengo, dunque, che debbano essere compiuti maggiori sforzi, da entrambe le parti, affinché tale obiettivo possa essere raggiunto.

4-327

Charles Tannock (PPE-DE), in writing. – Russia has to make up its mind: does it aspire to the EU's common values or not? There are many areas of agreement with Russia, which all said and done is our strategic partner. We acknowledge the common threat of nuclear proliferation, particularly from Iran. We need Russia's help as part of the Quartet to work towards a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict with a new PM of Israel and US President in place. However we cannot allow Russia to bully its neighbours and use its hydrocarbon resources as a diplomatic weapon. Similarly, we cannot allow Russia simply to behave as if last summer's war in Georgia did not happen. The annexation of sovereign Georgian territory cannot be brushed under the carpet, either by Russia or the EU. Lastly Russia must observe its binding OSCE/Council of Europe commitments to upholding human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

4-328

– **Rapport: Frédérique Ries (A6-0089/2009)**

4-329

John Attard-Montalto (PSE), in writing. – I am taking this opportunity to fully support this report which is being proposed so as to further health protection of EU citizens but I'd also like to take this opportunity to say that in Malta and Gozo certain areas of the basic health system are in shambles. The waiting lists of Maltese and Gozitans in need of medical tests and surgical interventions are unbelievable. 2 per cent of the population is waiting for cataract operations.

The waiting list saga is one of many examples supporting my statement. Others include lack of beds in what is supposed to be a state of art hospital costing nearly a billion euro.

4-330

Liam Aylward (UEN), in writing. – I voted in favour of this report specifically because it urges the Commission to utilise current scientific evidence to protect EU citizens from the potential hazards of electromagnetic fields (EMFs). The 1999 recommendation requires an update within five years of it being published that takes into account ongoing research. No update has taken place. I requested in my 2008 letter to Commissioner Kyprianou that the original recommendation be revised, as it was then four years overdue for revisions, but there have still been no updates.

Since the recommendation, we have seen scientific research and conclusions change and evolve as well as significant technological developments using EMFs such as WiFi and Bluetooth. Due to the ever-changing nature of this field, we need to re-evaluate the regulations protecting our citizens.

A 2007 European survey indicates that the majority of EU citizens feel that public authorities have not done an adequate job of informing them on ways to protect themselves from EMFs. The EU must take a stronger lead in gathering essential research on any possible harm from EMFs and to recommend guidelines for its citizens. I support further research into the effects of exposure to electromagnetic fields on public health and hope that the 1999 recommendation will be reviewed and updated.

4-331

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE), in writing. – I support this report which urges the Commission to remain vigilant and undertake a review of the scientific basis and adequacy of EMF limits through the Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR). In this way consumers can continue to have a high level of protection without hampering the functioning and development of wireless technologies.

Electromagnetic fields (EMF) are a matter of direct concern to EU citizens. A special Euro barometer on EMF indicated that Europeans are divided in their concerns about the potential health risks of EMF: 14 % not at all concerned, 35% not very concerned, 35% fairly concerned and 13% very concerned. Several scientific studies on the matter have been published in recent years, however, none of them have provided clear evidence on possible effects of electromagnetic fields emitted by wireless technology on human health.

4-332

Edite Estrela (PSE), por escrito. – Votei favoravelmente a resolução sobre preocupações com a saúde associadas aos campos electromagnéticos, uma vez que esta é uma matéria que afecta directamente todos os cidadãos da Europa, expostos a campos electromagnéticos, tanto em casa como no local de trabalho.

Ao longo dos últimos anos, a exposição a fontes de campos electromagnéticos fabricados pelo homem tem aumentado substancialmente, devido sobretudo ao aumento da procura de electricidade e às tecnologias sem fios cada vez mais evoluídas. Por este motivo, penso que é de extrema importância garantir um elevado nível de protecção a todos os consumidores, sem contudo prejudicar o funcionamento das redes móveis e o desenvolvimento de novas tecnologias sem fios.

4-333

Robert Goebbels (PSE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté contre le rapport d'initiative de Frédérique Ries. C'est le genre de rapport parfaitement inutile dont raffolent certains parlementaires, qui se plaisent à appliquer le "principe de précaution" à tort et à travers et qui font grand cas de la moindre "préoccupation" des citoyens. Alors que l'espérance de vie des Européens croît d'année en année, toute nouvelle étude sur les effets éventuels des champs électromagnétiques qui évoque des questions sans réponses est montée en épingle. Par contre, les dizaines d'études d'académies scientifiques et d'autres organismes réellement compétents ayant conclu à l'absence d'un risque réel sont systématiquement ignorées. Tout ce qui est exagéré est insignifiant.

4-334

Françoise Grossetête (PPE-DE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport Ries concernant les préoccupations quant aux effets pour la santé des champs électromagnétiques.

Il est indispensable de garantir un haut niveau de protection des consommateurs, et des enfants en particulier, sans pour autant entraver le fonctionnement des réseaux de téléphonie mobile. Bien qu'aucune preuve scientifique ne permette de démontrer que l'utilisation des téléphones mobiles présente un risque pour la santé, cette hypothèse ne peut définitivement être exclue et il est donc pour cela nécessaire que cette question s'inscrive dans le cadre du principe de précaution. Il est important de réactualiser régulièrement les valeurs limites de l'exposition du public aux champs électromagnétiques.

Il est urgent enfin d'avoir davantage d'informations disponibles sur les effets des ondes électromagnétiques et de se doter d'un régime unique pour les autorisations relatives à l'installation d'antennes et de relais comme le souligne le rapport.

4-335

David Martin (PSE), *in writing*. – I support this report which calls for further research to be carried out on electromagnetic fields emitted from devices such as radios, TVs, microwaves, mobile phones and high-voltage power lines. The report recommends that schools, crèches, retirement homes and hospitals should be kept away from mobile phone antennas or high-voltage power lines by a specific distance to be determined by scientific criteria.

4-336

Αθανάσιος Παφίλης (GUE/NGL), *γραπτώς*. – Το ψήφισμα για τα προβλήματα υγείας που σχετίζονται με τα ηλεκτρομαγνητικά πεδία επιδιώκει τη διαχείριση των επιπτώσεων και τη συγκάλυψη των υπευθύνων, ώστε να μη θιγεί η δράση και η κερδοφορία των μονοπωλίων, και όχι την πρόληψη και την προστασία. Η ευαισθητοποίηση και ανησυχία των λαϊκών στρωμάτων απέναντι στις εταιρείες ηλεκτρισμού, τηλεπικοινωνιών, και στους κατασκευαστές ηλεκτρικών και ηλεκτρονικών συσκευών που αποτελούν την βασική πηγή κινδύνου υποχρεώνει σε έρευνες με αμφισβητήσιμα συμπεράσματα, εφόσον την ευθύνη τους έχουν ουσιαστικά οι ίδιες οι εταιρείες που ενδιαφέρονται να πουλήσουν τα προϊόντα και τις υπηρεσίες τους, άρα και να ΜΗΝ αποδεικνύονται οι βλαβερές συνέπειες.

Για την αντιμετώπιση του ιδιαίτερα σοβαρού αυτού προβλήματος που μπορεί να προκαλεί κινδύνους για την Δημόσια Υγεία απαιτούνται δημόσιες και εμπεριστατωμένες έρευνες για νεοπλασίες, εκφυλιστικές παθήσεις του εγκεφάλου, συνολικότερα την επίδραση των ΗΜΠ στην ομοίωση του ανθρώπινου οργανισμού κλπ.

Απαιτείται συντονισμένος αγώνας των εργαζομένων ώστε με βάση της αρχής της προφύλαξης να μειωθούν τα όρια έκθεσης και η ίδια η έκθεση σε ΗΜΠ.

Ουσιαστική και αποτελεσματική προστασία της υγείας και ασφάλειας των εργαζομένων, στα πλαίσια της ΕΕ που στηρίζει την κερδοφορία, και την ανταγωνιστικότητα του κεφαλαίου υπονομεύοντας την δημόσια υγεία, δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει.

4-337

Luca Romagnoli (NI), *per iscritto*. – Voto favorevolmente la relazione presentata dalla collega Ries in merito alle preoccupazioni per la salute connesse ai campi elettromagnetici.

Convengo con la relatrice sulla necessità di dare ampio spazio al problema dell'impatto degli strumenti elettromagnetici sulla salute dei cittadini, favorendo studi e ricerche a tale riguardo che possano chiarire in misura sempre più precisa e approfondita questo tema che sta stimolando un crescente dibattito.

Mi trovo, quindi, d'accordo nell'esortare la Commissione ad adottare una politica chiara sulle onde elettromagnetiche, sebbene sia consapevole delle competenze esclusive degli Stati membri in certi ambiti, nei quali rientrano, ad esempio, le onde legate alla telefonia mobile.

4-338

– **Rapport: Pál Schmitt (A6-0124/2009)**

4-339

Charlotte Cederschiöld och Gunnar Hökmark (PPE-DE), *skriftlig*. – Vi har idag röstat för Schmitts initiativbetänkande om Bättre skolor: en agenda för europeiskt samarbete (A6-0124/2009). Rapporten pekar på många av de stora utmaningar de europeiska skolorna står inför och innehåller flera bra rekommendationer. Exempelvis om att bättre förbereda elever i skola och på universitet för en allt mer flexibel arbetsmarknad där arbetsgivares krav är snabbt föränderliga.

Däremot vänder vi oss mot en enskild paragraf i betänkandet som tillskriver stegrat våld i skolor till faktorer som ökade klasskillnader och den allt större kulturella mångfalden runtom i EU: s medlemsstater. Ökande skolvåld är ett allvarligt samhällsproblem med många och komplicerade orsaker som ej bör reduceras genom förenklade orsaksbeskrivningar.

4-340

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE), *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea raportului care vizează „școli mai bune: un program de cooperare europeană”.

Consider că UE trebuie să susțină modernizarea și îmbunătățirea programelor școlare, astfel încât acestea să reflecte cerințele actuale ale pieței muncii, realitățile sociale, economice, culturale și tehnice actuale.

Apreciez că școala trebuie să urmărească îmbunătățirea capacității de angajare, dar totodată să le ofere tinerilor șansa de a-și dezvolta aptitudinile lor personale. Trebuie să avem în vedere și necesitatea ca tinerii să poată dobândi competențe democratice de bază.

4-341

Marie-Hélène Descamps (PPE-DE), *par écrit*. – L'école constitue un enjeu fondamental qu'il convient aujourd'hui de réaffirmer. Le rapport intitulé "Améliorer les écoles: un programme de coopération européenne", auquel j'ai apporté tout mon soutien, s'inscrit dans cet objectif. Il insiste notamment sur la nécessité de garantir un égal accès pour tous les jeunes citoyens européens à une éducation de qualité, permettant l'acquisition de compétences et de connaissances solides. Il appelle de surcroît à renforcer le soutien financier aux établissements en difficulté. Aux côtés des connaissances de base, la résolution souligne aussi très justement l'importance de l'apprentissage des langues étrangères dès le plus jeune âge, de même que la possibilité de recevoir une éducation artistique, culturelle et physique, essentielles au développement personnel. Elle recommande, par ailleurs, davantage de mobilité et d'échanges dans le milieu scolaire et cite à cet égard l'excellent programme européen Comenius, notant toutefois la nécessité de le rendre plus visible et plus accessible. La résolution encourage enfin, dans le strict respect du principe de subsidiarité, la mise en place de programmes scolaires modernisés tenant compte des évolutions technologiques et des possibilités qu'elles offrent.

4-342

Lena Ek (ALDE), *skriftlig*. – "Det är medlemsstaterna som ansvarar för organisationen av, innehållet i och reformerna av utbildningen." Detta slås fast i första paragrafen i Schmitts initiativbetänkande om "bättre skolor". Så långt är jag med. EU ska underlätta utbyten mellan olika skolor och rörligheten för studenter. Allt annat som rör skolan ska EU däremot hålla sig borta från. Tyvärr så lyckas inte Schmitts resolution hålla sig till sin inledande utfästelse. Det börjar tämligen omgående pillas i hur skolorna ska finansieras, utvärderas och vad som ska stå i läroplanen etc. Just precis de saker som EU inte ska syssla med; just precis de saker som medlemsstaterna själva ska råda över. Jag röstar för ett smalare men vassare EU. Jag röstade därför nej till såväl initiativbetänkandet som den alternativa resolutionen.

4-343

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), *skriftlig*. – Förslaget till uttalande innehåller åtskilliga bra tankar, men skolfrågor är ett politiskt område som faller under medlemsstaternas politiska ansvar att besluta över. Denna resolution behandlar därför frågor som ligger utanför den Europeiska unionens kompetensområde. Vi som tar subsidiaritetsprincipen på allvar menar därför att parlamentet borde rösta nej till betänkandet och att EU-parlamentets utskott för kultur och utbildning bör lägga ned.

Vi har naturligtvis själva röstat nej till betänkandet.

4-344

Louis Grech (PSE), *in writing*. – In principle we are in favour of this report, however certain clauses (e.g. introducing into school curricula classes taught to migrants in their native language) do not reflect the realities of certain Member States, especially in respect of influx of immigrants, financial and administrative capabilities, size of country population and many other factors.

4-345

Ian Hudgton (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – I voted in favour of the Schmitt report on better schools. The report rightly notes that the provision of school education is a Member State competence and I believe it is correct that individual nations' education systems are given autonomy and respect. Nonetheless, the educational experience of children across the EU can only be enhanced by greater European cooperation and education systems across the continent must adapt to keep up with modern challenges.

4-346

Livia Járóka (PPE-DE), *írásban*. – Szeretnék gratulálni Schmitt Pál képviselőtársamnak a jobb iskolákról szóló európai együttműködés menetrendjéről szóló jelentéséhez, amely nagyon helyesen rámutat, hogy az inkluzív oktatási modellek elősegítik a hátrányos helyzetben lévő tanulócsoportok és a különleges oktatási igényekkel rendelkező tanulók integrációját, továbbá felszólítja a tagállamokat, hogy javítsák az ilyen tanulók hozzáférését a legmagasabb szintű követelményeknek megfelelő képzéshez.

Szerte Európában a roma gyermekeket sújtják leginkább az oktatási hátrányok: az általános iskolás romagyerekek csaknem negyede tanul elkülönített osztályokban, míg a túlnyomórészt indokolatlanul speciális iskolákba kényszerített tanulók többsége roma származású. A romák 82%-a mindössze általános iskolai, vagy annál alacsonyabb végzettséggel rendelkezik, és csak 3,1%-uk jut a többségi átlagnak megfelelő színvonalú oktatáshoz. Pedig a roma gyermekek oktatási színvonalának emelése nemzetgazdasági szempontból jövedelmező befektetés, hiszen az a ráfordítás, amely ahhoz szükséges, hogy egy roma gyerek elvégezze a középiskolát, bőségesen megtérül a költségvetéshez való későbbi hozzájárulásai révén. A jobb oktatás által megnövekedett munkaerőpiaci esélyeik révén maguk is egyre inkább a társadalom hozzájáruló tagjaivá válnak ahelyett, hogy a jóléti rendszertől függenének. A befizetett adók növekedése és a kifizetett segélyek csökkenése pedig együttesen nettó hasznot jelent a költségvetés számára.

4-347

Σταύρος Λαμπρινίδης (PSE), γραπτώς. – Η Κ.Ο. του ΠΑΣΟΚ υπερψήφισε το εναλλακτικό ψήφισμα στην Έκθεση Σμίτ σχετικά με τη βελτίωση των σχολείων στην ΕΕ, το οποίο πέτυχε τη διαγραφή της αναφοράς για την εκπαίδευση για παιδιά μόνο "νομίμων" μεταναστών και περιείχε και άλλες βελτιώσεις. Διευκρινίζει ταυτόχρονα ότι διαφωνεί με την παράγραφο 15 του κειμένου και τη διασύνδεση που αυτή επιχειρεί μεταξύ της εκπαίδευσης όλων των βαθμίδων και της "ευελιξίας" στην αγορά εργασίας με βάση τις επιθυμίες των εργοδοτών.

4-348

Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański (UEN), na piśmie. – Sprawozdanie z inicjatywy własnej Pála Schmitta na temat planu europejskiej współpracy dla szkół europejskich próbuje wskazać na wspólne wyzwania i zagrożenia stojące przed systemami szkolnictwa państw członkowskich. Jest ono słuszne w wielu miejscach. Takie wspólne rozpoznanie jest potrzebne, choćby ze względu na ogromną migrację wewnątrz Wspólnoty.

Sprawozdanie zasługuje na poparcie, nie można jednak oprzeć się wrażeniu, że wspólne wartości, które sprawozdawca uznaje za podstawę reformy oświaty nie wyczerpują wszystkich tych, które ukształtowały Europę na przestrzeni wieków. W punkcie 17 sprawozdanie odwołuje się do pełnego i wieloaspektowego rozwoju jednostki, kultywowania poszanowania praw człowieka i sprawiedliwości społecznej, kształcenia ustawicznego mającego na celu rozwój osobowy i awans zawodowy, ochronę środowiska oraz dobrobyt jednostki i społeczności. To pożądane wartości, ale chodzi o szczegóły: wartości te mają mianowicie swoje źródło, którym są chrześcijańskie korzenie Europy.

Krótko mówiąc, w moim przekonaniu zjednoczenie w duchu chrześcijańskim jest bodaj jedynym mającym charakter trwałej i owocnej więzi. Jest solidnym fundamentem. Oczywiście brak takiego odniesienia jest wadą nie tylko tego sprawozdania, ale wręcz całej legislacji wspólnotowej. Pozostawia to wątpliwości co do kierunku zmian. Dzisiaj mówimy „tak” dla dobrych wartości, ale też pytamy jakie te wartości będą jutro?

4-349

Luca Romagnoli (NI), per iscritto. – Esprimo il mio voto contrario riguardo alla relazione presentata dal collega Schmitt in merito a "Scuole migliori: un ordine del giorno per la cooperazione europea".

Nonostante sia d'accordo in linea di principio con le finalità generali contenute nella relazione e con il fatto che i sistemi di istruzione europei debbano essere rivisti per migliorarne la qualità, non ritengo che tale relazione individui delle soluzioni efficaci per favorire il reale miglioramento della qualità dell'insegnamento e delle prerogative della scuola quale luogo di comunicazione e socializzazione.

4-350

Andrzej Jan Szejna (PSE), na piśmie. – Edukacja to zdecydowanie najważniejszy temat, któremu powinniśmy poświęcać więcej uwagi. Należy zwracać szczególną uwagę już na pierwszy etap edukacji, jakim jest przedszkole. Trzeba dbać o odpowiednie otoczenie socjalne i o warunki, w jakich rozwijają się dzieci i młodzi ludzie. Edukacja młodych ludzi to nasza przyszłość, to przyszłość całej Unii Europejskiej. Trzeba nieustannie dążyć do poprawiania warunków nauki, do wyrównywania szans wśród dzieci i młodzieży, nie zapominając również o osobach z gorszymi szansami, o mniejszościach narodowych i obcokrajowcach.

Niezwykle ważnym elementem jest ciągle szkolenie kadry nauczycielskiej i wprowadzanie nowoczesnych metod nauczania. Trzeba poprawić płace nauczycielskie i dowartościować znaczenie zawodu nauczyciela.

Uważam, że trzeba także zwrócić uwagę na młodzież, która chce uczyć się w innych krajach Unii Europejskiej. Sytuacja finansowa nie powinna być wyznacznikiem miejsca ani tym bardziej poziomu wykształcenia młodych ludzi.

Popieram sprawozdanie Pála Schmitta i zgadzam się całkowicie z tym jak ogromne znaczenie ma kształcenie młodych ludzi na wszystkich szczeblach edukacji.

4-351

11 - Corrections et intentions de vote: voir procès-verbal

4-352

12 - Transmission des textes adoptés au cours de la présente séance : voir procès-verbal

4-353

13 - Calendrier des prochaines séances : voir procès-verbal

4-354

14 - Interruption de la session

4-355

Le Président. – Aujourd'hui, Mesdames et Messieurs, c'est un jour un petit peu spécial pour moi puisqu'après dix ans de bons et loyaux services, c'était ma dernière présidence de séance, ici, à Bruxelles.

C'est donc avec un petit pincement au coeur que je déclare interrompue la session du Parlement européen.

(La séance est levée à 13 heures)