



C/2024/2517

3.5.2024

Zinssatz der Europäischen Zentralbank für Hauptrefinanzierungsgeschäfte ⁽¹⁾

am 1. Mai 2024: 4,50 %

Euro-Wechselkurs ⁽²⁾

2. Mai 2024

(C/2024/2517)

1 Euro =

Währung			Kurs	Währung			Kurs
USD	US-Dollar		1,0698	CAD	Kanadischer Dollar		1,4678
JPY	Japanischer Yen		165,63	HKD	Hongkong-Dollar		8,3633
DKK	Dänische Krone		7,4589	NZD	Neuseeländischer Dollar		1,8047
GBP	Pfund Sterling		0,85538	SGD	Singapur-Dollar		1,4538
SEK	Schwedische Krone		11,6820	KRW	Südkoreanischer Won		1 470,41
CHF	Schweizer Franken		0,9759	ZAR	Südafrikanischer Rand		19,9690
ISK	Isländische Krone		150,10	CNY	Chinesischer Renminbi Yuan		7,7465
NOK	Norwegische Krone		11,8430	IDR	Indonesische Rupiah		17 302,04
BGN	Bulgarischer Lew		1,9558	MYR	Malaysischer Ringgit		5,0864
CZK	Tschechische Krone		25,090	PHP	Philippinischer Peso		61,628
HUF	Ungarischer Forint		388,98	RUB	Russischer Rubel		
PLN	Polnischer Zloty		4,3278	THB	Thailändischer Baht		39,508
RON	Rumänischer Leu		4,9763	BRL	Brasilianischer Real		5,5025
TRY	Türkische Lira		34,6345	MXN	Mexikanischer Peso		18,1187
AUD	Australischer Dollar		1,6386	INR	Indische Rupie		89,2938

⁽¹⁾ Auf das letzte Geschäft vor dem angegebenen Tag angewandter Satz. Bei Zinstendern marginaler Zuteilungssatz.

⁽²⁾ Quelle: Von der Europäischen Zentralbank veröffentlichter Referenz-Wechselkurs.



**GEMEINSAMER SORTENKATALOG
für landwirtschaftliche Pflanzenarten – Ergänzung A 2024/4**

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/2699)

1. Die vorliegende Ergänzung der konsolidierten Fassung des Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalogs für landwirtschaftliche Pflanzenarten ⁽¹⁾ enthält die Änderungen, die durch die bei der Kommission eingegangenen Mitteilungen der Mitgliedstaaten notwendig geworden sind.
2. Die vorliegende Ergänzung folgt in ihrer Einteilung der konsolidierten Fassung. Es kann auf die Erläuterungen zu der genannten Ausgabe Bezug genommen werden.
3. Diese Ergänzung berücksichtigt die Mitteilungen, die zwischen dem 1.3.2024 und dem 31.3.2024 eingegangen sind.
4. Die Änderungen gegenüber der konsolidierten Fassung sind wie folgt gekennzeichnet:
 - (add.): Es handelt sich um eine neue Position im Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog.
 - (mod.): Es handelt sich um eine Änderung an einer schon enthaltenen Position. Die Angaben zu dieser Position in der vorliegenden Ergänzung ersetzen die in der konsolidierten Fassung hierzu enthaltenen Angaben.
 - (del.): Die genannte Position wird mit allen Angaben aus dem Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog gestrichen.
5. Die vorliegende Ergänzung betrifft die notifizierten Sorten, für die die Bestimmungen des Artikels 16 Absatz 1 der Richtlinie 2002/53/EG des Rates ⁽²⁾ gelten.
6. Wenn die Nummer des Verantwortlichen für die Erhaltungszüchtung nicht in der konsolidierten Fassung erscheint, können sein Name und seine Anschrift bei der Stelle ermittelt werden, die in der Liste für den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat bzw. EFTA-Staat angegeben ist.

⁽¹⁾ Konsolidierte Fassung vom 22. Dezember 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/plant_variety_catalogues_databases_en

⁽²⁾ ABl. L 193 vom 20.7.2002, S. 1.

Inhalt

Seite

I. Beet

1	<i>Beta vulgaris</i> L. – Sugar beet	4
2	<i>Beta vulgaris</i> L. – Fodder beet	10

II. Fodder plants

5	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L. – Creeping bent	11
7	<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> L. – Meadow foxtail	11
9	<i>Bromus catharticus</i> Vahl – Rescue grass	11
11	<i>Cynodon dactylon</i> (L.) Pers. – Bermuda grass	11
12	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L. – Cocksfoot	12
13	<i>Festuca arundinacea</i> Schreber – Tall fescue	12
15	<i>Festuca ovina</i> L. – Sheep's fescue	14
16	<i>Festuca pratensis</i> Huds. – Meadow fescue	14
17	<i>Festuca rubra</i> L. – Red fescue	14
18	<i>Festuca trachyphylla</i> (Hack.) Krajina – Hard fescue	15
19	<i>Festulolium</i> Asch. et Graebn. – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus <i>Festuca</i> with a species of the genus <i>Lolium</i>	15
20.1	<i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. >> Ssp. <i>alternativum</i>	16
20.2	<i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam. >> Ssp. <i>non alternativum</i>	16
21	<i>Lolium perenne</i> L. – Perennial ryegrass	17
25	<i>Phleum pratense</i> L. – Timothy	20
29	<i>Poa pratensis</i> L. – Smooth-stalked meadowgrass	20
30	<i>Poa trivialis</i> L. – Rough-stalked meadowgrass	22
34	<i>Hedysarum coronarium</i> L. – Sulla	22
36	<i>Lotus corniculatus</i> L. – Birdsfoot trefoil	22
37	<i>Lupinus albus</i> L. – White lupin	23
38	<i>Lupinus angustifolius</i> L. – Narrow leaved lupin	23
39	<i>Lupinus luteus</i> L. – Yellow lupin	23
47	<i>Medicago sativa</i> L. – Lucerne	24
50	<i>Medicago</i> × <i>varia</i> T. Martyn – Sand lucerne	25
51	<i>Onobrychis viciifolia</i> Scop. – Sainfoin	26
54	<i>Pisum sativum</i> L. (partim) – Field pea	26
55	<i>Trifolium alexandrinum</i> L. – Berseem/Egyptian clover	27
60	<i>Trifolium incarnatum</i> L. – Crimson clover	28
63	<i>Trifolium pratense</i> L. – Red clover	28
64	<i>Trifolium repens</i> L. – White clover	29
65	<i>Trifolium resupinatum</i> L. – Persian clover	29
67	<i>Trifolium subterraneum</i> L. – Subterranean clover	30
71	<i>Vicia faba</i> L. (partim) – Field bean	30
73	<i>Vicia sativa</i> L. – Common vetch	32

74	<i>Vicia villosa</i> Roth. – Hairy vetch	32
75	<i>Brassica napus</i> L. var. <i>napobrassica</i> (L.) Rchb. – Swede	32
77	<i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i> Benth. – California bluebell	32

III. Oil and fibre plants

79	<i>Raphanus sativus</i> L. var. <i>oleiformis</i> Pers. – Fodder radish	33
82	<i>Brassica juncea</i> (L.) Czern. – Brown mustard	33
83	<i>Brassica napus</i> L. (partim) – Swede rape	33
85	<i>Cannabis sativa</i> L. – Hemp	45
86	<i>Carthamus tinctorius</i> L. – Safflower	45
87	<i>Carum carvi</i> L. – Caraway	46
89	<i>Helianthus annuus</i> L. – Sunflower	46
91	<i>Papaver somniferum</i> L. – Poppy	56
92	<i>Sinapis alba</i> L. – White mustard	56
93	<i>Glycine max</i> (L.) Merr. – Soya bean	57

IV. Cereals

94	<i>Avena nuda</i> L. – Small naked oat / Hulless oat	63
95	<i>Avena sativa</i> L. (including <i>A. byzantina</i> K. Koch) – Oat and Red oat	63
97.1	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L. >> 2-row barley	65
97.2	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L. >> 6-row barley	72
98	<i>Oryza sativa</i> L. – Rice	75
100	<i>Secale cereale</i> L. – Rye	78
101	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) Moench – Sorghum	81
103	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) Moench × <i>Sorghum sudanense</i> (Piper) Stapf. – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of <i>Sorghum bicolor</i> and <i>Sorghum sudanense</i>	83
104	× <i>Triticosecale</i> Wittm. ex A. Camus – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus <i>Triticum</i> and a species of the genus <i>Secale</i>	84
105	<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L. – Wheat	86
106	<i>Triticum durum</i> Desf. – Durum wheat	105
107	<i>Triticum spelta</i> L. – Spelt wheat	110
108	<i>Zea mays</i> L. (partim) – Maize	111

V. Potatoes

109	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i> L. – Potato	147

I. Beet

1 *Beta vulgaris* L. – Sugar beet

Acero		mod.
Acero	IT	(mod.)
Aluco		del.
Aluco	DE 1403	(del.)
Anakin		add.
Anakin	LT 130	(add.)
Arma		mod.
Arma	IT	(mod.)
Aslan		add.
Aslan	LT 130	(add.)
BTS 1280 N		mod.
BTS 1280 N	DE 9210	(del.)
BTS 1280 N	BE 701	
BTS 2385		mod.
BTS 2385	DE 9210	(del.)
BTS 2385	FR 95693	
BTS 6685 RHC		add.
BTS 6685 RHC	DE 9210	(add.)
BTS Smart 1215 N		add.
BTS Smart 1215 N	DE 9210	(add.)
Barbarica KWS		add.
Barbarica KWS	DE 105	(add.)

1 Beta vulgaris L. – Sugar beet

Bico		del.
Bico	DE 601	(del.)

Biljana KWS		mod.
Biljana KWS	AT 618	(add.)
Biljana KWS	HR 737	
Biljana KWS	HU 149293	

Bombina		add.
Bombina	DE 601	(add.)

Boomerang		mod.
Boomerang	BE 221	(mod.)
Boomerang	NL 683	

Boone		del.
Boone	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Brumby		add.
Brumby	BE 221	(add.)

Cartoon		del.
Cartoon	SE 86	(del.)

Cetra		mod.
Cetra	IT	(mod.)

Chess		del.
Chess	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Comet		del.
Comet	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

1 Beta vulgaris L. – Sugar beet

Eucalyptus		mod.
Eucalyptus	BE 221	(del.)
Eucalyptus	FR S13115	

Fantoom		del.
Fantoom	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Fendria KWS		mod.
Fendria KWS	SE 89	(del.)
Fendria KWS	DK 28	

Flexness		del.
Flexness	DK 263	(del.)

Gandalf		mod.
Gandalf	LT 130	(add.)
Gandalf	DK 263	

Habicht		add.
Habicht	DE 601	(add.)

Havana		mod.
Havana	IT	(mod.)

KW 394		add.
KW 394	DE 105	(add.) Component Variety=Yes

KW 396		add.
KW 396	DE 105	(add.) Component Variety=Yes

1 Beta vulgaris L. – Sugar beet

KW 397		add.
KW 397	DE 105	(add.) Component Variety=Yes

Kashmir		del.
Kashmir	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Leonidas		add.
Leonidas	AT 627	(add.)

Lince		mod.
Lince	IT	(mod.)

Lynx		del.
Lynx	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Marabella KWS		add.
Marabella KWS	DE 105	(add.)

Merens		del.
Merens	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Mira		mod.
Mira	IT	(mod.)

Mishel		mod.
Mishel	LT 191	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Mishel	IT 000	

1 Beta vulgaris L. – Sugar beet

Nelexa		mod.
Nelexa	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Nelexa	HR 769	
Nelexa	HU 107770	

Nexus		del.
Nexus	SE 86	(del.)

Olivenza Smart		add.
Olivenza Smart	LT 119	(add.)

Pavo		del.
Pavo	DE 1263	(del.)

Pottok		del.
Pottok	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Racoon		mod.
Racoon	DE 1403	(del.)
Racoon	NL 704	

Regatta		del.
Regatta	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Ritol		mod.
Ritol	IT	(mod.)

Romanta		del.
Romanta	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

1 Beta vulgaris L. – Sugar beet

ST Rotterdam		mod.
ST Rotterdam	DE 8962	(add.)
ST Rotterdam	NL 1118	

Savio		mod.
Savio	IT	(mod.)

Shannon		mod.
Shannon	LT 191	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Shannon	FR S14917	

Sirio		mod.
Sirio	IT	(mod.)
Sirio	NL 633	

Smart Adiella KWS		add.
Smart Adiella KWS	DE 105	(add.)

Smart Alexa KWS		mod.
Smart Alexa KWS	LT 73	(add.)
Smart Alexa KWS	SE 89	

Smart Renja KWS		mod.
Smart Renja KWS	SE 89	(del.)
Smart Renja KWS	LT 73	

Stresa		mod.
Stresa	IT	(mod.)

Valdemar		del.
Valdemar	DK 263	(del.)
Valdemar	LT 130	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

1 *Beta vulgaris* L. – Sugar beet

Viola KWS		mod.
Viola KWS	DE 105	(add.)
Viola KWS	CZ 69	
Viola KWS	HR 737	
Viola KWS	HU 149293	
Viola KWS	PL 52	
Viola KWS	SK 221	
Viola KWS	IT 183	

Zoom		del.
Zoom	LT 191	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

2 *Beta vulgaris* L. – Fodder beet

Energarcı		mod.
Energarcı	DE 9569	(del.)
Energarcı	FR S14431	

Ursus Poly		mod.
Ursus Poly	LT 90	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Ursus Poly	PL 321	

II. Fodder plants

5 *Agrostis stolonifera* L. – Creeping bent

007DSB		mod.
007DSB	IT	(mod.)

13M		del.
13M	IT	(del.)

Mackenzie		del.
Mackenzie	IT	(del.)

Mariner		del.
Mariner	IT	(del.)

Memorial		del.
Memorial	IT	(del.)

7 *Alopecurus pratensis* L. – Meadow foxtail

Vulpera		mod.
Vulpera	DE 61	(del.)
Vulpera	CH 162	

9 *Bromus catharticus* Vahl – Rescue grass

Cabro		del.
Cabro	IT	(del.)

11 *Cynodon dactylon* (L.) Pers. – Bermuda grass

Highlander		mod.
Highlander	IT	(mod.)

Riviera		mod.
Riviera	IT	(mod.)

12 *Dactylis glomerata* L. – Cocksfoot

Baridana		mod.
Baridana, Dana	CZ 147	(mod.)
Caius		mod.
Caius	IT	(del.)
Caius	DE 7352	
Caius	FR S13804	
Currie		mod.
Currie	IT	(mod.)
Dactyla		mod.
Dactyla	SK 629	(mod.)
Porto		mod.
Porto	IT	(mod.)

13 *Festuca arundinacea* Schreber – Tall fescue

Arid III		del.
Arid III	IT	(del.)
Bladerunner 2		mod.
Bladerunner 2	IT	(mod.)
Dynamic II		mod.
Dynamic II	IT	(mod.)
Endeavor II		mod.
Endeavor II	IT	(mod.)
Fesnova		mod.
Fesnova	IT	(mod.)

13 Festuca arundinacea Schreber – Tall fescue

Firenza		del.
Firenza	IT	(del.)
Greenheaven		del.
Greenheaven	IT	(del.)
Hudson		del.
Hudson	IT	(del.)
Lara		mod.
Lara	IT	(mod.)
Picabù		add.
Picabù	IT	(add.)
Rendition RX		add.
Rendition RX	IT 1870	(add.)
SC1		mod.
SC1	IT	(del.)
SC1	FR S8234	
Scorpiones		del.
Scorpiones	IT	(del.)
Speedway		mod.
Speedway	IT	(mod.)
Stingray		mod.
Stingray	IT	(mod.)
Titan RX		mod.
Titan RX	IT 1870	(mod.)

13 *Festuca arundinacea* Schreber – Tall fescue

Turbo RZ		mod.
Turbo RZ	IT	(mod.)

Wolfpack II		del.
Wolfpack II	IT	(del.)

15 *Festuca ovina* L. – Sheep's fescue

Bighorn GT		add.
Bighorn GT	IT	(add.)

Lenka		add.
Lenka	SK 629	(add.)

Spartan II		mod.
Spartan II	IT	(mod.)

16 *Festuca pratensis* Huds. – Meadow fescue

Draco		add.
Draco	CZ 201	(add.)

Fiola		del.
Fiola	SI 86	(del.)

Predor		add.
Predor	CZ 201	(add.)

17 *Festuca rubra* L. – Red fescue

Chancellor		mod.
Chancellor	IT	(mod.)

Florentine		del.
Florentine	IT	(del.)

17 *Festuca rubra* L. – Red fescue

Garnet		mod.
Garnet	IT	(mod.)

Magic Wand GT		mod.
Magic Wand GT	IT	(mod.)

Red Peak		mod.
Red Peak	IT	(mod.)

Seabreeze		del.
Seabreeze	IT	(del.)

Tiffany		del.
Tiffany	IT	(del.)

Victory		del.
Victory	IT	(del.)

Wendy Jean		del.
Wendy Jean	IT	(del.)

Zodiac		mod.
Zodiac	IT	(mod.)

18 *Festuca trachyphylla* (Hack.) Krajina – Hard fescue

Ruhnu		add.
Ruhnu	EE 23	(add.)

19 *Festulolium* Asch. et Graebn. – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus *Festuca* with a species of the genus *Lolium*

Becva		mod.
Becva	IT	(del.)
Becva	CZ 201	
Bečva	SK 000	

19 Festulolium Asch. et Graebn. – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus Festuca with a species of the genus Lolium

Lekos		add.
Lekos	SK 629	(add.)

20.1 *Lolium multiflorum* Lam. >> Ssp. alternativum

Crema		mod.
Crema	IT	(mod.)

Diamond T		mod.
Diamond T	IT	(mod.)

Esmeralda		mod.
Esmeralda	IT	(mod.)

Flying A		mod.
Flying A	IT	(mod.)

Galactico		mod.
Galactico	IT	(mod.)

Levonet		add.
Levonet	SK 629	(add.)

Weyda		add.
Weyda	DE 39	(add.)

20.2 *Lolium multiflorum* Lam. >> Ssp. non alternativum

Altair		mod.
Altair	IT	(mod.)

Certo		mod.
Certo	IT	(mod.)

20.2 *Lolium multiflorum* Lam. >> Ssp. non alternativum

Cesco		mod.
Cesco	IT	(mod.)

Ctirad		del.
Ctirad	CZ 201	(del.)

Gordo		mod.
Gordo	SI 86	(del.)
Gordo	NL 682	

Kyra		add.
Kyra	SK 827	(add.)

Lubina		del.
Lubina	IT	(del.)

Medoacus		mod.
Medoacus	IT	(mod.)

Nibbio		mod.
Nibbio	IT	(mod.)

21 *Lolium perenne* L. – Perennial ryegrass

Applaud II		del.
Applaud II	IT	(del.)

Artic Green		mod.
Artic Green	IT	(mod.)

Barnamic		mod.
Barnamic	DE 7663	(add.)
Barnamic	NL 205	(mod.)

21 Lolium perenne L. – Perennial ryegrass

Barquad		mod.
Barquad	NL 205	(mod.)

Cadeau-noir		add.
Cadeau-noir	DE 39	(add.)

Cadillac		del.
Cadillac	CZ 351	(del.)

Carlevè		add.
Carlevè	IT	(add.)

Floris		del.
Floris	BE 218	(del.)

Galleon		mod.
Galleon	IT	(mod.)

LS Mojito		add.
LS Mojito	LT 222	(add.)

MMW		del.
MMW	IT	(del.)

Melways		mod.
Melways	BE 218	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Melways	LU 21002	

Pavel		add.
Pavel	CZ 171	(add.)

21 Lolium perenne L. – Perennial ryegrass

Ponderosa		mod.
Ponderosa	IT	(mod.)

Quickstart II		del.
Quickstart II	IT	(del.)

Quijote		mod.
Quijote	IT	(mod.)

Ringer II		mod.
Ringer II	IT	(mod.)

Rinovo		mod.
Rinovo	IT	(mod.)

Sherkal		add.
Sherkal	PL 631	(add.)

Sun		mod.
Sun	IT	(mod.)

Tetra Gain SLT		add.
Tetra Gain SLT	PL 1188	(add.)

Top Gun		del.
Top Gun	IT	(del.)

Varda		add.
Varda	DK 14	(add.)

Wizard II		del.
Wizard II	IT	(del.)

21 *Lolium perenne* L. – Perennial ryegrass

Zuri		add.
Zuri	DK 14	(add.)

25 *Phleum pratense* L. – Timothy

Dolina		mod.
Dolina	CZ 115	(add.)
Dolina	BE 218	
Dolina	LU 7001	
Dolina	NL 634	
Dolina	PL 161	
Dolina	DK 51	

Glacier		mod.
Glacier	IT	(mod.)

Tiller		mod.
Tiller	CZ 115	(add.)
Tiller	LT 64	
Tiller	DE 283	
Tiller	AT 729	

29 *Poa pratensis* L. – Smooth-stalked meadowgrass

Armada 366		mod.
Armada 366	IT	(mod.)

Award		del.
Award	IT	(del.)

Babe		add.
Babe	LT 6	(add.)

Blustar		add.
Blustar	IT 1413	(add.)

29 Poa pratensis L. – Smooth-stalked meadowgrass

Brilliant		del.
Brilliant	IT	(del.)

Finishline		del.
Finishline	DE 39	(del.)

Heatmaster		mod.
Heatmaster	IT	(mod.)

Huntsville		del.
Huntsville	IT	(del.)

Jumpstart		mod.
Jumpstart	IT	(mod.)

Latoya		add.
Latoya	DE 283	(add.)

Lavinia		add.
Lavinia	DE 283	(add.)

Monique		mod.
Monique	IT	(mod.)

Northstar		del.
Northstar	IT	(del.)

Prosperity		mod.
Prosperity	IT	(mod.)

SR 2100		add.
SR 2100	IT	(add.)

29 *Poa pratensis* L. – Smooth-stalked meadowgrass

Selway		add.
Selway	LT 6	(add.)

Tattoo		del.
Tattoo	CZ 115	(del.)

Thermal Blue Blaze		del.
Thermal Blue Blaze	IT	(del.)

Wildhorse		del.
Wildhorse	IT	(del.)

30 *Poa trivialis* L. – Rough-stalked meadowgrass

Quasar		mod.
Quasar	IT	(mod.)

Winterway		mod.
Winterway	IT	(mod.)

34 *Hedysarum coronarium* L. – Sulla

Bellante		mod.
Bellante	IT	(mod.)

S. Omero		mod.
S. Omero	IT	(mod.)

36 *Lotus corniculatus* L. – Birdsfoot trefoil

Baco		mod.
Baco	IT	(mod.)

Frilo		del.
Frilo	IT	(del.)

37 *Lupinus albus* L. – White lupin

Multitalia		mod.
Multitalia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
SM Belter		add.
SM Belter	PL 618	(add.)
Tennis		mod.
Tennis	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

38 *Lupinus angustifolius* L. – Narrow leaved lupin

Polo		mod.
Polo	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Primabella		add.
Primabella	DK 220	(add.)
SM Cyrkon		add.
SM Cyrkon	PL 618	(add.)
SM Filemon		add.
SM Filemon	PL 618	(add.)
SM Orion		mod.
SM Orion	DE 9960	(add.)
SM Orion	PL 618	
VB Ainiai		add.
VB Ainiai	LT 32	(add.)

39 *Lupinus luteus* L. – Yellow lupin

Opal		add.
Opal	PL 1	(add.)

47 *Medicago sativa* L. – Lucerne

4 Cascine		mod.
4 Cascine	IT	(mod.)

Alba		mod.
Alba	IT	(mod.)

Alfaplan		del.
Alfaplan	IT	(del.)

Andantino		mod.
Andantino	CZ 115	(add.)
Andantino	FR S14431	
Andantino	PL 161	
Andantino	EE 13	

Beda		mod.
Beda	IT	(mod.)

Central		mod.
Central	IT	(mod.)

Cigale		mod.
Cigale	CZ 115	(add.)
Cigale	EE 13	
Cigale	FR S14431	
Cigale	PL 161	

Gea		mod.
Gea	IT	(mod.)

HybriForce 2420 Wet		del.
HybriForce 2420 Wet	SI 544	(del.)

47 *Medicago sativa* L. – Lucerne

Itaca		mod.
Itaca	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Krima		mod.
Krima	SI	(mod.)

Lighty		add.
Lighty	PL 442	(add.)

PR59N49		del.
PR59N49	IT	(del.)

PS3008		del.
PS3008	IT	(del.)

Pomposa		mod.
Pomposa	IT	(mod.)

Profit		del.
Profit	IT	(del.)

Soča		mod.
Soča	SI	(mod.)

Venice		mod.
Venice	IT	(mod.)

50 *Medicago* × *varia* T. Martyn – Sand lucerne

Milda		add.
Milda	LT 32	(add.)

51 *Onobrychis viciifolia* Scop. – Sainfoin

Espata		add.
Espata	PL 1158	(add.)

VB Žilvinai		add.
VB Žilvinai	LT 32	(add.)

Zeus		mod.
Zeus	IT	(mod.)

54 *Pisum sativum* L. (*partim*) – Field pea

Alster		del.
Alster	EE 161	(del.)

Asgard		mod.
Asgard	DK 50	(add.)
Asgard	PL 249	

Audit		mod.
Audit	LT 135	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025
Audit	CZ 1207	
Audit	EE 1	

Balder		mod.
Balder	SE 142	(mod.)

Coraline		mod.
Coraline	IT	(mod.)

Fraser		mod.
Fraser	IT	(mod.)

Iconic		mod.
Iconic	EE 79	(add.)

54 *Pisum sativum* L. (partim) – Field pea

Iconic	LT 86	(add.)
Iconic	DE 147	
Iconic	FR S13804	

Maplus		add.
Maplus	DK 220	(add.)

Perceval		mod.
Perceval	LT 86	(add.)
Perceval	FR S13804	

Twister		add.
Twister	PL 153	(add.)

Ursus		add.
Ursus	PL 1	(add.)

55 *Trifolium alexandrinum* L. – Berseem/Egyptian clover

Alcatraz		add.
Alcatraz	DE 39	(add.)

Alex		mod.
Alex	IT	(mod.)

Axi		mod.
Axi	IT	(mod.)
Axi	AT 613 / 177	

Cerro		mod.
Cerro	IT	(mod.)

Karalis		del.
Karalis	IT	(del.)

55 *Trifolium alexandrinum* L. – Berseem/Egyptian clover

Lorena		mod.
Lorena	IT	(mod.)

60 *Trifolium incarnatum* L. – Crimson clover

Blaza		del.
Blaza	IT	(del.)

Cegalo		mod.
Cegalo	IT	(mod.)

Diogene		mod.
Diogene	IT	(mod.)

Edipo		mod.
Edipo	IT	(mod.)

Piry		add.
Piry	HU 146182	(add.)

Red		mod.
Red	IT	(mod.)

Szarvasi Bíborka		add.
Szarvasi Bíborka	HU 143433	(add.)

63 *Trifolium pratense* L. – Red clover

Milo		mod.
Milo	IT	(mod.)

Nelson		mod.
Nelson	IT	(mod.)

63 *Trifolium pratense* L. – Red clover

Salino		mod.
Salino	IT	(mod.)

Sigord		mod.
Sigord	SK 715	(mod.)

Slatina		mod.
Slatina	SK 602	(mod.)

Taigete		mod.
Taigete	DK 14	(add.)
Taigete	CZ 201	
Taigete	SK 170	

Viglana		mod.
Viglana	SK 602	(mod.)

64 *Trifolium repens* L. – White clover

Aladdin		del.
Aladdin	IT	(del.)

King		mod.
King	IT	(mod.)

MIC		mod.
MIC	SI 86	(mod.)

65 *Trifolium resupinatum* L. – Persian clover

Gorby		mod.
Gorby	IT	(mod.)
Gorby	AT 613 / 404	

65 *Trifolium resupinatum* L. – Persian clover

Kyambro		del.
Kyambro	IT	(del.)

67 *Trifolium subterraneum* L. – Subterranean clover

Antas		mod.
Antas	IT	(mod.)

Campeda		mod.
Campeda	IT	(mod.)

Limbara		del.
Limbara	IT	(del.)

Losa		mod.
Losa	IT	(mod.)

71 *Vicia faba* L. (*partim*) – Field bean

Amina		add.
Amina	PL 249	(add.)

Atlantis		add.
Atlantis	DE 871	(add.)

Chiaro di Torre Lama		mod.
Chiaro di Torre Lama	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Collameno		mod.
Collameno	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Enrico		mod.
Enrico	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

71 Vicia faba L. (partim) – Field bean

Genius		mod.
Genius	PL 159	(add.)
Genius	FR S8632	
Genius	DE 147	
Genius	EE 31	
Genius	LT 44	

Hammer		mod.
Hammer	LT 44	(add.)
Hammer	DE 147	
Hammer	DK 44	

Iron		mod.
Iron	LT 44	(add.)
Iron	DE 147	
Iron	DK 44	

Ketu		mod.
Ketu	LT 44	(add.)
Ketu	DK 44	
Ketu	EE 31	

Scuro di Torre Lama		mod.
Scuro di Torre Lama	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Sicilia		mod.
Sicilia	IT	(mod.)

Victus		mod.
Victus	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Victus	IE 212	
Victus	FR S12730	

73 *Vicia sativa* L. – Common vetch

Josè		add.
Josè	IT	(add.)

Principessa		mod.
Principessa	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

74 *Vicia villosa* Roth. – Hairy vetch

Ascasubi Inta		add.
Ascasubi Inta	DE 61	(add.)

Negra		del.
Negra	CZ 880	(del.)

75 *Brassica napus* L.var. *napobrassica* (L.) Rchb. – Swede

LG Aphrodite		add.
LG Aphrodite	AT 562	(add.)

77 *Phacelia tanacetifolia* Benth. – California bluebell

Facita		mod.
Facita	IT	(mod.)

Felicja		add.
Felicja	PL 1272	(add.)

III. Oil and fibre plants

79 *Raphanus sativus* L. var. *oleiformis* Pers. – Fodder radish

Alligator		add.
Alligator	DE 9777	(add.)

Altea		add.
Altea	DE 2418	(add.)

Arriba		add.
Arriba	DE 289	(add.)

Mamba		add.
Mamba	DE 7352	(add.)

Radical		mod.
Radical	SI 86	(del.)
Radical	NL 296	
Radical	DE 289	

Relax		add.
Relax	DE 871	(add.)

Sharky		add.
Sharky	DE 7352	(add.)

Tornado		add.
Tornado	DE 289	(add.)

82 *Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern. – Brown mustard

Enterprise		add.
Enterprise	DE 9777	(add.)

83 *Brassica napus* L. (partim) – Swede rape

Alfons		del.
Alfons	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

Armstrong		mod.
Armstrong	DK 223	(del.)
Armstrong	DE 1323	
Armstrong	LT 176	

Axana		mod.
Axana	LV 213	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Axana	FI 6217	
Axana	LT 82	

Birgit		add.
Birgit	LT 42	(add.)

C 604251 MS		del.
C 604251 MS	DE 105	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

C 999031 MS		del.
C 999031 MS	DE 105	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

Caesar CL		mod.
Caesar CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Caesar CL	DE 147	

Calimera CL		add.
Calimera CL	LT 44	(add.)

Cascade CL		add.
Cascade CL	LT 44	(add.)

Cassate		del.
Cassate	IT	(del.)

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

Catmandu CL		mod.
Catmandu CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Catmandu CL	DE	

Ceos		mod.
Ceos	DK 208	(add.)
Ceos	FR S13804	

Chameleon CL		del.
Chameleon CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Chevy CL		mod.
Chevy CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Chevy CL	DE 147	

Churchill		add.
Churchill	DK 16	(add.)

Cipressa		add.
Cipressa	DK 44	(add.)

Claro CL		del.
Claro CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Cocktail CL		add.
Cocktail CL	LT 44	(add.)

Codirepka		del.
Codirepka	IT	(del.)

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

Colibri CL		mod.
Colibri CL	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Colibri CL	DE	

Colin CL		add.
Colin CL	LT 44	(add.)
Colin CL	LV 48	(add.)

Cornet CL		add.
Cornet CL	HU 106300	(add.)

Credo		add.
Credo	DK 44	(add.)

Crevit		add.
Crevit	DK 44	(add.)

DK 7175 CL		del.
DK 7175 CL	LT 125	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

DK Exdeka		add.
DK Exdeka	HU 108843	(add.)

DK Imistar CL		del.
DK Imistar CL	LT 125	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

DK Impression CL		mod.
DK Impression CL	EE 11	(mod.)
DK Impression CL	LT 51	

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

DK Sedona		del.
DK Sedona	LT 125	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

DWS 006 A 13		del.
DWS 006 A 13	DE 147	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

Daniela		mod.
Daniela	SI	(mod.)

Delrico		mod.
Delrico	HU 104164	(add.)
Delrico	IT 000	

Desperado		mod.
Desperado	LT 51	(add.)
Desperado	CZ 25	
Desperado	PL 205	
Desperado	SK 224	
Desperado	HU 100452	

ES Fuego		mod.
ES Fuego	PL 1274	(mod.)

Eclipse		del.
Eclipse	IT	(del.)

Eriksen		add.
Eriksen	DK 44	(add.)

Fenja		mod.
Fenja	LT 91	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Fenja	EE 51	

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

George		mod.
George	LT 152	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
George	NL 77	

Granat		del.
Granat	IT	(del.)

Hinsta		add.
Hinsta	DK 184	(add.)

Hybra		add.
Hybra	DE 289	(add.)

INV120 CL		del.
INV120 CL	LT 82	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

INV210 CL		del.
INV210 CL	LT 82	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Ilia		mod.
Ilia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Invigor 2040		add.
Invigor 2040	HU 241463	(add.)

Invigor 305 PS		mod.
Invigor 305 PS	LT 82	(add.)
Invigor 305 PS	PL 1178	

Invigor240 CL		add.
Invigor240 CL	LT 82	(add.)

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

Jerome		del.
Jerome	LT 73	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Jerry		del.
Jerry	LT 73	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Jurek		mod.
Jurek	LT 51	(add.)
Jurek	EE 11	
Jurek	SK 224	
Jurek	CZ 1517	
Jurek	PL 205	

KWS Demos		mod.
KWS Demos	HU 149293	(add.)
KWS Demos	SK 221	

KWS Ektos		mod.
KWS Ektos	DK 28	(add.)
KWS Ektos	DE 105	

KWS Moos CL		add.
KWS Moos CL	HU 149293	(add.)

KWS Nautilus		mod.
KWS Nautilus	DK 28	(add.)
KWS Nautilus	DE 105	

KWS Vamos		mod.
KWS Vamos	DK 28	(add.)
KWS Vamos	DE 105	

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

Kapelli CS		del.
Kapelli CS	IT	(del.)

Kicker		mod.
Kicker	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Kicker	SK 63	

Kimono		add.
Kimono	DK 269	(add.)

Kutiba		mod.
Kutiba	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

LG Adapt		mod.
LG Adapt	DK 223	(add.)
LG Adapt	FR 44360	

LG Aphrodite		mod.
LG Aphrodite	HU 132938	(add.)
LG Aphrodite	PL 849	
LG Aphrodite	FR 44360	

LG Areti		mod.
LG Areti	LT 165	(add.)
LG Areti	PL 872	

LG Armada		mod.
LG Armada	HU 132938	(add.)
LG Armada	SK 441	(add.)
LG Armada	FR 45125	
LG Armada	PL 872	

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

LG Atacama		mod.
LG Atacama	DK 223	(add.)
LG Atacama	SK 441	(add.)
LG Atacama	PL 872	
LG Atacama	FR 45125	

LG Aviron		mod.
LG Aviron	LT 165	(add.)
LG Aviron	AT 562	
LG Aviron	BG 21	
LG Aviron	DK 223	
LG Aviron	HU 132938	
LG Aviron	PL 849	
LG Aviron	SK 406	
LG Aviron	LU 12041 / 6043	
LG Aviron	FR 44360	

LID Cabero		add.
LID Cabero	HU 104164	(add.)

LID Maestro		add.
LID Maestro	HU 104164	(add.)

LID Sandro		mod.
LID Sandro	HU 104164	(add.)
LID Sandro	PL 1273	

Lava		mod.
Lava	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Lava	PL 159	
Lava	DE	

Minerva		del.
Minerva	LT 51	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

NK Petrol		del.
NK Petrol	LT 152	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Nicky		add.
Nicky	SK 508	(add.)
Nova Zembla		add.
Nova Zembla	DE 9777	(add.)
Ombrage		del.
Ombrage	IT	(del.)
Orlando		mod.
Orlando	IT	(del.)
Orlando	HR 180	
PR45H72		del.
PR45H72	IT	(del.)
PR45H73		mod.
PR45H73	IT	(mod.)
PS303		mod.
PS303	LT 190	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
PS303	SK 440	
Parcours		mod.
Parcours	LT 44	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Parcours	EE 31	

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

R 110006 X 48		mod.
R 110006 X 48	DE 105	(mod.) Component Variety=Yes

R 6042		del.
R 6042	DE 105	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

RGT Paradizze		mod.
RGT Paradizze	SK 520	(add.)
RGT Paradizze	FR S13804	

Raul		del.
Raul	IT	(del.)

Respect		del.
Respect	DK 44	(del.)

Ribera		del.
Ribera	IT	(del.)

Romeo		mod.
Romeo	LT 51	(add.)
Romeo	PL 205	
Romeo	CZ 000	

SLM 164703		del.
SLM 164703	DE 4316	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

SR 001212 MS		del.
SR 001212 MS	DE 105	(del.) Component Variety=Yes

83 Brassica napus L. (partim) – Swede rape

SY Florian		mod.
SY Florian	LT 152	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
SY Florian	DK 13	
SY Florian	PL 787	

SY Iowa		mod.
SY Iowa	LT 152	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
SY Iowa	RO 2198	
SY Iowa	PL 787	

SY Julietta		mod.
SY Julietta	LT 152	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
SY Julietta	NL 1029	

SY Saveo		mod.
SY Saveo	DK 187	(del.)
SY Saveo	CZ 711	

Sherlock		mod.
Sherlock	LT 73	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Sherlock	PL 52	

Shiraz		add.
Shiraz	DK 208	(add.)

Skodi CS		del.
Skodi CS	IT	(del.)

Stina		del.
Stina	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

83 *Brassica napus* L. (partim) – Swede rape

Sunder		del.
Sunder	EE 111	(del.)
Sunder	LT 82	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Tartu		add.
Tartu	DK 44	(add.)

Tores		mod.
Tores	SK 443	(mod.)
Tores	HR 100	

Zidane		mod.
Zidane	DK 44	(add.)
Zidane	FR S14808	

85 *Cannabis sativa* L. – Hemp

Alive SK		del.
Alive SK	LT 208	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Austa SK		mod.
Austa SK	LT 208	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Austa SK	LV 202	

Estica		mod.
Estica	EE 23	(mod.)

86 *Carthamus tinctorius* L. – Safflower

Arizona		mod.
Arizona	IT	(mod.)

Oscar		mod.
Oscar	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

87 *Carum carvi* L. – Caraway

Luban		add.
Luban	CZ 1610	(add.)

89 *Helianthus annuus* L. – Sunflower

ACA99		del.
ACA99	IT	(del.)

Admont		del.
Admont	IT	(del.)

Agrisol		mod.
Agrisol	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Albird		mod.
Albird	IT	(mod.)

Allium RM		add.
Allium RM	IT	(add.)

Ancilla		mod.
Ancilla	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Ancona		mod.
Ancona	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Archeo		mod.
Archeo	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Bonasol		mod.
Bonasol	IT	(mod.)

Boogy		del.
Boogy	IT	(del.)

CF27CL		del.
CF27CL	IT	(del.)

Celina SU		mod.
Celina SU	IT 837	(mod.)

Cllub		mod.
Cllub	IT	(mod.)

Codivox CL		del.
Codivox CL	IT	(del.)

Copenhagen		del.
Copenhagen	IT	(del.)

ES Grafic CL		mod.
ES Grafic CL	IT	(mod.)

ES Leonora		mod.
ES Leonora	IT	(mod.)

ES Novamis CL		mod.
ES Novamis CL	IT	(mod.)
ES Novamis CL	CZ 1684	
ES Novamis CL	RO 2205	

Elly		del.
Elly	IT	(del.)

Esperencia		del.
Esperencia	IT	(del.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

Fabio		del.
Fabio	IT	(del.)
Florencia CS		del.
Florencia CS	IT	(del.)
Flosun		del.
Flosun	IT	(del.)
Gloriasol		mod.
Gloriasol	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Goleador		del.
Goleador	IT	(del.)
HS03		del.
HS03	IT	(del.)
Hispalis		mod.
Hispalis	IT	(mod.)
Ibis		mod.
Ibis	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Incisif		del.
Incisif	IT	(del.)
Insun 277 SU		add.
Insun 277 SU	IT 1171	(add.)
Insun 288 CLP		add.
Insun 288 CLP	IT 1171	(add.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

KWS Dragon		mod.
KWS Dragon	IT	(del.)
KWS Dragon	HR 102	
KWS Dragon	PT 586	

KWS Mondeo		mod.
KWS Mondeo	IT	(del.)
KWS Mondeo	PT 586	

Kalluga		mod.
Kalluga	IT	(mod.)

Klarika CL		mod.
Klarika CL	IT	(mod.)
Klarika CL	SK 500	

LG50540 CLP		mod.
LG50540 CLP	SK 406	(add.)
LG50540 CLP	IT 837	

LG50549 SX		mod.
LG50549 SX	SK 406	(add.)
LG50549 SX	RO 2111	
LG50549 SX	IT 837	

LG50574		mod.
LG50574	SK 406	(add.)
LG50574	IT 837	

LG50632		mod.
LG50632	SK 406	(add.)
LG50632	IT 837	

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

LG50636 CLP		add.
LG50636 CLP	SK 406	(add.)
LG50643		mod.
LG50643	SK 406	(add.)
LG50643	BG 21	
LG5382		del.
LG5382	IT 837	(del.)
LG5403		del.
LG5403	IT	(del.)
LG5405		del.
LG5405	IT 837	(del.)
LG5497		del.
LG5497	IT 837	(del.)
LG5503		del.
LG5503	IT	(del.)
LG5509		del.
LG5509	IT 837	(del.)
LG5516		del.
LG5516	IT 837	(del.)
LG5519		del.
LG5519	IT	(del.)
LG5528		del.
LG5528	IT	(del.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

LG5534		del.
LG5534	IT	(del.)

LG5547HO		del.
LG5547HO	IT 837	(del.)

LG5563 CL		del.
LG5563 CL	IT 837	(del.)

LG5577		del.
LG5577	IT 837	(del.)

LG5625		del.
LG5625	IT	(del.)

LG5627		del.
LG5627	IT 837	(del.)

LG5649		del.
LG5649	IT	(del.)

LG5677HO		del.
LG5677HO	IT	(del.)

Lavoria CS		del.
Lavoria CS	IT	(del.)

MAS 82A		del.
MAS 82A	IT	(del.)

Michel		mod.
Michel	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

Multisol		mod.
Multisol	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

NS Gladijator		mod.
NS Gladijator	RO 2012	(mod.)

Nogal		del.
Nogal	IT	(del.)

Olencia CS		del.
Olencia CS	IT	(del.)

Olex		del.
Olex	IT	(del.)

Opera PR		del.
Opera PR	IT 1164	(del.)

P63HH69		mod.
P63HH69	IT	(mod.)

P63LL06		mod.
P63LL06	IT	(mod.)
P63LL06	AT 77	
P63LL06	HR 214	

P64HH167		mod.
P64HH167	AT 77	(add.)
P64HH167	IT 1057	
P64HH167	FR S10858	

P64HH70		del.
P64HH70	IT	(del.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

P64LE24		del.
P64LE24	IT	(del.)

P64LE25		mod.
P64LE25	IT	(mod.)
P64LE25	BG 34	

P64LE28		del.
P64LE28	IT	(del.)

P64LE36		del.
P64LE36	IT	(del.)

P64LE45		del.
P64LE45	IT	(del.)

PR63A83		del.
PR63A83	IT	(del.)

PR64A44		del.
PR64A44	IT	(del.)

Panter		mod.
Panter	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Pelikan		mod.
Pelikan	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Phomostar		mod.
Phomostar	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Pirineos		del.
Pirineos	IT	(del.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

Pluto CLP		mod.
Pluto CLP	IT 837	(mod.)
Pokora		mod.
Pokora	RO 2123	(mod.)
Primex		mod.
Primex	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Primoli		mod.
Primoli	IT	(mod.)
ST9093		del.
ST9093	IT	(del.)
SUBEO		mod.
SUBEO	AT 543	(add.)
SUBEO	RO 2082	
SUBEO	PT 586	
SY AMAZONIA		mod.
SY AMAZONIA	SK 219	(add.)
SY AMAZONIA	PT 586	
SY AMAZONIA	RO 2082	
SY Lazuri CLP		add.
SY Lazuri CLP	SK 219	(add.)
SY Rolfi		del.
SY Rolfi	IT	(del.)
SY Sanbala		del.
SY Sanbala	IT	(del.)

89 Helianthus annuus L. – Sunflower

Sangria CS		del.
Sangria CS	IT	(del.)

Sirocco		mod.
Sirocco	IT	(mod.)

Solnet		del.
Solnet	IT	(del.)

Star		mod.
Star	IT	(mod.)

Suliano		add.
Suliano	SK 219	(add.)

Supersol		mod.
Supersol	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Surest		add.
Surest	SK 219	(add.)

Tilt		mod.
Tilt	IT	(mod.)

Tolkien		del.
Tolkien	IT	(del.)

Tromba		mod.
Tromba	IT	(mod.)

Utopia CS		mod.
Utopia CS	HR 179	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

89 *Helianthus annuus* L. – Sunflower

Utopia CS	IT 345	
Utopia CS	SK 500	

Verlin		del.
Verlin	IT	(del.)

Vincenzo		mod.
Vincenzo	IT 60 1263 530	(mod.)

Vivasol		del.
Vivasol	IT	(del.)

91 *Papaver somniferum* L. – Poppy

Emanuel		add.
Emanuel	CZ 1354	(add.)

KSZF Mustang		add.
KSZF Mustang	SK 840	(add.)

Kedvenc		add.
Kedvenc	HU 103859	(add.)

SO Lear		add.
SO Lear	SK 840	(add.)

Snow White		add.
Snow White	SK 770	(add.)

92 *Sinapis alba* L. – White mustard

Aba		mod.
Aba	DE 212	(add.)
Aba	BE 1499	

92 *Sinapis alba* L. – White mustard

Azaro		add.
Azaro	DE 7352	(add.)
Elendil		mod.
Elendil	IT 177	(mod.)
Finish		add.
Finish	DE 871	(add.)
Ines		add.
Ines	DE 2418	(add.)
Newton		add.
Newton	DE 9777	(add.)
Torpedo		mod.
Torpedo	SI 86	(del.)
Torpedo	DE 289	
Torpedo	NL 296	
Verte		mod.
Verte	IT	(del.)
Verte	DE 7352	

93 *Glycine max* (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Acapulca		add.
Acapulca	PL 676	(add.)
Adonai		mod.
Adonai	IT	(mod.)
Alda		del.
Alda	IT	(del.)

93 Glycine max (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Ales		del.
Ales	IT	(del.)

Algebra		add.
Algebra	AT 124	(add.)

Alhambra		add.
Alhambra	HU 106630	(add.)

Allidea		add.
Allidea	AT 124	(add.)

Almavia		add.
Almavia	AT 124	(add.)

Ancagua		mod.
Ancagua	DE 31	(add.)
Ancagua	AT 124	

Aralia		add.
Aralia	AT 124	(add.)

Arietta		add.
Arietta	AT 124	(add.)

Arnold		mod.
Arnold	DE 871	(add.)
Arnold	CH 41	
Arnold	PL 1027	

Astramelix		add.
Astramelix	PL 892	(add.)

93 Glycine max (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Astronomix		add.
Astronomix	PL 892	(add.)
Atalana		add.
Atalana	DE 8905	(add.)
Atlantic		mod.
Atlantic	IT	(mod.)
Aurora		mod.
Aurora	IT	(mod.)
Avisia		add.
Avisia	HU 106630	(add.)
BSF-1942		add.
BSF-1942	HU 148340	(add.)
Benno		add.
Benno	AT 534	(add.)
Bétabon		add.
Bétabon	HU 148340	(add.)
Dekabig		mod.
Dekabig	IT 1522	(mod.)
Demetra		del.
Demetra	IT	(del.)
Dragibus		mod.
Dragibus	LT 155	(add.)
Dragibus	SI 587	

93 Glycine max (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Duchessa		mod.
Duchessa	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Gioconda		mod.
Gioconda	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Hola		add.
Hola	AT 719	(add.)

Kombino		add.
Kombino	AT 534	(add.)

LID Boutondor		add.
LID Boutondor	HU 104164	(add.)

LID Diamantor		mod.
LID Diamantor	PL 1273	(add.)
LID Diamantor	RO 2205	
LID Diamantor	FR S15312	

LID Yendor		add.
LID Yendor	HU 104164	(add.)

Lajma		mod.
Lajma	PL 1246	(add.)
Lajma	LT 175	

Lanca		del.
Lanca	IT	(del.)

Liuba		mod.
Liuba	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

93 Glycine max (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Luise PZO		add.
Luise PZO	HR 183	(add.)

Orlanda		del.
Orlanda	IT	(del.)

PEM 04		add.
PEM 04	DE 10609	(add.)

PR92Y21		del.
PR92Y21	IT	(del.)

PRA 03		add.
PRA 03	DE 10609	(add.)

PRO Helicon		add.
PRO Helicon	BE 91000	(add.)

PRO Jacinto		add.
PRO Jacinto	BE 91000	(add.)

PRO Taranaki		add.
PRO Taranaki	DE 10780	(add.)

PRO Vesuvio		add.
PRO Vesuvio	BE 91000	(add.)

Pacific		del.
Pacific	IT	(del.)

Paco		del.
Paco	IT	(del.)

93 Glycine max (L.) Merr. – Soya bean

Prolix		add.
Prolix	AT 534	(add.)
Ranka		mod.
Ranka	AT 719	(add.)
Ranka	HR 186	
Romy		add.
Romy	DE 4046	(add.)
Sirio		mod.
Sirio	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Totem		del.
Totem	IT	(del.)
Vineta PZO		mod.
Vineta PZO	DE 10310	(add.)
Vineta PZO	PL 1024	

IV. Cereals

94 *Avena nuda* L. – Small naked oat / Hulless oat

Elbany		add.
Elbany	AT 5	(add.)

Samuel		del.
Samuel	DE 8976	(del.)

95 *Avena sativa* L. (including *A. byzantina* K. Koch) – Oat and Red oat

Armstrong		mod.
Armstrong	SE 176	(mod.)

Asterion		mod.
Asterion	CZ 77	(add.)
Asterion	DE 9056	

Bionda		mod.
Bionda	IT 1143 1675	(mod.)

Bison		mod.
Bison	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Bison	DE 9056	
Bison	LU 6017	

Elron		add.
Elron	AT 5	(add.)

Flavia		mod.
Flavia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Fulvia		mod.
Fulvia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Galeon		add.
Galeon	LT 43	(add.)

95 Avena sativa L. (including A. byzantina K. Koch) – Oat and Red oat

Luna		add.
Luna	IT 1334	(add.)

Marisa		mod.
Marisa	IT 1334	(mod.)

Naomi		mod.
Naomi	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Nemesis		mod.
Nemesis	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Nemesis	SE 71	

Nigra		mod.
Nigra	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Pogon		del.
Pogon	CZ 77	(del.)

Primula		mod.
Primula	IT	(mod.)

RGT Motala		mod.
RGT Motala	SE 142	(mod.)

RGT Skara		add.
RGT Skara	SE 142	(add.)

Simer DS		add.
Simer DS	LT 32	(add.)

95 Avena sativa L. (including A. byzantina K. Koch) – Oat and Red oat

Symphony		mod.
Symphony	LV 172	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Symphony	DK 77	
Symphony	EE 75	
Symphony	LU 6017	
Symphony	LT 60	
Symphony	FI 6196	
Symphony	DE 9056	

TEOBD40		mod.
TEOBD40	IT 1334	(mod.)

Typhon		del.
Typhon	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Vaclav		mod.
Vaclav	SK 602	(mod.)

Vojtech		mod.
Vojtech	SK 602	(mod.)

Vok		del.
Vok	CZ 172	(del.)

WPB Jubilee		add.
WPB Jubilee	EE 95	(add.)
WPB Jubilee	LT 167	(add.)

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Aiace		mod.
Aiace	IT	(mod.)

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Arlom		add.
Arlom	SE 71	(add.)
Bastille		mod.
Bastille	IT	(mod.)
Biatlon		del.
Biatlon	CZ 1065	(del.)
Bounty		add.
Bounty	DE 2889	(add.)
Callas		mod.
Callas	IT	(mod.)
Charles		del.
Charles	DK 203	(del.)
Dasio		mod.
Dasio	IT 1675	(mod.)
Digersano		del.
Digersano	IT	(del.)
Edelmira		add.
Edelmira	AT 5	(add.)
Edmore		add.
Edmore	AT 5	(add.)
Embrace		del.
Embrace	LT 105	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Enola		del.
Enola	IT	(del.)

Esterreich		add.
Esterreich	AT 5	(add.)

Evergreen		mod.
Evergreen	LV 163	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Evergreen	DK 220	
Evergreen	EE 67	

Gesine		mod.
Gesine	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Gesine	SK 295	
Gesine	HU 107747	
Gesine	FI 6205	

Gluck		mod.
Gluck	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Greenway		mod.
Greenway	CZ 1265	(del.)
Greenway	DK 220	

Gunda DS		add.
Gunda DS	LT 32	(add.)

Idra		mod.
Idra	IT	(mod.)

Invictus		del.
Invictus	LT 105	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

KH Noémi		del.
KH Noémi	HU 151322	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
KWS Premis		mod.
KWS Premis	EE 28	(add.)
KWS Premis	FR S13467	
KWS Premis	LT 41	
KWS Premis	DK 230	
KWS Premis	PL 53	
Kelibia		del.
Kelibia	IT	(del.)
Kompakt		del.
Kompakt	CZ 457	(del.)
LG Andante		mod.
LG Andante	AT 888	(add.)
LG Andante	DE 1323	
LG Bolero		mod.
LG Bolero	LT 165	(add.)
LG Bolero	FR S13491	
LG Caruso		mod.
LG Caruso	LT 165	(add.)
LG Caruso	DE 1323	
Laureate		mod.
Laureate	DE 9503	(del.)
Laureate	CZ 697	
Laureate	LU 6056 / 6031	
Laureate	EE 126	
Laureate	SK 443	

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Laureate	FR 11839	
Laureate	IE 328	
Laureate	LT 152	
Laureate	LV 201	
Laureate	NL 798	
Laureate	FI 6234	

Lisbona		del.
Lisbona	IT	(del.)

Lucrezia		add.
Lucrezia	IT 60 1263	(add.)

Luhkas		mod.
Luhkas	SE 142	(mod.)
Luhkas	ES 2023	
Luhkas	FI 6214	

Mita		mod.
Mita	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Montoya		mod.
Montoya	LT 57	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Montoya	SK 595	
Montoya	CZ 1261	

Nitran		mod.
Nitran	CZ 457	(del.)
Nitran	SK 113	

Nure		mod.
Nure	IT 110 1293	(mod.)

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Ortilus		mod.
Ortilus	IT	(mod.)
Ortilus	ES 2023	

Otis		mod.
Otis	IT	(mod.)

Paustian		mod.
Paustian	LT 105	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Paustian	PL 513	
Paustian	NL 749	
Paustian	IE 222	
Paustian	DK 35	

Pribina		del.
Pribina	CZ 457	(del.)

RGT Sirius		mod.
RGT Sirius	LT 86	(add.)
RGT Sirius	DK 208	

SY Signet		mod.
SY Signet	DK 13	(add.)
SY Signet	NL 77	(mod.)

SY Solar		mod.
SY Solar	DE 9503	(del.)
SY Solar	LV 201	
SY Solar	LT 152	
SY Solar	EE 126	
SY Solar	CZ 1507	
SY Solar	AT 507	

97.1 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 2-row barley

Salome		mod.
Salome	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Salome	FI 6147	
Salome	SK 295	
Salome	SE 41	

Scotty		add.
Scotty	LT 56	(add.)
Scotty	LT 56	(add.)

Sirio		mod.
Sirio	IT 1833 1293	(mod.)

Sladar		del.
Sladar	CZ 457	(del.)

Sting		mod.
Sting	LT 60	(add.)
Sting	HU 107747	
Sting	DE 9056	
Sting	PL 306	
Sting	FR 45185	

Tea		mod.
Tea	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Tipo		mod.
Tipo	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Trasimeno		del.
Trasimeno	IT	(del.)

97.1 *Hordeum vulgare* L. >> 2-row barley

Uta		mod.
Uta	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Uta	FI 6205	
Uta	HU 107747	
Uta	SK 295	

Varenne		del.
Varenne	IT	(del.)

Vedette		del.
Vedette	IT	(del.)

97.2 *Hordeum vulgare* L. >> 6-row barley

Amistar		mod.
Amistar	IT	(mod.)
Amistar	FR S14472	

Arianna		mod.
Arianna	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Atlante		mod.
Atlante	IT	(mod.)

Azzurro		mod.
Azzurro	IT	(mod.)

Bazooka		mod.
Bazooka	DE 6880	(del.)
Bazooka	IE 328	

Belleplaine		del.
Belleplaine	IT	(del.)

97.2 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 6-row barley

Candy		del.
Candy	IT	(del.)
Contra		del.
Contra	DE 1410	(del.)
Dexter		add.
Dexter	DK 35	(add.)
Diomede		mod.
Diomede	IT 1675	(mod.)
Estival		del.
Estival	IT	(del.)
Etrusco		del.
Etrusco	IT	(del.)
FM 0711		del.
FM 0711	DE 9503	(del.)
FM 9918		del.
FM 9918	DE 9503	(del.)
Futura		mod.
Futura	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Giada		mod.
Giada	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Hydra		add.
Hydra	AT 671	(add.)

97.2 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 6-row barley

Jakubus		mod.
Jakubus	LT 60	(add.)
Jakubus	PL 306	
Jakubus	HU 107396	
Jakubus	CZ 77	
Jakubus	EE 33	

KWS Antonis		add.
KWS Antonis	AT 504	(add.)

KWS Libris		add.
KWS Libris	PL 53	(add.)

Kaylin		mod.
Kaylin	DE 4046	(del.)
Kaylin	PL 1011	

Ketos		mod.
Ketos	IT	(mod.)
Ketos	FR 12814	

Luise		mod.
Luise	PL 205	(add.)
Luise	CZ 000	

MT 0711		del.
MT 0711	DE 9503	(del.)

MT 9918		del.
MT 9918	DE 9503	(del.)

Opale		mod.
Opale	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

97.2 Hordeum vulgare L. >> 6-row barley

Perla		mod.
Perla	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
RE 22		del.
RE 22	DE 9503	(del.)
RGT Alessia		add.
RGT Alessia	PL 434	(add.)
SU Elsa		add.
SU Elsa	PL 340	(add.)
Salus		del.
Salus	IT	(del.)
Sonnengold		del.
Sonnengold	DE 1410	(del.)
Sonora		del.
Sonora	IT	(del.)
Thimea		add.
Thimea	AT 124	(add.)
Venezia		mod.
Venezia	PL 676	(add.)
Venezia	CZ 1052	
Venezia	AT 124	

98 Oryza sativa L. – Rice

Agata		mod.
Agata	IT	(mod.)

98 Oryza sativa L. – Rice

Ambra		del.
Ambra	IT	(del.)
Asia		del.
Asia	IT	(del.)
Augusto		mod.
Augusto	IT	(mod.)
CL12		mod.
CL12	IT	(mod.)
CL46		mod.
CL46	IT	(mod.)
CL80		mod.
CL80	IT	(mod.)
Cadet		del.
Cadet	IT	(del.)
Centro		del.
Centro	IT	(del.)
Creso		del.
Creso	IT 158	(del.)
Elba		mod.
Elba	IT	(mod.)
Elettra		mod.
Elettra	IT	(mod.)

Fast		del.
Fast	IT 158	(del.)
Febo		mod.
Febo	IT	(mod.)
Fedra		mod.
Fedra	IT	(mod.)
Genio		del.
Genio	IT 158	(del.)
Iarim		mod.
Iarim	IT	(mod.)
Karnak		del.
Karnak	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025
Mare CL		mod.
Mare CL	IT	(mod.)
Meco		del.
Meco	IT	(del.)
Ninfa		mod.
Ninfa	IT	(mod.)
Oceano		mod.
Oceano	IT	(mod.)
Pony		del.
Pony	IT 158	(del.)

98 *Oryza sativa* L. – Rice

Presto		mod.
Presto	IT	(mod.)

Sagittario		mod.
Sagittario	IT	(mod.)

Scirocco		del.
Scirocco	IT 158	(del.)

Sfera		mod.
Sfera	IT	(mod.)

Sole CL		mod.
Sole CL	IT	(mod.)

Teseo		mod.
Teseo	IT	(mod.)

Thaibonnet		mod.
Thaibonnet	IT	(mod.)
Thaibonnet	ES 000	

100 *Secale cereale* L. – Rye

IS Secator		add.
IS Secator	SK 115	(add.)

KWS AB192R		del.
KWS AB192R	PL 53	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027 Component Variety=Yes

KWS AB211R		add.
KWS AB211R	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes

KWS AB212R		add.
KWS AB212R	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
KWS Belenor		add.
KWS Belenor	EE 28	(add.)
KWS Cursor		add.
KWS Cursor	DK 230	(add.)
KWS Cursor	PL 53	(add.)
KWS Fidalgor		add.
KWS Fidalgor	PL 53	(add.)
KWS Jeskor		del.
KWS Jeskor	DK 230	(del.)
KWS Motivator		del.
KWS Motivator	DK 230	(del.)
KWS Novor		del.
KWS Novor	PL 53	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027
KWS Skylor		del.
KWS Skylor	DK 230	(del.)
KWS Wisdor		add.
KWS Wisdor	AT 504	(add.)
LO1071P		del.
LO1071P	PL 53	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027 Component Variety=Yes

100 Secale cereale L. – Rye

LO1093N		del.
LO1093N	PL 53	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027 Component Variety=Yes
LO1122N		add.
LO1122N	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
LO3002N		add.
LO3002N	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
LSR10045		add.
LSR10045	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
LSR10049		add.
LSR10049	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
LSR10050		add.
LSR10050	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
LSR152		del.
LSR152	PL 53	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027 Component Variety=Yes
LSR90002		add.
LSR90002	PL 53	(add.) Component Variety=Yes
SU Atum		add.
SU Atum	PL 250	(add.)

100 Secale cereale L. – Rye

SU Bebop		mod.
SU Bebop	AT 518	(add.)
SU Bebop	DE 750	

SU Erling		add.
SU Erling	DK 91	(add.)

SU Isaksson		del.
SU Isaksson	PL 250	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

SU Ivar		add.
SU Ivar	DK 91	(add.)
SU Ivar	PL 250	(add.)

SU Torvi		add.
SU Torvi	DK 91	(add.)

101 *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench – Sorghum

Argensil 162		mod.
Argensil 162	IT	(mod.)

Argensor 151DP		mod.
Argensor 151DP	IT	(mod.)

Capello CS		mod.
Capello CS	IT	(mod.)

ES Aquilon		del.
ES Aquilon	IT	(del.)

Favorite		del.
Favorite	IT	(del.)

101 Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench – Sorghum

Felsina		mod.
Felsina	IT	(mod.)

Iggor		mod.
Iggor	IT	(mod.)

Jumbo Star		mod.
Jumbo Star	IT	(mod.)

KWS Pluto		mod.
KWS Pluto	IT	(del.)
KWS Pluto	PT 120	

KWS Wotan		mod.
KWS Wotan	IT	(del.)
KWS Wotan	PT 120	

Margo		mod.
Margo	HU 171625	(add.)
Margo	RO 2194	
Margo	FR S13860	

PR823F		del.
PR823F	IT	(del.)

PR830F		del.
PR830F	IT	(del.)

PR88Y92		mod.
PR88Y92	IT	(mod.)
PR88Y92	AT 77	

101 *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench – Sorghum

Sofra		mod.
Sofra	IT	(mod.)

Tonkawa		mod.
Tonkawa	IT 1873	(mod.)

103 *Sorghum bicolor* (L.) Moench × *Sorghum sudanense* (Piper) Stapf. – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of *Sorghum bicolor* and *Sorghum sudanense*

KWS Freya		mod.
KWS Freya	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025
KWS Freya	CZ 69	
KWS Freya	HR 737	

KWS Hugin		mod.
KWS Hugin	IT	(del.)
KWS Hugin	PT 120	

King 61 DR		mod.
King 61 DR	IT	(mod.)

Nicol		mod.
Nicol	IT	(mod.)
Nicol	ES 116	

True		mod.
True	IT	(mod.)

Turno		del.
Turno	IT	(del.)

104 ×*Triticosecale* Wittm. ex A. Camus – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus *Triticum* and a species of the genus *Secale*

Alambic		mod.
Alambic	IT	(mod.)

Ambasador		add.
Ambasador	PL 153	(add.)

Cappricia		mod.
Cappricia	LT 140	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Cappricia	CZ 930	
Cappricia	AT 673	

Catria		mod.
Catria	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Comodoro		add.
Comodoro	PL 611	(add.)

Conero		mod.
Conero	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Cortino		del.
Cortino	IT	(del.)

Dalmateo		add.
Dalmateo	PL 611	(add.)

Granador		del.
Granador	IT	(del.)

Hercules		mod.
Hercules	IT	(mod.)

104 ×Triticosecale Wittm. ex A. Camus – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus Triticum and a species of the genus Secale

IS Flavianus		add.
IS Flavianus	SK 115	(add.)

Lumaco		mod.
Lumaco	LT 140	(add.)
Lumaco	AT 673	
Lumaco	DE 6871	
Lumaco	EE 101	
Lumaco	LU 6062	
Lumaco	FR 000	

Oceania		del.
Oceania	IT	(del.)

PS Tecko		mod.
PS Tecko	SK 715	(mod.)

Pitino		mod.
Pitino	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Promiso		add.
Promiso	PL 792	(add.)

Quirinale		mod.
Quirinale	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Rufus		mod.
Rufus	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Rufus	PL 306	

TC Lupus		mod.
TC Lupus, Lupus	CZ 77	(del.)
TC Lupus	NL 564	

104 ×Triticosecale Wittm. ex A. Camus – Hybrids resulting from the crossing of a species of the genus Triticum and a species of the genus Secale

Tinos		add.
Tinos	PL 1011	(add.)

Tulus		mod.
Tulus	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Tulus	LU 6017	
Tulus	PL 306	
Tulus	AT 500	
Tulus	DE 9056	

105 *Triticum aestivum* L. – Wheat

AG300		mod.
AG300	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Acapulco		del.
Acapulco	IT	(del.)

Afrodite		mod.
Afrodite	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Agadir		del.
Agadir	IT	(del.)

Alfabetic		del.
Alfabetic	IT	(del.)

Altare		mod.
Altare	LV 169	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Altare	CH 41	

Altezza		mod.
Altezza	IT	(mod.)

Ambrogio		mod.
Ambrogio	IT	(mod.)

Anapurna		mod.
Anapurna	IT	(del.)
Anapurna	BG 21	
Anapurna	RO 2111	

Annibale		mod.
Annibale	IT	(mod.)

Apian		del.
Apian	DE 6880	(del.)

Arabella		mod.
Arabella	LV 67	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Arabella	PL 153	
Arabella	NO 186	

Architekt		mod.
Architekt	LT 51	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Architekt	EE 11	

Arpion		del.
Arpion	IT	(del.)

Artdeco		mod.
Artdeco	IT	(mod.)
Artdeco	FR 44360	

Avvento		del.
Avvento	IT	(del.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Axial		del.
Axial	IT	(del.)

Azul		del.
Azul	IT	(del.)

BC Mistika		add.
BC Mistika	HR 10	(add.)

Basico		del.
Basico	IT	(del.)

Bellini		mod.
Bellini	IT	(mod.)

Berlock		mod.
Berlock	EE 46	(mod.)
Berlock	NO 323	
Berlock	LT 42	

Beryll		del.
Beryll	DE 6880	(del.)

Blasco		mod.
Blasco	IT	(mod.)

Bokaro		mod.
Bokaro	IT	(del.)
Bokaro	ES 2048	

Boss		mod.
Boss	LT 160	(add.)
Boss	DE 1410	

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Brilliant		mod.
Brilliant	DE 6880	(del.)
Brilliant	CZ 1151	

Calisol		mod.
Calisol	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025
Calisol	HR 745	
Calisol	FR S14472	

Calixo		mod.
Calixo	LT 160	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Calixo	EE 102	
Calixo	LV 175	
Calixo	FI 6170	

Camillo		del.
Camillo	IT	(del.)

Caravaggio		del.
Caravaggio	IT	(del.)

Carisma		del.
Carisma	IT	(del.)

Carlander		add.
Carlander	LT 193	(add.)

Carracci		del.
Carracci	IT	(del.)

Cavallo		del.
Cavallo	IT	(del.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Colfiorito		mod.
Colfiorito	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Colledoro		mod.
Colledoro	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Como		add.
Como	PL 513	(add.)

Cordia		mod.
Cordia	LT 59	(add.)
Cordia	EE 94	

Countess		del.
Countess	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Crickett		del.
Crickett	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Cubic		del.
Cubic	IT	(del.)

Damian		mod.
Damian	PL 407	(add.)
Damian	FR S14713	

Darma		mod.
Darma	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Delabrad 2		mod.
Delabrad 2	RO 1001	(mod.)

Desamo		mod.
Desamo	DE 6880	(del.)
Desamo	LT 152	

Drusilla		mod.
Drusilla	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Elaya		add.
Elaya	LT 217	(add.)

Elektra		mod.
Elektra	LT 59	(add.)
Elektra	PL 611	

Eletta		mod.
Eletta	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Eriksen		add.
Eriksen	PL 513	(add.)

Esperia		mod.
Esperia	IT	(mod.)

Ethic		mod.
Ethic	IT	(mod.)

Exsal		mod.
Exsal	LT 51	(add.)
Exsal	DE 39	

Fabian		add.
Fabian	PL 407	(add.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Famulus		mod.
Famulus	LV 81	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Famulus	LT 51	

Fantazja		add.
Fantazja	PL 1011	(add.)

Felgen		mod.
Felgen	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Felgen	LV 178	
Felgen	NO 323	

Festa		del.
Festa	IT 60 40 1263	(del.)

Francia		del.
Francia	IT	(del.)

Franz		del.
Franz	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Franz	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

Frontal		mod.
Frontal	SE 142	(mod.)

Fuzja		add.
Fuzja	PL 1	(add.)

Galerist		mod.
Galerist	DE 6880	(del.)
Galerist	LT 152	

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Genio		del.
Genio	IT	(del.)

Genius		mod.
Genius	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Genius	HU 107747	
Genius	CZ 77	
Genius	DE 9056	
Genius	LU 6017	

Giunone		mod.
Giunone	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Gordian		mod.
Gordian	DE 6880	(del.)
Gordian	CZ 1507	
Gordian	LT 152	

Gorecki		del.
Gorecki	IT	(del.)

Gunilla		del.
Gunilla	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Gustav		mod.
Gustav	LT 91	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Gustav	DE 25	

Hellas		del.
Hellas	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

IS Conditor		mod.
IS Conditor	SK 115	(mod.)
Ilaria		mod.
Ilaria	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Iluminacja		add.
Iluminacja	PL 153	(add.)
KWS Brise		add.
KWS Brise	DK 230	(add.)
KWS Buran		mod.
KWS Buran	LV 174	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
KWS Buran	LT 41	
KWS Carusum		mod.
KWS Carusum	CZ 31	(add.)
KWS Carusum	DE 129	
KWS Carusum	LT 41	
KWS Carusum	PL 53	
KWS Dorium		mod.
KWS Dorium	LT 41	(add.)
KWS Dorium	PL 53	
KWS Espinum		add.
KWS Espinum	PL 53	(add.)
KWS Jubilum		mod.
KWS Jubilum	EE 28	(add.)
KWS Jubilum	LT 41	
KWS Jubilum	DE 129	

KWS Kilburn		del.
KWS Kilburn	DE 3344	(del.)
KWS Lirum		mod.
KWS Lirum	LT 41	(add.)
KWS Lirum	PL 53	
KWS Mintum		mod.
KWS Mintum	LT 41	(add.)
KWS Mintum	DE 129	
KWS Scope		add.
KWS Scope	DK 225	(add.)
Kalango		mod.
Kalango	IT	(del.)
Kalango	ES 2048	
Kaprun		add.
Kaprun	PL 933	(add.)
Kask		mod.
Kask	LT 42	(add.)
Kask	EE 46	
Kask	SE 71	
Kelda		add.
Kelda	CZ 172	(add.)
Košútka		del.
Košútka	CZ 457	(del.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

LG Algebra		add.
LG Algebra	PL 738	(add.)

LG Fabianus		add.
LG Fabianus	PL 738	(add.)

LG Mondial		mod.
LG Mondial	AT 889	(add.)
LG Mondial	BE 216	
LG Mondial	CZ 1405	
LG Mondial	SK 441	
LG Mondial	LT 165	
LG Mondial	PL 738	

Libra		del.
Libra	IT 60 40 1 263	(del.)

Licamero		mod.
Licamero	EE 98	(mod.)
Licamero	DE 1410	
Licamero	LU 6049	
Licamero	LT 160	
Licamero	LV 175	
Licamero	FI 6170	

Lindbergh		mod.
Lindbergh	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027
Lindbergh	HU 107747	

Linnea		mod.
Linnea	LT 105	(add.)
Linnea	EE 173	
Linnea	FI 6172	

Lj-180		add.
Lj-180	SI	(add.)

Luca		del.
Luca	IT	(del.)

Lucilla		mod.
Lucilla	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Magnello		del.
Magnello	IT	(del.)

Magnezja		add.
Magnezja	PL 1	(add.)

Mandalore		add.
Mandalore	LT 42	(add.)
Mandalore	LV 178	(add.)

Manital		mod.
Manital	IT	(mod.)

Maremma		del.
Maremma	IT	(del.)

Marly		mod.
Marly	PL 880	(add.)
Marly	DK 220	

Maxus		add.
Maxus	PL 205	(add.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Medola		del.
Medola	IT	(del.)

Memory		mod.
Memory	DE 1410	(del.)
Memory	NL 510	

Mindful		mod.
Mindful	BE 904	(del.)
Mindful	DK 225	

Minerva		mod.
Minerva	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Mol		del.
Mol	IT	(del.)

Mulan		mod.
Mulan	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Mulan	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027
Mulan	CZ 77	
Mulan	HU 107747	

NS Grivna		add.
NS Grivna	HR 633	(add.)

NS Igra		add.
NS Igra	HR 633	(add.)

Nalle		mod.
Nalle	EE 67	(add.)
Nalle	LT 144	(add.)
Nalle	FI 6196	

Nefertari		mod.
Nefertari	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Nimrod		add.
Nimrod	SE 144	(add.)

Nobless		mod.
Nobless	LT 42	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Nobless	NL 779	

Nordkap		mod.
Nordkap	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027
Nordkap	LU 6017	
Nordkap	DE 9056	
Nordkap	CZ 77	

Nox		add.
Nox	SK 457	(add.)

PR22R58		mod.
PR22R58	IT	(mod.)

Pakito		del.
Pakito	IT	(del.)

Paleotto		mod.
Paleotto	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Pallas		mod.
Pallas	AT 546	(add.)
Pallas	CZ 1364	
Pallas	PL 933	

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Pascal		del.
Pascal	IT	(del.)
Patria		add.
Patria	PL 1	(add.)
Peter		del.
Peter	BE 237	(del.)
Pireus		mod.
Pireus	CZ 1364	(add.)
Pireus	PL 933	
Polarkap		mod.
Polarkap	LT 51	(add.)
Polarkap	EE 11	
Polarkap	PL 205	
Polarkap	DE 39	
Porthus		mod.
Porthus	BE 750	(del.)
Porthus	DE 214	
Project W		mod.
Project W	IT	(mod.)
Quality		mod.
Quality	IT	(mod.)
RGT Arkata		del.
RGT Arkata	IT 1125	(del.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

RGT Braddock		add.
RGT Braddock	SE 142	(add.)

RGT Hexton		add.
RGT Hexton	DK 208	(add.)

RGT Kreuzer		mod.
RGT Kreuzer	SE 142	(add.)
RGT Kreuzer	PL 631	
RGT Kreuzer	NL 1046	
RGT Kreuzer	DE 7352	

Rabelais		del.
Rabelais	IT 1125	(del.)

Raffaello		del.
Raffaello	IT	(del.)

Rebelde		mod.
Rebelde	IT	(mod.)
Rebelde	FR S12728	

Rivero		mod.
Rivero	LT 60	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Rivero	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027
Rivero	CZ 77	

Rubisko		mod.
Rubisko	IT	(mod.)
Rubisko	FR S13804	
Rubisko	LU 12022 / 12008	

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Rumor		mod.
Rumor	LT 204	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Rumor	DE 214	
Rumor	CZ 1364	

SU Geometry		del.
SU Geometry	PL 306	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

SU Joran		mod.
SU Joran	PL 306	(add.)
SU Joran	SE 41	

SU Willem		mod.
SU Willem	LT 91	(add.)
SU Willem	PL 340	
SU Willem	DE 25	

SY Ideo		mod.
SY Ideo	IT	(mod.)

SY Koniko		del.
SY Koniko	DE 6880	(del.)

SY Moisson		mod.
SY Moisson	IT	(mod.)
SY Moisson	HR 102	
SY Moisson	FR S15434	

SY Plantus		del.
SY Plantus	DE 6880	(del.)

Safari		mod.
Safari	DE 6880	(del.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Safari	LU 6031 / 6011	
Safari	CZ 1409	

Sailor		mod.
Sailor	LT 160	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Sailor	LV 175	
Sailor	DE 1410	

Selina		mod.
Selina	LT 105	(add.)
Selina	FI 6172	
Selina	EE 173	

Sima		add.
Sima	LT 32	(add.)

Sobred		mod.
Sobred	IT	(mod.)

Sogby		del.
Sogby	IT	(del.)

Stendal		mod.
Stendal	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Tecla		mod.
Tecla	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Terramare		mod.
Terramare	IT	(mod.)

Tintoretto		mod.
Tintoretto	IT	(mod.)

105 Triticum aestivum L. – Wheat

Torysa		mod.
Torysa	SK 603	(mod.)

Turelli		del.
Turelli	IT	(del.)

Veda		del.
Veda	IT 60 40 1263	(del.)

Verna		del.
Verna	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Vittorio		mod.
Vittorio	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

WPB Francis		mod.
WPB Francis	CZ 1365	(add.)
WPB Francis	LT 167	

WPB Lambada		del.
WPB Lambada	LT 167	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

WPB Lynx		mod.
WPB Lynx	LT 167	(add.)
WPB Lynx	PL 523	

WPB Monfort		del.
WPB Monfort	BE 212	(del.)

Zena		mod.
Zena	IT	(mod.)

106 *Triticum durum* Desf. – Durum wheat

Achille		mod.
Achille	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Adone		mod.
Adone	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Aleandros		mod.
Aleandros	IT 91	(mod.)

Alfeos		mod.
Alfeos	IT 91	(mod.)

Asterix		mod.
Asterix	IT	(mod.)

Athoris		mod.
Athoris	IT	(mod.)
Athoris	ES 200	

Bacco		mod.
Bacco	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Balsamo		del.
Balsamo	IT	(del.)

Catone		mod.
Catone	IT 110	(mod.)

Cleto		mod.
Cleto	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Corallo		mod.
Corallo	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

106 Triticum durum Desf. – Durum wheat

Cosmodur		del.
Cosmodur	IT	(del.)
Crivu		del.
Crivu	IT	(del.)
Cuspide		mod.
Cuspide	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Dario		mod.
Dario	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Domino		mod.
Domino	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Duetto		del.
Duetto	IT	(del.)
Durango		mod.
Durango	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Dylan		mod.
Dylan	IT	(mod.)
Ermes		mod.
Ermes	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Ettore		mod.
Ettore	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Furio Camillo		mod.
Furio Camillo	IT	(mod.)

Gardena		mod.
Gardena	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Geniale		mod.
Geniale	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Ghibli		mod.
Ghibli	IT 1675	(mod.)
Gianni		del.
Gianni	IT	(del.)
Giove		mod.
Giove	IT	(mod.)
Gitago		mod.
Gitago	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Grazia		mod.
Grazia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)
Grecale		mod.
Grecale	IT	(mod.)
Growbar		del.
Growbar	IT	(del.)
Karalis		del.
Karalis	IT	(del.)
Lancia		mod.
Lancia	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

106 Triticum durum Desf. – Durum wheat

Learco		mod.
Learco	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Lemares		del.
Lemares	IT	(del.)

Levante		mod.
Levante	IT	(mod.)

Lucso		mod.
Lucso	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Maciste		mod.
Maciste	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Malakos		mod.
Malakos	IT 60 1263 1427	(mod.)

Marakas		mod.
Marakas	IT	(mod.)

Nerone		mod.
Nerone	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Normanno		mod.
Normanno	IT	(mod.)

Obelix		mod.
Obelix	IT	(mod.)

Ovidio		mod.
Ovidio	IT	(mod.)

PR22D40		del.
PR22D40	IT	(del.)

Pablo		mod.
Pablo	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Plasmadur		add.
Plasmadur	AT 124	(add.)

Provenzal		mod.
Provenzal	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

RGT Albiozur		del.
RGT Albiozur	IT 1125	(del.)

Radoso		del.
Radoso	IT	(del.)

Rusticano		mod.
Rusticano	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Santur		mod.
Santur	IT	(mod.)

Semolon		mod.
Semolon	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Simeto		mod.
Simeto	IT	(mod.)

Telemaco		mod.
Telemaco	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

106 *Triticum durum* Desf. – Durum wheat

Tresor		mod.
Tresor	IT 60 1263	(mod.)

Trionfo		mod.
Trionfo	IT 1190 1812	(mod.)

Tripudio		mod.
Tripudio	IT 1812	(mod.)

Valbelice		mod.
Valbelice	IT	(mod.)

Valerio		del.
Valerio	IT	(del.)

Varano		mod.
Varano	IT 1675	(mod.)

Vettore		del.
Vettore	IT	(del.)

Vitrico		mod.
Vitrico	IT	(mod.)

107 *Triticum spelta* L. – Spelt wheat

Benedetto		mod.
Benedetto	IT 1675	(mod.)

Giuseppe		mod.
Giuseppe	IT 1334	(mod.)

108 *Zea mays* L. (partim) – Maize

Activo		add.
Activo	AT 20	(add.)

Agrister		del.
Agrister	IT 1242	(del.)

Agro Sana		mod.
Agro Sana	AT 618	(add.)
Agro Sana	NL 1085	(mod.)
Agro Sana	DE 105	

Agrolino		add.
Agrolino	DK 28	(add.)

Agrolupo		add.
Agrolupo	DE 105	(add.)

Alpedro		add.
Alpedro	AT 20	(add.)

Amarone		add.
Amarone	DE 105	(add.)

Amatino		add.
Amatino	DE 105	(add.)

Amman		del.
Amman	IT	(del.)

Anjou 297		del.
Anjou 297	CZ 1136	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Antiss		del.
Antiss	IT 1243	(del.)

Apulio		add.
Apulio	AT 20	(add.)

Arcadio		mod.
Arcadio	AT 20	(add.)
Arcadio	RO 2165	
Arcadio	CZ 414	
Arcadio	SK 60	

Arequipa		add.
Arequipa	AT 939	(add.)

Aroldo		mod.
Aroldo	DE 1328	(add.)
Aroldo	AT 20	

Arosa		del.
Arosa	LT 138	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Aston		add.
Aston	HR 44	(add.)

Atlas		mod.
Atlas	IT	(mod.)

Auxkar		mod.
Auxkar	AT 930	(add.)
Auxkar	FR 45483	

Bakersfield		add.
Bakersfield	LT 106	(add.)

Baracuda		del.
Baracuda	LT 194	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Baymondo		del.
Baymondo	IT	(del.)

Bogota		add.
Bogota	AT 939	(add.)

Bots		mod.
Bots	PL 892	(add.)
Bots	IT 1764	
Bots	SI 587	

Brennus		mod.
Brennus	IT 1125	(mod.)

Brookite		add.
Brookite	HU 108843	(add.)

Buckley		del.
Buckley	IT 837	(del.)

Caixa		del.
Caixa	IT	(del.)

Cantabris		del.
Cantabris	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Capsir		mod.
Capsir	IT	(mod.)
Careli		del.
Careli	IT	(del.)
Casadio		add.
Casadio	AT 618	(add.)
Celerina		mod.
Celerina	HU 104164	(add.)
Celerina	BG 22	
Cisko		del.
Cisko	IT	(del.)
Codikart		mod.
Codikart	IT	(mod.)
Codireal		del.
Codireal	IT	(del.)
Codismart		del.
Codismart	IT	(del.)
Codispot		del.
Codispot	IT	(del.)
Corido		del.
Corido	IT	(del.)

Costanza		mod.
Costanza	IT	(mod.)
Costanza	PT 457	

Covadi		del.
Covadi	IT	(del.)

DKC 3144		add.
DKC 3144	DE 7502	(add.)

DKC 4042		add.
DKC 4042	DE 7502	(add.)

DKC3523		del.
DKC3523	IT	(del.)

DKC3623		mod.
DKC3623	IT	(del.)
DKC3623	AT 930	
DKC3623	SK 438	

DKC3937		mod.
DKC3937	AT 930	(add.)
DKC3937	IT 469 / 1166	

DKC4031		mod.
DKC4031	AT 930	(add.)
DKC4031	FR 45483	

DKC4122		del.
DKC4122	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

DKC4212		del.
Toolbox	HU 108843	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

DKC4320		mod.
DKC4320	HU 108843	(add.)
DKC4320	AT 930	
DKC4320	FR 45483	

DKC4539		add.
DKC4539	HU 108843	(add.)

DKC4655		add.
DKC4655	HU 108843	(add.)

DKC4726		mod.
DKC4726	HU 108843	(add.)
DKC4726	SK 438	

DKC5029		add.
DKC5029	HU 108843	(add.)

DKC6216WX		del.
DKC6216WX	IT	(del.)

DKC6724		del.
DKC6724	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

DKC6728		mod.
DKC6728	IT	(mod.)

DKC7211		del.
DKC7211	IT	(del.)

DMS Epos		add.
DMS Epos	LT 221	(add.)
DS0309		del.
DS0309	IT	(del.)
Daridor		del.
Daridor	LT 194	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Dehlia		del.
Dehlia	IT	(del.)
Denny		del.
Denny	IT	(del.)
Denver		add.
Denver	LT 106	(add.)
Dolton		del.
Dolton	IT	(del.)
Drakoner		del.
Drakoner	IT	(del.)
Drasti CS		del.
Drasti CS	IT	(del.)
Drax		mod.
Drax	LT 161	(add.)
Drax	IT 370	

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

ES Armandi		mod.
ES Armandi	IT	(mod.)
ES Armandi	ES 000	

ES Montano		del.
ES Montano	IT	(del.)

ES Skywalker		mod.
ES Skywalker	DE 3501	(mod.) Market extension date=30/04/2024

ES Torquaz		mod.
ES Torquaz	IT	(mod.)

Edenstar		del.
Edenstar	IT	(del.)

Erasmus		mod.
Erasmus	DE 6880	(del.)
Erasmus	SK 219	

Eurokorn		del.
Eurokorn	IT	(del.)

Evidence		add.
Evidence	DE 1323	(add.)

Evoluxxion		add.
Evoluxxion	HU 108843	(add.)

Fanga		add.
Fanga	LT 192	(add.)

Fannie		del.
Fannie	IT	(del.)

Fantom		del.
Fantom	IT	(del.)

Fariana		del.
Fariana	IT	(del.)

Farm CH4		del.
Farm CH4	IT	(del.)

Farmadonis		del.
Farmadonis	IT	(del.)

Farmdent		del.
Farmdent	IT	(del.)

Farmentor		del.
Farmentor	IT	(del.)

Farmerino		mod.
Farmerino	DE 8440	(del.)
Farmerino	IT 272	
Farmerino	NL 787	

Farmikone		mod.
Farmikone	IT 1125	(mod.)

Farminator		del.
Farminator	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Folli		del.
Folli	IT	(del.)
Format		del.
Format	LT 138	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
GDM440		mod.
GDM440	IT	(mod.)
GDM461		mod.
GDM461	IT	(mod.)
GDM571		mod.
GDM571	IT	(mod.)
GDM721		mod.
GDM721	IT	(mod.)
GK Bertalan		add.
GK Bertalan	HU 149567	(add.)
GKT271		del.
GKT271	SK 215	(del.)
GL Patrizia		mod.
GL Patrizia	IT	(mod.)
GW0739		add.
GW0739	BG 60	(add.)
GW1083		add.
GW1083	BG 60	(add.)

GW1092		add.
GW1092	BG 60	(add.)

GW2042		add.
GW2042	BG 60	(add.)

GW2063		add.
GW2063	BG 60	(add.)

GW8361		add.
GW8361	BG 60	(add.)

Gevara		del.
Gevara	IT	(del.)

Gianeri		del.
Gianeri	IT	(del.)

Greystone		mod.
Greystone	DE 3501	(add.)
Greystone	FR S15312	

Hagrid		mod.
Hagrid	LT 161	(add.)
Hagrid	IT 370	

Hawking		del.
Hawking	DE 7502	(del.)

Helen		mod.
Helen	IT	(mod.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Henley		mod.
Henley	BE 842	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Henley	PL 738	
Henley	NL 1009	

Hulk		mod.
Hulk	CZ 533	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

INDEM1012		mod.
INDEM1012	AT 77	(add.)
INDEM1012	IT 53	

ISH618		mod.
ISH618	IT	(mod.)

ISH712		mod.
ISH712	IT	(mod.)

ISH714		mod.
ISH714	IT	(mod.)

ISH715		mod.
ISH715	IT	(mod.)

Ibarama		add.
Ibarama	PL 1273	(add.)

Influence		add.
Influence	HU 108843	(add.)

Informia		del.
Informia	DE 7502	(del.)

Interactis		add.
Interactis	SK 438	(add.)

Jeff		mod.
Jeff	IT 654 1812	(mod.)

Juno		del.
Juno	HU 149293	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Justice		mod.
Justice	LT 165	(add.)
Justice	DK 223	

KWS Adamo		mod.
KWS Adamo	PL 52	(add.)
KWS Adamo	CZ 69	

KWS Adorado		mod.
KWS Adorado	AT 618	(add.)
KWS Adorado	NL 1085	

KWS Anastasio		add.
KWS Anastasio	LT 73	(add.)

KWS Artesio		add.
KWS Artesio	AT 618	(add.)

KWS Arturello		mod.
KWS Arturello	AT 618	(add.)
KWS Arturello	NL 1085	(mod.)
KWS Arturello	DE 105	
KWS Arturello	FR S14995	

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

KWS Berro		add.
KWS Berro	DE 105	(add.)

KWS Iconico		mod.
KWS Iconico	BE 713	(del.)
KWS Iconico	FR S14995	

KWS Kaduro		add.
KWS Kaduro	AT 618	(add.)

KWS Kolendo		add.
KWS Kolendo	PL 52	(add.)

KWS Lupollino		add.
KWS Lupollino	DE 105	(add.)

KWS Norento		add.
KWS Norento	PL 52	(add.)

KWS Pluvio		add.
KWS Pluvio	PL 52	(add.)

KWS Portabello		add.
KWS Portabello	DK 28	(add.)

KWS Reo		add.
KWS Reo	DK 28	(add.)

KWS Seferino		del.
KWS Seferino	IT 264	(del.)

KWS Smaragd		mod.
KWS Smaragd	HU 149293	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
KWS Smaragd	AT 618	
KWS Smaragd	BG 16	
KWS Smaragd	RO 2032	
KWS Smaragd	SK 221	
KWS Smaragd	HR 737	

KWS Temisto		mod.
KWS Temisto	PL 52	(add.)
KWS Temisto	CZ 69	

KWS Vocaliso		add.
KWS Vocaliso	AT 618	(add.)

KWS Zimo		add.
KWS Zimo	DK 28	(add.)

KWSEK 544		add.
KWSEK 544	DE 105	(add.) Component Variety=Yes

Kamil		mod.
Kamil	IT 1787	(mod.)

Kanela		mod.
Kanela	HU 108843	(add.)
Kanela	SK 438	

Karate		mod.
Karate	IT 1787	(mod.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Kaseri CS		mod.
Kaseri CS	IT	(mod.)
Kaseri CS	SK 500	

Katone		del.
Katone	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Kayras		del.
Kayras	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Keops		mod.
Keops	BE 713	(del.)
Keops	DE 105	

Kermess		del.
Kermess	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Kilowatt		del.
Kilowatt	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Kimera		del.
Kimera	IT	(del.)

Kinemas		mod.
Kinemas	HU 149293	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Kinemas	RO 2032	

Kingstone		mod.
Kingstone	PL 1273	(add.)
Kingstone	IT 1847	

Kingstone	FR S15312	
Kingstone	AT 772	

Klaxon		mod.
Klaxon	IT 1787	(mod.)

Klimt		mod.
Klimt	IT 1787	(mod.)

Kneja 577		add.
Kneja 577	BG 19	(add.)

Kneja 581		add.
Kneja 581	BG 19	(add.)

Komedi		del.
Komedi	IT	(del.)

Konsens		del.
Konsens	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Kraken		mod.
Kraken	LT 161	(add.)
Kraken	IT 370	

Kumin		mod.
Kumin	IT 1787	(mod.)

LG 31215		add.
LG 31215	DE 1323	(add.)

LG 31304		add.
LG 31304	DE 1323	(add.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

LG 33.30		del.
LG 33.30	HU 132938	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

LG30525		del.
LG30525	IT 837	(del.)

LG30595		del.
LG30595	IT 837	(del.)

LG30703		del.
LG30703	IT 837	(del.)

LG31160		mod.
LG31160	SE 159	(add.)
LG31160	NL 1009	

LG31401		del.
LG31401	IT 837	(del.)

LICA29S17		del.
LICA29S17	IT	(del.)

LID1244C		add.
LID1244C	PL 1273	(add.)

LID2155C		add.
LID2155C	PL 1273	(add.)

LID2288C		add.
LID2288C	PL 1273	(add.)
LID2288C	SK 858	(add.)

LID4040C		mod.
LID4040C	HU 104164	(add.)
LID4040C	CZ 1684	
LID4040C	IT 1171	

LSM0811		mod.
LSM0811	IT	(mod.)

Laperi CS		del.
Laperi CS	IT	(del.)

Lenny		del.
Lenny	IT	(del.)

Lili		del.
Lili	LT 187	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Longstone		mod.
Longstone	LT 106	(add.)
Longstone	CZ 1684	

Luz		add.
Luz	LT 138	(add.)

MAS 26B		mod.
MAS 26B	IT	(mod.)

MAS 66C		mod.
MAS 66C	IT	(del.)
MAS 66C	PT 120	

MAS 68A		del.
MAS 68A	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

MAS 73E		mod.
MAS 73E	IT	(mod.)

Madiba		mod.
Madiba	IT 1125	(mod.)

Madisson		del.
Madisson	IT	(del.)

Magepi CS		del.
Magepi CS	IT	(del.)

Marabu		del.
Marabu	LT 194	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Maracana		del.
Maracana	IT	(del.)

Marteli		mod.
Marteli	IT	(mod.)

Mexicana		mod.
Mexicana	IT	(mod.)

Milanno		mod.
Milanno	CZ 1065	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Moguur		del.
Moguur	IT	(del.)

Mondehn		del.
Mondehn	IT	(del.)

Morasso		del.
Morasso	IT	(del.)

Morendo		add.
Morendo	PL 52	(add.)

Morinho		del.
Morinho	IT	(del.)

Mv 224		add.
Mv 224	HU 143257	(add.)

NK Gitago		del.
NK Gitago	BE 881	(del.)

Narvik		del.
Narvik	IT	(del.)

Nerissa		del.
Nerissa	CZ 711	(del.)

Noah		del.
Noah	IT 1243	(del.)

Nostrano Peroni SF		add.
Nostrano Peroni SF	IT	(add.)

Novistar		del.
Novistar	IT	(del.)

OS3722		add.
OS3722	HR 67	(add.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

OS4777		add.
OS4777	HR 67	(add.)

OS5522		add.
OS5522	HR 67	(add.)

Omega VSM		del.
Omega VSM	IT	(del.)

Opferando		add.
Opferando	DK 28	(add.)

Ovni		del.
Ovni	IT	(del.)

P 83224		add.
P 83224	DE 514	(add.)

P0216		mod.
P0216	IT	(mod.)
P0216	HR 214	
P0216	HU 166210	

P0621		mod.
P0621	IT	(del.)
P0621	SK 450	

P0660		del.
P0660	IT	(del.)

P0722		mod.
P0722	IT	(del.)
P0722	PT 457	

P1007		del.
P1007	IT	(del.)
P1114E		del.
P1114E	IT	(del.)
P1208		del.
P1208	IT	(del.)
P1211		del.
P1211	IT	(del.)
P1293W		mod.
P1293W	IT 53	(mod.)
P1409		del.
P1409	IT	(del.)
P1431W		del.
P1431W	IT	(del.)
P1503		del.
P1503	IT	(del.)
P1526		del.
P1526	IT	(del.)
P1535		mod.
P1535	IT	(mod.)
P1649		del.
P1649	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

P1728		del.
P1728	IT	(del.)
P1733		del.
P1733	IT	(del.)
P1817		mod.
P1817	IT	(mod.)
P7737		mod.
P7737	AT 77	(add.)
P7737	IT 53	
P7818		mod.
P7818	PL 823	(add.)
P7818	SK 450	
P7818	AT 77	
P7818	NL 1099	
P8012		del.
P8012	IT	(del.)
P8475		mod.
P8475	AT 77	(add.)
P8475	IT 53	
P8517		mod.
P8517	AT 77	(add.)
P8517	IT 53	
P8523		mod.
P8523	IT	(mod.)
P8523	AT 77	

P8567		mod.
P8567	IT	(mod.)
P8567	AT 77	
P8567	SI 481	
P8567	HR 214	

P8573		mod.
P8573	AT 77	(add.)
P8573	IT 53	

P8589		mod.
P8589	IT	(mod.)

P8660		mod.
P8660	PL 823	(add.)
P8660	IT 53	

P9027		mod.
P9027	IT	(mod.)
P9027	PL 823	
P9027	HR 214	
P9027	AT 77	
P9027	DE 1357	
P9027	SI 481	

P9255		mod.
P9255	PL 823	(add.)
P9255	IT 53	

P9308		del.
P9308	IT	(del.)

P9398		mod.
P9398	PL 823	(add.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

P9398	HU 100265	
P9398	IT 53	

P9501		del.
P9501	IT	(del.)

P9528		del.
P9528	IT	(del.)

P9639		mod.
P9639	PL 823	(add.)
P9639	IT 53	
P9639	AT 77	

P9721		del.
P9721	HU 166210	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

P9889WX		add.
P9889WX	AT 77	(add.)

P9975		mod.
P9975	HU 100265	(add.)
P9975	IT 53	

PR31K18		del.
PR31K18	IT	(del.)

PR32D99		mod.
PR32D99	IT	(del.)
PR32D99	PT 457	

PR34G13		mod.
PR34G13	IT	(mod.)
PR34G13	FR 10858	

PR35Y65		del.
PR35Y65	IT	(del.)

PR36Y03		mod.
PR36Y03	IT	(mod.)

PR38A24		mod.
PR38A24	HU 149204	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
PR38A24	HR 214	

PR39F58		mod.
PR39F58	DE 8346	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

Pandress		del.
Pandress	IT	(del.)

Paxxifonne		mod.
Paxxifonne	IT 1125	(mod.)
Paxxifonne	SK 520	

Paykan		add.
Paykan	AT 930	(add.)

Pegoro		mod.
Pegoro	SI 625	(del.)
Pegoro	SK 60	
Pegoro	RO 2165	

Picture		del.
Picture	DK 223	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Picuris		add.
Picuris	IT 469 1166	(add.)

Platform		mod.
Platform	LT 106	(add.)
Platform	SI 747	

Plutarco VSM		del.
Plutarco VSM	IT	(del.)

Polentin		del.
Polentin	SI 625	(del.)

Prexxtton		add.
Prexxtton	AT 930	(add.)

Prophet		mod.
Prophet	LT 138	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Prophet	SK 571	

Quirinal		mod.
Quirinal	IT	(mod.)

RGT Alonixx		add.
RGT Alonixx	LT 86	(add.)

RGT Cedexx		mod.
RGT Cedexx	PL 631	(add.)
RGT Cedexx	FR S13804	
RGT Cedexx	IT 1125	

RGT Deixxel		mod.
RGT Deixxel	PL 631	(add.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

RGT Deixxel	IT 1125	
RGT Deixxel	CZ 1065	

RGT Jutexx Duo		add.
RGT Jutexx Duo	DE 7352	(add.)

RGT Kepoxx		add.
RGT Kepoxx	LT 86	(add.)

RGT Lanxx		mod.
RGT Lanxx	IT 1125	(mod.)
RGT Lanxx	PL 631	(add.)
RGT Lanxx	CZ 1065	

RGT Oddaxx		add.
RGT Oddaxx	DE 7352	(add.)

RGT Veluxxo		mod.
RGT Veluxxo	PL 631	(add.)
RGT Veluxxo	IT 1125	

RK14		del.
RK14	IT	(del.)

RK25		del.
RK25	IT	(del.)

RK30		del.
RK30	IT	(del.)

RK36		del.
RK36	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Ranulo		add.
Ranulo	PL 52	(add.)

Readi		del.
Readi	IT	(del.)

Redel		mod.
Redel	IT	(mod.)

Richard KWS		del.
Richard KWS	BE 713	(del.)

Rivoxx		mod.
Rivoxx	CZ 1065	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Roano		mod.
Roano	IT	(mod.)

Rockhampton		mod.
Rockhampton	AT 939	(add.)
Rockhampton	IT 1847	

SM Adego		add.
SM Adego	PL 618	(add.)

SM Fagun		add.
SM Fagun	PL 618	(add.)

SM Gracja		add.
SM Gracja	LT 50	(add.)

SM Zadra		add.
SM Zadra	PL 618	(add.)

SM Zerka		add.
SM Zerka	PL 618	(add.)

SNH8606		mod.
SNH8606	IT	(mod.)

SNH9503		mod.
SNH9503	IT	(mod.)

SNH9609		mod.
SNH9609	IT	(mod.)

SNH9613		mod.
SNH9613	IT	(mod.)

SNH9711		mod.
SNH9711	IT	(mod.)

SY Abelardo		mod.
SY Abelardo	DE 6880	(del.)
SY Abelardo	AT 543	
SY Abelardo	NL 1029	
SY Abelardo	LT 154	
SY Abelardo	DK 187	

SY Afinity		mod.
SY Afinity	IT	(del.)
SY Afinity	HR 102	

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

SY Aladium		del.
SY Aladium	IT	(del.)

SY Astrella		mod.
SY Astrella	NL 1029	(mod.)
SY Astrella	IT 1164	

SY Batanga		del.
SY Batanga	IT	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2025

SY Boost		mod.
SY Boost	DE 6880	(del.)
SY Boost	IT 1164	
SY Boost	FR S14123	

SY Bradford		mod.
SY Bradford	DE 8145	(del.)
SY Bradford	CZ 711	

SY Competo		del.
SY Competo	IT	(del.)

SY Deciso		del.
SY Deciso	IT	(del.)

SY Defender		del.
SY Defender	IT	(del.)

SY Easytop		del.
SY Easytop	IT	(del.)

SY Energetic		mod.
SY Energetic	BE 881	(del.)

SY Energetic	FR S14123	
SY Energetic	NL 1029	

SY Fanfara		mod.
SY Fanfara	PL 874	(add.)
SY Fanfara	IT 1164	

SY Granaris		mod.
SY Granaris	AT 543	(add.)
SY Granaris	IT 1164	

SY Impulse		mod.
SY Impulse	DE 6880	(del.)
SY Impulse	CZ 711	
SY Impulse	IT 1164	
SY Impulse	FR S14123	

SY Opale		mod.
SY Opale	NL 1029	(mod.)
SY Opale	IT 1164	

SY Pracht		del.
SY Pracht	CZ 711	(del.)

SY Radioso		del.
SY Radioso	IT	(del.)

SY Remco		add.
SY Remco	DE 8145	(add.)

SY Stupendo		del.
SY Stupendo	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

SY Sylveo		del.
SY Sylveo	IT	(del.)

SY Symbio		del.
SY Symbio	IT	(del.)

Sagunto		mod.
Sagunto	IT	(mod.)

Scolari		mod.
Scolari	LT 106	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Scolari	IT 345	

Serafino		add.
Serafino	PL 264	(add.)

Severeen		mod.
Severeen	BE 842	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Severeen	NL 1009	
Severeen	DE 275	

Singular		add.
Singular	HR 67	(add.)

Sobrico		mod.
Sobrico	IT 1125	(mod.)

Spektro		add.
Spektro	PL 264	(add.)

Suardino		mod.
Suardino	IT	(mod.)

Sulli		del.
Sulli	IT	(del.)

Sultixx		del.
Sultixx	IT	(del.)

Tapio		del.
Tapio	HU 149293	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Taranis		mod.
Taranis	IT	(mod.)

Tarsus		del.
Tarsus	IT	(del.)

Thor		del.
Thor	LT 194	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Toronto		del.
Toronto	IT	(del.)

Traiano VSM		mod.
Traiano VSM	IT	(mod.)

Traminga		mod.
Traminga	LT 192	(add.)
Traminga	IT 440	

Trinidad		del.
Trinidad	IT	(del.)

108 Zea mays L. (partim) – Maize

Truva		mod.
Truva	IT	(mod.)
Ulisse VSM		mod.
Ulisse VSM	IT 68 1812	(mod.)
Vialli		del.
Vialli	IT	(del.)
Voltige Duo		add.
Voltige Duo	HU 108227	(add.)
Willy		del.
Willy	IT	(del.)
Winterstone		mod.
Winterstone	AT 939	(add.)
Winterstone	PL 1273	(add.)
Winterstone	CZ 1684	
Yukon		mod.
Yukon	LT 165	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Yukon	DK 223	

V. Potatoes

109 *Solanum tuberosum* L. – Potato

Agrie baltie		del.
Agrie baltie	LV 177	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026

Alcedo		add.
Alcedo	DE 3052	(add.)

Angelina		add.
Angelina	DE 7485	(add.)

Atlantic		add.
Atlantic	PL 1028 1262	(add.)

Auris		add.
Auris	DE 3941	(add.)

Baltic Blue		add.
Baltic Blue	DE 3052	(add.)

Batory		add.
Batory	PL 308	(add.)

Begonia		add.
Begonia	PL 617	(add.)

Benjamin		add.
Benjamin	AT 21	(add.)

Berist		add.
Berist	DE 55	(add.)

Bianchidea		mod.
Bianchidea	IT	(del.)
Bianchidea	LU 16003	

109 Solanum tuberosum L. – Potato

Coco		add.
Coco	DE 2352	(add.)
Colomba		mod.
Colomba	PL 599	(add.)
Colomba	NL 429	
Cordula		add.
Cordula	DE 7485	(add.)
Curtis		add.
Curtis	DE 3941	(add.)
Golden Queen		mod.
Golden Queen	IT	(del.)
Golden Queen	LU 16004	
Hajduk		add.
Hajduk	PL 617	(add.)
Hanna		del.
Hanna	IT	(del.)
Hannibal		mod.
Hannibal	DK 233	(del.)
Hannibal	FR S14823	
Hestia		add.
Hestia	PL 308	(add.)
Ina		add.
Ina	DE 7485	(add.)

Jola		add.
Jola	DE 3052	(add.)

Joris		add.
Joris	DE 3941	(add.)

KIS Krka		mod.
KIS Krka	SI	(mod.)

KIS Vipava		mod.
KIS Vipava	SI	(mod.)

Kerren		add.
Kerren	DE 7485	(add.)

Kimi		add.
Kimi	DE 3052	(add.)

Kresnik		mod.
Kresnik	SI	(mod.)

Lisbeth		add.
Lisbeth	AT 21	(add.)

Marabou		add.
Marabou	DE 3052	(add.)

Melia		add.
Melia	DE 10763	(add.)

Milenia		add.
Milenia	DE 7485	(add.)

109 Solanum tuberosum L. – Potato

Oceania		del.
Oceania	IT	(del.)
Olga		add.
Olga	PL 617	(add.)
Riccione di Napoli		mod.
Riccione di Napoli	IT	(mod.) Conservation Variety=Yes Region of Origin=Campania
Skywalker		add.
Skywalker	BE 201	(add.)
Smilla		add.
Smilla	DE 2352	(add.)
Sniegoga		del.
Sniegoga	LV 177	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Theda		add.
Theda	DE 7485	(add.)
Tuluza		add.
Tuluza	PL 617	(add.)
Wanda		add.
Wanda	DE 2352	(add.)
Zorba		mod.
Zorba	DE 11099	(mod.)
Zorba	IT 520	
Zorba	ES 282	



**GEMEINSAMER SORTENKATALOG
für Gemüsearten – Ergänzung H 2024/4**

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/2700)

1. Die vorliegende Ergänzung der konsolidierten Fassung des Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalogs für Gemüsearten ⁽¹⁾ enthält die Änderungen, die durch die bei der Kommission eingegangenen Mitteilungen der Mitgliedstaaten notwendig geworden sind.
2. Die vorliegende Ergänzung folgt in ihrer Einteilung der konsolidierten Fassung. Es kann auf die Erläuterungen zu der genannten Ausgabe Bezug genommen werden.
3. Diese Ergänzung berücksichtigt die Mitteilungen, die zwischen dem 1.3.2024 und dem 31.3.2024 eingegangen sind.
4. Die Änderungen gegenüber der konsolidierten Fassung sind wie folgt gekennzeichnet:
 - (add.): Es handelt sich um eine neue Position im Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog.
 - (mod.): Es handelt sich um eine Änderung an einer schon enthaltenen Position. Die Angaben zu dieser Position in der vorliegenden Ergänzung ersetzen die in der konsolidierten Fassung hierzu enthaltenen Angaben.
 - (del.): Die genannte Position wird mit allen Angaben aus dem Gemeinsamen Sortenkatalog gestrichen.
5. Die vorliegende Ergänzung betrifft die notifizierten Sorten, für die die Bestimmungen des Artikels 16 Absatz 1 der Richtlinie 2002/55/EG des Rates ⁽²⁾ gelten.
6. Wenn die Nummer des Verantwortlichen für die Erhaltungszüchtung nicht in der konsolidierten Fassung erscheint, können sein Name und seine Anschrift bei der Stelle ermittelt werden, die in der Liste für den betreffenden Mitgliedstaat bzw. EFTA-Staat angegeben ist.

⁽¹⁾ Konsolidierte Fassung vom 22. Dezember 2022: https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_propagation_material/plant_variety_catalogues_databases_en

⁽²⁾ ABl. L 193 vom 20.7.2002, S. 33.

Inhalt

	Seite
1.2 <i>Allium cepa</i> L. >> Cepa Group – Onion, Echalion	3
3 <i>Allium porrum</i> L. – Leek	3
4 <i>Allium sativum</i> L. – Garlic	3
8 <i>Asparagus officinalis</i> L. – Asparagus	4
9.1 <i>Beta vulgaris</i> L. >> Garden beet Group (beetroot, including Cheltenham beet)	4
10.1 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Kale Group	4
10.2 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Cauliflower Group	5
10.3 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Broccoli Group (calabrese type and sprouting type)	5
10.4 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Brussels sprouts Group	6
10.5 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Savoy cabbage	6
10.6 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Capitata Group – White cabbage	6
10.8 <i>Brassica oleracea</i> L. >> Kohlrabi Group	7
11.1 <i>Brassica rapa</i> L. >> Chinese cabbage Group	7
11.2 <i>Brassica rapa</i> L. >> Vegetable turnip Group	7
12 <i>Capsicum annuum</i> L. – Chili, Pepper	7
13.2 <i>Cichorium endivia</i> L. >> Plain-leaved endive	9
15 <i>Citrullus lanatus</i> (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai – Watermelon	9
16 <i>Cucumis melo</i> L. – Melon	9
17.1 <i>Cucumis sativus</i> L. >> Cucumber Group	10
17.2 <i>Cucumis sativus</i> L. >> Gherkin Group	11
19 <i>Cucurbita pepo</i> L. – Marrow / Courgette	12
21.1 <i>Daucus carota</i> L. >> Carrot	12
22 <i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> Miller – Fennel - Azoricum Group	13
23 <i>Lactuca sativa</i> L. – Lettuce	13
24 <i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i> Mill. – Tomato	16
25 <i>Petroselinum crispum</i> (Mill.) Nyman ex A. W. Hill – Leaf parsley and root parsley Group	21
26 <i>Phaseolus coccineus</i> L. – Runner bean	21
27.1 <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L. >> Dwarf French bean Group	21
27.2 <i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L. >> Climbing French bean Group	22
28.1 <i>Pisum sativum</i> L. (partim) >> Wrinkled pea Group	22
29.1 <i>Raphanus sativus</i> L. >> Radish Group	23
29.2 <i>Raphanus sativus</i> L. >> Black radish Group	23
33 <i>Spinacia oleracea</i> L. – Spinach	23
36.1 <i>Zea mays</i> L. (partim) >> Sweet corn Group	24
37.2 <i>Cucurbita maxima</i> Duch. x <i>C. moschata</i> Duch.	25

1.2 *Allium cepa* L. >> Ceba Group – Onion, Echalion

Bomo		mod.
Bomo	SE 136 a	(mod.)

Decko		mod.
Decko	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Redcamaro		add.
Redcamaro	NL 105 a	(add.)

Starton		add.
Starton	NL 79 a	(add.)

Tacoma		add.
Tacoma	NL 8 a	(add.)

3 *Allium porrum* L. – Leek

Dana		mod.
Dana	SE 136 a	(mod.)

Fanton		add.
Fanton	NL 60 a	(add.)

Freezo		mod.
Freezo	DE 4676 a	(mod.)

4 *Allium sativum* L. – Garlic

Kente		add.
Kente	LV 215 a	(add.) Vegetative Propagation=Yes

8 *Asparagus officinalis* L. – Asparagus

Ariane		mod.
Ariane	DE 4821 a	(mod.)
Mondeo		mod.
Mondeo	DE 4821 a	(mod.)
Rakete		add.
Rakete	DE 7627 a	(add.)
Ramada		del.
Ramada	DE 265 a	(del.)

9.1 *Beta vulgaris* L. >> Garden beet Group (beetroot, including Cheltenham beet)

Vesna		mod.
Vesna	SI 232 a	(mod.)
Červená kulatá		mod.
Červená kulatá	CZ 256 1612 1495 1187 a	(add.)
Cervena kulata	SK 250 a	
Czerwona Kula 2	PL 000 a	
Detroit 2	HU 108436 a	
Detroit 2, Tonda a globo 2 Palla rossa 2 Detroit dark red 2	IT 125 b	
Detroit 2, Noire ronde hâtive 2 Globe 2 De Detroit améliorée 2	FR 000 b	
Detroit 2, Kogel 2	NL 000 b	
Detroit 2	SI 232 a	
Rote Kugel 2	DE 8863 a	

10.1 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Kale Group

Altmärker Braunkohl		add.
Altmärker Braunkohl	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

10.2 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Cauliflower Group

Apoteosi		mod.
Apoteosi	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Cardex		add.
Cardex	NL 78a b	(add.)

Jakku		mod.
Jakku	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Moncayo		mod.
Moncayo	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Novillas		mod.
Novillas	NL 8 a	(mod.)

Starline		mod.
Starline	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Subasio		add.
Subasio	NL 78a a	(add.)

Suntory		mod.
Suntory	NL 26 a	(mod.)

10.3 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Broccoli Group (calabrese type and sprouting type)

Floris		add.
Floris	DE 4676 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

10.4 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Brussels sprouts Group

Rokero		add.
Rokero	DE 4676 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

10.5 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Savoy cabbage

Alabama		add.
Alabama	NL 79 a	(add.)

Dojran		add.
Dojran	NL 79 a	(add.)

Ohrid		add.
Ohrid	NL 79 a	(add.)

Stelvio		add.
Stelvio	NL 79 a	(add.)

10.6 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Capitata Group – White cabbage

Amager Hög Hg		mod.
Amager Hög Hg	SE 136 a	(mod.)

Damianos		del.
Damianos	PL 1095 a	(del.)

Mediouma		mod.
Mediouma	NL 108 b	(mod.)

Twistma		mod.
Twistma	NL 108 b	(mod.)

10.8 *Brassica oleracea* L. >> Kohlrabi Group

Adriana		mod.
Adriana	DE 920 a	(mod.)

Blusta		mod.
Blusta	DE 920 a	(mod.)

11.1 *Brassica rapa* L. >> Chinese cabbage Group

Darek		del.
Darek	CZ 719 a	(del.)

Manoko		mod.
Manoko	CZ 278 a	(del.)
Manoko	NL 8 b	

11.2 *Brassica rapa* L. >> Vegetable turnip Group

Kranjska Podolgovata		mod.
Kranjska Podolgovata	SI a	(mod.)

12 *Capsicum annuum* L. – Chili, Pepper

Amaryl		mod.
Amaryl	CZ 472 a	(del.)
Amaryl	SK 697 a	

Atabal		add.
Atabal	NL 108 a	(add.)

Crispystar		mod.
Crispystar	NL 26 a	(mod.)

12 Capsicum annuum L. – Chili, Pepper

Dunbar		add.
Dunbar	NL 78a a	(add.)
Gustina		add.
Gustina	LT 32 a	(add.)
Irina		mod.
Irina	SI 232 a	(mod.)
Kaliope		del.
Kaliope	CZ 1179 a	(del.)
Karolina		del.
Karolina	CZ 196 a	(del.)
Lucia		add.
Lucia	DE 4676 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Malevi		mod.
Malevi	NL 26 a	(mod.)
Masami		add.
Masami	NL 79 a	(add.)
Polepos		add.
Polepos	NL 108 a	(add.)
Publio		add.
Publio	NL 26 a	(add.)
SV6947PB		add.
SV6947PB	NL 78a a	(add.)

12 *Capsicum annuum* L. – Chili, Pepper

Sitrunate		mod.
Sitrunate	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Yoyoma		add.
Yoyoma	AT 88 a	(add.)

13.2 *Cichorium endivia* L. >> Plain-leaved endive

Mascha		add.
Mascha	DE 4676 a	(add.)

15 *Citrullus lanatus* (Thunb.) Matsum. et Nakai – Watermelon

Balos		mod.
Balos	NL 108 a	(mod.)

Corellana		mod.
Corellana	NL 108 a	(mod.)

Elite Slice		mod.
Elite Slice	NL 60 a	(mod.)

16 *Cucumis melo* L. – Melon

Barroso		mod.
Barroso	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Bodelice		mod.
Bodelice	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Nocibe		mod.
Nocibe	NL 26 a	(mod.)

Podengo		mod.
Podengo	NL 26 a	(mod.)

16 Cucumis melo L. – Melon

Promoteo		mod.
Promoteo	NL 26 a	(mod.)
Quintero		mod.
Quintero	NL 60 a	(mod.)
Serafin		mod.
Serafin	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Tagete		mod.
Tagete	NL 60 a	(mod.)
Tiare 100		mod.
Tiare 100	NL 60 a	(mod.)
Tiare 200		mod.
Tiare 200	NL 60 a	(mod.)

17.1 Cucumis sativus L. >> Cucumber Group

Abysal		add.
Abysal	NL 108 a	(add.)
Antje		add.
Antje	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Bluesjake		add.
Bluesjake	NL 108 a	(add.)
Carapaz		add.
Carapaz	NL 108 a	(add.)

17.1 Cucumis sativus L. >> Cucumber Group

Estelar		add.
Estelar	NL 78a a	(add.)

Seculare		add.
Seculare	NL 60 a	(add.)

Serein		add.
Serein	NL 60 a	(add.)

Skybox		add.
Skybox	NL 60 a	(add.)

Skylit		add.
Skylit	NL 108 a	(add.)

Tamega		mod.
Tamega	NL 8 a	(mod.)

Vortice		add.
Vortice	NL 108 a	(add.)

17.2 Cucumis sativus L. >> Gherkin Group

Froome		mod.
Froome	NL 60 a	(mod.)

Heras		mod.
Heras	NL 60 a	(mod.)

Kitto		add.
Kitto	NL 105 a	(add.)

Ninja		add.
Ninja	NL 105 a	(add.)

17.2 *Cucumis sativus* L. >> Gherkin Group

Piccolo Di Parigi		mod.
Piccolo Di Parigi, Cornichon de Paris	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Cornichon de Paris	ES 31 b	
Piccolo verde di Parigi, Wisconsin	IT 000 b	
Vert petit de Paris	LU 000	

19 *Cucurbita pepo* L. – Marrow / Courgette

Cauldron		add.
Cauldron	NL 170 a	(add.)

GL Albert		add.
GL Albert	AT 13 b	(add.)

GL Franz		add.
GL Franz	AT 13 b	(add.)

GL Frodo		add.
GL Frodo	AT 13 b	(add.)

GL Josef		add.
GL Josef	AT 13 b	(add.)

GL Olaf		add.
GL Olaf	AT 13 b	(add.)

Pablo		add.
Pablo	AT 20 b	(add.)

21.1 *Daucus carota* L. >> Carrot

Mirella		add.
Mirella	AT 88 a	(add.)

21.1 Daucus carota L. >> Carrot

Rockfire		add.
Rockfire	NL 60 a	(add.)

Solveig		add.
Solveig	AT 88 a	(add.)

22 Foeniculum vulgare Miller – Fennel - Azoricum Group

Sannio		mod.
Sannio	NL 8 a	(mod.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Alburnus		add.
Alburnus	NL 26 a	(add.)

Antanas		add.
Antanas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Antiope		add.
Antiope	NL 108 a	(add.)

Aruanas		add.
Aruanas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Azulita		mod.
Azulita	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Azzedine		mod.
Azzedine	NL 108 a	(mod.)

Balbinas		add.
Balbinas	NL 108 a	(add.)

23 Lactuca sativa L. – Lettuce

Belokranjska solata		mod.
Belokranjska solata	SI b	(mod.) Conservation Variety=Yes Region of Origin=Slovenia
Besma		add.
Besma	NL 108 a	(add.)
Carayuma		mod.
Carayuma	NL 26 a	(mod.)
Exwink		mod.
Exwink	NL 108 a	(mod.)
Fioris		mod.
Fioris	NL 8 a	(mod.)
Fontinas		add.
Fontinas	NL 108 a	(add.)
Giacomo		mod.
Giacomo	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Ice Cartago		add.
Ice Cartago	NL 79 a	(add.)
Ice Mar		add.
Ice Mar	NL 79 a	(add.)
Ice Meralda		add.
Ice Meralda	NL 79 a	(add.)
Ice Pascal		add.
Ice Pascal	NL 79 a	(add.)

Ice Willow		add.
Ice Willow	NL 79 a	(add.)
Kantai		mod.
Kantai	NL 108 a	(mod.)
Kilnsey		mod.
Kilnsey	NL 26 a	(mod.)
Latoya		add.
Latoya	NL 26 a	(add.)
Lazarita		mod.
Lazarita	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Lotta		add.
Lotta	DE 4676 a	(add.)
Mona		mod.
Mona	CZ 56 a	(del.)
Mona	DE 8840 a	
Moonice		mod.
Moonice	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Nautinas		add.
Nautinas	NL 108 a	(add.)
Pandrera		mod.
Pandrera	NL 26 a	(mod.)
Plenty		del.
Plenty	CZ 320 a	(del.)

23 *Lactuca sativa* L. – Lettuce

Portago		mod.
Portago	NL 108 a	(mod.)

Raška		mod.
Raška	SI 232 a	(mod.)

Sendanas		add.
Sendanas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Sulfita		mod.
Sulfita	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Thunderinas		add.
Thunderinas	NL 108 a	(add.)

Totalai		mod.
Totalai	NL 108 a	(mod.)

Vittaly		add.
Vittaly	AT 88 a	(add.)

Wendel		del.
Wendel	CZ 505 a	(del.)

Xapia		mod.
Xapia	NL 108 a	(mod.)

24 *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. – Tomato

Allurea		add.
Allurea	CZ 1630 a	(add.)

Almaindeto		add.
Almaindeto	BG 3 b	(add.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Aspen		del.
Aspen	DE 3901 a	(del.)
Attrio		add.
Attrio	NL 60 a	(add.)
Batorange		add.
Batorange	NL 26 a	(add.)
Black Beauty		add.
Black Beauty	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Black Plum		mod.
Black Plum	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Black Plum	AT 88 b	Amateur Variety=Yes
Blicello		add.
Blicello	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Clibana		mod.
Clibana	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Damerino		mod.
Damerino	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Dominet		add.
Dominet	NL 79 a	(add.)
Doppia		mod.
Doppia	NL 5 a	(mod.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Estoril		add.
Estoril	NL 108 a	(add.)
Eyfelle		add.
Eyfelle	NL 79 a	(add.)
Fantix		mod.
Fantix	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Fellini		add.
Fellini	CZ 1463 a	(add.)
Gott der Liebe		add.
Gott der Liebe	DE 9342 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Gustelle		add.
Gustelle	NL 79 a	(add.)
Khaleesi		add.
Khaleesi	NL 79 a	(add.)
Kumbulu		add.
Kumbulu	NL 108 a	(add.)
Limetto		mod.
Limetto	DE 8863 a	(mod.) Market extension date=30/06/2026
Marzano P 4		add.
Marzano P 4	CZ 1187 a	(add.)
Mazingher		add.
Mazingher	NL 78a a	(add.)

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Midelyce		add.
Midelyce	NL 78a a	(add.)
Nightshade		add.
Nightshade	CZ 1275 a	(add.)
Piccodona		add.
Piccodona	NL 79 a	(add.)
Pioppi		add.
Pioppi	CZ 1630 a	(add.)
Porcelain		mod.
Porcelain	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Prigobello		add.
Prigobello	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Primabella		add.
Primabella	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Prospano		add.
Prospano	NL 108 a	(add.)
Proticia		add.
Proticia	NL 108 a	(add.)
Retillo		add.
Retillo	DE 8847 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

24 Lycopersicon esculentum Mill. – Tomato

Robinio		add.
Robinio	BG 141 b	(add.)

Ronvine		mod.
Ronvine	NL 60 a	(mod.)

SS 1427		add.
SS 1427	CZ 1553 a	(add.)

SVTM9000		add.
SVTM9000	NL 78a a	(add.)

Shervina		mod.
Shervina	NL 79 a	(mod.)

Snackion		add.
Snackion	NL 60 a	(add.)

Summer		add.
Summer	BG 35 b	(add.)

Sunrosa		add.
Sunrosa	CZ 1552 a	(add.)

Sunstream Keys		add.
Sunstream Keys	NL 26 a	(add.)

Sunstream Lau		add.
Sunstream Lau	NL 26 a	(add.)

Tempos		add.
Tempos	BG 16 b	(add.)

24 *Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. – Tomato

Tomamini Red		add.
Tomamini Red	NL 89 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes
Tutti		add.
Tutti	CZ 1630 a	(add.)
Varsity		mod.
Varsity	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Ventema		add.
Ventema	NL 108 a	(add.)
Yellibo		add.
Yellibo	NL 79 a	(add.)

25 *Petroselinum crispum* (Mill.) Nyman ex A. W. Hill – Leaf parsley and root parsley Group

Kinsky		add.
Kinsky	AT 88 a	(add.)
Tamino		mod.
Tamino	NL 26 a	(mod.)

26 *Phaseolus coccineus* L. – Runner bean

Eureka		mod.
Eureka	CZ 682 a	(add.)
Eureka	PL 92 a	

27.1 *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. >> Dwarf French bean Group

Bonita		del.
Bonita	SE 85 a	(del.)

27.1 *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. >> Dwarf French bean Group

Paas Lintorfer Frühe		add.
Paas Lintorfer Frühe	DE 7480 b	(add.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Redemption		mod.
Redemption	NL 79 a	(mod.)

27.2 *Phaseolus vulgaris* L. >> Climbing French bean Group

Jabelski pisanec		mod.
Jabelski pisanec	SI a	(mod.)

Jeruzalemski		mod.
Jeruzalemski	SI a	(mod.)

Kifeljček Justi		mod.
Kifeljček Justi	SI b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Klemen		mod.
Klemen	SI a	(mod.)

Ptujski maslenec		mod.
Ptujski maslenec	SI a	(mod.)

Semenarna 22		mod.
Semenarna 22	SI a	(mod.)

28.1 *Pisum sativum* L. (partim) >> Wrinkled pea Group

Berta		mod.
Berta	DE 232 a	(mod.)

Frigga		mod.
Frigga	DE 11002 a	(mod.)

28.1 *Pisum sativum* L. (partim) >> Wrinkled pea Group

Jumbo		mod.
Jumbo	DE 11002 a	(mod.)
Lochsa		del.
Lochsa	DE 920 a	(del.)
Misty		mod.
Misty	DE 9216 a	(mod.)
Sprinter		mod.
Sprinter	DE 232 a	(mod.)
Sublima		mod.
Sublima	DE 9089 a	(mod.)
Waitaki		del.
Waitaki	DE 232 a	(del.)

29.1 *Raphanus sativus* L. >> Radish Group

Ewka		del.
Ewka	PL 286 a	(del.) Market extension date=30/06/2027

29.2 *Raphanus sativus* L. >> Black radish Group

Münchner Radi Valentin		mod.
Münchner Radi Valentin	DE 9245 b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

33 *Spinacia oleracea* L. – Spinach

Aries		mod.
Aries	NL 60 a	(mod.)
Castula		mod.
Castula	NL 60 a	(mod.)

33 Spinacia oleracea L. – Spinach

DES30177		del.
DES30177	PL 1203 a	(del.)
El Fortunado		mod.
El Fortunado	NL 79 a	(mod.)
El Majestic		mod.
El Majestic	NL 79 a	(mod.)
El Samba		mod.
El Samba	NL 79 a	(mod.)
Fabris		mod.
Fabris	SE 136 a	(mod.)
Peccary		mod.
Peccary	NL 108 a	(mod.)
Pershing		mod.
Pershing	NL 8 a	(mod.)

36.1 Zea mays L. (partim) >> Sweet corn Group

Fragman		add.
Fragman	BG 41 b	(add.)
Kneja sweet 1		add.
Kneja sweet 1	BG 19 a	(add.)
Macaron		add.
Macaron	BG 41 b	(add.)

36.1 Zea mays L. (partim) >> Sweet corn Group

Mezdi		mod.
Mezdi	DE 4676 b	(mod.) Amateur Variety=Yes

Mousse		add.
Mousse	BG 41 b	(add.)

Sherbet		add.
Sherbet	BG 41 b	(add.)

Wim		add.
Wim	HU 249953 b	(add.)

37.2 Cucurbita maxima Duch. x C. moschata Duch.

Security		mod.
Security	DE 8863 a	(mod.) Rootstock=Yes Rootstock Info=CUCUR_MMO



AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 2. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3009)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode	3
2. Eröffnung der Sitzung	3
3. Erklärung der Präsidentschaft	3
4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	4
5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	4
6. Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll	4
7. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll	4
8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	4
9. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
10. Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschlüsse des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	4
11. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll	4
12. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	4

Inhalt	Seite
13. Arbeitsplan	4
14. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (Aussprache)	9
15. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (kurze Darstellung)	22
16. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (kurze Darstellung)	30
17. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (kurze Darstellung)	34
18. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (kurze Darstellung)	40
19. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen	44
20. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	50
21. Schluss der Sitzung	50

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 2. OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 14 settembre 2017.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.05)

3. Erklärung der Präsidenschaft

Presidente. – Cari colleghi, purtroppo ancora una volta all'apertura dei nostri lavori siamo costretti a ricordare vittime innocenti del terrorismo internazionale, secondo ciò che per noi sta diventando ormai una tristissima consuetudine.

Questa volta la follia omicida ha colpito due donne. È evidente come questa scelta, doppiamente vile, non sia affatto casuale. La pari dignità fra uomo e donna faticosamente raggiunta dalla nostra civiltà europea figura tra i valori ai quali siamo più attaccati ed è uno degli elementi che più caratterizza il nostro modo di vivere e di pensare. Colpendo le donne, si vuole colpire ciò che più ci sta a cuore.

A nome del Parlamento voglio esprimere la nostra vicinanza alle famiglie di queste due donne innocenti assassinate ieri a Marsiglia, la nostra solidarietà alla popolazione di questa città francese ed europea e la nostra accresciuta determinazione a difendere i valori nei quali crediamo. Non abbasseremo la testa, né cambieremo il modo di vivere e andremo avanti finché non avremo sconfitto il terrorismo.

Qualche minuto fa, attraverso un comunicato, l'Isis ha rivendicato la paternità di quanto accaduto oggi a Las Vegas. Nessuno sarà mai in grado di spiegare cosa può spingere una persona a commettere atti così terribili nei confronti di altri esseri umani. Ad ogni modo, quale ne sia l'origine, perché il governo degli Stati Uniti non conferma la matrice terroristica, a nome del Parlamento europeo vorrei esprimere la nostra solidarietà e le più sincere condoglianze a tutti coloro che sono stati coinvolti in questo tragico avvenimento: siamo tutti vicini alle vittime innocenti e alle famiglie che stanno soffrendo per la perdita dei propri cari in circostanze così drammatiche.

Ringrazio i servizi di emergenza che si sono adoperati coraggiosamente per soccorrere i loro concittadini. Voglio infine ricordare le vittime dell'attentato avvenuto sabato scorso, a Edmonton, in Canada. Vi sarei grato se poteste unirmi a me nell'osservare un minuto di silenzio in memoria di tutte queste persone innocenti.

(Il Parlamento, in piedi, osserva un minuto di silenzio)

4. **Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**
5. **Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
6. **Antrag auf Aufhebung der Immunität: siehe Protokoll**
7. **Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll**
8. **Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll**
9. **Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll**
10. **Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschlüsse des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
11. **Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**
12. **Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll**

13. **Arbeitsplan**

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti il 28 ottobre a norma dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Lunedì Non sono proposte modifiche

Martedì Il gruppo Europa delle Nazioni e della Libertà ha chiesto che la discussione sullo stato di avanzamento dei negoziati con il Regno Unito non sia seguita da alcuna risoluzione.

Janice Atkinson, on behalf of the ENF Group. – Mr President, I propose that the vote on the motion for a resolution on the state of play of negotiations with the UK be taken off the agenda. During negotiations the European Parliament does not – and should not – play any formal role. This is just grandstanding obstruction offering headlines for Guy Verhofstadt. The real conservatives in here understand free market principles. The groups opposite do not. Instead, I suggest that you go back to your countries and request that your Heads of State request that Michel Barnier negotiate a free trade deal with the UK. That is in your interests because, if not, your economies will suffer. That is a more constructive use of time. Otherwise we are just going to walk away, because we have 40 free trade agreements that we can sign up to the day we walk out of here. So, colleagues, do the right thing.

Guy Verhofstadt (ALDE). – Mr President, I disagree with the proposal because it is the role of Parliament to steer the whole process, as we have to approve the outcome of the negotiations at the end. In order to be able to do that after the negotiations, we need to act in advance, and that is what we are doing – especially because, in this resolution, we put all the emphasis on citizens' rights. It is the role of Parliament to defend the rights of citizens, not only our European citizens but also the UK citizens living on the continent. Now is the right moment – just before the next negotiation round and before the European Council takes a position.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta di modifica)

Presidente. – Ho ricevuto dal gruppo Verts/ALE la richiesta di iscrivere all'ordine del giorno di martedì una discussione sull' «Obiezione a norma dell'articolo 106: progetto di regolamento della Commissione che modifica l'allegato II del regolamento (CE) n. 1107/2009 stabilendo criteri scientifici per la determinazione delle proprietà di interferente endocrino».

Philippe Lamberts, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Monsieur le Président, la question des perturbateurs endocriniens est une de ces questions qui obsèdent nombre de nos concitoyens, qui redoutent que l'Europe pourrait permettre que l'on commercialise des poisons qui polluent ce qu'ils mangent, ce qu'ils boivent et ce qu'ils respirent.

Il me semble par conséquent absolument indiqué qu'après le vote très clair de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, nous ayons un débat à ce sujet dans cette enceinte.

On sait à quel point la «science» est utilisée de manière plus que discutable pour justifier des décisions qui ont pour but premier de favoriser les intérêts des entreprises qui commercialisent ces produits. Donc, je vous propose que nous en débattions ici, avant le vote.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta di modifica)

Mercoledì

Presidente. – Possiamo alla questione Spagna e Catalogna. Mi sono pervenute diverse richieste da diversi gruppi parlamentari. Prima di tutto vorrei chiedere all'Aula se è d'accordo o meno sull'organizzazione di un tale dibattito, poi chiedere quando il dibattito dovrebbe avere luogo e infine decidere il titolo, visto che ci sono tre proposte differenti.

Ska Keller, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, we did indeed request a debate on which I would like to ask colleagues to vote. However you feel about the referendum, I think we cannot – as Europe – turn a blind eye to the police violence that we saw yesterday in Catalonia. Violence can never be used as a tool for solving political conflict. Only politics can solve political conflicts.

It is clear that we need dialogue now – that is the only way forward. Therefore, Europe needs to watch closely. We should also offer mediation in order to overcome the problem that we have. Therefore, we urge you to support our request for a debate on the police violence in Catalonia against peaceful citizens.

Presidente. – Onorevole Ska Keller, prima di passare al titolo della discussione che Lei ha illustrato per quanto riguarda il gruppo Verts/ALE, vorrei intanto vedere se l'Aula è favorevole alla discussione. Credo di sì ma preferisco verificare con una votazione: chi è favorevole a tenere una discussione sulla questione Spagna – Catalogna?

(Il Parlamento esprime il suo accordo)

La discussione avrà luogo.

Ci sono diverse proposte per quanto riguarda la data della discussione: il gruppo Verts/ALE propone martedì; i gruppi GUE/NGL e ALDE mercoledì; i gruppi S&D e PPE propongono giovedì.

(Reazioni in Aula).

Non c'è molto da ridere. Stiamo parlando di una questione molto seria per cui non c'è alcunché da ridere.

Gianni Pittella, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, semplicemente noi siamo favorevoli a che la discussione si tenga mercoledì.

Presidente. – Il gruppo Verts/ALE mantiene la sua proposta per il mercoledì?

(Conferma da parte del gruppo Verts/ALE)

Siamo dunque d'accordo di tenere la discussione mercoledì. Ma va bene di mattina? Poiché sarà richiesta la presenza della Commissione sarebbe meglio tenere la discussione la mattina.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Mr President, as far as we know, on Wednesday morning we have a debate on the preparation of the Council meeting. Do we change the agenda for Wednesday morning? Shall we move it somewhere? We have to decide when.

Presidente. – Si riduce un po' il tempo di parola. Se non c'è un accordo, bisogna votare. I gruppi PPE e ALDE propongono di tenere la discussione il pomeriggio. Mi pare vi sia un accordo su mercoledì pomeriggio.

James Carver, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, it seems you have jumped the gun before I spoke. The eyes of the world are on the European Union here. To delay this until Wednesday would send a clear message and embarrass a certain Member State. If we go ahead and have this debate, certainly tomorrow at the very earliest, that is a reasonable request. The eyes of the world are looking to the European Union and the European Parliament to speak on this issue. I feel that the debate should take place on Tuesday.

Presidente. – L'Aula ha votato, per cui la discussione avrà luogo mercoledì pomeriggio come primo punto all'ordine del giorno.

Passiamo ora al titolo della discussione: i gruppi Verts/ALE e GUE/NGL hanno chiesto che la dichiarazione della Commissione trattasse la violenza della polizia contro i cittadini pacifici in Catalogna. I gruppi PPE, S&D e ALDE hanno chiesto una dichiarazione relativa alla Costituzione, allo stato di diritto e ai diritti fondamentali in Spagna alla luce degli avvenimenti in Catalogna. Il gruppo EFDD ha chiesto una dichiarazione della Commissione sullo Stato di diritto e le violente azioni ostili da parte del governo spagnolo contro il popolo catalano. Il gruppo EFDD, a differenza degli altri, chiede che la discussione si concluda con una risoluzione. Iniziamo ad ascoltare i gruppi che illustrano le loro richieste.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, we requested this title because there will certainly be different views about the referendum – 'yes', 'no', whatever – but I think we can have a clear, united stance when it comes to asserting that violence is never the way to solve a political problem.

Here in this case, as in every other political conflict, we need a political solution. We need dialogue. We also need to see what we can do from the European level to help to mediate and solve the problem, and, for that reason, we need to watch closely what is happening and we need to offer all the help we can give. We should ask the Commission what they intend to do, and we should ask the Commission to offer mediation. There have been calls for international mediation and that is why we think this title is the one we can unite around.

Maria João Rodrigues, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, we are, of course, worried about the violent situation and the lack of dialogue in Catalonia. Nevertheless, the problem is larger than this. That is why the S&D Group is proposing the following title: this should be a debate and a Commission statement 'on the constitution, rule of law and fundamental rights in Spain in the light of the events in Catalonia'. This is the title that my Group is proposing and it is also backed by other Groups.

Françoise Grossetête, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais apporter mon soutien aux propos tenus par M^{me} Rodrigues au nom du groupe socialiste, et dire que, pour notre groupe PPE, il y a quand même des principes fondamentaux à respecter.

Je voudrais rappeler que jamais l'Union européenne n'a accepté de se mêler de référendums qui ont lieu dans un État membre, et d'autant plus quand il s'agit d'un référendum anticonstitutionnel. Par contre, ce qui est important, c'est de rappeler les principes fondamentaux de l'Union: c'est que le droit doit être respecté et appliqué.

C'est pour cela que je soutiens, au nom du groupe PPE, la proposition du groupe socialiste portée par M^{me} Rodrigues, et nous insistons pour qu'elle soit intitulée «La Constitution, l'État de droit et les droits fondamentaux en Espagne à la lumière des événements de Catalogne».

Guy Verhofstadt, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais apporter mon soutien à la proposition et souligner que je suis entièrement d'accord avec ce que M^{me} Ska Keller a dit, sauf pour ce qui est de sa conclusion. Elle a en effet démontré la nécessité d'un débat beaucoup plus large. C'est d'ailleurs pour cette raison que le titre que nous proposons inclut les droits fondamentaux. Les droits fondamentaux, c'est de cela qu'il sera question aussi, et je pense que la meilleure chose est d'avoir un titre qui soit le plus large possible, plutôt que de s'enliser dans un point unique.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, je crois qu'aucun des titres proposés ne convient, et ce pour une raison extrêmement simple, à savoir que chacun de ces intitulés préjuge en réalité du contenu du débat.

Si vous parlez des violences, évidemment, on s'oriente vers une condamnation de l'État espagnol. Si vous parlez de l'état de droit, on va supposer que l'état de droit a été violé. Par qui a-t-il été violé?

Il y a des événements qui se produisent en Catalogne. Soit chacun vient à ce débat avec des idées préconçues, et n'a pas l'intention d'en changer, et dans ce cas-là, ce débat n'a aucun intérêt. Soit le débat doit être, ce que je pense personnellement, véritablement ouvert, auquel cas il faut ouvrir le débat sur les événements qui se sont produits en Catalogne ou sur la situation en Catalogne; il me semble que c'est tout à fait suffisant.

Presidente. – L'on. Arnott deve presentare la richiesta del gruppo EFDD che, ripeto, a differenza degli altri gruppi, prevede anche una risoluzione al termine della discussione.

Jonathan Arnott, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, to see those police actions, to see 761 injuries, to see ballot boxes being seized – that is alien to everything that we cherish if we claim to uphold democracy. These matters are questions of rule of law, they are questions of self-determination and they are also questions of the actions of the police. That is why our proposal is to include all of those elements that have been mentioned on both sides.

The important point here is not just the title of the debate, but that this does not end up being something that is brushed under the carpet. What is happening in Catalonia is something which could become an incredibly serious and major diplomatic issue in months and years to come and this is something which needs to be got right. We cannot brush this under the carpet.

One thing that I would say is that we must not forget that is important, within our motion, that we add a resolution as part of the debate. It is not just about having the debate, it is about winding it up with a resolution so that we are actually saying something.

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir wissen alle, dass die Lage ernst ist und dass uns die Meldungen aus Katalonien sehr viel Sorge machen. Es ist doch jetzt klar, dass wir die Debatte haben, dass wir die auch bekommen. Jetzt geht es nur noch um den Titel. Wir haben den Grünen ja angeboten, dass wir die Grundrechte in den Titel der Entschließung mit aufnehmen. Das heißt, wir haben versucht, zu den Grünen Brücken zu bauen. Ich verstehe nicht, warum wir jetzt noch darüber streiten müssen. Lassen Sie uns den großen Konsens, den wir jetzt durch den Vorschlag der Sozialdemokraten haben, doch bitte aufgreifen. Lassen Sie uns diese Woche einfach die Sachen miteinander diskutieren. Deswegen bitte ich, Herr Präsident, dass über den Vorschlag der Sozialdemokraten als Erstes abgestimmt wird.

(Beifall)

Matt Carthy, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, the most important thing is that we have a debate. It is quite clear that there are Members of this Parliament who have something to be fearful of. Let us just remind ourselves about what we saw yesterday: it was not clashes between police and protesters. What we saw was an EU Member State using armed police to physically prevent people from exercising their right to vote. We need to ensure that the voice of this Parliament is strong and robust and that we defend the rights of the people of Catalonia and in turn defend the rights of democrats right across the European Union.

Presidente. – Mi può dire quale proposta sostiene perché non l'ho capito? Il Suo intervento era a sostegno della proposta del gruppo GUE/NGL? *(L'on Carthy conferma)* Quindi anche il prossimo intervento della onorevole Zimmer sarà a sostegno della richiesta del gruppo GUE/NGL.

Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident! Um das klarzustellen: Wir unterstützen – da wir ja diesen Antrag auch selber zusammen mit den Grünen eingebracht haben – die Formulierung, die von Ska Keller vorgetragen worden ist. Wir sind aber auch bereit und halten es für sinnvoll, die Formulierung aufzunehmen, dass die Grundrechte in den Titel mit hineinmüssen. Also insofern könnten wir hier eine gemeinsame Lösung finden.

Ich spreche mich aber gleichzeitig auch ganz klar gegen eine Entschliebung aus, weil ich denke, dass das dann tatsächlich eine Einmischung wäre, die wir hier nicht einfach kurzerhand übers Knie brechen sollten. Das sollten wir einfach mal sein lassen, wir sollten uns hier verständigen und ein klares Signal senden.

Esteban González Pons, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, creo que soy el primer español que toma la palabra, y me gustaría que fueran todas sus Señorías conscientes de que el asunto del que estamos hablando es muy grave y que no tenemos que tratarlo de una manera superficial.

No están solo las imágenes del día de ayer que todos hubiéramos preferido no ver. Además, está en juego una declaración unilateral de independencia contra la Constitución que se ha anunciado para el próximo jueves y que puede romper mi país en dos mitades. Por eso, con todo respeto y con toda seriedad, les pido que pasemos a votación la propuesta mayoritaria, que celebremos el debate cuando lo hemos decidido y que se haga un debate, si es posible con la Comisión, y que solo haya un turno de intervención por grupo para que hablen los presidentes y el debate sea del máximo nivel.

Hay cosas en la Unión Europea con las que no se puede jugar. Aquí estamos para unir. Este Parlamento lo que no puede hacer es contribuir a dividir y a romper.

Presidente. – Onorevole Zimmer, se ho capito bene, Lei è favorevole alla proposta dell'onorevole Weber di avere un titolo comprensivo anche dell'aspetto dei diritti, quindi possiamo votare la richiesta dell'onorevole Weber? È d'accordo anche il gruppo Verts/ALE? Bene, mi pare dunque di ravvisare una unanimità o una stragrande maggioranza del Parlamento....

Il gruppo EFDD è contrario a questa proposta? *(reazioni senza microfono, inaudibili)*

Calma! Procediamo alla votazione della proposta dell'onorevole Weber, che raccoglie l'insieme delle proposte con il titolo così come formulato nella proposta del gruppo S&D: Costituzione, stato di diritto e diritti fondamentali in Spagna alla luce degli avvenimenti in Catalogna.

(Il Parlamento approva la richiesta di modifica)

Giovedì

Non sono proposte modifiche

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato)

14. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Gabriel Mato, a nome della commissione per la pesca, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che stabilisce le misure di gestione, di conservazione e di controllo applicabili nella zona della convenzione della Commissione internazionale per la conservazione dei tonidi dell'Atlantico (ICCAT)

(COM(2016)0401 - C8-0224/2016 - 2016/0187(COD)) (A8-0173/2017).

Gabriel Mato, ponente. –Señor presidente, señor comisario, acojo con agrado el acuerdo político alcanzado en los diálogos tripartitos sobre la transposición al Derecho de la Unión Europea de las recomendaciones relativas a las medidas de ordenación, conservación y control aplicables en la zona del convenio de la CICAA. Creo que es fundamental, aunque, escuchando alguna de las intervenciones anteriores, uno se plantea si realmente vale la pena seguir hablando de Derecho, de leyes, cuando algunos pasan absolutamente de ellas, las transgreden sin ningún tipo de problema.

En todo caso, yo no me voy a extender mucho en el contenido, pero sí quiero resaltar algunos mensajes muy claros.

En primer lugar, lógicamente, quiero expresar mi agradecimiento al Consejo, a la Comisión y a los ponentes en la sombra que han hecho posible este Acuerdo.

El Acuerdo prevé la igualdad de condiciones para todos los operadores, tanto de la Unión Europea como del extranjero, que operan en la misma zona. Garantizar condiciones idénticas para todos en la misma zona en que las flotas europeas compiten con flotas extranjeras es crucial si queremos contar con la confianza de los pescadores.

En la flota de la Unión Europea se aplican con frecuencia medidas mucho más estrictas que las adoptadas en las organizaciones regionales de ordenación pesquera. Tenemos que convencer a los terceros países, a través de nuestra acción en las OROP, de que sigan las normas de la Unión Europea en estos casos. Por ejemplo, el trasbordo en el mar, que está prohibido para los buques de la Unión Europea en aguas de la Unión Europea.

El trasbordo en el mar es una de las principales causas de la falta de transparencia en la pesca a nivel mundial y que facilita la pesca INDNR. Y esto lo realizan con frecuencia flotas extranjeras, siempre las mismas a nivel global —y no hace falta mencionarlas—, con consideraciones sociales bajas o no ambientales.

Es importante seguir desplegando todos los esfuerzos para exportar nuestros estándares de sostenibilidad a las flotas de terceros países. El texto final acordado insta a la Comisión Europea a realizar todas las gestiones necesarias para extender la prohibición de la Unión a todas las aguas. Es algo que desde hace muchos años nuestro sector ha solicitado —y legítimamente— y creo que tenemos que agradecer.

También el texto acordado destaca la necesidad de prestar una atención especial a la pesca tradicional y artesanal y de ofrecer incentivos a los pescadores de atún rojo y de pez espada de la Unión Europea que emplean artes de pesca y técnicas de reducción de impacto ambiental y de que esto se tenga en cuenta cuando se repartan las cuotas a nivel nacional. Esa fue una batalla que tuvimos con los Estados miembros y que negociamos muy bien entonces para el atún rojo, y ahora se confirma ese compromiso.

Sin embargo, me preocupa mucho que la Comisión, casi un año después de la adopción por la CICAA de un plan de recuperación plurianual sobre el pez espada del Mediterráneo —una especie icónica cuyas existencias están en muy mal estado—, no haya enviado al Parlamento Europeo ninguna propuesta transponiendo este plan. Y esa es la tónica general de la Comisión: más retraso del que sería deseable.

Yo estoy convencido de que el señor comisario tampoco está de acuerdo y valora muy negativamente esto. De hecho, vamos a adoptar, vamos a transponer, una serie de medidas de la CICAA que hoy son obsoletas y están anticuadas.

Estamos hablando de medidas de hace diez años. Estas medidas se pusieron sobre la mesa hace diez años y estas recomendaciones las vamos a aprobar ahora: no hay justificación alguna. Esto conduce a inseguridad jurídica para los operadores y a las críticas legítimas de las partes interesadas. Esta situación es legal y, lo que es más importante, políticamente inaceptable.

Por eso, hemos presentado una declaración al texto final expresando nuestras preocupaciones. Yo sé, señor comisario, que usted lo va a aceptar de buen grado, y tiene que haber un compromiso de la Comisión para que estas reglas no nazcan muertas. Hoy aprobamos unas recomendaciones que ya han sido superadas hace un año por un plan en relación con el pez espada.

Y tengo que reconocer también mi descontento por la última decisión adoptada por la CICA A sobre la fijación de las cuotas de pez espada en el Mediterráneo sin tener en cuenta, a la vez, que los barcos que se dedican a esta pesca son los mismos que se dedican a la pesca del atún rojo. Y, mientras reducen, seguramente con razón, las cuotas del pez espada, no aumentan las de atún rojo, cuando se ha demostrado que tras un plan muy bien llevado a cabo se ha recuperado total y absolutamente la población.

Yo, simplemente, espero que ahora, señor comisario, en el mes de noviembre en Marrakech, donde hay una nueva reunión de la CICA A, esa recuperación se plasme claramente en un aumento muy notable de las cuotas y, además, en una distribución más equitativa y que se tenga en cuenta —como decía al principio— a los pequeños barcos, los barcos artesanales y los barcos que son más respetuosos con el medio ambiente.

Comisario, señorías, quiero agradecer nuevamente la buena disposición que han tenido en todo momento y pensar y plantear el reto —que sé seguro que va a aceptar el comisario— de que la transposición de la recomendaciones no tarden diez años: si son diez meses, mucho mejor.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate the rapporteur, my colleague Gabriel Mato, and his team for their excellent work, and also Renata Briano for her earlier opinion. Considering the scope and complexity of this matter, the Commission is very pleased that the co-legislators were able to reach a political agreement smoothly and in a spirit of good cooperation and compromise.

This is a challenging proposal because this transposition of measures agreed under the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) relates to numerous recommendations adopted since 2008. Some had already been partially implemented through the Control Regulation and the Regulation on illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing. A review of some other regulations, including on control measures for highly migratory fish and on the system of statistical monitoring of trade in bluefin tuna, swordfish and bigeye tuna, is therefore also implied.

I have read the statement tabled by the Committee on Fisheries for adoption by Parliament on the issue of EU compliance with ICCAT recommendations. I do not want in any way to justify any delays. However, while I agree that we should transpose such measures faster, I would like to clear up immediately a potential misperception that the EU has not been complying with its international obligations. That is clearly not the case.

First, following the adoption of the Treaty of the Functioning of the EU, any measures adopted by an international organisation to which the EU is party is binding on the Member States even without transposition. Second, despite some occasional delays in transposition, the EU has always ensured compliance with the international obligations it assumes, and the adoption of the ICCAT transposition regulation will, in the future, permit faster and more efficient implementation of new ICCAT recommendations, thanks to the delegation of certain well-framed powers to the Commission.

I strongly support this practical approach, as it will allow the Union to deliver on its international obligations towards the regional fisheries management organisation (RFMO) in a timely manner, providing certainty to Member States and a level playing field for operators.

The transposition of measures adopted under ICCAT is necessary because they not only impose obligations on Member States but also create obligations for individuals, such as the vessel master and owner. These obligations need to be transposed into EU law to ensure legal certainty and a level playing field for operators across the EU. The ICCAT transposition regulation embraces the series of ICCAT recommendations with the exception of measures concerning the recovery plan for bluefin tuna and Mediterranean swordfish, which are included in separate regulations. The one for bluefin tuna has already been adopted. The Commission is currently finalising a draft regulation for a recovery plan for Mediterranean swordfish, which is in internal consultation, and we aim to adopt the proposal before the end of the year.

Let me assure you that the Union will continue working with the RFMOs to ensure better ocean governance and more sustainable fishing. We are fully committed to comprehensively and systematically addressing the issue of transshipment at sea within the framework of the RFMOs, with a view to extending the Union prohibition on transshipment at sea from our own to all waters.

Thank you for your kind attention and for tabling this important regulation for debate. I look forward to hearing your views.

Renata Briano, *relatrice per parere della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, la trasposizione delle raccomandazioni ICCAT è ambientalmente importante, poiché prevede misure di protezione per alcune specie marine molto vulnerabili, come squali, uccelli marini e tartarughe.

Un altro punto positivo, voluto da questo Parlamento, riguarda l'obbligo per gli Stati membri di applicare criteri trasparenti e oggettivi nell'assegnazione delle quote di tonno rosso e pesce spada: gli Stati membri dovranno adoperarsi per ripartire equamente i contingenti nazionali, tenendo conto della pesca tradizionale artigianale, troppo spesso penalizzata.

Non posso però non rimarcare che ciò che andiamo a votare domani riguarda raccomandazioni ICCAT datate e quindi ormai superate per alcune specie, con il rischio di creare confusione giuridica: basti pensare al piano di ricostituzione del pesce spada, su cui si sta già lavorando, dopo le decisioni del 2016. A tal proposito, voglio ribadire il disappunto, che ho già manifestato con tre interrogazioni parlamentari, riguardo l'ingiusta distribuzione delle quote di pesce spada tra gli Stati membri.

L'UE ha infatti usato criteri diversi di ripartizione in sede ICCAT e poi tra gli Stati, che penalizzano solo l'Italia: anche per questo annuncio, quindi che, personalmente, domani non voterò a favore della proposta.

Werner Kuhn, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Vella, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zuvallerst möchte ich Gabriel Mato für seinen Bericht danken, den er sehr fachlich und präzise abgefasst hat. Denn die Internationale Kommission zur Erhaltung der Thunfischbestände im Atlantik ist natürlich eine Organisation, die weiter reicht als die Fischereipolitik der Europäischen Union. Sie wurde 1966 — also vor über 50 Jahren schon — gegründet, weil der Rote Thun im Atlantik in einer ganz schwierigen Situation war und zu kollabieren drohte. Das bedeutet schon, dass hier natürlich auch alle Anrainerstaaten um den Atlantischen Ozean — Nordatlantik, Südatlantik — zusammenarbeiten müssen. Diese Konferenzen, die mittlerweile alljährlich durchgeführt werden, beziehen sich direkt darauf, welche Bestände wir zur Verfügung haben, um Roten Thun, um Großaugenthun, Gelbflossenthun und in besonderer Weise auch den Schwertfisch zu fangen. Wir haben es gehört, auch von der Kollegin Briano, dass hier natürlich auch eine komplizierte Situation im mediterranen Bereich ist.

Die Europäische Union mit ihren Mitgliedstaaten hat das Verhandlungsmandat an die Kommission übertragen, und die Kommission ist sozusagen dann in dieser ICCAT-Konferenz die maßgebende und verhandelnde Institution, die hier über die entsprechenden Quoten mit den einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten verhandeln kann. Eine Delegation des Europäischen Parlaments hat dort nur Beobachterstatus, aber wir müssen dann letztendlich die Ergebnisse — Gabriel Mato hat es vorhin gesagt — implementieren. Dass da ein Verzug von über zehn Jahren ist, ist einfach nicht hinnehmbar. Kommissar Vella hat es vorhin noch mal gesagt: Sie werden daran arbeiten, dass diese Zeiträume in der Zukunft verbessert werden.

Es ist auch so, dass die Kontrolle über die Fischereifahrzeuge, die eine ICCAT-Konzession und auch eine Eintragung in den entsprechenden Schiffsregistern haben, verbessert werden muss, auch über die Möglichkeiten der Datenübertragung per Satellit etc. Sie ist auf einem guten Weg, aber wir müssen gemeinsam sehen, dass gerade diese illegale, nicht gemeldete und unregulierte Fischerei, nämlich die im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes Schwarzfischerei, bekämpft werden muss.

Der Rote Thun und auch die anderen Thunfischarten sind wieder in einem Bestand, wo man sagen kann: Wir haben diesbezüglich eine Zukunft. Und es ist auch gut, dass die Zusammenarbeit mit China, auch mit Taiwan und auch mit Japan in den letzten Jahren wieder Fahrt aufgenommen hat. Wenn wir eine Situation haben, dass ein südkoreanisches Schiffsregister anzeigt, dass ein Fischereifahrzeug, ein Langleinenfänger, verkauft worden ist, ohne dass es eine Konzession hat, und versucht, in den afrikanischen Gewässern illegal Thunfisch zu fangen, dass er dort aufgebracht wird, an die Kette gelegt werden kann – das sind Dinge, wo wir diesbezüglich wirklich auch sehr positive Tendenzen berichten können. Aber was das Umladeverbot für die Fänge im Atlantik oder auch in den anderen Gewässern – unsere Flotte fischt ja auch im Indischen und im Pazifischen Ozean – betrifft: Das ist ein ungerechtfertigter Wettbewerbsvorteil für alle anderen Mitglieder der ICCAT, die das nicht berücksichtigen müssen.

Bei der Kontrolle der Bekämpfung der illegalen Fischerei – das habe ich schon erwähnt – müssen wir noch viel besser zusammenarbeiten, und die Quotenverteilung gerade für die Klein- und handwerkliche Fischerei – das steht auch in der Grundverordnung drin – muss uns in besonderer Weise am Herzen liegen, damit die auch dort eine Überlebenschance haben. Ansonsten stimme ich als Vertreter der EVP-Fraktion dem von Gabriel Mato verfassten Bericht zu.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais, gostaria de congratular o relator, o colega Gabriel Mato, e alguns relatores-sombra, nomeadamente Isabelle Thomas e, pela ENVI, Renata Briano. O trabalho que realizaram é importante e a vossa celeridade neste caso contrasta com a lentidão da Comissão. Foram necessários quase 10 anos para que a Comissão tivesse cumprido esta obrigação, deixando a União Europeia em incumprimento internacional.

Esta transposição das disposições da ICCAT para o Direito Europeu promove a utilização de artes de pesca artesanal com menor impacto ambiental e de embarcações locais.

Portugal, e em particular os Açores, de onde sou oriundo, tem vindo a defender esta estratégia porque contribui para construir e estimular uma economia mais justa, mais equitativa e mais resiliente.

A pesca industrial tem, certamente, o seu espaço, mas não pode estrangular as comunidades tradicionais de pescadores. Como prevê bem o regulamento, na repartição das possibilidades, os Estados-Membros são chamados a utilizar critérios transparentes e objetivos, incluindo critérios ambientais, sociais e económicos, e devem conceder incentivos aos navios de pesca da União Europeia que utilizam artes de pesca seletiva ou técnicas de pesca com impacto reduzido no ambiente.

Bati-me por este ponto de vista neste Parlamento e no meu país por diversas vezes, nomeadamente no que diz respeito à repartição da cota de rabilo para os Açores. Como agora fica expresso, deve haver a obrigação de procurar distribuir, de forma equitativa, as cotas nacionais entre os diferentes segmentos da frota, tendo em consideração a pesca tradicional e artesanal.

O novo regulamento exorta à ampliação da proibição de transbordos no mar em águas não pertencentes à União Europeia e estas posições estão em linha com o combate à pesca ilegal, não declarada e não regulamentada.

Temos que manter a posição de líder da União Europeia na defesa do desenvolvimento sustentável e no combate à pesca INN.

Para o garantirmos, há que reforçar os programas de observadores, usando todo o potencial do regulamento de recolha de dados que recentemente aqui aprovámos.

Por último, quero referir que as pescarias de tunídeos na generalidade estão em crise. A cada boa notícia seguem-se más notícias. Os grandes cardumes de atum, que antes visitavam anualmente as ilhas oceânicas, como os Açores, deixaram de o fazer. Pode haver um conjunto de explicações para isso, mas estou quase certo que a utilização de dispositivos de concentração de pescado nas águas tropicais deve ter a sua parcela de responsabilidade.

A utilização destes dispositivos era desregada no passado mas permanece excessiva no presente e, principalmente, estes dispositivos continuam a ser utilizados sem o respetivo estudo de impacto ambiental.

Nos Açores, nós pescamos de linha e anzol, recusamos o uso de redes industriais. Cada pescador usa apenas um anzol e, mesmo assim, as nossas pescarias eram lucrativas. Hoje já não! Resta-lhes resolver o problema a montante, garantindo que os mananciais se mantêm saudáveis e conseguem voltar a cruzar os oceanos. Isto está nas nossas mãos.

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Gospodine predsjedniče, poštovani povjereniće Vella, kolegice i kolege, zaštita morskih resursa važan je segment europskih politika, a najveći je izazov kako s time uskladiti interese ribara na koje također moramo misliti pri donošenju nove regulative. Stanje se na terenu mijenja vrlo brzo i zato ne smijemo kaskati želimo li postići i dugoročno održati ravnotežu između ovih dvaju ciljeva koji ribarstvo čine održivim i ujedno profitabilnim zanimanjem.

Nedopustivo je da Europska komisija predlaže prenošenje ICCAT preporuka sa zakašnjenjem od četiri, odnosno devet godina jer se otad na moru i ljudima koji od njega žive štošta promijenilo. Pozivam Komisiju da u narednim postupcima uzme u obzir vremenske rokove i pravovremeno reagira.

Budući da dolazim iz Hrvatske, ne mogu se ne osvrnuti na pitanje kvota za iglune. Hrvatska je ribarska flota orijentirana samo na Jadransko more i ne izlazi na ostale dijelove Sredozemlja ili na oceane kao što je to praksa među flotama drugih država članica.

Jadransko je more od ključne važnosti za opstanak hrvatskog ribarstva, ali i primorskih te otočnih zajednica, što mora biti uzeto u obzir pri dodjeli kvota. Ovim putem stoga želim izraziti svoje veliko protivljenje kvotama za izlov igluna koje su nam dodijeljene i tražim da one za Hrvatsku budu veće jer će ove koje su predložene nanijeti veliki udarac hrvatskom ribarstvu.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, quiero lamentar que hayamos tardado diez años en convertir en legislación europea estas recomendaciones del ICCAT para los túnidos en el Atlántico, algo completamente ajeno a la voluntad y habitual diligencia del ponente de este informe, el señor Mato, al que quiero agradecer su excelente trabajo.

Así, se ha perjudicado nuestra credibilidad y capacidad de liderazgo en el campo de la sostenibilidad y el impulso de buenas prácticas pesqueras, tanto por el tiempo transcurrido como por lo obsoletas que han quedado algunas de las recomendaciones. Por esa vía podemos generar inseguridad jurídica como la que afecta, por ejemplo, al pez espada, con un plan de conservación que se aplica a los operadores, pero que no se ha traspuesto aún a la legislación comunitaria pese a tratarse de un proceso simple.

Al menos, y gracias a las aportaciones de la Comisión de Pesca, hemos añadido a las medidas de protección y conservación algunas consideraciones que las conectan mejor con los criterios de la política pesquera común para la gestión de los stocks pesqueros. Así, nos obligamos aplicar criterios más transparentes a la hora de adjudicar cuotas de captura entre los Estados miembros. Igualmente, apoyaremos las flotas artesanales por su menor impacto sobre el medio y por su decisiva aportación al mantenimiento de una actividad económica sostenible y la posibilidad de obtener así recursos para poder diversificar las fuentes de renta en las zonas costeras.

Es fundamental también priorizar la utilización de artes selectivas de bajo impacto y no imponer obligaciones adicionales a los barcos europeos sobre las que deben cumplir los de los países terceros; al contrario, es necesario que los buques de terceros países cumplan con las mismas exigencias que los buques europeos, por ejemplo, en el caso de los trasbordos en altamar. Es igualmente un avance incorporar la pesca recreativa al ámbito de aplicación. Y, finalmente, no me cansaré de insistir en la necesidad de que los Estados miembros acepten de una vez la aplicación íntegra del artículo 43, apartado 2, y el artículo 43, apartado 3, del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión, que incluye los temas pesqueros en el procedimiento legislativo ordinario y que debe favorecer una adjudicación más transparente de las cuotas.

Necesitamos planes de gestión a largo plazo, con adjudicaciones sobre la base de procedimientos conocidos y pactados, que estén basadas en datos científicos solventes sobre cuál es el estado de los *stocks* y unas cuotas previsibles en el medio plazo. Este es el mejor favor que podemos hacer a la conservación de las especies y a la estabilidad de la renta del sector pesquero.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – We spreken vandaag over beschermingsmaatregelen voor tonijn en aanverwante soorten. Veel tonijnsoorten, zoals de geelvintonijn en de grootoogtonijn, worden nog steeds bedreigd door overbevissing. Voor een aantal andere soorten bestaat er nog steeds grote wetenschappelijke onzekerheid.

In november vindt de jaarlijkse vergadering van de Internationale Commissie voor de instandhouding van Atlantische tonijnen (ICCAT) plaats. Ik wil de commissaris op het hart drukken om het voorzorgsbeginsel ter harte te nemen en dit ook uit te dragen tijdens deze aankomende ICCAT-vergadering.

Minimale tekenen van herstel, zoals we bijvoorbeeld bij de blauwvintonijn zien, zijn geen excuus om de visserijdruk nu al weer veel groter te maken. De blauwvintonijn staat nog steeds op de rode lijst van bedreigde diersoorten. Ik vind het dan ook onverantwoord dat de rapporteur in de toelichting van dit verslag alweer vooruitloopt en pleit voor meer vangst van blauwvintonijn. Temeer omdat het opschroeven van de quota voor tonijn niet alleen de blauwvintonijn zelf in gevaar brengt, maar ook andere kwetsbare diersoorten, zoals de zwaardvis en de marlijn. En die laatste willen we nou juist beschermen met deze regelgeving.

Dit verslag van de visserijcommissie bevat verschillende voorstellen die veel minder ver gaan dan de Europese Commissie voorstelde. Ze beschermen het ecosysteem veel minder. De Europese Commissie wilde bijvoorbeeld een verkleining van de vissersvloot voor grootoogtonijn, of deze in elk geval niet verder uitbreiden. De rapporteur wil die verkleining laten varen omdat die niet strikt verplicht zou zijn. Maar het is geen schande om iets meer ambitie te tonen.

Tot slot het verkoopverbod voor witte en blauwe marlijnen die boven quotum zijn gevangen. Ze zijn overbevist en de status van deze vissoorten is kwetsbaar. Niet voor niets zijn er nauwelijks vangstmogelijkheden ingesteld. De visserijcommissie stelt nu voor om marlijnen niet mee te tellen als ze boven quotum worden gevangen en aangeland. De dieren zouden bijvoorbeeld gebruikt kunnen worden voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Voor sommigen komt het misschien als een verrassing, maar een vis die is gedood en aangeland, ontbreekt uit het ecosysteem, of je hem nu meetelt of niet. En of je hem nu opeet of onderzoekt: overbevissing wordt niet gestopt door gedode vissen maar even niet mee te tellen. Overbevissing wordt gestopt door minder of zelfs niet te vissen.

En voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouw- en visserijsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Mike Hookem, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, you can't save your money and spend it, you can't have your cake and eat it, and you can't pretend to be a nation when you are not. The EU tries to do all three all the time. This report illustrates that perfectly. This is an international convention. The word 'international' means between nations. The European Union, despite what it likes to think, is not a nation. It follows that it cannot be – and should not be – a party to such international agreements, this one and many others.

If David Davis has even half a brain, this is an important negotiating card, an ace in the pack, but any card is only as good as how you play it. Happily, we have the perfect opportunity to play it and play it repeatedly. We, the United Kingdom, are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. We must not give this up. On the contrary, we must start to make better use of it. This means using it to oppose, block and even veto behaviour on international treaties, conventions and agreements which are against our interest.

There is a clear UK message here for the European Union: do you think you hold all the cards? You don't. Our hand is potentially a lot better than you understand. What the UK has to do, however, is to understand itself how good our hand is and then be prepared to use it. If the British Government is worth anything at all, those who play hardball with us should – and, I hope, will – find that we can play hardball with them.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Caro Comissário Vella, Caros Colegas, como é sobejamente conhecido, os tunídeos e espécies afins são espécies altamente migratórias, exploradas pela pesca comercial ao longo de toda a sua distribuição geográfica por frotas de diversas nacionalidades, com um esforço de pesca muito variado e que utilizam artes de pesca muito distintas.

A sustentabilidade dos recursos biológicos marinhos deverá ser uma enorme preocupação para todos nós. No entanto, defendo que esta sustentabilidade não deve ser cega, ou seja, deverá ter igualmente em conta a sustentabilidade económica e social a longo prazo, e, neste sentido, não posso deixar de referir a situação dos pescadores e das suas famílias, que atravessam uma situação de crise, de falta de rendimento, mesmo trabalhando mais e arriscando muito as suas vidas.

Falo-vos especialmente dos pescadores das zonas costeiras, de regiões ultraperiféricas como é o caso dos Açores, que sofrem cada vez mais com a escassez de recursos biológicos marinhos, ou seja, de peixe. É por isso que esta proposta é deveras importante pois surge no sentido de podermos equilibrar todas estas vertentes, especialmente no que respeita aos tunídeos.

Também aqui, ano após ano, quer os pescadores quer a nossa indústria atuneira veem cada vez menos recursos, menos atum, pondo em causa a sustentabilidade desta importante atividade na minha região, os Açores, ameaçando, desta forma, centenas de postos de trabalho diretos e indiretos porque, a dada altura, seja por razões climáticas, que levaram à alteração das rotas de migração dos tunídeos, seja por razões humanas, com técnicas agressivas de pesca por parte de outros que reduzem, em grande número, os indivíduos que conseguem fazer esta migração.

As pescarias dos Açores, portanto, fazem parte do património cultural, regional e constitui uma atividade socioeconómica altamente relevante. Com efeito, os açorianos são altamente dependentes da pesca e os recursos marinhos desempenham um papel-chave na economia e no emprego locais, incluindo nas indústrias associadas à pesca, nomeadamente a indústria conserveira do atum.

Senhor Comissário, o que nos traz aqui hoje pretende harmonizar e alargar o âmbito de aplicação das recomendações do ICCAT. Queria aqui deixar duas mensagens muito claras: a primeira passa por uma igualdade de tratamento entre as frotas europeias e de países terceiros. Não podemos continuar a impor aos nossos pescadores regras mais restritivas e limitadoras do que a outras frotas que, muitas vezes, não respeitam os mais básicos princípios dos padrões europeus.

A segunda mensagem passa pelo compromisso que lhe pedimos para que tenha em consideração as frotas artesanais, especialmente as das regiões ultraperiféricas, como é o caso dos Açores, pois temos sido um exemplo a nível europeu e mundial da sustentabilidade da pesca de tunídeo. Nos Açores, os tunídeos são pescados com salto e vara e, em geral, com isco vivo, uma arte de pesca altamente sustentável, com pouco impacto ambiental e muito seletiva.

A maioria das capturas é processada pela indústria de conservas de atum, localmente importante, embora o atum fresco esteja a tornar-se cada vez mais importante porque produz preços mais altos, especialmente no mercado de exportação.

Por último, queria também solicitar que tenha em consideração a possibilidade de um aumento das cotas do atum rabilho, cujo *stock* se encontra em franca expansão e que de facto seria muito útil para podermos compensar os pescadores europeus do corte nas cotas da pesca do espadarte que, como é comumente reconhecido, sofreu uma forte deterioração nos seus *stocks*.

Por todos os motivos anteriormente expostos, encoraja-se a adoção crescente de informação coligida e gerida pelo ICCAT no sentido de adotar medidas de gestão adequadas e que salvaguardem os interesses dos operadores do setor que praticam pescarias altamente sustentáveis, como é o caso específico dos Açores.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, le présent règlement vise à transposer l'accord de la commission internationale pour la conservation des thonidés de l'Atlantique, dont l'Union européenne est partie contractante depuis 1997, que cela plaise ou non à M. Hookem.

Cet accord couvre une trentaine d'espèces de thonidés sur l'Atlantique et les mers adjacentes, c'est dire son importance pour la gestion, la conservation et le contrôle des ressources halieutiques en accord avec les fondements de la politique commune de la pêche.

Ainsi, sur le papier tout semble parfait. Sauf qu'il ne s'agit pas de l'accord de 2016, le plus récent, mais de celui de 2008.

Nous transposons un texte avec plus de neuf ans de retard. La Commission nous a présenté un projet de transposition, non seulement vieux de neuf ans, mais qui plus est, en partie caduc, puisqu'un nouvel accord de la CICTA a été négocié en 2016.

Ainsi, alors qu'il s'agit de gérer une précieuse ressource, aussi bien sur le plan économique qu'écologique, alors que les stocks se sont effondrés ou améliorés selon les espèces, et alors, surtout, que la politique commune de la pêche s'appuie sur les connaissances scientifiques les meilleures et les plus récentes, Bruxelles fonde sa réglementation sur des données vieilles de dix ans.

C'est la raison pour laquelle, à la demande du groupe socialiste démocrate, entendue par le rapporteur, que je remercie, la commission de la pêche a voté à l'unanimité une résolution annexée, dénonçant cette situation inacceptable qui exclut notamment l'espadon.

Bien sûr, une fois de plus, et je m'adresse à vous Monsieur le Commissaire pour que cela ne soit pas le cas, la Commission risque de nous proposer un acte délégué pour mettre à jour ce règlement, ce qui est démocratiquement plus que discutable.

Je terminerai en rappelant que j'avais présenté des amendements pour inclure les petites pêcheries, proposant qu'elles puissent avoir accès au quota de thon rouge sans remettre en cause la stabilité relative. Pour faciliter le compromis, on a repris les vieilles formulations déjà existantes et, de ce fait, on peut déplorer que cette question, pourtant sensible sur nos côtes, n'ait pas été prise en compte dans l'accord final.

Retards et manques de discussion détériorent le dialogue interinstitutionnel, même si finalement je soutiens le rapporteur et sa proposition.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Na wstępie pragnę pogratulować koledze Mato, jak i kontrsprawozdawcom bardzo udanego sprawozdania, w którym wyraźnie wskazano na potrzebę zachowania zasady równości dla flot europejskich względem flot państw trzecich. Także opowiadam się za ścisłą transpozycją zaleceń ICCAT, tak aby stworzyć równe warunki działalności dla wszystkich operatorów. Zapewnienie jednakowych warunków dla wszystkich ma podstawowe znaczenie, jeśli chcemy uzyskać poparcie rybaków.

Chciałbym też wskazać na fakt, że musimy zachować daleko idącą ostrożność przy połowach tuńczyka błękitnopłetwego, jak i przy połowach łuczniaka na Morzu Śródziemnym, które jest morzem bardzo przełowionym w Unii Europejskiej. Wprowadzenie całkowitych dopuszczalnych połowów, czyli TAC, jak również inne środki ochronne, w tym stosowanie narzędzi połowowych w sposób mądry i roztropny dla tych gatunków muszą być respektowane przez wszystkie strony organizacji ICCAT. Tylko wspólne działania obejmujące również państwa trzecie uchronią w znacznym stopniu te gatunki przed nadmierną presją połowową i przyczynią się do zachowania stabilności i zrównoważonych połowów w tym regionie.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o ICCAT cuja convenção a União Europeia ratificou em 1997, tem a responsabilidade técnica e científica de apresentar propostas e recomendações específicas para a conservação e gestão das pescarias de tunídeos.

Trata-se de atos essencialmente dirigidos às partes contratantes mas que contêm obrigações direcionadas também para operadores privados, de que são exemplo os mestres de navios.

Identificamos duas grandes contradições na posição da Comissão. A primeira, que a proposta que apresentou com recomendações e medidas de gestão próprias contraria o espírito da convenção, que visa uma transposição daquelas recomendações de forma exata, garantindo a todos os pescadores e frotas da região as mesmas condições.

Por outro lado, tendo em conta que as recomendações do ICCAT entram em vigor seis meses após a sua adoção, é incompreensível que estejam só neste momento a ser transpostas as recomendações de 2008, algumas já desatualizadas, tal como se verifica no caso das pescarias do peixe-espada no Mediterrâneo, para as quais foram desenhadas, em novembro último, novas recomendações. Um atraso que evidencia as limitações que se impõem pelo facto de os Estados-Membros terem perdido para a União Europeia a sua capacidade de gestão dos recursos marinhos, com inevitáveis prejuízos para a gestão de recursos no plano nacional mas também para a defesa de artes que têm particular relevância no plano regional, porquanto, sendo artesanais, e damos como exemplo o salto e vara nos Açores ou a almadra em Espanha, carecem de medidas atempadas que garantam, de forma intransigente, a sua defesa e de todo o património histórico, social e cultural, para além da importância económica para as comunidades que as mantêm e praticam.

Entendemos que se devem manter as propostas tal como emanadas do ICCAT, cujas medidas de gestão asseguram oportunidades de pesca, dando atenção especial à pesca de pequena escala e artesanais, visando a sustentabilidade das unidades populacionais de tunídeos.

Entendemos igualmente que é negativa a tentativa da Comissão de abrir caminho a alterações e centralizar decisões importantes através de atos delegados. Considera-se, pois, que a transposição direta das recomendações das organizações regionais é um procedimento mais acertado, garantindo maior equidade entre os diferentes países.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, quiero, en primer lugar, felicitar al señor Mato por el trabajo realizado —creo que es muy bueno— junto con los ponentes en la sombra. Creo que finalmente la transposición que se hace es adecuada. A lo mejor hay algún aspecto que falta, pero creo que ha realizado un gran trabajo. Mi felicitación.

La transposición al Derecho de la Unión de estas medidas de conservación es necesaria para garantizar que los buques cumplan con la normativa del Convenio de la Comisión de la CICA. Como todos, nos estamos refiriendo específicamente al atún del Atlántico.

Con esta transposición también se garantiza que se haga una gestión responsable de las especies que regula esta organización regional, aunque sea fuera de la zona que establece el Convenio. Es importante que tanto pescadores comunitarios como no comunitarios operen bajo las mismas reglas y que el peso de recuperación de las poblaciones no recaiga solamente sobre unos pocos.

Sé que todos estamos insistiendo en ello, pero como yo vivo en España y sé lo que pasa en el Mediterráneo —donde, a veces, las normas de los pescadores que tenemos en la Unión Europea no son las mismas que las de los países limítrofes—, es importante esta insistencia: que todos los que operamos en una zona tengamos las mismas normas.

En virtud de este Reglamento se regulan especies tan importantes para la flota española como el atún rojo o el pez espada. Es fundamental garantizar que esta gestión de estas poblaciones se haga de manera sostenible, sin olvidar el aspecto socioeconómico ni a las poblaciones costeras que viven de esta captura. Para mí, ambos aspectos son muy importantes.

La Comisión Europea, sin embargo... Todos lo decimos, pero es verdad: es muy llamativa la tardanza de estos nueve, casi diez años, en hacer la transposición de las veintiocho recomendaciones. Una demora que es muy difícil justificar y que, en cualquier caso, no puede volver a repetirse. Ahora tenemos el plan de gestión del pez espada, que estamos esperando.

Cabe destacar la importancia que tienen estas normas de gestión, ya que actualmente las poblaciones de atún rojo se encuentran en muy buen estado. Así lo demuestran los informes científicos publicados al respecto, y esto es una gran noticia.

Esta mejora de las poblaciones se debe a las buenas prácticas del sector y debería traducirse en un aumento del total admisible de capturas para recompensar a los pescadores el esfuerzo que han hecho contribuyendo a su recuperación. En tres años, el total admisible de capturas del atún rojo se ha incrementado en un 60 %. La CICA, que puede revisar regularmente sus recomendaciones y poner en marcha nuevas medidas, debe tener en cuenta el futuro de algunas flotas: la del pez espada de todo el litoral de España —y especialmente quiero mencionar la flota de Carboneras, en Almería, que está sufriendo los dos recortes, el del pez espada y el del atún rojo—.

Termino diciendo: hay que dejar de hablar de la recuperación del atún rojo y, en cambio, empezar a hablar del plan de gestión.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αλιεία του τόννου και του ξιφιά στη Μεσόγειο και τον Ατλαντικό είναι ιδιαίτερης σημασίας, διότι συμβάλλει στη δημιουργία θέσεων εργασίας σε πολλές χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Όμως, κύριε Vella, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να αντιδράσει στις αθέμιτες πρακτικές των αλιευτικών στόλων των τρίτων χωρών, διότι οι Ευρωπαίοι αλιείς τηρούν τα συμφωνηθέντα, ενώ οι αλιευτικοί στόλοι των τρίτων χωρών κυριολεκτικά κάνουν πειρατεία.

Επιπλέον, πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για τη στήριξη της παραδοσιακής και μικρής αλιείας, ιδίως στη Μεσόγειο και στην Ελλάδα—στην Ελλάδα όπου οι αλιείς, μετά τη σκληρή επίθεση εκ μέρους της τρόικας στο θέμα της φορολογίας, κυριολεκτικά έχουν φτωχοποιηθεί. Για τον λόγο αυτό, πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα για τη στήριξη των Ελλήνων αλιέων.

Τέλος, κύριε Vella, ιδίως τώρα που λόγω του ναυαγίου του δεξαμενόπλοιου «Αγία ζώνη II» ο Σαρωνικός κόλπος έχει υποστεί τεράστια οικολογική καταστροφή λόγω της ρύπανσης από το μαζούτ, σας ζητώ να δηλώσετε εδώ τι μέτρα στήριξης θα λάβετε υπέρ των Ελλήνων αλιέων που έχουν υποστεί τεράστια ζημιά λόγω αυτής της οικολογικής καταστροφής. Θέλω μια απάντηση στο θέμα αυτό, κύριε Vella, διότι οι Έλληνες αλιείς αναμένουν να μας πείτε πώς θα τους στηρίξετε στην αντιμετώπιση αυτού του προβλήματος που υπάρχει σήμερα στον Σαρωνικό.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo quasi dieci anni, la Commissione sta predisponendo l'attuazione delle raccomandazioni ICCAT che risalgono al 2008 e che quindi risultano obsolete, in particolare per il pesce spada del Mediterraneo, una specie per la quale l'ICCAT ha adottato l'anno scorso un piano pluriennale di ricostituzione che è già applicabile dall'aprile 2017.

La situazione è ancora più inaccettabile perché la Commissione, quasi sei mesi dopo l'approvazione da parte dell'ICCAT della raccomandazione sul pesce spada del Mediterraneo, non ha ancora adottato alcuna proposta di recepimento, creando addirittura confusione sul periodo di riferimento per il calcolo delle quote. La Commissione deve agire in maniera più trasparente e tempestiva per le future proposte di recepimento delle raccomandazioni.

Il settore della pesca non merita questa superficialità e ha bisogno di certezze; ed è per questo che, nonostante il buon lavoro fatto dai relatori, domani non voterò a favore della trasposizione, ritenendo che i criteri utilizzati nelle ultime decisioni danneggiano alcuni Paesi, tra cui l'Italia.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, first I would like to welcome the 28 recommendations for conservation, management and control of fisheries, as they have not yet been covered by EU rules. Even though they are binding, the decisions adopted by the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) must be transposed as soon as possible into EU law. The regulation will set out various specific provisions on, for example, tropical tunas, marlins, sharks and swordfish, and will include measures to limit incidental catches of seabirds and turtles. It will also establish a number of common control measures.

Taking into consideration that the ICCAT may regularly review its recommendations and decide on new measures, I would like to underline my support for the proposal to give the Commission delegated powers so that such recommendations can be incorporated rapidly into EU law.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, io credo che sia necessario fare molta attenzione quando prendiamo decisioni importanti che potrebbero avere gravi ripercussioni sul settore della pesca. Le raccomandazioni dell'ICCAT, alcune tra l'altro davvero datate, seppur con l'obiettivo generale di regolare l'attività e di rendere sostenibile la pesca, rischiano di imporre nuovi e sempre più pesanti obblighi ai nostri pescatori, che già da anni vivono una profonda crisi.

Prima di accogliere nuove norme, dovremmo essere in grado perciò di assicurare alcune tutele. Prima di tutto, in sede di assegnazione delle possibilità di pesca, gli Stati membri dovrebbero distribuire equamente le quote nazionali tra i vari segmenti di flotta. In più, sarebbe necessario predisporre incentivi per i pescatori, che già fanno sforzi enormi e impiegano attrezzi da pesca selettivi o che utilizzano tecniche di pesca con un ridotto impatto ambientale. Terzo e non ultimo, le raccomandazioni dell'ICCAT dovrebbero essere osservate anche dai paesi extraeuropei.

Per questo, nel ringraziare i relatori per il loro lavoro, ritengo di dover tutelare, prima di tutto, l'interesse dei nostri pescatori.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, this is about the EU approving an international convention. The object is scarcely the point. Do we want to conserve tuna? Of course we do! We want the largest possible breeding stock to deliver the greatest numbers. That is common sense. Whether this agreement will achieve that is debatable at the very best.

What is clear is that international conventions are for nations – I repeat – nations to sign. The clue is in the name: nations! Over the weekend we witnessed bloody scenes as Spanish police terrorised the people of Catalonia to stop them expressing their views – the very negation of everything my Group stands for. It is also in our name: Freedom and Direct Democracy! That is our Group.

Madrid justifies its behaviour on the grounds that Spanish law is being broken. Putting aside the question as to whether a government should beat up its people in that way, even if they are breaking the law, we are entitled to expect the government that does this to be a stickler for the letter of the law. An international convention is a convention between nations. That means the parties to it should be nations. The EU is not a nation or a state and should therefore not be a party to international agreements – international, may I say.

If the Spanish Government are sticklers for the legal protocol, they should share our view. They do not, of course, because their view of the law is entirely contentious and self-interested. If they were consistent and decent, they would not try to deny the long-standing international agreement of the Treaty of Utrecht, some hundreds of years old. They would not constantly try to bully Gibraltar. To clarify, we – the UK – put our money on democracy where our mouths are. We staged a referendum on Scottish independence, at taxpayers' expense may I add, and the vote was won for the Union. The Spanish might have done much better to behave as the British did.

We oppose this convention, as *ultra vires*.

PRÉSIDENCE DE SYLVIE GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Interventions à la demande

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, al orador que me ha precedido en el uso de la palabra le diría que el Gobierno español cumple el Derecho internacional, cumple las Resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas, cumple con los Tratados europeos y con la Constitución española. Lo que sucede es que este señor no respeta la verdad, ni siquiera la verdad más mínima.

Dicho esto, vayamos ahora a los temas serios y no a los temas de circo. En los temas serios, esta transposición me gusta porque es fiel a la última Resolución del ICCAT. Lo único que lamento es que las transposiciones se realicen en ocasiones de forma tan tardía: se ha tardado casi diez años, y no se actualizan, sin embargo, las medidas relativas al pez espada, especie objeto de un plan de recuperación, creo que aprobado en 2016. Por eso, en fin, hemos tenido que hacer esta declaración aneja a la Resolución aprobada por la Comisión de Pesca del Parlamento que pone de manifiesto estos desajustes, y me gustaría que se tuviera en cuenta para futuras transposiciones.

Y voy a manifestar un deseo más: que, por favor, se tenga en cuenta la necesidad de aumentar las cuotas del atún rojo ahora, para compensar además las restricciones que se han establecido respecto del pez espada.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

La Présidente. – Restez debout parce qu'on a failli avoir un carton bleu de M. Iturgaiz sur M. Coburn, mais là, M. Coburn voudrait vous poser une question, M. Millán Mon, êtes-vous d'accord?

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Si es una pregunta y no un insulto.

La Présidente. – Monsieur Coburn, vous n'allez pas l'insulter?

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – I would assure the Honourable Gentleman it is not, but I would like to point out that what we did in the United Kingdom – and it was a brave and sensible thing to do, and the right thing to do – was that we had a debate on Scottish independence. I led one side of it – or part of one side of it – and other people led the other. That seemed to be a better way of solving these matters than the way the Spanish Government is doing it now. I am also very pleased to see that the European Union has kept out of this. I talked to Jean-Claude Juncker and he did not want to become involved. I think that is good. But do you not think that my method of doing this or our method ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

La Présidente. – Monsieur Coburn, cela n'a rien à voir avec le débat.

Vous vous étiez engagé à ne pas l'insulter mais vous deviez aussi rester dans le débat. Excusez-moi mais, pour l'instant, c'est moi qui préside. Donc, nous restons dans le débat.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor Coburn, entre las cosas que hay que aprender es que es distinta la Constitución británica, que es un texto no escrito, de la Constitución española.

Por consiguiente, no se puede comparar el caso escocés con el caso catalán, porque las Constituciones son distintas.

Repito: la Constitución española dice claramente que la nación española es indisoluble —única e indisoluble— en su artículo 2. Nada tiene que ver con el texto británico, que encima ni existe.

Por consiguiente, no se pueden mezclar cosas que son total y absolutamente distintas.

Carlos Iturgaiz (PPE). – Señora presidenta, deseo también recordarle al señor Coburn en diez segundos que hemos visto muchas veces imágenes de la policía británica cuando ha tenido que ir a repeler manifestaciones, porque ellos representan la ley y el orden —la policía británica, como la policía española—; hemos visto también cómo lo han hecho en el Reino Unido, y pocas lecciones puede dar el señor Coburn al Reino de España.

Señora presidenta, permítame que lo primero que haga sea felicitar al ponente, mi compañero Gabriel Mato, ya que este informe sobre las medidas de gestión, conservación y control aplicables en la zona del Convenio de la CICA es un informe complejo, laborioso y muy esperado por el sector pesquero, ya que se establecen las medidas de gestión y control, con el fin de lograr la conservación del atún atlántico.

Debo recordar —como se ha dicho aquí también— lamentablemente, que todavía la Comisión Europea no ha mandado ningún plan sobre esta cuestión; y ha pasado una década desde las peticiones parlamentarias y las peticiones sobre este asunto de los trabajadores del sector —los pescadores—, que son los que sufren directamente esa apatía que se está produciendo. Eso se une también al hecho de que, desafortunadamente, no se han aumentado las cuotas para el atún, cuando hay datos técnicos y biológicos de que sí se puede realizar.

Por lo tanto, exigimos a la Comisión una respuesta favorable a las demandas del señor Mato.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all those who participated in the debate. It has shown a very broad criticism of the delay but broad support for the approval of this proposal and I am very happy that the negotiations have concluded.

Many have stressed the issue of the delayed transposition, which I fully understand. I have already commented on the delay in my introductory remarks. I stress again that the European Union has been complying with its international obligations all along, in spite of the delay in transposition. The EU was never in breach of any law. The adoption of this proposal will also contribute to reducing such delays in the future. This is a milestone that will contribute to a quicker procedure to transpose international obligations, acquired by the Union under regional fisheries management organisations (RFMO), into EU law in a timely manner.

I want to stress the fact that the EU fishing industry was never exempt from any measure of the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). The European Union is a contracting party to ICCAT since 1997; as such the EU is under international obligation to ensure that the provisions of the ICCAT recommendations are effectively complied with, but pursuant to Article 216(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) this international obligation also lies with Member States. They are bound to comply with the provisions of RFMOs and take necessary measures to this end, even in the absence of transposition of the said measures into EU law.

In fact, the Commission was continuously monitoring to ensure that all Member States were adhering to ICCAT obligations and measures. With regards to the use of data, I can assure you all that we are not using ten year old data as was said. I want to assure everyone that all fishing opportunities are evaluated by scientists on the latest data given by all contracting parties.

One comment regarding Mr Marias' question on what support could be given to fishermen affected by an oil spin – I will take note of this and will revert directly to you to see whether support measures are available under the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF).

With regards to this regulation, the Commission sees it as an inspiration for future transpositions. It was led by the principle of fair and strict transpositions and it allows for quick implementation of new ICCAT recommendations. As I said, the proposal transposing the management plan for swordfish is expected to reach you during the next months. The issue of quota distribution, which was raised by some MEPs, is not part of this regulation. This has been discussed extensively with Member States both before the ICCAT meeting and also after. We have found a good solution.

Madam President, I would like to thank again Mr Mato and Madam Renata Briano for their support and the debate. I am looking forward to a very positive vote in the future.

Gabriel Mato, *ponente*. – Señora presidenta, solo cuando escucho al señor Coburn veo algo positivo en el *brexít*. ¿Saben qué es? Que no volverá a estar en este Parlamento. Cuando se habla de libertad y de democracia, no se puede hablar de ellas si no se habla de libertad, de respeto a las leyes y a los tribunales.

Gracias a todos, a todos los que han intervenido, incluso a aquellos que han dicho que no iban a apoyar este proyecto.

En todo caso, yo lo que quiero decir, señor comisario, es que acepto su compromiso de trabajar en la línea de ir más rápido. Es evidente, es necesario.

Estamos hablando ahora del plan del pez espada. Ha dicho que va a estar antes de fin de año..., ¡ojalá! Ya es un año y pico, un año largo para que esté aquí. Pero, en todo caso, no son los nueve años de los que estamos hablando, y yo se lo agradezco.

Es verdad que dice que hay una falsa percepción, que han cumplido... Hombre, lo que no sabemos son las consecuencias. Evidentemente, al ser vinculantes, se han podido aplicar, pero, desde luego, estamos de acuerdo en que no es lo deseable.

Y no entienda la declaración, no la vea solo como una crítica —que lo es, evidentemente—. Debe entenderla como un aliciente, como una alerta y como una invitación para que esto no vuelva a suceder.

La señora Hazekamp decía, con respecto al plan de recuperación del atún, que no podíamos pedir más cuotas. Hombre, el plan de recuperación ha sido total y absolutamente un éxito. Y me decía que no tenga vergüenza en tener más ambición. No, no tengo en absoluto vergüenza de tener más ambición. Lo que pasa es que no sé si nuestras ambiciones van en el mismo camino, porque es importante imponer medidas estrictas cuando es necesario —y así se ha hecho—, pero igualmente es importante recompensar a los pescadores por su esfuerzo, y eso hay que hacerlo.

Decía el comisario que, efectivamente, no es el motivo de lo que estamos hablando hoy —el aumento de cuotas de atún rojo—. Pero no podemos decir a los pescadores que estamos hablando de la CICA, que estamos hablando de recomendaciones y que estamos hablando de planes del pez espada, en los que se imponen unas cuotas, y, paralelamente, no les decimos «ustedes han hecho un esfuerzo, ustedes han conseguido que se hayan recuperado las poblaciones de esto y, por tanto, vamos a ampliarles las cuotas».

Nada más, presidenta. Nada más, comisario.

La Présidente. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 3 octobre 2017.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD), par écrit. – La conservation des ressources biologiques marines étant une politique exclusive de l'UE, il n'y a d'autre choix pour les États membres que d'agir dans ce cadre (ou de quitter l'UE comme l'a fait le Groenland en 1985). Ce texte contribue à préserver non seulement les stocks de poissons en Atlantique et en Méditerranée, mais également à protéger les espèces de tortues et d'oiseaux marins menacées par la pêche industrielle. Malheureusement, les États ont la charge de nombreux contrôles, ce qui constitue une charge administrative importante.

Norbert Erdős (PPE), írásban. – A szavazásra kerülő javaslat célja, hogy az Atlanti-óceánban és az azzal határos tengerekben élő Atlanti Tonhal Védelmére Létrehozott Nemzetközi Bizottság által elfogadott állományvédelmi, ellenőrzési és érvényesítési intézkedéseket átültesse az uniós jogba. Támogatni kell-e ajánlások kötelezővé tételét, hiszen a tengeri halállományok megvédésével és a tengerek biológiai sokféleségének és ökoszisztémájának a megőrzésével valójában a gyermekeink és unokáink – akik közül remélhetően sokan tengeri halászattal foglalkoznak majd – jövőjét és megélhetését biztosítjuk.

Ebből a szempontból látni kell, hogy az EU-ban az akvakultúra jelenleg sajnos másodlagos szerepet tölt be a halászat mellett. Egyértelmű azonban, hogy a fenntartható módon végzett tengeri halászat nem képes kiszolgálni az emberiség növekvő igényét a halászati termékek iránt, így minőségi váltással az akvakultúra-fejlesztés irányába kell elmozdulni az Európai Uniónak. Ezáltal nő az ágazat versenyképessége és csökken a halászati termékek tekintetében az importfüggősége Európának. Az EU kevesebb, mint 2 százalékát adja a világon akvakultúrában megtermelt halnak, ám a minőség tekintetében az élen jár. Erre a minőségre alapozva kell a munkát folytatni, segítve így az ágazat növekedését. Ez nem csak munkahelyek számának növekedését jelenti, hanem hozzájárul az élelmezésbiztonság javításához is.

15. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (kurze Darstellung)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Anna Hedh sur l'émancipation économique des femmes dans les secteurs privé et public dans l'Union (2017/2008(INI)) (A8-0271/2017).

Anna Hedh, föredragande. – Fru talman! Även om Europa är världsledande på kvinnors rättigheter och jämställdhet så har vi väldigt mycket kvar att göra. Precis som talman Tajani sa när han öppnade sammanträdesperioden har vi här i huset ett enormt ansvar för kvinnors rättigheter, och kan göra skillnad.

Därför är jag glad över att idag få lägga fram mitt betänkande om kvinnors ekonomiska egenmakt i den privata och den offentliga sektorn i EU. I dagens Europa ser vi ojämställdheten tydligt mellan män och kvinnor i vår vardag, om det så gäller det könsbaserade lönegapet, pensionsklyftan, ansvaret för det obetalda hemarbetet eller trakasserier på arbetsplatsen.

I arbetet med jämställdhet är ekonomiskt självbestämmande en central fråga och något vi alltid måste ha i beaktande när vi försöker nå förändring. En av de främsta faktorer som begränsar människor är ekonomisk utsatthet, och kvinnor är överrepresenterade i såväl fattigdom som ekonomiskt beroende. Ett resultat av detta är lönegapet och den efterföljande pensionsklyftan, som tyvärr fortfarande är alarmerande. Lönegapet mellan män och kvinnor är 16,5 procent i EU, vilket i sin tur resulterat i en pensionsklyfta på 40 procent, samtidigt som skillnaden i sysselsättning mellan män och kvinnor kostar EU ungefär 370 miljarder euro per år.

Dessutom hålls idag 17 miljoner kvinnor i EU ofrivilligt utanför arbetsmarknaden på grund av osäkra arbetsvillkor. Vi måste se till att kvinnors anställningar är trygga och ge rätt till heltid. Dessutom måste vi ta tag i det obetalda hemarbetet, som kvinnor i EU lägger 24 timmar mer på än män. Jag vill se ett slut på det här och jag tror att en viktig väg framåt för jämställdhet handlar om ekonomiskt självbestämmande. Vägen dit är inte lätt och vi måste våga tänka brett och långsiktigt. Men jag tror att mitt betänkande kan vara vägledande.

Inför omröstningen imorgon är det vissa saker i mitt betänkande som jag vill trycka extra på, och som vi faktiskt kom överens om i utskottet. Trots det så försöker nu EPP och ALDE som vanligt att plocka bort de här viktiga frågorna. Några av dem är lönegapet mellan män och kvinnor, som måste upphöra. Därför föreslår jag lönekartläggningar och att de sociala parterna ska arbeta för höjda löner i sektorer där kvinnor utgör en majoritet av arbetsstyrkan, att de makroekonomiska tendenser vi har idag måste omprövas.

Vi behöver ett jämställdhetsperspektiv på den ekonomiska politiken. Det märktes tydligt under den ekonomiska krisen, då åtstramningarna slog särskilt hårt mot kvinnor. Mäns våld mot kvinnor är ett av dagens stora säkerhetsproblem. Vi måste få ett slut på de patriarkala föreställningar som resulterat i att kvinnor dör. Och vi måste se till att alla har tillgång till sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter. Rätten att bestämma över sin egen kropp får aldrig inskränkas.

Vi befinner oss bara tre år från 2020, där vi själva satt upp mycket höga mål som vi måste uppnå. Vi kan inte acceptera ett misslyckande och måste fortsätta arbeta för kvinnors egenmakt och deltagande på arbetsmarknaden.

Vi måste visa ledarskap genom att inta en bestämd hållning om att vi inte tolererar ojämställdhet och att vi även förväntar oss att både den offentliga och privata sektorn tar ansvar för den bristande jämställdheten, som breder ut sig på grund av de problem som tas upp i det här betänkandet som vi röstar om imorgon.

Jag vill tacka alla som har deltagit i arbetet med det här betänkandet, såväl ledamöter som tjänstemän. Det är varit ett fantastiskt jobb att arbeta tillsammans med er.

Interventions à la demande.

Michaela Šojdrová, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, ženy a muži mají rovná práva a přesto mají ženy slabší ekonomické postavení, mají nižší příjmy a nižší zastoupení v řídicích funkcích. Je to nespravedlivé pro ženy a neefektivní pro společnost. Je tedy správné, abychom hledali cesty, jak ženy podpořit. Musíme striktně trvat na dodržování zásady stejné odměny za stejnou práci a prosazování antidiskriminační legislativy. Já osobně oceňuji také poslední návrh Evropské komise, který má za cíl zlepšit možnosti pro sdílení péče o děti oběma rodiči.

Přesto pro návrh zprávy, kterou nyní projednáváme, jsem ve výboru FEMM nehlasovala. Ekonomické postavení ženy nemůžeme zlepšovat jen tím, že ženy pošleme do práce a zabráníme jim mít děti a být matkami. To by byl velký omyl. Ekonomické postavení žen zlepšíme tím, když jim umožníme kvalitní vzdělání, když finančně oceníme jejich péči o dítě v době mateřské a rodičovské dovolené. Když umožníme maminkám uplatnit jejich vzdělání a pokračovat v jejich profesi, když zaměstnavatelé budou motivováni k zaměstnávání na částečný úvazek. Ekonomické postavení žen podpoříme tím, když uznáme hodnotu jejich mateřství a umožníme svobodnou volbu rodičovské a profesní kariéry.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nonostante i progressi degli ultimi anni, la potenziale forza lavoro delle donne è ancora lontana dall'essere utilizzata appieno e in maniera ottimale. Il tasso complessivo di occupazione delle donne è tuttora inferiore a quello degli uomini del 12% e dunque, anche in Europa, le donne soffrono un divario considerevole dal punto di vista socioeconomico nei confronti degli uomini: sono sottopagate e spesso sottostimate rispetto ai colleghi uomini e sono ancora sottorappresentate nei posti decisionali, soprattutto nel mondo degli affari e della politica.

Anche l'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro sottolinea la persistenza di un *gap* di genere nella retribuzione delle donne. Insomma, nonostante il lavoro diventi sempre più un aspetto importante dell'identità femminile, c'è ancora molta strada da fare per il raggiungimento di una parità vera tra uomini e donne.

La vera rivoluzione dell'Europa in favore della parità di genere si misura, a mio avviso, anche a livello culturale, combattendo le discriminazioni di genere in ogni forma queste si presentino. Questa, penso, sia una delle sfide principali dell'Unione europea.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι γνωστό ότι υπάρχει ένα συγκεκριμένο κοινωνικοοικονομικό πλαίσιο ισχυρών φραγμών που εμποδίζουν την οικονομική ενδυνάμωση των γυναικών. Τα στοιχεία καταδεικνύουν ότι στον εργασιακό χώρο παραμένει ένα τεράστιο μισθολογικό χάσμα ανάμεσα στα δύο φύλα, που ανέρχεται στο 16,4% εις βάρος των γυναικών, ενώ αντίστοιχα το συνταξιοδοτικό χάσμα ανέρχεται στο 39%. Αν λάβουμε υπόψη ότι οι γυναίκες απασχολούνται σε ευέλικτες μορφές απασχόλησης, αυτό σημαίνει ότι τα συνταξιοδοτικά τους δικαιώματα γίνονται ακόμη υποδεέστερα. Επιπλέον, θα πρέπει να λάβουμε υπόψη ότι η συνολική απασχόληση των γυναικών υπολείπεται αυτής των ανδρών κατά 12%. Σύμφωνα με την Eurostat, ο σημερινός μέσος όρος των γυναικών στα διοικητικά συμβούλια των μεγάλων εισηγμένων εταιρειών είναι μόλις 23,9%. Επιπλέον, στην Ελλάδα, όπου τα μνημόνια έχουν διαλύσει κυριολεκτικά την ελληνική κοινωνία, οι γυναίκες αποτελούν την ομάδα του πληθυσμού που έχει πληγεί περισσότερο. Για αυτό χρειάζονται μέτρα για τη στήριξη των γυναικών, ιδίως των γυναικών στην Ελλάδα, ιδίως της νέας αγρότισσας.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quería agradecer el trabajo de la ponente con este informe y, como ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, quería señalar que estoy muy satisfecha, especialmente en algunos aspectos, como son el reconocer que las barreras estructurales que frenan el empoderamiento económico de las mujeres tienen su origen en muchas formas de desigualdad y discriminación que se solapan y, por lo tanto, las respuestas tienen que ser integrales.

Quiero hablar de la necesidad de modificar y de impulsar el sector de los cuidados, un sector ocupado mayoritariamente por mujeres. Hay informes de la Conferencia Internacional de Sindicatos que plantean que, invirtiendo un 2 % del producto interior bruto, en muchos países europeos se podría generar un incremento del empleo de entre el 2 y el 6 % en este sector, y a la vez dignificarlo, mejorar la calidad y combatir la precariedad.

Es necesario, en este sentido, que planteemos ya unos permisos de paternidad y de maternidad iguales e intransferibles, que redistribuyan de forma equitativa los cuidados entre hombres y mujeres, además de una serie de medidas...

(La presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, I believe in equality of opportunity, I oppose any gender-based discrimination. The best candidate should be chosen at the same pay – irrespective of gender, religion, sexuality, ethnicity or pretty much anything else. In fact where the private sector is concerned, whenever they choose the wrong person for a job by discriminating, they effectively discriminate against themselves because it hits their own effectiveness, and consequently hits their profits.

But where I diverge from this report is I do not consider equality of outcome to be an appropriate measure in and of itself of non-discrimination, because outcomes are based on a host of other factors. Not least that more men or more women might be more interested in a particular job or have different life and career goals, and in my view society should not measure that – it is none of the state's business how we choose to approach work – but what we should do is stand against illegal and unfair discrimination.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, pri čítaní odsekov 44 a 45 predloženej správy som si spomenula na slová nedávno zosnulej Simone Veil, ktorú tak často spomíname v tomto parlamente. Keď uvádzala svoj návrh zákona, ktorým boli vo Francúzsku legalizované potraty, povedala: „Žiadna žena nie je šťastná, keď sa musí uchýliť k potratu. Len počúvajte ženy. Vždy to bola a zostane tragédia. Preto hoci tento návrh zákona berie do úvahy existujúce fakty, hoci akceptuje možnosť potratu, jeho hlavným cieľom je kontrolovať ho a tam, kde je to možné, odradiť ženy.“ Ak neželané tehotenstvo zhoršuje postavenie ženy v práci, existuje tisíc spôsobov, ako to môžeme riešiť. Potrat k nim však nepatrí, pretože degraduje hodnotu života ženy a aj jej dieťaťa. Preto nemôžem správu podporiť.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, mă bucur că foarte mulți bărbați au luat cuvântul la o asemenea temă și sper să poată să influențeze în țările domniilor lor egalitatea de șanse.

Capacitatea și inteligența femeilor sunt resurse ce nu trebuie să fie ignorate. Studiile, așa cum arată și raportul, arată că, dacă am îmbunătăți această egalitate de șanse, am putea, până în 2050, să suplimentăm cu peste zece milioane de locuri de muncă. Egalitatea de șanse nu trebuie să fie o statistică. Aici vorbim însă și de educație și voi vota cu toată inima acest raport, însă, domnule comisar, cred că trebuie să vedem și cum se transpune în legislația națională și cum se corelează educația, pentru că avem încă bariere și mentalități și la femei și la bărbați, tocmai din cauza precarității educației. Trebuie să susținem femeia să-și ocupe locul de muncă pe care îl dorește, dar să fie remunerată, să fie plătită la același loc de muncă cu același salariu dacă are aceeași responsabilitate.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, zadiranje zakonodavca u privatnu sferu u obimu u kojem preporučuju ovo i slična izvješća svojstveno je totalitarnim režimima, a ne demokratskim sustavima. Nije stvar politike kako će supružnici raspodjeljivati kućanske poslove i koliko će se koji od njih posvetiti djeci. To je stvar dogovora unutar obitelji s kojim država ne bi trebala imati baš ništa.

Žene moraju imati istu startnu poziciju na tržištu kao muškarci i treba ih se procjenjivati na temelju njihovih kompetencija, a ne spola. I sama sam bila žrtva diskriminacije i prošla težak put da bih bila tretirana kao moji muški kolege. Na kraju sam pobijedila sustav svojim sposobnošću i upornošću, a ne nečijom milošću.

Kvota su ponižavajuće za žene jer ih automatski obilježavaju manje vrijednima, a služe samo određenim krugovima kako bi lakše ostvarili svoje političke ciljeve. Istome služi i tzv. Istanbulska konvencija, otvoreno promiče rodnu ideologiju i zato se nadam da je Hrvatska neće ratificirati.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Madam President, I have listened with great interest to what the lady said, I have looked at the report and I am looking forward to reading it more. I myself am a rampant feminist: my grandmother was a suffragette. I do not agree with everything the report says, may I say, but I hope she has looked into the BBC – the British Broadcasting Corporation – an organisation which consistently trumpets its left-wing credentials and, dare I say, progressive, whatever that might mean, and in spite of that, the salary differentials in the BBC between ladies and gentlemen are absolutely blatant. I encourage you to look into them. They are letting down the cause of meritocracy and, dare I say it (it is not a word I generally use), egalitarianism. So I do hope you will look into the BBC. What is going on there is something worth looking at – a lot of hypocrisy. I hope you will do that.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przede wszystkim gratuluję sprawozdawczyni tego sprawozdania, podjęcia bardzo ważnego tematu dotyczącego obecności kobiet na rynku pracy i wzmocnienia ekonomicznego kobiet. Tak naprawdę mówimy tutaj o zachętach dla kobiet, powinniśmy mówić może nie tyle o zachętach, ile o tym, żeby w końcu przestano kobietom rzucać klody pod nogi, żeby w końcu te widzialne i niewidzialne bariery na rynku pracy zniknęły, żeby nie było luki płacowej, szklanego sufitu, żeby nie było luki emerytalnej i szeregu innych rzeczy, z którymi kobiety muszą się zmagać, kiedy wkraczają na rynek pracy.

Dzisiaj w Unii Europejskiej mamy rynek pracownika. Brakuje coraz bardziej pracowników i będzie brakowało, szacuje się, że w ciągu następnych kilkunastu lat 27 milionów. Ta luka mogłaby być mniejsza, gdyby kobiety mogły pracować, ale nie ma żłobków, nie ma przedszkoli, nie ma domów opieki w takiej ilości, w jakiej powinny być, i dlatego te cele są zbieżne i dlatego powinniśmy w końcu coś zrobić.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I congratulate my colleagues, and particularly Anna Hedh, on this report on women's economic empowerment. It is a great example of the progressive consensus-based policy-making that happens in this House, which makes it such an important institution in the world today.

The report highlights many important actions that are required in order to empower women: significantly, education, overcoming discrimination in the workplace and fighting against violence against women. I would specifically like to highlight the enormous potential of social enterprises and cooperatives to provide opportunities to those women who are most vulnerable and marginalised in our society, and those who suffer intersectional discrimination and social exclusion, such as refugees, asylum seekers, disabled women, LGBTI women, Roma women and women in rural areas.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! A nők gazdasági szerepvállalásának növelése egy kívánatos eszköz társadalmaink igazságosabbá tételében, ám ehhez elengedhetetlen a munka világának és a családi életnek a jobb összeegyeztethetősége. Ehhez a tagállamoknak is sokat kell tenniük a meglévő jogi keret fejlesztésével, a különböző munkavállalási formák rugalmassá tételével, a részmunkaidő és a távmunka támogatásával. Ma vannak olyan tagállamok az EU-ban, ahol továbbra is elenyésző ezen rugalmas munkavégzési formák aránya.

Sőt, Romániában a kormány bevezette, hogy a cégek ezentúl a részmunkaidős munkavállalóik után is ugyanolyan mértékű közterheket fizetnek, mint a teljes munkaidős alkalmazottaik után. Ez semmiképpen sem a nők munkaerőpiaci helyzetének erősítését célzó intézkedés egy olyan országban, amely egyébként a foglalkoztatottság tekintetében még mindig jelentősen elmarad más tagállamoktól és az EU felé tett vállalásaitól is.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, in my community of Lancashire there are women earning up to 27% less than men for the same work. In fact, the National Centre for Social Research named two communities in my constituency in the 10 worst local economies in the UK to be women.

The EU and Member States acknowledge the problem, but we are crippled by slow progress. One analysis this year estimates that, at the current pace, the UK pay gap will not be eradicated until 2069 – that will be 99 years after the introduction of the Equal Pay Act.

This is a holistic problem that touches education, affordable childcare, support for carers and boardroom gender equality. At its heart, it is a problem of basic dignity at work for women everywhere.

Please let's not let progress stall. My constituents cannot afford to wait until 2069.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, en effet, j'ai souhaité intervenir car ce sujet est important pour tout le monde, c'est pourquoi tous les membres de ce Parlement, les hommes y compris, doivent pouvoir s'exprimer sur ce rapport.

I would like to welcome the call for concrete action for women's economic empowerment in the private and public sectors in the EU for equal pay between men and women for equal work and work of equal value. I believe that the draft on women's economic empowerment is right and smart at the same time, because it is enhancing a better-quality work-life balance. We should step up towards concrete legislation that includes gender perspective, which does not necessarily equate to empowerment without including measures to combat all forms of gender-based violence.

Finally, it is accurate to state that gender equality and gender balance is an incontrovertible fundamental right in the better integration of women in the labour market and can lead only to property and economic growth.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, în primul rând vreau să o felicit pe Anna Hedh pentru abordarea avută în cadrul acestui raport. Într-o societate aflată într-o evoluție continuă, consider că educația este cel mai important instrument pentru ca femeile să poată participa pe deplin la dezvoltarea socială și economică, pentru a-și putea găsi un loc de muncă de calitate. Una din acțiunile cheie pentru atingerea acestui obiectiv este consolidarea politicilor și creșterea investițiilor în educație și formare, promovarea sectoarelor și a funcțiilor în care femeile sunt subreprezentate pentru a crește rata de angajare a lor în asemenea posturi. În plus, este esențială formarea în domeniul antreprenoriatului, corelată cu formarea și sprijinul în accesarea unor surse alternative de finanțare și a oportunităților de constituire a unor rețele de afaceri pentru a-și lansa singure sau în colaborare propriile afaceri bazate pe idei inovatoare.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. –Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank Anna Hedh, the rapporteur of this report. Women's equal participation in the labour market and in economic decision-making are preconditions for women's empowerment.

The Commission's strategic engagement for gender equality 2016-2019 identifies five priority areas for action. 1: increasing female labour market participation and the equal economic independence of women and men; 2: reducing the gender pay earnings and pension gaps and thus fighting poverty among women; 3: promoting equality between women and men in decision-making; 4: combating gender-based violence and protecting and supporting victims; and 5: promoting gender equality and women's rights across the world.

In this context, let us focus on two important aspects. First, closing the gender employment gap. Women remain significantly under-represented in the labour market. In 2016, women's employment rate was still more than 10 points lower than men's employment rate. If you look at the full-time equivalent employment rate, the gap reaches 18 points. This gap is not related to professional qualifications or academic achievement, where women more and more out-perform men. It is first and foremost related to the way women and men share caring responsibilities in our society.

The Commission has developed an extensive package of measures contributing to the economic empowerment of women. The main objective of our proposal for a directive on work-life balance of working parents and carers is to address women's under-representation in the labour market. The proposed directive aims at modernising the current EU legal and policy frameworks for family-related leave and flexible working arrangements.

The proposed directive is complemented with non-legislative measures with the objective to promote the development of formal care services; the enforcement of the rules with regard to dismissal; protection for pregnant women; and removing economic disincentives for second earners to work. We are also developing the relevant indicators in order to be able to measure progress in all these areas.

The second aspect to focus on when it comes to the economic empowerment of women is closing the gender pay gap. The gender pay gap has been decreasing only slowly and seems to have stabilised at 16% over the last years as a result of pervasive segregation on the labour market, persistent stereotypes fuelled by inadequate work-life balance policies, and discrimination, all of this combined with a lack of transparency.

The effective application of the existing legal framework on equal pay remains a challenge in all Member States. The Commission constantly monitors whether EU law on equal pay is applied correctly and supports Member States and other stakeholders in the proper enforcement of the existing rules.

We are now finalising – and intend to propose – an action plan to tackle the gender pay gap from all possible angles. It will aim, in particular, at improving the application of the equal-pay principle, combating segregation in occupations and sectors, combating vertical segregation, and recognising women's skills, efforts and responsibilities.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 3 octobre 2017.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aunque la UE es un líder mundial en materia de derechos de la mujer e igualdad de género, todavía no hemos alcanzado la equiparación total en cuanto a la participación de la mujer en el mercado de trabajo, los salarios y las pensiones, la representación política y económica, etc. Es necesario que la UE adopte cuanto antes medidas concretas para potenciar el empoderamiento de las mujeres, porque solo cuando logremos la independencia económica de todas las mujeres podremos alcanzar la igualdad de género. Es necesario mejorar la conciliación de la vida personal y laboral, lograr un reparto más equilibrado del trabajo no remunerado entre hombres y mujeres, mejorar la transparencia salarial y la cartografía de los salarios mediante disposiciones vinculantes para alcanzar un salario igual por trabajo igual y de igual valor, exigir que las empresas negocien planes en materia de igualdad de género para reforzar la igualdad de oportunidades y combatir la discriminación, garantizar una representación paritaria en los equipos que intervienen en la negociación colectiva, aumentar la participación de las mujeres en la toma de decisiones, fomentar el uso de cuotas de género y listas cremallera en la toma de decisiones políticas y erradicar la violencia de género.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Statistiniai duomenys rodo, kad ES, siekdama užtikrinti lyčių lygybę, dar nėra pasiekusi reikšmingos pažangos. Kol kas matome tik nereikšmingą lygybės padidėjimą.

Nepaisant to, kad moterys turi aukštesnį išsilavinimą nei vyrai, vyrų ir moterų darbo užmokesčio skirtumai yra ryškūs ir sudaro 16,1 proc. Dar labiau skiriasi pensijų dydis – 40,2 proc. Didelė problema – neapmokamo darbo namų ūkyje nevienodesnis paskirstymas. Kai neapmokamas namų ūkio darbas bus atliekamas tiek vyrų, tiek moterų, ir taps vienodai pasidalyta našta, moterys galės dalyvauti darbo rinkoje kaip vyrai, bus sukurtas geresnis pagrindas deramai profesinio ir asmeninio gyvenimo pusiausvyrai ir taip atsiras galimybės moterims konkuruoti vienodomis sąlygomis. Taip ne tik bus užtikrinamos žmonių teisės, bet ir atneš ekonominės naudos.

Siekiant stiprinti moterų ekonomines galias, visų pirma reikia užtikrinti, kad visiems būtų mokamas vienodas užmokeskis už vienodos vertės darbą. Taip pat sektoriuose, kuriuose daugiausia dirba moterys, darbuotojams turi būti mokamas didesnis užmokeskis. Kalbant apie įmonių valdybas ir viešąjį sektorių, kur priimami aukšto lygio sprendimai, moterų dalyvavimo patirtis rodo teigiamus rezultatus.

Todėl Taryba yra raginama skubiai priimti direktyvą dėl moterų įmonių valdybose. Įmonės ir įvairios institucijos yra raginamos pasitvirtinti lyčių lygybės planus, kurie padeda mažinti nelygybę darbo vietoje: spręsti įdarbinimo, darbo užmokesčio, karjeros, mokymo bei profesinio ir asmeninio gyvenimo pusiausvyros problemas, o taip pat užkirsti kelią seksualiniam priekabiavimui.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aunque la UE es líder mundial en materia de derechos de la mujer e igualdad de género, todavía no hemos alcanzado la equiparación total en cuanto a la participación de la mujer en el mercado de trabajo, los salarios y las pensiones, la representación política y económica, etc. Es necesario que la UE adopte cuanto antes medidas concretas para potenciar el empoderamiento de las mujeres, porque solo cuando logremos la independencia económica de todas las mujeres podremos alcanzar la igualdad de género. Es necesario mejorar la conciliación de la vida personal y laboral, lograr un reparto más equilibrado del trabajo no remunerado entre hombres y mujeres, mejorar la transparencia salarial y la cartografía de los salarios mediante disposiciones vinculantes para alcanzar un salario igual por trabajo igual y de igual valor, exigir que las empresas negocien planes en materia de igualdad de género para reforzar la igualdad de oportunidades y combatir la discriminación, garantizar una representación paritaria en los equipos que intervienen en la negociación colectiva, aumentar la participación de las mujeres en la toma de decisiones, fomentar el uso de cuotas de género y listas cremallera en la toma de decisiones políticas y erradicar la violencia de género.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aunque la UE es un líder mundial en materia de derechos de la mujer e igualdad de género, todavía no hemos alcanzado la equiparación total en cuanto a la participación de la mujer en el mercado de trabajo, los salarios y las pensiones, la representación política y económica, etc. Es necesario que la UE adopte cuanto antes medidas concretas para potenciar el empoderamiento de las mujeres, porque solo cuando logremos la independencia económica de todas las mujeres podremos alcanzar la igualdad de género. Es necesario mejorar la conciliación de la vida personal y laboral, lograr un reparto más equilibrado del trabajo no remunerado entre hombres y mujeres, mejorar la transparencia salarial y la cartografía de los salarios mediante disposiciones vinculantes para alcanzar un salario igual por trabajo igual y de igual valor, exigir que las empresas negocien planes en materia de igualdad de género para reforzar la igualdad de oportunidades y combatir la discriminación, garantizar una representación paritaria en los equipos que intervienen en la negociación colectiva, aumentar la participación de las mujeres en la toma de decisiones, fomentar el uso de cuotas de género y listas cremallera en la toma de decisiones políticas y erradicar

la violencia de género.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), schriftelijk. – Vrouwen zijn in de Europese Unie nog altijd ondervertegenwoordigd op de arbeidsmarkt. De totale arbeidsparticipatie van vrouwen ligt anno 2017 nog altijd 12 procent lager dan die van mannen. In het verslag van mijn collega Hedh worden diverse redenen genoemd voor dit grote verschil. Zolang niet of minder werken geen vrije keuze is, is dat voor mij onacceptabel. Daarom kijk ik ook graag naar de oplossingen om deze kloof te dichten.

Deze ontwerpresolutie biedt een aantal goede handvatten. Zo dienen er instrumenten te komen voor overheden en het bedrijfsleven die leiden tot meer loontransparantie. Hierdoor moet de loonkloof tussen mannen en vrouwen verkleind worden. Ook behoren de zogenaamde Barcelona-criteria gehaald te worden. Gezinnen kunnen hierdoor eerder kiezen voor kwalitatief betaalbare kinderopvang, zodat de arbeidsparticipatie van vrouwen kan toenemen.

In dit debat zijn er naar mijn mening grofweg twee stromingen. De eerste stroming stelt dat de ongelijkheid tussen mannen en vrouwen vanzelf wegebt. De tweede stroming probeert de kloof nu te dichten. Als uit berekeningen blijkt dat het in het huidige tempo tot het einde van deze eeuw duurt om de kloof te dichten, dan snap je dat ik deze kloof nu wil dichten.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), kirjallinen. – Vain puolet meistä EU:n naisista tekee kokopäivätyötä. Maanosa, jonka pitäisi näyttää muulle maailmalle esimerkkiä, jättää puolet naisista työvoiman ulkopuolelle. Tilanne ei ole paranemassa. Naiset syntyvät köyhempinä, elävät köyhempinä ja kuolevat köyhempinä kuin miehet. Naiset ovat aliedustettuina työmarkkinoilla koko EU:ssa. Naisten kokonaistyöllisyysaste on yhä lähes 12 prosenttia alhaisempi kuin miesten. 32 prosenttia työssäkäyvistä naisista tekee osa-aikatyötä, miehistä vain kahdeksan prosenttia.

Huijaammeko me Euroopan naisia? Väitämme, että kouluttautuminen on tie paremmille palkkoille. Huolimatta siitä, että naisten koulutustaso on EU:ssa nykyään keskimäärin miehiä korkeampi, sukupuolten välisen palkkakuilun suuruus on yhä 16 prosenttia. Naiset eivät siis nouse miesten palkkoille, vaikka ovat paremmin koulutettuja. Väitämme myös, että työskentelemällä paljon voi saada paljon palkkaa. Sekin on huijausta. Naiset tekevät enemmän töitä kuin miehet. Ero on siinä, että miehille maksetaan suuremmasta osasta heidän tekemäänsä työtä. Naiset tekevät EU:ssa ainakin kaksi ja puoli kertaa enemmän palkatonta kotitalous- ja hoivatyötä kuin miehet. Se on oikeaa työtä, mutta naisille ei makseta siitä. Kun kotona ja työpaikalla tehty työ lasketaan yhteen, ovat naisten työpäivät pidempiä. Iso syy nykytilalle onkin se, että naiset hoitavat lapsia ja vanhuksia kotona merkittävästi enemmän kuin miehet. Tätä pitää korjata asennekasvatuksella, mutta myös lainsäädännöllä Euroopan että jäsenmaiden tasolla. Tämän mietinnön ehdotukset on syytä ottaa erittäin vakavasti.

Javi López (S&D), por escrito. – Aunque la UE es un líder mundial en materia de derechos de la mujer e igualdad de género, todavía no hemos alcanzado la equiparación total en cuanto a la participación de la mujer en el mercado de trabajo, los salarios y las pensiones, la representación política y económica, etc. Es necesario que la UE adopte cuanto antes medidas concretas para potenciar el empoderamiento de las mujeres, porque solo cuando logremos la independencia económica de todas las mujeres podremos alcanzar la igualdad de género. Es necesario mejorar la conciliación de la vida personal y laboral, lograr un reparto más equilibrado del trabajo no remunerado entre hombres y mujeres, mejorar la transparencia salarial y la cartografía de los salarios mediante disposiciones vinculantes para alcanzar un salario igual por trabajo igual y de igual valor, exigir que las empresas negocien planes en materia de igualdad de género para reforzar la igualdad de oportunidades y combatir la discriminación, garantizar una representación paritaria en los equipos que intervienen en la negociación colectiva, aumentar la participación de las mujeres en la toma de decisiones, fomentar el uso de cuotas de género y listas cremallera en la toma de decisiones políticas y erradicar la violencia de género.

Claudia Tapardel (S&D), in writing. – Whether in businesses, as entrepreneurs or employees, or by doing unpaid care work at home, women make enormous contributions to economies. Therefore, their economic empowerment is an essential element of gender equality, further boosting growth and prosperity. But while the EU is a world leader when it comes to women's rights, it is unacceptable that it still lags behind as regards to their participation in the labour market and in economic decision-making. Given that women are the most affected by austerity, cuts and, unfortunately, violence, we need binding measures on pay transparency at work, and policies to tackle all forms of gender-based abuses. I am happy that the present report makes bold and necessary recommendations as to how to empower women. As a member of TRAN Committee, I fully support women's equal participation on the labour market, particularly in areas normally associated with men, such as transport, where only two out of ten workers are female. All sectors need to create better opportunities for women, but the transport sector is one of the sectors that can bring new opportunities, especially in the age of digitalisation and automation. Women empowerment is the only way to dismantle stereotypes and break barriers.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), par écrit. – Aujourd'hui, au sein de l'Union européenne, il existe encore un écart de 12 % entre le taux d'emploi des hommes et celui des femmes. Les raisons de cette situation inégale sont multiples et variées, mais elles nécessitent des mesures globales et ambitieuses. Non seulement cette situation est une honte pour des démocraties modernes telles que les nôtres qui défendent des principes d'égalité, mais ça correspond également à une aberration économique! En effet, selon l'OCDE, «La promotion de l'égalité des sexes et de l'activité des femmes pourrait déboucher sur des gains économiques considérables dans les pays de l'OCDE et du G20». Une amélioration de la situation des près de ¾ des femmes d'ici à 2025 pourrait correspondre à une augmentation du PIB mondial équivalente à celui de la zone euro, soit 12 000 milliards d'euro. Des mesures telles que des rémunérations égales pour un travail égal, un équilibre entre les hommes et les femmes dans les secteurs privés et publics ou encore la promotion de l'égalité entre les sexes vont dans le bon sens, mais ce n'est qu'un début! Il est grand temps que nos pays, nos dirigeants, prennent leurs responsabilités et luttent efficacement contre les inégalités liées au genre!

16. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (kurze Darstellung)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, sur le rétrécissement de l'espace dévolu à la société civile dans les pays en développement (2016/2324(INI) (A8-0283/2017).

Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, ponente. – Señora presidenta, estamos ante un informe de iniciativa de gran importancia para la sociedad civil en los países en desarrollo y también para las instituciones europeas.

Antes de detenerme en los puntos más importantes de este informe, quisiera subrayar la posición unánime que hemos mantenido todos los grupos políticos al afrontar la situación de la sociedad civil en los países en desarrollo. También he visto la importancia que tiene el trabajo conjunto y el consenso para alcanzar un buen resultado, y gracias a esa buena voluntad, por la importancia que este informe tenía, conseguimos aprobarlo con 22 votos a favor, una abstención y un voto en contra.

Es un informe muy oportuno y pertinente, ya que refleja la realidad de la sociedad civil en muchos países en desarrollo que reciben ayuda de la Unión Europea. He tenido oportunidad de reunirme con las ONG que trabajan *in situ*, escuchar los problemas y las dificultades que afrontan. También he tenido ocasión de reunirme con representantes de la Comisión Europea y del Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior y ellos también me han permitido ver otro prisma de los desafíos a los que hay que hacer frente en la Unión Europea para poder ayudar a los más desfavorecidos.

Todos estamos de acuerdo en que se han de respetar los derechos humanos, el Estado de Derecho y la democracia. La sociedad civil en los países en desarrollo es tan débil que necesita de toda nuestra acción y atención.

He visto las dificultades que viven cooperantes, periodistas, defensores de los derechos humanos; situaciones inadmisibles que, en muchas ocasiones, les llevan a la muerte.

También hay situaciones muy desesperadas en países en conflicto. Estoy pensando en África, donde los cooperantes y la sociedad civil sufren diariamente el azote del terrorismo.

A lo largo de este texto ha sido mi intención subrayar el valor de la sociedad civil para preservar una sociedad más democrática, más digna y más justa, colaborando positivamente también con el sector público y el sector privado. Por otra parte, es de suma importancia, y así lo refleja el informe, el reconocimiento de la acción de la Unión Europea, ya que defiende y potencia el papel de la sociedad civil en la cooperación al desarrollo.

Las iniciativas las podría agrupar en dos partes. La primera, el apoyo político, donde se plantean varias medidas, como encuentros regulares con miembros de la sociedad civil en el marco de las visitas oficiales —cuando los diputados vamos en delegación, yo personalmente tengo la presidencia, a un país, siempre reservo un espacio para atender a todas las ONG—. También incorporar regularmente este tema en la agenda de los Consejos de Asuntos Exteriores. También el fomento de la coherencia de las políticas en materia de derechos humanos, desarrollo, justicia y seguridad. También la creación de un mecanismo de seguimiento y alerta temprana en relación con la reducción del espacio en la sociedad civil.

La segunda iniciativa se refiere al apoyo financiero. Se recuerda que la Unión Europea es el principal donante de ayuda a las organizaciones de la sociedad civil en los países en desarrollo, pero pedimos que se incrementen los fondos de los instrumentos dedicados a ello, como el instrumento europeo de derechos humanos y el instrumento de cooperación al desarrollo.

También se insiste en la necesidad de mayores sinergias entre todos los instrumentos, solicitando un seguimiento, país por país, de todas las actividades de apoyo a la sociedad civil financiadas por la Unión Europea.

Para terminar, quisiera de nuevo recalcar ante esta Cámara la unidad de criterio en el trabajo desarrollado en comisión parlamentaria. Seguramente algunas partes no cubren el cien por cien de las expectativas de quienes hemos trabajado en ello, pero creo que en el diálogo mantenido han prevalecido el sentido común y la disponibilidad a la hora de hacer un buen trabajo.

Por ese motivo, pido el apoyo de esta Cámara, porque creo que debemos lanzar un mensaje importante, alto y claro, a esta sociedad civil amenazada en muchos países del mundo.

Interventions à la demande

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przede wszystkim chciałbym podziękować koleżance Jiménez-Becerril Barrio za bardzo dobre sprawozdanie. Niepokojący trend zmniejszania się przestrzeni dla społeczeństwa obywatelskiego w krajach rozwijających się jest zdecydowanie tematem, który należy nagłaśniać i podtrzymywać. Tym bardziej że Unia Europejska jest największym dawcą pomocy rozwojowej, poprzez którą wartości takie jak demokracja, dobre rządy czy prawa podstawowe są promowane w krajach partnerskich. Ważne jest, aby rządy, partie polityczne i administracja w krajach rozwijających się, zamiast wprowadzać ograniczenia dla takich organizacji i przesładować obrońców praw człowieka, potrafiły efektywnie z nimi współpracować. Dlatego kluczowe znaczenie ma promowanie inicjatyw na rzecz ściślejszego dialogu między stroną rządową i organizacjami społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, przedstawicielami władz lokalnych oraz sektorem prywatnym.

Mam nadzieję, że problem zmniejszającej się przestrzeni dla społeczeństwa obywatelskiego zostanie włączony do głównego nurtu działań polityki zagranicznej Unii Europejskiej.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, vreau de la bun început să felicit raportoarea pentru că, într-adevăr, este un raport de care avem nevoie cu toții. Sunt de acord că societatea civilă este cel de-al treilea sector al unei societăți democratice, decente, sănătoase, alături de sectorul public și cel privat. Societatea civilă poate juca un rol important în consolidarea democrației, în monitorizarea puterii statale, în promovarea unei bune guvernări.

Înțeleg îngrijorarea manifestată privind unele cazuri de restrângere a spațiului societății civile. Doresc însă să atrag atenția referitor la faptul că există o legătură directă între nivelul și calitatea educației și integritatea, calitatea și eficiența societății civile. De aceea, cred, domnule comisar, că este nevoie să avem programe conexe prin care să putem să asigurăm educația populației, pentru că societatea civilă este de fapt cine? - populația.

Poate există exemple în țări în curs de dezvoltare în care, din rândul societății civile, așa-zisă societate civilă, avem cazuri de persoane corupte și care acționează în contrasens cu democrația. De aceea, eu văd cele două programe corelate.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ρόλος της κοινωνίας των πολιτών στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικός, διότι μπορεί πραγματικά να στηρίξει την ανάπτυξη της δημοκρατίας στις χώρες αυτές, να στηρίξει την ίδια την υπεράσπιση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, τα οποία πραγματικά πλήττονται σε αυτές τις χώρες. Πρέπει λοιπόν να αναγνωρίσουμε τον ιδιαίτερο ρόλο της κοινωνίας των πολιτών. Αυτό αναφέρεται και στη Συμφωνία του Cotonou. Προφανώς, υπάρχει ανησυχία για τη συρρίκνωση της κοινωνίας των πολιτών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να λάβει συγκεκριμένα μέτρα, ιδίως να στηρίξει τις προσπάθειες που καταβάλλουν η εκκλησία και οι συνδικαλιστικές οργανώσεις. Θα ήθελα, όμως, να επισημάνω ότι υπάρχει και μια άλλη πλευρά της κοινωνίας των πολιτών. Υπάρχουν οργανώσεις οι οποίες αναμειγνύονται και σε αναπτυξιακά έργα και σε έργα αξιοποίησης κονδυλίων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και σε θέματα που έχουν σχέση

με τους πρόσφυγες. Εκεί γίνεται κυριολεκτικά ένα «πάρτι» και θα πρέπει να υπάρξει άμεσος έλεγχος της ίδιας της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής όσον αφορά τον τρόπο που διαχειρίζονται οι ΜΚΟ τα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, I do not of course disagree with the importance of civil society. I quote from the report and I support the principle of 'a genuinely independent pluralistic and vibrant civil society'. Where civil society is shrinking in developing countries, then of course we need that to be reversed.

Where I think I perhaps differ from the rapporteur is in two senses. Firstly, I think there is a hint of top-down action here: a supranational institution working together with national governments, to my mind, is something that is less valuable than organisations developing organically from the ground up within communities with the support of NGOs. Secondly, the overall tone of this report seems to be pushing in a direction of more and more harmonisation. Again, I think that is perhaps to an extent contrary to the aims that it is setting out to achieve.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ύπουλος και αποσταθεροποιητικός ρόλος των ΜΚΟ και των λεγόμενων οργανώσεων της κοινωνίας των πολιτών ενισχύεται με την αρωγή πολιτικών ανδρείκελων, σε εθνικό και ενωσιακό επίπεδο, που τις χρηματοδοτούν και τις προωθούν. Ήδη από την «Επανάσταση των Ρόδων» στη Γεωργία και την «Πορτοκαλί Επανάσταση» στην Ουκρανία φάνηκε στην πράξη πως οι ΜΚΟ εμπορεύονται άριστα την επιλεκτική και ανειλικρινή τους δράση, προωθώντας ύπουλα δήθεν προοδευτικές πρακτικές και αριστερά ιδεολογήματα προάσπισης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Οι οργανώσεις αυτές αμφισβητούν ευθέως αξίες και θεσμούς, αποδομούν την ιστορία των εθνών, τις ηθικές παραδόσεις, τη χριστιανική πίστη και αλλοιώνουν βίαια τις εθνικά ομοιογενείς κοινωνίες προωθώντας τη λαθρομετανάστευση. Όσοι δε πολιτικοί τις ενισχύουν, κεφαλαιοποιούν την υποστήριξή τους διά της ασυλίας και απαλλαγής κάθε ποινικής δίωξης, όπως για παράδειγμα ο πρώην Έλληνας Πρωθυπουργός Γιώργος Παπανδρέου, ο οποίος χρηματοδότησε παράνομα ΜΚΟ φίλων και συγγενών με τεράστια ποσά, ενώ ταυτόχρονα παρέσυρε τον ελληνικό λαό στη δίνη των μνημονίων.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl poděkovat paní zpravodajce za předložení této zprávy, protože podle mého názoru se velmi dobře vymezila vůči těm sporným bodům, které zde byly již zmíněny. Podle mého názoru tímto úskalím paní kolegyně proplula skutečně dobře. Já vnímám hodnotu občanské společnosti v těch rozvojových zemích jako skutečné srdce demokracie, jako skutečně klíčovou hodnotu, kterou bychom měli pomáhat rozvíjet.

Role Evropské unie v těchto státech je naprosto nepostradatelná a my bychom neměli pomáhat těmto subjektům pouze v té diplomatické části, ale samozřejmě v té finanční, jak zmínila paní kolegyně. A ta naše aktivní obhajoba se nám potom vyplatí právě s ohledem na mezinárodní diplomatické vztahy. Jsem přesvědčen, že pokud budeme dobře schopni cílit naši rozvojovou pomoc právě do těchto zemí a na podporu těchto rozvojových společností, tak se nám to vyplatí v tom dlouhodobém měřítku.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I am very glad to see this report come before Parliament at this time because when we look around the world we see civil societies face ever-increasing attacks from governments around the world in every region, including here in Europe. The European Union is a union of values and peoples, and it needs to rise to this challenge by investing seriously in the promotion of democracy, human rights and the rule of law around the world.

We talk a lot about tackling the root causes of the crises we face – the root causes of migration, radicalisation and instability – but supporting democratic civil society groups, NGOs and human rights defenders around the world is a key foreign policy priority for the EU, and it is really important that we invest in these vital grassroots groups. It is vital for all our futures.

Maria Heubuch (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Wenn die Hohe Vertreterin Mogherini die Menschenrechte nicht entschlossen schützt, wird es uns im Herzen Europas treffen. In allen Regionen dieser Welt gehen Regierungen massiv gegen die Zivilgesellschaft vor. Sie haben schmutzige Methoden, um Aktivistinnen mundtot zu machen: von bürokratischen Schikanen bis zu Kontosperrungen, von Verhaftungen bis hin zur Gewalt. Wenn wir seriös mit unseren Werten wie der Meinungsfreiheit umgehen wollen, dann dürfen wir nicht weiter zusehen, wie die Repressionen gegen die Zivilgesellschaft zunehmen, außerhalb Europas, aber auch innerhalb der europäischen Grenzen. Handlungsspielraum der Bevölkerung ist die Basis der Demokratie.

Und was sollte die Hohe Vertreterin nun tun? Sie muss jeden Angriff gegen die Zivilgesellschaft in den Partnerländern im politischen Dialog thematisieren, und sie muss ihn entschlossen anprangern. Menschenrechte sind keine Ware, nicht verhandelbar, auch nicht in Deals mit Ägypten und Äthiopien.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nei paesi in via di sviluppo si registra un preoccupante aumento delle segnalazioni riguardanti persecuzioni, molestie, stigmatizzazioni, detenzioni o arresti arbitrari a danno di attivisti e membri delle organizzazioni della società civile. In alcuni paesi ciò avviene in assoluta impunità, talvolta con la compiacenza o il benessere dell'autorità.

In molti territori in via di sviluppo il lavoro svolto dalle associazioni e dalle ONG è insostituibile: si tratta dei difensori dei diritti umani – avvocati, intellettuali, giornalisti e operatori di pace – che mettono a rischio la propria vita per contribuire al progresso civile e materiale di una popolazione.

Il problema va affrontato adottando politiche volte a denunciare, in modo sistematico ed inequivocabile, ogni tentativo di sottoporre gli operatori europei a qualsiasi forma di violenza o persecuzione. Ma occorre anche fare di più, cioè un approccio globale che renda più flessibili e semplificate le procedure di accesso ai fondi messi a disposizione dall'Europa. Solo così le istituzioni europee potranno assumere un ruolo centrale nel sostegno delle organizzazioni della società civile.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Committee on Development and, in particular, the rapporteur, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, and the shadow rapporteurs for presenting this forward-looking report with very useful recommendations on how we can address the worrying trend of shrinking space for civil society in certain countries.

This is a reality that we must tackle together as it is the only way development cooperation will bear fruit. The European Union is seeking to formulate coherent and effective responses – building on the experience gathered so far. We are increasing our efforts in preserving civil space and ensuring an enabling environment for civil society organisations. Clear expressions of our strong commitment are: the Commission's communication on Europe's engagement with civil society in partner countries from 2012, the EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy and our new European Consensus on Development. They all emphasise the crucial role of civil society as actors of governance and development.

Overall, your report is in line with the thinking and the ongoing work of the Commission and the High Representative to strengthen our support to civil society organisations and to continue our engagement in promoting their greater autonomy. EU delegations are at the forefront of translating EU policies into concrete actions on the ground. Therefore they proactively identify and report on threats to civil society space, including reprisals, and take steps to counter such threats. This implies using all of our diplomatic tools throughout the world, human rights dialogues and high-level contacts to raise the cases of individuals at risk.

Supporting a genuinely independent, diverse, pluralistic and vibrant civil society is essential to help achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. We are committed to investing more in existing good practices and highlighting the positive aspects of the Sustainable Development Goals' implementation through civil society organisations. The Commission and the High Representative are engaging with EU partner countries through various channels. When it comes to development cooperation, we support partner countries through funding that focuses on engagement with civil society and by ensuring consistency between all relevant EU policies and activities.

However, I would like to emphasise that the support to our partner countries is not only financial. Our relations with civil society organisations are, first and foremost about policy dialogue, hence the need for appropriate space for them to share their views. The Commission will continue engaging with various stakeholders to drive this agenda forward and the European Parliament is one of our essential partners. Building trust and continuing to work closely with all relevant actors is key to addressing the challenges faced by civil society.

As you know, the EU Guidelines on Human Rights Defenders were adopted in 2008. We consider human rights defenders as one of the cornerstones of every well-functioning state and are key allies in the promotion of the democratisation and expansion of civil space. Providing support and giving them visibility has been, and remains, one of the major priorities of the EU's external human rights policies.

The progress and achievements since 2012 are reflected in the Commission's report on EU engagement with civil society in external relations, which was issued in April this year. It provides concrete examples of how the EU is acting on its priorities with regard to civil society, showing the diversity, complementarity and strength of the EU's worldwide interventions in support of civil society. The report was followed by Council conclusions last June, which confirm that on this essential point all EU institutions stand united.

The Commission and the High Representative are committed to continue working closely with the European Parliament and EU Member States to ensure that together we can build a better environment for civil society organisations. By preventing the further shrinking of civil space, we are not only enabling civil society organisations to engage more effectively as development actors, but we are living up to our duty to defend the values of democracy, freedom, pluralism and solidarity.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 3 octobre 2017.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), in writing. – I welcome the report as it puts the spotlight on the central role that civil society plays in ensuring democratic consolidation, social justice and respect for human rights as well as in promoting accountability and good governance. Whereas clamping down on civil society organisations is getting more difficult to address, we need to step up efforts and provide guidance to beneficiary countries on strategies for creating adequate legal, administrative and political environment, which allows to these key actors to work efficiently. Civil society actors including human rights defenders and development NGOs must always possess the space to operate free from intimidation, harassment, violence and undue bureaucratic burdens. Moreover, in line with the EU's long-standing commitment to civil society in developing countries, I strongly believe that we have to boost our engagement through increased and diversified funding modalities and mechanisms.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL), in writing. – Restrictions on civil society have become increasingly repressive. To counterbalance this fact the report brings forward positive proposals to guarantee the role NGOs play in fostering democracy and the well-being of citizens worldwide. However, in order not to jeopardise the development of free and diverse civil societies, and in line with policy coherence for development, we believe it is fundamental for the EU to establish legal human rights obligations for business. In addition, we believe in free and independent civil societies, but deplore the strong reference the report makes to religion or faith-based movements. We will therefore abstain from supporting this resolution.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

17. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (kurze Darstellung)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi im Namen des Ausschusses für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres über die Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (2017/2068(INI)) (A8-0272/2017).

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη, Εισηγήτρια. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε King, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, θεωρώ μεγάλη μου τιμή να παρουσιάσω την έκθεση για τον αγώνα κατά του εγκλήματος στο Διαδίκτυο, κατά του κυβερνοεγκλήματος όπως λέγεται, γιατί είχα την ευκαιρία για πολλά χρόνια ασκώντας μάχιμη δικηγορία στο ποινικό δίκαιο στην πατρίδα μου αλλά και ως πολιτικός να ασχοληθώ με το πολύ σημαντικό αυτό αντικείμενο. Ο αγώνας κατά του κυβερνοεγκλήματος δεν είναι εύκολος, γιατί απαιτείται υψηλή εξειδίκευση, συνεχής εκπαίδευση και ενημέρωση, ασφάλεια δικαίου και συντονισμός.

Στην έκθεση περιλαμβάνω τα στοιχεία με τα οποία αναδεικνύεται η ιδιάζουσα μορφή και ο ιδιαίτερος χαρακτήρας που έχει το έγκλημα στο Διαδίκτυο. Αυτό έγκειται στην ευκολία και την ταχύτητα με την οποία διαπράττεται το έγκλημα, στην ανωνυμία, στον διασυννοριακό χαρακτήρα του εγκλήματος, στη δυσχερή διερεύνηση. Οι ψηφιακές απειλές σε ευρεία κλίμακα εξελίσσονται ταχύτατα και εμείς δεν διαθέτουμε τα επαρκή μέσα και τα εργαλεία, διότι η τεχνολογία και οι εγκληματίες που χρησιμοποιούν την τεχνολογία είναι πάντοτε ένα βήμα μπροστά από τις διωκτικές αρχές και από την ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία. Υποχρέωση μας όμως είναι να αντιμετωπίσουμε αυτό το φαινόμενο, γιατί οι επιθέσεις πλήττουν τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών, προσβάλλουν άμεσα και καίρια το κράτος δικαίου και κλονίζουν τη σταθερότητα των δημοκρατικών κοινωνιών. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι στατιστικά υπάρχουν κράτη μέλη όπου το ετήσιο έγκλημα κατά 50% έχει τη μορφή του εγκλήματος στο Διαδίκτυο και υπάρχουν επίσης στοιχεία τα οποία δείχνουν ότι το 2016 αυξήθηκαν οι επιθέσεις του κυβερνοεγκλήματος εναντίον των ηλεκτρονικών συστημάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης κατά 20%. Αυτό μας δείχνει την αύξηση αλλά και την ταχύτητα με την οποία εξελίσσεται το έγκλημα στο Διαδίκτυο.

Η έκθεσή μας περιλαμβάνει παραμέτρους που επηρεάζουν τον αγώνα κατά του κυβερνοεγκλήματος. Αναδείξαμε προκλήσεις, νομοθετικά κενά, νομικά κενά και νέες απειλές. Καταθέτουμε προτάσεις οι οποίες περιλαμβάνουν τον τρόπο της πρόληψης με συντονισμένη συνεργασία, με ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών μεταξύ των κρατών μελών, αλλά και μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των τρίτων χωρών και μεταξύ των αστυνομικών και δικαστικών αρχών. Βεβαίως προτάσσουμε σε ειδικό κεφάλαιο την ανάγκη προστασίας των ευάλωτων ομάδων: των νεαρών ατόμων, των ανηλίκων και των παιδιών, και δίνουμε έμφαση στη νομοθετική πρωτοβουλία για τη συλλογή και χρήση ηλεκτρονικών αποδείξεων και το πλαίσιο συλλογής προσωπικών δεδομένων πάντοτε με σεβασμό των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων.

Σε αυτό το σημείο πρέπει να επικροτήσουμε τη νέα στρατηγική που ανακοινώθηκε πρόσφατα από την Επιτροπή και από τον κύριο King, προσωπικά, για την ασφάλεια μέσα στο Διαδίκτυο. Εμείς θέλουμε να πιστεύουμε ότι και αυτή η έκθεση βάζει ένα λιθαράκι και συμβάλλει σε αυτή την προσπάθεια για τη θωράκιση της ασφάλειας στο Διαδίκτυο.

Τονίζουμε την ανάγκη να γίνουν πιο λειτουργικές οι ευρωπαϊκές υπηρεσίες για το κυβερνοέγκλημα όπως, παραδείγματος χάρι, η ENISA, που έχει την έδρα της στο Ηράκλειο Κρήτης και επιτελεί πολύ σημαντική δουλειά, για την οικονομική ενίσχυση με ευρωπαϊκούς πόρους, για τη στελέχωση με κατάλληλο ανθρώπινο δυναμικό, διότι ο σκοπός μας είναι να μπορέσουμε να πλησιάσουμε τα ίχνη των εγκληματιών μέσα στο Διαδίκτυο, να βρεθούμε, ει δυνατόν, μπροστά από αυτούς, με το δεδομένο ότι εκείνοι πάντα προηγούνται της τεχνολογίας, και να είμαστε κοντά στους πολίτες που εμπιστεύονται τις ψηφιακές τεχνολογίες.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η έκθεση είναι μια αρχή στον αγώνα κατά του κυβερνοεγκλήματος, αλλά κυρίως και πρωτίστως είναι ένα στοιχείο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τη θωράκιση των δικαιωμάτων των πολιτών που εμπιστεύονται τις τεχνολογίες και κυρίως για τη θωράκιση των δικαιωμάτων των επόμενων γενεών.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, stále více občanů v EU má e-mailovou adresu a elektronická komunikace se stala nutností, má ale samozřejmě velká rizika. Paní předkladatelka zprávy, paní Vozemberg o nich hovořila a já jí chci velmi za její zprávu poděkovat. Nedávné útoky ve formě *ransomware*, neboli programů požadujících výkupné, ukázaly, že se taková situace může dotknout spousty lidí. Jen v minulém roce bylo v EU přes internet podniknuto více než 4 000 útoků požadujících výkupné, a to za jeden den.

Právě obrana proti kriminalitě na internetu je oblastí, kde je spolupráce na úrovni EU žádoucí a vítaná právě ze strany občanů a může lépe uchránit nejen státní instituce, ale hlavně osoby v internetovém prostředí nejzranitelnější, jako jsou děti a senioři. Chci připomenout, že právě tento měsíc, 13. září 2017, Komise přijala balíček opatření zabývajících se kriminalitou na internetu.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, di pari passo con le evoluzioni tecnologiche, il fenomeno del *cybercrime* sta assumendo forme sempre più complesse e diversificate. La criminalità informatica, infatti, provoca sempre più spesso notevoli danni sociali ed economici che interessano i diritti fondamentali delle persone, rappresentano una minaccia per lo Stato di diritto nel ciberspazio e un rischio per la stabilità delle società democratiche.

Per svolgere un'azione di contrasto efficace, va armonizzata la definizione dei reati connessi agli attacchi contro i sistemi di informazione, nonché allo sfruttamento e all'abuso sessuale di minori online e vanno obbligati gli Stati membri a istituire sistemi di registrazione e di scambio di dati statistici su tali reati.

La lotta alla criminalità informatica va affrontata puntando al rafforzamento delle infrastrutture critiche e dei dispositivi in rete, oltre che sulle misure repressive, ovviamente. Data la sua natura transfrontaliera è indispensabile una stretta cooperazione con i paesi terzi, anche attraverso lo scambio delle migliori prassi, indagini comuni, il rafforzamento della capacità e l'assistenza giuridica reciproca.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχάς θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια, την κυρία Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη, για την έκθεσή της, η οποία πραγματικά θίγει σημαντικά ζητήματα που πρέπει να μας απασχολήσουν, διότι είναι πραγματικά πολλά τα περιστατικά των κυβερνοεπιθέσεων που πραγματοποιούνται και κατά κρατών και κατά επιχειρήσεων και κατά των πολιτών. Χρειάζεται λοιπόν να ληφθούν μέτρα τα οποία πραγματικά να είναι αποτελεσματικά. Αλλά και τα μέτρα πρόληψης πρέπει ταυτόχρονα να σέβονται τα προσωπικά δεδομένα και, κυρίως, τα δημοκρατικά δικαιώματα των πολιτών. Η λογοδοσία των παρόχων υπηρεσιών είναι κάτι πολύ σημαντικό, όπως επίσης και η ενίσχυση της συνεργασίας των αστυνομικών και των δικαστικών αρχών.

Ο ENISA θα πρέπει να ενισχυθεί. Πρέπει να παραμείνει στο Ηράκλειο και πρέπει να σταματήσει αυτή η κοροϊδία, δηλαδή να υπάρχουν άλλες υπηρεσίες στο Ηράκλειο της Κρήτης και άλλες στην Αθήνα. Θα πρέπει να δουλέψει σοβαρά ο ENISA.

Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, la cybercriminalité est la nouvelle menace, et cela ne fait que commencer. Les dernières attaques Petya et WannaCry ont dramatiquement démontré, premièrement, la vulnérabilité de nos systèmes, deuxièmement, la fulgurance de la propagation de ces attaques et, troisièmement, surtout, notre retard critique par rapport à l'efficacité et au temps d'avance qu'ont les cybercriminels dans ce domaine.

Le rapport – et j'en salue le contenu – de ma collègue Elissavet répond à un certain nombre de priorités, elle l'a dit. J'en retiendrai trois.

Tout d'abord, la résistance et la résilience. On doit renforcer la protection des infrastructures, des réseaux et des contenus, et notamment le chiffrement. Ensuite, la réponse. Les autorités doivent être dotées de moyens humains et budgétaires car elles commencent à être dépassées. Enfin, il faut sensibiliser de manière accrue les citoyens dans leur comportement.

J'en profite pour saluer le mois d'octobre, qui est le mois européen de la cybersécurité. À cet égard, ce n'est pas un gadget.

Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this report states, right at the beginning, the European Parliament 'underlines that the fight against cybercrime should be first and foremost about safeguarding and hardening critical infrastructures and other networked devices, and not only about pursuing repressive measures'.

That is the central point of this report, and it is why Parliament also stresses the importance of free and open-source software and reiterates that, with respect to the Internet of Things, producers are the key starting-point for tightening up liability regimes which will lead to a better quality of products and a more secure environment in terms of external access and a documented update facility.

Parliament also says clearly that it urges the Member States – which are absent here – not to impose any obligation on encryption providers that would result in the weakening or compromising of the security of their networks or services, such as the creation or facilitation of 'back doors'.

I hope, Commissioner, that you will follow these guidelines.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, this 89-paragraph report has got some wonderful aims. We all want to fight against cybercrime, as it becomes proportionately more and more important every single year, and we all want to make sure that the internet is safe for us all to use and enjoy.

There are a number of positives that I do see such as – and a colleague has already mentioned this – in terms of open-source software. We are concerned about hacking and about fighting against that. Those borders are not just national; nor are they just European, but they are global. Global cooperation is needed. But one thing does worry me, which is that we must always balance security with freedom of expression and the right to privacy. I see in the report itself precious little that would really remind us of the existence of that balance or that would indeed fully take it into account.

As is often said, if a citizen desires privacy, they may have something to hide. Only in the same context, I suppose, as people who have curtains in their houses.

Bernard Monot (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, en mars 2017, la Commission européenne a adopté son plan d'action de développement des services financiers de détail.

Ce plan d'action recommande l'utilisation massive des nouvelles technologies numériques, les *fintechs*, afin de développer l'accès des citoyens aux services financiers transfrontaliers.

Ce plan s'appuie en particulier sur le règlement «eIDAS», qui oblige les États membres à deux choses: d'une part, chaque pays doit avoir mis en place un système d'identité électronique de ses citoyens avant le 29 septembre 2018, et d'autre part, chaque pays devra automatiquement accepter les systèmes d'identité électronique des autres États.

L'objectif pour la Commission est ainsi de permettre, par exemple, qu'un citoyen en Espagne, sur la base de son identité électronique espagnole, puisse avoir un compte en banque en Lettonie, sans avoir à se déplacer dans ce pays.

Je tiens à souligner deux problèmes importants: ce plan contribue à réduire la capacité des États à protéger leurs propres citoyens, et dans le domaine des services financiers, il accroît les risques de fraudes massives. Ainsi, nous avons appris que le système d'identité électronique en Estonie avait été récemment piraté.

C'est pour cette raison que nous voterons l'abstention.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι πρακτικά αδύνατη η πλήρης προστασία του κυβερνοχώρου έναντι καιροσκοπών, εγκληματικών δικτύων και τρομοκρατών, οι οποίοι μπορούν να επιφέρουν δυσανάλογο πλήγμα με σχετικά περιορισμένα μέσα. Από την άλλη μεριά, οι ευρωπαϊκές αποφάσεις δυσχεραίνουν το έργο των αρχών παρακολούθησης, σύλληψης και δίωξης επιβάλλοντας όρια στην αστυνομική και δικαστική πρόσβαση, στα δεδομένα υπόπτων και στη διατήρηση δεδομένων υπό το πρίσμα των αρχών της αναγκαιότητας και αναλογικότητας. Ο ENISA, η Ευρωπόλ και η Eurojust μπορούν να συμβάλουν στις αρχές αναγνώρισης και χειρισμού ψηφιακών πειστηρίων όσον αφορά τους τρόπους αξιοποίησης των μέσων κοινωνικής δικτύωσης, τους βέλτιστους τρόπους αναφοράς κυβερνοεπιθέσεων και την κατανόηση πρακτικών νομολογικών πτυχών περί απορρήτου επικοινωνιών. Οι απαιτούμενες καινοτόμες και ευέλικτες απαντήσεις δεν πρέπει να μειώνουν περαιτέρω τη διαδικασία των κρατών μελών. Η Επιτροπή επικουρικά οφείλει να περιοριστεί στην επιβολή υποχρεωτικής και αμοιβαίας ανταπόκρισης σε αιτήσεις υπηρεσιών επιβολής του νόμου και στη συνεργασία και τη λογοδοσία των παρόχων υπηρεσιών.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Madam President, just as people, services and things become more and more sophisticated and interconnected, so are they becoming more likely to become targets of ever more intense and complex cybercrime. As the 2016 report of The Internet Organised Crime Threat Assessment (IOCTA) revealed, cybercrime even exceeds traditional crime in some EU countries and is closely interlinked with other dangerous areas of crime.

A comprehensive European approach to building cybercrime resilience therefore would need to be able to reply to diverse challenges. Besides harmonisation of legislation, it should be recognised that companies cannot deal with the challenge alone, and new regulation should provide more and efficient legal tools and incentives encouraging safer behaviour by service providers and users.

Technological development allowed a previously unforeseen level of convenience, ease of use of services and well-being. But these can be safeguarded only in a free, open and secure cyberspace.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, this is an important and timely report on how our society deals with new emerging issues of safety and security online. These issues impact our private and public lives, as well as the way we conduct our democratic politics. We must balance the need for safety online with privacy, and we must guarantee freedom of expression and association, while combating incitement to violence and radicalisation.

It is also crucial that we protect our democratic institutions and elections from being hijacked, such as during the UK referendum or, recently, in the US elections. We must legislate to prevent data mining companies like Cambridge Analytica using secret money to harvest private data and use it to disseminate disinformation, as reported by the investigative journalist Carole Cadwalladr.

These are new challenges, and only a large global actor like the EU can take action to tackle them.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl poděkovat paní zpravodajce za její velmi obsáhlou zprávu, má mnoho aspektů. Já bych se chtěl věnovat pouze jednomu aspektu, a to je otázka volebních rizik právě v souvislosti s kybernetickými útoky. Jsem rád, že se této věci zhostila i EU v rámci probíhajícího summitu nebo speciální konference v rámci estonského předsednictví.

Pro mě je důležité, že ty útoky, které mohou nabývat velmi dramatických rozměrů v rámci voleb v jednotlivých členských státech, že se jim skutečně věnujeme. Mají pro mě několik souvislostí, samozřejmě v předvolební kampani a potom při sčítání hlasů. Možnost ovlivnění výsledků voleb v souvislosti s kybernetickými útoky je skutečně značná. Musíme proto budovat odolný systém, který je integrální, a za druhé být na špičce odborného vývoje, to znamená být lídry v dané oblasti. Jenom to nás zachrání z hlediska budoucnosti a z hlediska možných kybernetických útoků.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la criminalità informatica rappresenta oggi una delle minacce più insidiose a livello globale. Secondo il rapporto IOCTA del 2017 di Europol, i crimini commessi via Internet nel corso dell'ultimo anno sono aumentati, in alcuni casi, addirittura del 750%: attacchi informatici, frode informatica e furto d'identità sono in aumento, facendo registrare livelli mai riscontrati in precedenza.

Per affrontare tale sfida, innanzitutto è necessario un quadro europeo penale comune che prescriva una definizione uniforme di criminalità informatica e che fornisca delle linee guida omogenee in merito all'individuazione e all'utilizzo processuale delle *e-evidence*.

Ma la lotta alla criminalità informatica potrà avere successo solo attraverso una stretta collaborazione fra le autorità competenti e i fornitori di servizi, sinergia che ha già dimostrato di essere un'efficace arma contro il *cybercrime*, e sono necessarie campagne europee di prevenzione e gestione dei rischi online, rivolte agli adulti ma anche ai minori, particolarmente esposti ad adescamento o sfruttamento sessuale e cyberbullismo.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα και εγώ με τη σειρά μου να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια κυρία Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη για την εμπεριστατωμένη έκθεση που παρουσίασε για το ιδιαίτερα ευαίσθητο και σοβαρό θέμα του εγκλήματος στον κυβερνοχώρο. Όπως γνωρίζουμε, η επίθεση στον κυβερνοχώρο αποτελεί ένα από τα ισχυρότερα όπλα του υβριδικού πολέμου, διότι πέραν των άλλων αυξάνει και το κυβερνοεγκλήμα, το οποίο επεκτείνεται και σε δραστηριότητες πέραν του παραδοσιακού εγκλήματος, όπως η σεξουαλική εκμετάλλευση, η παιδική πορνογραφία και η δυσχέρεια της λειτουργίας του διεθνούς ψηφιακού εμπορίου. Εάν μάλιστα οι τρομοκρατικές οργανώσεις αποκτήσουν πρόσβαση μέσα στον κυβερνοχώρο, τότε οι απειλές οι οποίες θα υπάρξουν θα είναι πολύ σημαντικές. Για να μπορέσουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε όλη αυτή την κατάσταση, θα πρέπει όλα τα κράτη να συνεργαστούν μεταξύ τους, θα πρέπει να επιβάλουν μια Δικαιοσύνη στον κυβερνοχώρο, να συνεργαστούν οι δικαστικές και οι αστυνομικές αρχές και να εντοπιστεί η πρωτότητα όλων αυτών των σημείων που πρέπει να προσέξουμε. Τέλος, επισημαίνω και εγώ την ανάγκη της ολοκληρωμένης λειτουργίας του ENISA και πρέπει, οπωσδήποτε, να προσέξουμε, όταν εφαρμόζουμε αυτά τα μέτρα, να μην παραβιάσουμε τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα.

Arndt Kohn (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eine Studie der Bertelsmann Stiftung zeigt, dass sich 80 % der Schülerinnen und Schüler in Deutschland einen Einsatz digitaler Medien im Schulunterricht wünschen. Auch wenn wir von einem flächendeckenden Einsatz noch weit entfernt sind, stellt sich die Frage: Lernen junge Menschen in ausreichendem Maße, wie man verantwortungsvoll mit digitalen Diensten und seinen persönlichen Daten umgehen sollte?

Dieser Bericht über die Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität zeigt auf, dass alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger wissen sollten, wie sie sich vor Cyberkriminalität schützen. Nahezu jeder nutzt digitale Dienste, besitzt ein Smartphone oder einen Laptop. Somit ist nahezu jeder ein potentielltes Opfer von Cyberkriminellen. Wir müssen daher die weltweite Zusammenarbeit von Polizei und Justiz verbessern, und wir müssen unbedingt in mehr Bildung investieren. Ich bekräftige daher die Forderung an die Europäische Kommission, eine Kampagne zur Sensibilisierung der Nutzer durchzuführen. Aber auch an Schulen sollte das Thema Digitalisierung und deren Gefahren mehr Raum bekommen. Nur so können wir sicher sein, dass auch die junge Generation besser vor Cyberangriffen geschützt wird.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Julian King, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, this is a key subject and I am glad it has been raised. I want to thank the rapporteur for her personal contribution, and indeed all the Members for their engagement on this subject. As has been noted, cyber-attacks do not pay heed to geographical borders. They can be achieved at a surprisingly low cost, but with devastating effect, and they pose a risk to our security and sometimes to our democratic processes and institutions. Which is why we need to promote our cybersecurity, and that indeed was the objective of the package of measures the Commission issued on 19 September.

As a number of you have suggested, we need to build on what already exists so we recognise the importance of the European Union Agency for Network Information and Security (ENISA) and of Europol, but we need to strengthen the work that they have been doing and strengthen cooperation between the various agencies and instruments. We have the Directive on the Security of Network and Information Systems. Once that is fully implemented it will improve national cybersecurity capabilities, enhance cooperation between Member States and require operators in important economic sectors such as energy, transport, banking and health, as well as digital service providers, to adopt risk-management measures, and report major incidents to national authorities.

However, some of the attacks that we have seen recently, like the 'WannaCry' attack and the 'Not Petya' attack, showed the need to do even more on resilience and on preparedness. Resilience means being harder to attack and quicker to respond, so a proposed cybersecurity act would revise the mandate of ENISA and reinforce it.

We are also proposing to introduce an EU certification framework for internet-connected products and services. Building on the cybersecurity public-private partnership, the Commission has said that we want to create a network of cybersecurity competence centres and a new European cybersecurity research and competence centre at its hub. Both network and centre would contribute to increased investment and reinforce capabilities across the European Union.

Cybercrime should not pay. Sadly, it will continue and will continue to grow as long as it does appear to pay, so we also need to take steps – as well as building our resilience – to improve deterrents and to make cybercrime easier to detect, trace and prosecute. We want law enforcement agencies to have the tools they need to tackle online crime effectively.

The Commission adopted a proposal for a directive on non-cash payment fraud, a crime that is worth some EUR 1.5 billion in the eurozone alone. We take a technologically neutral approach, but we want to facilitate cross-border cooperation and ensure that this crime is treated as seriously as it deserves to be. We have said that, by the beginning of 2018, we will propose measures to improve cross-border access to electronic evidence for criminal investigations.

With regard to encryption – mentioned by a number of you – when it comes to encryption in criminal investigations, we are reviewing possible options and possible ways forward, and we will revert both to the Council and to this House. But we recognise, and we agree, that strong encryption is key to how we use the internet. It has a key role in maintaining effective cybersecurity. We recognise and respect that.

Finally, we agree with Parliament's calls for action to empower and protect children from online risks. The annual Safer Internet Day is a flagship event promoting awareness amongst children, teachers and parents. Next year's Safer Internet Day is on 6 February. The Commission is considering launching a major EU-wide campaign covering online safety and cybersecurity for minors.

Our communication last week on tackling illegal content online also set out guidelines to encourage more effective identification and removal of illegal content, including material in relation to child sexual abuse. It explicitly encourages more proactive measures to tackle this scourge.

I want to thank you again for your engagement on these issues. From the Commission side we very much looking forward to continuing our discussion and dialogue with you on building our cybersecurity.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Dienstag, 3. Oktober 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – Il contrasto alla criminalità informatica, fenomeno in forte crescita, è, ad un tempo, difficile e delicato. Difficile è infatti l'opera di contrasto a livello nazionale di una problematica che, per sua natura, non ha alcun tipo di barriera, da qui l'importanza fondamentale di un approccio coordinato a livello europeo; delicato è poi il rapporto tra la necessità di fronteggiare la cosa e quella di salvaguardare il diritto alla protezione dei dati personali, alla privacy e alla libertà di espressione. Riuscire a trovare un bilanciamento tra questi due aspetti non è facile ma, come detto, è assolutamente necessario e urgente. La relazione presentata riesce in questo difficile compito e sono quindi lieto di sostenerla.

Miriam Dalli (S&D), in writing. – It is a well-established fact that citizens' everyday lives are becoming increasingly digital. Our energy supply, our homes, our banking systems and even our hospitals are all today very much reliant on technology. And with great technology, comes great responsibility; a responsibility to ensure that citizens' data is safe, critical infrastructure is not rendered inoperable, democracies and voting systems are not compromised, and that ultimately citizens lives aren't put into jeopardy because of cyber-attacks, such as the ransomware attack which crippled the NHS just a short few months ago. Let me be clear though, the technological advances which have made such attacks possible are not only challenges, but they are also opportunities. We must recognise that such progress has resulted in ample young talent youth who are ready to contribute to a greater good. This is why we are calling on the industry and governments to engage with white hat hackers – those who do what they do out of morality and not for monetary purposes. The EU cannot fight the fight against cybercrime alone – we must use our best resource; our youth.

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – A digitalizáció és az internet elterjedése rohamos ütemben változtatja meg az életünket. Az új eszközök és új kapcsolatok új távlatokat nyitnak meg előttünk és korábban elképzelhetetlen hatékonyságnövekedést okoznak. Egyre több időt töltünk az interneten, miközben folyamatosan jelennek meg az életünkben az újabb csatlakoztatott eszközök. Ezek által gyorsabbá és kényelmesebbé válik az életünk, ugyanakkor nem szabad megfeledkeznünk arról, hogy egy ilyen gyors átalakulás veszélyeket is rejt magában. Az internettel együtt járó anonimitás és titkosítás remek fedezéket nyújt.

Az elmúlt évek konfliktusainál a fegyveres összecsapások mellett a kibertérben is dúlt a háború. Mostanra a hagyományos fegyvernemekkel egyenlő szintre került a kiber hadviselés és minden jelentős országnak van saját hekker osztaga. Az internetes támadások azonban nem csak államok közötti konfliktusokra korlátozódnak, hanem megannyi független és ismeretlen szervezet is próbál visszaélni a világháló nyújtotta lehetőségekkel, ahogy azt az elmúlt évek adatlopásai és zsarolóvírusai is bizonyíthatják. Egy ilyen bizonytalan és fenyegetésekkel teli környezetben kiemelt feladatunk, hogy megvédjük az európai polgárok biztonságát.

A szolgáltatások, az infrastruktúra, a vagyon és a személyes adatok védelme éppen olyan fontos, mint a fizikai biztonság. Úgy gondolom, hogy a kiberbiztonság kérdése korunk egyik legerősebb problémája és gyors és hathatós együttműködésre van szükség.

18. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (kurze Darstellung)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Reinhard Bütikofer im Namen des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten über die politischen Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (2017/2026(INI)) (A8-0243/2017).

Reinhard Bütikofer, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Seitdem dieses Haus 2014 einen ersten Bericht über die politischen Beziehungen zwischen der EU und der ASEAN-Staatengruppe beschlossen hat, hat sich in diesem Bereich enorm viel Positives getan. Der zweite Bericht, den der AFET-Ausschuss nun dem Plenum vorlegt, bildet das ab. Zugleich ergibt sich die Gelegenheit, dass wir auf 50 Jahre ASEAN und 40 Jahre Beziehungen zwischen der EU und ASEAN zurückblicken und das zum Anlass nehmen, eine neue Phase in diesen Beziehungen zu beschreiben.

Für uns ist die ASEAN-Staatengemeinschaft ein strategischer Partner mit Bedeutung für die Zusammenarbeit im ganzen indopazifischen Raum. Insbesondere ist wichtig, dass das ein Partner ist, der sich wie die EU für Multilateralismus und die internationale Herrschaft des Rechts einsetzt. Die Zusammenarbeit erstreckt sich inzwischen auf mehr Bereiche als jemals zuvor. Im Bereich der Konnektivität verhandeln wir etwa über ein Luftverkehrsabkommen. Es gibt Zusammenarbeit bei der Umwelt oder bei den Nachhaltigkeitszielen der UNO oder der Frage natürlicher Ressourcen. Es gibt Zusammenarbeit im Hinblick auf die Sicherheit auf See, Piraterie, eine Zusammenarbeit zwischen Europol und Aseanapol gegen organisierte Kriminalität, gegen Terrorismus, im Hinblick auf Cybersicherheit und auch natürlich beim Krisenmanagement. Auch die Themen der Demokratieförderung und der Förderung von Menschenrechten spielten nach wie vor eine große Rolle in unseren Beziehungen.

Wir thematisieren in dem Bericht die Verpflichtung von Unternehmen, die im Rahmen der sehr engen Handels- und Investitionsbeziehungen zwischen EU und ASEAN dort investieren, die Verpflichtung im Hinblick auf soziale und Umweltverantwortung. Wir thematisieren die Möglichkeiten der Kooperation auf kommunaler Ebene, die Möglichkeiten der Kooperation zwischen Menschen – insbesondere bei der jungen Generation –, und eines der konkreten Projekte, das hier vorgeschlagen wird, ist, dass zwischen der EU und ASEAN ein *Young Leaders Programme* aufgelegt wird. Schließlich betont der Bericht auch, dass wir die Kooperation zwischen Parlamentariern beider Seiten fördern wollen.

Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, es war eine sehr fruchtbare, sehr konstruktive Zusammenarbeit mit den Schattenberichterstattern der verschiedenen Fraktionen. Es gibt ein großes Maß an Übereinstimmung. Wir haben es sogar geschafft, an einem Punkt gemeinsam eine Selbstkritik im Hinblick auf die nicht besonders lobenswerte Zögerlichkeit der EU zu formulieren, als es darum ging, eine Stellungnahme zu der Entscheidung des Unclós-Gerichtshofes zum Südchinesischen Meer abzugeben. Aber unter dem Strich ist es eine positive Entwicklung, der wir mit viel Engagement Unterstützung geben und von der wir hoffen, dass sie in den nächsten Jahren noch mehr Auftrieb gewinnt.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! A jelentéstevőhöz hasonlóan magam is erőteljesen támogatom az EU–ASEAN szabadkereskedelmi megállapodásról szóló tárgyalások újraindítását, és az erre vonatkozó egyeztetéseket. Az ASEAN az EU harmadik legnagyobb Európán kívüli kereskedelmi partnereként jelentősen hozzájárulhat ahhoz, hogy gyorsabban és eredményesebben alkalmazkodjunk a világkereskedelemben zajló átalakulásokhoz.

Ugyanakkor fontos, hogy az ASEAN-tagállamok közötti jelentős gazdasági és társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek kezelésének esélyét is javíthatja a fokozottabb együttműködés a régió államai között. Közös érdeknek nevezhető tehát a gazdasági és ezzel párhuzamosan a politikai kapcsolatok magasabb szintre emelése, amely természetesen együtt járhat az emberi jogi helyzet javulásával is. Ebben az esetben is érvényes az a tétel, hogy az EU leginkább példamutatással, sokak számára vonzó társadalmi berendezkedésének felmutatásával járulhat hozzá az ezekben a társadalmakban végbemenő változásokhoz.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, my congratulations to the rapporteur for his report on EU-ASEAN relations. I had the honour to represent this House at the ASEAN interparliamentary assembly in Manila, a fortnight back. I very much concur with what Mr Bütikofer has said in relation to having dialogue with young people and with the ASEAN parliamentarians. It is so important that we actually have dialogue with the ASEAN parliamentarians, as opposed to just having individual bilateral relationships with Member States of ASEAN.

I raised the issues that this Parliament has raised, condemning the atrocities committed in Myanmar against the Rohingya minority. I was the only one, apart from the Indonesian Head of Delegation, to do so. Afterwards, delegates from many other countries came up and said they really did support this and that we had to do more to work together to stop these atrocities. Through you, madam President, I would like to extend an invitation to the ASEAN parliamentarians if we can.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I offer my congratulations to the rapporteur, Mr Bütikofer, and I thank him for the excellent cooperation on this report. Deepening cooperation with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is in our mutual strategic, political and economic interest. Not only has ASEAN become one of the fastest growing regions in the world, the integration of ASEAN countries is increasingly important in terms of security and stability. We should use relations with ASEAN to step up our economic and political presence in this strategically important region.

The EU is one of the biggest investors in and trading partners of ASEAN. We need to be ambitious and build on this cooperation. Taking steps forward to the strategic partnership would certainly strengthen our economic trade, political and security relations. To this end, it is important to intensify political dialog with ASEAN countries. This is one of the most important messages of this resolution.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πράγματι οι σχέσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με τον ASEAN είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικές. Καλύπτουν ένα ευρύ φάσμα τομέων: εμπόριο, επενδύσεις, ανάπτυξη, οικονομία και πολιτικές υποθέσεις. Ο ASEAN είναι ο τρίτος εμπορικός εταίρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι ο δεύτερος εμπορικός εταίρος του ASEAN, οι ετήσιες διμερείς εμπορικές συναλλαγές ξεπερνούν τα 200 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, ενώ η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι η πρώτη δύναμη σε άμεσες ξένες επενδύσεις στην περιοχή. Αυτό συμβαίνει διότι εκεί οι ευρωπαϊκές πολυεθνικές έχουν βρει έναν παράδεισο, έχουν βρει χώρους όπου μπορούν αντί πινακίου φακής με χαμηλούς μισθούς να παράγουν τα δικά τους προϊόντα. Δεν ενδιαφέρονται, δυστυχώς, ούτε για την τήρηση των εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων, ούτε για την τήρηση των περιβαλλοντικών όρων, ούτε για την ασφάλεια των εργαζομένων. Νομίζω αυτά αναφέρονται στο σημείο 14 της έκθεσης. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να μην παραμελεί, στο όνομα της δήθεν ανάπτυξης, την προστασία των εργασιακών και ανθρώπινων δικαιωμάτων.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, jsem ráda, že v oblasti jihovýchodní Asie existuje organizace typu ASEAN. Jsem totiž přesvědčena, že v dané oblasti je zapotřebí mnoho spolupráce a vzájemné pomoci. Blíží se zima, během té došlo na konci roku 2015 k masivním požárům v Indonésii. V délce asi 8 000 kilometrů, na více než dvou milionech hektarech hořel deštný prales. Požár za tři týdny vypustil do atmosféry více CO₂, než zvládne Německo za celý rok. Na vině byla nezodpovědná produkce palmového oleje. 69 milionů obyvatel Indonésie a Bornea dýchalo znečištěný vzduch a tisíce lidí zaplatilo za tyto požáry životem.

Chtěla bych využít proto této příležitosti, abych apelovala na státy sdružení ASEAN i EU, aby pomohly Indonésii s prevencí tak, aby letos k žádným požárům nedošlo. Máme jen jednu planetu a máme za ni společnou zodpovědnost a na to nesmíme nikdy zapomenout.

Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Im 40. EU-ASEAN-Jubiläumsjahr fordern wir eine Aufwertung der EU-ASEAN-Beziehungen hin zu einer strategischen Partnerschaft. Mit sieben Staaten wurden und werden Partnerschafts- und Kooperationsabkommen verhandelt, die Philippinen werden wahrscheinlich vom APS+-Handelssystem profitieren, und mit Singapur und Vietnam sind Freihandelsabkommen verhandelt worden.

Demgegenüber hat sich leider die Menschenrechtssituation in mehreren ASEAN-Staaten in letzter Zeit eklatant verschlechtert, zum Beispiel die ethnischen Vertreibungen und Gewaltexzesse gegen die Rohingya in Myanmar, die Angriffe auf die Opposition und Zivilgesellschaft im Vorfeld der Wahlen in Kambodscha, der massive Anstieg extralegalen Hinrichtungen auf den Philippinen.

Die EU muss ihre Handelsbeziehungen entschiedener und effektiver für einen verbesserten Menschenrechtsschutz nutzen. Dabei muss sie glaubhaft und konsequent vorgehen, das heißt, auch die Menschenrechtsklauseln anwenden und gegebenenfalls Handelsvorteile aussetzen.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, prvně bych chtěl poděkovat panu zpravodaji za výbornou zprávu. Myslím si totiž, že odvedl obrovský kus práce, a chtěl bych poděkovat i všem, kteří se na této zprávě spolupodíleli, protože mi přijde z mého pohledu velmi vyvážená.

Bylo už tady zmíněno, že pro nás ASEAN je třetí nejdůležitější obchodní partner, ale nikdo tady nezmínil, že pro ASEAN my jsme druhý nejdůležitější obchodní partner a je potřeba dialog a rozvoj obchodních vztahů dále prohlubovat. To, co bych řekl panu komisaři a co by si měl odnést z tohoto dialogu s Komisí, je to, že my chceme rozvíjet právě i ten politický dialog, chceme nastolovat témata lidských práv. V řadě zemí sdružení ASEAN prostě témata lidských práv a právního státu bohužel jsou prázdné pojmy. A vedle toho je potřeba se státy hovořit také o životním prostředí, o větší bezpečnosti a třeba i o tom tématu inovací.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci zdůraznit, že skutečně ta vzájemná obchodní relace té výměny, ta činí tento prostor pro obě dvě strany velmi důležitý. To zdůraznil pan zpravodaj s tím, že řekl, že indicko-pacifický prostor je skutečně strategický pro EU, a myslím, že ta příležitost EU je znásobena tím, že Trumpova administrativa tento prostor vyklízí. To je obrovská příležitost pro EU, myslím, že politika pana Trumpa je nepochybně chybná, a my bychom měli posílit naše diplomatické kapacity, abychom této slabosti využili, protože je příležitostí, znovu opakují, pro EU.

V této souvislosti bych chtěl připomenout, že na minulém plenárním zasedání jsme se o Indii, která je rovněž strategickou zemí pro Evropu, bavili rovněž bez rozpravy v pozdním večeru. Myslím si, že by roli a význam těchto lokalit, těchto zemí opravdu zdůraznilo, kdybychom se bavili v rámci řádné rozpravy, nikoli tímto způsobem.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Julian King, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I welcome this report on behalf of the Commission and High Representative/Vice-President Mogherini. It speaks to the importance the EU attributes to relations with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), notwithstanding the last comment. It is also an appropriate way to celebrate this 40th anniversary.

Europe and the ASEAN region may be separated geographically, but we remain closely linked. What happens in Southeast Asia matters to us, and – I think we all agree – the same is true for our ASEAN friends. Today's challenges and crises very often have a global dimension, a global impact. The situation in the South China Sea and in the Korean peninsula, the fight against terrorism, radicalisation to mention just a few examples are ASEAN interests, but they are our interests too.

The EU wants to contribute to the security of the ASEAN region. The EU has become one of the main contributors to the security-related activities of the ASEAN Regional Forum. In 2017, we have sponsored initiatives on counter-radicalisation, people trafficking, preventive diplomacy and mediation. For the third year in a row, we have invited ASEAN partners to be acquainted with the EU's capabilities in common defence and security policies. A seminar in Rome allowed for a visit to the headquarters of Operation Sophia. Shortly, the EU will co-sponsor the fourth edition of the EU-ASEAN high-level dialogue on maritime security this year with the Philippines. We see the recent invitation to attend the November East Asia Summit as an acknowledgment of these efforts. We want to thank all ASEAN members, and in particular the Philippines, for inviting us. We look forward to contributing to the summit's work as a partner and a friend. The same goes for other security and defence forums in Southeast Asia, notably the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus.

There is much we can do together in terms of trade, connectivity, making the most out of globalisation, as well as addressing together the imbalances it can give rise to. Both the EU and ASEAN want to continue fighting climate change and to preserve the Paris Agreement. I am glad that we adopted, in August, a joint statement to reaffirm that we stand by Paris, and we will push forward implementation.

We should not underestimate the joint potential of cooperation between EU and ASEAN in a range of sectors. After all, as has been noted, together we represent over one billion people, and we are among the largest world economies.

The European Union is the first foreign investor in ASEAN and the second trading partner. The impact of bilateral free trade agreements between the European Union and Singapore, Vietnam, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand would be huge, with great benefits for our companies and citizens. These agreements could be the stepping stones towards a future region-to-region agreement.

The comprehensive air transport agreement we are negotiating would be the first of its kind. Once finalised, thousands of new jobs will be created, and one billion people will be able to fly directly for lower prices and with the highest standards of security.

The potential for greater engagement is huge. To turn this potential into reality, in Manila in August the EU and ASEAN adopted a comprehensive plan of action to guide cooperation from 2018 to 2022. All the key areas of common interest are covered, including human rights, good governance, women's rights and the rule of law.

Forty years ago, we took the first steps to build cooperation between the European Union and ASEAN. We have come a long way since. Today, every day, we see that many of our interests coincide, as do many of the challenges we face. The EU remains committed to comprehensively upgrading the EU-ASEAN relationship. We can be proud of what we have achieved over the last 40 years. We should be ambitious about what we can do together in the years ahead.

Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for your engagement on this report and the debate this evening.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Dienstag, 3. Oktober 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), písemně. – Sdružení ASEAN oslavilo nedávno 50. výročí založení. Počtem obyvatel je podobné EU, dlužno podotknout, že i některé problémy má podobné, ne-li stejné. 40 let od navázání prvních vztahů mezi EU a ASEAN vidíme pozitivní vývoj ve spolupráci v řadě oblastí. Avšak podobně jako v EU se některé státy potýkají s problematikou porušování lidských práv a neobčanů. Velké komunity bez státní příslušnosti se v současnosti nacházejí v Bruneji, na Filipínách, v Thajsku, Malajsii a zejména v Myanmaru. V něm se jedná o Rohingye, jejichž postavení je v zemích ASEAN horší než v případě občanů bez státní příslušnosti v zemích EU. O těch se bohužel zpráva nezmiňuje. Dlužno podotknout, že dlouhodobě několik desítek tisíc neobčanů žije i ve státech EU, konkrétně Lotyšsku a Estonsku. Tito neobčané dokonce mají osobní dokumenty, například pas, s označením neobčan. Jedním z velkých problémů zemí ASEAN je ochrana životního prostředí a boj proti pirátství. V Jihočínském moři se dlouhodobě nedaří řešit konflikt mezi státy ASEAN vzájemně a mezi státy ASEAN a Čínou. Ani EU však není prosta podobných problémů. Mezinárodní arbitráž mezi Slovinskem a Chorvatskem v Piranském zálivu je podobným konfliktem v malém. Obě strany, tedy EU i ASEAN, by měly být vyzvány k vyřešení naznačených problémů.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Kumppanuuksien edistäminen Kaakkois-Aasian maiden liiton (ASEANin) jäsen-maiden kanssa on EU:lle strateginen etu. ASEAN-maat muodostavat yhdessä maailman seitsemänneksi suurimman talou-den ja ASEAN on EU:n kolmas kauppakumppani. Vuotuisen kahdenvälisen tavarakaupan arvo on yli 200 miljardia euroa. Alue on yksi maailman dynaamisimmista ja nopeimmin kasvavista myös teknologian ja tutkimuksen osalta.

Vuoropuhelu ja yhteistyö muodostavat yhteisen edun monella alalla kyberturvallisuudesta ilmastomuutoksen torjuntaan. Strategista kumppanuutta ei luonnollisestikaan tule ajaa ummistamatta silmiä esimerkiksi alueella ilmeneville ihmi-soikeusrikkomuksille. Kumppanuuksissa tulee myös edistää YK:n yrittäjätoimintaa ja ihmisoikeuksia koskevia suosituksia. EU:lla on mahdollisuus käyttää suhteitaan vaikuttaakseen ihmisoikeuksien toteutumiseen alueella niin kauppakumppa-nuuksiensa kuin avulle suuntautuvan kehitysyhteistyön avulla.

19. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 163 GO).

Pál Csáky (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! A Szlovák Köztársaságban, amelynek polgára vagyok, a magyar nemzeti kisebbséghez tartozó polgárok ismét azon panaszkodnak, hogy szlovák nyelvvendörök zaklatják őket azért, mert anyanyelvüket használnák az érvényes törvényeknek megfelelően.

Igen, jól hallják, nem Orwell állatfarmjáról beszélek, hanem a realitásról: Szlovákiában, az EU egyik tagállamában nyelvrendőrség működik, amelynél bármelyik állampolgár feljelentheti a másikat azért, mert az valahol a kisebbségi nyelvét használta, s ezért akár több ezer eurós büntetés is kiroható. Ha eljönnek Szlovákiába, azt látják, hogy vállalatok óriási felületeken reklámoznak csak angol vagy más idegen nyelvű hirdetéseket. Ez ellenkezik ugyan a hatályban lévő, sovinszta nyelvtörvénnyel, de ezt mindenki tolerálja. Azt viszont már nem, ha az ország saját állampolgárai, akik valamelyik kisebbséghez tartoznak, az anyanyelvüket használják, például nyilvános feliratokon. Kérem Timmermans urat és Jourová asszonyt, hogy kérjenek felvilágosítást ezzel kapcsolatban a szlovák kormánytól.

Γιώργος Γραμματικάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, την Κυριακή 10 Σεπτεμβρίου βυθίστηκε στον Σαρωνικό κόλπο της Ελλάδος ένα σχετικά μικρού μεγέθους δεξαμενόπλοιο. Σύμφωνα με τους ειδικούς, η διαρροή πετρελαίου δεν ήταν αρχικά σημαντική και θα μπορούσε να είχε περιοριστεί πριν εξαπλωθεί. Ωστόσο, όπως διαπίστωσαν όλοι από τις εικόνες, προκλήθηκαν τεράστιες περιβαλλοντικές ζημιές και οι επαγγελματίες ψαράδες οδηγήθηκαν σε απόγνωση. Έχει ήδη ασκηθεί έντονη κριτική στην αντίδραση και στην ολιγωρία του κρατικού μηχανισμού. Σε κάθε περίπτωση όμως μπορούμε από τώρα να θέσουμε κάποια σημαντικά ερωτήματα: έχουν οι εθνικές αρχές, που κρίνουν το αξιόπλοο των πλοίων τέτοιου τύπου, την τεχνική κατάρτιση και την ανεξαρτησία ενός αναγνωρισμένου νηογνώμονα; Δεύτερον, θα έπρεπε αυτό το πλοίο, που ήταν 45, παρακαλώ, ετών, να πλέει σε ευρωπαϊκά ύδατα; Για εμάς τους Έλληνες, κυρία Πρόεδρε, το γνωρίζετε, η θάλασσα έχει, ιστορικά, ιδιαίτερη σημασία και μας καθορίζει κοινωνικά, οικονομικά και πολιτιστικά. Με τη συνδρομή λοιπόν της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ελπίζω ότι θα θέσουμε την προστασία της θάλασσας ως κύριο στόχο μας.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, тези дни в народното събрание на Република Албания се разглежда един изключително важен закон, който се приема и под натиска на Европейския парламент, а именно законът за националните малцинства. В него са изброени няколко такива общности, но липсва една историческа общност, която е призната от албанската държава още от 1932 година и това е българската общност.

Това, разбира се, предизвиква нашето учудване, тъй като, както е добре известно, в тази зала в миналогодишния доклад за напредъка на Албания към Европейския съюз, изрично Европейският парламент посочи и българската общност сред тези в Албания и настоя правителството на Албания и народното събрание да вземат всички необходими мерки, за да запазят правата и законните интереси на тези граждани на Република България – българи по произход.

Затова моят апел към правителството на Република Албания е да спазва европейските правила и норми и да не превърша този изключително важен двустранен въпрос в едно поле за спекулации, които само радват Белград и други държави и навреждат на добрите ни приятелски отношения.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, quiero mostrar mi solidaridad con todos los heridos ayer en Cataluña durante una actuación policial desproporcionada y violenta. Solo sirvió para vulnerar derechos fundamentales y alterar la convivencia, contra las órdenes judiciales expresas en sentido contrario. Espero que sea el último capítulo de una estrategia errónea: negar la realidad y tratar de reprimir a golpe de sentencias un problema político a cuya solución debería contribuir la Unión Europea como agente de convivencia.

España se proclama nación unida pero es, en realidad, una unión de naciones. La mayoría de los ciudadanos de Cataluña y Euskadi quieren que se reconozca y asuma esta realidad sobre la base del respeto mutuo, el diálogo, la negociación, el acuerdo y la ratificación: un referéndum legal y pactado.

Lamento que la parte más poderosa, que también vulnera leyes, no confíe en lo que ofrece para sumar con vascos y catalanes. La violencia, el abuso de poder, las escaladas verbales o la utilización electoral de estos conflictos a costa de encontrarlos no son un proyecto seductor. Generan quiebras de convivencia que ningún político responsable debe permitir ni alentar.

§Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente: patadas en la cabeza, porrazos, pelotas de goma, dedos rotos y hasta una denuncia por agresión sexual. Recordad que esta gente solo quería votar.

Ante esto, el silencio de las instituciones europeas. Un silencio cómplice. Después de esto, ¿quién garantiza que en la huelga que hay convocada para el martes no se repita esta brutalidad policial?

El domingo, millones de catalanes y catalanas dieron una lección, respondieron a la represión con democracia.

Se puede discutir si queremos, como el Partido Popular y el Partido Socialista, que Cataluña se quede bajo la monarquía española o si echamos «al Borbón» y construimos todos juntos una república federal o si apostamos por la independencia, pero son los catalanes y las catalanas los que deciden sobre su futuro.

Frente a la imposición con violencia el derecho de autodeterminación de los pueblos.

Marco Zanni (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio esprimere qui solidarietà, oggi, a Jacques Sapir, uno degli economisti eterodossi francesi che, purtroppo, è stato silenziato pochi giorni fa. Infatti, la piattaforma dove pubblica da ormai otto anni le sue analisi, ha deciso di non permettergli più di pubblicare queste analisi perché vanno contro il governo francese. Guarda caso, il signor Dacos, che è il gestore di questa piattaforma, è stato nominato consulente del governo Macron.

Solidarietà con Jacques Sapir, una delle poche voci libere e critiche contro quest'Unione europea e contro l'Europa: se questa è la democrazia, se questa è la libertà di espressione che vuole colui che è presentato come il riformatore e salvatore d'Europa, Macron, noi non ci stiamo. Proteggiamo la libertà di parola e di espressione di chi ha denunciato gli orrori di questa Unione europea.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Ukrajna már sokszor megsértette azokat az elveket, amelyeknek az érvényesítését az EU-val kötött társulási szerződésben vállalta. Legutóbb, nemzetközi tiltakozás ellenére fogadta el azt az oktatási törvényt, amely lehetetlenné teszi a nemzeti kisebbségek anyanyelven való képzését, többek között a 150 000-es őshonos magyar közösségét.

A múlt héten az ukrán hatóságok nem engedték belépni az ország területére Morvai Krisztina, európai parlamenti képviselőt, az általa addig nem ismert kitiltó határozat állítólagos indoka az, a vád, hogy 2014-ben Donbaszban járt, és a szeparatistákat támogatta. Ez az állítás hazugság. Soha nem járt Donbaszban a képviselő asszony. Ez egy súlyos provokáció, ami az ő személyén keresztül magát az Európai Parlamentet érte, ezért mindez nem maradhat következmény nélkül.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovolu, abych upozornila na situaci v Turecku. Tuto zemi jsem navštívila před deseti dny navzdory tomu, že oficiální delegace EP do Turecka byly zrušeny, s čímž kategoricky nesouhlasím. Chtěla jsem se přesvědčit o tom, jak probíhá v Turecku integrace více než tří milionů uprchlíků. Byla jsem velmi pozitivně překvapena úsilím, úspěšnými výsledky těch, kteří se v Turecku o uprchlíky starají přímo v terénu, od zaměstnanců veřejné správy, škol až po zaměstnavatele. Zde jsou také prostředky EU velmi dobře využity ve prospěch těch, kteří je potřebují.

Bohužel to vše v kontrastu s tím, že musím konstatovat, že politická situace v Turecku není dobrá. Měla jsem možnost hovořit s rodinnými příslušníky vězněných novinářů, se zástupci perzekuovaných akademiků a zastánců vězněných aktivistů z ostrova Buyukada. Chci z tohoto místa podpořit jejich boj za demokracii a návrat Turecka k hodnotám právního státu, občanských a lidských práv. Právě dnes 2. října, kdy je Světový den nenásilí jako památka narození Mahátmy Gándhího. Podpořme turecké občany a přátele v jejich... *(předsedající řečnici odebrala slovo).*

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, como saben sus señorías, España es el principal exportador de aceituna de mesa del mundo, a lo que contribuye Andalucía con un 80 %, desde Sevilla, Jaén o Córdoba, y una facturación de más de 350 millones de euros al año. Saben que la industria alimentaria estadounidense ha elevado quejas por procedimiento antidumping por bajo precio —supuesto bajo precio—, por las ayudas de la PAC, ante la Organización Mundial del Comercio, lo cual la Comisión Europea sabe que no es cierto.

No es cierto, porque sabe que la PAC está perfectamente alineada con las normas de la Organización Mundial del Comercio. Por eso le pido a la Comisión que establezca el diálogo con la Administración estadounidense, así como que haga un pronunciamiento explícito y adopte medidas concretas que dé la seguridad jurídica que necesita en estos momentos el sector agroalimentario de la aceituna de mesa, tan importante en mi región y en el conjunto de España.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin, wertee Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Für Europa sind wir uns einig: Gewalt ist keine Lösung! Gleichzeitig möchte ich als ein Mitglied der AKP-Delegation unseren Fokus auf eine Gewalteskalation lenken, die seit Sonntag 4000 Kilometer von hier passiert und uns historisch doch sehr nahe gehen muss. In Kamerun kam es seit Sonntag zu Gewaltexzessen der französischsprachigen Regierung gegen Menschen, die den 56. Geburtstag ihrer englischsprachigen Region feiern wollten. Seitdem herrscht eine Nachrichtensperre, das Internet ist abgeschaltet. Amnesty sagt, es sei eine „ongoing campaign to silence any form of dissent in the West and South-West regions of Cameroon“. Die Kolonialmächte Frankreich und Großbritannien tragen hier eine besondere Verantwortung. Sie haben das Durcheinander verursacht, das bereits viele Opfer gefordert hat. Schweigen wir nicht! Geschaffene Strukturen müssen geordnet und befriedet werden. Stellen wir uns an die Seite Afrikas – nicht wegen der Macht über Rohstoffe, sondern um der Menschen willen, die ein Recht haben, endlich Afrikaner zu sein.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το PKK είναι στη λίστα των τρομοκρατικών οργανώσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Αυτό είναι σεβαστό. Υπάρχει όμως μια πρόσφατη απόφαση του Εφετείου του Βελγίου, που αποφάνθηκε ότι το PKK δεν είναι τρομοκρατική οργάνωση. Εγώ προσωπικά λέω καθαρά ότι δεν είμαι σε θέση να πω ποιος είναι πράγματι ο χαρακτήρας αυτής της οργάνωσης και είμαι ενάντια σε κάθε τρομοκρατία, όπως κάθε σοβαρός άνθρωπος πρέπει να είναι. Όμως νομίζω ότι μια αναθεώρηση αυτής της θέσης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης μπορεί να οδηγήσει, συν τη προτροπή της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, σε διαπραγματεύσεις μεταξύ του τουρκικού κράτους και του PKK, έτσι ώστε να βρεθεί μια διέξοδος στο πρόβλημα που ταλανίζει τη χώρα.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il 22 ottobre si terrà in Lombardia e in Veneto un referendum per l'autonomia. Io penso che sarebbe giusto e anche opportuno un saluto del Parlamento europeo a questa giornata di libertà e di democrazia, sulla base del sacrosanto principio di autodeterminazione dei popoli, che il mio movimento, la Lega Nord per l'indipendenza della Padania ha sempre sostenuto anche su questi banchi.

Io domenica ho svolto volontariamente il ruolo di osservatore internazionale come membro della commissione per gli affari esteri del Parlamento europeo in Catalogna e, autorizzato dalla Generalitat, sono stato ai seggi e volevo testimoniare su questi banchi la regolarità di questa votazione, il carattere pacifico e assolutamente non di parte, non violento, non fazioso di questa richiesta sostenuta da una grandissima parte del popolo catalano. Voglio rendere omaggio a questo popolo e alla sua determinazione e condannare naturalmente gli atti di violenza.

Spero veramente che ci sia molta solidarietà in Europa e che si deplori il silenzio delle autorità europee.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se dnes musím vyjádřit k děsivým obrázkům, které jsme v neděli viděli z Katalánska. Ty obrázky jsou natolik šokující, že si každý musí říci: Jsou to obrázky z členské země EU? Používat proti mírumilovným voličům, kteří drží v ruce maximálně volební lístky, gumové projektily, to je výjev, který bych čekal maximálně někde z Ruska, ne z demokratického státu EU.

Nemůžeme rozhodně mlčet, já v žádném případě nebudu. Jsem zde v Evropském parlamentu členem Evropské lidové strany, ve které jsou členy i moji kolegové ze Španělska, a to zvolení právě za stranu pana Rajoye. Jsem si vědom, že daná otázka je interní věcí členského státu, samozřejmě je to otázka ústavního práva Španělska. Ovšem množství zraněných nás všechny v Evropské lidové straně nutí odsoudit tento bezohledný zákrok. Já jej chci dnes se vši rozhodností odsoudit a chci volat k zodpovědnosti právě španělskou vládu.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, thank you for allowing me to address this House on the protection of consumers within the digital single market. The Commission is currently consulting on this area, and I very much hope that one of the outcomes will be the strengthening of those aspects of the Consumer Rights Directive on complete price information. This directive seems to have been broadly effective in ensuring that consumers can make purchasing decisions with full information and without hidden charges.

There are still, however, many areas where digital trading pushes the boundaries of good practice. For example, in sports and music ticketing – where demand is especially price-inelastic – leading aftermarket sites frequently add outrageous service and delivery charges well after the point where the buyer is emotionally committed to the purchase. Meanwhile, the technology applies pressure to buyers who are prepared to pay whatever it takes to see their favourite performer, band or football match. I hope we will see the Commission addressing this issue in the near future.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W ramach wystąpień jednogodzinnych chciałabym zaprotestować przeciwko zapowiadanej zmianie dyrektywy Komisji Europejskiej zmuszającej ojców do skorzystania z czteromiesięcznego urlopu tacierzyńskiego bez możliwości przeniesienia go na drugiego rodzica. Matki po porodzie mogą być zmuszone do szybszego powrotu do pracy, co nie tylko osłabi konieczną więź matki z dzieckiem, ale spowoduje nieodwracalne skutki psychofizyczne. Według psychologów dziecko dobrze znosi rozłąkę z matką tylko na tyle godzin, ile ma lat. Nieobecność matki przez osiem godzin pracy w pierwszym roku życia będzie powodem lęków separacyjnych, zaburzeń fizycznych, chorób oraz zaburzeń tożsamości, zwłaszcza że od szóstego miesiąca życia wzrasta przywiązanie i wpływ matki na dziecko, a do drugiego roku życia dziecko nieświadomie identyfikuje się z matką. Natomiast ojciec odgrywa ważną rolę w późniejszym okresie.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, tá mé ag iarraidh labhairt anocht ar ábhar cearta daonna, daonlathas agus saoirse tionóil.

Is léir ón méid a bhí le feiceáil inné gur léiriú cumhachtach, daonlathach, síochánta a bhí sa reifreann sa Chatalóin. Tá dualgas orainn mar fheisirí i bparlaimint daonlathach seasamh anois le muintir na Catalóine. Ní féidir linn neamhaird a dhéanamh ar na radhairc dhrámatúla agus scanrúla a bhí le feiceáil ar shráideanna agus i scoileanna na Catalóine inné. Agus ní féidir leis an Aontas Eorpach neamhaird a dhéanamh ar an teachtaireacht láidir a tháinig ó mhuintir na tíre sin. Ní féidir linn ach a bheith buartha agus feargach agus póilíní na Spáinne ag déanamh ionsaí ar ionaid vótála, ionsaí ar shaoránaigh agus iad ag vótáil, agus ag scaoileadh urchair phlaisteacha leis na sluaite. An é seo an próiseas daonlathach atá uainn – ag greadadh daoine agus iad ag caitheamh vóta? Mo náire iad.

Tá dualgas orainn mar dhaonlathaithe foréigean agus brú faoi chois na Spáinne a cháineadh. Cuireann ciúnas ár gceannairí náire orm, agus tá sé thar bheith in am dóibh siúd a nguth a ardú anois. Caithfidh an tAontas Eorpach seasamh go hionlán le muintir na Catalóine ar son na saoirse agus ar son an daonlathais.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, já jsem moc rád, že dnes tady sedíte zrovna Vy, protože bych rád upozornil na jeden problém, o kterém se tady v Evropském parlamentu příliš nehovořilo. A to jsou výsledky operace OPSON, která proběhla pod záštitou Europolu a Interpolu, a bylo během ní zabaveno 10 tisíc tun, 27 milionů litrů, 13 milionů kusů potencionálně škodlivých potravin v 61 zemích.

Pane komisaři, to je poměrně závažný problém. Máme tady co do činění s potravinovou kriminalitou, a pokud nezříkáme nějaký úřad, který bude koordinovat ten postup proti potravinové kriminalitě, tak může dojít velmi brzo k ohrožení životů občanů EU. Máme tady příklady, kdy se do potravin sype sůl, která se používá na údržbu silnic. Máme tady příklady, kdy se pašuje maso. Myslím si, že je potřeba něco s tím udělat, a myslím si, že třeba v Europolu nebo EEAS je... (*předsedající řečníkovi odebrala slovo*).

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je voudrais attirer votre attention sur une situation scandaleuse qui a lieu dans mon pays, la Lettonie. Le commerce illégal de déchets est devenu une tragédie nationale. Il y a beaucoup d'endroits où des propriétaires privés peu scrupuleux entassent des déchets volumineux et parfois toxiques en provenance directe de Suisse, des Pays-Bas, etc.

Il s'agit là d'un business très juteux qui nuit à notre environnement mais malheureusement notre législation nationale ne permet pas de le faire cesser et de sanctionner les responsables.

Chers collègues, nous devons absolument mettre fin à ce trafic par une législation européenne appropriée.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το πρόβλημα με τα κόκκινα δάνεια εντείνεται στην Ελλάδα, καθώς η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ δρομολογεί τους ηλεκτρονικούς πλειστηριασμούς. Ο ελληνικός λαός, παρότι πλήρωσε ακριβά με τρία μηνώνια τις διαδοχικές ανακεφαλαιοποιήσεις των ελληνικών τραπεζών, τώρα δέχεται την επίθεση των τραπεζών, οι οποίες έχουν εντελώς αφελληνιστεί και οι οποίες ετοιμάζονται, κυριολεκτικά, να ξεπουλήσουν τα «κόκκινα» δάνεια στα funds, δηλαδή στα «κοράκια» αντί πινακίου φακής. Όμως ο ελληνικός λαός δεν πρόκειται να επιτρέψει στην τρόικα και στα «κοράκια» να του αρπάξουν τα σπίτια του. Το κόμμα μας «ΕΛΛΑΔΑ – Ο ΑΛΛΟΣ ΔΡΟΜΟΣ» απαιτεί την ίδρυση ενός δημοσίου ταμείου για «κόκκινα» δάνεια, ενός ταμείου σωτηρίας των δανειοληπτών, προκειμένου να μπορέσουν να σώσουν τα σπίτια τους. Το ταμείο αυτό θα μπορούσε να χρηματοδοτηθεί με 4,5 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ από τα 25 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ που περισεύουν από το τρίτο δανειακό πακέτο. Επιπλέον, απαιτούμε να θεσμοθετηθεί στην Ελλάδα το μοντέλο της Κύπρου, προκειμένου ο δανειολήπτης να έχει δικαίωμα προτίμησης αγοράς του δανείου του στην τιμή της πρώτης προσφοράς που κάνουν τα «κοράκια».

Marie-Pierre Vieu (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, l'élevage du canard dans le Sud-Ouest de la France n'est pas qu'un argument touristique, c'est aussi une réalité structurante de l'économie régionale et du maillage territorial. Pourtant, aujourd'hui, 30 000 emplois directs et 100 000 emplois indirects sont menacés.

Depuis 2015 et le début des épidémies de grippe aviaire, les choses n'ont fait qu'empirer. En 2017, quatre millions de bêtes ont été abattues préventivement, soit des mois de vide sanitaire pour plus de 1 000 communes, et une année sans aucun revenu pour certains producteurs. Une lente agonie !

Les compensations octroyées ne sont pas à la hauteur et la colère grandit, se nourrissant de l'injustice de la situation. En effet, là où les pertes des gros groupements ont été bien indemnisées, les petites exploitations, elles, paient le prix fort.

Je suis partisane du principe de précaution et consciente des nouvelles normes et contrôles à mettre en place, mais cela implique d'aider les producteurs à appliquer ces changements et à sécuriser leurs exploitations face à la grippe aviaire, alors qu'ils doivent faire face à la pression combinée des retards de paiements de la PAC, des nouvelles normes, des mesures de confinement et des coûts liés aux analyses.

Ce que je vous demande aujourd'hui, c'est d'abord de prendre conscience de notre responsabilité dans la préservation d'un patrimoine, de nous engager clairement et d'assurer des solutions pérennes...

(La Présidente interrompt l'oratrice).

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, this evening in the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development there were votes on a mandate for trade with New Zealand and Australia, putting forward the concerns of the Agriculture Committee. While we do want Europe to conclude trade agreements, we want it to be sensitive to the impact they can have on farmers in the European Union.

In that context there is deep concern, certainly among beef farmers in Ireland, about the potential offer that the European Union will make to the Mercosur countries, and the figure being quoted is of 70 000 tons of tariff-rate quota for beef. This will have consequences not just for Ireland but for livestock farmers across Europe. What I would say to our Trade Commissioner, and indeed to all of the Commissioners, is that they must look very carefully and calculate the combined impact of all these trade agreements on the agriculture sector. We have a common agricultural policy, we have a model of agriculture, and we need to defend it.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, recent, președintele Comisiei Europene, domnul Juncker, a afirmat în discursul despre starea Uniunii necesitatea ca România și Bulgaria să fie acceptate în spațiul Schengen.

Ulterior, mesajul său a fost întărit de comisarul european pentru migrație, afaceri interne și cetățenie, care a afirmat că un spațiu Schengen coordonat și unitar ar trebui să includă Bulgaria și România. Comisia Europeană cunoaște și recunoaște de mai mult timp faptul că România și-a respectat angajamentele și, deci, acceptarea țării noastre în spațiul Schengen este legitimă, corectă și dezirabilă.

Un astfel de pas nu este doar în avantajul României sau Bulgariei, ci în beneficiul celorlalte state membre, pentru că ar permite o întărire a cooperării pentru tot ce înseamnă consolidarea securității la granițele UE.

Invocarea oricăror pretexte pentru a bloca aderarea României la spațiul Schengen este contrară principiilor pe care le împărtășim și contraproductivă pentru securitatea și economia Uniunii Europene.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, declarația mea din această seară este legată de persoanele cu dizabilități fizice, psihice și intelectuale. Da, știm cu toții că au drepturi prevăzute în Convenția ONU. Din păcate, legislațiile naționale reflectă diferit drepturile acestor persoane și, nu numai că le reflectă diferit, ci diferă și modul de aplicare.

Am avut mai multe întâlniri cu asociații europene ale persoanelor cu dizabilități, asociații naționale și asociații din țara mea. Discuțiile pe care le-am avut m-au determinat să declar în această seară, domnule comisar, pentru că eu cred că este necesar, mai ales în ceea ce privește instituția tutelă, că acele persoane cu dizabilități care sunt sub tutela unor persoane sunt pur și simplu mai rău decât în detenție. Deci, cred că trebuie să revizuim, să vedem la nivel național, la nivel european, cum am putea să reglementăm uniform drepturile a zeci de milioane de persoane cu dizabilități. Existența unei dizabilități nu justifică pierderea de drepturi și cred că merită să facem această analiză și vă solicit acest lucru, domnule comisar.

Emilian Pavel (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, parlamentul ucrainean a adoptat recent o actualizare a legii educației promulgate de președintele țării. Ea limitează învățământul în limbile minorităților naționale.

Aceasta este o încălcare brutală a obligațiilor internaționale ale statului ucrainean. Minorități precum cea română și multe altele vor avea enorm de suferit în urma acestei legi. Sunt extrem de dezamăgit de faptul că reacțiile Uniunii Europene față de acest abuz au fost inexistente.

Azi însă, vreau să cer Parlamentului European să sancționeze urgent și fără rezerve Ucraina. Dacă această țară, așa cum pretinde, dorește să se apropie de Uniunea Europeană, ea trebuie să știe că astfel de legi, motivate de nevoia de omogenizare a populației, aparțin altor secole. Ele nu au ce căuta în Europa, ele nu pot fi promovate de adevărații prieteni ai Uniunii Europene.

Toate aceste acțiuni agresive împotriva multiculturalității pot fi regăsite și în discursurile recente ale negociatorilor britanici din cadrul Brexit. Aceștia amenință, printre altele, cu posibila impunere a vizelor în cazul românilor, bulgarilor și polonezilor. Eu cred că avem obligația de a nu-i lăsa pe toți acești cetățeni europeni singuri în fața abuzurilor și acestor dezastre istorice.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

20. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

21. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 20.55 Uhr geschlossen.)

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



C/2024/3010

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 3. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3010)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	3
2. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll	3
3. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (Aussprache)	3
4. Abstimmungsstunde	41
4.1. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017) (Abstimmung)	41
4.2. Beschränkung der Verwendung bestimmter gefährlicher Stoffe in Elektro- und Elektronikgeräten (A8-0205/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (Abstimmung)	42
4.3. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (Abstimmung)	42
4.4. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh) (Abstimmung)	42
4.5. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (Abstimmung)	42
4.6. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi) (Abstimmung)	42
4.7. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer) (Abstimmung)	42
5. Stimmerkklärungen	42

Inhalt	Seite
5.1. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017)	42
5.2. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato)	47
5.3. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh)	48
5.4. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)	51
5.5. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi)	52
5.6. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer)	54
6. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	55
7. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	55
8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	55
9. Lage in der Republik Moldau	55
10. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (Aussprache)	67
11. Prioritäten für die Partnerschaft EU-Ägypten 2017-2020 (Aussprache)	84
12. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll	92
13. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (Aussprache)	92
14. Annullierung Tausender Flüge durch Ryanair und Durchsetzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 261/2004 über Fluggastrechte (Aussprache)	110
15. Einwand gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (Aussprache)	128
16. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll	138
17. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe – Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen – System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (Aussprache)	138
18. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	148
19. Schluss der Sitzung	148

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 3. OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.00)

2. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll

3. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sul tema «Stato di avanzamento dei negoziati con il Regno Unito» (2017/2847(RSP)).

Jean-Claude Juncker, President of the Commission. – Mr President, September was a month rich in speeches. I started with my State of the Union address on the future of Europe here in this House, where I laid out the road map for a more united, stronger and more democratic Union. This debate on building a more united, stronger and more democratic Europe continued at the Sorbonne in Paris: President Macron gave a very bold and a very European speech, and I would like to congratulate him and thank him once again. Prime Minister May's speech, on the other hand, was about separation. In Florence, she struck an optimistic tone on the future relationship between the United Kingdom and the Union.

When it comes to Brexit, we still cannot talk about the future without real clarity. This is because the condition of Article 50 and the mandate given to us by the leaders of the EU 27 are very clear: we first need to agree on the terms of the divorce and then we will see if we can, half-lovingly, find one another again. The Prime Minister's speech in Florence was conciliatory, but speeches are not negotiation positions and, as Michel Barnier, the Commission's excellent chief negotiator, said last week, work still remains to be done. We have not yet made the sufficient progress needed.

The negotiators have made good progress on citizens' rights, but the indispensable role of the European Court of Justice in guaranteeing those rights still needs to be agreed. I am pleased that Prime Minister May and her team recognise that the UK has financial obligations which it must respect. The devil will be, as always, in the detail, but the taxpayers of the EU 27 should not pay for the British decision. And when it comes to Ireland we can only talk of solutions that fully respect EU law and the Good Friday Agreement. I will not go into any more detail here, as negotiations continue next week and Michel Barnier will complete what I have just been saying.

For those who think that the UK should just go over Michel Barnier's head, I would remind them that the Commission was appointed by the 27 Member States, and my choice of Michel Barnier was welcomed by them. He acts on their behalf on the basis of clear negotiating mandates and he will report to them at the next European Council. To date, I cannot say that we are ready to enter the second phase of the negotiations.

Monsieur le Président, après le départ du Royaume-Uni, une page de l'histoire européenne se tourne et une autre est en train de s'écrire pour décider de l'avenir que nous voulons construire à vingt-sept.

Trop longtemps, nous avons repoussé des questions cruciales à des lendemains incertains. Trop longtemps, nous avons préféré nous livrer à de longues discussions institutionnelles au lieu de débattre clairement avec les peuples d'Europe de la finalité de notre Union. Tout cela doit changer et tout cela est en train de changer. Les débats sur l'avenir de l'Europe se multiplient dans tous les États membres. C'est bon signe car cela témoigne de la santé et de la vigueur de la démocratie européenne. C'était l'objectif que visait la Commission avec le livre blanc sur l'avenir de l'Europe, les documents de réflexion et les nombreux dialogues citoyens qui se sont multipliés dans tout le continent.

Mais il ne faut pas se disperser. C'est pourquoi j'ai voulu placer la poursuite de ce débat public dans le contexte d'une feuille de route structurée avec des échéances précises sur des propositions concrètes. Cette route nous mènera jusqu'au 30 mars 2019, au sommet spécial de Sibiu-Hermannstadt, en Roumanie, où nous donnerons notre vision d'avenir pour l'Europe et où nous déciderons de ce que nous serons prêts à défendre et à construire ensemble, à vingt-sept.

Notre avenir ce n'est pas le Brexit, c'est l'Europe.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Michel Barnier, *négociateur en chef pour le Brexit*. – Monsieur le Président, je tiens à remercier votre assemblée de me donner l'occasion de m'exprimer, aux côtés du président Juncker.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les présidents et parlementaires, cher Matti, je suis très heureux de me trouver aux côtés du président Juncker, que je remercie de sa confiance personnelle et de son soutien, et aux côtés de Matti Maasikas, que je félicite et remercie pour la qualité de la présidence estonienne, tout au long des semaines passées.

Nous étions réunis au sein de cet hémicycle pour débattre du même sujet le 5 avril 2017, au moment où vous adoptiez votre première résolution. Vous fixiez alors le cap politique de cette négociation, comme l'a fait, de son côté, le Conseil européen sous l'impulsion du président Tusk, en adoptant peu après des lignes directrices très précises.

Six mois plus tard, alors que l'horloge tourne, et à quelques jours du Conseil européen des 19 et 20 octobre, nous faisons donc à nouveau le point sur cette négociation, et votre projet de résolution démontre aujourd'hui, au-delà des sujets concrets qu'elle aborde, l'implication pleine et entière du Parlement européen dans ces pourparlers. Je rappelle souvent à l'extérieur de cet hémicycle que votre assemblée aura le dernier mot, au moment de la ratification.

Depuis le premier jour, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous savons que cette négociation est extraordinaire, qu'elle est extrêmement complexe, qu'elle est lourde de conséquences humaines, sociales, juridiques, financières, techniques, économiques, et souvent d'ailleurs, ces conséquences sont sous-estimées.

En tant que négociateur de l'Union, c'est à la Commission qu'il revient, avec votre confiance, de négocier au nom des 27 et de toutes les institutions de l'Union.

Notre plus grand atout, je peux vous le dire, à la place où je me trouve, c'est notre unité. Nous savons que cette unité ne se décrète pas, elle ne tombe pas du ciel, elle se construit jour après jour par la transparence que nous avons entretenons tous les jours avec le président Juncker, par le débat public et par la confiance.

Je veux d'ailleurs, Monsieur le Président Tajani, vous remercier personnellement, ainsi que Guy Verhofstadt, coordinateur pour le Brexit, les présidents de groupe et les membres du *Brexit Steering Group*, que je rencontre très souvent, comme cela a été le cas hier encore, pour la qualité et la franchise de nos échanges.

Forts de votre soutien, nous nous attachons depuis le début de cette négociation à mettre en œuvre le mandat qui nous est confié par le Conseil, en pleine cohérence avec votre résolution et avec les orientations adoptées par le Conseil européen.

Ce mandat est simple: il consiste à nous mettre d'accord avec le Royaume-Uni, le plus tôt possible, sur les conditions de son retrait – un retrait ordonné de l'Union européenne – et sur les principes de ce retrait, afin de commencer au plus vite les étapes suivantes de la négociation.

Vous le savez, Mesdames et Messieurs, dans le contexte de ce retrait, il y a beaucoup de sujets qui ne sont pas négligeables – Euratom, les procédures judiciaires, les procédures administratives, les biens placés sur le marché, la gouvernance –, mais les trois sujets principaux de ce retrait ordonné concernent d'abord les citoyens, soit 4,5 millions de personnes, puis l'Irlande et enfin le règlement financier. Ces trois sujets sont indissociables, et constituent les trois sujets clés de ce retrait ordonné.

Comme vous le dites-vous-même dans votre projet de résolution, et comme vient de le rappeler le président Juncker, la première ministre, Theresa May, a proposé plusieurs ouvertures dans deux discours qu'elle a prononcés vendredi dernier à Florence.

L'équipe de négociation, comme je le souhaitais, a commencé la semaine dernière à traduire ces ouvertures en propositions concrètes et à apporter un certain nombre de clarifications, sur lesquelles je reviendrai brièvement dans un instant.

Nous avons donc pu avancer notamment sur notre priorité, qui reste la protection des droits des citoyens. Nous convergions également sur les principes communs qui guideront notre réponse aux questions sensibles que soulève la situation unique de l'Irlande.

À côté de ces points positifs, que je dois mentionner, pour dresser un bilan objectif de l'état de la négociation, il nous reste des divergences sérieuses, en particulier sur le règlement financier.

Sur cette question, dont j'ai déjà parlée ici, les choses sont également simples. Nous n'accepterons pas de payer à 27 ce qui a été décidé à 28, c'est aussi simple que cela. Les contribuables des 27 États membres de l'Union n'ont pas à payer les conséquences d'une décision qu'ils n'ont pas prise, rien de plus, rien de moins.

(Applaudissements)

Nous avons aussi des divergences sur le moyen de garantir les droits des citoyens. Nous connaissons et partageons, tout comme vous connaissez, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, puisque vous les représentez, l'inquiétude de ces 4,5 millions de citoyens, britanniques et originaires des 27 autres pays de l'Union, qui souhaitent aujourd'hui simplement continuer à vivre et à travailler là où ils sont, avec leur famille, comme avant le Brexit.

Cette inquiétude, vous le rappelez dans votre résolution, est d'ailleurs aggravée par certaines mesures discriminatoires prises depuis quelques mois par les autorités britanniques, et nous nous en inquiétons.

Pour garantir ces droits, effectivement, nous avons besoin de plusieurs éléments. Premièrement, il faut que l'accord de retrait ait un effet direct pour permettre aux autorités et aux juges britanniques de s'appuyer directement sur cet accord, sans quoi, évidemment, ces droits pourraient être modifiés au fil du temps.

Deuxièmement, nous avons besoin d'une interprétation cohérente de l'accord de part et d'autre de la Manche, que, de notre point de vue, seule la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne peut assurer.

Au-delà de cette question de gouvernance, nous attendons aussi des garanties du Royaume-Uni sur le regroupement familial et sur la jouissance à l'étranger des avantages sociaux acquis au Royaume-Uni.

Concernant le deuxième sujet principal, celui de l'Irlande, tant l'Union européenne que le Royaume-Uni reconnaissent qu'elle se trouve dans une situation tout à fait exceptionnelle et que toute solution devra en tenir pleinement compte.

Comme je l'ai mentionné à plusieurs reprises, les solutions que nous devons trouver devront respecter à la fois l'intégrité de l'ordre juridique de l'Union et l'accord du vendredi saint (*Good Friday Agreement*) dans toutes ses dimensions.

À ce stade, il s'agit notamment d'élaborer les modalités concrètes qui permettront de poursuivre durablement les très nombreuses coopérations Nord-Sud prévues dans cet accord et de perpétuer la zone de voyage commune. Et cette tâche nécessite encore un travail précis et détaillé, dans lequel nous sommes engagés avec la délégation britannique de manière constructive.

En définitive, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, et vous le dites à juste titre dans votre projet de résolution, en ce qui concerne ces trois sujets clés indissociables, nous n'avons pas encore réalisé aujourd'hui de progrès suffisants pour entamer en toute confiance la deuxième phase de la négociation. Il s'agira tout d'abord de prévoir une éventuelle période de transition, dans des conditions qui ont été clairement définies par le Conseil européen et auxquelles vous êtes vous-même attentifs, puis de définir le cadre de notre future relation de partenariat avec ce grand pays.

Un cinquième cycle de négociation se tiendra la semaine prochaine à Bruxelles. Notre attitude restera résolument constructive, parce que nous voulons mener à bien et l'accord sur le retrait ordonné et la discussion sur notre future relation avec le Royaume-Uni.

Avec le Royaume-Uni, qui deviendra un État tiers, en toute hypothèse, puisque c'est son choix, le 30 mars 2019, nous voulons établir un partenariat ambitieux et durable, bien sûr en matière commerciale, puisque telle est sa demande, à travers un accord de libre-échange dans des conditions dont nous discuterons, mais aussi au-delà du commerce, en matière de sécurité, de lutte contre le terrorisme et de défense ou encore en matière de recherche et d'innovation.

Plus vite nous nous mettrons d'accord sur les principes de ce retrait ordonné, plus vite nous pourrions nous concentrer sur cet objectif fondamental qui relève de notre intérêt commun, à savoir la construction de ce partenariat nouveau avec le Royaume-Uni.

Mesdames et Messieurs, notre approche s'appuie sur les principes fondamentaux de notre Union: l'unité, l'intérêt des 27 - États membres et des institutions, notre autonomie de décision, l'intégrité de notre marché intérieur et les quatre libertés de circulation qui en sont le fondement. Ces quatre principes sont au cœur de notre projet politique depuis son origine. Le Royaume-Uni les connaît bien pour les avoir partagés avec nous pendant 44 ans, et ils ne sont pas négociables.

Une fois encore, comme l'a dit la chancelière allemande, il y a quelques semaines et comme vient de le rappeler le président Juncker, nous savons désormais que l'avenir de l'Union est bien plus important que le Brexit.

Il est de la responsabilité des 27 États membres et du Parlement européen de construire ensemble cet avenir et de relever ensemble les défis; nous voyons bien dans l'actualité qu'ils sont graves et nombreux. Une page se tourne, ou va se tourner. C'est le choix souverain du Royaume-Uni, et nous le respectons. C'est à nous de faire en sorte, comme vient de le dire Jean-Claude Juncker, d'écrire de nouvelles pages pour l'Union européenne.

(Applaudissements)

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, this debate is taking place barely two weeks before the October European Council and with one round of negotiations still to take place. The matters under discussion are serious ones with an impact on the rights of millions of citizens, on the budget of the Union and on the continuation of peace in Ireland.

Following Prime Minister May's speech on 22 September, we have noted a more constructive spirit and it seems to be providing new momentum to the negotiating process. However, we can only assess progress based on official negotiation. What actually matters is the position paper presented at negotiations as an official position. When reviewing progress, we take as a benchmark the guidelines set by the European Council on 29 April and supplemented by the negotiating directives of the Council adopted on 22 May, both setting principles and priorities shared in the European Parliament resolution of last April.

I am confident that, this time, the views expressed in the resolution due to be voted on by your institution right after this debate will again tally with ours, and with the assessment of the Union negotiator, Michel Barnier. Indeed, it is on the basis of this assessment that, on 20 October, the European Council will consider the state of play in these negotiations and how to move from there. We have noted that the UK is now acknowledging the need for a transition of sorts. The principle of transitional arrangements is indeed recognised, subject to clear conditions set in the European Council guidelines I referred to earlier. A transition could be welcome in easing the impact of the withdrawal and mitigating the uncertainties affecting citizens and businesses but, again, in order to be able to consider transition in good time, we need far more clarity than has been provided so far.

Likewise, concerning citizens' rights, we do see improved convergence on key rights and on how to ensure they can actually be enjoyed by European citizens in the UK on the basis of simple procedures. But a number of issues remain open and there is not yet any satisfactory assurance that these rights will be implemented in a consistent manner on both sides of the Channel.

Turning to Ireland and its unique situation, both sides are certainly close in terms of principles and continued support for the Good Friday Agreement and what could be achieved within its framework, and on the continued operation of the Common Travel Area and what it means for Irish citizens. But this is not enough in terms of certainty.

Last but not least, the financial settlement is also one of the key issues on which sufficient progress must be made before moving to the next phase of the negotiations. No doubt, positive words have been said but we are still awaiting concrete proposals. All this leaves us still wondering about the conclusion we can draw as to progress – an uncertainty which I read, too, in the draft motion for a resolution before you. European Parliament resolutions are valuable for the Council.

As I noted earlier, there are still 15 days and one round of negotiations to go. I was glad to conclude the meeting of the General Affairs Council (Article 50) on 25 September by noting that the EU 27 is united, that we have a single line of negotiations with a clearly defined mandate and we fully support the work of Michel Barnier. A certain new momentum has recently been instilled into the negotiations. Let us build on it. Let us achieve watertight solutions for our citizens, for our businesses and for our Union.

(Applause)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, firstly I think the top question for the moment is: who should I call in London who speaks for the government – Theresa May, Boris Johnson or even David Davis? On reading Johnson's attacks against his own prime minister, he shows that the British Government is trapped by their own party quarrels and political contradictions. First Florence, then Manchester: we are listening to a lot of speeches but substance, dear friends... London is being very creative in putting red lines on the table in order to please party supporters. However, it is failing to give any solution to the voters and citizens. I fully agree with Theresa May on at least one single point, when she said 'we can do so much better than this'. Theresa May, please do not put your party first; please put Britain first, please put the citizens first; and please, no more speeches. Show leadership on content. And the best thing would probably be to please sack Johnson, because we need a clear answer as to who is responsible for the British position.

(Applause from certain quarters)

A second point is the perspective of the citizens in the European Union. They can see what leaving the European Union means. We have a downgrading by the rating agencies. We have a lot of European companies who are saying they will not invest any more, and the growth rate in Great Britain when we look at the OECD data is going down from 1.6% to 1%, so only half of the gross rate which we have today in the eurozone. That is the result when you do a Brexit.

The third point I want to put on the table is what are we doing in the next steps? First of all, the British Government has to understand that cherry-picking is over. What we saw through the summer break was the British Government presenting a lot of new ideas, but with these ideas they showed that they want to keep ties, they want to keep contact. They did not explain to us what leaving the European Union really means. Another point is that we should not speak too much about the transitional period because we are already in a transitional period, dear friends. We need clear results in 2019; otherwise the consent of the European Parliament is not guaranteed. A country outside the Union cannot have the same advantages as a country which is a member of the club.

(More general applause)

The last two points: I think it is obvious to everybody what the Commission President and Michel Barnier underlined, that for the moment there is not sufficient progress on the negotiations on the table, so I think the EU leaders, the European Council, has to understand that there is no chance of entering into the second phase of the negotiations.

Finally, I want to thank Jean-Claude Juncker and Michel Barnier for their great job, for keeping the European Union together. I also want to thank Guy Verhofstadt for doing a great job for us as an institution, as the European Parliament, in bringing our voice to the table. We are prepared and we can be proud of the job we have done in the last months.

(General applause)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quando Theresa May arrivò a Downing Street promise che la Brexit sarebbe stata una passeggiata. Sì, una brevissima passeggiata di appena 500 giorni. E ancora c'è nebbia fitta attorno al negoziato e la responsabilità – come è stato ricordato – è del governo conservatore e delle sue divisioni. Noi però vogliamo essere positivi. In gioco ci sono gli interessi dei cittadini.

È stato ricordato dal presidente Juncker e dal negoziatore Barnier, che la signora May ha fatto un discorso dai toni più costruttivi a Firenze. Ci fa piacere: ma nel merito restano ancora molti punti oscuri. Bisogna innanzitutto rispettare l'ordine, la sequenza dei negoziati. Quando due coniugi vanno alla disunione, prima negoziano i termini del divorzio e poi le future relazioni e quindi prima bisogna negoziare le questioni del recesso e poi si può parlare di periodo transitorio. E deve esser chiaro che anche in questo periodo transitorio, se ci sarà e quando ci sarà, si applicheranno le quattro libertà e la Corte di giustizia, come ha ricordato il presidente Juncker, resterà competente.

Devo dire che anche sugli impegni finanziari, il governo britannico è troppo vago, gioca sui numeri senza mai prendere impegni precisi. E sull'Irlanda del Nord davvero fatico a capire come le autorità britanniche possano opporsi al mercato unico e volere allo stesso tempo un confine leggero con l'Irlanda: vogliono i vantaggi del mercato unico senza farne ufficialmente parte! La pace nell'Irlanda del Nord è un pilastro dell'Europa, per cui invito Londra e invito il governo britannico a tenere un atteggiamento responsabile e realistico su questo punto.

Nell'accordo di recesso bisogna riconoscere tutti i diritti dei cittadini, così come quelli dei loro familiari, ed è inammissibile che già da ora le autorità britanniche facciano gravare sui cittadini europei che vivono nel Regno Unito adempimenti amministrativi e burocratici che di fatto li discriminano. E io voglio dire a nome del mio gruppo che noi non accetteremo mai che ci siano cittadini di serie A e cittadini di serie B ed esigiamo lo stesso impegno anche da parte di Londra.

Finché su questi punti il governo britannico non prenderà impegni chiari e irrevocabili, il negoziato sulle relazioni future non potrà iniziare. Io non devo dare consigli a nessuno, tanto meno alla signora May. Noi parliamo attraverso il voto delle nostre risoluzioni: ancora una volta il Parlamento è fortemente unito, grazie all'opera di Guy Verhofstadt e dei nostri negoziatori, insieme all'amico Barnier e al presidente Juncker. Però, se mi posso permettere, segua il governo britannico la nostra strada: la strada dell'equilibrio e della saggezza, la strada che porta ad un successo per l'Europa e per lo stesso Regno Unito.

(Applausi)

Raffaele Fitto, a nome del gruppo ECR. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono ormai passati più di sei mesi dal 29 marzo, giorno in cui il Primo ministro britannico ha attivato l'articolo 50 per l'uscita del Regno Unito dall'Unione europea. In questi sei mesi i negoziati non hanno prodotto quello che tutti quanti noi auspicavamo ma, come ha ricordato poco fa il Commissario Barnier, il discorso di Theresa May di alcuni giorni fa a Firenze e i timidi, anche se non ancora sufficienti, progressi del quarto round dei negoziati della scorsa settimana ci inducono ad essere più ottimisti per il raggiungimento di un accordo.

Sarebbe un grave errore perseverare nel cercare di dividere entrambe le parti, di far prevalere l'una rispetto all'altra, un errore che non possiamo permetterci. I nostri concittadini e le nostre imprese chiedono certezze nella loro vita quotidiana, chiedono un accordo su un rapporto quanto più stretto possibile ed equilibrato in termini di diritti ed obblighi. Ecco perché non penso, sinceramente, anche avendolo ascoltato questa mattina, che sia utile a nessuno polemizzare addirittura all'interno di un governo e creare elementi di contrasto e contrapposizione, che certamente non agevolano il percorso di fronte al quale noi stiamo andando. Io ho ascoltato dal Commissario Barnier, questa mattina, parole molto positive e costruttive, che non corrispondono alle parole che ho ascoltato successivamente e me ne dispiace molto, perché non penso che questo sia il clima utile per raggiungere questo importante accordo.

D'altronde, come ribadito dalla Premier britannica, il Regno Unito abbandona l'Unione europea ma non abbandona l'Europa: problematiche come l'immigrazione, il terrorismo e la sicurezza globale possono e devono essere affrontate e risolte solo se siamo in grado di stare tutti quanti insieme, a prescindere da quelle che sono le posizioni giuridicamente che ci vedono divisi da una parte o dall'altra. Queste sono le sfide del futuro che ci vengono di fronte e su queste sfide è il momento della chiarezza, della concretezza e della responsabilità. Ormai manca poco al 2019 e non possiamo concederci il lusso di un mancato accordo o di un accordo al ribasso: le conseguenze sarebbero inimmaginabili e sicuramente indebolirebbero entrambe le parti e i cittadini non ce lo perdonerebbero.

Mettiamo da parte in questo momento, in quest'Aula, nel rapporto fra i diversi livelli istituzionali, nel rapporto con il governo inglese, i motivi di discordia e impegniamoci per superare questa fase dei negoziati, dove sono i dettagli e non i principi a creare le divisioni.

Siamo tutti concordi nell'evitare il ripristino di barriere fisiche tra Irlanda e Irlanda del Nord. Siamo tutti convinti di dover garantire continuità e stabilità al processo di pace e tutti crediamo che gli impegni presi in termini finanziari, alla fine, sulla base di un confronto debbano essere rispettati. I diritti e gli interessi dei cittadini dell'Unione europea e dei cittadini britannici che risiedono e che hanno risieduto negli Stati membri o nel Regno Unito, devono essere la priorità. Creiamo le condizioni affinché lo status di queste persone sia soggetto ai principi di reciprocità, equità e non discriminazione.

Per questo motivo dobbiamo essere molto più realistici di quanto la politica spesso ci porta a non esserlo: lo voglio dire con molta franchezza. Dobbiamo trovare un compromesso e tenere in considerazione che nel 2019 il Regno Unito sarà, di fatto, un Paese terzo.

Come gruppo dell'ECR ci rammarichiamo del fatto che il Parlamento, proprio attraverso questa risoluzione, pur comprendendo le ragioni che sono state indicate, non abbia accelerato sull'avvio della seconda fase dei negoziati. Ritardare l'avvio della seconda fase non rappresenta infatti una soluzione; anzi rischia di complicare la situazione. E noi abbiamo il dovere di definire con chiarezza il futuro rapporto e di garantire un quadro giuridico certo, a livello commerciale ed economico, sia per le nostre imprese che per le future relazioni tra l'Unione europea e il Regno Unito.

Non possiamo permettere di lasciare il sistema produttivo e commerciale dell'Unione europea e del Regno Unito in balia dell'incertezza più totale: qui è in ballo, come è stato ricordato, il presente e il futuro di milioni di lavoratori e delle loro famiglie, che deve essere garantito. Al tempo stesso, anche qui, come per quanto riguarda i diritti dei cittadini, la soluzione non può essere l'imposizione di una posizione rispetto a un'altra, ma deve necessariamente essere un'occasione d'intesa.

Quanto avevamo già affermato in Aula alcuni mesi fa lo vogliamo ribadire oggi: per noi la Brexit, che è un fatto deciso dai cittadini, piaccia o non piaccia, non deve essere un motivo di scontro ma io mi auguro che ci possa essere l'occasione per diventare un'opportunità per stabilire dei rapporti futuri, di cui mi sembra che questa Unione europea abbia fortemente bisogno.

Questo è il lavoro, l'impegno e il contributo che, come conservatori e riformisti, noi daremo a partire da oggi a questo dibattito.

Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, first of all, I have to say – and I am addressing my words to Mr Fitto also – that I deplore the fact that we have come to a resolution saying there is no sufficient progress. Our idea – and I think Michel Barnier's also – was that by October we would see sufficient progress. But Mr Weber is right in his analysis of the situation on the other side of the negotiating table: there is a lack of clarity; there is even disunity. There is opposition between Hammond and Fox, and opposition and divisions between Johnson and May. It is difficult to make sufficient progress and it is difficult to take the steps towards the second phase of the negotiations.

So I deplore the fact that we cannot put before the plenary a resolution other than today's resolution. On the other hand, it does demonstrate the unity among ourselves – and I hope, Mr Fitto, that we can keep that unity in this House, and even that you can join it when we vote in a few moments' time, because that unity is absolutely needed. Parliament and Council – not Parliament only, but Parliament and Council – for once, and I have never seen it before, I have to tell you, in my political life, are going beyond national differences and considerations of party obedience, and are really defending, together with the negotiator, the interests of the citizens in all 27 Member States.

So my call to you, and to everybody in the plenary, is to join this unity: let us keep this unity.

I have three worries – three points that I think need to be addressed in the debate. The first is Northern Ireland. I have to tell you that I went to Northern Ireland. I had never been in Northern Ireland before, I had never been in Belfast before, but I went there. I had thought: 'Yeah, it's been 20 years now since this has been on our television screens and the problems are solved. It's a bit like Berlin: the Berlin Wall has disappeared, and everything is going well.' So I can tell you it was a shock to come to Belfast, because the reality is that the problems are not over. There is peace, due to the Good Friday Agreement, but there are still these tensions. There are fences that are 12 metres high – today in the 21st century!

I have to tell you that keeping this Good Friday Agreement is key. It is a ceasefire. It is a little bit of a guarantee in a frozen conflict. The worst thing what can happen is that we lose the peace that Europe has brought there, to Northern Ireland, with the efforts that we in the European Union have made. I stood next to memorials where you see pictures of young people aged 15 or 16 who died in a conflict based on nationalism, based on extremism. So, to ensure that the violence does not return is, I think, an absolute priority for this House.

(Applause)

And that means – and this is a question I would put to the negotiator – why not attach the Good Friday Agreement as a declaration to the withdrawal agreement that we are going to secure? And, of course, let us not return to a border there on the island of Ireland because then the violence will certainly return.

My second worry is about citizens' rights. You will be aware of the so-called deportation letters that were sent out by the UK authorities a short time ago. There have been excuses by the UK Government, saying that it was a mistake, but I have difficulty believing that. Why do I say that? Well, when it comes to collectively securing the rights of EU citizens living in the UK, the UK authorities tell us it is not possible: they don't know them and they don't know where they are. Yet, when it comes to sending a deportation letter, they find their addresses! So I want to say – in all honesty and very calmly – that I do not think we can accept a situation in which three million of our citizens would need to ask for settled status in Britain, with the huge administrative burden that would entail.

Our proposal is very simple: let us recognise this collectively; let us give EU citizens living in the UK the same rights that they have now. And let's do exactly the same for the UK citizens living on the continent.

(Applause from certain quarters)

I am asking myself why we are still discussing this. This can, in fact, be solved immediately by recognising their rights – recognising the rights of all citizens.

Lastly, on the financial settlement, I will not repeat what has already been said. We are fully in agreement that you cannot pay with 27 what has been committed by 28.

To conclude, it is true, Mr Fitto, that Ms May made a number of clarifications in her Florence speech, but not enough – let us be honest – for even you to say that there is sufficient progress. So what I hope is that, in her address tomorrow to the Conservative Party conference, she will bring further clarity so that, on that basis, concrete proposals can be put on the negotiation table before Michel Barnier. Finally, I hope that the ECR Group too will show massive support for this resolution in the vote at midday.

(Applause)

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – (inaudible) That includes the part where the consent of the people of Ireland – both North and South – would be required to alter the constitutional position of the North. It includes the agreed areas of cooperation – environment, agriculture, tourism, health, transport and education – plus it allows for more. It includes a Bill of Rights – rights resisted by the DUP – and also, importantly, it includes conformity with EU law.

The Good Friday Agreement in all its parts includes, as this resolution recognises, being in the single market and the Customs Union. Britain should remain in the single market and the Customs Union, but if it does not, then the north of Ireland must.

There are different ways that this could be done: 'in some form' could mean the North of Ireland staying in the EU, or it could mean Irish unity. And the Good Friday Agreement has provisions for a unity poll – a right to decide. Otherwise, we are not upholding the Good Friday Agreement in all of its parts.

This resolution is balanced with regard to citizens' rights and the financial settlement, and it is an important step forward in recognising that the requirements of the North of Ireland are different from those of Britain. Hence the need for special status or the need for the special circumstances to be taken into account.

Finally, I would like to welcome the comments from Guy Verhofstadt that we will explore how to give legal protection to the Good Friday Agreement in the Withdrawal Agreement. If you support the Good Friday Agreement, if you support the peace process, then please support this resolution.

Philippe Lamberts, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear British citizens, my fellow European citizens, the clock is ticking. You know where we Greens, and the European Free Alliance, wanted your country to be: to remain at the heart of the European Union. But the majority of those British citizens who voted decided otherwise. While we accept the result of the referendum, this decision will produce no winners. Not only the business we do with one another but also the interests of both UK citizens and citizens of the EU 27 will be harmed by the separation.

British citizens come to see me every week, to alert me to the damage that will be inflicted on your healthcare system or on the quality of research in your top universities, where so many EU nationals are working day in, day out. Above all, both British citizens in the EU 27 and UK citizens on the continent have been thrown into total disarray, and Europeans in the UK have started experiencing administrative vexations before Brexit has even started. If we want to limit the inevitable damage that will be caused by this lose-lose situation we should waste no more time, and negotiate in good faith.

But make no mistake about it, no deal by March 2019 would be the worst deal for everyone and, firstly, for our respective citizens.

Allow me at this stage to point to two contradictions in the position of your own Prime Minister. The first concerns Ireland. How can she say, on the one hand, that there will be no border and, on the other hand, that she will take the United Kingdom out of the Customs Union, the single market and the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice? This will create a border, and I do not know where to place it while at the same time respecting the Good Friday Peace Agreement.

The second contradiction is this idea that in order for Britain to become global it needs to cut its ties with its closest neighbours, with whom it shares history and geography. I believe that, rather than being an impediment to Britain being global, the European Union is the only way for it as a European country, and one of a number of former imperial powers, to have any influence in a world where it represents barely one percent of the population. In the 21st century, more than ever, size matters.

Let me conclude with a few words on democracy. As your Prime Minister explained, the decision to leave the European Union is a statement as to how you want your democracy to work. I take exception to the idea that only if the UK leaves the EU would decisions that affect your daily lives be taken by people directly accountable to you. Who adopts EU law? On the one hand, this European Parliament was elected by, and is accountable to, the very same people who elect your national parliaments. On the other hand, the Council is 28 governments who are accountable to their citizens via their national parliaments. In other words, every EU law is decided by people who are directly accountable to you sitting at the table and taking part.

But let's be frank with one another: what seems unacceptable to some is that, in certain cases, Britain might be out-voted. That, I am afraid, is a rule of democracy, and one that your own government has no qualms about invoking by remarkably overruling the pro-remain majorities in Scotland and Northern Ireland. If democracy can be had only at the level of the nation state, I know many regions which would immediately aspire to become one.

(Heckling)

Indeed! And if a democratic union is possible, Mr Farage, between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, then it can certainly be possible between European nation states. A majority of the British voters instructed Her Majesty's Government to negotiate Brexit. Let us respect the democratic vote and do just that, without further delay. But if we want to be fair to those same citizens, let them, or at least those people who have been elected to represent them, have the last word on this story. When confronted with the result of that negotiation, who knows what they might ultimately decide?

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, whilst we debate the really important issue of Brexit, I think European citizens – those that do take any interest in what happens here – will be stunned that Mr Juncker comes here for his one appearance in the Strasbourg session this week, and there is absolutely no mention made of the dramatic events that have taken place inside a European Union Member State that is, allegedly, a modern democracy.

One of the reasons why I always wanted Brexit was because I thought the system of law-making whereby the Commission has the sole right to initiate legislation was something that would in fact damage, and in the end destroy, any concept of national democracy. And yes, I've called the European Union undemocratic; I've called it anti-democratic, but never in my fiercest criticisms here did I think that we would see the police of a Member State of the Union injuring 900 people in an attempt to stop them going out to vote. Whether or not it was legal nationally for people in Catalonia to have a vote, surely, people are allowed to express an opinion. We saw women being dragged out of polling stations by their hair, old ladies with gashes in their foreheads. It was the most extraordinary display – and what do we get from Mr Juncker today? Not a dicky bird. In fact, previously we heard that the rule of law must be maintained, and it is quite extraordinary to realise that this Union is prepared to turn a blind eye.

Can you imagine if the British police roughed up a couple of Scottish National Party protesters, or if something happened against a pro-Brexit rally? You would all be screaming blue murder. Indeed, the calls would be that the United Kingdom must go before the European Court of Human Rights, and yet you don't even want to talk about this. Knowing, as I do, your advanced plans, with seven of the Member States here having their military police – your European Gendarmerie Force – all I can say once again is 'thank God we're leaving'.

Brexit was an act of liberation. It was a voice of national self-determination that cannot, and will not, be stopped. But throughout this negotiating process, you have treated us as if we're some kind of a hostage from the start, and unless we pay a ransom, unless we meet all of your demands, then you won't even have an intelligent conversation with us about trade heading on from here.

There are no guarantees that – whatever Ms May says or does – you will ever come to us, even when we have met your demands, and want to have a sensible trade agreement. It was sad, in fact it was pitiful, to see the British Prime Minister in Florence. I have heard you saying that she is being conciliatory, that she is being grown up, that people are happy with what she said. Actually Ms May, I am sad to say, is not worldly enough to recognise that when you face up to a bully, the one thing that you do not do is try to appease them. She is begging you to give her a transition period and there is no guarantee that you will do it, so I do actually agree with the criticisms that I have heard around the room about the mixed messages coming out from the UK government.

I just hope that in Manchester the Conservative Party starts to say in public what they are all saying to me in private: that she is a waste of space, that she needs to go, and that we need a proper prime minister who says to Monsieur Barnier 'okay, here's a deadline, here's a date, we work towards that date. If we can't reach a sensible deal on trade and everything else, then we are simply leaving and reverting to WTO rules'. This charade cannot go on year after year. After all, we voted Brexit.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Janice Atkinson, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, what can I say? I agree with everything that Nigel has said. The British people listen to you, and they hear that you want us shackled to the ECJ, and they say 'no'. The British people see that you are getting an EU army and, given what happened in Catalonia on Sunday, most of you so-called leaders were silent on this matter. You saw what happened, with the violence against its people, its women (and some of them are children), and they wonder what it will be like under Mrs Merkel, and also Mr Macron, when they get their hands on the guns and the tanks. The British people say 'no'. They vote to take back control of our borders, and you say 'no'. The UK said 'yes' to leaving the single market and the Customs Union, so you should just cut a deal on a free trade agreement. But you can't. Has Mrs May met Mrs Malmström, our resident former sociology lecturer who is in charge of trade? She is incapable of saying 'yes' or 'no', because she has never worked in business. Last night at the Conservative Party Conference, a former Brexit minister, with the Brexit Secretary David Davis in the audience, said that the Brexit department are drawing up plans for a no-deal. Listening to Mr Barnier today, they had better get on with it, because that is what is going to happen.

Mr Weber, you ask who you should you call in London. I agree with you. Mrs May will be gone soon. I suggest you get Boris or Jacob on speed dial.

Mr Verhofstadt, do not lecture us and try and rewrite history on Northern Ireland. I think it is you that is inciting violence, sitting in this Chamber.

Last June we voted to take back control of our laws, our courts, our borders and our money. Anything else is a betrayal. 17.4 million people. Watch and learn from Catalonia.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Diane Dodds (NI). – I will focus on only one aspect of the resolution today, and that is my constituency, Northern Ireland. I am encouraged by agreements in Brussels, London and Belfast that there should be no hardening of the border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. I'm encouraged by reports of fruitful progress on the issue of the Common Travel Area. However, it is not flexible or imaginative to claim that a trade solution can only be found if Northern Ireland remains inside the single market or the customs union. Let's be absolutely clear: Northern Ireland's Brexit solution will be part of the United Kingdom's Brexit solution. There can be no question of a deal that cuts us adrift from our most important market and erects barriers within the United Kingdom single market. The interlinked nature of the Brexit negotiations means that we need to move swiftly to phase two of the negotiations for a full resolution on this issue. Northern Ireland is not a bargaining chip in these negotiations. Genuine concerns in my constituency should not be exploited in pursuit of every British pound.

And finally, a word to Mr Verhofstadt, who claimed that Europe had brought peace to Northern Ireland: peace in Northern Ireland was hard-fought and hard-won by its people and by the bravery of its security forces in the face of an awful terrorist campaign, that killed thousands of our people. Europe has helped, but it has not been the sole arbiter of peace in Northern Ireland.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor Presidente, después de escuchar al señor Farage, dejo sobre la mesa el discurso que tenía porque tengo que responderle, aunque él se esté marchando.

Mi país no puede aceptar lecciones de democracia de quien no considero que sea un demócrata; y la prueba de que no es un demócrata es que ni siquiera se queda a escuchar lo que tengo que responderle.

El señor Farage hace que me alegre del *brex*it, porque gracias al *brex*it se marchará de esta Cámara la extrema derecha. Lo único bueno que tiene el *brex*it es que no tendremos que escuchar jamás al señor Farage.

Si quería hacer un favor a los independentistas de Cataluña, les ha hecho justo lo contrario, porque estoy convencido de que quienes están intentando ilegalmente la independencia de Cataluña lo último que esperaban era el apoyo de la extrema, extrema, derecha europea, lo que, al final, nos demuestra a todos qué es lo que realmente está sucediendo en Cataluña y a qué se enfrenta realmente el Gobierno de España.

Tenían una oportunidad de hablar de Gran Bretaña y del *brexit* y la han dejado pasar. Prefieren hablar de España que de Gran Bretaña porque de su país, aparte de gritar, ustedes no tienen nada que decir.

Y les diré —hablando exactamente de Gran Bretaña— que mi grupo parlamentario está preocupado, como el señor Verhofstadt, por Irlanda del Norte, y muy preocupado por Irlanda del Norte, porque es un problema único que requiere una solución única y que va a exigir lo mejor de nosotros.

Señorías, en contra de lo que hoy dice el señor Farage y algunos independentistas en Cataluña, España es una democracia consolidada, un socio leal y un buen amigo de toda la Unión Europea, que necesita la ayuda de todos. Y a los únicos que no necesita allí, porque yo no aportan nada, es a la extrema derecha, por más que quieran apuntarse a la fiesta.

(Aplausos)

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Mr President, we are now at a decisive moment in our negotiations. A lot of time has been lost, and we now see a more positive dynamic. At the same time, a number of fundamental issues have yet to be clarified, and problems remain to be solved. For this reason, it is very important that the message that comes from this Parliament is clearly heard and understood. A positive conclusion of the first phase of the negotiations is possible, but we are not yet there. The Parliament is, and will be, open and constructive in its assessment, but we are, and will be, equally firm on our principles.

First, of course, a full safeguard of citizens' rights, which is our first priority. The positive principle of direct effect of the agreement must be underpinned by an effective mechanism which allows the Court of Justice to ensure a consistent interpretation of its provisions.

Second, as we are safeguarding existing rights and not discussing future UK immigration rules, we will not accept to depart from any of the current provisions, in particular about future family members of eligible citizens that should have the same rights as current family members, about the declaratory nature of documents, about the need to avoid any burdensome administrative procedure, and on the possibility to export social benefits.

On Ireland, our resolution is extremely clear, and on financial settlement it is extremely important that the now-shared principle, apparently, that all commitments made by the UK during its membership of the Union shall be honoured is implemented fully and consistently.

On the basis of this short analysis of the points, it is clear that, despite some positive steps forward, a lot of work is still required in order to move to phase two of the negotiations. So, as we say in the resolution, unless a major breakthrough takes place next week, the European Council should postpone its assessment of sufficient progress. By stating this obvious element, we are not closing a door. We are pointing out a way forward that is fair for both the EU and the UK. In this respect, we have to be clear on the transition.

First, it can be discussed and agreed only after sufficient progress on the withdrawal agreement. Second, it should be based on the full existing EU regulatory, budgetary, supervisory, judiciary and enforcement instruments and should, of course, fully include the free movement of citizens. Third, while some objective links between the withdrawal agreement and the transitional phase might be explored, any attempt to buy access to parts of the single market through concessions on the financial settlement would be rejected.

So we are in the middle of a very difficult journey. There is only one path clearly laid out if we want to get to our final destination. The path is the one indicated by the EU, and we will follow you, Michel, along this way.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, for decades, during some very dark times, Europe was a good friend to Northern Ireland without taking any side. I will always remember, at the time of the ceasefires in 1994, when I went with my other two MEP colleagues from Northern Ireland to the meeting with Jacques Delors which brought about the Peace programme. At that time, over GBP 2 billion in extra funding was given to Northern Ireland and to the border counties in the Republic.

However, in this resolution, it is clear to me that you are now taking sides in Northern Ireland, Mr Verhofstadt. Let me make it clear to you, Mr Verhofstadt, that peace in Northern Ireland was won by the leader of my party, now Lord Trimble, and the leader of the SDLP, Mr John Hume. They bore the brunt at a time when the other party leaders, represented on both sides in this House, who are now that the lead parties in Northern Ireland, stood on the sidelines and did nothing to help to bring peace in Northern Ireland. In fact, they have messed it up big time, which does not make the situation we have today any easier.

Shortly after those ceasefires, by calling for Northern Ireland to remain in the single market and the customs union with the rest of the United Kingdom, Mr Verhofstadt is essentially calling for an international border to be placed between Northern Ireland and the rest of Great Britain. Let me make it very clear: I will not accept any attempt by anyone in this Parliament to use Brexit as an excuse to break up my country. At its heart, this proposal goes against the Belfast Agreement the Parliament is mandated to protect and defend. The Belfast Agreement is clear: Northern Ireland is a full part of the United Kingdom, and we entered into the then EEC as one United Kingdom and we will leave the European Union as one United Kingdom.

This is a sad day for me. If the Parliament supports this text, it will be turning its back on decades of good relations with all communities in Northern Ireland. Mr Verhofstadt, you can no longer be deemed to be neutral after this resolution. That is your mistake. It is a huge mistake, and today I have heard nothing new. Unless we have a change in the direction this is heading, we are heading for a crash.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Mr President, as Chair of the Petitions Committee it is my responsibility and duty to listen to and respond to the concerns of EU citizens. My committee has received a large number of petitions expressing grave anxiety about citizens' rights in a post-Brexit era. They all have something in common: they are all the result of the insecurity people feel that they have been thrown into due to a very unclear withdrawal of the UK from the European Union. Some of them have tens of thousands of signatures.

From also the perspective of the Conference of Committee Chairs, let me just express that there is an immense task we are all aware of in front of us for all the committees. I know how important it is that realism and pragmatism is allowed to inform and shape the debate and the negotiations, and we are lucky to have an excellent negotiator in Michel Barnier.

In this context, the European Parliament proposal of a transitional period is very much welcomed, because it ensures that we have sufficient time to ensure that we have an orderly and civilised divorce at the end of the process, where citizens' rights are secured both for the EU citizens residing in the UK and vice versa, the UK citizens residing on the continent.

I really look forward to a more dignified debate after this. I pay attention to Mr Farage, who has now left the room, but he is not willing to discuss Brexit; he wants to discuss anything but Brexit. I think it should have been raised as a point of order, and he should have been made aware by you, Mr President, to actually pay attention to what the subject is for today.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con la risoluzione congiunta che sarà messa al voto, questo Parlamento esprimerà un giudizio che approvo. Ancora non è possibile parlare di progressi sufficienti sui diritti dei cittadini e la questione nordirlandese non è risolta. Fin d'ora, tuttavia, mi chiedo quale sarà la sorte degli accordi il giorno in cui li considereremo sufficienti sui cittadini. Come potremo metterli al riparo da improvvise regressioni dettate dal principio secondo cui «*nothing is agreed until everything is agreed*». Saremo veramente disposti a chiedere ancora agli europei nel Regno Unito e agli inglesi nell'Unione di mettere in *stand-by* il loro futuro in attesa dell'accordo finale?

Un'altra domanda concerne la libertà di movimento: quel che temo è che si profitti del Brexit per ridurre anche da noi tale libertà, soprattutto per i lavori non qualificati. Spero non vi saranno compromessi su questo, che proteggeremo lo status di tutti i cittadini europei, senza alcuna condizionalità. Nonostante l'evidente unicità dell'accordo di recesso, è più che mai necessario spezzare il vincolo di dipendenza dell'accordo sui diritti da altri capitoli negoziali. In gioco non è solo una questione di certezza giuridica ma la garanzia concreta che dovremo dare a favore di milioni di cittadini.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I am struck as ever by the unity of purpose across the Council and the Member States, and indeed across this House, amongst the EU 27. I commend our coordinator, Mr Barnier, for keeping that unity in check. But where the EU is united against the UK, I assure you the UK is anything but united.

I represent Scotland within this House. We desire to remain within our family of nations; 48% of the UK population want to remain. The idea that Theresa May leads a united government is a risible proposition, as we see on a daily basis from our own colleagues who are treating her as a Viking longship that they are going to float out into the North Sea, having piled as much nonsense onto it as possible, and then they'll set fire to it. They're fighting amongst themselves like ferrets in a sack, while the UK's national interest, however we define it, is ignored by them utterly. Shame on them. It is not good enough for Europe, it is not good enough for the UK either.

And from Scotland, we agree with the tone and content of this resolution. We have seen nowhere near enough progress on citizens' rights, on Ireland or in the financial settlement. On citizens' rights, I am receiving emails on a daily basis that would break your heart – people who have made choices about their lives, about their residence – on the basis of rights which they face having taken away. Our first duty in this House is to them.

On Ireland, north and south, Scotland's close neighbours and friends, solutions are possible; solutions could be found, but we need to see a lot more seriousness from the UK government than we have seen to date. The Good Friday Agreement is fragile; it must be respected. We need to see seriousness from the UK administration.

And on the financial settlement, it says just how far the UK's reputation has been trashed, that the idea that the UK will meet its financial obligations is news. If Global Britain's first act is to walk away from international financial contributions, it is just not a serious prospect. I fear for the future unless we see some real seriousness in these discussions. Scotland wants to find solutions, colleagues. We must see more seriousness from the UK in that endeavour.

(Applause)

Presidente. – *(Rivolgendosi all'onorevole Coburn)* Se si tratta di una polemica con altri paesi, io non lo tollero, perché la discussione è sulla Brexit e non è per fare polemica con questo o quel paese. Per essere chiaro: la Spagna è un paese democratico; il suo re si è battuto contro il colpo di stato; Felipe Gonzales e Adolfo Suarez hanno costruito una grande democrazia, quindi vi prego di evitare polemiche tra un paese e un altro perché non è questo il luogo per farlo.

David Coburn (EFDD). – It is not about Spain, Sir. I must say it is disgraceful that European politicians should exploit the tragedy of Northern Ireland for their own purposes. That is a disgrace! I think it is a point of order, that we are not discussing ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Presidente. – Onorevole, io sono abituato a rispettare tutti i deputati ma pretendo anche i deputati rispettino la Presidenza. Se Le do la parola per intervenire su un punto all'ordine del giorno e Lei non lo fa, vuol dire che sta prendendo in giro la Presidenza. E questo non lo posso accettare.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Mr President, we're here to discuss the state of play of the negotiations and what progress has been made. Well, very little. And there are two main reasons for that. One, of course, is that you don't want us to leave. You're going to do everything you possibly can to make it as difficult as possible, to delay it as long as possible, so that either we end up with a very, very bad deal or we reverse the decision of the referendum. The second reason, of course, is Mrs May, who simply doesn't have a clue. She has neither the courage, the will nor the resolve to actually see these so-called negotiations through.

But Mrs May has made some very serious and dangerous concessions already. What has she actually said? 15 months already after the referendum, nothing much has changed. She intends that we should leave the European Union on March 2019. We will leave the Commission, we will leave the Council, we will no longer have members of the European Parliament. We've left. But nothing much very changes, nothing much at all changes. She's said that we are going to incorporate all EU law into UK law. And then she wants another two years transition period, which will take us up to five years from the referendum, during which case nothing much changes on immigration, the laws don't change, and she has made one very, very, very dangerous concession, which is talking about an EU treaty on security and defence. We will continue to be bound to your military ambitions. We will continue to be bound to your security policy and foreign policy and to all the police and criminal justice measures like the hated European arrest warrant. She has not got a clue. And what she'll end up with is a withdrawal agreement whereby we leave in name but we do not leave in reality.

Now, Mr Barnier, Mr Juncker: I don't understand why you don't actually make it easy for us to leave. Why don't you kick us out as quickly as possible? Because then you can get on with your ambitions for full economic, financial, political and military integration. You can create your United States of Europe. Make it easy for us to go, so that we can get on with pursuing our freedom and independence, prosperity and our future in the world, not in the EU. Do yourself and us a favour, please!

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Im Juni 2016 gab es in Großbritannien das Referendum über den Austritt aus der Europäischen Union, und 52 % der Briten haben gesagt: Ja, wir wollen die Europäische Union verlassen. Eineinhalb Jahre Schockstarre, eineinhalb Jahre Chaos, eineinhalb Jahre Ratlosigkeit! Das was hier – und zwar auf beiden Seiten – passiert, ist nicht professionell, es erinnert mehr an einen Kindergarten.

Ich kann nur an Sie appellieren: Respektieren Sie diesen demokratischen Volksentscheid und machen Sie hinter den Kulissen keine Tricks! Denn das, was ich vernehme und was auch hinter den Kulissen zu hören ist, ist, dass längst an einem Plan gearbeitet wird, die Briten mit einem zweiten Referendum, mit einem Hinauszögern der Verhandlungen und mit vielen weiteren Tricks doch in der Europäischen Union zu halten und diesen demokratischen Volksentscheid zu sabotieren und zu boykottieren. Ich appelliere an Sie: Respektieren Sie die Entscheidung des britischen Volkes! Gehen Sie fair und professionell damit um! Achten Sie darauf, dass beide Seiten keinerlei Nachteile erhalten! Als Vertreter eines Nettozahlerlandes kann ich nur sagen: Achten Sie darauf, dass Länder wie Österreich dadurch keinen Euro mehr an Belastungen zu erfahren haben.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, Abraham Lincoln famously once said: 'you can fool some of the people all of the time; you can fool all of the people some of the time; but you can never fool all of the people all of the time'. Well, the British people are no longer fooled that the EU wants to negotiate a fair Brexit agreement, or even negotiate at all. From Verhofstadt to Juncker, to Barnier and to Tusk, the message is clear: the EU will delay, damage and deny Brexit.

When President Tusk says the UK can't have its cake and eat it, what he actually means is the EU wants its cake – our cake, the morning croissant, afternoon tea and, finishing it, we're taking a pound of Britain's economic flesh, washed down with a glass of subsidised EU chianti.

As Shakespeare said: 'this England never did, nor never shall, lie at the feet of a proud conqueror'. It is clear that the EU will not change its tune, so it is time for the UK to walk away and end this charade.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen, lieber Michel Barnier! Wenn ich Farage und Co. hier höre, habe ich den Eindruck, wir hätten den Antrag auf Brexit gestellt, nie sie selbst. Jetzt haben sie das Problem damit und versuchen, uns zu beschimpfen.

Wir sollten das eine sehen, und da schließe ich mich Michel Barnier an: Wir verhandeln inzwischen in einer besseren Atmosphäre als vorher. Es sind Fortschritte erreicht worden – nicht genügend Fortschritte, aber es sind Fortschritte erreicht worden –, und das soll man weitermachen. Das ist das Normalste in Verhandlungen. Und wir sollten feststellen, dass wir in einer solchen Atmosphäre Schaden begrenzen wollen. Der Eindruck von Farage und anderen ist: Sie wollen den Schaden! Sie wollen den Schaden provozieren und nicht nüchterne Verhandlungen zur Schadensbegrenzung. Und dafür müssen sie natürlich die Bedingungen entsprechend erfüllen mit den drei Fragen: Bürgerrechte, die Fragen mit der Finanzierung und die Fragen mit Irland.

Auch müssen wir sagen, dass wir keine Verhandlungsstrategien akzeptieren können, die sagen: Die finanziellen Verpflichtungen sollen auf den Zeitpunkt verschoben werden, wenn wir die zukünftigen Beziehungen verhandeln, um das für die Verhandlungen dann als Verhandlungschip einzusetzen. Die vernünftigen Beziehungen zu organisieren, ist im gemeinsamen Interesse. Da braucht man nicht Geld, um sich gegenseitig zu erpressen. Deswegen möchte ich Michel Barnier, Jean-Claude Juncker und die Kommission auffordern, die bisherige Verhandlungsstrategie beizubehalten. Die Verhandlungsstrategie ist richtig. Wir brauchen ein Scheidungs-Agreement, das all das beinhaltet, was da hineingehört. Wenn das geschaffen ist, kann man für eine gewisse Zeit eine Übergangsregelung machen, um für einen Freihandelsvertrag oder was auch immer Zeit zu gewinnen. Aber wir wissen bis heute nicht, was Großbritannien wirklich will. Ich habe den Eindruck, die schreiben Papiere, in denen sie einen Antrag auf die Mitgliedschaft im Binnenmarkt stellen wollen, aber nicht die Belastungen dafür tragen wollen. Das scheint mir doch einer der Punkte zu sein. Hier erbitten wir Klarheit.

Ich meine aber, dass der Wille vorhanden ist und die Atmosphäre vorhanden ist, zu einem vernünftigen Ergebnis zu kommen, und dies sollten wir uns nicht durch diese Propagandareden kaputtmachen. Die große Mehrheit dieses Hauses will eine konstruktive Lösung mit Großbritannien für zukünftige Beziehungen. Daran sollten wir arbeiten.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Mr President, it is increasingly obvious to all that the negotiations are not proceeding as fast as they should and have no chance, or little chance, of reaching the stage of being able to move on to the second phase. It is also growing increasingly obvious to everyone where the blame lies for this: the chaos, the confusion and the divisions within the British Government, a government which is now a minority government, having lost an election on a platform of going for a particular form of Brexit that the public did not support.

Mr Barnier, you will recall the very first meeting of the negotiations, one year after the referendum. The British Government did not put a single position paper on the table at that meeting. Here we are, six months after triggering Article 50, and we have no agreement on the issues in the first phase of those negotiations, despite David Davis, rightly or wrongly, accepting the sequencing that was proposed for those negotiations. This is just not good enough.

The motion for resolution before Parliament hopes that progress can still be achieved by the next meeting of the European Council – only two weeks away. There is indeed another negotiating round. I suppose this hope is based on the fact that maybe, after the Conservative Party conference has finished this week, there may be some movement in the Conservative Government. I would say, ‘don’t count on it’.

Mrs May’s Florence speech was not so much to improve and clarify her positioning for the negotiations with the 27, it was to improve her negotiating position within the British Conservative Party, and it has clearly failed even to do that. They are still at loggerheads, they are still divided, and sometimes I wonder whether they don’t even want to move on to the second phase of the negotiations because they do not yet know what kind of relationship they want to secure for the future. They are still too split, they are still at loggerheads, and there is still no clarity on that from the British Government.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Mr President, I would like to make it very clear from the beginning: I was against Brexit. Mr Gonzáles Pons made the point that after Brexit, people like Farage are leaving this Parliament. I would like to remind you: not only him, but all British people are leaving this Parliament, and these are the last advocates in this Parliament who are in favour of competitiveness, of decentralisation and of self-responsibility of a country for its debts. But it was – and let's not forget – the Junckers, it was the Broks, it was the Verhofstadts in this Parliament who carry a lot of responsibility for the Brexit in the first place. It was their mantra for more Europe, more centralisation, more socialisation, which led to the referendum in the first place. And it was their inflexibility on the immigration issue which gave the arguments for the Johnsons and the Farages to swing the results towards Brexit.

To minimise the damage, we now need to do three things. First of all, Mr Verhofstadt, people like you should stop this arrogance vis-à-vis the British voters. Secondly, Mr Barnier, you should stop giving the impression that you want to punish the British for their decision. And here is a message to London: they should really get their act together and come up with a stable and unified government to face this Commission in this critical phase.

(Applause from the right wing of the House)

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). – Mr President, so Mrs May has never felt at home in the EU. Well, she's not talking for me, nor the millions who voted to stay in and still want to stay in. We have millions of EU citizens who need clarity now with a stand-alone agreement, whatever the negotiations deal. But what Mrs May really meant is that the Brexiteers in her own party haven't bothered to find out the benefits of the EU. They stay at home and think that the British Empire still owes them a living.

Mrs May is surrounded by Brexiteers. They are in control, and she is too weak to deal with them. Brexiteers constantly blame Brussels for their own failings. They said: 'In the EU we can't control our borders!' That's nonsense. We can manage EU migration; we just haven't adopted the laws to do it. They say they have a plan for Ireland, but so far, nothing. They said that the EU stops us making trade deals, but we have over 50 international trade deals now. So where is the vision for Brexit? May's Florence speech has left more waffle, fudge and half-eaten cake on the table than is good for anyone's cholesterol.

Prime Minister, get a grip, or pack your bags and leave now. We can exit from Brexit, so allow those of us who do feel European to sort this mess out democratically.

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident! Ein CEO von Rolls Royce in Ludwigsfelde in Deutschland, unweit von Berlin, sagte mir auf meine Frage zu seinen Sichten, Fragen und Problemen mit den Brexit-Verhandlungen: Er habe nur eine Sorge, ein wichtiges Anliegen: Gewährleistet die Arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit durch die Verhandlungen! Es geht also auch in der globalen Wertschöpfungskette, der internationalen Produktion, in Absatz, Forschung und Entwicklung eines der britischen Weltkonzerne insbesondere um die Absicherung der erworbenen Rechte und die eindeutige, garantierte rechtliche Absicherung dieser für die Zukunft. Deshalb auch an die Kommission und den Rat gewandt: Seien Sie doch konkret! Wo sind die konkreten Probleme? Wo fallen die Interessen auseinander? Sagen Sie, was in den zwei Jahren Übergangsphase passieren soll und was bereits vorher!

Als wären sie nicht mehr Mitglieder der Europäischen Union, reisen Delegationen von der Insel durch die Welt – auch in der letzten Woche beim WTO-Public-Forum – und versuchen, Freihandelsverhandlungen bereits vorzubereiten. Die Rechtslage des Verbandsverbots wird schlicht ignoriert. Jedem, der will, wird radikaler Freihandel angeboten. Das wirft Europa zurück, schreiten Sie deshalb ein! Denn unser künftiges Vertragswerk mit dem Vereinigten Königreich muss konstruktiv sein und unseren gesamten wirtschaftlichen und gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen im Rahmen einer Welt globaler Wertschöpfungskette einen Dienst erweisen und sie adressieren.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as we debate the Brexit negotiations here in Strasbourg, back in Manchester Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson is preparing to deliver his speech to his party conference. He encapsulates the disaster that Brexit is for my country. He was complicit in the biggest lie in the history of British politics and, with his Tory cronies, he has used Brexit as a power grab for himself.

In her Florence speech, Theresa May said that the United Kingdom has never felt totally at home in the European Union. Personally, I have never felt less at home in the UK since the vote to leave the EU. Such a sentiment is echoed by many people: by the majority of young people who still consider themselves European, by people living in our diverse and multicultural cities and, of course, by those European citizens who have chosen – for reasons of love, work or study – to make the UK their home. If Brexit is a divorce, then we are the children of the divorce and the process is a painful and troubling one.

(Applause)

Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD). – Mr President, the Commission's attitude to the wishes of the British people to leave the EU has been a disgrace. You would apparently rather harm other European nations by placing trade in peril than meet your own obligations to be constructive. If you were truly confident about what the EU has to offer, you would be content to let go an unwilling participant in the process of ever-closer union, but instead you wish to punish us to discourage the others: Poles and Hungarians dismayed by migration bullying; Greeks and Italians disgusted by the consequences of monetary union.

Britain is holding out the hand of friendship, confident of its place in the world, connected to a Commonwealth and to an Anglosphere, as well as to European neighbours. You, by contrast, are the hollow men, afraid that our success will show up your failings. We will not be intimidated. We will not be deterred. Once again, we will set an example to Europe. We are going to show that being free, democratic and truly global can see a great future for our country.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, Brexitul a creat un fenomen de dependență. Nu există sesiune plenară fără o doză de dezbateri despre această chestiune. Încerc să ies din logica grupurilor politice și să intru într-o logică normală. Prin activarea articolului 50, politicul a vorbit deja. Acum să lăsăm echipele de negociatori să își facă treaba. Dacă noi, Parlamentul, ne amestecăm în negocierile tehnice, Brexitul se va produce la calendele grecești. Or, interesul ambelor părți este ca despărțirea să se producă rapid și lin, fără să lăsăm schelete în dulap.

Pe de altă parte, subliniez că Brexitul produce un precedent nu numai prin ieșirea din Uniune, ci și prin faptul că, la un moment dat, orice stat poate să dorească acest lucru. De asemenea, orice stat care a ieșit, după un anumit timp, poate dori să se reintroducă.

Europa nu poate urma Statele Unite. Avem nevoie de un alt model, mai modern și mai dinamic. Uniunea Europeană va supraviețui și se va dezvolta numai dacă va înțelege că între central și local trebuie să existe un echilibru dinamic. Or, este clar că acum viteza cu care au loc schimbările depășește viteza procedurilor noastre, care sunt centralizate, greoaie și ineficiente.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, well it is certainly 'bash-up the Brits day', isn't it? I would like to give the Parliament here a gold medal for political bullying, because that is quite frankly what we have heard so far.

A number of people have referred to the lack of clarity of documents coming from the United Kingdom. Can I remind everybody that there was an agreement between both parties to keep those details confidential, and it has taken individuals in this Parliament to divulge them and to criticise the United Kingdom for not being forthcoming. Well I have got more faith in my politicians that abide by confidentiality agreements than I have in a number of the individuals in the Parliament this morning.

One of my political colleagues back in the United Kingdom during the referendum campaign made a very, very strong statement, which is: 'the United Kingdom should not be a star on somebody else's flag'. It quite clearly appears to be that this Parliament wants to erase the United Kingdom from the flag but it wants to keep everything that the United Kingdom contributes, be it money, be it defence forces, be it knowledge – whatever it might be. Well, if you want that, go back to the negotiating rules. Go back and understand what negotiation actually means. It means giving a bit to get something back in return. You have not given one iota.

It is all very well holding 27 Member States together in terms of unity but, quite frankly, what we are seeing now is a facade and theatre from Parliament in terms of the negotiations. They are not serious and the sooner this country, the United Kingdom, leaves, the better.

(Applause from the right)

Presidente. – Onorevole James, per Sua informazione, le stelle sulla bandiera dell'Unione non rappresentano gli Stati membri.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, I speak as the Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, which in a year from now will be working, hopefully, on the consent procedure of this House.

Michel Barnier said in his introductory remarks that 15 days and one negotiation round separate us from an important meeting of the European Council that will debate and decide. That meeting will be a chance for the European leaders to take stock of the results so far and decide whether to expand the negotiating mandate, allowing for parallel discussions on the future agreement and the transition. But maintaining the new dynamics of the negotiation process depends heavily on whether the UK Prime Minister's speech in Florence will be translated into new negotiation positions and concrete proposals as soon as possible. Accelerating the pace of meetings has to go hand in hand with progress on content.

On content, I will make four points. We need reassurance on how the direct effect will work in practice. We need reassurance that bureaucratic burdens will be avoided. We also need to avoid the risks of incoherence and distortion in the interpretation of the withdrawal agreement, and we need to see respect for the fact that the situation of Northern Ireland is unique and deserves to be treated in a unique way.

We all want to reach that deep and special partnership that Ms May has called for and which is in the interest of all European citizens, but lack of progress now would delay the whole process of the negotiations. That is why achieving confidence now, and a shared understanding on the essential issues of the first phase, is of such importance.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anzitutto voglio dire che apprezzo la chiara indicazione del presidente Juncker che l'Unione europea deve andare avanti con il dibattito e le concrete proposte e iniziative per il futuro dell'Unione europea. E voglio dire ai colleghi inglesi: non è vero che vogliamo trattenerci; vogliamo semplicemente che ogni tanto oltre ad ascoltare voi stessi, ascoltiate anche gli altri, perché qui praticamente non avete fatto che ascoltarvi. Credo che il nostro negoziatore sia stato chiaro e apprezzo il lavoro che sta facendo.

Vorrei focalizzare il mio intervento su due punti: anzitutto, la questione dei diritti dei cittadini europei e britannici, compresi quelli dei figli nati dopo la Brexit o di eventuali nuovi matrimoni. L'accordo, anche se farà parte di quello generale di ritiro, com'è ovvio, prima saremo in grado di spiegarlo a questi cittadini e meglio sarà. Sono in attesa di capire meglio.

Il secondo punto è quello del *Good Friday Agreement*, che deve certamente essere rispettato per l'Irlanda: dobbiamo garantire la libertà dei cittadini irlandesi ma dobbiamo anche garantire l'integrità del mercato unico e in questo momento appare evidente che si tratta di due esigenze che sono contraddittorie, che a noi sembrano conciliabili solo se tutto il Regno Unito, almeno l'Irlanda del Nord, restano nell'Unione doganale e nel mercato unico.

Se esistono proposte diverse tocca al Premier britannico darne la dimostrazione, facendo proposte concrete. Su questi temi ci deve essere un accordo chiaro e preciso. Concludo, dicendo che periodo di transizione non può voler dire posticipare la soluzione dei problemi.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przemówienie pani premier Theresy May we Florencji obudziło nadzieję, że negocjacje z Wielką Brytanią wreszcie przyspieszą, a tego oczekują obywatele Unii. Propozycję okresu przejściowego oraz deklarację, że rząd brytyjski będzie nadal wnosił swój wkład do wspólnego budżetu na lata 2014-2020 należy ocenić pozytywnie.

Wydaje się, że także kwestia ochrony praw obywateli UE mieszkających w Wielkiej Brytanii znajdzie odpowiednie rozwiązanie. Teraz Unia powinna zrobić krok naprzód. Być może pan przewodniczący Juncker powinien wygłosić podobne przemówienie jak pani premier.

Zresztą my w Polsce ostatnio martwimy się bardziej o prawa naszych pracowników we Francji niż prawa Polaków zamieszkających w Wielkiej Brytanii. W ogóle paradoks tych negocjacji polega na tym, że rozmowa z Brytyjczykami o wolnym rynku i przepływie osób i ich praw toczy się w sytuacji, gdy w ramach Unii pod hasłem walki z dumpingiem socjalnym coraz wyraźniejsze staje się dążenie do protekcjonizmu wewnątrz UE.

Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE). – Hr. formand! I denne uge var der besøg fra København i London. Den danske erhvervs- og økonomiminister var af sted sammen med den danske nationalbankdirektør og med ham 20 CEOs fra de største danske finanshuse og pensionskasser. Hvad skulle de så i London? Ja, de skulle være med i kampen om at tiltrække nogle af de 30 000 finansarbejdspladser, som i øjeblikket er på vej ud af London til andre steder i Europa. Fra hele Europa – Tyskland, Frankrig, Holland, Sverige og alle andre steder – er finansbosserne nu i London for at finde ud af, hvordan de skal tiltrække alle disse mennesker.

Det lader til, at man nogle steder i Storbritannien har fundet ud af, at det er den gale kurs, man er på, og at man er ved at betale prisen for konsekvenserne af det, der foregår. I det halvandet år, der er gået siden brexit, er jeg blevet rystet over den forudsigelighed, hvormed man bevæger sig ud i sumpen fra britisk side. Jeg mangler stadig at høre, hvad den britiske regering vil stille op med de 759 aftaler med 168 lande uden for EU, som skal genforhandles. Hvordan i alverden har man forestillet sig, det skulle foregå og hvornår? Hvad regner man med, at der skal ske? Alle vi, der elsker Storbritannien, og som følger godt med, kan undre os over, at der er så meget kaos, og at man ikke snart finder ud af, hvad man skal stille op. Jeg håber på, at der snart indsniger sig en eller anden form for realisme i disse brexitforhandlinger, og jeg håber, at Storbritannien finder ud af det, så man kan komme i gang med noget realistisk og på den måde også kan få gang i de forhandlinger om fremtiden, som er så virkelig nødvendige for, at det britiske erhvervsliv og det britiske samfund ikke skvatter sammen.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o respeito pela decisão soberana e legítima do povo britânico de sair da União Europeia não é compatível com chantagens, ameaças ou punições. Os impasses e bloqueios das negociações resultantes de contradições do grande capital britânico e europeu não são alheios a uma agenda que visa perverter, contornar e, eventualmente, reverter a decisão do povo britânico.

O caráter neoliberal das forças em presença, a natureza da classe do poder em ambos os lados das negociações fica patente na intenção anunciada de manter e aprofundar políticas comuns, nomeadamente na vertente securitária, militarista e de resposta à crise dos refugiados.

Neste quadro é imprescindível afirmar a exigência de que os direitos dos imigrantes sejam assegurados nas negociações, incluindo os emigrantes portugueses no Reino Unido, os seus direitos laborais e outros direitos sociais, como o de residência, a igualdade de tratamento ou o acesso a serviços públicos, à portabilidade das prestações de segurança social, ao reagrupamento familiar ou ao reconhecimento mútuo de diplomas académicos e de qualificações profissionais.

Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I have to say that at some points this morning this debate has taken me back to my teaching days, where you used to get the occasional pupil who would behave so badly, as if they wanted to be thrown out of your lesson because they felt that way they were going to have an easy time and not have to do any work. I see some have bunked off early today.

So let's say here that this is a serious setup. It is a serious negotiation, and we do want an ongoing relationship. Some of us would like the same one, but that is not on the table. So we have to ask whether walking away actually makes this a serious relationship. And no, it does not. Aiming and continuing to say that no deal is better than a bad deal, or no deal is okay, is not a serious outcome. And does all of that show to other countries that you want to be a trusted partner in future negotiations? No, it does not.

Let's also be clear that paying what you promised to pay is not a punishment: it is also about keeping your word.

(Applause from the centre)

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Ik zou onze Britse vrienden willen waarschuwen voor wat er nu gaande is. Ze mogen niet onderschatten welke tegenstander ze tegenover zich hebben. Dat is een Europese elite die uit is op revanche, op weerwraak, op een soort van strafexpeditie; in ieder geval een strategie die tijd wint en die zorgt dat de *remain*-strategie wind onder de vleugels kan krijgen.

Dat is wat er gaande is en dat is de reden waarom deze hele procedure op dit ogenblik langzaam maar zeker in een soort van chaos wordt omgebouwd. De parlementaire procedure die hier wat mij betreft eigenlijk niks mee te maken zou mogen hebben – want het zou gewoon een afhandeling tussen twee executieve niveaus moeten zijn – maakt daar deel van uit.

Ik ken Verhofstadt al 35 jaar. Hij is de geknipte man om van die brexitprocedure een chaos te maken, met allerlei nevenpaadjes zoals het bedreigen van de burgers, het praten over geld en het praten over Noord-Ierland. Laat dat niet gebeuren. Zorg dat je een goed plan B hebt, zeg ik aan onze Britse vrienden: een goed plan B voor de onafhankelijkheid van uw land.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A brexit-tárgyalások során az Európai Unió elsődleges feladata a 27 tagállam érdekeinek képviselete. Mindenekelőtt az Egyesült Királyságban élő állampolgárok jogainak biztosítása a kölcsönösség alapján, valamint előnyös szabadkereskedelmi megállapodás megkötése.

A cél a rendezett megállapodással történő távozás. Ehhez azonban figyelembe kell vennünk az Egyesült Királyság méltányos érdekeit. Méltányosak vagyunk-e akkor, amikor elvárjuk, hogy a kilépés után is elfogadják az Európai Unió Bíróságának joghatóságát? Vajon méltányosak vagyunk-e akkor, amikor meg akarjuk tiltani minden előzetes kereskedelmi tárgyalás folytatását harmadik országokkal?

Mindezzel én az EU huszonhetek érdekeit képviselem, ugyanis, ha mi büntetni akarjuk a kilépésért a briteket, azért mert egyesek álmát szertefoszlatta az Európai Egyesült Államokról, akkor veszélyes útra tévedünk, mert nem lesz szervezett kilépés, nem lesz megállapodás, ennek pedig mindkét oldal vesztese lesz.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, this resolution merely states the obvious, that insufficient progress has been made on the three key issues before us. But I want to accentuate the positive, and I think Michel Barnier, Mr Verhofstadt and others have said that there are welcome developments in the British Prime Minister's speech.

Let me be very clear: on citizens' rights, we can make progress because we have to. We cannot let people down. Some of the banter in this debate will frighten citizens who are listening to it. So on that issue, let us make progress. On the issue of the financial settlement, there is a solution and that the UK will meet and honour its commitments. They are an honourable nation and I believe they will do that.

But let me be very frank. I am the first Member of the European Parliament from the Republic of Ireland to speak. I listened with great respect to my colleagues from Northern Ireland who spoke here. Nobody owns the peace process, but let us salute those who lost their lives for the peace process, those politicians and civil society actors on all sides who won peace so that my children do not see the violence of the past. Nobody, including this Parliament, wants to see that. But I would like to make this observation: we want things to remain the same as they are today on the island of Ireland after Brexit. That is why I say that we do need the United Kingdom to stay in the single market and the Customs Union. If that is not to be, then please tell me what will replace that. I want a solution. I am afraid I hear nothing from the UK side that will leave things as they are today, but we will welcome a proposal with open arms. Michel Barnier wants that too. In the negotiations, we will have to make progress on this issue. I cannot go back home to my constituents in Donegal, in Cavan, in Monaghan, in Louth, in Meath, in all of that constituency, and say that we are going to return to the borders of the past. I will not let that happen.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Es ist für uns alle von Interesse, dass die Brexit-Verhandlungen mit Konsequenz und Realitätssinn abgeschlossen werden. Viel zu lange ist eigentlich nichts substantiell weitergegangen, und das liegt vor allem an der britischen Seite. Jetzt scheint etwas Bewegung in die Sache zu kommen. Gut so! Die Menschen haben es satt, nur Reden zu hören – Ergebnisse sind notwendig. Bei aller Bereitschaft, Kompromisse zu machen, dürfen diese Kompromisse aber nicht zulasten von gewissen Problembereichen gehen.

Da sind zwei Eckpunkte zu nennen: Das ist einmal Irland. Wir brauchen keine neue Grenzen und kein Wiederaufleben der alten Konflikte. Vor allem aber geht es um die Millionen Unionsbürger im Vereinigten Königreich und Briten in der EU. Hier geht es um Menschen, die ihre Lebensplanung auf ganz anderen Grundlagen gemacht haben und die jetzt deswegen nicht benachteiligt oder gar diskriminiert werden dürfen. Vor allem darauf müssen wir uns konzentrieren.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik denk dat het heel belangrijk is dat we vooruitgaan met de brexitonderhandelingen. Onduidelijkheid creëert onzekerheid en dat is voor niemand goed: niet voor het Verenigd Koninkrijk, maar ook niet voor Europa.

Het is inderdaad belangrijk om duidelijkheid te hebben over de rechten van EU-burgers in het Verenigd Koninkrijk, over de financiële verplichtingen van het Verenigd Koninkrijk, over de grens tussen Noord-Ierland en de Republiek Ierland. Maar het is nog veel belangrijker om op het einde van de rit een goede brexitovereenkomst te hebben.

Daarom een warme oproep om de twee fasen niet te allen tijde op een kunstmatige wijze gescheiden te willen houden. Op het einde van de rit zal er één deal op tafel liggen en die zal ook niet uit twee delen bestaan.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, research has shown that in the event of a hard Brexit, the UK would lose half a million jobs whilst the EU would lose 1.2 million. Crucially, they say that these losses will not be evenly distributed, with Ireland being worst hit, suffering a relatively greater loss in both jobs and GDP than even the UK itself. This must be factored into any final outcome of the negotiations.

Largely, today's debate was positive, and just like the negotiations it must be about establishing a cooperative future – not about settling old scores, or, heaven forbid, opening new wounds. Today's resolution offers hope in the context of Northern Ireland, where it speaks of Northern Ireland staying in some form in the internal market and Customs Union. I believe the majority of people in Northern Ireland who voted to remain would support today's proposal, and it would fit in with Theresa May's proposal to exclude any physical infrastructure at the border.

Those who represent Northern Ireland must be clear: do they want a hardening of the border, will they accept a harder border, or do they support a unique solution for Northern Ireland that will avoid a hardening of the border, maintain the travel area and uphold the Good Friday Agreement?

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, od samého začátku jsme věděli, že jednání o odchodu Velké Británie z Evropské unie nebudou vůbec jednoduchá. Hlavním problémem však je, že EU nemá na druhé straně jednacího stolu rovnocenného partnera. Britská vláda se utápí ve vnitřních konfliktech a situace na britské politické scéně je velmi nepřehledná. Premiérka Mayová žádá po EU kreativní řešení, ale nepřináší nic na jednací stůl. Boris Johnson znovu opakuje lži o bájných 350 milionech a občané EU v Británii a Britové v EU se stále utápí v nejistotě, jak to bude po brexitu s jejich právy. Občané jsou zase jednou nuceni sledovat mocenské a stranické hry, které mohou mít zásadní dopady na jejich životy a budoucnost. Souhlasím, že je nutné se dohodnout, ale už je opravdu nejvyšší čas pro to to udělat. Občané nesmí být rukojmí a my nesmíme dopustit, aby se tak stalo.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, as a politician I understand that political negotiations take time, that legal studies need to be conducted, that there are political games being played, and maybe I even understand that one side of the House wants to make a circus out of this. But, as a citizen, I must admit I am still completely lost as to what the British Government actually wants out of these negotiations. And I think this is deeply worrying.

That is why I have two points to make to Theresa May, and I think she can clarify them tomorrow in her speech at the party congress: Finally, Madam Prime Minister, let us, and the millions of citizens who are waiting for this, know what the British Government actually wants out of these negotiations. And secondly – and this is also an important signal to send here from this European Parliament – never forget that there is still a way out of this mess. The strength of a leader is demonstrated not by stubbornness but by insight. You can still turn this around, Ms May. It is high time to do so!

Auke Zijlstra (ENF). – Het siert meneer Juncker niet dat hij nu net weggelopen is bij het debat, maar oké.

Voorzitter, ik ben vorige week in Engeland geweest en de EU heeft zich daar zó onmogelijk gemaakt dat niemand nog sympathie voelt voor Brussel. Premier May doet een keurig voorstel voor een permanente verblijfsvergunning voor iedereen die zich daar nu legaal bevindt en de EU wijst dat direct af. Ze stelde dat een redelijk bedrag betaald kan worden en de EU wil meer, meer, meer. Iedere vorm van onderhandeling over een toekomstig vrijhandelsverdrag wordt afgewezen totdat Londen zich onderwerpt aan deze afpersing.

Voorzitter, waar is onze eeuwige dankbaarheid voor het land dat de Duitse spijkerlaars heeft verslagen? Brussel wil het de Britse burgers inpeperen dat ze iedereen hier diep hebben beledigd door te stemmen vóór het verlaten van de EU, alsof dat hoogverraad is. Brussel vindt het oké om een Brits referendum te frustreren. Morgen gaan we horen waarom Brussel het ook oké vindt om Catalaanse stemmers in elkaar te knuppelen. Voorzitter, het totale morele failliet van de EU kan deze week niet duidelijker zijn.

David McAllister (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Als jemand, der neben der deutschen auch die britische Staatsbürgerschaft besitzt, bedaure ich nach wie vor unendlich die Entwicklungen seit dem Mai 2016. Ich halte den Brexit für einen historischen Fehler mit schwerwiegenden Konsequenzen für das Vereinigte Königreich. Am Brexit ist nichts, aber auch gar nichts gut.

Aber der britische Weg – so irrational er auch erscheinen mag – ist natürlich zu akzeptieren. Und deshalb sollten wir nun – und dafür machen wir uns als Parlament heute einmal mehr stark – eine ordentliche und vernünftige Trennung und anschließend eine wegweisende Vereinbarung über unsere künftigen Beziehungen anstreben. Viele Vorredner haben bereits darauf hingewiesen: Ein ausreichender Fortschritt mit Blick auf die Scheidungsbedingungen ist bislang nicht festgestellt worden. Hier muss die britische Seite konkret liefern. Und auch, wenn durch die Rede in Florenz mancher Fortschritt erzielt worden ist, bleibt es Frau Mays Aufgabe, morgen auf dem Parteitag der britischen Konservativen etwas mehr Klarheit zu schaffen. Und dann müssen wir sehen, was in der nächsten Verhandlungsrunde beginnt. Ansonsten wird das im Oktober nichts werden, wie es bereits mehrfach angesprochen wurde.

Es liegt aber auch in unserem eigenen Interesse, dass wir die künftigen Beziehungen zum Vereinigten Königreich vernünftig organisieren und dass wir nach wie vor eine intensive wirtschaftliche und politische Partnerschaft pflegen werden.

Ich möchte abschließend ausdrücklich einen Dank an Michel Barnier und an sein gesamtes Team aussprechen. Ich glaube, viele von uns hier in diesem Hause haben das Gefühl, dass unsere europäischen Anliegen bei Ihnen, lieber Michel Barnier, in besten Händen sind.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Nach der Trennung der Beatles schrieb Paul McCartney den Song *Too many people: „That was your first mistake, you took your lucky break and you broke it in two.“* Das passt zum Brexit. Die britische Regierung scheint es langsam zu begreifen: Ihr Referendum war ihr *first mistake*, und die Euphorie der Brexit-Anhänger – endlich *lucky break!* – ist längst verfliegen. *You broke it in two* – Konsequenzen folgen.

Die Unteilbarkeit von Binnenmarkt und Zollunion, bestehende finanzielle Verpflichtungen, volle Anerkennung des EuGH sind nicht verhandelbar. Es fehlt nach wie vor eine Garantie für Reziprozität, für Gleichheit und Nichtdiskriminierung der Rechte von EU-Bürgern in Großbritannien und von Briten in der EU. Und dies auch für die Kinder, die nach dem Brexit geboren werden, denn es darf keine Familienmitglieder erster und zweiter Klasse geben.

Frau May, Sie könnten sich verzocken. Auch dazu ein Beatles-Song: *We can work it out* –vor der Trennung geschrieben: „*Think of what you're saying. You can get it wrong and still you think that it's alright. Think what I am saying, we can work it out and get it straight, or say good night.*“ Es ist Ihre Entscheidung.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Collega Verhofstadt heeft met anderen een resolutie over de brexit opgesteld en aan het begin van die tekst worden mooie woorden gezegd over de gezamenlijkheid van de EU en het Verenigd Koninkrijk. Bijvoorbeeld dat EU-burgers ook Britse burgers zijn en dat het Europees Parlement ook de Britse burgers vertegenwoordigt.

Vervolgens legt de tekst echter alle verantwoordelijkheid geheel eenzijdig bij de Britten. Zij moeten de rechten van de burgers volledig garanderen. De Britten dragen volledige verantwoordelijkheid voor de relatie tussen Noord-Ierland en Ierland, en de Britten moeten de betaling eerst volledig regelen.

Gebeurt dat niet, dan worden de onderhandelingen opgeschort. Geen woord dus over andere wederzijds gemeenschappelijke belangrijke onderwerpen, zoals handel en visserij. Slechts eenzijdige Brusselse eisen en die kunnen maar één doel hebben, Voorzitter: never nooit moeten de burgers van welke lidstaat dan ook het in de kop krijgen en er zelfs maar aan denken om uit de EU te willen stappen. Verhofstadt en de zijnen willen een vechtscheiding. Dat levert aan beide kanten slechts verliezers op.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, Ireland needs these negotiations to work out more than any other country. Diplomacy is a bit like dating. If you want it to succeed, you need to be careful what you say. One thing you don't say to your future partner if you want your relationship to work is that they would be a dwarf without you. That is what you said, Mr Verhofstadt, if you could come off your phone for a second.

Another thing you don't do is run down their family, no matter how bad their brother or sister might be, even if they have a lower of opinion of them, you don't run them down! Today, Manfred Weber did just that by demanding that Boris Johnson resign. I agree. I don't like him, but it is the British people's choice. You have made it harder today, Manfred!

Another thing you don't do with your date is tell them you are in a hurry. Jean-Claude Juncker, you said you would not have much time to spend on this. Another thing you don't do is make public what happens in the bedroom! You brought out what happened in private discussions.

We need this to work! We have been bitten by Europe on Lisbon and Nice and on bank debt. It is time to put your egos away, time to make this work, and time to stop insulting people that you ultimately want to work with you.

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, dans cette résolution, vous exigez des Britanniques le respect de la libre circulation des individus et le respect des décisions de la Cour de justice européenne. Nous l'avons compris, l'Union européenne veut faire payer ainsi au peuple britannique son désir légitime de liberté et de retour de sa souveraineté. Car, souvenons-nous de ce qui s'est passé: à peine l'article 50 du traité déclenché, nous avons assisté à une avalanche de sommations et de menaces de la part d'une Union européenne aux abois. En réalité, l'Union européenne a peur, peur de voir le Royaume-Uni mieux s'en sortir à l'extérieur de l'Union qu'à l'intérieur, ce qui, évidemment, pourrait inciter d'autres États membres à suivre cette voie vers la souveraineté nationale.

Les négociations sont un véritable chantage, un chantage insupportable, mais le Brexit aura eu au moins ce mérite: celui de montrer le vrai visage d'une Union européenne antidémocratique et incapable de respecter la volonté des peuples car on ne peut pas négocier avec un revolver sur la tempe.

György Schöpflin (PPE). – Madam President, anyone following the relationship between the European Union and the United Kingdom since the Brexit vote will be struck by a number of factors. First of all, why is everything in slow motion? The Brexit referendum took place well over a year ago, yet the pace of discussions has been glacial.

Second, the United Kingdom never seems to have believed that the EU 27 would preserve its unity. Indeed, the UK made a serious diplomatic effort to split that unity. This failed.

Third, the EU's position was made very clear indeed in the Council mandate and in the various statements by Michel Barnier. Despite the clarity, the message never seems to get through. The UK side, when it responds, does so in vague all too often unfocused language or makes complaints of inflexibility or punishment. Fourth, the discussion in the UK itself seems to be entirely unaware of what the EU is saying. It is as if the UK has become another planet.

From the outset, in the 1970s – and I was there – the UK never sought to understand what the EU was for. The attitude was entirely transactional. Equally England – and I mean England, and not the UK as a whole – has become intensely focused on itself, thereby making it very hard to see the EU as it is, a body of values.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, nous étions contre le Brexit, mais le peuple britannique a voté pour. Alors, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, jusqu'au 29 mars 2019, les Britanniques restent membres de l'Union européenne, et il est de votre devoir, en votre qualité de président de la Commission, de veiller à ce que la législation soit entièrement appliquée.

Tout d'abord concernant les droits des citoyens, qui, avant même la sortie du Royaume-Uni, sont trop souvent victimes de discriminations; concernant également la lutte contre la fraude à la TVA car, manifestement, le Royaume-Uni est devenu la plaque tournante d'une fraude générée par des importations en provenance de Chine; concernant enfin la situation à Gibraltar, qui semble être devenu une passoire pour les licences bancaires et les captives d'assurance.

Et puis, un nouvel élément est apparu récemment: la «phase de transition». Pour une fois, je vais vous surprendre, je suis d'accord avec M. Weber. Il ne faudrait pas que l'on ramène tout à cette phase de transition avant même qu'elle soit effective. La transition, nous y serons quand nous serons parvenu à un accord: 1) sur les conditions du divorce, et 2) sur les conditions de la relation future.

C'est le bon séquençage. Nous devons nous y tenir.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, г-н Юнкер, г-н Барние, колеги, хубаво е, че най-накрая виждаме известен прогрес в преговорите с Обединеното Кралство относно Брексит. В своята реч г-жа Мей показва готовността на Великобритания да продължи преговорите в духа на компромиса. Ако искаме да запазим близките си отношения с Обединеното Кралство след напускането на Европейския съюз, то е нужно възможно най-бързо да преминем към установяване пряко на споразумение, което да влезе в сила след Брексит. Това ще успокои хората, работодателите, икономиката и пазарите.

Вярвам, че никой не иска в Европа отново да се повторят икономическите трусове от последните години. Те са неминуеми, ако Европейският съюз не постигне добро, приятелско и разумно споразумение с Великобритания. Нека да спрем да говорим за това как Великобритания трябва да бъде наказана. Това отношение е неконструктивно и бих казал глупаво.

Очевидно Обединеното Кралство има добра воля да реши трите важни въпроса: правата на гражданите, ирландският въпрос и плащането на дължимото по договори с Европейския съюз. Не може да очакваме това плащане, ако няма добра сделка.

Искам да призова за рационалност, разум, запазване на добрите отношения. Великобритания трябва да остане най-добрият съюзник на Европейския съюз след Брексит.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, durante estos meses de negociaciones hemos visto diferentes posiciones, más o menos duras, pero lo que no hemos visto ha sido ningún avance. Se habla de unidad de Europa, de las empresas, de los derechos de los ciudadanos, pero, en todo este periodo, no se ha dicho nada, absolutamente nada, de los trabajadores, los grandes olvidados del *brex*it.

Pondré el ejemplo de los más de 12 000 trabajadores fronterizos españoles, que suponen el 27 % de la mano de obra de Gibraltar y cuyos puestos de trabajo están en peligro por la falta de concreción de su estatus futuro. En la zona existe una interdependencia social y económica que va a ser alterada, alterada, por supuesto, a peor, porque nada se dice en las negociaciones de cómo proteger el empleo y las condiciones de los trabajadores.

Todos los intentos por tener el *brex*it más beneficioso atienden a los intereses económicos de las empresas y los mercados y, una vez más, son los trabajadores los que se ven amenazados y desamparados, al ser la última prioridad en la mesa de negociación.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rok temu wydawało się, że referendum brytyjskie i jego następstwa to będzie problem egzystencjalny całej Unii Europejskiej. Zgłaszali się naśladowcy w innych krajach. Dzisiaj już widzimy, że szok brexitu zamienił się w swoistą terapię szokową dla Europy, bo odnowił wiarę Unii Europejskiej we własną przyszłość. Natomiast ujawnia się w całości problem, jaki mieszkańcy Wysp Brytyjskich zgotowali sami sobie. Można współczuć, ale nas interesuje przede wszystkim zabezpieczenie interesów Irlandii, naszych obywateli na Wyspach oraz projektowanie finansów przy niepewności, jaką stwarza brexit. Dlatego strategia realizowana przez Michela Barniera zgodnie z wytycznymi Rady i rezolucją Parlamentu ma sens – najpierw postęp w tych sprawach, a potem rozmowy o przyszłym modelu relacji między Unią Europejską i Wielką Brytanią. Ale nie ma tej przesłanki, jest chaos po drugiej stronie.

Chciałbym wyrazić swoje osobiste rozczarowanie. Mam prawo do tego wyrazu osobistego rozczarowania dlatego, że w komunistycznej Polsce w podziemiu, co rodziło pewne ryzyko osobiste, wskazywałem Wielką Brytanię jako wzór dojrzałej demokracji. Dojrzałej, czyli takiej, która jest odporna na demagogię i populizm. Niestety referendum brytyjskie było świadectwem nieprawdy (*fake news*) i stąd moje rozczarowanie, ale też cieszę się, że Unia Europejska jako całość odzyskała wiarę we własną przyszłość.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente Juncker, è stato evocato stamattina da più parti l'intervento che la Premier May ha tenuto nella mia città, Firenze, qualche giorno fa: mi lasci dire che nel discorso di Theresa May, a Firenze, di bello c'era solo Firenze e nessuna rassicurazione, almeno su alcuni punti importanti.

Primo: abbiamo sempre affermato che al rispetto degli accordi del Venerdì Santo debba corrispondere l'integrità del mercato unico e l'Unione doganale, evitando che si creino varchi, dai quali possano arrivare in Europa merci prive di alcun controllo, capaci di eludere i dazi doganali all'entrata; in secondo luogo, credo inoltre, che davanti alla richiesta, da parte del governo inglese di un periodo transitorio, l'Unione europea debba, sicuramente dimostrarsi disponibile. Ma un periodo di transizione non è un periodo senza regole e dovrà basarsi sull'insieme delle attuali norme dell'Unione europea, incluso il rispetto delle quattro libertà fondamentali.

Duemila anni fa, Seneca scrisse che «non esiste vento favorevole per il marinaio che non sa dove andare». Il tempo scorre e noi – e penso con noi anche i cittadini inglesi – vorremmo sapere qual è la rotta che la signora May vuole seguire.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Madam President, we have heard the usual ranting from UKIP and far-right colleagues fuelled by their diminishing testosterone levels. They state the obvious. They say they want a cliff edge, no deal and a complete withdrawal – what Kenneth Clarke called a calamitous act of national self-harm. Well, there is no surprise there: that's what they want. Be clear about that, colleagues. That's what they want.

But I don't want that, and let me assure you that that's not what a lot of British Conservatives want. We want to make progress. Ms May has signalled in Florence that she wants to move. Let's speed this process up. This Parliament can play an important role in moving the deal forward. We are experienced in negotiating; we are experienced in reaching consensus and compromise. I would like to make one point about this resolution, which is the one point I do not agree with. It is really important that this Parliament urges Mr Barnier, the Commission and the Council to move forward with a parallel negotiation on some of the issues that the UK is signalling are important, on the principle that no deal is agreed until everything is agreed. That would open up channels of communication that would show goodwill and the willingness to go forward without digging our heels in and being just as stubborn and just as awkward as those gentlemen that I mentioned earlier. I'm not with them; I'm with this parliament, and I think that we could play a useful role here. Let's get on and do so.

Jérôme Lavrilleux (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, dans à peine 420 jours, la convention de divorce, négociée de main de maître par Michel Barnier, devrait être adoptée par les Vingt-Sept et votée par notre Parlement, qui aura le dernier mot.

Or, à 420 jours de cette échéance cruciale, que constatons-nous? Qu'une fois de plus, une classe politique britannique, qui n'est décidément pas plus à la hauteur des enjeux qu'elle ne l'est de son propre peuple, n'a pour seule préoccupation que son propre nombril. Son problème n'est pas l'avenir de la Grande-Bretagne, sinon celle-ci serait restée dans l'Europe. Son problème n'est pas non plus l'Union européenne, ni une supposée technocratie supranationale qui n'existe que dans leurs fantasmes. Non, la seule obsession de cette classe politique nombriliste et cynique est d'échafauder des plans pour conserver ou conquérir des majorités de circonstance au sein même de ses propres partis politiques. Peu importe si pour cela elle doit mentir, se renier et se trahir elle-même en excitant au besoin quelques dangereux populistes. Nous devons lui dire «stop»!

Ceux qui pensent, en Grande-Bretagne comme ailleurs, que l'avenir consiste à rejeter l'autre parce que l'on est trop riche pour être solidaire et trop fier pour être fraternel, trompent leur peuple. Car ce n'est pas plus de richesse ou d'indépendance qu'ils trouveront au bout du chemin, mais plus de pauvreté et d'isolement.

Chers collègues britanniques, il vous reste encore quelques jours pour avoir du courage et arrêter ce processus qui n'a aucun sens. Si vous n'avez pas ce courage, trouvez alors au moins celui de la clarté et cessez vos atermoiements dont vous êtes et serez les seules victimes.

In c'est in, et out c'est out.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Barnier, Herr Verhofstadt! Ich habe nun über 40 Verhandlungen mit dem Rat über Gesetzgebungen geführt und viele Handelsverträge begleitet, aber solche Zustände, wie wir sie in den Brexit-Verhandlungen erleben, habe ich noch nie gesehen. So unklare Positionen des Verhandlungspartners habe ich noch nie erlebt. Wenn ich mir den Parteitag jetzt in Manchester angucke – wem solch ich da zuhören? May, Johnson, Davidson, Mogg oder Hammond? Völlige Unklarheit, und das kann doch keine seriöse Grundlage für Verhandlungen sein! Wir brauchen Klarheit – intern für die Verhandlungen zwischen EU und Großbritannien, aber auch darüber hinaus!

Ich war letzte Woche in Genf die WTO-Partner gucken: Wir wollen wissen, wie es mit Großbritannien und der EU weitergeht. Wir brauchen auch hier Klarheit in einer Situation, wo das Welthandelssystem eh in einer destabilisierten Situation ist. Und wir brauchen auch für unsere Handelsverträge in Zukunft z. B. mit Australien Klarheit.

Also die dringende Bitte an die britische Regierung: Klarheit schaffen, damit wir auch weiter vorankommen können! Ich glaube, wir können wirklich Herrn Barnier, Herrn Verhofstadt für die gute Zusammenarbeit Danke sagen. Kooperativ und transparent – so arbeiten wir weiter!

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I too would like to thank Mr Verhofstadt and his team for his good work and for the resolution before us today, and also to thank him for coming to Ireland two weeks ago, where he was well received as was Mr Barnier when he came to the PPE Bureau meeting in May and went to the North to see the position of the border. Thankfully – and I appreciate this very much – there is a determination to maintain the provisions of the Good Friday Agreement, the special circumstances of Northern Ireland, and a seamless border.

Some progress has been made was in relation to a transition period. This has now been recognised, and I appreciate that. However, one thing I would say is that a transition period needs to be open-ended, with a target minimum length of maybe two years, without setting a maximum, because it is during that transition period that people will realise what Mr Barnier has said today and what has not been realised up till now: that the consequences, like the extraordinary complexity of the issue, have been underestimated. Given enough time, people will realise that, and then come to an arrangement that would be in the best interests of the EU and the best interests of the United Kingdom and of Ireland.

The other point I would like to make is that an awful lot of speeches, even here today, have to be taken with a pinch of salt, because they are aimed at constituents back home. This is grandstanding. We need less of the public speeches and more engagement where it matters most – around the negotiating table. I think that, over a period of time, around the negotiating table, trust can be built and we can come to conclusions that are satisfactory to everybody.

(Applause)

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señora presidenta, esta mañana hemos oído aquí un apoyo encendido por parte de Mister Farage al nacionalismo catalán, y creo que es un torpedo mortal a la causa independentista de Cataluña, porque no puede haber peor amigo, no puede haber peor apoyo en Europa y en el mundo al nacionalismo que el de Mister Farage, que el de la ultraderecha.

Señorías, Europa se construyó para superar las guerras entre nuestros países; Europa se construyó para superar los nacionalismos, y el *brexít*, como estamos viendo hoy en esta negociación, es la expresión de un nacionalismo viejo, es la pretensión de una independencia anacrónica. Hoy lo estamos viendo en una negociación que va a requerir de una transición muy larga —como ha pedido la señora May—, una transición que tenemos que negociar de nuevo.

Señorías, los referéndums de independencia los carga el diablo: son un barco lleno de problemas ciudadanos; son un barco que navega hacia ninguna parte, la mayoría de las veces.

La bandera del nacionalismo es la independencia, es la soberanía. Pero la soberanía, hoy, es Europa: una Europa más fuerte, más unida y más democrática, como dicen Juncker y Macron.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, I must say I deeply regret the decision of the UK to leave the EU. The UK in this way abandons a community of more than 500 million people, a community that has an essential role in the future of our continent and the world. The economic impact of that is just one small part of the problem, but it is an important one. Let me illustrate that in numbers: the UK, by leaving the single market, will make it complicated for its businesses to join and use the market of 450 million people, while the opposite way around this is just 65 million people.

In today's interconnected and highly effective world, any uncertainty means job losses, lower wages and budget and investment problems. Unfortunately, for the time being, it seems to me that we are not on the way to reducing this uncertainty. The reason is that while the EU 27 has quite a clear negotiating position, it seems to me that the UK side of the negotiation table is trying to square a circle. We know that squaring a circle is not possible, and we have known that for more than 100 years.

It is time to act. It is important that we can move forward, and the recent speeches by the UK Prime Minister show the possibility to get improvement, but they must understand that there are some limits and some conditions that must be fulfilled. This is the only way to reach progress and reduce the cost and uncertainty of Brexit. The cost will be there, but it depends on whether it is high or low. I hope it will be low!

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, *(fuori microfono)* almeno una parte di esso sembra capire o cominciare a capire che non si può avere accesso al mercato unico e insieme costruire muri contro i lavoratori comunitari; come dicono gli inglesi, non si può avere la torta e poi mangiarla.

Gli alfieri della Brexit, qui tutti scomparsi, fanno i conti con la realtà che sarà inevitabilmente dura per la Gran Bretagna e cambiano tono ma noi continuiamo sulla nostra strada: chiediamo a Theresa May concretezza e certezza sulle condizioni di recesso. Apprezzo completamente la posizione esposta stamattina dalla Commissario Barnier.

Il Parlamento lo deve dire chiaro: nessuna tattica dilatoria, nessuna transizione senza certezze. Non si gioca con la vita delle persone. Io penso che la vita dei cittadini non possa essere messa tra parentesi, per un certo periodo di tempo, in attesa magari di rimandare il momento in cui i politici conservatori britannici, che hanno spesso giocato per le loro reciproche posizioni di partito, saranno chiamati a rendere conto dei propri errori.

Il nostro non è un atteggiamento punitivo bensì è la voglia di arrivare a un risultato. Ma vedo invece oggi e sento dalle parole dei colleghi molta paura di rispondere delle conseguenze delle proprie scelte.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Madam President, I would first like to say one thing about a mistake we must not make here in this Chamber: Mr Farage and his friends might be British, but they are not the representatives of Great Britain.

(Applause)

Great Britain is much greater than that. They are loving the conflict and the tensions, and they are, for me, contradictory to what the United Kingdom is, and has been, for Europe. I think Brexit is a sad thing. It is not win-win; it is lose-lose. In the negotiations we need to be counterparts, but in the future we need to be partners. That means that this is time for negotiation more than agitation. We need the British Government to get its act together, and we need to secure the rights of citizens, secure a way to deal with the bill and proceed with the Irish issue. But in day-to-day life, regarding prosperity and our big challenges, we need to be serious about how we manage this divorce and create a new partnership.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Juncker, Herr Barnier! Im Frühjahr dieses Jahres hat OLAF, das Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung der Europäischen Union, einen Zollbetrug in Großbritannien aufgedeckt, der durch systematische Unterbewertung zustande gekommen ist. Der Schaden für unseren Haushalt – für den Haushalt der EU – beläuft sich auf knapp zwei Milliarden Euro, eine Summe, von der ich nicht weiß, ob sie in den Rechnungen der EU-Kommission über die Abschlusskosten des Brexits auftaucht, und einen zusätzlichen Schaden von 3,2 Mrd. EUR an entgangener Mehrwertsteuer für die Mitgliedstaaten. Der britische Zoll weiß das, und er tut nichts dagegen, denn er ist nicht in der Lage dazu. Er hat zu wenig Personal, und er hat die Anweisung seiner Regierung, den Fokus der Aufgaben auf eine andere Stelle zu richten. Ob den administrativen Empfehlungen, die OLAF ausgesprochen hat, nachgegangen worden ist, ist mir unbekannt; eine juristische Aufarbeitung findet nicht statt.

Vor diesem Hintergrund glaube ich, dass wir sehr hohe Aufmerksamkeit darauf richten müssen, wie die Kontrollen an der irischen Grenze organisiert sind. Wir können nicht hinnehmen, dass die Integrität der Europäischen Union und der Zollunion durch schlampiges Verhalten des britischen Zolls beeinträchtigt werden. Ich bitte Sie, an dieser Stelle hohe Aufmerksamkeit zu haben und Garantien einzufordern, damit uns nicht weiter passiert, was uns zurzeit passiert, denn der Skandal dauert an.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, it has been six months since Article 50: six months in which substantial progress could have been made on citizens' rights, on the financial settlement, and on the Irish border issue; six months that could have paved the way for a meaningful conversation about our common future; six months in which bridges could have been built between those who voted to leave and those who would have preferred to remain.

But all we have seen in the past six months is chaos: a Prime Minister who is so preoccupied with her own position that she cannot focus on these negotiations; a Foreign Secretary who is the main cause of the Prime Minister's preoccupations; a House of Commons leader who said yesterday that the UK will take back control of its borders, its money and its laws in 2019, denying the idea of a transition period; David Davis, who first agreed to the sequencing of negotiations, but now cannot stop complaining about it; Michael Gove, who is too busy selling pigs' ears to China to make any meaningful contribution to the process; and then Nigel Farage stands here in this House and demands a meaningful, intelligent conversation while even he himself has said that, if he does not Brexit his way, he will be forced to pick up a rifle. Well, good luck having an intelligent conversation with someone like that.

So please, our friends in London, be serious. Get your act together. Stop your party political games and come to the table as a serious, united and credible negotiating partner. All our citizens deserve that.

(Applause)

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, por razões que, em larga medida, se ficaram a dever a erros sucessivos na política económica e na gestão da crise dos refugiados da União Europeia, uma maioria dos eleitores do Reino Unido decidiu deixar esta União. A concretização dessa decisão legítima tem que ser conduzida com toda a transparência. Proteger os direitos dos cidadãos europeus e o futuro do projeto europeu no quadro dos Tratados é a prioridade absoluta.

Portugal tem uma longa tradição de cooperação bilateral com o Reino Unido. Essa cooperação sempre se pôde desenvolver no quadro da pertença comum à União Europeia. Autonomia, identidade e cooperação são pilares que não se anulam, mas antes se valorizam entre si. Uso o meu país como exemplo para tornar mais clara a mensagem que devemos deixar clara na resolução do Parlamento Europeu.

Queremos continuar a cooperar com o Reino Unido. Nada nos move contra o seu povo. Mas devemos fazê-lo no quadro da integridade das instituições europeias e dos seus valores e princípios. Com calendários transparentes e claros. Com garantias de total respeito pelos direitos dos cidadãos europeus que vivem no Reino Unido. Assegurando a indivisibilidade e a proteção da coerência e da integridade do projeto europeu. Queremos, em síntese, um projeto europeu que continue forte e aprenda com a experiência do BREXIT para não voltarem a ser cometidos os erros que a ele nos conduziram.

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, έφτασε η ώρα να αναπτύξουμε πρωτοβουλίες για να είναι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μετά το Brexit ισχυρότερη και ελκυστικότερη. Χρειαζόμαστε μια σοβαρή συζήτηση για την αύξηση των ιδίων πόρων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και για τη χρηματοδότηση νέων πολιτικών. Και μη μου πείτε ότι οι φορολογούμενοι των χωρών σας δεν θέλουν να χρηματοδοτήσουν ευρωπαϊκές πολιτικές, γιατί θα σας απαντήσω ότι τα ίδια έλεγε ο David Cameron και είδατε τι έπαθε! Δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία ότι το City του Λονδίνου θα παραμείνει και μετά το Brexit ένα ισχυρό χρηματοπιστωτικό και ναυτιλιακό κέντρο. Έχουμε υποχρέωση όμως να ενισχύσουμε τη συγκριτική μας θέση στη Φρανκφούρτη, στο Δουβλίνο, στο Παρίσι και στον Πειραιά, ειδικά σε ό, τι αφορά την εμπορική ναυτιλία. Να συνδυάσουμε, λοιπόν, την πολύ καλή διαπραγμάτευση από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που βρίσκεται σε πλήρη εξέλιξη, με την οργάνωση ενός καλύτερου μέλλοντος για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση των 27.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hace ya dieciséis meses que los británicos decidieron salirse de la Unión. Quienes gestionaban a esa salida soñaban con una estrategia *cherry picking*: escoger las cerezas que les gustaran. Soñaban con que, al otro lado, en la Unión Europea, habría división e intereses contrapuestos, pero la realidad, hoy, es que donde hay confusión y división es en la parte británica y aquí hemos sido capaces de mantener la unión en torno al proceso de negociación.

La Resolución de este Parlamento subraya el apoyo de esta Cámara a la estrategia negociadora del señor Barnier. Me sumo a quienes han visto esta mañana con sorpresa como el líder del UKIP y el líder del grupo del Frente Nacional apoyaban con entusiasmo la estrategia independentista de Cataluña. Solo quiero recordar que tomen nota de que se trata de dos partidos, dos movimientos supremacistas, entre cuyos objetivos fundamentales está sacar a sus países de la Unión Europea, esa unión que los otros veintisiete queremos mantener y reforzar.

Christofer Fjellner (PPE). – Fru talman! Ingen borde förvånas över att de här förhandlingarna om en skilsmässa mellan EU och Storbritannien går uselt. För det är en konstig skilsmässa. Ingen kommer ju att flytta. Det kommer att förbli 32 kilometer mellan Dover och Calais. Vår framtid och vårt öde är och förblir sammanflätat. Storbritannien kommer fortfarande att bo kvar, men har liksom sagt att man vill flytta ner i källaren, kanske bo på soffan.

Jag har här i parlamentet under 13 år följt handelsförhandlingar. Det här är egentligen precis samma sak, men tvärtom. För i handelsförhandlingar är alla vinnare. Man avskaffar handelshinder och gränser som alla tjänar på, oavsett vem som ger med sig. Men här gör vi motsatsen. Här förhandlar vi om vilka handelshinder och gränser vi ska resa – en förhandling där alla blir förlorare. Frågan är bara hur mycket. Och det vet vi inte, för Storbritannien har ju faktiskt ingen aning om vilka handelshinder eller gränser man vill införa.

Men för att lyckas måste vi alltid ha samma sak: ett tydligt mandat och en bred politisk uppslutning. Där är EU ett föredöme. Vi har ett solklart mandat och den bredaste totala uppslutningen, men Storbritannien måste ta sig samman. För man är inte ens överens i regeringen om vad man vill åstadkomma, och än mindre verkar det tydligt att man har parlamentet eller folket med sig. Ta sig samman!

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, le droit des citoyens et la question irlandaise sont parmi les deux préoccupations essentielles.

Il faut souligner ici, et c'est une surprise, la faiblesse du gouvernement britannique qui ne semble ni savoir ce qu'il veut, ni assumer le résultat d'un référendum qu'il a pourtant voulu. C'est la faiblesse d'un gouvernement désuni, au sein duquel Boris Johnson, irresponsable enfant gâté, continue de sévir.

L'attitude de M. Farage tout à l'heure, qui parle de l'Espagne pour éviter le débat, est inqualifiable. Son succès électoral, il ne sait pas l'assumer, parce qu'il a plongé son peuple dans le désarroi et l'inconnu. Le peuple britannique mérite mieux.

Quant à vous, Monsieur Barnier, Monsieur le négociateur en chef, je vous félicite de préserver l'unité de l'Union européenne et de privilégier l'intérêt des citoyens, ce qui devrait être la préoccupation principale de tout responsable politique.

Continuez dans cette voie, car vous êtes vraiment, comme on dit à Londres «*the right man in the right place*».

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, sobre o Brexit, três notas breves sobre a clareza, sobre as pessoas e sobre a celeridade.

Clareza: estamos atrasados. O artigo 50.º foi acionado há mais de seis meses e não há verdadeiros progressos nas negociações. Este impasse não aproveita a ninguém. Há mais tempo para discursos mediáticos do que para apresentar propostas concretas. Ouvimos Theresa May em Florença, mas continuamos a ignorar propostas concretas consequentes.

Sobre as pessoas: há cinco milhões de cidadãos com o futuro hipotecado. Europeus que vivem no Reino Unido e britânicos que escolheram outro dos 27 países. 400 mil portugueses vivem num limbo inaceitável. É urgente que o Reino Unido se comprometa com a salvaguarda dos direitos dos cidadãos europeus residentes. Violar o direito da União de forma mais ou menos camuflada e retirar direitos seria intolerável.

E sobre a celeridade: por isso é tão importante decidir e decidir agora. Para preservar os direitos de todos os cidadãos europeus e trabalhar para uma transição tranquila. Isso implica a aplicação do acervo comunitário assente nas quatro indissociáveis liberdades de circulação. Precisamos de um bom acordo e o relógio está a contar.

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). – Fru talman! Som många påpekat idag är det olyckligt att den fjärde förhandlingsrundan inte har resulterat i tillräckliga framsteg vad gäller medborgarnas rättigheter, situationen i Irland och Nordirland och Storbritanniens ekonomiska förpliktelser inom EU. Därför är det bra att vi kräver konkreta framsteg på dessa områden. Men samtidigt: Varför talar vi om britterna som ett enigt kollektiv som har gjort ett välinformerat val när de röstade ja till Brexit? Vi vet ju att det inte är så.

Själv känner jag i likhet med exempelvis kollegan Lavrilleux stor sorg över att britterna sannolikt lämnar. Jag minns också vad Michel Barnier sa när ni inledde ert arbete: "Se upp med hatet", sa ni. "Det kommer att dyka upp efter ett tag." Så låt oss alltså hålla en anständig ton, samtidigt som vi kräver resultat i förhandlingarna.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Barnier, έξι μήνες μετά την ενεργοποίηση του άρθρου 50 της Συνθήκης για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η πρόοδος είναι ισχνή, αλλά η σύγχυση γύρω από την πορεία του Brexit μεγάλη. Η ασάφεια στη σχέση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου υπονομεύει την προοπτική της και, κυρίως, δεν εξασφαλίζει τα συμφέροντα των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. 3,2 εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες ζουν σήμερα στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, εκ των οποίων 63.000 είναι Έλληνες. Είναι υποχρέωσή μας να τους παράσχουμε ασφάλεια άμεσα, ενσωματώνοντας όλα τα δικαιώματα που απολαμβάνουν, χωρίς να υπάρξει ουσιαστική μεταβολή στη θέση τους για εκείνους και τα παιδιά τους.

Στο πεδίο του οικονομικού διακανονισμού είναι απαραίτητο να επιτύχουμε συμβιβασμό το ταχύτερο δυνατόν. Υπάρχουν χώρες όπως η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, που εξαρτούν σε ένα μεγάλο βαθμό την οικονομική τους ανάπτυξη από τη χρηματοδότηση από τον κοινοτικό προϋπολογισμό. Υποχρεώσεις που ανελήφθησαν από 28 κράτη μέλη δεν μπορούν να εκπληρωθούν από τα 27 και το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο πρέπει να τηρήσει στο ακέραιο τις δημοσιονομικές υποχρεώσεις που έχει αναλάβει. Αλλιώς, τον λογαριασμό θα τον πληρώσουν οι πιο αδύναμοι και ανάμεσα σε αυτούς είναι και οι Έλληνες.

Τέλος, ενόψει της απόφασης του Συμβουλίου τον Νοέμβριο του 2017 για τον προσδιορισμό των εδρών των ευρωπαϊκών οργανισμών που εδρεύουν στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, θα ήθελα να επαναφέρω εδώ ενώπιον της Ολομέλειας του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου, ενώπιον των αντιπροσώπων όλων των κρατών μελών, το αίτημα της Ελλάδας για τη φιλοξενία της έδρας των Ευρωπαϊκού Οργανισμού Φαρμάκων στην Αθήνα. Διαθέτουμε τις υποδομές, μπορούμε να εξασφαλίσουμε στις οικογένειες των 900 εργαζομένων πρόσβαση σε πολύγλωσση εκπαίδευση, μπορούμε να συνεισφέρουμε σε τεχνογνωσία. Σας καλώ να δώσουμε αυτή την ευκαιρία στην Ελλάδα, στέλνοντας ένα ηχηρό μήνυμα ίσων ευκαιριών στην Ευρώπη μετά το Brexit.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, in Florence, Prime Minister May gave the best Remain speech never held. Ms May touched on a range of extremely important issues – terrorism, climate change, the refugee and migrant crisis, global free trade, organised crime and territorial aggression – issues so challenging, so dangerous and so complex that we can only solve them together. To put it bluntly, one could paraphrase Ms May's speech like this: 'you need now, more than ever, to work together – so I am leaving!'

Ms May was very concrete on what she does not want. She does not want a Norway model and she does not want a Canada model, but what does the British Government want? Nobody knows! All we get from Ms May is a desire, and I quote from the speech, for 'a bold, new strategic, comprehensive framework that is unprecedented in breadth'. That sounds like something out of 'Yes, Prime Minister'. Did Sir Humphrey write the Florence speech, one could ask?

How can we negotiate a workable Brexit agreement if the UK Government cannot state clearly what they want? Please, Prime Minister May: wake up, speak up! You owe it to your citizens.

(Applause)

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte am Ende der Debatte noch einmal klarstellen, dass dieses Parlament heute mit breiter Mehrheit eine Entschliebung beschließen wird, die eine logische Folge des Beschlusses über die Verhandlungsposition des Parlaments vom April dieses Jahres ist. Wir beschließen diese Entschliebung deshalb mit großer Einigkeit, weil wir Verhandlungen wollen, weil wir berechenbar und entschlossen sind, eine klare Position haben. Diese Entschliebung ergreift Partei – Partei für die Bürger, Partei für den Friedensprozess in Irland, Partei für die Steuerzahler, Partei für unsere rechtlichen, politischen und moralischen Verpflichtungen. Das muss die Grundlage von Verhandlungen sein, weil wir uns unseren gemeinsamen Werten, dem gemeinsamen Recht und den gemeinsamen Zielen verpflichtet fühlen.

Alle jene schreien heute, die das nicht wollen, sondern die sich immer auf die Seite der Verletzung des Rechts, des Nationalismus, des Extremismus und der Verlogenheit als politisches Instrument von Taktik und Strategie gestellt haben. Die Mehrheit dieses Parlaments steht auf klaren Grundlagen. Man weiß, woran man ist, wenn man mit uns verhandelt.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Muszę przyznać, że w pełni solidaryzuję się z tym, co usłyszałem i w jakiej formie usłyszałem – powiedziane tym spokojnym tonem – od pana Michela Barnier, i również od Guy Verhofstadta. Przyznam się, że dawno nie słyszałem Guy Verhofstadta bez teatralnych gestów, i to jest właśnie bardzo dobre. Dwie zasady, o których Panowie powiedzieli, a które mnie szczególnie przekonują: po pierwsze, byłe państwo członkowskie Unii Europejskiej nie jest państwem członkowskim Unii Europejskiej, po drugie, ludzie są najważniejsi, czyli my chcemy traktować bardzo życzliwie i normalnie obywateli Zjednoczonego Królestwa w Unii Europejskiej, pod warunkiem że będzie wzajemność – i to podejście również bardzo mi odpowiada.

Chciałbym też zwrócić Państwa uwagę na sprawę studentów wyższych uczelni. Otóż dotychczasowe zapisy przewidują, że po brexicie nie będziemy uznawać dyplomów w sposób automatyczny. Namawiam, abyśmy uznawali dyplomy brytyjskie, a także aby dyplomy wyższych uczelni, stopnie i tytuły uzyskane w Unii Europejskiej były uznawane w Wielkiej Brytanii.

Derek Vaughan (S&D). – Madam President, some in the UK Government want to blame the EU for the lack of progress in negotiations, but of course it was the UK Government who, knowing the consequences, triggered Article 50 – and now, six months after triggering Article 50, the UK Government still doesn't know what it wants. It is spending all its time negotiating, or rather fighting, with itself; it is an embarrassment to watch. It can't agree amongst itself what it wants from the divorce settlement, from transitional arrangements or from a future relationship with the European Union. And as they squabble, companies in the UK go bust or look to relocate elsewhere, and people are losing their jobs. Day after day now, we hear bad economic news, and as they squabble things get worse and worse. It really is about time the UK Government pulled itself together: they should be clarifying their position and negotiating properly. They should be accepting the view of the Scottish and Welsh Governments that the UK needs to be in the single market and the customs union for the transitional period, and indeed permanently. For once, the British Government should put the country first, before the party.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pan Michel Barnier stwierdził, że oprócz uregulowań finansowych, kwestii irlandzkiej, to tak naprawdę prawa kilku milionów obywateli są tutaj najważniejsze, i one są głównym aspektem prowadzonych negocjacji. Za chwilę przyjmimy rezolucję, która, niektórzy mówią, że jest twardą rezolucją, ale im więcej informacji dociera do tych wielu milionów obywateli, tym więcej jest pytań o ich przyszłość. Dotyczy to również moich rodaków, Polaków, których wielu mieszka w Wielkiej Brytanii. To jest kwestia prawa do pobytu, warunków, które winni spełnić, kwestia uprawnień socjalnych, również emerytalnych, zasad, które dotyczą przemieszczania się osób po brexicie – te pytania są związane z troską, czy będzie równe traktowanie obywateli, wielu pyta również o kwestię łączenia rodzin.

Ostatnie deklaracje pani premier May są obiecujące. Z drugiej strony Wielka Brytania jest ważnym partnerem i chcemy to tak widzieć również po brexicie, bowiem jest partnerem w NATO, sąsiadem w Europie, zatem konieczny jest w tych negocjacjach również wzajemny szacunek, ale ważna jest też treść tych negocjacji, ostateczny wynik korzystny dla Unii Europejskiej.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, ni este Parlamento Europeo ni los ciudadanos de los 27 - Estados miembros votaron el *brexit*; lo hizo una exigua mayoría de ciudadanos británicos; y solo entonces se pone en marcha el equipo negociador —dirigido por el señor Barnier, con el apoyo de este Parlamento Europeo— para velar por los derechos de los ciudadanos europeos, por la integridad de las cuatro libertades —tal y como están interpretadas por la jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia— y por la justicia en el reparto de los costes. Esta es la posición de la Unión Europea.

Pero del lado británico solo vemos confusión; y hemos visto deportaciones; y hemos visto la división social, generacional y territorial, la fractura de la propia sociedad británica. Ese es el resultado de un referéndum en el que se han salido con la suya el nacionalismo reaccionario y la demagogia populista azuzada por la extrema derecha, cuyos discursos infames hemos soportado, una vez más, en esta Cámara.

Y esos son los fantasmas contra los que nació la Unión Europea; esos son los enemigos a los que se enfrenta la Unión Europea y a los que tenemos el deber de derrotar. Y nos vamos a asegurar de que lo haremos.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, dovoľte mi na začiatok povedať, že práve teraz je čas na spoluprácu a hľadanie prienikov. Spojené kráľovstvo a Európska únia musia nájsť vhodnú cestu pre odchod z Európskej únie. Žiaľ, tento návrh uznesenia diktuje Spojenému kráľovstvu, ako má napredovať. Napríklad pán Verhofstadt odmietol ďalší dialóg, kým pani premiérka nepríde s finančnou ponukou. Ale nevie pán Verhofstadt, že pri akomkoľvek vyjednávaní prehráva ten, kto prvý udáva cenu? Všetci vieme, že živobytie mnohých Britov v Európe a tiež občanov EÚ v Spojenom kráľovstve je ohrozené. Aj pre viac ako deväťdesiat tisíc Slovákov v Spojenom kráľovstve, ktorí tam žijú, je potrebné zabezpečiť dodržanie ich sociálnych práv vrátane možnosti bývať na britskom území s celými rodinami. Slováci popri iných Východoeurópanoch prispeli k životnej úrovni Britov a nesmú byť len tak odložený nabok. Som presvedčený, že moji britskí kolegovia budú vo svojich rozhodnutiach prezieraví a múdri, pretože akýkoľvek rozvod je drahý, bolestivý a zanecháva jazvy. Napriek odchodu by sme sa mali naučiť spolu vychádzať ako bratské národy a príkladom by mohlo byť rozdelenie Československa v roku 1993.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, estas negociaciones certifican que ni los defensores del *brexit* ni el Gobierno del Reino Unido creyeron nunca que los británicos decidiesen abandonar la Unión Europea. Ahora hay que asumir lo decidido y aparecen la improvisación y la melancolía. Por eso, antes que nada, hay que persistir en negociar rápidamente las condiciones del divorcio, incluido el coste de la factura, priorizar el debate sobre los derechos de la ciudadanía y blindar el trabajo por la paz realizado por la Unión Europea en Irlanda del Norte. Mostrar, en definitiva, lo mejor de la Unión; asentar la mejor convivencia posible por separado en el futuro; y, quién sabe, ofrecer argumentos para regresar a la vida en común.

Toda una lección sobre lo que aporta a la Unión y sus valores el derecho a decidir. Aclara a quienes se van el alcance real de su decisión; obliga a quienes nos quedamos a insistir en lo que nos une: un espacio de derechos, libertades y prosperidad; una unión voluntaria, construida desde abajo, suma real de toda nuestra diversidad, capaz de representarnos como agente global, que nunca se nos ocurriría imponer a porrazos, porque convence. Y, en un escenario así, nuestro futuro —como ha dicho Juncker— es la unión, no el *brexít*.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I have been listening to this debate with extreme attention. I am not a specialist in divorce issues, as I have been living with my spouse almost as long as the UK has been in the EU and we do not have any thoughts of breaking up. However, the key to a harmonised and hateless divorce lies on the basis that both sides recognise their mistakes and do not blame it all on the other side. In my opinion, there is space for improvement in that respect on both sides of the British Channel. Finally, I would ask the British Conservatives: please do not hire Boris Johnson as your defence lawyer, because he is so untypical of the British people: a man with no good manners.

(Applause)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διαδικασία της αποχωρήσεως του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να γίνει με τρόπο πολιτισμένο, ανάλογο του κύρους των δύο μερών. Από την πλευρά της, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν πρέπει να επιδεικνύει εκδικητική διάθεση, διότι οι πολίτες της Μεγάλης Βρετανίας αποφάσισαν να αποχωρήσει η χώρα τους από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αλλά και η κυβέρνηση του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου δεν πρέπει να χρησιμοποιεί ως ομήρους τους υπηκόους των υπολοίπων χωρών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως που ζουν και εργάζονται εκεί, απειλώντας να καταστρέψει τη ζωή των ιδίων και των οικογενειών τους.

Θα συμφωνήσω με τη θέση του κυρίου Verhofstadt ότι πρέπει στο Μπέλφαστ να γκρεμιστούν οι φράκτες που χωρίζουν κάποιες συνοικίες της πόλεως. Αυτό πρέπει να γίνει, διότι η κατάσταση αυτή είναι απαράδεκτη. Είναι όμως, εξίσου, απαράδεκτο να διατηρείται η πράσινη γραμμή στη Λευκωσία, την πρωτεύουσα της Κύπρου, τμήμα της οποίας κατέχεται παράνομα από την Τουρκία. Πρέπει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση —γιατί και αυτή ευθύνεται για αυτή την απαράδεκτη κατάσταση—, να λάβει τα μέτρα της ούτως ώστε να πιεστεί η Τουρκία και να λήξει αυτή η απαράδεκτη κατάσταση, η οποία μειώνει το κύρος της πολιτισμένης Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se domnívám, že Evropský parlament dnes musí vyslat jasný signál jako odpověď těm občanům, kteří žijí v nejistotě. Ať už je to 3,2 milionu občanů z členských zemí, kteří žijí na území Spojeného království, nebo naopak občanů Spojeného království, kteří žijí na území členských států, kterých je 1,2 milionu.

Říkáme, že přechodné období je možné, ale musí mu předcházet dohoda o všech zásadních otázkách a po tuto přechodnou dobu budou platit *acquis communautaire*. Tedy Evropská unie dokazuje svoji akceschopnost a reakci na zásadní problémy, zatímco Spojené království nemá jasno. Myslím, že to je také jasný signál populistickým a separatistickým snahám v jiných členských státech. Na závěr chci říci, že brexit je pro mne zklamáním, o to více se musíme snažit, aby naše vztahy do budoucna byly co nejlepší, abychom dokázali spolupracovat, je to závazek vůči těm, kteří hlasovali proti brexitu.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, doresc de la bun început să subliniez că susțin rezoluția și felicit grupurile politice care și-au asumat o asemenea revoluție. Vin dintr-o țară care are îngrijorări privind situația cetățenilor săi care trăiesc în Marea Britanie. Problematika eventualei introduceri de către Marea Britanie a vizelor pentru cetățenii din țara mea ulterior datei retragerii Marii Britanii din UE, constituie un subiect major pentru mine și țara mea.

Discriminarea unor cetățeni europeni, oricare ar fi naționalitatea lor, este de neacceptat. De aceea, felicit că în rezoluție avem acest cuvânt magic: „reciprocitate”. Trebuie să asigurăm un tratament egal, de reciprocitate. Aceasta trebuie să fie condiția de bază alături de plata în 28 a tot ce s-a cheltuit din bugetul Uniunii Europene și nu în 27. Felicit raportorii – decizia de a părăsi Uniunea Europeană are un cost și acest cost trebuie suportat și de cel care și-a asumat decizia, nu numai de cei cărora, oricum, le-a creat probleme de reorganizare.

Este păcat însă că suportă acest cost și cetățenii care nu au votat Brexitul. Ar fi foarte interesant ca Marea Britanie să aibă un referendum în cunoștință de cauză după ce se negociază în Brexitul.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση για το Brexit αναδεικνύει τα θεμελιώδη στοιχεία λειτουργίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το δικαίωμα αποχώρησης ενός κράτους μέλους από την Ένωση είναι αδιαπραγμάτευτο. Είναι κυρίαρχο δικαίωμα ενός κράτους μέλους να φύγει. Οι διετείς διαπραγματεύσεις έχουν ως στόχο να διευκολύνουν την ενάσκηση αυτού του δικαιώματος και όχι να παρακωλύσουν το δικαίωμα εξόδου. Εδώ γίνεται μια προσπάθεια, από την πλευρά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, να τεθεί σε ομηρία ένα κράτος μέλος το οποίο επιθυμεί να αποχωρήσει. Γίνεται ουσιαστικά προσπάθεια διάσπασης αυτού του κράτους μέλους, καθώς δίνονται δικαιώματα στη Βόρειο Ιρλανδία να παραμείνει μέλος της Τελωνιακής Ένωσης. Επίσης, δίνεται δικαίωμα στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να αποφασίζει και για το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο μετά την αποχώρησή του. Νομίζω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να επικεντρωθεί στη διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των πολιτών της Ένωσης που βρίσκονται στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, μεταξύ των οποίων πάνω από 63.000 Έλληνες συμπολίτες μας.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Michel Barnier, négociateur en chef pour le Brexit. – Monsieur le Président, au terme de ce débat dense, vif et long, mes premiers mots seront pour remercier le Parlement européen de ses nombreux témoignages de soutien au travail que j'ai l'honneur de conduire avec la confiance du président Juncker, des services de la Commission, et en confiance avec votre propre équipe, celle de Guy Verhofstadt et tous les membres du *Brexit Steering Group* du Parlement européen et des présidents de groupe.

Nous avons besoin de ce soutien et de cette confiance, et aussi de cette unité dont fait preuve le Parlement, dans sa très grande majorité. Au terme de ce débat durant lequel je vous ai tous écoutés avec attention et en m'excusant de ne pas répondre, comme je le fais habituellement, à chacune et à chacun d'entre vous, je voudrais dire brièvement quelques mots.

D'abord, je voudrais dire clairement à beaucoup de ceux qui se sont exprimés, qu'il y a deux mots que je ne peux pas accepter, car ils ne correspondent nullement, ni à mon état d'esprit, ni à mon attitude. Ce sont les mots de revanche et de punition.

J'ai pour le Royaume-Uni, depuis très longtemps, une très grande admiration. Je rappelle même souvent qu'en 1972, pour mon premier vote en tant que jeune citoyen français, j'avais alors 21 ans, j'ai fait campagne en faveur du référendum organisé dans mon pays pour l'adhésion du Royaume-Uni, de l'Irlande, du Danemark et de la Norvège. Cela n'a pas été facile pour le jeune membre du parti gaulliste que j'étais à l'époque, et je n'ai jamais regretté ce vote. J'ai pour votre pays, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés du Royaume-Uni, une très grande admiration et jamais, au grand jamais, vous ne trouverez dans mon attitude le moindre esprit de revanche et la moindre intention de punition. Jamais!

(Applaudissements)

Monsieur Farage, il y a un autre mot que je n'accepte pas et que vous avez prononcé à nouveau, qui est celui de rançon. Il n'y a pas de rançon, il n'y a pas de facture de sortie. Il y a simplement le fait qu'au moment où vous décidez de partir, nous vous demandons de solder les comptes. Ni plus, ni moins! De payer ce à quoi vous vous êtes engagés!

(Vifs applaudissements)

J'ajoute que ce point est important si nous voulons, comme vous l'avez vous-même souhaité, bâtir dans l'avenir une relation différente, mais solide et durable, en matière de commerce, en matière de protection de la sécurité, de lutte contre le terrorisme et de défense. Nous avons besoin de confiance entre nous pour une relation durable dans l'avenir. La clé de cette confiance est aussi que vous acceptiez objectivement de solder les comptes.

Il y a quelque chose que vous avez dit, les uns et les autres, que je ne comprends pas. C'est l'idée que le négociateur européen que je suis ou l'Union européenne voudrait faire traîner les choses ou voudrait vous retenir, qu'elle jouerait la montre. Mais, Mesdames et Messieurs, le référendum au Royaume-Uni a eu lieu le 23 juin 2016. Nous avons reçu la lettre de Theresa May notifiant cette volonté de retrait le 30 mars 2017. Nous avons, en raison des élections au Royaume-Uni, attendu la fin juin 2017 pour commencer cette négociation. Nous ne jouons pas la montre. Vous avez pris le temps. Nous respectons ce temps, mais franchement je ne peux pas accepter ce reproche.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Nous sommes même prêts, et je suis prêt, à accélérer et à intensifier le rythme des négociations autant que nous le pourrons.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, il y a quelques points que je voudrais télégraphiquement qu'on comprenne bien ou qu'on comprenne mieux.

Le Royaume-Uni a décidé de quitter l'Union européenne. C'est son choix souverain. Il quitte en même temps, selon ce que dit le gouvernement britannique, «le marché unique et l'union douanière», après 44 ans d'intégration. Je recommande que personne, vraiment personne, ne sous-estime la complexité, les difficultés juridiques, humaines, sociales, économiques et financières de cette décision. Je recommande également que chacun de ceux qui ont pris cette décision accepte d'en assumer les conséquences.

(Applaudissements)

Deuxième point, nous respectons le choix souverain des citoyens britanniques. Nous mettons en œuvre le retrait que vous avez choisi. Nous voulons que ce retrait soit ordonné, et pour beaucoup de raisons je pense qu'il vaut mieux que vous quittiez l'Union européenne le 30 mars avec un accord plutôt que sans accord. Il en va de l'intérêt commun. Nous respectons ce choix, mais nous vous demandons de respecter l'Union européenne. Nous vous demandons de respecter le fait que nous serons intransigeants sur l'intégrité du marché unique, le respect des règles de fonctionnement et l'autonomie de décision de l'Union européenne. Le Brexit ne peut pas avoir des conséquences payées par les contribuables de l'Union européenne. Le Brexit ne peut pas avoir pour conséquence de fragiliser le marché unique et les quatre libertés qui en font intrinsèquement partie.

(Vifs applaudissements)

Enfin, nous aurons les uns et les autres, et vous-mêmes Mesdames et Messieurs les députés comme élus des peuples, des comptes à rendre aux citoyens, qui sont notre priorité, s'agissant de leurs droits. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aux contribuables. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aux entreprises. Nous aurons des comptes à rendre aussi à ceux qui ont construit depuis 60 ans cette Union européenne et dont nous sommes les cogarants et les coresponsables.

Je veux simplement que les comptes que nous allons rendre au terme de cette négociation, Mesdames et Messieurs, soient des comptes justes et vrais.

Je ne reviendrai pas sur les différents points de la négociation qui sont en suspens. Nous avons accompli des progrès, clarifié beaucoup de points. Je dis que l'intérêt général requiert d'avancer par étapes. Nous avons peu de temps entre aujourd'hui et octobre ou novembre 2018 pour aboutir à ce traité sur le Brexit, c'est-à-dire sur le divorce ou le retrait ordonné, et le cas échéant, puisque cela a été demandé par le gouvernement britannique, sur une éventuelle période de transition dont les conditions ont été clairement encadrées par votre résolution d'avril dernier et par les lignes directrices du Conseil. Ce sera une période courte, encadrée, pendant laquelle nous maintiendrons, parce que c'est notre raison d'être, la totalité de l'architecture de régulation des conditions budgétaires, juridiques et le rôle de la Cour de justice. C'est votre demande que d'avoir cette période de transition courte, c'est notre droit de dire qu'elle se fera dans les conditions qui sont celles du marché unique.

Nous ne sommes pas surpris par cette demande de transition, nous l'avions prévue, nous en discuterons le moment venu, et j'aurai besoin d'un mandat pour le faire.

Je précise aussi simplement à l'intention de M. Farage un point juridique. L'accord commercial que vous souhaitez ne peut pas être signé avec un État membre de l'Union. Il faut que vous soyez juridiquement sortis, que vous soyez en dehors, pour que nous signions cet accord.

Mesdames et Messieurs, nous garderons tout au long de cette négociation qui continue, l'espoir que le ton constructif, adopté par Theresa May dans son discours de Florence, sera maintenu et consolidé, et que nous pourrions dès la semaine prochaine accomplir de nouveaux progrès.

Pour ce qui me concerne, dans la responsabilité qui m'a été confiée, avec votre confiance et votre soutien, tout au long des mois à venir, je ferai en sorte que les négociations restent dignes, calmes et fermement attachées aux principes de l'Union européenne.

(Applaudissements vifs et prolongés)

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi.

Angelo Ciocca (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chiedo davvero un attimo di attenzione, è un intervento importante. In Tunisia, esattamente nel porto di Sfax, si sta consumando il rapimento di due cittadini europei, di due cittadini italiani che si chiamano Giacomo e Salvatore, due cittadini che sono detenuti sul loro peschereccio sequestrato dal governo tunisino da ben 18 giorni: 18 giorni senza cibo, senza energia elettrica e a Salvatore mancano ormai i medicinali.

Chiedo davvero, in nome del rispetto dei pescatori, del lavoro, della libertà, di aiutare Salvatore e Giacomo a rientrare in Europa, a rientrare in Italia.

Presidente. – Avverterò immediatamente il Servizio esterno perché si possano intraprendere tutte le iniziative utili quanto meno in relazione alla fornitura di medicinali a uno dei due cittadini europei che sono detenuti dalla Tunisia.

Mi auguro che si possa arrivare quanto prima alla loro liberazione. Appena uscito dall'Aula chiamerò il Servizio esterno in modo che si possa avviare immediatamente un'iniziativa da parte europea.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), in writing. – Negotiation efforts between the EU and the UK seem to be stagnating. It has become apparent, now more than ever, that there is a great need for clear political direction from the UK and for a sense of partnership between the two parties. To my mind, the most important aspect of the negotiations is the status of European citizens living in the UK – especially that of Romanian nationals – which must be clearly defined so as to avoid the risk of confusion with non-EU migrants. Moreover, the UK must honour its promise to continue its financial contributions to the EU budget until the end of this financial year (following rule n+3). I am delighted to see that, given the circumstances, the EU is speaking with one voice, highlighting the coordination and collaboration among all the leading EU players.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los negociadores de la UE y el Reino Unido no han logrado progresos suficientes en las áreas clave, condición necesaria para comenzar las discusiones sobre la futura relación bilateral. Valoramos positivamente las clarificaciones de la primera ministra británica, Theresa May, en su reciente discurso en Florencia, pero seguimos pidiendo propuestas concretas para: garantizar en su totalidad los derechos que disfrutaban actualmente los 4,5 millones de ciudadanos de la UE y el Reino Unido, respetar los compromisos financieros asumidos por el Reino Unido con la UE, y resolver la cuestión fronteriza entre Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, en línea con el acuerdo de Viernes Santo. Además, para dar por concluida la primera fase de negociación es necesario que se garantice el respeto a la legislación comunitaria hasta el momento de la salida oficial del Reino Unido de la Unión. La votación de esta sesión plenaria confirma la unidad del Parlamento junto a las otras instituciones comunitarias.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D), *írásban*. – Több mint hat hónapja tartanak a Brexit tárgyalások, de még mindig nem látszik tényleges előrelépés. A brit miniszterelnök firenzei beszéde adott némi lendületet a tárgyalásoknak, de még mindig jelentősek a nézetkülönbségek. Különösen igaz ez a mintegy 3 millió, az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU állampolgárok ügyében.

Szaporodnak azok a jelek, amelyek arról tanúskodnak, hogy a brit hatóságok már jelenleg is hátrányosan megkülönböztetik az EU-s állampolgárokat. Éppen ezért támogatom az Uniónak azt a javaslatát, amely szerint az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU-s állampolgárok, illetve az EU-ban élő brit állampolgárok kollektíve kapjanak azonos jogokat. Vonatkozik ez a családegyesítés, valamint a már korábban megszerzett jogok fenntartására is. Ez a megoldás jelentős mértékben javítaná az Egyesült Királyságban élő, az ott dolgozó magyarok helyzetét is.

Hiszen az Orbán kormány semmit nem tesz ezeknek az embereknek az érdekében, magukra hagyta őket. Nemcsak szavazati jogaik gyakorlásában korlátozza őket, hanem szociális biztonságukkal sem törődik. Számunkra azonban az Egyesült Királyságban élő honfitársaink ügye fontos, meghatározó európai kérdés. Csak akkor fogjuk megszavazni a brexit-tárgyalások eredményeit, ha azok egyértelműen megvédik az állampolgári jogokat, s biztosítják honfitársaink már megszerzett jogait.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – Los negociadores de la UE y el Reino Unido no han logrado progresos suficientes en las áreas clave, condición necesaria para comenzar las discusiones sobre la futura relación bilateral. Valoramos positivamente las clarificaciones de la primera ministra británica, Theresa May, en su reciente discurso en Florencia, pero seguimos pidiendo propuestas concretas para: garantizar en su totalidad los derechos que disfrutaban actualmente los 4,5 millones de ciudadanos de la UE y el Reino Unido, respetar los compromisos financieros asumidos por el Reino Unido con la UE, y resolver la cuestión fronteriza entre Irlanda e Irlanda del Norte, en línea con el acuerdo de Viernes Santo. Además, para dar por concluida la primera fase de negociación es necesario que se garantice el respeto a la legislación comunitaria hasta el momento de la salida oficial del Reino Unido de la Unión. La votación de esta sesión plenaria confirma la unidad del Parlamento junto a las otras instituciones comunitarias.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Brexit-neuvottelut ovat edenneet ristiriitaisten viestien saattelemana ja moni asia on edelleen auki. Tosiasia on, että Britannia voi lähteä unionista ilman varsinaista erosopimusta, sillä sopimuksen Euroopan unionista (SEUT-sopimus) 50 artiklan mukaisesti pelkkä ilmoitus riittää. On näin ollen kaikkien EU-maiden ja kansalaisten intressissä, että erosopimus syntyy.

Britannian pääministeri May on todennut, että on parempi lähteä ilman sopimusta kuin huonon sopimuksen kanssa. EU:n tulisi pyrkiä välttämään sopimukseton tila, sillä se vaikeuttaisi mm. ulkomaankauppaa ja kansalaisten asemaa. On selvää, että Britannia edellyttää erosopimuksen lisäksi kattavaa vapaakauppasopimusta. Parasta olisikin pyrkiä neuvotteluissa nopeasti eteenpäin ja varmistaa, että kaikkia osapuolia hyödyttävä vapaakauppasopimus voi syntyä. Näin on mahdollista saavuttaa erosopimus, jonka pohjalta Britannia vastannee taloudellisista velvoitteistaan pidemmän aikaa. Mikäli kustannuksia tulisi lisää siksi, että Britannia ei vastaisi velvoitteistaan maaliskuun 2019 jälkeen, olisivat seuraukset kaikkien jäljelle jääneiden EU-maiden veronmaksajille kohtuuttomia. Olennaista on varmistaa, että brexitin jälkeen EU:n budjetti myös pienenee samassa suhteessa kuin brittien osuus on ollut maksuista. Lisäkustannuksia EU:n nettomaksajille kuten Suomelle ei saa syntyä.

Monika Smolková (S&D), písomne. – Pri rokovaníach EÚ s Veľkou Britániou má rozhodujúce slovo aj EP, ktorý je aj priebežne informovaný o stave rokovaní. To dáva záruku transparentnosti a v konečnom dôsledku aj schválenia zmluvy, ktorá bude po vystúpení Veľkej Británie z EÚ dávať záruky všetkým 3,2 milióna občanom EÚ, ktorí žijú alebo pracujú vo Veľkej Británii, všetky práva a povinnosti také, aké mali pred brexitom. Týka sa to aj 1,2 milióna občanov Veľkej Británie, ktorí žijú alebo pracujú v niektorom členskom štáte EÚ. Oceňujem prácu komisára p. Barniera, ktorý sa veľmi dôsledne zhostil úlohy hlavného vyjednávača. Vyjednávanie zmluvných podmienok, za akých Veľká Británia vystúpi z EÚ, nie je jednoduché, pretože brexit má vážne dôsledky ľudské, sociálne, hospodárske a finančné. Medzi hlavné témy pri vyjednávaní sa tiež musí dostať aj otázka Írska a Severného Írska, kde osobitné okolnosti je potrebné zahrnúť do zmluvy o vystúpení, aby sa nezaviedli pevné hranice, aby bol zachovaný mierový proces a aby platila Veľkopiatočková dohoda. Ako najťažší bod v rokovaníach sa javí finančné vyrovnanie, pri ktorom EÚ chce, aby Veľká Británia splatila všetky svoje záväzky, ku ktorým sa zaviazala pri schvaľovaní viacročného finančného rámca na roky 2014-2020. V konečnom dôsledku nemôže 27 členských štátov doplatiť na rozhodnutie jedného členského štátu, ktorým bol brexit.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), na písmie. – Kolejná runda negocií medzi Komisją Europejską a Wielką Brytanią zakończyła się 28 września. Pomimo iż po wystąpieniu premier Wielkiej Brytanii Theresy May we Florencji dało się odczuć nową dynamikę rozmów i przebiegały one w konstruktywnej atmosferze, postęp nadal nie został uznany za wystarczający. Wielka Brytania zgodziła się nadać „bezpośredni skutek” umowie o wyjściu z UE. Daje to więcej pewności i stabilności obywatelom UE w Wielkiej Brytanii. Jednak nadal pozostają rozbieżności w zakresie jurysdykcji Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości. Konieczne jest także przedstawienie klarownego stanowiska Wielkiej Brytanii w zakresie pełnego wywiązania się ze zobowiązań finansowych wobec UE.

Nierozwiązana pozostaje także m.in. kwestia uznawalności wykształcenia. A jest to szczególnie ważne, ponieważ dotyczy tysięcy młodych osób, zarówno obywateli Wielkiej Brytanii, jak i UE. Studenci, którzy rozpoczynają naukę przed dniem wyjścia Wielkiej Brytanii, muszą mieć pewność, że mogą ukończyć kurs na tych samych warunkach, na jakich go rozpoczęli, oraz że nadal będą mieli dostęp do pożyczek studenckich i innych form wsparcia finansowego na takich samych warunkach. Dodatkowo studenci, którzy rozpoczynają naukę muszą mieć pewność, że uzyskane kwalifikacje zostaną uznane zarówno w UE, jak i w Wielkiej Brytanii, a po ukończeniu kursu zachowają takie same prawa pobytu w Wielkiej Brytanii, jakie przysługiwały im przed dniem wyjścia.

4. Abstimmungsstunde

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

4.1. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017) (Abstimmung)

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK

Vizepräsidentin

President. – Dear colleagues, before proceeding to the votes, allow me to make a short personal statement. Some of you know that I am the leading candidate for the Austrian Greens in the snap elections on 15 October. This means that I will be leaving this Parliament. It also means that this is the last time I will chair the votes with you as your Vice-President.

(Loud applause)

I would like to thank you for these eight years in which I have been working with many of you in this Parliament, sharing this spirit of cooperation rather than confrontation that unites us, or at least the majority of us here, and also for the three years as one of your Vice-Presidents. They have been very good years for me, and I promise you I am taking this European spirit that I have experienced here with me to our national debates and to the Austrian parliament.

I am also looking forward to working with you in the future in a different function, because we need strong national parliaments as well as a strong European Parliament. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

4.2. Beschränkung der Verwendung bestimmter gefährlicher Stoffe in Elektro- und Elektronikgeräten (A8-0205/2017 - Adina-Ioana Vălean) (Abstimmung)

4.3. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato) (Abstimmung)

4.4. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh) (Abstimmung)

— *After the vote:*

James Carver (EFDD). – Madam President, I apologise to my colleagues, but my voting system seems to be breaking down. It is not often, as my colleagues can appreciate, that I vote in favour of something in this place, but it would be quite nice to be able to do so on occasion when I wish to. Could one of the technicians look at it in the break? It is very sticky and static, and it needs sorting out.

4.5. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (Abstimmung)

4.6. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi) (Abstimmung)

4.7. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer) (Abstimmung)

President. – That concludes the vote.

5. Stimmerklärungen

5.1. Stand der Verhandlungen mit dem Vereinigten Königreich (B8-0538/2017, B8-0539/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, although we saw some openings in the Prime Minister's speech in Florence, many key issues remain to be solved. The most important among them is the question of the Irish border. I am from the Western Balkans myself and I know perfectly well that a hardening of the border will lead to tensions and nationalist sentiments. We cannot pretend that the whole solution to the problem is to promise not to have a physical border. In Bosnia there are no physical borders, but nationalism and tensions certainly do exist.

In order to prevent it, you need to make sure that no new mental, cultural and religious borders are established, and that demands much clearer thinking than has been the case so far. Therefore, the message that we send here is very clear: the time for political games should be over. It is crucial for Prime Minister May to translate her commitments into tangible actions. We need to move forward before the tensions and conflicts arise. The citizens of Northern Ireland need clarity, action and responsible leaders.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Madam President, 'we do not know' I said in answer after answer at an event I spoke at about Brexit recently. It didn't make for a very interesting or illuminating evening, but the crippling uncertainty is playing havoc with the British economy. Every sector that I speak to has their own Brexit problem: ground-breaking research that relies on cross-border data flows, imports and exports at our ports, or the freedom of movement of Newmarket's race horses. Today's debate shows what everyone knows. The talks are not going well, and that is hardly surprising when we have a cornered Prime Minister more worried about negotiating with her own cabinet than engaging constructively in the Brexit process.

As a remainer, I have no doubt that Britain will emerge from all of this weaker, poorer and more isolated. Today, this Parliament has sent another warning siren. So I say to the British government: with a bumpy landing ahead why, oh why, do you choose to deliberately fly through turbulence?

(Applause)

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az Egyesült Királyságban körülbelül félmillió magyar ember él, többnyire gazdasági kényszerből. Az ő segítségüket szeretném kérni a jelentés hatodik paragrafusával kapcsolatban, amelyet megszavaztam egyébként, és amelynek tartalma az, hogy az Egyesült Királyságnak tartózkodnia kell mindennemű adminisztratív, vagy más gyakorlattól, amely többek között a munkahelyükön akadályozza, vagy hátrányosan megkülönbözteti az Egyesült Királyságban élő EU-27 tagállamok polgárait.

Kérdezem a magyar honfitársainktól, természetesen mindannyian azt szeretnék leginkább, hogy minél előbb jöjjenek haza, de ameddig ez nem történhet meg, tájékoztassanak e-mailben, levélben arról, hogy melyek ezek a gyakorlatok, hátrányosan megkülönböztető gyakorlatok, milyen problémáik, milyen nehézségeik akadnak a munkahelyen, vagy máshol, a közigazgatásban vagy egyéb helyen a brexit-folyamat óta.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, may I just thank you for your service to Parliament and wish you well as you go to fresher pastures.

Briefly on Brexit: 557 Members supported this resolution. I think what it says very clearly is that this Parliament wants to see progress. I hope that the vote and the strength of the resolution will urge the UK side, in particular, to come forward with a much stronger and clear negotiating position, because every day there are new nuances to the Brexit story. There are problems and concerns about child protection laws around the border, about the supply of medicines to citizens, about health care and about all sectors of society. Therefore, we need progress on the withdrawal agreement before we can move forward to the next phase and I hope today's vote will nudge those at the negotiating table to make that progress.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodo predsjednice, Ujedinjena Kraljevina bila je važan motor u ekonomskoj liberalizaciji Europe i stvaranju pretpostavki za uspostavu jedinstvenog tržišta u punom smislu riječi. Njezino vodstvo u uklanjanju suvišne regulative, micanju barijera i otvaranju naših tržišta te jasan zagovor nacionalnog suvereniteta i načela supsidijarnosti nedostajat će ovoj Zajednici.

No, Britanci su jasno izrazili svoju volju da napuste Europsku uniju i na nama je sada da taj proces prođe uz što manje problema za građane i tvrtke s obje strane Kanala.

Glavovala sam protiv ove Rezolucije jer nepotrebno preporučuje dodatno kompliciranje ovog ionako kompliciranog razvoda. Parlament se ne bi trebao previše miješati u pregovore o Brexitu, nego to prepustiti Komisiji i Vijeću.

U protivnom će pregovori postati još složeniji s naše strane jer se bliže europski izbori, a naši budućí bliski odnosi s Ujedinjenom Kraljevinom ne smiju biti žrtva populizma i politikanstva.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το Brexit είναι ένα χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα για το πού μπορούν να οδηγήσουν οι εθνολαϊκιστές μια χώρα, όσο ισχυρή και αν είναι. Η Μεγάλη Βρετανία προχωράει τώρα σε αχαρτογράφητα νερά. Δυστυχώς, έξι μήνες μετά την έναρξη των διαπραγματεύσεων δεν έχει σημειωθεί επαρκής πρόοδος. Τη θέση αυτή εξέφρασαν τόσο το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο όσο και η Επιτροπή. Η Μεγάλη Βρετανία δεν έχει αποδεχθεί τη διατήρηση των δικαιωμάτων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών που κατοικούν εκεί. Πάνω από τρία εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίοι, εκ των οποίων πολλές χιλιάδες Έλληνες, ζουν, σπουδάζουν και εργάζονται στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο. Δεν μπορεί αυτοί να πληρώσουν τους τακτικισμούς του κυρίου Cameron. Πολλοί από αυτούς έχουν εγκατασταθεί εκεί, έχουν κάνει οικογένειες, είναι πλέον το σπίτι τους. Δεν μπορούμε να αλλάξουμε τη ζωή τους. Δεν μπορεί να τους χρησιμοποιεί η βρετανική κυβέρνηση ως μοχλό πίεσης στις διαπραγματεύσεις. Δεν μπορεί να τους εκφοβίζει στέλνοντάς τους, κατά λάθος, χαρτιά απέλασης. Οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες που κατοικούν στην Αγγλία θα πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να απολαμβάνουν τα ίδια δικαιώματα που τους εξασφαλίζει σήμερα η ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία. Τίποτα λιγότερο δεν μπορεί να γίνει αποδεκτό από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, на референдум, на който голяма част от британското общество беше подведено с едностранни и недоказани твърдения с гласовете на малко над един милион граждани, започна период на несигурност и на политически сътресения във Великобритания. За съжаление това се пренася към Европейския съюз.

Близо 5 милиона граждани ще бъдат директно повлияни от решението на Великобритания да напусне Европейския съюз. Тук говорим за близо 3,6 милиона европейски граждани, от които 200 хиляди български граждани във Великобритания и над 1,2 милиона британци в Европейския съюз.

Смятам за фрапантно липсата на резултат, вече над шест месеца след обявяването на напускането на Великобритания на Съюза, относно правата на всички тези граждани. Смятам за безотговорни спекулациите на някои британски политици, че Великобритания може да напусне Съюза без да уважи финансови задължения, направени години преди референдума.

Несигурността, която произлиза от решението за напускане, не трябва да бъде транспонирана върху европейските производители и земеделци. Затова подкрепих тази резолюция.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ho votato a favore della risoluzione perché ritengo che il Parlamento debba con forza proseguire nei negoziati, per far sì che il Regno Unito rispetti i termini e le condizioni per uscire dall'Unione, a ormai un anno e mezzo dal referendum. Ritengo, infatti, che allo stato attuale i progressi risultino davvero poco evidenti.

Credo che l'Unione europea non possa invece permettersi né incertezze, né insicurezze. L'Europa deve continuare ad agire e a garantire la salvaguardia dei cittadini europei che oggi vivono oltre Manica: sono più di 600.000.

Ritengo, infine, di dover sottolineare che la Gran Bretagna debba mantenere fede agli impegni finanziari, laddove invece essa presenta un notevole deficit commerciale con l'Unione europea. Su questo e su altri punti chiave dell'accordo restano divergenze e incoerenze, che vanno al più presto affrontate.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se domnívám, že je důležité, že Evropský parlament přijal toto usnesení, dokonce s velkou podporou, když pro něj hlasovalo 558 poslanců a poslankyň. Je to důležité, protože EP se nakonec bude vyjadřovat k výsledné dohodě mezi Evropskou unií a Spojeným královstvím. Je to tedy důležitá informace o politické shodě na dalším postupu při vyjednávání.

Usnesení velmi správně akcentuje práva občanů EU ve Spojeném království a jejich zajištění je jedním z hlavních úkolů, které jako Unie máme před sebou. Do těchto úkolů bezesporu patří také zachování britské účasti v programech, jako je Erasmus+ a Horizont 2020. Je to v zájmu občanů jak EU, tak Spojeného království. Také zcela souhlasím s přístupem, který ve zprávě je zvolen, co se týká Severního Irsku. Je nutné, aby hranice na irském ostrově zůstala i po brexitu otevřená, a pokud to tak má být, rýsuje se možnost, že by Severní Irsko samotné bylo součástí celní unie a vnitřního trhu.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D). – Madam President, there are more than 3 million EU citizens residing in the United Kingdom and more than one million citizens of the United Kingdom residing in the EU. They are all asking the same question: what will happen to me, to my family, to my job, to my business, to my studies? People are right to be worried about the future, because they do not really know what will happen come Brexit day.

Moving to another country is a major decision, usually based on the rights that they would have in that country. That is why maintaining the whole set of EU rules on citizens' rights, with the full application of the four freedoms and without imposing unnecessary hardship on the citizens of the EU living in the United Kingdom and vice versa, is the main prerequisite for the success of these negotiations.

The work of this Chamber determines the fate of over 4 million citizens, and that is why we first need to defend people's interests, and that is why I voted in favour of this resolution.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, I echo the sentiments of colleagues wishing you the best in your future endeavours: you have always tried to chair with impartiality, and for that I thank you.

Article 8 of the Lisbon Treaty is all about neighbourliness and cooperation. That is the spirit in which the Brexit negotiations should be conducted, and a bit of give-and-take would be great, but it seems it is all give from Theresa May and all take from Michel Barnier.

This resolution is a shopping list: the EU's goals on the Northern Ireland border but nothing on Gibraltar's. No one wants a hard border, but effectively this place are the ones raising the possibility. Do we want reciprocal rights for EU citizens in the UK and vice versa? Of course we do, but please do not gold-plate it to your children and children's children.

This sufficient progress test is nothing more than an unnecessary hurdle designed to throw a spanner in the works. This intransigence will not help Britain, it is true – but it will not help the EU either. Theresa May should fight fire with fire and act with boldness, not cowardice.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałem przeciwko i chciałem zwrócić uwagę, że Brytyjczycy dlatego wyszli z Unii Europejskiej, że nie lubili praw rządzących Unią Europejską. W związku z tym jeżeli będziemy się domagali, żeby pewnych ludzi, którzy są pod władzą brytyjską, obowiązywało prawo europejskie, to efekt będzie dokładnie odwrotny. Przypominam, że nawet taki zbrodniarz jak Lenin mieszkał spokojnie w Londynie, mimo że nikt: ani Rosja, ani Europa, ani Niemcy, ani Francja nie domagały się, żeby Wielka Brytania traktowała go uczciwie. Dlatego też moim zdaniem trzeba zostawić tę sprawę Brytyjczykom, bo każde mieszanie się w to spowoduje niechęć Brytyjczyków w stosunku do obywateli Unii Europejskiej.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Debatten i dag gav et rystende indtryk af den manglende forståelse for folkeafstemninger som et demokratisk instrument, der findes i dette hus. Måske fordi man i EU generelt igennem hele sin historie har gjort, hvad man kunne, for at undgå folkeafstemninger, ja ofte betragtet dem som en decideret ondskab, som kun ville forhindre projektet. Men dermed har man også bragt sig selv i et modsætningsforhold til den europæiske befolkning. Det er det modsætningsforhold, der gør, at vi i dag står i en situation, hvor briterne ikke længere føler, at de kan være medlem af denne Union.

Årsagen til, at briterne forlader EU, skal ikke findes i London, men skal findes i Bruxelles, i Frankfurt, i Strasbourg og i alle de andre europæiske hovedstæder, hvor man i årevis har ført en linje væk fra den europæiske befolkning, som rettelig har et krav om at blive hørt og spurgt. Vi skylder ikke briterne spot og nedgørelse, men respekt for at holde folkeafstemninger, således at befolkningen bliver spurgt.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, bhí áthas orm gur glacadh leis an moladh seo inniu, 557 ina fhábhar, 92 ina choinne agus 29 ag staonadh. Ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a chur in iúl do Guy Verhofstadt, Michel Barnier agus gach duine a chabhraigh linn cás na hÉireann a chur chun tosaigh sna pointí seo: go háirithe ag iarraidh na moltaí agus na socruithe a ghabhann le comhaontuithe Aoine an Chéasta a choimeád agus teorainn bhog a bheith againn in ionad teorainn chrua. Bíodh sin ráite, tá sé soiléir go bhfuil bac mór ann, is é sin mar a thug Michel Barnier air: “An Bille Imeachta”: Iarraim ar údarás na Ríochta Aontaithe teacht le moladh cinnte chun an bille seo a réiteach. Má éiríonn linn é sin a réiteach, níl aon dabht in aon chor ach gur féidir linn an spriocdháta a bhaint amach agus idirbheartaíocht a chríochnú in am.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovolu mi, abych se vyjádřil k mému dnešnímu hlasování, kdy jsem hlasoval pro tuto zprávu, ale s jedním důležitým aspektem, že mi v ní chybí stále konkrétní vyjádření toho, jak bude dále financován rozpočet EU. My nemáme stále dohodnuté parametry, jakými budeme spolupracovat s Velkou Británií, a jak se tedy bude Velká Británie a na čem konkrétně v rámci evropské politiky podílet. A to si myslím, že je důležité nejenom pro sestavování rozpočtu pro příští rok, ale především pro sestavování rozpočtu po odchodu Velké Británie. A proto bych chtěl vyzvat především vyjednavače i Velkou Británii, aby tento aspekt zohlednili a co nejrychleji se snažili na něm domluvit.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the European Parliament has recognised that Theresa May’s Brexit has the potential to be devastating for the island of Ireland. The prospect that is envisaged by the Tories, and unfortunately endorsed by Unionist representatives in this House today, of a small island of 6.5 million people operating with one part inside the EU and another part outside would be catastrophic for the Irish economy north and south, for Irish agriculture north and south and, of course, for the Irish peace process.

I welcome the fact that Parliament understands that all of Ireland needs to remain in the single market and the Customs Union. Of course, the easiest way for this to happen is for Britain to do so also, but if they do not do this they need to know that they have no mandate to drag the North of Ireland into economic, political and social upheaval. The Irish Government must now seize upon this report and lead the demand for special status for the North of Ireland in the EU in order to protect our entire island.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, Michael Gove has promised that, as a result of Brexit, the UK will be able to export more pig’s ears to China. The Tory Government has certainly made a pig’s ear of these negotiations and what is quite clear is that they have run out of ideas completely. The Tories continue, distracted by a power tug-of-war, to steer us towards a cliff edge, promising three decades of damage to the UK economy. Yet many persist in the deluded belief that we can cherry-pick.

Parliament’s resolution is a much needed reality check. That is why I supported it. What is clear in my region, the West Midlands, is that no-deal means costs going up by 30% to 40% in dairy and meat and 10% in cars. That is why Labour is saying ‘no deal is no way’ – whereas we will deliver one that retains jobs and protects rights.

David Davis, as you know, having not even delivered on his own job at the moment, is talking about his retirement whilst millions of people living in the EU and the UK have no idea what their future may be.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, I would like to add my appreciation to those who have already thanked you for your service in the chair.

This resolution and, even more, the speeches that we have heard today bear very little relation to the progress in the talks. Britain has already said that it will not put up any physical border in Ireland. We have already said that we will look at the financial settlement in the spirit of wanting advantageous outcomes for our European allies, as well as for us. We have already said that all of the social, working, residence and healthcare rights of EU nationals in the UK will be guaranteed. These things have been formally stated. I understand that there are some colleagues here who love to have a go at us – this is not new, it is not a post-Brexit thing; it is an occasional occurrence in this House.

What I think is strange – and will strike people in the UK as strange – is to have British MEPs, particularly in the S&D Group, lining up to say that everything is going to be catastrophic and that the economy is tanking when that bears no relation to people's actual experience. I hope that after we have left we will remove the main cause of contention and will be able to enjoy a better relation than we have now.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, a poco più di un anno dal referendum sulla Brexit, la consapevolezza del ruolo dell'Unione europea è notevolmente cresciuta. L'Unione ha davanti a sé una finestra di tempo per cogliere anche le opportunità offerte da questo inciampo, a patto però che lo stato di incertezza generato da una coabitazione non voluta, non si proroghi oltre misura.

L'accettazione della richiesta del Primo ministro britannico di un periodo transitorio di durata limitata va dunque subordinata alla certezza della durata di tale periodo, alla prosecuzione di tutto l'acquis comunitario, alla piena giurisdizione della Corte di giustizia dell'Unione e alla conclusione di un vero e proprio accordo di recesso, che contempli soprattutto le questioni relative ai diritti dei cittadini europei nel Regno Unito e dei britannici in Europa, al destino dell'Irlanda e agli obblighi di liquidazione finanziari vantati dall'Unione europea.

Alle belle parole dello scorso settembre, Theresa May deve far seguire i fatti. Senza un recesso ordinato dal Regno Unito dell'Unione, nessun negoziato dovrà essere avviato sul quadro delle future relazioni, né alcuna fase di transizione potrà e dovrà essere concessa.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałabym przyłączyć się do podziękowań moich kolegów za współpracę z Panią.

Obywatele Unii Europejskiej osiedlają się w innym państwie członkowskim, korzystając z możliwości stworzonych im przez prawo wspólnotowe i zakładając, że przez całe życie będą mogli z tego prawa korzystać. Dlatego też wszelkie negocjacje o postbrexitowym statusie obywateli Unii w Zjednoczonym Królestwie czy Brytyjczyków w Unii powinny opierać się na tym prawie. Nie może być więc zgody na jakiegokolwiek zmiany w ich położeniu prawnym czy faktycznym. Nowe propozycje Londynu nie są zgodne z tym prawem, dopuszczają bowiem ograniczenia na przykład w prawie do łączenia rodzin, a także wprowadzają nową nie do końca zdefiniowaną kategorię osoby osiedlonej. Negocjacyjny postęp osiągnięty w tym zakresie jest więc dalece niewystarczający. Przeciagające się rozmowy potęgują niepewność wśród ludzi zwykłych, ani obywatele Unii mieszkający w Wielkiej Brytanii, ani Brytyjczycy w Unii nie wiedzą jaka przyszłość ich czeka. Ta niepewność uniemożliwia im zabezpieczenie swoich praw i interesów, dlatego też negocjatorzy powinni jak najszybciej dojść do porozumienia mieszczącego się w ramach regulacji traktatowych i gwarantującego poszanowanie praw nabytych. Nie możemy się zgodzić na żadne ich ograniczanie. Z tych powodów poparłam dzisiaj z pełną odpowiedzialnością rezolucję Parlamentu Europejskiego.

5.2. Bewirtschaftungs-, Bestandserhaltungs- und Kontrollmaßnahmen für den Übereinkommensbereich der ICCAT (A8-0173/2017 - Gabriel Mato)

Oral explanations of vote

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa importante relazione doveva recepire al meglio, nel diritto dell'Unione europea, le misure adottate addirittura dieci anni fa dalla commissione ICCAT: servono per la conservazione e gestione dei tonnidi. Non solo lo facciamo in ritardo, ma lo facciamo anche male. Era l'occasione buona per tutelare le specie ittiche ma anche il reddito dei nostri pescatori, penso soprattutto a quelli della pesca artigianale e tradizionale.

Andava, prima di tutto, aumentata la trasparenza allo scopo di contrastare la pesca irregolare e illegale. L'allocazione delle quote di tonno e pesce spada doveva seguire criteri trasparenti e oggettivi, inclusi quelli di natura ambientale, prestando attenzione altresì all'aspetto sociale e all'economicità. La distribuzione dei totali ammissibili di cattura (TAC) doveva venire prestando particolare attenzione alla pesca tradizionale e artigianale e incentivare i pescherecci dell'Unione che utilizzano dispositivi di pesca selettivi o tecniche di pesca con ridotto impatto ambientale.

Anche per questo ci sarebbe dovuta essere una particolare attenzione alla disciplina delle catture accessorie o accidentali, per venire incontro alle richieste della pesca artigianale, che cerca di sfruttare una risorsa non più in crisi da alcuni anni, ma la cui abbondanza sta mettendo in ginocchio decine e decine di imprese.

Per queste ragioni non ho potuto sostenere la relazione che, così emendata, rappresenta addirittura un passo indietro rispetto allo status quo.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quienes más han perdido con la ineficacia de la Comisión y de los Estados miembros en la aplicación del Convenio de la CICA son los pescadores artesanales que, tradicionalmente, han sido el principal motor económico de las localidades costeras. En España no se cumple el artículo 17 de la política pesquera común porque el Partido Popular utiliza la cuota como arma política para enfrentar a los pescadores, a los territorios y, además, quitarles su derecho a la mar.

El Partido Popular deja la mayor parte de la cuota de atún rojo a grandes factorías pertenecientes al grupo Balfegó y Ricardo Fuentes y, después, se llenan la boca de patria. Patria es defender el pan de los pescadores artesanales. Lo hemos dicho en reiteradas ocasiones: vamos a apoyar todo aquello que tenga que ver con la mejora de la vida de las personas que cada día se baten el cobre en la pelea contra las olas para mantener a su familia. Esperamos que este informe no se quede en papel mojado y que la Comisión castigue y persiga a quienes legislan favoreciendo a las grandes corporaciones mientras empobrecen a nuestro pueblo y destruyen nuestro bien común.

5.3. Stärkung der wirtschaftlichen Stellung der Frau im Privatsektor und im öffentlichen Sektor in der EU (A8-0271/2017 - Anna Hedh)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałam przeciwko dokumentowi nie dlatego, że jestem przeciwna wyrównaniu płac za taką samą pracę czy przeciwko poprawie statusu materialnego kobiet albo podniesieniu świadczeń emerytalno-rentowych, które można osiągnąć, niekoniecznie realizując cele barcelońskie. Głosowałam przeciw, gdyż prezentowane zapisy i tendencje w rzeczywistości skierowane są przeciwko kobiecości i kobietom, redukując ich rolę do jednego z elementów napędzającego maszynę ekonomiczną i PKB. Propozycje, poza osłabieniem więzi rodzinnych, dyskredytacją macierzyństwa uprzedmiotawiają kobiety. Ponadto istnieje wiele innych kontrowersyjnych zapisów, chociażby określenie zdrowia reprodukcyjnego zamiast szanującego godność określenia prokreacji. Najlepszą opiekę nad dzieckiem sprawuje kochająca matka i nikt i nic jej nie zastąpi. Pamiętam dokładnie z czasów komunizmu, kiedy nie zważając na różnice psychofizyczne mężczyzn i kobiet oraz ich szczególne powołanie, namawiano Polki do wsiadania na traktory.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dzisiaj w Polsce obchodzimy rocznicę tak zwanego czarnego protestu, czyli protestu kobiet przeciwko propozycjom rządowym, które godziły w ich autonomię i samodzielność. Z tego powodu także i dzisiaj będzie protest rocznicowy. Korzystając z okazji, przesyłam wszystkim organizatorkom słowa solidarności z ich ideami i dążeniami, ale wracając do dokumentu, o którym rozmawiamy, prezentuje on wiele aspektów nierówności. Chciałbym ze względu na brak czasu wskazać na jeden, moim zdaniem, bardzo kluczowy, a mianowicie w wielu krajach, także w Polsce, obowiązuje różnica wieku przechodzenia na emeryturę. To jest rzecz, która absolutnie dyskryminuje kobiety, powoduje, że otrzymają mniejsze świadczenia emerytalne na emeryturze, a jest fałszywie prezentowana jako przywilej. To jest skandal.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, celebro que este informe aborde cuestiones clave para el feminismo, como la economía de los cuidados y la educación sexual. Lamento que no se concrete en sanciones decididas contra la cultura de la violación, que se expande peligrosamente a través de los medios de comunicación y que tiene relación con la cosificación de los cuerpos de las mujeres y, por tanto, con la mercantilización de la vida.

La economía de los cuidados, no es una frase decorativa: trata de una nueva forma de producir, de entendernos, de establecer las reglas que rigen nuestras sociedades, donde no solo el beneficio cuenta.

Hoy en día, desgraciadamente, hasta nuestros vientres se convierten en mercancía. Por eso, la solidaridad entre nosotras, mujeres del mundo, es más necesaria que nunca; también con nuestras hermanas musulmanas, a las que, por desgracia, este informe ha dejado olvidadas, a pesar de que viven con nosotras, puerta con puerta, en Europa y que merecen todo el respeto y el reconocimiento del mundo.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovolu mi zdůvodnit, proč jsem nehlasovala pro tuto zprávu, přestože dlouhodobě se zasazují o odstranění diskriminace žen a za ocenění žen jako matek a jejich rodičovské péče. Jsem přesvědčena o tom, že ekonomické postavení žen podpoříme tím, když uznáme hodnotu mateřství a jejich rodičovské péče, když umožníme volbu mezi rodičovskou a profesní kariérou. Tato zpráva ale bohužel nejde tímto směrem. Bohužel jde za hranu toho, co je možné diktovat členským státům a firmám. Například v tom, že navrhuje opatření pro firmy, kterým by se závazně muselo sledovat rozdíly v platech. Rovněž jsem nemohla souhlasit s požadavkem na zavedení životopisů bez uvedení pohlaví nebo např. s tím, aby všechny ekonomické modely a daňové politiky zohledňovaly genderové hledisko. Tato zpráva je stereotypní i v tom, že i do ekonomického posílení žen zavádí sexuální a reprodukční zdraví.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Én egyetértettem ennek a jelentésnek az alapvetésével, ami végighúzódik rajta, mégpedig hogy sajnálatos, hogy mind a mai napig a nők tekintjük majdnem hogy a kizárólagos felelősnek mindannak, ami a családban, a családi otthonban, a háztartásban történik.

Valamiféle hamis biológia különbségre hivatkozva azt mondjuk, hogy a nők képesek, alkalmasak és kötelesek kizárólagosan a gyermekek gondozására, nevelésére, az idős hozzátartozók gondozására, a betegápolásra, az esetleges fogyatékos családtagnak az ápolására, és ez elviselhetetlen és folyamatos fizikai, lelki és lelkiismereti terhetek okoz a nőknek.

Alapvető lenne ennek a szemléletnek a megváltoztatása, abban ugyan egyetértek, hogy nem kötelezheti az Unió a tagállamokat, de oktatásban, médiában és EU-s ajánlásokban jó lenne valahogy odahatni, hogy társként, férfi és nő, valamint a társadalom együtt vállalja fel ezeket a fontos feladatokat.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W sprawozdaniu o wzmocnieniu pozycji gospodarczej kobiet wbrew deklarowanym intencjom znalazły się narzędzia społecznej degradacji kobiet. Uzależnianie pozycji gospodarczej kobiet od tzw. prawa do aborcji – jakkolwiek by nie było nazywane jako prawa reprodukcyjne czy seksualne – przyjmuje za rzecz naturalną nakłanianie kobiet przez pracodawców do wyboru między macierzyństwem a pracą zawodową. Oczywiście takie podejście wpisuje się w kulturową presję na kobiety, żeby rezygnując – częściowo albo wręcz całkowicie – z macierzyństwa, konkurowały z mężczyznami. Traktowanie macierzyństwa i roli kobiet w rodzinie jako obojętnych albo zbędnych społecznie prywatnych opcji jest najwyższą krzywdą, którą liberalny konsumpcjonizm wyrządza kobietom, dzieciom, rodzinom i całemu społeczeństwu.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, timing is everything. I wanted to make a very brief comment on this report. I think in this House we talk a great deal about the invisibility of women on boards or in politics and how we want to empower young women as they go through the education process to become more visible, but I think very often we forget that there are a great deal of women in very invisible positions in low-paid work. I think we do not spend enough time talking about their empowerment and looking after their rights because they are invisible to many of us. So I think there is a challenge to women, when we are addressing this issue, to talk about all women across all sectors and not just the more visible parts of our society and our economy. That is why I think this is an important report. I supported it, but I think we need to widen the debate and be more inclusive.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quería expresar, como ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, mi satisfacción por algunos elementos de este informe, como el hecho de reconocer que las barreras estructurales que frenan el empoderamiento económico de las mujeres tienen su origen en múltiples formas de desigualdad y discriminación.

Para superar estas barreras, las respuestas tienen que ser integrales. Es necesario combatir la segregación en el mercado laboral, pero también en la educación, la formación y las tareas de cuidados. Debemos reducir la precariedad de las trabajadoras en los llamados sectores feminizados, como el trabajo doméstico y de cuidados. Y necesitamos, asimismo, escuelas infantiles y servicios de asistencia para personas dependientes, que sean públicas, accesibles, suficientes y de calidad.

Debemos luchar contra la discriminación directa e indirecta que existe en el mercado laboral, garantizar que haya igual retribución para un mismo trabajo, combatir las formas atípicas y precarias de los contratos laborales, que afectan sobre todo a las mujeres, y garantizar una redistribución de los cuidados con, por ejemplo, permisos de paternidad y maternidad iguales e intransferibles.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Jeg kommer fra et land, hvor vores statsoverhoved, Hendes Majestæt Dronningen, er en kvinde, hvor formanden for parlamentet, Folketinget, den absolut højeste civile position, man kan opnå, er en kvinde, min tidligere partiformand Pia Kjaersgaard, hvor det absolutte flertal af partier i Folketinget har eller har haft kvindelige formænd, og hvor man derfor i hele det politiske spil kan se, at det ikke er kvoter og reguleringer og politiske beslutninger, der gør, at kvinder vinder frem, men deres egenskaber, deres evner, deres gåpåmod, deres arbejde. Det er dét, vi skal fremme. Ikke et særligt pussenusse-system, hvor vi laver kvoter ud fra særlige politiske bestemmelser. Slet ikke når vi kan se, hvordan det eksempelsvis i Norge, hvor man for 10 år siden lavede et sådant system, er slået fejl. Det har ikke dér ført til topposter i erhvervslivet, men det kan vi til gengæld i Danmark se, at det har inden for det politiske uden kvoter. Derfor er det vejen at gå. Frivillighedens vej og respekten for den enkelte. Ikke kvoter.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I supported this report, which promotes the crucial protection of women's rights in the private and public sectors. Economic empowerment of women is not only important in a human rights context, but also for the EU's prosperity at large and for its fair and economic growth.

When discriminatory practices have a negative impact on women due to their gender, they are hindered from reaching their full potential and from engaging with society in a meaningful way. Important tools for empowering women in the workplace include ensuring the work-life balance, wage mapping, gender quotas, gender equality plans, equal pay for equal work of equal value, collective agreements and social partners.

Eurostat findings show that the proportions of working women compared to working men in the EU in full-time work amounts to a full-time employment rate gap of 25.5%. Irish society has much to thank the EU for in terms of gender equality legislation, but there are still many improvements to be made in Ireland and across the EU.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, v tomto parlamente som tri a pol roka a za tú dobu sa snažím častokrát poukazať na to, že EÚ sa potrebuje prinavrátiť ku rešpektovaniu judeo-kresťanských hodnôt a k pochopeniu o Bohu a prirodzených úlohách a rolách mužov a žien v živote. Na jednej strane je schválenie tejto správy pre mňa Pyrrhovo víťazstvo, prešli obidva moje pozmeňujúce návrhy a som presvedčený, že si musíme začať poriadne vážiť neplatenú prácu mužov a žien, ktorí sa starajú o starších príbuzných alebo postihnutých v rodine a ich obeta zostáva nepovšimnutá. Na druhej strane, napriek tomu, že tieto návrhy môžu pomôcť veľa ľuďom a prešli, som veľmi nespokojný s touto správou, lebo je tá z najhorších, aké sme tu kedy za posledné obdobie mali. Znovu presadzujú a prinášajú LGBTI agendu, tlačia nás do schvaľovania kvót pre firmy, ktoré sú kótované na burze, aby tam bolo viac žien, alebo jednoducho presadzujú veci, ako je napríklad Istanbulský dohovor, s ktorým mnohé štáty nesúhlasia. Takže som musel hlasovať proti.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Niepokojące są dla nas informacje, iż w ostatnich latach w zasadzie nie udało się osiągnąć postępu w kwestii dyskryminacji kobiet. Powinniśmy postawić sobie pytanie, czy instrumenty, które wykorzystujemy, są rzeczywiście efektywne, jeżeli nadal wynagrodzenia kobiet są średnio o 16% niższe w porównaniu do tych, które dostają mężczyźni, a emerytury i renty otrzymywane przez kobiety średnio o 40% niższe w porównaniu do tych, które dostają mężczyźni. Silna dyskryminacja w okresie aktywności zawodowej prowadzi do realnej głębszej pauperyzacji kobiet na starość.

Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawczynią, że zachodząca właśnie rewolucja cyfrowa może być szansą na wzmocnienie pozycji gospodarczej kobiet. Konieczne jest jednak podjęcie działań zachęcających kobiety nie tylko do zdobywania formalnego wykształcenia w tym obszarze, ale przede wszystkim do przekwalifikowywania się i podnoszenia swoich umiejętności. Powinniśmy też wypracować instrumenty ukierunkowane na wspieranie kobiet chcących założyć przedsiębiorstwa w obszarze cyfrowej gospodarki. Stoimy przed wyjątkową szansą wzmocnienia pozycji gospodarczej kobiet. Dlatego też poparałam sprawozdanie w głosowaniu końcowym, szczególnie jednocząc się z Polkami walczącymi dzisiaj na polskich ulicach o swoje prawa podstawowe.

5.4. Maßnahmen gegen Einschränkungen des Handlungsspielraums der Zivilgesellschaft in Entwicklungsländern (A8-0283/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)

Oral explanations of vote

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, în Rusia, societatea civilă este eliminată prin lege. *Transparency International*, de exemplu, sau organizația *Memorial* fondată de Andrei Saharov și alte peste o sută de organizații neguvernamentale au fost forțate de Kremlin să își încheie activitatea. În Turcia, judecători, profesori, oameni de afaceri, familiile lor, jurnaliști, au fost arestați pe motivul că sunt guleniști. Landromatul azer a arătat cum zeci de politicieni europeni sunt corupți de Azerbaidjan. Propaganda mincinoasă cu George Soros a început să-și facă loc și în țări europene și se îndreaptă spre dictatură, evident, pentru că efectul este împotriva societății civile.

Ca să nu fim ipocriți, respectăm valorile Uniunii Europene sau nu? Da sau nu? E simplă întrebarea. Dacă da, atunci să impunem aceste valori tuturor țărilor din UE și din afara UE și să le sancționăm drastic, inclusiv financiar, pe cele care nu le respectă.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, en cuanto a la votación de este tipo de informes, la verdad es que cada vez están más vacíos de contenido, pero repletos de una hipocresía política, y es lo que hace que una se sienta un poco absurda en este Parlamento.

Cuando promovamos un comercio internacional entre iguales, que anteponga las personas y el medio ambiente al lucro de las transnacionales, y cuando existan cláusulas vinculantes al respecto, entonces sí estaremos haciendo algo por la sociedad civil de los países en vías de desarrollo.

Mientras tanto, me gustaría emplazar a mi homóloga española Jiménez Becerril, ponente de este informe, a preocuparse por la sociedad civil española, una sociedad civil a la que su partido, el Partido Popular, está reprimiendo y enfrentando.

El día 1 fue Cataluña y hoy es Murcia. Es la sociedad civil española en su conjunto la que es reprimida y la que sufre una violencia digna de tiempos pasados. Están convirtiendo al Gobierno de España en una enorme vergüenza a ojos del mundo entero y de toda la gente que en España seguimos del lado de la democracia y de la libertad.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, antes de mais felicidades na sua nova contenda no seu país. Espero que tenha boa sorte e desejo-lhe grandes felicidades.

Senhora Presidente, votei a favor desta resolução porque entendo que a sociedade civil desempenha um papel central na construção e no reforço da democracia e na promoção da boa governação e as organizações da sociedade civil são agentes importantes na ajuda ao desenvolvimento. Realizam relevantes atividades no domínio social e ambiental, salvaguardam os interesses das pessoas com deficiência, vulneráveis e marginalizáveis, movimentos sociais e aos povos indígenas.

A União Europeia é o maior doador para as organizações locais da sociedade civil nos países em desenvolvimento e tem sido um ator de primeiro plano na proteção dos agentes da sociedade civil e dos defensores dos direitos humanos através do Instrumento Europeu para a Democracia e os Direitos Humanos e do Fundo Europeu para a Democracia.

Por tudo isto, Senhora Presidente, entendo que esta resolução é, na minha opinião, de facto, um instrumento fundamental na defesa dos direitos individuais e no reforço da democracia. Muito obrigado. Por isso votei a favor.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, in my role as Vice-President, I look after dialogue with religious communities and non-confessional organisations and we talk a great deal about freedom of religion and belief. In the developing world, a vibrant civil society is very important in terms of protecting that freedom. It is something that we work on with the UN and we need to deepen the involvement of civil society in the developing world on this issue because it is a matter of life or death in many developing countries.

The problem – and it has been addressed by this report – is that we are seeing, in some developing countries, a shrinking space, with little room for civil society to have its place. Therefore, as part of our development policy, we need to help these countries to respect the full range of human rights. We need to empower communities and individuals and we need to make this a priority.

5.5. Bekämpfung der Cyberkriminalität (A8-0272/2017 - Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi)

Oral explanations of vote

Philippe Juvin (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, ce que je voulais dire est assez simple.

Quand on tape certains mots-clés dans Google, je ne vais pas les citer car ce sont des mots très simples, parmi les premiers résultats de recherche apparaissent les journaux d'Al-Qaida, du Front al-Nosra ou de l'État islamique.

Que trouve-t-on dans ces journaux? On y trouve des appels au meurtre et des informations sur la manière d'assassiner quelqu'un, de fabriquer une bombe et de crypter ses communications.

Si un seul journal papier était publié et mis en vente chez un libraire avec de tels contenus, le libraire et l'éditeur seraient évidemment condamnés, et le journal serait interdit.

Sur le plan numérique, en revanche, rien ne se passe. Il y a une totale impunité des diffuseurs numériques. Ce que nous voulons est très simple. Si l'on entend lutter contre le crime, il faut que tous ceux qui diffusent des contenus incitant au meurtre soient incriminés, poursuivis et punis. Car ces publications sont identiques, sous leur forme papier ou en version numérique. C'est là une question de bon sens, et si nous ne faisons pas cela, ne venons pas nous plaindre lorsque le prochain attentat se produira!

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl říct, že evropské instituce v posledních letech zažily několik kybernetických útoků. A myslím si, že z tohoto důvodu by neměly podceňovat kybernetickou bezpečnost. V řadě států vznikly speciální úřady, ale myslím si, že pořád chybí kooperace mezi jednotlivými úřady členských států a snaha, abychom opravdu jako celá EU čelili těmto hrozbám.

Dále je tady obrovský problém kybernetické šikany. Je to problém, kterému se nevěnuje příliš velikánská pozornost a kterému jsou vystaveni jak žáci, tak velmi často učitelé nebo ředitelé různých škol. A vedle represe bych chtěl říct, že v této zprávě oceňuji, že je zmíněná i prevence, protože si myslím, že prevence především v rodině, kdy vysvětlujeme, že některé věci se na internetu třeba nepublikují nebo se na něj nepíší, je velmi důležitá.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Bezpieczeństwo w cyberprzestrzeni urasta dzisiaj do problemu numer jeden. Ono dotyczy bezpieczeństwa narodowego, bezpieczeństwa państwowego, bezpieczeństwa gospodarczego, ale dotyka powoli już także bezpieczeństwa politycznego. Mamy coraz więcej uzasadnionych podejrzeń, że niektóre państwa ingerują w demokratyczne procesy wyborcze innych państw. To jest absolutnie niedopuszczalne, w związku z czym rodzina demokratycznych państw świata powinna się przeciwstawić tym wszystkim zagrożeniom zwłaszcza, że przecież technologie, o których mówimy, są technologiami przyszłości. Potrzebne są więc działania na rzecz ustanowienia międzynarodowego prawa dotyczącego bezpieczeństwa w cyberprzestrzeni oraz międzynarodowej współpracy na rzecz skutecznego wprowadzenia nowych norm prawnych w życie.

Stefano Maullu (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la lotta contro la criminalità informatica, credo, debba rappresentare una delle priorità dell'Unione europea per il valore che rappresenta e soprattutto per i settori che coinvolge: dalla lotta alla pedopornografia, ai reati informatici che colpiscono le aziende, alle truffe che sono in costante e continuo aumento, un vero grande pericolo! E l'uso che noi facciamo della tecnologia per tutte le nostre attività e per la vita quotidiana, rende il settore ancora più vulnerabile.

Credo che questo provvedimento non possa che tener conto della necessità per i paesi dell'Unione di fare un lavoro assolutamente corale, per poter utilizzare la lotta contro i crimini informatici soprattutto sul fronte su cui siamo più esposti: il terrorismo. Un terrorismo che è sempre più tecnologico, che mira a raccogliere il consenso attraverso il web, in una maniera assolutamente invasiva, che credo debba essere combattuto in maniera assolutamente dura e profonda.

E solo grazie a un lavoro che deve essere di squadra, di rete e di coesione attraverso i paesi è possibile ottenere questo risultato.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Madam President, thank you very much for your collegiality, and I wish you all the best in your future to come.

We have to strike a balance in enjoying the benefits of modern technologies without compromising on our security or privacy. Therefore, I fully agree with this report calling for the update of the European Union's cybersecurity strategy. It is important to enhance cooperation at EU level in order to fight the current and newly emerging cybercrime trends. Member States should combine their efforts for a better information exchange through Eurojust, Europol or the European Union's Agency for Network and Information Security.

Lastly, let's not forget that every single one of us can make small steps to avoid becoming a victim of cybercrimes. We therefore urge the Commission to launch information and awareness-raising campaigns for citizens so that they know the risks and can develop a good digital hygiene.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, dovoluji mi pár vět k samotnému hlasování. Já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože považuji za důležité, aby u těch forem trestné činnosti, které mají přeshraniční charakter, státy EU mnohem více spolupracovaly. Kyberkriminalita k tomuto objektivně patří. Žádný stát na národní úrovni není schopen tyto problémy vyřešit samostatně. Tady ten princip spolupráce 28 zemí je jednoznačně na místě a já jej podporuji. Takže zprávu jsem podpořil.

Ve zprávě je celá řada pozitivních, konkrétních věcí, které do budoucna bude třeba řešit. Je dobře, že vzniklo Evropské centrum pro boj proti kyberkriminalitě v rámci Europolu, ale bude třeba se také zabývat tím, jak toto centrum bude aktivní. Jestli to bude pouze úřad pro úřad nebo bude přinášet své výsledky. Důležité jsou ty části zprávy, které přinášejí preventivní opatření. Ty zvláště považuji za důležité a doufám, že se ta zpráva naplní.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Fru formand! Det, som bekymrer mig ved denne betænkning, er, når talen falder på »fake news« og »hate speech regulation«. Vi er alle sammen imod, at falske nyheder spredes. Vi er også alle sammen imod hadefulde udtalelser. Det er imidlertid en enorm magt at lægge i hænderne på få at afgøre, hvad der er falsk og sandt, at afgøre, hvad der er had og ikke had. Ved at lave den opdeling, hvor vi kriminaliserer den ene gruppe, men ikke den anden gruppe, er vi på vej ned mod en totalitær tilstand, hvor vi grundlæggende vil sætte nogle få mennesker til at være dommere over en af de mest vitale demokratiske rettigheder, nemlig retten til at ytre sig. Jeg tror ikke på et sådant stats- eller europæisk censursystem. Jeg tror, at borgerne – oplyste, kloge og dygtige til at navigere imellem nyheder – selv kan sondre imellem det sande og det usande, det gode og det dårlige.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report, which outlines the challenges and the legal gaps related to the threats posed by cybercrime. Cybercrime is one of the most pressing issues we face today. Across the EU it is increasing in intensity and is causing ever greater economic and social damage.

Europol's assessment of the threat posed by cybercrime is that it has affected the fundamental rights of individuals and that 80% of companies in Europe have experienced at least one cybersecurity incident. Children who are using the internet at an early age are particularly vulnerable to cybercrime. The proposals outlined by this report aim to address these challenges. They include improved responsibility and liability of service providers, and enhanced cooperation among police and judicial authorities, etcetera. To combat child exploitation online, an action plan has been proposed for the protection of children's rights online and offline in cyberspace. I agree with this.

To conclude, Madam President, may I wish you all the best for the future. I have always found you to be a very fine, honest and pleasant MEP.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože skutečně kybernetický prostor představuje velmi vážné nebezpečí do budoucna. Jsem velmi rád, že se mu zpravodajka ve své rozsáhlé zprávě věnuje a že získala takhle průřezovou podporu napříč všemi politickými frakcemi. Také jsem rád, že EU toto téma vnímá jako vážné a zásadní v okamžiku, kdy v Estonsku se k tomu konala speciální konference.

Já bych si vybral dvě okolnosti, které si myslím, že jsou velmi podstatné na té zprávě. Za prvé EU musí být lídrem, musí být na špici odbornosti, protože právě odbornost je předpokladem pro vyrovnávání se s hrozbami spojovanými s kybernetickými útoky. A za druhé je důležité, aby systémy, které budujeme, byly co nejvíce odolné, aby byly integrální. No a za třetí je důležité občany samozřejmě informovat o těchto hrozbách, aby byli připraveni na případné útoky.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamna președintă, în 2016, la Varșovia, NATO a recunoscut spațiului cibernetic drept una dintre amenințările în care alianța trebuie să se apere, la fel cum o face acum în spațiul aerian, maritim sau terestru.

Atacul WannaCry din mai anul acesta a lăsat în urmă peste 200 de victime din 150 de țări. Spațiul cibernetic nu are reguli și de aceea trebuie să dăm instrumentele necesare, inclusiv financiare, inclusiv accesul la toate bazele de date celor care luptă împotriva infracțiunii cibernetice.

În acest moment, lupta este total inegală; situația de astăzi arată că sunt insuficiente și inegale mijloacele de luptă. Dacă nu le dăm aceste instrumente și nu le creștem, repet, finanțarea și nu le dăm tot ce au nevoie, atunci vom avea și mai mulți morți pentru că știm foarte bine că infracțiunile cibernetice finanțează și terorismul și ajută la spălarea banilor.

Putem fi și noi cu un pas înaintea criminalității, înaintea infracționalității, pentru că altfel nu o să rezolvăm niciodată nimic.

5.6. Politische Beziehungen der EU zum ASEAN (A8-0243/2017 - Reinhard Bütikofer)

Oral explanations of vote

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Madam President, I voted in favour of this report because

EU-ASEAN relations are comprehensive and cover a wide range of sectors, including trade and investment, development, economics and political affairs. I believe that this report comes at the right time, as this year we celebrate the 40th anniversary of our formal relations and the 50th anniversary of ASEAN.

ASEAN is one of the world's most dynamic and fastest growing regions and the potential for the EU to deepen its relations with the region should not be neglected. A good example is that the EU granted the Philippines GSP+ status, and I think that we should advocate the launching of negotiations for a regional EU-ASEAN FTA. Of course we have to address not only the successes, but also the challenges faced by the EU-ASEAN relationship. The EU will continue to place human rights at the centre of its relations with third countries, and ASEAN countries need to comply with human rights standards and promote gender equality and women's empowerment.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Region Stowarzyszenia Narodów Azji Południowo-Wschodniej (ASEAN) to dzisiaj jeden z najbardziej dynamicznie rozwijających się regionów świata, także w czymś, co jest bardzo ważne, a więc nowych technologiach. Ten region jest też dla nas bardzo ważny, jeżeli chodzi o utrzymywanie światowego bezpieczeństwa, dlatego stosunki Unii Europejskiej z krajami ASEAN powinny być dla nas kluczowe i tak samo ważne jak stosunki na przykład z innymi krajami Azji jak Chiny, Indie czy Japonia. Natomiast musimy pamiętać, że w ramach tych stosunków powinniśmy rozwijać nie tylko współpracę ekonomiczno-gospodarczą, ale także działalność na rzecz demokracji i praw człowieka, kwestii klimatu i ochrony środowiska. Powinny to być sprawy równie ważne jak ekonomiczno-gospodarcze.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamnă președintă, Uniunea este al doilea partener comercial al ASEAN și primul furnizor de investiții directe. Până în anul 2020, Uniunea și statele membre s-au angajat să aloce peste trei miliarde de euro pentru a reduce sărăcia și a stimula dezvoltarea țărilor cu venituri mici. Dar acest ajutor financiar trebuie condiționat de respectarea drepturilor omului și de finanțarea societății civile, de eliminarea arestărilor abuzive și a dictaturilor.

De exemplu, *Amnesty* numește legile adoptate în diverse țări, cum ar fi Malaysia, Thailanda și altele, drept legi draconice. În Malaysia, în noiembrie 2016, 15 activiști au fost arestați pentru că au cerut reforma electorală. Sau, în Thailanda, în august 2017, studentul Pai a fost condamnat la cinci ani de închisoare pentru că a distribuit pe Facebook imaginea președintelui. Mulți alți activiști au fost arestați și anchemati pentru că s-au opus torturii și sistemului dictatorial. Adică o țară în care oamenii nu sunt liberi nu se va dezvolta niciodată și degeaba punem bani în ea.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl říct, že rozvoj vztahů se sdružením ASEAN je krok správným směrem. Je nutno ale při této příležitosti říct, že ten rozvoj vztahů není pouze ekonomický, ale musí být i politický. Musíme s řadou států sdružení ASEAN vést poměrně velmi otevřený dialog o lidských právech. Nemyslím teď jenom situaci Rohingů, ale musíme třeba se stát, jako je Vietnam nebo Laos, hovořit otevřeně o tom, co se v těchto státech děje a jak jsou zde potlačována lidská práva. Já osobně vidím ve sdružení ASEAN obrovskou příležitost. Poté, co se z této části začaly víceméně stahovat Spojené státy, si myslím, že Evropa zde může poměrně dobře investovat. A má zde velmi dobré jméno, takže věřím, že nadále budou vztahy s těmito státy posilovány.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, ke zprávě pana Bütikofera bych si dovolil říci, že mne velmi těší, že nás upozornil na to, jakým způsobem jsou země sdružení ASEAN pro nás strategické. Skutečně se jedná o třetí nejvýznamnější ekonomickou destinaci pro naše investování a to si myslím, že je velmi důležité zde podtrhnout. I z tohoto důvodu já jsem tuto zprávu podpořil. Chci zdůraznit roli tohoto prostoru, tzn. zemí sdružení ASEAN v boji proti terorismu. Myslím si, že to je důležité, abychom zmínili. A také chci závěrem podtrhnout fakt, že Amerika vyklízí tento prostor, já to pokládám za chybu, jedná se o diplomatickou příležitost pro evropskou diplomatickou službu i pro nás.

President. – Before adjourning the sitting I would like, on a personal note, to thank the interpreters for the great work they have been doing and continue to do in this Parliament, and also to thank all the departments of the Administration with whom I have really enjoyed working.

6. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(The sitting was suspended at 13.55)

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

7. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Ședința a fost reluată la 15.02)

8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

9. Lage in der Republik Moldau

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind Declarația Vicepreședintelui Comisiei/Înaltului Reprezentant al Uniunii pentru afaceri externe și politica de securitate referitoare la situația din Moldova (2017/2848(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, the last few years have been particularly intense for our relationship with Moldova. There are several reasons for this, including geography and the close ties between our people. But there is one reason in particular I would like to focus on, and that is the kind of relationship that we have proposed to Moldova.

A partnership with the European Union is not about spheres of influence and geopolitics. We do not ask our partners to pick sides. They do not have to choose between us and other global powers – this is not how our partnership works. Our partnership is always about improving the life of our citizens, inside the European Union, and of course inside Moldova. It is a partnership for, not against. It is about the economy and trade. It is about democracy, human rights, the rule of law and the fight against corruption. It is with this attitude that we are heading towards our Eastern Partnership Summit next month.

This is the spirit that led to the new association agenda that we adopted with Moldova last August, setting out the priorities for the implementation of the association agreement in the coming two years. And this is also the spirit that leads us to speak out when we see new challenges emerge for democracy in Moldova. This is what we did last July when a new electoral law was adopted.

Commissioner Hahn and the Vice-President/High Representative said very clearly many times that the new legislation contradicts the recommendations of the Venice Commission of the Council of Europe, and the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. Both these institutions had pointed towards the importance of broad political consensus on the reform, and of avoiding a system that would expose candidates to the influence of business interests. These suggestions have not been addressed by the new electoral law.

Since then, the law has not yet been implemented. The effects of this law on multi-party democracy will depend on how it is implemented. From our side, I can assure you that we will continue to closely monitor developments, particularly on the definition of single-mandate constituencies.

I know that you have discussed the electoral law within the framework of the decision on a macro-financial assistance programme for Moldova. This decision has been adopted in agreement with the European Parliament, and entered into force on 23 September 2017. Any payment, though, will depend on the respect by Moldova of political preconditions and by the implementation of a Memorandum of Understanding that we will sign with Moldova. These conditions will include reforms that are necessary to guarantee macro-financial stabilisation, together with the implementation of our Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement.

Turning now to reform for business, a healthy economy requires transparency in the financial and public sector; it requires a strong fight against corruption and money laundering; it requires a positive business climate. These are the reforms we will be asking for, because these are the reforms that the people of Moldova expect.

As you know, a massive banking fraud was recently unveiled in the country: a comprehensive investigation and the recovery of the diverted funds are also essential to the credibility of Moldova's economic system. Last year, in 2016, we saw important reform in the energy sector, including on the use of renewable sources: it is now crucial to complete this reform process, with the swift adoption of the energy law.

But a strong economy also needs to be supported by a strong and functioning democracy. For this reason, we will continue to monitor how Moldova implements recommendations of international partners regarding the new electoral law. A healthy democracy does not only depend on a good electoral law: it also needs a strong judicial system, a serious fight against corruption, and of course a free and open space for civil society organisations.

These are the issues that matter to the people of Moldova, and so these are the issues we care about. Our budget support aims precisely at supporting good reform in these fields. For instance, we have a budget support programme to support reforms in the justice sector, and for the moment we will not transfer any funds related to this programme since there has not been sufficient progress to justify these payments. There are also other pending budget support payments that are linked to democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

Turning to assistance now, this is how our partnership works. If you look at our package of assistance for 2017 to 2020, it has a strong focus on projects directly benefiting citizens, for instance on rural development, infrastructure and women's empowerment. Our assistance aims at supporting the reforms that will move Moldova forward, particularly towards the goal of political association and economic integration with the European Union. The more Moldova does to address its citizens' needs, the stronger our assistance and support.

When we discuss budget lines and reforms, it may sound like we are talking technicalities. But everything we do has a very concrete impact on the lives of many – in the European Union and in Moldova. It is a partnership for our people, with very practical benefits for both sides. Take the visa liberalisation that allows our citizens to travel freely between the European Union and Moldova, or the reforms that were adopted last year after our Council Conclusions on the Republic of Moldova of February 2016. The European Parliament has been very active in shaping our partnership and making sure that we always focus on what truly matters: helping Moldova become a stronger country with stronger democratic institutions and a stronger economy: a country that can truly address its citizens' needs.

Cristian Dan Preda, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule președinte, în sesiunea dinaintea vacanței am discutat în acest Parlament despre ajutorul macrofinanciar acordat Moldovei. Am decis prin vot să condiționăm trimiterea acestor fonduri de respectarea recomandărilor Comisiei de la Veneția de către autoritățile de la Chișinău. Reamintesc că această prestigioasă comisie declarase în mod foarte clar că trecerea la un sistem electoral mixt nu este de recomandat în prezent pentru Moldova.

Ce s-a întâmplat la două săptămâni după discuția și votul nostru din Parlament, cu care Comisia și Consiliul au fost, de altfel, de acord, la Chișinău, disprețuind toate aceste referințe, Parlamentul a votat modificarea legii electorale. De ce s-a întâmplat așa? Avem o explicație la îndemână pentru că, în mod public, președintele Dodon, un apropiat al lui Putin, și șeful Partidului Democrat, un apropiat al colegilor noștri socialiști europeni, au considerat că problema numărul unu a Moldovei este eliminarea tuturor partidelor cu excepția celor pe care ei înșiși le conduc.

În aceste condiții, cred că e rațional să solicităm Comisiei să aplice strict condiția fixată și să suspende transferul ajutorului macrofinanciar. Mai mult decât atât, cred că e necesară o monitorizare strictă a implementării legii electorale și a evoluției politice din Moldova din partea Comisiei, a Serviciului European de Acțiune Externă și a Parlamentului European. Consider că ar fi bine ca cinci membri acestui Parlament să se alăture acestui grup de monitorizare.

Victor Boștinaru, în numele grupului S&D. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, recunosc, aproape că înțeleg frustrările PPE, și totuși mă voi adresa în special domnului McAllister, domnului Brok, care au o solidă înțelegere a complexității situației din Republica Moldova.

Am auzit astăzi în discursul colegului meu român aceeași teză, o presupusă complicitate între Partidul Democrat și președintele pro-rus Dodon, și vă invit să discutăm faptele. Nu voi discuta de partea economică, știți mai bine ca mine, situația economică e în favoarea Republicii Moldova și acest lucru a fost confirmat și de Fondul Monetar Internațional și de Comisia Europeană. În primul rând, Guvernul Republicii Moldova a participat cu efective militare la manevrele organizate de NATO în Ucraina în această vară ca răspuns la manevrele Zapad 2017. Acest lucru s-a făcut cu opoziția președintelui Dodon. Președintele Republicii Moldova, pro-rusul Dodon, s-a opus sistematic nominalizării, în două rânduri, a ministrului apărării. Guvernul Republicii Moldova a cerut trupelor rusești să părăsească Transnistria și a făcut-o inclusiv de la tribuna Organizației Națiunilor Unite de la New York. Ce este și mai important, în aceste zile, în Republica Moldova, se discută de amendarea Constituției pentru a introduce un articol special referitor la integrarea europeană, pentru ca un viitor Dodon să nu poată să deturneze cursul acestei țări. Sunt aceste fapte complicități cu Rusia sau sunt exact opusul?

Discutând despre reforma electorală, domnule comisar, să fim clari: cei care manipulează subiectul reforma electorală uită sau nu vor să țină cont de faptul că această lege este 100 % *copy/paste* după legea electorală din Germania, este o lege democratică sau nu? Uită că au fost încorporate peste 80 % din recomandările Comisiei de la Veneția, acest lucru este democratic sau nu? Uită că noi nu putem judeca oportunitatea adoptării legislației? Într-un cuvânt, dacă nu sprijinim Moldova astăzi, o dăm pe gratis Rusiei și atunci vom spune la final „*Do svidaniya, Moldova!*”, dar pe mâna PPE-ului.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Od czasu aneksji Krymu wybór opcji zachodniej lub opcji rosyjskiej przez społeczeństwo i ewentualnie władze Mołdowy oznacza wybór zupełnie innych zasad bezpieczeństwa, zupełnie innych wartości, zupełnie innych zasad demokracji. Cieszę się, że dostrzegają to zarówno NATO, jak i Unia Europejska. Mołdowa stała się terenem priorytetowego projektu współdziałania obydwu organizacji w dziedzinie cyberbezpieczeństwa. Pochwalam politykę bezpieczeństwa rządu Mołdowy. Monitoruję postęp w tej dziedzinie i uważam, że jest ciekawy, interesujący i godny pochwały. Niestety również dostrzegam w tym kraju pewne niepokojące oznaki, do takich należy ciągłe monopol medialny i wpływy oligarchów.

Petras Auštrevičius, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, this is the third time in the last five months that we are discussing Moldova in this Chamber. As a standing rapporteur, it is not the kind of attention I would like to see for Moldova so repeatedly.

Let me start by addressing the Moldovan authorities very frankly: the main thing that I miss in Moldovan politics is a critical lack of a real consensus in the national political field. Do not expect Brussels to do it for you. Consensus must be built on a daily basis in Chișinău, Bălți and Comrat. The newly adopted election law was clearly a bulldozer-type move – not what we expect from an EU-associated partner. As a result, respectable international bodies – the Venice Commission and the OSCE – are ignored and bypassed. At home, smaller political parties feel unfairly pressed and even eliminated.

Moldovan citizens are waiting for a different type of politics. People, including us in this House, want to see the unimpeded publication of the Kroll 2 investigation report. We all expect no further delay in the identification and bringing to justice of those persons or politicians who are hiding behind this unprecedented bank fraud scandal. At the same time, we continue to be concerned to see biased legal proceedings, such as in the case of Chişinău Mayor, Dorin Chirtoacă. We stress that only an independent and depoliticised judiciary can deliver justice and trust.

I will keep repeating that I see today many missed opportunities for Moldova. As a true friend, I am critical of idea of the European future of Moldova. However, the country will continue losing until the moment when its authorities finally come to the conclusion that building a national consensus in a European way is exactly what makes Moldova's statehood stronger and consolidates its society.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, jako dlouhodobý člen delegace pro spolupráci – podtrhuji slovo „spolupráci“ – EU-Moldavsko bych mohl jedině přivítat, že EU systematicky, a to nejen finančně, přispívá na pomoc a rozvoj Moldavska. Moldavsko je členem Východního partnerství již od jeho vzniku, tedy od roku 2009. A rád slyším slova, že je to partnerství ne proti někomu, ale pro spolupráci.

Bohužel jsem nucen konstatovat, že doposud nedošlo k naplnění očekávání ani ze strany EU, ani samotných Moldavanů. Moldavsko stále zůstává nejchudší zemí v Evropě, korupce je na vzestupu, stát je veden fakticky oligarchy a občanská společnost zůstává nevyslyšena. Od všech dosavadních vlád jsme očekávali potřebné změny v justici, boji s korupcí a organizovaným zločinem. Vnitřní uspořádání státu je jistě věcí každého státu, ale racionálně uvažující člověk se musí ptát, zda je v pořádku plánovaná koncentrace moci v rukou jediného člověka. Domnívám se, že bychom měli vyhodnotit účinnost a prospěšnost projektu Východního partnerství pro všechny zúčastněné. Chci zdůraznit, že brána na Balkán – Moldavsko – by se neměla stát místem doutnajícího konfliktu či druhou Ukrajinou.

Igor Šoltes, v imenu skupine Verts/ALE. – Res je, kar so rekli kolegi o Moldaviji.

V tem zadnjem obdobju govorimo kar velikokrat, vendar situacija zaradi tega ni nič boljša, in upravičeno se sprašujem tudi sam, ali je smiselno pošiljati finančna sredstva v Moldavijo za njen razvoj in pomoč, ko pa ta sredstva izginjajo, ko pravzaprav tudi sredstva iz banke, ki pomenijo kar velik škandal, še vedno po tolikem času ne dobijo ustreznega epiloga.

Problem se v Moldaviji samo krepi in korupcija se povečuje, tudi situacija na področju svobode medijev in svobode govora ni idealna in se slabša.

Nevladni sektorji, nevladne organizacije govorijo tudi o množičnem kršenju človekovih pravic in pravzaprav o politiki izključevanja, o aretacijah, ki seveda nimajo nič skupnega z demokracijo in pa seveda tudi s pravičnim sojenjem. In to so signali, na katere mora tudi Evropski parlament ukrepati.

Tudi zaradi te situacije sem prepričan, da mora Parlament odigrati tudi svojo vlogo, in se strinjam s kolegom Predo, ki tudi predlaga, da se tudi predstavniki Evropskega parlamenta vključijo v ta monitoring situacije v Moldaviji ali pa s posebno misijo pregledamo vse te navedbe.

James Carver, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the international community should support this country on a basis of maintaining strict neutrality on their democratic process. The EUR 100 million euros in grants and loans to Moldova recently approved by the European Union have, of course, the usual strings attached, not least when you consider Parliament's recent reports underlining your support, given their forthcoming parliamentary elections.

With respect to your comments, Commissioner, this naked ambition to attempt to influence Eastern European nations is just another part of the EU's neo-colonialism or, as you prefer to call it, foreign policy. Surely the time has come, colleagues, for a different approach. Why not recognise the geographic and cultural dilemmas affecting such countries and, instead of the usual tug-of-war with Russia, use Moldova's position as a conduit to attempt to build bridges.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je savais déjà que l'Europe, cela pouvait être la guerre économique, du fait du principe de concurrence, qui implique la guerre.

Je sais maintenant, et je constate tous les jours, que l'Europe, c'est aussi la guerre politique menée au nom des droits de l'homme, de l'état de droit ou de la démocratie, à usage très ambivalent et, selon les pays, évolutif.

Cela ne renforce ni l'intégration ni la paix, mais entraîne une division à géométrie variable, notamment vis-à-vis de l'ennemi unilatéralement désigné que serait la Russie.

Faut-il établir des contrôles aux frontières moldaves entre l'Ukraine et la Transnistrie? Faut-il mettre en place un bureau d'information de l'Otan? Faut-il des ONG pilotées par des financements étrangers pour remettre en question, à tout moment, la démocratie moldave?

Et puis parlons de la corruption: jamais un système n'a été aussi corrompu que celui-ci. Donc, quelle est votre politique, Monsieur le Commissaire? Expliquez-moi!

David McAllister (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Das Assoziierungsabkommen der Europäischen Union mit der Republik Moldau legt aus meiner Sicht besonderen Wert auf drei Punkte: erstens auf die Einhaltung demokratischer und rechtsstaatlicher Prinzipien, zweitens auf eine verantwortungsvolle Staatsführung sowie drittens auf die Wahrung von Grund- und Menschenrechten. Vorredner haben es bereits betont: In diesem Land muss insbesondere die Korruption bis auf die höchste Ebene bekämpft und die Justiz des Landes reformiert werden. Diese dringenden Reformen gilt es voranzutreiben. Die Verantwortlichen in Chișinău rufe ich eindringlich dazu auf, allen Empfehlungen der Venedig-Kommission im Rahmen der Wahlrechtsreform zu folgen.

Herr Kommissar, ich will an dieser Stelle deutlich werden: Die Europäische Union ist der größte Geldgeber der Republik Moldau. Mit dieser Entschließung machen wir als Parlament deutlich: Der Ball liegt im moldauischen Spielfeld, und wenn die Fortschritte in den genannten Bereichen ausbleiben, muss das auch Konsequenzen für die finanzielle Unterstützung von unserer Seite haben.

Die europäische Nachbarschaftspolitik fußt auf dem Grundsatz „*more for more*“. Das kann aber konsequenterweise im Gegensatz auch bedeuten „*less for less*“, und dessen müssen sich alle Verantwortlichen in Chișinău bewusst sein.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Skepsis ist angebracht, da gebe ich Ihnen Recht. Unter sogenannten proeuropäischen Regierungen ist das Land systematisch von einem Skandal in den nächsten gerutscht, und die Menschen in Moldau wissen nicht wirklich, ob das nun der Weg der Europäischen Union ist. Nein, er ist es nicht! Wir selbst haben uns ein bisschen mitschuldig gemacht, weil wir zu nett waren und ab und zu auch weggeguckt haben.

Ich glaube, die Situation ist heute besser geworden. Die Wirtschaft fängt an, sich zu erholen, wenn Sie beim Internationalen Währungsfonds nachsehen, wenn Sie bei der Weltbank nachsehen, kann man das auch nachlesen. Reformen werden angegangen. Gut so, aber nicht genug und nicht schnell genug – einverstanden mit dieser Kritik. Insbesondere die Reform der Justiz und auch der Kampf gegen organisierte Kriminalität, Korruption müssen deutliche Früchte zeigen. Dennoch: Die Politik gegenüber NGOs und die Medienfreiheit – diese Rechte wollen wir nicht vergessen.

Die Wahlrechtsreform ist ein sensibles Thema in jedem Land. Niemand kann der Regierung in Chișinău vorschreiben, was für ein Wahlrechtssystem sie haben will. Aber sie sollte bei der Einführung und bei der Art der Ausführung des Gesetzes deutlich auf die Venedig-Kommission hören. Ich glaube, das ist wirklich in ihrem Interesse, auch nach dem, was Herr McAllister gesagt hat.

Letzter Satz: Ich traue der Kommission und dem Auswärtigen Dienst eine Menge zu. Wir wollen nicht anfangen, dass wir das infrage stellen, indem wir immer lieber selbst reisen und die Behörde dann auflösen. Wir haben in unserer Fraktion noch nicht darüber geredet, ob wir das, was Sie vorgeschlagen haben, gut finden. Diesen speziellen Punkt halte ich selbst für überzogen und auch nicht für notwendig. Ich traue Frau Mogherini und ihren Mitarbeitern.

Bas Belder (ECR). – De nieuwe Moldavische kieswet van 20 juli impliceert een verdere ondergraving van exact een democratische rechtsstaat. Deze politiek doorzichtige wetgeving beoogt immers elke potentiële oppositie uit te bannen of te marginaliseren. Dat voorspelt weinig goeds voor de parlementsverkiezingen van herfst volgend jaar.

Dat brengt mij bij een vraag: moet de Europese Unie in deze zorgelijke situatie toch gewoon overgaan tot de verstrekking in termijnen van 100 miljoen euro macrofinanciële hulp aan Moldavië? Commissie, hoe verhoudt zich dat tot de gezamenlijke verklaring van de Raad, de Commissie en het Parlement die precies om een rechtsstatelijke afweging vraagt voor juist deze hulpverlening?

Ik vraag dit niet zonder haast, want in Nederland zijn er tal van particuliere stichtingen – ik heb er zelf ook deel van uitgemaakt, ik ben bij Moldavië betrokken geweest – die het hart in de hand willen hebben voor Moldavië, maar dat moet kunnen op grond van een democratische rechtsstaat die functioneert en dat is niet het geval.

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). – Domnule președinte, acordul de asociere cu Republica Moldova vizează cetățenii Republicii Moldova și cred că, în preocupările fiecărui om politic european, aceasta trebuie să fie o prioritate, nu jocurile politice care vizează întărirea unui partid sau altul.

Salut, domnule comisar, abordarea dumneavoastră cu privire la asistența financiară. Proiectele care vizează direct bunăstarea cetățenilor trebuie să continue, pentru că, numai așa, Uniunea Europeană poate să fie relevantă și poate aduce bunăstarea și în această parte de lume atât de controversată, atât de săracă și atât de dificil poziționată într-o strategie de securitate în această zonă. Altfel, ar însemna ca cele 100 de milioane să vină probabil peste câțiva ani direct de la Moscova, iar Bruxelles-ul va fi irrelevant și este păcat pentru ceea ce am investit noi în sprijinul cetățenilor moldoveni, care sunt cetățeni europeni.

Reformele continuă. Creșterea economică este de 4 %. Sunt, sigur, chestiuni care urmează să fie rezolvate, dar acestea cu sprijinul Uniunii Europene, și nu altfel, vor aduce prosperitate Republicii Moldova.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Ein Wort zur Wahlrechtsreform als Erstes: Also ich denke, dass man diese Reform, so wie die Gesellschaft dazu polarisiert ist, nicht ein Jahr vor der nächsten Wahl machen sollte. Das ist auch die wichtigste Kritik der Venedig-Kommission an dieser ganzen Vorbereitung derjenigen, die jetzt Moldau regieren. Ich glaube, dass diese Wahlreform nicht dazu führen wird, dass Politiker zuverlässiger werden und weniger Korruption in den politischen Eliten stattfindet. Das würde besser erreicht werden – und auch das hat die Venedig-Kommission gesagt –, wenn man die Parteienfinanzierung transparent machen würde und wenn es endlich mehr und unabhängige Medien in Moldau gäbe.

Trotz dieser Kritik glaube ich, dass es sehr wichtig ist, dass die Europäische Union gegenüber Moldau zuverlässig ist. Wir haben eine Möglichkeit, durch die Implementierung des Assoziierungsabkommens etwas zu erreichen. Wir sollten unsere makrofinanzielle Unterstützung allerdings nicht bedingungslos geben. Gerade die Bürger von Moldau wollen, dass wir unser Geld an Erfolge bei der Korruptionsbekämpfung binden.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Die Republik Moldau ist nach wie vor eines der ärmsten europäischen Länder und wird von der Korruption einiger weniger Oligarchen in Geiselhaft genommen. Zwischen 2007 und 2015 überwies die Union 782 Mio. EUR an Finanzhilfe, und laut dem amtierenden Präsidenten, Igor Dodon, ist mindestens die Hälfte dieses Betrags verschwunden. Jetzt kann man sagen: Ja und, der Herr ist ja Moskau-orientiert und daher auch so politisch motiviert. Allerdings ist unter der proeuropäischen Regierungskoalition der Allianz für europäische Integration auch eine halbe Milliarde versickert, im Korruptionssumpf verschwunden.

Eine weitere Annäherung ist daher zu überlegen. Weitere finanzielle Unterstützung Moldaus sollte in Anbetracht dieser wüsten Korruption durchaus rational überdacht werden und nicht dem politischen Wunsch entspringen, Russland hier offensichtlich wieder einmal zu provozieren.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în sesiunea trecută, aici, la Strasbourg, Președintele Comisiei a prezentat în discursul său propunerea ca, în această toamnă, Comisia să vină cu o foaie de parcurs pentru integrarea Serbiei și Muntenegrului.

Îmi exprim regretul că Moldova nu este în acest pachet. Acum câțiva ani făcea eforturi și progrese foarte mari. Din păcate, în ultima perioadă, lucrurile au decurs altfel. Sunt foarte multe lucruri care nu sunt în ordine în Moldova: vorbim despre statul de drept, despre corupție, despre foarte multe lucruri care nu fac din Moldova un stat care să poată să fie stat candidat.

Însă, în același timp, Uniunea Europeană are o politică de vecinătate care dorește să aducă liniște la granițele Europei. Toate aceste acorduri de parteneriat sau acorduri de asociere sunt făcute în acest în scop. De aceea, eu cred că trebuie să continuăm această politică. E adevărat, în cazul unor astfel de state, după părerea mea, există o singură posibilitate: condiții, apoi îndeplinirea acestor condiții și apoi banii. Cred că aceasta este calea pe care ar trebui să o urmăm.

Andi Cristea (S&D). – Mr President, today's debate demonstrates that, notwithstanding the many challenges the EU is confronted with, the Republic of Moldova is and remains a top priority for the Union and for this House. While many domestic and external challenges are still present, my feeling is that finally Moldova is back on track.

Let me be very clear, the Filip government is delivering results. The state of crisis of 2015 has been replaced by steady progress on important reforms. The economic situation has stabilised with many indicators showing solid improvement. It is a fact! Political association and economic integration with the EU through the provisions of the Association Agreement and the DCFTA are proceeding at a stable pace.

The next months will be crucial to confirming this positive trend. This is why all political forces must overcome the polarised political climate ahead of the electoral period and engage in constructive dialogue, taking into account the real needs and expectations of the citizens.

The EU and the European Parliament are looking forward to working with both the majority and the opposition to this end. As always, we stand ready to assist the Republic of Moldova through all the means at our disposal.

Let me be very clear, and I have this advice from my colleagues from the EPP Group: we should work together, not bash ourselves!

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, Moldova a primit în ultimii trei ani de la Uniunea Europeană peste 300 000 000 EUR pentru reformele în justiție, pentru administrație și pentru infrastructură. De ce? Pentru că vrem ca Moldova să intre în familia europeană. Dar Dodon și Plahotniuc își continuă proiectul de a scoate Moldova de pe drumul european.

Ne-am opus votului uninominal în Moldova, de exemplu, așa cum a recomandat și Comisia de la Veneția, pentru că folosea numai oligarhilor și prietenilor lui Putin și nu folosea populației, al cărei vot ar fi fost corectat și numărat incorect. Ei l-au ignorat, ne-au ignorat și pe noi în decizia noastră și Comisia de la Veneția și au votat votul uninominal. Moldova trăiește din bani europeni, nu din banii lui Plahotniuc, nu din banii lui Dodon și nu din banii Rusiei.

Moldova trebuie să înceteze cu ipocrizia, clasa politică din Moldova trebuie să înceteze cu ipocrizia și trebuie sancționată prin condiționarea sprijinului financiar de respectarea principiilor democratice și de a nu fura din banii de la Uniunea Europeană.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Noriu atkreipti Jūsų dėmesį į svarbą, kuri išorės politikoje tenka Moldovai. Moldova – ES išorės santykių mechanizmo lakmuso popierėlis. Ji yra skurdi ir ne itin gerai valdoma šalis, kuriai reikia pagalbos tiek užtikrinant darnią plėtrą, tiek ir gerą valdymą. Ji yra įšaldytų konfliktų šalis – Padniestrės problema yra tokia pat skausminga kaip ir Šiaurės Kipro problema. Moldovoje susikerta šalies piliečių noras suartėti su Europa ir Rusijos nenoras paleisti iš savo kontrolės. O padėti dar labiau komplikuoja silpna ir į vidinius konfliktus įsivėlus vietinė valdžia, kurios veikla pastaruoju metu kelia abejonių dėl suderinamumo su demokratijos principais. Europa turėtų pasiūsti aiškią žinią, kad suartėjimas su Europa ir rinkų atvėrimas bei parama yra įmanoma tik mainais į demokratines, teisėtvarkos ir rinkos reformas.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, oui à une Moldavie européenne, oui à une Moldavie dans l'Europe des nations, en partenariat avec la Russie.

Aujourd'hui, vous voulez faire de la Moldavie l'Ukraine. C'est là un beau scénario dont personne ne veut. La Moldavie est un pays indépendant et souverain, et ce ne sont pas les Roumains que vous êtes qui allez ignorer ce fait d'histoire.

La Moldavie est une grande nation, même si sa population compte seulement trois millions d'habitants. Aujourd'hui, l'Union européenne veut engager des réformes pour la Moldavie, à la place de la Roumanie. Elle a ainsi prévu de consacrer 2,8 millions d'euros à une réforme de l'administration et à une réforme territoriale.

Moi, je crois qu'il faut respecter la souveraineté des nations. La Moldavie est un État indépendant, un État situé entre l'Est et l'Ouest, un État auquel il faut, bien évidemment, demander l'accord en vue de sa participation.

Aujourd'hui, il est vrai que la Moldavie a refusé, avec son président M. Dodon, de participer aux engagements de l'OTAN. Je crois personnellement qu'il faut respecter la souveraineté de cet État.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die moldauische Bevölkerung hat sich in vielen Wahlen für eine westliche europäische Politik entschieden. Zweitens: Sie haben dafür auf eigenen Wunsch einen Assoziierungs- und Freihandelsvertrag bekommen, den sie ratifiziert haben, und darin steht, dass dies entwickelt werden muss, einschließlich der inneren Entwicklung zur Rechtsstaatlichkeit gegen Korruption. Was wichtig ist, ist, dass das Land selbst Fortschritte für die Bürger hat, weil Rechtsstaatlichkeit, und Antikorruption eine Bedingung für weitere Investitionen und Arbeitsplätze sind.

Ich weiß nicht, Herr Kollege, was daran falsch sein sollte. Das ist eine Vereinbarung, die da sein soll. Wir müssen feststellen, dass wir Moldau unterstützen müssen, damit es seine Unabhängigkeit gegen den Nachbarn, der diese Unabhängigkeit zerstören will, verteidigen kann! Da liegt doch die Aggression, wenn man beispielsweise auf die Transnistrien-Frage hinweist.

Und eine letzte Bemerkung: Das sollte man aber nicht mit einem Wahlrecht, das manipulationsträchtig ist, machen. Wenn man Wahlkreise gewinnen kann und das nicht auf das Gesamtergebnis angerechnet wird und dann noch mal bei den Listen Mandate kriegen kann, dann kann man mit 50 % der Stimmen 80 % der Mandate bekommen und das so weiter rechnen. Das ist eine Wahlmethode, die nicht korrekt ist, und aus diesem Grunde ist das ein falscher Einsatz.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Trzysta trzydzieści pięć milionów euro w ciągu trzech lat Unia przekazała Mołdowie. Wydaje się, że to spore pieniądze. Oczywiście wymagamy, aby te pieniądze były dobrze użytkowane. Z drugiej strony w Mołdowie w tej chwili toczy się pewien mecz geopolityczny między nami, Zachodem, Unią, a Rosją. To też trzeba wziąć pod uwagę, że jest proeuropejski rząd i prorosyjski prezydent. Trzeba szczególnej dyplomacji i mądrości, aby wspierać siły proeuropejskie w tym kraju i aby pokazywać również społeczeństwu tego kraju to, w jakim stopniu ten kraj może stać się częścią rosyjskiej strefy wpływów ze wszystkimi tego konsekwencjami geopolitycznymi. Jestem za tym, żeby ta pomoc ze strony Unii była jak największa i żeby ona przesuwała Mołdawię w kierunku Europy, tylko Europy politycznej, bo w Europie Mołdawia jest.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, I would say to the Commissioner that Moldova has certainly reached a crossroads. This is a warning, but it could yet become an incentive for hope and progress. Political and social stability have been seriously undermined and, as has been pointed out, the lack of national consensus about the European road is a warning signal.

We have been critical of the latest electoral law which, as the Venice Commission has warned, could favour the influence of oligarchs and disadvantage minorities and women. But, to be fair, this is not about the laws as such: it is about the possible misuse of a law in the short-term interests of political and economic groups. The truth is that Moldova represents a warning of the long-term, devastating impact of foreign-imposed frozen conflict that the international community has not been willing or able to address. Therefore, we should support the request for the Moldovan Government to include the withdrawal of Russian troops on the General Assembly's agenda, because this promise, which should have been fulfilled 15 years ago, in 2002, is still unfulfilled.

We certainly remain committed to supporting Moldova, but we have to remind the Moldovan authorities that granting micro-financial assistance has to be conditional on their meeting European and democratic standards for civil society.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nic nie przemawia za tym, by Unia Europejska odstąpiła od przyjętej strategii wyraźnego wsparcia dla wolnościowych i europejskich aspiracji Mołdawii. Jeden z posłów UKIP mówił tutaj o nadużyciu ze strony Unii Europejskiej, o neokolonializmie, o neutralności politycznej. Otóż w tym świecie nie ma neutralności politycznej: albo Mołdawia będzie częścią rodziny europejskiej, albo znajdzie się w strefie wpływów rosyjskich. Jednak pomoc nie może być naiwna i bezwarunkowa, więc ten realistyczny głos jest jak najbardziej godny wsparcia. Musimy oczekiwać walki z korupcją, uzdrowienia sądownictwa, autentycznej wolności politycznej i pluralizmu mediów, nie tylko ze względu na europejskie oczekiwania, ale i interesy Mołdawii. Mołdawia, która nie uzdrowi siebie sama, skaże się na obecność w rosyjskiej strefie wpływów. Jeśli się uzdrowi, będzie mogła dzielić wspólny los z narodami Europy.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Fulvio Martusciello (PPE), Domanda «cartellino blu». – Soltanto per chiedere se nella legge elettorale vi siano disposizioni per aiutare i tanti moldavi che vivono all'estero – in Italia ce ne sono 135 000 – mettendoli nella condizione di poter partecipare al voto. Chiedo, quindi, se questo può essere un ulteriore elemento di discussione.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Jak najbardziej, to znaczy tego typu oczekiwania powinny być rozważone. Jeszcze w większym stopniu powinny być rozważone oczekiwania dotyczące prawdziwej wolności, konkurencyjności i swobody wyborów, więc jak najbardziej tego typu oczekiwania są godne wsparcia. Natomiast ważny jest kierunek strategiczny – czy z dobrą wolą wspieramy aspiracje europejskie Mołdawii, czy też nie. Ja opowiadałam się za tym pierwszym rozwiązaniem.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Tuż przed szczytem Partnerstwa Wschodniego chcielibyśmy widzieć zupełnie inną debatę na temat Mołdawii i to jest niespełna rok po wejściu w życie układu stowarzyszeniowego wraz ze strefą wolnego handlu. Wiemy też, że dobre skutki odnosi ruch wizowy, no ale trudno jest nie podnosić tego tematu, bowiem umowy to wzajemne zobowiązania. Kiedy mamy problemy ze zwalczaniem korupcji, zawłaszczaniem środków publicznych, kiedy mamy problemy z wymiarem sprawiedliwości, również te sygnały dotyczące zmian, jeżeli chodzi o system demokratyczny w samej Mołdawii.

Chciałbym przypomnieć, że 22 maja parlamentarny komitet stowarzyszenia z zadowoleniem przyjął między innymi narodowy plan działania do roku 2019, który został przyjęty przez Mołdawię. Teraz należałoby go wypełnić treścią, w szczególności jeżeli chodzi o postępowanie w legislacji. Problem stały to oczywiście Naddniestrze, które ogromnie wpływa na sytuację wewnętrzną w Mołdawii, tego nie możemy pominąć i to być może jest jeden z elementów, który usprawiedliwia nieco to, co się dzieje w Mołdawii, ale z drugiej strony trudno inne sprawy akceptować. Myślę, że to stwierdzenie Pana Komisarza, że należy wspierać społeczeństwo obywatelskie, to dobry kierunek, Panie Komisarzu. Zawsze jest tak, że gdy próbujemy państwo i jego władzę trochę naprostować, to nie powinniśmy karać społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i wydaje mi się, że to jest niezmiernie istotne.

Również z zadowoleniem chcę powiedzieć, że przyjmujemy tę wspólną deklarację przewodniczących parlamentów Mołdawii, Gruzji, Ukrainy, która odnosi się do szczytu Partnerstwa Wschodniego. To też jest dobry sygnał, w końcu pochodzący z parlamentów narodowych.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziś rano odbyła się burzliwa debata na temat stanu negocjacji w sprawie brexitu. Wielka Brytania opuszcza Unię. Z drugiej strony, co niedawno triumfalnie zapowiedział szef Komisji Juncker, Unia liczy na przyjęcie innych krajów. W przedśionku unijnym czeka także Mołdawia. Kraj ten podpisał z Unią Europejską układ o partnerstwie i współpracy już 23 lata temu. Przed trzema laty podpisał umowę stowarzyszeniową. Wciąż jednak daleki jest od spełnienia unijnych kryteriów. Unia Europejska przeciwstawia się zmianom w ordynacji wyborczej Mołdawii. Domaga się skutecznej walki z korupcją, a także straszy Komisją Wenecką. W twardym dążeniu do ideologicznych standardów niektórzy zdają się nie dostrzegać, że trzyipółmilionowa Mołdawia należy do najbardziej biedniejszych państw europejskich, a jej wewnętrzne problemy wykorzystuje Rosja. Jeśli zasklepimy się w unijnej retoryce, za chwilę może się okazać, że kraj ten wypowie umowę stowarzyszeniową i znajdzie się w unii, ale euroazjatyckiej.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to repeat that we have been standing behind Moldova's pro-European ambitions and have had high hopes for its involvement in our joint projects. Yet now I am very concerned about the deterioration of the rule of law and democratic standards in the Republic of Moldova. We have seen the intimidation and harassment of pro-European political opposition and the disregarding of the recommendations of the Venice Commission to change the electoral system. It is clear that the changes in the electoral law directly undermine democratic standards in the country. The recent internal political developments in Moldova are nowhere near the positive momentum we witnessed three years ago. The implementation of the Association Agenda is lagging behind and it is clear that it needs to become a priority of the political leadership.

I would like to appeal to the High Representative and the Commission to make use of our external policy instruments in order to bring the country back to democratic standards. We in the European Parliament stand ready to support Moldova on its European path and its reform process. This can happen, however, only once we see real commitment to a pro-European path and respect for democratic values from the leaders of the country.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi. Adevăratele mize ale relației noastre cu Republica Moldova sunt următoarele: unu – reformele pe care le așteaptă cetățenii Republicii Moldova, și doi – creșterea sprijinului cetățenilor Republicii Moldova pentru parcursul european al Republicii Moldova.

Republica Moldova are nevoie de reforme profunde în justiție, combaterea corupției, administrația publică și multe alte domenii. Oamenii așteaptă aceste reforme, iar noi trebuie să utilizăm toate instrumentele pe care le avem la dispoziție pentru a accelera ritmul reformelor. Nu trebuie să ne fie teamă să aplicăm condiționalități pentru sprijinul financiar pe care îl aplicăm Republicii Moldova. Dimpotrivă, condiționalitatea este ceea ce cetățenii Republicii Moldova așteaptă. Cetățenii Republicii Moldova nu mai vor să acordăm cecuri în alb. Doar fiind fermi în sprijinirea acestor reforme vom avea sprijinul cetățenilor.

Trebuie să fim cinstiți. Majoritatea parlamentară de la Chișinău a modificat legislația electorală în ciuda avizului Comisiei de la Veneția și a semnalelor de alarmă trase de către Comisia Europeană și a pierdut, ca atare, încrederea noastră. A ne mulțumi cu mimarea procesului de reformă înseamnă a fi naivi și a pierde susținerea cetățenilor Republicii Moldova pentru procesul de integrare europeană.

Ca raportor general pentru bugetul Uniunii Europene, am propus de la începutul anului mai multe fonduri pentru vecinătatea estică, inclusiv pentru Republica Moldova, dar acești bani să fie folosiți acolo unde e nevoie de ei.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tu debatu velmi pozorně poslouchal a osobně se domnívám, že – alespoň pro mne – z toho plynou dva závěry, i pro zástupce Komise. Za prvé je třeba, podle mého názoru, jasně říkat moldavským státním orgánům, že reforma volebního práva, která byla přijata, je pro nás nepřijatelná. Myslím si, že je třeba v tomto být jednoznačný, mít jasný postoj a orgány státu jasně kritizovat.

Na druhou stranu bychom v žádném případě neměli omezovat finanční pomoc Moldavsku. Pokud vyklidíme prostor a stáhneme se z Moldavska, ten prostor geopoliticky obsadí Rusko. Rusko čeká na to, až naše pomoc bývalým sovětským satelitům bude omezena, bude snížena a Rusko samo tento prostor mocensky vyplní. Takže já moc prosím, pane komisaři, podporujeme finančně občanský sektor v Moldavsku, pomáháme Moldavanům dále, mějme na paměti, že boj s Ruskem o toto území stále probíhá.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Domnule președinte, cred că cei care solicită suspendarea acordului financiar și a ajutorului financiar acordat Republicii Moldova vor să vadă această țară dusă spre Uniunea Euroasiatică, acolo unde vrea să o ducă domnul Dodon – domnul Dodon, care face orice e posibil să fie inclus în partea negativă, întunecată a scurtei istorii a Republicii Moldova.

Cetățenii Republicii Moldova vor un parcurs european și trebuie să ne gândim că anul viitor, în 2018, vor fi alegeri parlamentare. Acum este momentul să susținem parcursul european al Republicii Moldova mai mult ca oricând. Doamnelor și domnilor, este un moment important acesta și nu trebuie să îl pierdem.

În același timp, vă solicit, domnule comisar, solicit Comisiei Europene, Parlamentului European și altor instituții, atunci când vorbesc de Moldova, să folosească termenul corect de Republica Moldova, pentru că Moldova este și o parte a României.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Mr President, it is absolutely right that the citizens of Moldova want European integration. Unfortunately, the political situation in Moldova is getting very complicated and embarrassing. We are witnessing continuing confrontation and, indeed, political deadlock between pro-Western and pro-Eastern forces in the country. In this context, I urge all political leaders and parties in Moldova to engage in constructive dialogue in order to ensure democracy, the rule of law and political stability there.

I strongly believe that politicians in Moldova should focus their efforts on important issues for the future of the country and implement crucial political and economic reforms in order to provide better living standards for all Moldovans.

The EU has the capacity to play the essential role of facilitator, on the one hand for political dialogue among the country's political factions and, on the other, for the implementation of sorely needed reforms.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Unione europea e Moldavia: siamo un *player* o solo un *payer*? Mentre il Parlamento moldavo adottava una riforma del sistema elettorale, passando a un sistema fortemente criticato anche dalla Commissione di Venezia, per gli enormi vantaggi per il partito di governo, era infatti ancora fresco l'inchiestro sulla nostra decisione di concedere l'assistenza macrofinanziaria. E questa è solo la punta dell'iceberg.

I recenti emendamenti alla nuova legge sulle ONG, se adottati, comprometterebbero gravemente l'attività della società civile, spesso unico baluardo nel paese contro la corruzione dilagante. Mentre sulla colossale frode bancaria da un miliardo di dollari, dopo tre anni tutto ancora tace.

Da ex osservatore elettorale nel paese, l'auspicio mio e di molti è di vedere un giorno la Moldavia, insieme a noi nella famiglia dell'Unione europea. Ma la nostra benevolenza non deve essere scambiata per stupidità. Ritengo che sia opportuno, se il governo moldavo non ritornerà prontamente sui suoi passi, rivalutare la concessione dell'assistenza macrofinanziaria per indirizzarla invece su progetti e programmi a pieno sostegno della società civile.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η περίπτωση της Μολδαβίας είναι ένα ακόμη δείγμα της εσφαλμένης εξωτερικής πολιτικής που ακολούθησε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Παρά το γεγονός ότι, από το 2005 και μετά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χορήγησε τεράστια χρηματικά ποσά στη Μολδαβία, τα χρήματα αυτά δεν χρησιμοποιήθηκαν για να αναπτυχθούν τομείς, οι οποίοι θα έδιναν και θέσεις εργασίας, όπως παραδείγματος χάρι η βιομηχανία και ο αγροτικός τομέας, αλλά για να διανοιγούν κάποιες αγορές που ενδιέφεραν την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αυτό είχε σαν συνέπεια να δοθεί η δυνατότητα στις δυνάμεις του εσωτερικού κατεστημένου και της διαφθοράς της χώρας να εκμεταλλευθούν τα χρήματα αυτά, να τα καταχραστούν, να δημιουργήσουν ένα οικονομικό κενό της τάξεως του ενός δισεκατομμυρίου δολαρίων σε τρεις τράπεζες της χώρας και γενικά να καταρρακωθεί η οικονομία της χώρας. Η καταστροφή της χώρας έλαβε τη χαριστική βολή από τα μέτρα τα οποία εφάρμοσαν εναντίον της Ρωσίας οι χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, διότι η Ρωσία αποτελεί τον βασικό προμηθευτή αερίου στη Μολδαβία και τον μεγαλύτερο εισαγωγέα προϊόντων της χώρας. Με βάση αυτά πιστεύω ότι, εάν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν αναθεωρήσει τη στάση της, θα χάσει αυτή τη μικρή σύμμαχο χώρα.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Domnule președinte, această dezbatere pe Republica Moldova este binevenită. Dintre toate țările Parteneriatului estic, Republica Moldova este poate cel mai de succes exemplu. Direcția europeană a fost menținută, în ciuda multor presiuni dinspre est și mă refer, evident, la Rusia.

Sunt însă informații și dovezi îngrijorătoare legate de starea democrației, de ademeniri, amenințări și presiuni la adresa unor parlamentari sau aleși locali să își schimbe opțiunea politică în legătură cu schimbarea legislației electorale. Comisia Europeană trebuie să facă toate demersurile, cât mai ferme și mai hotărâte, ca angajamentele asumate de Republica Moldova să fie respectate și democrația și statul de drept să funcționeze, poate chiar să reflecteze la înființarea unei structuri în interiorul Comisiei Europene care să monitorizeze implementarea angajamentelor, mai ales în domeniul judiciar.

Și, sigur, dacă toate aceste demersuri nu dau roade, putem vorbi și de sancțiuni financiare, deși mă tem că ele vor afecta mai mult cetățenii obișnuiți și mai puțin pe cei care conduc astăzi Republica Moldova.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, comme l'Ukraine, la Moldavie est tiraillée entre l'Union européenne et la Russie. Notre devoir est de tout faire pour qu'elle se reconnaisse dans les valeurs européennes, et l'aide que nous lui apportons doit y contribuer.

La loi électorale, la démocratie et l'indépendance de la justice font, à l'évidence, partie de ces valeurs. Le parti unique n'entre pas dans notre conception de la démocratie, mais nous devons aussi favoriser le développement économique de la Moldavie, qui possède des ressources minières intéressantes, et lutter contre la pauvreté.

Selon moi, c'est à partir de ces progrès qu'il y aura une prise de conscience du peuple moldave. Si nous ne devons pas nous ingérer directement dans la gouvernance de la Moldavie, nous devons porter ces valeurs auprès du peuple et nous serions bien inspirés, me semble-t-il, de faire en sorte qu'une partie de cette aide soit consacrée au pluralisme des médias.

Dans tous les cas de figure, la Moldavie ne peut en aucun cas devenir une nouvelle Crimée.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πριν τρία χρόνια η Ένωση και η Μολδαβία υπέγραψαν Συμφωνία Σύνδεσης, συμπεριλαμβανομένης της Συμφωνίας Ελεύθερων Συναλλαγών, ενώ η Μολδαβία έγινε η πρώτη χώρα εταίρος που επωφελήθηκε από το καθεστώς απαλλαγής θέωσης. Στόχος ήταν να υποστηριχθεί η χώρα για πολιτική, κοινωνική και οικονομική μεταρρύθμιση, προκειμένου να ενισχυθούν ο εκδημοκρατισμός και η χρηστή διακυβέρνηση, η ενεργειακή ασφάλεια και η οικονομική και κοινωνική ανάπτυξη. Αντ' αυτών ένα δισεκατομμύριο δολάρια εξαφανίστηκαν από τα τρία μεγαλύτερα τραπεζικά ιδρύματα μέσα σε δύο ημέρες. Ο πληθυσμός της χώρας μειώθηκε κατά 10% σε μια χώρα με 2,9 εκατομμύρια εναπομείναντες πολίτες, όπου 600.000 ζουν μόνιμα στο εξωτερικό και 350.000 πηγαиноέρχονται σε γειτονικές χώρες για να επιζήσουν. Η χώρα οδηγήθηκε σε ενεργειακή και αγροτική κρίση λόγω των συνεπειών των κυρώσεων της Ένωσης προς τη Ρωσία. Είναι, επομένως, λογικό οι Μολδαβοί πολίτες να στρέφονται προς τη Ρωσία. Η Ένωση θα έπρεπε να έχει αντιληφθεί ότι τα χρήματα δεν εξαγοράζουν το εθνικό φρόνημα. Τέτοιες πολιτικές είναι καταδικασμένες να αποτύχουν.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, o să am o altă abordare. Eu cred că trebuie să plecăm de la scopul principal. Scopul nostru principal este ca Republica Moldova să continue drumul spre Uniunea Europeană. Evident că trebuie să avem două asistențe din partea Uniunii Europene: una, cea financiară – și nu sunt de acord cu ce au spus colegii din PPE, nu putem să pedepsim un popor -, și cealaltă este să ne concentrăm pe cum putem să le asigurăm o consiliere forțelor pro-europene pentru a putea să răspundă și pentru a avea rezultate bune în anul viitor.

Nu ne putem bloca în faptul că Parlamentul Republicii Moldova a votat modificarea legii. Discursul public al președintelui Dodon, critic față de Uniunea Europeană și NATO, arată că el deja se pregătește pentru alegerile viitoare. Ce facem noi? Noi trebuie să vorbim cu forțele pro-europene să se unească, să aibă un discurs, să aibă o strategie astfel încât să evităm încă un mandat pentru Dodon. Aceasta cred că trebuie să fie strategia, domnule comisar, nu să suspendăm pur și simplu finanțarea și asistența față de Republica Moldova pentru că e strategic: Republica Moldova este importantă pentru toată regiunea, nu doar pentru cetățenii din Republica Moldova.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Christos Stylianides, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the speakers for their contributions. From this debate I conclude that we share the opinion that it is important to continue supporting the Republic of Moldova with its reform agenda. Secondly, I understand your concerns in relation to the rule of law and democracy.

Let me assure you that the European Union will consider thoroughly any decision on future assistance and that these decisions will be consistent with messages transmitted as part of our political dialogue. At the same time, I would like to repeat our position about the partnership. The partnership with the European Union is not about spheres of influence and geopolitics. We do not ask our partners to pick sides – they do not have to choose between us and other global powers. This is not how our partnership works. Our partnership is about improving the lives of our citizens inside the European Union, and of citizens in Moldova. It is a partnership for, not against. It is about the economy and trade. It is about democracy, human rights, the rule of law and, of course, the fight against corruption.

It is with this attitude that we are heading towards our Eastern Partnership Summit next month. Thank you for your attention and for this fruitful discussion.

Președintele. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc în cadrul unei viitoare perioade de sesiune.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Dominique Martin (ENF), par écrit. – Nous étions surpris du montant du budget alloué à la Moldavie (1 milliard d'euros sur 10 ans, soit 100 millions par an), dans un pays comptant 3 millions d'habitants... Nous étions surpris d'un tel montant alors même que nos États membres ont grandement besoin de ce budget, et alors même que l'UE impose, ici et là, une politique d'austérité...

La réponse de la Commission à notre question écrite, donnée par M. Hahn le 6 septembre 2017 constituait une première piste de réflexion: «préalablement à l'octroi de l'aide, il sera tenu compte du respect satisfaisant d'un vaste ensemble de conditions politiques (...)», c'est à dire, permettez-moi une traduction politique: «si vous souhaitez cet argent, acceptez notre intrusion dans votre souveraineté»!

Par exemple, Christos Stylianides insiste, lors de cette session, sur la réforme de la justice, un secteur tout particulièrement régalien. Par ailleurs, certaines interventions de mes confrères constituent une deuxième piste: celle d'une lutte toujours plus irrationnelle contre la Russie. Nous sommes favorables à une Moldavie dans une Europe des nations sans immixtion dans sa souveraineté, comme nous l'avions expliqué lors du vote en juillet.

10. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (Aussprache)

Președintele. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind întrebarea cu solicitare de răspuns oral referitoare la eradicarea practicii de căsătorie a copiilor, adresată Comisiei de Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, în numele Comisiei pentru drepturile femeii și egalitatea de gen (O-000064/2017 – B8-0328/2017) (2017/2663(RSP)).

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Autorė. – Besivystančiose šalyse viena iš trijų mergaičių ištekinama dar nesulaukus 18 metų, o viena iš devynių – net 15 nesulaukus. Nuo vaikų santuokų kenčia ir berniukai, ir mergaitės, bet mergaitėms, kurios sudaro 82 proc. susituokusių vaikų, kyla didžiausia rizika. Ir ši problema aktuali ne tik trečiojoje šalyse, bet ir Europoje.

Pagal Europos Sąjungos sutarties 3 straipsnį ES skatina vaiko teisių apsaugą, tačiau vaikų ankstyvos ir priverstinės santuokos yra šių teisių pažeidimas. Vienas iš Jungtinių Tautų darnaus vystymosi tikslų yra panaikinti visą žalingą praktiką, įskaitant vaikų ankstyvas ir priverstines santuokas. Be to, vaikų ankstyvų ir priverstinių santuokų panaikinimas kaip vienas iš veiklos ES prioritetų yra įtrauktas į bendrą tarnybų darbinį dokumentą „Lyčių lygybė ir moterų įgalėjimas: keisti mergaičių ir moterų gyvenimą plėtojant ES išorės santykius (2016-2020 m.)“, į 2015-2019 m. ES veiksmų planą žmogaus teisių srityje ir į lyčių lygybės veiksmų planą, kuriame pabrėžiamas poreikis užtikrinti, kad moterys ir mergaitės galėtų visapusiškai naudotis visomis žmogaus teisėmis ir pagrindinėmis laisvėmis.

ES neseniai nusprendė pasirašyti Stambulo konvenciją, kurioje priverstinė santuoka laikoma smurto prieš moteris forma ir kurioje raginama joje nurodytas priemonės taip pat taikyti berniukams ir vyrams, kadangi jie irgi gali tapti priverstinių santuokos aukomis. Konvencijoje reikalaujama vaiko privertimo tuoktis veiką ir vaiko išviliojimą į kitą šalį siekiant priversti jį susituokti laikyti nusikaltimu. Ankstyvos ir priverstinės santuokos labai kenkia bendram mergaičių ir moterų teisių įgyvendinimui ir galimybei jomis naudotis, taip pat mergaičių sveikatai, įskaitant didelę nėštumo komplikacijų, neretai besibaigiančių mirtimi, ir ŽIV infekcijų riziką. Dėl per ankstyvų santuokų mergaitėms kyla pavojus tapti seksualinės prievartos, smurto šeimoje ir netgi nužudymo dėl garbės aukomis.

Turime įvertinti ir tai, kad labai skiriasi oficialiai užregistruotų atvejų ir galimų aukų, prašančių pagalbos, skaičius, o tai parodo, kad daug vaikų santuokų gali būti sudaromos nepastebėjus valdžios atsakingoms institucijoms. Todėl labai svarbu, kad socialiniams darbuotojams, mokytojams ir kitiems darbuotojams, tiesiogiai bendraujantiems su galimomis aukomis, būtų suteiktas specialus mokymas ir parengti vadovai, kuriuose būtų paaiškinta, kaip nustatyti aukas ir pradėti pagalbos jiems procedūras.

Taip pat noriu priminti, kad Parlamentas smerkia nėštumo nutraukimą remiančių organizacijų nefinansavimo taisyklės atnaujinimą ir taikymo srities išplėtimą ir jos poveikį pasaulinei moterų ir mergaičių sveikatos priežiūrai ir jų teisėms. Ir čia noriu dar kartą paraginti ES ir valstybes nares užpildyti jau atvertą finansavimo spragą seksualinės ir reprodukcinės sveikatos srityje, panaudojant nacionalines ir ES vystymuisi skirtas lėšas.

Taigi klausimai gerbiamai Komisarai: kaip Komisija įvertina projektų ir kampanijų, skirtų kovoti su vaikų santuokomis, poveikį ir tai, kiek finansavimo skiriama šiam tikslui vykdant visus Europos Sąjungos išorės veiksmus? Ar Komisija atsižvelgia į vaikų santuokų rodiklius savo bendradarbiavimo susitarimuose ir ar nustato konkrečius lyginamuosius standartus, kad šitas reiškinys būtų panaikintas? Kokių veiksmų imamasi siekiant užtikrinti visų vaikų Europos Sąjungos valstybėse narėse teisių ir sveikatos, įskaitant lytinę ir reprodukcinę sveikatą ir teises, apsaugą vaikų santuokų atvejais ir siekiant taikyti suvienodintus teisinius standartus, be kita ko atsižvelgiant į tai, kad Europos Sąjunga ketina ratifikuoti Stambulo konvenciją? Ir pagaliau, kaip Komisija ir valstybės narės sprendžia vaikų santuokos problemą, ypač, kai tai susiję su nepilnamečiais pabėgėliais ir prieglobsčio prašytojais? Ačiū ir laukiam atsakymo iš gerbiamos Komisarės.

Věra Jourová, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, the Commission's position is absolutely clear. We cannot accept or tolerate any kind of violence, including forced marriage. But it is a complex problem which cannot be solved at one stroke.

As for question 1, we are participating in comprehensive programmes to put an end to harmful practices such as child marriage. Their impact can only be measured in the long term over generations. For example, in 2016 the EU contributed EUR 6 million to the UNICEF United Nations Population Fund Global Programme to Accelerate Action to End Child Marriage. This programme works at local, national and regional level and targets the communities of 12 countries. The objective is to improve access to services, strengthen enforcement mechanisms, increase girls' empowerment and challenge social norms, so that girls can fully enjoy their childhood and grow up to control their own destiny. In 2019, when this programme comes to an end, we shall evaluate its quantitative impact using the quantitative indicators. The same applies to other ongoing projects to address child marriage which we are supporting in Tanzania, Niger, Mali, Malawi, Lesotho and Sudan. Beyond this targeted support, the EU also contributes to programmes dedicated to social protection, access to education, violence against children, and access to justice and health, including sexual and reproductive health and rights. They also contribute to a reduction in child marriage.

As for question 2, accession to the Istanbul Convention is a priority for the Commission. The criminalisation of forced marriage based on the definition of the Istanbul Convention will remain a matter of Member State competence. However, many victims of forced marriage, especially underaged, may fall victim to other serious forms of gender-based crime, such as rape. This offence is criminalised in all EU Member States. The Victims' Rights Directive provides for targeted and integrated support for victims with specific needs, such as victims of sexual violence, victims of gender-based violence and victims of violence in close relationships, including trauma support and counselling or shelter for victims in need of a safe place. The EU's accession to the Istanbul Convention would further strengthen the Union's framework on protection of and support to victims of forced marriage and other crimes covered by the Convention. For instance, the Istanbul Convention will require the EU to ensure that resident status is granted to victims of gender-based violence, which could be independent from that of the spouse, and that victims may obtain the suspension of expulsion. The Convention requires that gender-based violence against women be recognised as a form of persecution under the Geneva Convention and that the obligation of non-refoulement is applied to women victims in need of protection where they might be subject to torture or inhuman treatment or punishment.

As regards sexual and reproductive health, the Istanbul Convention provides for a prohibition of forced abortion and sterilisation, for instance, abortion without full and informed consent. It does, however, not contain provisions regarding rights to safe abortion or as to whether abortion in unsafe conditions constitutes violence against women. On 25 November 2016 the Commission launched a year of focused actions to combat violence against women. The focused actions, which involve local, national and EU-level initiatives, aim to mobilise, connect and support all relevant stakeholders in combating the problem and to ensure the dissemination of good practices across the EU.

Let me now answer question 3. Married minors are also considered vulnerable under the EU asylum acquis and therefore benefit from special rights and procedural guarantees. It will often be the case that the law or practice of the responsible Member State does not recognise an adult spouse as being responsible for a minor spouse. Therefore, if the minor spouse travels only with the adult spouse and is not accompanied by her parents or tutor, the married minor would often be considered unaccompanied and thus in need of special guarantees. Moreover, non-consensual child marriages are prohibited by international law. The authorities of the Member State of arrival have an obligation to verify if the minor has consented to the marriage. If this is not the case, the child must be offered protection. This issue is to be distinguished from the separate matter of whether the legal effects of the marriage undertaken in the country of origin or prior to arrival in the EU can or cannot be recognised according to the national law of the Member State responsible.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, today we give a voice to the 750 million girls forced to marry around the world. Let's say together: enough is enough! Child marriage is child abuse. Girls are exposed to rape, domestic and even honour violence. It can be devastating for their health, with serious risks concerning pregnancy and infections.

Child marriage is a crime recognised under the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women. Once again, I call on all Member States to ratify and enforce the Convention, to combat impunity and protect girls. Many girls seeking asylum arrive in Europe married – in Sweden alone there are 132. Authorities must consider the best interests of the child. A child is first of all a child, and we cannot have parallel communities in Europe where child marriage is tolerated. There is no tradition and no culture that can justify child abuse.

Girls forced to marry are forced out of school. Desperate parents give away daughters to older men to save them from poverty. But on the contrary, early marriage condemns girls to poverty and discrimination. Education is the best chance for girls to be empowered. No child should be deprived of their childhood.

Civil society plays a key role. The Girls not Brides global partnership, UNICEF, ombudsmen and many others in civil society deserve more support. President Trump's global gag rules will affect projects for thousands and of girls who are victims of child marriage. Europe should step in and provide resources.

I call on the High Representative on the Commission to do more in all EU external action to eliminate child marriage by helping countries to adopt and to enforce legislation. We need to combat stereotypes, change mentalities, work with family and community leaders and break the vicious circle of submission and violence.

Mr President, in conclusion, as author of the European People's Party Group resolution and co-Chair of the Intergroup on Children's Rights, I call for your support. This Parliament should join forces and send a clear message – we are committed to a zero-tolerance policy on child marriage. It is time to act.

Iratxe García Pérez, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, hemos utilizado en muchas ocasiones esta Cámara, este Parlamento Europeo, para debatir y para poner encima de la mesa todas las cuestiones referidas a la igualdad de género, a los derechos de las mujeres y también a los derechos de los niños y las niñas. Por eso, creo que traer hoy aquí este debate es algo importante y esencial.

Tengo una sobrina de ocho años: juega, va al colegio, es una niña feliz, independiente y es una niña que está viviendo la edad que le corresponde. Y no debería decir esto, pero es una niña afortunada por nacer donde ha nacido, porque ha nacido en un país, en el seno de una familia donde la igualdad de género es una cuestión esencial.

No podemos permitir desde este lado de la historia que haya niñas que no tienen esa oportunidad de disfrutar de su niñez porque se ven obligadas a casarse, a contraer estos matrimonios de los que hoy estamos hablando. Hay datos que nos ponen encima de la mesa como una cruda realidad: en los países en desarrollo, una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de cumplir los quince años.

La política de cooperación y desarrollo de la Unión Europea relativa a estos países en desarrollo tiene que tener la perspectiva de género dentro de su esencia y ser capaz de posibilitar que las niñas que han nacido en otros países tengan las mismas oportunidades y los mismos derechos que las niñas europeas.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! „Sind Sie hierher gekommen, um nach reiflicher Überlegung und aus freiem Entschluss mit Ihrer Braut den Bund der Ehe zu schließen?“ Diese Frage steht am Anfang jeder christlichen Trauung in Europa. Es ist eine wichtige Frage: aus freiem Entschluss? Leider ist das weltweit keine Selbstverständlichkeit. 700 Millionen Frauen weltweit sind zwangsverheiratet, mehr als 250 Millionen von ihnen waren zum Zeitpunkt der sogenannten Eheschließung unter 15 Jahre alt. Jährlich werden weltweit 15 Millionen Mädchen verheiratet, bevor sie volljährig sind – das entspricht einer Kinderehe alle zwei Sekunden. Und das ist keine kulturelle Besonderheit, das ist kein Kavaliersdelikt. Nein, wer Kinder zwangsverheiratet, missbraucht sie. Wer Kinder missbraucht, begeht ein Verbrechen.

Europa ist entschlossen, Kinderehen weltweit zu bekämpfen – so steht es geschrieben. Weit unklarer wird es, wenn wir auf die nationale Ebene gehen. Zwar haben die meisten Mitgliedstaaten Kinderehen inzwischen untersagt, aber kaum einer geht effektiv gegen im Ausland bereits geschlossene Ehen vor. Diese haben mit der aktuellen Flüchtlingskrise deutlich zugenommen. Mein leidenschaftlicher Appell lautet: Null Toleranz gegen Kinderehen, auch dann, wenn sie im Ausland geschlossen wurden! Das Wohl der Mädchen muss unser Ziel sein, ihrer Zukunft muss all unsere Hilfe gelten. Da, wo wir sie den Händen ihrer Ehepeiniger entreißen, müssen wir sie sanft in behutsamen Händen auffangen. Das – und nur das – sollte heute unser gemeinsames Ziel sein: Nein zur Kinderehe! Es sind Mädchen, keine Bräute.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, comisaria Jourová, el matrimonio infantil es un problema global que se produce en diferentes países, culturas, religiones y etnias. Niega a las niñas su derecho a la salud, a la educación, a vivir con seguridad y a elegir con quién casarse y, si es el caso, cuándo y cómo.

Sin independencia económica, las niñas abandonan la educación y quedan atrapadas, junto a sus familias y comunidades, en un ciclo de pobreza. En más de 20 países en todo el mundo, es más probable que una niña cruce el umbral del dormitorio conyugal que el de su clase de secundaria.

Para combatir el fenómeno de las niñas-novias necesitamos un enfoque holístico y comprensivo, que se ajuste a los contextos locales y las particularidades de cada comunidad. Necesitamos verdadera coordinación de varios sectores, incluyendo educación, sanidad, justicia y desarrollo económico.

Terminar con el matrimonio infantil requiere destinar a los países más afectados inversiones significativas y bien orientadas, tanto de donantes internacionales como de los gobiernos.

También debemos cortar la ayuda al desarrollo a aquellos países que rehúsan limitar la edad mínima de matrimonio a los 18 años. Aunque no conviene olvidar lo que ocurre en Europa por la falta de armonización legal: en España, en mi país, la edad mínima para casarse todavía son los 16 años.

Pero lo más importante es dar poder a las niñas. Debemos trabajar directamente con ellas para que puedan adquirir habilidades y conocimiento, para que vean las posibilidades que tienen de elegir con casos reales, para que comprendan y ejerciten sus derechos y creen sus auténticas redes de apoyo.

Estas reformas serían sencillas y eficaces y demostrarían que la Unión Europea no solo habla de valores, sino que los refuerza, de verdad, en todo el mundo.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εξελίσσεται μπροστά μας ένα σύγχρονο δουλοπάζαρο. Τα θύματα όμως δεν φορούν σκισμένα και βρώμικα ρούχα, αλλά νυφικά και κοστούμια. Τι μας λέει η μελέτη; Αν συνεχιστούν οι σημερινές τάσεις μέχρι το 2030, υπολογίζεται ότι 150 εκατομμύρια παιδιά-νύφες θα έχουν παντρευτεί πριν γίνουν 18 ετών. Για αυτό απαιτούμε αμέσως την εφαρμογή της Σύμβασης της Κωνσταντινούπολης, που καταδικάζει τους αναγκαστικούς γάμους. Και καλώ την Επιτροπή, πρώτον, να ρυθμίσει πανευρωπαϊκά την ποινικοποίηση του εξαναγκασμού παιδιών σε γάμο καθώς και της σκόπιμης μεταφοράς τους σε άλλη χώρα για τον γάμο αυτό. Δεύτερον, να φροντίζει ώστε κάθε ασυνόδευτο προσφυγόπουλο να έχει νομικό εκπρόσωπο, που θα εγγυάται τον σεβασμό του και τα δικαιώματά του.

Linnéa Engström, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Barn- och tvångsäktenskap är ett övergrepp och ett symptom på sjuka normer som existerar i våra samhällen. Det kan inte accepteras. Barn har en okränkbar rätt att få vara just barn. Flickor och pojkar världen över måste få utvecklas i sin egen takt till trygga och starka individer. Bara så säkrar vi en hållbar utveckling och livsutrymme för alla.

Det är nedslående att titta på siffrorna: 37 000 minderåriga flickor blir bortgifta varje dag. Det blir 14 miljoner barn- och tvångsäktenskap varje år. Om vi ska klara de enorma utmaningar som världen står inför så måste vi stärka kvinnors rättigheter. Kvinnor måste ges ekonomiskt självbestämmande och rätten till den egna kroppen. För varje förhindrat barnäktenskap så minskar risken att barn dör i barnsäng och att svåra förlossningar leder till sjukdomar och spädbarnsdöd.

Det är EU:s skyldighet att på alla fronter bekämpa fenomenet med barn- och tvångsäktenskap. Medlemsstaterna måste se till att myndigheterna har kunskap nog att känna igen fenomenet och resurser och lagstöd att hantera situationen. Budskapet är klart: Vi accepterar inte barn- och tvångsäktenskap.

Daniela Aiuto, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissaria, grazie anche al supporto di diverse associazioni presenti sul territorio, abbiamo sollevato in commissione FEMM la problematica dei matrimoni precoci all'interno dell'Unione europea, proponendo la presentazione di un'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale con relativa risoluzione.

Ecco, perché questa urgenza? Perché ogni anno milioni di bambine affrontano viaggi dagli Stati membri verso le terre d'origine dei loro genitori per contrarre un matrimonio non voluto e non sognato, accordato dagli stessi genitori con uomini adulti.

Milioni di bambine che ogni anno vedono svanire il loro sogno di vivere libere e di realizzarsi professionalmente. Proprio il mese scorso un'inchiesta giornalistica italiana, denunciava la sparizione annuale di migliaia di ragazze tra i tredici e i diciassette anni di età, fatte partire per il Bangladesh, il Pakistan e altri paesi, per sposare un lontano parente molto più grande di loro.

Ma queste ragazze sono nate e cresciute in Europa, hanno frequentato le scuole e la cultura europea, sono a tutti gli effetti europee. Mancano purtroppo dei dati certi ed è per questo motivo che oggi chiediamo con forza alla Commissione di prendere coscienza della gravità del problema, invitando allo stesso tempo gli Stati membri a monitorare sulle situazioni a rischio presenti al loro interno e inasprire le pene contro questi veri e propri stupri perpetrati sulle minorenni.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

Mylène Troszczynski, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Madame le Commissaire, les enfants sont notre avenir et, à ce titre, doivent être protégés. Le mariage des enfants est une violation de leurs droits.

La Convention des Nations unies relative aux droits de l'enfant énonce à son article 3 que «dans toutes les décisions que prend une autorité, l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant doit être une considération primordiale». Marier un enfant va donc clairement à l'encontre de son intérêt supérieur, qui est de se construire et de bénéficier, dans la mesure du possible, de la protection d'un cadre familial jusqu'à sa majorité.

À la violation de ce droit élémentaire, à la vie future gâchée de ces enfants, viennent s'ajouter environ 70 000 décès par an dus à la grossesse ou à l'accouchement et un taux de mortalité faramineux des enfants de ces enfants.

Il est primordial de rappeler que le mariage des enfants fonctionne comme une norme sociale et ancestrale dans ces pays, souvent en voie de développement.

Mais que faire après ce constat? Comme vous le précisez dans votre texte, c'est une bonne chose de lutter contre ce phénomène en collaboration avec les pays tiers, sous réserve que l'on ne dépasse pas le cadre de la coopération et que l'on ne verse pas dans l'interventionnisme.

Vous admettez qu'avec la crise migratoire, le nombre d'enfants déjà mariés en Europe augmente, et pourtant vous persistez dans votre folle politique d'immigration et d'accueil.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει αμφιβολία πως οι γάμοι ανηλίκων, ειδικά δε παιδιών σε προεφηβική ηλικία ή στην έναρξη της εφηβείας, είναι για τα δεδομένα του δυτικού πολιτισμού απορριπτέοι και καταδικαστέοι. Ο δε εξαναγκασμός σε γάμο είναι απεχθής σε οποιαδήποτε ηλικία, πόσω μάλλον όταν αφορά ανηλίκους. Ευτυχώς, εξ όσων γνωρίζω, το νομικό πλαίσιο σε όλες τις χώρες της Ένωσης είναι σε μεγάλο βαθμό επαρκές, ενώ και οι κοινωνίες μας, με ελάχιστες εξαιρέσεις συγκεκριμένων κοινωνικών ομάδων, δεν αποδέχονται τέτοιου είδους πρακτικές.

Δυστυχώς, όμως, με τη δραματική αύξηση της λαθρομετανάστευσης και την εισροή στην Ευρώπη πληθυσμιακών ομάδων από χώρες με τελείως διαφορετικό πολιτισμό και ήθη, το φαινόμενο αυτό τείνει να λάβει ανησυχητικές διαστάσεις. Για να αντιμετωπίσουμε τέτοιες πρακτικές θα πρέπει να λάβουμε συγκεκριμένα μέτρα. Το νομικό πλαίσιο θα πρέπει να συμπληρωθεί όπου υπάρχουν κενά και οι ποινές να γίνουν πιο αυστηρές για τους παραβάτες. Όμως πραγματική λύση θα υπάρξει μόνο αν καταστήσουμε σαφές σε όσους έρχονται νόμιμα στην Ευρώπη με σκοπό να εγκατασταθούν σε όσες χώρες επιθυμούν να τους δεχτούν πως, ασχέτως με τις παραδόσεις και τα «έθιμα» που έχουν στις χώρες προέλευσής τους, θα πρέπει να συμμορφώνονται με τις αξίες και τις αρχές του ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού, αλλιώς δεν μπορούν να παραμείνουν στην ήπειρό μας.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mówimy dzisiaj tutaj o małżeństwach dzieci, ale tak naprawdę powinniśmy mówić o małżeństwach z dziećmi: dorosłych mężczyzn, czasami dojrzałych mężczyzn z dziewczętami poniżej 15 roku życia. W europejskich kodeksach karnych współzycie dorosłej osoby z dzieckiem poniżej 15 roku życia klasyfikowane jest jako pedofilia. Zważywszy na fakt, że w krajach, gdzie występują, małżeństwa te są społecznie akceptowane, bo taki jest zwyczaj, tradycja, oraz na fakt, że występują one także w Europie, mamy do czynienia z potężnym konfliktem prawnym i kulturowym, a ofiarami braku reakcji i decyzji w tej sprawie są dziewczynki i młode kobiety.

Naprzeciw tym problemom wychodzi konwencja stambulska, która jasno przesądza, że przymusowe małżeństwa i małżeństwa z dziećmi są formą przemocy, i wymaga od sygnatariuszy konwencji, ażeby uznać zmuszanie dzieci do małżeństwa za czyn przestępczy. Konwencja stanowi też, że przemoc nie może być usprawiedliwiana tradycją ani religią. W przypadku konfliktu tych wartości zwyczajne, które oparte są na idei niższości kobiet i które usprawiedliwiają przemoc, powinny być wykorzenione. Tak stanowi art. 12 konwencji i dziś, gdy mówimy o małżeństwach z dziećmi, warto przypomnieć to przesłanie konwencji, gdyż na tej sali są posłowie, którzy sprzeciwiają się tej konwencji i sprzeciwiają się właśnie treści art. 12.

(Mówczyni zgodziła się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Marek Jurek (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Bardzo liczne na przykład w Niemczech przymusowe małżeństwa dziewcząt to jest bardzo poważny problem. Cały czas o tym słyszymy. Tylko co z tym właściwie ma wspólnego konwencja stambulska? A nasz kraj – no i to dzięki tobie Agnieszka niestety – ją ratyfikował. Ja byłem przeciwny. Ale, no wiesz dobrze, że Węgry, Słowacja, Czechy, Litwa, Łotwa – kraje, które nie ratyfikowały konwencji stambulskiej – to nie są kraje, gdzie ten problem występuje. Wiele z tych dziewcząt byśmy ocalili, gdyby ich rodziny nie znajdowały się pod taką presją muzułmańskiego otoczenia.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – To nie jest pytanie, to jest, jak rozumiem, komentarz. Jak to, co ma z tym wspólnego konwencja stambulska? Konwencja stambulska to jest międzynarodowy dokument, a dla państw sygnatariuszy tego dokumentu treść konwencji staje się prawem krajowym. Nawet jeżeli na poziomie prawa krajowego była niepewność co do tego, jak rozwiązywać konflikty wartości w prawie, to konwencja te konflikty rozstrzyga.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, estava aqui a pensar se é mesmo verdade que estamos a ter um debate sobre o casamento infantil em pleno século XXI. Alguma coisa, de facto, está muito errada neste mundo. A infância deveria ser um tempo de alegria e de tranquilidade.

Já aqui foi dito que o casamento infantil destrói milhões de vidas de meninas e raparigas. Nega-lhes o direito a tomar decisões sobre o seu bem-estar e a sua saúde sexual, na altura devida. Rouba-lhes o direito à educação. Condena-as a uma vida sem perspetivas.

Estas meninas e raparigas ficam expostas à violência, aos abusos, às doenças e à morte precoce. Ficam grávidas ainda meninas. Muitas morrem do parto. Outras são mães quando deveriam estar a aprender ou a brincar. São esposas quando deviam ser crianças. São marcadas pela violação de alguém com idade para ser o seu pai.

Não há uma solução isolada. Há a necessidade de um esforço coletivo. Acabar com o casamento infantil exige um trabalho a todos os níveis. Neste aspeto, cabe à União Europeia uma responsabilidade acrescida no que diz respeito à sua política externa. Implica da nossa parte uma ação que resolva e mate este problema na sua origem. Acabar com o casamento infantil impõe um maior investimento que esteja claramente direcionado, educação, intervenção comunitária, legislação mais dura e quem não cumprir não pode receber financiamento europeu.

O combate ao casamento infantil não tem ideologia. Tem um rosto, ou melhor, milhões de rostos.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Małżeństwa dzieci to jedna z najbardziej haniebnych form seksualnego niewolnictwa, którego ofiarą padają kilkuletnie dziewczynki. Niestety w związku z nasileniem się kryzysu migracyjnego ta pedofilska praktyka rozlała się po krajach Unii Europejskiej. Niestety w tym przypadku, jak i w innych, poprawność polityczna bierze górę nad fundamentalnymi chrześcijańskimi wartościami, które ukształtowały Europę i które przecież nie dają przyzwolenia na haniebne traktowanie dziewcząt. Powiedzmy to sobie otwarcie: praktyki te mają źródło w imigranckich środowiskach Unii Europejskiej. To twardo pokazują statystyki. Nie możemy pozwolić sobie na relatywizowanie i przemykanie oczu. Tak więc chciałabym zapytać panią komisarz: czy komisja zamierza wszcząć procedurę naruszenia praworządności w stosunku do państw, w których te pedofilskie praktyki są tolerowane?

Charles Goerens (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, quand on parle aux représentants des pays qui, hélas, tolèrent encore le mariage forcé des jeunes filles, on a souvent droit à la réponse suivante: «cette pratique est fortement ancrée dans notre culture et dans nos traditions».

La présente discussion et le vote de votre résolution devraient contribuer à mettre fin à cette situation exécrable qui, malheureusement, méprise encore les droits humains les plus élémentaires des jeunes filles.

Nous ne pouvons, bien entendu, pas faire la loi dans les pays qui tolèrent encore ces pratiques, mais nous pouvons mobiliser des moyens susceptibles d'influer sur leur politique: dans nos contacts avec leurs responsables, dans le cadre du dialogue politique avec ces pays, dans le renforcement du système multilatéral, et notamment au niveau des Nations unies, et dans le cadre des accords entre l'Union européenne et les pays tiers.

Il ne sert à rien d'inscrire une mention dans le préambule d'un traité si l'on n'arrive pas à mettre les bouchées doubles. En clair, je voudrais que nous profitons du futur accord avec les pays ACP, par exemple, pour faire de l'abolition du mariage des enfants et des jeunes filles un élément de conditionnalité. Vous ne respectez pas ce principe inscrit dans la convention d'Istanbul, alors vous n'obtiendrez plus d'aide.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, los matrimonios forzados de mujeres menores, fuera y dentro de la Unión, son una de las expresiones más lacerantes de las sociedades patriarcales, y los debemos atajar con estrategias globales y coordinadas donde la política de género esté incluida transversalmente.

Para ello, la Unión Europea debe incluir en sus acuerdos de cooperación medidas específicas para la lucha contra esas prácticas. Pero, al mismo tiempo, no podemos caer en la simplicidad: no se puede hablar de empoderamiento de las mujeres, cuando alimentamos conflictos a través de una política exterior marcada por intereses económicos propios. Si, por ejemplo, se desestabilizan países en el tercer mundo para obtener materias primas baratas, es difícil que se pueda garantizar la paz y un desarrollo social y económico que ayuden a derribar las barreras de la igualdad.

Por ello, insistimos en que la política de desarrollo tiene que ser coherente y contar con una financiación adecuada, al mismo tiempo que debemos promover una política exterior de paz.

Margot Parker (EFDD). – Mr President, the luring and forcing of a child into a marriage is a disgusting crime, and one that UKIP deplores. Helpless and vulnerable children are often exploited in this way during school holidays. Such criminal activity is a threat to our society and its values and is a hindrance to integration, wherever it is perpetrated. It is an absolute violation of the human rights of many of our young girls and boys.

Today, more than 250 million women worldwide are believed to have entered into a marriage before the age of 15. We strongly believe that those involved in such a dreadful crime must be prosecuted. In addition, there should be a refusal of permanent leave to remain, or the withdrawal of British citizenship, for any adult who has procured such a marriage for themselves or for children.

It is shocking, in the 21st century, to recognise that forced marriage became a criminal act in the United Kingdom as recently as 2014. This monstrous crime needs to be tackled immediately and by all parties, and the law should apply equally irrespective of race, faith or ethnic origin.

André Elissen (ENF). – We spreken vandaag over kindhuwelijken, een fenomeen dat helaas nog steeds bestaat, en zelfs in ons beschaafd Europa voorkomt. Niet zelden vinden deze huwelijken plaats in Afghaanse, Somalische, Iraanse, Syrische en Pakistaanse gemeenschappen. Dit is niet zo vreemd wanneer men kijkt naar de legitimatie van veel van deze huwelijken. Deze legitimatie komt voort uit de islam.

In bepaalde Europese landen is het nog steeds mogelijk om een in het buitenland gesloten huwelijk met een minderjarige te laten erkennen. Dit is te gek voor woorden. Het is aan de natiestaten om erkenning van dit soort barbaarse praktijken onmogelijk te maken. Het is puur kindermisbruik. Het is de plicht van eenieder om dit krachtig te veroordelen.

We hebben geen behoefte aan duur betaalde onderzoeken, geen Commissie waarin open deuren worden ingetrapt en waar overbetaalde bobo's zich laven aan snoepreisjes. We hebben behoefte aan krachtig beleid vanuit de natiestaten. We willen minder islam en een halt op immigratie vanuit islamitische landen.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Dámy a pánové, Alexandr Solženicyn kdysi napsal, že žádný tvor na světě netrpí tolik jako ruská žena. Stále mám před očima ruské ženy ve vatovaných kabátech podbíjející pražce železničních kolejí. Solženicyn nedohlédl dále než k Solovkám a Magadanu. Neviděl miliony žen Afriky a Asie, které trpí primitivním maskulinním násilím, hladoví, jsou uráženy a ponižovány. Jsou v dětském věku obřezávány a vdávány. To jsou ti živí tvorové, kteří trpí nejvíce.

Kdysi jsem v Afghánistánu natočil film o ženách. Jedna z hrdinek byla žena, která měla 13 dětí. Po 13. dítěti řekl lékař manželovi: „Další těhotenství vaše žena nepřežije“. Znovu otěhotněla a zemřela. Její muž jí urodil k smrti. Poprvé byla těhotná, když jí bylo 15 let.

Dnes žije na světě přes 700 milionů žen, které byly vdány v dětském věku. Každý rok je k sňatku přinuceno 15 milionů dívek před 18. rokem. 60 % dětských nevěst v rozvojových zemích je negramotných, protože jim je upíráno právo na vzdělání. Islamofobie táhnoucí se Evropou zdůrazňuje, že dětské sňatky jsou vlastní islámské víře. Dovolují si říci, že to není pravda. Obrovské počty dětských sňatků jsou v nemuslimských zemích, v Indii, Brazílii či Etiopii. Násilí na dětských nevěstách je problém nadkonfesní.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, sono sessanta milioni le spose bambine nel mondo ed è stato calcolato che nei paesi in via di sviluppo una bambina ogni tre si sposa prima dei diciott'anni; una su nove, addirittura prima dei quindici anni e le bambine prive di istruzione hanno il triplo delle probabilità di sposarsi ancora prima.

Risulta elevatissima – lo hanno ricordato anche i colleghi – la probabilità di morte a causa di rapporti sessuali che avvengono prima della pubertà ed è elevata naturalmente anche la mortalità durante i parti. Si tratta di numeri che parlano di una vera e propria emergenza, Presidente e Commissaria. Un'emergenza rispetto alla quale noi non possiamo davvero voltarci dall'altra parte, ed è bene dirci con chiarezza che questi matrimoni infantili precoci forzati sono la legalizzazione e la copertura per chi continua a praticare la pedofilia, per chi continua a macchiarsi di un reato particolarmente aberrante, particolarmente odioso e rispetto al quale io credo noi non dobbiamo avere assolutamente tolleranza.

E questo significa fare cose concrete, significa certamente andare nella direzione che noi abbiamo voluto attraverso questa risoluzione che è una cosa importante, perché combattere queste pratiche significa difendere semplicemente i diritti umani fondamentali.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, nútenie mladistvých dievčat k tomu, aby sa vydávali, považujem za absolútne neakceptovateľný prejav v európskej kultúre v roku 2017. Ale je tiež morálne hanebné, že tvorcovia predloženej rezolúcie a otázky nám podsúvajú tak krutú udalosť, akou je detské manželstvo, na presadzovanie ďalšej krutosti, a tou je zabíjanie nevinných detí v ženských materniciach. Riešenie jednej traumy pomocou nepotrebných a brutálnych tzv. „liečby“ je jednoducho návodom na vyvolávanie ďalších mentálnych chorôb a nie je vhodné, aby to zaznievalo v tejto sále. Názov témy rokovania – Ukončenie manželstiev maloletých – je zavádzajúci. Očakával by som totiž, že sa budeme baviť o tom, ako pomôcť deťom narodeným z týchto manželstiev a zlepšiť tak život ďalšej generácie, ale žiadne ponúkané riešenie som tam nenašiel. Tento názov je falošnou reklamou. Nútené sobáše vznikajú v uzavretých komunitách, kde sa nerešpektuje európske právo. Ja sa potom pýtam, kde sú sudcovia, polícia a štátna správa? Tieto dievčatá treba viesť ochrániť. Ale jednu krivdu chceme nahradiť inou, a to tým, že zoberieme nenarodený život. Toto im nepomôže, naopak, poškodí ich to ešte viac.

(Rečník súhlasil, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty (článok 162 ods. 8 rokovacieho poriadku))

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE), blue-card question. – Mr President, I see that the members of the European Conservatives and Reformists Group and my colleague Mr Škripek are saying that there is nothing to do and that it is behind closed doors, but there is a legal instrument. It is called the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women, which also criminalises child and early marriage. Why did you all vote against it? This is the instrument – or do you only care if this practice is done in your Member State or not? (Applause) It is a global phenomenon affecting millions of girls, and with access to the Istanbul Convention we have more legal tools and more comprehensive means to deal with it in the world.

Branislav Škripek (ECR), blue-card answer. – There are many errors being used as an answer to this problem. We say that this is something which is being pushed forward. It is not a real solution to suggest so-called sexual and reproductive rights and yet more money for abortions. This is not a solution. You mention the Istanbul Convention, but this is again a legally flawed document which is not yet accepted by many countries, so we cannot rely on it.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che oggi si tratti di collocarsi, come recita il titolo di un bellissimo libro di Elena Gianini Belotti, «dalla parte delle bambine». Penso che la discussione che abbiamo fatto nella scorsa plenaria, chiedendo con forza la ratifica della Convenzione di Istanbul in tutta l'Unione europea, da parte di tutti gli Stati membri, ci dia uno strumento e un'indicazione importante proprio perché riconosce la violenza sulle donne in molteplici declinazioni, compresa la violenza contro le bambine.

Bambine a cui questi matrimoni precoci impediscono di svolgere appieno un percorso di autodeterminazione, un percorso di autoconsapevolezza e la cui salute viene minata – come è stato già detto benissimo dalle colleghe che mi hanno preceduto – da rapporti sessuali costretti, forzati e non scelti e da gravidanze, appunto, non scelte.

Penso che questo sia un'urgenza per quest'Aula e mi auguro che la Commissione intenda agire con forza nella direzione di salvaguardare i diritti delle bambine.

President. – Ms Forenza, I do apologise to you but I would take this opportunity to remind the Members that we are behind schedule, the time has been allocated and has to be respected. I will follow that up but let us also pay some respect to those who have asked for catch-the-eye time and possibly for blue cards. We want to have a debate, so from now on I will be even stricter than I have been up to now.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). – Herr talman! Barn ska inte föda barn. Och barn ska inte gifta sig. Samtidigt lever vi i en värld där 27 flickor i minuten blir bortgifta, oftast mot sin vilja. Barnäktenskap medför en extrem allvarlig risk för dödlighet för flickor framförallt när det gäller komplikationer i samband med graviditet och att dessa barn föder barn.

FN har som mål att utplåna barnäktenskap i världen innan 2030, detta när antalet bara ökar, här har vi som en välfärdsstat ett ansvar att kraftfullt se till att göra vårt bästa för att stoppa och förhindra att barn blir bortgifta. Vi får inte blunda för detta förtryck, vi måste stå upp för barnens rättigheter och sätta hårt mot hårt. I Sverige hör vi rapporter som säger att så många som 70 000 unga riskerar att bli bortgifta.

Vi vet också att i och med den stora invandringen som skett till Europa har orsakat att många av de barn som kommer är gifta med äldre män, många gånger har giftermålen skett strax innan man kommit till Europa för att man trott att det ska leda till större chanser för att få asyl, min fråga är då här hur gör man i dessa fall för att säkerställa barnens bästa, vågar vi verkligen utreda barnens situation eller blundar vi för att vi är fega och tror oss kränka någons kultur eller tradition. Men låt mig då påminna er om att detta är inget annat en ett fruktansvärt förtryck.

(Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 162.8 i arbetsordningen.)

Marek Jurek (ECR), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Chciałem zapytać, czy Szwecja potrzebuje konwencji stambulskiej po to, żeby walczyć z plagą przymusowych małżeństw dziewcząt.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD), svar ("blått kort"). – Ja, vi har ju ratificerat Istanbulkonventionen i Sverige och jag tycker att det faktiskt är viktigt att alla medlemsstater gör det. Som sagt: Det är kanske inte bara är upp till Istanbulkonventionen att bekämpa det här. Vi måste på nationell nivå våga säga ifrån, för vi blundar ofta och ser mellan fingrarna för att vi är så rädda för att kränka någon. Så vi måste nog jobba från många håll när det gäller det här.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Wir schreiben das Jahr 2017 Anno Domini in Europa, geschätzte Kollegen, und worüber müssen wir uns in diesem Haus unterhalten? Wir müssen uns darüber unterhalten, dass Kinder zur Ehe mit erwachsenen Männern gezwungen werden.

Wo liegt denn die Wurzel dieses Übels? Man sieht ja, wie sich die linke Seite winden muss, um ja nicht die Wurzel anzusprechen. Die Wurzel dieser grausamen Praxis liegt bei der ungezügelter Zuwanderung, die Sie befürworten, bei einer ungezügelter Zuwanderung aus muslimischen Staaten, wo in der Scharia ja erlaubt ist, Mädchen bereits mit neun Jahren zu verheiraten. Diese Rechtspraxis widerspricht jedem geltenden europäischen Recht seit der Erfindung durch die Römer, als sie das Recht mehr oder weniger erfunden haben.

Also die Problematik liegt an der unkontrollierten Zuwanderung. Und dieses Haus beschäftigt sich immer wieder exzessiv mit Gender-Maßnahmen, die völlig an der Problematik vorbeigehen. Auf der anderen Seite wird hier eine Kinderehe toleriert. Also, so kann es mit uns nicht gehen.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, permita-me subscrever e partilhar a perplexidade de que deu nota a Deputada Liliana Rodrigues, mas a verdade é que todos os anos, a cada minuto, 28 meninas são obrigadas a casar. Isto significa 15 milhões por ano e, se nada fizermos, 150 milhões na próxima década. Estima-se que existam já no mundo 700 milhões de mulheres e 150 milhões de homens que foram obrigados a casar antes da sua maioridade. Números como estes reforçam o sentido de urgência no combate a esta realidade, um combate que passa, necessariamente, pela política externa da União.

Países como a Nigéria, Moçambique ou a Índia são exemplos onde esta realidade ainda persiste, mas também no nosso território necessitamos de agir. É urgente garantir que temos os meios mais adequados para erradicar este fenómeno dentro de portas. É ainda mais intolerável que existam casamentos forçados dentro da União Europeia. Ainda recentemente, este Parlamento aprovou a adesão da União à Convenção do Conselho da Europa para a prevenção e o combate à violência contra as mulheres e urgiu os Estados-Membros em falta para o fazerem, como recordou Anna Maria Corazza Bildt.

Em suma, Senhor Presidente, temos de fazer deste combate uma prioridade, para resgatar estas crianças dos casamentos forçados e garantir que, no futuro, muitas mais não sejam agrilhoadas. Uma prioridade para todos, nos Estados-Membros e no resto do mundo.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, cette résolution ne suffira pas sans un signal politique fort. Les chiffres, nous les connaissons, les instruments juridiques de protection des enfants existent, alors pourquoi toujours faire face à cette terrible réalité?

Les mariages d'enfants sont toujours forcés. Toujours! C'est sur la notion de consentement que je voudrais insister car c'est le grand perdant de nos débats. À partir de quel moment peut-on dire qu'un mariage est librement consenti par une fillette terrorisée? À partir de quel moment la première relation sexuelle est consentie lorsque cette même fillette doit prouver sa fertilité et sa virginité?

Ces circonstances inégalitaires ne démontrent-elles pas la contrainte sidérante? Le silence ne peut valoir consentement.

Par conséquent, Madame la Commissaire, je vous demande d'engager une initiative européenne sur la notion de consentement des filles et des femmes en général, afin de mettre fin aux disparités nationales et au défaut de protection des législations européennes.

Enfin, je tiens à dire à mes collègues d'en face qu'un mariage d'enfants mineurs sur trois se produit dans les pays développés.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Zwischen 2011 und 2020 werden weltweit voraussichtlich 140 Millionen Kinderehen geschlossen. In diesen Ehen verlieren Jugendliche ihr Selbstbestimmungsrecht, manchmal werden ihnen die Freiheit und die Zukunft genommen. Sie landen in Abhängigkeit, was dazu führt, dass sie oftmals sehr früh schwanger werden, dies führt zu Schulabbrüchen und erst recht auch zu Ausbildungsabbrüchen. Das heißt, sie landen in Abhängigkeit – Abhängigkeit gegenüber ihren Ehemännern und in der Konsequenz vielleicht auch gegenüber dem Staat.

Kulturen, in denen so etwas vorkommt – darüber müssen wir uns doch im Klaren sein –, passen – wenn sie das in Europa leben wollen – nicht zu uns. Deshalb müssen wir dafür sorgen, dass solche Ehen in Europa nicht anerkannt werden und dass Menschen, die hierher kommen und eine Kinderehe praktizieren wollen, hier nichts verloren haben. Das sollten wir in aller Klarheit sagen.

Marco Zullo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio anche i colleghi che hanno portato in Aula questo importante tema del matrimonio dei bambini. Ringrazio anche le associazioni che ogni giorno lavorano sul territorio per fermare questo fenomeno. L'abbiamo detto: sono milioni le bambine costrette a sposarsi forzatamente, quindi in piena violazione dei diritti umani.

Noi possiamo agire come Europa, come Parlamento, prendendo in considerazione negli accordi di cooperazione questo fenomeno, perché non è etico che si facciano affari con i paesi che non rispettano i diritti umani.

Però non dobbiamo dimenticare che il tema delle spose bambine riguarda sempre di più anche noi dell'Unione europea e non solo i paesi in via di sviluppo. Lo abbiamo già citato: mi riferisco per esempio ai casi di abbandono scolastico, dove bambine europee improvvisamente spariscono e, se va bene, rimangono in Italia o addirittura vanno al di fuori dei confini europei.

Noi dobbiamo interrompere questo flusso: serve una forte iniziativa normativa a livello europeo e nazionale per fermare questo fenomeno.

Dominique Bilde (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, il est impératif de lutter contre les mariages d'enfants, mais encore faut-il être logique.

Cette proposition rappelle que ces enfants abandonnent souvent leur scolarité. Étonnamment, elle propose de mettre l'accent sur l'éducation. Mais si ces enfants ont été contraints de quitter l'école, ce n'est pas par des moyens éducatifs que nous ferons cesser le phénomène.

La proposition indique que le mariage des enfants n'est pas l'apanage des pays tiers. Nous voilà affectés! Mais elle fait elle-même le lien avec l'immigration, liant crise migratoire et mariages d'enfants contractés à l'étranger. Comme quoi la mobilité n'est pas toujours libératrice!

À aucun moment elle n'évoque la question de l'intégration. C'est pourtant ce que l'on demande aux populations qui ont de telles pratiques. Qu'elles assimilent nos mœurs. Cette intégration ne peut réussir avec le flux actuel.

Incapable de remettre en cause l'accueil inconditionnel et illimité des migrants, la proposition va jusqu'à encourager l'évolution des mœurs des pays tiers via l'éducation.

Comment faire pour soigner le mal à la racine? Peut-être faudrait-il commencer par ne pas importer ce mal sur notre sol.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní komisařko, ta debata jasně ukazuje, že ten problém má dvě polohy. Dětské sňatky ve třetích státech a dětské sňatky na úrovni Evropské unie. U té první polohy, tzn. dětské sňatky ve třetích státech, je třeba, abychom výrazně tlačili na naše partnery, aby přijali Istanbulskou úmluvu. Ale téma dětských sňatků jako princip porušování lidských práv by měl být mnohem více obsažen v naší evropské diplomacii. Při jednání s našimi partnery bychom neměli řešit jenom otázku svobody projevu, trestu smrti nebo jiné formy porušování lidských práv. Ale měli bychom také řešit i toto právo, tzn. právo ženy na sebeurčení a právo ženy v dospělém věku se svobodně rozhodnout, jestli vstoupí či nevstoupí do sňatku. Je to o naší diplomacii při jednání s našimi partnery, při poskytování finanční pomoci třetím státům toto zahrnout jako jednu z podmínek pro to, abychom těmto státům nějakou ekonomickou pomoc poskytovali.

Druhá věc jsou pak dětské sňatky na území EU. Už to zde bylo řečeno, jejich počet narůstá s příchodem dalších migrantů na území EU. A tady mě osobně mrzí, že usnesení, o kterém zítra hlasujeme, v bodu 14 pouze hovoří, že je třeba řádným způsobem monitorovat dětské sňatky na území EU. Čekal bych mnohem tvrdší odsouzení, čekal bych, že důsledkem bude už zde zmiňovaná evropská iniciativa, která jasně zakáže jakékoliv tolerování dětských sňatků na území EU a dětské sňatky na území Evropy bude kriminalizovat. V Evropě to můžeme řešit.

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, beaucoup de choses ont été dites, c'est pourquoi je limiterai mon propos à la différence dans le traitement juridique, en prenant quelques exemples.

En 2016, un tribunal de Bavière a approuvé le mariage d'un Syrien de 21 ans avec sa cousine de 14 ans. Le tribunal a estimé que ce mariage était valide parce qu'il avait été conclu en accord avec la loi syrienne. Fin 2015, selon le même principe, les Pays-Bas reconnaissaient les mariages de mineurs lorsqu'ils avaient été enregistrés dans le pays d'origine. En Allemagne aussi, le gouvernement fédéral a présenté, il y a quelques mois, en Conseil des ministres, un projet de loi qui interdit le mariage des mineurs, l'âge légal minimum passant de 16 à 18 ans. En France, les deux époux doivent avoir 18 ans, mais un mariage avec un mineur peut être autorisé pour des motifs sérieux comme, par exemple, une grossesse.

L'important est d'essayer d'aller vers une harmonisation. Par le vote de cette résolution, nous essaierons d'appliquer des normes juridiques uniformes sur le territoire européen en ce qui concerne le mariage des enfants et, si possible, son interdiction, comme le rappelle le rapporteur spécial des Nations unies en la matière.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, kannatan täydestä sydämestäni lapsiavioliittojen lopettamista. Euroopassa ei voida enää sulkea silmiä lapsiavioliitoilta monikulttuurisiin arvoihin vedoten. Eurooppaan saapuvilta on edellytettävä samanlaista ihmisoikeuksien kunnioitusta kuin eurooppalaisilta itseltään.

Lapsiavioliittojen estäminen ei ole pelkästään humanitaarista. Se on vaikuttava keino edistää pitkällä aikavälillä kehitysmaiden kehitystä ja padota pakolaistulvaa kestävästi. Tyttöjen koulutus on niitä harvoja tekijöitä, jotka on tutkimuksissa havaittu yli sukupolvien vaikuttavaksi investoinniksi köyhyyden vastaisessa taistelussa. Lapsiavioliitot, vähäinen koulutus ja nopea väestönkasvu ovat sidoksissa toisiinsa. EU:lla on tässä tilaisuus osoittaa suurta johtajuutta, eikä tätä tilaisuutta tule jättää käyttämättä.

President. – Colleagues, we now come to catch the eye. Even if I am very generous I will not be able to provide speaking time to more than half of those colleagues who have applied to speak because the list is very long.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Többször beszéltünk már a gyermekházasságok riasztóan magas számáról, mégsem lehet elégszer elmondani, hogy a jelenség megfékezése nem csak emberi jogi szempontok miatt fontos. Hiszen hozzá kell tennünk azt, hogy főleg a fejlődő országokban, szegénységben élő családok gyermekeiről van szó, akik így iskolai tanulmányaikat is félbehagyják, ezzel saját és családjuk társadalmi felemelkedését és a szegénység csökkentését teszik még nehezebbé.

Óriási lakosságszámmal rendelkező államokban, Indiában, Bangladesben vagy éppen Afrika középső részén nagyon elterjedtek a gyermekházasságok, ahol a népszaporulat is magas, és ezek az államok sok esetben Európába irányuló migrációs forrásországoknak is számítanak. Elképesztő adat, hogy 2030-ra 950 millió főt fog érinteni a gyermekházasság, ami az Unió lakosságának kétszeresét teszi ki. Nem lehet a hagyományokkal és a szokásokkal magyarázni a jelenség fenntartását. Ha a világ kezelni szeretné a túlnépesedésből, a globális felmelegedésből és a migrációból eredő problémákat, akkor a gyermekházasságok gyakorlatát meg kell szüntetni.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signora Commissaria, i matrimoni precoci e forzati, e in particolare il fenomeno delle spose bambine, rappresentano una piaga mondiale, forse ancora sottostimata e quindi non adeguatamente contrastata sul piano giuridico e socioculturale.

Sono milioni nel mondo le giovani donne che hanno contratto matrimonio addirittura prima del compimento dei 14 anni e tali matrimoni, precoci e forzati, costituiscono un fenomeno estremamente pregiudizievole, che comporta una grave violazione dei diritti delle bambine, spesso sottoposte a violenze ed abusi, in ogni caso private del diritto all'infanzia ma anche della dignità, della speranza e della possibilità di scegliere il proprio futuro.

Come Unione europea, abbiamo la responsabilità di intervenire: dobbiamo far sì, che il rispetto della dignità e dei diritti dei minori, oltre ad essere sempre affermati sul territorio europeo, siano le necessarie premesse per avviare accordi di cooperazione con quei paesi in via di sviluppo nei quali persiste tale pratica, per sollecitare e avviare un percorso di riforme, nel segno del rispetto dei diritti delle giovani donne e delle bambine.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il fenomeno delle spose bambine è in costante aumento e, secondo *Save the Children*, è tra le principali barriere che impediscono alle ragazze di accedere a servizi e opportunità.

Ogni sette secondi nel mondo, una ragazza con meno di 15 anni si sposa, spesso con un uomo molto più grande. Tutte queste bambine non sono pronte né fisicamente, né psicologicamente, non possono affrontare un matrimonio, né tantomeno una gravidanza.

Purtroppo, l'impegno legale volto a proteggerlo attraverso la penalizzazione del matrimonio infantile incontra notevoli ostacoli dovuti alla cultura politica prevalente, all'accondiscendenza di estremisti religiosi e al perdurare di pregiudizi di genere.

La comunità internazionale si è impegnata a mettere fine alla pratica dei matrimoni precoci entro il 2030: ma se il numero di spose bambine nel mondo continuerà a crescere ai ritmi attuali, entro quella data avremo 950 milioni di giovani donne sposate. Il lavoro da fare è sulla diffusione di legislazioni che impediscano la possibilità di contrarre un matrimonio con delle minori e l'Europa deve fare la sua parte.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, child marriages are a violation of the human rights of children, of young girls, and are a form of gender-based violence. This debate provides an opportunity for elected representatives to hear from the Commission about the effectiveness of EU measures, whether it is in Europe or in developing countries. For example, the right-wing ruling party in Turkey recently considered a proposal to free convicted rapists provided that they marry their victims. To truly confront the reality, we must take a holistic view, empowering women and girls through education, ensuring that systems that subject girls to child marriages are eroded through women's leadership from the grassroots community upwards and that girls themselves are enabled and empowered to speak up in every way they can.

I am proud to be part of a European Union that takes action to advance the rights of women and girls around the world and I look forward to hearing from the Commission about their work on this.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, I am glad that we are having this debate because it gives us the opportunity to reiterate, loud and clear, that child marriage is a violation of human rights and should be criminalised as such. Girls are the most targeted group in this vile practice. This scourge only furthers gender discrimination and, in practical terms, it means legalising domestic sexual violence. The EU stands with women and girls and is committed to eradicating child marriage, with initiatives such as the Daphne programme, but we can do more.

We need to push all countries to introduce a minimum age for marriage and to ensure better access to sexual and reproductive health services. Ending child marriage would be a major milestone on the path towards the empowerment of women, and thus it should remain a priority of the European Union.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, dječji brakovi nespojivi su s onim što Europa danas jest – jedna napredna civilizacija koja se oslanja na vladavinu prava. Naš pravni sustav ovakav oblik nasilja nad najranjivijim članovima društva stavlja izvan okvira dozvoljenog i to bi svi žitelji država članica Unije, neovisno o vlastitom kulturnom ili vjerskom nasljeđu, trebali poštovati.

Problem nastaje kad se pripadnike raznih manjina automatski svrstava u ranjive skupine pa im se neke stvari, koje nikome drugome nisu dozvoljene, ipak dozvoljavaju. Jedna od tih stvari su i dječji brakovi koji su u Europi dominantno praksa manjinskih zajednica.

Ovo je još jedno pitanje koje pokazuje kolika je potreba za boljom integracijskom politikom i dosljednim provođenjem zakona u Europi. Zakon mora biti isti za sve jer ćemo se u protivnom vratiti u neka ružna vremena kojih se europski narodi ne sjećaju s osobitom nostalgijom.

President. – Colleagues, just by way of explanation, I have seen some colleagues asking for catch-the-eye after the catch-the-eye debate has started. I am not in a position to take those requests.

By the way, this does not concern you, Ms Vautmans. I am just saying it as a general remark: looking at you does not mean it is about you! But seriously, I cannot take those requests, not least because we are behind schedule and the list is very long. So, my apologies, but the moment catch-the-eye starts we cannot even put your name on the list to give you the floor.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – 750 miljoen meisjes wereldwijd, kindhuwelijken. Jaarlijks 15 miljoen meisjes. Dat aantal is toch wel verschrikkelijk. Het gebeurt in ontwikkelingslanden en, collega's, ik heb ze bezocht. Zwanger zijnde in een kraambed, baby's die sterven, jonge meisjes die lijden aan fistels en nadien verstoten worden. Ik heb ze ook weggedragen zien worden. Kindbruiden, zwanger geworden, stervend in het kraambed.

Dat is wat vandaag de dag nog altijd gebeurt en daar moeten we op inzetten in de ontwikkelingslanden. Zoals collega Goerens zei: met educatie, met opleiding, met politieke druk op de politieke verantwoordelijken aldaar. Maar we moeten ook in eigen hart durven kijken. We moeten, zoals de heer Tarabella zei, ook kijken naar wat hier in Europa gebeurt. Waar herkennen we die kindhuwelijken? Hoe kunnen we hier kinderen beschermen zodat ze niet worden uitgehuwelijkt? Laten we samen gaan voor nultolerantie.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, v rozvojových zemích se každá třetí dívka vdá před dovršením 18. roku a každá devátá před dovršením 15 let. Problém dětského manželství se dotýká jak dívek, tak chlapců, ale dívky, které představují 82 % sezdaných dětí, jsou ohroženy nejvíce. Problém se netýká však pouze třetích zemí, ale také Evropy. Omlouvám se, že používám silná slova, ale dětské sňatky považuji za naprosto neakceptovatelnou zvrácenost. Například úřady v Německu v loňském roce evidovaly již 1 500 vdaných či ženatých dětí. To je zcela nepřijatelné, není přece možné, abychom v EU akceptovali dětská manželství, která jdou zcela proti evropskému právu. Děti patří do škol a ne k plotnám a to je princip, od kterého se na území EU není možné odklonit. Tato praxe musí skončit, pokud se stále chceme považovat za místo s jistým morálním a civilizačním rozměrem. A tato debata by

měla zcela konkrétní opatření, která jí zabrání uvnitř EU, připravit do budoucna a já pevně věřím, že tomu tak bude, paní komisařko.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, νομίζω ότι το πρόβλημα έχει περιγραφεί πάρα πολύ καλά από πολλούς συναδέλφους και δεν θα επαναλάβω τίποτα. Πρέπει όμως, κυρία Επίτροπε, να λάβουμε μέτρα, οικονομικά, πολιτικά και νομικά. Νομίζω ότι έχετε ακόμα δρόμο να διανύσετε και πρέπει να αναλάβετε την προσπάθεια αυτή. Θέλω να κλείσω με το εξής για να μην τρώω πολύ χρόνο: είναι λανθασμένη η προσέγγιση που ακούσαμε από τα απέναντι έδρανα για την αύξηση των γάμων αυτών και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Είναι ένα υπαρκτό πρόβλημα, αλλά εμείς το κοιτάζουμε παγκόσμια. Δεν μπορεί να έχουμε διαφορετική ματιά για αυτό που συμβαίνει στην Αφρική, στην Ασία και διαφορετική για αυτό που συμβαίνει ίσως και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Το πρόβλημα πρέπει να το αντιμετωπίσουμε με τους ίδιους τρόπους. Να λάβουμε πιο επιτακτικά μέτρα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αλλά να μην ρίχνουμε το βάρος στο ότι υπάρχει μετανάστευση. Υπάρχει μετανάστευση, αλλά έχουμε καλύτερους τρόπους για να αντιμετωπίσουμε το πρόβλημα μέσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for this very interesting and very alarming debate. On 30 June this year a great step was taken as the Convention, the Istanbul Convention which has been mentioned here many times in the discussion, was signed on behalf of the EU. The decision on the conclusion is currently being negotiated in the Council, and I can assure you that the Commission is working very closely with the Estonian Presidency to achieve progress towards ratification.

I can assure you that I will use every possible moment and opportunity to discuss with those States which have not yet ratified, to do so. On behalf of the Commission I can say that we are very grateful for the considerable support for accession expressed by Parliament on many occasions.

President. – I have received one motion for a resolution tabled in accordance with Rule 128(5) of the Rules of Procedure.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Wednesday, 4 October 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve, antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), *în scris*. – Pe lângă toate aspectele legate de acest subiect sensibil, menționate în întrebarea orală, vreau să vă atrag atenția în primul rând că, odată cu recenta criză a migrației, au apărut noi cazuri de căsătorii de copii încheiate în străinătate, care implică uneori copii cu vârsta mai mică de 14 ani, ceea ce este absolut revoltător.

În al doilea rând, vreau să subliniez faptul că, atât la nivel național și la nivelul Uniunii, cât și la nivel internațional, sunt disponibile foarte puține statistici care să demonstreze magnitudinea problemei reprezentate de căsătoriile copiilor, căsătoriile timpurii și căsătoriile forțate (CEFM). Având în vedere că această practică este prezentă nu doar în țările terțe, ci și în unele state membre ale Uniunii Europene, consider că este necesară o monitorizare adecvată și armonizată a tuturor acestor cazuri de căsătorii pe teritoriul UE, dar și o colectare de date defalcate în funcție de gen, pentru a putea evalua mai bine amploarea acestei probleme.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), *por escrito*. – Quisiera dar la bienvenida a esta pregunta parlamentaria en la medida en que impulsa las iniciativas europeas encaminadas a erradicar los matrimonios infantiles y asegurar los derechos universales de los niños. Al mismo tiempo, quisiera recordar que esta complicada cuestión no podrá ser tratada de forma eficaz sin tener en cuenta diversos condicionantes culturales, económicos y políticos. Por ejemplo, según la asociación no gubernamental *Child not brides*, siete de cada diez países con mayores tasas de matrimonio infantil son considerados Estados frágiles. Simultáneamente, se sabe que las crisis humanitarias, los conflictos y las catástrofes ambientales exacerban las condiciones de pobreza e inseguridad que favorecen los matrimonios infantiles, lo que también se refleja en las crisis migratorias, incluyendo la que afecta a Europa en los últimos años. Todos estos factores deben tomarse en consideración a la hora de abordar una estrategia eficaz que vaya más allá de las declaraciones tranquilizadoras. Por último, quisiera saludar la decisión de mencionar explícitamente a los niños (no sólo a las niñas) en la pregunta, lo que muestra un genuino compromiso con la igualdad de género.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Fakt, że na publicznej arenie w krajach rozwijających się istnieje takie zjawisko, jak małżeństwa nieletnich, pokazuje, że nie idziemy do przodu, ale cofamy się, w przepaść ignorancji umysłowej. Nieletnie dziewczynki i potomstwo (takich małżeństw) płacą cenę za tę ohydę umysłową, która skłania ludzi do wydawania za mąż dziewczynek, które nie osiągnęły dojrzałości płciowej lub zaledwie ją osiągnęły. Jest to umysłowe ześlizgiwanie się do tyłu, które ma bardzo poważne konsekwencje. Mała dziewczynka nie może znieść wymagań życia małżeńskiego ani psychicznie, ani fizycznie. Jest to zatem przestępstwo, które może powstrzymać tylko prawo.

Ze względu na migrację z krajów dotkniętych klęską i dużą liczbę uchodźców powyższy problem dotyczy również Europy. Traktaty wymagają, by UE promowała prawa dziecka. Samoistnie nasuwa mi się więc pytanie: jak Komisja zajmuje się tą kwestią?

Pragnę jednocześnie zaznaczyć, że nie zgadzam się na ustępstwa pochwalamy aborcję (ukrytą pod hasłem praw seksualnych i reprodukcyjnych). Moje poparcie dla rezolucji nie ma więc nic wspólnego z tymi ustępami, którym stanowczo się sprzeciwiam.

Livia Járóka (PPE), *írásban*. – Minden évben 15 millió 18 év alatti kislány köt kényszerházasságot, tehát úgy is mondhatnánk, hogy percenként 28 lány, másodpercenként pedig 1 lány esik a nők elleni erőszak eme formájának áldozatául. A roma nők Európa-szerte nem csak nemük, hanem etnikai hovatartozásuk miatt is hátrányos, összetett, többszörös megkülönböztetés áldozatai a széles körben elterjedt cigányellenesség következtében. Ezért is különösen fontos, hogy az EU Roma 2020-2030 stratégiában kiemelten foglalkozzunk a kérdéssel. Magyarország kormányja 2012-ben indított „Nő az esély” programja keretében 1,5 milliárd forintot szakképzési támogatást nyújt, hogy minél több roma nő tudjon elhelyezkedni a munkaerőpiacon. Hasonló célzott intézkedéseket javasolunk a többi kormány számára is.

Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Mit dieser EntschlieÙung setzen wir ein klares Zeichen gegen die Verhehlchung von Kindern. Die Bekämpfung von Kinderehe unterstütze ich vollumfänglich. Allerdings möchte ich davor warnen, verschiedene Themen zu vermischen. Daher lehne ich den Antrag betreffend die sexuelle und reproduktive Gesundheit und die damit verbundenen Rechte und Dienstleistungen, einschließlich des sicheren und legalen Schwangerschaftsabbruchs, ab. Außerdem lehne ich es ab, dass die Europäische Union Gelder für die Finanzierungslücke der „Global Gag Rule“ im Bereich der reproduktiven und sexuellen Rechte zur Verfügung stellen soll.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con personas, en la mayoría de los casos hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia, su inocencia, y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil, precoz y forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible de 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D), in writing. – In recent years child marriage has gained increasing prominence on international and national development agendas. Each year, 15 million girls are married before the age of 18. Child marriage is a crime recognised under the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women, which we must end in order to achieve a fairer future for all.

Child brides face enormous challenges as a result of being married as children. Child marriage is a complex issue: poverty, lack of education or different cultural practices. Ending child marriage requires work across all sectors and at all levels. We must take a holistic approach to empower young girls through education, to ensure that systems that subject girls to child marriages are eroded through women's leadership from the grassroots community upwards and that girls themselves are enabled and empowered to speak up in every way they can. Today, we have a unique opportunity to act on this momentum and accelerate our efforts to help change the lives of girls and young women all over the world.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Laste varajased ja sundabielud on lapse õiguse rikkumine ning naiste- ja tütarlaste vastane vägivald. Arenguriikides abiellub iga kolmas tütarlaps enne 18-aastaseks saamist ja iga üheksas enne 15-aastaseks saamist. Väikeste või keskmiste tuludega riikides on rasedus- ja sünnitusaegsed tüsistused 15-19-aastaste tütarlaste seas peamine surmapõhjus. Varajased ja sundabielud on seotud emasuremuse kõrge määraga ning tavaliselt tähendab see ka tütarlapse hariduse omandamise lõppu. Selline praktika tuleb peatada ja see peab olema ELi välistegevuse prioriteet naiste õiguste ja inimõiguste edendamise valdkonnas. Oluline on ka märkida, et probleem ei esine mitte ainult kolmandates riikides, vaid ka ELis. Eelarves tuleb leida vahendid laste abielude ennetamise programmidele, tuleb toetada kolmandaid riike selliste praktikate kaotamisel ning suurendada teadlikkust erinevate kampaaniate raames. Veel on erilised murekohad laste kaitse tagamine pagulaste ja varjupaigataotlejate seas – vastuvõtavad riigid peavad tagama lapspagulastele täieliku juurdepääsu haridusele ning abistama laps- või sundabielude ohvreid. Samuti leian, et ELil on kohustus leida rahastus USA poolt tekitatud tühimikule nn üldise vaikimisseaduse uuesti kehtestamisega seksuaal- ja reproduktiivtervise valdkonnas.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), por escrito. – Todos los niños y todas las niñas tienen derecho a disfrutar de una infancia feliz. Es intolerable que en pleno siglo XXI se siga obligando a menores, sobre todo niñas, a contraer matrimonio con hombres mucho mayores, que no respetan su infancia y las obligan a dar un salto brutal a la vida adulta, las violan, las dejan embarazadas y muchas mueren porque su cuerpo no está aún preparado. En los países en desarrollo una de cada tres niñas se casa antes de cumplir los dieciocho años y una de cada nueve antes de los quince. El matrimonio infantil afecta tanto a las niñas como a los niños, pero las niñas corren más peligro, ya que representan el 82 % de los menores casados. Este problema afecta también a Europa. El matrimonio infantil forzado constituye una violación de los derechos de los niños y las niñas reconocidos en los Tratados de la UE. La UE debe cumplir los objetivos del programa de desarrollo sostenible 2030 para luchar contra el matrimonio infantil, cooperar con ONU Mujeres, UNICEF y FNUAP y diseñar políticas de cooperación y desarrollo que contemplen la defensa de los derechos de los niños y las niñas.

11. Prioritäten für die Partnerschaft EU-Ägypten 2017-2020 (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the EU-Egypt partnership priorities for 2017-2020 (2017/2874(RSP)).

Miguel Arias Cañete, *on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, last July, High Representative Mogherini and the Egyptian Foreign Minister, Sameh Shoukry, chaired the European Union-Egypt Association Council, in the presence of Commissioner Hahn. It was on that occasion that our new Partnership Priorities were adopted.

This was the first Association Council with Egypt in seven years, so the first since the beginning of the revolts in the Arab world. It is precisely in these times of transition that our cooperation becomes more important. It is important for the people of Egypt and their aspiration to security, democracy and economic growth. It is essential for the region – from Libya to Syria – and it is essential for Europe, because we are neighbours and we share many of the same challenges.

So we are glad that we have managed to reopen such an important channel for dialogue with Egypt. This does not mean that the European Union and Egypt agree on all files. But precisely when you disagree on something, engagement becomes essential. There is no other way to address any outstanding issue, in the interest of the Egyptian people and of the whole region.

Our partnership with Egypt will be structured around four main tracks. Firstly, support to the Egyptian government's socio-economic reform agenda. In this field, there has been much concrete progress in the last year: the Egyptian authorities adopted an economic reform plan supported by the International Monetary Fund, aimed at bringing back macroeconomic stability and inclusive growth. This is an important step, and we are eager to support the plan, including through our bilateral assistance programme. We are also keen to support Egypt's efforts to address the social and economic impact of these reforms, particularly on the most vulnerable parts of the population.

The second track of our partnership is building stronger cooperation on common challenges, such as counterterrorism and migration. Terrorism poses a fundamental threat to Egypt's stability and security. Time and again, we have stood on the side of the Egyptian people when they were hit by a new attack. It is not just 'moral' solidarity; we are ready for more concrete cooperation in this field, and the Partnership Priorities are giving us the opportunity to explore new forms of common engagement.

Let me add that, whenever we discuss counterterrorism with our Egyptian counterparts, we always insist that repressive measures are never enough to address this issue. Terrorism needs to be tackled in full respect of international human rights standards and fundamental freedoms.

On migration, Egypt has made an important contribution in hosting refugees, not least Syrian refugees. It has also significantly reduced irregular migration flows, through the implementation of the Valletta Action Plan and the Khartoum process. A better and more humane management of migration flows is in the interest first and foremost of migrants, but also of countries of origin, transit and destination. So we are currently working with our Egyptian counterparts to launch a high-level migration dialogue.

The third track relates to closer dialogue and cooperation on foreign policy and regional issues. Egypt currently seats on both the UN Security Council and the African Union Political and Security Council. Beyond that, it is an essential partner to address other crises in our region, starting with the conflict between Israel and Palestine. We share an interest in working together more, including on the conflicts in Libya and Syria, as well as to address tensions in the Gulf.

Last, but definitely not least, there is a strong political track in our partnership, which includes governance, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. The European Union's position on this is very clear and we reiterate it constantly in our dialogue with our Egyptian counterparts: sustainable security and stability can only be achieved when human rights – those guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution and flowing from Egypt's international commitments – are fully implemented.

If we want to help improve the situation of human rights in Egypt or to preserve the space for civil society, we have no alternative to engaging with them. It is in this spirit that the European Union Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, visited Egypt in February, to enhance dialogue on human rights with the Egyptian authorities.

We continue to pass this message both in public and in private, in all our contacts both at bilateral level and in multi-lateral fora. This is what we did, for instance, on the possible consequences of the new NGO law.

On NGOs, in particular, there is something we should not forget. The European Union is the biggest donor in Egypt. Total ongoing European Union financial assistance commitments to Egypt amount to over EUR 1.3 billion in grants. If Member State and European Financial Institutions' grants, loans and debt-swaps are included, the figure rises to EUR 11 billion. A relevant part of this bilateral assistance relies on civil society organisations as implementing partners. Our partnership needs a strong and lively civil society, and this is something our Egyptian friends should also keep in mind.

The four tracks of our partnership are closely linked to one another. Sustainable security is linked to sustainable development, which is linked to human rights and to regional stability. This is the approach we have adopted with our Partnership Priorities, and this is the proof that only through engagement can we address our common interests for the people of Egypt, for Europe and for our entire region.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, le partenariat entre l'Union et l'Égypte est important pour la stabilité et la prospérité des deux rives de la Méditerranée. Nous avons des intérêts communs, nous devons également affronter des défis communs comme la lutte contre le terrorisme, le trafic des êtres humains, les migrations et l'instabilité dans notre voisinage Sud.

Sur tous ces fronts, nous avons besoin d'une action conjointe plus poussée. C'est pour cela que notre groupe salue la tenue, le 25 juillet dernier, du septième Conseil d'association UE-Égypte. Une impulsion supplémentaire a été ainsi donnée à ce partenariat, et nous partageons l'orientation générale des priorités qui ont été convenues.

Je me réjouis en particulier de voir que la section consacrée aux principes de la coopération évoque l'approfondissement du dialogue politique sur la démocratie et les droits de l'homme et la nécessité d'une collaboration avec les organisations de la société civile pour la mise en œuvre de ce partenariat.

Les deux dimensions sont très importantes, puisqu'on sait qu'il reste beaucoup à faire en matière de respect des droits de l'homme et de participation de la société civile en Égypte.

D'ailleurs, lorsqu'on discute avec nos interlocuteurs égyptiens, ils sont les premiers à le reconnaître. Et je trouve qu'il est essentiel de continuer à travailler avec eux pour promouvoir les droits de l'homme et privilégier une approche constructive qui nous permettra d'obtenir de meilleurs résultats sur le terrain.

Ainsi, une mission d'information du groupe PPE, à laquelle ont participé nos collègues Elmar Brok et Mariya Gabriel, a été dépêchée en Égypte en novembre 2016, et l'un des principaux messages communiqués à nos partenaires est que l'Union soutiendra toutes les mesures visant à l'adoption de normes internationales en matière des droits de l'homme en Égypte.

C'est un travail, certes de longue haleine, qu'il faudra soutenir avec constance afin de promouvoir une véritable transition démocratique en Égypte.

À cet égard, le mécanisme de suivi et d'évaluation qui sera mis en place dans le cadre du partenariat jouera un rôle essentiel, et il conviendra de s'assurer qu'il est suffisamment doté pour nous permettre d'atteindre ces objectifs.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, Egypt is a key partner for the EU and we welcome the first EU-Egypt Association Council after the revolution and the adoption of the partnership priorities for the period 2017-2020. Egypt is undergoing a difficult period, but its path towards stability and sustainability is so important. Egypt is confronted with a challenging internal situation following the revolution and faces terrorism that continues to strike the country, with all its consequences on people, on tourism and on the economy.

We know there are many shortcomings, and yet we know and acknowledge the progress already made in certain areas, including the new parliament; but equally, we have to take note of the many areas where EU-Egypt cooperation is of fundamental importance. I mentioned terrorism. There is no doubt that to defeat terrorism we need a close cooperation with all partners, including Egypt. In this regard, I welcome the efforts of the President el-Sisi to reform Islam and to prevent radicalisation, as well as the strong effort to protect Christians, which has recently prevented attacks being launched against the Christian communities. But let me also add the importance of cooperating with Egypt on migration and for regional stability. We praise in particular the efforts of Egypt to play its very important broker's role in Palestinian reconciliation. Just today we have taken note of the successful talks between the two sides and the fact that the two sides have decided to build up the national consensus government of Palestine. It's an example of what Europe can do.

(The President cut off the speaker.)

President. – Thank you, colleague. My apologies on behalf of those of us who are sitting here. You really had two minutes but there was a mistake in the papers. I give you our apologies.

Bas Belder, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Vanuit Europees perspectief loont het zeker de moeite kennis te nemen van de sociale media in Egypte. In deze sociale media woedt immers al maandenlang een verhit debat over de resultaten van het bewind van president Sisi en diens vooruitzichten op herverkiezing in april 2018.

Dit debat valt grosso modo positief uit voor het Egyptische staatshoofd: een ruime herverkiezing in april 2018 ligt in het verschiet. Echter, ook onder de sympathisanten van president Sisi heerst onmiskenbaar grote teleurstelling over 's lands ronduit dramatische sociaal-economische situatie (broodrellen bijvoorbeeld).

Dat brengt mij bij de grote rol die het Egyptische leger in de nationale economie speelt. Graag wil ik van de Raad en de Commissie weten, desnoods schriftelijk, hoe zij met dit militaire “*business empire*” omgaan binnen het kader van de partnerschapsprioriteiten tussen de EU en Egypte 2017-2020, die duidelijk spreken over “versterking van de rol van de private sector”. Ik hoop dat de Commissie er nota van neemt en dat ik hierop een schriftelijk antwoord krijg: de rol van het militaire apparaat in de Egyptische economie. Zie dat eens te rijmen met versterking van de private sector.

In het officiële document over de gezamenlijke partnerschapsprioriteiten lees ik op pagina 7 dat de EU en Egypte samen blijven werken in de strijd tegen extremisme, discriminatie, inclusief islamofobie en xenofobie. Op grond van de Egyptische realiteit mogen hier twee woorden niet ontbreken: contra christofobie en contra antisemitisme.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I hope these words are conveyed to the High Representative, Commissioner. The circumstances that Egyptians live under and the EU's relation to this crucial country merit a serious and critical assessment. Considering the increased focus on security, managing migration and now the EU-Egypt partnership, it is shocking and disappointing that the EPP and S&D Groups have blocked this debate for three years and, even now, colleagues have ensured that this House does not express itself in a resolution this month. I consider this to be a cut-out.

The human rights situation in Egypt cannot only be relevant for us when it hits home, however terrible the brutal murder of Giulio Regeni might be, and I too echo the ongoing calls for justice in that case. But countless Egyptians face grave injustices and violations of their rights, and we must address their fate too. They face systematic torture, enforced disappearances and extrajudicial killings, and all of this is happening with impunity. Civilians are still tried by military courts and we have now seen 22 cases of death sentences. Very restrictive NGO laws make the work of civil society, including EU-based organisations, nearly impossible. Journalists and bloggers are harassed – and I want to highlight particularly the ongoing imprisonment of Alaa Abd El-Fattah – and they cannot work freely, and that is unacceptable. Add to that the recent wave of arrests of gay people and the intimidation of LGBT people. That is also unacceptable.

No short-term cooperation in the field of anti-terrorism or ‘migration management’ can compensate for these gross violations, nor can they justify the EU's ongoing silence. Egyptians deserve better and need better. We know what a boiling point can be reached if the needs of young people are not addressed. There cannot be a partnership without respect for human rights.

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, é verdade tudo o que foi dito relativamente à estratégia que é preciso estabelecer entre a União Europeia e o Egito enquanto parceiro histórico: as relações culturais e as relações de vizinhança.

É verdade também o papel fundamental do Egito relativamente à questão da Síria, da Líbia ou até mesmo da Palestina. Mas gostaria de retomar o que foi dito pela colega agora mesmo. É que entre parceiros não pode haver assuntos tabu, nomeadamente a questão dos direitos humanos nos dois sentidos: seja no que diz respeito à violação de direitos humanos no Egito, seja no que diz respeito à violação de direitos humanos na União Europeia.

Por isso, queria aqui afirmar, com muita veemência, que não pode haver cláusulas neste acordo que fiquem apenas no papel. É nossa responsabilidade que tudo o que está escrito no acordo seja cumprido e a questão dos direitos humanos não pode ser uma questão menor. Tem que estar ao nível das questões do comércio, tem que estar ao nível da questão dos interesses económicos, ou melhor, tem que estar acima delas, porque senão será sempre uma vítima pobre.

Peço, por isso, à Senhora Comissária que tenha em conta que, para haver parceria e para sermos amigos, temos que falar de direitos humanos e, volto a dizer, nos dois sentidos.

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Das Partnerschaftsübereinkommen verpflichtet die EU und Ägypten, Menschenrechte auf der Basis von internationalen Standards zu achten und zu fördern. Die Realität in Ägypten sieht anders aus: Aktivisten der Zivilgesellschaft werden bespitzelt, bedroht und eingesperrt, Menschenrechtsorganisationen berichten von Folter, willkürlichen Verhaftungen, dem Verschwindenlassen von Inhaftierten, unfairen Gerichtsverfahren, Diskriminierung von Minderheiten und Frauen. Wir haben im letzten Jahr aufgrund der Ermordung von Giulio Regeni hier eine Entschließung verabschiedet, die die katastrophale Menschenrechtssituation in Ägypten klar verurteilt.

Sie, Herr Kommissar Cañete, haben erwähnt, dass Sie sich für dieses NGO-Gesetz eingesetzt haben. Aber mit welchem Ergebnis? Das jüngste Partnerschaftsabkommen ist eine vertane Gelegenheit. Die EU hätte entschiedener auf konkrete Verbesserungen der Menschenrechtssituation drängen müssen. Beispielsweise hätte sie sich eben deutlich gegen dieses inzwischen verabschiedete NGO-Gesetz positionieren müssen. Dieses restriktive Gesetz bedroht direkt die Arbeit von Menschenrechtsorganisationen.

Die EU hat es versäumt, Ägypten gegenüber Klartext zu sprechen. Offenkundig haben Wirtschaftsinteressen Vorrang. Das zeigt sich auch darin, dass zahlreiche EU-Mitgliedstaaten sogar Waffen nach Ägypten exportieren, und dies im Widerspruch zum Beschluss des EU-Außenministerrats vom August 2013. Ich denke, mit dieser Ägypten-Politik machen sich die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten an der dortigen Menschenrechtspolitik mitschuldig.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Egitto e l'Unione europea si impegnano a promuovere la democrazia, le libertà fondamentali, i diritti umani come diritti costituzionali di tutti i loro cittadini. Parole scritte del partenariato UE-Egitto 2017-2020, parole che risultano paradossali, amaramente surreali, pensando che nel territorio del nostro partner, chiunque voglia indagare sui circa 378 casi di sparizioni forzate, viene zittito brutalmente, come dimostra il recente caso dell'avvocato della famiglia Regeni, Ibrahim Metwaly Hegazy, rinchiuso nel carcere di massima sicurezza di Tora.

Gli sono stati tolti tutti i vestiti e il suo corpo è stato sottoposto a scosse elettriche; è in isolamento senza energia elettrica e la cella è piena di spazzatura. Lo dice la Commissione egiziana per i diritti e la libertà, alla cui sede oggi l'autorità egiziana probabilmente metterà anche i sigilli. Rafforzare la cooperazione con l'Egitto è un'aspirazione che condividiamo ma non possiamo chiudere gli occhi, né far tacere la nostra voce davanti al vergognoso silenzio sul sequestro, sulle torture e sulla morte di Giulio Regeni, un ragazzo italiano, un cittadino europeo.

Non siamo e non saremo complici di una utilitaristica ipocrisia e oggi, come sempre, chiediamo a gran voce, verità e giustizia per Giulio Regeni.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sicuramente l'importanza di questo accordo di partenariato non può essere ignorata da chi ha a cuore, come noi, il problema della sicurezza del Mediterraneo, il problema dell'immigrazione, ma anche e forse soprattutto, il grave problema del terrorismo. È più che mai necessaria la collaborazione del Cairo per la sicurezza ora che, dopo la sconfitta in Iraq e in Siria, l'ISIS sta spostando l'asse operativo del Califfato verso il Nord Africa e il Sahel, cioè molto vicino all'Europa e in particolare al mio paese, l'Italia: ma non è che non veda anche la gravità della situazione dei diritti umani.

Se noi, come Unione europea, vogliamo essere amici e partner affidabili e credibili di questo paese che io continuo a ritenere amico, dobbiamo parlare con molta chiarezza su alcuni fatti di una gravità eccezionale, come quelli, più volte e giustamente, ricordati dai colleghi, come il caso veramente emblematico di Giulio Regeni, un ragazzo inviato da una università europea – ed è anche strano che l'Unione europea non abbia voluto approfondire il ruolo di questa università e di questi insegnanti, quali veri incarichi avessero dato a questo giovane ricercatore, sicuramente in buona fede.

Io vorrei sapere quali azioni concrete l'Alto rappresentante Mogherini ha posto in atto per difendere la memoria, l'onore e soprattutto le richieste, anche da un punto di vista morale, di due genitori italiani che ancora adesso hanno diritto di sapere la fine che ha fatto il loro figlio.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η εταιρική σχέση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με την Αίγυπτο κινείται στα πλαίσια της αναθεωρημένης Πολιτικής Ευρωπαϊκής Γειτονίας και συνοψίζεται στην αντιμετώπιση των κοινών προκλήσεων, στην προώθηση κοινών συμφερόντων και στην εξασφάλιση μακροχρόνιας σταθερότητας και στις δύο περιοχές της Μεσογείου. Η Αίγυπτος είναι στρατηγικός εταίρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως και για τον λόγο αυτό συνεργάζεται μαζί της και σε άλλα σοβαρά θέματα, όπως είναι η εξασφάλιση σταθερότητας στην περιοχή της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, η προώθηση θεμάτων κοινού ενδιαφέροντος, η αντιμετώπιση της τρομοκρατίας, η αντιμετώπιση της μεταναστεύσεως και τέλος η προώθηση της δημοκρατίας.

Η Αίγυπτος έχει δεσμευθεί να κατοχυρώσει συνταγματικά τις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των πολιτών της και προστατεύει τα δικαιώματα των μεταναστών και των περιθωριοποιημένων ατόμων. Συνεργάζεται επίσης και σε θέματα ενεργείας. Μάλιστα η ανακάλυψη του υπεργigαντιαίου κοιτάσματος ZOP στην ΑΟΖ της Αιγύπτου θα συμβάλει στην προώθηση της συνεργασίας των δύο αυτών μερών. Τέλος, επισημαίνω ότι η τριμερής συνεργασία της Αιγύπτου με την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο θα συμβάλει στη σταθερότητα στην περιοχή και στην προώθηση των κοινών σκοπών της εξωτερικής πολιτικής.

President. – Colleagues, from now on and in future, the moment you exceed the time and continue speaking I shall see that as a mark of disrespect to your colleagues, so next time I will cut you off exactly to the second, regardless of the colleague concerned or the political group.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, Egipto, por su dimensión, por su situación estratégica, por su influencia en la región y en el mundo árabe, por ser miembro del Consejo de Seguridad de las Naciones Unidas, está llamado a ser un socio destacado de la Unión Europea, tanto en su agenda bilateral como ante los problemas globales.

Se ha celebrado en julio la reunión del Consejo de Asociación, y creemos que es una noticia positiva. Estuvo siete años suspendido. Entendemos que en siete años han pasado muchas cosas en Oriente Medio, en Europa y en el mundo. Por eso tenemos que adaptar nuestra agenda de cooperación a la nueva configuración de las amenazas, contribuir a la estabilización de la región —evidentemente, no se podrá conseguir hasta que no haya un avance en el problema de Siria—, superar las diferencias en el Consejo de Cooperación del Golfo y, evidentemente, luchar contra el terrorismo.

Es evidente que la cooperación en el ámbito de la seguridad y la eficiencia energética y de la lucha contra el cambio climático, ambas competencias del comisario Arias Cañete, son también muy importantes. Aquí se ha subrayado la importancia que tiene la nueva cooperación, la ayuda de la Unión Europea, que tiene que situarse en el ámbito de la política de vecindad revisada, y tenemos que avanzar también en los ámbitos que nos propone el Servicio Europeo Acción Exterior: desarrollo y modernización económica y social, comercio e inversión y, desde luego, no por último y por ello menos importante, en el ámbito del respeto de los derechos humanos.

Quiero recordar lo que pasó cuando los Hermanos Musulmanes llegaron al poder por la vía democrática y quiero recordar, señor presidente, ante algunas insinuaciones, que yo renuncié a la jefatura de la misión de observación de las últimas elecciones presidenciales en Egipto.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente, la alta representante, señora Mogherini, ha definido a Egipto como un socio clave para nuestra política exterior común, y mi Grupo también piensa lo mismo: son tantos y tan graves los escenarios que están abiertos en la región, que la colaboración, la cooperación con Egipto aparece como una necesidad imperiosa para la causa de la paz y de la estabilidad.

Es verdad que esta asociación no puede establecerse a cualquier precio. Comparto muchos de los objetivos que marca este Acuerdo de Asociación y, enunciándolos en sentido inverso, empezaré por los derechos humanos.

Egipto tiene que cambiar ese rumbo: no puede seguir adelante con las cárceles llenas de opositores, reprimiendo duramente a la sociedad civil. La Unión Europea no puede consentirlo.

En cuanto a la seguridad, Egipto tiene que seguir echando la llave con mayor eficacia al apoyo al terror, al apoyo financiero al terror.

En política exterior, Egipto debe estar en condiciones de volver a tener el liderazgo en la solución al conflicto entre Israel y Palestina. Su papel en esta cuestión es clave, y Egipto debe caminar y debe definirse como una democracia sin matices, pero está lejos de ello.

Por eso, aunque celebro de nuevo la reanudación de las conversaciones, me parece muy importante que la Unión Europea deje claro que, si va en contra los derechos de los ciudadanos egipcios, no vamos a callarnos.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Egypten er overordnet set en kerneallieret for Europa, ikke bare en kerneallieret i regionen, men også en venligtsindet og konstruktiv magt, der normalvis arbejder med os i Europa for vores fælles interesser.

Det gælder, når det handler om at modstå terrorisme, om vores fælles sikkerhed, om at skabe stabilitet i en region, der har en direkte indvirkning på vores fred, sikkerhed og stabilitet her i Europa.

Det gælder også, når der er tale om den bredere politik i forhold til Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, senest eksemplificeret ved de egyptiske bestræbelser på at få de palæstinensiske selvstyreområder til at tale bedre sammen og til måske igen at forme en fælles regering, som på sigt vil være den eneste måde, hvorpå en realistisk fredsftale kan nås mellem Israel og Palæstina.

Vi ved ikke, hvad det vil bringe med sig endnu, men vi ved, at uden Egypten og de arabiske allierede kommer vi ingen vegne.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, l'Égypte est un pôle de stabilité sur une Méditerranée au bord de l'effondrement. La Tunisie est convalescente par rapport au prétendu Printemps arabe, la Libye est un État fantôme, l'Algérie se prépare à une transition lourde de menaces.

Monsieur le Commissaire, vous parlez de sécurité et de développement, et vous rajoutez les droits de l'homme. Méfiez-vous des droits de l'homme qui vont contre la sécurité et le développement parce qu'à la fin, vous n'aurez ni la sécurité, ni le développement, ni les droits de l'homme.

Aussi, il est irresponsable de vouloir déstabiliser l'Égypte, au nom des droits de l'homme, alors que son gouvernement lutte comme il le peut contre le fondamentalisme des Frères musulmans.

Nous sommes, comme beaucoup de pays musulmans, en guerre contre le totalitarisme islamiste. Cela doit être clair pour nous. Dans cette guerre, des hommes comme le maréchal Al-Sissi, le général Haftar ou Bachar El-Assad sont des remparts pour les pays européens, et ceux qui voudront les déstabiliser sont les complices du terrorisme et les ennemis de l'Europe.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io sono convinto dell'importanza strategica del ruolo dell'Egitto nello scacchiere mediterraneo e ritengo fondamentale che alla base del dialogo ci sia un impegno comune anche sui valori della democrazia e rispetto dei diritti umani, così come sottoscritto nel preambolo del documento del Consiglio di associazione.

Per questo mi chiedo come sia possibile oggi parlare di cooperazione, commercio, investimenti, immigrazione e terrorismo in costanza di pesanti violazioni di tale preambolo da parte dell'Egitto, attraverso politiche repressive in materia di diritti umani. I casi come quelli di Ibrahim Metwaly, avvocato impegnato sul fronte dei diritti e impegnato nella triste vicenda di Giulio Regeni, per la quale si è fortemente battuto per ottenere verità, detenuto in condizioni disumane o come quello dei suoi colleghi Ahmad Amasha Hanan e Badr el-Din. Sono casi questi, come tanti altri, che sono lì a dimostrare che noi abbiamo il dovere di intervenire, utilizzando anche gli strumenti che il partenariato offre perché vengano rilasciati e l'Egitto cambia registro sui diritti umani.

Signor Commissario, capisco il realismo politico ma quando esso fa tabula rasa dei principi morali, il problema si pone e con forza. Dobbiamo essere consapevoli che la coerenza e la credibilità della politica estera europea si misurano anche da come affrontiamo questi problemi.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, this House has shown extraordinary patience with Egypt, which is considered a key partner by many in the House. But I believe it is time we made up our mind. Can we stand by a partner where nearly 400 activists and dissidents have disappeared off the radar since August 2016? Where students like Giulio Regeni are murdered in cold blood? Where 22 people are arrested for waving rainbow flags, and where rockets are bought from North Korea?

I share the concerns outlined by the High Representative over the economy and the ticking time bomb of youth unemployment, but we cannot let Egypt be the sole decider in our partnership, excluding any cooperation on the rule of law and fundamental rights. I have two questions to the Commissioner. Firstly, our total ongoing assistance to Egypt is worth EUR 11 billion. What are we doing to leverage this? Secondly, what measures have been taken to follow up on the resolution adopted last year following Regeni's murder to stop companies from exploiting technology that contributes to human rights violations in Egypt?

Catch-the-eye procedure

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parliamo di partnership tra UE ed Egitto: ma quale partnership può esserci con un paese che calpesta quotidianamente i diritti fondamentali e senza verità sulla tortura e la barbara uccisione di un giovane ricercatore europeo, Giulio Regeni: oggi sono 20 mesi che chiediamo verità senza ottenerla.

Le autorità egiziane non hanno mai collaborato efficacemente nelle indagini. E questa è sì una battaglia per Giulio ma anche per tanti altri ed altre che in Egitto trovano la stessa sorte. Continuano le sparizioni forzate, le gravi intimidazioni ai danni dei legali che assistono la famiglia di Giulio in Egitto, non ultimo l'arresto di Ibrahim Metwaly, e il tentativo di chiudere gli uffici della Commissione egiziana per i diritti umani e le libertà.

I genitori di Giulio sono stati in questo Parlamento un anno fa e hanno chiesto cose precise, rimanendo inascoltati: interrompere l'invio di armi e di materiale per lo spionaggio, non considerare l'Egitto un paese sicuro, interrompere i rimpatri.

Ecco, è scandalosa la mancanza di solidarietà da parte degli altri paesi europei che hanno continuato tranquillamente a commerciare, anche armi, con l'Egitto e Tusk, quando incontra al-Sisi a New York, parla solo di collaborare per fermare i migranti.

Se l'UE chiude un occhio sul rispetto dei diritti umani, ha finito di esistere.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, οι προτεραιότητες και οι φιλοδοξίες μας στην εταιρική μας σχέση με την Αίγυπτο πρέπει να εξυπηρετούν και τους λαούς μας στις δύο πλευρές της Μεσογείου. Ανάπτυξη αφενός, αλλά και ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και αξιοπρεπή διαβίωση. Οικονομική ανάπτυξη και τεχνική βοήθεια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αλλά, ταυτοχρόνως, και απαιτήσεις για τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και το κράτος δικαίου. Αυτά συμβαδίζουν με ισορροπημένο τρόπο. Όντως η Αίγυπτος έχει να επιδείξει ουσιαστική πρόοδο σε πολλούς τομείς, περιλαμβανομένων και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, αλλά, ταυτοχρόνως, υπάρχουν και αναπάντητα ερωτήματα στα οποία πρέπει να απαντήσει.

Δύο προκλήσεις όμως είναι κυρίαρχες στην ατζέντα μας: τρομοκρατία και ενεργειακή ασφάλεια. Κλείνω, λοιπόν, με μία πρόταση: η σταθερότητα της κυβέρνησης el-Sisi είναι θεμέλιο για τα κοινά μας συμφέροντα.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συμφωνούμε χωρίς καμιά αμφιβολία στο άνοιγμα διαύλων επικοινωνίας με την Αίγυπτο και το ίδιο αναμένουμε να γίνει και με άλλες χώρες της περιοχής. Κυρίως, όμως, νομίζουμε πως οιαδήποτε οικονομική ή άλλη σχέση πρέπει να προσφέρει στον ίδιο τον αιγυπτιακό λαό, με περισσότερο βάρος στις ευάλωτες ομάδες. Ιδιαίτερα στεκόμαστε απέναντι στα αιτήματα των νέων της Αιγύπτου για πραγματική δημοκρατία και ελευθερία. Χρειάζεται, ως εκ τούτου, ενδελεχής έρευνα σε σχέση με τα βασικά ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Να καταπολεμηθεί στη χώρα κάθε βάνουση συμπεριφορά απέναντι σε ευάλωτες ομάδες.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come hanno già detto alcuni colleghi precedentemente, penso che sia assurdo discutere in quest'Aula di Egitto e di cooperazione con l'Egitto senza mettere al centro il tema della costante violazione dei diritti umani. La famiglia di Regeni, i genitori di Giulio Reggiani, proprio un anno fa, come ricordava la collega Schlein, hanno chiesto qui al Parlamento europeo di prendere una posizione sull'Egitto, sul suo continuo silenzio sull'omicidio di Giulio Regeni e sulle torture che ha subito in Egitto.

Continuare a considerare l'Egitto un paese sicuro, continuare a far finta di niente, al solo fine di garantire che l'Egitto continui a impedire ai migranti di arrivare in Europa è un crimine, un crimine che la storia non perdonerà all'Unione europea, così come non le perdonerà il silenzio sulla violazione dei diritti umani in Libia e su quello che continua a fare Israele.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, like my colleagues, I am very worried about the situation for human rights defenders and human rights activists. I have met numerous women's rights activists who are subject to extreme persecution at the moment.

But today I want to raise the specific situation of LGBTI persons being persecuted. I am sure you have seen the reports of this increasing persecution: of 33 or more youths being detained, of sexual assault in detention and of violence. It is also a question of when the authorities perpetrate this kind of violence. Public violence and hate speech against LGBTI people in Egypt are rampant and increasing, and we have reports on that. The EU must act against these human rights abuses. To say that we are passing on the message, Mr Commissioner, is just not enough: you don't pass on the message about human rights – you demand that human rights be respected! We need a different kind of partnership.

President. – Before I give the floor to the Commissioner I would like to express my appreciation for one thing across the political spectrum today, namely the emphasis on respect for human rights and on the clause in international agreements. I would appreciate it if we remembered this debate, because sometimes some of us deviate from that central principal. I note this with much appreciation, but we need to apply it across the board, with all international agreements.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Miguel Arias Cañete, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, I think this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the honourable Members for their contributions.

Many of you have addressed the different problems relating to human rights. Human rights are an integral part of our partnership priorities and we address the situation not only through bilateral dialogue, silent diplomacy and formal demands, but also through public statements, including in multilateral forums such as the Human Rights Council in Geneva.

The European Union, in its position for the EU-Egypt Association Council, has raised clear concerns regarding the blocking of websites and the ongoing pressure on human rights organisations and defenders. It calls on Egypt to comply with its commitments to promote freedom of expression, association and assembly, as well as the freedom of the press, as guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution and according to its international obligations. This position was also expressed in the recent European Union statement at the Human Rights Council, under item 4.

Some of you referred to the case of the Egyptian lawyer Ibrahim Metwaly. This is a case that the European Union is following very closely, and one we have raised with our Egyptian counterparts at a high level both in Cairo and in Brussels. We have stressed the need to allow human rights defenders to carry on their work, including cooperation with the United Nations human rights agencies and mechanisms, without intimidation or harassment, in line with Egypt's international obligations and with the guarantees enshrined in the Egyptian Constitution for democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms. This message, as well as the need to shed light on the circumstances of the death of Giulio Regeni, was clearly expressed in our statement to the Association Council, and in the recent European Union statement at the Human Rights Council in Geneva.

You can count on us to continue to insist on this in our contacts with our Egyptian counterparts at all levels.

Some of you also referred to the LGBTI situation. The present position is that the arrest of an increasing number of people after the concert of rock band Mashrou' Leila in Cairo and sentences of one to six years in prison for so-called 'practices of debauchery' are not in line with Egypt's commitments to promote freedom of expression as guaranteed by the 2014 Constitution, nor with Egypt's international obligations.

Freedom of expression is essential in a democratic society, and we call on Egypt to take active measures to promote it and to abide by its national and international commitments in that regard. The European Union wishes to reaffirm its commitment to freedom of expression, and to the quality and dignity of all human beings, irrespective of their sexual orientation and gender identity.

Finally, regarding the situation of Ibrahim Halawa, his acquittal is welcome news and a relief for his family, for Ireland and for the European Union. The Commission was particularly pleased to hear that Ibrahim was finally acquitted after four years in pre-trial detention. This is a case that the European Union has been following very closely and one we have actively raised with the Egyptian authorities, in coordination with and support of the Irish Government's efforts. Nonetheless we remain concerned about the use of a mass trial in which 442 defendants received heavy prison sentences: this is not in line with Egypt's human rights obligations. The European Union looks forward to the appeals and expects Egypt to uphold its national and international commitments to due process and fair trials.

To conclude this debate, I think that we all agree on the importance of our partnership with Egypt, even if there are different views on how to take it forward. As I have stressed before, we now need to approach it in a coherent and comprehensive way in order to make the best out of it in the interests of Egyptians and Europeans. We will continue to look at how best to achieve progress on the four tracks of our partnership, and to use all the instruments available to us to foster a system of stability, growth and social and economic development in the country. We count, too, on Parliament's support to contribute to the success of this partnership and its concrete impact on our people.

President. – The debate is closed.

12. Berichtigung (Artikel 231 der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll

13. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on

— the oral question to the Council on the 2017 UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn, Germany (COP23) by Adina-Ioana Vălean, Peter Liese, Gilles Pargneaux, Julie Girling, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Estefanía Torres Martínez, Marco Affronte, Mireille D'Ornano and Piernicola Pedicini, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000068/2017 – B8-0329/2017) (2017/2620(RSP)), and

— the oral question to the Commission on the 2017 UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn, Germany (COP23) by Adina-Ioana Vălean, Peter Liese, Gilles Pargneaux, Julie Girling, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Estefanía Torres Martínez, Marco Affronte and Piernicola Pedicini, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (O-000069/2017 – B8-0330/2017) (2017/2620(RSP)).

Adina-Ioana Vălean, author. – Mr President, it has been almost two years since the birth of the Paris Agreement and almost exactly one year since its entry into force on 4 November 2016. 195 parties have signed up to the Agreement to date and 166 of these have already deposited with the UN their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to what one might qualify as the most significant multilateral international agreement of the decade.

Undoubtedly, climate change is one of the most important challenges for humankind. Those of us who believe in the science explaining climate change keep on stressing this fact and the associated disastrous consequences for both our present and our future. But we should also act on our beliefs. The Paris Agreement was a major step, but a lot more needs to be done to ensure that this agreement will deliver on its intentions. We all know in this House from our work on European legislation that if it is hard to agree on a common set of policy design and the numbers, it is even harder to implement them in a meaningful way. And this is where we are with the Paris Agreement. For the past year, preparatory work has started that will go on well into 2018 laying down the foundation for the implementation of the accord. We are one month away from the start of the 23rd climate conference in Bonn, which will be a milestone in the technical work on the implementing rules for the agreement. We expect quite importantly that there will be some clarification on the structure of the 2018 facilitative dialogue. This will be a key opportunity to take stock of progress made towards the agreement's mitigation goals and to inform the preparation and revision, by 2020, of the parties' 2030 nationally determined contributions.

The regrettable decision by the President of the United States to withdraw his country from the Paris Agreement will have numerous implications but, most worryingly, it has an immediate impact on climate financing, which is one of the cornerstones for international climate action. The suspension of US contributions to the Green Climate Fund will open up substantially a hole which we have all been working hard to fill. These are very pertinent issues that we look forward to discussing today with both the Council and the Commission, who will both be sitting at the negotiation table in Bonn in 4 weeks' time. As every year, in line with our commitment to the international climate process, the European Parliament will attend the Bonn conference and follow the discussion and decisions made there, and through its privileged contacts with parliamentarians from around the world will support the EU position.

Tomorrow we will be adopting our resolution on the topic, which sets out the vision, concerns, expectations and aspirations of our institution. This will also constitute our mandate for the Bonn conference. I am looking forward to a fruitful exchange with all of you this afternoon, as well as much cooperation between our institutions in the run-up to and during the climate negotiations in November.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me highlight at the outset that by the United Nations Climate Change Conference taking place in November this year in Bonn, known as COP 23, all Member States should have finalised their ratification procedures for the Paris Agreement.

By this step we confirm our credibility and our responsibility. The EU and its Member States have reaffirmed clearly their commitment to continued climate action in line with the objectives of the Paris Agreement.

Despite the political changeover in the US, we are encouraged by good news from other countries moving forward on climate action. The international community, including non-state actors, remains committed to implementation of the Paris Agreement. This was also demonstrated during the Hamburg G20 summit held on 7 and 8 July and the recent Montreal Ministerial Meeting on climate action that took place in September.

The upcoming conference in Bonn will be an important occasion to demonstrate the collective determination of the international community on climate action. The EU and its Member States have expectations for broad-ranging progress at COP 23 and we are working closely with our international partners to ensure it is a success.

Firstly, COP 23 must establish a solid foundation for the completion of the Paris work programme by COP 24 next year in Katowice, Poland. This should include making substantial progress on the work programme with a view to finalising it next year and to preparing for the implementation of all provisions of the Paris Agreement, comprising mitigation, adaptation, means of implementation, support and the transparency framework. It is important that we achieve clarity on the process for next year, so that all parties and external stakeholders are reassured that we will deliver on our task.

We expect an agreement on the 2018 facilitative dialogue at COP 23. The dialogue will be the key political moment at COP 24 and the first opportunity after Paris to take stock of our collective efforts towards achieving the objectives of the Paris Agreement. It will help inform the preparation of subsequent nationally determined contributions or NDCs. Therefore the EU considers that COP 23 should result in a clear proposal on how the 2018 facilitative dialogue should be prepared, outlining the work for next year.

In this respect non-party stakeholder contributions will be key in terms of presenting policy options, approaches and technologies with high potential, experiences and lessons learned. They also bring concrete opportunities to overcome barriers in NDC implementation and international cooperation, such as partnerships through the Global Climate Action agenda.

With regard to the transparency framework, it is important to have comparable and robust methodologies to track progress and make sure that the chosen policy instruments have the desired impact in terms of reducing emissions or increasing resilience. COP 23 should result in significant progress on the details of the modalities, procedures and guidelines of the framework.

Further action by all parties, individually and collectively, will be required to reorient and make finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate resilient development. The EU and its Member States are the world's biggest climate finance donor. In 2015 it provided, together with the European Investment Bank, EUR 17.6 billion for climate finance to third countries.

The EU will continue to support climate action in partner countries and is fully committed to the implementation of the 2020 climate finance roadmap. We remain committed to scaling the mobilisation of climate finance as part of a global effort to assist developing countries to implement their low-carbon sustainable development, and in particular their NDCs. Domestic implementation, climate policies and measures to achieve intended nationally determined contributions and their full integration into national policies are of crucial importance.

At this stage the Council and Parliament are the key actors currently working on completion of the EU's own legislative and regulatory package that is necessary to deliver our Paris target of reducing economy-wide emissions by at least 40% by 2030. That remains the most ambitious pledge under the Agreement. This is an important sign of leadership as the success of Paris will ultimately depend on concrete action on the ground.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, President Juncker stressed in his recent State of the Union address that he wants Europe to be the leader when it comes to the fight against climate change. He added that, set against the collapse of ambition in the United States, Europe must ensure we make our planet great again because it is the shared heritage of all humanity.

Recently, the European Union, Canada and China convened a Ministerial Meeting on Climate Action. This was the first ministerial meeting of its kind, bringing together three major economies in a leadership role and gathering ministers from more than 30 countries, including both major economies and also some of the most vulnerable countries, to discuss how to advance global action on climate change.

For the UN Climate Change Conference in Bonn (COP23) the European Union envisages three broad areas of deliverables. Firstly, there should be substantial progress on developing the detailed modalities, procedures and guidelines of the Paris Agreement with a view to concluding them by 2018. Secondly, we need to find political agreement on the design of the 'Facilitative Dialogue' that will take place in 2018. This is a clear deliverable expected by COP23 from the Moroccan and Fijian Presidencies, as was mandated by the decision in Marrakech. Thirdly, the European Union attaches great importance to the Global Climate Action Agenda to expand multi-stakeholder action and further build momentum.

Let me elaborate further on the first deliverable. The Paris Agreement achieved comprehensive coverage of mitigation, adaptation and means of implementation by treating these and other issues in a balanced and tailored way. The delicate balance set in Paris now needs to be made operational through detailed modalities, procedures and guidelines.

Priority areas to advance are the work programme that includes the Paris transparency framework and the five-yearly global stocktake. The transparency framework will make it possible to track progress made on all parties' commitments, for both adaptation and mitigation as well as support, according to common agreed rules and methodology, and to compare and aggregate results in terms of emission reductions and assess progress towards the global goal on adaptation.

The global stocktake is one of the fundamental features of the Paris Agreement and it is the key element of a wider ambition cycle that will inform and incentivise processes progressively to enhance ambitious action, both domestically and collectively. At European Union level, the proposal for the 2030 legislative framework provides for a review in 2024, and every five years thereafter, of the overall functioning of the legislation, in order to take account of evolving national circumstances and to be informed by the results of the global stocktake under the Paris Agreement.

Coming back to the second deliverable, the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue is intended to take stock of the collective efforts of parties in relation to progress towards the long-term emissions reduction goal and inform the preparation of further or updated nationally determined contributions (NDCs). The European Union sees the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue as an important milestone in promoting subsequent discussions about ambition. Parties will have to consider and explain what the outcomes of the 2018 Facilitative Dialogue imply for them individually in terms of their domestic processes.

In the context of the insufficient global ambition currently on the table, the Commission supports the European Union's active participation in the dialogue as a first important opportunity to take stock of the collective efforts of parties and to demonstrate how we have been preparing for the implementation of our NDC.

Looking ahead, and to facilitate the preparation of long-term strategies, the Commission is preparing an in-depth analysis of the economic, social and environmental impacts of pathways coherent with the long-term temperature goals of the Paris Agreement in order to stimulate the political debate in the European Parliament and the Council and with stakeholders.

Let me give you some further comments on climate finance. The Commission participated closely with many Member States in the development of the donors' 2020 USD 100 billion road map. We remain committed to the collective goal of mobilising, from a variety of sources, USD 100 billion a year in climate finance by 2020 for climate action in developing countries, and continuing significantly to increase adaptation finance. However, neither the European Union nor any other party acting alone can be expected to fill the gap left by the United States. We need to work collectively and look for innovative solutions and scalability. In that respect the COP21+2 Climate Summit convened by the French Government, the United Nations and the World Bank in Paris on 12 December will usefully complement the COP23 Conference and should help us work better together to redirect public and private investments towards the clean energy transition.

Lastly, looking beyond the amount of finance mobilised, we must also consider the important role of technical cooperation for the implementation of the Paris Agreement and of NDCs. In that respect, we are mobilising technical support from across Europe to share our experience and help partner countries develop and implement climate policies and measures.

Presidente. – Ascoltiamo ora le dichiarazioni dei gruppi politici. In questa fase non sono ammesse le domande «cartellino blu».

Peter Liese, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Ratspräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich denke, das wichtigste Signal, das von der Konferenz in Bonn ausgehen muss, ist, dass wir den Prozess weiter vorantreiben – auch nach der Ankündigung von Donald Trump. Der Rest der Welt hält zusammen, Klimaschutz bleibt eine wichtige Aufgabe, und wir sind sehr froh darüber, dass das auch viele in den USA erkannt haben. Es ist schon traurig, dass angesichts der Überschwemmungen und Wirbelstürme bei dem Präsidenten und seinen Beratern noch kein Nachdenken eingesetzt hat. Natürlich kann man nie ein einzelnes extremes Wetterereignis auf den Klimawandel zurückführen, aber es ist vonseiten der Wissenschaft klar, dass solche Ereignisse zunehmen, wenn wir so handeln würden wie Trump und nicht so wie der Rest der Welt. Deswegen, glaube ich, ist es gut, dass wir das in unserer Entschlie­ßung auch ganz klar sagen: Der Prozess muss weitergehen, und wir freuen uns, dass sich Bundesstaaten und andere in den USA auch weiterhin beteiligen.

Die EVP hat der Entschlie­ßung im Ausschuss zugestimmt, weil in ihr viele sehr wichtige Punkte enthalten sind. Uns war vor allem wichtig, dass die Änderungsanträge des Industrieausschuss es berücksichtigt wurden, dass wir dabei auch an die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Industrie denken und dass extreme Anträge abgelehnt wurden, und die sind zum Glück auch gar nicht wieder im Plenum vorgelegt worden. Ich glaube, wir haben eine insgesamt ausgewogene Entschlie­ßung. Wir möchten sie mit unseren beiden Änderungsanträgen noch mal ein bisschen verbessern, aber ich glaube, wir werden in jedem Fall morgen zustimmen. Ich bedanke mich bei unserer Vorsitzenden Adina Văleano, bei allen, die geholfen haben dieses Ergebnis herbeizuführen, und freue mich auf ein starkes Signal in die USA und in den Rest der Welt bei der Abstimmung morgen im Plenum.

Gilles Pargneaux, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Ministre, l'accord de Paris est irréversible et non négociable. C'est le message que nous adressons au Président des États-Unis dans notre résolution commune sur la COP 23.

L'annonce de ce retrait des États-Unis de l'accord de Paris a finalement galvanisé les 194 autres signataires de la COP 21 et, depuis le 1^{er} juin, les chefs d'État et de gouvernement du monde entier ne cessent de réaffirmer leur engagement à maintenir la hausse de la température mondiale entre 2,4 degrés et 6,6 degrés d'ici à 2050.

Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Union européenne est, selon nous, le nouveau leader dont le monde a besoin pour lutter efficacement contre le changement climatique. C'est pourquoi nous vous encourageons à aborder à la COP 23 à Bonn les sept priorités suivantes:

La création de financements innovants pour lutter contre le changements climatique, avec la fixation d'un prix plancher pour la tonne de carbone et la réforme du système européen d'échange de quotas de carbone;

L'instauration d'une véritable économie circulaire et la dynamisation des énergies renouvelables;

La suppression des subventions allouées au secteur des énergies fossiles, qui mènera, à terme, à l'abandon des combustibles fossiles;

L'intensification des efforts de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre produites par les secteurs des transports et de l'agriculture pour atteindre les objectifs fixés pour 2020 et 2030;

La concrétisation de l'engagement financier des pays développés à fournir 100 milliards de dollars par an aux pays en développement d'ici à 2020;

La promotion de l'accès universel à l'énergie durable dans les pays en développement, en particulier en Afrique, qui dispose d'un potentiel incroyable en énergies renouvelables, pour l'instant inexploité;

L'impact des changements climatiques sur les migrations et la reconnaissance au niveau international du statut de réfugié climatique.

Si, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous abordez, nous abordons à Bonn, ces sept priorités, la COP23 sera un succès.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Porozumienie paryskie było przełomowym dokumentem opartym na dwóch kluczowych elementach: elastycznym formułowaniu własnych zobowiązań dostosowanych do możliwości gospodarczych i rezygnacji z postulatu dekarbonizacji. Niestety w dzisiejszej rezolucji ten kompromis już nie jest postrzegany jako element niezbędny do zachowania równowagi między wolą ambitnego działania a realnymi możliwościami. Konferencja w Bonn oraz szczyt klimatyczny w Katowicach to doskonała okazja do wypracowania rozwiązań, które pozwolą stronom porozumienia paryskiego zachować poczucie, że razem i w rozsądnym tempie idziemy do wspólnego celu. Najważniejsza jest faktyczna poprawa komfortu naszego życia i kolejnych pokoleń i niezławienie europejskiego przemysłu. Mam nadzieję, że pan komisarz był uprzejmy słuchać mojego wystąpienia.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and the Council for their statements. It is two years, and unfortunately a record number of hurricanes, floods and heat waves, since Paris, and while Marrakech last year was a sort of post-Paris party (though unfortunately under some dark clouds due to the newly elected US President, Donald Trump), the real work will start now again in Bonn, because it is really very important that we clarify the structure of the facilitative dialogue in 2018. This facilitative dialogue should provide us with a clear picture of where we stand, because Paris was a huge success, but we knew even while we were still applauding there that it was not enough; that it was not enough to stay within the 1.5 degrees or even the 2 degrees.

The facilitative dialogue can therefore lead only to one conclusion: that we have to do more, that we are falling short at the moment. That is why we should not allow the US to renegotiate the commitments that it made in Paris. That is crucial, absolutely. But it also means how crucially important it is that we do our work on both the emission trading system, on the effort sharing, and on the energy package. We seriously have to deliver on Paris, and not only that: we also have to work on proper implementation. It is wonderful news that our economy is growing again, really good news, but at the same time we see that even in our Member States CO₂ emissions are growing again. They are growing instead of decreasing – and that is something that we should really work on. It is great that we applauded Paris, but we cannot applaud without delivering on the promises that we made there.

Estefanía Torres Martínez, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, como ustedes saben, la COP21 fue la conferencia de las decisiones. De ella nació el acuerdo de París. La COP22 se dijo que sería la de las soluciones, pero más bien fue la de las paradojas. Ahora les diré qué debe ser la COP23: o es la de los compromisos económicos, o habremos llegado definitivamente tarde.

Instamos hoy a este Parlamento a apoyar los esfuerzos de los países en desarrollo en la transición hacia sociedades de bajas emisiones de carbono, para que así sean más sostenibles y más seguras. Pero también debemos instarnos a nosotros mismos a dejar de hacer políticas al servicio de los mercados y empezar a hacerlas al servicio de las personas. Porque, ¿de verdad creemos que es compatible la transición energética y la política comercial de la Unión Europea, sobre todo, con la lucha contra el cambio climático? No lo es. Lo hemos dicho muchas veces: mientras no haya un cambio de modelo de crecimiento económico, no habrá forma de paliar el deterioro medioambiental del planeta.

Necesitamos un cambio profundo en nuestro sistema productivo. Transición energética, sí, pero también necesitamos cambios en el sistema agroalimentario mundial. La batalla por el clima es política y enfrenta dos visiones distintas del mundo. En esta COP23 esperemos que gane protagonismo la visión del mundo de las mujeres, especialmente de las agricultoras y de las indígenas, y que pierda todo el poder la visión de los lobbies energéticos y de las multinacionales, que hablan, muchas veces, a través de nuestros gobiernos.

Marco Affronte, *a nome del gruppo Verts/ALE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la verità è che siamo persino un po' stanchi di parlare dei cambiamenti climatici in quest'Aula. La COP 23 è importante, la nostra risoluzione è fatta bene ed è altrettanto importante per tutti i motivi che hanno già detto i colleghi.

E poi leggiamo però proprio in questi giorni le cifre che nel 2016, così come negli anni precedenti, gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea hanno regalato alle fonti fossili: 112 miliardi di euro di finanziamento. 112 miliardi che si inchiodano un po' al passato e non ci consentono di andare avanti verso il cambiamento.

Non sappiamo neanche se questa cifra è corretta perché non c'è trasparenza su questi finanziamenti o sussidi; quindi, potrebbe essere addirittura una cifra parziale e l'importo potrebbe essere anche maggiore. Ma sappiamo che il 44% di questi fondi vanno per esempio al settore dei trasporti.

Questo ha consentito e consente a Sergio Marchionne della FCA di dire che le auto elettriche sono le armi a doppio taglio e che è preferibile migliorare i motori a benzina, invece. Ovviamente, le auto elettriche non sono l'unica soluzione, lo sappiamo bene anche noi, ma se Marchionne può permettersi di dire questo è proprio perché il mercato è alterato dai sussidi che vengono dati attraverso i soldi pubblici.

Quattro miliardi ce li mette direttamente l'Unione europea, cui si aggiungono quelli che ci mettono la Banca europea per gli investimenti e la Banca internazionale per la ricostruzione e lo sviluppo: se vi sembrano pochi, sappiate che, in un solo anno, sono cinque volte quello che noi diamo, nel periodo dal 2014 al 2020, per l'accoglienza ai migranti.

Quindi, di cosa parliamo esattamente quando parliamo di lotta al cambiamento climatico?

Julia Reid, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the climate and energy package was imposed by the EU with the objective of achieving by 2020 a 20% reduction in CO₂ emissions compared to 1990 levels. Since then, climate-obsessive politicians have set various objectives towards establishing targets that would involve the final deindustrialisation of Europe. We in UKIP disagree with the climate change alarmism which is the cause of the EU's current damaging and counterproductive energy policy. However, the Commission continues to impose never-ending objectives for emissions reductions which invest vast amounts of money into activities that will have little or no effect on climate. Realistically, we can expect global CO₂ emissions to keep rising for several decades. The massive exit of EU industry and investment is not only damaging our economies, but by its relocation to countries with lower environmental standards it actually increases CO₂ emissions.

After Brexit the EU will be in charge of its own destiny and we in Britain will be able to formulate our own energy policy. The British people are looking forward to cheaper, reliable and affordable energy.

Marcus Pretzell, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren Kollegen! Ich möchte Ihre Wohlfühlatmosphäre ganz kurz mit einigen Zahlen stören: China ist für etwas mehr als 28 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf dieser Welt verantwortlich. Die USA sind für rund 16 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf dieser Welt verantwortlich. Indien steht für über 6 %, Russland für rund 4,5 %. Zusammen stehen diese vier Länder für 55 % des CO₂-Ausstoßes auf der Welt.

China hat angekündigt, bis 2030 keine Reduktion des CO₂-Ausstoßes vorzunehmen. Die USA – wie Sie es hier alle beklagen – haben bereits angekündigt, aus dem Klimaabkommen auszusteigen. Indien hat gerade laufende Planungen für 370 neue Kohlekraftwerke. 370 neue Kohlekraftwerke, meine Damen und Herren, so viel CO₂ können Sie in den kommenden Jahrzehnten in der ganzen Europäischen Union nicht einsparen! Russland hat bislang noch gar nicht ratifiziert und hat das für 2020 angekündigt. Schauen wir mal.

Was ich Ihnen damit sagen möchte? Wenn Herr Juncker sagt, die EU soll federführend sein, dann meint er vermutlich eher, dass die EU ein Federgewicht beim Klimaschutz ist. Es handelt sich hier um Zwerge, die gemeinsam etwas erreichen wollen.

Meine Damen und Herren, liebe Klima-Alarmisten, orientieren Sie sich an dem Machbaren! Das Klima der Welt wird nicht in der Europäischen Union gerettet, es wird nicht durch die Europäische Union gerettet, und Sie machen sich mit Ihren Forderungen auch in Bonn vor den Augen der Welt lächerlich.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! 2015 decemberében ez a Parlament úgy ünnepelte a párizsi találkozó eredményeit, hogy új időszámítás kezdődött a klímavédelem területén. Miért? Mert állítólag jogilag számon kérhető elkötelezettségek születtek. Én a Bizottsághoz fordultam. Megkérdeztem, hogy hogyan lehet majd számon kérni Obama elnök vállalását az USA vezetésén a jövőben?

Cañete úr teljes mértékben megnyugtatót, hogy kötelezően végre kell hajtani az USA-nak ezt. Új időszámítás kezdődött amikor Trump elnök kivonta a világ második legnagyobb szennyezőjét a Párizsi Megállapodás alól. Természetesen az Európai Unió teljesítse a kötelezettségét, járjon élen, de az teljesen abszurd, amit Juncker elnök mond, hogy az Európai Unió fog majd az USA helyére lépni, és helyette vállalásokat tenni, miközben csak tíz százalék kibocsátásért vagyunk felelősek. Ez teljes mértékben az európai ipar tönkretételét eredményezné.

Presidente. – Abbiamo ascoltato tutti i gruppi politici. Da questo momento in poi è possibile usare le domande «cartellino blu».

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący, celem konferencji COP23 w Bonn jest zaawansowanie rozmów na temat wytycznych dotyczących wdrożenia porozumienia paryskiego. Mamy dobre wieści z wielu krajów, 166 krajów złożyło dokumenty ratyfikacyjne, a porozumienie jest w naszej ocenie dużym sukcesem konferencji paryskiej, w szczególności ze względu na te dobrowolne zobowiązania wielu państw.

Jesteśmy jednak przed wieloma wyzwaniem, które niekoniecznie mają odzwierciedlenie w negocjacjach. Ważne jest stanowisko Stanów Zjednoczonych, słyszeliśmy już deklaracje o wyjściu z porozumienia, pozostaniu, renegocjacji. Dla całego porozumienia byłoby dobrze, aby Stany Zjednoczone pozostały w porozumieniu i wypełniły jego zapisy, a zatem najgorszą sytuacją jest taki stan niepewności.

Również w wielu krajach, na tej sali również o tym mówiono, podejmuje się decyzje, które są w sprzeczności z porozumieniem paryskim. Cieszą natomiast dane dotyczące emisji gazów cieplarnianych za ubiegły rok, według których światowa emisja tylko nieznacznie wzrosła, co może wskazywać, że być może znajdujemy się gdzieś blisko szczytu emisji, niedługo zacząć te emisje spadać. Jako Parlament będziemy uczestniczyć w konferencji w Bonn wsparci przez udzielony mandat, który Parlament przyjmie w dniu jutrzejszym w postaci rezolucji. Ważnym elementem będą też wspomniane pięcioletnie plany działania i okresowe oceny postępów w ograniczeniu emisji.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Għaliġa, il-konferenza tat-tibdil fil-klima f'Bonn hija pass importanti favur progress fuq tibdil fil-klima. Il-Gvernijiet, iwa, huma importanti, imma nemmen li dan huwa ż-żmien għall-ibliet, għan-negozji u għaċ-ċittadini tagħna, biex ikunu huma li jmxexxu t-triq 'il quddiem. Ma nistgħux u m'għandniex ninzammu ostaġġi tal-impuls politiku ta' pajjiż wiehed, kbir kemm hu kbir dak il-pajjiż.

Ejja nbiddlu l-approach tagħna ta' kif nindirizzaw it-tibdil fil-klima, mill-metodu tas-soltu fejn min hu fuq jiddetta x'għandu jagħmel minn hu taħt, għal sistema fejn ikunu ta' taħt li jcaqilqu l-policies, fejn flok nibqgħu nitkellmu dwar spejjeż biss, ejja nibdew nitkellmu dwar benefiċċji, u benefiċċji hemm hafna. Fejn flok noqogħdu niffukaw fuq x'jista' jiġri għada, ejja nibdew niffukaw fuq x'inhu jiġri llum madwarna.

U dan kollu huwa dwar il-htieġa li nagħmlu l-hajja taċ-ċittadini tagħna ferm ahjar. Li nagħxu fuq it-tibdil fil-klima jfisser li pereżempju nibdew innaqqsu l-attakki ta' azzma li jsofru minnhom it-tfal, li nsalvaw membri tal-familji tagħna minn mard respiratorju, li nżidu l-ammonti ta' snin li nistgħu ngħixu ahna stess, li nnaqqsu, iwa, il-kontinġent tal-enerġija tagħna, li ntejbu l-kwalità tal-hajja tagħna u nżidu n-numru ta' impjiegi fil-komunitajiet tagħna.

COP23, nemmen, li se toffrilna opportunità, li jekk irridu, immexxu d-diskussjoni dwar il-klima fejn wahda li ssolvi l-problemi u tidentifika l-opportunitajiet. Aktar ma naddottaw din it-tip ta' attitudni, aktar huma ċ-chances li nindirizzaw b'mod effettiv din l-isfida li għandna quddiemna.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αδράνεια που επιδείχθηκε μέχρι σήμερα έχει ως αποτέλεσμα τους καταστροφικούς τυφώνες, την όξυνση της ενεργειακής φτώχειας, την περαιτέρω αποψίλωση των δασών, την ανεπανόρθωτη μόλυνση των θαλασσών, τη συνέχιση της καταστροφής του πλανήτη μας. Επίσης, επειδή δεν βάλαμε φραγμό στην ανεξέλεγκτη δράση των πολυεθνικών, οδηγηθήκαμε, μεταξύ άλλων, και στο μεγάλο σκάνδαλο με τους ρύπους στην αυτοκινητοβιομηχανία. Δεν γίνεται να παραμείνουμε και άλλο στις εξαγγελίες, χωρίς να ληφθούν δεσμευτικές αποφάσεις για ουσιαστική δράση.

Με τη Συμφωνία του Παρισιού επιτεύχθηκε ένα σημαντικό πλαίσιο για την αντιμετώπιση των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Ωστόσο, δυστυχώς, στην 22η Διάσκεψη για το Κλίμα στο Μαρακές δεν υπήρξε η πρόοδος που αναμέναμε για άμεση δράση. Η 23η Διάσκεψη στη Βόννη δεν πρέπει να είναι ακόμα μια ανούσια επανάληψη διακηρύξεων και κροκοδειλιών δακρύων για την κατάσταση του περιβάλλοντος και την όξυνση των περιβαλλοντικών προβλημάτων. Ενόψει αυτής της Διάσκεψης ζητάμε από την Επιτροπή, ανεξάρτητα από την πρόθεση της διοίκησης Trump να αποσυρθούν οι ΗΠΑ, να συνεργαστεί με την Κίνα και τα άλλα κράτη, να στηρίξει τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και να αναπτύξει ένα ολοκληρωμένο σχέδιο δράσης για τον τερματισμό της αλόγιστης χρήσης των φυσικών πόρων, τη μείωση των εκπομπών του θερμοκηπίου και την προώθηση των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, it is great that we are again talking here about climate action, and I want to stress that word ‘action’, because the Commission also said that Europe wants to be the leader in climate action, did it not? So then, maybe it is time to act as well, and that is going to be the key.

Up to now Europe has just had plans on the table there are insufficient to meet the Paris goals. We all know that. We have to do more. So, Commission, when you are reading Parliament’s resolution, please also note that we are demanding for next year a low emission strategy for 2050, because we need this long-term planning. After the facilitative dialogue next year, we need new NDCs in Europe where we are increasing our action. Only then will we be the leading continent on climate action which we claim to be.

But it is not only about numbers and targets. This is about our future economy, and I say this to our nationalist friends on the right who are always very proud of what we can achieve as a country but then suddenly when it is about climate action, suddenly they say we are little, we are small, it does not matter what we do. Come on, stay on and be consistent! This is about our future economy. If we take the lead, the jobs will be here. If we do not take the lead, we will suffer from climate change and will have to import the technologies from all those regions that you so much fear. So be clever and take action now!

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Mr President, having listened to the last speaker I can say I disagree with every single word he says. This ludicrous myth of man-made global warming is going to impact on agriculture. Farmers apparently are going to have to improve the world weather by emitting fewer greenhouse gases. There are two of them that we it emit where we find ourselves in total contradiction to EU dogma.

The first is CO₂. We emit CO₂ by tractor use, exhausts and engines running. If we are seriously going to reduce that on farms, we’re going to have to reduce our tractor usage and that means we must go to no-till agriculture, which means using glyphosate and adopting GM crops. You hate those two things more than you actually hate CO₂.

Then of course we’ve got the other juxtaposition on nitrous oxide. We produce nitrous oxide by growing leguminous crops. Yet we are told by the EU ‘you must grow more leguminous crops’ because they will substitute for all the GM soya beans coming in from South America.

I could go on, Mr President, but I’m out of time.

(Applause)

Olaf Stuger (ENF). – Prachtig betoog van mijn voorganger. Ik wil deze debatten altijd beginnen door te zeggen dat het nog maar helemaal de vraag is of de mens iets met die klimaatverandering te maken heeft. De wetenschappers zijn het hier in ieder geval niet over eens. Wat mij erg stoort, is dat er in het maatschappelijk debat heel weinig ruimte is om daar überhaupt over te discussiëren.

Er is een Nederlandse documentairemaker, Marijn Poels, die een documentaire heeft gemaakt waarin heel duidelijk wordt dat je, op het moment dat je er maar een klein beetje negatief over bent of je afvraagt of de mens er iets mee te maken heeft, nul op het rekest krijgt en meteen wordt weggezet als een paria.

Of de mens er nou invloed op heeft of niet, Al Gore vindt wel dat de mens invloed heeft op het klimaat. Dat weerhoudt hem er niet van om het hele jaar door met een privéliegtuig de hele wereld over te vliegen. En waar hij ook veel invloed op heeft, is zijn eigen financiële klimaat. Ik heb het even nagekeken: als je Al Gore wil boeken, bijvoorbeeld als spreker voor een dagdeel, dan ben je 200 000 euro kwijt. Ja, ik zeg 200 000. Dan moet je tien kamers boeken in een vijfsterrenhotel voor z’n gevoel. En dan moet je natuurlijk ook nog die privévlucht betalen. Dus, Voorzitter, dat weet ik wel zeker.

Wat ik ook zeker weet, is dat de energierekening van Nederlandse gezinnen de afgelopen vier jaar met 200 euro is gestegen. Dus die is weer ouderwets, spreekwoordelijk, de sjaak, Voorzitter. En dat is regelrechte diefstal.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι προσπάθειες καταπολέμησης της υπερθέρμανσης του πλανήτη και των ανθρώπινων παρεμβάσεων που την προκαλούν δεν έχουν τα επιθυμητά αποτελέσματα. Πολλές χώρες έχουν παραμείνει σε απλές δεσμεύσεις, που δεν συνοδεύονται από πρακτικές εφαρμογές, ενώ κάποιες άλλες δεν συμμετέχουν στη Συμφωνία των Παρισίων λόγω οικονομικών και πολιτικών συμφερόντων. Οι συνέπειες όμως της υπερθέρμανσης του πλανήτη στο κλίμα, τους ωκεανούς, την υγεία και τη γεωργία είναι αδιαμφισβήτητες και τείνουν να γίνουν μη αναστρέψιμες. Είτε μιλάμε για υπερθέρμανση είτε για υπερψύξη του πλανήτη, γεγονός είναι ότι η γη έχει φτάσει σε οριακό επίπεδο απορρόφησης των επικίνδυνων ρυπογόνων ουσιών, αερίων, υγρών και στερεών. Το δεδομένο αυτό χρησιμοποιείται βέβαια ως πεδίο αντιπαράθεσης επιστημόνων και πολιτικών, ειδικά πρώην κομμουνιστών του υπαρκτού σοσιαλισμού που ενδύθηκαν τον μανδύα των οικολόγων πράσινων, και θεωρώ ότι η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος είναι σοβαρή υπόθεση για να την εμπιστευτούμε είτε σε αυτούς είτε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Europa debe ejercer el liderazgo en la consecución de los objetivos que nos dimos en la COP21 y, en este sentido, hoy el 20 % del presupuesto de la Unión se destina a acciones de lucha contra el cambio climático.

Estamos en pleno desarrollo de actualización del mercado del comercio de emisiones y en el establecimiento de una economía circular que minimice los residuos y optimice las primeras materias, y debemos hacer más. De poco servirá que tengamos un acuerdo si, al final, no se acaba cumpliendo o si los principales actores no se acaban implicando, favoreciendo una situación de externalizaciones de la industria europea que acabe manteniendo el mismo número de emisiones y, por lo tanto, no haya ningún avance en la parte ambiental, y por otro lado, de rebote, tengamos un grave impacto negativo en la parte social y económica en Europa.

Por ello, queremos pedir a la Comisión y al Consejo que velen para que en el cumplimiento del Acuerdo de París se celebre un diálogo constructivo para conseguir los objetivos que nos hemos marcado entre todas las partes y para que lleguen los recursos necesarios para alcanzar el objetivo conjunto de 100 000 millones de dólares estadounidenses anuales para el 2020.

Hace ya dos años que llegamos al Acuerdo, y cada minuto que pasa nos aleja más de la meta.

Jo Leinen (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die COP23 findet zwar in Deutschland statt, aber die Präsidentschaft liegt bei einem Land, das vom Klimawandel bereits enorm betroffen ist – den Fidschi-Inseln –, genauso wie die anderen Inselstaaten im Pazifik. Ich glaube deshalb mit anderen Kollegen hier im Haus, dass Bonn noch mal ein Moment sein muss, wo sich die Welt zum Übereinkommen von Paris und zum Klimaschutz bekennt und wo wir die Klimazweifler und -kritiker in die Schranken weisen, sie in die Isolation weisen. Wir wissen, dass wir im Moment natürlich näher beim Drei-Grad-Celsius als beim Zwei-Grad-Celsius-Ziel sind. Von daher ist gar kein Zweifel, dass Industrieländer wie die EU-Mitgliedstaaten noch mehr machen müssen.

Ich erhoffe mir, Herr Kommissar, dass wir die *High Ambition Coalition* noch mal neu aufleben lassen können. Wir müssen das mit unserer Agenda 2030 machen. Das Parlament schlägt ja für erneuerbare Energien und Energieeffizienz wesentlich höhere Ziele vor, als das die Kommission gemacht hat, und bis 2030 müssen wir auch wesentlich besser werden.

Ich glaube, dass wir auch langfristig bis 2050 die Ziele klar haben müssen – die Akteure müssen wissen, wo es hingeht –, und Klimaschutz ist auch Entwicklungspolitik, er ist auch Industriepolitik. Hier ist China erwähnt worden. Herr Kommissar, Sie machen mit China gemeinsame Sachen. Passen Sie auf, dass uns China in dem Tempo der Erneuerung und des technologischen Wandels nicht überholt.

Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Zeitfenster, um etwas gegen die globale Erwärmung zu tun, wird immer kleiner. Wir brauchen eine Transformation hin zu einer Politik, in der die Sorge um den Planeten und seine Bewohner im Fokus steht – und nicht wirtschaftliches Wachstum, die Profite der Konzerne und die Schaffung möglichst vieler Arbeitsplätze.

Um die Klimaziele zu erreichen, müssen wir den Fokus stärker auf die klimaschädlichen Emissionen aus der Landwirtschaft richten. Ich habe hier in diesem Hause bereits mehrfach darauf hingewiesen, dass die globale Fleisch- und Milchwirtschaft für rund 18 % der in CO₂-Äquivalenten berechneten Emissionen verantwortlich ist. Die Rodung von Flächen für die Viehwirtschaft schlägt nach neuesten Studien sogar allein mit 20 % zu Buche. Deshalb sind die nationalen Klimaschutzbeiträge, was die Landwirtschaft betrifft, unbedingt massiv nachzubessern. Der klimaschädlichen Landwirtschaft, insbesondere der Massentierhaltung, muss Paroli geboten werden.

Ob wir unsere Erde noch vor einem Klimakollaps bewahren, steht und fällt mit dem politischen Willen, neue Wege zu gehen. Ich hoffe, Herr Kommissar, dass Sie diese brisanten Themen in Bonn auch anschnitten werden.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, on a tout eu cette année: les sécheresses, les inondations, les feux et les ouragans qu'il serait temps de renommer Exxon, Total, BP ou Trump!

Évidemment, on a besoin de l'accord de Paris, mais l'accord de Paris, c'est deux choses: la diplomatie, avec un objectif ambitieux, sérieux de 1,5 ou 2 degrés, mais c'est aussi l'action climatique et, sur ce point, l'action climatique des États, aujourd'hui, c'est 3, 4, 5 degrés de réchauffement climatique. Par conséquent, c'est le chaos.

Notre sujet, c'est de passer de la diplomatie à l'action climatique parce que c'est là que se glissent toutes les schizophrénies. Mon président de la République, Emmanuel Macron, le président de la France, garant de l'accord de Paris, fait un magnifique discours sur le climat aux Nations unies mais, au niveau européen, vous le savez, il sabote les objectifs en énergies renouvelables et il sabote les stratégies de coopération européenne sur l'action climatique.

Oui, la bonne nouvelle, c'est que l'Union européenne doit être leader de l'action climatique. La bonne nouvelle, c'est que l'Union européenne a tous les éléments: les énergies renouvelables pas chères, les emplois créés, l'aménagement du territoire.

Alors, que l'Union européenne devienne le leader de l'action climatique, c'est bien pour le climat et c'est un magnifique projet pour tous les Européens.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Mr President, I have been listening to my colleagues' beautiful words about the future of our countries and the future of our children, and I think they have been the best words we can say in such circumstances.

My question is, how many of you really want to pass from words to facts? Because it is a fact that climate change and global warming are caused by fossil fuels. However, while we are here, among the best words we can say to save the planet, the governments of the Member States are financing fossil fuels with an incredible – an astronomical – amount of money. While we are here speaking, France is giving EUR 250 million to the Green Fund but at the same time financing fossil fuels to the tune of EUR 1.5 billion. Germany is giving EUR 250 million to the Green Fund but at the same time financing fossil fuels to the tune of EUR 5.5 billion. And Italy, my country, while contributing only EUR 84 million to the Green Fund, is at the same time financing fossil fuels with EUR 3.5 billion.

We are here to find the best solution to save the planet and not to find the best compromise with oil companies. Therefore, let us stop saying beautiful words and let us move on to facts. Let us eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels right now. There is nothing else to do.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – De Overeenkomst van Parijs eist het: alle sectoren samen op voor de redding van het wereldwijde klimaat. Daarom vraag ik de Commissie en de lidstaten in het bijzonder om de klimaatinspanningen van familie- en gezinsbedrijven in de Europese landbouw eindelijk te erkennen en financieel te bevorderen. Ik herinner u eraan dat de Overeenkomst van Parijs eist dat de landen zich aan de negatieve gevolgen van klimaatverandering aanpassen op een wijze die de voedselproductie niet in gevaar brengt.

Boeren en tuinders in lidstaten als Nederland zijn al volop bezig met de vermindering van hun broeikasgasuitstoot en met een klimaatvriendelijke productiewijze van ons dagelijks brood – met beleg erop.

Daarom moet de Europese Unie snel aan de slag met actieplannen voor financiering van klimaat efficiënte landbouw, zoals het Parlement ook eiste in het ESR-verslag, het verslag-Gerbrandy. De groeiende wereldbevolking ontwikkelt een groeiende voedselvraag. De groeiende middenklasse buiten ons werelddeel vraagt om "luxe" voeding zoals vlees en zuivel.

Omwille van het wereldwijde klimaat en het kostbare regenwoud moet de Europese Unie, die straks in Bonn deelneemt, bij alle klimaatmaatregelen voorkomen dat er koolstof- en investeringslekkage van Europese landbouwproductie naar derde landen optreedt! Onze boeren en tuinders produceren duurzaam voedsel voor de wereldbevolking. We moeten onze Europese boeren en tuinders koesteren, helpen bij de overgang, meer vertrouwen geven en uiteindelijk duidelijk bieden over de klimaattransitie. Uiteindelijk is dat van groot belang voor een leefbaar platteland.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, qu'il est bon de se taper sur l'épaule en se félicitant du travail bien fait. De COP en COP, on se plaît à dépeindre l'Union européenne comme étant à la pointe du combat climatique.

Et pourtant, que voit-on? Que certains objectifs 3X20 ne seront pas tenus, que le système SEQE, même révisé pour la phase 4, restera bien trop généreux pour les pollueurs, pas assez ambitieux pour atteindre des objectifs et générera un prix du CO₂ bien trop faible pour réorienter les priorités. Que la TTF, dont certains imaginaient qu'elle puisse financer le Fonds vert, n'a toujours pas vu le jour. Et pourtant, qu'entend-on? Que le rapport Stiglitz évoque un prix pour l'ensemble des émissions mondiales compris entre 50 et 100 dollars pour 2030, nous en sommes très loin.

Il nous faut donc des mesures d'urgence, et je plaide par exemple depuis longtemps pour la mise en place de l'ajustement carbone aux frontières, mais cela fait tellement longtemps qu'on en parle et que rien ne bouge.

Ce manque de volonté politique est renforcé par le confort de se dire qu'on fait mieux que les autres. On connaît la formule de Talleyrand: «Quand je me regarde, je me désole, quand je me compare, je me console», mais méfions-nous, car si nous sommes tous désolants, ce sont nos enfants et nos petits-enfants qui seront désolés.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Wer die Klimaziele von Paris und die Klimawissenschaft ernst nimmt, weiß, dass uns nur noch ein sehr enges Budget für Treibhausgasemissionen bleibt. Und, Herr Arias Cañete, das direkt an Sie: Die Klimaziele, die Sie für die Europäische Kommission vertreten und die auch im Rat nicht überschritten oder nicht getoppt werden, bedeuten, dass fast alles, was die EU-Mitgliedstaaten im Rahmen der Ziele von Paris noch freisetzen dürfen, bis 2030 aufgebraucht sein wird. Ihre Zögerlichkeit über die Jahre bedeutet, dass die Emissionen nach 2030 — in nur einem Jahrzehnt! — dann auf null gebracht werden müssen, wenn wir auch nur eine geringe Chance haben wollen, das 2-Grad-Ziel zu erreichen.

Und der fehlende Mut und die ganze Zögerlichkeit in der Europäischen Kommission führen eben nicht nur dazu, dass wir beim Klimaschutz verlieren, sondern gleichzeitig wird die Europäische Union im internationalen Wettbewerb um kreative Lösungen und zukunftsfähige Technologien abgehängt. Es ist heute schon so – Jo Leinen hat das angesprochen –, dass die kreativen Lösungen, saubere Autos, Solar- und auch Effizienztechnologien außerhalb der Europäischen Union politisch gestützt und forciert werden – zum Beispiel in China –, dass dort dann auch die Produktionsstandorte entstehen und dass dort die Arbeit der Zukunft stattfindet. Wir denken, dass das, was Kohle und Stahl in der Gründungsphase der Europäischen Gemeinschaft waren, nämlich ihr Mittelpunkt, und das was da gemacht worden ist, jetzt Effizienztechnologien, Klimatechnologien werden müssen, und dass da auch die eigentliche Erneuerung des Industriestandorts der Europäischen Union liegt.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, gospodine povjereniče, ne treba puno dokaza da bismo vjerovali u postojanje klimatskih promjena, one su evidentne. I zato se rukovodim govorom Jeana-Claudea Junckera koji je rekao da moramo kao Europska unija predvoditi u borbi protiv klimatskih promjena kada je govorio o stanju Europske unije.

Jasno je da će biti vrlo teško nadoknaditi izlazak Sjedinjenih Američkih Država, ali Bonn je prilika da Europska unija i dalje nastavi ovdje biti lider. Ali je potrebno prijeći s naših političkih odluka stvarno na konkretna djela i moramo naše odluke konkretizirati. Konkretno, moramo do 2020. doći do 100 milijardi eura godišnje ili dolara godišnje, o kojima smo govorili, da bismo stvarno mogli provesti sve ove zaključke.

Ono u što vjerujem, to je energetska učinkovitost, to je energetska sigurnost, to je manje onečišćenje zraka kako bismo utjecali na bolje zdravlje ljudi. Vjerujem isto tako da je potrebno u svakom slučaju upotrijebiti u svakom diplomatskom dijalogu, koristiti kao našu stratešku osnovu, govor o klimatskim promjenama i borbi protiv klimatskih promjena.

Isto tako se moramo boriti protiv svih ovih situacija na način da klimatske promjene stavimo uvijek u prvi plan, da se borimo na razini cijelog planeta. Nijedna nacionalna politika, nijedna nacionalna strategija ne može sama za sebe donijeti rezultat i stoga idemo zajedno u Bonn i pokušajmo se i dalje postaviti kao nositelji borbe protiv klimatskih promjena.

(Govornica je pristala odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 162. stavak 8. Poslovnika))

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *Kékkártyás kérdés.* – Elnök Úr! Tisztelt Képviselő asszony, Ön azt mondta, hogy eljött a tettek ideje, tenni kell, és föl is sorolt nagyon sok mindent, hogy mi mindent lehet tenni. Én tisztelettel kérdezem, hogy Ön ezt a teendők listáját hajlandó lenne-e fölbovíteni, azzal, hogy az Európai Uniónak a kereskedelmi megállapodásaiban is tükörnie kell az akaratát? Magyarul kedvezményeket, kereskedelmi kedvezményeket ahhoz a feltételhez kötni, hogy teljesítik-e a Párizsi Megállapodásban foglaltakat.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), *odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice.* – Gospodine predsjedniče, u potpunosti se slažem s vama i smatram da upravo trgovački ugovori u koje ulazimo i koje potpisujemo moraju nositi upravo ove karakteristike, a to je borba protiv klimatskih promjena i moraju nositi sve ono što dovodi do toga da imamo održivi razvoj. Slažem se s vama. Žao mi je što izlazimo iz pregovora sa Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, a veselim se što je stupio na snagu CETA i što nastavljamo dalje pregovore s Novim Zelandom i ostalim državama i vjerujem da će Europska unija zaštititi svoje interese i interese naših nacionalnih država.

Damiano Zoffoli (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con questa risoluzione, ribadiamo il nostro impegno per dare attuazione, con forza e coerenza, all'accordo di Parigi sulla lotta ai cambiamenti climatici, Trump o non Trump.

Serve un nuovo modello di sviluppo più sostenibile a livello economico, ambientale e sociale per uscire dalla crisi e produrre nuova e buona occupazione per i nostri giovani.

L'obiettivo europeo di ridurre del 40% le emissioni entro il 2030 passa attraverso impegni trasversali a tutti i settori dell'economia e a tutti i livelli istituzionali, dagli Stati alle comunità locali.

In particolare nei trasporti, responsabili del 25% delle emissioni globali, bisogna rapidamente colmare una lacuna che riguarda i mezzi pesanti: anche le emissioni dei camion e degli autobus, che causano il 40% dell'inquinamento da trasporto su strada, devono essere, al pari di quelle delle auto, certificate, monitorate e regolate da standard a livello europeo.

Max Andersson (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the presence of the fossil lobby at the climate conferences is a huge conflict of interest that we need to address. Soon the world will be going to Bonn. Politicians, scientists and civil society will be there to seek solutions to the climate crisis. But the dirty coal and oil lobby will also be there and they have an economic interest in trying to delay, water down and prevent those solutions. We need strong rules on conflicts of interest if we are going to be able to limit emissions so that we can stay below 1.5°C. We have no time to waste. This is about our children's future.

The fossil lobby should not be allowed to pollute climate policy. I urge you all to support the Green Group amendment on conflicts of interest.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, in March of this year the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) observed that sea ice had reached a record low wintertime maximum extent in the Arctic. At the end of the summer, in the southern hemisphere, the ice around Antarctica hit its lowest extent ever recorded by satellites.

While there is year-on-year variability, up to last year the trend has been towards more melting of the ice caps. Additionally in 2016, the great barrier reef lost 29% of its coral due to rising ocean temperatures. In Port Douglas, Queensland, up to 70% was lost. Rising sea levels, along with an increase in the frequency and magnitude of storm events, will bring increased rates of coastal erosion around the world.

My own country, Ireland, and especially the south coast, is particularly exposed. Waterford and Cork are highly exposed to the problem of erosion and the local authorities are doing excellent work in developing coastal management strategies at Cork harbour and Tramore strand. Tramore is particularly subject to coastal erosion.

However, we must act at European and global level to ensure that this work and the millions of similar examples around the world are not in vain. Countering these effects is the challenge of our time. Having represented Parliament at COP21 and COP22, I am lucky enough to have witnessed at first hand the coming into force of the agreement that will see us meet the two-degrees target. That target must be met, and I compliment Commissioner Cañete for his role in that matter.

In the EU we must ensure that we reduce emissions by at least 40% by 2030 by deploying more renewable energy, pricing carbon and moving to lower carbon and a more sustainable society.

I look forward, as shadow rapporteur on the Renewable Energy Directive, to playing my part.

Νίκος Ανδρουλάκης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε λίγες ημέρες συμπληρώνουμε ένα χρόνο από την έναρξη εφαρμογής της Συμφωνίας του Παρισιού. Δυστυχώς, μέσα σε αυτό τον χρόνο, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες της Αμερικής, ο δεύτερος μεγαλύτερος ρυπαντής στον κόσμο, αποφάσισαν να αποχωρήσουν από τη Συμφωνία. Ευτυχώς, οι πρώτες αντιδράσεις απομόνωσαν τον κύριο Trump και απέτρεψαν ένα φαινόμενο ντόμινο. Παρ' όλα αυτά ο κίνδυνος παραμένει. Στην επικείμενη COP23 που, αν και θα πραγματοποιηθεί στη Βόννη, διοργανώνεται από τα νησιά Φίτζι, μία χώρα που κινδυνεύει να εξαφανιστεί λόγω της κλιματικής αλλαγής, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να φανεί αντάξια των προσδοκιών. Οι πρωτοβουλίες μας και οι προτεραιότητές μας πρέπει να είναι προς τη διασφάλιση των συμφερόντων όλων των λαών. Να παραμείνουμε πρωτοπόροι στον αγώνα κατά της κλιματικής αλλαγής, ακόμα και αν η Αμερική αλλάξει στρατηγική και υπαναχωρεί από τις δεσμεύσεις που ανέλαβε ο Πρόεδρος Obama. Να διασφαλίσουμε ότι αυτά που αποφασίσαμε στο Παρίσι θα εφαρμοστούν. Η ευημερία, η δημοκρατία, η σταθερότητα εξαρτώνται άμεσα από τις συνθήκες διαβίωσης των ανθρώπων σε όλα τα μέρη του κόσμου.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, quero falar-vos em quatro pontos. Primeiro, quero elogiar a ambição do Acordo de Paris e o seu reforço na Cimeira de Marraquexe e da rapidez da sua ratificação pela maioria das partes, bem como demonstrar a minha esperança de que, após uma fase inicial de absurdas declarações do Presidente Trump, os Estados Unidos percebam a importância deste acordo.

Segundo, importa continuar a investir em tecnologias que possibilitem uma emissão líquida nula, através de estratégias de captação de carbono, sendo uma área com um enorme potencial de criação de postos de trabalho sustentáveis. Devemos, portanto, encarar com seriedade a transição ecológica europeia e, aqui, quero enaltecer o papel da economia social neste desafio.

Terceiro, há que ter uma estratégia para a agricultura mundial que seja respeitadora da utilização de recursos hídricos e dos solos, da sua reafetação e da exploração sustentável das florestas, tal como fazemos a nível europeu. Não existem pessoas mais respeitadores do ambiente do que os agricultores informados. Devemos, portanto, promover as boas práticas agrícolas europeias para outros locais em que possam ser uma mais-valia.

Quarto, e termino já, os mais afetados pelas alterações climáticas são, infelizmente, os países mais pobres em desenvolvimento, ou mesmo insulares, como vimos recentemente pela devastação causada numa das regiões mais ultraperiféricas europeias, Martinica e Guadalupe, pelo furacão Maria.

Expresso aqui a minha solidariedade para com elas, uma vez que também venho de uma região ultraperiférica, os Açores.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! FN's Klimakonference COP23 i Bonn er vigtig. Klimaforandringerne er en af de allerallerstørste udfordringer for menneskeheden i vores tid. Vi skal altså bruge denne konference til at vise, både at EU er klar, og at EU er villig til at tage førertrøjen på globalt. Vi skal i øvrigt også fortælle, at en indsats for klimaet ikke er en hæmsko for vækst og udvikling. Tværtimod: En grøn omstilling er faktisk nøglen til at sikre en bæredygtig vækst og nye jobs såvel som en renere fremtid. Vi har vist en del af vejen for dette i Danmark. Vi har vist, at en grøn omstilling giver flere jobs, og vi skal være med til at sprede det budskab, for ellers tror jeg, vi får for meget modstand mod at levere. Parisaftalen skal føres ud i livet. Vi har brug for mere handling og hurtigere handling. Det bør være EU's

budskab i Bonn. Kloden og verdens borgere har brug for det.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε Cañete, στη Βόννη ένα από τα κύρια θέματα συζήτησης θα είναι η κλιμάκωση της χρηματοδότησης για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής και των συνεπειών της. Είναι αλήθεια πως ο κοινός στόχος για την κινητοποίηση 100 δισεκατομμυρίων δολαρίων σε ετήσια βάση για το περιβάλλον είναι φιλόδοξος και ενδεχομένως να μην είναι αρκετός, αν και εδώ στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουμε ήδη δεσμευτεί να δαπανούμε το 20% του προϋπολογισμού μας σε σχετικούς με το περιβάλλον στόχους.

Ωστόσο, είναι πολύ κρίσιμο να δούμε πώς γίνεται η εφαρμογή αυτής της δέσμευσης, ειδικά στα κράτη μέλη. Η αγωνία για την απώλεια θέσεων εργασίας από τομείς στους οποίους υπάρχουν δικαιώματα εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί από την απάντηση που θα δώσουμε με τη δημιουργία βιώσιμων θέσεων εργασίας σε νέες τεχνολογίες. Είναι απαραίτητο να δημιουργήσουμε μια πολιτική που θα ενισχύει έργα και υποδομές για την αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Μια στοχευμένη πολιτική που θα δημιουργήσει βιώσιμες αγορές και έτσι θα μπορέσουμε να είμαστε ελκυστικοί και για πόρους από τον ιδιωτικό τομέα. Τα παραδείγματα είναι πολλά: η απεξάρτηση από τον άνθρακα, η ενθάρρυνση της χρήσης εναλλακτικών πηγών ενέργειας στις μεταφορές, η περαιτέρω προώθηση της ενεργειακής αποδοτικότητας των κτιρίων και των ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας. Εμείς εδώ στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση μπορούμε, με ή και χωρίς τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, να συνεχίσουμε να διαδραματίζουμε ηγετικό ρόλο στην επίτευξη των στόχων του Παρισιού. Το χρωστάμε στα παιδιά μας.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, saúdo a resolução em debate que é uma posição forte e consistente do Parlamento Europeu. As alterações climáticas são os mais importantes desafios que a Humanidade enfrenta e já não se trata apenas de prognósticos, é algo que os povos sofrem quotidianamente.

Em Portugal, por exemplo, a brutal vaga de incêndios florestais este verão é apenas um entre muitos exemplos com que quotidianamente nos defrontamos em consequência das alterações climáticas. Estão a destruir o planeta, a afetar as populações, em particular as mais vulneráveis economicamente. E, por isso, é preciso agir agora e já, pôr em prática o Acordo de Paris em todas as suas políticas.

Combater a visão retrógrada da administração americana, aproveitar a transição energética digital para criar novas oportunidades de crescimento sustentável e emprego com qualidade, combater as desigualdades e melhorar as condições de vida no planeta.

Devemos reforçar as parcerias existentes e procurar novas alianças económicas, políticas e de investigação e desenvolvimento.

Por isso, esta resolução constitui um forte mandato político para a delegação do Parlamento Europeu que participará na COP23 e é também um mandato político para a Comissão e para os Estados-Membros.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, as alterações climáticas são uma das maiores ameaças ambientais, sociais e económicas que o Planeta e a Humanidade enfrentam. Todos os dias, assistimos a exemplos de fenómenos climáticos severos e sem precedentes que mostram a todos essa verdade.

Desde os furacões Irma, Maria, que tudo devastam na sua passagem, aos fogos florestais que no meu país, recentemente, ceifaram a vida a 64 pessoas.

Na COP23 será discutida e negociada a implementação do Acordo de Paris e, em particular, as questões da transparência, adaptação, redução de emissões, financiamento, capacitação e tecnologia, permitindo que estas matérias venham a ser aprovadas na próxima COP, que se realizará em 2018, na Polónia.

A assinatura do Acordo de Paris foi um momento histórico em torno de um consenso na luta contra as alterações climáticas. Trata-se de um acordo multilateral sem precedentes. O Sr. Trump invocou, para abandonar o Acordo de Paris, que este é injusto para os trabalhadores americanos e perverso para a competitividade dos Estados Unidos. Mas se este anúncio pode tornar mais difícil a luta contra as alterações climáticas, estou certo de que não há retorno neste combate e de que a transição mundial para a energia limpa veio para ficar.

O êxito da COP23 implica uma determinação política forte e uma robusta diplomacia climática. A União Europeia deve continuar a liderar através das suas políticas climáticas ambiciosas e de um apoio aos que são particularmente vulneráveis, a fim de construir economias fortes e sustentáveis.

O mundo está numa corrida contra o tempo e a União Europeia e os seus Estados-Membros devem manter-se unidos e absolutamente comprometidos com uma aplicação plena e rápida do Acordo de Paris. Daí a importância que entendo que a COP23 trará para o nosso Planeta.

Simona Bonafè (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'enciclica Laudato si', citata anche nella risoluzione che andremo ad approvare, Papa Francesco scrive «Dio perdona sempre l'uomo; qualche volta la natura non perdona mai». E in effetti basta vedere che cosa sta succedendo oggi: siccità prolungate, dimezzamento delle piogge e poi alluvioni, bombe d'acqua, trombe d'aria anche nelle nostre regioni europee.

Questi sono dati, sono fatti; quindi non serve scomodare la scienza per dare un nome a tutto questo. Serve però agire e agire presto. Il cambiamento climatico non è un problema che possiamo pensare di spostare nel futuro, perché stiamo già assistendo ai suoi effetti. E se non agiremo, il cambiamento impatterà molto più di quanto si pensi sulle nostre comunità, causando costi sociali ma anche danni economici a persone e a interi sistemi produttivi.

E allora, Commissario, abbiamo una grande responsabilità: dobbiamo accelerare in Europa la transizione verso un'economia sostenibile, a basse emissioni di carbonio e circolare e coinvolgere, come Europa, in questo processo anche gli altri attori globali, anche chi oggi si permette di stracciare la Carta degli accordi di Parigi e mette però a rischio il futuro nostro e delle prossime generazioni.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo di Parigi è irreversibile e non rinunciabile e, nel percorso di contrasto al cambiamento climatico, la COP 23 di Bonn deve essere una tappa fondamentale per portare a termine entro il 2018 l'elaborazione delle modalità di dettaglio di attuazione dell'accordo. La tabella di marcia per la mobilitazione di 100 miliardi di dollari entro il 2020 da destinare all'azione per il clima nei paesi in via di sviluppo rappresenta solo un punto di partenza.

Il costante aumento dei finanziamenti dell'Unione europea a favore del clima non è soddisfacente e non dà garanzie sul raggiungimento dell'obiettivo: serve un impegno ambizioso da parte dei governi e degli studi finanziari pubblici e privati, delle banche, dei fondi pensione e delle compagnie di assicurazione per allineare le pratiche di prestito e di investimento all'obiettivo di contenere l'aumento della temperatura ben al di sotto del 2% e per abbandonare gli investimenti a favore dei combustibili fossili.

Servono garanzie pubbliche specifiche a favore degli investimenti verdi, nonché certificazioni e vantaggi fiscali per i fondi di investimento verdi e per l'emissione di obbligazioni verdi.

Insomma, dobbiamo passare dalle parole ai fatti.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, v dveh stvareh se, mislim da, širom po svetu strinjamo.

Prvič, da smo ljudje povzročili klimatske spremembe, ki nam delajo takšne težave, kot smo jim priča, bodisi v Karibskem morju ali pa v Evropi.

In drugič, da je bila Evropa tista, ki je prva prepoznala svojo obveznost in tudi svojo vlogo na področju zelenih ekonomij in na področju zmanjševanja izpusta toplogrednih plinov.

Imamo številne politike, bodisi prehod in strategija prehoda na krožno gospodarstvo, kjer govorimo o učinkoviti rabi virov.

Na področju energetike smo marsikaj že postorili, na področju učinkovite rabe energije vedno bolj prehajamo na obnovljive vire energije, potreben je še velik korak na področju transporta.

Veseli me tudi to, da takšne onesnaževalke, kot je Kitajska, sledijo evropskemu zgledu, ki so povsem prenehale z izdelavo novih termoelektrarn, in da Kitajska danes že proizvaja več vetrne energije kot celotna Evropa.

Z zgledom bomo največ pokazali in na tej poti moramo vztrajati.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πραγματικά η υπερθέρμανση του πλανήτη έχει τεράστιες συνέπειες και για την ανάπτυξη της γης συνολικά, αλλά βεβαίως και για το μέλλον μας. Από την άλλη πλευρά, πρέπει να εξετάσουμε σε ποια κατάσταση βρισκόμαστε, γιατί ο δεύτερος μεγαλύτερος ρυπαντής του κόσμου, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, έχουν αποσυρθεί από τη Συμφωνία. Επιπλέον, η Κίνα, θα έλεγα, «πετάει την μπάλα στην εξέδρα», διότι μέχρι το 2030 δεν έχει αναλάβει καμία δέσμευση. Αυτοί λοιπόν οι οποίοι έχουν αναλάβει τη δέσμευση είναι η δική μας πλευρά, χωρίς όμως αυτό να σημαίνει ότι επί του πρακτέου μπορεί να συμβεί κάτι, διότι, όταν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες και η Κίνα αλλά και η Ινδία δεν έχουν δεσμευτεί, η όποια δραστηριότητα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης θα έχει πολύ μικρές συνέπειες για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Ταυτόχρονα, με τις πολιτικές που ακολουθούμε διαλύονται και παραδοσιακές βιομηχανίες. Πρέπει λοιπόν να ληφθεί σοβαρά υπόψη ότι οι βασικοί ρυπαντές δεν δεσμεύονται καθόλου.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν υπάρχει λόγος για κανέναν αγώνα και καμία μάχη αν δεν καταφέρουμε να σώσουμε τον πλανήτη. Αλλά πώς θα επιτευχθεί αυτός ο μεγαλεπήβολος στόχος, όταν εμείς δεν βρίσκουμε τρόπο να πιέσουμε τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες να αλλάξουν τη στάση τους; Αν δεν βρίσκουμε τρόπους ή δεν θέλουμε να βρούμε τρόπους να αντιμετωπίσουμε τη Monsanto, την εταιρεία που υποτάσσει την παγκόσμια διατροφική αλυσίδα με ενέργειες που επηρεάζουν αρνητικά το κλίμα; Χρειαζόμαστε πολιτικές που να προάγουν την αλλαγή στη λειτουργία της οικονομίας η οποία προωθεί την ιδέα του υπερκαταναλωτισμού, καθώς και τερματισμό της αλόγιστης χρήσης των φυσικών πόρων της γης.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Den klimatutveckling vi ser i stora delar av världen kommer att bidra till politisk instabilitet och en upptrappning av flyktingströmmarna. Runt år 2050 menar FN att världen kan ha 200 miljoner människor som drivits från sina hem på grund av klimatförändringar.

Europaparlamentet noterar med oro att cirka 21,5 miljoner människor tvingades lämna sina hem mellan 2008 och 2013 på grund av naturkatastrofer. Det är viktigt att vi tar fördrivning och migration av människor som en följd av klimatkatastrofer på allvar. Vi måste utveckla FN-systemen för migration och de befintliga definitionerna och verktygen så att de också inkluderar denna kategori av flyktingar.

Jämställdheten lyser med sin frånvaro i de olika processer som pågår inom ramen för Parisavtalet. Det är ett allvarligt misstag. FN:s gröna klimatfond kommer att spela en viktig roll för finansieringen av anpassningsbehov i de länder som drabbas hårdast. På klimattoppmötet i Bonn kommer förhoppningsvis en handlingsplan för ökad jämställdhet att förhandlas och antas. Jag uppmanar därför kommissionen och våra medlemsstater att medverka till att ett beslut tas i Bonn om en ambitiös handlingsplan med specifika mål, för vi kan glömma klimatet om vi inte satsar på jämställdhet.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, it's impossible to talk about climate change without drawing attention to the grave situation in Amazonia, Brazil, where violence, land grabbing and serious human rights violations are now endemic under Michel Temer's corrupt presidency. The current administration is propped up by agri-business, extractive industries and the hydro-electric dam lobby. Multinationals given carte blanche to tear down the forest, rip open the earth, pollute the water supply and flood historic settlements such as San Juan de Araguaia, a 400-year-old town doomed to inundation by plans for mega electric hydroelectric dam on the nearby Tocantins river.

The guardians of the environment are the indigenous people and it is them we should be listening to. I listened and I saw. I went to Amazonia in August — into the heart of the forest — and I bore witness to the unfolding environmental disaster, not just for the indigenous people or for Brazil, but for the whole world. There is a direct link between the extratropical storm Desmond that devastated my constituency in December 2015 and the destruction of the Amazon. Climate change knows no borders. The Amazon is the lungs of the world, and its breath is life on earth.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I have listened carefully to the debate today and I am encouraged by the engagement shown by the Members of this House. I appreciate your commitment to maintaining the European Union's role as a pathbreaker in the field of international climate action.

I would like to thank the honourable Members for raising this important issue in Parliament, thereby providing additional political momentum, and I am convinced that, with your support, the Commission and the Council under the leadership of the Estonian Presidency will be able to deliver substantial progress on the implementation of the Paris Agreement at the next climate conference in Bonn in November.

Many of you referred to the need to raise our level of ambition. In this regard, I would say that the European Union, along with the other parties, is required to communicate by 2020 its mid-century development strategy for the long-term lowering of greenhouse gas emissions. These long-term strategies will have to explore the feasibility of our 1.5°C scenario, which certainly goes beyond the level of domestic reduction we are heading towards with the current 2030 policy framework.

For the long-term strategies, we are, however, dependent on further international developments in order to have the necessary science and analytical basis in place. We will have to obtain the science on the 2°C and 1.5°C pathways, including through a report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in the second half of 2018. The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Facilitative Dialogue at the end of 2018 is also essential, as it will show us how countries are implementing Paris and what more is needed.

To facilitate the preparation of these strategies the Commission will prepare an in-depth analysis of the economic and social transformations needed in order to feed the political debate in the European Parliament and the Council and with the stakeholders.

I want to conclude by thanking you again for the opportunity of having this debate, and I hope we can continue our dialogue in the future.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank you again for your cooperation. I am very much encouraged by the debate today on COP 23 and the next steps in the implementation of the Paris Agreement. As on previous occasions, the support from Parliament in our outreach efforts to our international partners is very much appreciated. I look forward to continuing this exchange and working closely together in the run up to the Bonn Conference in order to achieve the best possible outcome.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Πρόεδρος. – Έχω λάβει σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 128 παράγραφος 5 του Κανονισμού μία πρόταση ψηφίσματος.

Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τετάρτη 4 Οκτωβρίου.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162)

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban*. – Idén novemberben különösen fontos lesz, hogy konkrét, lényegi előrehaladást érjünk el a bonni találkozón annak érdekében, hogy a párizsi klímamegállapodás lendülete 2018-ban és azt követően is megmaradjon. A megállapodás gyakorlati végrehajtása mellett az egyik legnagyobb feladatunk az ambíciószint fenntartása és a klímaváltozás témájának folyamatos napirenden tartása.

További kihívást jelent a tárgyalások során a nemzeti vállalások közös jellemzőinek meghatározása, míg globális szinten a veszteségek és károk fejlődő országok által javasolt kezelése okoz fejtörést Európának és a fejlett országoknak. A polgárok egyre szélesebb köre lép fel a dekarbonizáció érdekében azzal a céllal, hogy ellenállóbbá váljanak az éghajlatváltozással szemben. Különösen üdvözlendőnek tartom a nem állami szereplők, mint például a természetvédelemben aktív vallásos szervezetek elköteleződését a Párizsi Megállapodás mellett.

Fontos, hogy ezt a potenciált kiaknázzuk és összehangoljuk az állami szintű vállalásokkal. Ennek megfelelően biztosítanunk kell őket elismerésünkről és támogatásunkról. Úgy gondolom, hogy megalapozott nemzeti vállalások csak a nem állami és a magánszektor részvételével határozhatók meg, amelyhez ösztönözni kell az állami és nem állami szereplők közti párbeszédet.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), in writing. – To avoid acceleration of further uncontrollable climate disruption, we must stay strongly committed to the full implementation of the Paris Agreement. We must be clear that this agreement is irreversible and will not be renegotiated. This clarity and certainty to all actors is crucial to build trust and help solidify confidence in the global commitment to climate action. In that sense I deplore the opening Commissioner Cañete made to the Trump Administration to 'chart its own path' within the Treaty and to come back on the terms under which they agreed to participate previously. Such a back step is dangerous and could open a Pandora's box, since other Parties to the Paris Agreement might start to consider weaker contributions as well. This is contrary to the Paris Agreement itself that states in art.4.3 that 'Each Party's successive NDC will represent a progression beyond the Party's then current NDC and reflect its highest possible ambition, reflecting its common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities'. Current NDCs will still lead to a global warming of 3°C. Parties should do more, not less. The EU also has to raise its ambitions. The Facilitative Dialogue in 2018 is an excellent opportunity to do so.

14. Annullierung Tausender Flüge durch Ryanair und Durchsetzung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 261/2004 über Fluggastrechte (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί των δηλώσεων του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τις χιλιάδες ακυρώσεις πτήσεων από τη Ryanair και την εφαρμογή του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 261/2004/ΕΚ σχετικά με τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών αεροπορικών μεταφορών (2017/2876(RSP))

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, air travel is a vital transport link for EU citizens. In the European Union, some 918 million passengers travelled by air in 2015 and this figure is increasing steadily from year to year.

Ryanair has grown to become the largest EU airline by scheduled passengers flown, and has carried more international passengers in 2015 than any airline in the world. It currently operates from 84 bases connecting 33 countries across Europe and North Africa. The abrupt cancellation, in the six weeks from September to October 2017, by Ryanair of thousands of its flights in the EU has caused major disturbances for passengers. A large number of them were left stranded at airports and many had to cancel journeys or re-route their flights. There are complaints that in a number of cases the airline has given little or no notice of such cancellations. Furthermore, there have been claims that the limited information dispensed by the airline with regard to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to assistance and the right to compensation, may have been misleading to passengers.

It is deeply regrettable that the passengers were left in such a position. Airlines operating in the EU must respect European rules. Air passengers' rights are indeed protected under EU law. The Flight Compensation Regulation sets a minimum level of quality standards for passenger protection, adding an important citizens' dimension to the liberalisation of the aviation market. When a flight is cancelled, airlines are obliged to inform passengers of their rights. These rights include the right to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to care and, in some circumstances, the right to compensation. Any EU airline not adhering to these rules must be held accountable.

The national enforcement bodies in each Member State must act to verify that airlines are respecting EU rules and that passengers' rights are protected. They must also strive to ensure that passengers are aware of their rights.

Violeta Bulc, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission wishes to make the following statement on the recent case of Ryanair cancellations. A few days ago, Ryanair publicly announced that it would reduce its operations by cancelling thousands of scheduled flights, disrupting the travel plans of passengers across Europe. This affected firstly flights scheduled until the end of October, totalling 2 100 flights, and then others due to operate during the winter season.

A very large number of passengers will be affected and, just like all of you, the Commission wants to make sure that those passengers are treated fairly. The EU is the only area in the world where citizens are protected by a full set of passengers' rights, whether they travel by air, rail, ship, bus or coach. All passengers whose flights are cancelled have a comprehensive set of rights. It is essential that they receive correct and complete information about their rights in order to be able to enforce them. Let me recall that these rights include the right to reimbursement, re-routing or return, as well as the right to care and, in some circumstances, the right to receive financial compensation. The Commission has asked the national authorities to be vigilant on this issue, and to try to cooperate with each other in order to ensure that passengers can fully exercise their rights.

As guardian of the Treaties, the role of the Commission is to oversee and monitor the implementation of EU law in each Member State. For this reason, the Commission immediately issued a statement underlying, in particular, that Ryanair just – like all airlines operating in the EU – must fully comply with EU air passengers' rights.

We are in direct contact with all the national enforcement bodies to make sure that passengers' rights are respected, and I specifically welcome the enforcement actions already taken by the UK civil aviation authorities and further actions by other civil aviation authorities, including in Ireland and Spain.

I'm also confident that the Irish civil aviation authority will continue to fulfil its oversight obligations and ensure that Ryanair continues to comply with our aviation acquis. Mr President and honourable members: let me also use this opportunity to remind you that in 2016, the Commission issued guidelines on the existing rules to make it easier for passengers and national authorities alike. The Commission also proposed to modernise the rules on air passengers' rights in 2013 — a proposal which is currently blocked in Council. I hope that we will soon be able to make progress on this for our passengers travelling across the EU.

This incident clearly highlights the need for a modern and robust European regulatory framework. Honourable Members, President: the Commission has contacted Ryanair and we expect them to fully comply with its obligations. Together with my colleague, Commissioner Jourová, I have written an official letter to Ryanair to underline our concerns and highlight the obligations under EU law.

Firstly, we recalled that the passengers must receive correct and complete information about their rights in due time in order to be able to enforce them, including on re-routing and compensation.

Secondly, Ryanair has to ensure that all communication channels are working properly and that passengers can communicate with staff. Thirdly, another important issue is the complaint handling process. Ryanair shall make information available on its website on its complaint handling process and on the relevant contact addresses where passengers can file claims. I am pleased to report that the Ryanair has already responded by giving a number of assurances addressing the issues we have raised.

Indeed, for September and October 98% of affected customers have had their claims processed. For November to March 2018, the figure is at 75% and we expect this to go up rapidly in the coming weeks. This is a positive development. I will be pursuing my contacts with Ryanair in the Irish civil aviation authority during a visit to Dublin in a few days, and the Commission will of course remain in close contact with all national enforcement bodies to further follow-up on this issue.

President and honourable Members, the single aviation market has many benefits, but also many obligations. We therefore expect all airlines operating in the EU to fully respect European rules.

Deirdre Clune, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for the clarification and for her action in this area in contacting Ryanair. On 18 September last, Ryanair suddenly announced flight cancellations and it was only last Friday, 29 September, 11 days later, that we seem to have come to a point where we had full clarification on the issue, and – in relation to passenger rights – for the passengers' entitlements to be communicated directly to them. That followed meetings with the Commission for Aviation Regulation in Ireland and the UK and in Spain, as you have mentioned, so it took that time to ensure that passengers' rights were outlined clearly and communicated to them directly.

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 has been in place since 2004 and we are all well aware of it, and I am sure a European airline that is benefiting from the liberalisation of European airspace should have been aware of the issue. They have said that they take the matter seriously and have put in place strong communication now with their customers.

All this came from what has been described as a rostering management failure. It is not a safety issue, as some people would like to think or would like to link it to, and we should be clear on that. Flight time regulations were established by these institutions: the amount of time a pilot can fly, and indeed the time that cabin crew can be in the air, in one calendar year was established. In an effort to ensure that they remained compliant and continued to remain compliant, Ryanair had a rostering issue and they had to cancel flights and ensure that they could remain compliant. They are compliant, they continue to be compliant, but there is a serious question mark over their management, certainly in the compliance area, when it comes to EU rules and regulations.

İsmail Ertug, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ryanair hat verkündet, dass bis zum März 2018 20 000 Flüge gestrichen werden. Ungefähr 700 000 Passagiere werden davon betroffen sein. Das wirft natürlich Fragen auf, nämlich Fragen danach, ob die Fluggastrechte auch gewahrt werden. Wer trägt z. B. die Mehrkosten, wenn eben so ein Flug gestrichen wird? Werden die Kunden auch ausreichend aufgeklärt? Die Frage muss erlaubt sein: Wo war die irische Luftfahrtbehörde? Denn sie ist ja letztendlich auch für die Genehmigung zuständig, und sie muss sicherstellen, dass der Flugbetrieb letztendlich auch reibungslos verläuft. Da muss irgendetwas schiefgelaufen sein, das müssen sich auch die Zuständigen gefallen lassen.

Warum überhaupt – stellt sich für mich die Frage – müssen Flüge gestrichen werden? Es heißt, die Pünktlichkeit soll gesteigert werden – das ist auch vollkommen in Ordnung –, nur wissen wir, dass Ryanair seit geraumer Zeit ja nicht immer nur mit positiven Schlagzeilen aufwartet, sondern auch mit negativen – negativen insbesondere, was die Beschäftigungsbedingungen der Piloten anbelangt. Mag es vielleicht tatsächlich an der Beschäftigungspraxis bei den Piloten liegen, die nur dann Geld bekommen, wenn sie fliegen? Mag es vielleicht an diesen Beschäftigungsbedingungen oder -verhältnissen liegen? Frau Kommissarin, Sie müssen da als Kommission darauf achten, dass das tatsächlich auch nicht auf dem Rücken der Kolleginnen und Kollegen und der Kunden ausgetragen wird.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Bez wątpienia tanie linie odegrały ogromną rolę w upowszechnieniu latania jako ważnego i przystępnego cenowo środka transportu w Unii Europejskiej. Ryanair jest dziś zdecydowanym liderem w tym segmencie, dlatego trzeba podkreślić, że oprócz dużych zysków z taką pozycją wiąże się także odpowiedzialność. Obecna sytuacja, a szczególnie chaos informacyjny związany z odwołaniem tysięcy połączeń, powoduje uzasadniony niepokój pasażerów i stanowi poważne wyzwanie dla wielu lokalnych portów lotniczych, dla których połączenia realizowane przez tę linię są często kluczowe dla utrzymania rentowności. Nie do przyjęcia jest sytuacja, w której Ryanair unika lub nie w pełni wywiązuje się z obowiązków, jakie ciąży na nim w przypadku odwołania lotu, szczególnie w zakresie zapewnienia pasażerowi alternatywnego połączenia. Regulacje europejskie są tutaj jasne i pasażer musi mieć pewność, że jego prawa są respektowane. Właśnie na pani komisarz spoczywa egzekwowanie art. 5 rozporządzenia Parlamentu i Rady, do czego niniejszym Panią wzywam i namawiam. Oczekuję, że państwa członkowskie oraz Komisja będą monitorowały sytuację i podejmą odpowiednie kroki, by chronić prawa pasażerów.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I too am glad that we have this point on the agenda in the plenary today and that we can debate it. I think it is worth saying that clearly something went wrong in Ryanair. To put it bluntly, Ryanair has messed something up. If I were the CEO, I would probably take measures because, of course, the first affected in this respect is the company, with its business and its reputation. There is no doubt something went wrong: it is obvious due to the implications that we are debating.

However, the Commissioner said one important thing and I think it is something we should focus on in terms of where we go from here and what the policymaking is to be. That is that, regarding the European Union, our internal market, the rights of consumers and passengers' rights, if we compare the situation with any other region in the world, or any other country, we have the most protective legislative framework. That goes without saying. I also see that the Commission has acted and has given a response so I am sure that, as far as the competences of the Commission are concerned, it will make sure that Ryanair implements what it has promised and what it has to implement. And of course we also have the relevant national authorities.

What I am more concerned about is that, although we have had this most protective legislative framework for 10 years, there are still entities and people that do not know what passengers' rights are today, what can be reimbursed and what kind of obligations the airline has. That is something else that we need to draw conclusions from. I hope that, in the future, apart from the monitoring of implementation – on which, of course, I will focus – we will be able to bring forward the question of passengers' rights, not only in aviation but also in other modes of transport, in a combined way.

Lastly, I apologise that, due to a previous commitment, I have to leave. Please do not consider that as disrespect to you, Mr President, Madam Commissioner, or to the issue, which I think is a serious one.

Matt Carthy, on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group. – Mr. President, Ryanair deliberately misled customers concerning their rights as passengers under EU regulations. It refused to disclose correct information on compensation rights until its hand was forced, but we shouldn't be surprised by Ryanair's disrespectful behaviour towards its passengers. For years, its CEO has prided himself on the company's disrespectful treatment towards its workers. Ryanair refuses to negotiate with trade unions, it forbids its workers on many bases from organising, and remember this debacle of cancelled flights is the direct result of pilots and other workers fleeing Ryanair.

The episode demonstrates that promoting so-called competitiveness to the detriment of workers' rights cannot and will not succeed. Therefore we across the EU institutions have to stop pushing ahead with our aggressive competition agenda in the transport sector and acknowledge first and foremost that flights cannot run and planes cannot fly if we do not have pilots and workers to service them.

(Applause)

Karima Delli, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, les annulations de vols par Ryanair sont une nouvelle provocation de la compagnie *low cost*. Quelque 400 000 passagers sont pénalisés à cause d'une mauvaise gestion de planning. Mais c'est une blague! Cette compagnie fait manifestement des passagers une variable d'ajustement. Je vous le dis comme je le pense: ce n'est plus du *low cost*, c'est du zéro service.

Face à de tels agissements, je demande à la Commission européenne de faire en sorte que Ryanair respecte la législation européenne sur le droit des passagers, mais également d'envisager des sanctions parce que cela ne va pas s'arrêter là. Ryanair vient encore d'annoncer l'annulation de 18 000 nouveaux vols d'ici mars prochain.

Cet épisode met en évidence les limites du modèle *low cost* qui n'est vertueux ni pour la planète, ni pour les salariés, ni pour les consommateurs. Il est grand temps que l'Union européenne en prenne conscience, et cesse d'encourager le *low cost*, le dumping social et les subventions dont il bénéficie.

Par conséquent, renforçons le droit des passagers, rendons-le plus clair, mais créons un mécanisme de sanctions à l'encontre des compagnies «voyous».

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è uno scandalo perché più di 21 000 voli sono stati cancellati. Milioni di passeggeri sono a terra e più che altro sono in zone remote e su isole. Questo perché? Perché è un monopolio. Questo signori è un monopolio a spese dei cittadini. Fatto con cosa? Con i soldi dei cittadini, per l'appunto, dei contribuenti, con i contributi che regioni e comuni danno a Ryanair per mantenere i voli sui propri territori.

Ben venga l'inchiesta della Commissione europea. I consumatori vanno tutelati ma secondo noi vanno non solo rimborsati bensì vanno risarciti. Attenzione anche alla tutela dei diritti dei lavoratori, però, perché noi vorremmo capire se il periodo di riposo proposto dall'azienda a fronte di un corrispettivo economico si in linea con il pieno rispetto della condizione psicofisica dei lavoratori di Ryanair.

L'Unione europea non si può tirare indietro, né si può girare dall'altra parte: anche se si tratta di una malagestione dell'azienda oppure se si assistesse a un'operazione di mercato, mettendo da parte risorse per acquistare slot aeroportuali o compagnie più piccole, a noi importano i diritti dei cittadini e dei lavoratori.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziesięć dni temu niespodziewanie odwołano mi lot i odzyskałem tylko dwieście euro, bo jak mi wyjaśniono, więcej się nie należy na mocy jakiejś konwencji. Jeśli ja mam problem, to jest to mój problem. Jeżeli milion ludzi ma problemy, to jest to milion problemów indywidualnych, a nie problem społeczny czy polityczny. Zawsze słyszałem narzekania, że Ryanair odbiera pasażerów innym liniom. Jeżeli teraz w okresie zimowym chce oddać dziesiątki tysięcy pasażerów innym liniom, to powinny się one cieszyć. Ryanair ma prawo zlikwidować połowę swoich połączeń. Jeśli Ryanair lata, to mówicie, że to jest bandytyzm. Jeśli Ryanair nie lata, to też bandytyzm. Ryanair odwołuje loty i płaci pasażerom wymagane prawem odszkodowania. Nie widzę najmniejszego powodu, żeby jakkolwiek instytucja wtrącała się w decyzje prywatnego przedsiębiorstwa. Na miejscu firmy Ryanair odpowiadałbym każdej takiej instytucji: pocałujcie mnie w czołko. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Dieter-Lebrecht Koch (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Frau Kommissarin Bulc! Weit über 300 000 Ryanair-Kunden sind schon von Flugausfällen betroffen, bis März 2018 werden wohl noch 400 000 weitere dazukommen. Von all den Gründen, die Ryanair bezüglich der Ausfälle und Verspätungen vorbringt, kann ich eigentlich keinen einzigen akzeptieren. Die entscheidende Frage ist jetzt, ob bei diesem Flugausfallmarathon die bestehenden Rechte der Fluggäste gewahrt blieben oder nicht. Deshalb möchte ich alle betroffenen Fluggäste dazu animieren, ihre Rechte in Erfahrung zu bringen und diese bei den entsprechenden nationalen Behörden durchzusetzen. Selbst zu spät erfolgte, unvollständige oder nicht korrekte Informationen auf der Ryanair-Website hat die Fluggesellschaft zu verantworten. Je nach ausgefallener Flugstrecke können 250, 400 oder sogar 600 Euro Entschädigung fällig werden, falls die Informationen zu spät kamen und eine Reisealternative mit wenigen Abweichungen nicht möglich war.

Den Versprechen betreffend des zukünftigen Flugverhaltens der Ryanair traue ich nicht. Für mich ist diese Situation ein Grund mehr, den Rat der Verkehrsminister dazu zu animieren, die Überarbeitung der Fluggastrechte, die in unserem Haus bereits am 5. Februar 2014 verabschiedet wurde, nicht weiter zu blockieren. Wir brauchen diese Überarbeitung der Regelung aus dem Jahr 2004 dringend, um eine weitere wirksame und einheitliche Durchsetzung von Fluggastrechten zu bewirken.

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señor presidente, mientras estamos aquí, de todos modos, quejándonos con toda razón de la pérdida de derechos de 400 000 pasajeros, la propia compañía está lanzando un megasaldo de un millón de plazas para los mismos meses y a un precio que... en fin, no lo voy a decir para no hacer publicidad, pero que es vergonzoso: «Dejo a 400 000 en tierra y los maltrato y, al mismo tiempo, me hago propaganda y lanzo un millón de plazas para los otros, para los que serán maltratados en la próxima oleada».

Por eso considero que, de alguna manera —porque ya empiezo a pensar que es una ingeniería financiera perversa—, deberíamos meterle mano a esta compañía porque, desde luego, engaña a los viajeros.

Su organización no puede ser peor y sus previsiones absolutamente inaceptables. También está el maltrato a los pilotos —de quienes se ríe y a quienes critica—, además de que ataca directamente las normas europeas y la previsión de la fatiga en las tripulaciones.

Por lo tanto, señora comisaria, le pediría no solamente las sanciones concretas que podamos imponer por mandato a nivel europeo y su armonización. Porque hay unas sociedades que les piden unas cosas, otros otras... Al final, no sabemos realmente cuál va a ser la sanción definitiva.

Y, por otro lado, facilitar las reclamaciones. Desde el punto de vista digital, cada viajero debería recibir, en el momento en el que compra un vuelo, la información sobre sus derechos y sobre cómo reclamar automáticamente a la compañía.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik betreur ten eerste dat we nu pas een debat voeren over deze problematiek. Meer dan een jaar geleden stelde ik de Commissie reeds een vraag over de klachten van klanten tegen Ryanair en over het niet naleven van de consumentenregels. Toen ontving ik het antwoord van uw diensten dat er niets aan de hand was.

Op 4 juli van dit jaar vroeg ik u opnieuw om stappen te ondernemen tegen luchtvaartmaatschappijen die het haast onmogelijk maken om klachten in te dienen. Opnieuw kwam het antwoord dat u de zaak zou bekijken.

Nu duizenden consumenten getroffen zijn, hoop ik dat u eindelijk stappen zal ondernemen.

Naar aanleiding van de Ryanair-zaak reageerde u al in de pers dat maatschappijen de Europese regels moeten respecteren, want die regels bestaan al. Het is in de eerste plaats aan de lidstaten om die regels af te dwingen en aan de Commissie om de lidstaten hierop te wijzen. Ik wil u dan ook oproepen om hier eindelijk werk van te maken en de lidstaten – en dus zo ook de maatschappijen – op hun verantwoordelijkheid te wijzen.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – Ik vraag me af: waar draait het om in de luchtvaart? Het gaat er toch om passagiers veilig en efficiënt te vervoeren naar een bestemming? Hun reisdoel is zeker niet om verzeild te raken in procedures met de luchtvaartmaatschappij, die plotseling talloze vluchten annuleert. Procedures over het recht op financiële compensatie, over het recht op alternatieve vluchten, over het recht op verzorging en op informatie, kortom over hun rechten als passagier.

Europa had ooit de ambitie mensen die vliegen te beschermen tegen wanpraktijken. Europa had de intentie om consumenten te helpen hun recht te halen. Europa heeft een voorstel om passagiersrechten in de luchtvaart aan te scherpen en die aanpassing van Verordening nr. 261 uit 2004 wordt steeds nijpender. Want in 13 jaar is de wereld van de luchtvaart sterk veranderd en passagiers moeten makkelijker hun rechten bij annuleringen en vertragingen te gelde kunnen maken. Passagiers moeten een verruimd recht krijgen op alternatieve vluchten en passagiers moeten beter geïnformeerd worden door luchtvaartmaatschappijen. Voor misleiding en niet-transparante communicatie is in mijn Europa geen plaats.

Die aanscherping van de passagiersrechten door de wijziging van Verordening nr. 261 zit muurvast in de Raad. Het Europees Parlement, wij, de volksvertegenwoordiging, wij nemen mensen die vliegen serieus. Maar de Raad, de vertegenwoordiging van de lidstaten, weigert al drie jaar met ons tot een compromis te komen. En dat allemaal, zoals bekend, vanwege het geschil omtrent de status van de luchthaven van Gibraltar.

Europese Raad, neem uw verantwoordelijkheid, hak politieke knopen door, ondanks de complexiteit van de brexit. U kunt persoonlijke drama's voorkomen rond annuleringen en met ons, het Europees Parlement, ervoor zorgen dat passagiers in de luchtvaart bij dergelijke vervelende omstandigheden alsnog – om in luchtvaarttermen te blijven – een zachte landing kunnen krijgen.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, dear colleagues, passengers' and workers' rights need to be respected. This is unfortunately not the case for Ryanair. This kind of unfair business model and ultra-low cost model in the transport sector in general needs to be avoided.

If we look at the current situation for customers, no real safeguards exist against flight cancellations or delays. How do passengers really feel when they book a Ryanair flight, but they don't know whether it will ever take off, and then the company blames poor planning of staff holidays. It is not only the customers who are affected, it is also the crew members, who work on an hourly rate and don't get paid when flights get cancelled. What are the workers' social conditions if they are only being paid for the hours when they are flying, with no income security when flights are cancelled?

Is this the model of aviation we want in Europe or elsewhere – a new model of legal slavery? We need to fix the grey areas of the current air passenger rights regulation. We know very well the regulation is open to interpretation, and Parliament is ready and willing to get an agreement on this important subject. We need a clear and fair air passenger rights regulation, and the citizens of Europe are waiting for European Union leadership in this matter and for fair conditions and fair aviation that is safe for customers and workers alike.

Jakop Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Ryanair har nyligen meddelat att det ställer in en stor mängd flighter fram till mars 2018, vilket drabbar hundratusentals resenärer.

Detta är mycket olyckligt och ett uttryck för Ryanairs mycket problematiska affärsmodell, som bygger på oanständiga arbetsvillkor för personalen och indirekt offentligt stöd från regionala flygplatser. Att på detta sätt pressa priser på flygresor som förstör klimatet och dessutom låta prisdumpningen gå ut över personal och resenärer är inte hållbart. Nu måste vi se till att de hundratusentals resenärer som har blivit drabbade tas om hand. Men på lång sikt måste vi se till att lagstiftningen stärks så att kabinpersonalen får goda arbetsvillkor och resenärer tryggt kan boka sina flygresor. Och till sist: Flyget måste börja betala för sin klimatpåverkan, och de fossila subventionerna på flyget måste ta slut.

Daniela Aiuto (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi quindici anni i vari governi degli Stati membri hanno svenduto il cielo europeo, riempiendo le tasche della compagnia irlandese, elargendo agevolazioni, contributi più o meno mascherati da aiuti al funzionamento, soprattutto per gli aeroporti minori, quelli che faticavano a mantenere un traffico passeggeri sufficiente, e il tutto in barba alle regole sulla concorrenza.

Sono i vari Stati membri che hanno consentito la proliferazione di una compagnia aerea, che ha fatto del precariato lavorativo la sua parola d'ordine. Dopo aver regalato per anni voli quasi gratis in tutta Europa – e sappiamo bene a spese di chi – oggi Ryanair è passata in cassa: ma non sono solo i governi nazionali gli unici architetti della crisi attuale in atto.

Quante volte la Commissione si è lavata le mani dalle innumerevoli violazioni segnalate da questo Parlamento? Quante volte ha ignorato le nostre interrogazioni sull'evasione fiscale di Ryanair e sugli aiuti di Stato illeciti, scaricando il barile delle responsabilità sui tribunali nazionali.

Sono vent'anni che l'Unione europea lascia nel limbo il distacco dei lavoratori e sono vent'anni che ogni Stato interpreta quelle regole come vuole: a fare le spese della vostra indifferenza sono oggi i diritti dei passeggeri, andati in fumo con un click, e dei lavoratori del settore, non solo quelli delle *low cost*, ma anche delle compagnie di volo di linea. Per non parlare del danno ai sistemi nazionali di previdenza sociale.

Massimiliano Salini (PPE). – Signor presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, devo dire che sono molto colpito dalla discussione sullo scandalo di Ryanair. Sono molto colpito, perché all'interno del Parlamento e all'interno delle commissioni in cui lavoro – la commissione per l'industria, la ricerca e l'energia, la commissione per i trasporti e il turismo – spesso ci troviamo a dibattere di come tutelare il mercato europeo e tutelare le alte performance delle nostre aziende in termini di tutela del mercato stesso, di tutela della vita dei lavoratori, di tutela degli utenti e in questo caso dei passeggeri.

Ci difendiamo da chi sta fuori dal mercato, cioè da chi non rispetta le regole della concorrenza. E facciamo bene! Tuttavia, in questo caso ci ritroviamo in una situazione paradossale perché, come al solito, parlando di aziende, abbiamo di fronte il cliente, il lavoratore e l'azienda stessa.

Per quanto riguarda i passeggeri abbiamo detto: gli utenti hanno ampi margini per tutelare i loro diritti. Dall'altro lato, i lavoratori hanno fatto un ricorso, la Corte si è espressa e quindi hanno tutto lo spazio per creare le condizioni perché il loro lavoro sia tutelato e operino in condizioni tali da poter garantire un servizio corretto.

A questo punto, parliamo della compagnia. Io non sono abituato a far processi anticipati, ma a quanto pare, la compagnia ha creato condizioni di concorrenza sleale, togliendo lavoro e illudendo i passeggeri.

Bene, allora, qual è il nostro compito? Il nostro compito non è fare un processo bensì garantire che tutti lavorino secondo le condizioni attraverso le quali possiamo ancora dire che l'Europa è il più grande mercato del mondo. Ma il più grande mercato del mondo deve tener conto di tutti questi fattori e pare che in questo caso non sia stato fatto.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, ce n'est malheureusement pas la première fois que nous pointons du doigt les pratiques antisociales de la compagnie aérienne Ryanair.

Aujourd'hui, nous dénonçons de nouveau les pratiques abusives de cette compagnie en matière de non-respect des droits des passagers: 2 000 vols annulés aujourd'hui, et demain 20 000, conséquence logique de la non-prise en compte des obligations de congés des pilotes et des équipages.

Cette affaire illustre les limites des modèles économiques qui poussent les employés à bout. Droits des passagers et droits des travailleurs sont les deux facettes du même combat pour l'amélioration de la qualité de service. Sur ces deux problématiques, l'Union européenne peut agir.

En 2014, notre Parlement avait adopté une proposition de règlement pour élargir les droits des passagers en matière d'indemnisation et d'assistance. Il est grand temps que le Conseil adopte sa position afin que ce nouveau règlement entre en vigueur.

Par ailleurs, conformément à l'arrêt de la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne du 14 septembre contre Ryanair, il est indispensable de mieux définir le lieu principal d'activité pour éviter que des entreprises emploient leur personnel à des conditions sociales en vigueur dans d'autres pays que leur base d'affectation. La législation européenne doit renforcer ces décisions pour mieux protéger les travailleurs en question.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι απαράδεκτη και ανάληψη η συμπεριφορά της Ryanair, που εγκατέλειψε στην τύχη τους μέχρι στιγμής 400.000 επιβάτες και ακύρωσε πτήσεις και, όπως λέει, θα ακυρώσει και άλλες μέχρι την έναρξη της άνοιξης. Η Ryanair είναι η μεγαλύτερη εταιρεία, δρα σε 84 αεροδρόμια και φυσικά έχει μονοπώλιο. Αυτή είναι η κατάσταση. Αξιοποιεί αυτή τη μονοπωλιακή της θέση προκειμένου να βγάλει υπερκέρδη. Όλα προκλήθηκαν διότι υπάρχει σοβαρή αρρυθμία και στις σχέσεις της με τους πιλότους. Δεν τους κατοχυρώνει τα δικαιώματα και φυσικά οι πιλότοι δεν είναι διαθέσιμοι να δουλέψουν υπερβολικές ώρες. Το ίδιο ισχύει και για το πλήρωμα καμπίνας.

Το βασικό όμως είναι ότι δεν αρκεί να ακούμε ευχολόγια από την Επιτροπή. Τι μέτρα θα ληφθούν κατά της Ryanair η οποία πραγματικά παρανομεί; Πώς θα υπάρξει προστασία των επιβατών; Πώς θα υπάρξει προστασία των καταναλωτών; Πώς θα πάρουν τις αποζημιώσεις τους; Αυτά είναι τα ερωτήματα στα οποία πρέπει να απαντήσουμε, για να σταματήσει η Ryanair να καταχράται τη δεσπόζουσα θέση την οποία έχει στην αγορά αυτή τη στιγμή. Όλα όσα έγιναν, έγιναν διότι στόχος ήταν τα υπερκέρδη και φυσικά η εταιρεία «δεν έδινε φράγκο» στους ίδιους τους εργαζομένους της. Αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ryanair hat angekündigt, 98 % der Passagiere, die im September und Oktober von Streichungen betroffen waren, hätten ihr Geld zurückbekommen oder eine Umbuchung erhalten. Wenn man nicht über Fluggastrechte informiert wäre, hätte man den Eindruck: „Mensch, das ist ja super, was die gemacht haben!“ Das Problem ist aber, dass sie ihre Passagiere nicht über alle Optionen, die dort bestehen, aufgeklärt haben. Es geht bei gestrichenen Flügen nämlich nicht nur darum, eventuell Geld zurückzubekommen, sondern auch um eine Entschädigung – Herr Kollege Koch hat es schon gesagt – von 250, 400 oder 600 Euro, je nach Strecke. Und man ist als Fluggesellschaft eben auch verpflichtet, auch eine Umbuchung bei teureren Airlines anzubieten.

Ich finde es sehr gut, dass die Luftfahrtbehörde in Irland gerade letzte Woche Ryanair wirklich praktisch dazu gezwungen hat, die Passagiere nachträglich über ihre Rechte aufzuklären.

Der Punkt ist der: Wenn so gehandelt wird, ist es kein Wunder, dass eben tatsächlich viele sagen: Die Fluggastrechte müssen verschärft werden. Es wurde schon von meinem Kollegen van Miltenburg gesagt: Wir haben ja bessere Fluggastrechte, die aber leider im Rat blockiert werden. Wir brauchen das dringend, denn es muss ja so sein, dass man eben als Fluggast auch seine Rechte bekommt und sich auf die Airlines verlassen kann.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, não são apenas os direitos dos passageiros que estão em causa, tal como não se pode dissociar este caso das opções políticas que a UE tem imposto no setor.

Opções como a promoção sistémica de privatizações é a destruição do modelo de companhias aéreas de bandeira e de assistência em escala, as concentrações no setor com a apologia e permissividade às abordagens *low cost* e a crescente precarização e desregulação das relações laborais, baixando os custos com pessoal, comprometendo ainda mais um elemento da soberania nacional.

É esta a raiz do problema. Os trabalhadores atingiram o limite das condições deploráveis que a Ryanair lhes impõe. Deixamos, aliás, uma fraterna saudação a todos quantos, no setor dos transportes aéreos, lutam pela melhoria e pela dignidade das condições laborais.

Urge inverter as opções impostas e afirmar a necessidade de retomar o controlo público deste setor estratégico, essencial para o desenvolvimento de qualquer país. Só assim se garantirão as melhores práticas laborais e de operação no setor.

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, meine lieben Kolleginnen und Kollegen! 18 000 Flüge sind gestrichen worden, fast 800 000 Kunden sind davon betroffen. Geltende Gesetze wurden verletzt – wir können sie verschärfen, aber geltende wurden verletzt –, und ich bin davon überzeugt: Die Gesetzesbrecher müssen bestraft werden, aber nicht die Kunden, wie das Ryanair gemacht hat!

Eine Kollegin hat mir erzählt, wie es war. Sie wollte von Riga nach Frankfurt fliegen. Abgesagt der Flug, keine SMS, keine Mail, keine Essensgutscheine, keine Assistenz, Auskunft nur auf einer Hotline, die erst drei Stunden später eingeschaltet wurde, Umbuchung gab es nur für einen Ryanair-Flug eine Woche später! Alles andere wurde abgelehnt. Es gab keine Übernahme von Kosten für die Unterkunft, für die Verpflegung, keine Rückerstattung. Und als sie das gesagt hat, da wurde ihr gesagt: Ja, Sie haben keine Ryanair-Reiserücktrittsversicherung abgeschlossen, deshalb kriegen Sie kein Geld. Sie wussten genau, was los war! Sie haben die Gesetze gebrochen. Das dürfen wir nicht akzeptieren. Ein Gesetz, das nicht verfolgt und nicht bestraft, nicht mit Sanktionen belegt wird, ist kein gutes Gesetz! Deshalb sind die Kommission, die Mitgliedstaaten und die Organisationen gefordert, dem nachzugehen. Der Kunde hat die Priorität, und nicht Ryanair, die die Kollegen ausbeutet, die die Piloten ausbeutet. Deshalb gab es ja nicht mehr genug Piloten, die das gemacht haben. Die Scheinselbständigkeit muss bestraft werden, und mit diesem Lohndumping muss Schluss sein! Sonst verlieren wir unsere Glaubwürdigkeit hier in Europa.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Podczas dzisiejszej debaty rodzi się wiele pytań i wątpliwości, niemniej najważniejsze, co było tu często podkreślane to kwestia praw pasażerskich oraz odpowiedzialności firmy, która dążąc do ograniczenia kosztów, lecz również cen biletów, anulowała w ostatnim czasie kilkanaście tysięcy lotów, a także, o czym nikt nie mówi, zawiesiła w okresie zimowym loty na trzydziestu czterech trasach. Pani Komisarz, jaką odpowiedzialność poniesie firma? Tysiące pasażerów dowiedziało się, że ich lot został odwołany, i nie wiemy, czy są oni świadomi swoich praw wynikających z rozporządzenia Rady, czy zostali poinformowani, że mogą domagać się rekompensat oraz czy wiedzą, że mogą skorzystać z lotów innych linii na koszt Ryanair.

Bardzo ważna jest kwestia pracowników firmy. Rodzi się bowiem pytanie, co było powodem tego, że przy stosunkowo dobrym wynagrodzeniu tylu pilotów zrezygnowało z pracy, oraz jak toczące się w Parlamencie Europejskim liczne dyskusje na temat odpoczynku, czasu pracy kierowców, wynagrodzenia kierowców, dumpingu społecznego mają się do funkcjonowania spółki Ryanair. Zwróćmy uwagę na proponowane ceny biletów. Jak to możliwe, by kupić bilet za dwa i pół euro na połączenie między dwoma krajami Unii Europejskiej? Czy nie mieliśmy tu do czynienia z dumpingiem społecznym? Jakoś nikt tego tematu nie porusza. Jak to możliwe, że wielu z trzynastu tysięcy zatrudnionych pracowników jest samozatrudnionych, nie ma płatnych urlopów i nie otrzymuje świadczeń społecznych? Mam nadzieję, Panie Przewodniczący i Pani Komisarz, że Komisja pociągnie firmę do odpowiedzialności, a także będzie pilnowała, aby firma przestrzegała prawa europejskiego i praw konsumentów.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli deputati, sono membro della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo e ho ben presente la questione che oggi stiamo trattando. Ho a cuore il trasporto a tariffe competitive per dare un servizio più accessibile e per sviluppare il turismo, settore che ci sta dando molte soddisfazioni. Ma va detto che per essere leader nel settore dell'aviazione, non basta aver conquistato una congrua fetta di mercato: bisogna soprattutto essere rispettosi dei diritti dei lavoratori e dei diritti dei passeggeri.

Su questi aspetti ci sono legittimi dubbi, per cui è urgente che da parte della Commissione si faccia la dovuta chiarezza e in fretta. Si parla di ferie dei piloti non godute: siamo proprio sicuri che i motivi siano questi e non ci siano invece anche altre ragioni? Quanto ai voli cancellati, le norme sono chiare: non saranno accettate transazioni al ribasso. Chi causa un danno, deve risarcirlo per intero.

Infine, chiedo che si vada avanti con la revisione del regolamento sui diritti dei passeggeri, fermo al Consiglio dal lontano febbraio del 2014. Dobbiamo dare ai passeggeri una tutela maggiore e al passo coi tempi.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, la anulación masiva de vuelos de la compañía Ryanair es una oportunidad para demostrar la utilidad de la Unión mediante la cooperación entre todas las partes competentes en la materia.

Aunque son las autoridades nacionales quienes deben controlar en cada Estado, la Comisión debe garantizar criterios homogéneos en todos los Estados de la Unión y que el proceso ofrezca resultados satisfactorios e idénticos. Para conseguirlo, y con más de 400 000 afectados, la Comisión podría elaborar una guía digital que, de un modo sencillo y barato, poco más que un PDF interactivo y un banner específico, podría ser ofrecido en todas las lenguas oficiales a través de los Estados miembros. Consultándola, los usuarios de Ryanair que adquieran sus billetes, principalmente por internet, podrían contrastar esta información oficial con la que ofrece la propia compañía y, de ese modo, se protegerían todos los derechos que corresponden a los usuarios y se informaría mejor sobre las reclamaciones.

Igualmente es un buen momento para volver a revisar el funcionamiento de esta compañía —desde hace años bajo la lupa por prácticas poco claras— y, además, impulsar la transparencia de las organizaciones privadas que venden sus servicios de asesoría para este tipo de reclamaciones y garantizar que ofrecen las prestaciones que anuncian.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, 18 000 vuelos de 34 rutas y 400 000 clientes afectados en cuatro meses. Si estuviéramos hablando de una compañía pública, se hablaría de gestión nefasta y seguramente los responsables tendrían que haber dimitido ya. Pero como se trata de una empresa con un largo historial de cancelaciones y desprotección al consumidor y a sus trabajadores, pareciera que hay que resignarse y creer que estas cancelaciones son debidas a una pequeña compañía que hace un reajuste de vacaciones.

Sin embargo, Ryanair es hoy la compañía que más pasajeros transporta en Europa y debemos exigirle los máximos niveles de responsabilidad. Estas irregularidades deben ser investigadas por las autoridades aéreas europeas. El Reglamento (CE) n.º 261/2004 sobre los derechos de los pasajeros establece unos mínimos en cuanto a cancelación, información, indemnizaciones y alternativas, que Ryanair no ha cumplido.

Este caso abre una caja de Pandora que la Comisión ha tratado de mantener oculta anunciando el supuesto éxito de la liberalización del sector de la aviación. Se ve que estaban más preocupados de la desregulación que de la protección de los pasajeros. ¿Van a esperar a la siguiente cancelación masiva? ¿Las cosas cambiarían si los comisarios europeos viajaran alguna vez en *lowcost*?

Wim van de Camp (PPE). – In Nederland hebben wij een prachtig spreekwoord en dat luidt “hoogmoed komt voor de val”. Ryanair laat zich altijd voorstaan: “Wij zijn de grootste luchtvaartmaatschappij, wij vervoeren de meeste toeristen.” Maar in de praktijk blijkt het toch veel moeilijker te zijn om al die mensen op een nette manier naar hun bestemming te brengen.

Dit is op zich een ernstig feit, vooral als je zoveel reclame maakt. Maar nu gaat het erom hoe we het oplossen en ik hoop dat Ryanair de hele restitutie – het schadeloosstellen van de mensen – niet ten onder laat gaan in eindeloze bureaucratische internetprocedures, maar simpel en eerlijk het geld teruggeeft en de mensen schadeloosstelt.

Tot slot herhaal ik de vraag van collega Ertug: waar was de Ierse toezichthouder? Het kan toch niet zo zijn dat Ryanair beschermd wordt door de Ierse toezichthouder op dit soort punten? Ik hoop dat de commissaris daar een helder antwoord op geeft. We hebben toezichthouders en die moeten hun werk doen.

Tweede vraag die ik herhaal, is de vraag van Van Miltenburg aan de Raad: die passagiersbeschermingsverordening ligt nu al drie, vier jaar bij de Raad en we kunnen hier allemaal krokodillentranen huilen, maar waar is de oplossing? De Raad, onder voorzitterschap van Estland, zou hier een hele goede rol in kunnen vervullen.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Mam wrażenie, że uczestniczymy w debacie, podczas której ktoś siedzi z boku i się po prostu z nas lekceważąco śmieje. Mam tu na myśli wielkiego, sławnego i wyjątkowo nietypowego menedżera, jakim jest właściciel i szef Ryanair. Po pierwsze, zbieramy owoce bezkarności, po drugie, zbieramy owoce lekceważenia obowiązujących reguł i wreszcie zbieramy owoce rozgrywek Komisji i poszczególnych państw członkowskich i zwyczajnego zabiegania o to, żeby Ryanair był wszędzie. Sprzedawano iluzję, bo niezrealizowany rozkład lotów to jest po prostu sprzedaż iluzji, a to powinno być zabronione. Pojawia się więc dylemat, gdyż śmiem twierdzić, że to Ryanair odwraca się od pasażerów, a nie pasażerowie od Ryanaira, bo spodziewam się, że niestety za marne pieniądze będą oni gotowi wrócić. Pani Komisarz, czy chodzi jedynie o Ryanair, czy sprawdziliście inne tanie linie? Będziemy mieć następne Ryanairy?

Στέλιος Κούλογλου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, θα ήθελα να αναφέρω τρία σημεία: πρώτον, η ακύρωση δεκάδων χιλιάδων πτήσεων δείχνει έλλειψη σεβασμού προς τους επιβάτες. Έλλειψη σεβασμού που έχει εκφραστεί και διαφορετικά: έχουμε έναν υπεύθυνο της Ryanair να λέει ότι εξετάζει την περίπτωση να ταξιδεύουν οι επιβάτες όρθιοι με ειδικά αεροπλάνα. Δεύτερον, σε όλες τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης όπου αναπτύσσει δραστηριότητα η Ryanair πρέπει να τηρείται η εργατική νομοθεσία και να γίνονται σεβαστά τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων. Τρίτον, το να μεταχειρίζεσαι τους επιβάτες με έλλειψη σεβασμού, να τους μεταχειρίζεσαι σαν ζώα που ταξιδεύουν όρθια, και επίσης το να μην υπάρχουν κανόνες εργασίας επηρεάζει την ασφάλεια των πτήσεων. Τα αεροπλάνα πετάνε, είναι μηχανές, αλλά τα αεροπλάνα τα χειρίζονται άνθρωποι. Προσωπικό το οποίο είναι ξεκούραστο και ευχαριστημένο είναι προσωπικό ασφαλές. Εάν δεν υπάρχει αυτό, κινδυνεύουμε να έχουμε άλλα πολύ δυσάρεστα γεγονότα και θα είμαστε όλοι υπεύθυνοι. Βλέπετε το κλίμα εδώ, κυρία Επίτροπε. Είναι καιρός να λάβετε μέτρα.

Ivo Belet (PPE). – Het is hier al vaak gezegd, maar de manier waarop Ryanair is omgegaan met de rechten van de passagiers, die brutaal met voeten heeft getreden, is werkelijk ongezien. En dat de maatschappij pas na lang aarzelen en na veel druk vanuit de media en de politiek beslist heeft om zijn klanten een compensatie aan te bieden, is echt cru en onaanvaardbaar.

Het is hier al 100 keer gezegd: de Europese regels bepalen dat de passagiers uiteraard recht hebben op een schadevergoeding als zij niet tijdig over de annulering van de vlucht worden geïnformeerd.

De Belgische minister van Consumentenzaken heeft al een onderzoek opgestart naar Ryanair vanwege oneerlijke handelspraktijken, en ik denk dat de Europese Commissie niet anders kan dan dat voorbeeld te volgen. U hebt inderdaad met uw collega een brief gestuurd naar Ryanair, maar we zijn ervan overtuigd dat hier doortastender optreden nodig is en dat Ryanair tot de orde geroepen moet worden.

Tot slot nog een ander punt dat hier ook al aan de orde is geweest, maar dat we misschien nog even extra aandacht willen geven. We moeten ook werk maken van een betere werking en een betere toegankelijkheid van de nationale bemiddelingsinstanties, zodat die beter toegankelijk zijn, sneller toegankelijk zijn, vlotter toegankelijk zijn voor gedupeerde passagiers; zodat alle consumenten, alle passagiers, op een vlotte en toegankelijke manier recht hebben op datgene waarop zij volgens de Europese regelgeving inderdaad recht hebben.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, když letecká společnost Ryanair před několika týdny uvedla, že bude muset zrušit až 50 letů denně, dotklo se toto opatření stovek tisíců cestujících. Jejich let byl zrušen ze dne na den a postižení samozřejmě byli i zaměstnanci společnosti. Zmíněný letecký dopravce slíbil odškodnit cestující, kterých se rušení letů týká. Toto odškodnění ovšem neobsahuje jasnou povinnost přeměrování cestujících k jiným dopravcům. Jinými slovy možnost letět v daném termínu s někým jiným. Tuto povinnost přeměrování přitom obsahuje mimo jiné revize nařízení o právech cestujících v letecké dopravě, kterou Evropský parlament projednal již v roce 2014. Zhruba stejnou dobu je její projednání blokováno v Radě. Výzva Radě, aby se konečně dohodla na nové úpravy nařízení, je proto více než na místě.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, os milhares de cancelamentos de viagens praticados pela companhia Ryanair causaram danos elevados na confiança dos consumidores europeus. Muitos consumidores têm relatado uma ocultação persistente da informação sobre os seus direitos e muitas reclamações apresentadas à transportadora aérea, a autoridades nacionais, às associações de consumidores e à Comissão referem a ausência de resposta, a não aplicação das regras do artigo 5.º do Regulamento (CE) n.º 261/2004 e informações enganosas para fugir às compensações ou a utilização de lacunas no Regulamento no que respeita aos voos sequenciais. É lamentável que só três autoridades nacionais tenham ameaçado com medidas sancionatórias. As outras limitam-se apenas a monitorizar a situação. O apoio tem sido prestado maioritariamente pelas organizações de consumidores e a Comissão Europeia não se tem manifestado de forma clara neste processo.

A proteção eficaz dos consumidores é um elemento fundamental do bom funcionamento do mercado. A má gestão de uma companhia não pode ser pretexto para se furta ao dever de indemnização e compensação dos passageiros afetados. Dos relatos que nos chegaram, estamos perante casos de práticas comerciais enganosas por omissão da informação necessária para que os consumidores afetados possam fazer valer os seus direitos.

As autoridades nacionais de defesa do consumidor têm de atuar. A Comissão não deve ficar parada num caso objetivamente transnacional que afeta milhares de europeus. E a realidade dá-nos razão quando propusemos o reforço da cooperação entre as autoridades nacionais de proteção do consumidor, que iremos votar aqui em Estrasburgo já no próximo mês.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Vorgänge rund um Ryanair zeigen die Schattenseiten der aggressiven Geschäftspraktiken der Billigairline. Den Preis für diese „Geiz ist geil“-Mentalität bezahlen im konkreten Fall 700 000 Passagiere, die von Flugstreichungen betroffen sein werden. Dass Ryanair seiner Informationsverpflichtung über Fluggastrechte nachkommen wird, wage ich wirklich zu bezweifeln.

Gleichzeitig bedeutet die Streichung der Flüge für das Bordpersonal massive Einkommensverluste. Wenn die Flugzeuge am Boden bleiben, gibt es auch kein Geld. Die Konzernleitung spricht von Problemen bei der Urlaubsplanung. Tatsache ist jedoch: Die Belegschaft und die Pilotinnen und Piloten haben genug von Null-Stunden-Verträgen und prekären Anstellungen. Ryanair und alle anderen Billigairlines müssen endlich einen sozialpartnerschaftlichen Dialog und faire Beschäftigungsverhältnisse in ihren Betriebsalltag übernehmen.

Pascal Arimont (PPE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, wertee Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Ich möchte mich direkt an den Chef von Ryanair wenden. Sehr geehrter Herr O’Leary, stellen Sie sich vor, Sie hätten einen Flug gebucht, z. B. mit Ryanair, und hätten in Tallinn, Paris oder London ein schönes Hotel gebucht, oder hätten einen ganz wichtigen beruflichen Termin und plötzlich sagt man Ihnen, einen Tag vor der Reise oder am Tag selbst, dass dieser Flug nicht stattfindet, weil er gecancelt ist. Ich glaube, Herr O’Leary, Sie würden fluchen wie Kapitän Haddock. Genauso ging es auch all denjenigen, die das jetzt erfahren mussten. Man spricht hier von 400 000 Personen, es kommen noch 300 000 dazu.

In meinem kleinen Wahlkreis haben mich viele Bürger wütend angerufen und dagegen protestiert, und man hat mich gefragt: „Was macht Europa denn dagegen, oder was kann ich als Bürger oder als Betroffener machen?“ Die Antwort ist hier die Verordnung aus dem Jahre 2004. Das ist eine Verordnung, die die Rechte der Bürger definiert. Diese Rechte sind gut, die Passagiere müssen diese Rechte einfordern. Man muss ehrlich sagen: Die Kurzfristigkeit der Annullierung war und ist eine Frechheit, und das kann auch so nicht sein. Die Kosten für diese annullierten Flüge muss Ryanair bezahlen, und da müssen Sie, Frau Bulc, Herrn O’Leary auf die Finger schauen. Zwar mag es sein, dass die Freiheit über den Wolken grenzenlos ist, aber der Unverschämtheit einer solchen Planung müssen Grenzen gesetzt werden. Und das haben Sie in der Hand, Frau Bulc. Schauen Sie ihm auf die Finger, und ich kann auch jedem Kunden nur raten, diese Rechte geltend zu machen. Der Kunde sitzt da am längeren Hebel. Wenn jeder diese Rechte geltend macht, verhindert man, dass solche Dinge in Zukunft wieder passieren.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la cancellazione di voli in tutta Europa da parte di Ryanair sta creando grandi disagi ai cittadini europei. La causa è da ricercare, a mio avviso, nel dumping sociale praticato in maniera spericolata sulla pelle dei dipendenti da questa compagnia, che cerca così di sbaragliare la concorrenza.

Vale la pena di ricordare che soltanto ieri, la *low cost* britannica, Monarch, operativa dal 1968 è fallita. Probabilmente va ripensata l’attuale impostazione del mercato interno in questo settore, così come vanno fatte rispettare le norme europee a tutela dei passeggeri.

La Commissione deve far luce sulle modalità con cui le compagnie aeree informano i viaggiatori. Sembra che la Ryanair proceda alla comunicazione della cancellazione dei voli tra le 48 ore e le 6 ore antecedenti l’orario di partenza: non mi sembra un margine di anticipo sufficientemente ampio. Ma al di là del rimborso del biglietto, il vero nodo è il risarcimento che spetta agli utenti in caso di cancellazione in prossimità della data del volo, che Ryanair ha il dovere di disporre in modo automatico e senza alcuna spesa per i consumatori.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule preşedinte, doamna comisar şi stimate Consiliu, iată, aveţi o unanimitate aici în Parlament. Toate grupurile politice susţin acelaşi lucru, s-a spus unde a greşit Ryanair. Eu cred că ne sfidează. Nu se poate să motivezi că ai anulat zeci de zboruri, sute de mii de pasageri afectaţi pentru că nu ţi-ai planificat concediile.

Este o ruşine această companie. Trebuie să găsim soluţii, nu se poate să nu ajungem la o creştere a exigenţei privind drepturile consumatorilor. Eu fac parte şi din Comisia TRAN, şi din Comisia IMCO. Eu şi toţi ceilalţi suntem trimişi aici de cetăţeni să le apărăm drepturile, toate drepturile, inclusiv acelea de pasageri. Operează această companie şi în ţara mea. În 21 de zboruri, chiar în oraşul din care fac parte, cetăţeni din ţara mea au fost afectaţi.

Doamna comisar, stimaţi domni din Consiliu, trebuie să stabilim măsuri. S-a spus destul aici, nu cred că trebuie să mai argumentăm că această companie îşi bate joc de noi. Nu este o greşală de management, aici este un furt calificat şi trebuie să punem capăt.

Un singur lucru vreau să mai spun, colegului Liberadzki a spus: doamna comisar să știți că drepturile pasagerilor sunt încălcate și la alte companii și trebuie să nu mai ajungem, nu lăsați să mai ajungem în situația lui Ryanair. Trebuie să verificați în avans.

Hugues Bayet (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, il est évident que le développement des compagnies *low cost* a ouvert le transport aérien à des millions d'Européens et, en conséquence, a généré des milliers d'emplois via le développement de certains aéroports et de leur région.

Dans ma région, à Charleroi, l'aéroport est l'une des plus grandes réussites économiques belges de ces dernières années, et on l'a démontré à suffisance. Mais l'actualité nous oblige à réaffirmer les principes protecteurs définis par l'Europe, et qui doivent obligatoirement accompagner ce développement.

Premièrement, le droit des passagers doit être totalement protégé. Le règlement est clair: toute compagnie qui annule un vol doit informer chaque passager de ses droits, notamment celui d'être indemnisé sous certaines conditions. Par conséquent, Madame la Commissaire, je pense que vous devez prendre une initiative pour faciliter cette procédure d'indemnisation et contrôler le processus. L'exemple clair de Ryanair démontre que cela ne fonctionne pas.

Deuxièmement, les droits sociaux des équipages doivent être pleinement respectés. Cela passe notamment par le récent arrêt de la Cour de justice européenne quant à la juridiction nationale compétente en matière de droit du travail. Là aussi, il faut sécuriser le dispositif.

Nous comptons évidemment sur vous, Madame la Commissaire, pour changer ces deux éléments.

Παρεμβάσεις με τη διαδικασία «catch the eye»

Андрей Новаков (PPE). – Г-н Председател, струва ми се, че в този дебат имаше много повече емоции отколкото трябваше. Няма криза, която да може да се реши по такъв емоционален начин с крясъци и с евтин популизъм. Намирам за важно Европейската комисия, в сътрудничество и диалог с Ryanair, бързо да разяснят правата на засегнатите пътници. Не е за вярване, че във времената, в които живеем, все още има хора, които не знаят какви права имат. И тук отговорността е наша. Да предоставим тази информация по достъпен начин, на достъпен език, така както хората очакват.

Учуден съм да разбера, че масовата практика е авиокомпаниите да уведомяват пътниците по имейл. За добро или лошо има хора, които все още нямат имейл или не го ползват толкова активно. Длъжни сме на всеки един от тях да е ясно какво може и кога да ползва. Защото щетите стигат много повече от просто един отменен полет: провалени планове, хотелски резервации, изхранване, настаняване и прочие.

Тази криза ще отmine. За съжаление обаче можем да очакваме други като нея да дойдат. Тя е показател, че имаме за решаване проблем: да реформираме защитата на потребителите и разясняването на техните права по възможно най-добър начин.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 162, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността))

Michael Cramer (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Es geht nicht darum, dass die Passagiere die Rechte nicht kennen, die sie haben. Selbst wenn sie sie kennen und sie einbringen wollen – Ryanair ist derjenige, der die Rechte genau kennt, sie aber nicht wahrhaben will! Das ist das Problem, nicht die Inkompetenz der Passagiere, sondern die brutale Handlungsweise von Ryanair gegen die Passagiere, die ihre eigenen Rechte einfordern! Das wird zurückgewiesen, das ist der Skandal, nicht die Unkenntnis der Passagiere!

Андрей Новаков (PPE), отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта. – Да приемем, г-н Крамер, че Вие сте прав и има случаи, в които дадена авиокомпания е злоупотребила със своите права и е накарнала правата на своите пътници. Затова сме създали система и процедура – хората да знаят къде да се оплачат и какво могат да получат. В противен случай какво – ще закриваме всяка авиокомпания, която е накарнала или нарушила дадена процедура? Хората трябва да знаят във всяка една ситуация какво могат да направят, как да потърсят правата си и, ако някой ги е нарушил, да си плати справедливо за това.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Mr President, an airline's operational measures cannot be influenced but, in every circumstance, airlines must act in accordance with the high standards of the consumer protection rules established by the EU. Therefore the failure to inform passengers or others of passenger entitlements, as happened in the case of Ryanair, is unacceptable. After announcing thousands of flight cancellations, Ryanair failed to inform passengers on several occasions that they have an option to be re-routed with other airlines where there is no suitable Ryanair service available within a reasonable time frame.

This kind of misinformation has negative consequences beyond the damage done in the given case. When consumers are misled in such a way it discourages them from seeking access to their rights and destroys the enormous work that has been done on empowering EU consumers. Ryanair must meet its legal obligations and act in compliance with EU rules, which means it must take responsibility for the re-routing of passengers, including with other airlines. However, we must not forget about the damage that has been done in the field of consumer rights awareness.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la crisis de Ryanair no ha respondido a un problema de organización y gestión de la compañía. Es más, es mucho más. Nos encontramos con una compañía con las prácticas de contratación laboral más nocivas en el sector de la aviación, lo que ha supuesto que más de 140 pilotos de la compañía irlandesa se hayan marchado de ella. Más del 70 % de la plantilla de pilotos de Ryanair está compuesta por falsos autónomos, sin derecho a cobrar durante ausencias por enfermedad, ni las vacaciones. No se respetan los tiempos de descanso y, para poder trabajar, son obligados a abrir su falsa empresa en Irlanda, beneficiando en la tributación a la compañía *low cost*.

Es la falta de regulación y control por parte de la Unión Europea de lo que se está beneficiando Ryanair y esto es la que ha llevado a esta crisis, en la que se han visto afectados cientos de miles de consumidores. La culpa no es de la gestión, sino de la denigrante práctica laboral y de la permisividad de la Unión Europea.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gospod predsednik, torej, kako daleč gre lahko gospodarska družba, podjetje, pri ustvarjanju dobička, v tem primeru letalska družba?

Ali je lahko v tem ustvarjanju dobička vključeno tudi to izkoriščanje pilotov in pa seveda kabinskega osebja, ki ga ta družba postavlja v položaj, ki je nasproten delovno-pravnim standardom in razmerjem? Ali je torej v tem kovanju dobička primerno in upravičeno tudi zavajati potnike in odpovedovati toliko in toliko tisoč letov?

In seveda se tukaj utemeljeno zaradi vsega tega postavlja lahko tudi vprašanje varnosti.

In če ob tem seveda Ryanair oceni skupne stroške svojih odpovedi na manj kot 50 milijonov eurov, vendar pa je dejal, da to ne bo spremenilo napovedi letnega čistega dobička v višini okoli 1,4 milijarde eurov, pomeni, da se mu tako ravnanje splača, mislim pa, da je seveda tu Evropska komisija in pa seveda Evropski parlament tisti, ki na to morata reagirati in pa seveda sprejeti tudi ustrezne sankcije.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, I apologise that I was delayed getting to this debate, but it is about Ryanair so I suppose that being late is quite fitting.

Are we really surprised that we are here debating Ryanair, the airline that charges you fifty quid to check in at the airport? I mean, seriously, can you imagine if any other business made its customers' lives a misery on purpose? Imagine if it was somewhere like McDonalds and they charged you extra to have a cup for your drink or to carry your food on a tray?

And now we've got planes with no pilots because they treat their pilots in the same way that they treat their customers and there is not the slightest hint that they give a stuff about their customers.

On a serious note, the Irish Government needs to pull its finger out and do something about it. The worst part of it all is that Ryanair loves it: they love the rumours about standing-room on planes, or charging to go to the toilet, because they see criticism as free advertising. Ryanair literally wants to charge you for absolutely everything.

Frankly they'll probably want to charge us for Brexit as well! No, hang on, that's the European Union.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, como disse o representante do Conselho, o transporte aéreo é um dos principais meios de comunicação e um dos principais motores de desenvolvimento de qualquer nação moderna.

A Ryanair – uma das principais companhias aéreas a operar na Europa – cancelou milhares de voos entre setembro e outubro deste ano causando com isso milhares de euros de prejuízo aos seus clientes.

Caros Colegas, todo e qualquer operador que opere no espaço da União Europeia tem que, como disse a Sra. Comissária muito bem, tem que respeitar a legislação europeia. Os direitos dos passageiros têm que ser escrupulosamente defendidos e protegidos e os faltosos penalizados com sanções adequadas e, no meu entender, bem pesadas.

Senhora Comissária, a liberalização do espaço aéreo não pode ser entendida como libertinagem ou a aplicação da lei do faroeste. A Comissão tem que ter mão firme e não deixar que este tipo de atitude, violadora dos direitos dos passageiros aéreos, por parte da Ryanair, se volte a repetir em prejuízo dos cidadãos e das economias dos Estados-Membros.

Senhora Comissária, quem não cumpre não deve ser permitido operar no espaço da União.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta «cartão azul» (n.º 8 do artigo 162.º))

Arne Gericke (ECR), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Faria! Eine ganz kurze Frage: 800 000 Passagiere in kürzestem Zeitraum. Könnten Sie mir verraten, wie viele der Passagiere, die gegebenenfalls für 15 Euro von Hamburg in die Ukraine oder sonst wohin fliegen, wirklich daran geglaubt haben, dass sie da kostendeckend fliegen?

José Inácio Faria (PPE), Resposta segundo o procedimento «cartão azul». – Caro Colega, não percebi muito bem a sua pergunta, mas o que eu quero dizer é que os passageiros têm direito a ser ressarcidos pelos prejuízos que sofrem, seja 15, seja 20, seja 30, seja o que for e há, de facto, dispositivos na lei que dizem o montante pelas horas de atraso e pelos cancelamentos. Portanto, não é nada que seja novo. É preciso é que sejam aplicadas as regras e elas existem. A legislação europeia existe, está aí. É preciso é que ela seja implementada.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, αν δεν θέλουμε «να κάνουμε τα στραβά μάτια», το πρόβλημα με τη Ryanair υπάρχει εδώ και πάρα πολλά χρόνια και διαπράττεται παραβίαση βασικών εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων όχι μόνον των πιλότων αλλά και πολλών άλλων εργαζομένων. Το θέμα που εγείρεται σήμερα είναι ποια μέτρα θα λάβει η Επιτροπή για την αποκατάσταση των ζημιών που υπέστησαν 400.000 περίπου άνθρωποι και ποια μέτρα θα ληφθούν έτσι ώστε η ίδια η εταιρεία να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες της. Δεν είναι δυνατόν οι εταιρείες να εργάζονται με αυτά τα δεδομένα για τόσα πολλά χρόνια και εμείς εδώ «να κάνουμε τα στραβά μάτια» και απλώς να ερχόμαστε να συζητήσουμε ένα θέμα, αφιερώνοντας έστω και λίγο περισσότερο από τον προβλεπόμενο χρόνο.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I believe I am the last passenger for tonight's debate.

I just want to say that I am sure Michael O'Leary, Chief Executive of Ryanair, is listening to this debate and his ears are burning, and that may be no harm. I hope he has heard the emotion of many colleagues in the Chamber, who have expressed the upset caused to passengers and the fact that we need to take this on board.

Ryanair is a very large airline. The statistics, if you bear with me, are these: 131 million customers this year; operating in 33 countries; an unblemished safety record of 32 years. But the cancellations were of such a scale that people did begin to question whether there was more behind this than simply a rostering error. So Ryanair has work to do. On connecting with passengers, they have work to do, as all airlines have. When there is a problem, we need to talk to a human being, and perhaps that is something we could stitch into a regulation.

Two further points. Firstly, could the Commission study the follow-up to this crisis? How many people actually claimed their rights? This would be an exercise that would be useful to us, to see if the legislation is working effectively. And lastly, Commissioner, do you think there is a need to tighten up the rules, or do you think everything is fine as we have it today?

(Τέλος παρεμβάσεων με τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye»)

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first let me thank you for this very rich debate and I would like to assure you once more that the Commission will be in close contact with all national authorities and enforcement bodies concerned, to make sure that European rules, including those on passengers' rights, are strictly respected.

Let me now address some of your more specific questions.

First on social problems. I'm not here to really speculate on the root causes of Ryanair's decision. At this stage, Ryanair has confirmed that this is solely due to rostering issues and management failure. European rules are really crystal clear. It is the responsibility of the Irish authorities to oversee Ryanair as an Irish airline and I'm confident that they are closely monitoring that Ryanair respects all its obligations. If they discover wrongdoing, I'm also confident that they will act accordingly.

On communication with stakeholders – information campaigns have been present since 2010 including videos, brochures, leaflets and so on. Interactive content is present on Your Europe.

Coordination with NAPS ensuring airlines provide info, check-in online and at the airports is also ensured and present, and there are also more mobile applications that the customers can download. Obviously, this still is not enough. I issue a special statement before every holiday, summer and Christmas, and we can still look to see if anything else can be done so that people learn about their rights.

What were we doing on social conditions? There were several questions regarding that. There are concerns regarding the development of social conditions of mobile workers in aviation and I am very committed to moving forward on the social dimension of aviation and it will be the focus of my portfolio and an aviation strategy next year.

As far as state aid is concerned, the rules are the same for all airlines.

My services will soon launch also a study on certain employment and social aspects including bogus employment and alleged pay-to-fly schemes for pilots. The purpose is to understand better the facts on the ground and how they relate to existing legal obligations and EU policy for the future. Our work will take into account the case-law of the EU Court of Justice, including the recent one on the home base of air crews and the determination of the place of work.

The next question was related to intervening and sanctioning Ryanair, and, here, let me say the following. Member States have designed national enforcement body called NAPs, which are responsible for the enforcement of EU air passengers' rights. The sanctions for infringements of this regulation are laid down by Member States. For the time being, there is no reason to initiate any infringement procedures against Ireland and, as I said, I'm confident that they will do the work that they have to do.

And last but not least, EU safety rules – EU rules are the same for legacy and low-cost carriers. The EU has the highest aviation safety standards in the world and I'm also confident all national authorities follow this closely, including Ireland. So let the system do the job.

President and honourable Members, the single aviation market has propelled European mobility forward, bringing Europeans closer together and providing a solid foundation for more jobs and economic growth. Successful reforms played a key role here and the Commission along with national authorities has ensured and will ensure that these common rules are respected by all players, big or small. It is thanks to the EU that all passengers have a full set of rights when flying.

This very unfortunate event has only further cemented the importance of these rules and the need for their full implementation, and it is in this spirit that I'm inviting you to see the challenge in front of us, as well. A challenge that we are actively addressing to the benefit of passengers. I can only hope that we can unblock the new proposal on passengers' rights in the Council and get it up and operational as an important tool for even stronger enforcement of passengers' rights.

And I really welcome your support, honourable Members, on this point. This is exactly why we put forward guidelines last year to provide clarity and certainty, and yes I do travel low-cost, as a Commissioner and as a private citizen.

Matti Maasilaks, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, some speakers have referred to the revision of the current legislation, something the Commission duly proposed in 2013. We all know what the state of affairs is with this piece of legislation, and we also all know why that is. The Council is, however, aware of its obligation. Similarly to the Commissioner, I can only hope that this highly regrettable Ryanair case will also give incentives to the Member States concerned to reconsider their position, so that we can adopt this set of stronger new rules for the passengers' sake – for our citizens' sake.

Meanwhile the Ryanair case must be resolved. It must be resolved soon and all affected passengers must be duly compensated. Secondly, the national enforcement bodies must do all they can to assist passengers affected and to ensure that EU airlines abide by their legal obligations in the future.

Similarly, EU airlines should be more proactive in providing clarity to their customers regarding the rules on compensation and assistance. The airlines are legally obliged to make passengers aware of their rights and should act accordingly.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162)

Andor Deli (PPE), *írásban*. – Az utóbbi időben nagy port kavart a hír, amely szerint a Ryanair fapados légitársaság több ezer járatát volt kénytelen törölni, utasok tízezreinek életét megkeserítve ezzel. Pár nappal később a társaság bejelentett egy még nagyobb törlési hullámot a téli menetrend során. Lépésüket azzal indokolták, hogy ezzel szeretnék növelni járatainak pontosságát, amely szeptember első két hetében az előző 90%-ról 80 % alá esett, valamint, hogy új szabadság-rendszerre állnak át, amely az eddigi április-március helyett a naptári évre vetíti előre a szabadságokat.

Ezen intézkedések negatív hozománya a rengeteg járatotrlés. Amit mindenképpen szem előtt kell tartania a társaságnak, az a 261/2004-es európai rendelet, amely szigorúan szabályozza az utasok jogait járatotrlések esetén. Nagyon fontos, hogy ezt a Ryanair figyelembe vegye, és ennek megfelelően járjon el a kárt vallott utasok esetében. Nem elég, ha kompenzációt fizet az érintetteknek, hanem adott esetben szállodai szállást és egyéb szolgáltatást is biztosítania kell a rendelet előírásainak megfelelően a külföldön rekedt utasai számára.

Még így is sok ezer ember lehet abban a szituációban, hogy már lefoglalta a szállását, megvette múzeumi belépőit, koncertjegyét konkrét időpontokra. Ilyen esetekben fontos, hogy egyéni elbírálásban részesüljenek az érintettek. Csak remélni tudom, hogy a társaság tanul a jelen helyzetből és a jövőben sokkal körültekintőbben jár el hasonló esetekben, mindenkor az utasok jogait és érdekeit szem előtt tartva.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Sytuacja, która miała miejsce z tysiącami odwołanych lotów linii Ryanair, jest w sposób oczywisty nieakceptowalna i nie powinna nigdy mieć miejsca. Pokazuje ona jednak również wyraźnie, jak bardzo potrzebna jest Europejczykom Unia Europejska w ich codziennym życiu. Gdyby bowiem nie istniało unijne prawodawstwo, pasażerowie zdani byłiby jedynie na dobrą wolę linii lotniczych. Tymczasem to właśnie dzięki Unii Europejskiej poszkodowani pasażerowie mają prawo do otrzymania odszkodowania oraz pomocy, między innymi w formie zapewnienia zakwaterowania i posiłków na czas przedłużonego pobytu wskutek odwołania lotu.

Odszkodowanie i zwrot kosztów są jednak należne pasażerom na podstawie proaktywnego wystąpienia o nie do linii lotniczych, uważam zatem, że Ryanair powinien przeprowadzić szeroką kampanię informacyjną i zachęcać pasażerów do dochodzenia swoich praw.

Alex Mayer (S&D), *in writing*. – This crisis of cancellations, inconveniencing thousands of passengers has been on the cards for some time, and it is right that we debate how passengers' rights should be enforced but what people really want is a convenient and reliable service. The truth is there is an inherent vulnerability in the Ryanair model, relying on unsustainable employment practices: zero-hour contracts, bogus self-employment, degrading treatment and even paying for one's own training. You cannot pummel pilots for decades and then expect a smooth ride. This crisis may pass but the problems will roll on unless there is a change of mind-set. As MEP for the East of England, covering Stansted airport, my message is clear. This does not take blue-sky thinking just an end to employment practices that are unsustainable and wrong.

József Nagy (PPE), *írásban*. – Nem maradhatott le a plenáris agendájáról a Ryanair járatörléseinek ügye, hiszen az mintegy 2000 járatot és több százezer utast érint. Az Európai Unió különösen magas standardokkal rendelkezik a légitözlekedést illetően, és ebbe az utasok jogainak megfelelő védelme is beletartozik. Éppen ezért volt fontos felhívni a Ryanair figyelmét arra, hogy az érintett utasokat időben értesítsék a kialakult helyzetről és a rendelkezésükre álló eszközökről ahhoz, hogy megfelelő kárpótlásban részesülhessenek.

A Ryanair Európa legnagyobb fapados légitársasága és családok ezreinek teszi lehetővé, hogy megfizethető áron utazzanak. Ebben az évben 131 millióan vették igénybe a légitársaság szolgáltatásait, melyek 33 országban üzemelnek. Bízom benne, hogy a légitársaság vezetősége tudatosítja a járatörlések komoly következményeit és minden megtesz majd annak érdekében, hogy a jövőben elkerülje az ilyen jellegű intézkedéseket.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Od dwudziestu lat Unia Europejska próbuje bronić praw pasażerów linii lotniczych. Okazuje się jednak dzisiaj, iż europejskie przepisy nadal są niewystarczające i nieprecyzyjne, pozostawiając przewoźnikom szeroki margines interpretacyjny. Pasażerowie wbrew naszym oczekiwaniom są coraz słabiej chronieni. Ostatnie wydarzenia i nagłe, masowe odwoływanie tysięcy lotów przez irlandzkiego przewoźnika Ryanair wyraźnie pokazują, że pasażerowie ciągle narażeni są na nieprzewidywalne zachowania i arbitralne decyzje linii lotniczych. Brak umiejętności racjonalnego planowania i skutecznego zarządzania nie tylko obniża wiarygodność przewoźników i niszczy ich reputację, ale przede wszystkim obniża zaufanie społeczne do transportu. Ryanair często nie informował z wyprzedzeniem o odwołanych lotach. Tysiące pasażerów bez prawa do odszkodowania, ograniczone możliwości przebookowania biletu na lot innego przewoźnika i linie lotnicze uchylające się od odpowiedzialności to obraz dzisiejszego lotnictwa pasażerskiego. W obliczu zaistniałej sytuacji Unia musi niezwłocznie zwiększyć zakres odpowiedzialności przewoźników i wzmocnić obowiązek wypłaty odszkodowań w przypadku odwołania lotu. Uważam również, iż w przypadku odwołania lotu przez linie niskokosztowe, należy wprowadzić również obowiązek przebookowywania biletów na loty przewoźników tradycyjnych bez określania limitów cenowych tak, aby uniemożliwić liniom uchylanie się od wypełniania swoich obowiązków.

Tokia Saïfi (PPE), *par écrit*. – Alors que la compagnie aérienne low cost avait déjà annoncé le 17 septembre dernier l'annulation de 2 100 vols, Ryanair vient, à nouveau, de décider de l'annulation de plus de 18 000 vols. Ce seront près de 400 000 passagers européens qui seront affectés par ces annulations.

Cette situation est inacceptable. Les voyageurs européens sont pris en otage par la mauvaise politique de gestion du personnel de Ryanair. Notre priorité doit être de faire respecter le droit européen et les droits des passagers. En effet, la Commission européenne doit veiller à ce que Ryanair ne s'exonère pas de ses responsabilités et respecte la législation européenne de 2004 en matière de protection des droits des voyageurs.

Les passagers doivent avoir un complet accès aux informations sur l'indemnisation ainsi qu'à l'ensemble des options de réacheminement disponibles. Ces annulations viennent rappeler la nécessité de débloquent au niveau du Conseil les discussions au sujet de la révision des règles relatives aux droits des passagers pour laquelle le Parlement a donné sa position en 2014. Il y a urgence, l'Union européenne et les États membres doivent agir.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Pasażerowie wciąż znajdują się na słabszej pozycji niż linie lotnicze, mimo posiadania konkretnych praw. Bardzo często zdarza się, że linie lotnicze nie powiadamiają pasażerów o przysługujących im prawach w przypadku zakłócenia lotu (opóźnienia, odwołania), chociaż rozporządzenie dotyczące praw pasażerów lotniczych nakłada na nie taki obowiązek.

Tylko w ostatnim tygodniu irlandzki przewoźnik Ryanair poinformował o anulowaniu, do końca października, ponad dwóch tysięcy połączeń do różnych miast europejskich. Unijne regulacje mówią, że jeśli lot jest odwołany, pasażer ma prawo do zwrotu kosztów, zmiany planu podróży lub lotu powrotnego, a także prawo do uzyskania pomocy i odszkodowania. Linie lotnicze działające w UE muszą respektować europejskie przepisy!

Oczekujemy, że Ryanair będzie przestrzegał europejskich zasad odnoszących się do praw pasażerów. Działanie Wspólnoty w dziedzinie transportu lotniczego powinno mieć na celu zapewnienie wysokiego poziomu ochrony pasażerów. Ponadto winno zwracać uwagę na ogólne wymogi ochrony konsumentów.

Należy podjąć dalsze kroki, aby linie lotnicze konsekwentnie stosowały się do przepisów, a państwa członkowskie skuteczniej egzekwowały ich przestrzeganie. Istnieje potrzeba przeprowadzenia dalszych prac w wielu obszarach, takich jak: poprawa egzekwowania przepisów, interpretacja niejasnych aspektów rozporządzenia, rozróżnienie opóźnień od odwołań lotu (jako że pasażerom przysługują różne prawa w zależności od okoliczności) oraz zwiększenie roli krajowych organów wykonawczych nadzorujących stosowanie wspólnych zasad.

15. Einwand gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί:

της αντίρρησης σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 106 του Κανονισμού σχετικά με το σχέδιο κανονισμού της Επιτροπής για την τροποποίηση του παραρτήματος II του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 1107/2009 με τον καθορισμό επιστημονικών κριτηρίων για τον προσδιορισμό των ιδιοτήτων ενδοκρινικής διαταραχής (2017/2872(RSP))

Jytte Guteland, författare. – Herr talman! Jag ska prata svenska för det är ett sådant ämne som jag känner så starkt för. Hormonstörande ämnen förekommer bland annat i barns leksaker, i matförpackningar, i kläder, i olika sorters plaster, men också i bekämpningsmedel som vi kan få i oss genom livsmedel.

De här kemikalierna kan leda till flera typer av ohälsa, bland annat problem med att få barn, cancer och risk för diabetes. Små barn och foster är extra utsatta och känsliga för dessa kemikalier och effekterna visar sig senare i livet. Ändå saknas i dagsläget ett ordentligt regelverk i EU som ger ett heltäckande och fullgott skydd mot hormonstörande ämnen.

Kommissionen fick för mer än sju år sedan i uppdrag att ta fram vetenskapliga kriterier för att identifiera vilka kemikalier som är hormonstörande. Kommissionen har, jag är ledsen att säga, hanterat det här mycket dåligt. Efter flera års försening och efter att ha dömts i EU-domstolen för underlåtande att agera har man nu presenterat ett förslag.

Frågan vi måste ställa oss är: Lever det här förslaget upp till det som det är till för, att skydda miljö och folkhälsa? Tyvärr är svaret nej. Vi har givit kommissionen i uppdrag att identifiera vilka kemikalier som är hormonstörande – inget mer än detta. Det kommissionen nu föreslår är varken förenligt med EU-rätten eller ger tillräckligt skydd för människors hälsa och miljön mot hormonstörande ämnen i bekämpningsmedel.

Det handlar om den grundläggande principen om rättsstaten här. Kommissionen har inte rätt att bryta mot EU-rätten med det här förslaget. Det är en överträdelse av kommissionens mandat. Men kommissionens förslag om ett undantag för bekämpningsmedel är framtagna just för att attackera skadedjurs hormonsystem. De är alltså till designen hormonstörande. Ändå tycker inte kommissionen att bekämpningsmedlen ska klassas som hormonstörande ämnen, även om de har inverkan också på andra djur än målgruppen. Vi pratar exempelvis här om bin, fjärilar, humlor, kräftor och krabbor, som alla har hormonsystem som kan påverkas av de här bekämpningsmedlen. Det är inte vetenskapligt försvarbart.

Idag handlar det om bekämpningsmedel, men kommissionen uppger att de föreslagna kriterierna i framtiden ska kunna användas också inom andra områden. Därför är det ännu viktigare att de här kriterierna är bra. Vi kräver att kommissionen gör rätt. Ta bort det här regelvidriga undantaget och kom tillbaka med ett nytt förslag utan dröjsmål. Barn och bin går före enskilda intressenters ekonomiska intressen.

Bas Eickhout, *author*. – Mr President, I think my colleague Ms Guteland has already explained the importance of this debate on endocrine disruptors. To be very clear, we have been debating this since 2009 when the Commission was asked to come forward with criteria to define what endocrine disruptors are. This was part of the regulation on biocides and pesticides and it was one of the key debates. What are the criteria for endocrine disruptors?

It took many years before the Commission finally came up with those criteria. It actually took the Court of Justice to push the Commission to come forward with the criteria.

But another very important discussion that took place in 2009 was to ask what the cut-off criteria were with regard to the definition of endocrine disruptors. These cut-off criteria were crucial because, of course, if you fall outside the scope of the definition, you are not considered to be an endocrine disruptor. That was a crucial debate. An entire annex was drafted to design these cut-off criteria, and one of the key provisions there was that substances should be approved only if they were not considered to have endocrine-disrupting properties on non-target organisms. I repeat: 'on non-target organisms'. It is precisely this provision that the Commission is now changing – through comitology and a delegated act.

The Commission is changing a key provision of a law through comitology, and that is precisely what we are objecting to. The key question is whether the Commission is exceeding its implementing powers and the answer is 'yes'. We even have advice from the Legal Service saying 'yes', the Commission is exceeding its implementing powers. That is exactly what we are discussing here. The Commission will say that we need to hurry up now, as this will delay things. Well, sorry! I say to the Commission: you have been delaying since 2009.

Secondly, the Biocides Regulation is putting the same criteria on the table and there is no objection to that one. So we are objecting to the Commission exceeding its implementing powers, and that is a legal question that all our colleagues need to answer. This is not about whether you like it or not: this is about whether we allow the Commission to change a crucial part of the law through implementing powers. If they want to make that change, then they should come forward with a proposal for codecision. That is the way we do it. My question to our colleagues is: are we here for the rule of law or for the rule of industry?

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Vytėnas Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, yes, we will together follow the rule of law. It is crucial today for all of us, and I stress it because the Commission is following the mandate from the pesticides and biocides regulation, and of course this Commission started work in 2014 and started to deal with these very complex issues.

We are here today debating the draft objection tabled in Parliament against the Commission regulation setting out criteria to identify endocrine disruptors in the context of the pesticides legislation. This proposal was sent by the Commission to Parliament and the Council for scrutiny on 20 July. I strongly ask the honourable Members to support the proposed criteria. I strongly request this. There is no benefit for health and the environment in keeping the interim criteria that are currently applicable. These are clearly not fit for purpose and this is recognised by all the stakeholders. Indeed, they fail to identify those that are real endocrine disruptors.

I would like to stress that our proposed criteria are protective of human health and the environment, and are based on the widely agreed World Health Organisation definition of an endocrine disrupter. The criteria are also designed to identify known and presumed endocrine disruptors on the basis of all available scientific information, including human and animal evidence, as well as in-vitro and in-silico data.

Furthermore, a 'weight-of-evidence approach' is to be used for the analysis of all the available scientific information. The Commission's proposal is thus based on science and reflects a reasonable approach. It is supported by a clear majority of Member States. In fact, on 4 July this year after more than a year of intense negotiations, a qualified majority of Member States supported the draft Commission regulation setting criteria to identify endocrine disrupters for pesticides. Twenty-one Member States, representing more than 72% of the population, voted in favour, while those voting against, or abstaining, did so for different and sometimes opposite reasons. Some wanted stricter criteria, others weaker criteria or more possibilities for derogation.

The proposed criteria are therefore a careful compromise and I would like to draw your attention to that. Yes, we know very well how difficult it is to build a compromise. This one would not have been reached without the inclusion of the specific provision which is at the centre of the draft objection tabled here in Parliament. This particular provision was added at the request of some Member States, during the negotiations – yes, during the negotiations – to improve their policy on sustainable use of pesticides, and was instrumental in getting the necessary support. And here we are discussing necessary support. The Commission did not want to oppose a reasonable and limited exemption for substances which target only arthropods and have no impact on vertebrates (human or animal).

The Commission strongly believes that it has not exceeded its powers by including this provision in the draft Commission regulation, as it does not concern an essential element of the regulation. Furthermore, this provision is in line with the general objective of the regulation to promote the development and use of active substances that have, overall, more favourable properties in relation to the protection of human health and the environment.

Let me also remind the honourable Members that, with the adoption of the draft regulation under scrutiny, the European Union would become the first regulatory system in the world with legally binding criteria to define what an endocrine disrupter is and to apply those criteria to pesticides, not only with regard to human health but also with regard to the environment.

I am aware that some consider the proposed criteria to be imperfect, for different reasons. However, their adoption would be a significant step forward compared to the current situation with respect to better protection of human health and the environment. We are not in a hurry: our concern, as always, is how to protect human health and the environment. I strongly believe we owe that better protection to European citizens and the European environment.

Only when the new criteria start to apply and we gain experience with them can we evaluate how they work in practice. The Commission had proposed to evaluate and report on their functioning at the latest in seven years' time.

In addition, the adoption of the criteria would constitute a solid basis for the Commission to advance in developing a new strategy on endocrine disrupters. Without finalised criteria there is no chance of obtaining a horizontal perspective, in relation to various types of chemicals. We need to have final criteria now because otherwise there is no possibility of moving forward.

This House has repeatedly asked the Commission to come forward with criteria to identify endocrine disrupters. I believe we now have a solid compromise and criteria which represent a real step forward. Therefore, and to conclude, I invite you to seize the opportunity for better protection of human health and the environment from endocrine disrupters in the area of pesticides by not supporting this objection, and by enabling the Commission to adopt these protective criteria and move forward. Otherwise we will remain in the same situation as now. Today's situation is very dangerous for people's health and for the environment.

Angélique Delahaye, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, cela fait presque huit ans que nous demandons des critères d'identification des perturbateurs endocriniens à la Commission européenne.

Nous avons enfin une proposition, qui n'est certes pas parfaite, mais qui a au moins le mérite d'exister. Elle reprend non seulement la définition des perturbateurs endocriniens donnée par l'OMS, mais surtout elle permet à l'Union européenne de se placer une fois de plus à l'avant-garde en matière de protection de la santé et de l'environnement.

Les perturbateurs endocriniens sont partout: dans les meubles, les vêtements, les emballages, les contenants et les produits alimentaires.

Il est donc primordial de fixer des critères stricts et scientifiquement fondés. Nous ne pouvons plus attendre. De plus, cette proposition permettra de remplacer la législation actuellement en vigueur, qui est dépassée et ne répond plus aux enjeux auxquels nous sommes aujourd'hui confrontés.

Nous devons assurer un niveau de protection toujours plus élevé aux citoyens. Pour cela, il faut avancer avec les connaissances techniques et scientifiques dont nous disposons et il est donc fondamental d'encourager la recherche et l'innovation dans ce domaine.

Or, ce sont les industriels, les PME et les TPE qui développent la recherche et l'innovation. Ils ont donc besoin d'orientations claires pour savoir quelle direction prendre et pour être en mesure d'élaborer des produits plus sûrs pour l'avenir.

Si nous refusons la proposition de la Commission, et adoptons cette objection, nous conserverons la législation actuelle et repartirons pour des négociations qui risquent de durer encore dix ans. Ce n'est pas un pas en arrière, comme certains l'insinuent, mais bien un pas en avant vers la mise en place d'une des législations les plus strictes au monde.

Miriam Dalli, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, as a matter of fact, the issue of the definition of endocrine-disrupting chemicals, as was mentioned, has been an ongoing and contentious issue over the past years. And trust me, we are not enjoying it! However, it is totally unacceptable and uncalled for to place the responsibility of the delay in the adoption of identification criteria on the European Parliament, particularly when the delay is mainly due to the unnecessary, and often biased, impact assessments carried out, despite the pressure from the European Parliament.

And yes, the European Parliament has the right of scrutiny. If every time we object we are told that nothing else will be proposed, this is completely unacceptable. Ultimately, as I have said, we have the right of scrutiny even when the Commission thinks it should not be reminded of the limits of its regulatory power.

Yes, in this case the Commission has exceeded the mandate granted by Parliament and the Council by coming back to the co-legislators' decision to impose a strict ban on endocrine-disrupting pesticides. It is not acceptable that, in the current proposal, the Commission incorporated a special exemption for certain types of pesticides. This goes way beyond what we asked for as the European Parliament. Furthermore, the way the proposal is presented, it is simply introducing a derogation – an exemption – that is creating an improper loophole in the regulation, allowing continuous use of dangerous pesticides.

The Commission's task was to set scientific criteria – nothing more, nothing less – and we will not accept the Commission deciding to go beyond its legislative power and introduce exemptions. That is why we want the Commission to withdraw the draft regulation and submit a new one, setting strict, straightforward and legally sound, scientific criteria without this aforementioned derogation.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir diskutieren EDs, endokrine Disruptoren – unappetitlich, aber allgegenwärtig: Kinderspielzeug, Lippenstift, S-Pestizide, überall –, viele in der Wirkung gänzlich unerforscht. Genau deshalb ist die EU seit 2000 aktiv, um neue Wege gegen EDs zu gehen.

Seit 2009 verhandeln wir über das heute diskutierte Registriersystem, um EDs besser zu erfassen und zu verbieten. Ich bin mit der langen Dauer dieses Prozesses nicht zufrieden. Ich halte das von der Kommission vorgelegte System allenfalls für einen kleinen Trippelschritt in die richtige Richtung – einen Schritt, dem viele folgen müssen.

Ich bin daher auch besorgt über die ablehnende Haltung einiger. Wollen wir wirklich fünf Jahre wissenschaftlicher Arbeit in den Wind schlagen – zurück auf null –, obwohl wir gerade auf dem richtigen Weg waren? Nein! Denn wer dagegen stimmt, stimmt gegen die Gesundheit unserer Kinder. Folgen wir den Wissenschaftlern, nicht der Lobby – für die Bürger. Ich respektiere deshalb auch die Warnungen der 3 000 Petenten und zahlreicher nichtstaatlicher Organisationen. Lasst uns einen Anfang in die richtige Richtung machen – für unsere Umwelt, für unsere Kinder, gegen hormonstörende Chemikalien!

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, it is a very bad thing that we are having this debate here tonight, because the issue of endocrine disruptors is a very serious one that should have been settled years and years ago. The Commission had to set the scientific criteria, but by introducing a derogation it took not a technical decision but a political decision. That leaves us with no other choice than to object.

Commissioner, I am afraid you have just given all the arguments why this is a political decision. You talked about year-long negotiations within Council. Why should you negotiate for a year if it is a technical decision? That is incomprehensible. You talked about a balanced compromise, but that is incompatible with a technical decision. I am afraid that you have completely side-lined the European Parliament: we should have been part of these negotiations with Council, and that is why you leave us no other solution than to object.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – De Europese Commissie verzint al jarenlang smoesjes om hormoonverstorende stoffen op de markt te houden, terwijl honderden studies aangetoond hebben dat ze zelfs in lage doses schadelijk zijn voor de gezondheid.

En ze zijn overal. Ze zitten in cosmetica en speelgoed, ze zitten in landbouwgif en ze zitten in de rubberkorrels op de kunstgrasvelden waar onze kinderen op spelen.

De Commissie heeft de wettelijke plicht om mens, dier en milieu te beschermen tegen hormoonverstorende stoffen. Ik herinner de Commissie eraan dat die bescherming niet doeltreffend zal zijn als zij de achterdeur openhoudt voor hormoonverstoorders en dat ook nog eens doet via een illegale procedure die de inspraak van het Parlement onmogelijk maakt.

Ik herinner de Commissie eraan dat die bescherming niet doeltreffend zal zijn als de bewijslast wordt verzwaard en het voorzorgsbeginsel niet wordt gehanteerd. Halve maatregelen worden niet geaccepteerd. Alle hormoonverstoorders moeten van de markt.

De Commissie heeft daartoe al vele kansen gehad. Commissaris, wat mij betreft heeft u meer kansen niet verdiend.

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich hoffe, wir sind uns hier alle dessen bewusst, dass hormonverändernde Stoffe – sprich: endokrine Disruptoren – hochproblematisch sind. Deshalb hat sie der Gesetzgeber ja auch 2009 in Pestiziden weitestgehend verboten – mit gutem Grund. Der Auftrag 2009 war, dass die Kommission Kriterien festlegen soll, wie man endokrine Disruptoren denn wissenschaftlich bewertet und wie man einvernehmliche Kriterien festlegt. Das, was die Kommission jetzt vorlegt, geht aber weit darüber hinaus. Es geht deshalb darüber hinaus, weil die Kommission an vielen Punkten jetzt nicht versucht, Kriterien festzulegen, sondern schlichtweg versucht, Verbote im Umweltbereich damit wegzubekommen.

Das können wir nicht tolerieren, Herr Kommissar! Sie ändern sozusagen eine gesetzliche Grundlage, und deshalb ist das keine Frage, wie man das bewertet, sondern das ist eine hochproblematische politische Entscheidung, die Sie hier treffen und die wir nicht akzeptieren können. Unser Juristischer Dienst beim Parlament sagt ganz klar: Das ist ein Rechtsverstoß! Wenn wir uns als Parlament ernst nehmen – das muss man ganz klar sagen –, dann muss dieses Parlament sein Veto dagegen einlegen. Sie haben noch genügend Zeit, das zu überarbeiten und eine neue Vorlage zu machen. Wir lassen uns aber jetzt nicht zeitlich unter Druck setzen. Sie hatten immerhin lange genug Zeit, etwas Vernünftiges vorzulegen. Das haben Sie leider nicht getan, Herr Kommissar.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner. Endocrine disruptors are a problem but I think the problem with this issue is the time it has taken to get to this stage. Others have mentioned the eight-year gap in addressing the issue, which does not help in terms of confidence.

I think all of us want to protect public health. The question I face, somewhere in between the extremes in this debate, is whether we are better to go with what the Commission has tabled, so that we make progress – it is better than the status quo, as I understand it, and I listened carefully to the Commissioner's statement – or whether we should go with the objectors and say that we reject the Commission proposal and start from scratch.

My fear with that proposal is that we would then wait another eight years to achieve any progress at all. Perhaps I am exaggerating the case but it does seem to me that that is the likely outcome. I am looking towards an election in the European Parliament, a change of Members of Parliament, a change of Commission, and all the reasons why things get delayed along the way.

I am not sure what is wrong with the World Health Organisation definition, which we are accepting here, and I think that is something to follow, and wisely so. But if we accept the Commission proposal, which is my inclination at this stage, and reject your objections, colleagues, then I would like us to keep a close eye on the monitoring in relation to your idea of the definition, so that we can intervene earlier than is suggested.

These are my thoughts at this stage. But we are talking about the health and well-being of consumers and of farmers, and we have to put that as our priority.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Hormonforstyrrende stoffer er et stort sundhedsproblem for os. Vi bliver nødt til som lovgivere at gøre noget ved det. Det er derfor, vi i Europa-Parlamentet i årevis har ønsket at få en basis for at kunne gribe ind over for de hormonforstyrrende stoffer. Det er altså vigtigt at få nogle kriterier.

Når vi nu skal til at gøre det, bliver vi også nødt til at gøre det ordentligt. Det forslag, der ligger fra Kommissionen, er simpelthen ikke godt nok. Den ene del handler om det, som kollegerne har talt om, undtagelsen. Det nytter ikke noget, at vi starter med vores basiskriterier og så allerede der indfører en undtagelse. Men det handler også om flere ting. Det handler også om niveauet for den dokumentation, der skal laves for overhovedet at finde et hormonforstyrrende stof. Dokumentationsniveauet er så højt, at det ligger langt, langt over de kriterier, vi har, når vi for eksempel skal vurdere kræftfremkaldende stoffer. Det går simpelthen ikke! Det er ikke kun os her i Parlamentet, men også nogle medlemslande, som synes, dette er et problem. Dertil hører mit eget medlemsland, Danmark, som bestemt ikke ønsker, at vi skal sige ja til det forslag, der ligger på bordet nu.

Jeg bliver vred, når vi får ansvaret for, at det trækker ud, når ansvaret ligger hos jer i Kommissionen for ikke at have ageret. Der bliver talt om, at dette er et kompromis. Jeg mener ikke, at vi kan gå på kompromis med borgernes sundhed. Vi bliver nødt til at gøre det ordentlig fra starten.

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, cette question de la définition des perturbateurs endocriniens est essentielle. L'OMS a fait les comptes en 2013: 800 substances chimiques modifient le système hormonal humain. Il s'agit de 800 substances qui sont responsables ou que l'on soupçonne de l'augmentation de toute une série de maladies: certains cancers, le diabète, l'obésité, l'infertilité, ainsi que différents troubles liés au développement du cerveau. C'est dire si l'enjeu de santé publique est majeur, mais les États membres se divisent sur la question de l'identification de ces critères.

Le compromis adopté au début des vacances en est la meilleure preuve, avec son boulevard de dérogations. En outrepassant ses compétences, et Bas l'a parfaitement expliqué, la Commission a exclu de la définition de ses pesticides ceux qui sont conçus précisément pour viser les systèmes hormonaux des insectes et des plantes avec des dégâts considérables sur ceux aux alentours qui ne sont pas visés.

L'Endocrine Society, qui regroupe 18 000 chercheurs et cliniciens dans le monde, nous fait part de son extrême inquiétude. Les citoyens en Europe sont mobilisés. Nous demandons donc demain une nouvelle définition des perturbateurs endocriniens, définition protégeant réellement la santé publique et l'environnement.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Monsieur le Commissaire à la santé, il y a quelques jours, le Parlement européen fermait ses portes à Monsanto, parce que Monsanto ne méprise pas simplement notre santé, Monsanto méprise notre démocratie.

Cela fait huit ans que, sur les perturbateurs endocriniens, la Commission laisse porte ouverte à tous les lobbies de la chimie, des pesticides... Cela fait huit ans que vous méprisez notre santé et que nous sommes en permanence obligés de vous rappeler à vos prérogatives et à la démocratie.

Alors aujourd'hui, maintenant qu'il est avéré que vous outrepassiez vos prérogatives, que vous outrepassiez vos compétences, vous avez raison de mentionner que les États membres ne sont pas clairs sur ce sujet-là, et j'ai moi-même profondément regretté le recul de la France sur le sujet, mais c'est votre responsabilité d'être garante des lois qui sont adoptées, y compris dans ce Parlement.

Vous les lisez tous les jours, les études qui dénoncent les dangers. Alors demain, pour des raisons de santé, pour des raisons de démocratie, nous allons refuser vos critères pour que vous fassiez de nouveau votre boulot, pour la santé et pour la démocratie !

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, hormonihäiritsijät vaikuttavat pieninä annoksina usein ylisukupolvisesti ja niitä saadaan useista lähteistä. Me kaikki tiedämme, että tämä on aliarvioitu, peruuttamaton ja pitkäaikainen riski. Siksi on ollut valitettavaa nähdä, miten komissio on laahannut jalkoja tämän asian kanssa sekä kriteerien valmistelussa, jossa oikeuden kautta jouduttiin vauhdittamaan tätä prosessia, että sisällön muodostamisessa. Siksi tuntuu myös pahalle, että nyt komissio viittaa parlamenttiin suhteessa kiireeseen, kun ensin koko valmisteluprosessi on ollut hyvin ongelmallinen.

Toiseksi komissio todellakin on parlamentin lainopillisen arvion mukaan ylittänyt toimivaltansa. Se on tehnyt poliittisen kompromissin. Arvoisa komissaari, ymmärrän kuinka hankalaa poliittisten kompromissien tekeminen on, mutta ihmisten terveydellä ja juridisesti se ei ollut tässä mahdollista. Joskus on parempi olla tekemättä huonoa lainsäädäntöä, joka on pitkäaikainen, kuin jättää se tekemättä. Se on syy parlamentin hylkäyskantaan, joka on mielestäni järkevä.

Guillaume Balas (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'histoire se répète indéfiniment. La Commission n'agit pas sur des problèmes de santé absolument essentiels, comme celui des perturbateurs endocriniens, si bien qu'elle finit par être condamnée pour cette inaction. Ensuite, elle entreprend d'agir, mais le résultat est médiocre et insuffisant. Des dérogations graves sont accordées pour inscrire dans le marbre le fait que de grandes entreprises, de grandes multinationales de la chimie, puissent continuer à nous polluer. Mais vous nous dites: «C'est à prendre ou à laisser, et si vous n'acceptez pas notre proposition, alors vous n'aurez rien».

Donc là, on s'attaque non seulement à la santé des gens, mais aussi à la démocratie. En somme, nous, qui avons été élus par les peuples européens, nous n'aurions pas la légitimité suffisante pour vous demander à vous, l'exécutif européen, de faire une chose très simple, à savoir de retirer votre proposition et de nous en présenter une nouvelle. C'est là qu'est votre rôle, et c'est ce qu'aujourd'hui, vous devez aux peuples européens et ce que vous nous devez à nous, qui avons été élus par les citoyens européens.

Donc, que ce soit sur la question de la santé, gravement mise en danger, tous les scientifiques le disent, par les perturbateurs endocriniens – et l'on sait que votre proposition actuelle sur le sujet est insuffisante, voire dangereuse – ou que ce soit sur la question de la démocratie, aujourd'hui, vous avez tout faux.

C'est pour cela que nous allons voter cette objection, et nous vous demandons de faire preuve de responsabilité et de nous faire une nouvelle proposition qui, cette fois-ci, réponde aux attentes, notamment en ce qui concerne la santé de nos concitoyens européens.

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, je vedecky podloženým faktom, že endokrinné disruptory sú látky, ktoré majú schopnosť ovplyvňovať hormonálny systém ľudí, a tým negatívne vplyvať na ich zdravie. Tieto chemické látky bývajú často spájané s vážnymi ochoreniami, nevynímajúc rakovinu, obezitu, problémy s plodnosťou, mutagenitu či rôzne nervové ochorenia. Európska únia si plne uvedomuje závažnosť súvisiacich rizík a proti následkom takýchto negatívnych vplyvov bojujeme už dlhodobo aj v tomto parlamente. Veď mnohé látky, ktoré endokrinné disruptory obsahujú, už v súčasnosti platná európska legislatíva o pesticídoch a biocídoch aj zakazuje. Z pohľadu lekára považujem ľudský život a zdravie za tie najvyššie hodnoty a cieľ, ktorý by sme mali primárne sledovať aj v procese normotvorby. Domnievam sa zároveň, že aj v súvislosti s aktuálne diskutovaným legislatívnym návrhom je nevyhnutné prihliadať predovšetkým na poznatky vedy a dbať na dôsledné zakomponovanie vedeckých kritérií do právnych predpisov, aby sme zabezpečili čo najvyššiu možnú ochranu zdravia dospelých i našich detí. Regulačný rámec Únie sa prijatím kritérií navrhovaných Komisiou stane v globálnom meradle vôbec najprísnejším, a teda postačujúcim z hľadiska efektívnej ochrany zdravia európskych občanov. Kľúčový bude však dôsledný proces implementácie – na tom trvám –, bez ktorého je aj najkvalitnejšie pripravená legislatíva len úmyslom, a nie faktom.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich sehe es als unsere Aufgabe, zwei wesentliche Dinge zu tun: Das eine ist, Umwelt und Gesundheit zu schützen, und das andere ist, unsere Rechtsgrundsätze einzuhalten. Mit dem, was Sie uns präsentiert haben, werden beide Kriterien nicht erfüllt. Wir erfüllen nicht den höchstmöglichen Schutz der Gesundheit, und wir erfüllen nicht den höchstmöglichen Schutz der Umwelt, aber wir widersprechen auch unseren Rechtsgrundsätzen. Denn im Gegensatz zu dem, was Sie in Ihren Ausführungen betont haben, dass die Kommission die Befugnisse nicht überschritten hat, ist dieses Hohe Haus und ebenso auch der Juristische Dienst des Parlaments ganz eindeutig der Auffassung, dass Sie genau das getan haben, dass nämlich mit dieser Ausnahmeregelung der Basisrechtsakt so wesentlich verändert worden ist, dass das nicht in Ihrer Kompetenz liegt.

Die sachlichen und fachlichen Argumente gegen Ihren Vorschlag haben Sie heute wirklich deutlich zu hören bekommen. Wir erwarten von Ihnen, dass wir schnellstmöglich einen geänderten Vorschlag erhalten, in dem diese Ausnahmeregelung nicht zu finden ist. Wir fühlen uns auch nicht dafür verantwortlich, dass es fast acht Jahre gedauert hat, bis etwas vorgelegt worden ist. Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass, wenn dieser eine Absatz, um den es hier geht, nämlich diese Ausnahmeregelung, entfernt ist, wir sehr schnell etwas finden werden, das der Rechtsstaatlichkeit und auch dem besten Schutz für Gesundheit und Umwelt gerecht wird.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Mr President, the Commission's proposal is the result of efforts and dialogue between the Commission and the Member States, and it is very balanced and reasonable. The proposal is based on the WHO definition of endocrine disruptors and it is based on three elements: adverse effect, endocrine activity and causal link. Unfortunately, the discussions on endocrine disruptors derive from arguments that are more emotional, and much incomplete and false information has been circulated. The stringent EU regulation framework in place does address endocrine disruption, maybe not as ideally as some of us would want to, but there is no legal vacuum now in Europe.

As we speak, citizens are not left unprotected. I do not understand the goal of the objection because there is no benefit for health and environment in maintaining the interim criteria. The criteria are based on science and reflect an approach supported by 21 Member States, as the Commissioner stated earlier. The EU would be a pioneer in this field, and we could inspire other global players in legislating on endocrine disruptors.

Those colleagues who are now initiating the objection, opting instead to reject the proposal and ask the European Commission to come with a new proposal, are either idealistic or are merely engaging in an exercise of rhetoric. It is impossible to come up with a new proposal as soon as possible. It will take some time, maybe years. So let us be reasonable and really work to the benefit of European citizens.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è la prima volta che affrontiamo in quest'Aula il tema degli interferenti endocrini e non sarà nemmeno l'ultima. Sappiamo tutti, ad esempio, che il regolamento europeo relativo all'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti fitosanitari prevede che una sostanza attiva possa essere autorizzata solo se non altera negativamente il sistema endocrino.

Ritengo che la proposta di individuazione degli interferenti endocrini avanzata dalla Commissione vada oltre i poteri conferiti alla stessa, perché restringe arbitrariamente il campo degli interferenti ed è quindi inadatta a garantire un'adeguata protezione della salute umana e dell'ambiente.

Una simile decisione dovrebbe essere preceduta da una modifica del regolamento sui prodotti fitosanitari, modifica che può avvenire solo attraverso un normale iter legislativo e quindi con l'approvazione del Parlamento e del Consiglio. Ma vi è di più: la mancata inclusione nella proposta della Commissione di una categoria di interferenti endocrini sospetti e di riferimenti incrociati, in caso di presenza concomitante di due o più interferenti, è una carenza inaccettabile.

Non possiamo continuare ad anteporre gli interessi economici dei grandi gruppi industriali alla salute dei cittadini europei.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι ενδοκρινικοί διαταράκτες είναι επικίνδυνες χημικές ουσίες που περιέχονται σε υλικά, σε παιχνίδια, σε τροφές. Είναι δεδομένο ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα κατά της χρήσης όλων αυτών των χημικών ουσιών που έχουν βλαβερές επιπτώσεις στη δημόσια υγεία και στο περιβάλλον. Όπως προκύπτει, τα κριτήρια ταυτοποίησης και εντοπισμού των ενδοκρινικών διαταρακτών πρέπει να καθοριστούν βάσει επιστημονικών και τεχνικών προδιαγραφών. Δεν μπορεί να είναι αποτέλεσμα ενός πολιτικού συμβιβασμού των κρατών μελών. Αυτό που βλέπουμε όμως είναι ότι υπάρχει ένας πολιτικός συμβιβασμός που δεν έχει καμία σχέση με επιστημονικά κριτήρια. Ούτε βέβαια πρέπει να δεχθούμε την αντιστροφή του βάρους απόδειξης.

Κατά την άποψή μας, η Επιτροπή έχει υπερβεί τις εξουσίες τις οποίες έχει αποκτήσει στο συγκεκριμένο αντικείμενο. Θεωρούμε, λοιπόν, ότι πρόκειται για μονομερή υπέρβαση των εξουσιών και φυσικά αρμόδιο για τη λήψη των αποφάσεων είναι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο σε συνεργασία με το Συμβούλιο. Επαναλαμβάνουμε, λοιπόν, ότι πρόκειται για «καραμπινάτη» υπέρβαση εξουσιών εκ μέρους της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής.

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous avez dit qu'il faut protéger la santé et l'environnement. Si nous en sommes là aujourd'hui, si nous faisons cette objection, c'est d'abord à cause de la Commission.

La première fois, en 2013, vous deviez définir des critères. En 2015, ces critères n'avaient toujours pas été fixés. Il a fallu saisir la Cour de justice européenne. Maintenant, nous ne sommes pas d'accord avec votre définition. Pourquoi? Parce que vous faites une exemption sur des produits qui sont fabriqués pour être des perturbateurs endocriniens. Les services juridiques disent que vous outrepassiez vos droits.

Aussi, je m'adresse à mes collègues: aujourd'hui, si nous votons cette définition qui ne satisfait pas les endocrinologues sur le plan international, nous l'aurons tout au long de législation car elle fera référence. Il ne faut absolument pas être complice d'une définition qui ne correspond pas à la protection de la santé et de l'environnement.

Par conséquent, Monsieur le commissaire, il faut revoir cette définition. Il ne faut pas que vous soyez complice d'un système dans lequel les lobbies chimiques poussent à avoir cette dérogation. Revoyez votre copie parce que si nous en sommes ici aujourd'hui et que nous nous bagarrons autant, c'est dans l'intérêt des citoyens européens et non pas dans l'intérêt du privé.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Komisijos narys. – Gerbiami kolegos, gerbiami Parlamento nariai, aš labai įdėmiai klausiau jūsų pasisakymų. Norėčiau dėl kiekvieno pasisakymo pasakyti keletą pastabų, bet gaila, kad kai kurie kolegos nutarė neklausyti mano atsakymo, išėjo iš salės, nors kalbėjo labai kategoriškai. Ir aš norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį, kolegos, į keletą būtinų faktų.

Pirmas dalykas, puikiai žinome, kad šie pasiūlymai buvo pradėti diskutuojant su visa mokslinė bendruomene Europos Sąjungoje: endokrinologais, toksikologais, onkologais, kardiologais. Aš pats esu kardiologas. Aš žinau, ką reiškia žmonių sveikata. Ir jokios multinacionalinės korporacijos čia nepadės. Ne apie tai eina kalba.

Kalba eina apie mokslinius kriterijus ir mes matėme, kad tarp mokslininkų daug labai skirtingų nuomonių. Kadangi ir reguliavimo sferos labai plačios, tad nutarėm pasiekti mokslinio sutarimo. Mes nesame mokslininkų teisėjai. Jie pateikė savo sutarimą ir bendrą žvilgsnį. Ir taip pat jie diskutavo dėl metodologijų ir dėl reguliavimo mechanizmo.

Aš labai norėčiau išgirsti jūsų konkrečius pasiūlymus dėl metodologijų. Juk mes pradėjome diskutuoti ENVI komitete nuo pat 2014 m., man atėjus čia. Pristatėm 2015 m. pozicijas, po to diskutavome dėl *impact assesment'o*, tuomet buvo *public consultations* laikas, diskutavom labai daug. Tiesą pasakius, komitete mes ne vieną kartą apie tai kalbėjome, nes profilinis komitetas dirba su tomis pozicijomis. Man tai priimtina, man priimtini argumentai. Suprantama, kad diskutavom ir teisinius argumentus, ir štai – net ne prieš metus su Europos Taryba pradėjom diskutuoti, o tik šių metų liepos mėn., kadangi užbaigėm sudėtingus derinimus, Komisijoj derinom su Komisijos Teisės tarnyba, ji nėra nekompetentinga, nes, kaip žinot, neįmanoma pateikti pasiūlymo negavus Teisės tarnybos sutikimo.

Aš suprantu, kad skirtingų institucijų teisės tarnybos gali skirtingai interpretuoti, bet aš nesu šalininkas teisinio ginčo. Ir todėl aš manau, kad mes pateikėme subalansuotą pasiūlymą ir su tam tikromis metodologijomis. Kai diskutavom su Taryba, taip, šalys narės pateikė skirtingus argumentus, reikėjo juos derinti, bet šita pateikta pataisėlė – ji nepažeidžia bendrų kriterijų ir mokslinių apibrėžimų. Daugiau nėra, yra tik Pasaulio sveikatos organizacijos bendras apibrėžimas. Mes juo ir remiamės. Todėl aš manau, kad šiandien yra tikrai puiki proga diskutuoti, ypač su tais, kurie išėjo, kurie dabar manęs neklauso. Diskutuoti, nes aš atviras diskusijoms. Daug kas kalbėjo apie demokratiją, čia ir yra demokratija – diskutuoti, bet ne pasakyti nuomonę ir išeiti. Aš linkęs į diskusijas.

Let me conclude. I am aware that some of you consider the criteria proposed as imperfect. I would, however, like to strongly emphasise once again that their adoption would be a significant step forward compared to the current situation with respect to the better protection of human health and the environment.

The current applicable interim criteria are, indeed, not fit for purpose. It is true. We could discuss the theory of the perfect criteria for many more years, as opinions and views on this topic remain deeply divided. However, we will only make progress on this issue if we replace the interim criteria and start to apply new criteria. We will be the pioneering Union in the world. These criteria will constitute a unique opportunity to better protect the health of citizens and the environment. I therefore ask you not to vote in favour of the proposed objection tomorrow.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Carolina Punset (ALDE), por escrito. – Nos hemos acostumbrado a las primaveras silenciosas, casi sin insectos, sin pájaros y con muy poca vida silvestre. El uso extendido químicos en todos los ámbitos de la actividad humana y sus efectos como disruptores endocrinos fue advertido en 2013 por la OMS. Este organismo destacó que la exposición a estos productos es preocupante no solo para la vida salvaje, sino también para los seres humanos. La OMS insistió en que los legisladores debían tomar medidas para regular la exposición humana y ambiental a estas sustancias. Después de una larga espera, la Comisión nos sorprende con una definición de disruptor hormonal, que excluye a los plaguicidas disruptores hormonales de insectos y los exime de ser considerados como tales, incluso si tienen efecto hormonal en otros artrópodos. ¿Es así como la Comisión cumple su mandato de protección de las personas, los animales, el medio ambiente y sus ecosistemas? Esta exclusión afecta al 95 % del reino animal formado por artrópodos, con roles clave en el equilibrio de los ecosistemas, además de arriesgar la salud de humanos y otros vertebrados. Es inaceptable una definición así que, además, obliga a efectuar pruebas de peso para la determinación del efecto endocrino que podrían dilatarse años.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – Les perturbateurs endocriniens, ces substances qui perturbent l'organisme et induisent des effets néfastes, ne peuvent en aucun cas être autorisés. Malheureusement, sous pression de certains États membres, la Commission européenne a, dans le cadre du texte qui va nous être soumis, largement outrepassé son mandat, en ajoutant une dérogation autorisant des pesticides. La raison: le but desdits produits est précisément d'éviter aux nuisibles de se reproduire.

Mais qu'en est-il vis-à-vis des êtres humains? Après la saga du glyphosate, voici donc venue la saga des perturbateurs endocriniens? Non. Dans ces deux cas, le principe de précaution doit continuer à prévaloir! Cela sera le sens de mon vote, comme cela l'a d'ailleurs toujours été.

Supprimons la clause visant les perturbateurs par conception. Demandons le retrait du règlement d'exécution et demandons la présentation d'une nouvelle proposition, sans délai. Une fois le texte, je l'espère, adopté, la Commission européenne devra retirer son projet et revoir sa copie en négociations avec les États membres. Et l'on prouvera au passage que, non, «Bruxelles» ne décide pas de tout.

16. Zusammensetzung der Fraktionen: siehe Protokoll

17. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe – Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen – System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (Aussprache)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate conjunto sobre:

— el informe de Daniela Aiuto, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/45/CE sobre las reglas y normas de seguridad aplicables a los buques de pasaje (COM(2016)0369 - C8-0208/2016 - 2016/0170(COD)) (A8-0167/2017),

— el informe de Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo que modifica la Directiva 98/41/CE del Consejo, sobre el registro de las personas que viajan a bordo de buques de pasaje procedentes de puertos de los Estados miembros de la Comunidad o con destino a los mismos y la Directiva 2010/65/UE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, sobre las formalidades informativas exigibles a los buques a su llegada o salida de los puertos de los Estados miembros (COM(2016)0370 - C8-0209/2016 - 2016/0171(COD)) (A8-0168/2017), y

— el informe de Dominique Riquet, en nombre de la Comisión de Transportes y Turismo, sobre la propuesta de Directiva del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre un sistema de inspecciones para garantizar la seguridad en la explotación de transbordadores de carga rodada y naves de pasaje de gran velocidad en servicio regular y por la que se modifica la Directiva 2009/16/CE del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo sobre el control de los buques por el Estado rector del puerto y se deroga la Directiva 1999/35/CE del Consejo (COM(2016)0371 - C8-0210/2016 - 2016/0172(COD)) (A8-0165/2017)

Daniela Aiuto, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo arrivati al termine di questo percorso di revisione della legislazione europea in materia di trasporto marittimo, svolgendo un ottimo lavoro di concerto tra Parlamento, Commissione e Consiglio. Ringrazio tutti i colleghi della commissione per i trasporti e il turismo, i rappresentanti della Commissione europea, i rappresentanti della Presidenza del Consiglio maltese per il proficuo e costruttivo lavoro.

La sicurezza marittima è un tema di vitale importanza per tutti i passeggeri europei ed è fondamentale che si lavori per raggiungere standard sempre più elevati negli Stati membri, pur nel rispetto di tutte quelle che sono le norme internazionali definite nell'ambito dell'IMO. È dunque importante che vi sia congruità ed efficacia di tutte le norme adottate e che l'Europa mantenga sempre un ruolo proattivo e da protagonista in tal senso.

Parlamento e Consiglio hanno accolto con favore la proposta di revisione e di semplificazione della Commissione, al fine di rendere più chiari svariati settori previsti dalla legislazione vigente e rimuovere le ambiguità che creavano problemi nell'attuazione e nella trasposizione delle norme.

Siamo stati concordi sull'esclusione dal campo di applicazione della direttiva di una serie di categorie di imbarcazioni per le quali, effettivamente, si riteneva sproporzionata l'attuazione delle norme prescritte. Mi riferisco in particolare alle navi da passeggeri di lunghezza inferiore a 24 metri, alle navi di servizio che trasportano lavoratori verso impianti offshore, alle navi a vela, purché munite di propulsione meccanica ausiliare.

Ritengo sia stato invece importante chiarire e includere il concetto di alluminio come materiale equivalente. È importante che ciò avvenga, in quanto dobbiamo tenere in considerazione quelle che sono le proprietà intrinseche del materiale e la necessità di compararle alla capacità ignifuga di materiali simili. L'alluminio deve essere considerato un materiale equivalente all'acciaio: ne va della sicurezza dei passeggeri in caso di incidenti e incendi.

Tuttavia, come Parlamento, abbiamo molto insistito affinché non vi siano zone grigie di sicurezza per le categorie escluse. È per questo che abbiamo ribadito la necessità di un impegno, da parte della Commissione e degli Stati membri, ad adoperarsi, sia a livello nazionale che a livello di IMO, affinché la garanzia della sicurezza sia sempre garantita.

Altro punto per noi importante, emerso nei lavori parlamentari e portato avanti anche nei negoziati con il Consiglio, è stato quello dell'importanza data all'elemento umano e di correlare la dimensione sociale dei lavoratori direttamente alla sicurezza a bordo. Le condizioni che riguardano la vita a bordo del personale e gli aspetti sociali influiscono sull'efficienza e sull'efficacia della prevenzione di rischi, di problemi e di incidenti.

È importante che questo collegamento diventi una costante e sia trasversale in tutte le politiche dell'Unione europea in materia di trasporti. È per questo che mi rivolgo al Commissario affinché si faccia portavoce di questa istanza anche nelle future iniziative legislative. Solo se gli addetti ai lavori operano in condizioni ottimali, i passeggeri potranno avere standard di sicurezza adeguati.

Punto ancora importante per il Parlamento è stato quello della trasparenza: abbiamo insistito affinché qualsiasi esenzione, equivalenza e ulteriore misura di sicurezza sia pubblicata su un sito web accessibile al pubblico e anche su tale tema siamo riusciti a trovare una convergenza con la Presidenza maltese.

Abbiamo accolto le istanze provenienti da alcuni Stati membri al fine di tutelare le specificità nazionali, in alcuni casi di natura geografica, in altri legate ad aspetti occupazionali e lavorativi. Siamo riusciti a raggiungere, dunque, un accordo con il Consiglio, consci che le disposizioni adottate da questa Assemblea devono sempre essere un valore aggiunto per gli Stati membri e non un elemento deleterio, come purtroppo talvolta è accaduto in passato.

In conclusione, mi auguro che questa procedura di revisione della legislazione vigente nel settore marittimo possa portare a un effettivo beneficio ai passeggeri, agli addetti ai lavori, alle imprese del settore e, più in generale, al tema della sicurezza dei trasporti in Europa.

Mi auguro che la Commissione continuerà in futuro a monitorare con attenzione l'evolversi delle norme adottate per assicurare standard sempre elevati ai cittadini europei.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, ponente. – Señor presidente, mejorar la seguridad de los pasajeros en el transporte marítimo, ofreciendo datos homogéneos a los servicios de rescate en caso de accidente en toda la Unión, y hacerlo desde el más escrupuloso respeto de la privacidad y de la normativa europea de protección de datos, es el objetivo de este informe.

Recogemos aquí un acuerdo que ha contado desde el principio con la mejor disposición por parte de todos, una actitud que quiero reconocer y quiero agradecer especialmente a Itxaso y Mae el trabajo desempeñado, a los ponentes alternativos y también a la Comisión. Pero permítanme que subraye especialmente el papel de la Presidencia maltesa, que merece un público reconocimiento por el empeño con que ha desempeñado su presidencia semestral.

Este informe quiere contribuir además al objetivo compartido de legislar mejor, de eliminar obstáculos gracias a normas más simples, porque, en este concreto aspecto de los datos de los pasajeros, la dispersión normativa, los condicionantes organizativos y la distancia que había entre lo que planteaban las normas y lo que permite la tecnología era ya hoy inaceptable: una brecha que, además de penalizar la eficacia en una posible operación de rescate, abonaba la inseguridad jurídica.

Así, este acuerdo con el Consejo se centra en las nuevas reglas para digitalizar el registro de pasajeros de buques y ofrecer datos completos a los servicios de rescate para mejorar su operatividad. Así protegemos el derecho y respondemos también a la necesidad de los familiares de disponer de una información constatada y segura en situaciones de emergencia y de angustia.

El propósito es hacer que el número exacto de pasajeros y otra información útil esté inmediatamente disponible para los servicios de búsqueda y salvamento en caso de accidente. En la actualidad se pueden perder valiosos minutos, porque los datos de las personas a bordo son almacenados por una compañía naviera. El centro de búsqueda y de rescate tiene que pedir a la persona de contacto de la compañía la información necesaria, y, en forma digital, la información será directamente accesible.

Para facilitar la asistencia a las víctimas y sus familiares, los datos registrados incluirán la nacionalidad de los pasajeros. La normativa vigente obliga a la compañía naviera a registrar el nombre, la fecha de nacimiento, el sexo y, si así lo desea el pasajero, la necesidad de asistencia especial en caso de emergencia. Además, se añade la posibilidad voluntaria de que el pasajero incluya un número telefónico de contacto para casos de emergencia.

Con arreglo a los nuevos requisitos, los datos se enviarán a la autoridad competente en formato electrónico en los quince minutos siguientes a la salida del buque. Pueden utilizarse dos medios de transmisión: la ventanilla única nacional o el sistema de identificación automática, sujeto a ciertas condiciones. Los avances en el desarrollo de las ventanillas únicas nacionales espero que sirvan de base para impulsar una ventanilla única europea en un futuro.

El acuerdo se caracteriza, además, por su capacidad para ofrecer soluciones y flexibilidad y contempla situaciones específicas para travesías breves que afectan a Alemania, Dinamarca y Suecia. En estos casos, se aceptará la transmisión de datos hasta una hora después del comienzo del viaje. La privacidad y la protección de datos queda garantizada por la inmediata destrucción de estas listas de pasajeros, automáticamente y sin demora injustificada, en cuanto concluya el viaje y los datos dejen de ser necesarios para apoyar a los servicios de rescate en un accidente, emergencia o para su uso en causas judiciales.

Los Estados miembros dispondrán de cuatro años para realizar la necesaria transición tecnológica y organizativa y de otros dos a partir de la entrada en vigor de la Directiva para poder incorporar las nuevas normas a su legislación nacional.

Dominique Riquet, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers confrères, mes chers collègues, ce rapport sur le système d'inspection des transbordeurs rouliers et des ferries est l'occasion de rappeler cet affreux accident qui a eu lieu à une heure du matin, le 28 septembre 1994, entre Tallinn et Stockholm. Ce jour-là, en moins de dix minutes, une ouverture non contrôlée des portes de chargement a permis à l'eau de s'engouffrer dans le ferry Estonia qui a sombré entraînant la mort de 852 personnes. C'est l'accident impliquant un navire de passagers le plus mortel en Europe après le Titanic, et cela s'est passé il y a moins de 23 ans. Et ce n'est pas un accident isolé. Quelques années auparavant, c'est au large du port de Zeebrugge qu'une autre catastrophe avait causé la mort, dans les mêmes conditions, de 193 personnes. Et, il y a quatre ans, au large de la Corée du Sud, 454 enfants ont trouvé la mort dans le naufrage d'un ferry.

En 2015, les ports de l'Union européenne ont enregistré 395 millions de passagers maritimes. C'est un nombre considérable, c'est pourquoi il est primordial que la sécurité de ces passagers soit assurée selon les normes les plus élevées.

Cette directive relative à un système d'inspection pour l'exploitation en toute sécurité de services réguliers de transbordeurs rouliers et d'engins à passagers à grande vitesse est une modification de la directive relative au contrôle par l'État du port, qui devient la directive de référence, et abroge par la même occasion la directive sur un système de visites obligatoires spécifiques aux transbordeurs rouliers.

L'exercice a d'abord été de simplifier, rationaliser et concentrer les normes existantes. Nous avons ensuite renforcé et clarifié le règlement, les éléments clés du rapport étant les suivants: clarification des responsabilités entre l'État du port et l'État du pavillon en évitant les doublons et les vides juridiques; définition de l'autorité compétente de l'État membre; clarification de la périodicité des inspections, lesquelles doivent avoir lieu deux fois par an, dont une en opération, et à intervalle de quatre à huit mois.

Une autre nouveauté est que les inspections des transbordeurs rouliers et des engins à passagers à grande vitesse doivent être considérés comme absolument prioritaires dans le quota des inspections annuelles des États membres.

Un article a été ajouté sur la prise en compte des risques liés aux passagers et à l'équipage, afin d'inclure un élément humain supplémentaire dans ces inspections.

Une formulation de la Commission permet d'adopter autant que nécessaire les actes délégués dans des conditions adaptées. Enfin, nous avons un accord sur les réinspections en cas de changement d'affectation du navire.

Finalement, une base de données sera mise en place pour permettre d'échanger les informations dans les plus brefs délais lors des inspections en cours entre les États membres.

Laissez-moi remercier ici tous les rapporteurs fictifs de la commission des transports et du tourisme pour leur travail et leur excellente collaboration, le directeur compétent de la Commission européenne pour son soutien et son expertise, sans oublier bien sûr la Présidence maltaise pour sa coopération, son ambition de mener à bien cette tripléte de directives et sa capacité à faire droit aux remarques et aux demandes du Parlement européen.

C'est ainsi qu'en juin dernier, nous avons trouvé rapidement un accord en trilogue sur cette directive. J'espère qu'elle recueillera un vote massif de notre Parlement.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, passenger ships play a key role in the mobility of our citizens as well as being a holiday experience. With more than 200 million passengers embarking from European Union ports each year, their safety is at the heart of our common transport policy. The vote in this House will make our safety rules clearer, more proportionate and better fit for purpose.

The three directives on passenger and ship safety that we are debating today were put in place 20 years ago to provide for a common level of safety and to remove barriers to trade. It was now high time to ensure that these objectives are improved upon in view of the implementation of experience and technological progress. We can only applaud the constructive and positive approach of the co-legislators that made it possible to reach a compromise in one month. This clearly shows that the safety of European Union citizens is our principal and shared objective.

The new legal act can still be adopted this year as we regard 2017 as 'Maritime Transport' year, during which we are working intensively with all stakeholders and, of course, for the benefit of citizens as is the case when safety rules are reviewed.

On Directive 2009/45/EC on safety rules and standards for passenger ships: concerning the safety rules and standards for passenger ships, we welcome an agreement reached on how to deal with an aluminium ship built outside the scope of the directive. The agreed phase-in period provides for a clear direction to influence the business strategies of the shipyards in question in order to adapt and maintain jobs. The duration of this transition still remains long.

On the issue of derogation for land-locked countries with no passenger ships, we are reassured by the agreed solution. While minimising the administrative burden, it provides for strong safeguards that prevent Member States from allowing ships to fly their flag unless they have transposed the corresponding directive.

On Directive 98/41/EC on the registration of passengers, we are glad to see that the Commission's proposal has been preserved and the vision of electronic data reporting confirmed. However, the six-year phase-in period is a lost opportunity considering the speed of digitalisation in many areas of life. We truly hope that most Member States will not make use of such a long phase-in period in practice. To finish on a positive note, the Commission wholeheartedly welcomes the amendment driven by Parliament to halve the delay in reporting the information on persons on board to the single window.

On Directive 1999/35/EC, the inspection proposal means a reduced administrative burden for shipowners. Member States maritime administrations will be able to rationalise their inspection efforts, all the while preserving the same safety level. The new rules should make it easier for the operators to comply with legislation and for the national competent authorities to apply it. It also makes it easier for us – the Commission and the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) – to support Member States in implementation and enforcement. We want to take this opportunity to highlight the indispensable contribution of the EMSA in this respect, including its role in enabling the information sharing between Member States.

Joëlle Bergeron, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission JURI*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, je tiens à féliciter ma collègue Daniela Aiuto pour avoir présenté dans son rapport les objectifs que nous nous étions fixés en commission juridique, à savoir le maintien d'un niveau de sécurité élevé sur les navires et la préservation de la confiance des passagers.

Dans le cadre du processus de simplification opéré par la Commission, bon nombre des définitions contenues dans la directive ont été adaptées aux circonstances actuelles, en raison notamment de l'évolution des technologies dans le domaine des transports maritimes. Tel est le cas en particulier pour les matériaux de construction des navires.

En effet, dans sa version initiale, la directive ne s'appliquait, par exemple, qu'aux navires en acier et matériaux équivalents, mais elle n'a pas été mise en œuvre de la même manière dans tous les États membres, et ce au mépris des règles de sécurité.

La proposition clarifie donc le champ d'application de la directive en ce qui concerne la définition de l'aluminium en tant que matériau équivalent et résistant autre que l'acier, et ce afin de parvenir à des normes de sécurité élevées et communes pour tous ces navires.

Il s'agit donc ici d'élever le niveau de sécurité pour les navires à passagers, et il y a lieu de réserver un accueil favorable à cette initiative européenne.

Helga Stevens, *rapporteur voor advies commissie LIBE*. – De richtlijn van 1998 was de eerste Europese wet rond de veiligheid van passagiersschepen in de EU. Het doel is niet alleen te verzekeren dat de veiligheid van passagiers op passagiersschepen niet in gevaar wordt gebracht door het toegestane maximum aantal passagiers te overschrijden, maar de richtlijn bepaalt ook dat opsporings- en reddingsoperaties na een ongeval efficiënt dienen te verlopen.

Deze richtlijn wordt nu geactualiseerd. In de Commissie burgerlijke vrijheden, justitie en binnenlandse zaken volgde ik dit dossier op en diende ik een aantal amendementen in. Ik ben blij dat vele van mijn voorstellen zijn opgenomen in de definitieve versie, aangenomen door de Commissie vervoer.

Zo werd naast gegevensbeschermingsbeginselen ook de verplichting opgenomen om de nationaliteit van een opvarende mee te delen aan de kapitein van het schip. Op die manier kan bij ongevallen sneller betrouwbare informatie aan verwanten bezorgd worden.

Daarom werden de identificatieprocedures vereenvoudigd. Identificatie neemt altijd tijd in beslag en dus hoe sneller, hoe beter voor ongeruste familieleden.

Wim van de Camp, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Ik wil op de eerste plaats mijn collega Cláudia Monteiro verontschuldigen, die schaduwrapporteur was voor twee van deze verslagen.

Uit de belangstelling voor dit debat zou je niet afleiden dat het hier om een groot maritiem dossier gaat. Er zijn verschillende aspecten die wij vanavond bespreken, die rechtstreeks het werk van de interne markt beïnvloeden. Een interne markt op maritiem gebied, en dat is voor Europa van groot belang.

Inderdaad allereerst de veiligheid van de schepen en de passagiersschepen. Een groot onderwerp, helaas met een paar ongelukken in het verleden. En als we buiten Europa kijken, zien we nog veel van die ongelukken.

Tweede element is inderdaad de automatisering en de registratie. Mevrouw Stevens zei het al: betere veiligheid voor de passagiers, dat ze weten waar ze aan toe zijn.

Het derde onderwerp is de inspectie. Wij moeten oppassen in Europa dat we niet te veel overlapping van inspecties hebben. Met het laatste voorstel worden de inspecties versimpeld, vereenvoudigd en verbeterd.

Tot slot de service aan de burgers. Dat is toch een belangrijk onderdeel van deze drie verslagen. Men weet sneller waar men aan toe is. Men weet sneller wie er aan boord is en dat zal wederom de veiligheid bevorderen.

Tot slot dank aan de rapporteurs, de schaduwrapporteurs, maar ook aan de trialogen die toch soepel zijn verlopen voor deze technische dossiers. We brengen de veiligheid en de ontwikkeling van "Maritiem in Europa" toch wel weer een stap vooruit.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowny Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! (Chociaż szkoda, że nie ma dzisiaj pani komisarz Bulc z nami, bo mam kilka ciepłych słów dla niej, co się rzadko zdarza.) Tragiczne wydarzenie, jakim była katastrofa promu Costa Concordia, było impulsem do usunięcia istniejących nieścisłości i różnic w interpretacji przepisów dotyczących bezpieczeństwa na statkach pasażerskich, z których korzysta co roku blisko 400 milionów osób. Pozytywnie więc należy ocenić działanie Komisji mającej na celu doprecyzowanie wielu przepisów, szczególnie jeśli chodzi o zagadnienia związane z konstrukcją statków pasażerskich.

Warto pochwalić nowe ramy prawne dla przyspieszenia cyfryzacji procesu rezerwacji biletów i rejestracji pasażerów. Szybki dostęp do danych osobowych podróży jest niezwykle ważny ze względów bezpieczeństwa, także w trakcie akcji ratunkowych. Należy docenić również elastyczność proponowanych rozwiązań, które wprowadzą racjonalne okresy przejściowe oraz istotne wyłączenia, na przykład dla statków pasażerskich o długości do 24 metrów.

Z pełnym przekonaniem popieram przyjęcie tego pakietu i mam nadzieję, że szybko przyniesie on wymierne efekty.

Gesine Meissner, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar in Vertretung von Frau Bulc! Es ist tatsächlich so, dass nicht nur der Unfall der Costa Concordia ausgelöst hat, dass wir uns hier im Parlament mit der Schiffssicherheit befassen, sondern eben auch andere Schiffsunglücke, die da gewesen sind. Es war einfach an der Zeit, die Schiffssicherheit auch bezüglich Materialien und Digitalisierung auf einen neuen Stand zu bringen, und das ist hiermit passiert.

Das ist natürlich sehr, sehr wichtig, weil sich die Schifffahrt immer größerer Beliebtheit erfreut. Es geht ja nicht nur um Schiffe, auf denen Fracht transportiert wird, sondern vor allen Dingen um Passagierschiffe und Fähren. Da ist es wirklich sehr notwendig, dass wir jetzt eine Lösung gefunden haben, die nicht nur aktuell den Gegebenheiten angepasst ist, sondern auch weniger Bürokratie bedeutet, Vermeidung von Doppelungen mit sich bringt, also gleichzeitig auch eine bessere Rechtsetzung bedeutet. Das ist das, was die neue Kommission angestrebt hat. Das begrüßen wir sehr, und deswegen unterstützen wir als Parlament das auch sehr.

Malta ist ja eine Seefahrernation. Unter maltesischer Ratspräsidentschaft ist das noch verhandelt worden. Und die Malteser sind nicht mehr da, aber das ist auch ein sehr großer Erfolg gewesen. Darum noch mal Glückwunsch an alle, die daran beteiligt waren!

James Carver, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, a constituent of mine, Sally Lloyd, contacted me in relation to a family tragedy four years ago when her brother, Richard Fearnside, disappeared while travelling on a ferry. The lack of CCTV cameras on the ferry passenger decks left his family with many unanswered questions, not knowing whether Richard suffered an accident, took his own life, or was possibly even pushed overboard. His name is added to an increasing list of missing ferry and cruise ship passengers and I am humbled to be able to support his family's campaign for mandatory CCTV and thermal imaging cameras on all ferries operating from British and EU ports. Nearly 100 000 people have now signed their 'Change.org' petition and tonight I formally urge all international institutions to act accordingly on this important matter. All the bereaved ask for is a degree of closure. Surely that is not unreasonable?

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι αλλαγές που προτείνονται, όπως και οι ισχύουσες οδηγίες, κινούνται στη γραμμή ενίσχυσης της κερδοφορίας του εφοπλιστικού κεφαλαίου. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις της, όπως αυτή των ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ, σε συνέχεια των προηγούμενων, αναθέτουν τους ελέγχους ασφάλειας πλοίων, επιβατηγών και εμπορικών, σε ιδιωτικές επιχειρήσεις-νηγώνιμονες, συνδεδεμένες με τους εφοπλιστές και άλλα τμήματα του κεφαλαίου. Αυτές «πουλάνε» διάτρητα πιστοποιητικά αξιοπλοίας σε υπέργηρα και υποσυντήρητα «σαπάρια» του εφοπλιστικού κεφαλαίου, με μειωμένες οργανικές συνθήκες, εξοντωτικές συνθήκες εργασίας των ναυτεργατών.

Με τον τρόπο αυτό η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις συγκαλύπτουν τα εφοπλιστικά εγκλήματα, που κοστίζουν ζωές και προκαλούν περιβαλλοντικές καταστροφές, όπως αυτή πρόσφατα στην Ελλάδα στον Σαρωνικό με το ναυάγιο του γεμάτου μαζούτ δεξαμενόπλοιου. Απαιτείται εδώ και τώρα αποζημίωση όλων των πληγέντων.

Οι λαοί μπορούν να βγάλουν συμπέρασμα: το καπιταλιστικό κέρδος και το σύστημα που το υπηρετεί είναι ασύμβατα με την ασφάλεια της ζωής επιβατών και πληρωμάτων, την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, τις λαϊκές ανάγκες για σύγχρονες, φθηνές, ποιοτικές μεταφορές.

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Wenn wir von der Argumentation des Vorredners ausgehen, ist es wirklich schlüssig, dass es notwendig ist, die Sicherheitsvorschriften gerade für die Fahrgastschiffahrt, für Roll-on/Roll-off-Schiffe immer wieder zu aktualisieren. *Safety of Life at Sea* – das ist das SOLAS-Abkommen. Dem müssen wir natürlich nachkommen. Da sind auch die Berufsgenossenschaften, die für die Crews zuständig sind, da stark hinterher, damit die Arbeits- und Lebensbedingungen auf den Schiffen immer weiter verbessert werden.

Aber in besonderer Weise schauen wir natürlich auch auf die Passagiere, und die Passagiere müssen so schnell wie möglich registriert werden, wenn sie auf ein solches Schiff gehen. Diese Daten sollten digitalisiert sein. Sie sollten – auch wenn ein solches IT-System nicht an Bord befindlich ist – über das automatische Schiffsidentifikationssystem auch dem jeweiligen Hafen, in den dieses Passagierschiff einläuft, übermittelt werden. Denn gerade in schwierigen Situationen – wenn Suche und Rettung angesagt ist, das heißt, wenn sich dort Seeunfälle anbahnen – müssen die Rettungsmittel zur Verfügung stehen, müssen natürlich auch landgestützte Rettungseinheiten so schnell wie möglich zu einem solchen Passagierschiff kommen können. Wir haben vorhin gerade vom Kollegen Riquet – bei dem ich mich für seine gute Arbeit, die er geleistet hat, noch mal herzlich bedanken möchte – ganz konkrete Beispiele dazu gehört.

Die Schiffskonstruktion spielt natürlich auch eine ganz entscheidende Rolle, die sich auch immer weiterentwickelt. Estonia: Was war denn die Ursache für dieses unglaubliche Schiffsunglück? Die Bugklappe hat sich nicht vernünftig geschlossen, und es kam Seewasser in den Laderaum hinein, eine freie Oberfläche, und binnen kurzer Zeit ist diese Fähre gesunken und 800 Menschen sind ums Leben gekommen. Solche Dinge müssen wir darauf haben. Ob nun Aluminiumkonstruktionen oder Stahlkonstruktionen das Richtige sind – ich glaube, beides funktioniert sehr gut.

Und bei den Hochgeschwindigkeitsfähren ist es natürlich auch notwendig, dass die Antriebsleistung entsprechend ist, auch bei den anderen Fahrgastschiffen, damit Manövrierfähigkeit da ist, die Ruderanlage in Ordnung ist, die Rettungsmittel da sind. So können wir im Prinzip auch die Zukunft des Seeverkehrs in Europa gestalten.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, uno dei compiti che ci poniamo come legislatori è quello di verificare l'impatto delle norme che proponiamo e, nel caso, successivamente di revisionarle per renderle più snelle. Ed è proprio questo che avviene con le normative che riguardano la sicurezza delle navi passeggeri.

La semplificazione, oltre che andare incontro alle mutate esigenze del settore, è il mezzo che ci permette di ottenere anche una maggiore trasparenza e di rendere più sicure tali navi. Sono quindi assolutamente d'accordo sull'esenzione, per le imbarcazioni al di sotto dei 24 metri, dal campo di applicazione della normativa e anche sull'equiparazione dell'alluminio e materiali equivalenti all'acciaio. Per quanto riguarda le ispezioni, dal 1999 a oggi, molte cose sono cambiate e quindi è opportuno rafforzare tale regime, combinandolo con la normativa del 2006.

Infine, per il regime di registrazione dei passeggeri a bordo delle navi, sono d'accordo su un invio tempestivo dei dati, ovvero 15 minuti dalla partenza della nave dal porto, per mezzo di un sistema elettronico comune. Casi tristemente noti di naufragi e incendi avvenuti a bordo e in cui molte persone hanno perso la vita in questi anni, magari non si sarebbero potuti evitare, ma conoscere il numero dei passeggeri a bordo, in maniera tempestiva e l'eventuale presenza di persone con particolari esigenze di mobilità, ci avrebbe forse aiutato a salvarne di più.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, prijedlozi koje donosi ovaj paket mjera učinit će sustav sigurnosti za putničke brodove jednostavnijim, modernijim i učinkovitijim. I Komisija i izvjestiteljica zauzeli su fleksibilan stav prema manjim plovilima kraćim od 24 metra i manjim brodarima koji uglavnom obavljaju kratku domaću plovidbu kraću od 20 nautičkih milja.

To je dobar pristup jer neće otežati poslovanje manjim brodarima, ali će svejedno podići razinu sigurnosti putnika. Načelo proporcionalnosti u ovakvim je slučajevima važno primijeniti kako ne bismo pretjerano opteretili male prijevoznike i učinili ih nekonkurentnima, što bi dovelo do velikih prometnih izazova i gubitka radnih mjesta.

Slažem se s izjaviteljicom kako je iznimno važno uzeti u obzir zaštitu podataka putnika i da oni moraju biti automatski uništeni nakon što ispune svoju svrhu. Manipulacije podacima moramo izbjeći želimo li pridobiti povjerenje putnika i brodara u novi sustav.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, quiero agradecer a la señora Aiuto el trabajo que ha realizado en este complicado informe, porque esta propuesta añade garantías de seguridad a los pasajeros de transporte marítimo y porque clarifica los requisitos que deben respetar los buques durante su proceso de construcción. Además, detalla sus condiciones de estabilidad y mejora las medidas de protección contra incendios.

El acuerdo, que se aplicará para los barcos de más de 24 metros de eslora, refuerza la eficacia de la legislación porque los nuevos estándares que define favorecen una interpretación uniforme. La lógica consecuencia es un refuerzo de las garantías de seguridad y más posibilidades de control.

El acuerdo resuelve también el problema que suscitaba el plazo previsto inicialmente para la derogación de esta Directiva en relación con los barcos de aluminio, un problema grave para uno de los Estados miembros. La solución encontrada permite aparcar esta exigencia solo para los barcos actualmente en construcción o para los encargos de que dispongan los astilleros, para los que ya existan contratos de financiación. En todo caso, estos buques quedarán sujetos a la normativa nacional sin menoscabo de sus condiciones de seguridad.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, this is without doubt an important package of legislation, which aims to clarify the current EU passenger ship safety regulatory framework and to allow for a simple and clear application of that framework. This will ultimately contribute to a higher standard of safety for passengers, which we all welcome.

This proposed revision will simplify rules and minimise administrative costs, as well as making sea travel safer. It is important that we maintain EU rules where necessary and proportionate and ensure that those rules are applied correctly and transparently. This text achieves the right balance in this regard. Additionally, the proposal looks to prevent any clash of duties and inconsistencies between various related pieces of legislation, which is positive, and I welcome it.

It is important that passenger ships are subject to frequent systematic inspections. This revision makes a much-needed update to EU passenger safety legislation and brings our laws in line with the evolving demands and limitations of modern safety standards. The proposal prioritises efficiency and frequency of inspections conducted by national administrations without unnecessarily restricting ships' commercial operations. With 23 coast Member States and four island Member States, passenger ships play an important role in EU citizens' mobility. This makes safety regulations in this area all the more important.

Janusz Zemke (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Katastrofa statku wycieczkowego Costa Concordia była efektem poważnego błędu kapitana tego statku, a nie wadliwych przepisów dotyczących bezpieczeństwa statków pasażerskich, jak to tutaj w dyskusji starało się nam kilka osób zasugerować. Proponowane zatem przez Parlament Europejski i Radę zmiany prawne nie muszą dokonywać rewolucji w materii prawnej. Celem nowych dyrektyw na szczęście nie jest tworzenie nowych reguł prawnych, lecz ich uporządkowanie i uproszczenie. Wydaje się, że rodzi to szansę na utrzymanie jak najwyższego poziomu bezpieczeństwa przy jednoczesnym ograniczeniu biurokracji. Przepisy prawne muszą być jasne i muszą gwarantować jak najwyższą jakość materiałów do budowy statków, wysoką jakość nawigacji i profesjonalizm załogi. Jeśli spełnimy te warunki, to jest szansa na bezpieczne podróżowanie statkami.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι μετακινήσεις με πλοία είναι ιδιαίτερα σημαντικές στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. 400 εκατομμύρια επιβάτες διακινούνται, εκ των οποίων 120 εκατομμύρια επιβάτες σε εγχώριες μετακινήσεις. Αν λάβουμε υπόψη και τα πλοία κρουαζιέρας, αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι πρόκειται για μεγάλο αριθμό συμπολιτών μας οι οποίοι μεταφέρονται με πλοία.

Ως εκ τούτου, πρέπει να έχουμε αυξημένα πρότυπα ασφαλείας για τα επιβατηγά πλοία και φυσικά και για τα οχηματαγωγά και τα ταχύπλοα. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να εμμένουμε στο θέμα της ασφάλειας. Πρέπει η όποια απλοποίηση διαδικασιών να μην είναι εις βάρος της ασφάλειας, πρέπει να σταματήσει η διαδικασία όπου σε ορισμένες χώρες, συμπεριλαμβανομένης και της Ελλάδος, δίνονται περιέργα πιστοποιητικά αξιοπλοίας σε «σαπάκια». Είχαμε την περίπτωση της βύθισης του «Αγία Ζώνη II» που κυριολεκτικά μόλυψε τον Σαρωνικό και αποδεικνύεται ότι χρειάζονται αυστηρότερες προδιαγραφές, γιατί το βασικό είναι η προστασία των επιβατών και όχι φυσικά η κερδοφορία των επιχειρήσεων και των εφοπλιστών. Αυτό είναι πάρα πολύ σημαντικό.

Τέλος, η καταγραφή των στοιχείων των επιβατών πρέπει να πραγματοποιείται, αλλά με τέτοιο τρόπο που να προστατεύονται τα προσωπικά δεδομένα. Αυτό είναι επίσης ένα ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό θέμα.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le tre proposte di direttiva sulla sicurezza delle navi passeggeri mirano ad obiettivi comuni, che sostanzialmente sono quelli di migliorare la legislazione in materia di trasporto marittimo, standardizzare le procedure di sicurezza e introdurre l'utilizzo di tecnologie digitali nella gestione dei flussi passeggeri.

Il lavoro di razionalizzazione della normativa attraverso il REFIT va focalizzato sull'eliminazione delle incertezze tutt'oggi presenti, concernenti, ad esempio, la classificazione delle zone di rischio in mare, le ispezioni di sicurezza e la registrazione digitale dei dati dei passeggeri e offrendo strumenti efficaci pensati per gli operatori del settore e le autorità, nel rispetto dei dati sensibili dei passeggeri.

A questo proposito, è importante che si valorizzi il ruolo e le competenze dell'EMSA, l'Agenzia per la sicurezza marittima, che negli ultimi anni sta assolvendo a compiti complessi e delicati, soprattutto nel bacino del Mediterraneo. Il 2017 è l'Anno marittimo europeo: non c'è occasione migliore per dare una nuova spinta al settore, valorizzando il trasporto marittimo come parte essenziale dell'economia dell'Unione europea.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, doresc să felicit raportorii pentru toate cele trei rapoarte. Sunt rapoarte complexe, sunt rapoarte tehnice și, cu atât mai mult, merită să fie felicitati pentru faptul că au reușit să meargă în direcția propusă de Comisie, dar, sigur, să aducem și îmbunătățiri.

Ca membră a Comisiei TRAN, dar și IMCO și LIBE, am încercat să țin cont de toate cele trei atribuții ale comisiei: protecția consumatorilor, protecția datelor, siguranța cetățenilor.

Pentru că nu am timp, vreau să mă ocup de primul raport și să o felicit pe Daniela Aiuto. Propunerea Comisiei privind modificarea directivei este binevenită pentru creșterea standardelor de calitate, dar și pentru recunoașterea reciprocă a certificatelor de siguranță ale navelor.

Susțin raportul, sunt justificate excepțiile de la aplicarea acestei directive și le susțin. Este clarificată în raport clasificarea zonelor maritime în funcție de riscurile pentru nave care funcționează într-o anumită zonă a mării. Pentru că, așa cum spuneam, sunt și membră a comisiei IMCO, am privit acest raport și din perspectiva protecției pasagerilor. Cred că standardele de siguranță trebuie aplicate de toate statele membre.

Pentru abordări locale, specifice, scutirea navelor de anumite cerințe, de exemplu, trebuie ca statul membru să notifice Comisia. Siguranța și condițiile de viață și de muncă la bord sunt extrem de importante, iar aceste trei rapoarte aduc o îmbunătățire a siguranței și a vieții, precum și a muncii la bord până la urmă.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário Andriukaitis, o debate de hoje inscreve-se num momento crucial para o setor marítimo, uma vez que este ano celebramos o Ano Marítimo Europeu. Esta proposta diz respeito à necessidade de manter padrões elevados em matéria de segurança para os navios de passageiros na União e resulta do balanço realizado pela Comissão sobre a qualidade da legislação existente relativa à segurança dos navios de passageiros, incluindo consultas aos Estados-Membros e às partes interessadas.

Senhor Comissário, este balanço demonstrou que certas ambiguidades das disposições jurídicas produziram leituras divergentes por parte das autoridades nacionais e por isso, a presente proposta propõe alterações para colmatar estas divergências.

Caros Colegas, a segurança dos passageiros e das tripulações tem que ser a principal prioridade e preocupação de todos nós e, muito particularmente, da Comissão e dos Estados-Membros. Senhor Comissário, os passageiros e as tripulações têm que se sentir seguros e viajar com confiança a bordo das embarcações de passageiros na União Europeia.

Quero congratular os colegas relatores, especialmente a colega Aiuto, por este relatório que acredito permitirá ajudar à execução, monitorização e aplicação das regras nos Estados-Membros e, por conseguinte, contribuir para a manutenção de um alto nível de segurança global e reformar a dimensão social e laboral do pessoal marítimo a bordo dos navios.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, με το πρόσχημα της ασφάλειας των επιβατών που ταξιδεύουν με επιβατηγά πλοία από και προς λιμένες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, το Συμβούλιο και το Κοινοβούλιο πρότειναν να τροποποιηθεί η ισχύουσα οδηγία. Η πρόταση είναι να καταγράφονται ηλεκτρονικά, ψηφιακά δηλαδή, τα δεδομένα των επιβατών. Είναι γεγονός ότι η ασφάλεια είναι πολύ σημαντικό θέμα και πρέπει να το προσεγγίζουμε με προσοχή και υπευθυνότητα. Η ασφάλεια όμως δεν εξασφαλίζεται με το να καταγράφουμε τα δεδομένα των επιβατών· εξασφαλίζεται με το να χρησιμοποιούμε σύγχρονα πλοία, να επιβιβάζουμε και να αποβιβάζουμε γρήγορα τους επιβάτες και να υπάρχουν, ενδεχομένως, κάμερες σε διάφορα σημεία των πλοίων και των λιμανιών.

Αντιθέτως, η ψηφιακή καταγραφή των προσωπικών δεδομένων των επιβατών ενέχει τον κίνδυνο αυτά να υποκλαπούν, να αποτελέσουν αντικείμενο επεξεργασίας από αναρμόδιους ή και από εγκληματίες και να χρησιμοποιηθούν για παράνομες δραστηριότητες. Για αυτό ακριβώς το λόγο, θεωρώ ότι η ψηφιακή καταγραφή των δεδομένων των επιβατών εξυπηρετεί μόνο διαδραστικούς σκοπούς και δεν έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία ούτως ώστε να την επιδιώξουμε και να την αποδεχθούμε.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Vytėnė Povilaitė, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of Commissioner Bulc, I would like to thank the Parliament and, in particular, all three rapporteurs and the shadow rapporteurs for their work on these files and for their constructive approach which facilitated reaching an agreement with the Council. Thank you so much.

On safety rules and standards, we are sending a clear signal to our citizens travelling on board passenger ships in EU waters that their safety is our priority. I wish to reiterate that the Commission's services, with the assistance of the European Maritime Safety Agency, are currently focusing on developing guidelines for small passenger ships. We will also duly respond to the Parliament's call to assess the need for common European requirements for sailing ships and ship carrier tenders.

Concerning the legislation proposal, we are ensuring that the competent authorities have immediate access to accurate data on persons on board in case of emergency, and that they can therefore deal with any accident more effectively. I am sure that you will continue to fully support our efforts to further digitalise maritime transport and to enhance the single window for reporting formalities. This is where the Commission is committed to proposing revised legislation on reporting formalities by next April, which will establish a harmonised European maritime single window environment.

The new rules on inspections will ensure that the respective regime brings value for money for all parties concerned. Besides the cost savings, it removes the unnecessary duplication and complexity of existing regimes, which had developed over time and resulted in overlapping requirements spread across different pieces of legislation. The new rules will facilitate implementation, monitoring and enforcement.

I am sure that you will continue to fully support our efforts to further improve, simplify and modernise maritime legislation, and Commissioner Bulc looks forward to our future cooperation.

Daniela Aiuto, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ringrazio il Commissario per l'apprezzamento per il lavoro svolto, l'attestazione di stima e ringrazio anche tutti i colleghi, anche quelli che sono giustamente già andati via. Questo dossier, quando è stato votato in commissione, ha avuto pressoché l'unanimità e quindi, un po' da come si è evoluta la discussione e da come sembrano andare le cose, mi auguro che anche domani ci sia un'evoluzione positiva perché, appunto, ne va della sicurezza dei cittadini europei e quindi credo che vada riconosciuto il valore dell'ottimo lavoro svolto.

Grazie ancora anche agli altri relatori dei due dossier, perché comunque abbiamo lavorato di concerto ed è stato veramente un piacere lavorare con due colleghi di questa caratura.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, para nosotros está claro que son tres informes muy importantes, pero no han debido de generar mucho entusiasmo en la Cámara. En cualquier caso, sí que voy a responder a la intervención de nuestro compañero, que ha hablado de que la seguridad de los buques no se consigue con el registro. Evidentemente, estamos hablando de una directiva que va a mejorar la recopilación de los datos para que la búsqueda y el salvamento sean efectivos en caso de accidente. Por lo tanto, tenemos que centrar los argumentos en esta Directiva y en este contenido.

Respecto al miedo que usted tiene, hablaba usted del posible abuso que se pueda hacer de esta información, debo decirle que aquí se va a aplicar el Reglamento (UE) 2016/679 —por lo tanto, votado muy recientemente por todos nosotros—, que habla de la protección de los datos personales y de la privacidad. Además, yo, en mi intervención, he hecho una referencia a que los datos van a ser eliminados, o sea toda la información, cuando esta ya no sea necesaria para los fines para los cuales han sido recuperada. Y va a ser borrada de manera automática y sin demora injustificada. Por lo tanto, todos los miedos que usted podía tener están cubiertos en este informe.

Nada más que decir, aparte de expresar mi agradecimiento a todos.

Y un último mensaje sobre el problema que tenemos siempre: nosotros hemos hecho el esfuerzo; espero que mañana el Parlamento efectivamente vote con una amplia mayoría, pero lo que necesitamos es que los Estados miembros cumplan las directivas en los plazos que están recogidos, porque esto sí va a contribuir a la mejora y la seguridad de todo el sector marítimo.

Dominique Riquet, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, ayant l'avantage et l'honneur d'être le dernier orateur de cette journée de session, je ne voudrais pas abuser de votre patience, ni de celle de la Commission ou des très nombreux collègues qui assistent encore à la séance.

Je voulais simplement remercier mes collègues et, comme l'a dit M^{me} Aiuto, cela a été un plaisir et un bonheur de travailler ensemble dans un excellent esprit, en collaboration étroite avec la Commission, et avec un Conseil, celui de la présidence maltaise, qui a été particulièrement efficace et qui, je crois, tenait absolument à ce que nous arrivions à une conclusion sous cette présidence.

Ce rapport sur les inspections des transbordeurs rouliers et des ferries, de même que l'entière du paquet sur la sécurité des navires à passagers, revu dans le cadre d'un REFIT, est l'illustration concrète des défis posés par le maritime et montre comment les institutions de l'Union européenne y répondent, en protégeant les citoyens, ce qui est, selon moi, la chose la plus importante.

Je pense que demain, Mesdames et Messieurs, nous aurons un vote massif sur ces trois rapports qui concluront cette amélioration significative de notre sécurité.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate conjunto.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

18. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

19. Schluss der Sitzung

(Se levanta la sesión a las 22.40 horas)

—

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 4. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3011)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	4
2. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll	4
3. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
4. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
5. Mittelübertragungen: siehe Protokoll	4
6. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	4
7. Vorbereitung der Tagung des Europäischen Rates (19./20. Oktober 2017) (Aussprache)	4
8. Zusammensetzung der Delegationen	36
9. Abstimmungsstunde	37
9.1. Übereinkommen zur Errichtung der internationalen EU-Lateinamerika/Karibik-Stiftung (A8-0279/2017 - Javier Couso Permuy) (Abstimmung)	38
9.2. Bestimmungen des Schengen-Besitzstands über das Visa-Informationssystem in Bulgarien und in Rumänien (A8-0286/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)	38
9.3. Automatisierter Austausch von Fahrzeugregisterdaten in der Tschechischen Republik (A8-0288/2017 - Maria Grapini) (Abstimmung)	38

Inhalt	Seite
9.4. Automatisierter Austausch daktyloskopischer Daten in Portugal (A8-0289/2017 - Jaromír Štětina) (Abstimmung)	38
9.5. Automatisierter Austausch daktyloskopischer Daten in Griechenland (A8-0287/2017 - Claude Moraes) (Abstimmung)	38
9.6. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe (A8-0167/2017 - Daniela Aiuto) (Abstimmung)	38
9.7. Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen (A8-0168/2017 - Izaskun Bilbao Barandica) (Abstimmung)	38
9.8. System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (A8-0165/2017 - Dominique Riquet) (Abstimmung)	38
9.9. Einwände gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (B8-0542/2017) (Abstimmung)	38
9.10. Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Entwurf eines Durchführungsbeschlusses der Kommission über die Zulassung des Inverkehrbringens von Erzeugnissen, die genetisch veränderte Sojabohnen der Sorte FG72 x A5547-127 enthalten, aus ihnen bestehen oder aus ihnen gewonnen werden, gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über genetisch veränderte Lebensmittel und Futtermittel (B8-0540/2017) (Abstimmung) .	38
9.11. Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Entwurf eines Durchführungsbeschlusses der Kommission über die Zulassung des Inverkehrbringens von Erzeugnissen, die genetisch veränderte Sojabohnen der Sorte DAS-44406-6 enthalten, aus ihnen bestehen oder aus ihnen gewonnen werden, gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über genetisch veränderte Lebensmittel und Futtermittel (B8-0541/2017) (Abstimmung) .	39
9.12. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (B8-0535/2017) (Abstimmung)	39
9.13. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (B8-0534/2017) (Abstimmung)	39
10. Stimmerklärungen	39
10.1. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe (A8-0167/2017 - Daniela Aiuto)	39
10.2. Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen (A8-0168/2017 - Izaskun Bilbao Barandica)	41
10.3. System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (A8-0165/2017 - Dominique Riquet)	41
10.4. Einwände gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (B8-0542/2017)	42
10.5. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (B8-0535/2017)	43
10.6. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (B8-0534/2017) .	45
11. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	46
12. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	46
13. Verfassung, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Grundrechte in Spanien vor dem Hintergrund der Ereignisse in Katalonien (Aussprache)	47
14. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	57

Inhalt	Seite
15. Der fiskalpolitische Pakt und seine Integration in den Rechtsrahmen der EU (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)	57
16. Vorstellung des Jahresberichts 2016 des Rechnungshofs (Aussprache)	73
17. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (Aussprache)	92
18. Über Interpol ausgestellte Haftbefehle (rote Ausschreibungen) (Aussprache)	110
19. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	116
20. Sicherheit auf Europas Straßen (Aussprache)	116
21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	124
22. Schluss der Sitzung	124

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 4. OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.08)

2. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (eingereichte Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll

3. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll

4. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll

5. Mittelübertragungen: siehe Protokoll

6. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

7. Vorbereitung der Tagung des Europäischen Rates (19./20. Oktober 2017) (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione concernente la preparazione della riunione del Consiglio europeo (19 e 20 ottobre)

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, in two weeks' time, the 28 Heads of State or Government will be meeting in Brussels. President Tusk has put four items on the agenda: migration, digital Europe, defence and external relations. Let me take them one by one.

The first item on the agenda is migration. Recent developments are encouraging. Illegal flows along the central Mediterranean route have gone down significantly. The determined action of the EU as a whole, together with the resolute bilateral efforts from Member States, is yielding results. Leaders will want to consolidate these trends and root them in a long-term vision. This is why we need to scale up our work with international partners. This is also why a strong partnership with countries of origin and transit is indispensable. Tackling the root causes is the only way to handle this challenge of irregular immigration in the long term.

Concerning the future Common European Asylum System, the European Council is expected to welcome progress already achieved and to call for further convergence to reach an agreement which strikes the right balance between responsibility and solidarity and ensures resilience to future crises.

Second on the agenda, leaders will come back to the digital vision for Europe, following the successful Digital Summit in Tallinn last Friday. Behind the concept of a digital Europe lies more than the digital single market. The leaders will of course also want to take stock of the progress made on the concrete legislative proposals under the digital single market but there is much more. The question today is quite simply whether Europe is gearing up to meet the challenges and opportunities of the digital revolution. This is a key challenge for the future of Europe. It has an impact on all aspects of our lives, be it our citizens, our businesses or our governments. Leaders already touched upon this issue last June. Digital was also the focus of the summit last Friday in Tallinn in which you, President Tajani, also participated. In October, the European Council will provide further guidance to ensure that Europe is well equipped for this transformational change.

Let me now turn to the third item on the agenda, defence. Leaders established a comprehensive work programme in December 2016. They moved the discussion further in June 2017 with additional guidance focused on Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), but also on EU battlegroups and the industrial dimension of EU defence. More has been achieved in the last year than in a decade. Leaders are keeping a close eye on progress to maintain this momentum. In October, they will review efforts to launch an inclusive and ambitious Permanent Structured Cooperation. Discussions are moving in the right direction. Leaders will want to push for a rapid agreement on that basis.

The last item on the agenda of the European Council is external relations. Leaders will discuss recent developments on the international stage. One of the topics for this debate will be relations with Turkey. It is a little too early to pin down the other topics which will require leaders' attention. I will therefore leave this open.

To conclude, I would also like to mention that leaders will meet as 27 in October as well. You discussed the latest state of play of the Brexit negotiations yesterday. You adopted a resolution and, as you know, a fifth round of negotiations is scheduled for next week. The European Council, under Article 50, will be the occasion for the 27 leaders to review the state of the negotiations.

Frans Timmermans, *vice-président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président en exercice du Conseil, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, il y a trois semaines, s'adressant à cette assemblée, le président Juncker a appelé, dans son discours sur l'état de l'Union, à savoir tirer profit d'une conjoncture qui, pour l'instant, nous est plutôt favorable.

Il est vrai qu'aujourd'hui, l'Europe bénéficie d'une reprise économique qui commence à se faire sentir dans tous nos États membres et d'un regain de confiance. De nouvelles opportunités s'ouvrent, et la balle est dans notre camp. Saisissons-la au bond car en réalité, il nous reste encore beaucoup à faire pour passer d'une amélioration économique passagère à une amélioration durable, qui sera réellement ressentie dans toutes nos régions par tous nos citoyens, y compris par les jeunes à la recherche d'un emploi.

Il nous reste encore beaucoup à faire pour passer d'un regain de confiance à une véritable adhésion à un projet d'avenir commun. Le prochain Conseil européen, d'ici dix jours, doit être l'occasion de faire quelques pas de plus dans cette direction, dans le même esprit d'urgence et d'énergie qui ressort des discours récents de Jean-Claude Juncker, d'Emmanuel Macron et d'Antonio Costa.

Nous devons maintenir fermement notre cap en répondant concrètement aux attentes et aux préoccupations de nos concitoyens, et en ne cédant rien sur nos valeurs, y compris le respect de l'état de droit.

Le moment est venu de nous fixer des objectifs ambitieux mais réalisables d'ici 2025 pour une Union à vingt-sept plus unie, plus forte et plus démocratique.

Honourable Members, the Europe we are working for each day is a Europe which protects its citizens, which empowers and defends them. The Digital Agenda which was at the heart of the discussions at the summit in Tallinn, and which will also be on the agenda for the European Council, is one example of where we really need to show concrete results.

Since the start of the mandate, this Commission has presented some 40 initiatives, 24 of which are legislative proposals. We have proposed action ranging from making sure high quality internet is available in public spaces for thousands of local communities, to measures to combat threats to cybersecurity and to ensure that personal data is as well protected online as it is offline. We have launched a discussion about how best to ensure that services provided through online platforms are effectively taxed.

It is now time to find agreement on the 18 legislative proposals which are pending here in this House and in the Council. I hope that we can see tiny progress in particular on the telecoms package, the revision of the Audiovisual Media Services Directive, and on our recent proposals on cybercrime.

The Commission would also like to see timely progress on the other new proposals made together with the State of the Union speech. Trade in particular is an area where urgent action is needed to take advantage of the momentum.

The European Council will also pay particular attention to migration. Last week, the Commission presented our views on how to ensure and consolidate the ongoing work on the European Agenda on Migration. We have identified where and what further efforts are needed in coming months. Particular attention must be given to stepping up returns and to resettlement, whilst the reform of the Common European Asylum System in Dublin now needs to be completed as soon as possible.

We must also continue our work with priority third countries and the Commission would like to see a concerted effort from leaders when it comes to the issue of financing, where we need to live up to our collective promises and we are living up to them today.

Finally, the European Council will also review progress on defence. The Commission is closely following the developments on Permanent Structured Cooperation. The Commission wants to incentivise greater cooperation in defence in line with the Treaty and stands ready to support it with the instruments at its disposal. For this, we need to ensure an early agreement on the proposed European defence industrial development programme.

Honourable Members, together we have more or less 18 months to finish the job and deliver on the 10 priorities on the basis of which this House approved the college in 2014. If we fail, this will be a collective failure. To the outside world it makes no difference whether we failed because the Commission made the wrong proposals, or Parliament or Council took too long. When we succeed, it will be our collective success. When we fail, it will also be our collective failure.

I set out in the road map for a more united, stronger and more democratic Union. Europe now has an opportunity to look further ahead. The road map sets out a path to March 2019 when our Union will sadly become a union of 27. It is in Sibiu, Romania, on the banks of the Cibin river in Transylvania, that we should reassert this Union and our confidence in our future together, a Union based on our values, a Union of equals, a Union able to deliver for its citizens on the things that matter the most.

We saw in Tallinn that there is now a real appetite amongst European leaders to move forward together, but we cannot wait until March 2019 to start the work and we cannot be bogged down in process, treaty changes or institutional wrangles in the meantime. That is why in the letter of intent, Jean-Claude Juncker and I laid out a concrete set of actions which are all achievable under the current treaties to prepare the Europe of 2025. I can assure you that we will continue to work alongside you every step of the way, starting with a social summit in Gothenburg where I hope we can proclaim the European Pillar of Social Rights. And then in December, with the euro area summit underpinned by concrete proposals to deliver a strong economic and monetary union and ensure the lasting stability and success of our European single currency.

This summit will be inclusive with the participation of those EU members whose intention is to introduce the euro before 2025. I know Jean-Claude is looking forward to organising the summit together with President Tusk. The Commission will then present its full package of proposals on the EMU on 6 December. For Dutch and Flemish people, I would say on St Nicholas day.

I trust that the Commission can count on the full support of this House as we implement the road map together. Let's use the next 18 months to deliver positive changes in the lives of Europeans and to set the course for a more united, stronger and more democratic Union for the future.

(Applause)

Manfred Weber, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident Herr Ratsvertreter, meine lieben Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Menschen erwarten von uns praktisches Handeln, und ich bedanke mich sowohl beim Ratsvertreter als auch bei Frans Timmermans für diese Grundrichtung, dass wir uns jetzt um die Themen kümmern, die die Menschen umtreiben.

Ich finde auch wichtig, was Frans Timmermans gemacht hat, nämlich zunächst über die Erfolge zu reden. Wir können die Menschen nur von unserem Projekt überzeugen und mitnehmen, wenn wir über Erfolge reden. Das Wachstum im Euro-Währungsgebiet ist stark und solide, wir haben die Arbeitslosigkeit auf Vorkrisenniveau zurückgebaut, die Verschuldung im Euro-Währungsgebiet, in der Europäischen Union ist – verglichen mit den Amerikanern, mit den Japanern, mit anderen großen Währungsräumen – gering.

Und auch bei der zweiten großen Aufgabe, nämlich bei der Lösung der Migrationsfrage, sind wir stark vorangekommen. Im Vergleich zum Jahr 2015, als wir die großen Migrationsströme hatten, wurden die Zahlen an der Außengrenze um über 80 % reduziert. Europa liefert, Europa kommt voran, und wir können die großen Aufgaben gemeinsam anpacken.

Und auch gestern ist uns ein großer Erfolg gelungen: Der Kollege Salvatore Cicu hat mit allen Verantwortlichen der anderen Fraktionen einen neuen Investitionsschutz und neue WTO-Regelungen gefunden – in Partnerschaft mit allen Parteien. Wir wollen Welthandel, aber wir Europäer wollen uns auch verteidigen können, wenn unfairer Welthandel praktiziert wird. Große Schritte für diesen Kontinent! Ich glaube, dass wir zu Recht davon reden dürfen, dass Europa liefert.

Beim Rat geht es um die Aufgaben, die jetzt vor uns liegen. Das Topthema ist sicher die große offene Wunde des Kontinents, und das ist nach wie vor die Migrationsfrage. Trotz Erfolgen liegt noch keine legislative Lösung vor, wie wir die Migrationsfrage dauerhaft lösen. Für die EVP-Fraktion ist klar, dass Europa helfen muss. Wir müssen Menschen, die aus dem Bürgerkrieg fliehen, Obdach anbieten. Auf der anderen Seite brauchen wir Kontrolle und auch einen starken Staat, der den Schlepperbanden und der organisierten Kriminalität das Handwerk legt. Deswegen müssen wir am weiteren Ausbau des Grenzschutzes arbeiten. Warum stärken wir nicht weiter Frontex – zum Beispiel mit dem Aufbau von weiteren Kapazitäten zur direkten Intervention an bestimmten Grenzen des Schengenraums?

Als Zweites brauchen wir die Kooperation mit den Vereinten Nationen. Der Vorschlag der Kommission von letzter Woche, ein Kontingent von 50 000 für die Neuansiedlung anzubieten, ist der richtige Weg. Durch die Vereinten Nationen kontrolliert, strukturiert Menschen in Not nach Europa holen, um ihnen dort eine bessere Versorgung nach humanitären Kriterien anzubieten, und auch Sicherheitskontrolle – das ist der richtige Weg.

Das Dritte, was wir klarstellen müssen, ist, dass die Asylfrage nicht zur Debatte steht. Asyl ist ein Grundrecht der Europäischen Union, das wir durch viele blutige Erfahrungen, die wir gemacht haben, erkämpft haben. Deswegen darf das Asylrecht in keinsten Weise zur Debatte stehen. Echte Hilfe ist dort nötig.

Und zu guter Letzt: Solidarität mit Afrika, Fluchtursachen bekämpfen. Europa wird nur auf Dauer in Frieden leben können, wenn auch Afrika eine vernünftige Zukunft hat.

Das zweite große Thema ist die digitale Agenda. Da bedanke ich mich für die vielen Vorschläge, die die Kommission auf den Tisch gelegt hat. Die Dringlichkeit ist offensichtlich. Europa kommt nur voran, wenn wir gemeinsam agieren, um die Skaleneffekte für die Wirtschaft zu erzielen. Uns muss die Balance zwischen dem Nutzen von Chancen und gleichzeitigem Implementieren unserer Werte gelingen. Für die EVP-Fraktion möchte ich deutlich machen, dass wir als Europäer schon die Aufgabe haben, diesem digitalen Binnenmarkt einen Rahmen zu geben, der von unseren Werten geprägt ist. Beispielsweise ist das Urheberrecht, das wir derzeit diskutieren, ein Wert, den wir erkannt haben. Wir müssen geistiges Eigentum schützen. Das muss auch in der digitalen Welt durchgesetzt werden, Prinzipien müssen durchgesetzt werden, weil wir nur so unsere Lebensart verteidigen werden.

Das weitere große Thema werden die Sicherheitspolitik und die Außenpolitik sein. Ich möchte bei der Außenpolitik noch zwei Punkte herausgreifen. Zum einen möchte ich für meine Fraktion volle Unterstützung für Federica Mogherini und die Kollegen im Außenbereich signalisieren, dass wir die Vereinbarungen mit dem Iran für existenziell halten. Es wäre eine katastrophale Entwicklung, wenn wir neben dem Nordkorea-Konflikt jetzt auch noch einen zweiten Atomkonflikt auf dieser Welt eröffnen. Was Europa dort mit dem Iran-Abkommen erreicht hat, ist Vorbild, dass wir nämlich diese Konflikte nicht krieglerisch, sondern auf diplomatischem Weg mit Abkommen lösen. Wir hoffen, dass Europa da eine klare Sprache spricht.

Zu guter Letzt möchte ich noch eine politische Anmerkung machen: Wir erleben ja unseren Dauerkampf gegen Populismus und Extremismus auf diesem Kontinent. Wir hatten positive Erfahrungen wie in Frankreich, wir hatten auch negative Erfahrungen wie jetzt beispielsweise in Deutschland, wo Populisten und Extremisten in Stärke wieder neu ins Parlament einziehen. Das heißt, die Debatte, der Kampf gegen diese Vereinfacher bleibt auf unserem Tisch.

Ich möchte nur eines äußern, und zwar, lieber Gianni Pittella, in Richtung der Sozialdemokratie, weil wir in der deutschen Erfahrung am Wahlabend vor einer Woche erlebt haben, dass sich die deutsche Sozialdemokratie von Beginn an jedem Gespräch darüber verweigert hat, eine Regierung zu bilden. Martin Schulz hat entschieden, sofort in die Opposition zu gehen. Ich glaube persönlich, dass es richtig ist, dass wir als Demokraten zunächst miteinander reden. Es kann das Ergebnis von Gesprächen sein, dass man in die Opposition geht, aber es ist nicht der Startpunkt, dass man in die Opposition geht. Ich spreche das hier an, weil wir das auch in den Niederlanden erlebt haben, weil wir das auch in Spanien erlebt haben, dass sich die Sozialdemokratie immer stärker der Verantwortung entzieht. Ich hoffe, dass sich das nicht durchsetzt.

(Beifall von der EVP-Fraktion)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, caro collega Weber non credo sia opportuno discutere delle elezioni tedesche, mentre si sta discutendo il prossimo Consiglio europeo. Ma se proprio vuole una risposta su questo punto, io ho salutato favorevolmente la decisione del collega Schulz di prendere atto della conclusione della grande coalizione in Germania, così come abbiamo fatto qui nel Parlamento europeo alcuni mesi prima. Questo non significa che noi non si possa collaborare: una cosa è tenere una dialettica forte, vera tra la destra e la sinistra, i conservatori moderati e progressisti, e una cosa è fare le grandi coalizioni.

Ieri abbiamo dimostrato, sulla questione del riconoscimento della Cina come economia di mercato, che il Parlamento, pur mantenendo questa dialettica forte, può lavorare insieme e abbiamo ottenuto un grande risultato, difendendo le industrie europee e i lavoratori europei. Io voglio ringraziare i compagni e i colleghi del gruppo socialista che hanno avuto un ruolo cruciale, a cominciare dalla collega Mosca, dal collega Maurel e dal presidente Bernd Lange.

Ho ascoltato parole confortanti da parte di Frans Timmermans, primo Vicepresidente, che sono in linea con la relazione che ha fatto il presidente Juncker e voglio dire alla Commissione europea: i socialisti sono pronti, sono stati sempre pronti! Quando si tratta di agire e di fare, noi siamo pronti; quando si tratta di avere coraggio, noi siamo pronti! Non siamo pronti e siamo contro, quando si mette la testa sotto la sabbia. Bisogna sfidare il Consiglio, insieme, in modo costruttivo, ma in modo chiaro.

Sull'immigrazione noi aspettiamo risposte convincenti. Il fatto che si siano ridotti i flussi dell'80% non può tranquillizzarci sull'eliminazione delle cause profonde dei flussi migratori; anzi, dobbiamo utilizzare questa fase per affrontare le cause profonde che spingono migliaia e migliaia di persone a venire in Europa e non dobbiamo scambiare le cause con gli effetti e sbagliare la terapia. La terapia non può essere quella di costringere l'Europa e l'Africa in una fortezza. La terapia non può essere quella di alzare nuovi muri! Lo dico al Consiglio e lo dico alla Commissione: l'idea di creare nuove frontiere, di rafforzare le frontiere interne agli Stati europei, di prolungare il tempo a queste frontiere è l'arma sbagliata per affrontare un problema serio che è quello del terrorismo.

È legittimo per gli Stati membri dotarsi di strumenti efficaci nella lotta al terrorismo ma non illudetevi di curare un problema serio con l'aspirina! L'aspirina può far venire l'ulcera allo stomaco: le frontiere interne possono abolire una grande conquista dell'Europa che è la libera circolazione delle persone all'interno dell'Unione europea. E attenzione a non trasformare gli *hotspot*, che sono uno strumento per la gestione emergenziale dei flussi, in uno strumento di gestione ordinaria dei flussi migratori. Non è giusto, non è utile, non è efficace fare queste cose.

Nei giorni scorsi abbiamo rivolto un appello al presidente Tusk perché riconosca finalmente il Consiglio a Bulgaria a Romania e, nei tempi dovuti anche alla Croazia, il diritto di far parte dello spazio di Schengen ma anche perché si riformi finalmente il regolamento di Dublino: il Parlamento sta facendo il suo lavoro – come sempre – e il Consiglio deve iniziare il suo!

Qui non possiamo dire: «L'Europa non funziona». No! La Commissione ha formulato una proposta e il Parlamento sta occupandosene. È il Consiglio che non ha aperto il file! Questa è la verità. Vogliamo dirlo chiaro e forte: quando l'aprirà il Consiglio, dirò: «Bravo Consiglio, fai bene, stai facendo bene» e dobbiamo dire con chiarezza che quella norma che prevede che sia il primo paese di arrivo a farsi carico di tutti i fardelli e di tutte le responsabilità è contraria allo spirito di unità e di solidarietà che ci deve essere nell'Unione europea.

Infine, l'Africa. Ne ha parlato anche il collega Weber: mi fa piacere, perché si sta diffondendo quest'idea che l'Africa è una nostra priorità. Due anni fa è stato lanciato il Fondo fiduciario a La Valletta; bene, grande lungimiranza della Vicepresidente Mogherini e della Commissione europea. Ma gli Stati membri che hanno alimentato quel fondo sono stati pochissimi: anche qui lo dico al rappresentante del Consiglio: se ne faccia carico! L'Africa non è uno slogan: l'Africa è un tema che richiede risposte. Bene il piano di investimenti di 44 miliardi: ma quegli investimenti devono essere veicolati e finalizzati agli interventi che realmente creano sviluppo e creano posti di lavoro, perché questo serve per dare un futuro alle ragazze e ai ragazzi africani e anche a ridurre i flussi migratori.

Io sono sempre più convinto che dall'Africa passi la soluzione delle nostre sfide globali e locali. Vorrei concludere con una frase bellissima di Fatou Diome. «Bisogna smetterla con l'ipocrisia: saremo ricchi insieme o annegheremo tutti insieme».

Ryszard Antoni Legutko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, it is highly probable that the Council will start with everyone congratulating Chancellor Merkel on her electoral victory. Indeed, Ms Merkel should be congratulated. Firstly, because she won for the fourth time, which is remarkable; secondly, because she won after having made the worst political decision of her life: opening the European borders without bothering to consult anyone. So much for solidarity, by the way.

Yet, while Ms Merkel's victory was a success, it should also be viewed in equal measure as a wake-up call for Europe. After all, the two main parties scored the worst results for years, something that only months ago happened in the French elections too. For many years, Germany epitomised what political science calls 'consensual politics'. We had a sample of it a while ago in what Mr Weber said, to put it crudely, a sort of united front in which everyone tends to speak with one voice. But if in a country like this – and Germany is just such an example, because of its remarkable political culture – we see some cracks in the hitherto monolithic structure, perhaps we are witnessing the beginning of some kind of pluralism underway in the western part of the European Union.

As for me – and on this point I believe I differ from most of you – I believe it is a good thing and long overdue, considering the stifling atmosphere of European politics, the absence of any serious debate, and the routine bullying of anyone who dares to voice a different opinion. The Council will take up for the nth time the problem of immigration – perhaps the most misrepresented, mystified, lied about, contaminated to the core by political correctness, problem of recent decades.

The good thing is that the infamous mandatory relocation scheme is now history. It is dead. It is dead and gone. It is an ex-relocation scheme. But from the very beginning this was a bad idea. This was a stillborn idea, and whatever progress we have achieved in controlling immigration – and we have made some progress – this scheme had nothing to do with it whatsoever. Will this idea disappear? I am not sure. Experience has taught us that in the European Union bad ideas die hard.

There has been a lot of talk about the new European asylum policy, and it is a good thing that we should be working on it and making it better and better. President Macron mentioned it in his speech too, but President Macron's speech was not really the exposition of a strategy as a lot of us expected it to be. It was more – I apologise for the comparison – like a pep talk, but beautifully delivered as always.

So whatever shape this asylum policy – and everything that surrounds it that is related to immigration – will take, it should not repeat the errors of the past. The asylum policy on immigration is not a matter for a majority to decide. There has to be a consensus of all Member States. Otherwise, we will be back in the situation where the big guys do what they want, they can get away with anything and they order the others are not so strong to obey. That has to be over. Demographic policy is too subtle and too complex a problem to be imposed by the European political and ideological bulldozers.

Of course, anything is possible so it can be predicted that remarks like mine will be ignored and the EU will sink more deeply into the sea of troubles, because we are already quite deep in the sea of troubles. There should be some hard thinking rather than going in the same direction with the same remedy – whatever happens, more of the same. That is not a solution. I have serious doubts if the coming Council will start rethinking, but I really hope they do. I do hope against hope.

(Applause from the ECR Group)

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I hope for two things for this European Council. The first has been already echoed by other colleagues, namely that there can be a breakthrough in the migration package. In fact, if there is one role the European Council can play, it is on that because they have to give political direction. So a conclusion by the European Council, where they push forward the package as it has been introduced by the Commission is what we need now, because we can continue to complain about Dublin, which is not a European system of asylum, we can continue to complain about the lack of legal migration ways in Europe, and we can continue to complain about the bad management of our outside borders, but the proposals are there. We need a European Council which in fact now steers the Ministers of the Interior responsible in that direction. So that is my first wish.

My second wish for this European Council is to further take up the work on the reform of the European Union. My fear is that – you know how it is – there are elections in France, elections in the Netherlands, elections in Germany and then it is like– I cannot say a pudding, because that is a British word I think – a soufflé, that is maybe a French word, and then suddenly we go back to business as usual. Business as usual for the last 18 months before the European elections. That cannot be the case. I think that President Juncker made an enormous effort on this reform of the European Union with his State of the Union speech, I think that President Macron made an enormous effort with his important intervention on the future of the European Union, and we hope to see other leaders express themselves on this. I do not even see big differences. The whole discussion about the difference between the Macron speech and the Juncker speech is that one is saying we are going to do it in one circle and the other is saying that we are going to do it in two circles. But on the content, we agree and not only do they agree, but also this House because let me recall that, at the beginning of this year, we adopted three important reports on the future of the European Union which were completely in line with President Juncker's State of the Union speech and which were completely in line with the proposals of the French President.

(Applause from ALDE and Vert Groups)

So it is the moment – and that is my message to the Council – to pick this up and not to lose the momentum because it is true what Manfred Weber said. It is not the end of nationalism. It is not the end of populism. It will be the end of nationalism and populism if we are capable of reforming the European Union, changing the European Union and breaking the deadlock that exists. In that sense, I think there are doubts – the Liberals in Germany, will there be an obstacle, yes or no? – but I can tell you one thing. I know the FDP. It is a genuine pro-European party still anchored in the legacy of Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in favour of a European defence union, in favour of European transnationalism, and in favour of European capacities in investigation and intelligence. If there is a difference in the point of view on the eurozone, we know that there are rules to be applied in the eurozone and we want a new governance of the eurozone. Well, the one is not in contradiction with the other. You need both of them. You need a new governance to have a sustainable eurozone and to apply these rules.

So my last wish – and this is not for the Council President but more for us – is what is the role we are going to play in this? It is this House that has to take the lead on this reform and this debate on the European Union. So my plea to you – and I know that you are in favour – and also to the plenary is let's organise here, every session, this debate on the future of the European Union. Secondly, let's ask, through our Committee on Constitutional Affairs, to have regular meetings with the national parliaments because we are not going to reform the European Union without the help of these national democracies and these national parliaments. Finally, let's put the three institutions together – the Commission, the Council, the Parliament – in such an endeavour.

(Applause from the ALDE Group)

Dennis de Jong, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, after the Second World War, Europe was the driving force behind the many treaties that were concluded to protect human rights. The Geneva Convention on the Protection of Refugees was one of these. Now the European Council is to talk about stemming illegal flows on all migration routes. That same Geneva Convention states very clearly that illegal entry can never be held against refugees, so this type of language undermines respect for the elementary rights of refugees. I call upon the Council to rephrase the wording, putting the emphasis again on Europe's tradition of caring about people, and to make sure that the refugees are protected.

In the field of human rights, ambition is lacking more generally. The Commission is making no progress whatsoever with the ratification by the EU of the European Convention on Human Rights, nor with the European Social Charter. When, First Vice-President Timmermans, can we expect to see a breakthrough here?

In a few weeks' time, in Geneva, the UN will again discuss a convention on business and human rights. The Commission and the Member States are not driving forces there, indeed they are reluctant to participate, whereas we all know about inhuman practices, in closing factories, or in mines, and in Africa and developing countries generally. If we want dignity and stability, we need to invest in respect for human rights, including by our companies, instead of in arms and defence.

We all saw the tragic pictures of the attack in Las Vegas. It is cynical that, after such an attack, arms sales in the USA go up – for so-called self-defence. This is a vicious circle: the more arms people buy, or a state buys, the more attacks. Let us learn from this. Instead of speaking about more defence, let us stick to the European tradition of promoting human rights, including through radical disarmament treaties. We should not fall into the Trump vicious circle. Let us be different, let us be ourselves and let us invest in human rights and not in arms.

(Applause from the left)

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'été dernier, sur une colline du sud de la Bourgogne, j'ai rencontré une vingtaine de jeunes Hongrois qui m'ont fait part de leur désarroi face à une société, une Europe, de plus en plus polarisées, coupées en deux par des lignes de fracture, apparemment infranchissables, qui divisent jusqu'au sein même des familles.

Je pense qu'ils voyaient juste car, petit à petit, notre Union semble gagnée par ce cancer de l'esprit, qui voudrait réduire nos sociétés à une opposition entre «eux» et «nous», tel un paysage sans nuances, figé, en noir et blanc, le royaume des murs réels et virtuels qui, lorsqu'ils ne sont pas en béton ou en barbelés, sont dressés par des mots ou des actions. Dans un tel monde, nous sommes sans cesse appelés à choisir notre camp.

Les exemples ne manquent pas. Rappelez-vous la crise de l'euro, qui séparait l'Europe entre États créanciers, par définition vertueux en tout, et pays débiteurs, nécessairement coupables de tout.

Sur la question des travailleurs détachés, il y aurait les vilains États membres profiteurs, et les gentils États membres victimes du dumping social. Après les attentats terroristes, je me rappelle un Premier ministre français assénant qu'expliquer c'était déjà un peu excuser, ou ici même, que refuser la mise en surveillance généralisée de notre société équivaldrait à se rendre complice des tueurs.

Enfin, tout appel à ce que l'Europe prenne ses responsabilités pour faire plus et mieux dans l'accueil des migrants se voit aussitôt dénoncé comme un insupportable appel d'air ou une menace pour notre identité.

Chers collègues, ce qui s'est passé dimanche dernier à Barcelone est le résultat de cette logique binaire, selon laquelle il faut choisir son camp. Face à l'insatisfaction manifeste d'une majorité de citoyens de Catalogne quant au statut de leur région, le gouvernement de Madrid a choisi le déni. Au fil des ans, ce refus obstiné de tout dialogue a mené à des actions unilatérales, certes, mais pacifiques, dont rien, absolument rien, ne peut justifier la répression violente à laquelle nous avons assisté.

Et ne nous y trompons pas, parce que vous me demanderez quel est le lien avec le Conseil ? Ne nous y trompons pas! Ce qui se joue en Catalogne en ce moment n'est pas seulement une affaire espagnole, elle touche l'Union européenne en ses fondations, car qu'est-ce que l'Union européenne, si ce n'est une décision consciente et résolue de résoudre nos conflits et nos différends par le dialogue, la négociation et le compromis plutôt que par la violence.

Notre devise n'est-elle pas «l'Unité dans la diversité», une diversité que nous choisissons de voir comme un atout, plutôt que comme un handicap? C'est tout cela qui se trouve aujourd'hui mis en cause dans la crise constitutionnelle et politique espagnole. C'est pour cela, Monsieur Juncker ou Monsieur Timmermans, c'est pour cela, Monsieur Tusk, que vous ne pouvez pas rester spectateurs.

Qui peut comprendre le silence et l'inaction de la Commission? Qui pourrait comprendre, Monsieur Maasikas, que le Conseil européen se réunisse la semaine prochaine en ignorant une crise qui, bien plus que le Brexit, peut mettre à mal l'esprit même de l'intégration européenne?

S'il s'agit, Monsieur Timmermans, d'une affaire intérieure, c'est bien d'une affaire intérieure à l'Union européenne. S'il faut intervenir pour aider à renouer le fil du dialogue entre l'Espagne et la Catalogne, c'est à l'Union européenne de s'en charger. Et il y a urgence. N'attendons pas que d'autres démarches unilatérales s'engagent, qui rendraient encore plus difficile une solution négociée.

Chers collègues, c'est la crédibilité même de l'Union européenne et de son projet qui est ici en jeu.

Beatrix von Storch, *im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Eine spannende Debatte – es ist insbesondere spannend, wer hier über was redet. Herr Weber hat angefangen, über den Deutschen Bundestag und die Regierungsbildung zu reden. Herr Weber, wir freuen uns schon sehr darauf, wenn Sie mit den Grünen gemeinsam Politik machen und dann im nächsten Jahr in Bayern in die Wahlen gehen. Wir warten das mit Spannung ab, wie Sie eine harte Linie in der Sache Migration durchsetzen wollen. Wir betrachten das mit großem Vergnügen und Interesse.

Der Rat redet über Digitales, über Verteidigung, über Außenbeziehungen und dann in etwa 45 Sekunden auch noch über das Thema Migration am Rande. Das unterscheidet Sie von Herrn Timmermans, der so lange über Migration nicht geredet hat. Sie haben geredet über den Aufschwung, der überall zu sehen ist, über die Werte, die wir bewahren wollen, über die digitale Agenda, über Cybersicherheit, Breitbandausbau, Handel. Aber das alles entscheidende Thema, an dem sich die Zukunft der Europäischen Union entscheiden wird, wird von Ihnen so gut wie überhaupt nicht berührt. Aber so ist das eben.

Wir sind im Jahre zwei nach dem Ausbruch der dramatischen Flüchtlingskrise, und es sind immer noch zwei Fragen offen. Erstens: Wie verhindern wir den Zugang weiterer Millionen nach Europa? Zweitens: Wie führen wir die zurück, die illegal hierher gekommen sind? Wir müssen feststellen: Die Balkanroute ist immer noch nicht dicht. Diejenigen, die sich dafür engagieren, werden auf das Härteste attackiert. Das ist Herr Orbán, der wird angegriffen und nicht verteidigt. Gleichzeitig unterstützen wir Mazedonien – nicht Mitglied in der EU, nicht Mitglied im Schengen-Raum. Dort bauen wir Zäune, dort unterstützen wir den Zaunbau. Aber wenn Herr Orbán das macht, dann wird er kritisiert. Wir machen Deals mit Warlords überall auf der Welt – am Bosphorus z. B. mit Herrn Erdoğan. Das ist der völlig falsche Weg.

Die australische Lösung haben wir immer noch nicht. Wir müssen wie Frankreich die Europäische Menschenrechtskonvention aussetzen, damit wir die Flüchtlinge im Mittelmeer retten, aber dann eben zurückschleppen können und nicht herüber nach Europa. Wir machen stattdessen Deals auch noch mit libyschen Warlords – alles kehrt. Herr Juncker hat davon gesprochen, dass 36 % der Illegalen abgeschoben, zurückgeschoben werden – eine erstaunliche Zahl! In Deutschland sind es etwa 5 %. Wie Herr Juncker auf 36 % kommt – keine Ahnung.

Flüchtlinge – das gerät völlig in Vergessenheit – haben nur einen temporären Schutz, ein temporäres Bleiberecht, und wenn in den Staaten, aus denen sie kommen, die Möglichkeit besteht, zurückzukehren oder Schutzzonen dort einzurichten, damit sie dorthin zurückkehren können, dann müssen wir das unterstützen. Darauf sollten wir uns konzentrieren. Und ich rede hier natürlich von Afghanistan und von Syrien.

Aber, Herr Timmermans und der Rat, reden Sie weiter über Breitbandausbau. Dann werden wir sehen, wie sich diese Union weiterentwickelt. Wenn Sie die richtigen Themen irgendwann anfassen, kommen wir vielleicht voran. So nicht!

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, le sommet européen qui aura lieu prochainement sera l'occasion de traiter plusieurs sujets majeurs qui concernent les nations de l'Union européenne.

Je commencerai par la question de l'immigration. M. Timmermans nous explique qu'il veut aujourd'hui renforcer encore Frontex. Mais Frontex est une illusion! Il y a quelques semaines, j'étais à Varsovie où j'ai visité le site de cette agence. On nous a très bien expliqué que, finalement, l'essentiel du travail des gardes-côtes et des gardes-frontières consistait à arraisonner les bateaux de migrants clandestins pour sécuriser leur approche dans les eaux territoriales italiennes, avant de les laisser s'installer sur le continent européen.

Jamais l'Union européenne n'a eu la moindre volonté d'empêcher ou de freiner l'immigration clandestine. Jamais elle n'a mis en œuvre les moyens efficaces pour assurer le retour dans leur pays d'origine des immigrés illégaux. D'ailleurs, aujourd'hui, quand on évoque la question de l'asile, on nous dit qu'il faut harmoniser les règles, et cette harmonisation ira évidemment dans le sens de critères toujours plus souples, qui font que l'asile est aujourd'hui devenu une filière à part entière de l'immigration clandestine. Cela permet à des millions de personnes d'arriver sur le continent européen sans aucune perspective d'en être un jour expulsées. D'ailleurs, ce qui est très révélateur dans nos débats, c'est qu'on n'évoque jamais les moyens techniques que pourraient mettre en œuvre l'Union européenne ou les nations européennes pour organiser le retour de ces migrants dans leur pays d'origine.

En ce qui concerne la défense, la coopération structurée permanente que vous voulez renforcer correspond à une volonté désormais affichée de supprimer la souveraineté des nations. On sait qu'il y a des disparités considérables entre les différents États membres, que certains ont des ambitions et des forces militaires, et d'autres, beaucoup moins. C'est lié à la fois à l'histoire et aux capacités propres de chaque nation. Il est évident que les intérêts en matière de défense sont totalement différents, parfois divergents, et même contradictoires. Il faut l'accepter. Et si on force l'harmonisation ou la coopération renforcée en vue d'une hypothétique défense européenne, on aboutira dans le domaine de la défense, comme dans tous les autres domaines, à l'impuissance collective de nos nations.

Le numérique est évidemment un sujet très important, mais commençons d'abord par évoquer à nouveau les questions industrielles. L'Union européenne n'a aucune stratégie en matière industrielle. Nous voyons bien avec l'affaire Alstom-Siemens que nous sommes soumis à la fois aux intérêts américains – M. Macron a été en première ligne pour dépecer Alstom d'une partie de ses activités – et principalement aujourd'hui, aux intérêts allemands, qui sont défendus au détriment de ceux des autres nations.

En matière économique, Monsieur Timmermans, vous nous dites que la reprise est là, ce qui est faux. La vérité, c'est que vous tenez compte uniquement des points de croissance et des perspectives de croissance. Mais la croissance correspond à votre conception de l'économie. Elle sera peut-être au rendez-vous, et sans doute dans des proportions plus limitées que vous ne le dites, mais elle relève de l'économie financière, ce qui ne correspond pas nécessairement à une augmentation de l'emploi, ni à une amélioration du pouvoir d'achat. C'est-à-dire que la distorsion sera toujours plus grande entre votre conception purement financière de l'économie et l'économie réelle qui, elle, continue de souffrir.

Quant à votre volonté d'harmonisation fiscale ou sociale, elle aboutira, là encore, à un nivellement par le bas. Quand on voit les différences de salaires qui existent entre l'Europe orientale et l'Europe occidentale, cette harmonisation serait bien évidemment désastreuse.

Pour conclure, je voudrais répondre à M. Weber. Monsieur Weber, vous vous présentez comme un grand démocrate, mais souffrez la démocratie, acceptez le verdict des urnes et respectez les six millions d'Allemands qui ont voté pour nos alliés de l'AfD. Respectez les 90 députés de ce parti au Bundestag, qui ont dit et disent encore clairement qu'ils n'en peuvent plus de la folle politique que vous avez soutenue et que M^{me} Merkel a menée, qui a consisté à organiser l'invasion migratoire de l'Europe.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, certains des discours que j'ai entendus, qu'ils émanent du Conseil, de la Commission ou d'autres orateurs, me rappellent de vieux souvenirs parce que je suis député dans cette institution depuis bientôt 28 ans.

Cela fait 28 ans que j'entends dire qu'en matière de migration, il faut s'attaquer aux causes, mais le problème, c'est qu'on ne s'est jamais attaqué aux causes et que l'on continuera de ne pas s'y attaquer.

Que signifierait le fait de «s'attaquer aux causes» dans la situation actuelle? Cela serait par exemple s'occuper de l'abominable régime qui sévit en Érythrée, qui contraint la population en particulier masculine de ce pays à venir en Europe pour échapper au service militaire à perpétuité. Mais pour cela, il faudrait bien sûr que nous entrions en relation avec l'Union africaine. S'attaquer aux causes, cela voudrait dire ne pas abandonner une grande partie des côtes libyennes aux trafiquants, mais cela supposerait évidemment une action concertée. Ce n'est pas seulement, comme l'a excellemment fait remarquer l'orateur précédent, envoyer des bateaux récupérer les candidats à la migration, après avoir reçu un appel téléphonique des trafiquants signalant que le bateau se trouve à deux ou trois milles des côtes, comme me l'a confié personnellement un amiral français responsable de la force armée européenne sur place.

Et pour conclure, j'aurais encore beaucoup de choses à dire, Monsieur le Président, vous avez laissé les autres orateurs dépasser leur temps de parole.

Un mot en matière de relations extérieures...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Präsidenten, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Es ist gut, dass auf der Tagung des Europäischen Rates in zwei Wochen über die Zukunft der Europäischen Union gesprochen wird und dass wir nicht nur aktuelle Krisenbewältigung betreiben müssen. Wir müssen den Blick nach vorne richten und konkret sagen, was die Europäische Union zu leisten hat. Ich sage Ja zu einem starken, effizienten Europa, wo wir gemeinsame Lösungen brauchen – beim Kampf gegen den Terrorismus, bei der Verteidigung, bei Asyl und Migration und dem internationalen Handel.

Ja, wir brauchen ein gemeinsames europäisches Asylrecht, einen effektiven Grenzschutz. Wir müssen biometrisch gesicherte Ausweisdokumente einführen und Flüchtlinge zurückführen, die kein Bleiberecht haben, und wir müssen uns auch in Afrika engagieren. Ich finde es sehr gut, dass einer der Schwerpunkte beim Europäischen Rat das Thema Migration und Asyl ist. Ich möchte den Kollegen von der rechten Seite, die uns aufzeigen wollen, dass wir nichts geliefert hätten, nichts geleistet hätten, noch einmal in aller Deutlichkeit die Zahlen in Erinnerung rufen. Ich weiß gar nicht, warum wir diskutieren, wenn keiner zuhört. Es hat doch sowohl Vizepräsident Timmermans als auch der Vertreter des Rates deutlich darauf hingewiesen: 80 % weniger Flüchtlinge, weniger Zuwanderung als noch vor einem, vor zwei Jahren. Wenn das kein Erfolg ist, dann muss ich mir schon mal die Frage stellen: Wo leben wir eigentlich? Wir haben die Schmuggler bekämpft, wir haben die Menschenschmuggler vor Ort bekämpft, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Und wenn wir mit den afrikanischen Staaten sprechen, ist doch das die richtige Lösung. Das ist nicht alles einfach und gut, aber – Entschuldigung – wir gehen dieses Problem in Europa zusammen konsequent an. Ich wehre mich gegen diese Populisten, die behaupten, alles sei Mist, es sei nichts geleistet worden. Wir können schon ein Stück weit mit Stolz auf das blicken, was wir auch hier in diesem Hause zusammen beschlossen haben.

Wir sind noch nicht am Ende des Weges, aber wir sind auf einem guten Weg. Und ich erhoffe mir, dass auch von dem Ratsgipfel jetzt in 14 Tagen noch mal entscheidende Schritte ausgehen. Ja, wir lösen unsere Probleme hier in Europa gemeinsam! Das macht uns stark, und das lässt mich auch hoffnungsfroh auf die Zukunft in diesem gemeinsamen Europa blicken.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Richard Sulík (ECR), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Zuerst eine Anmerkung: 80 % Erfolg oder 80 % weniger Migranten sind zwar sehr schön, aber wir gehen von einer Zahl von einer Million aus, also bleiben 200 000. Das ist wahrscheinlich ein Rekordjahr. Angenommen es kämen zehn Millionen Migranten, dann hätten Sie sogar 98 % Erfolg. Also ich würde nicht zu viel mit den Prozenten argumentieren.

Meine Frage lautet: Sind Sie dafür, dass die Europäische Union außerhalb der Union Lager, Flüchtlingszentren errichtet, wo die Asylanträge bearbeitet werden?

Der Präsident. – Ich möchte darauf hinweisen, dass für solche Fragen 30 Sekunden und für die Antwort auch 30 Sekunden vorgesehen sind. Damit wir im Zeitplan bleiben, werde ich das ohne weiteres Klopfen jeweils streng einhalten.

Herr Kollege Sulík, es geht natürlich nicht, dass Sie 24 dieser 30 Sekunden für ein Statement verbrauchen. Diese blauen Karten sind für Fragen da, nicht für Statements.

Angelika Niebler (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Europa basiert auf gemeinsamen rechtsstaatlichen Grundsätzen, und im Gegensatz zu anderen bin ich der Meinung: Wer Asylrecht beanspruchen kann, darf das auch in Anspruch nehmen und ist auch bei uns in Europa willkommen.

Zu Ihrer konkreten Frage: Wir müssen das Thema Flüchtlinge, Migration an den Außengrenzen lösen, und wenn wir – wie aufgezeigt – es auch schaffen, hier Transitzentren in afrikanischen Staaten zu errichten, dann, glaube ich, ist das der richtige Weg.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, the time to wait is over. This is the time to deliver. Mr Verhofstadt is no longer here, but I would like to pick up the issue he raised. We do have a road map for the European Union, and we could force this road map through cooperation between the three institutions. Recently, three speeches of three leaders – Juncker, Macron and Antonio Costa – have showed important overlaps from different political sensitivities.

This means something, but let me be clear about the real meaning of delivery. If we want to deliver on the migration crisis once and for all, we need to prepare a much stronger partnership for African development, and we need to create a real European asylum agency. If you want to deliver better social equality in Europe in this digital age, we need to have a strong pillar to ensure that everybody in employment can count on a decent labour contract and access to social protection. If you want to close these divergences which we still have in Europe, you need to have a community budget and a Eurozone budget working for convergence.

And finally, if you come with the argument that we don't have the money for this, I'm sorry. The money is there if you add taxation properly on big corporations which are operating in the single market and benefiting from it, particularly in the digital economy. So we have the solutions; we need to start delivering, and the next European council should be a step for this.

Roberts Zīle (ECR). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Es novēlētu Padomei izmantot šo relatīvi labo ekonomisko stāvokli Eiropas Savienībā un mazāk politizācijas pēc lielām vēlēšanām, bet, lai nekļūtos, bieži vien ir jāatzīst kļūdas, kas ir pieļautas, un šeit Padomes dienas kārtībā, manuprāt, ir piemēri, kas varētu novērst šīs kļūdas.

Par migrāciju. Lai jūs varētu veidot jaunu migrācijas politiku, bez šaubām, jums ir jāatzīst kļūdas, kas ir pieļautas, un, ja mēs paskatāmies Eiropas Komisijas preses paziņojumā, ir minēts, ka 23 000 patvēruma meklētāji pārmitināšanas rezultātā ir atraduši sev mājas Eiropas Savienībā. Tā nav taisnība!

Manā valstī, Latvijā, visi, kas bija šajā pārmitināšanas shēmā atbraukuši uz Latviju, ir prom no Latvijas, un tas noticis ļoti daudzās valstīs. Līdz ar to ir jāatzīst kļūda, ka šādi tas nestrādā.

Maasikas kungam un Igaunijas prezidentūrai novēlu turpināt piekto brīvību: datu plūsmas uzstāšanu, kamēr vēl tas ir iespējams.

Un, visbeidzot, mani ļoti pārsteidza *Timmermans* kunga nolasītais, ka Eiropa sargā savus pilsoņus. Šodien Barselonas ielās tas skan mazliet neticami.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, the biggest threat to Europe at the moment is not migration or terrorism. The biggest threat to the European Union is paralysis, stagnation and a lack of courage. There are plenty of good ideas on the table, but there is little progress.

The biggest test will be to see if the European Union is willing and able to uphold its own values, which we have laid down in the Treaties, when they are under pressure. Some grand visions for the future have been laid out by Mr Juncker, Mr Macron and others, and some react by saying these are too romantic: if you have vision you need to see an eye doctor, it is unrealistic, it is a fantasy. I actually think it is totally unrealistic to imagine we can tackle the challenges of the 21st century with a model that was perfect for the 19th century but is totally unsuitable for the world of today. I think that is a fantasy and that is unrealistic.

(Applause)

Finally, on migration, I hear what the Council is saying but Parliament has been doing its homework on the asylum package. We are waiting for ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el 1 de octubre se mostró de forma clara y contundente el anhelo de Cataluña por decidir su futuro en libertad y sin candados. La respuesta del Gobierno fue contundente: violencia policial y vulneración de derechos fundamentales en la Unión Europea, con el único fin de que los catalanes y las catalanas no pudieran votar, demostrando una deriva autoritaria muy preocupante.

El Gobierno y sus aliados se han negado sistemáticamente a ofrecer una salida democrática y pacífica al pueblo de Cataluña. Esto ya no es solo una cuestión de «independencia sí o no», sino de «democracia y libertades civiles sí o no». Europa tiene que tomar partido, defendiendo a las decisiones legítimas del pueblo de Cataluña, abriendo un diálogo entre iguales, sin represión y sin candados, para construir una libre convivencia, democrática y solidaria.

Si las instituciones europeas no toman partido por el diálogo, se convertirán en parte del problema.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, sitting in the next European Council there will be a Member State President who has become a real problem and a source of shame for Europe. I am talking about Mr Rajoy, who is violating fundamental rights and European values in Catalonia. Last Sunday, he went as far as to order the Spanish police to repress, with dreadful violence, peaceful crowds who just wanted to vote. More than 800 citizens, voters, were injured by the Spanish police as a result of this irresponsible action.

Mr Timmermans, you are doing a great job when trying to defend fundamental rights in the European Union. Will you ask Mr Rajoy on what grounds did he violate the European Charter of Fundamental Rights? Will you help us to get mediation to resolve the situation in a democratic and peaceful way? When are you going to trigger Article 7?

If the European institutions keep saying that it is all about the law and nothing but the law, that it is an internal matter, you will deserve the world record for turning Catalan pro-European citizens into eurosceptics. Against all the difficulties and despite all the state repression, we voted, and we voted to be free. So, as we say in Catalan: *visca Catalunya lliure!*

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Carlos Iturgaiz (PPE), pregunta de tarjeta azul. – Al señor Solé, le preguntaría: a usted que se le llena la boca de libertad, de democracia... ¿Usted cree que dar un golpe de Estado en un país, ir contra la Constitución de este país, ir contra las leyes de este país es libertad? ¿Eso es democracia, por parte de los secesionistas, que usted está apoyando en Cataluña, señor Solé?

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Los golpes de Estado los dan los militares, no los votantes, no los votos, no las urnas. Defendemos las libertades fundamentales, las libertades de los ciudadanos y ciudadanas de Cataluña, que también somos ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la Unión Europea. Votar no es dar ningún golpe de Estado. Votar es democracia.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Po sekmadienio smurto Katalonijoje kalbėti apie klausimus, kurie numatyti eiliniame Vadovų Tarybos posėdyje, būtų ne tiktai kvaila, bet ir šventvagiška. Tarsi vaidintume, kad nieko neatsitiko.

Manau, kad ir mes Europos Parlamente, ir Vadovų Taryba pirmiausia turėtų pasisakyti demokratijos klausimu pradedant nuo to, kaip mes ją suprantame. Nuotraukos iš Katalonijos visam pasauliui parodė kitokią, iki šiol neįprastą demokratijos vaizdą. Sukrūvinti veidai, guminėmis kulkomis sužeisti žmonės, už plaukų tampomos moterys. Už tai, kad norėjo pasinaudoti viena iš esminių savo laisvių, demokratijos instrumentu – referendumu.

Veiksmais Katalonijoje akivaizdžiai pažeista Europos Sąjungos pagrindinių teisių chartija, Visuomeninė žmogaus teisių deklaracija, Europos žmogaus teisių konvencija ir daugelis kitų tarptautinės teisės normų.

Išdrįsiu vis tiktai paklausti, kuo tai skiriasi nuo 1956 m. Vengrijoje, nuo 1968 m. Čekoslovakijoje, nuo 1988 m. Lietuvoje ir nuo 1989 m. Gruzijoje, kai policija ir kariuomenė bananais, kastuvėliais ir tankais auklėjo demokratijos, laisvės ir nepriklausomybės siekiančias tautas.

Atsižvelgiant į situaciją dėl Ispanijos vyriausybės veiksmų...

(Pirmininkas nutraukė kalbėtoją)

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Herr Präsident, werte Damen und Herren! Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, dass wir uns hier inmitten der Haupt- und Schlüsseldebatte befinden und die bevorstehende Tagung des Rates debattieren. Auf der Tagesordnung steht das Thema nicht, das Europa eigentlich am meisten bewegen sollte: das Referendum in Katalonien. Ich will jetzt hier nicht über die verfassungsrechtliche Seite urteilen, weil es viel zu komplex wäre und die Zeit dafür auch nicht vorhanden ist. Aber wenn im Herzen Europas 900 Menschen mit Gummiknüppeln und mit Gummigeschossen davon abgehalten werden, eine Willenserklärung abzugeben, dann sage ich: Dann ist Feuer am Dach, und dann muss auch dringend gehandelt werden.

Dass gerade das Europäische Parlament, das immer als Erster irgendetwas verurteilt, sich immer zu irgendetwas äußert, hier die Stimme nicht erheben und eine Debatte darüber heute in die Nachmittagsstunden verlagern will, das ist nicht in Ordnung! Was auf der Tagesordnung des Rates steht, ist allerdings das Türkei-Thema. Gerade Erdoğan, der jetzt sagt, dass er gar nicht mehr in die Europäische Union möchte, ist für Sie immer noch nicht Grund genug, diese Debatte endlich abubrechen. Wir haben über fünf Milliarden verschwendet, sie angesichts einer katastrophalen Situation im Bereich Menschenrechte und Demokratie in Richtung Türkei zu bringen. Beenden Sie dieses Spiel mit der Türkei, und beenden Sie die Beitrittsverhandlungen.

Der Präsident. – Ich weise darauf hin, dass ich keine blauen Karten zulasse, wenn ich dem jeweiligen Redner wegen Überschreitung der Redezeit das Wort entzogen habe.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ανταγωνισμοί και συμβιβασμοί κρατών και μονοπωλίων, κλιμάκωση της αντιλαϊκής επίθεσης και των επεμβάσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, παντού με θύματα και πρόσφυγες για τα κέρδη τους, σηματοδούν κάθε Σύνοδο Κορυφής. Η λαϊκή δυσaréσκεια διογκώνεται στην Ελλάδα των μνημονίων· αλλά και στη Γαλλία του «αναμορφωτή» Μακρον, θυμίζοντας ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αλλάζει, αλλά μόνο προς το χειρότερο· στις εκλογές της πλούσιας Γερμανίας, όπου επιβεβαιώνεται το ΚΚΕ: η καπιταλιστική ανάπτυξη χτίζεται με λαϊκές θυσίες δίχως τέλος· στην Καταλονία με τη βάρβαρη καταστολή όπου οι εθνικισμοί των δύο πλευρών πυροδοτούνται από σύγκρουση μερίδων του κεφαλαίου.

Η ανησυχία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για τη συνοχή των κρατών είναι «à la carte». Η ίδια την αμφισβητεί αλλού υποδαυλίζοντας επικίνδυνες αλλαγές συνόρων (βλ. Βαλκάνια, Μέση Ανατολή). Όμως η λαϊκή δυσaréσκεια, εκφρασμένη είτε με εθνικισμούς είτε με ακροδεξιά μορφώματα, όπως το AfD στη Γερμανία, εγκλωβίζεται σε συμφέροντα άλλων μερίδων του κεφαλαίου, εξίσου αντιλαϊκών. Για να γίνει αποτελεσματική: πρέπει να στοχεύσει στην καρδιά του «θηρίου»: στην εξουσία του κεφαλαίου και στην ανατροπή της.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Agenda najbliższej Rady jest zróżnicowana. Ciężko to ocenić w ciągu jednej czy dwóch minut, ale łatwo jest zauważyć, że Rada zajmie się zarówno największym wyzwaniem współczesności, jakim jest migracja, jak i największą szansą, jaką jest wspólny rynek cyfrowy w przekroju globalnym. Migracja bardzo dzieli, rodzi napięcia, kontrowersje. Natomiast wspólny rynek cyfrowy jest rzeczą bezsporną, niekontrowersyjną.

Oczywiście wszystkie uproszczenia są mylące, bo chociaż rewolucja cyfrowa jest nieuchronna, to przecież różny stopień zaawansowania krajów członkowskich może stworzyć albo pogłębić Unię wielu prędkości w sensie gospodarczym. Natomiast migracja oczywiście dzieli i rodzi napięcia, ale jeżeli rozmawiamy o systemach relokacji – przykra sprawa dla mnie, z pokolenia Solidarności, z kraju milionów uchodźców i emigrantów, gdy widzę zachowania niektórych rządów w tej sprawie.

Natomiast jeżeli patrzymy na agendę najbliższej Rady, to nie widać tu jakichś wielkich kontrowersji czy spraw spornych, to są mianowicie sprawy wspólne, te elementy, które będą omówione na najbliższej Radzie: zatrzymanie szlaków nielegalnej imigracji, dodatkowe narzędzia pomocy dla krajów najbardziej zagrożonych, współpraca z organizacjami międzynarodowymi, współpraca z krajami pochodzenia imigrantów czy uchodźców i krajami tranzytowymi, wreszcie reforma systemu azylowego.

To są cele wspólne Europy i to w dodatku w dziedzinie, w której rodzą się największe lęki, w której dziś najbardziej potrzebujemy bezpieczeństwa w Europie, i okazuje się, że narzędzia poszczególnych krajów są niewystarczające. Trzeba szukać odpowiedzi europejskiej i tu właśnie rozstrzygnie się spór pomiędzy frakcjami europejskimi a europejskim populizmem i ksenofobią. Zatem należy życzyć dobrze tej części agendy najbliższej Rady.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Mr President, Schengen is the largest free travel area in the world and it is one of the major achievements of the European Union. It is an achievement that should be preserved, notably by including all Member States that wish to be integrated, if they already fulfil the criteria.

Unity is the most important element of the future of our Union. The Union today faces common cross-border challenges and threats, and it is of the utmost importance further to enhance police and judicial cooperation and to protect the external border of the Union more effectively. Therefore, I welcome the Commission communication last week, drawing conclusions from the implementation of the 'Back to Schengen' road map and proposing new steps for strengthening the Schengen area. If we want to strengthen the Schengen area and to enhance security cooperation and mutual trust between Member States, then it is more important than ever to open the Schengen area to Bulgaria and Romania immediately, as the Commission had proposed, and to Croatia once it has met all the criteria.

I call on the Council to act immediately on this proposal. Moreover, real progress in the fight against terrorism can be achieved only by working together towards effective security and defence cooperation and a Union in which both the external and internal dimensions are important. Therefore, I call for the immediate implementation of a consistent package for permanent structured cooperation (PESCO).

Ulrike Trebesius (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Sicherlich ein deutlicher Schuss vor den Bug der EU. Meine Hoffnung, dass man in Straßburg das Referendum in Großbritannien zum Anlass nimmt, um zu hinterfragen, was falsch gelaufen ist, wurde nicht erfüllt. Stattdessen will man die vermeintliche Chance nutzen, um einen Zentralstaat Europa zu installieren.

Deshalb bin ich besonders über die Zurückhaltung meiner deutschen Kollegen im Bundestagswahlkampf überrascht. Wenn Sie so sehr von der Richtigkeit einer europäischen Arbeitslosenversicherung überzeugt sind, liebe Genossen von der SPD, warum sind Sie dann damit in den letzten Wochen nicht offensiv umgegangen? Und wenn Sie von der Alternativlosigkeit von europäischen Finanzministern, den europäischen Steuern und europäischem Zentralismus überzeugt sind, liebe Genossen von der CDU und CSU, lieber Herr Weber, warum haben Sie das im Bundestagswahlkampf nicht thematisiert? Ich befürchte, weil Ihnen klar ist, dass man mit diesen Punkten in Deutschland keine Wahlen gewinnen kann. Deshalb ist es unlauter, was Sie nun hier in Straßburg tun, nämlich eine Transferunion zu unterstützen, ohne die deutschen Wähler über Ihr Vorhaben und die Konsequenzen aufzuklären.

Javier Nart (ALDE). – Señor presidente, la Unión Europea es una necesaria realidad entre naciones que, tras siglos de guerras fratricidas, entendieron que el camino era la paz, la unión en democracia. Y no hay democracia sin ley, y la ley, la Constitución, es el pilar que garantiza nuestros derechos, nuestra libertad, que todas las opiniones tengan su lugar en diálogo y no en confrontación.

Violar la Constitución es violar la democracia, los valores de la Unión Europea y el artículo 4 del Tratado de la Unión, que determina el respeto al orden constitucional a la integridad territorial.

En Cataluña, una mayoría parlamentaria, pero minoría en votos, ha violado el Estatuto de Autonomía y la Constitución española, para en sectaria irresponsabilidad intentar conseguir sus objetivos, fracturando en dos a la sociedad catalana.

Hans Kiesel, el referente del constitucionalismo, definió como golpe de Estado la subversión del orden constitucional fuera de las vías legalmente establecidas.

Esto es lo ocurrido en Cataluña, y Cataluña no es solo el domingo: fundamentalmente es antes y después del 1 de octubre.

No se trata solamente de un ataque contra la democracia en España, es también contra la Unión Europea: es una caja de Pandora.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, en el Estado español el régimen del 78 se hunde. Sus tres patas se rompen. El domingo se demostró que el Estado de las Autonomías no da respuesta a las aspiraciones de millones de catalanes y catalanas.

Ayer vimos una monarquía más rancia y peligrosa que nunca, y el sistema económico solo genera paro y pobreza. El Partido Popular quiere resucitar el régimen con «Arriba España», «Viva la Guardia Civil», sacando al Borbón a pasear y con porrazos. Y para esto, como para casi todo, cuenta con la inestimable colaboración del Partido Socialista y de una Unión Europea diseñada para que nada cambie y que, aún, a día de hoy, no ha condenado la violencia extrema de las fuerzas de seguridad españolas el domingo en Cataluña.

No hay solución con Mariano Rajoy en Moncloa, y por eso decimos: «Rajoy, dimisión». Pero, vamos más allá: no hay solución con este régimen. Que Cataluña sea el principio del fin de la monarquía y que abra las puertas a un nuevo modelo territorial, pero, sobre todo, que Cataluña sea lo que los catalanes y catalanas quieran que sea.

(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Señora Albiol, cuando usted habla del régimen del 78, ¿habla de esto? ¿Habla usted de la Constitución de 1978? ¿De la Constitución que votamos los españoles mayoritariamente, especialmente en Cataluña, y por la que nos dimos como forma política una monarquía parlamentaria, cuyo jefe de Estado es el rey? ¿Habla usted de este régimen? ¿Habla usted de la transición democrática después de 40 años de franquismo?

Por favor, explíqueme usted de qué habla, cuando se refiere a este régimen.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Sí, hablo del régimen del 78, del régimen heredero del franquismo, de una monarquía que no hemos votado. Nadie ha elegido a ese señor. No hemos podido votar y, además, el Gobierno de España siempre se ha negado a un referéndum sobre monarquía o república. La Constitución se ha demostrado ya caduca. Vayamos a un proceso constituyente y vayamos a una república federal.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, señores del Consejo, señor Timmermans, no pueden dejar de ver lo que está pasando en Cataluña. Ayer, muchísima gente volvió a salir a las calles pacíficamente para denunciar la violencia y para pedir que se les escuche. Ustedes deben escucharlos.

Tengo que decirle: deben condenar los actos de violencia que se produjeron. La actuación policial tenía orden judicial, pero el operativo del Ministerio del Interior vulneró derechos fundamentales reconocidos en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales, y usted tiene que decir algo, debe hacerlo.

Mire, tienen que ser muy conscientes de la situación actual. Si ustedes no intervienen —que es lo que ustedes deben hacer—, si no hay diálogo, vamos a una situación muy, muy preocupante.

En estos momentos, podemos ir a una declaración unilateral de independencia —que seguro es un error, pero que llevará a más represión por parte del Estado— o podemos abrir vías de diálogo.

Señor Timmermans, le pido en nombre de muchos catalanes y catalanas que hoy están preocupados en sus casas que abra vías de negociación y de diálogo. Es urgente, porque esto, señor Timmermans, también es un asunto europeo. Por favor, intervengan, faciliten el diálogo y respondan a lo que los catalanes están pidiendo estos días.

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Die Geschäftsordnung sieht ja vor, dass sich die Redner zum Tagesordnungspunkt zu äußern haben. Es wird heute Nachmittag eine Debatte zu dem Thema geben, das von vielen hier angesprochen wird. Aber die Tagesordnung des Rates sieht dieses Thema, über das hier viele reden, nicht vor. Also wäre es vielleicht nicht schlecht, wenn wir darauf achten würden, dass wir uns auf die Tagesordnung konzentrieren. Das ist nur eine Anregung für die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die jetzt demnächst sprechen.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Graf Lambsdorff! Ich habe die Sache mit Herrn Präsident Tajani erörtert. Sie haben natürlich auf der einen Seite recht, auf der anderen Seite kann dann sicher jeder auch für sich reklamieren, dass dieses Thema natürlich auch den kommenden Gipfel prägen wird, und deshalb werden sich die Kollegen darauf berufen.

Ich werde deshalb nicht eingreifen. Ihre Anregung sollten die Kollegen trotzdem hören. Aber ich werde sehr streng darauf achten, dass Zwischenfragen auch Zwischenfragen sind und keine Zwischenstatements, und ich werde ansonsten sehr bedacht auf die Einhaltung der Redezeit achten und im Übrigen auch alle gleich behandeln.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). – Herr talman! Den punkt inför det kommande rådsmötet som måste stå i centrum är så klart händelserna i Katalonien och kommissionens senfärdiga agerande. Alla såg vi bilderna i tv och i tidningar där spansk militärpolis med urskillningslös brutalitet slog och sparkade människor, både unga och gamla, tills blodet rann. Detta sker i ett EU-land och där ska demokratin förväntas vara ledstjärnan.

Det är inget annat än en ren skam, det som har hänt, och kommissionens rädsla och feghet för att kritisera Spanien för detta brutala övervåld är genant att behöva se. Givetvis måste man ha respekt för den spanska författningen, men den totala bristen på respekt för människor och det brutala våld som använts bör kommissionen kraftfullt fördöma.

Jag hörde nyss herr Weber säga att meningsmotståndare måste bekämpas. Ni valde då att använda ordet extremister om de människor som inte delar era åsikter. Samma budskap använder de flesta federalister i detta hus. Skulle jag använda mig av samma retorik till de människor som inte delar mina åsikter skulle jag ju stå här och kalla alla er för extremister. Ni har ju fullständigt missuppfattat vad demokrati går ut på. Demokrati innebär att man måste kunna lyssna på argumenten även från dem man inte delar åsikter med.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo sentito ancora una volta parole generiche sul terrorismo e sull'immigrazione del tutto inconcludenti. Invece, questo prossimo Consiglio, che si svolge a poche ore di distanza dai fatti della Catalogna, esclude questo argomento dalle discussioni.

L'esponente del gruppo liberale ha detto che bisogna fare tutti i mesi una riflessione sull'Europa e sul futuro dell'Europa. Il dibattito di questi momenti è un dibattito sul futuro dell'Europa perché vede, da una parte – cioè da tutti noi che eravamo fascisti, antidemocratici, ecc. – tutti schierati a favore del popolo catalano, o almeno del suo legittimo desiderio di poter votare e, dall'altra, gli esponenti del super partito socialista e popolare che governa questa Europa dei burocrati, delle banche e delle multinazionali, che appoggia invece un'azione di polizia.

Una polizia che farebbe bene a continuare a occuparsi del terrorismo, magari anche dei clandestini, invece di manganellare – come ho visto io stesso – gente tranquilla, senza bandiere di parte, che è stata per ore sotto la pioggia per poter esercitare il proprio diritto di voto. Allora è chiaro che da che parte

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Mr President, there is so much talk in this House about European values, so now it is time to act. Mr Timmermans, may I ask you please to make a statement – and the European Council should also make a similar statement soon – that mass police violence against unarmed people does not pass the human rights law tests of necessity and proportionality. It violates European values and norms and, under no circumstances, can it be tolerated by the European Union. You must make such a statement, regardless of who you think is right. Whether the Catalanian people are right or the Spanish government is right, no justification can be made for this brutal violence. Please make such a statement if you want the European Union and its values to be taken seriously.

Franck Proust (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, je souhaite d'abord exprimer, bien entendu, notre solidarité avec les familles des victimes de l'ignoble attaque de Marseille et de la terrible tuerie de Las Vegas. Plus que jamais, la lutte contre le terrorisme et l'éradication de Daech doivent faire l'objet d'une stratégie européenne.

Lors du prochain Conseil européen, les chefs d'État et de gouvernement évalueront les progrès des négociations sur le Brexit. Il n'y a aujourd'hui rien de tangible dans la position des Britanniques, nous l'avons encore rappelé dans notre résolution d'hier. Une telle négociation n'est évidemment pas facile, d'autant plus que nous avons d'un côté les Européens, emmenés par notre négociateur, Michel Barnier, qui adopte une approche séquentielle et sérieuse, et de l'autre, aucun engagement clair et chiffré de M^{me} May.

Les grandes déclarations et les revirements britanniques masquent l'ampleur des difficultés que cause la sortie du Royaume-Uni. Le message britannique était au départ: «Nous ferons mieux seuls qu'avec vous». Maintenant, M^{me} May propose de copier les méthodes européennes, par exemple, dans les accords commerciaux. Quel hommage rendu à l'Europe!

Tant sur le plan tactique que technique, nous restons constants sur la nécessité de divorcer avant de stabiliser une relation à l'avenir. Pour faire avancer l'Europe, il faut avoir une méthode et ne pas être dans l'incantation. Récemment, le président français a montré qu'il souhaitait une politique européenne qui se décrète, en recyclant d'ailleurs des idées sur lesquelles nous travaillons ou même des propositions déjà mises en œuvre: lutte contre le dumping social et la concurrence déloyale avec la révision de la directive sur le détachement des travailleurs; sécurité avec des mécanismes de renforcement des contrôles aux frontières que nous avons votés; protection de notre industrie avec l'accord trouvé hier – on en parlait tout à l'heure – sur la nouvelle méthodologie antidumping. C'est une étape de plus pour l'Europe qui agit et, surtout, qui protège ses intérêts.

Enfin, on nous présente maintenant les listes électorales transnationales comme un remède au manque d'adhésion au projet européen, mais cela aura l'effet contraire. Pour rendre compte de notre action aux Européens, il faut une Europe du quotidien qui n'est pas celle des élus hors-sol, mais celle des représentants qui connaissent la réalité des territoires.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Wenn die Staats- und Regierungschefs diesmal wieder über Migration und Flucht diskutieren, dann erinnert das an ein regelmäßiges Déjà-vu: laut hinausposaunte Vorsätze, jetzt alles besser zu machen, große Pläne und Erwartungen. Der Fortschritt ist freilich gering. Positiv vielleicht: sich endlich ernsthaft mit Neuansiedlung auseinanderzusetzen.

Alarmierend finde ich, dass wir offensichtlich nichts gelernt haben. So haben die VN gestern bekannt gegeben, die Essensrationen in kenianischen Flüchtlingslagern um 30 % zu kürzen. Unglaublich! Niemand wird Notiz davon nehmen, bis es wieder mal zu spät ist. Ich möchte daran erinnern, was Frau Merkel am Höhepunkt der Flüchtlingskrise am 25. September 2015 auf einem dieser Gipfel gesagt hat: Wir haben alle nicht gesehen, dass die internationalen Programme nicht ausreichend finanziert sind, dass Menschen in Flüchtlingslagern hungern, dass die Lebensmittelrationen gekürzt werden. Dieses Mal könnten wir es sehen!

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Ik had van alles voorbereid over de vele digitale uitdagingen waarvoor Europa staat, maar vandaag kan ik niet anders dan het lange stilzwijgen van de Europese Unie over het geweld waarvan we zondag allemaal getuige zijn geweest streng te veroordelen.

Geweld kan nooit de oplossing zijn voor een politiek conflict, nooit. Ik roep dan ook op tot een dialoog tussen Madrid en Barcelona met internationale bemiddeling.

Commissaris Timmermans, u heeft mensenrechten in uw portfolio. U kan toch niet anders dan een lidstaat veroordelen die geweld gebruikt en schiet op haar eigen burgers?

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Ich bin hier in diesem Haus 2004 Mitglied geworden, als die Balten und die Polen, die Tschechen und die Slowaken, die Ungarn Mitglieder der Europäischen Union wurden. Für mich ist es immer noch ein Wunder, dass wir auf einem freien Kontinent in Einheit und Freiheit und Frieden vereint miteinander leben, wobei Einheit ganz klar nicht Einigkeit bei jedem Thema heißt. Ob das Migration oder Marktwirtschaft, Energiepolitik oder Erweiterung ist, es gibt zum Teil sehr unterschiedliche Ansätze zwischen Ost und West, zwischen Nord und Süd. Mir ist eines wichtig: dass wir in allen Debatten, die wir hier führen, einander den Respekt nicht versagen, dass wir auch andere Meinungen anhören – egal, was für Themen es sind.

Ich freue mich, dass die Europäische Union jetzt durch die Reden von Jean-Claude Juncker, aber besonders von Emmanuel Macron einen neuen Impuls bekommen hat, und ich werde weiter für die Europäische Union arbeiten – demnächst aus dem deutschen Parlament heraus.

Das ist nach 13 Jahren meine letzte Rede. Ich danke Ihnen sehr für die Zusammenarbeit. Ich werde nie vergessen, dass es mir als jungem deutschem Abgeordneten möglich war, hier mit einem Mann wie Bronisław Geremek zusammenzuarbeiten. Das war eine sehr bewegende Erfahrung. Ich danke allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen sehr und verabschiede mich. Herzlichen Dank!

(Beifall)

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Graf Lambsdorff! Alles Gute für Ihre Arbeit an neuer Stelle im neuen Parlament!

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la delegación parlamentaria internacional en la que participé considera que el referéndum fue una demostración de la determinación del pueblo catalán en lo que al derecho de voto y proceso democrático se refiere, e insta a la Unión Europea a tener en cuenta el resultado. Pero dice la Comisión que es un asunto interno. Ya no. Ya es un asunto europeo, y lo estamos viendo claramente aquí. No se escondan detrás de la ley. La defensa tozuda de la Constitución ha llevado a un Estado miembro a la violencia.

Aquí hay un problema político de fondo que no es nuevo y hay que afrontarlo. El Gobierno español no lo va a hacer. No cometan el mismo error y actúen. Votar es un ejercicio democrático, y es que hay pueblos dentro de su mapa geopolítico que queremos ser libres, simplemente porque así lo sentimos.

No pedimos que lo entiendan, pero sí que lo respeten. Al pueblo catalán y a sus políticos, *moltes gracies* por su lección de dignidad y valentía. Tenéis el apoyo y la solidaridad del pueblo vasco, y pronto recorreremos el mismo camino.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor Juaristi, sorprende que usted dé significaciones de democracia a nadie, cuando su partido todavía no ha condenado completamente la violencia política que comandaron en el País Vasco.

Usted habla del pueblo vasco, en nombre de los que son como usted y de los que no lo son. Usted no puede arrogarse la representación de todo el pueblo vasco.

Usted está en contra de la ley. La ley es el fundamento de este Parlamento, el Estado de Derecho. Y el orden de los factores altera el producto.

(El Presidente retira la palabra a la oradora)

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Quiero dirigirme a la Comisión, al señor Timmermans, para que vea que este es un problema realmente europeo. Por favor, actúen. Actúen. No piensen que es un asunto interno del Estado español. Esto necesita una solución, necesita una solución política y necesita la implicación europea. Por favor, actúen.

Der Präsident. – Ich werde mir künftig die Freiheit nehmen, auch die Fragesteller zu unterbrechen, wenn es sich nicht um eine Frage handelt. Und wenn der, der gefragt ist, keine Antwort gibt, dann werde ich mir auch erlauben, die Antwort zu unterbrechen.

Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission Timmermans, Vertreter des Rates! Das Thema Migration ist ein ganz wichtiges. Ich finde es gut, dass es das nächste Mal wieder auf der Tagesordnung des Rates steht. Was wir aber brauchen, sind endlich legale Zugänge in die Europäische Union, zum Beispiel über Botschaftsasyl und Solidarität innerhalb der Mitgliedstaaten.

Was ich aber auch ansprechen möchte: Es ist völlig inakzeptabel, dass auf dieser Tagesordnung des nächsten Rates das brutale Vorgehen der spanischen Polizei in Katalonien am letzten Wochenende einfach nicht einmal vorgesehen ist.

Y cambiaré al castellano ahora.

Después de que el Gobierno español se ha negado a hablar y de la actuación brutal de la policía el pasado domingo, yo le pido a usted que la Comisión ofrezca a Cataluña y al Gobierno de Madrid una mediación, para entablar un diálogo, para volver a la mesa a hablar.

Especialmente, les pido a los miembros del Grupo PPE, el Partido Popular Europeo, que ya no digan que esto es un asunto interno de España: dentro de la Unión Europea no existen asuntos internos; dentro de la Unión Europea eso no funciona. Somos todos europeos. Debe haber diálogo y una solución práctica.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, al punto numero uno dell'ordine del giorno di questo Consiglio figurano le emigrazioni: a fronte degli sforzi enormi di Italia e Grecia, ancora non è applicata una decisione sulla redistribuzione, che peraltro è stata confermata anche dalla Corte di giustizia dell'Unione.

Il sistema comune di asilo è ancora molto lontano da quello che dovrebbe essere, ovvero un vero meccanismo di redistribuzione obbligatorio, preventivo e permanente, per far sì che la solidarietà non sia solamente una chiacchiera. Le vergognose condizioni dei campi libici sono un male per la nostra democrazia: crediamo fortemente che ci sia un monitoraggio, un intervento delle Nazioni Unite e dell'Unione europea per ravvisare quello che purtroppo c'è sul campo, ovvero sequestri, violenze carnali, schiavitù, stupri, anche su donne incinte, e torture. Tutto questo è inaccettabile.

Pretendiamo anche che, quando si parlerà di Turchia, si prenda finalmente atto che il percorso scelto da Erdogan è molto lontano da quello che dovrebbe essere lo Stato di diritto e dai principi fondamentali dell'Unione e che si chiudano una volta per tutte i negoziati di adesione, che assomigliano sempre più a una farsa in cui non credono neanche più gli attori protagonisti.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Wat betreft de maatregelen om illegale migratiestromen te controleren, wil ik de regering-leiders eraan herinneren dat de inzet van bijvoorbeeld Belgische marineschepen niet langer mag dienen om illegale migratie te faciliteren, maar er integendeel op gericht moet zijn te verhinderen en te beletten dat mensen aan een gevaarlijke overtocht beginnen.

Het uitgangspunt moet zijn dat asielzoekers in eigen regio worden opgevangen. Opvang in eigen regio leidt tot efficiëntere besteding van beschikbare middelen en maakt dan ook de terugkeer naar eigen land makkelijker.

Er moet meer druk worden gezet op derde landen die niet meewerken aan het indammen van illegale migratie. Ontwikkelingshulp en samenwerkingsverbanden moeten worden gekoppeld aan de bereidheid van deze landen om afgewezen asielzoekers en illegalen terug te nemen.

Vandaag de dag overleven in Vlaanderen mensen die hun hele leven hebben gewerkt met een bruto pensioen van 1100 of zelfs soms amper 900 euro, terwijl voor de opvang van een asielzoeker gemiddeld 1300 euro per maand ter beschikking moet worden gesteld.

Voorzitter, het geld is op. Tijd voor een immigratiestop.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señor presidente, hoy mi corazón está en España. Por eso he escrito mi discurso, para no emocionarme. En pocas horas o días, una región de España, que jamás ha sido independiente, declarará unilateralmente, de forma ilegal y por la fuerza a su independencia.

No sé si ustedes son del todo conscientes de eso. A todos nos duelen las imágenes del domingo, sí. Sin embargo, les ruego que no se queden ahí, cuando faltan 48 horas para que el segundo país más extenso de Europa, mi país, pueda romperse por la mitad. España no es Yugoslavia. Somos una democracia estable y madura, tan estable y tan madura como cualquiera de las que están representadas aquí, y no necesitamos tutelas y tampoco necesitamos mediadores con políticos insurrectos.

¿Vamos a dialogar? Sí, bajo el manto de la Constitución. ¿Nuestra Constitución puede cambiarse? Sí, pero no por la fuerza. Decidir si España se rompe o sigue unida corresponde a todos los españoles y solo a los españoles.

Como anoche dijo el Rey, no vamos a dejar solos a los catalanes. No vamos a dejar solos a los que, por miedo al estigma, permanecen en silencio y no participaron en el falso referéndum. Y tampoco a quienes, de buena fe, acudieron el domingo a votar, a los que ni puedo ni quiero ignorar. Todos los catalanes son españoles y todos los catalanes son mis compatriotas.

Pero no se equivoquen: el problema del nacional-populismo no es exclusivo de España. Es una plaga que se extiende por Europa. Si hoy ustedes dejan que España se rompa por Cataluña, una fila de fichas de dominó le seguirá por todo el continente. En lugar de una Europa de 27 tendremos una «no Europa» de mini Estados. El nacionalismo es históricamente el causante del dolor de Europa. Como europeístas no den ustedes la razón a los nacional-populistas.

Ayer se cumplieron 30 años de la reunificación alemana. Ahora es España la que está luchando por permanecer unida. Es España ahora a quien le corresponde dialogar con España, a nadie más. Terminó: no nos señalen, apóyennos como en su momento nosotros apoyamos a Alemania, a las repúblicas bálticas o a Europa del Este. Europa está hecha para unir no para romper.

(Aplausos)

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, ia falar de outro tema, mas a forma como aqui foi abordada a questão espanhola/catalã, obriga-me – por um imperativo de consciência – a dizer o seguinte: é infame estabelecer qualquer comparação entre a Espanha democrática e uma forma qualquer de ditadura. A Espanha fez um percurso exemplar, uma transição democrática exemplar. Passou do franquismo para um regime democrático, um regime que consagra, aliás, autonomias praticamente sem paralelo no quadro europeu.

Eu não sou espanhol. Sou português, mas sinto-me neste momento na obrigação, em nome da defesa dos valores europeus, de fazer aqui esta afirmação clara: a Espanha é um grande país democrático e deve e tem que ser tratado, neste Parlamento, como tal.

A questão catalã existe naturalmente e espero que, com consenso e com diálogo, ela possa ser resolvida e todos estamos atentos ao que se está a passar. Agora isso não autoriza ninguém a pôr em causa a grande democracia que é a democracia espanhola.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte zuerst feststellen, dass es im Rahmen meiner blauen Karte nicht zu einem eigenen Statement kam, sondern zu einer direkten Reaktion auf die Frau Abgeordnete Niebler. Und das begünstigt doch die Diskussion, da sollten Sie eher dafür sein.

Vážení pán predsedajúci, dovoľte mi, prosím, pár poznámok k najnovším európskym návrhom francúzskeho prezidenta Emmanuela Macrona. Trochu ma prekvapujú tieto návrhy, lebo som si myslel, že bol zvolený, aby riešil problémy Francúzska. Po prvé, jeho návrhy považujem za socialistické, preto, lebo sú postavené na, po prvé, vyšších daniach, po druhé, viac prerozdelení, po tretie, nových úradoch. Ďalej, do veľkej miery ide o socializáciu dlhov, konkrétne o to, aby Nemecko zdieľalo dlhy Francúzska. Naopak, vyslovene chceme oceniť návrh prezidenta Macrona, aby Európska únia konečne zriadila utečenecké, migrantské tábory mimo územia Európskej únie. Avšak za najdôležitejšiu považujem otázku, s akým mandátom prezident Macron... (prerušené po jednej minúte)

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Sulík, Sie haben nicht mehr das Wort. Und Ihre wortreichen Erklärungen, dass das vorher kein Statement war, sind ja schön, und es ist besonders nett, dass Sie das auf Deutsch tun, aber es ist halt nicht zutreffend. Wenn man Debatten lebendiger gestalten will, dann kann man das tun, da gibt es viele Möglichkeiten, aber nicht dadurch, dass einige systematisch an die Grenzen der Regeln gehen und darüber hinaus. Und wenn Sie glauben, dass Ihre Bemerkung betreffend meine Entscheidung ein Statement war und dass das von Ihrer Redezeit abgezogen wird, dann liegen Sie halt eben auch falsch.

Zur Geschäftsordnung. Bitte, Herr Sulík. Das wäre der richtige Weg gewesen.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Herr Präsident! (*Der Redner spricht ohne Mikrofon.*) ... Bitte welche? Ich bekomme eine oder zwei Minuten Redezeit pro Monat. Das ist das Erste. Ab und zu eine blaue Karte. Ich habe auf die Rede von Frau Niebler ganz konkret reagiert – zur Diskussion. Ich habe keine eigenen Statements vorgetragen und hier keine Regeln missbraucht. Und vielleicht könnte die Redezeit ein bisschen länger sein.

Der Präsident. – Herr Sulík! Ich empfehle erstens, dass Sie sich bei Ihrer Fraktion um mehr Redezeit bemühen. Hier gelten für alle die gleichen Regeln.

Und zweitens: Bemühen Sie sich doch mal bei den Vertretern Ihrer Fraktion im AFCO-Ausschuss, dass man dort über Geschäftsordnungsänderungen nachdenkt, wie man Debatten lebendiger gestalten kann. Aber die Regel, dass immer nur Herrn Sulík geholfen wird, gibt es halt nicht, und die wird es auch nicht geben.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, la crisis migratoria, la amenaza del terrorismo global, los problemas que frenan la unidad de los mercados del transporte digital o de la energía son problemas reales, acuciantes, que tienen su lógico espacio en el próximo Consejo Europeo.

Y yo les voy a pedir, en línea con la carta que el presidente de mi país —el *lehendakari* Iñigo Urkullu—envió ayer al presidente de la Comisión Jean-Claude Juncker, que incorporen a la agenda el problema que se vive en Cataluña, porque la estabilidad de un Estado miembro está en juego y, en consecuencia, la de la propia Unión.

Somos europeístas, creemos en los valores de los padres fundadores y estamos muy preocupados porque el silencio, el bloqueo o la violencia no son soluciones para abordar un problema que solo puede afrontarse recurriendo a la política.

Hablamos de derechos fundamentales. Tras la Segunda Guerra Mundial, los gobernantes de las potencias que se enfrentaron en el campo de batalla fueron capaces de fundar este proyecto que nos une en nuestra diversidad. Aquel primer acuerdo, que dio lugar a la CECA, no se construyó intercambiando reproches y esgrimiendo los límites de la ley, sino escuchando, entendiendo al otro y construyendo con él.

Por favor animen a que esta forma de hacer se aplique a la solución de este problema.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, España no está dispuesta a dialogar, lo hemos visto nuevamente ayer con el mensaje del Rey. Por eso pido a la Unión Europea altura de miras, que haga respetar los derechos fundamentales de la Unión Europea y los derechos humanos, que han sido vulnerados en Cataluña.

Y esto no lo digo yo, lo dice el equipo internacional de expertos en investigación electoral. Leo textualmente: «Asistimos a acontecimientos que ningún observador de las elecciones debe atestiguar jamás, y esperamos no volver a presenciar escenas de esta naturaleza. Vemos numerosas y repetidas violaciones de los derechos civiles y humanos. Aún más, está claro ya que fue una operación central orquestada, de estilo militar, cuidadosamente planeada. Estamos atónitos de que oficiales armados y enmascarados entraron en las mesas electorales con el propósito de impedir un proceso democrático pacífico». Eso —dice también— insta a que se respete el proceso.

Consentir más represión sobre el pueblo catalán y sus instituciones solo provocará más desafecciones.

Julia Reda (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, the promise of the European Union is the unconditional validity of fundamental rights, including freedom of speech. It is the Commission and the Council's responsibility to uphold these values when they are threatened inside the EU, and this is not an internal matter. This week, the front pages show images of charges of Spanish police in Catalan schools.

Another serious form of repression took place in the weeks leading up to this weekend. Spanish police raided the registrar of the Internet domain '.cat'. Its CTO, Pep Masoliver, was held for more than 60 hours and is now facing criminal prosecution. More than 140 domains were blocked and a number of domains were seized, including websites run by civil society organisations. These measures are counterproductive; they undermine freedom of speech and they set a dangerous precedent for a Europe that wants to be a champion of digital rights.

The European institutions should immediately offer intermediation to help de-escalate the situation, and I call upon both sides of the conflict to accept such an offer and refrain from further steps that would escalate the situation. It should be on the top of every agenda, including the European Council meeting.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi consenta una piccola premessa: è entrato in modo violento e strumentale un dibattito che dovrebbe essere tenuto oggi pomeriggio. Io trovo scandaloso che ci sia quella parte di estrema sinistra che strumentalizza, in modo ideologico, una vera sofferenza, un dramma. Noi dobbiamo essere facilitatori di dialogo. Vergognatevi! Siete una parte ideologica e antidemocratica. Noi dobbiamo favorire il dialogo a favore di tutto un popolo, quello spagnolo. Noi tutti vogliamo offrire solidarietà a questo grande popolo, che troverà sicuramente la strada e l'uscita nel dialogo, nella concordia, nella pace, nella democrazia, nel rispetto dei diritti umani e nel rispetto dallo stato di diritto. Vergogna!

E torniamo adesso invece al Consiglio. Allora, noi dobbiamo lavorare per un'Europa più forte, più democratica, come ha detto Lei, caro Vicepresidente, siamo d'accordo, siamo tutti qui, abbiamo questo compito. Ci sono tanti segnali, anche positivi: dobbiamo rafforzarli e lavorare su quelli.

Non c'è dubbio che la prima delle condizioni è la sicurezza. Ed è proprio per questo che noi siamo sempre stati, come parte politica, a favore di una comune difesa europea. Solo se l'Europa avrà una sua politica estera, una sua politica comune, non solo potrà meglio difendere i propri cittadini, ma finalmente potrà avere un ruolo geopolitico quale ci aspetta, seduta tra i grandi della terra, e non come oggi, che siamo un po' – tante volte, non sempre – al seguito, a ricasco, a rimorchio o a reagire. No: noi siamo una grande storia, una grande civiltà! Con i nostri valori dobbiamo prenderci il posto che ci spetta nel mondo.

Abbiamo ancora una ferita aperta, come ha detto Weber, ossia l'immigrazione. Voglio anch'io ringraziare quanto fatto da tutto il Parlamento, con l'onorevole Cicu, nel mettere in campo queste regole *antidumping*, perché abbiamo bisogno di una comune politica industriale per risolvere il problema della disoccupazione, specialmente giovanile.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Voorzitter, ik heb eerst een vraag aan u als voorzitter. Op de agenda staat vandaag het debat over de Europese Raad. Ik hoor hier de ene na de andere tussenkomst over Catalonië en ik vind Catalonië erg belangrijk, maar dat staat vanmiddag op de agenda. Dus ik wil er graag toe oproepen dat we hier vandaag debatteren over wat nu op de agenda staat en dat is de Europese Raad. En daar staan belangrijke zaken op.

Ik hoor hier nu een mevrouw pleiten voor een Europese defensie. Ik ben blij dat de EVP eindelijk ook het ALDE-standpunt daarover volgt. Maar ik hoor u niets zeggen over de noodzakelijkheid van een migratiepact. Dat is prioriteit één.

Ik denk dat we als Unie sterk moeten optreden. Eén Europese asielaanvraag, strenge bewaking van de buitengrenzen en vooral: mensensmokkelaars aanpakken. Ik wil dat het dáár over gaat.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin Vautmans! Ich habe jetzt Ihre Intervention nicht als Frage an Frau Kollegin Gardini verstanden, sondern als Geschäftsordnungsintervention. Deshalb habe ich Ihnen auch mehr Zeit gelassen als 30 Sekunden. Wir können nicht beliebig mischen. Wenn Sie vorher zugehört hätten, als ich dem Kollegen Lambsdorff geantwortet habe, dann würden Sie vielleicht schon wissen, dass ich das mit dem Präsidenten besprochen habe und dass, auch wenn es nicht auf der Tagesordnung steht, beim Gipfel sicher auch darüber gesprochen wird und ich den einzelnen Kollegen nicht die Freiheit ihres Mandats beschränken kann, hier im Rahmen dieser Debatte auch Schwerpunkte zu setzen.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herausforderung: Flüchtlinge! Einige setzen auf Abschottung um jeden Preis. Echte Lösungen sehen anders aus.

Drei Kernpunkte: Erstens weniger Flüchtlinge in Europa und europäische Werte schützen, das heißt, Fluchtursachen bekämpfen, Herkunfts- und Transitländer stärken, damit auch sie Schutz und neue Perspektiven bieten können. Zweitens schnelle und transparente Asylverfahren sowie Abkommen mit Herkunftsstaaten, Zurücknahme abgelehnter Asylbewerber. Drittens klare Wege der Arbeitsmigration, verbunden mit Regeln zur Verhinderung von Lohn- und Sozialdumping.

Übrigens sagen viele: Echten Flüchtlingen würden wir gerne helfen. Erstaunlich, wie niedrig dann die Zahlen der Neuansiedlung sind! Mauern sind keine Lösung. Gestalten wir diese Herausforderung mutig und gemeinsam!

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Mr President, in my capacity as rapporteur for the reform of the Dublin Regulation, I am convinced that this House is about to find a common position, gathering broad support for backing bold, ambitious and realistic reforms. However, we need our counterparts in the Council – and I would ask them to stop pandering back to domestic egoism – to engage with us in building a common European asylum system which is fit for purpose.

For too long, the Council has tried to find unanimity. Instead, it should try to find solutions to fix the broken, collapsed common European asylum system. Now it is high time to find solutions, and also one position. To the Estonian Presidency, I would like to say: stand firm. Knowing some Member States, you will never find unanimity, but a qualified majority is perfectly good enough, according to the Treaties. In my negotiating team, we are determined. We need to find a solution based on the fair sharing of responsibilities, aiming at taking back European control of migratory flows and ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I see that the Council intends to discuss the EU's external relations at its next meeting. You guys have some nerve! You plan to lecture others on human rights while you sit on your hands while witnessing a vicious assault on peaceful EU citizens in Catalonia because they had the audacity to vote. The truth is that European leaders have disgracefully ignored thuggish human rights abuses that are happening within the EU. While this inaction on Catalonia continues, you have lost the right to lecture others. Let's be clear, nobody, not a non-elected king, not a non-elected Commission, not even a minority government in Madrid, has the right to declare illegal the democratic exercise on self-determination by a people.

We are told that the EU stands for peace, democracy and human rights. Where were those values on Sunday? If you dare to use the Council meeting to talk about peace or democracy without standing clearly for those values in Catalonia, then the people of Europe, the people of the world, will rightly consider you to be nothing more than a shower of utter hypocrites.

Ádám Kósa (PPE). – Elnök Úr! A két hét múlva sorra kerülő tanácsi ülés összes témája nagyon fontos. Engedjék meg, hogy ezekre reflektáljak. A migrációs helyzet kapcsán szeretném kihangsúlyozni, hogy az európai polgárok véleményére alapulva lehet csakis sikeres bevándorláspolitikát folytatni. Mi, magyarok, elutasítjuk a korlátozások nélküli bevándorláspolitikát.

Hatékony, de szigorú határvédelemre, az üldözöttek helyben való megsegítésére, ellenőrzött és csak a valódi menekültekre koncentráltó protokollokra van szükség. A gazdasági bevándorlókat pedig az adófizető állampolgárok akaratával egybehangzóan, minél előbb vissza kell küldeni származási országukba.

Szeretnék utalni a nem régen elfogadott ukrán oktatási törvényre, amely a Kárpátalján élő, magyar, szlovák, román és lengyel nemzeti kisebbségek nyelvhasználati jogát csorbítja elfogadhatatlan módon. Nagyon remélem, hogy az Európai Tanács ezzel a mélyen jogsértő állapottal foglalkozni fog az ülésén, és egyértelmű jelzést fog küldeni az ukrán hatóságok felé.

A Digitális Európával kapcsolatban pedig szeretném hangsúlyozni, hogy ez csak akkor lehet sikeres, hogyha a szolgáltatások akadálymentesítve lesznek. Az akadálymentesítési jogszabálycsomag első olvasatát az Európai Parlament múlt hónapban, tehát a szeptemberi ülésen fogadta el, kérem tehát a soros elnökséget, hogy minél előbb fogadják el az álláspontjukat, hogy mielőbb megkezdődhessen a trialógus.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la présidence estonienne est déjà associée à une image très positive sur le numérique. Vous êtes un pays de l'excellence numérique, et vous allez porter ce thème lors du Conseil européen, ce dont je vous félicite.

Mais vous devez faire cela de manière inclusive, comme nous aimons à le dire ici. Donc, vous ne pouvez pas attendre le dernier moment pour traiter de la dimension sociale de l'univers numérique.

Qu'est-ce que cela signifie? Notre collègue Kósa vient de parler de l'accessibilité, mais il y a aussi la question du statut des travailleurs dans le domaine du numérique, et de ce point de vue-là, l'accès à une protection, à la portabilité des droits, à la formation, à la possibilité de mener des revendications collectives, est un défi nouveau pour le droit social que vous devez aussi aborder.

Puis, bien sûr, il n'y aura pas de justice sociale pour les travailleurs du numérique s'il n'y a pas une fiscalité adaptée et, de ce point de vue, les initiatives qui sont lancées ici ou là, un peu dans le désordre, ne doivent pas miner la vraie réforme de la modernité dans le domaine fiscal, qui est celui de l'impôt sur les sociétés.

Aucune autre...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur).

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Министър, колеги, искам да се спра накратко на трите теми, които ще обсъжда Съветът – това е дигитализацията, миграцията, отбраната и външните отношения.

Цифровите технологии са бъдещето, ако искаме на нашия континент да имаме конкурентоспособна европейска икономика, и тя трябва да гарантира по-добро и вярно съдържание, киберсигурност и защита на личните данни, както и голямата тема за електронното здравеопазване.

Когато Съветът обръща обаче внимание на темата миграция, нека да спре с приказките, трябва действия. Връщането на незаконно пребиваващите и влезли в Европейския съюз мигранти е приоритет. Относно реформите в Дъблинското споразумение от години чуваме само приказки, но не и действия.

Стига лицемерие по отношение на приемането на България и Румъния в Шенгенското пространство. Аз моля, или призовавам по-точно г-н Министъра това да бъде също поставено на дневен ред в Съвета.

Усещането на голяма част от европейските граждани е, че Европейският съюз, без да се прави разграничаване между институциите, е неефективен. Съветът е призован да промени това. Моят призив е за по-малко приказки и за реални действия за повече сигурност. Повече общ ангажимент по отношение на отбраната и ефективна външна политика. По отношение на ситуацията в Испания ние сме абсолютно солидарни с нашите испански приятели – конституцията, защитата на законния ред и, разбира се, правата на всички испански граждани, са на първо място.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo me quiero dirigir a ustedes como socialista catalán a la vista de los acontecimientos que hemos visto recientemente.

En primer lugar, muchos hemos visto unas imágenes que nos han horrorizado, que, en nuestro lugar, además, hemos denunciado por un uso desproporcionado de la fuerza contra manifestantes pacíficos.

Pero hoy el Parlamento Europeo sobre todo tiene que enviar un mensaje sobre la situación política de fondo y apelar a varias cosas: 1) al respeto del Estado de Derecho y no a la ley por la ley, sino a la ley como garantía de la convivencia, la ley como garantía de que no se cometan abusos por parte de los poderes públicos; 2) al diálogo, a encontrar soluciones políticas como única salida posible, a encontrar nuevos consensos políticos que reconozcan y garanticen a todos sus sensaciones, sus sentimientos, sus identidades; y 3) hacer un llamamiento para calmar la situación actual, para rechazar cualquier vía unilateral que lleve a la institucionalidad catalana al desastre, para, como europeos, encontrar soluciones — fruto del reconocimiento y la convivencia— para el conflicto.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dovoluji, abych se vyjádřila ke dvěma bodům Rady, které spolu úzce souvisí. Je to migrace a zahraniční politika. Migrační tlak nyní polevil a EU je v dobré kondici. Ale do budoucna musíme počítat s dalšími tlaky na migraci. Je to realita a my jsme získali čas na to, abychom se nyní mohli lépe připravit. Očekávám tedy, že summit Evropské rady bude provádět reflexi efektivnosti dosavadních opatření tak, abychom neopakovali v budoucnosti chyby. Nesmí se stát, že EU bude opět zaskočena a nebude připravena, proto podporuji bezpečnost jako prioritu. Musíme se zaměřit na ochranu hranic schengenského prostoru, na urychlení návratu a pomoc v zemích původu a v zemích tranzitu, které jsou klíčové v souvislosti např. s pomocí Libye jak finanční, tak v oblasti bezpečnostních kapacit ve spolupráci s OSN. Právě tam musíme posílit návratovou politiku a znovuusídlení v nejbližších zemích původu.

Pokud jde o návrh společného azylového systému, pak reforma azylového systému je nutná ve smyslu lepší koordinace. A rozhodnutí o udělení azylu musí zůstat plně v rukou členských států, protože členské státy jsou zodpovědné za vnitřní bezpečnost. Solidarita je samozřejmě nutná, ale musí být ve shodě s členskými zeměmi. Chtěla bych připomenout, že Česká republika je solidární, když vybudovala velký tábor pro 30 tisíc uprchlíků v Jordánsku.

(Řečnice souhlasila s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 162 odst. 8 jednacího řádu).)

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”.* – Stimată colegă, ați vorbit despre migrație, despre responsabilitate, despre securizarea frontierelor Schengen, dar ce părere aveți despre țări ca România și Bulgaria, Croația, care nu sunt în Schengen, dar au aceleași responsabilități vizavi de migrație?

Nu considerați că este necesar să decidă o dată Consiliul pentru aceste state care au același tratat, aceleași responsabilități, dar nu au aceleași drepturi?

Cum să securizăm frontierele Schengen? Iar pe celelalte țări cine le securizează, și cum?

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE), *odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty.* – Děkuji za Vaši otázku, víme, že se jedná o přijetí těchto zemí do schengenského prostoru. Já se domnívám, že právě v otázce migrace tyto země splnily svoji úlohu, že se zachovaly velmi zodpovědně. Chtěla bych také připomenout, že Česká republika poslala do těchto zemí pomoc ve formě bezpečnostních složek, a jsem pro to, aby tyto země byly oceněny za své úsilí, které se týká zajištění bezpečnosti na svém území.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nostro futuro è l'Europa. Ieri ricorreva il quarto anniversario della strage di Lampedusa: era il 3 ottobre 2013 e ciò che rimane nella mia memoria non è solo il numero delle vittime, ma l'immagine di quella tragedia.

Quel giorno, abbiamo detto tutti insieme: mai più. Da allora ci siamo impegnati a sostituire cinismo ed egoismi con la solidarietà, in difesa della vita. Eppure la situazione è pressoché tornata ad essere quella di prima. Qualcosa non va. Qualcosa non è andato. L'immigrazione non è un fenomeno che si può fermare, ma è un fenomeno che si può gestire. La riduzione dei flussi, così come ribadito dal presidente Pittella, non ci può tranquillizzare. Sono le cause profonde che spingono le persone ad abbandonare i propri paesi.

Lavoriamo seriamente anche con il Consiglio per dare una risposta globale al fenomeno migratorio e i risultati finora raggiunti sono stati possibili grazie al ruolo di colegislatore del Parlamento, che ad oggi sta elaborando la propria posizione sulla riforma di Dublino. E noi non ci nascondiamo dietro le nostre divisioni e le nostre divergenze politiche. Noi andiamo avanti perché crediamo in una riforma solida del sistema...

(Il presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, the European Council must underline at its meeting that the European Union is a union of laws. They apply to all and everyone. To national governments as well as to local governments, authorities and citizens. That is the only way to stability, peace and dialogue.

Secondly, the defence issue. We need to develop a defence facing all the challenges we see today, where Russia is not only a test case, but also a real challenge. On all the levels of threats coming therefrom, we need to strengthen our capabilities and our defence.

Thirdly, the digital challenge. We cannot only talk about it, we need to ensure that we can be in the lead, phasing out not only roaming charges, but also roaming by pan-European networks, on mobile broadband, enabling other facilities and a scale of economy that can make us the leaders.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Elnök Úr! A kollégának is köszönöm, hogy válaszol a kérdésemre! Nagyon helyesen Ön említette, hogy a törvényeket, az európai jogszabályokat mindenkinek be kell tartani, kormányoknak is. Ezt fontos, hogy említette, de vajon ezeket a mondatokat elmondja-e Ön a Néppárt soraiban ülő Fidesznek, hogy a magyar kormány az elmúlt napokban is olyan elképesztő hazugságkampányt folytat az Európai Unióval, különösen a menekültekkel kapcsolatban, ami, hogy mondjam, hova tovább a náci időkre emlékeztet, és én csak kérdezem [...] *(Az elnök megvonta a szót.)*

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege Szanyi! Ich halte Vergleiche mit der Nazizeit nicht für angemessen.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), blue-card answer. – This is a very simple question and it has a simple answer: laws are for everyone. There is no party and no colour attached to laws. We all need to abide by the laws. I can be critical of bad policies wherever they come from – whether they belong to my party group or your party group – but the main thing is that the laws are decided here. We have a court and a legal system to implement them, and that must be respected. I continue to call on the Commission to ensure that the laws are implemented, and followed.

(The President cut off the speaker)

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, the forthcoming EU Council risks being a complete non-event if ambitions are not raised. The EU needs to look seriously at reforms and at the implications of a no-deal Brexit: Capital Markets Union (CMU) for example, and the digital agenda could be another, given the strong presence of tech startups in the UK.

The EU and the UK also need to maintain close cooperation on foreign and defence issues. This is vital in files where the UK has been leading, such as Syria, where, over the past two weeks we have witnessed the highest death toll in 2017. Heavy retaliatory strikes by the Assad regime and Russia in the north, even targeting hospitals, have taken away all credibility from the Astana Process. A real political transition has to be a priority in Geneva. The EU has to take political leadership to balance Russian and Iran, but also the USA. I urge the Tory government to be earnest about continued collaboration with the EU on defence, and not to use security as a bargaining chip.

On migration, subsequent Commission plans have failed due to the lack of political will of Member States. I urge the Council to ditch the dithering and engage in substantial reform of the Common European Asylum System.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οφείλω σήμερα να καταγγείλω με όλη τη δύναμη της ψυχής μου τις απαράδεκτες, συνεχιζόμενες, προκλητικές και βάνανσες ενέργειες της Τουρκίας σε βάρος της Κύπρου, μιας χώρας μέλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ο κύριος Timmermans γνωρίζει, γιατί συμμετείχε στις διαπραγματεύσεις του Crans-Montana, ότι η Τουρκία με τις απαράδεκτες και προκλητικές της θέσεις οδήγησε σε αδιέξοδο τις διαπραγματεύσεις για το Κυπριακό, επιμένοντας να παραμείνουν κατοχικά στρατεύματα, εγγυήσεις και μονομερή επεμβατικά δικαιώματα σε χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Αυτή η προκλητική και απαράδεκτη Τουρκία με το κατοχικό καθεστώς σήμερα το πρωί επέβαλε απαγόρευση διέλευσης ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας για τους ηρωικούς Έλληνες εγκλωβισμένους της Καρπασίας, επιβάλλοντας νέα τετελεσμένα και πολιτικές εθνικού ξεκαθάριαματος στην Κύπρο.

Κύριε Timmermans, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή οφείλει να αντιδράσει άμεσα, όπως αντέδρασε η UNFICYP. Καλώ επίσης την Εθνοτική Προεδρία να θέσει αυτό το ζήτημα άμεσα στο επόμενο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο για να καταδικάσει με κυρώσεις την Τουρκία. Ακόμα καλώ με όλη τη δύναμή μου τους αγαπητούς συναδέλφους ευρωβουλευτές να καταψηφίσουμε όλα εκείνα τα κονδύλια που αφορούν την Τουρκία για να στείλουμε ένα ισχυρό μήνυμα.

Για την Ισπανία θέλω να δώσω ένα ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα: οφείλουμε όλοι μας, κύριε Πρόεδρε, να υπερασπιστούμε την εδαφική ακεραιότητα, τη συνταγματική τάξη και τη συνταγματική ακεραιότητα κάθε χώρας μέλους της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή.)

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Úr! A migráció és a menekültek ügye még hosszú ideig meg fogja határozni az európai politikát. Éppen ezért kettős feladat előtt állunk. Egyrészt folytatni kell a közös európai menekültügyi rendszer kiépítését, szükség van hatékony európai menekültügyi ügynökségre, a Dublini Egyezmény újragondolására és a függőben lévő menekültügyi dossziéknak a mielőbbi lezárására.

Égető szükség van közös európai szociális integrációs modellre, hiszen csak így tudjuk elkerülni a radikalizációt, a későbbi súlyos társadalmi problémákat. Másrészt viszont az eddigieknél sokkal, de sokkal határozottabban kell szembefordulni azokkal a kormányokkal, amelyek a menekültügyet önző, és gyakran alantas politikai célokra használják. Semmi nem tesz annyi kárt Európában, mint a félelem- és gyűlöletkeltés, az idegenellenesség, a bezárkózó nacionalizmus.

Persze keresni kell a kompromisszumokat, de a kompromisszumoknak is van határa. Ha túl sok engedményt teszünk a szélsőjobb felé kacsingató kormányoknak, saját identitásunkat adjuk fel, saját hagyományainkat tagadjuk meg.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, the Tallinn Digital Summit agreed on an inspiring agenda, and after that the Estonian Presidency concluded that the Digital Single Market could be completed by 2018. That is in one year's time. The EU's biggest problem still is implementation: bringing to life the spirit of Tallinn requires continued political determination to avoid returning to 'business as usual'.

Incidentally, President Macron, in his maiden speech, was surprisingly modest when he called just for strengthening of the digital market. Today our job is not to limit ourselves anymore to Eurospeak terms like 'strengthening' or 'deepening' but rather to complete tasks on which we have all agreed. It is also important clearly to understand that the single European cyberspace and single cybersecurity market do not merely constitute a lofty goal but could and should be become a reality in eight years' time.

May I express my full support to the Spanish Constitution and Spain's integrity.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich erwarte mir von den Staats- und Regierungschefs, dass sie nicht nur über die Sonnenseiten der Digitalisierung sprechen. Das digitale Europa muss in einem Atemzug mit dem sozialen Europa diskutiert werden. Der digitale Binnenmarkt ohne soziale Mindeststandards ist absurd. Wir dürfen also nicht nur über Vereinfachungen für Unternehmen und das Boosten des digitalen Binnenmarkts sprechen, wenn jetzt schon europaweit per Mausclick digitales Sozialdumping betrieben wird.

Denn egal, ob als Uber-Fahrer, als Foodora-Lieferant oder als Fabrikarbeiter oder Fabrikarbeiterin – faire Löhne, arbeitsrechtlicher Schutz und Gewerkschaftsrechte müssen für alle arbeitenden Menschen in Europa gelten. Wenn wir über die Digitalisierung sprechen, dann erwarte ich mir außerdem, dass darüber gesprochen wird, wie wir die Internetmultis – Facebook, Google und Co. – dazu bringen können, endlich ihre Steuern zu zahlen.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Mr President, Turkey is on the agenda of the European Council meeting, and it is high time the European leaders developed a proper strategy on how to deal with developments in this EU candidate country. Until now, the approach has been to wait, see and hope that things will improve in the country whilst the situation continues to deteriorate. The European Parliament has called on the Council and the Commission to formally suspend the accession talks if the new Constitution is implemented, as it runs contrary to the Copenhagen criteria. But it is also important that we stand in solidarity with the Turkish population in these difficult times.

We expect EU leaders at the Summit to make the same distinction in their approach. Strict when it comes to our own values and in reaction to clear breaches of fundamental rights, while sending a strong message to the citizens of Turkey that we are willing to continue supporting democrats and civil society in their country. It would be a mistake only to react to President Erdogan and to forget about the population.

Sergei Stanishev (S&D). – Mr President, after many years of absence from the agenda of the European Council, security and defence are back, and with good reason. The citizens of the European Union expect us to act together in order to provide external and internal security, both for citizens and for our Member States.

The European Union is known as a soft power and this identity should be preserved and developed. This is unique for Europe, but it is good too to have strength and to show the ability to protect ourselves. There are two major tools which we possess, or rather which are in development. The first is the permanent structured cooperation (PESCO) initiative, and I would like to stress that it should be inclusive, because if we are to have a single shield we cannot allow cracks in it. The other is the European Defence Fund. I would like to stress that the intention to have more than EUR 5 billion per year for this fund requires own resources for the European Union. I think that if we act together we can respond to the expectations of our citizens.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa ha accettato la sfida digitale, ma ora il punto è come vincerla questa sfida. Primo: il mercato unico digitale va completato al più presto, perché è una questione di rilevanza sociale e civile, come è stato detto, oltre che economica. L'abolizione del roaming è stato un progresso tangibile e apprezzato dai cittadini ma non possiamo permetterci di impiegare anni e anni per completare il mercato unico digitale.

Secondo: dobbiamo creare le infrastrutture necessarie dalla connessione a banda larga all'implementazione del 5G.

Terzo: servono investimenti massicci nella formazione del personale. Le statistiche ci dicono che c'è un grande, terribile *gap* tra le competenze esistenti sul mercato e quelle che sarebbero necessarie. Allora, investire nella formazione, oltre che nelle infrastrutture, io penso sia il modo per garantire una buona occupazione, come diceva la collega Berès.

Quarto: dobbiamo trovare i fondi, tassando in modo giusto le aziende digitali. L'elusione fiscale dei colossi del web, da un lato, e i ritardi europei nel digitale, dall'altro, sono due facce della stessa medaglia. E non possiamo risolvere l'una senza l'altra.

Infine, dobbiamo avere la consapevolezza che lo sviluppo e la corretta gestione delle tecnologie digitali sono una questione centrale per la sicurezza e la difesa.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señor presidente, Europa nació como un proyecto de paz, de entendimiento, de diversidad y de convivencia, y hoy hay una parte de Europa donde ese proyecto está en peligro. Por supuesto que —al igual que ocurre a muchos de mis compañeros— hay imágenes que vimos el 1 de octubre que no nos gustan, que rechazamos y lamentamos, pero, sobre todo, hay una realidad, que es una fractura social que nos preocupa.

Por eso apelamos al Estado de Derecho. Por eso apelamos al cumplimiento de la legalidad. Porque entendemos que se puede votar, pero hay que votar un diálogo social. Hay que votar tras un acuerdo político de las fuerzas de nuestro país, para entender que debemos buscar esos espacios de convivencia. Apelo al entendimiento, al diálogo.

No es el momento de reproches. No es el momento de venir aquí a repartir responsabilidades. Habrán podido venir algunos a decir cuál es su discurso para verse aplaudidos, pero creo que es el momento de escuchar lo que se nos está pidiendo. Por, favor, hablemos. *Si us plau, parlem.*

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen nun zum *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren. Ich bitte um Verständnis. Wir haben dreimal so viele Nachfragen, wie wir eigentlich Zeitfenster haben. Deshalb werde ich von jeder Fraktion nur einen Kollegen berücksichtigen.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Mr President, both President Juncker and President Macron were right to point out for the need for the EU to harmonise taxation and adopt qualified-majority voting in taxation decisions. This should be a priority at the European summit, otherwise, the EU will continue to be bogged down by an ungovernable European monetary union, shrinking national and European fiscal resources, a fictional single market with competition distorted by tax dumping, and the tax jungle prone to be made worse by Brexit.

The reality, however, is already alarming. We will not work for common security and defence by letting corruption and organised crime, including human trafficking and terrorism, continue, and by allowing the proceeds through our taxation and financial systems, taking advantage of the digital era. The Commission set alarm bells ringing with the report on VAT carousel fraud, showing it provides EUR 5 billion per year to organised crime, including terrorism. How can EU governments and the EU Council be effective with action on VAT and the common consolidated corporate tax base (CCCTB) if they go on enabling terrorists and mafia to get funds through our own tax system on a massive scale?

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Europsko vijeće još jednom će raspravljati o nezakonitim migracijskim tokovima i ništa se nakon te rasprave neće promijeniti.

Zašto? Zato što u Europskoj uniji nema konsenzusa o useljeničkoj politici, pa tako ni o tome kako se boriti protiv nezakonite migracije. Dok god je tako, dio članica nastavit će poticati useljavanje iz nekih svojih razloga, a dio će mu se i dalje opirati. U takvim se okolnostima ne može donijeti i voditi učinkovita politika.

Na ovom se pitanju vide sve razlike među članicama. Neke su iz svog nacionalnog interesa, primarno zbog starenja autohtonog stanovništva i nedostatka radne snage, spremne pristati na masovno useljavanje, a neke druge imaju značajno drukčiju ekonomsku situaciju i ovo vide kao prijetnju svojoj kulturi i tradiciji.

Želimo li doista biti „ujedinjeni u raznolikosti“, europska useljenička politika mora uvažiti argumente, želje i ambicije obje strane u ovoj raspravi. Dosad to nije bio slučaj i to se mora promijeniti.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, a mí me gustaría utilizar este minuto para aclarar algunas cosas que forman parte del abecé de la democracia y de esta Cámara y de lo que representa.

España es miembro de la Unión Europea porque ha acreditado un orden constitucional y, para seguir siendo miembro, debe mantener ese orden. El vicepresidente Timmermans hace poco se expresó en este sentido porque, efectivamente, la situación en que estamos ahora mismo es claramente competencia europea, pero lo es porque España, que tiene su bandera ahí junto a las demás, debe mantener ese orden para seguir siendo miembro.

Lo único que quiero decir adicionalmente es que los secesionistas han intentado romper ese orden constitucional, y de lo que estamos hablando aquí es de representar y defender a todos los ciudadanos europeos y a todos los ciudadanos españoles.

Cuando hablamos de los catalanes, hablamos de todos los catalanes, y yo quiero recordar aquí solamente las palabras del jefe del Estado, del Rey, que ayer claramente expresó que había habido una deslealtad inaceptable y una apropiación indebida de las instituciones.

Por tanto, claro que sí, desde Europa yo reclamo que traslademos a todos los ciudadanos que debemos defender el orden de España.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, και πάλι το μεταναστευτικό μονοπωλεί τη συζήτησή μας. Η φτωχοποίηση στην οποία οδηγήθηκαν μεγάλα τμήματα του πληθυσμού λόγω των νεοφιλελεύθερων πολιτικών λιτότητας, μαζί με την ξενοφοβική ρητορική που ακολουθούν οι κυβερνήσεις, λιπαίνει το έδαφος για την ακροδεξιά, τον ρατσισμό και την ξενοφοβία. Κύριοι συνάδελφοι, δεν είναι αργά να αντιταχθούμε στην Ευρώπη-φρούριο. Δεν είναι αργά να εφαρμόσουμε, επιτέλους, ένα κοινό σύστημα ασύλου, νόμιμες και ασφαλείς μεταναστευτικές οδούς και να υποχρεώσουμε όλα τα κράτη μέλη να αναλάβουν τις ευθύνες τους με ίση κατανομή των βαρών. Να αντιταχθούμε στις απάνθρωπες πολιτικές στρατιωτικοποίησης των εξωτερικών και εσωτερικών συνόρων της Ένωσης που, αντί να ενισχύουν τις γειτονικές χώρες, τις μετατρέπουν σε συνοριοφύλακες. Η αλληλεγγύη των λαών φαίνεται μέσα από αναπτυξιακές πολιτικές, οι οποίες πρέπει να προάγουν την ειρήνη και την αλληλοκατανόηση. Προάγονται μέσα από πολιτικές, οι οποίες προωθούν την κοινωνική ανάπτυξη, την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη προς όφελος των λαών εντός και εκτός της Ένωσης.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα θέματα της ατζέντας της επόμενης συνόδου του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου είναι ιδιαίτερα σοβαρά, αν και πιστεύω ότι θα ακολουθηθούν οι ίδιες καταστροφικές πολιτικές στα θέματα μετανάστευσης, άμυνας και εξωτερικής πολιτικής. Την Κυριακή ο Πρόεδρος της Τουρκίας Erdoğan, μιλώντας στο Κοινοβούλιο της χώρας του, δήλωσε ότι η Τουρκία δεν χρειάζεται πια την ένταξη της στην Ένωση. Επιπρόσθετα, ο Ευρωπαίος Επίτροπος αρμόδιος για τη Διεύρυνση, Johannes Hahn, δήλωσε ότι η Τουρκία υπό την προεδρία του Erdoğan έχει γυρίσει την πλάτη της στην ένταξη της στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Έπειτα από χρόνια τελεματωμένων ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων με την Τουρκία οι Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες αντιλαμβάνονται ότι η διαδικασία είναι νεκρή, γνωρίζοντας τους διωγμούς του Erdoğan εις βάρος των επικριτών του, τις δηλώσεις περί ναζιστικών κυβερνήσεων στην Ευρώπη και το δημοψήφισμα που του έδωσε υπερεξουσίες. Όμως τώρα είναι μια χρυσή ευκαιρία για τους ηγέτες των κρατών μελών να απαλλάξουν την Ευρώπη από τον Erdoğan και να διακόψουν κάθε συνεργασία και συνομιλία με την Τουρκία.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened very carefully to the comments made by the Members of Parliament. Many of the comments were made about the situation in Spain. I have taken careful note of all the comments, and I would like to refer those who put the questions and made the comments to the statement I will make on behalf of the Commission later today in this plenary.

Now, going back to the agenda of the European Council, it is clear to me that there is a strong convergence of views between the Commission and the European Parliament on such issues as the digital single market, the social pillar and tackling the enormous challenge of migration. Let me reiterate that last week we put on the table a number of proposals in a holistic approach to the migration issue. There is not one silver bullet that will solve this challenge to Europe and its societies.

We can only be successful in managing the challenge of globalisation and migration in that framework if we are better at protecting our external borders; if we make agreements with countries of origin to offer prospects to people where they are instead of having people think they need to find a better future elsewhere; if we have agreements with the countries of transit; if we are more successful at combating human trafficking, at combating this terrible criminal activity on the backs of innocent people; but also if we understand that the Dublin Agreement was made at a time of different challenges and that now it needs to be adapted to the world of today and tomorrow. This means that the issue of solidarity cannot be avoided and must also be tackled in this framework.

It is my firm belief that, although there are different emphases in different Member States on parts of the package, the package as a whole is the only way forward. I count on the strong support of the European Parliament to convince the leaders of the Member States that this should be done now, with a sense of urgency, so that we can show Europeans, before the next European elections, that Europe is capable of answering their call that we should do better at managing migration and that we should do more for our collective security.

(Applause)

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their comments and observations on the next European Council meeting. I will convey them to the President of the European Council, Donald Tusk, as it is he who sets the agenda of European Council meetings.

On the Presidency's behalf, I note that the reform of the Common European Asylum System was mentioned repeatedly during the debate. As first Vice-President Timmermans said, we should not lose sight of the fact that there are seven legislative proposals under this reform of the Common European Asylum System. Good progress has been made on some of them, others are already in the negotiation phase between the Council and Parliament, but the reform of the Dublin Regulation remains controversial. It was rightly mentioned that some Member States have not moved on this proposal, and I would add that this is the case with not just one but both extremes in this particular debate. Estonia is doing what the Presidency must do: we are in intense consultations with the Member States. The Estonian Minister for the Interior, at the Ministers' meeting next week, will present the state of play, and we are also looking for guidance from the European Council meeting in two weeks' time on that particular legislative proposal.

The broader debate on the future of Europe was discussed over dinner at the Tallinn Digital Summit. President Tusk's conclusion was that, within two weeks, he will consult the Heads of State and Government of the EU Member States and will then set out his way forward in this debate.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank all the Members of this House for their comments on the digital single market and, more broadly, on the digital society. Ms Berès, Mr Kelam and others rightly brought out various aspects of the digital society. The debate is not only about the digital single market proposals, it is much broader, and the digital revolution affects us all. There was overwhelming agreement and a common understanding at the Tallinn Digital Summit last week that all these aspects must be tackled by the European leaders. This, if you will, is indeed the spirit of Tallinn.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La seduta è sospesa fino alle 12.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D), *γραπτώς*. – Λέχθηκε ότι πρέπει να χειριζόμαστε την Τουρκία με πολιτικές που αναγνωρίζουν τη διαφορά ανάμεσα στο καθεστώς Erdoğan και τις δημοκρατικές δυνάμεις. Αυτό είναι ορθό. Εννοείται ότι πολιτικές που ενδυναμώνουν το καθεστώς Erdoğan και που τις επιζητεί για να εμπεδώσει την εξουσία του είναι λάθος και πρέπει να αποφεύγονται. Μπορούν να τεκμηριώσουν οι υποστηρικτές της αναβάθμισης της Τελωνειακής Ένωσης της Τουρκίας με την ΕΕ πώς αυτή η πολιτική αποδυναμώνει τον Erdoğan; Αυτό το καθεστώς Erdoğan που σήμερα το πρωί αποφάσισε να στερεί τα τρόφιμα και την ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια που η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία στέλνει επί δεκαετίες -βάσει αμοιβαίας συμφωνίας μέσω του ΟΗΕ- στους λιγοστούς Ελληνοκύπριους εγκλωβισμένους στα κατεχόμενα, που η Τουρκία θέλει να εκδιώξει. Αυτά συμβαίνουν σε έδαφος της ΕΕ, στην Κύπρο, που η Τουρκία κατέχει από το 1974.

Αναφορικά με το δημοψήφισμα στην Καταλονία, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να προστατεύει την εθνική κυριαρχία, το κράτος δικαίου και την εδαφική ακεραιότητα της Ισπανίας, καθώς και την τήρηση της συνταγματικής τάξης και της ενότητας της χώρας. Μόνο το σύνολο του λαού της Ισπανίας μπορεί να αποφασίσει για οποιαδήποτε αλλαγή στην ίδια του τη χώρα μέσω των δημοκρατικών διαδικασιών.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Nyugaton új Európa van születőben. A francia elnök a DK által is támogatott Európai Egyesült Államokat jelentette be múlt héten, közös hadsereggel, határvédelemmel, európai pénzügyminiszterrel. Ma két fajta uniós tagállam létezik: a kisebb uniós tagállamok és olyanok, amelyek még nem tudják magukról, hogy kicsik. Németország például, Európa legnagyobb állama csak közepes kínai tartománynak megy el.

Az Európai Unió az európai államok közös sorsa, jövője. Ha van Unió, fennmarad az európai jólét, szociális háló, mindenkinek járó egészségügy. Ha nincs, mindennek búcsút inthetünk. A nacionalista nosztalgia nem használ az orosz agresszióval, vagy a kínai befektetésekkel szemben. Ez a hamis nosztalgia, ellenségeskedés elterelheti figyelmünket ideig óráig, de az Európai Unió az egyetlen esélyünk a feltörekvő hatalmakkal szemben. Néhányan keleten ezt az utolsó esélyt támadják kizárólag rövidlátó politikai érdekből. A francia elnök által most bejelentett javaslatokat a DK már 2014 óta támogatja. Európának és benne Magyarországnak egyetlen járható útja van, az pedig az Egyesült Európai Államok létrehozása. Ezért támogatom az olyan javaslatokat, mint az európai egyetem, az európai FBI vagy az európai valutalap létrehozása.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne*. – Predstavitelia Európskej rady a Komisie sa venovali blížiacemu sa zasadnutiu Európskej rady, pričom boli načrtnuté štyri body programu. Prvým bodom bude migrácia, kde boli dosiahnuté pozitívne výsledky v zmysle zníženia počtu migrantov smerujúcich do EÚ. Je však potrebné prijať také legislatívne kroky, ktoré budú namierene voči pašerákovi, budú posilňovať hranice schengenskej zóny a prehľbovať spoluprácu s OSN. Oceňujem, že Rada aj Komisia sa v ďalšom bode venujú digitálnej agende, kde musíme prijať rámcové opatrenia nato, aby sa EÚ pripravila na zmeny, ktoré digitalizácia prináša. Tretí bod, ktorému sa zasadnutie bude venovať, je bezpečnosť, kde oceňujeme mierový dialóg s Iránom, ktorý by mohol byť vzorom diplomatického riešenia konfliktov vo svete. S posledným bodom blížaceho sa zasadnutia budú zahraničné vzťahy, kde sa budú riešiť mnohé aktuálne témy, ako napríklad i vzťahy s Tureckom.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), *în scris*. – Comisia Europeană și-a luat angajamentul de a prezenta noul cadru financiar 2021-2027 în mai 2018. Numai astfel va fi posibil ca acest cadru financiar să fie adoptat înainte de noile alegeri pentru Parlamentul European din iunie 2019 și să se asigure buna pregătire a tuturor regulamentelor necesare pentru execuția programelor și proiectelor europene, începând cu primul an 2021. Acest cadru financiar ar trebui să cuprindă deja efectul deciziilor cu privire la viitorul Uniunii Europene. De aceea, este important ca statele membre să folosească și acest Consiliu European pentru a pregăti aceste decizii, care să fie adoptate în primul trimestru al anului viitor.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – No passado dia 30 de Setembro acabaram as quotas do açúcar e aquelas que era o último regime de quotas agrícolas ainda em vigor na União Europeia. A decisão de pôr agora termo às quotas de açúcar resulta da reforma de 2013 da política agrícola comum (PAC) que teve início em 2006 e que inclui, entre outras malfeitorias o fim das quotas leiteiras e dos direitos de plantio da vinha. O fim das quotas de açúcar acaba por ter um significado político que marca o fim de uma viragem em direção à completa liberalização da oferta que passa agora a reger-se única e exclusivamente através da lei do mercado. Mas como a realidade demonstra, o tal mercado que a União Europeia apregoa não passa de um mecanismo destinado a concentrar a produção nos países mais ricos criando laços de pura dependência e vassalagem para com os países mais pobres. Com a crise agrícola em pano de fundo, é hoje imperioso parar com esta deriva neoliberal ao nível da PAC, seja repondo os instrumentos de regulação da oferta, seja ao nível dos diversos acordos de livre comércio que estão a colocar uma pressão insuportável nos nossos agricultores.

(La seduta è sospesa per qualche istante)

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

8. Zusammensetzung der Delegationen

President. – Before we move to the vote, I give the floor to Ms Berès.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, n'ayant jamais eu l'honneur d'occuper votre position, je mesure toute la difficulté de présider les séances de notre assemblée.

Il n'empêche que ce matin votre prédécesseur, M. Wieland, a mené les débats de telle manière que, finalement, nous avons eu dix minutes de suspension, alors qu'il a interrompu un certain nombre d'orateurs, dont moi-même, dans des conditions parfaitement discourtoises et contraires à la cohérence de la pensée.

Donc, je voulais faire cette observation.

President. – Ms Berès, to show solidarity with Vice-President Wieland, I have never found him discourteous, but I take note of your comment. I will perhaps bring it to the Bureau and we could look at this issue because I also get criticism when I am very strict with time.

My one observation is that yesterday I did not use the gavel during one debate, as an experiment, and it actually worked very well. But we take note of your comment.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, for over one month now this Parliament has failed to fulfil its duty under Rule 20 of our Rules of Procedure, which sets out an imperative requirement. I quote: 'If it becomes necessary for the President, a Vice-President or a Quaestor to be replaced, a successor shall be elected'.

Former Vice-President, Ms Gáll-Pelcz, left the Parliament for the Court of Auditors in September this year, and I wish to announce to this Chamber, to the democratically-elected representatives of the European people, that I have fulfilled the criteria for nomination, according to Rule 15(1).

I ask the President to put the vacant post to the vote tomorrow, in order to stop embarrassing this Parliament with indecisiveness, and to give the EPP Group enough time to nominate their candidate. If they continue not to be interested in this important parliamentary post, I will humbly accept the seat of Vice-President by acclamation.

These times are scary, colleagues, and Europe needs leadership, not vacancies and empty-seat policies.

President. – Mr Tarand, your humility is noted and recorded.

As you know, the Conference of Presidents sets the agenda. With respect to their prerogative in this area, we will vote when they set a deadline for submission of nominations for the position and put it on our agenda. But we take note of your comments.

I have one announcement before the vote. The President has received from the S&D Group a nomination for membership of a delegation. This nomination will be noted in the minutes of the sitting. If no observations have been submitted by the time the minutes are adopted, the nomination will be deemed to have been accepted.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quería presentar una moción de orden por el artículo 186, porque hoy el debate de preparación para el próximo Consejo se ha centrado en la cuestión de Cataluña, y quien presidía el debate se ha quejado. El problema de esto es que el lunes decidieron permitir celebrar el debate sobre la situación de los derechos fundamentales en Cataluña solo a los presidentes de grupo y de una forma muy poco transparente. El presidente Tajani dijo el lunes que estábamos votando, en primer lugar, si el debate tenía lugar, en segundo, la hora, y, en tercero, el título; pero en ningún momento se votó ni se decidió en esta Cámara el formato.

Por favor, no traten de tapar la gravedad del conflicto de Cataluña y la violencia contra civiles con una chapuza. Deberíamos decidir claramente en qué formato vamos a celebrar ese debate. La ciudadanía y este Parlamento se merecen decidirlo clara y democráticamente.

President. – Just to inform the House: those of us who were here at the start of business reached an agreement across the House as to how this debate would be handled. We are all extremely aware of the sensitivities of this issue. I think that, as a responsible parliament, we look forward to this debate and hope that we can assist in a very delicate situation.

9. Abstimmungsstunde

President. – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details of the vote; see Minutes)

9.1. Übereinkommen zur Errichtung der internationalen EU-Lateinamerika/Karibik-Stiftung (A8-0279/2017 - Javier Couso Permuy) (Abstimmung)

9.2. Bestimmungen des Schengen-Besitzstands über das Visa-Informationssystem in Bulgarien und in Rumänien (A8-0286/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)

— *After the vote:*

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Madam President, in the previous vote I voted in favour, but the light changed by itself. I did not touch the button, so something must have happened. That is why.

(Laughter)

President. – Mr Melo, just be warned. Keep a close eye on the light on your vote should it move or change without your intervention.

9.3. Automatisierter Austausch von Fahrzeugregisterdaten in der Tschechischen Republik (A8-0288/2017 - Maria Grapini) (Abstimmung)

9.4. Automatisierter Austausch daktyloskopischer Daten in Portugal (A8-0289/2017 - Jaromír Štětina) (Abstimmung)

9.5. Automatisierter Austausch daktyloskopischer Daten in Griechenland (A8-0287/2017 - Claude Moraes) (Abstimmung)

9.6. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe (A8-0167/2017 - Daniela Aiuto) (Abstimmung)

9.7. Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen (A8-0168/2017 - Izaskun Bilbao Barandica) (Abstimmung)

9.8. System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (A8-0165/2017 - Dominique Riquet) (Abstimmung)

9.9. Einwände gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (B8-0542/2017) (Abstimmung)

9.10. Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Entwurf eines Durchführungsbeschlusses der Kommission über die Zulassung des Inverkehrbringens von Erzeugnissen, die genetisch veränderte Sojabohnen der Sorte FG72 x A5547-127 enthalten, aus ihnen bestehen oder aus ihnen gewonnen werden, gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über genetisch veränderte Lebensmittel und Futtermittel (B8-0540/2017) (Abstimmung)

9.11. Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO: Entwurf eines Durchführungsbeschlusses der Kommission über die Zulassung des Inverkehrbringens von Erzeugnissen, die genetisch veränderte Sojabohnen der Sorte DAS-44406-6 enthalten, aus ihnen bestehen oder aus ihnen gewonnen werden, gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1829/2003 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über genetisch veränderte Lebensmittel und Futtermittel (B8-0541/2017) (Abstimmung)

9.12. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (B8-0535/2017) (Abstimmung)

9.13. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (B8-0534/2017) (Abstimmung)

President. – That concludes the vote.

10. Stimmerklärungen

10.1. Sicherheitsvorschriften und -normen für Fahrgastschiffe (A8-0167/2017 - Daniela Aiuto)

Oral explanations of vote

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con questa relazione la relatrice si propone di introdurre un requisito di registrazione di notifica digitale dei dati dei passeggeri tramite procedimenti amministrativi armonizzati, intesi a facilitare le operazioni di ricerca e salvataggio in caso di emergenza.

Ho deciso di sostenere il lavoro della collega Bilbao, per la particolare attenzione rivolta alla tutela dei dati dei passeggeri alla loro distruzione quando non più necessari. Un aspetto, quello della tutela dei diritti e dei dati dei cittadini, molto caro in Movimento. Sono contenta di vedere che la nostra proposta di aggiungere la data di nascita e un numero di contatto ai dati richiesti sia stata accettata, contribuendo così a una maggiore chiarezza nelle identificazioni.

Per quanto riguarda alcune deroghe, sebbene avessimo chiesto che fossero accessibili, attraverso la creazione di un database pubblico online, la trasparenza delle esenzioni è comunque garantita dalla loro accessibilità al pubblico.

Ringrazio la collega per il lavoro svolto e saluto i suoi sforzi per una maggiore garanzia dei diritti dei passeggeri europei.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, vreau să felicit raportoarea și să spun că am susținut acest raport pentru că eu cred că protecția datelor este o prioritate și cred că modalitatea în care a fost cuprins în raport acest lucru trebuia votat.

Sper să fie și aplicat pentru că, de multe ori, avem probleme nu cu reglementarea, nu cu apariția unei noi legi, ci cu aplicarea. Este important ca datele să se șteargă, așa cum s-a prevăzut în raport și, de fapt, raportul a mers în sensul propunerii Comisiei, a fost un raport tehnic și mulțumesc celor care au contribuit.

Am depus amendamente și am susținut acest raport, considerând că este necesar să avem claritate în ceea ce privește protecția datelor pe navele de circulație.

Rupert Matthews (ECR). – Madam President, some years ago I wrote a book about the wreck of RMS Titanic. That terrible night showed all too clearly the consequences of not enforcing safety rules at sea.

These rules that we have passed today bring the European Union into line with the International Maritime Organisation, a branch of the United Nations which is based in London, a great maritime city with a seagoing heritage reaching back more than 2 000 years. That is a reminder that in many areas of international relations it is not the European Union that calls the shots, but other international organisations, and that Britain is already a member of many of those organisations. This is just another reason why I believe Brexit is going to be a great success.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zawsze wypowiadałem się przeciwko biurokracji i jestem – jak tego wielokrotnie dowodziłem – zwolennikiem jej ograniczania, dlatego też przyjąłem tę rezolucję z dużą satysfakcją. Cieszę się, że ogranicza się ilość rozmaitych potencjalnych ingerencji do mniejszej ilości podmiotów. Cieszy mnie także zapowiedź przewodniczącego Junckera, że Parlament Europejski w coraz większym stopniu będzie przeznaczać swój czas na rzeczy ważne, te rzeczy kluczowe, i rezygnować ze szczegółowych regulacji. Ten dzisiejszy dowód jest według mojej oceny znakomity, aby potwierdzić deklarację całego Parlamentu.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! A hatályos szabályokkal összhangban lefolytatott európai bizottsági célravezetőségi vizsgálat megállapította, hogy a jogi rendelkezésekben meglévő egyes pontatlanságok a nemzeti hatóságoknál eltérő értelmezésmódokhoz vezettek, különösen a tekintetben, hogy az irányelv hatálya kiterjed-e a kisebb hajókra, illetve más hajófajtákra.

Az Európai Bizottságnak most a követelmények egyszerűsítése és egyértelművé tétele a feladata, ezért átfogó felülvizsgálatot indított el. A jelentéstelevővel egyetértek abban, hogy a személyhajók biztonságáról szóló rendelet fő céljával annak biztosítását kell kitűzni, hogy az utasok és a legénység biztonságosan közlekedhessenek az Unióban a személyhajók fedélzetén. Többek között mindezek miatt szavazatommal támogattam a jelentést.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, my colleague, Rupert Matthews, just propagated an enduring myth, namely that the Titanic did not meet the safety standards of its time. It is an idea sedulously propagated ever since, not least in the film in which Leonardo DiCaprio and Kate Winslet show such impressive post-coital vigour and energy for the rest of the duration of the sinking. In fact, the Titanic was well in advance of the safety rules of its time on lifeboats and everything else, but I think there is a lesson to be drawn there about modesty, and about not thinking that you can declare some invincible or irresistible policy.

Look at the things we are voting on today: all these plans to eliminate unemployment and become the greatest knowledge economy, and so on. We are like the architects of that doomed vessel, with the lack of self-awareness to see that we cannot decree these things and make them happen. Let us rather act in the spirit of the poor bandleader, Wallace Hartley, who, in his final minutes, played himself out with his threnody, remembering the hymn he had learned as a boy. If we stick to what we know, rather than presuming to tell the rest of the world what to do, we might be a little bit more respected.

Lucy Anderson (S&D). – Madam President, in contrast to some of the bizarre views just expressed on the other side of the Chamber, this is a very important update to passenger ship safety laws. It is quite a technical measure but it is very important. The main purpose of these laws must be to ensure that passengers and crew can travel safely on board passenger ships and boats in the EU.

This simplification should help to ensure improved implementation, monitoring and enforcement of the rules, and it should therefore be supported. However, it is important that passenger confidence is maintained and that penalties for breaches of the national provisions adopted will be adequate and enforced. Some of my amendments and the amendments of colleagues have ensured that. The final text moves in the right direction in these respects. It is absolutely worth voting for, and I am glad that I did so.

10.2. Registrierung der an Bord von Fahrgastschiffen im Verkehr nach oder von einem Hafen eines Mitgliedstaates befindlichen Personen (A8-0168/2017 - Izaskun Bilbao Barandica)

Oral explanations of vote

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il collega Riquet per il lavoro profuso in questa relazione che mira ad eliminare l'incertezza derivante dalla coesistenza di due direttive sull'ispezione delle navi, rispettivamente la direttiva del 1999 e del 2009.

La proposta mira a eliminare alcune incertezze legate alle modalità tempistiche delle ispezioni dei traghetti Ro-Ro e alle unità veloci passeggeri adibite a servizi di linea da parte delle autorità competenti.

Due aspetti che mi stanno particolarmente a cuore sono la sicurezza dei passeggeri e gli aspetti sociali delle suddette ispezioni. Per quanto riguarda la sicurezza dei passeggeri, ho deciso di sostenere il lavoro della collega, perché il testo garantisce standard di sicurezza elevati, la semplificazione delle direttive precedenti non lede in questo modo i diritti dei passeggeri.

In merito agli aspetti sociali, le ispezioni previste da questa nuova direttiva tengono conto degli ambienti di lavoro e della vita personale di bordo, coniugando così una maggiore attenzione alla sicurezza con il necessario rispetto dei lavoratori e dei loro diritti.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Szavazatommal támogattam a tagállamok kikötőibe érkező, vagy onnan induló személyhajókon utazó személyek nyilvántartásáról szóló jelentés elfogadását. Egyetértek a személyhajók fedélzetén utazó utasok és a személyzet számbavételével kapcsolatos jelenlegi szabályok és nyilvántartásuk aktualizálásával, egyértelműsítésével és egyszerűsítésével, amely várhatóan a biztonság szintjének növekedésével jár majd.

Így hasznosnak ítélem a Bizottság által javasolt, egy ablakos nemzeti rendszeren keresztüli digitális bejelentést is a hosszabb távú utazás esetén, miközben osztom a jelentéstevő véleményét az utasok személyes adatainak védelmével kapcsolatos megjegyzéseit.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Bezpieczeństwo obywateli czy bezpieczeństwo ich danych osobowych – tak zaczynał się spór, który pamiętam, przy okazji kontroli ruchów pasażerskich, a dotyczyło to lotów lotniczych. Dziś mamy ten sam dylemat – bardzo dobrze rozstrzygnięty – przy okazji pasażerów statków.

Muszę powiedzieć, że według mnie nie ma sprzeczności między tymi dwoma elementami: trzeba dbać równocześnie o bezpieczeństwo danych osobowych, jak i bezpieczeństwo samych pasażerów. Te dwa elementy można upraszczać, można łączyć, a ta rezolucja jest tego najlepszym dowodem.

10.3. System von Überprüfungen im Hinblick auf den sicheren Betrieb von Ro-Ro-Fahrgastschiffen und Fahrgast-Hochgeschwindigkeitsfahrzeugen im Linienverkehr (A8-0165/2017 - Dominique Riquet)

Oral explanations of vote

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, votei a favor desta resolução porque o seu objetivo primeiro é assegurar a exploração segura dos navios ro-ro, passageiros e das embarcações de passageiros de alta velocidade. Com mais de 400 milhões de passageiros a passar em portos europeus todos os anos, o transporte marítimo tem sido um dos pilares fundamentais do crescimento económico e da prosperidade na Europa. Esta proposta da Comissão inscreve-se no programa para a adequação e a eficácia da regulamentação REFIT, tendo por objetivo simplificar o quadro legal, assegurar regras comuns, claras, simplificadas e reforçadas para os ferrys e as embarcações de passageiros de alta velocidade a partir da União Europeia e com destino à União Europeia, reduzindo os encargos administrativos que recaem sobre os armadores e racionalizar os esforços das administrações marítimas dos Estados-Membros.

Caros Colegas, acabamos de aprovar um quadro jurídico sólido e coerente do transporte marítimo de passageiros. Acredito que estas medidas garantem e reforçam o nível de segurança comum e um ambiente de concorrência equitativo para todos os operadores.

10.4. Einwände gegen eine Durchführungsmaßnahme: Wissenschaftliche Kriterien für die Bestimmung endokrinschädigender Eigenschaften (B8-0542/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W ostatnich raportach WHO i Europejskiej Agencji Środowiska potwierdzono na podstawie aktualnych badań szkodliwość chemikaliów stosowanych do produkcji żywności, kosmetyków, opakowań czy innych produktów plastikowych dla ludzi i środowiska. Zaburzacze hormonalne powodują zaburzenia płodności i wiele innych chorób cywilizacyjnych jak wady, nowotwory, cukrzyca, choroby neurologiczne, nad którymi Parlament debatuje co najmniej od 2009 r. Dlatego wstrzymałam się od głosu, mając nadzieję na postęp prac.

Pouczająca debata z jednej strony pokazywała odmienne stanowisko wobec obowiązującego prawa, ale przede wszystkim konflikt między dbałością o ludzkie zdrowie i środowisko a troską o konkurencyjność europejskiego rolnictwa na światowym rynku. Mimo ogromnej ilości środków, także biopestycydów, brakuje zapewnienia odpowiedniego poziomu ochrony chemicznej, gdyż producenci tych środków koncentrują się na najbardziej opłacalnych uprawach wielkoobszarowych.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, heureusement qu'il y a le Parlement européen. Nous pouvons être fiers de notre vote qui redonne de l'élan à la démocratie européenne, violente il faut bien le dire, de bout en bout sur ce dossier des perturbateurs endocriniens.

La Commission doit à présent revoir sa copie, tant elle nous a donné l'impression d'être tenue pendant huit ans par les lobbies auxquels elle n'a jamais cessé de se soumettre, au risque d'être tenue responsable, demain, d'un des plus grands scandales sanitaires en Europe. Il s'agit de lobbies très puissants, comme Monsanto, que le Parlement européen, lui, a tenu à distance en lui fermant la porte de notre institution.

La Commission doit agir maintenant en faisant le choix, non pas des intérêts morbides des lobbies industriels, mais de la santé des citoyens européens.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Predsednica, torej, Evropska komisija je zopet popustila lobijem in pa tisti industriji, ki želi zaščititi predvsem svoje lastne kapitalske interese, zlasti seveda na račun zdravja ljudi, zato seveda pozdravljam, da je danes Evropski parlament izglasoval veto na merila, ki jih je Evropska komisija predlagala za določitev endokrinih motilcev.

Komisija je seveda prekoračila svoj mandat s tem, ko je predlagala, da se določene kemikalije izvzamejo iz opredelitve endokrinih motilcev, ker merila bi tako zelo oteževala prepoznavanje endokrinih motilcev, kar pomeni, da bi bilo s trga odstranjenih zelo malo izdelkov, kar seveda koristi tej industriji. Kar pomeni, da bi seveda zopet izpostavili zdravje ljudi za interese kapitala.

Že večkrat smo opozorili, da so ti motilci snovi, ki lahko spremenijo delovanje hormonskega sistema ljudi in so izjemno nevarni in predstavljajo na nek način globalno grožnjo, zato še enkrat pozdravljam odločitev Parlamenta za ta veto.

Sylvie Goddyn (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, la proposition actuelle de définition des perturbateurs endocriniens, dont il faut rappeler qu'ils sont responsables de nombreux cancers, d'un accroissement de la stérilité chez les hommes et les femmes, d'une baisse généralisée du quotient intellectuel, ou encore de troubles comportementaux chez l'enfant, n'est en aucune façon à la hauteur de la fermeté et du courage qu'il faut avoir sur ce sujet.

Avec un coût sanitaire de 100 milliards d'euros par an pour l'Europe, les perturbateurs endocriniens sont un véritable fléau. Aujourd'hui, la Commission se moque du monde en faisant inscrire au débotté une dérogation concernant des molécules spécialement conçues pour perturber le fonctionnement du système endocrinien.

Ce n'est pas le rôle du Parlement européen d'encourager la fabrication de pesticides ayant comme mode d'action la perturbation endocrinienne. C'est pourquoi, avec mes collègues du groupe Europe des Nations et des Libertés, j'ai soutenu cette objection qui s'oppose à la définition des perturbateurs endocriniens proposée par la Commission.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ψήφισα υπέρ της αντίρρησης και χαιρετίζω το βέτο, το οποίο εγκρίθηκε από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο με 389 ψήφους. Είναι ένα σημαντικό μήνυμα προς την Επιτροπή ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δεν ανέχεται να γίνεται υπέρβαση εξουσίας, όπως έγινε εν προκειμένω με το σχέδιο κανονισμού της Επιτροπής σχετικά με τον καθορισμό επιστημονικών κριτηρίων για τον προσδιορισμό των ιδιοτήτων της ενδοκρινικής διαταραχής. Διότι από τη συζήτηση αποδείχθηκε ότι τα κριτήρια τα οποία αξιοποίησε η Επιτροπή, επί του πρακτέου προήλθαν από πολιτικό συμβιβασμό και δεν ήταν κριτήρια που έχουν σχέση με επιστημονικές και τεχνικές προδιαγραφές. Είναι γνωστό ότι οι ενδοκρινικοί διαταράκτες είναι χημικές ουσίες επικίνδυνες για τη δημόσια υγεία και για το περιβάλλον και χαιρετίζω για άλλη μια φορά την αποφασιστικότητα του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου να στείλει μήνυμα ότι δεν περνάει οι πιέσεις των λόμπι.

10.5. Kinderehen ein Ende setzen (B8-0535/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Tartózkodtam ennél a jelentésnél, és főleg azért, mert egyáltalán nem foglalkozott a gyermekházasságoknak azzal a de facto fajtájával, ami az én hazámban, Magyarországon is, különösen a roma közösségekben jellemző. Tehát itt nem de jure, jog szerinti házasságokról van szó, hanem olyan de facto, tényleges helyzetekről, amikor 14, 15, 16 éves, 17 éves lányok az úgynevezett szokások vagy tradíciók vagy hagyományok miatt közvetve arra kényszerülnek, nem valamiféle fizikai kényszerrel, hanem közvetett kényszerrel, hogy felhagyjanak a tanulással, gyermeket szüljenek, háztartást vezessenek, gyerekeket neveljenek, és ezáltal elveszítsék azt a lehetőséget, hogy máshogy élhessenek, mint az édesanyjuk generációja, a nagymamájuk generációja.

A cigányság felemelkedésének, és különösen a roma nők felemelkedésének a legfontosabb záloga a tanulás, az oktatás, a szakmaszerzés, és ehhez át kell törni ezeket az évszázados hagyományokat. Erre több gyakorlati útmutatást, és tanácsot szerettem volna ebből a jelentésből.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, caros Colegas, votei a favor desta resolução no reconhecimento de que o casamento infantil é uma violação dos direitos das crianças e uma forma de violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas e deve ser liminarmente condenado. O casamento infantil, precoce ou forçado, constitui uma violação dos direitos da criança e constitui uma negação básica do direito das crianças à autonomia de dispor do seu próprio corpo e ao respeito pela sua integridade física. Dados recentes da Organização Save the Children apontam que, a cada 7 segundos, uma menina de quinze anos é forçada a casar-se e o último relatório do Banco Mundial refere que todos os anos 15 milhões de meninas em todo o mundo se casam antes de completarem os dezoito anos, ou seja, direitos humanos fundamentais são negados a 37 mil meninas diariamente.

O casamento infantil, caros Colegas, precoce e forçado deve constituir uma das prioridades para a ação externa da União Europeia no domínio da promoção dos direitos das mulheres e dos direitos humanos no quadro do respeito pelos princípios fundamentais e pelos valores fundamentais essenciais da União Europeia, em particular, a igualdade de género e a proteção dos direitos da criança.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, аз подкрепих тази резолюция, защото намирам проблема със сключването на брак в детска възраст за изключително важен и търсенето на решението му за нетърпящо отлагане във времето. Този проблем съществува и в моята страна България, което ме прави още по-съпричастен към позициите, изразени в тази резолюция.

Според експерти, ранното начало на семеен и родителски живот създава предпоставки за ранно напускане на училище, което съвсем нормално означава, че тези деца не успяват да придобият умения, които са нужни за живота, и по този начин попадат в категорията на социално изключените хора.

В тази връзка, светът, в който живеем, е изключително динамичен и неусвояването на тези умения води до попадането на тези хора в категорията на хора, които страдат от бедност през целия си живот. Още повече, ако говорим и за проблеми със здравето, които възникват от ранната бременност.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przymusowe małżeństwa dzieci, najczęściej dziewczyny, i to często wysyłanych za granicę, to jest dodatkowy efekt masowej imigracji islamskiej. Efekt tym większy, im bardziej masowa jest ta imigracja, bo integracja społeczna tych rodzin byłaby prostsza, gdyby nie żyły w tak utrzymujących te nieeuropejskie obyczaje otoczeniach.

I wykorzystywanie tej patologicznej praktyki do tego, żeby forsować konwencję stambulską, to chyba najbardziej kuriozalny przykład lewicowo-liberalnego populizmu, którego często jesteśmy świadkami. Ja w tym kontekście chcę zwrócić uwagę, że kraje, które przeciwstawiają się konwencji stambulskiej – kraje katolickie, takie jak Chorwacja czy Słowacja – nie znają tej dramatycznej praktyki. Jedynym krajem, gdzie ona występuje, który podjął konkretne działania, żeby się temu przeciwstawić, uruchomił biuro, jest Wielka Brytania, i ona również nie ratyfikowała konwencji stambulskiej, więc naprawdę zastanówcie się Państwo nad tym.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Oczywiście popieram w projekcie rezolucji wyeliminowanie możliwości zawierania małżeństw przez dzieci, jakie dotyczy zwłaszcza środowisk imigranckich i przynajmniej w naszej kulturze chrześcijańskiej, europejskiej traktowane jest od dawna jako przemoc i przestępstwo, istniejące także w prawie międzynarodowym. Jednak zawieranie małżeństw przez dzieci jest popularne nie tylko wśród europejskich środowisk imigranckich, ale w Azji, w Afryce i całej Ameryce Łacińskiej, co wymaga przeciwdziałania na arenie międzynarodowej.

Przemoc seksualna, przymusowe małżeństwa stanowią poważne zagrożenie dla zdrowia psychofizycznego, porzucania edukacji, zwiększają możliwość wykorzystania i przemocy seksualnej, a nawet wielu chorób i śmierci.

O ile ochrona dzieci i przeciwdziałanie przymusowym małżeństwom powinny być priorytetem, to jednak nie może być zgody na kontrowersyjne zapisy dotyczące finansowania aborcji, a także wykorzystania dramatów dziewczynek do wprowadzenia nie mniej szkodliwej i urazowej seksualizacji.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przymusowe małżeństwa kilkuletnich dziewczynek są obrzydliwym, są pedofilią w czystej postaci. Wstrząsające dla mnie jest to, że do takich małżeństw dochodzi również w wielu krajach Unii Europejskiej. Szczególnie można tutaj wskazać te kraje, które tak głośno krzyczą o konwencji stambulskiej, która jakoby miała chronić przed przemocą. A to w tych krajach również do takich małżeństw dochodzi, szczególnie w strefach objętych szariatem.

Zastanawiające jest to, jak Unia Europejska chce pouczać stać cały świat, a sama nie potrafi posprzątać w swoim własnym domu. To właśnie w związku z nasilającym się kryzysem migracyjnym to patologiczne, zbrodnicze, bestialskie postępowanie niestety się szerzy. Chcę powiedzieć z całą odpowiedzialnością, że Komisja Europejska, jej przywódco, powinni podjąć radykalne działania i wszcząć wszelkie procedury przeciwko państwom członkowskim Unii Europejskiej, gdzie ta patologia występuje.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, υπερψήφισα το ψήφισμα για την εξάλειψη των γάμων παιδιών, διότι οι γάμοι παιδιών, οι πρόωροι γάμοι, οι καταναγκαστικοί γάμοι συνιστούν παραβίαση και άρνηση των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων των παιδιών. Σύμφωνα με τα στοιχεία, στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες το 1/3 των κοριτσιών που συνάπτουν γάμο είναι κάτω των 18 ετών, το 1/9 είναι κάτω των 15 ετών. Αποδεικνύεται, λοιπόν, ότι στην πράξη στερούνται αυτά τα παιδιά και την εκπαίδευση, πέραν του γεγονότος ότι οδηγούνται σε πρόωρη εγκυμοσύνη ως δήθεν απόδειξη της γονιμότητας. Κατά την άποψή μου, η Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης πρέπει να προωθηθεί, καθώς απαγορεύει τον καταναγκαστικό γάμο. Ο ρόλος της κοινωνίας των πολιτών είναι σημαντικός, αλλά πρέπει να επισημάνουμε ότι οι πρόωροι γάμοι έχουν, κυρίως, σχέση με ισλαμικές παραδόσεις, οι οποίες πλέον περνούν και στην Ευρώπη, καθώς είναι αυξημένος ο αριθμός των μεταναστών. Και αυτό πρέπει να σταματήσει.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem toto usnesení podpořil, budu ve svém vysvětlení stručný. Pokládám danou rezoluci za správnou, i když do jisté míry měkkou, umím si představit i tvrdší rezoluci. Osobně bych byl především pro to, aby EU zvýšila diplomatický tlak na země, které porušují tato práva dětí, protože tyto sňatky jsou nepochybně porušením základních práv dítěte. Je to násilí na dětech, je to sexuální násilí. Měli bychom to řešit nejen ve světě, ale podle mého názoru samozřejmě i na domácím dvorku, protože jak jsem se dozvěděl, v Německu je dokonce několik set těchto manželství uzavřeno. A myslím si, že je důležité především si udělat pořádek doma, ale také vzhledem k tomu, že se jedná o základní právo dětí, využít i diplomatickou službu EU.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, it is important that the Parliament today supported this resolution on the issue of child marriage. It affects both boys and girls, but in fact girls are more at risk. Eighty-two percent of married children are girls. It is not just a problem for third countries. It is also a problem that affects Europe.

The Istanbul Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence asks that the act of intentionally forcing a child to enter into marriage be criminalised. So, if we are serious about gender equality, we need to act in this area as well and end the practice. It promotes the empowering of women through education, and it improves social and economic development for women.

There have been important recommendations in the resolution that we work with law enforcement authorities on the need for special training and assistance in this area and on education and prevention programmes, and that special procedures would be applied to refugee and asylum seekers reception centres. These are important recommendations, and it is essential that we welcome the fact that Parliament has today put this item on the political agenda. We need more political commitment to working in this area, in particular, internationally.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil toto usnesení, protože to považuji za velmi důležitý boj proti tomuto potlačování lidských práv, konkrétně dětí. Ale chci tady sdělit, a proto jsem zvolil formu vysvětlení hlasování, že mne mrzí, že ta samotná deklarace dnes přijatá je z mého pohledu příliš měkká. Myslím si, že jsme měli být tvrdší ve svém usnesení.

Třeba bod 14, který se týká dětských sňatků v členských státech EU, hovoří pouze o tom, že máme tento jev řádně monitorovat. Já se domnívám, že bychom měli na území EU vyvinout evropskou iniciativu, jak zkrátka dětské sňatky na území EU vymýtit. Je to forma v zásadě trestné činnosti. Takže proto říkám ano, usnesení podporuji, ale do budoucna bychom měli být i na evropské úrovni tvrdší, razantnější proti tomuto negativnímu jevu.

10.6. Klimakonferenz 2017 der Vereinten Nationen in Bonn, Deutschland (COP23) (B8-0534/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, изменението на климата е само предизвикателство пред нас, но е участ за следващите поколения. Затова смятам, че трябва отговорно отношение и конкретни стъпки, които да намалят ефекта от глобалното затопляне.

Особено съм притеснен от факта, че южната част на Европа, към която принадлежи и моята страна България, ще бъде засегната от зачестилите климатични крайности. Наводненията и засушаванията са само няколко примера. Ще има и повишаване на температурата.

Изменението на климата ще засегне много сектори, един от които е земеделието, който се грижи за прехраната на всички нас. В тази връзка земеделието и сектор горско стопанство могат да бъдат основните приемници на парниковите газове, които се получават заради климатичните промени.

От тази гледна точка подкрепих тази резолюция. Смятам, че 23-тата конференция по изменение на климата в Бон трябва да надгради това, което беше заложено в Маракеш и Париж.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Wylesianie i degradacja lasów, lasów nie tylko tropikalnych, odpowiada za 20 % problemów klimatycznych związanych z emisją gazów cieplarnianych. O tym mówi także ta rezolucja, ale nie zwraca uwagi na słabości mechanizmów, słabości różnego rodzaju narzędzi, aby temu przeciwdziałać, także w Europie.

Wydaje mi się, że zwrócenie uwagi na zwiększanie się stopnia zurbanizowania miast w Europie, przeznaczania wielu terenów zielonych albo przeznaczonych pod tereny zielone na nowe bardzo gęsto zabudowane osiedla to problem Europy i problem poważny. Zwróciłbym uwagę właśnie w Bonn, kiedy będziemy mieli ten kolejny szczyt klimatyczny, aby pokazywać dobre praktyki, aby starać się zwiększać siłę oddziaływania, tak aby ograniczenia parków, lasów, ogrodów w obszarze naszej odpowiedzialności, europejskiej odpowiedzialności, dało się ograniczyć.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, this text is important for Parliament. It clarifies and defines its position in view of the COP 23 Climate Change Conference. The text is important and I would emphasise – and have done – the contribution of all sectors, specifically those of international aviation and the maritime sector.

Efforts are ongoing in the area of the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Maritime Organisation. So it is very important that we reiterate that global agreements are the best place in which to deal with emissions and with the effect on climate change in these areas. We have done so previously in other resolutions, and it is important that it is reiterated today.

I also think that the ambitious targets that have been set down in the Paris Agreement, whilst they are very welcome, do not guarantee that significant climate impacts will be avoided. The resolution has called for global greenhouse gas emissions to reach their peak, and to do it as soon as possible.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η κλιματική αλλαγή είναι πραγματικά σημαντική πρόκληση για την ανθρωπότητα και φυσικά όλοι παλεύουμε ενάντια στην υπερθέρμανση του πλανήτη. Βεβαίως πρέπει να λάβουμε σοβαρά υπόψη τι συμβαίνει. Διότι ο δεύτερος μεγαλύτερος ρυπαντής του κόσμου, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, έχουν αποχωρήσει πλέον από τη Συμφωνία του Παρισιού και δεν δεσμεύονται. Το ερώτημα είναι: πώς θα αναγκαστούν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες να επανέλθουν και να δεσμευτούν; Δεύτερον, η Κίνα δεσμεύεται ουσιαστικά σε κανόνες για μετά το 2030. Άρα μέχρι τότε ουσιαστικά και η Κίνα θα ρυπαίνει τον πλανήτη. Όσον αφορά την Ινδία, συμβαίνει το ίδιο. Επομένως, ποια είναι τα όρια παρέμβασης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης; Τι μπορεί να κάνει μόνη της η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με τα μέτρα τα οποία λαμβάνει; Διότι τα παρεμβατικά μέτρα που ισχύουν μόνο για την Ευρώπη, επί της ουσίας διαλύουν την ανταγωνιστικότητα της Ευρώπης και είναι εις βάρος των ίδιων των καταναλωτών και των πολιτών της.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Najważniejszym zadaniem negocjatorów klimatycznych jest sfinalizowanie prac nad pakietem wykonawczym do porozumienia paryskiego. Konferencja w Bonn będzie kluczowym krokiem na drodze do ostatecznego celu, jakim jest przyjęcie wszystkich decyzji w trakcie COP24 w Katowicach. W Bonn musimy osiągnąć mierzalny cel, czyli opracować pierwsze projekty decyzji, a także jasny, ale i elastyczny harmonogram dalszych prac.

Polska popiera wynikającą z porozumienia paryskiego otwartość w zakresie dobrowolnego wyboru metod realizacji jego celów, aby możliwe było zachowanie bezpieczeństwa energetycznego i bezpieczeństwa dostaw uwzględniającego uwarunkowania krajowe i opartego na wykorzystaniu własnych zasobów energetycznych. Konferencje klimatyczne w Bonn i w Katowicach będą doskonałymi momentami dla utrzymania dynamiki z 2015 r., dlatego przyjęcie pakietu wykonawczego do porozumienia paryskiego będzie stanowiło początek lepszej przyszłości dla naszej Ziemi.

President. – That concludes the explanations of vote.

11. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(The sitting was suspended at 13.08)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

12. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 15)

Carlos Iturgaiz (PPE). – Señor presidente, le pediría que se retire una bandera golpista contra un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea, que es España, que están enarbolando esas personas.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, under Rule 162, on Monday in this House I proposed, as did other representatives of political groups, that we should have a debate on the situation in Catalonia. This is a complex situation. It requires a proper debate, and I believe that the suspension of blue cards and catch-the-eye for this debate means that this matter cannot truly be debated. I would just like to put on record my protest that this debate is now containing the bare minimum in the way of debate.

If these events had happened anywhere else in the world, if this had been something that had happened in the USA or Russia, we would be holding a major debate on this now. Yet with something that is actually happening in a Member State of the European Union, it seems that we are doing the absolute bare minimum. I just want to put that comment on record.

(Applause)

Presidente. – La discussione è adeguata. Credo che bisogna portare rispetto alla Commissione europea e ai presidenti dei gruppi che interverranno. Tutti i gruppi avranno la possibilità di parlare, per cui verranno espresse tutte le posizioni dell'intero Parlamento.

Enrique Calvet Chambon (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, une petite remarque pour plus de précision dans nos débats, parce que la confusion est à l'ordre du jour.

Je demanderai à mes collègues, quand ils parlent de ce problème, qui est un problème espagnol, de parler de la Catalogne espagnole et pas de la Catalogne tout court, parce qu'il existe heureusement une Catalogne française très démocratique qui n'a rien à voir avec tout ça. Par conséquent, soyons précis dans nos allocutions.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, with respect to the previous interjection, this is not a Spanish-Catalonian problem. This is a problem of human rights, decency, democratic process and democratic rights. It is a matter not just for the European Union, but an international matter.

13. Verfassung, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Grundrechte in Spanien vor dem Hintergrund der Ereignisse in Katalonien (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the Constitution, rule of law and fundamental rights in Spain in the light of the events in Catalonia (2017/2888(RSP)).

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, today's debate is carefully worded as being about the Constitution, the rule of law and fundamental rights in Spain in the light of the events in Catalonia.

In Europe, after the Second World War, then after the end of dictatorships in Spain, Portugal and Greece, and again after the fall of the Berlin Wall, we have shaped our democratic societies on the basis of three principles: democracy, respect for the rule of law, and human rights. The three need each other. They cannot exclude each other. You cannot use one against the other. If you remove one pillar, then the others will fall too.

Respect for the rule of law is not optional: it is fundamental. If the law does not give you what you want, you can oppose the law, you can work to change the law, but you cannot ignore the law.

(Applause)

So it is fundamental that the constitutions of every one of our Member States are upheld and respected, and this is the basis for our debate today. In that debate, we should be guided by the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union, values which are common to Member States and citizens, and on which our Union is founded.

As Jean-Claude Juncker said in his State of the Union address to this House last month, our Union is not a state but it is a community of law. We must never lose sight of this. There is general consensus that the regional government of Catalonia chose to ignore the law when organising the referendum held last Sunday, the Spanish Constitutional Court having suspended the Catalan laws on the organisation of the referendum and issued daily penalties against those who went against its orders.

That does not change the fact that we have all seen saddening images from Sunday. Let me be clear: violence does not solve anything in politics. It is never an answer, never a solution, and it can never be used as a weapon or instrument. Europe knows this better than anywhere else. None of us want to see violence in our societies. However, it is a duty of any government to uphold the rule of law, and this sometimes requires the proportionate use of force.

We understand that people wanted to express their views. Freedom of expression is a fundamental right for all European citizens, and thus for all Spanish citizens. But one opinion is not more valuable than another opinion only because it is expressed more loudly.

As the Commission has stated, under the Spanish Constitution Sunday's vote in Catalonia was not legal. Looking ahead, it is clear that an agreed way forward is needed in Spain. In the Commission's view, as President Juncker has reiterated repeatedly, this is an internal matter for Spain that has to be dealt with in line with the constitutional order of Spain. That is why the Commission has called on all relevant parties to move quickly now from confrontation to dialogue. The power of dialogue – of sitting down and talking to each other even if, and especially when, we passionately disagree – is what our Union is built on. All lines of communication must stay open. It is time to talk, to find a way out of the impasse, while working within the constitutional order of Spain.

At the end of the day, the real answers can only come from all those concerned. Those directly concerned are all 46 million Europeans who are Spanish citizens. Those indirectly concerned are all Europeans who are citizens of all the other Member States.

Jean-Claude Juncker is in touch with Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy, who, I trust, will ensure that the situation is resolved in a spirit of dialogue and in full respect for the Spanish Constitution and the fundamental rights of citizens. This must be the goal for all of us.

Allow me to stress that the development of Spain since the Spanish people liberated themselves from dictatorship is one of the greatest success stories Europe has seen in its history.

(Applause)

In less than my lifetime, Spain was transformed from a nation under the boot of a dictator into a nation that leads globally in a great many areas, where every citizen has full rights protected by the rule of law, where culture flourishes and the economy grows. This is the awe-inspiring achievement of all Spaniards, including Catalans. It would not have been possible without full respect for the rule of law, respect for the separation of powers, and respect for the rulings of judges. And, let me add, nowhere is attachment to the rule of law stronger than in those nations which have memories of what it means to be deprived of it.

All this was achieved through hard work, commitment, dialogue and respect for diversity. Please let this inspire all of us to leave the path of confrontation and follow the road of cooperation and dialogue to resolve the situation.

(Applause)

Manfred Weber, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, nobody can remain indifferent to what we have seen in Catalonia over the last days. We are very sorry for all those who were hurt. The news arriving from Catalonia is extremely worrisome. Citizens were hurt, but so also were policemen who were sent to stop the referendum – not by the Spanish Government, they were sent by Catalan judges to defend the rule of law.

The European People's Party (EPP) rejects force as a political solution. European history teaches us that violence is never an answer. What is at stake today is the integrity of an EU Member State, and this justifies the debate we are having today. An EPP Group colleague, who is from Catalonia, yesterday told us: 'I am Catalan and I am Spanish.' It is not a conflict between Catalonia and Spain, he said, it is a conflict within Catalonia. A government without a majority of votes in the last elections is using all means for this escalation. We as the EPP, cannot accept such a behaviour. Europe is built upon the rule of law and Spain is built upon the rule of law. There is no doubt that Spain is a country that guarantees fundamental rights for all citizens. We stand by the freedom to demonstrate. For a living democracy, freedom of demonstrations is not only indispensable, it is also desired.

Nevertheless, demonstrations cannot replace a democratic decision-making process in a society. Not the protests on the streets, but the institutions in a democracy in Spain, will decide on the future of the country. Let me be very clear: mass demonstrations in Barcelona will not change the Constitution of Spain. Only democratic institutions can do so. For the moment, everybody is focusing on the separatists, but who is taking the perspective of the rest of the country into account? Spaniards from Catalonia, Aragon, Castilians, have been living together in one country over centuries peacefully and now an irresponsible government in Catalonia is splitting the country. The Spanish legal situation is clear for us: in Spain, no person in charge, not even the Catalan regional government, is allowed to disregard the law. The rights of all Spanish citizens have to be respected. It is unacceptable that a few Catalan politicians encourage civil servants, officials and citizens to break the law.

From our point of view, the referendum is not valid. The legal base was not adopted in line with the Constitution of Catalonia. It is against the Spanish Constitution, and last Sunday, the Catalan authorities were changing the electoral law 45 minutes before the so-called referendum started. This is not credible behaviour.

Another point dear friends is also clear: we need an inner-Spanish dialogue, on the basis of Spanish law. We appeal to everybody, please sit all together. Instead of further escalations, we call upon all the actors involved to engage in dialogue in Spain, but first and foremost in Catalonia itself. A peaceful dialogue in Spain is necessary. We will not find a solution to this Spanish internal conflict here in the European Parliament. This conflict can only be solved by the Spanish people itself. The EU has neither the will nor the right to intervene in a true liberal democracy such as Spain. The dialogue has to be frank. The times in Europe in which division trumped compromise, hatred won over cooperation and egoism beat solidarity, have long gone.

As a Bavarian, I know that nation states are compatible with proud regions. Europe needs both strong nation states and regional diversity. For today we appeal to the Catalan authorities: do not take irreversible steps and please keep in mind that whoever leaves Spain, leaves the European Union. This means leaving the internal market, leaving the Schengen area and leaving the Eurozone. Is this really in the Catalans' best interest? Europe is living in historic times. This morning, we asked for more European cooperation in our debate. The European way of life does not need division, but unity in diversity. The European way of life needs not more nationalism but more cooperation. The European way of life needs not more egoism but solidarity and the willingness to compromise.

We are sorry for all people hurt. We stand behind Spain's integrity. We support the Spanish Government and the politicians who respect the rule of law and we ask everybody for a constructive, peaceful dialogue in a European spirit.

(Applause)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io penso che questa sia l'ora dell'unità e della responsabilità, non delle divisioni, non delle bandiere, non del tifo, bensì l'ora della prudenza e della saggezza. Dimentichiamo per un attimo le nostre appartenenze: dobbiamo pronunciare una parola sola: «Parad»!, «Fermatevi»!

A volte basta un gesto per cambiare il corso della storia. E quando si è sull'orlo del baratro, basta poco per cadere nel baratro; ma basta anche poco un gesto di raziocinio e di buona volontà perché il dialogo riparta, come ha chiesto il primo vicepresidente Frans Timmermans.

Mi rivolgo, innanzitutto, al governo della Generalitat catalana. E lo dico esplicitamente: una dichiarazione unilaterale di indipendenza sarebbe un'ulteriore provocazione e getterebbe benzina sul fuoco dopo l'inutile referendum di domenica: un plebiscito unilaterale imposto in aperta violazione della Costituzione democratica e dello Stato di diritto. Un governo regionale che rappresenta meno del 50% non può pregiudicare il futuro di un popolo intero.

Il referendum non era legale, lo abbiamo detto in molti e non si tratta di un'arguzia giuridica. Sfidare oggi la legalità internazionale significa contribuire a distruggere quel sistema di regole che ha assicurato la pace in Europa negli ultimi cinquant'anni, sorto proprio per proteggere i popoli più deboli contro l'arbitrio dei più forti.

E dovremmo guardare con meno superficialità al ritorno del nazionalismo in Europa. Quando si sventola la bandiera della secessione, quando le identità tendono cioè ad escludere invece che ad includere, si sa dove si inizia ma non si sa dove si finisce.

Alcuni di voi ricorderanno la frase pronunciata da François Mitterrand nel suo ultimo discorso al Parlamento europeo: «*le nationalisme, c'est la guerre*». È la guerra! Io non rinuncerò mai all'idea che si possa essere allo stesso tempo catalani, spagnoli ed europei, senza bisogno di creare nuovi Stati, nuove frontiere e c'è un filo indissolubile che lega Catalogna, Spagna, Spagna, Europa: l'Europa è nata per riconciliare i popoli. L'Europa è nata per portare unità e pace.

In questi giorni, mentre in Spagna si discute di secessione, in Germania si celebra l'anniversario della riunificazione tedesca. La riconciliazione: questa è la ragione d'essere dell'Unione europea. Siamo nati per questo ed è per questo che noi europei dobbiamo fare tutto il possibile perché si esca da questa impasse. Noi lo dobbiamo non soltanto perché la Spagna è parte di noi, ma perché noi siamo – o dobbiamo essere – i difensori dell'Europa, dell'essenza dell'Europa, del DNA dell'Europa.

Voglio rivolgermi anche al Primo ministro, Mariano Rajoy, senza voler fare polemica: dico con onestà intellettuale che la gestione di questa crisi poteva essere e doveva essere diversa. I socialisti spagnoli e catalani hanno offerto proposte serie e praticabili, anche contemplando la possibilità di modificare la Costituzione. Si può cambiare ma con gli strumenti propri, non in spregio delle leggi e delle regole comuni: si lavora così in uno Stato di diritto: rispettando le leggi. Possiamo avere opinioni diverse ma nessun democratico può compiacersi delle cariche della polizia e degli scontri di domenica scorsa. E quando c'è un'irruzione delle forze di polizia in modo sproporzionato, c'è sempre il fallimento della politica.

Ora c'è bisogno di uno sforzo di rigenerazione. Serve un nuovo inizio. E io voglio fare un appello alle autorità catalane: non pronuncino questa sera la dichiarazione di indipendenza perché questa pronuncia potrebbe essere foriera di nuovi scontri e di nuovi disastri.

L'appello è congiuntamente rivolto al Primo ministro Rajoy, affinché, insieme alle altre forze politiche spagnole, porti avanti con tutte le loro forze il dialogo, perché la Spagna ha bisogno della sua integrità e della sua unità: una Spagna forte, con realtà interne forti e autonome dentro un'Europa ritrovata.

Questa è la nostra missione.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the European Commission repeatedly resorts to a moralistic language. We have just heard it talking about a union of values, but when we view the actions of the Commission in the handling of this particular situation in Catalonia, it looks more like a union of selective values. The double standards of the Commission is something that leaps to the eye. All are equal, but some are more equal than others. Everything depends on who is involved. Let us be honest, ladies and gentlemen, if it were another Member State rather than Spain, the consequences and the rhetoric from the Commission would have been far harsher.

I want to be clear: I do not believe the EU, or the European Commission for that matter, strengthens the EU's unity through infringement proceedings, or triggering the articles of the Treaties or all the political point-scoring and suchlike. This polarises the debate and pushes Member States and its voters further away from the EU. I urge the Commission to practice the virtue of self-restraint, but consistently, not selectively.

Coming to Catalonia, I do believe – a rather simple-minded observation but always worth repeating – that significant progress can be made through patient negotiations. Whether and how soon an effective resolution is possible in Catalonia, I do not know, and very few people, if anyone, in this Chamber knows that. I wish to be honest with our Spanish colleagues: riot police and violent scenes have not helped but shocked and, whatever your intentions, those scenes will continue to be a part of the image of your government for some time. Let us admit it, the handling of the crisis was appalling. It was really appalling.

What are the next steps to be taken? Whether it involves constitutional reform, or the granting of a referendum or international mediation, the role of the Commission is probably as an intermediary or a go-between. It is for the Spanish Government, Spanish society and the Catalanian people to decide for themselves. However, I do caution that the passions of those citizens in Catalonia seeking a new settlement is unlikely to fade away by simply drowning out or ignoring the voices of dissent.

To sum it up, the action of the riot police, the conspicuous silence or the Aesopian language of the European Commission will not make the problem disappear.

(Applause)

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I have to tell you first of all that I am a big admirer of Spanish democracy, especially since that dramatic date of 23 February 1981. That was the day that Colonel Tejero attempted his coup d'état. Javier Cercas, in his famous book '*Anatomía de un instante*', describes how, under the threat of Tejero's pistol, three Spanish political leaders stayed upright in their seats, refusing to hide under their benches. They were Santiago Carrillo, the historical leader of the Communist Party, Adolfo Suárez, the first Prime Minister of democratic Spain, and his deputy, General Gutiérrez Mellado.

Despite the shots, not one of them blinked, an act of courage and determination that anchored forever democracy in Spanish souls. Spanish democracy was born under the pistol of the putschist Tejero, so no one among us has to give a lesson in democracy to Spain.

(Applause)

Now, 36 years later, Spanish democracy has to surmount itself again – to surmount this deep division and to overcome this existential crisis. It has to do so not by believing that the judiciary can solve the problems on its own, and certainly not by using deplorable violence, even though it is based on a court ruling. In other words, this cannot be done just by relying on the power of the state.

No, what we need is a renewed political vision, an inclusive dialogue, a vision that the future and the interest of all people living in Spain lies in a multicultural, multilingual, federal state embedded in a multicultural, multilingual, federal Europe. It is true that you cannot go against the law and it is also true that you cannot govern without the law, but it is even more true that you cannot solve such a deep division only with the law. You also need to listen, to try to understand each other, to have dialogue and to talk with each other. That is the only way to find solutions, and that is the real strength of good politicians and of statesmen.

To my friends in Catalonia, it is not in the interests of your citizens to pursue separatism at all costs. That the referendum was against the Constitution is not my main point. The point is that this referendum simply lacked basic democratic legitimacy. You knew very well in advance that a majority of Catalans would not participate and would stay at home, as the majority of them are against separation. It is not by accident that you did not even install a minimum threshold. So the result of this referendum was already known before it began. What do you call this? Manipulation? Deception?

Moreover, to declare independence based on the outcome of a defective referendum is totally irresponsible, not so much for Spain, not so much for Europe, but for Catalonia itself. It will cause a fatal fracture in your society, a fracture that may be impossible to heal. Who is going to profit from this gamble? The anti-Europeans who, as we know, want to destroy our union and who have already started to abuse your cause and violate our treaties today.

(Applause)

I urge all sides to stop the escalation and to go and sit around the table. The spirit there, around that table, has to be the understanding that the future of more than 70 European nations, the future of Catalonia, the future of my own Flemish community, lies not in brutal separation but lies in deep cooperation – cooperation inside federal structures in a federal Europe. Look a little bit – if I can ask that – to your own Basque countrymen. Look at what they have achieved, how they have developed their country, defeating terrorism and reinventing themselves, proud and autonomous.

(Applause)

Finally, let me say that in politics it is not shameful to make compromises. The opposite is true. I have done it all my life and I am still alive. But, moreover, when you have to make a choice between the steps forward of a compromise or the standstill due to purity, then choose the way forward, however small the steps may be. In the words of Barbara Tuchman, in her famous book – whose title is applicable today – ‘The March of Folly’: ‘Don’t throw away the greater for the less, and don’t pursue the unworkable at the sacrifice of the possible’.

(Applause)

Patrick Le Hyaric, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, chers collègues, si dans n’importe quelle contrée lointaine, on avait, ce premier dimanche d’octobre, empêché par la force les citoyens de s’exprimer dans les urnes, fait charger la police, violenté et blessé plus de 900 personnes, tous les dirigeants européens auraient protesté contre le chef du gouvernement responsable de ces actes, demandé de mettre ce pays au ban des nations et que sais-je encore, peut-être demandé un blocus économique.

Or, ces événements se sont déroulés dimanche en Espagne, du fait d’un gouvernement aussi froid que faible, assis à la table du Conseil européen, alors que les autorités européennes détournent le regard en laissant une nation de l’Union se déchirer.

Nous vous demandons, M. Timmermans, de condamner clairement et sans délai la violence et la répression en Catalogne, et de dénoncer la violation de la charte des droits fondamentaux.

Cette crise ne nous est pas étrangère car on ne peut accepter l’usage de la force dans l’Union européenne, pas plus que nous ne pouvons accepter les proclamations unilatérales du gouvernement de Catalogne.

Nous devons demander au gouvernement espagnol de cesser son escalade dans la tension, dans l’utilisation de la répression et de la force policière et militaire. Et nous devons demander au gouvernement espagnol, comme au président du gouvernement de Catalogne, de mettre un terme à cette logique de confrontation, qui peut mener au pire. Les premières victimes ne seront pas les responsables politiques mais les citoyens et le peuple.

Hors de toute ingérence, l’Union européenne doit proposer ses services pour faciliter le dialogue en vue d’une sortie pacifique et démocratique de cette crise, dans le respect du droit international, du pacte fondateur de la constitution espagnole de 1978, de l’histoire de la Catalogne et de l’Espagne, et du pacte des droits civils et politiques de 1966 ratifié par l’Espagne, dont l’article premier dispose que «tous les peuples ont le droit à l’auto-détermination».

Le dialogue doit donc reprendre et nous devons le favoriser. Aidons à la recherche d’un compromis, qui passera sans doute par une définition commune du statut du référendum de dimanche dernier. Oui, il est illégal, oui, il n’a pas de légitimité démocratique, mais on ne peut pas ignorer l’aspiration à s’exprimer, l’aspiration démocratique des Catalans.

En même temps, les institutions régionales doivent être respectées, ainsi que le statut d’autonomie de la Catalogne. À partir de là doit s’ouvrir une période de dialogue et de débat approfondi en Catalogne et dans toute l’Espagne, dans la perspective de la conférence constitutionnelle, à l’issue de laquelle le peuple doit pouvoir se prononcer.

De façon plus générale, cette crise pose une nouvelle fois les questions de la sortie des politiques d’austérité imposées par la Commission européenne, du combat contre les inégalités territoriales, et d’une juste répartition des richesses au sein de l’Union européenne et de chaque pays.

Elle interroge aussi notre conception de l’Union européenne: soit une Europe de la coopération et de la solidarité, communauté de nations libres et souveraines, soit une Europe fédérale de régions en concurrence, sous domination encore plus grande des puissances industrielles et financières. Notre choix doit être la coopération, la solidarité et l’union des peuples libres et souverains.

Le dernier mot doit revenir à la démocratie.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, last Sunday will be remembered as a sad day and, I think, not just in Spain but all over Europe. We saw peaceful citizens confronted with a huge police force ready to use all the force they had. Families, pensioners, people of all backgrounds, were confronted with a state that was willing to use almost all means to stop the referendum from taking place.

The world was watching while this was happening, while the riot police met people with brutality, charging with batons and even firing rubber bullets. Polling stations and hotels, schools and city halls and streets were turned into front lines between national police and their own citizens. What happened in Spain is unacceptable. I think it will unfortunately also set the image that we all have of the situation for the future. This was massive police violence against peaceful people, and that was beyond any proportionality. Violence so disproportionate cannot be justified, no buts and no excuses. Whatever you think about the referendum, whatever you think of independence, I think that has to be clear: that violence is not a mean for solving political conflict.

And whatever the views about the referendum and everything, it is also clear that the strategy of Prime Minister Rajoy has clearly failed. He has refused the dialogue that was offered and he has used and reverted more to judicial means, to police means. But the judges cannot solve a political problem, police cannot solve a political problem. Criminal prosecution cannot work that way. It is inappropriate. What we need is a political solution, but rather than doing that Rajoy has worsened the problem. He has escalated the situation. The massive mobilisation we saw yesterday: it is not just independentists who are appalled by what happened last Sunday. I really think that Rajoy has not really been helpful in this situation.

In the future, I believe the Spanish Government must refrain from using police violence against peaceful people. It must aim to find a political solution, because the Catalan crisis is a political crisis, a political problem and therefore it needs to be solved politically, not by police force. The political solution must always mean that people talk to each other, that all sides talk to each other.

I believe the European Union has a role to play in that because the whole affair is not just an internal matter for Spain. Spain and Catalonia are inside the European Union. President Juncker cannot sit on the fence and just watch from Berlaymont what is happening and how the conflict escalates. The Catalan crisis is a European affair. It goes to the heart of the European Union's fundamental values because the European Union is built on the conscious decision to live together on this continent, settling our differences, however great they might be, through dialogue, through negotiation and through compromise rather than through violence. It is wrong, I believe, that the Commission shies away. It is its duty as the guardian of the Treaty to get involved and help in solving this problem, to offer mediation, to offer its help. I think this is something I would really expect of the European Union. Citizens all over Europe are looking at us, looking at what we are doing in the European Union. I think it is important that we offer our help, that we promote dialogue, that we tell both sides to stop escalations. The Commission can be an honest broker here.

Colleagues and Commissioner, I think it is very important that all of us understand how grave the situation is and how easily and how quickly it can escalate even further. No one knows what tomorrow will bring. I think if we have any chance at all to do something, to do our small bit, then we should do it. I believe, Mr Timmermans, that you have a chance to do something and I hope that we will use it all together.

The Spanish and the Catalan Governments, of course, also have their responsibility. They have to agree to negotiate, to sit together, to accept mediation and to prevent further escalation. The whole crisis is a breakdown of the rules and the democratic consensus that so far ensured a peaceful and non-violent relationship between Spain and Catalonia. The right to self-determination is firmly anchored in international law, and both sides, both the Spanish Government as well as the Catalan Government, have to take the responsibility to find a common solution for how to put it into place in a peaceful and in a democratic way.

Further police violence and intimidation will not solve the problem. Many actors have called for dialogue, including all over Catalonia, such as the Mayor of Barcelona, Ada Colau, many people have called for dialogue. Colleagues here have said that this is the way forward. I think this is something we all have to agree on. The European Union is built on dialogue. We have to solve political problems by political means and dialogue is the only way forward.

(Applause)

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I note the breaking news saying that the Spanish Government has now sent the army into Catalonia. This is not a good sign. We have all seen the media images regarding the attempted suppression of the independence referendum called by the Catalan Government over the weekend. My first question would be: why? Why did the Madrid Government feel it necessary to stop this in such a heavy-handed, brutal and, in the final analysis, counter-productive manner? It is blatantly obvious that by doing so, they have handed the initiative to the Catalan nationalists. Is the Madrid Government so afraid of its own people and so removed from political reality that it thought these actions would calm the situation?

Given that the Madrid Government has repeatedly stated, and we have heard it today, that a majority of Catalans do not want independence, and furthermore that the referendum had no validity under Spanish law, why did the government not simply state that whatever the result, the vote was null and void, and the Catalan Government was merely wasting everybody's time and money? Instead of which we now have a template which every independence movement on our continent can use to provoke unrest. Mark my words: by their actions, Mr Rajoy and his advisers have lit a bonfire under your Europe.

The fact that the EU's institutions and its leaders have failed to recognise the human rights abuses which have taken place and have instead focused merely on legalistic verbiage shows how shallow the foundations of this project really are. Any ruling order that can condone acts of state violence has no popular legitimacy. Those Catalans who have looked to the EU for succour will be sorely disappointed. I feel that the only way the Spanish Government can restore trust is to accept that its behaviour was ill-conceived, launch an immediate independent committee of inquiry into the violence and state, that when the inquiry has concluded, a new and binding referendum under the auspices of the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights will take place. Otherwise, ladies and gentlemen, this fire will burn and it will spread.

Marcel de Graaff, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Mr President, in July of this year the Commission and this Parliament threatened Poland with the withdrawal of voting rights because of legislation on the judiciary. The Commission and Parliament opposed amendments to the Constitution of Hungary, which included the organisation of public broadcasters. The Commission and this Parliament are fully at ease with the condemnation of laws and constitutions of democratic states when they do not obey the diktats of Brussels.

They claim that the EU is a community of values. What they do not say is that laws are subordinate to it, that democratic decisions, freedom and self-determination are subordinate to it. Freedom, democracy and human rights apply only to Member States that serve the EU agenda.

For Spain, national sovereignty and the primacy of the Constitution apply. For Poland and Hungary, they do not. This EU is indeed a community of values: of double values and double standards. If you are in favour of the EU elitist, globalist agenda, then you can do anything. When you are against it, they will combat you using all available means.

The hypocrisy of this Commission has no limits. In September last year, Mr Juncker explicitly condemned violence against Polish workers in the United Kingdom. In Spain 800 people have been beaten up and needed hospital treatment because hundreds of thousands were about to vote in a formally illegal referendum. In its declaration, the Commission stated only that violence can never be an instrument in politics. Certainly, violence does not belong in politics. And of course the state has the monopoly to use force to protect the rule of law. The state can use proportionate violence to stop unlawful behaviour or to prevent this from happening. But when hundreds of thousands illegally enter a country, would it be proportional to beat up 800 of them (so that they end up in hospital)? Would your response there be that violence can never be an instrument of politics?

I am convinced that Mr Timmermans would explode in anger and this Parliament would demand immediate action, so let me be clear: I fully support the rule of law – that is, the rule of law of the sovereign nation state, the free nation state, the democratic nation state. That is the rule of law which should be defended. However, I certainly cannot accept the hypocrisy of this Commission and this Parliament, which are concealing the advancement of their own elitist economic interest under the guise of European values.

I am completely against silencing opponents, against financing pro-EU propagandists and persecuting EU-sceptical parties and Member States, and I am telling Mr Timmermans and Mr Verhofstadt that Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union calls for respect for human dignity and equality. Equality and respect are not a right only for Europhiles and globalists: they are a right for all citizens in the EU. They should start acting accordingly.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, Sunday, 1 October, will forever be remembered in Spain and across the globe as the day that a forgotten history of Spanish state brutality on its people returned to its country. I watched with horror as a grandmother's blood washed down her tear-strewn face after a beating by the Spanish police. I watched as young people, hands held aloft in peace, were smashed by black-suited armed storm troopers and their wild batons.

The shame on Spain rests mainly on Rajoy, and now also the King of Spain, for not only permitting the brutality of their police, but also – shamefully – for blaming the violence on those violated and seeking to dismiss the abused as the originators of the abuse. And what of the European Union's response? Their first response should have been to completely condemn the violence. But no, whilst every right-minded person was outraged, they were critically silent on the violence. They sought to deflect the issue as a matter of breaking the rule of law by Catalans. This is from the EU, which recognised the independence of Kosovo without a referendum and which recognised Palestine as a nation state, even though the EU treaties did not permit it.

Twenty five years ago, Barcelona held the Olympics. The closing song was 'Amigos para siempre'. It was written by a Brit, Andrew Lloyd Webber, and sung by a Catalan, José Carreras. It means 'friends forever'. Well, I will tell the Catalan people: there are those who oppose violence by your police against you, and they are your friends forever, but if the EU continues to ignore the violence against your people, you will know that they are not your friends ever.

Frans Timmermans, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, perhaps you will allow me to reiterate that, for the European Union as a whole to function, respect for the rule of law is important. If you believe that because you feel passionately about something you can then say 'Because I feel so passionately I get to say what the rule of law is' and you can also say 'I feel so passionately I can ignore the rule of law', then be aware of the fact that what you think works for you now can be used against you by others who, perhaps, might feel as passionate about their position.

The rule of law in our Union is the only thing that protects the weak from the power of the powerful. The rule of law is the only thing that protects what is small from what is big. The rule of law is the only way we can create a union of Member States and citizens where big does not dominate small, where there is equal treatment before the law of every single citizen wherever they come from.

(Applause)

I detect, in some of the discourses by political movements who feel deeply inspired by populist nationalism, that democracy is portrayed as a tool you can use against the rule of law, that because you are a majority the minority no longer exists. The rule of law is enshrined in the EU Treaties, signed by sovereign Member States, ratified by national parliaments and thus conferring the protection of the law on every single European citizen. I insist on this today because I know you also debated the political side, the violence and everything else, and I would refer to what was said by Guy Verhofstadt about that. From the institutional position of the Commission, however, I have to insist on this point of the rule of law.

I say this also because there is no doubt – not in this Chamber, and not even among those who are extremely critical – that the referendum held on Sunday was not within the remit of the rule of law. There is also no doubt that the only way forward is dialogue, and there is also no doubt that Spain is a country where the rule of law is respected, where the institutions are independent and where there are no impediments whatsoever for a dialogue to start immediately. The only thing you need is political will.

Presidente. – Ringrazio la Commissione europea, custode dei Trattati, per la chiara posizione espressa in quest'Aula. Alla luce della discussione che si è appena svolta e come sintesi della posizione espressa dalla maggioranza del Parlamento, voglio sottolineare alcuni elementi fondamentali: come la storia dell'Unione europea ci insegna, in democrazia l'unica strada da percorrere è quella di lavorare insieme per la concordia e l'unità.

Nessuno, nessuno ha gradito gli eventi accaduti domenica. Ma le decisioni unilaterali, compresa la dichiarazione di indipendenza da uno Stato membro, sono in contrasto con l'ordinamento giuridico europeo e sono destinate a provocare pericolose divisioni.

Da questo Parlamento parte un appello a sostegno di una riflessione serena e profonda, che favorisca il dialogo in Spagna, nel rispetto del quadro costituzionale, compreso lo Statuto dell'autonomia della Catalogna, e che restituisca la politica alle istituzioni.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – Quello che è accaduto in Catalogna parla di una storia di inadeguatezza politica e di arroganza istituzionale, di violazione delle leggi e dei diritti civili, prima che politici. In altre parole: un episodio vergognoso nel cuore della civilissima Europa. Civilissima perché viviamo in uno Stato di diritto, abbiamo un ordinamento e delle leggi che sono i punti di riferimento del nostro agire, politico e istituzionale, e non solo dei meri principi ispirativi. Ma civilissima anche perché democratica, perché esiste la libertà di parola, di pensiero, di manifestazione – come giuridicamente andrebbe derubricato un referendum incostituzionale – contro la quale ogni uso della violenza costituisce un abuso, una repressione inaccettabile, che non credo rimarrà senza conseguenze. E in mezzo a tutto questo, l'assordante silenzio delle Istituzioni europee, che non dovevano e non devono parteggiare ma sicuramente non possono ignorare il problema senza tentare una mediazione. Mediazione che deve essere ancora possibile, prima che la situazione ci sfugga di mano e degeneri ulteriormente. Anche l'Europa ha i suoi testi di riferimento, che dicono che la Spagna è membro dell'Unione e che la Carta dei diritti fondamentali, pur non essendo integrata nei Trattati, ha il loro stesso valore giuridico.

Eugen Freund (S&D), schriftlich. – Dialog statt verhärteter Fronten! Es steht außer Zweifel, dass das am Sonntag in Katalonien abgehaltene Referendum über die Unabhängigkeit der Region keine rechtliche Basis hatte und das Ergebnis dadurch auch rechtlich nicht bindend sein kann. Genauso steht aber auch außer Zweifel, dass die gewaltsame Reaktion der konservativen Regierung Spaniens unverhältnismäßig war. Auch wenn die Stimmabgabe ungesetzlich war, darf darauf nicht mit Gewalt geantwortet werden. Die Zusammenstöße zwischen der Polizei und der Zivilbevölkerung hätten durch frühzeitige Gespräche verhindert werden können. Rechtsstaatlichkeit ist ein sehr wichtiges Gut, und das gilt für beide Seiten. Kritisiert werden muss, dass die katalanischen Behörden ihre Bürger trotz der negativen Justizurteile des spanischen Verfassungsgerichtshofs und katalanischer Gerichte zum Urnengang aufriefen. Genauso aber muss die monatelange Untätigkeit der spanischen Zentralregierung kritisiert werden. Der Konflikt zwischen Madrid und Barcelona ist nicht neu, genau deshalb kann er aber nur politisch und nicht mit polizeilichen Maßnahmen gelöst werden. Die Europäische Union muss hier vermitteln, und beide Seiten sollten das anstreben. Auch die Katalanen haben unterschiedliche Ansichten. Auch darauf muss entsprechend reagiert werden. Eine Lösung kann nur durch einen rechtlichen und politischen Dialog herbeigeführt werden – zu diesem müssen beide Seiten bereit sein.

Ana Gomes (S&D), por escrito. – O referendo de 1 de outubro foi unilateral, não permitindo que parte significativa da população da Catalunha votasse: mas só aconteceu porque não houve negociação sobre um estatuto autonómico num quadro constitucional em que a entidade nacional catalã se possa afirmar. Eu sou europeísta e federalista, logo contra a fragmentação de Estados e nacionalismos na UE.

Mas ninguém fez e está a fazer mais pela causa independentista da Catalunha do que o governo do Sr. Rajoy, somando à recusa de negociar a repressão de pacíficos cidadãos que queriam votar, a que todo o mundo assistiu horrorizado no passado dia 1. A tragédia do franquismo que conduziu à guerra civil em Espanha está na nossa memória coletiva. Como portuguesa, não posso deixar que resvalemos para mais enfrentamento violento. A UE não pode ficar à margem, a coberto do argumento estéril da legalidade: este problema não é apenas espanhol, é de toda a UE: afetados seremos todos se a Espanha se partir ou explodir em mais violência. É premente que a UE intervenha e facilite o diálogo e a negociação, contra medidas unilaterais que só farão escalar a violência.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), kirjalikult. – Ma olen väga mures, et niivõrd vanad kultuurirahvad nagu hispaanlased ja katalaanid on jõudnud sellisesse olukorda, et vajavad Euroopa Liidu vahendust. Sõltumata sellest, et PPE ja S&D teesklevad, et probleemi ei ole, eksisteerib ta tegelikult ikka ja seega ma nõuan presidentidelt Junckerilt ja Tuskilt ning õnnetul kombel ka just praegu roteeruvat ELi eesistumist pidavalt Eesti peaministrilt Rataselt kiiret ja otsustavat vahendusplaani, mille võiks Euroopa Parlamendile esitada hiljemalt kahekümne kolmandaks oktoobriks käesoleval aastal.

László Tőkés (PPE), írásban. – Kevésbé ismert, hogy az október 1-jei katalóniai népszavazást megelőzően a katalán kormányzati tisztségviselők, valamint a megfenyegetett polgármesterek zaklatása idején a spanyol parlament 166-158-as arányban leszavazott egy Mariano Rajoy miniszterelnök represszív politikájának támogatására irányuló törvényhozási határozatot.

A madridi parlamenti többséghez hasonlóan Európa többi demokratikus országa és polgárai sem érthetnek egyet azokkal az elnyomó és erőszakos módszerekkel, amelyeket a spanyol hatóságok, illetve karhatalmi erők alkalmaztak a vasárnapi népszavazáson a katalóniai választópolgárokkal szemben. Az Európai Parlament jelentős számú tagjával egyetértésben határozottan elítélem a spanyol rendőrség által elkövetett erőszakos cselekményeket. A teljes körű és tényleges kisebbségi autonómia hívéként a spanyol–katalán viszony, tárgyalások útján történő, békés rendezését sürgetem.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), por escrito. – Os acontecimentos ocorridos em 1 de outubro na Catalunha, pela sua substância e gravidade, são intoleráveis. Perante os factos, nenhuma das partes pode reivindicar a razão para o seu lado. O Governo Autónomo e as autoridades centrais foram cúmplices ao não evitarem a escalada da violência política e física. Urge que reatem o diálogo de forma a encontrar uma via de solução política que, respeitando o Estado de Direito democrático, permita que os catalães expressem a sua vontade em relação ao modelo de autonomia e relacionamento com o Estado espanhol. Neste contexto, as instituições europeias devem exortar ao diálogo político em Espanha, enquanto Estado-Membro da UE, e reforçar a sua vigilância para usar os instrumentos legais ao seu dispor, se isso vier a ser necessário, para assegurar o primado do direito e dos direitos fundamentais naquele País.

14. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

Vizepräsident

15. Der fiskalpolitische Pakt und seine Integration in den Rechtsrahmen der EU (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema gemäß Artikel 153a der Geschäftsordnung: „Der fiskalpolitische Pakt und seine Integration in den Rechtsrahmen der EU“ (2017/2866(RSP)).

Bei dieser Art von Aussprache gibt es kein *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren und auch keine blauen Karten.

Marco Valli, autore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi parliamo del *fiscal compact* e quindi della sottrazione della sovranità dei popoli e della loro sottomissione attraverso il vincolo economico.

Per farlo dobbiamo tornare un po' alla preistoria: 1972. Si parte col serpente monetario, il primo tentativo fallito di vincolare i cambi delle valute, per poi riuscire ad attuarlo nel 1979 con lo SME. 1981: gli italiani lo ricorderanno bene; è l'anno della separazione tra la Banca d'Italia e il ministero del Tesoro ad opera di due federalisti, nonché architetti di questa Unione europea, Ciampi e Andreatta, che consegnarono il controllo del nostro debito pubblico al mercato finanziario. 1992: il trionfale ingresso in Maastricht, con l'introduzione di vincoli numerici, come quello del limite della spesa del 3%, basati su nessun tipo di logica economica. Poi, nel 1999, arriva l'euro, voluto da Prodi che dichiarava: «lavoreremo un giorno di meno e guadagneremo come se avessimo lavorato un giorno in più».

La verità è che ci hanno privato della leva monetaria, senza dirci che ci avrebbero tolto la libertà di autodeterminarci. Ed eccoci al 2012: l'anno in cui 25 Stati membri su 28 sottoscrivono il *fiscal compact*, rendendo vincolanti il principio di pareggio di bilancio e il parametro del debito/PIL del 60% contenuta in Maastricht. Nel 2012 i governi si sono dati appuntamento a 5 anni per discuterne. Quei 5 anni scadono tra 3 mesi e i cittadini, a Natale, potrebbero trovarsi sotto l'albero l'ennesima cessione di sovranità, perché il *fiscal compact* diventerà giuridicamente superiore alla legislazione nazionale e renderà irreversibili le politiche liberiste ed austerità.

Il *fiscal compact* assume la trappola del debito unico come cornice indiscutibile entro la quale costruire la gabbia per i diritti sociali e del lavoro e la privatizzazione dei beni comuni. Se i governi confermeranno il *fiscal compact*, il mio paese per esempio, sarà obbligato per i prossimi vent'anni a portare il rapporto del debito PIL dall'attuale 133% al 60% attraverso un taglio sconsiderato della spesa pubblica relativa al welfare, e soprattutto, trattamenti medievali per le pensioni e i diritti dei lavoratori.

Questo è il pareggio di bilancio previsto dal *fiscal compact* e inserito nella Costituzione italiana con un colpo di Stato avvenuto nel 2011, per mano del professor Monti. Quello che è la Grecia è il più grande successo dell'euro, sostenuta dai partiti come il Partito democratico e Forza Italia che militano nel Parlamento europeo tra socialisti e popolari, che hanno vincolato per sempre la democrazia del mio paese al volere di Bruxelles.

Molti di voi a telecamere accese continuano a dire di essere contrari a questi principi di austerità ma lo fate solo per raccogliere voti: è accaduto nel passato, sta accadendo nel presente e non possiamo permettere che accada anche in futuro con questioni vitali come quelle sancite nella relazione Brok-Bresso, la parlamentare del Partito democratico del 40% di Renzi, quello della riscossa contro l'austerità e i vincoli economici, una relazione vergognosa, dove si celebrano il *fiscal compact* e quella che di fatto è un'istituzionalizzazione della troika.

Volete trasformare il Meccanismo europeo di stabilità nel Fondo monetario europeo, volete istituzionalizzare quel sistema perverso e di ricatto per fare in modo che gli Stati siano schiacciati dalla Troika. Volete istituzionalizzare tutto questo. Ci chiedete di mettere i nostri soldi nel Meccanismo europeo di stabilità e poi ce li date in prestito per pagare interessi finanziari insostenibili e soprattutto illegittimi. Il tutto orchestrato da un super ministro dell'Eurozona che dirà ai popoli cattivi della periferia quali riforme lacrime e sangue dover implementare.

Quindi che cosa sono il pareggio di bilancio e il *fiscal compact*? Sono semplicemente dei beceri strumenti di ricatto verso i diritti dei popoli europei, in contrasto con i principi delle Costituzioni dei nostri paesi e nello stesso trattato di Lisbona su cui si dovrebbe fondare tutta questa Unione europea.

Ma tutto questo può essere fermato entro fine anno: gli Stati dovranno decidere il destino del *fiscal compact*. Questo Parlamento ha il dovere morale di dare un'indicazione negativa alle politiche di austerità insostenibili e depressive.

Noi nel 2012 non c'eravamo: oggi sì e sappiamo che il nostro governo umilierà ancora i suoi cittadini. Chiediamo a questo Parlamento di sostenere la nostra battaglia per stracciare definitivamente il *fiscal compact*.

Matti Maasilta, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, the Intergovernmental Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the economic and monetary union aims for its substance to be incorporated into the EU legal framework. This includes the fiscal compact. At present, a review of the implementation of the fiscal compact by Member States is ongoing. In the context of the March 2017 Ecofin Council, Member States had a first exchange of views on this based on a Commission report.

According to this report, all contracting Member States have significantly adapted their national fiscal frameworks as a result of the fiscal compact requirements, but the Council has not yet been in a position to address the issue of integrating the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance into EU law. At the same time, a broader debate is currently taking place on the future governance of the EMU, of which the fiscal policy coordination is a part.

The Presidency supports this debate and looks forward to the Commission's legislative package on the economic and monetary union deepening to be presented on 6 December. This, as we understand, will include a proposal for incorporating the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance into EU law. Going forward, the December inclusive euro area summit at the invitation of President Tusk will be an important meeting, following which work on the EMU governance reform will continue.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, as you know, the fiscal compact is a cornerstone of the Intergovernmental Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance in the Economic and Monetary Union (TSCG). It was signed in March 2012 by 25 Member States. 22 out of those 25 contracting parties, namely the euro area countries Bulgaria, Denmark and Romania, are bound by the fiscal compact. The chief objective of the fiscal compact is to strengthen budgetary discipline by operating as a complement to the Stability and Growth Pact, the EU rule-based framework.

In fact, the fiscal compact was initially proposed as an amendment to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and became part of the intergovernmental instrument only after having failed to garner unanimity in the European Council. But this intergovernmental approach was understood from the onset as a way to move forward swiftly, as a response to the economic and financial crisis. The integration of the fiscal compact into Union law was already foreseen at the time of its creation. This is clearly acknowledged in the text itself, specifically in the so-called repatriation clause. This clause states that the necessary steps will be taken with the aim of incorporating the substance of the TSCG into the Union legal framework within five years at most from its entry into force. This means 1 January 2018.

The Commission is not legally bound by the provisions of TSCG. However, as a general principle, the Commission is in favour of integrating intergovernmental arrangements such as TSCG or the Treaty Establishing the European Stability Mechanism into Union law. These intergovernmental solutions were conceived as stop-gaps during the crisis. Their incorporation into Union law would bring greater democratic accountability and legitimacy across the Union.

These are not just the views of the Commission. The Five Presidents' report argues that a well-functioning Economic and Monetary Union would benefit from the integration into Union law of all intergovernmental instruments created during the crisis.

The Commission's Reflection Paper on deepening the Economic and Monetary Union published this May recalls the agreement among the contracting parties to integrate the relevant provisions of the fiscal compact into EU law as one of the elements towards completion of the Economic and Monetary Union by 2025. Accordingly, President Juncker's letter of intent that accompanied his State of the Union speech lists this step among the priority initiatives to be taken forward by the end of 2018. The integration into Union law should take into account the flexibility built into the Stability and Growth Pact.

The Commission is currently exploring the concrete options for this incorporation, with the aim of putting forward the proposal as part of the December package on the EMU as announced by President Juncker. I am looking forward to hearing your views.

Dariusz Rosati, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, the fiscal compact, as part of the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance, was adopted in 2012 as a response to the lack of compliance by some Member States with the provisions of the stability and growth pact. Its objective was to strengthen budgetary discipline across the EU, with the introduction of more effective and stricter fiscal rules, including independent monitoring, the automatic corrective mechanism, transposition of a balanced budget rule into national legislation, and swifter sanctions for non-compliance.

Four years after the Treaty entered into force, its implementation is only partly completed, and the results achieved are not very impressive. First, specific measures undertaken to comply with the fiscal compact vary from country to country, with different degrees of commitment and effectiveness. As a result, the budgetary situation in some Member States has not improved despite a generally better macroeconomic environment and stronger growth. Moreover, many Member States do not generate progress towards their medium-term objectives at a sufficient speed.

Moreover, the overall fiscal framework in the EU has become even more complex making its implementation more difficult and less transparent. Therefore, further steps are needed. While fully endorsing the fiscal compact, we need to enforce it more effectively. First, we need to make sure that its transposition into Member States' legislation leads to stronger national ownership and better compliance with the rules. Second, we have to reduce the complexity of the whole EU fiscal framework in order to make it more transparent and to ensure better monitoring and equal treatment of all Member States. And third, the revised and improved fiscal compact should be incorporated into the primary law of the EU to give it more legal clout and make it binding for all Member States.

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, Monsieur le représentant du Conseil, le TSCG (pacte budgétaire), signé et entré en vigueur en 2012, prévoit en son article 16, cinq ans après, son intégration dans le droit communautaire. Peut-être est-ce le moyen de transformer le TSCG, objet juridique mal identifié, en un instrument qui soit plus conforme à ce qu'il aurait dû être depuis le départ, et non pas un traité intergouvernemental accaparant des institutions de l'Union.

Pour autant, dès le début, notre groupe a été très clair, et nous avons bataillé pour que, a minima, les objectifs poursuivis par ce traité soient conformes à ceux qu'il nous semble indispensable de poursuivre, à savoir l'objectif d'une croissance durable de l'emploi, de la compétitivité et de la cohésion sociale.

Dès le départ, nous avons aussi été critiques sur la conditionnalité de l'accès au mécanisme européen de stabilité qu'il instituait, sur l'incorporation nécessaire dans l'ordre juridique des États membres de la règle d'or ou sur le durcissement qui nous semblait excessif de la surveillance budgétaire.

D'entrée de jeu, nous avons dit qu'il fallait que ce traité soit complété par des politiques économiques favorables à la croissance durable ou à la création d'emplois.

Nous en venons aujourd'hui aux conditions de son intégration dans le droit communautaire. Depuis longtemps, ce Parlement européen, résolution après résolution, et la dernière fois encore, dans le rapport de Guy Verhofstadt, demande que cette intégration soit précédée d'une évaluation rigoureuse de l'expérience acquise au terme de sa mise en œuvre. De ce point de vue, je ne peux que citer le président Juncker lui-même qui, dans son discours sur l'état de l'Union, a dit très clairement que l'application intelligente des règles avait permis d'améliorer la situation de l'Union sans casser la croissance.

C'est dans cet esprit que nous vous demandons de réviser et d'évaluer ce pacte pour le rendre conforme à l'objectif que nous avons toujours poursuivi. De ce point de vue, il y a beaucoup à faire car, dans le calcul des déficits structurels, dans l'évaluation de la trajectoire d'ajustement des économies, lorsqu'elles rentrent dans le « bras » préventif du pacte, nous voyons bien que le traité, tel qu'il a été dessiné il y a cinq ans, n'est pas adapté.

Par conséquent, nous soutiendrons une intégration, mais après une évaluation rigoureuse dans le cadre d'un débat démocratique ouvert que nous sommes prêts à mener.

Joachim Starbatty, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Es ist bekannt, dass Währungsunionen auseinanderbrechen, wenn die fiskalpolitische Disziplin nicht in allen Mitgliedstaaten ausgeübt wird. Jeroen Dijsselbloem, der Präsident der Euro-Gruppe, hat das in einen Vergleich gebracht, der das Haus sehr aufgeregt hat. Er sagte: Wenn die einen sich mit Frauen und Schnaps vergnügen, können sie nicht erwarten, dass andere die Zeche bezahlen! Schäuble hat das auch gesagt – nur vorsichtig. Warum ist es so, dass wir dauernd darüber sprechen, dass der Fiskalpakt effektiver ausgestattet werden muss, dass man da noch etwas ändern muss, dass man den integrieren muss? Warum ist das so?

Es ist ganz einfach! Wenn die Länder nicht für ihre Entscheidungen haften, können sie auch nicht für bestimmte Dinge haftbar gemacht werden! Es ist wie bei einem Fußballspiel. Wir haben Fußballspielregeln, und Regelverstöße werden geahndet. Dafür gibt es eine gelbe Karte. Und jeder Spieler weiß, dass bei einem zweiten Regelverstoß nicht eine zweite gelbe Karte, sondern die rote Karte kommt. Jeder Spieler weiß, dass bei mehrfachen Regelverstößen Platzverweis droht. Aber wenn es keine roten Karten gibt, kann man so viele gelbe Karten zeigen, wie man will, es wird sich nichts ändern!

Wir haben hier beim Fiskalpakt ein System, wo nur gelbe Karten aufgezeigt werden. Deswegen fragen wir uns immer wieder: Warum wird das nicht besser?

Jetzt haben Jean-Claude Juncker und Emmanuel Macron einen europäischen Finanzminister und ein eigenes Budget vorgeschlagen. Nur ist der Finanzminister nichts anderes als die Fortschreibung des Fiskalpakts. Wenn die Länder nicht wollen, dann wird man sie nicht disziplinieren können. Denn wenn wir sagen, wir haben eine unauflösliche Schicksalsgemeinschaft, und kein Land das Euro-Währungsgebiet verlassen muss, dann können wir uns nicht wundern, dass es Regelverstöße über Regelverstöße gibt.

Die Konsequenz wird sein, dass nur die Fonds, die Budgets für das Euro-Währungsgebiet übrig bleiben – also weitere Transfers, eine fiskalische Drainage. Aber was wir als Ökonomen auch wissen, ist: Wenn Subventionen und Transfers eingeführt werden, hören sie nicht irgendwann mal auf, sondern sie perpetuieren sich! Das ist die Erkenntnis der Ökonomie und auch der Politik. Budgets für das Euro-Währungsgebiet werden das Problem nicht lösen, sondern sie werden es verlängern, weil es jetzt nicht mehr notwendig ist, Regeln einzuhalten, denn andere kommen ja dafür auf!

Wenn ich dann Herrn Timmermans' Engagement für die Rechtsstaatlichkeit höre, die notwendig ist, – da unterstreiche ich jeden Satz, jeden Akzent! Aber in der Europäischen Währungsunion ist es ja so, dass wir uns nicht fragen: Ist das regelgerecht? Sondern wir fragen uns: Was müssen wir tun, um das Euro-Währungsgebiet zusammenzuhalten? Da werden auch Regeln gebrochen! Ich möchte, dass die Kommission und das Haus die Rechtsstaatlichkeit auch für die Währungsunion anwenden.

Petr Ježek, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the Economic and Monetary Union needs improvement in the areas of stability, convergence and governance. We do not only need to put in check public deficits, which in most Member States are now under control. We also need to reduce the excessively high debt levels to free money to invest in the future.

We also need to keep public spending under control so as not to overburden future generations, and we need to cater for future crises by not over-spending in economic good times so we have sufficient buffers in case the next crisis comes from the US. Moreover, the economic policies in the Union need to be more closely coordinated to generate positive spill-over effects and to enhance competitiveness in all Member States. We need a coordinated effort in modernising and reforming economies to create jobs and growth and face global competition. The Union has created so many new institutions, structures and procedures partly under Union law, partly on an intergovernmental basis, but not all of these new creatures have an equivalent counterpart holding them accountable.

If we want our citizens to have greater acceptance of the decisions that are taken at EU or indeed national level, we need to make sure that those can be effectively scrutinised, as many of these issues can be addressed if the Fiscal Compact were to be transposed into Union law. It is not without flaws and some of its provisions may need amendments, but overall, my group is strongly in favour of transposing the Treaty on Stability, Convergence and Governance to the greatest extent possible into the Union law in order to strengthen the principle of sound public finances, improve economic policy and coordination and legal uncertainty, and allow for proper democratic accountability.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, a estabilidade, a coordenação e a governação da União Económica e Monetária foi assinada em 2012 como resposta à crise financeira de 2008. Mas, em vez de tirar lições desta crise financeira, acentuou os aspetos mais negativos do Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento, querendo assim matar o paciente com a doença.

Como era de esperar, o tratado orçamental apenas prolongou a trajetória de divergência encetada com o euro e o Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento, impondo austeridade e a agenda neoliberal da União Europeia aos Estados-Membros contra a vontade dos seus povos.

Como o demonstra a situação de Portugal, a austeridade não é inevitável, revertendo as medidas da troika, apesar da chantagem da Comissão Europeia e das ameaças de sanções e cortes dos fundos estruturais, os salários e as pensões aumentaram, os impostos sobre o trabalho diminuíram e as privatizações andaram para trás, o crescimento voltou e o défice até baixou. Em vez de incorporar o pacto orçamental no quadro jurídico da União Europeia, melhor seria acabar com a União Económica Europeia ou, pelo menos, permitir a saída ordenada dos Estados-Membros que assim o desejem.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señor presidente, el Pacto Presupuestario ha sido uno de los grandes errores de la Unión Europea y uno de los puntos de inflexión que han alimentado de alguna forma también el antieuropeísmo. Este acuerdo intergubernamental es el buque insignia de la austeridad en Europa y ha sido el elemento que ha permitido al Consejo ser el brazo ejecutor de un programa de austeridad y reformas estructurales que ha empobrecido a muchos países y disparado las desigualdades.

Ahora ya podemos decir que esta receta ha sido un fracaso a nivel económico y devastadora a nivel social. Este artefacto, además, tiene graves faltas de escrutinio democrático tanto por el Parlamento como por parte del Tribunal de Luxemburgo.

Permítame que le recuerde cómo se aplicó en España la llamada «regla de oro» en 2011: con una reforma antidemocrática de la Constitución, sin debate, sin refrendo ciudadano, creando una grave crisis institucional...

Y muchas de las crisis institucionales posteriores tienen una gran vinculación con lo que pasó ese día, con un sentimiento de secuestro de la democracia en una parte de la ciudadanía que todavía hoy perdura.

Por eso, creo que lo mejor que se puede hacer con el Pacto Presupuestario es derogarlo y asegurar que todas las políticas de coordinación económica y presupuestaria en la Unión Europea, que son extremadamente necesarias, se hagan dentro de los Tratados con un fuerte escrutinio en el Parlamento Europeo y con pleno respeto de los procesos democráticos en cada Estado de la Unión Europea.

Bernard Monot, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous sommes totalement opposés à l'intégration du pacte budgétaire, le TSCG, dans le cadre juridique de l'Union européenne, et ce pour deux raisons principales.

Premièrement, par principe, parce que nous sommes partisans de l'Europe des nations, nous avons une nette préférence pour les accords intergouvernementaux, comme le TSCG, et ce afin d'éviter la propagation fédéraliste du cadre juridique de l'Union. Or, les matières du TSCG sont très importantes pour l'autonomie budgétaire des États.

Deuxièmement, parce que l'intégration du pacte budgétaire dans l'ordre juridique de l'Union européenne est extrêmement dangereuse dans le contexte de la mise en place d'un fonds monétaire européen, le FME.

La Commission européenne prépare en effet pour décembre un paquet de réformes de la zone euro qui inclut ce FME. Ce fonds monétaire européen est voulu par l'Allemagne. Gendarme macro-financier, il aura pour mission de mettre en place un mécanisme de restructuration des dettes publiques, c'est-à-dire un *buy-in* pour les États.

Le FME annoncera ainsi aux investisseurs et agents économiques les différentes paires qui seraient appliquées en cas de défaut. Cela aura l'effet d'accroître préventivement les pressions sur les États, via les disciplines de marché, et le renchérissement du coût des financements par la dette.

Le FME assurera le respect le plus strict du TSCG. Sa tâche sera facilitée par la possibilité nouvelle de saisir la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne. Cette possibilité, activement défendue par M^{me} Merkel lors de la négociation originelle du TSCG, avait alors été rejetée par les autres États. Cinq ans après, discrètement, nous y revenons.

Monsieur le Commissaire, nous nous opposerons résolument à la mise en place de la schlague du fonds monétaire européen et aux visées impérialistes de l'Union européenne, qui seront justement facilitées par la transformation législative du pacte budgétaire.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Słucham tej dyskusji z ogromnym rozbawieniem, bo Unia Europejska narzuca państwom członkowskim masę kretynizmów, masę zupełnie idiotycznych ustaw, a jak raz usiłuje narzucić coś rozsądnego, to słyszę głosy, że to jest skandal, że demokracja musi się ugiąć przed tym, że dwa razy dwa równa się cztery. My demokratycznie chcemy sobie uchwalać dług, ale kto nam to narzuca? Unia Europejska, której bank centralny drukuje fałszywe pieniądze – którymi nawiasem mówiąc płaci nam również nasze pensje – drukuje te pieniądze bez opamiętania, fałszując oczywiście monetę, Unia Europejska nam to narzuca. Proszę Państwa, powiedzmy sobie jasno, przez cały XIX wiek była deflacja, a nie inflacja, i był rozwój. Nie ma co się tego obawiać, że dyscyplina finansowa spowoduje zastój gospodarczy. To nie dyscyplina finansowa, tylko socjalizm hamuje rozwój gospodarczy. Państwo chcecie zachować socjalizm, bo większość tego chce. Pamiętajmy jasno, że głupich jest więcej niż mądrych. Dopóki mamy demokrację, nic rozsądnego nie będzie wprowadzone.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, we are talking about fiscal rules in the European Union. Let me start with a broad perspective and also history, but not so old. In pre-crisis time, the fiscal framework of European Union – the so-called SGP – has failed – or we should rather say that politicians of that time let it fail.

SGP was not respected, the purpose, neither substance. As the consequence, countries soon after suffered with substantial difficulties, and people have suffered. During the crisis, under the threat and during the very limited time, a new framework, including the Fiscal Compact that we are debating today, was created. More intelligent rules, as some would say, were the result of that. The results, the data and the figures are quite impressive. Just looking at the data, I would observe that in the Eurozone from 2009, every year there was a decline of deficit to GDP. Since 2014, there is a decline of debt to GDP, and the deficit to GDP reached 1.5% last year.

At the same time, if I look at the US data, I can see the deficit was twice as high. The debt is growing since 2008, with only one exception. People can ask: what about the growth? The European Union is growing, unemployment has dropped down and employment is at an all-time high. People can say that it was too much of austerity; I would rather say it was a responsibility. Spending money that people do not have is not a good policy; sometimes it is a mistake, and sometimes it is even a crime.

I fully support the idea of incorporation of the Fiscal Compact into EU legislation, but I understand why, at a given time, it was not part of that. But as Mr Dombrovskis said, it was always intended. We can build on current results and not waste them.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il *fiscal compact* è un trattato sbagliato due volte: nella forma, perché è intergovernativo, e nel contenuto, perché esprime una visione economica antiquata, che contraddice la necessità di politiche anticicliche e nega la funzione fondamentale degli investimenti pubblici.

Esatto, signor Starbatty, per il *fiscal compact* gettare denaro in donne e alcol, come ha detto infelicemente Dijsselbloem, è la stessa cosa del New Deal di Franklin Delano Roosevelt: non c'è differenza – cioè, una visione, appunto, che decenni di cultura economica del Novecento hanno contribuito a superare – e, inoltre, disconosce il concetto di posizione fiscale aggregata della zona euro, oltre a negare il fatto che una politica economica non si conduce solo sulle regole, sul pilota automatico, ma ha bisogno di un governo economico.

Questo, tanto più in quanto l'Unione economica e monetaria non dispone di un bilancio comune serio, degno di questo nome, che giustificerebbe un maggiore rigore a livello degli Stati membri. Peraltro, questa impostazione, com'è noto – forse il Movimento 5 Stelle lo ignora – è presente anche nel Patto di stabilità e di crescita, che è la vera fonte delle regole di cui si parlava.

Noi in questi anni ci siamo opposti a questa visione e ci siamo battuti per un'applicazione flessibile delle regole del patto di stabilità. E se oggi c'è la ripresa e il deficit si sta riducendo, come diceva Niedermayer, è proprio perché abbiamo applicato la flessibilità a delle regole, invece, concepite in un modo eccessivamente rigido e antiquato.

E tuttavia, è altrettanto evidente, che noi dobbiamo costruire delle regole migliori: non ci basta semplicemente ogni anno trovare il modo di applicarle in modo più intelligente. E in questo senso, il vero problema non è il *fiscal compact*, anche perché c'è un articolo 2 – vi spiego – che spiega che esso deve comunque assecondare eventuali cambiamenti delle leggi dell'Unione, ma è il patto di stabilità e noi chiediamo di migliorarlo, di cambiarlo, di introdurre una «golden rule», che distingua tra gli investimenti e la spesa corrente e di introdurre il concetto di posizione fiscale aggregata dell'eurozona.

Per questo noi crediamo che la Commissione farebbe bene a utilizzare, in modo più utile, il proprio tempo, a occuparsi a costruire una capacità fiscale dell'eurozona e a migliorare le regole del patto di stabilità. Se ciò non sarà, e si proporrà l'integrazione, sia chiaro che il Partito democratico in Italia e nel Consiglio porrà il veto, a meno di profondi cambiamenti nel contenuto del *fiscal compact*.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο είναι ένα σύστημα επιβολής μιας μόνιμης «μερκελικής» λιτότητας σε βάρος όλων των λαών της Ευρώπης. Επιβάλλει μάλιστα την υποχρέωση ενσωμάτωσής του στο Σύνταγμα των κρατών μελών. Επιπλέον, επιβάλλει στα κράτη μέλη τον περίφημο χρυσό κανόνα της Merkel, δηλαδή κρατικούς προϋπολογισμούς ισοσκελισμένους ή πλεονασματικούς. Σε διαφορετική περίπτωση, ενεργοποιούνται αυτόματα διορθωτικοί μηχανισμοί – ο γνωστός «κόφτης» – με μειώσεις μισθών, συντάξεων, κοινωνικών επιδομάτων και μέτρα βίαιης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής. Έτσι η δημοσιονομική πειθαρχία μπαίνει πάνω από την ανάπτυξη.

Πρόκειται για έναν δημοσιονομικό «ζουρλομανδύα», που επιβάλλει πρόστιμα και κυρώσεις, που περιορίζει την εθνική κυριαρχία, που αυξάνει την ανεργία, τις κοινωνικές ανισότητες. Η τρόικα και το Eurogroup εφαρμόζουν αυτή την πολιτική στην Ελλάδα, που έχει μετατραπεί σε πειραματόζωο του δημοσιονομικού συμφώνου με εκατομμύρια φτωχούς και στρατιές ανέργων, με ξεπούλημα της δημόσιας περιουσίας και αύξηση του επονείδιστου χρέους. Όμως, κύριε Dombrovskis, ο ελληνικός λαός δεν ανέχεται τα μνημόνια και την τρόικα και σύντομα θα σας στείλει το μήνυμα.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, a política orçamental única da União Europeia, com regras como a limitação do défice, restringe a capacidade dos Estados-Membros de responderem ao ciclo económico através da sua própria política orçamental.

O Tratado orçamental mostra que a União Europeia não aprendeu nada com a História e o que faz é reforçar dois aspetos perversos das regras que já existem, o envasamento ultraliberal das regras orçamentais, ou seja, austeridade como regra, agravando os problemas dos países na resposta à estagnação prolongada e ao desemprego elevado e ao introduzir o critério do saldo estrutural, a arbitrariedade que já existia na imposição das regras, tratando os países de forma desigual, que passa agora a ser ela própria uma regra.

Integrar o Tratado orçamental no direito comunitário será trágico. O papel dos socialistas é determinante e espero que não seja trágico como foi em momentos anteriores. Apelo a todos os grupos que reivindicam o Estado social, a proteção do trabalho e a Europa social que rejeitem esta conversão. Não sei se vamos a tempo de salvar a União. Mas não dar este passo será fundamental para isso.

Marco Zanni (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi dispiace che il collega Gualtieri se ne sia andato, perché mi avrebbe fatto piacere ricordargli che il suo partito non solo ha sostenuto il *fiscal compact* ma ha sostenuto anche Maastricht e il Patto di stabilità e crescita. Quindi è un po' ridicolo, dopo vent'anni, venire a chiedere scusa, e dopo i danni fatti agli italiani ridotti in povertà.

Per quanto riguarda il *fiscal compact*, questa è l'essenza dell'Unione europea: la morte dello Stato e della democrazia. È follia pensare che il bilancio di uno Stato venga gestito come il bilancio di una famiglia: vuol dire avere ignoranza e non capire come funziona il bilancio di uno Stato. Ci avete fatto credere che il problema e la causa della crisi fossero il debito pubblico e il deficit. No, non è il debito pubblico; il debito pubblico è stato una conseguenza delle azioni scellerate dell'asimmetria che l'euro ha portato all'interno dell'Unione europea.

Non lo dico io: lo dicono coloro che voi ritenete persone credibili e di buon senso. Lo dice il vicepresidente della Banca centrale europea, Constâncio, lo dice il Presidente della Banca centrale, Mario Draghi, lo dice il capo economista della BCE e uno dei più alti dirigenti della BCE, Benoît Cœuré: uno Stato che ha sovranità monetaria, che ha il potere di stampare la moneta in cui è denominato il suo debito, può sempre sostenere il suo debito. Andate a vedere il sito della BCE: queste ricerche e questi discorsi sono pubblici per tutti.

Oggi noi non possiamo sostenere questo sistema: dentro all'Europa, dentro a queste regole si muore. L'unica via è ritornare alla sovranità monetaria.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, as Chair of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, I will not refer to the substance of this Treaty but to the constitutional aspects of the Treaty. One may recall that the European Parliament has never been a proponent of resorting to an intergovernmental treaty governed by international law to strengthen the fiscal rules and compliance with fiscal discipline in the Union, and this is why, in the phase leading to the adoption of this Treaty in 2012 (which was exactly after the most famous, I think, of the British vetoes in December 2011), the European Parliament has insisted on certain safeguards to be put in the Treaty in order to guarantee conformity with the Union Treaties, the Union law in general, and to make the international nature of the Treaty temporary. It was the European Parliament that insisted on this specific clause contained in Article 16, which requires the substance of the Treaty to be incorporated into the legal framework of the Union before January 2018.

The Committee on Constitutional Affairs is concerned with the institutional aspects of the incorporation of the substance of the Treaty in the EU framework, and we have been investigating this issue for quite some time. Now we have it in the Commission work programme; we have it in the letter of intent of Jean-Claude Juncker, so we are expecting the proposal. There is in the Treaty the substance that is not necessary or suitable to be incorporated, because the provisions relate to the intergovernmental nature of the Treaty and have no substantial content or duplicate existing legislation but also concern elements that could be established within another framework.

There is also substance that is already – or can be – incorporated through secondary legislation, but there is also substance that most likely would require Treaty change, and this is about the key provisions of the Treaty. So we are awaiting the December proposal with a sort of curiosity, especially in the context of the declaration of the President of the Commission that No Treaty change is on the Union's agenda.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, the integration of the fiscal compact into the legal framework of the European Union should be envisaged only if the lessons of recent years are properly taken into account. The first lesson is that this Treaty is also about coordination and governance. When it comes to coordination, the objectives are not only stability but also growth and convergence. We have learned in recent years that this convergence should be guided by economic and social targets together and the European Semester should be designed with this purpose.

When it comes to reforms, the assumption is that the reforms which should be recommended to Member States should take into account their real priorities and not invented priorities. But we also need to deal with the governance part of the treaty and the governance must be democratic, which is not yet the case. This means that, if a eurozone summit is now being convened, let me remind you that the Treaty provides for Parliament's President to be invited. Most of all, we need to make sure that, all through the process, Parliament will play a central role: when we discuss the reforms of the economic and monetary union (EMU), when we discuss the fiscal stance and when we discuss the recommendations for the euro area. We also need to recognise that there is a role for the national parliaments – yes, there is – when they are involved in discussing the national reform programmes and the country-specific recommendations. But overall we need an interinstitutional agreement to set the rules for real democratic governance of the EMU.

Finally, on fiscal discipline, let me be clear: of course we need common fiscal discipline in the eurozone to make it sustainable, but it is also clear that, in order to have this common fiscal discipline, if we do not want to hinder growth and growth potential, we need to complement national fiscal discipline – which should be intelligent – with a proper fiscal capacity, as all other monetary zones in the world have. No monetary zone in the world has existed and been sustainable without a fiscal capacity.

So these are our lessons to be integrated into the new framework.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Kiedy ponad sześć lat temu w moim kraju, w Polsce, toczyła się debata na temat ratyfikacji traktatu fiskalnego, wyraźnie przedstawiliśmy swoje zastrzeżenia. Dotyczyły one przekazania do Brukseli suwerennych praw parlamentów krajowych w kwestiach budżetowych, forsowania koncepcji federalistycznej Unii Europejskiej oraz wykorzystywania zasobów całej Unii i jej instytucji do realizacji celów określanych w gronie niepełnej Unii, czyli w państwach eurostrefy.

Dzisiaj z rozczarowaniem obserwujemy, że trochę daliśmy się nabrać. Brak jest pozytywnego wpływu na wzrost gospodarczy unijnych gospodarek czy konkurencyjność krajów peryferyjnych strefy euro. Forsowany zintegrowany rygor fiskalny nie niweluje trwałego deficytu rachunków bieżących w Grecji, Portugalii, Hiszpanii czy Włoszech, o czym mówił pan Zanni. Zamiast tego pogłębia on przepaść między nimi a najsilniejszymi gospodarkami eurostrefy, głównie Niemcami. Wydaje mi się, że teraz Komisja powinna przedstawić, Panie Komisarzy, dokładną ocenę wpływu traktatu o stabilności. Jaki ma on wpływ na gospodarkę poszczególnych krajów?

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, hace veinticinco años se firmaba el Tratado de Maastricht. Yo tenía doce años, pero recuerdo muy bien cómo mucha gente entendió ya entonces que tratar de imponer, mediante un tratado, un modelo económico neoliberal era un peligro directo para la democracia, la soberanía y los derechos sociales en Europa. Desde entonces, la historia de Europa ha consistido en el esfuerzo de los poderosos por imponer políticas económicas neoliberales frente a la resistencia de los pueblos.

La firma del Pacto Presupuestario llevó a mi país a la modificación de la Constitución en medio de un verano, lo que supuso un golpe encubierto contra la democracia de la gran coalición de socialistas y populares. Lo único que se ha logrado con todo esto es sumir al continente en una situación de crisis política permanente, desempleo masivo, desigualdad y crisis territoriales.

Señorías, la Comisión anuncia ahora que pretende aprovechar la salida del Reino Unido para integrar este Pacto en la legislación europea: nosotros les decimos que desistan de su intento. El Pacto Presupuestario no lleva a una mayor cohesión europea, sino a un aumento de las tensiones y a la desintegración del propio proyecto europeo: no lo vamos a permitir. Desistan de su intento.

Mara Bizzotto (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, inserire il *fiscal compact* nei Trattati è pura follia. Il *fiscal compact* ha reso l'Italia ancora più schiava dei diktat di Bruxelles e della troika. Noi siamo stanchi dell'imposizione dell'Europa e dello Stato centrale: noi vogliamo essere liberi di usare i nostri soldi per i nostri cittadini. Le nostre regioni, i nostri comuni, i nostri territori hanno il diritto di usare questi soldi che sono soldi nostri, non dell'Europa, di Bruxelles o di Berlino.

Faccio un esempio: il mio Veneto e la Lombardia hanno residui fiscali più alti di tutta Europa. Sono le regioni che pagano di più ma che ricevono meno dallo Stato. Paghiamo più di tutti ma non possiamo usare in autonomia i nostri soldi.

Il prossimo 22 ottobre il Veneto e la Lombardia voteranno nel referendum per l'autonomia: quindici milioni di cittadini saranno chiamati alle urne e andranno a votare, serenamente e tranquillamente, non come è successo in Catalogna. Referendum ufficiali e legali, sanciti dalla Costituzione, che hanno l'obiettivo di trattenere più risorse economiche sul nostro territorio: meno centralismo e più autonomia per i territori e per le regioni.

È questa la direzione che dobbiamo prendere, in Italia e in Europa, per governare meglio e per creare sviluppo e benessere per i nostri cittadini.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, the idea of a fiscal compact is not as new as it sounds here, because it is a very old rule: if you spend more money than you have then you will in the end cause problems either for yourself or for someone else. That is why, in solidarity and in respect for others, you need to have stability in your economy. If you spend more than you get, then you either need to reform and spend less, or reform and earn more. A third alternative is of course to borrow money, and if you borrow money then your deficit will increase and your debt will increase.

I say this because reality is much more important than the rules. The rules we have are important, but reality is the really worrisome thing, because if you are increasing your deficit and cannot finance your public spending then it is the deficit and the increased deficit that is creating the austerity, not the rules. The rules are there in order to hinder the road to austerity. The rules are there to make us keep together around a sound and stable economy, sound and stable public finances, and I can never understand, if we look at all the experiences we have had, when countries – Sweden at the beginning of the 1990s, others in recent times – have nearly not been able to finance the public spending, not because of the rules but because of reality. That is why we need a fiscal compact in order to safeguard our economies.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente, conviene recordar que el Pacto Presupuestario y el Pacto de Estabilidad en gran parte son consecuencia de la moneda común. Me gustaría trasladarles un poco de reflexión histórica sobre lo que fue el abismo al que se enfrentó la economía europea con la moneda común hace ya unos años.

El Pacto de Estabilidad y el Pacto Presupuestario son la consecuencia de que las diferencias entre los diferentes países, las divergencias macroeconómicas entre el norte y el sur, obligaban a mantener el euro con arreglo a una serie de condiciones. A mí muchas de ellas no me gustan. El Pacto no me gusta en su conjunto, pero es la consecuencia de una moneda común, señorías. Y esto es lo que tenemos que asegurar, que tenemos una moneda común con la que enfrentar la crisis, el futuro, la globalización. Y yo, que soy europeísta, quiero una moneda común y asumo algunas condiciones.

Y esas condiciones, ahora, se van a poder discutir porque, al incorporar el Tratado al Derecho de la Unión, tenemos la posibilidad de que el Parlamento pueda discutirlo, cambiarlo, flexibilizarlo, evaluarlo. Sí, tenemos el control parlamentario. No es fácil, pero el Tratado es intergubernamental, el Derecho de la Unión es Derecho parlamentario.

Yo querría referirme a quienes se oponen a la moneda común y a la gente que quiere volver a la lira o la peseta o al franco. ¿Qué futuro ofrecen ustedes a sus ciudadanos volviendo a la lira? Díganlo claramente a los ciudadanos, porque no hay futuro económico fuera de la moneda común, aunque esto exija sacrificios.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is simply astounding to me that so many in this House want to permanently impose an austerity straitjacket on the entire EU by inserting the fiscal compact into the Treaty. The evidence is stark. The fiscal compact has prolonged the downturn, stifled growth and ensured that stagnation is the new normal. It has tied the hands of governments in the diverse countries now entirely reliant on the European Central Bank's one-size-fits-all monetary policies, which are running out of steam.

Where are the strict rules to reduce current account surpluses that will inevitably cause a new debt crisis? A single Member State could veto this move to enshrine this failed model into the treaties, but will any government in the EU have the courage to say that the German model does not work for us?

The failed austerity model has caused the rise of the far right in Europe. It has led to a crisis of legitimacy for the EU institutions. We have the opportunity to shake off the straitjacket. If we do not do so, the EU's political and economic crisis will become a political and economic catastrophe.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Es ist eine Selbstverständlichkeit, dass der Fiskalpakt in Unionsrecht übergeführt wird. So wie im Vertrag von Maastricht festgeschrieben wurde, dass der Euro die Währung für alle Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union ist, die die Kriterien erfüllen, so ist im zwischenstaatlichen Fiskalpakt festgeschrieben, dass dessen Bestimmungen so bald wie möglich in die europäischen Verträge übergeführt werden sollen.

Ich möchte mich überhaupt einmal dafür aussprechen, dass wir eine Generalklausel vom Rat beschlossen bekommen, dass alle europäischen Gesetze auf dem Boden des Unionsrechts und damit unter Mitbeteiligung des Europäischen Parlaments erarbeitet und beschlossen werden. Alle Maßnahmen zur Weiterentwicklung der Währungsunion und zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialunion, zur Schaffung einer Banken-, Kapitalmarkt-, Fiskal- und Investitionsunion müssen auf dem Boden des Unionsrechts erfolgen. Denn nur dann ist ihre demokratische Legitimierung durch diese Bürgerkammer gegeben.

Damit unsere einheitliche Währung funktionieren kann, brauchen wir gesunde öffentliche Haushalte, Marktdisziplin und klare Vorgaben für die gesamtwirtschaftliche und haushaltspolitische Überwachung. Daher müssen wir den Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt weniger komplex, aber verpflichtender und effektiver auslegen. Wir benötigen strengere und effektivere Sanktionsmaßnahmen gegenüber jenen, die das gemeinsam Beschlossene nicht einhalten. Bereits im Stufenplan zur Vollendung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion, dem sogenannten Pierre-Werner-Plan von 1970, steht, dass alle Maßnahmen im Laufe eines Jahrzehnts erreicht werden können, sofern ausreichend politischer Wille der Mitgliedstaaten besteht. Auf diesen politischen Willen kommt es an, nicht mehr und nicht weniger.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da europeista convinta concordo con quanti hanno ricordato che il trattato è in vigore ma non è un trattato comunitario e quindi esclude da qualunque potere questo Parlamento e le istituzioni comunitarie. Quindi la discussione deve avvenire e deve essere anche chiaro che la revisione in corso dovrà definire nuovi parametri che tengano conto dello scenario attuale.

Quando è stato ratificato dai governi, dagli Stati e dai parlamenti nazionali il *fiscal compact*, l'economia europea era in una situazione disastrosa: ricordo gli *spread* che salivano a centinaia e centinaia di punti e quindi il rischio di fallimenti concreti degli Stati era in corso. Oggi l'economia è in ripresa, grazie ai grandi sforzi che sono stati fatti. Non bastano le misure di austerità, anzi vanno dimenticate. Occorre affrontare in modo diverso una revisione delle politiche economiche dell'Unione, che da un lato, garantisca investimenti da parte dell'Unione europea, a fronte della disciplina fiscale e degli Stati, investimenti non solo privati ma anche quelli che forniscono beni pubblici e producono occupazione.

È solo se ci sarà un bilancio della zona euro, che consenta di rilanciare crescita e occupazione, che si potrà affrontare la questione della riduzione del debito, che è certamente necessaria, ma in un quadro che non crei povertà e ostilità nei confronti delle istituzioni europee.

Trenta secondi Presidente perché sono stata insultata personalmente. Al signor Valli, che è poco onorevole, risponderò sui *social* che tanto è l'unica cosa che sa

(Il presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Laura Agea (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, come capo delegazione del Movimento 5 Stelle, mi riservo di chiedere quali affermazioni ha fatto la collega Bresso, rivolgendosi alla mia delegazione, e voglio sapere dalle registrazioni se le offese che ci ha rivolto, mentre interveniva il suo collega Gualtieri, corrispondono a quanto da lei detto, perché mi riserverò di agire a nome della mia delegazione. Nessuno l'ha offesa! Si riservi un comportamento consono a quest'Aula e ai cittadini che anche Lei rappresenta.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin! Es gibt in unserer Geschäftsordnung den Artikel 164. Wenn Sie sich persönlich angesprochen oder beleidigt oder unrichtig wiedergegeben fühlen, können Sie hier beim Präsidenten beantragen, nach dem Ende der Debatte eine persönliche Erklärung abzugeben, um das richtigzustellen. Aber Sie können nicht die laufende Debatte unterbrechen, in der jetzt der Kollege Chountis warten musste. Bitte schauen Sie in die Geschäftsordnung, beantragen Sie die persönliche Erklärung und geben die dann ab. Die wird zu Protokoll genommen. Sie haben dafür drei Minuten Zeit, das ist mehr als die wenigen Sekunden, die Sie jetzt hatten.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, το δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο είναι η άρνηση της δημοκρατίας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τα κράτη μέλη που το έχουν υπογράψει μεταφέρουν τις εξουσίες επί των οικονομικών τους πολιτικών στους θεσμούς της ΟΝΕ. Όλες οι χώρες είναι υποχρεωμένες να υιοθετήσουν, ακόμα και στα Συντάγματά τους, κανόνες ισοσκελισμένων προϋπολογισμών και μηχανισμούς αυτόματης περικοπής δαπανών. Το αποτέλεσμα είναι να εφαρμόζεται μία και μόνη πολιτική, η νεοφιλελεύθερη πολιτική των ισοσκελισμένων προϋπολογισμών, των χαμηλών κοινωνικών δαπανών, της μείωσης των εισοδημάτων, της απελευθέρωσης των αγορών και των ιδιωτικοποιήσεων, της μείωσης των δικαιωμάτων και της διαπραγματευτικής δύναμης των εργαζομένων. Τα αποτελέσματα και τις συνέπειες μιας τέτοιας νεοφιλελεύθερης πολιτικής βιώνει ο ελληνικός λαός τα τελευταία εφτά χρόνια κατά δραματικό τρόπο.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, οι λαοί της Ευρώπης, αν θέλουν οικονομικές πολιτικές που να υπηρετούν την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και την ευημερία τους, οφείλουν να έρθουν σε ρήξη με τις πολιτικές και τις δομές της ΟΝΕ και του ευρώ. Αν θέλουν να επαναφέρουν τη δημοκρατία, οφείλουν να υπερβούν τα όρια που θέτει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, το σύμφωνο σταθερότητας και το δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο.

Der Präsident. – Meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben einen Fehler auf der Tafel. Der nächste Redner ist gleich Herr Stolojan.

Erlauben Sie mir nur, mich zu verabschieden. Das war meine letzte Sitzung als Vizepräsident. Ich bin in das nationale Parlament gewählt worden. Ich möchte das nicht tun, ohne mich hier zu bedanken bei denjenigen, die mir geholfen haben: den Beamten der Generaldirektion Präsidentschaft, den Saaldienern, den Dolmetschern für ihre hervorragende Arbeit und der Technik, die normalerweise dafür sorgt, dass hier alles reibungslos läuft.

Ich hoffe, dass Sie meiner Nachfolgerin das gleiche Vertrauen entgegenbringen wie mir. Ich danke sehr herzlich und wünsche einen guten Fortgang der Debatte.

(Beifall)

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, criza financiară și criza datoriilor publice nesustenabile ne-au reamintit că nu există niciun substitut pentru disciplina bugetară, disciplina fiscală. Toți cei care au crezut că pot să susțină o bunăstare prin îndatorare continuă au fost treziți la realitate de către crizele prin care am trecut, iar cel mai mult au avut de suferit oamenii simpli, pensionarii, oamenii atât din sectorul public, cât și din sectorul privat.

Exemplul Greciei este edificator. Grecia, după ani de suferință, și-a pus casa în ordine și, în prezent, înregistrează rezultate pozitive. De aceea, este necesar ca acest compact fiscal să devină regulă în legislația Uniunii Europene, pentru că, înainte de a te gândi la capacitate fiscală, la solidaritate, trebuie să fii conștient că trebuie să respecti regulile privind disciplina bugetară, disciplina fiscală și, după aceea, dacă respecti aceste reguli, să te gândești la solidaritate în cadrul Uniunii Europene. De aceea, așteptăm propunerile Comisiei în decembrie cu privire la transpunerea în legislația europeană a compactului fiscal.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Een gemeenschappelijke munt vraagt om een gemeenschappelijk beleid en niet om rigide regels. Ik sta in een Nederlandse traditie, ooit begonnen met een liberale minister van Financiën, Gerrit Zalm, wanneer ik pleit voor een structureel begrotingsbeleid waarbij schokken in de begroting worden opgevangen en niet worden afgewend door te bezuinigen en mensen voor hun baan moeten vrezen, en waarbij wordt gestreefd naar volledige werkgelegenheid in goede én in slechte tijden.

De euro kan zoveel beter. De euro had landen bij elkaar moeten brengen, maar heeft landen uit elkaar doen groeien. De euro had moeten zorgen voor stabiliteit, maar de economieën zijn kwetsbaar gebleken – vooral in het zuiden.

Dus pleit ik voor een euro met 1) een duidelijke, afgebakende, Europese verantwoordelijkheid door een bufferfonds, door schokdempers om de schok op te vangen, door een Europese achtervang, zodat banken landen niet omver kunnen trekken; maar ook met 2) een duidelijke Europese verantwoording. Want de euro is van ons en er moet democratische verantwoording worden afgelegd aan gekozen volksvertegenwoordigers. Dat kan door een Europese minister van Financiën en niet door een ongekozen voorzitter van een schimmige eurogroep. En dat kan ook door een begrotingsunie zoals nu wordt voorgesteld, maar anders dan nu is vastgelegd.

Kortom, de euro kan zoveel beter en de euro moet zoveel beter.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Mr President, fiscal discipline is obviously an essential tool for the success of a Union of 27 Member States which share a common single market and a common currency. Only by maintaining a balanced budget can a country increase its resilience in order to face an economic downturn or a financial crisis.

Fiscal rules make our economy stronger not weaker. Having a balanced budget means having more fiscal space when it is needed. It means having funds available to implement structural reforms, not only in bad times but also in good times. The time to repair the roof is always when the sun is shining.

My country, Romania, has been part of the fiscal compact since the beginning. Joining it was the correct decision. Let me explain briefly why. The actions of the current government of the country make clear why the fiscal compact is necessary and why it protects our citizens from what is sometimes irresponsible governance at national level. In Romania, the debt-to-GDP ratio has increased by 4 percentage points from 37% to 41% of GDP in less than two years, and structural deficit has increased from 0.6% of GDP to more than 3%. Due to the significant deviations from the budgetary medium-term objective, the Commission issued a warning, and the Council followed. In the case of any country that does not comply with the provisions, the Commission or any other country can take the case to the Court of Justice. The last step is the imposition of sanctions.

These current developments, in any Member State, highlight the importance of respecting EU fiscal rules and the importance of imposing them on governments that sometimes work only for short-term objectives. Otherwise, who will carry the burden of the increasing deficit and debt in any Member State? Certainly not the current government which just happens to be in office and which will have been voted out by the time the debt comes to maturity. Then it will be the younger generations who will have to shoulder this debt and who will have fewer options for the future than the previous generations.

Przewodniczący. – Było pytanie o niebieską kartę. Chciałem wyjaśnić, że to jest debata na tzw. temat aktualny i nie mamy ani formuły niebieskiej karty, ani też nie mamy formuły pytań z sali.

Hugues Bayet (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'inclusion du pacte de stabilité et de croissance dans les traités n'est, à mon sens, pas souhaitable, en tout cas pas sans modification en profondeur de ce pacte. Car si le TSCG doit être remplacé par un traité qui encourage la convergence économique et sociale des pays européens et, plus particulièrement, des pays de la zone euro, il ne peut l'être qu'en évitant évidemment de reprendre des mesures comme celles qui ont conduit à l'accentuation de l'austérité.

Pour l'instant, reconnaissons-le, la Commission n'analyse que les données budgétaires, mais aucune vision globale n'est envisagée. Pourtant, il serait vraiment plus pertinent de prendre en compte tous les indicateurs, qu'ils soient sociaux, environnementaux ou économiques, et pas uniquement budgétaires.

En ne prenant en compte qu'une partie des données, le TSCG empêche les États membres d'investir et, on le sait tous, sans investissement, aucune relance économique n'est possible. Cela signifie tout simplement de nouveaux emplois en moins et plus de précarité pour les citoyens européens.

La modification du TSCG est donc une condition indispensable pour proposer des emplois de qualité au plus grand nombre et lutter contre la pauvreté grandissante dans l'Union européenne. Le fait de considérer le budget comme une entité déconnectée de la vie des Européens a créé, comme vous le savez, des inégalités inacceptables en Europe au lieu d'apporter des solutions pour les réduire.

Ayez donc le courage de mettre fin à l'austérité. Nous pouvons en constater les dégâts tous les jours. Le retour à la confiance des citoyens nécessite un changement de cap social et économique majeur. Je pense qu'il en est plus que temps, Monsieur le Commissaire.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως τονίστηκε, το νομικό πλαίσιο για το δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο και το σύμφωνο σταθερότητας είναι πολύ σημαντικό, αλλά εφόσον προωθεί τη σύγκλιση στο επίπεδο των πραγματικών οικονομιών μας προς τα πάνω. Από τον Ιανουάριο του 2013 που τέθηκε σε ισχύ το δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο μέχρι σήμερα, το αποτέλεσμα σε επίπεδο πραγματικής σύγκλισης των οικονομιών μας είναι απογοητευτικό. Θα αναφερθώ σε συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα, αλλά θα τονίσω ότι χρειάζονται απαραίτητως προσαρμογές και αλλαγές που να στοχεύουν στη βελτίωση της πραγματικής οικονομίας. Χρειάζεται εμπλοκή των ιδίων των κρατών μελών στον σχεδιασμό των διαρθρωτικών τους αλλαγών και όχι επιβολή, ούτε ένα μέγεθος για όλους.

«Υπευθυνότητα» αναφέρεται στους κανόνες. Ναι, η Επιτροπή θα πρέπει να επιζητεί τη διόρθωση των μακροοικονομικών υπερβολών, αλλά αυτό θα πρέπει να στρέφεται τόσο προς τα υπερβολικά ελλείμματα όσο και προς τα υπερβολικά πλεονάσματα. Άλλωστε τα ελλείμματα των μεν είναι εν πολλοίς τα πλεονάσματα των άλλων. Όσον αφορά τα Διαρθρωτικά Ταμεία, πρέπει να σταματήσει η διασύνδεσή τους με το Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο. Όσοι θέλουν να αφαιρέσουν την πρόσβαση στα Ταμεία λειτουργούν ενάντια στους κανόνες που διέπουν τη λειτουργία τους, τους κανόνες της αλληλεγγύης και της κοινωνικής συνοχής. Τελειώνω με ένα ερώτημα: είναι δυνατόν να φτάσουμε μέχρι εδώ χωρίς ακόμα να έχει εφαρμοστεί πανευρωπαϊκή τραπεζική εγγύηση των καταθέσεων;

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Wir müssen uns vor Augen führen, was als Reaktion auf die Krise passiert ist: Sozialstandards wurden abgebaut, Gewerkschaftsrechte nicht nur in Griechenland ausgehebelt, und man hat das Ganze mit einer Flucht aus dem Europarecht ermöglicht. Der Fiskalpakt und die Rettungsschirme wurden um die Verträge herum errichtet, demokratische Sicherheitsmaßnahmen des Europarechts umgangen. Es liegt also auf der Hand, dass wir die europäische Wirtschaftspolitik demokratischer gestalten müssen. Die demokratische Kontrolle durch uns im Europäischen Parlament muss sichergestellt werden.

Aber für eine zukunftsfähige europäische Wirtschaftspolitik brauchen wir vor allem eines: eine Abkehr von der neoliberalen Sparpolitik – am Rücken von Beschäftigten, am Rücken von Schwächeren. Öffentliche Investitionen in die Zukunft, etwa in Bildung, müssen aus den strikten Regeln des Stabilitätspakts ausgenommen werden.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Der Fiskalpakt ist angelegt worden, um die Schuldenstände in der Europäischen Union zu senken und um die Neuverschuldung zu dämpfen. Wenn man jetzt darüber spricht, ob man den Fiskalpakt in die europäischen Verträge integrieren möchte, dann muss man doch erst mal gucken: Hat sich der Fiskalpakt denn bewährt? Hat er denn so funktioniert, wie er hätte funktionieren sollen? Hat es denn funktioniert, dass Staaten, die ihre Neuverschuldungsobergrenzen ein ums andere Mal überschritten haben, Sanktionen zahlen mussten, so wie es im Fiskalpakt vorgesehen ist? Und dann stellen wir fest, dass das nicht der Fall gewesen ist, dass man diesen Staaten immer wieder Aufschub gegeben hat, dass man beide Augen zugedrückt hat, dass man letzten Endes, als der Vertrag zwingend vorschrieb, dass wir jetzt Sanktionen verhängen müssen, gesagt hat: Na super, jetzt verhängen wir Sanktionen, nämlich Sanktionen von null Euro.

Was ist denn das für eine Politik? Jeder Autofahrer, der mal die Geschwindigkeit ein bisschen überschreitet, muss 30, 40, 50 EUR für ein kleines Delikt bezahlen, und hier, wenn ganze Staaten nicht rechtzeitig auf die Bremse treten, wenn sie ein ums andere Mal ihre Verschuldung, ihre Neuverschuldungsgrenze überschreiten, dann kriegen sie eine Strafe von null Euro!

Vizepräsident Timmermans hat vorhin in der Aussprache zum Katalonien-Konflikt gesagt, dass die Europäische Gemeinschaft auf dem Prinzip der Rechtsstaatlichkeit basiert. Das ist sicherlich richtig. Aber wir brauchen nicht nur die Rechtsstaatlichkeit, wir brauchen auch die Verlässlichkeit des Rechts. Wir müssen wissen, dass das staatliche Handeln berechenbar ist. Wenn der Staat aber immer wieder willkürlich handelt, wenn die Gesetze so flexibel angelegt sind, dass man ihren Geist einfach missachten kann, dann ist es mit der Verlässlichkeit des Rechts nicht weit her.

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, this was an important opportunity to exchange views on the integration of the fiscal compact into the Union's legal framework. The fiscal compact emerged five years ago as a stop-gap solution at a time of deep crisis. Even though today our European economies are sailing in calmer seas, the basic tenet of the fiscal compact, of pursuing responsible fiscal policies, remains entirely valid. Moreover, bringing the fiscal compact into the body of the EU fiscal framework will help enhance the resilience of the EU going forward, and it will do so in a way that ensures more accountability. But we also have to acknowledge that the incorporation is unlikely to be a routine operation. As we could also see from today's discussions, there are serious political and legal implications at stake. This is why on the Commission side we are looking carefully into possible options.

Once again, let me thank you for your persistent interest in this matter.

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, all'ordine 664 la deputata Mercedes Bresso ha dichiarato, durante il suo intervento, che io l'avrei insultata all'inizio, quando è stato appunto enunciato il mio dibattito.

Per quanto mi riguarda, io ho rivisto il mio discorso e non ho fatto nessun insulto. Quindi vorrei che, nel caso, si vedesse la registrazione di questo dibattito e si dichiarasse che io non ho insultato nessuno, perché ho rispetto per tutti i parlamentari che sono qui dentro.

Przewodniczący. – Przeczytamy tę debatę, przeczytamy zapisy i wtedy stosownie zareagujemy.

Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Laura Ferrara (EFDD), per iscritto. – La gravissima crisi economica, sociale e politica che sta attraversando l'Unione europea è stata aggravata da politiche di austerità che hanno avuto forti effetti prociclici e hanno generato livelli insostenibili di disoccupazione, povertà e disuguaglianze soprattutto nei paesi della periferia della zona euro. In tal senso, la paventata incorporazione del «Fiscal Compact» nell'ordinamento giuridico dell'Unione, con tutto quello che ciò comporta in termini di vincoli di bilancio giustiziabili davanti alla Corte di giustizia, rappresenta un pericolo gravissimo che occorre contrastare. Siamo convinti, infatti, che il «Fiscal Compact» impegni i governi a perseguire obiettivi di bilancio tecnicamente irrealistici e insostenibili da un punto di vista economico, politico e sociale, e ciò in quanto le misure di austerità che si renderanno necessarie a seguito della sua malaugurata inclusione nell'ordinamento dell'UE, saranno talmente drastiche da alimentare un'ulteriore recessione ed una conseguente disaffezione dei cittadini verso l'UE. Condivido pienamente, pertanto, l'allarme lanciato dal collega Marco Valli, e mi associo all'appello, rivolto al Parlamento europeo, a sostenere la nostra battaglia contro il «Fiscal Compact».

Андрей Ковачев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Приветствам предложението на Европейската комисия за включването на фискалния пакт в правната рамка на ЕС. Сключването му като междуправителствено споразумение в разгара на финансовата и икономическа криза беше необходимо, за да се преодолее липсата на единодушие в Европейския съвет, но общественият метод трябва да се запази и да не бъде отслабван.

Европейският съюз винаги се е развивал динамично, когато се е придържал към този метод на вземане на решения, и винаги е буксувал, когато решенията се основават на междуправителствени споразумения без необходимата прозрачност и контрол от страна на Европейския парламент. Съюзът трябва да изпълнява задачите си в контекста на единна институционална рамка и да се избягва създаването на нови институции извън тази рамка.

Включването на фискалния пакт в правната рамка на ЕС ще гарантира не само по-добър демократичен контрол по отношение на правилата за бюджетна дисциплина, но и по-голямата легитимност на европейските институции.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI), γραπτώς. – Το «δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο» της ΕΕ αποτελεί βήμα περαιτέρω ευρωενωσιακής ενοποίησης. Ο ενιαίος ευρωενωσιακός προϋπολογισμός, ο Ευρωπαϊός Υπουργός Οικονομικών, το Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο, σε ανταγωνισμό, αλλά και με τον ίδιο ρόλο με το ΔΝΤ, είναι η δίχως τέλος θωράκιση της αντεργατικής πολιτικής των κυβερνήσεων, υπό τη διαρκή εποπτεία της ΕΕ. Η υποχρέωση για ισοσκελισμένους προϋπολογισμούς – εντός του πλαισίου του «Συμφώνου Σταθερότητας» - σε περίπτωση υπέρβασης, υποχρεώνει τα κράτη σε ακαριαία αντεργατικά μέτρα, με «αυτόματους δημοσιονομικούς κόφτες», νέες περικοπές μισθών, συντάξεων, κοινωνικών δαπανών. Σε συνδυασμό με τον «ΕΜΣ» και το «Σύμφωνο του Ευρώ» για την ασφυκτική ευρωενωσιακή εποπτεία έως την αποπληρωμή του δημόσιου χρέους υπόσχονται μνημόνια διαρκείας. Τα αιτήματα διαφόρων κυβερνήσεων, όπως της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ – ΑΝΕΛ, πρωταθλήτριας στην εφαρμογή μνημονίων, για εξαίρεση από το σύμφωνο σταθερότητας των «ανάπτυξιακών» επενδυτικών δαπανών δεν αφορούν σε καμία περίπτωση τη χαλάρωση της ανταλλακτικής πολιτικής, αλλά επιδοτήσεις με τζάμπα χρήμα και φοροαπαλλαγές για το κεφάλαιο που θα πληρώσει πάλι ο λαός με αλληπάλληλες κατατιγίδες μέτρων και φόρων. Η πείρα των λαών μπορεί να αποτελέσει κριτήριο και βάση αντιμετώπισης του εργατικού – λαϊκού κινήματος. Καπιταλιστική ανάπτυξη χωρίς θυσιές διαρκείας των λαών, δικαίω ανάπτυξη μέσα σε ένα άδικο σύστημα δεν υπάρχει.

Alfred Sant (S&D), in writing. – Proposals for reforming and deepening the EU have proliferated. In the European Union, formally or informally, they must be acknowledged and taken into account. Especially with regard to the eurozone, most proposals envisage further deepening of central management structures on a federalist basis. They then put a bracket around meaningful consolidation strategies. Yet, these should be considered the top priority.

One reason why it's not happening follows from the dogma that the eurozone cannot operate as a transfer union. But that is the rationale behind any federal arrangement covering a monetary union. The US, a mature federal system, operating as a transfer union, has less controls on the policy options available to its component parts, than the eurozone already has as of now. Meanwhile, the 'terms of trade' defined by the eurozone's implicit internal exchange rate, actually make it a systemic 'transfer union' from south and east to north and centre.

The EU should aim to bridge these contradictions through a political settlement. Firstly, it must focus on convergence between economies and consolidation of existing euro management structures. Otherwise, deepening of the eurosysteem will remain either a chimera or a further curb on the weaker, smaller Member States.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI), γραπτώς. – Το «δημοσιονομικό σύμφωνο» της ΕΕ αποτελεί βήμα περαιτέρω ευρωενωσιακής ενοποίησης. Ο ενιαίος ευρωενωσιακός προϋπολογισμός, ο Ευρωπαϊός Υπουργός Οικονομικών, το Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο, σε ανταγωνισμό, αλλά και με τον ίδιο ρόλο με το ΔΝΤ, είναι η δίχως τέλος θωράκιση της αντεργατικής πολιτικής των κυβερνήσεων, υπό τη διαρκή εποπτεία της ΕΕ. Η υποχρέωση για ισοσκελισμένους προϋπολογισμούς – εντός του πλαισίου του «Συμφώνου Σταθερότητας» – σε περίπτωση υπέρβασης, υποχρεώνει τα κράτη σε ακαριαία αντεργατικά μέτρα, με «αυτόματους δημοσιονομικούς κόφτες», νέες περικοπές μισθών, συντάξεων, κοινωνικών δαπανών. Σε συνδυασμό με τον «ΕΜΣ» και το «Σύμφωνο του Ευρώ» για την ασφυκτική ευρωενωσιακή εποπτεία έως την αποπληρωμή του δημόσιου χρέους υπόσχονται μνημόνια διαρκείας. Τα αιτήματα διαφόρων κυβερνήσεων, όπως της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ – ΑΝΕΛ, πρωταθλήτριας στην εφαρμογή μνημονίων, για εξαίρεση από το σύμφωνο σταθερότητας των «αναπτυξιακών» επενδυτικών δαπανών δεν αφορούν σε καμία περίπτωση τη χαλάρωση της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής, αλλά επιδοτήσεις με τζάμπα χρήμα και φοροαπαλλαγές για το κεφάλαιο που θα πληρώσει πάλι ο λαός με αλληπάλληλες καταγίδες μέτρων και φόρων. Η πείρα των λαών μπορεί να αποτελέσει κριτήριο και βάση αντιμετώπισης του εργατικού – λαϊκού κινήματος. Καπιταλιστική ανάπτυξη χωρίς θυσίες διαρκείας των λαών, δικαίη ανάπτυξη μέσα σε ένα άδικο σύστημα δεν υπάρχει.

16. Vorstellung des Jahresberichts 2016 des Rechnungshofs (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest prezentacja sprawozdania rocznego Trybunału Obrachunkowego – 2016 r. (2017/2765(RSP))

Witam serdecznie prezesa Trybunału Obrachunkowego, pana Klause-Heinera Lehnego. Jeszcze raz witam pana komisarza Oettingera.

Klaus-Heiner Lehne, Präsident des Rechnungshofs. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren Abgeordnete! In diesem Jahr begeht der Europäische Rechnungshof sein 40. Jubiläum. Wie die Debatten diese Woche in diesem Hause gezeigt haben, haben sich im Verlauf der vergangenen vier Jahrzehnte die politischen, finanzpolitischen und wirtschaftlichen Rahmenbedingungen der Europäischen Union erheblich verändert. Die Herausforderungen der jüngsten Zeit haben das Vertrauen unserer Bürger in die europäischen und nationalen Institutionen vor eine Zerreißprobe gestellt. Wir, die wir in diesen Institutionen arbeiten, müssen darauf reagieren und Lösungen finden, und zwar jeder im Rahmen seines jeweiligen Verantwortungsbereiches. In dieser Hinsicht freue ich mich, Ihnen mitteilen zu können, dass ich durchaus Positives berichten werde.

Unserer Einschätzung nach vermittelt die EU-Jahresrechnung für 2016 ein den tatsächlichen Verhältnissen entsprechendes Bild. Die Einnahmen im Jahre 2016 waren nicht in wesentlichem Ausmaß mit Fehlern behaftet. Vor allem aber hat sich die geschätzte Fehlerquote bei den Zahlungen zulasten des europäischen Haushaltes kontinuierlich verbessert. Rund die Hälfte der von uns im Jahre 2016 geprüften europäischen Ausgaben wies eine Fehlerquote auf, die unter der Wesentlichkeitsschwelle von 2 % lag. Infolgedessen erteilten wir zu den Zahlungen des Jahres 2016 ein eingeschränkt positives Prüfungsurteil, anstatt dies zu versagen. Das ist unser erstes eingeschränktes Prüfungsurteil, seit wir 1994 begannen, jährlich eine Zuverlässigkeitserklärung vorzulegen. Es steht für eine bedeutende Verbesserung im EU-Finanzmanagement.

Konkret bedeutet dies: Die geschätzte Gesamtfehlerquote bei den EU-Ausgaben im Jahre 2016 beläuft sich auf 3,1 % gegenüber 3,8 % im Jahre 2015 und 4,4 % im Jahre 2014. Dies ist also eine kontinuierliche Verbesserung.

Die sogenannten anspruchsbasierten Zahlungen, die bei Erfüllung bestimmter Bedingungen geleistet werden, machen rund 49 % der EU-Ausgaben aus und wiesen Fehlerquoten von unter 2 %, unterhalb der Materialitätsgrenze, auf. Darunter fallen Direktbeihilfen für Landwirte, Studien und Forschungsstipendien sowie Personalkosten, um eine Reihe von Punkten beispielhaft zu benennen.

Demgegenüber wurden bei den sogenannten erstattungsbasierten Zahlungen, die geleistet werden, um Ausgaben zu erstatten, höhere Fehlerquoten festgestellt. Von den Mitgliedstaaten und der Kommission ergriffene Maßnahmen trugen zwar dazu bei, die geschätzte Gesamtfehlerquote zu verringern, doch stellten wir fest, dass ausreichende Informationen zur Verfügung standen, um weit mehr Fehler zu verhindern bzw. aufzudecken und zu berichtigen. Unserer Auffassung nach bedeutet dies, dass keine zusätzlichen Kontrollstufen nötig sind, die bestehenden Kontrollen aber ordnungsgemäß vollzogen werden müssen.

Lassen Sie mich aber auch eine Warnung aussprechen: Der Gesamtbetrag der Zahlungen, zu denen die Europäische Union im Rahmen künftiger Haushaltspläne verpflichtet ist, war mit 238,8 Mrd. EUR im Jahre 2016 so hoch wie noch nie zuvor. Die Beseitigung dieses Rückstandes und die Verhinderung neuer Rückstände sollten mit Blick auf die Planung der europäischen Ausgaben für den Zeitraum nach 2020, also im Zusammenhang mit dem nächsten MFR, im Vordergrund stehen.

Es ist für unsere Bürger wichtig, zu wissen, dass die öffentlichen Gelder rechtmäßig ausgegeben werden. Aber genauso wichtig – vielleicht sogar noch wichtiger – ist es für die Menschen, zu erfahren, was sie für ihr Geld erhalten haben. War der Bau einer bestimmten Straße oder eines Flughafens an einem bestimmten Standort oder irgendeiner anderen Infrastruktur wirklich sinnvoll? Wurden damit tatsächlich Arbeitsplätze und Wachstum geschaffen? Um diese Fragen zu beantworten, stellen wir zunehmend die Wirtschaftlichkeit und Wirksamkeit der europäischen Ausgaben und der Programme in den Fokus unserer Arbeit.

In vielen Bereichen des europäischen Haushaltes wurden Kontrollsysteme, die dazu dienen, Fehler zu verhindern, aufzudecken und zu berichtigen, in den letzten Jahren verbessert. Dies bietet für uns auch eine Chance, die Zuverlässigkeitserklärung mit dem Ziel weiterzuentwickeln, uns künftig im Hinblick auf die Ordnungsmäßigkeit der Ausgaben stärker auf diese Kontrollsysteme verlassen zu können. Wir werden so in der Lage sein, Parlament und Rat mehr und bessere Informationen im Rahmen der Prüfung des europäischen Haushaltes zur Verfügung stellen zu können.

Meine Damen und Herren, in den kommenden Jahrzehnten werden wir auch weiterhin als Hüter der europäischen Finanzen und der Interessen unserer Bürger tätig sein. Wir werden auch weiterhin eine unabhängige Stimme sein und Bereiche aufzeigen, die gut funktionieren, aber auch unbequeme Wahrheiten aussprechen. In einer Welt, in der Fehlinformationen und die Manipulation von Daten zunehmend weit verbreitet sind, wird der Europäische Rechnungshof fortfahren, zuverlässige und unparteiische Informationen zu liefern. Lassen Sie uns gemeinsam in jedem Stadium des Gesetzgebungs- und Haushaltszyklus dafür sorgen, dass die Europäische Union in Fragen, die für den Bürger von Bedeutung sind, Ergebnisse auf effiziente Weise erzielt.

Günther Oettinger, Mitglied der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, verehrter Herr Präsident Lehne und Herr Lazarou vom Europäischen Rechnungshof, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren Abgeordnete! Der Jahresbericht und die Empfehlungen des Europäischen Rechnungshofs sind für uns als Europäische Kommission wichtige Grundlagen für unsere weitere Arbeit. Diese Zusammenarbeit zwischen den verschiedenen Organisationen – dem Haushaltskontrollausschuss, dem Rat und dem Rechnungshof und andererseits der Kommission – tragen, so glaube ich, auch Früchte. Daran, dass wir zum zehnten Mal in Folge die Zuverlässigkeit unserer Rechnungsabschlüsse bestätigt bekamen, dass wir eine sich weiter verringernde Fehlerquote aufzeigen, dass das Prüfungsurteil des Rechnungshofes uns bestärkt, sieht man: Wir sind gemeinsam nicht ohne Erfolg unterwegs. Ein langer Prozess scheint sich auch zu lohnen.

Das Europäische Parlament kann stolz sein auf seinen Beitrag, der im Kontext des Entlastungsverfahrens durch Sie erbracht wird. Sie haben über Jahre hinweg dafür gesorgt, dass wir als Europäische Kommission durch konstruktive und kritische Begleitung besser geworden sind. Der Rechnungshof macht ganz konkrete Vorschläge, um das öffentliche Auftragswesen korrekt durchzuführen, um die Bemessung von Agrarflächen richtig vorzunehmen, um bei Finanzhilfen im Forschungssektor den bürokratischen Aufwand für Forscher zu verringern und damit einen höheren Wert unseres Forschungsprogramms zu erreichen.

Klar ist: Wir sind immer auch in engem Zusammenhang auf die Mitgliedstaaten angewiesen. Wir haben eine gemeinsame Verantwortung, und die Verwaltung der Mitgliedstaaten, ihrer Regionen ist oftmals mit uns gemeinsam oder gar federführend für eine ordnungsgemäße Mittelverwendung und Verfahrensdurchführung verantwortlich.

Das eingeschränkte Prüfungsurteil ist für uns eine durchaus gute Nachricht. Aber wir sagen nicht selbstzufrieden: „Das war's“, wir wollen unsere Arbeit effizienter machen und weiter verbessern. Herr Präsident Lehne hat den Backlog und die Schwierigkeiten erwähnt, die daraus in den Haushalten 2014 und 2015 entstanden. Stand heute laufen wir wieder in der Schlussphase dieser Periode in eine vergleichbare Entwicklung hinein, denn die Mittel, die 2015, 2016, 2017 und auch 2018 bereitstehen, werden vermutlich nicht mehr gebraucht. Wir werden in den nächsten Tagen Änderungsvorschläge machen und Kürzungen am laufenden Etat vornehmen, aber auch am Haushalt für 2018. Daraus müssen wir für die nächste Periode lernen – die Mitgliedstaaten und wir. Und möglicherweise sollte ein neuer MFR nicht erst kurz vor Weihnachten des letzten Jahres verabschiedet werden. Ein Jahr früher brächte früher Sicherheit für alle Beteiligten, und die Vorbereitung und die Fahrgeschwindigkeit wären ab dem ersten Jahr besser unterwegs.

Wir sagen gerne zu, dass wir aus all den Vorschlägen des Rechnungshofs lernen wollen. Und das Thema Erfolgsorientierung: Die Wirksamkeit und die Frage des Mehrwerts, den wir begründen werden und müssen, stehen dabei im Vordergrund bei allen Maßnahmen der Infrastruktur, bei Kohäsionsprogrammen, bei neuen Aufgaben wie Migration – der Mehrwert, den wir auf europäischer Ebene gegenüber einer Aufgabenerbringung und -finanzierung auf nationaler Ebene nachweisen müssen.

Wir wollen nochmals das Hohe Haus auf den Reflexionsprozess hinweisen. Für den nächsten Haushaltsrahmen haben wir ein Papier vorgelegt, in dem wir Optionen aufzeigen und wo wir auf Ihre Meinung großen Wert legen. Das gilt für die Zahl der Jahre des nächsten MFR, das gilt für die Prioritäten im nächsten MFR, das gilt für die Rubriken, und es gilt auch für die Programmierung, die dann wiederum für die Auftragsdurchführung und für die Erfolgsorientierung entscheidend wichtig ist.

Mein Dank gilt dem Rechnungshof. Ich glaube, dass die Grundlagen für eine gute Beratung in den nächsten Wochen hier in dem Hohen Hause heute geschaffen worden sind.

(Beifall)

Joachim Zeller, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, lieber Präsident des Rechnungshofs! Zunächst einmal wieder einen herzlichen Dank an Sie, Klaus-Heiner Lehne, und Herrn Lazaro und die Mitarbeiter des Rechnungshofs für den Jahresbericht für das Haushaltsjahr 2016. 322 Seiten des Jahresberichts des Rechnungshofs geben detailliert Auskunft darüber, wie die Kommission und die Mitgliedstaaten mit dem Haushalt der EU gearbeitet haben. Auch wenn es ein Blick zurück ist, bietet der Rechnungshofbericht gemeinsam mit den Sonderberichten des Rechnungshofs, die ich an dieser Stelle noch mal erwähnen möchte, eine sehr gute Analyse zur Zielerreichung bei den europäischen Programmen und Projekten. Die erneut gesunkene Fehlerquote von jetzt im Durchschnitt 3,1 % ist ermutigend, und wir begrüßen natürlich diesen positiven Trend.

Ein Blick auf die Fehlerquote allein reicht allerdings nicht aus. Fehler sagen häufig mehr über die Komplexität von Regeln aus als über Missbrauch und Betrug. Daher müssen wir das Regelwerk unserer Finanzverwaltung weiter vereinfachen, damit die Zahlungsempfänger noch schneller und besser in den Genuss der europäischen Haushaltsmittel kommen können.

Die höchsten Fehlerquoten treten nach wie vor wieder im Bereich der geteilten Mittelverwaltung auf. Mein Appell geht daher an die Mitgliedstaaten und ihre Verwaltungsbehörden, noch entschiedener an der Vermeidung von Fehlern zu arbeiten.

Anlass zur Sorge geben die auch vom Hof und auch vom Kommissar erwähnten und festgestellten erheblichen Verzögerungen beim Einstieg in die jetzige Förderperiode und damit zusammenhängende eklatante Zahlungsrückstände, denn das Jahr 2016 war bereits das dritte Jahr der laufenden Förderperiode. Das kann zu einem erheblichen Zahlungsüberhang beim nicht mehr allzu fernen Ende in der jetzigen Förderperiode führen. Deswegen ist es jetzt höchste Zeit, an der Abarbeitung der Rückstände zu arbeiten, damit die Ziele, die mit dem europäischen Haushalt erreicht werden sollen, auch wirklich erreicht werden können.

Durch die aktuellen Debatten ist die Redezeit bei mir begrenzt worden, deswegen kann ich jetzt nur sehr allgemein auf den Rechnungshofbericht eingehen. Aber in den nächsten Wochen werden wir gemeinsam mit der Kommission dieses opulente Werk im Detail diskutieren und dann zu einem Bericht des Parlaments führen. Noch mal herzlichen Dank für die geleistete Arbeit und für die konstruktive Zusammenarbeit!

Inés Ayala Sender, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, señor Lehne, señor comisario Oettinger, en este Pleno donde abundan los debates sobre —digamos— malas noticias para la Unión Europea —un *Brexit* que se atasca por incomparecencia de la parte que lo propició y un ejemplo de cómo procurarse réditos políticos secesionistas incumpliendo la legalidad y el Estado de Derecho y manipulando la buena voluntad de la gente—, sin embargo, solo podemos felicitarnos por una noticia excelente que hemos tardado solo veintitrés años en conseguir.

Y a usted le corresponde el éxito, señor Lehne, a todos sus colegas del Tribunal de Cuentas y a todos nosotros en general, puesto que este Parlamento y la Comisión de Control Presupuestario, especialmente, nos hemos peleado y batido el cobre para conseguirlo: una opinión no negativa, sino solo sujeta a reservas, que nos da, por fin, una foto verdadera de la realidad.

Una verificación rigurosa en la metodología del resultado de enormes inversiones en la mejora de los sistemas internos y externos de auditoría, en la formación de recursos humanos en todos los niveles, en visitas y entrevistas con responsables de instituciones, con responsables de Estados miembros, regiones, ayuntamientos, empresas, universidades, etcétera, para ir, año a año, aprobación de la gestión tras aprobación de la gestión, reduciendo el porcentaje inicial de dos dígitos al actual, para 2016, del 3,1 %; donde, por fin, tenemos, además, claramente datos que nos permiten comparar, con rigor y según los estándares internacionales obligatorios para una cámara pública como el Tribunal de Cuentas Europeo, lo que puede ser comparable, y no peras con manzanas.

De ahí que agradezca especialmente la aclaración sobre la necesidad de otra fórmula o formato para controlar los instrumentos financieros y para no seguir confundiendo a los ciudadanos europeos.

También le agradezco cómo, poco a poco, hemos ido consiguiendo los datos y su presentación hasta ser capaces de presentar no solo una tasa de error con mejor justificación metodológica sino, sobre todo, para indicar e incentivar la acción a instituciones europeas y Estados miembros, sabiendo que la información que ya tienen podía haberles ayudado a mejorar esa tasa de error.

Por fin y rápidamente, solamente le solicito —y prometo nuestro apoyo para ello— que mejore la metodología en los sistemas internos, que mejore la presentación y la pedagogía —que sean comparables con las de los Estados miembros, que los ciudadanos comprenden—. Y, finalmente, el salto hacia el siglo XXI: una metodología para los resultados y para poder medir el presupuesto fundado en los resultados, lo que usted muy bien nos ha explicado.

Ryszard Czarnecki, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the President of the Court of Auditors for his annual report regarding the financial year 2016. You have done a great deal of work. According to your report, there has been improvement in the estimated level of error in payments from the EU budget. You have issued a qualified opinion on the 2016 payments rather than an adverse one.

The overall level of error for EU spending was estimated at 3.1%. Your report indicates that ‘entitlement payments’, made for meeting specific conditions, and accounting for about 49% of EU spending, show levels of error below 2%. These payments include direct aid to farmers, grants to students and researchers and staff costs.

However, higher levels of error were found in ‘reimbursement payments’, made for economic, social and territorial cohesion. The estimated level of error here was 4.8%. For ‘natural resources, world development, the environment, climate action and fisheries’ it was 4.9%.

Action by the Member States and the Commission reduced the overall estimated level of error. However, sufficient information was available to further prevent, or detect and correct, many errors. If this information had all been used correctly the levels of error for economic social and territorial cohesion and for natural resources and ‘Global Europe’ would have been below the 2% threshold.

We strongly encourage the Commission to continue focusing on performance and simplification because simple rules reduce errors and increase the effectiveness of EU funding.

Martina Dlabajová, za skupinu ALDE. – Pane předsedající, pane předsedo Lehne, pane komisaři, letošní výroční zpráva Evropského účetního dvora za rok 2016 je nejen zprávou výroční, ale i jubilejní. Nese pořadové číslo 40, což je skutečně úctyhodné a také hodné malé oslavy. Nejsem si ale jistá, zda to je úplně na otevření šampaňského. Laická veřejnost by asi nechápala, ale my všichni, kteří se zabýváme evropskými financemi, bychom mohli oslavovat třeba tu skutečnost, že po 23 letech obsahuje výroční zpráva výrok s výhradou o spolehlivosti uskutečněných operací namísto výroku záporného. A v případě nárokových a správních plateb je chybovost dokonce hluboko pod úrovní míry významnosti.

Snižování chybovosti výdajové oblasti rozpočtu Evropské unie je jednou z řady priorit, kterých bychom při vynakládání prostředků EU v souladu se zásadami řádného finančního řízení rádi dosahovali trvale. Druhým, dle mého názoru ještě podstatnějším aspektem, je zaměření na výkonnost a přidanou hodnotu všech projektů a investic.

Novým a nelehkým úkolem, jež leží před Evropským účetním dvorem, je hledání odpovědi na otázku, zda nízká chybovost automaticky znamená i hospodárné, efektivní a účinné vynakládání finančních prostředků EU. Identický úkol stojí před Evropskou komisí a členskými státy. Zpoždění aktuálního víceletého finančního rámce má za následek historické maximum nespotebvaných prostředků Unie. Jistě se shodneme na tom, že prostředky občanů EU nesmí být vynakládány jen za účelem vyčerpávání národních alokací. Naopak. Usilujme o to, aby bylo těch téměř neuvěřitelných, nevyčerpaných 240 miliard EUR využito na financování kvalitních projektů, které budou mít pro evropské společenství skutečný přínos a přidanou hodnotu. Teprve potom možná přijde čas na to bouchnout šampaňské.

Dennis de Jong, namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie. – Dank aan de voorzitter van de Rekenkamer voor de presentatie van zijn jaarverslag, wat een heel belangrijk document is omdat het de basis vormt voor veel van ons werk over de begrotingscontrole.

Ik geef graag toe dat in het verleden de discussie over het verslag nogal is blijven hangen in de vaststelling dat de Rekenkamer alweer geen goedkeurende verklaring kon geven vanwege een te hoog foutenpercentage. Dat is niet goed, want het gaat natuurlijk om méér dan een foutenpercentage alleen. Daarom juich ik het op zich toe dat de Rekenkamer nu breder wil kijken naar waar voor ons geld.

Tegelijkertijd mag de aandacht voor de rechtmatigheid van de uitgaven niet verslappen. Als ik in een voetnoot moet lezen dat je ook kunt zeggen dat het werkelijke foutenpercentage geen 3,1 maar 5,1 procent is, dan is er iets mis. Het gaat hier om de verantwoording van de bestedingen uit de financiële instrumenten. De Rekenkamer stelt zelf dat 2,3 miljard euro aan bestedingen is uitgegeven buiten de bevoegde periode, dus zonder dat er een wettelijke basis is waar ook het Parlement mee heeft ingestemd. Hoe kan dat?

Hetzelfde geldt voor de voorbehouden van de Commissiediensten, die stijgen van 21 naar 26 procent van de uitgaven. Dan zou het voor het eerst zijn dat de Commissie zelf kritischer is dan de Rekenkamer. Dat zou echt een unicum zijn.

Hoe verklaart de Rekenkamer deze tegenstrijdigheden? En kunnen we er ook de komende 40 jaar op blijven vertrouwen dat de Rekenkamer zeer precies en zeer kritisch zal controleren op rechtmatigheid?

Indrek Tarand, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Lehne, Herr Kommissar Oettinger! Ich würde gern in meiner Muttersprache sprechen.

Ühesõnaga, järjekordne raport kontrollikoja teeb meid rõõmsaks, sest vigu on jäänud vähemaks ja ainult kolm protsenti rahast läheb kulutustele, mille põhjendatust ei ole võimalik tõestada. See on tore ja julgustav. Ning on huvitav, kas need kulud, mida me teeme kontrollimisele Luksemburgis, et saada teada neid audiitortulemusi, on ka põhjendatud. Ja nagu te teate, minu kauaaegne mõte on olnud selles, et pärast laienemise esimest vooru 2004. aastal on Euroopa institutsioonid mõttetult üles paisutatud rahvusriikide kasuks. Me teame, et iga riik peab saama voliniku, iga riik peab saama kontrollikoja liikme, iga riik peab saama prokurööri või prokuröri jne, jne. Minu arvates ei ole see, kui me tahame mõelda Euroopa Liidust kui efektiivselt toimivast organisatsioonist, üldse vajalik. Ja ma paluks härra Lehnelt järgmisel aastal teha kindlasti audit ja analüüsida, kas on mõttekas pidada seitset Ida-Euroopa riigi endist peaministrit asepresidentidena komisjonis, kus nugini volinik Oettinger teeb kogu töö ära ja nemad ainult asepresideerivad, ja kas on mõttekas kontrollikojas omada Eesti kontrollööri, meest, kes on põhja lasknud lennufirma, laevafirma, rongifirma, praamifirma, mida iganes, ja nüüd ta kontrollib meid. Palun tehke selles osas audit. Sest tegelikult on ka Euroopa Liidu mõttes võimalik teha kordamööda – kord on Saksamaal volinik, kord on Prantsusmaal, kord on Eestil, kord on Lätil. Aitäh teile!

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la Corte dei conti per la sua relazione che ogni anno ci dà elementi per valutare quella che è la spesa relativa ai fondi dell'Unione europea. Prendiamo atto della diminuzione degli errori anche se dobbiamo dire che tanti di questi errori, che molto spesso sono errori che si citano come procedure burocratiche, messe in un modo sbagliato e riportate in un modo sbagliato, in realtà, poi, sotto forse c'erano delle vere frodi, tipo procedure d'appalto che favoriscono determinate aziende rispetto ad altre, e inclusione, magari, di spese non ammissibili e mancanza di documenti giustificativi.

E questa, comunque, è solo una parte, perché la Commissione europea, come sapete, si limita a prendere questi documenti e a pagare le fatture. Non ha la capacità, ovviamente, di controllare tutto. E tutto, da quello che ho capito, è delegato agli Stati membri, che invito – ovviamente, per evitare proprio che la Commissione poi venga a dirci quello che dobbiamo fare – a creare un sistema più trasparente e di controllo di certificazione sui fondi. Perché, in tutti gli Stati in cui sono stato, in questi anni, soprattutto nei viaggi delle delegazioni, ho notato come questo sistema sia molto basato sul conflitto di interesse, dove le autorità di certificazione e controllo vengono poi dopo nominate dalla politica stessa, come è logico che sia, però allo stesso tempo, in molti casi si creano appunto campanilismi o rapporti poco trasparenti.

Quindi sta agli Stati membri, in questo momento, dal mio punto di vista, agire per evitare che una Commissione poi in futuro interferisca sull'utilizzo di questi fondi.

Olaf Stuger, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – Er wordt al jarenlang aantoonbaar belastinggeld over de balk gesmeten. Dat is niet zo verwonderlijk, want er zit namelijk een fout in het systeem. Als je bijvoorbeeld kijkt naar subsidiegeld: dat komt vanuit Brussel, maar moet door de lidstaten worden gecontroleerd. Die hebben daar geen belang bij, dus gebeurt het ook niet. Toch heeft de Rekenkamer met heel veel kunst- en vliegwerk en een hoop trucs gemeend goedkeuring te moeten geven en dat is onterecht.

Wat al helemaal geen pas geeft, is dat de heer Brenninkmeijer suggereert om champagne of prosecco open te trekken. Want wezenlijk is er niets veranderd ten opzichte van de afgelopen jaren. Het enige wat ik kan bedenken, is dat we in 2019 Europese verkiezingen hebben en dat je niet vroeg genoeg kunt beginnen met de goednieuwsshow.

Maar het ergste vind ik nog dat de heer Brenninkmeijer, het Nederlandse lid van de Europese Rekenkamer, hiermee een van de laatste rationele bastions in het EU-geweld – de Europese Rekenkamer – het subjectieve politieke moeras intrekt.

Brian Hayes (PPE). – Mr President, I want to welcome the report, the President of the ECA, and indeed the comments made by Commissioner Oettinger here today. This is a very important part of our procedure where we discharge on an annualised basis the expenditure under the EU budget. It is important not just because of the role of Parliament, but also the role of the Council in making sure that EU taxpayers know that their funds are being used properly in key areas of public expenditure. But we should never forget that we are talking about a very small fraction of total public expenditure in the European Union. That means that we should use that expenditure to the very best of our abilities and for the objectives of the programmes that we set out.

This particular report this year is welcomed, not least because of the qualified opinion that the Court has been able to make – that is a very welcome development – but also because of a very significant improvement in the error rate. It is not fair for Members of this House not to recognise the fact that, over the past three years, we have seen effectively a 25% reduction in the error rate, from about 4.4% to 3.1% over the past three years. That is a significant improvement and it is something to be recognised and something to be celebrated in this House and within the Council.

There are issues that we need to address. As other colleagues have said, the question of simplification of rules is crucial to reduce the error rate. One of the issues outlined in the report from the ECA this year is this question of outstanding payments. Substantial amounts of commitments are made into the future and the money is not spent. We have got to make sure we can get on with the task of spending those monies. But there will be enormous challenges, not least because of the question mark of the budget into the future on the question of Brexit, but also because we have to review the MFF. I think if we do this in a sensible and deliberative way, we can make sure that not only can we shine a light on what is bad about expenditure, but also shine a light on what is good and learn from that.

Derek Vaughan (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and, in particular, the President of the Court of Auditors and I wanted to welcome his new approach which I think has been a breath of fresh air. Also, of course, I wanted to welcome this year's positive report. It is welcome to see that not only do we have a positive report, overall the error rate is reducing and I am also pleased to say that the error rate for economic, social and territorial cohesion is also reducing, down from 5.2% to 4.8%. Of course we would all like to see further reductions in the error rate in the future.

It would be useful to know what actions have been taken which have led to the biggest fall in errors. I think that this information could be shared between Member States and then used to reduce errors in the future. I believe this is something we should be looking at and focusing on.

It is also important to note, as the President said, that Member States have the information to detect and reduce the error rate, maybe even below the 2% threshold. So again it would be useful to know why Member States are not using the information they have, which would allow them to reduce error rates even further.

On the important question of measuring performance – and I think this is something we all welcome, we talk about it all the time and we need to find better ways of measuring performance in the future – of course a number of measures have already been introduced to measure performance. Previously in its report the Court does suggest the Commission continues to look at other ways of linking payments to performance. I would be interested to know from the Commission and from the Court what those measures might be.

Richard Ashworth (ECR). – Mr President, I thank Klaus-Heiner Lehne and his team for their report and I am delighted to note that this is the first audit to receive a qualified positive opinion since the system began in 1994. This is welcome, but there is always room for improvement, and I note the continuing weakness in the areas of joint management.

In public finance it is important to strike the right balance between rigorous checks and controls and, on the other hand, ensuring public funding is readily available. So for that reason, controls need to be proportionate rather than a barrier to entry. This is taxpayers' money, and it is our duty to ensure that it is spent in a manner that is both beneficial and fully compliant.

This is a most encouraging report and I urge the Commission to ensure that they continue the steady improvement that we have seen over recent years.

Nedzhmi Ali (ALDE). – Mr President, the budget, as the annual financial framework of revenues and spending, is of significant importance for the implementation of the EU's policies. In this regard, the European Court of Auditors' (ECA) general conclusion that the revenue and payments for 2016 were legal and regular, with some exceptions for the payments, is good news. The estimated level of errors in the payments made from the EU budget for the last three years shows a clear trend of steady decrease from 4.4% to 3.1%.

The bulk of the errors are concentrated within the areas of economic, social and territorial cohesion as well as in the competitiveness for growth and jobs. We should underline that, in the ECA's report, there is an early warning on a number of issues that we should be careful about. The challenges are mainly related to budgetary and financial management. Delayed implementation of the programmes could create, at the end of the current programming period, a huge backlog of outstanding payments.

We need a budget that provides more flexibility to respond to unforeseen events, such as financial problems, disasters and refugee crisis. We should continue our efforts towards a budget focused on results, in order to achieve maximum effectiveness of spending the EU's financial resources.

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE). – Ik wil de heer Lehne bedanken voor het werk dat hij en zijn collega's en hun vele medewerkers hebben verricht om dit rekenverslag af te leveren.

We horen inderdaad mooie cijfers. 3,1 procent is een mooi cijfer, beter dan vorig jaar, zelfs lager dan het laagste cijfer ooit, van 2009. Maar ik sluit me aan bij de vragen van de heer De Jong. Die noot waarin sprake is van vijf procent, de voorbehouden van de Commissie: ik zou daar graag in de loop van de kwijtingsprocedure uitleg over krijgen.

Nu, alles kan beter. 3,1 procent is een mooi resultaat, zonder enige twijfel, maar we weten dat het overgrote deel van de middelen beheerd wordt – 80 procent van de middelen – in medebeheer, waar de lidstaten en regio's de verantwoordelijkheid dragen. In het jaarverslag lezen we dat er nu reeds een extra inspanning wordt gedaan om middelen terug te vorderen. Dat gebeurt ongetwijfeld onder druk van het Parlement, maar het kan beter gedaan worden.

Ik heb een vraag aan de heer Oettinger: hoe kunnen we samen – de Commissie en het Parlement – de lidstaten en de overheden van de regio's ertoe dwingen om hun verantwoordelijkheid beter op te nemen, om ervoor te zorgen dat die foutenmarge effectief onder de 2 procent uitkomt? Meneer Oettinger, ik denk dat we op dit punt moeten samenwerken, Parlement en Commissie, en de lidstaten en de regio's op hun verantwoordelijkheid moeten wijzen.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, the qualified opinion on the legality and regularity of payments underlying the EU accounts is still a very, very serious thing indeed. If any business were receiving a qualified opinion on its accounts, it would rightly be worried. Even more worrying, I suppose, is the way that we have arrived at this situation and why it was not the even worse adverse opinion as previous years.

Firstly, it is argued that errors are not pervasive, claiming that the errors are only high for reimbursement-based expenditure, but it needs to be pointed out that the errors exist across every single area of spending within the EU budget. The error rate of 3.1% is still over EUR 4 billion of taxpayers' money every year. If it were just that, it would still be bad enough, but it is not just that; there is an awful lot more to it than that.

First, the error rate does mask a far, far higher rate of projects where there are errors. For example, 23% of EAGGF payments had errors, but the error rate reported is 1.7%. For Rural Development and Environment, 39% of projects have some errors within them but the error rate then is 4.9%, so it masks something that is somewhat bigger. Second, about a third of all errors are not quantifiable and those therefore do not show up in the statistics. Third, foreign aid sent via third-country governments is just assumed to have zero error, which for accountancy purposes is understandable, but in practice is palpable, self-evident nonsense.

Fourth, we are only talking about money spent outside of the rules and waste of the money within the rules is not counted. Fifth, the errors in special instruments are not included, which would have led to a 5.1% error rate, rather than 3.1%. Sixth, the burden of proof is unequivocal errors, so these are only the errors that we are absolutely certain about. There are clearly more in practice.

Then we see that, in effect, there are blind eyes being turned left, right and centre. On page 47 of this report, we are reminded that pension contributions are not ringfenced but used to fund the general EU budget. Now that is something which, in any context and in any organisation, is not good practice. This is also the reason why we have the whole pension liability question in the Brexit debate in the first place, since this has not been done properly at EU level for many decades.

I now have deep concerns with regard to the Court of Auditors because auditors should always be completely independent of the organisation that they audit. That is the whole point of auditing. But now we are in a situation where nearly 40% of the Court are ex-politicians, and most of those are ex-MEPs. When all but six of the auditors are former civil servants, it starts to undermine a level of public confidence in those same auditors.

Throughout this report the perspective seems to me to be one of excusing problems so when 31% of projects contained errors on page 260, the report instead described them as 69% error free. It is not the job of the auditors to excuse failings. It is the job of auditors to expose them.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

France Jamet (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, d'après le rapport de la Cour des comptes sur l'exécution budgétaire 2016, on peut se féliciter du niveau d'erreur global qui se situe, nous dit-on, à 3,1 %, soit près de 4 milliards, ce qui n'est pas rien.

D'autre part, alors que les dépenses de l'Union européenne s'élèvent en 2016 à 136,4 milliards d'euros, les auditeurs nous précisent que ses dirigeants se sont d'ores et déjà engagés pour des dépenses à hauteur de 238,8 milliards d'euros. Nous n'avons donc plus de possibilité d'action jusqu'à la fin du mandat.

Vous relevez tout à l'heure le caractère exceptionnel de ces résultats. Moi, je relève ici une dramatique récurrence.

Alors que nos concitoyens sont soumis chaque jour à des exigences d'austérité et de rigueur imposées par l'Union, celle-ci, sans qu'il ne lui soit fait ici aucun reproche, se permet des libertés avec sa propre gestion.

Alors ce deux poids – deux mesures est insupportable. Les technocrates de Bruxelles d'un côté, le peuple de l'autre, l'enfer fiscal pour les uns, et la grâce pour les autres. Ce rouleau compresseur administratif qui impacte notre quotidien doit être radicalement réformé, selon nous. C'est la vision que nous défendons dans l'intérêt de nos compatriotes.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Mr President, this Parliament benefits highly from the expertise of the Court of Auditors. The annual report gives us a great amount of useful information and plays a crucial role in the discharge procedure. It acts as a basis for a thorough analysis of the implementation of the EU budget, so congratulations on this important work.

This year we can once again be mostly satisfied with the Court's report itself and the conclusions it incorporates. However, despite improvements in the error rates, there are still some weaknesses. I have to emphasise in particular the issues of compliance and performance. Indeed, the issue of the error rate as such can be seen as of relative importance. Unfortunately – a confusing case of non-compliance regarding the eligibility period of disbursements within financial instruments – the estimated level of error for cohesion expenditure does not necessarily represent the true state of its implementation. It has to be made clear, this is not the Court's fault. The Court is not at fault here. It did what it was bound to do within the legal interpretation. But the point beyond that is this: the European citizen has to have direct access to clearly understandable numbers, and there we still have some work to do.

We do appreciate that the Court has begun to put more emphasis on performance audit and this is the right path. In the coming years we still need more data on actual results and added value, also in and by Member States.

Arndt Kohn (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Präsident Lehne! Auch ich möchte Ihnen, Herr Lehne – stellvertretend für den Europäischen Rechnungshof – für die geleistete Prüfungsarbeit und den ausführlichen Bericht danken. Das eingeschränkt positive Prüfungsurteil, das der Rechnungshof zum ersten Mal seit 1994 abgibt, zeigt, dass es über die letzten Jahre deutliche Fortschritte bei der Verwaltung der EU-Mittel gegeben hat. Bei rund 50 % der verwendeten EU-Gelder liegt die Fehlerquote unter der Wesentlichkeitsschwelle von 2 %. Und auch wenn die Fehlerquote im Bereich der Kohäsionspolitik bei 4,8 % liegt, kann man doch auch hier gegenüber den Vorjahren deutliche Verbesserungen erkennen und aus Ihren Empfehlungen für die Zukunft lernen.

Die Kohäsionspolitik muss im nächsten mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen weiterhin eine wichtige Rolle spielen, um den sozialen, wirtschaftlichen und territorialen Zusammenhalt in Europa zu fördern. Ob die Menschen nun am Schwarzen Meer, am Atlantik oder an der Nordsee leben, mit diesen Fördermitteln wird Europa sichtbar und greifbar.

Die Kohäsionspolitik sollte auch weiterhin überwiegend auf Zuschüssen basieren. Finanzinstrumente sind insbesondere für kleinere Empfänger wie zum Beispiel Kommunen oder KMU schwerer zugänglich.

Die parlamentarische Kontrolle der EU-Finzen ist unerlässlich. Die europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben einen Anspruch darauf zu wissen, wie und wofür die Gelder ausgegeben wurden. Transparenz schafft Vertrauen, und nur über das Vertrauen der Bürger können wir Begeisterung und Unterstützung für Europa wiedergewinnen.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt (ECR). – Het is hier al aangehaald: het foutenpercentage daalt, maar er is nog altijd meer dan 4 miljard euro aan Europese subsidies die niet volgens de regels besteed wordt. We moeten dus nog efficiënter omgaan met het belastinggeld.

Daarom stel ik voor dat we gaan voor nog betere en duidelijkere Europese regels. Die moeten ervoor zorgen dat het makkelijker wordt om de uiteindelijke effecten van de uitgaven te beoordelen en zo ook beter prioriteiten te gaan stellen.

Ten tweede – en dat is ook al aangehaald, onder andere door collega Staes – is het belangrijk dat ook de lidstaten hun verantwoordelijkheid nemen: zij zijn immers verantwoordelijk voor 75 procent van het geld dat uit naam van de Europese Unie wordt uitgegeven.

Ten slotte moeten we er ook over waken dat enkel die uitgaven worden gedaan die een Europese meerwaarde hebben. Als ik dan zie dat we nog altijd 12 miljoen euro gaan besteden aan gratis InterRail-tickets, dan denk ik dat we hier jammer genoeg nog een lange weg te gaan hebben.

Hannu Takkula (ALDE). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitoksia puhemies ja komission jäsen, kiitoksia tilintarkastustuomioistuinten presidentti Lehne vuosikertomuksen esittelystä. Iloksemme voimme todeta, että olemme viimein päässeet olennaisuusrajan alapuolelle virhemarginaaleissa. Tämän myönteisen kehityssuunnan ylläpito edellyttää jatkuvaa työtä, sillä kuten kaikki tiedämme, kehitys pysähtyy tyytyväisyyteen. Tästä syystä hyvä vuosikertomus valaa uskoa siihen, että yhä parempia tuloksia on odotettavissa, jos ja kun me jatkamme samalla huolellisella linjalla Euroopan unionin taloudenpidossa.

Vuosikertomus kuitenkin nostaa esille huolia, joihin meidän tulee jatkossa kiinnittää huomiota paremmin. Ne on myös varmasti tilintarkastustuomioistuimessa otettu valmistelun alle. Yksi merkittävä tekijä on tämän vuoden budjetin ennätys-suuret erääntyvät maksuerät, mikä tarkoittaa myös tarkastusten määrän kasvua. Meidän tulee edelleen taata se periaate, että EU:n kansalaisilla on oikeus tietää mihin heidän varojaan käytetään. Heidän on myös voitava luottaa siihen, että näitä varoja valvotaan oikein. Tässä katsannossa myös rahoituksen tarkoituksenmukaisuus korostuu, ja toivoin yhä enemmän panostusta siihen, että veronmaksajien varoja ei ainoastaan käytetä teknisesti oikein vaan myös käytöllä täytetään rahoituksen tavoitteet.

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Corte europea dei conti non ce le manda a dire neppure questa volta: ci dice chiaramente che ci sono risorse finanziarie che non dovevano essere erogate dall'Unione europea poiché non utilizzate in conformità alla normativa e, per lo più, negli ambiti delle risorse naturali, quindi, sviluppo rurale, ambiente, azione per il clima e la pesca e della coesione economica, sociale e territoriale.

L'Europa ha commesso parecchi errori nei pagamenti. Errori commessi con denaro pubblico. Quali errori? L'assenza di documentazione essenziale, spese non ammissibili, conflitti d'interesse e irregolarità negli appalti. C'è poi un altro aspetto rilevante che viene sottolineato dalla Corte, ossia la complessità dei meccanismi di finanziamento, che è continuata ad aumentare. La Commissione ha giustificato il massiccio incremento del numero di soggetti e di strumenti che partecipano al finanziamento dell'attuazione delle politiche e dei programmi europei con la necessità di far fronte a nuove sfide, quali l'immigrazione, la Brexit, il cambiamento climatico. Onestamente non troviamo il nesso.

Tant'è però che la Corte si trova in difficoltà, a gestire, controllare e rendicontare la spesa, con il futuro rischio reale di non essere in condizione di comprendere come sia di fatto speso il denaro. In effetti, già alla fine del 2015 erano stati istituiti ben 1052 strumenti finanziari, il cui impiego non è sempre stato tracciabile in maniera precisa. Per di più, segnala ancora la Corte, uno dei principali vantaggi di questi strumenti, ossia la capacità di utilizzare i fondi per più di una volta, non è stato pienamente sfruttato.

In conclusione, quindi, ci sono troppe zone d'ombra, troppi errori nei conti del bilancio dell'Unione. Bisogna intervenire ed evitare di ripetere le prassi che hanno portato a risultati tutt'altro che esaltanti. L'Unione, che tanto spesso parla di trasparenza e di efficienza, ha il dovere di impiegare con correttezza e in maniera efficace il denaro dei cittadini europei.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir können zufrieden sein mit diesem Rechnungshofbericht, weil er uns Hoffnung macht, dass die Arbeit, die wir hier leisten, doch zu irgendetwas führt. Von daher, glaube ich, ist dies einer unserer besseren Tage heute.

Was mich beunruhigt, ist, dass sich die Probleme der Haushaltsabwicklung in den letzten Jahren doch sehr zuspitzen. Die Frage der RAL, die Frage n+3, die Frage von manchen Mitgliedstaaten. Deswegen, Herr Rechnungshofpräsident, möchte ich Sie bitten, dass wir das Problem da benennen, wo es ist, damit wir gezielt Abhilfe schaffen können. Wir glauben, dass nicht alle Mitgliedstaaten die gleichen Probleme haben. Das heißt, wir müssen wissen, wo das Problem ist und was wir tun können, um dieses Problem lösen zu helfen. Das ist für uns sehr wichtig.

Ich bin besorgt: In Ihrem Bericht steht, dass erst drei Viertel der Behörden vom Kohäsionsfonds benannt worden sind. Wenn es keine Behörden gibt, wie kann dann das Geld ausgegeben werden? Warum tun wir das, und warum werden die Behörden nicht benannt, Herr Kommissar? Was können wir tun?

Leistungsberichterstattung – ich gratuliere zu dem Kapitel. Aber damit, dass wir bei 50 % der Strukturfondsprojekte nur teilweise die Ziele erreichen, können wir nicht zufrieden sein. Aber es wäre wichtig zu wissen, welchen Teil wir erreichen und welchen Teil wir nicht erreichen. Damit, dass bei einem Drittel der Projekte im ländlichen Raum die Kosten nicht angemessen sind, können wir natürlich auch nicht zufrieden sein. Fast schon Satirecharakter hat die Tabelle, mit der Sie – es ist eine tolle Arbeit – die Zahl der Leistungsindikatoren je Milliarde darstellen. Je größer das Programm, desto geringer die Leistungsindikatoren, je kleiner das Programm, desto größer die Erwartungen. Dass das schiefgeht, ist natürlich auch klar. Hier brauchen wir natürlich auch Abhilfe, das kann ja auf keinen Fall so bleiben.

Eine Herausforderung: Finanzinstrumente. Herr Kommissar, wir können bei den Finanzinstrumenten nicht bis 2020 warten, um zu wissen, was los ist.

Георги Пирински (S&D). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, г-н Председател на Палатата, за първи път от 1994 г., откакто Палатата изготвя декларация за достоверност, за 2016 г. тя дава становище с резерви за бюджетните разходи, а не както през целия период досега – отрицателно. Каквото и да говорим, основание за това становище е ясната тенденция за намаляване на процента грешки, констатирани от Палатата.

В отговор на императивната необходимост от бюджет, ориентиран към резултати, се налага час по-скоро целите и показателите на бюджетната рамка драстично да бъдат съкратени и оптимизирани в съответствие с изричната препоръка на Палатата. По тази задача ще очакваме конкретните действия на комисаря Йотингер.

Крайно време е Комисията да изпълни и настоящата препоръка на Палатата от поредица доклади да представи сравнителен анализ на финансовите инструменти и грантовете от гледна точка на крайния ефект от прилагането им за изпълнение на бюджета. Само на такава основа бихме били сигурни, че правилно подбираме подходящите средства за успешно изпълнение на отделните цели, които предстои да залегнат в многогодишната финансова рамка след 2020 г.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panowie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Zabierając głos w tej debacie, chciałbym na ręce obecnego tu Pana Przewodniczącego Lehnego przekazać podziękowania za wysoką jakość udostępnianych posłom materiałów pokontrolnych, a także analiz, które powstają na ich podstawie. W sposób szczególny chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na dwa ważne sprawozdania specjalne.

Pierwsze dotyczy pomocy dla młodych rolników i pokazuje ogromne problemy rolnictwa w Europie. Mimo ogromnych nakładów z budżetu unijnego codziennie znika w Unii około tysiąca gospodarstw, głównie rodzinnych. Wieś się starzeje, zaledwie co piąty rolnik ma mniej niż 45 lat, rolnictwo europejskie jest na drodze ku likwidacji. Potrzebne są głębokie zmiany w WPR, aby je ratować.

Drugie z kolei to sprawozdanie dotyczące procedury nadmiernego deficytu. Pokazuje ono, że rządy udzielające innym lekcji zasad – myślę tu głównie o rządzie Francji – same łamią unijne zasady, że deficyt finansów publicznych nie powinien przekraczać 3 %, a dług publiczny 60 % PKB. A Komisja Europejska to łamanie zasad toleruje: choć powinna uruchomić sankcje, nie czyni tego. Gdy to porównać z determinacją, z jaką Komisja atakuje mój kraj, Polskę, za wyдуманym problemy z praworządnością, jak na dłoni widać, że stosuje ona podwójne standardy.

Claudia Schmidt (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Präsident des Rechnungshofes, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Rechnungshof hat uns wie jedes Jahr einen umfassenden Tätigkeitsbericht geliefert. Er ist mehr umfassend als spannend. Als Schattenberichterstatterin für den Haushalt dieses Hohen Hauses habe ich die zehn Seiten, die dem Kapitel Verwaltung gewidmet sind, als äußerst dürftig empfunden, vor allem, wenn man sich den Gesamtbericht mit 316 Seiten ansieht.

Natürlich ist die Fehlerquote von 0,2 % eine großartige Sache, auch im Vergleich zu der Gesamtfehlerquote, die bei 3,1 % liegt, wie wir schon gehört haben. Trotzdem kommt dem Europäischen Parlament hier ein Betrag von 1,9 Mrd. EUR zu, damit die Kosten abgedeckt werden können. Ich würde mehr ins Detail gehen, aber leider liefert dieser Jahresbericht für mich nicht die Grundlage, die nähere Ausführungen ermöglichen würde. Ich finde es bedauerndswert oder vielleicht auch ein bisschen fragwürdig, dass die Anhörung mit Herrn Klaus Welle uns wahrscheinlich mehr Informationen liefern wird als der vorliegende Bericht.

Wenn der, der kontrolliert wird, die Hauptinformationsquelle ist, läuft meiner Meinung nach doch etwas nicht ganz richtig. Es sind einige Fragen für mich offen geblieben. Ich möchte nur wenige erwähnen: Wie schaut es mit dem Fahrdienst aus? Was machen wir im Bereich der Übersetzer? Wie schaut es mit der Gebäudesicherheit aus? Wie stehen wir zur fragmentierten Parlamentsverwaltung? Und eine der wichtigsten Fragen: Wird es irgendwann einmal nur einen Sitz des Europäischen Parlaments geben?

Iris Hoffmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Oettinger, Herr Präsident Lehne! Ich möchte mich natürlich auch für die Arbeit des Europäischen Rechnungshofs bedanken, welche dazu geführt hat, dass sich die Gesamtfehlerquoten für die EU-Ausgaben kontinuierlich verringert haben. Der Europäischen Kommission stehen laut Jahresbericht 2016 alle Informationen zur Verfügung, um zukünftig die Wesentlichkeitsschwelle von 2 % zu erreichen. Hieran muss sich die Kommission weiterhin orientieren und engagiert daran arbeiten. Gleiches gilt für den Europäischen Entwicklungsfonds. Ich freue mich über eine Verbesserung der Mittelvergabe im Vergleich zu den Vorjahren.

Europäische Entwicklungszusammenarbeit besteht mittlerweile aber nicht mehr nur aus dem Entwicklungsfonds. Eine Reihe von Treuhandfonds hat sich in den letzten Jahren etabliert. Der neue Europäische Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung soll die Entwicklungszusammenarbeit außerdem komplementär begleiten, damit durch europäische Garantien Investitionen in Milliardenhöhe für Afrika generiert werden können. Ich begrüße die Einrichtung dieser Finanzierungsinstrumente ausdrücklich und halte eine ambitioniertere Politik auf diesem Gebiet für ausgesprochen wichtig.

Innerhalb dieser komplexen Garantie- und Geberstrukturen ist es allerdings nicht immer leicht, den Überblick zu behalten. Das macht die Rechnungsprüfung und die parlamentarische Kontrolle dieser Instrumente natürlich nicht leichter und einfacher und beschädigt die Transparenz der europäischen Entwicklungsbemühungen. Wir sollten langfristig zu einer einheitlichen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit unter dem Dach des EU-Haushalts kommen.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, quisiera también saludar la presencia del presidente del Tribunal de Cuentas, el señor Lehne, y felicitar al Tribunal por su 40 cumpleaños. He retenido un dato de su intervención que me ha satisfecho, que es el aumento de la confianza del ciudadano con respecto a las instituciones, señor comisario. Yo creo que este dato tiene mucho que ver, de alguna manera, con la manera en la que las instituciones utilizan los recursos que pone a su disposición el contribuyente.

Con otros colegas, me felicito de la reducción de la tasa de error, de que no haya errores generalizados, de que, efectivamente, las medidas de control hayan surtido efecto; pero, como decían el señor Zeller o la señora Grässle, es importante que no nos durmamos en los laureles —aunque sean merecidos—, sino que quedan también muchas cosas por hacer.

Una de ellas, es poner el acento en estos 280 000 millones, que es un récord en lo que se refiere a los créditos aplazados, y que debe hacernos reflexionar sobre cómo mejorar nuestros procedimientos; en el aumento del riesgo financiero global, que aumenta considerablemente y que afecta también a la Unión Europea; y, por supuesto —se ha señalado aquí, en este debate—, en el número de instrumentos financieros, el número de entidades que se benefician de los recursos del presupuesto. Creo que eso compromete, de alguna manera, la rendición de cuentas y la transparencia.

Vamos a seguir trabajando en las próximas semanas en la preparación del informe de aprobación de la gestión. El informe del Tribunal de Cuentas es, evidentemente, un instrumento precioso, y tenemos que seguir trabajando para que tengamos un presupuesto más eficaz, más ágil y más transparente.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, La ringrazio signor presidente della Corte dei Conti per avere oggi presentato la relazione annuale che tutti noi attendiamo perché ci fornisce una fotografia precisa dell'impiego del bilancio dell'Unione.

Il fatto che nella sua analisi la Corte stia ponendo sempre maggiore attenzione ai dati sulla *performance* dei risultati è, per i colegislatori europei, un dato di fondamentale importanza, perché ci aiuta a delineare le priorità nelle scelte e nelle modifiche, in alcuni casi necessarie, delle diverse politiche dell'Unione, in particolar modo quelle riferite ai Fondi strutturali.

Sicuramente conforta sapere che c'è stato un miglioramento nel quadro finanziario generale, segno che le riforme richieste in passato da questo Parlamento, se messe correttamente in pratica, possono contribuire ad un miglioramento costante del bilancio dell'Unione e della sua esecuzione, con un tasso di errore, abbiamo visto, costantemente in diminuzione.

Desidero sottolineare poi l'importanza di un *audit* specifico nei settori della sicurezza della cittadinanza, il cui *budget*, seppure costituisce una parte relativamente piccola del bilancio dell'Unione, rappresenta però uno dei fondamentali strumenti di sostegno agli Stati membri.

Un'ultima considerazione: il parere qualificato fornito dalla Corte a seguito della propria attività di controllo nei confronti dell'utilizzo del bilancio dell'Unione per il 2016 ha una valenza particolarmente significativa, mi sento di poter dire, poiché contribuisce, seppure indirettamente, ad accrescere la fiducia dei cittadini nei confronti delle istituzioni europee.

Julia Pitera (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Panie Prezesie! Europejski Trybunał Obrachunkowy odgrywa ważną rolę w procesie budowania zaufania obywateli do Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza w ostatnich latach naznaczonych negatywnymi, często dramatycznymi zdarzeniami, które bywają cynicznie wykorzystywane przez populistycznych polityków do budowania własnej siły kosztem jedności Unii Europejskiej. I właśnie na tle tych zjawisk prawidłowe funkcjonowanie instytucji europejskich i prawidłowe gospodarne zarządzanie pieniędzmi obywateli staje się szczególnie ważne. Dlatego z zadowoleniem trzeba przyjąć wyniki podane w sprawozdaniu Europejskiego Trybunału Obrachunkowego za 2016 rok. Miejmy nadzieję, że utworzenie izby odpowiedzialnej za kontrolę finansowania Unii Europejskiej i administracji oraz Komitetu ds. Kontroli Jakości dodatkowo podniosą jakość postępowań kontrolnych. Podobnie jak ustanowienie izb, z których każda zajmuje się określonym obszarem tematycznym, pozwoli na pogłębienie procesu specjalizacji. Trzeba też odnotować fakt, że w 2016 roku wszystkie sprawozdania roczne i specjalne zostały zrealizowane zgodnie z planem oraz że aż 80 % z nich opublikowano w przewidzianym wcześniej terminie. Ważne jest też, że w 2016 roku blisko 70 % sprawozdań specjalnych opracowano w czasie krótszym niż dotychczasowy termin docelowy. Efekty tych wysiłków organizacyjnych będziemy mogli wstępnie ocenić w przyszłym roku.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Pan prezes Lehne wypowiedział takie charakterystyczne zdanie, iż celem jest mówić prawdę. Nie zakwestionowaliśmy żadnego zdania z tego sprawozdania, a zatem rozumiem, że w tym sprawozdaniu jest prawda. I prawda wygląda następująco: po prostu funkcjonujemy coraz lepiej; Komisja funkcjonuje coraz lepiej, Trybunał Obrachunkowy coraz lepiej, sprawnie ocenia wyniki tej Komisji – taka jest prawda. Oczywiście zdarzają się błędy i można byłoby powiedzieć, że każdy błąd to o jeden błąd za dużo, ale nie w takiej rzeczywistości, kiedy mamy Komisję, kiedy mamy państwa członkowskie, kiedy mamy samo życie i kiedy mamy również pewną spuściznę, o której pan komisarz Oettinger mówił, czyli opóźnień z lat 2014-2015, które przełożyły się na rok 2016.

Proszę zauważyć, że w tym sprawozdaniu nie pada słowo „nadużycia”, w tym sprawozdaniu natomiast padają sformułowania typu „efekty”, „funkcjonowanie” i w zasadzie powinniśmy tutaj w duchu tego sprawozdania mówić nie tyle o wydatkowaniu środków, co zainwestowaniu środków, bo tutaj Trybunał Obrachunkowy nam też pokazuje stopę zwrotu czy europejską wartość dodaną.

I chciałbym bardzo serdecznie polecać słowa ostrzeżenia, o których pan prezes Lehne mówił, odnośnie do przyszłości i także tych dylematów, o których pan komisarz Oettinger mówił, jak uniknąć w najbliższych dwóch latach błędów, które zdarzyły się w latach 2015-16.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, chtěl bych poděkovat a vyzdvihnout to, že míra chybovosti vlastně rozpočtů v roce 2016 se snížila z 3,8 % na 3,1 %, přestože Účetní dvůr zjišťuje řadu nesrovnalostí. Ale jak už bylo tady řečeno předřečníkem, myslím si, že je tady velikánský posun a ten posun je poměrně pozitivní. Z výroční zprávy o plnění rozpočtu také vyplývá, že stále největším problémem je absorpce dostupných prostředků poskytovaných ze strany EU. A tady si myslím, že se shodneme s panem komisařem Oettingerem, že na tuto věc je potřeba se do budoucnosti zaměřit.

Čerpání evropských prostředků bývá často nástrojem různých kritik a dezinterpretace. Dokola se tady mluví o tzv. zjednodušení evropských peněz. Myslím si, že některé výsledky se dostavily. Ale některé je potřeba ještě dále změnit, především ale v členských státech. Stále zde vidím v členských státech obrovskou administrativní náročnost. Stále vidím změny podmínek pro čerpání, nadměrnou kontrolu finančních prostředků, kdy některé prostředky jsou kontrolovány pětikrát nebo šestkrát, a nepředvídatelný výsledek celého řízení.

Tím, že členské státy nečerpají peníze, jak by měly, vzniká finanční deficit a v praxi se dostavuje nedostatek zdrojů z EU, který se promítá v makroekonomické situaci zemí i celé EU.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule președinte al Curții de Conturi, mulțumesc pentru raport. Eu cred că este un raport foarte complet.

În ceea ce privește Raportul privind protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii, se vede o îmbunătățire față de anul precedent: 15% mai puține neregularități, 8% mai puțin ca sumă, însă suma este în continuare destul de mare, peste două miliarde.

Este evident că e importantă activitatea de pedepsire, de identificare a problemelor, dar, în același timp, este importantă și – cred eu – activitatea de prevenire. Iar pentru asta trebuie să lucrăm foarte mult la regulamente.

Există deja o încercare de simplificare prin modificările aduse la regulamentul financiar, dar cred că Curtea, printr-un raport special, se poate gândi și la alte instrumente, pentru că a avea același tip de regulamente, aceleași reguli în toate regulamentele pentru toate fondurile ar fi un lucru foarte bun, a avea standarde de cost stabilite în fiecare stat membru, a încerca, poate, ca directiva de *public procurement* să fie transformată într-un regulament și apoi o activitate electronică – totul, de la cerere, de la evaluare, de la aprobare, de la urmărire, să fie făcut electronic – cred că ar aduce foarte mari avantaje.

O să fac câteva astfel de propuneri în raportul meu.

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, I would like to congratulate the European Court of Auditors for making this step forward with the annual report. It is much more analytical – something which I appreciate. It is not just numbers and percentages, but it has very fruitful information for us.

Obviously, dropping the percent of error rate is something which we should celebrate and appreciate. By saying this, I am not saying that we can shift the focus from fraud prevention to something else, but we could have other priorities as well: for example, fully-fledged audit reform. What do I mean? First: single audit. Let us prevent double checks by managing authority, certifying authority and audit authority by same beneficiary. Why not introduce risk based audit as well? Those beneficiaries with a proven track record and those who are object of audit of national authority should have lighter control, otherwise we make their life worse.

Another thing: we can have simplified audit as well, introducing more simplified approach and removing unnecessary requirements. After all, I think we are moving in the right direction, and I am sure cooperation between the Court of Auditors and the Parliament will go in even greater perspective.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, fără îndoială, Curtea de Conturi este una dintre cele mai importante instituții la nivel european. Câteva observații se cuvin însă a fi făcute în contextul actualului raport.

Astfel, apreciez că atât Curtea de Conturi, cât și celelalte instituții europene, dar, mai ales, autoritățile naționale din statele membre, trebuie să fie preocupate de implementarea unor proceduri unice și simplificate la nivelul Uniunii Europene cu privire la cheltuirea banului public.

Definirea erorilor este extrem de importantă. Nu orice eroare trebuie să atragă suspendarea plăților pentru beneficiari, după cum prevenirea apariției acestora presupune consolidarea rolului de îndrumare și coordonare a Curții înaintea rolului de control.

Abordarea unitară a legislației la nivelul Uniunii este absolut necesară, astfel încât, fie la București, fie la Praga sau la Roma, să existe aceeași interpretare asupra unei norme juridice. Este inadmisibil să avem astăzi o anumită conduită care să fie incriminată ca abatere în România, dar, în același timp, să reprezinte un demers corect și legal în alte state.

Autorităților de audit și de reglementare de la nivel național trebuie să li se interzică în mod expres adăugarea de condiționalități dincolo de normele europene, deoarece acest lucru generează întotdeauna o birocrație excesivă. Schimbarea procedurilor pe durata derulării procesului de implementare a unui proiect european este un alt factor limitativ pentru beneficiarii fondurilor Uniunii Europene.

Am însă convingerea că o bună cooperare între autoritățile europene și cele naționale poate duce la fluidizarea procesului de absorbție a fondurilor europene.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone na kilka chwil)

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Catch-the-eye procedure

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πράγματι θεωρούμε το έργο του Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου ιδιαίτερα σοβαρό, διότι ενισχύει την εμπιστοσύνη των πολιτών της Ένωσης στον τρόπο διαχείρισης των ευρωπαϊκών κονδυλίων. Όμως αυτή η εμπιστοσύνη κλονίζεται στην Ελλάδα, κύριε Oettinger, κύριε Lehne, διότι οι πολίτες παρακολουθούν έργα ΕΣΠΑ, τα οποία έχουν χρηματοδοτηθεί, να μπαίνουν στην ιδιωτικοποίηση. Συγκεκριμένα, η Fraport, στο πλαίσιο της ιδιωτικοποίησης, έχει πάρει το αεροδρόμιο της Θεσσαλονίκης, όπου εκεί εκτελέστηκαν έργα ΕΣΠΑ 400 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, το αεροδρόμιο των Χανίων, όπου ακόμη εκτελούνται έργα ΕΣΠΑ 100 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ, και έργα ΕΣΠΑ 30 εκατομμυρίων ευρώ στη Σκόπελο. Είναι δυνατόν να συμβαίνει αυτό; Εμείς θεωρούμε ότι δεν επιτρέπεται να ιδιωτικοποιούνται έργα ΕΣΠΑ. Δεν έχει περάσει ούτε πενταετία. Θέλω να τα εξετάσετε αυτά τα θέματα διότι είναι σοβαρά, διότι οι Έλληνες πολίτες θεωρούν ότι γίνεται εν προκειμένω ξεπούλημα των περιφερειακών αεροδρομίων στη Fraport.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule președinte al Curții de Conturi, sigur, și eu vreau să vă felicit. Eu cred că trebuie să criticăm atunci când trebuie să criticăm și să felicităm atunci când lucrurile sunt bune.

Pe de altă parte, eu vin din mediul privat și știu foarte clar că prevenția este mai bună decât constatarea pe care dumneavoastră o faceți, și nu e vina dumneavoastră, dumneavoastră constatați niște greșeli. Eu cred că sistemul și regulamentele europene și naționale trebuie să prevadă un control mai riguros *ex ante*, pentru că nu mai puteți corecta, eventual ne ajuta pentru perioada următoare.

Apoi, s-a spus aici, cred că este foarte important, domnule comisar, să vedeți legea achizițiilor publice. Am fost întreprinzător, am accesat fonduri europene, am modificat deja Directiva privind achizițiile publice, însă nu funcționează. Vă spun sigur, există posibilitatea de a se face erori.

De asemenea, acte normative – un întreprinzător, un IMM-ist, dacă vrea să ia fonduri europene pe diverse axe, are diverse proceduri. Posibilitatea de eroare crește și, atunci, eu cred că, dacă dumneavoastră veniți cu măsuri suplimentare și, mai ales, domnule comisar, - că la dumneavoastră mă adresez acum pentru că, sigur, Curtea de Conturi își poate găsi mecanisme de control noi -, trebuie să avem proceduri uniforme în Uniunea Europeană, simplificate – birocrăția costă și poate duce și la eroare.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, the discharge exercise is highly important to the European Parliament, and it must be carried out with the utmost political commitment and objectiveness, while putting at the centre and safeguarding the financial interests of the European Union's citizens.

With regard to the Court of Auditors Annual Report 2016, I am glad that sustained efforts have been taken which generated an improvement in the estimated level of error in payments made from the EU budget, with a decrease from 4.4% to 3.1%. Furthermore, pertaining to the level of error, I am particularly glad to see that a slight decrease has been recorded in the area of European Development Funds as well.

Finally, I believe that while efforts have been mobilised, there is still scope for improvement, for instance, further action should be oriented towards the way in which the European Union's added value could be measured.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, zahvaljujem Revizorskom sudu na izvješću. Uvijek su nam ova izvješća itekako važna, jer nam pomažu da poboljšamo sustav upravljanja sredstvima iz EU proračuna.

Naravno, ono na što moramo paziti je da se uz usmjeravanje na zakonito namjensko u skladu s pravilima korištenja sredstava, usmjerimo i na efikasno i pravovremeno korištenje sredstava te ispunjavanje zadanih ciljeva i rezultata. Zato apeliram na Revizorski sud da u svojim revizijama što više daje preporuke i ocjene koliko su zaista europski ciljevi u državama članicama kroz korištenje europskih sredstava ispunjeni.

Otvaramo li nova radna mjesta, smanjujemo li nezaposlenost mladih, ostvarujemo li rast i razvoj i to dugoročan i održiv, to je ono na što moram zajedno paziti.

Isto tako, ako pojednostavljujemo sustav važno je da i revizori to prate, recimo kad je u pitanju metoda pojednostavljenih troškova.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, grazie signor Presidente della Corte dei Conti per l'esauritiva relazione annuale. Il giudizio con rilievi formulati dalla Corte rispecchia un importante miglioramento nella gestione delle finanze dell'Unione europea: la percentuale di spese generali è stata ulteriormente ridotta e per i pagamenti 2016 la Corte non ha emesso un giudizio negativo, ma un giudizio con rilievi. È la prima volta che ciò accade da quando la Corte ha iniziato a rilasciare una dichiarazione di affidabilità.

Mi rammarico, tuttavia, per la scarsa flessibilità del bilancio dell'Unione europea nel rispondere a eventi imprevisti, così come evidenziato dalla stessa Corte: basti pensare alla crisi del settore agricolo, alla quale l'Unione europea non ha saputo dare le giuste risposte in maniera rapida.

Un altro aspetto negativo riguarda la complessità, peraltro in continuo aumento, dei meccanismi di finanziamento dell'Unione europea: se questa tendenza dovesse persistere, si rischia di compromettere il rispetto dell'obbligo di rendiconto e la trasparenza del bilancio dell'Unione europea.

La Commissione deve accogliere l'invito della Corte ad una maggiore focalizzazione sulla *performance*. I fondi dell'Unione europea vanno spesi secondo i principi di sana gestione finanziaria, economici, di efficienza e di efficacia.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Günther Oettinger, Mitglied der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrter Herr Präsident Lehne! Die Vielzahl von konstruktiven und auch kritischen Beiträgen, aber auch die lobenden Worte haben wir gehört und werden sie innerhalb unserer Dienste gründlich auswerten. Ich beschränke mich auf ganz wenige Punkte.

Zum Ersten: Wir wollen in der Tat unseren Ehrgeiz beibehalten, um die Fehlerquote weiter abzusenken. Das heißt, eine gewisse Verlagerung auf das Thema Wirksamkeit, Erfolgsbezogenheit, *performing* darf nicht bedeuten, dass man die Fehlerquote außer Acht lässt. Hier ist weiterer Fortschritt hoffentlich erreichbar. Mit der von Frau Kollegin Jourová nachher hier vertretenen neuen Behörde und Staatsanwaltschaft, der EUSTA, haben wir ein Instrument, das sicherlich auch in diese Richtung als Partner auf europäischer Ebene Betrug, Untreue und Korruption im europäischen Haushalt bekämpfen hilft.

Zweitens: Ich teile die Meinung, dass neue Finanzinstrumente – Garantien, Darlehen – eine Ergänzung unserer Hebelinstrumente sind und man Barmittel damit nicht ersetzen kann. Für wichtige Projekte in wichtigen Mitgliedstaaten, namentlich auch in ländlichen Räumen und bei Kommunen, wird man auch weiter die Kofinanzierung und Barmittel aus dem europäischen Haushalt für die Realisierung von Projekten benötigen.

Zu Recht wurde angemahnt, dass noch immer nicht alle Mitgliedstaaten die für die Programmdurchführung verantwortlichen Behörden benannt haben. Wir haben diese Mitgliedstaaten angeschrieben, wir sind vorangekommen, aber noch nicht bei 100 %. Wir arbeiten hier nach, aber letztendlich sind wir in der Europäischen Union auf die konstruktive Mitwirkung der Mitgliedstaaten angewiesen. Wir haben keine eigene Verwaltung, keinen eigenen Unterbau in den Regionen. Und dass die Mitgliedstaaten die eigentlich ihnen zustehenden Strukturmittel nicht abrufen – im Grunde genommen müsste der Wähler merken, wie erfolgreich seine Verwaltungen arbeiten, und dies für Wahlentscheidungen, die anstehen, zu einem Maßstab machen. Wir können die Regierungen in den Regionen der Mitgliedstaaten nur beraten. Wir helfen, wo wir können, mit Rat und Tat. Aber die Beantragung von Mitteln, die Durchführung von Projekten und dann die Inrechnungstellung der gezahlten Beträge – all dies ist Verantwortung der Mitgliedstaaten, der Regionen, die hier für uns vor Ort die Ansprechpartner sind, die wir aber nicht ersetzen können.

Wir bauen darauf, dass die Mittel in den beiden nächsten Jahren hoffentlich stärker abfließen, und der Zeitplan für den nächsten MFR – wir sprachen gestern darüber – sollte entscheidend sein. Wir sollten uns nicht Zeit lassen, nicht erst im neuen Parlament beraten, nicht erst 2020 beraten. Ich will dringend vorschlagen, dass dieses Parlament gemeinsam mit Rat und Kommission ab Frühjahr des nächsten Jahres bis zur Europawahl die Zeit nutzt, um für die nächste Haushaltsperiode möglichst viel, wenn nicht gar alles entschieden und in trockenen Tüchern zu haben, damit man die Umsetzung dann auf den 1. Januar 2021 hinkommt und zu Beginn des nächsten Haushaltsrahmens keine verlorene Zeit hat.

Es wurde Vereinfachung in den Verfahren hier kritisch angemerkt. Mit unserem „Omnibus“ und der Reform der Haushaltsordnung haben wir genau dies vor. Wir bauen darauf, dass das Parlament in den nächsten Wochen die Beratungen zu einem Ergebnis führt und es dann schon ab dem nächsten Jahr zur Vereinfachung bei entsprechenden Finanzförderverfahren kommen kann.

Ansonsten besten Dank für die Mitwirkung. Ich freue mich auf die Beratungen, die auf der Grundlage jetzt im Fachausschuss stattfinden werden. Wir sind hier zu jeder weiterführenden Antwort, auch im Detail, gegenüber den Abgeordneten bereit.

Klaus-Heiner Lehne, *Präsident des Rechnungshofs*. – Herr Präsident! Zunächst einmal freue ich mich, dass es Ihnen besser geht und dass Sie dort oben wieder auf Ihrem Stuhl Platz genommen haben.

Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren Abgeordnete! Ich denke, das ist im Laufe der Debatte auch klar geworden, ich will es aber hier noch einmal sagen: Ein eingeschränktes Prüfungsurteil bedeutet jetzt nicht, dass alles perfekt ist, sondern es ist ein klares Ja, aber. Wer den Bericht liest, der wird auch erkennen, dass wir ein Gesamtbild betrachtet haben und im Rahmen dieses Gesamtbildes eben signifikante Veränderungen, Verbesserungen festgestellt haben. Wer aber in die Kapitel einsteigt und sich im Detail anschaut, was wir im Einzelnen in den Bericht geschrieben haben, der wird feststellen, dass es eine Vielzahl von Punkten gibt, in denen konkrete Verbesserungen anstehen und vorgenommen werden müssen.

Die Fehlerquote ist eben bei der Gesamtbetrachtung nur ein Faktor. Wir haben uns darum bemüht – und das ist auch unsere Aufgabe –, nicht im Rahmen einer mathematischen Guillotine irgendetwas zu entscheiden oder zu beurteilen, sondern ein sogenanntes *professional judgement*, eine qualitative Bewertung des Gesamtbildes vorzunehmen. Das ist der Grund, warum wir zu dem Ergebnis gekommen sind, zu dem wir gekommen sind.

Ich will auch ganz deutlich machen: Das ist nicht unsere Leistung. Wir haben als Hof nur Fakten und das Bild zu beurteilen gehabt. Es ist im Wesentlichen die Verbesserung des Finanzmanagements durch die Kommission. Daran haben wir natürlich indirekt mitgewirkt. Wir, das heißt der Rechnungshof, aber vor allem auch Sie, meine Damen und Herren früheren Kollegen im Europäischen Parlament.

Das nachhaltige Immer-wieder-darauf-Drängen in ihrer Arbeit – vor allen Dingen im Haushaltskontrollausschuss – und das Zusammenwirken unserer Organe – das kann man wirklich sagen – haben im Ergebnis zu dieser Verbesserung geführt. Ich denke, darauf können wir auch wirklich stolz sein, und das ist ein Prozess, den wir weiter fortsetzen wollen, der zeigt, dass unsere Bemühungen Früchte getragen haben. Ich denke das ist ja auch schon von Frau Kollegin Ayala Sender, von Frau Dlabajová, Frau Gräßle und Herrn Liberadzki hier im Einzelnen ausgeführt worden.

Zu den Anmerkungen von Herrn de Jong: Er hat die Fragen gestellt, die ja auch im Haushaltskontrollausschuss letzte Woche schon zum Teil eine Rolle gespielt haben. Warum haben wir das Thema Finanzinstrumente bei den Fehlern so bewertet, wie wir es getan haben? Das ist ganz einfach. Ich will das hier noch einmal sagen: Auf die Fehler, die wir hier in der Vergangenheit bemängelt haben, haben wir aus Gründen der Transparenz im laufenden Bericht natürlich wieder hingewiesen – das ist klar –, aber sie erneut in die Fehlerberechnung mit hineinzunehmen wäre sachlich nicht gerechtfertigt gewesen aus dem ganz einfachen Grunde, weil es sich um untypische Fehler handelt hat, Fehler, deren Ursache im Wesentlichen in einer anderen von uns nicht so geteilten Rechtsauffassung zu suchen sind. Vor dem Hintergrund wäre eine entsprechende Mitaufnahme in die Fehlerquote einfach nicht sachlich zu rechtfertigen gewesen. Auch hier haben wir unser *professional judgement* in dieser Frage angewandt.

Ich will vielleicht auch noch mal darauf hinweisen, welche Bedeutung diese geschätzte Fehlerquote eigentlich hat. Das muss man vielleicht auch gerade hier im Plenum noch einmal deutlich sagen. Wir sagen nicht, dass die Fehlerquote exakt die 3,1 % sind. Wir wenden ein mathematisches statistisches Verfahren an, bei dem wir Ergebnisse einer Stichprobe verwerten und am Ende – und das werden Sie sehen, wenn Sie die Erläuterungen in dem Bericht lesen – sagen, dass sich die eigentliche Fehlerquote mit einer Wahrscheinlichkeit von 95 % in einem Korridor zwischen 2,2 und 4 % bewegt. Da ist das, was wir angegeben haben, die 3,1 %, schlicht und ergreifend der relativ wahrscheinlichste Mittelwert. Das ist alles. Das muss man im Rahmen des Gesamtbildes, wenn man über diese Frage zu urteilen hat, natürlich auch berücksichtigen. Ich glaube, diese Erklärung ist wichtig. Herr Tarand hat das Thema der Größe der Organe angesprochen. Das ist nicht unsere Sache, die wir zu entscheiden haben, das entscheidet der Primärgesetzgeber der Europäischen Union, der Verfassungsgesetzgeber, also im Klartext der Konvent, in dem ja auch das Europäische Parlament mitwirken kann, danach die Regierungskonferenz und im Übrigen die Parlamente nationaler Mitgliedstaaten. Das ist etwas, was sich unserer Beurteilung entzieht, was der Verfassungsgesetzgeber der Europäischen Union zu diesen Fragen meint.

Herr Vaughan, Herr Kollege Staes und Herr Ashworth haben die Frage der Details, der Ursachen der Fehler angesprochen. Mit Blick auf die wenige Zeit, die wir haben, möchte ich dazu jetzt nichts sagen, sondern das den Ausschussberatungen überlassen.

Ich teile die Ansicht, die von Herrn Takkula, Herrn Salafranca und anderen gesagt wurde – das steht auch im Bericht drin: Wir brauchen verständlichere, klarere, einfachere Regeln und Zahlen.

Wir werden uns bemühen – das hat Frau Gräßle angesprochen –, in Zukunft mit der neuen Herangehensweise, die wir haben, mehr länderspezifische Informationen und auch konkret mehr Informationen zu Ursachen zu geben. Eine Anmerkung zu Frau Schmidt – die ist jetzt leider nicht mehr da –, die ich machen muss. Dass wir in diesem Bericht die Verwaltung nur mit wenigen Seiten behandelt haben, ist eigentlich völlig naheliegend. Denn bei einer Fehlerquote von 0,2 % kann man nicht viel sagen. Der Bericht befasst sich im Wesentlichen mit den Fragen der Rechtmäßigkeit. Die Fragen, die Frau Schmidt angesprochen hat, betreffen eher Fragen der *performance* der Wirtschaftlichkeit. Ich gebe das ganz einfach zurück: Wenn wir im Rahmen des Entlastungsbeschlusses als Rechnungshof aufgefordert werden, eine detaillierte Wirtschaftlichkeitsprüfung über die Verwaltung des Europäischen Parlaments zu machen, dann werden wir das natürlich ernsthaft in Erwägung ziehen. Dahin gehört das. Es ist ein Wirtschaftlichkeitsthema und kein Rechtmäßigkeitsthema. Von daher ist diese Frage, die dort gestellt worden ist, damit wohl auch beantwortet.

Das Stichwort Kontrolldichte ist von zwei Kollegen angesprochen worden, von Herrn Zdechovský und vom Herrn Novakov. Das ist tatsächlich ein zentrales Problem, und Sie werden aus meinen Ausführungen zu Beginn entnommen haben: Unser Ziel ist es, in Zukunft stärker auf die Qualität statt auf die Quantität der Kontrollmechanismen zu achten. Wir sind uns dieses Problems einer überzogenen Kontrolldichte durchaus bewusst, weil das natürlich auch ein Hindernis für die Umsetzung europäischer Politik sein kann. Darum lieber mehr Qualität als Quantität in dieser Frage, lieber bessere und weniger Kontrollen als zu viele Kontrollstufen, die theoretisch möglich sind. Das ist ein sehr konkretes klares Ziel.

Herr Buda hat gefordert, dass eine einheitliche Anwendung erfolgen soll, eine europaweite Regelung. Ich denke, da sind wir in völligem Konsens, das ist keine Frage. Herr Caputo hat etwas angesprochen, was wir wiederholt auch angesprochen haben: die fehlende Flexibilität im Gesamthaushalt. Das ist ein Thema, das aber – so hoffe ich – im Rahmen des MFRs adressiert werden wird.

Ich möchte mich zum Schluss bei Ihnen ganz herzlich für die interessante und wertvolle Debatte und vor allem auch für die ermutigenden Worte im Hinblick auf unsere Arbeit noch einmal herzlich bedanken. Ich werde das den Kollegen in der morgigen Kollegiumssitzung so mitteilen und bin sicher, dass das auf große Zustimmung und Freude stoßen wird.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – Az Európai Parlament Költségvetési Ellenőrző Bizottsága felel az uniós költségvetés végrehajtásának ellenőrzéséért. Az egyes pénzügyi évek zárszámadási eljárásai során ellenőrzik a források felhasználásának, az egyes intézmények gazdálkodásának szabályosságát, hatékonyságát. A 2016-os pénzügyi év zárszámadása az Európai Számvevőszék éves jelentésének szakbizottsági, majd plenáris bemutatásával indul el.

Nagyon fontos eredmény, hogy 1994 óta most először fordul elő, hogy 2016-ra nézve a beszámoló alapjául szolgáló tranzakciók szabályszerűségéről nem elutasító véleményt fogalmazott meg az Európai Számvevőszék. Az ellenőrzött 2016-os kiadások jelentős részét nem jellemezte lényeges hibaszint, és az elmúlt három évben folyamatosan javult az uniós költségvetésből teljesített kifizetések becsült hibaszintje is: a 2014-es 4,4%-ról 2015-ben 3,8%-ra, 2016-ban pedig 3,1%-ra csökkent.

Az Európai Számvevőszék jelentésében megállapítja, hogy az Unió 2016-os beszámolója megbízható és valós képet ad az Unió pénzügyi helyzetéről. Az elmúlt években több zárszámadási jelentés felelőseként a mentesítési eljárást, mint a pénzügyi ellenőrzés legfőbb parlamenti eszközét nagyon fontosnak tartom a közösségi költségvetés szabályosságának és hatékony felhasználásának biztosítása érdekében.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *na písmie*. – W swoim sprawozdaniu za 2016 rok Europejski Trybunał Obrachunkowy informuje, że nastąpiła stopniowa poprawa w kwestii szacowanego poziomu błędów w płatnościach dokonanych z budżetu UE. Kontrolerzy wydali opinię z zastrzeżeniem na temat płatności z 2016 r., a nie – jak we wcześniejszych latach – opinię negatywną. Poziom błędów w około połowie skontrolowanych w 2016 r. wydatków unijnych znajdował się poniżej 2 %. Ponadto kontrolerzy wydali opinię bez zastrzeżeń w odniesieniu do wiarygodności całego sprawozdania za rok 2016. W 2016 r. wydatki unijne wyniosły 136,4 mld euro. Wydatki te stanowią około 1 % dochodu narodowego państw członkowskich brutto i odpowiadają w przybliżeniu 2 % całkowitych wydatków publicznych państw członkowskich UE. Tegoroczna opinia z zastrzeżeniem odzwierciedla wyraźną poprawę w zakresie finansów UE. Cieszy mnie postanowienie Trybunału, aby w dalszym ciągu ulepszać swoje metody kontrolowania budżetu UE.

Pavel Poc (S&D), *písemně*. – Těší mě, že v roce 2016 došlo k snížení chybovosti na 3,1 %. O něco méně rád jsem ale za to, že největší míru pochybení nalézáme opět u programů a politik, kde dochází ke sdílenému řízení. V tomto ohledu je nutno poukázat opět na výdajovou oblast politiky soudržnosti, kde je procento chybných plateb až 4,8 %. Ačkoliv se vždy nejedná o úmyslné pochybení, musím vyjádřit zklamání nad tím, že do tohoto procenta spadají i úmyslná poškození a špatné interpretace pravidel. Jsem velmi smutný ze skutečnosti, že v oficiální zprávě figuruje u příkladů nezpůsobilých příjemců Česká republika. To, že se tyto podvody dějí hned v několika zemích, ale neznamená, že jsou akceptovatelné. Věřím proto, že Komise, Účetní dvůr, OLAF a nově i Úřad evropského veřejného žalobce nepoleví a sníží tuto nepěknou statistiku.

Soraya Post (S&D), *in writing*. – The European Court of Auditors in its special report last year with the title 'EU policy initiatives and financial support for Roma integration', stated that although Roma integration is explicitly mentioned in the European structural and investment funds, additional efforts are required from the Commission and the Member States to make sure that this will result in projects which contribute to Roma integration on the ground. As the Court of Auditors report says, the Commission should make sure, when checking the relevant operational programmes, that the supported projects are inclusive and fight segregation. Segregational practices should be clearly described and explicitly excluded from funding under the structural and investment fund framework and particular attention should be paid to education and housing projects. Unfortunately, we can see that most mainstream programmes systematically fail to reach out to young Roma (for example the YEI or Erasmus+). We would, therefore, call on the Court of Auditors to check the performance of EU employment and education programmes in a more thorough way and on a regular basis.

17. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad zaleceniem sporządzonym w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie projektu rozporządzenia Rady wdrażającego wzmocnioną współpracę w zakresie ustanowienia Prokuratury Europejskiej (09941/2017 — C8-0229/2017 — 2013/0255(APP)) (sprawozdawczyni: Barbara Matera (A8-0290/2017))

Barbara Matera, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo finalmente giunti alle ultime battute di un iter legislativo iniziato con la proposta di regolamento della Commissione risalente al 2013 e che ci ha visti impegnati in un estenuante lavoro di ricerca e di attività intensa, fatta di negoziati, compromessi e tanti incontri di confronto.

Con una base giuridica che si fonda sul capitolo quarto del Trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea nell'ambito di cooperazione giudiziaria in materia penale, il legislatore europeo ha sentito la necessità di combattere i reati che ledono gli interessi finanziari dell'Unione, attraverso una procedura legislativa speciale, atta ad istituire una Procura europea.

La frode, la corruzione e le altre attività illecite che ledono gli interessi finanziari dell'Unione europea costituiscono un grave *vulnus* per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi che, attraverso l'impiego di proprie risorse, l'Unione stessa si propone di realizzare, e richiedono pertanto un'attività di contrasto efficace, che necessita anche del ricorso al diritto penale.

L'istituzione della Procura europea rappresenta senza dubbio un tassello fondamentale nel processo di integrazione europea in materia di diritto penale, un'esigenza che nasce dai numerosi illeciti che vengono perpetrati. Secondo dati forniti dalla Commissione europea, ogni anno i bilanci nazionali europei perdono quasi 50 miliardi di euro di gettito IVA a causa di frodi transfrontaliere. La criminalità organizzata, agendo ad un livello transnazionale, trae guadagno nell'ordine di miliardi di euro, eludendo le norme nazionali ed evitando le azioni penali.

Pensate che nel 2015 gli Stati membri hanno individuato e segnalato alla Commissione irregolarità fraudolente per un importo di circa 600 milioni di euro. Gli strumenti a disposizione dei procuratori nazionali nella lotta contro la criminalità finanziaria transfrontaliera su vasta scala sono limitati.

La nuova procura dell'Unione fornirà un'azione di coordinamento, conducendo rapide indagini in tutta Europa e procedendo a uno scambio di informazioni in tempo reale. Le indagini penali sulle frodi e sugli altri crimini contro il bilancio dell'UE sono spesso ostacolati da una legislazione divergente: le autorità nazionali di contrasto, i procuratori e i giudici degli Stati membri decidono in base alle priorità stabilite dalla politica penale nazionale e sulla base delle competenze nazionali.

Di conseguenza, il livello di protezione degli interessi finanziari dell'Unione differisce significativamente da uno Stato all'altro, con risultati spesso deludenti. L'OLAF ci ha segnalato che il tasso di procedimenti di successo nei confronti dei reati contro il bilancio dell'Unione europea varia dal 19% al 90% da Stato a Stato.

L'attività di coordinamento della procura porterà così ad una maggiore efficacia nel perseguimento di tutti i crimini che hanno una dimensione transfrontaliera. Proprio rispetto a questa prospettiva, mi unisco alle tante voci che nelle ultime settimane hanno espresso l'esigenza di ampliare al più presto le competenze della Procura europea. Lo ha detto il Presidente Juncker durante il suo discorso sullo Stato dell'Unione, dichiarando di ritenere quanto mai opportuno incaricare la nuova Procura europea di perseguire i reati di terrorismo transfrontalieri.

Lo ha ripetuto anche il Presidente della Repubblica francese, Macron, che alla Sorbonne, pochi giorni fa, ha proposto la creazione di «una Procura europea antiterrorismo». Una posizione quindi in linea con quanto auspicato anche il Presidente dell'Europarlamento Antonio Tajani.

Ampliare il ventaglio delle competenze della Procura creerà i presupposti per una maggiore efficienza nella lotta alla criminalità organizzata e alle organizzazioni terroristiche: essere uniti, essere più forti, ed essere meno vulnerabili.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, it is a pleasure to be in the Parliament today and, believe me, that is not just a courtesy phrase. Just before the summer break, after long and extremely complex negotiations, the Council reached a political agreement to set up the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) as an enhanced cooperation, and I am happy that 20 Member States have already expressed their agreement to bring the protection of financial interests to an entirely new level through the establishment of a new Union body.

The EPPO will considerably step up the current efforts to fight crimes against the EU budget such as fraud, corruption, money laundering or VAT fraud, since its work will be more effective, especially as regards cross-border criminality; more criminals will be put behind bars; more money will be recovered; and more money will be put to the right use. The regulation provides a robust set of procedural rights of suspects and accused persons.

The EPPO will become the centrepiece of a new system, joining together national law enforcement, judicial authorities and EU actors such as OLAF, Eurojust and Europol. It will be to the benefit of the EU as a whole, the Member States and European taxpayers. Criminal investigations are essential to counter the most serious forms of abuse against the EU budget. The EPPO will carry out this task on the basis of a truly European investigation and prosecution policy. OLAF will closely cooperate with the EPPO to ensure complementarity of their respective mandates. The missions of the EPPO and OLAF are clearly defined. Strong energies will need to be created in order to allow both the EPPO and OLAF to perform their tasks in the most efficient and productive manner.

There will be no duplication of work. On the contrary, I believe that the result will be a significant enhancement of our capacity to tackle fraud. The Commission has just transmitted, on 2 October, the evaluation of the OLAF Regulation and is analysing the need to adapt the OLAF Regulation to ensure that OLAF can cooperate smoothly with the EPPO and has the tools it needs to fulfil its mandate. Also, Eurojust will continue to play an important role as a crime fighter in Europe, focusing more on other forms, such as the trafficking of human beings or drugs. I am therefore pleased to see that you are advancing well on the Eurojust reform under the leadership of the rapporteur, Mr Voss.

We would not be here today without the Parliament's strong support. I would particularly like to thank the Parliament's successive rapporteurs on the EPPO, Mr Iacolino, Ms Macovei, Ms Matera, as well as all the shadow rapporteurs, for their tireless efforts for a strong, independent and efficient EPPO. I would, of course, also like to thank Ms Reding for her efforts, because I took over the EPPO from her in a very good condition, ready to be finalised. I would also like to thank Ms Grässle and Mr López Aguilar for their crucial work, in particular on the Anti-Fraud Directive, which included serious cross-border VAT fraud in the scope of the material competence of the EPPO. The EPPO and the Anti-Fraud Directive are two sides of the same coin. They are constitutive parts in our joint efforts to better fight crimes affecting the EU budget.

The Parliament made its voice heard in key moments during the negotiations and improved many important aspects of the regulation. For instance, you have ensured a clear delineation of competences between the EPPO and the other European actors; helped to design appointment procedures and introduce permanent chambers which guarantee the EPPO's independence; ensured a robust judicial review of the EPPO's procedural acts, or made sure that, from the beginning, the EPPO can cooperate on a solid basis with non-participating Member States.

But the Parliament's involvement does not stop here. You will have your say in the selection process of the European Chief Prosecutor, as well as in ensuring the general political accountability of the EPPO's activities, and you will have a decisive say on its budget. I have no doubt that this House will continue to support the EPPO in its operations. As President Juncker said in his State of the Union speech, there is a strong case for tasking the new European Public Prosecutor's Office with prosecuting cross-border terrorist crimes and, as announced in the letter of intent, the Commission will issue, in the next year, a 2025 perspective – a communication on a possible extension of the tasks of the new European Public Prosecutor's Office to include the fight against terrorism on the basis of Article 86/4 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The Parliament will debate this question in due course.

I am convinced that the Member States that can participate in the EPPO but are still missing will soon see that this is a game changer and will join. We will welcome them with open arms – the sooner the better, and they know it from me. Your vote tomorrow will allow the Council to move to the final adoption of the regulation at next week's Justice Council, and it will allow the Commission to start setting up the EPPO so that, by 2020, the first cases can be investigated and prosecuted.

I would like to thank you for your support and to encourage you to give a strong consent to the EPPO regulation presented to you.

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! In der Tat, nach vier Jahren Verhandlungen ist es nun so weit: Morgen stimmen wir über die Schaffung der Europäischen Staatsanwaltschaft ab. Ein wichtiger Schritt hin zu einem gemeinsamen europäischen Rechtsraum, ja, ein großer Tag für Europa insgesamt. Erst recht, wenn man kurz die noch viel längere Vorgeschichte Revue passieren lässt. So hat das Parlament schon vor mehr als 20 Jahren – 1996 – die Einrichtung der Europäischen Staatsanwaltschaft gefordert, und die Kommission legte schon 2002 ein Grünbuch zu ihrer Schaffung vor, in dem es unter anderem heißt: „Soll die Glaubwürdigkeit des europäischen Aufbauwerks keinen Schaden nehmen, muss die Gemeinschaft ihren Mitgliedstaaten und den europäischen Steuerzahlern die Gewähr bieten, dass Betrug und Korruption tatsächlich, und zwar auch strafrechtlich, verfolgt werden.“

Genau darum geht es: Straftaten gegen die finanziellen Interessen der EU wie Fördermittelbetrug oder grenzüberschreitender Mehrwertsteuerbetrug sind keine Kavaliersdelikte! Der jährliche Schaden geht in die Milliarden, die Rechnung aber bezahlen wir alle als europäische Steuerzahler. Es ist wirklich höchste Zeit zu handeln.

Das Parlament kann zum ausgehandelten Text zwar nur Ja und Nein sagen, doch die Mitgliedstaaten hatten von uns keinen Blankoscheck. Wir haben den Verhandlungsprozess intensiv begleitet und klargemacht: Die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft muss unabhängig agieren können, sie muss über effiziente Strukturen verfügen, und die Verfahrensrechte der Beschuldigten müssen jederzeit gewahrt sein.

Da all dies gegeben ist, wird unsere Fraktion grünes Licht für die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft geben. Wir wollen, dass europäische Steuergelder in Zukunft effektiver geschützt sind.

Zutiefst bedauerlich ist jedoch, dass die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft nur im Rahmen der Verstärkten Zusammenarbeit entsteht und vorerst nur 20 Staaten dabei sind. Dies schwächt ohne Zweifel den europäischen Mehrwert. Bände spricht, finde ich, dass gerade die Regierungen von Ungarn und Polen die Staatsanwaltschaft nicht wollen. Ungarn erhält die meisten EU-Fördermittel pro Kopf der Bevölkerung, Polen mit 86 Milliarden im Zeitraum 2014-2020 die meisten Gelder von allen. Wir werden daher in Zukunft dafür streiten, dass alle Mitgliedstaaten teilnehmen, damit dieses europäische Gemeinschaftsprojekt rundum zum Tragen kommen kann.

Monica Macovei, *în numele grupului ECR*. – Domnule președinte, mâine votăm Regulamentul Biroului procurorului european. Am negociat cu miniștrii de justiție și de interne din statele membre timp îndelungat, tocmai pentru că am dorit un birou al procurorului european puternic, independent, cu o misiune clară și puteri de investigație care să ne permită investigații oriunde în Uniune.

După aproape trei ani de negocieri, Biroul procurorului european va fi, în fine, înființat. Pe scurt, cauzele de fraudă transfrontalieră cu bani europeni și unele infracțiuni teroriste vor fi investigate de la început la sfârșit, inclusiv finalizate prin trimitere în judecată, de Biroul procurorului european, iar, în cazurile de condamnare, evident, se vor confisca banii furați din buzunarele noastre. Frauda în Uniunea Europeană, reamintesc, este de 500 de milioane de euro în fiecare an.

Apoi, procurorul european va strânge probe din fiecare stat membru implicat în fraudă transfrontalieră. Pentru percheziții, de exemplu, în România, se va urma legea română, pentru interceptări în Germania, legea germană, pentru audieri sau alte investigații în alte state membre se va respecta legea acelor state membre. Toate aceste probe făcute în diferite state însă vor fi admisibile și valabile în instanța care va judeca cauza, dosarul cu fraudă transfrontalieră. E foarte important acest lucru și asta va face ca toate aceste cauze să fie anchetate și judecate mult mai rapid.

Procurorul european va avea competență prioritară asupra tuturor infracțiunilor, inclusiv asupra așa numitului carusel al TVA-urilor. Pentru infracțiunile cu fonduri europene se prevăd pedepse minime, adică judecătorii nu pot condamna la mai puțin de limita de ani stabilită în Directiva împotriva fraudelor cu fonduri europene.

Roberta Metsola, *fisem il-grupp PPE*. – Grazzi Sur President, grazzi Kummissarju, tad-dedikazzjoni tieghek fuq dan is-sugġett. Nixtieq ukoll niringrazzja lil kollegi li għal dawn is-snin kollha tant hadmu fuq dan il-proġett tista' tghid, nibda minn Monika Macovei u Barbara Matera, meta l-grupp taghna.

Dan l-uffiċċju huwa verament importanti. Meta ahna ktibna u hdimna fuq it-Trattat ta' Lisbona, għarafna l-bżonn li jkun kreat uffiċċju li l-ghan tiegħu jkun biex jipproteġi l-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni Ewropea. Kien hemm minn kellu xi dubji dwar dan l-uffiċċju meta bdejna niddiskutuh imma tul is-snin rajna l-importanza tiegħu. U allura jiena nixtieq li nkunu nerġġhu nistgħu nkunu f'din il-kamra u naraw li kull Stat Membru tal-Unjoni Ewropea jkun jista' jissieheb f'dan l-uffiċċju, għaliex dan huwa uffiċċju li tant jista' jibgħat il-messaġġ li kull Stat Membru tal-Unjoni Ewropea huwa favur li nikkumbattu, il-frodi transkonfinali. Dawn huma affarijiet li ahna kollha nistgħu nkunu on-board miegħu u jiena nerga' nappella lil kull Stat Membru, kull gvern li qiegħed ipoġġi fil-Kunsill tal-Ministri biex jara u jisma' l-appell tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea, halli kulhadd ikun jista' jinghaqad f'dan l-uffiċċju.

Jiena minn naha tiegħi nista' nkompli nuri l-appoġġ tiegħi, tal-grupp taghna għal dan il-Prosekutur Ewropew u ser inkompli nahdmu sabiex ikun verament effiċjenti f'dak li jagħmel fl-attivitatiet tiegħu dejjem skont l-iskop tal-poteri li huma mogħtija lilu fit-Trattat.

Louis Michel, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je suis convaincu pour ma part que le Parlement européen va apporter une plus-value inédite dans la protection des intérêts financiers de l'Union et je me réjouis, en particulier, de l'inclusion, malgré certaines limites, que je regrette d'ailleurs, de la fraude à la TVA dans les compétences du parquet.

Bien que nous n'ayons aucun pouvoir d'approbation sur le dossier, les préoccupations du Parlement ont été prises en compte de manière satisfaisante. Une ombre au tableau, naturellement: certains États membres ont décidé de ne pas participer, poussant ainsi les autres à se lancer dans une coopération renforcée. Je tiens pourtant à rappeler que la lutte contre la fraude au budget de l'Union relève d'une responsabilité partagée: celle de l'Union et celle des États. Nous parlons bien ici de l'argent des contribuables européens. Je trouve donc particulièrement regrettable, voire choquant, que des États membres, dont certains figurent parmi les plus grands bénéficiaires de fonds européens, puissent se soustraire à leur devoir moral et politique de tout mettre en œuvre pour lutter contre la fraude.

Pour ce qui me concerne, je crois d'ailleurs qu'il faudrait songer sérieusement à lier l'octroi de fonds européens à l'obligation de se soumettre à ce devoir.

Il est à mes yeux inconcevable que les intérêts financiers de l'Union ne bénéficient pas d'un niveau de protection uniforme dans tous les États membres. Heureusement, nous avons quand même à nous féliciter du fait que pas moins de vingt États membres aient décidé d'aller de l'avant pour protéger l'argent public européen. Il s'agit d'une étape cruciale de l'intégration européenne et de la construction de notre espace de justice.

J'espère vivement que le parquet pourra rapidement montrer son efficacité et que ses compétences seront à l'avenir élargies aux autres menaces transfrontières auxquelles sont confrontés tous les États européens, telles que la criminalité transfrontalière, le terrorisme et la criminalité organisée que l'on connaît aujourd'hui. Ce serait le minimum d'élargir les compétences à ces matières.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Panie Pośle! Pan z łatwością oskarża państwa, które nie przystąpiły do wzmocnionej współpracy, chociaż ta wzmocniona współpraca z istoty rzeczy jest dobrowolna. To Panu przychodzi z łatwością, tymczasem rzecz polega przede wszystkim na odpowiedzialności państw narodowych i Belgia ma wymiar sprawiedliwości, który nieraz jest poddawany bardzo ostrej krytyce, także ze strony innych państw, choćby polityków francuskich. Czy nie lepiej zacząć jednak od uzdrowienia wymiaru sprawiedliwości na poziomie narodowym, zanim oskarży się innych o to, że nie wchodzą do dobrowolnej współpracy?

Louis Michel (ALDE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Monsieur le Président, ma réponse sera extrêmement brève.

Je n'ai que vraiment très incomplètement compris la portée de cette question. Ce n'était pas une question, c'était..., je ne sais pas.... Il m'a renvoyé à la Belgique, il pense que la Belgique fait partie des 20 pays qui se sont donc ligüés pour faire cette coopération renforcée, donc je n'ai pas compris la portée de la question, vraiment, donc je m'en excuse auprès de l'intervenant.

Jiří Maštálka, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, přes některé pozitivní změny, které tu byly konstatovány předřečníky, jsem k návrhu na zřízení Úřadu evropského veřejného žalobce i nadále skeptický a to hned z několika důvodů. Domnívám se, že v EU již nyní máme dostatečné mechanismy pro boj s finančními podvody, jako je Eurojust, Europol a OLAF. Dalším problémem bude podle mě složitá struktura rozhodování o kompetenci k vyšetřování, kdy se bude muset nejdříve posoudit, zda spadá do kompetence národního nebo evropského žalobce. Není mi také jasné, kdo bude moci podávat dovolání a další opravné prostředky. Otázka dohledu rovněž zůstává nevyřešena. Máme v neposlední řadě nakročeno k postupné harmonizaci trestního práva v EU, což je trnitá cesta. Nekonečné zřizování nových a nových evropských úřadů jen těžko přispěje k rychlejšímu průběhu trestních řízení a snížení počtu procesních pochybení.

Jan Philipp Albrecht, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir erleben hier heute Abend einen historischen Moment: Wir haben etwa acht Jahre nach dem Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon die finale Aussprache über die Schaffung der Europäischen Staatsanwaltschaft. Das ist ein wirklich historischer Moment, und ich glaube, wir sollten den wertschätzen.

Umso enttäuschter bin ich, dass wieder mal auch der Rat nicht anwesend ist und auch die Mitgliedstaaten diesen Fortschritt nicht wirklich würdigen und tatsächlich mit Leben füllen. Ich hoffe, dass sich das ändern wird, und ich hoffe auch, dass die 20 Mitgliedstaaten, die sich auf den Europäischen Staatsanwalt eingelassen haben, die noch verbleibenden Mitgliedstaaten dazu bewegen können, an diesem Instrument teilzunehmen.

Es ist wichtig für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union, für den EU-Haushalt. Wir verlieren jedes Jahr mehrere hundert Millionen Euro in diesen Kriminalitätsbereichen, wenn es um die Straftaten zulasten des EU-Budgets geht. Manche Rechnungen gehen sogar deutlich darüber hinaus. Das haben wir zum Beispiel im Sonderausschuss gegen organisierte Kriminalität, Korruption und Geldwäsche vorgelesen bekommen: Mehrere Billionen Euro können es sogar sein. Das heißt, der Schaden ist enorm, und es ist deswegen umso wichtiger, dass wir dieses Instrument jetzt wirklich nutzen, dass es mit Leben gefüllt wird, dass die Mitgliedstaaten daran teilnehmen und dass sie es als Vorbild für eine ordentliche Zusammenarbeit in polizeilichen und in justiziellen Strafsachen nehmen. Das ist auch genau die Priorität, die wir uns geben müssen, wenn es darum geht, effektive Strafverfolgung in der Europäischen Union voranzubringen.

Es macht wenig Sinn, nach neuen Ermittlungsmaßnahmen oder irgendwelchen Datenbanken zu rufen, wenn am Ende das Personal und die Infrastruktur für ordentliche Zusammenarbeit von Polizei und Justiz in der Europäischen Union nicht zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Wir können diese Aufgaben nur gemeinsam bewältigen, und dafür ist der Europäische Staatsanwalt ein großes Vorbild und ein wichtiger Schritt.

Insofern stehen auch wir Grüne absolut hinter diesem Vorschlag. Wir werden für diese Schaffung der Europäischen Staatsanwaltschaft stimmen, und wir sind auch der Meinung, dass die jüngst geäußerten Vorschläge, die Kompetenzen in Zukunft zum Beispiel auch auf Terrorismusstraftaten zu erweitern, absolut diskutiert werden müssen, dass das ein richtiger Vorschlag ist. Wir als Europäisches Parlament sollten da dranbleiben und auch bei der Schaffung hoher Verfahrensstandards selbstverständlich weitermachen.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Pane kolego, pozorně jsem poslouchal Vaše vystoupení, které na mě působilo velmi optimisticky. Já se přiznám, že tak optimistický nejsem. Dovolte mi otázku. Myslíte si, že do doby, než ostatní státy případně přistoupí k tomuto novému institutu, než se, jak jste řekl, přidají k evropskému prokurátorovi, tak by tento nový úřad měl spolupracovat s justičními orgány těch členských zemí, které nechtějí evropského veřejného žalobce? Měla by zde probíhat taková spolupráce?

Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Sehr geehrter Kollege! Auf jeden Fall sollte eine enge Kooperation vereinbart werden zwischen den Staaten, die die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft jetzt aufbauen, und denjenigen, die – noch jedenfalls – nicht dabei sind, aber möglichst demnächst beitreten. Gerade ein Land wie Polen täte gut daran, ganz aktiv daran teilzunehmen. Wir haben die Eurojust-Verordnung noch auf dem Tisch liegen. Ich bin absolut dafür, eine sehr enge Zusammenarbeit dort zu vereinbaren. Aber es ist nicht so, dass man die gleichen Vorteile auch im Rahmen von Eurojust genießen wird. Sie werden diese Kriminalität nur dann effektiv bekämpfen können, wenn sie auch an diesem Instrument teilnehmen.

Laura Ferrara, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con il voto di oggi vedrà finalmente la luce la tanto attesa Procura europea, che noi consideriamo un elemento centrale della lotta contro la corruzione nell'Unione europea. Spiace innanzitutto constatare come alcuni Stati membri abbiano preferito rimanere fuori dall'ambito di competenza di questo nuovo organismo dell'Unione e, in tal senso, confidiamo in un loro repentino ravvedimento.

La procura, come sottolineato anche nella risoluzione del Parlamento europeo sulla lotta alla corruzione, di cui sono stata relatrice, dovrà essere efficiente e indipendente dai governi nazionali e dalle istituzioni dell'Unione europea, ma soprattutto al riparo da influenze e pressioni politiche.

Ritengo che il lavoro della Procura europea, grazie anche all'utilizzo delle risorse già esistenti in ambito europeo e grazie allo scambio di informazioni con altri organismi di contrasto alle frodi e alla corruzione, come l'OLAF, Europol ed Eurojust, possa garantire un'implementazione sia delle attività repressive, sia in ordine alla prevenzione dei crimini perpetrati ai danni dell'Unione europea.

Pertanto, auspico che vengano assegnate alla Procura europea risorse finanziarie umane e adeguate ai suoi compiti e mi rammarico del fatto che non rientrino nel suo mandato, quanto meno in maniera esplicita, competenze necessarie per il contrasto alla criminalità organizzata. Dico questo con la consapevolezza di chi ha visto andare in fumo milioni di euro di fondi dell'Unione europea, destinati ad esempio all'agricoltura nelle regioni del Sud Italia, finanziamenti che, purtroppo, sono finiti nelle mani di truffatori e della criminalità organizzata, come fra l'altro rilevato nell'ultima relazione del comitato per la lotta contro le frodi nei confronti dell'Unione europea, istituito presso il governo italiano, che ha registrato, tra i casi di frode agli interessi finanziari dell'Unione, addirittura casi di percezioni di contributi, in agricoltura, da parte di soggetti sottoposti a misure di prevenzione antimafia.

In conclusione, si poteva fare di più e meglio: ma non vi è dubbio che oggi l'Unione europea compie un significativo passo avanti nel contrasto al crimine.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

President. – Colleagues, I mentioned during the votes that I am going to try not to use the gavel. We are running slightly over time and I would ask you if you could cooperate with me and see whether, as an experiment, we can have a good debate without my having to use this. I think it is inappropriate.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF.* – Madame la Présidente, merci pour le rappel.

La justice pénale est une prérogative régalienne qui appartient aux États depuis toujours et est indissociable de leur souveraineté. C'est pourquoi je m'oppose à la création d'un parquet européen, qui serait compétent pour poursuivre les auteurs d'infractions portant atteinte «aux intérêts financiers de l'Union».

C'est aux parquets nationaux de poursuivre ce genre d'infractions, en coopérant entre eux en cas de besoin. Je m'oppose donc à l'idée d'un parquet européen qui les dépouillerait de leurs compétences.

Je m'y oppose d'autant plus qu'il travaillera en étroite collaboration avec l'OLAF. Or l'OLAF est décrédibilisé par les scandales. L'Union pervertit tous ses domaines de compétence, c'est pourquoi je lui dis stop, je ne veux pas qu'elle pervertisse aussi la justice pénale.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Εισαγγελία αποτελεί ένα ακόμα κατασταλτικό εργαλείο που προστίθεται στο ήδη υπάρχον επικίνδυνο πλέγμα καταστολής στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τα κράτη μέλη της. Με Γενικό Ευρω-εισαγγελέα και ευρωεισαγγελείς σε κάθε κράτος μέλος θα έχουν στη διάθεσή τους Ευρωπόλ και Eurojust, εθνικές αστυνομικές και δικαστικές αρχές, βάσεις δεδομένων και «φακελώματος», ευρωπαϊκά εντάλματα και άλλα. Η Ευρωεισαγγελία προορίζεται έτσι για τον ρόλο συντονιστή των κατασταλτικών μηχανισμών, ευρωενωσιακών και εθνικών.

Η αντιμετώπιση της απάτης αποτελεί πρόσχημα και προπομπό επέκτασης της δράσης της σε άλλους τομείς δίωξης και καταστολής, όπως της λεγόμενης «καταπολέμησης της τρομοκρατίας». Ο κανονισμός ψηφίζεται με σκόπιμες αοριστίες, διευρύνοντας ήδη το πεδίο δράσης. Πραγματικός όμως στόχος όλων αυτών των μηχανισμών είναι το εργατικό λαϊκό κίνημα, η κατάπνιξη των λαϊκών ελευθεριών. Για αυτό η πάλη ενάντια στην καταστολή για τις λαϊκές ελευθερίες και δικαιώματα πρέπει να στοχεύει τον πραγματικό εχθρό και αντίπαλο: την εξουσία των μονοπωλίων, τη θωράκιση της οποίας υπηρετούν οι ενώσεις και οι μηχανισμοί τους.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Also manchen Kollegen sollte man hier wirklich das Wort verbieten, weil sie mangels Sachkenntnis überhaupt nicht zum Thema sprechen sollten.

Der Europäische Staatsanwalt ist ein Meilenstein in der europäischen Justizgeschichte, weil es – Herr Kollege von gerade eben: Aufgepasst! – die einzige Einrichtung auf der europäischen Ebene ist, die selbst bestimmen kann, welche Fälle sie ermittelt. Bei allen anderen muss der Mitgliedstaat darum bitten, dass ermittelt wird. Und wir haben inzwischen halt Mitgliedstaaten, bei denen wir erhebliche Zweifel haben können, ob wirklich alle Verbrechen ermittelt werden, vor allem Verbrechen, von denen Mitgliedstaaten selber profitieren. Wir können uns eben – und das ist das Problem, und nehmen Sie es bitte zur Kenntnis, statt so dumm rauszureden, Entschuldigung – nicht mehr darauf verlassen, dass die Justizbehörden wirklich so funktionieren, wie sie funktionieren sollten. Das ist unser Problem, und da hilft die EUStA.

Frau Kommissarin, herzlichen Glückwunsch! Heute ist ein großer Tag. Liebe Frau Kollegin Matera, das haben Sie toll gemacht! Es war mühsam, aber es ist wichtig. Ich möchte wirklich sagen, dass dank Ihrer Hartnäckigkeit, Frau Kommissarin, diese Geschichte jetzt zu einem einigermaßen guten Ende geführt wird. Leider sind viele Kleingeister im Rat Justiz und Inneres, nicht in der Lage gewesen, ein wirkliches Gemeinschaftsmodell bei der EUStA voranzutreiben. Wir haben in der Organisation, in der Konstruktion erhebliche Mängel, und diese Mängel werden uns noch sehr beschäftigen.

Ich möchte, dass wir das tun, was Herr Michel gesagt hat: kein europäisches Geld mehr für all diejenigen, die nicht an der EUStA teilnehmen. Das muss das Ergebnis der nächsten MFR-Verhandlungen sein. Nur so kann es gehen! Wir müssen gerade Länder, an deren Justizsystem wir Zweifel haben müssen, in das europäische System zwingen. Wer von uns Geld will, muss auch dafür sorgen, dass im Zweifel Finanzverbrechen weiterverfolgt werden.

Ich möchte Ihnen sagen, dass wir mit der EUStA, mit Eurojust, mit Europol noch schwierige Tage vor uns haben werden. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass wir ein gutes Zusammenspiel dieser neuen Behörden haben, auch zusammen mit dem OLAF, das natürlich von den Befugnissen nicht mal ansatzweise mit der EUStA zu vergleichen ist. Wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die Dinge funktionieren. Wir müssen aber auch dafür sorgen, dass die EUStA nicht mit Aufgaben überlastet wird. Deswegen: Seid vorsichtig, wenn Ihr die Ausdehnung neuer Kompetenzen fordert. Ich halte davon nicht viel. Lasst uns zuerst die jetzige Organisation zum Funktionieren bringen!

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Jourová. ¡Por fin la Fiscalía Europea! Estamos dando un paso histórico.

Después de cuatro años de trabajos arduos, de debates, de tarjetas amarillas en los Parlamentos nacionales y de vetos de algunos Estados miembros, sale adelante una cooperación reforzada con veinte de los veinticinco posibles Estados miembros participantes, teniendo en cuenta que el Reino Unido, Irlanda y Dinamarca se han excluido de este espacio de libertad, justicia y seguridad.

Pero es un paso realmente enorme el que estamos dando, y el Parlamento Europeo hizo cuanto estuvo en su mano para facilitarlo, porque aprobamos efectivamente el Derecho penal sustantivo, la Directiva relativa a la protección de los intereses financieros de la Unión por medio del Derecho penal —y le agradezco que lo haya recordado, comisaria Jourová, fui ponente del informe—, ya que esta herramienta será crucial para proteger los intereses financieros de la Unión y el presupuesto de la Unión contra el fraude, que puede ascender a 500 millones de euros al año de acuerdo con la estimación más baja.

Y lo hará superando todas las dificultades técnicas, las dificultades impuestas por lo que se ha llamado la regalía de los Estados, una herramienta de captación de pruebas, de recolección de pruebas, de medidas de garantía de los derechos, de la defensa, dificultades procesales y el vínculo del fiscal del Estado nacional con la Fiscalía Europea cuando haya un interés específico de un Estado miembro.

Es un paso muy significativo, y lo que queremos es que se amplíe la base jurídica para cubrir también la delincuencia grave transnacional del artículo 83 y el terrorismo y para que el resto de los Estados miembros pueda subirse a bordo de este instrumento formidable que es la Fiscalía Europea.

Ojalá consiga cuanto antes ser efectiva y recuperar recursos económicos contra el fraude, que serán fundamentales para combatir el paro y producir empleo y crecimiento económico en la Unión Europea.

Helga Stevens (ECR). – Het Europees Openbaar Ministerie of EOM moet complexe gevallen van fraude bestrijden. Geen fait divers, want het verschil tussen de geraamde btw-inkomsten en de werkelijk geïnde btw-bedragen bedroeg in 2015 zo'n 152 miljard euro. Dat is gelijk aan de gehele jaarbegroting van de Europese Unie.

Sommige lidstaten, zoals België, zijn koploper inzake fraudebestrijding. Andere landen laten betijen. Het nieuwe EOM zal deze lidstaten kunnen verplichten om fraudeonderzoeken op te starten. Daar kunnen we natuurlijk niet tegen zijn, maar er is een maar. Eerst wisten we ondanks lopende onderhandelingen niet welke misdrijven het EOM ging vervolgen. Nadat duidelijk werd dat de focus zou liggen op grootschalige fraude, werd besloten om een nieuw agentschap op te richten. Maar volgens het Verdrag moest het EOM ingebed worden in Eurojust, de Europese Eenheid voor justitiële samenwerking. Helaas werd besloten om het EOM te laten functioneren naast Eurojust en OLAF. Niet erg efficiënt, maar gezien het belang van fraudebestrijding, zullen we ons hierbij neerleggen.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, si tiene que usar el mazo, conmigo puede usarlo. No voy a ser original, pero quiero ser justa.

Como ha señalado el señor Aguilar —como se ha dicho ya—, se supone que las arcas públicas de los Estados miembros dejan de recaudar, al menos, unos 500 millones de euros debido al fraude en el IVA transfronterizo y a distintos fraudes que tienen un enorme impacto en la financiación de las políticas públicas de los Estados, o sea, en el bienestar de los ciudadanos. Además, como también se ha señalado, están ligados muchas veces a tramas criminales que financian el terrorismo y el narcotráfico.

No es original decirlo, pero es importante: la Fiscalía Europea es crucial para proteger los intereses financieros de la Unión, que es defender a los ciudadanos. Así, la nueva Fiscalía Europea podrá iniciar procedimientos penales y lo hará con una estructura y un funcionamiento que persiguen la eficacia; será independiente de los Estados miembros, y se aspira a que lleve esto a cabo de manera rápida —esto más difícil de creer, pero vamos a ver—.

Sabemos que no es una solución mágica y, aunque un grano no hace granero, algo ayudará a mejorar la viabilidad de nuestros sistemas de bienestar, y es importante.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a instituição de uma Procuradoria Europeia representa um passo em frente no processo de integração europeu, na comunitarização e na harmonização da justiça, nomeadamente na vertente penal, visando uma justiça servil aos interesses das grandes potências e do grande capital.

Prossegue-se o ataque à soberania dos Estados, reforçando a postura federalista do projeto de integração, neste caso o poder judiciário, através de órgãos supranacionais em que se concentram cada vez mais competências e poderes, obliterando a necessária e desejável cooperação livre e soberana entre Estados nacionais.

A criação de uns e o fortalecimento de outros destes organismos europeus pretendem tutelar e sobrepor-se às legítimas instituições dos Estados-Membros, condicionar a sua capacidade de intervir em sede própria na defesa dos seus interesses e limitar a sua soberania judiciária.

Com estas propostas, centralizam-se, estruturam-se e reforçam-se entidades que escapam ao controlo democrático e jurisdicional, ultrapassando garantias quanto aos direitos e liberdades previstas nos quadros legislativo e constitucional nacionais.

Eva Joly (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, l'argent des contribuables européens sera désormais mieux protégé, et les fraudeurs transfrontaliers davantage poursuivis.

C'est le message qu'envoie l'Union avec la création du parquet européen. Celui-ci aura le pouvoir d'enquêter et de poursuivre les auteurs de fraudes affectant le budget de l'Union, comme les détournements de fonds ou les fraudes à la TVA, qui s'élèvent, comme chacun le sait, chaque année, à plus de 50 milliards d'euros.

Après plus de quatre ans de discussions, il était temps que l'Union se dote d'un organe capable d'appréhender ce phénomène servant parfois à financer le terrorisme. Bien sûr, nous aurions préféré que tous les États membres participent à ce parquet, mais je suis convaincue que les vingt premiers pays seront bientôt rejoints par les autres. Comment fermer les yeux plus longtemps sur les ravages de la criminalité financière?

Bien sûr, les compétences du parquet pourraient être plus larges et couvrir, par exemple, les crimes environnementaux, mais ses pouvoirs pourront être étendus à l'avenir.

Ce qui est essentiel maintenant, c'est de doter le parquet de ressources à la hauteur de ses ambitions, d'assurer une coopération efficace avec Eurojust et surtout de lui garantir une indépendance véritable. C'est de cela que dépendent sa valeur ajoutée et sa capacité à enquêter, notamment sur des dossiers pouvant s'avérer trop sensibles à l'échelon national.

Le parquet est une avancée pour l'Europe de la justice. Donnons-lui les moyens de changer réellement la donne.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Madam President, the stated purpose of the European Public Prosecutor's Office is to pursue financial and economic crimes committed against the European Union. Now, the intention is to pursue criminals for crimes against the EU's budget, but also the EU's wider financial interests, for example cross-border crime such as counterfeiting and VAT fraud. This new office usurps the authority of nation states and control of their own legal systems. For that reason, eight of the 28 Member States have opted out of the European Public Prosecutor's Office.

Britain has an opt-out, but we are leaving the European Union. I have always maintained that these opt-outs are essentially worthless, because the Prosecutor would be able to utilise the EU's existing legal instruments and legal institutions in order to circumvent the opt-outs. On Monday, 25 September, I asked this very question at a meeting in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE). The representative of the Commission present confirmed that what I have said all along is correct, and leaving the EU will not make any difference for Britain.

Ms May has said that she wants a new security relationship treaty with the European Union. The treaty would include our subservience to all the existing EU legal instruments and institutions. We are being lied to, as usual. If Ms May has her way, Britain will be subject to the European Public Prosecutor after we leave the European Union.

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, thank you very much for being able to address this subject this evening, which, regretfully, I will not be supporting tomorrow in terms of the vote.

Now, my colleagues have described how it is going to be portrayed, but can I just issue a big reminder? The European Union has an absolutely abysmal record in terms of finance, budget and accountancy. It has had numerous scandals, that have been mentioned, and therefore to even begin to establish an organisation like this makes one wonder whether it actually has the competence to investigate what is happening within its own body?

Mention has also been made of the fact that a number of states have opted out. I think that is a very good move. The signal they are sending is that this ought to be stopped for a moment, a review ought to be conducted, and the financial systems and investigations that the EU currently has ought to be addressed, before embarking on something new which is going to cost, which requires resources and which ultimately takes away sovereign power from Member States.

Viviane Reding (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, un parquet européen en mesure de rechercher et de poursuivre les fraudeurs... Enfin!

En 2013, j'avais mis le projet sur la table en ma qualité de commissaire à la justice. M^{me} la commissaire Jourová le boucle aujourd'hui et il entrera en vigueur en 2020. Et c'est une avancée majeure.

Enfin notre budget européen recevra la protection européenne qu'il mérite. Finis les jours où les escrocs pouvaient facilement détourner l'argent du contribuable européen, sachant pertinemment qu'ils ne seraient pas poursuivis et finie, donc, l'impunité.

Lorsque les malfaiteurs agissent à l'international, notre réponse aussi doit être transnationale et européenne.

Je me réjouis que vingt États membres aient décidé d'aller de l'avant. La coopération renforcée fait ainsi ses preuves et montre que l'Europe des précurseurs peut entraîner dans son sillage les États membres qui, aujourd'hui encore, hésitent à protéger plus efficacement l'argent du contribuable.

La création du poste de procureur européen est la preuve que l'Europe peut et doit avancer avec une avant-garde, et cette preuve a d'ailleurs déjà été apportée par le règlement sur le divorce et la proposition sur la succession.

L'espace européen de la justice se met lentement en place, et ce sera un honneur pour le Luxembourg, en tant que siège des institutions judiciaires, d'accueillir les nouveaux procureurs européens.

L'Europe agit et doit continuer à le faire, j'appelle donc de mes vœux pour l'avenir l'élargissement des compétences du procureur à la criminalité organisée et à la lutte antiterroriste pour mieux protéger nos citoyens.

Madame la Commissaire, la fenêtre d'opportunité est ouverte, les traités nous permettent d'avancer, et c'est donc à nous de le faire.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, l'istituzione della Procura europea è senz'altro uno dei maggiori progressi nel processo di integrazione europeo di diritto penale, perché si tratta di un organismo che avrà non soltanto funzioni di coordinamento ma è, per la prima volta, un potere diretto nell'esercizio dell'azione penale e che troverà nella direttiva PIF una normativa penale armonizzata per la protezione degli interessi finanziari dell'Unione.

Il testo negoziato dal Consiglio rappresenta un buon compromesso che tiene in debito conto molti dei suggerimenti formulati dal Parlamento europeo. Fra questi, l'inclusione delle frodi IVA nella competenza della Procura, l'inserimento di norme adeguate in materia di trattamento dei dati personali e la previsione di specifiche garanzie procedurali, soprattutto con riferimento al controllo giurisdizionale delle decisioni della Procura stessa.

Resta il rammarico per il mancato raggiungimento dell'unanimità. Ciononostante, sono convinta che il testo garantisca, così come sollecitato dal Parlamento, adeguate misure per il coordinamento e la cooperazione giudiziaria anche con quei Paesi non partecipanti, che devono rimanere quanto più possibile all'interno del sistema europeo di contrasto penale dei reati PIF.

L'auspicio è che la Procura europea possa iniziare la propria attività nei tempi previsti, per un più efficace contrasto agli illeciti finanziari in danno dell'Unione, con la prospettiva, come da Lei stessa sottolineato, signora Commissaria e anche per questo la ringrazio, di una possibile futura estensione delle competenze ad altri gravi reati di natura transfrontaliera, quali i reati di criminalità organizzata e il terrorismo.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zwalczanie przestępstw finansowych powinno być powszechnie akceptowanym i wspieranym celem. Będzie to jednak nadal przede wszystkim odpowiedzialność wymiarów sprawiedliwości państw członkowskich. Prokuratura Europejska może wspomagać ten cel, ale nie zastąpi organów i instytucji narodowych. Bardzo żałuję, że w tej debacie nie odniesiono się do zastrzeżeń tych państw, które nie przystąpiły do Prokuratury Europejskiej, a są wśród nich zarówno państwa od dawna uczestniczące we Wspólnocie Europejskiej, jak i te, które przystąpiły do Unii Europejskiej w ostatnich latach. Życzę pani komisarz Jourovej w tym momencie tego, by ta instytucja była efektywna i by okazała zaufanie i dobrą współpracę w stosunku do państw członkowskich, bo efektywność, zaufanie i dobra współpraca z państwami członkowskimi to warunek tego, by w przyszłości inne państwa dołączyły do tej instytucji. Najgorszą rzeczą, którą można robić, jest to, co było kilkakrotnie powiedziane na tej sali: straszenie dyskryminacją budżetową tych, którzy nie przystąpili do Prokuratury Europejskiej. To jest rzecz bardzo niekorzystna, niebezpieczna i szkodliwa z punktu widzenia współpracy europejskiej i zaufania do tej instytucji, która startuje.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Fru talman! Jag skulle vilja börja med att gratulera kommissionären Vera Jourová och också alla de 20 medlemsländer som nu har valt att ansluta till den gemensamma åklagarmyndigheten. Tyvärr vill jag också ta tid att rikta mig till de länder som valt att inte ansluta sig. Dessvärre gäller det Sverige, mitt eget hemland, som tillsammans med länder som Ungern och Polen nu valt att fjärma sig från gemensam brottsbekämpning och gränsöverskridande samarbete för att backa in i framtiden. Det är *det* det handlar om, att inte offensivt försöka slå tillbaka mot de gränsöverskridande brottsliga nätverken. Jag tycker att det är väldigt viktigt att de ansluter sig som fort som möjligt. Jag vill uppmanna den svenska regeringen att göra det.

Etableringen av åklagarkammaren är väldigt viktig. Kriminella ligor känner inga nationsgränser och de rättsvårdande myndigheterna i Europa måste nu göra samma sak, alltså jobba gränsöverskridande och inte låta nationella gränser utesluta en effektiv brottsbekämpning. Så kan vi bygga ett säkrare Europa för oss alla.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, for many VAT is that loathed tax that adds to the cost of our weekly shop. The reality is that consumption tax is meant to fund our schools and hospitals and the other vital public services. However, it is being avoided on a massive scale and the proceeds of VAT fraud are being diverted to fund global terrorist organisations. A staggering EUR 50 billion is being lost each year in VAT fraud. A nice round figure to publicise on the side of a bus! Indeed, it is extremely disappointing that the UK is one of a number of EU countries that have fought tax cooperation, the tax cooperation we so desperately need.

By opting not to take part in the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's Office, the UK is contradicting and undermining its own insistence on maintaining defence and security cooperation with the EU after Brexit.

I call on the UK Government to stop its anti-terrorism posturing and go to the heart of the problem by joining the EU in its battle to fight VAT fraud and starve the terrorists of the funds they need to function.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Kétségtelenül szükség van az EU költségvetésének és pénzügyi érdekeinek fokozottabb védelmére, hiszen egész biztosan van rá példa, amikor a strukturális alapok támogatásait a jogszabályokkal ellentétes módon használják fel, azaz csalnak. A szubszidiaritás elve alapján persze a tagállami ügyészségek hatásköre ez, ám sok esetben határon átnyúló csalásokról van szó, amelyek kivizsgálásához komoly segítséget nyújthat majd az Európai Ügyészség.

A megerősített együttműködés intézményének alkalmazása tehát indokolt ezen a területen, ugyanakkor mint minden megerősített együttműködési mechanizmusnak, ennek is nyitottnak kell lennie az egyelőre kimaradó tagállamokkal szemben, és lehetővé kell tenni a csatlakozásukat az EPPO-hoz. Éppen ezért egyértelműen el kell utasítanunk azokat a feltevéseket, melyek értelmében csak azok a tagállamok részesülhetnek majd kohéziós forrásokból 2020 után, amelyek csatlakoznak ehhez a megerősített együttműködéshez.

Az újonnan létrehozandó intézmény hatékonyságával, pártatlanságával és az ügyészek professzionális munkájával lehetne meggyőzni a kimaradókat, hogy javukra válik, ha csatlakoznak. Nem gondolom, hogy ehhez hasonló javaslatok, még ha csak sajtónyilatkozat formájában öltenek is testet, hozzájárulnak az európai államok kohéziójának növeléséhez, vagy az európai állampolgárok EU-ba vetett bizalmának erősítéséhez.

Ehhez egészen más intézkedések szükségesek, például az Európai Ügyészség eredményes munkája, amelynek révén valóban megbizonyosodhatnak róla a polgárok, hogy felelősen bánnak a tagállamok a közös költségvetés forrásaival. Ebben az esetben nincs kétségem afelől, hogy a most kimaradó államok is megfontolják a csatlakozást.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Gratulation, Frau Kommissarin, Gratulation an die Berichterstatterin und alle, die daran mitgearbeitet haben! Um die 500 Mio. EUR an öffentlichen Geldern verlieren wir pro Jahr wegen Korruption und Betrug. 500 Millionen, die wir in unsere Jugend investieren könnten – und sollten natürlich – oder in sichere Arbeitsplätze. Die Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft als echte grenzüberschreitende Strafverfolgungsbehörde mit direkten Ermittlungskompetenzen in den beteiligten Mitgliedstaaten ist ein Riesenerfolg – ein Riesenerfolg für die Europäische Union und für alle Mitgliedstaaten, die davon profitieren.

Als ich in der letzten Legislaturperiode die JURI-Stellungnahme verfasste, hatten so viele Zweifel – Mitgliedstaaten, Abgeordnete – und umso besser ist es, dass es nun klappt. Eines ist aber wichtig, gerade im Hinblick auf die Revision des mehrjährigen Finanzrahmens: Alle Mitgliedstaaten, die EU-Gelder verwenden, sollten sich an der Nase nehmen und bei der EU-Korruptionsstaatsanwaltschaft mitmachen. Es darf nicht sein, dass jene Mitgliedstaaten, die die größten Anteile an EU-Geldern erhalten, sich hier der Justiz entziehen.

Mein Vorredner aus Ungarn hat sein Land angesprochen, er hat es andersrum argumentiert. Ich möchte konkret Polen und Ungarn auffordern, hier bei diesem Instrument mitzumachen. Wenn sie das nicht machen, sollten wir uns andere verstärkte Kontrollen und Durchgriffsrechte überlegen. Denn dieses Instrument ist etwas Großartiges, und ich kann nur alle auffordern, hier auch mitzumachen.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, уважаеми колеги, подкрепям създаването на Европейска прокуратура и смятам необходимостта от институционални мерки на европейско равнище за ефективно наказателно преследване на измамите и други престъпления, засягащи финансовите интереси на данъкоплатците от държавите – членки на Европейския съюз, за належаща.

България е част от двадесетте държави – членки на Европейския съюз, желаещи да стартират засилено сътрудничество за създаването на тази служба. Радвам се да видя, че в своята препоръка комисията по граждански свободи, правосъдие и вътрешни работи одобрява това решение на Съвета. Защитата и наказателното преследване на престъпленията срещу бюджета на Европейския съюз и финансовите интереси на Европейския съюз са от изключителната компетентност на държавите членки.

OLAF, Евроюст и Европол не разполагат с мандат на провеждане на това наказателно разследване и затова функциониращата Европейска прокуратура ще запълни тази институционална празнина. Злоупотребите със средства на Европейския съюз трябва да бъдат престъпление, което да се преследва със създаването на новата служба. И ще бъде изключително радостен и доволен, ако това се случи по времето на предстоящото българско председателство.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, дами и господа, Лисабонският договор предоставя възможност за Европейския съюз да изгради Европейска прокуратура. За съжаление в продължение на години преговорите за тази нова структура бяха в застой, но се радвам, че в крайна сметка бе намерено решение и ще одобрим създаването на Европейската прокуратура.

Престъпленията не признават граници, били те национални или европейски. В продължение на повече от 20 години се опитвахме с различни средства да подобрим сътрудничеството и обмена на информация между различните държави членки и затова създадохме Евроюст например. Но когато говорим за измамите с европейски средства, това не е достатъчно. Набавянето на доказателства в чужбина е бавно и забавя разследванията. Процедурите по сътрудничество също невинаги носят желаните резултати и не отговарят на реалността на отворените граници.

Нашите икономики и данъкоплатци заслужават по-добра защита на парите, които отделят за изпълнение на европейския проект. Всяка година поне 50 милиарда евро ДДС се губи поради най-различни трансгранични престъпления, включително с европейски средства. Европейските фондове трябва да допринасят към стимулиране на растежа, създаване на работни места, увеличаване на кохезията между различните държави членки, а не да облагодетелстват престъпници.

Вярвам, че новата прокуратура ще подобри разследванията и сътрудничеството на тези престъпления. Тя ще бъде силна, независима, с нужните й инструменти за разследване. Ще си сътрудничи с държавите членки в разследването на редица престъпления, свързани с европейски средства, измами, корупция, пране на пари. Ще подобри сътрудничеството и обмена на информация. В същото време ще гарантира високо ниво на спазване на процесуалните права в Европейския съюз.

За да може да изпълни тази своя дейност, прокуратурата ще има нужда от едни от най-добрите прокурори, ефективни вътрешни правила и адекватен бюджет. Всичко това ще бъде договорено по време на българското председателство на Съвета и се надявам на конструктивност от държавите членки.

За моята страна – България, един от най-ранните привърженици на прокуратурата, е чест да гарантираме, че Европейската прокуратура ще започне да работи пълноценно през 2020 г. Вярвам, че и за другите държави членки, участващи в тази нова структура, това е приоритет.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! A korrupció, az adócsalás, a szervezett bűnözés már réges-rég nem vesz tudomást a határokról, és éppen ezért nem is lehet csak tagállami keretekben ezek ellen harcolni. Ezért kellett létrehozni az Európai Ügyészséget, hiszen az Európai Ügyészség lehetővé teszi, hogy sokkal hatékonyabban harcoljunk a korrupció ellen. Pontosan tudjuk, hogy hiába az OLAF mindenfajta erőfeszítése, ha vannak olyan tagállami ügyészségek, amelyek politikai okokból nem hajlandók ténylegesen kivizsgálni a korrupciós vádakat.

Nem kell sajnos messzire mennem konkrét példákért, az én országom, Magyarország talán ebből a szempontból is az egyik legszomorúbb eset. Az utóbbi években az OLAF által javasolt huszonnégy esetből összesen háromban indított tényleges nyomozást a magyar ügyészség. Ezekben az esetekben mindig EU pénzekről, az európai adófizetők pénzéről volt szó, amit a magyar kormány az illiberális demokrácia felépítésére, és nem az ország javára fordít. Ezt a gyakorlatot csak az Európai Ügyészség állíthatja meg, és a magyar kormány ezért nem hajlandó az Európai Ügyészséget támogatni.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodo predsjednice, zalažem se za jačanje pravosudne suradnje među državama članicama, pogotovo u pogledu provedbe Europskog uhiđenog i istražnog naloga, kao i za daljnji razvoj suradnje među nacionalnim policijskim snagama na bilateralnoj razini, ali i unutar zajedničkih instrumenata poput Europol ili Eurosur. Smatram da je tješnja suradnja važna želimo li imati funkcionalnu zajednicu i jedinstveno tržište.

No, isto tako smatram da bi inicijativa u pokretanju sudskog postupka trebala ostati isključivo u nadležnosti nacionalnih javnih tužitelja. Budući da mi je jako teško zamisliti kako bi Europski javni tužitelj u ovome bio učinkovitiji, riječ je o očitim podrivanju principa supsidijarnosti.

U slučajevima prijave protiv financijskih interesa Unije, podsjećam da smo nedavno usvojili direktivu koja usklađuje pravosudne okvire država članica u ovom području pa bismo trebali raditi na usavršavanju tog mehanizma umjesto da stvaramo paralelne institucije.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, sigur Parchetul European, ca instituție distinctă, a apărut din cauza nevoii, din cauza evaziunilor, din cauza evaziunilor transfrontaliere. Numai din TVA, s-a spus aici, suma imensă care lipsește și lipsește, până la urmă, din bugetele naționale, așadar, din buzunarele contribuabililor.

Evident că Parchetul European este o instituție care trebuie să fie foarte bine delimitată ca sarcini de Olaf, de Eurojust, de Europol, s-a spus și acest lucru. Cred, doamnă comisar, că de acum începe greul, pentru că, sigur, a durat foarte mulți ani până să convingem statele. Nu sunt toate statele convinse. Mă gândesc că este foarte greu să avem această cooperare consolidată atunci când 7 state nu participă. Ce se întâmplă la granițele acelor state?

Cred că este foarte important să se delimiteze foarte bine competențele Parchetului European. Nu cred că trebuie să-i punem în sarcină totul, pentru că, atunci, ce mai fac celelalte instituții? Trebuie să fie o cooperare cu parchetele naționale, dar nu mă pot abține să nu pun o întrebare, doamnă comisar: dacă e vorba de o cooperare consolidată, ce facem cu responsabilitatea magistraților, care, ni s-a răspuns că aparține domeniului subsidiarității? Totuși, trebuie să avem și aici o cooperare consolidată – în privința magistraților.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Mamy sytuację następującą: mamy wspólny obszar gospodarczy, mamy Europę bez granic, jeżeli chodzi o obroty gospodarcze, handlowe, przepływ ludzi – tylko nie mamy wspólnego obszaru prowadzenia śledztw. Mamy oczywiście wspólny obszar przestępstw, ale nie ich ścigania, dlatego z zadowoleniem witam tę ideę i patrzę na to nie tylko jako na ochronę naszego budżetu, ale także jako na instrument chroniący nasze interesy finansowe, nasze interesy gospodarcze. Ta prokuratura powinna być takim sygnałem: prawdopodobieństwo wykrycia przestępstwa jest coraz większe, zatem podejmowane ryzyko też jest coraz większe, ergo coraz mniej powinno się nam opłacać dokonywanie przestępstw gospodarczych. Spodziewam się, że jeżeli prokuratura wystartuje i będzie efektywna, państwa, które dotychczas odmawiały lub się wahały, uznają, że w ich interesie leży dołączyć – i to byłby nasz sukces. Dziękuję bardzo, właśnie minęła minuta.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'istituzione della Procura europea colma il vuoto rappresentato dall'impossibilità per OLAF, Eurojust ed Europol di svolgere indagini penali, una limitazione molto pesante sul piano operativo.

Per il momento la Procura europea avrà solo un compito integrativo e un mandato limitato alla tutela degli interessi finanziari dell'Unione: combinerà gli sforzi espliciti a livello europeo e nazionale in materia di contrasto alle frodi ai danni dell'Unione europea, inquadrandoli in un approccio unificato e superando il limite dell'attuale esclusività dello svolgimento delle indagini da parte delle autorità nazionali.

Ma l'attività integrativa è solo un primo passo. La Procura dovrà col tempo assumere un compito generale e perseguire ogni tipo di crimine a dimensione transfrontaliera, includendo attivamente tutti gli Stati membri, tra cui, ovviamente, anche quelli che oggi non partecipano alla cooperazione rafforzata.

Non mancano esperienze pilota in questo senso e non manca neanche la volontà politica di fare un passo avanti verso un'amministrazione unificata della giustizia. Per ora è un piccolo passo ma è un passo necessario e significativo verso un'Europa unita.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης γίνεται αυτή τη στιγμή στα κράτη μέλη. Υπάρχουν οι εθνικές εισαγγελίες, υπάρχουν οι διωκτικές αρχές και γνωρίζουμε πολύ καλά ότι, από την ώρα που γίνονται καταγγελίες ή μηνύσεις, ασκείται ποινική δίωξη και υπάρχει ποινική τιμωρία. Για ποιον λόγο, λοιπόν, θα πρέπει να δημιουργηθεί μία υπερεθνική αρχή, μία Ευρωπαϊκή Εισαγγελία, η οποία θα έχει το δικαίωμα άσκησης δίωξης;

Οι διωκτικές αρχές, όπως ξέρετε, ασκούν κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα. Διωκτικές αρχές έχουν μόνο τα κράτη, δεν έχουν οι υπερεθνικοί οργανισμοί. Αυτό που γίνεται στην πράξη είναι να δημιουργηθούν «από το παράθυρο» κατασταλτικοί μηχανισμοί από την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η οποία δεν αρκείται ή δεν εμπιστεύεται, ενδεχόμενα, τους κατασταλτικούς μηχανισμούς των κρατών μελών. Έχουμε τη Eurojust, έχουμε την OLAF, έχουμε την Ευρωπόλ, τώρα θα έχουμε και τον Ευρωπαίο Εισαγγελέα. Θεωρώ ότι το μοντέλο αυτό δεν έχει κανένα νόημα.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you very much for this very interesting and important debate. I will react to what we have just heard. This is EU money and it requires a response from the EU institution. I think that is very clear. In the EU we see that crime is on the rise, cross-border crime is on the rise, we see permanent structures working against our interests, against our taxpayers' financial interests, and we need to come with a permanent structure. This is a very practical response we are coming with.

This is a very important moment for me too, because I worked for many years in cohesion policy, and I always found this to be a policy which is driven by a very strong ethical impetus. There is solidarity in it and there is a very strong, legitimate expectation from the European taxpayers that we will guarantee the protection of their money; and we have to do that! This is what we are doing now by the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) which is not replacing national prosecution services. It is going to work in a very strong synergy with national prosecutors, which will come into play in cases where the national prosecutors cannot come with an efficient response.

Here we heard a lot about the missing, non-participating countries. Three countries – the UK, Ireland and Denmark – have a permanent opt-out from criminal justice policies. What about the remaining five countries? I had to convince many more than those five, where we have failed for the time being. This was a very important time when, yes, we had yellow cards and it forced me to go to the national parliaments and have very intensive communications with the national authorities, national co-decision-makers in the field of the fight against crime, arguing that this is a very important step forward. I had to bring a lot of arguments, facts, figures. You mentioned EUR 500 million. I will add EUR 50 billion which we have as an estimation of the cross-border carousel VAT fraud. That is why it is very important that we added this cross-border carousel fraud under the remit of the EPPO. This was a real game-changer, and I must again thank those who worked on the Fifth Directive when we added this to the remit of the EPPO.

We had to solve the unsolvable problem: we had the duty or the task not to touch the national criminal prosecution, because the EPPO will work under national criminal prosecution rules; and I am sure we have managed to do that.

So, what about the missing Member States? I will keep trying to convince them. From Sweden and the Netherlands I heard the arguments: our prosecution works well. I have to be better in explaining that this is not about well or badly functioning prosecution services, it is about guaranteeing the protection of your taxpayers' money. So this is my task for the near future. On Poland and Hungary I have never hidden that I see the need to take the EPPO as a factor in the negotiations on the future multiannual financial framework and for the possible future Cohesion Policy. I will be very strong on this because I am convinced that the EPPO will work as a very strong deterrent and, let me use the word, repressive body.

If a Member State does not have the EPPO then we will have to be much stronger in preventive action. Already now in the Cohesion Policy, in structural funds distribution, there is a lot of control, a lot of audit, a lot of preventive measures, and still you see so much fraud and corruption in it. For the Member States which will get the Cohesion Fund money and will not be under the EPPO we will simply have to be much stronger in enhancing this control and audit. This will be my effort for the months to come when we discuss the future Cohesion Policy.

Thank you very much for your support. I hope the vote tomorrow will reflect the mainly positive debate here in Parliament, and I will keep you informed about the next phase – after, I hope, having the final adoption by the Council – about the practical steps towards the implementation of the regulation and full functioning of the EPPO.

Barbara Matera, relatrice. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi unisco anch'io alle parole del Commissario Jourová, reiterando il rammarico per il fatto che il regolamento sia oggetto di una cooperazione rafforzata che riguarda 20 Stati membri e non la totalità dell'Unione.

Confido che le ragioni che hanno spinto alcuni paesi a non partecipare all'attività della Procura vengano presto superate. Il processo di integrazione non passa solo per una cessione di sovranità, ma anche per un coordinamento puro e semplice, che permetta ad un sistema complesso come quello dell'Unione europea, di funzionare meglio e in maniera più efficace.

Assicurare un efficace coordinamento delle indagini e dei procedimenti giudiziari, risolverà l'annoso problema legato alle differenze notevoli tra i diversi sistemi giuridici applicabili. Garantire che le limitate risorse finanziarie dell'Unione siano utilizzate nel migliore interesse dei cittadini dell'Unione e siano protette dalle frodi, è indispensabile anche e soprattutto per la legittimità delle spese e per garantire la fiducia presso l'Unione. Proteggere gli interessi del bilancio dell'Unione, quindi, vuol dire proteggere i soldi dei contribuenti: non si tratta di un dettaglio banale.

Assistiamo ad uno scollamento dei nostri cittadini dalle istituzioni europee, a un crollo di fiducia e a un serpeggiare di populismo. La Procura darà lustro al sistema così come è stato concepito e sono orgogliosa di essere stata relatrice del Parlamento europeo: qualcuno qui ha detto: «oggi si scrive un pezzo di storia di questa Unione».

Ringrazio i relatori ombra per il proficuo spirito cooperativo che hanno dimostrato e messo in campo in questi anni. Ringrazio la Commissaria Jourová e il suo staff per il sostegno e il lavoro continuo in questi anni. Ringrazio, infine, i colleghi oratori che mi hanno preceduto e ringrazio soprattutto le varie presidenze di turno e mi rammarico che questa sera non siano stati con noi e abbiano preso parte al dibattito.

President. – Thank you for your work.

The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Az Európai Ügyészség (EPPO) létrehozása mögött meghúzódó célkitűzésekkel alapvetően egyetértek. Ugyanakkor a szubszidiaritás és a hatékonyság elvének tiszteletben tartása alapvető fontosságú kell, hogy legyen, ezért is döntött úgy Magyarország, – számos más tagállam mellett (mint Hollandia, Svédország, Málta, Lengyelország, Dánia, Írország és az Egyesült Királyság) – hogy nem vesz részt a megerősített együttműködésben.

Az Európai Ügyészség – mint önálló intézmény – létrehozása hazám esetében az alaptörvénnyel való összhang kérdését is felveti, miután az alaptörvény szerint a magyar ügyészség az állam büntetőigényének kizárólagos érvényesítője. Több olyan uniós intézmény is létezik, mint az Eurojust vagy az OLAF, amelyek eljárnak az EU pénzügyi érdekeit sértő bűncselekmények elkövetőivel szemben, inkább ezeket kellene erősíteni egy újabb uniós intézmény létrehozása helyett.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), írásban. – Az Európai Ügyészség az első olyan uniós szervezet, amelyik képes lesz az Unió pénzügyi érdekeit a büntetőjog eszközeivel megvédeni. Ez nagy áttörés még ha egyelőre nem minden tagország csatlakozik az uniós szintű bűnüldöző szervezethez. A kimaradó országok azzal érvelnek, hogy az EPPO elfogadhatatlan mértékben érinti a nemzeti szuverenitást. Ez azonban nem igaz.

Az EPPO létezése valóban érinti a tagországok szuverenitását, de olyan bűncselekményi körben, amelyeket a tagállami hatóságok jelenleg egyáltalán nem üldöznek, vagy nem üldöznek hatékonyan. Ilyen például a határokon átnyúló áfacsalások köre.

A kimaradók tartanak attól, hogy az uniós pénzek ellenőrzése felett a hazai ügyészség mellett az uniós vádhatóság is jogköröket kap, és ez valószínűleg náluk gazdasági érdekeket érint. Mégsem engedhetjük a következetlenséget. Felkérem ezért a Bizottságot és a Tanácsot, valamint képviselőtársaimat, hogy a következő hosszú távú pénzügyi keret elfogadásakor, az uniós pénzosztó rendszerből való haszonélvezetet csak az EPPO hatáskörének elfogadása mellett engedjék meg. Ennek hiányában ugyanis a büntetőjogi eszközrendszer kijátszhatóvá válik: a pénzügyi bűncselekményeket, többek között az áfacsalásokat ezek után, majd nem Németországban, vagy Franciaországban hajtják majd végre, hanem Magyarországon, vagy Lengyelországban.

Ha pedig az uniós pénzek elköltésének előfeltételeként az EPPO tagságot írjuk elő, bízhatunk benne, hogy még a legkínosabb kormányzatok is inkább alá fogják vetni magukat, hiszen a forrásoktól elesést nem engedhetik meg maguknak.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D), písomne. – Vnútroštátne rozpočty krajín Únie prichádzajú ročne o 50 miliárd EUR na podvoch s DPH. Stovky miliónov EUR sú hlásené na ďalších podvodných nezrovnalostiach. Ide o cezhraničné páchanie trestnej činnosti, kde sú kompetencie vnútroštátnych vyšetrojúcich orgánov obmedzené. V Únii absentuje jednotná, nezávislá a účinná inštitúcia oprávnená vyšetrovať trestné činy súvisiace s podvodmi na finančných prostriedkoch Únie, najmä so závažnými podvodmi na DPH. K právnomu a faktickému zriadeniu Európskej prokuratúry chyba v Rade k požadovanej jednomyselnosti osem hlasov. Preto dvadsať členských štátov využilo možnosť, ktorú dáva Zmluva o fungovaní EÚ, a opätovne predložilo návrh nariadenia Rade. Takáto posilnená spolupráca sa bude vzťahovať len na zúčastnené členské štáty. Plne podporujem zriadenie Európskej prokuratúry, ktorá zabezpečí rýchle, účinné a nezávislé vyšetrovanie trestných činov. V spolupráci s OLAF-om, Europolom a Eurojustom, ale aj vnútroštátnymi orgánmi prispeje k realizácii nulovej tolerance podvodov na zdrojoch Únie. Oceňujem, že Slovenská republika, ktorá sa počas svojho predsedníctva zasadila o finalizáciu textu nariadenia, patrí ku štátom posilnenej spolupráce.

Julia Pitera (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Zadaniem Prokuratury Europejskiej będzie ochrona europejskich funduszy i pieniędzy podatników poprzez zwalczanie oszustw finansowych i nadużyć. Prokuratura Europejska ma być utworzona w ramach „wzmocnionej współpracy”, czyli bez udziału niechętnych jej krajów UE. Urząd Prokuratora Europejskiego zostanie utworzony dzięki współpracy 20 państw członkowskich: Austrii, Belgii, Bułgarii, Chorwacji, Cypru, Czech, Estonii, Niemiec, Grecji, Włoch, Finlandii, Francji, Łotwy, Litwy, Luksemburga, Portugalii, Rumunii, Słowenii, Słowacji i Hiszpanii. Inne państwa członkowskie będą mogły przystąpić do współpracy w dowolnym momencie. Urząd Prokuratora Europejskiego będzie odpowiedzialny za prowadzenie dochodzeń, ściganie i stawianie przed sądem sprawców przestępstw przeciwko interesom finansowym Unii. Obecnie tylko organy krajowe mogą prowadzić śledztwa i ścigać oszustwa finansowe przeciwko funduszom unijnym, lecz ich jurysdykcja nie sięga poza granice danego państwa. Od 2014 r. posłowie przyjęli już kilka rezolucji, w których opowiedzieli się za utworzeniem urzędu Prokuratora Europejskiego, podkreślając konieczność zapewnienia niezależności prokuratorów. Prokuratura Europejska będzie miała siedzibę w Luksemburgu, ale każde państwo członkowskie oddeleguje co najmniej jednego prokuratora urzędującego na miejscu. W przyszłości lista poważnych przestępstw podlegających jurysdykcji europejskiej prokuratury generalnej będzie mogła być rozszerzona, na przykład o terroryzm. Wyrażam nadzieję, że polski rząd zmieni swoją decyzję i Polska przyłączy się do grupy państw współpracujących w tym zakresie.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF), *în scris*. – Urmărirea penală a infracțiunilor împotriva bugetului european este de competență exclusivă a statelor membre și în acest domeniu nu există nicio autoritate a Uniunii Europene. Prin acest regulament, statele membre își vor ceda suveranitatea națională în domeniul cercetării și urmăririi penale a infracțiunilor care aduc atingere intereselor financiare ale Uniunii, în condițiile în care acestea sunt deja obligate prin tratat (art. 325) să protejeze interesele financiare ale Uniunii Europene în același mod ca și interesele financiare naționale. Procurorul european va schimba modul de cooperare, până acum orizontal, între autoritățile competente din statele membre, într-unul vertical, care implică cedarea suveranității.

Mă îndoiesc de contribuția unui astfel de organism (nou, complex, pe mai multe niveluri) la eficiența investigației și sancționării infracțiunilor. În plus, costurile generate de crearea acestei instituții depășesc eventualele beneficii. De altfel, există deja instituții cu competențe în cooperarea judiciară la nivel european, iar crearea unei instituții noi (prea complexă și prea costisitoare) va afecta instituțiile deja existente și lupta împotriva fraudei în general.

Consider că acest proiect, care se negociază de atâția ani, nu este decât o altă încercare a Comisiei de invadare a competențelor statelor membre și de supranaționalizare.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Európai Ügyészség létrehozásáról szóló javaslat azok közé tartozik, amelyeket valóban az élet kényszerített ki, hogy végre konkrét és hatékony formában védje az európai adófizetők érdekeit. Éppen ezért az EP határozott egyetértését és gyors végrehajtást sürgetek. Sajnálatos, de az elmúlt évek tapasztalata azt mutatja, hogy az európai források elköltése során előforduló visszaélések, csalások leleplezésére és szankcionálására az igazságszolgáltatás tagállami szervezetei nem alkalmasak, néhol nem megbízhatóak.

Az OLAF, az Eurojust, az Europol számára pedig, mint tudjuk, a Szerződés nem biztosít ilyen jogosítványokat, hiszen a jogalkotó egyszerűen nem számolhatott olyan helyzettel, ahol az Unión belül, kormányzati támogatással, az európai forrásokon élőködő komplett korrupciós maffiarendszerek épülhetnek ki. Szomorú tény, hogy ennek ma a legnyilvánvalóbb példája saját hazám, az EPPO együttműködésből – nem véletlenül – kimaradó Magyarország, ahol Orbán autokrata, Európa ellenes rezsimjét jelentős részben az európai források elcsalásából finanszírozott, belső ad-hoc jogalkotással körülbástyázott, rendszerszerű korrupcióra építi.

Ezt a gyakorlatot leplezi – nem pedig hivatásának megfelelően leleplezi – a rezsim szoros politikai kontrollja alatt álló ügyészégi szervezet, ahol az OLAF megkeresései rendre elakadnak. Bízom benne, hogy belátható időn belül minden tagállam, köztük saját hazám is részese lesz az Európai Ügyészség keretében megvalósuló fontos együttműködésnek.

Janusz Zemke (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Zwalczanie przestępstw godzących w budżet Unii Europejskiej, z którego finansowane są najważniejsze unijne polityki społeczne i rozwojowe, stanowi ważne wyzwanie, szczególnie w kontekście coraz bardziej wyrafinowanych metod przestępczych. Istotne znaczenie ma również fakt, że skuteczna ochrona interesów finansowych Unii wymaga często transgranicznej współpracy karnej, która przy zastosowaniu dotychczasowych metod kooperacji wymiarów sprawiedliwości państw członkowskich niejednokrotnie okazywała się nieefektywna. Prokuratura Europejska stanowi zdecydowaną odpowiedź na te wyzwania, jej funkcjonowanie w formacie wzmocnionej współpracy może jednak w znacznym stopniu ograniczyć zakładaną skuteczność. Dlatego przystąpienie do projektu kolejnych, jeszcze niezdecydowanych państw członkowskich byłoby z pewnością zdecydowanym krokiem naprzód w procesie integracji i pogłębiania współpracy – w interesie wszystkich obywateli Unii.

Uważam ponadto, że pojawiające się w ostatnim czasie liczne zagrożenia terrorystyczne uzasadniają podjęcie dyskusji na temat ewentualnego poszerzenia mandatu Prokuratury Europejskiej o zwalczanie szczególnie poważnej przestępczości zorganizowanej. W pierwszej kolejności jednak urząd ten musi powstać, by swoim działaniem dać wyraz skutecznego wypełniania mandatu w dziedzinie ochrony interesów ekonomicznych Unii Europejskiej.

18. Über Interpol ausgestellte Haftbefehle (rote Ausschreibungen) (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the Council and Commission statements on Interpol arrest warrants (Red Notices) (2017/2873(RSP)).

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, let me start by underlining that the possible abuse of Interpol Red Notices for political purposes is a matter of great concern to the Council. Following a letter from the German and the Swedish Foreign Ministers to the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Federica Mogherini, regarding the arrest of two EU citizens with dual nationality on the basis of Interpol Red Notices, the Presidency decided to address this topic at the joint meeting of the Political and Security Committee and the Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security, on 26 September.

This was just the first step and the Presidency plans to raise the topic again at the half-yearly meeting of the EU Justice and Home Affairs Senior Officials with Interpol on 20 November. We aim to discuss then possible improvements to the existing Interpol systems, and we will listen carefully to Interpol's plans.

The number of Red Notices has increased over recent years, and they are an extremely useful tool in obtaining the provisional arrest of persons sought for extradition for serious crimes. This was shown by the result of a Commission questionnaire in 2016 regarding Members States' use of Interpol Red Notices. Over the years, these notices have indeed resulted in the arrests of numerous criminals. Nonetheless, it is important that the proper review should take place before Red Notices are issued, which is a demanding task. It is essential that the rights of our citizens are protected and that an effective redress mechanism exists.

The Presidency is aware that the Interpol general assembly last week, 26-29 September, discussed Red Notices. Interpol has an internal, systematic and proactive review process for vetting the legality of new Red Notices entered into the Interpol database. The Presidency will discuss with Interpol how this process could be speeded up and improved.

The use of Interpol Red Notices for the purpose of obtaining the arrest of persons sought with a view to extradition is not new. The 1957 extradition Convention of the Council of Europe, to which all Member States are parties, as well as Turkey, allows Interpol to be used for transmitting requests for provisional arrest. Whether a Member State accepts an Interpol Red Notice, pending a decision on an extradition request, falls solely within the competence of the Member State.

I would like to emphasise that an Interpol Red Notice will never be the basis for a decision to extradite, as that decision will be the subject of judicial review in a separate judicial procedure. Therefore, there is always a judicial review before a person is extradited. It does not appear feasible to have such a judicial review a priori but, as I have indicated, we will discuss with Interpol on 20 November how to improve the review of Red Notices by Interpol itself.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, I am aware that Interpol's Red Notice system has been used for political purposes in some cases. Obviously this is of great concern and it can have a significant impact on the persons involved. The overwhelming majority of Red Notices are genuinely used to seek the arrest of suspects and serious offenders. Exchanging information with Interpol is important in preventing and fighting serious crime. The arrest in Brazil of one of the most wanted Italian mafia criminals is an example of the added value of Interpol Red Notices.

EU Member States are members of Interpol and make use of its Red Notice system. They are, however, not obliged to act upon them. It is for the EU Member States to assess what action they can take when they encounter a Red Notice and to consider such notices carefully in the light of their originating country.

If there are abuses of Interpol's system, it is for Interpol to put in place the necessary measures to prevent such abuse. As the EU is not a member of Interpol, the Commission cannot directly influence how Interpol puts in place procedures to avoid such misuse. However, the Commission has already, in the past, raised concerns with Interpol about misuse of its instruments. The Commission conducted a number of fact-finding missions and meetings in order to understand the procedures that Interpol has put in place to process personal data. Since February 2015 Interpol has presented a new framework for processing personal data. The processing of notices and 'diffusions' against refugees will not be allowed if the status of refugee or asylum seeker has been confirmed. It will also not be allowed if a person fears persecution by the country establishing the notice.

I understand that Interpol has completed the process of reviewing its procedures and tabled a draft resolution to its general assembly last week. The Commission will raise this issue with Interpol as part of its November EU-Interpol senior official meeting. The Commission is ready to provide, as it has done in the past, any support that may be deemed necessary.

As regards the procedures put in place by EU Member States, the Commission gathered information in October 2015 in order to understand how Member States are using Red Notices from Interpol. A large majority of Member States indicated that the upload of Interpol Red Notices into national databases is done only after further examinations and checks. The Commission will continue to follow this important question closely in cooperation with our Member States.

I want to thank the House for your attention and I look forward to fruitful discussion with you.

Claude Moraes (S&D), *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we have heard very clearly from the Council and from the Commissioner a very clear recognition of a potential abuse of Interpol Red Notices, and it is refreshing to hear that very clearly. The issue really for us today is to understand what we do about it, and the Council went some way to explaining that mechanism – 20 November, and I want to say more about that in a second.

The Commission also explained some of the limitations to what can be done, and again we must address that today. But let us be very clear what is happening – and again we have support from both the Commission and Council in recognising that these notices and the systems have been abused to – let us be very clear – harass and detain political opponents and dissidents. The countries involved include Russia, China and Iran, let us be very clear. A process to prevent this abuse is needed to resolve the issue, which will become ever more important as databases are increasingly, directly and automatically consulted. This is not an issue that will go away on its own and I respect the honesty of the Council in recognising this. There have been a number of recent examples of abuses of the system in Turkey. After the failed coup in the country last year, we have seen worrying signs that the situation of human rights is deteriorating, and we see this additional problem with the Interpol Red Notices as exacerbating the situation.

We have received reports from journalists who are watching this debate carefully that they are now being harassed, and many others – including the Nobel Peace Prize nominee Can Dündar who is living in exile in Germany and who is currently on trial – are also being affected by this situation. We have heard from Fair Trials International, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and others of what we need to do. As Members of the European Parliament, we need not only to speak out whenever there are incidents of political repression, but also to ensure there are safeguards in place to prevent the abuse of Interpol arrest warrants, which are an important tool in ensuring the security of the EU.

My questions then come back to the Commission and Council: can we provide more detail on what has been done to ensure the rights of EU and third-country citizens, and whether there is a better mechanism to ensure that necessity and proportionality checks are carried out on Interpol alerts from certain countries. Could the Commission also provide guidelines on a common response on how best to handle extradition requests from third countries. I understand the limitations and the legal limitations, but I am happy that, in the initial responses from the Council and Commission, there is a clear recognition that we cannot see these potential abuses of Interpol Red Notices happening on our territory; we cannot see these obvious abuses of human rights. We respect our freedom, we are a European Union of values, so let us not see these abuses continue.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Meine Damen und Herren! Weder Interpol noch Staatsanwaltschaften – das muss man klar sagen – dürfen sich zum Büttel von Diktatoren machen. Artikel 3 des Interpolstatuts verbietet ausdrücklich den Missbrauch polizeilicher Fahndung zu politisch-militärisch-religiösen und rassistischen Zwecken und damit auch Verhaftungen, wie sie im Falle des Schriftstellers Doğan Akhanlı stattgefunden haben. Wir fordern deshalb nicht nur, dass Interpol sich einfach an geltendes Recht hält, sondern auch dass alle Datenbanken zu *Red Notices* überprüft werden, um weiteren Missbrauch zu verhindern.

Wir verlangen insbesondere von den spanischen Behörden, endlich ihre Praxis zu ändern und politisch motivierten Haftgesuchen nicht nachzukommen, wie das übrigens alle anderen Mitgliedstaaten der EU machen – nur Spanien macht das nicht. Nicht nur das Beispiel Akhanlı zeigt, dass da einiges bei Interpol falsch ist, und ob ausgerechnet der neue Chef, einziger Vize-Chef der inneren Sicherheit in China, auf Besserung hoffen lässt, steht in den Sternen, denn China ist doch bekannt dafür, genau mit solchen Haftgesuchen Dissidenten und Flüchtlingen beikommen zu wollen.

Noch einmal: Interpol muss das Gebot von Unabhängigkeit und Neutralität strikt wahren, und dafür sollten wir uns einsetzen.

Bodil Valero, *für Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Jag vill börja med att tacka kommissionen för att jag idag fick svar på den fråga jag ställde under förra plenarsammanträdet. Den handlade om den svenska journalisten Hamza Yalcin med turkisk bakgrund, som ju fängslades i Spanien i väntan på en eventuell utvisning. Vad jag vet idag så har han släppts i väntan på ett slutligt beslut.

Interpol är ju en organisation som tillkommit för, och vars uppgift är, att beivra brott och lagföra brottslingar. Internationellt polissamarbete är nödvändigt och välkommet. Men vi har ett problem när systemet missbrukas i politiskt syfte, och det ser vi ju allt fler exempel på. Det är, precis som har sagts här tidigare, väldigt viktigt att understryka att den här varningen inte är en arresteringsorder och att Interpol vare sig utfärdar arresteringsordrar eller tvingar medlemsstaterna att arrestera en person med "red notice".

Varje stat gör sig egen bedömning. Man ska vara särskilt noga när det handlar om personer som har skyddsstatus av någon form. Där skulle jag också vilja understryka att det är viktigt att inte bara de som har fått flyktingförklaring, utan att de som har fått stanna på någon annan skyddsgrund, för det finns ju olika nivåer och under olika tider – åtminstone i den svenska lagstiftningen har vi haft tre, fyra olika artiklar med skyddsgrunder, men det är bara den ena där man får flyktingförklaring enligt FN-systemet, så att säga – så det är viktigt att även de som har fått stanna på andra skyddsgrunder tas särskild hänsyn till.

Det är också oerhört viktigt att medlemsstaterna verkligen trycker på för att Interpol använder sig av det här systemet, så att medlemsstaterna följer det; det skulle jag vilja säga.

Tim Aker, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, it is very noble to criticise the governments in Moscow and Ankara for using arrest warrants to round up political opponents. This would have been very laudable had the events of last weekend in Spain not happened. But one cannot lecture on other governments' human rights records when this institution and the European Union turn a complete blind eye to what happened in Catalonia last Sunday. The responses that we had from the Commission about dialogue and the rule of law were, frankly, toothless. These were people who were going to put a cross on a bit of paper in a box. They were not calling for armed revolution, they were not trying to impose force on other people. They were expressing an opinion. And here we say to the governments in Moscow and Ankara that expressing an opinion is a human right.

Do not lecture other governments until you get your own house in order. Get tough on Spain because had it been any other government you would use all the powers you have to hold it to account.

(The President cut off the speaker)

President. – Colleagues, just for information, this is not a debate on Spain. Mr Aker, I really allowed you extra privilege to make your contribution.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Interpol je největší policejní organizace na světě. Sdružuje 192 států. Spolupracuje při pronásledování a zatýkání pachatelů trestných činů. Interpol musí spolupracovat i se státy nedemokratickými. Právě spolupráce s diktátorskými režimy přináší možnosti zneužívání Interpolu k vydávání politických protivníků těmto režimům. Mezi státy zneužívající Interpol patří například Rusko, Ázerbájdžán, Kazachstán, Turecko či Moldavsko.

Interpol proto do své konstituce zařadil důležitý článek 3: Je přísně zakázáno konat ve věcech charakteru vojenského, politického, náboženského a rasového. Přesto však řada osob zůstává v hledáčku nedemokratických zemí. I když extradice těchto osob byla zamítnuta, mohou být stále na seznamu hledaných osob, hrozí jim zadržení a pobyt v detenci, nemohou volně cestovat či najít práci.

Interpol se žádostmi nedemokratických vlád zabývá. Například Achmed Zakajev, premiér čečenské republiky Ičkeria, byl zatčen v Dánsku na základě obvinění z terorismu. Až v roce 2003 získal v Británii azyl poté, co byla ruská žádost britskými soudy uznána za politicky motivovanou. V některých případech Interpol žádosti zamítnul. Například v případě Williama Browdera, autora tzv. Magnitského zákona. Interpol na základě článku 3 odmítl i zatčení a extradici 3 poslanců EP, které žádal Ázerbájdžán kvůli tomu, že „protizákonně“ letos navštívili Náhorní Karabach.

Interpol v boji proti zločinu potřebujeme. Proto vítám započatou reformu Interpolu. Interpol by měl přijmout daleko větší pojistky proti zneužívání.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Chciałem, żeby nasza debata w pierwszej kolejności nie prowadziła do osłabienia Interpolu bądź dezorientacji w tym, co ma robić. Mamy czasy takie, jakie mamy, i jest oczekiwanie społeczne, że potrzebna jest po prostu skuteczność w ściganiu wszelkiego rodzaju przestępców. To jest pierwsze – zasadnicze moim zdaniem – przesłanie.

Druga rzecz – Interpol powinien oceniać, kiedy ma podejmować działania i czy mają być to działania do końca skuteczne, kiedy ma ich nie podejmować. Uważam, że debata na temat kryteriów jest ze všech miar dobra i owocna, a kryteria raz zapisane nie mogą być niezmienné, ponieważ nasze życie, nasza praktyka jest bardzo dynamiczna. W związku z tym jeżeli Interpol ma odpowiadać w każdym momencie potrzebom chwili, ten dialog, te przesłanki, obszary, państwa, kryteria powinny być jednoznacznie określone, debatowane.

Chciałbym także bardzo wyraźnie podkreślić to, o czym mówiła pani komisarz Jourova: procedury odszkodowawcze, naprawianie szkody, jeżeli nastąpiła pomyłka. Pomyłki mogą się zdarzyć i te procedury byłyby ważne. Tak że nasza debata powinna pomóc Interpolowi. Takie jest oczekiwanie, że będzie to nadal skuteczna organizacja.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, Hamza Yalçın, periodista sueco de origen turco ha pasado 56 días en prisión en Barcelona porque el Gobierno de Mariano Rajoy atendió una orden de Interpol que había interpuesto el Gobierno turco: una orden por insultos al presidente, por escribir en una revista no adepta al régimen y por vínculos terroristas por militar en un partido de izquierdas.

El Gobierno de España de Mariano Rajoy ha actuado en complicidad con el régimen autocrático que el presidente Erdogan ha impuesto en Turquía, que mantiene a 163 periodistas encarcelados, ha cerrado 128 medios de comunicación o mantiene en la cárcel a 78 alcaldes y alcaldesas y 13 diputados y diputadas de la izquierda kurda y turca. Pero parece que mientras Turquía colabore con el proyecto xenófobo de esta Europa fortaleza, la Unión Europea está dispuesta a ser cómplice de represión.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se chci také připojit k hlasům svých kolegů, kteří zde volají po reformě Interpolu a po reformě červených oznámení. Byla zde zmiňována celá řada případů, kdy např. Turecko zneužívá tohoto institutu k šikanování a postihování disidentů, kteří opustí území Turecka.

Nejsou to jen příklady ve Španělsku, já jsem z České republiky a i v České republice jsme takovýto konkrétní případ měli. Možná je Komisi znám, byla to kauza Nazmiho Sahina, který byl tureckým občanem kurdské národnosti, byl v Turecku odsouzen na šest let za trestní čin napojení na organizaci s politickými zájmy neslučitelnými se státním zřízením Turecka. To znamená, byl to zjevně politický delikt. Nastoupilo tedy červené oznámení, on opustil svoji vlast, přišlo tedy červené oznámení Interpolu a česká justice toto řešila. Česká justice samozřejmě tohoto dotyčného člověka nevydala, ale celé řízení trvalo více než rok a dotyčný Sahin byl zkrátka zadržován, byl omezován na svých právech, byl v zásadě takto nepřímo šikanován a přitom česká justice postupovala zcela podle zákona.

Myslím si, že reformu musí provést sám Interpol, musí být provedena reforma červených oznámení, protože jednotlivé justiční orgány potom zcela podle hmotného práva v dané členské zemi řeší, jak se má postupovat. A i když dotyčný není vydán, tak několikaměsíční šikana je podle mě zcela zbytečná. Ostatně platí to, co říkal jeden z mých předřečníků, i když třeba tento člověk Českou republikou nebyl vydán, tak dál toto červené oznámení platí a on může být zadržen v kterémkoliv jiném státě a opět se ten dotyčný může dostat do obtíží. To znamená je v zásadě permanentně šikanován. Takže také volám po reformě červených oznámeních.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisaria Jourová, este es un debate que no solamente es oportuno, es un debate necesario, porque el sistema de Red Notices —«informaciones rojas»— de Interpol ha dado lugar no solamente a disfunciones, sino claramente a abusos políticos intolerables. Por ejemplo, en mi propio país, como aquí se ha señalado, en el verano de 2017, un ciudadano turco-sueco y un ciudadano germano-turco fueron los dos objeto de probables expedientes de extradición, sobre la base clarísima de persecución política.

Y el Consejo de Europa ya ha advertido, como lo ha hecho la Asamblea Parlamentaria en una Resolución de 2017, de la necesidad de impedir que países con un historial infame en materia de derechos humanos puedan valerse de Interpol para perseguir a sus oponentes.

Es importante que la Comisión aclare a este Parlamento que es lo que piensa hacer para asegurarse de que esta distorsión no pueda tener lugar, de que el sistema esté sometido a todos los controles de fundamentación de los expedientes de extradición para que no puedan ser objeto de violaciones o de abusos de los derechos humanos, de usos inadmisibles, y, en particular, en el sistema de intercambio de información a través del SIS de segunda generación, a través de SEIAV, a través del Sistema de Entradas y Salidas y del intercambio de información entre los sistemas de los Estados miembros e Interpol.

Y por eso es importante que la Comisión clarifique qué medida piensa adoptar para extremar el rigor, para impedir que pueda ejercerse un mandato de privación de libertad o un abuso sobre los derechos fundamentales de las personas a través de las notificaciones de Interpol.

Catch-the-eye procedure

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caros Colegas, a Assembleia Parlamentar do Conselho da Europa aprovou em massa a Resolução 2161, intitulada *Abusive recourse to the Interpol system: the need for more stringent legal safeguards*. A Interpol é um instrumento eficiente de cooperação internacional na luta contra a criminalidade transnacional, incluindo o terrorismo, e baseia-se na assistência mútua entre as autoridades nacionais de aplicação da lei e deve funcionar em total neutralidade e com respeito pelos direitos humanos dos suspeitos.

O processo de globalização abriu diversos canais de atividade criminosa transnacional. As ameaças são hoje complexas, numerosas e desestabilizantes, pelo que a colaboração internacional entre polícias e entidades judiciárias é a resposta à internacionalização do crime. O alerta internacional permite que a polícia dos Países-membros partilhe informações críticas relativas a crimes ocorridos, designadamente, o alerta vermelho. Dados disponíveis dizem-nos que, na última década, o número de alertas vermelhos emitidos aumentou drasticamente.

Senhora Comissária, penso que tudo isto é possível desde que haja respeito pelos direitos humanos e pelo primado do Estado de direito.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli avvisi rossi dell'Interpol costituiscono una richiesta di cooperazione internazionale delle autorità investigative in materia penale per localizzare e arrestare, o comunque limitare la libertà di movimento, di soggetti nel territorio di un altro Stato.

Sul tema degli avvisi rossi sono noti casi di utilizzo improprio da parte di alcuni paesi, anche per reprimere libertà individuali e per perseguire scopi politici. Secondo un rapporto della ONG *Fair Trials*, c'è stato un aumento significativo degli avvisi rossi provenienti da paesi in cui le libertà fondamentali sono meno tutelate e anche in rapporto alla base di una risoluzione del Consiglio d'Europa evidenzia una crescita consistente degli avvisi rossi negli ultimi anni, con oltre 12000 avvisi emessi solo nel 2016.

Occorre vigilare maggiormente sul corretto utilizzo degli avvisi rossi, garantendo che i diritti dei cittadini dell'Unione europea e dei paesi terzi non siano violati mediante l'uso di dati Interpol da parte degli Stati membri e che la Commissione adotti misure di salvaguardia contro gli abusi in materia di controlli alle frontiere esterne e di utilizzo di sistemi d'informazione.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο ρόλος της Interpol είναι πράγματι σημαντικός και για την αντιμετώπιση της παγκόσμιας εγκληματικότητας και για την αντιμετώπιση της τρομοκρατίας. Βεβαίως η Interpol δεν μπορεί να είναι κράτος εν κράτει. Πρέπει να υπάρχει έλεγχος. Πρέπει κατά τη δραστηριότητά της να σέβεται τις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες και τα προσωπικά δεδομένα.

Στο ψήφισμα του Συμβουλίου της Ευρώπης, όπως ελέγχθη, αναφέρεται σαφώς ότι στο θέμα των κόκκινων σημάτων γίνεται κατάχρηση, διότι μια σειρά χώρες εκδίδουν, για πολιτικούς λόγους, κόκκινο σήμα και, εν συνεχεία, πολλοί άνθρωποι, οι οποίοι είναι ακτιβιστές, φυλακίζονται και παραμένουν, ενδεχόμενα, στις φυλακές για αρκετό διάστημα ή και γίνεται έκδοση. Πρέπει, επομένως, να εξετάσουμε υπό ποιους όρους μπορεί και ο ενδιαφερόμενος να παρέμβει και να προσφύγει κατά του κόκκινου σήματος.

Τέλος, εγώ θα ήθελα να συνεργαστεί η Interpol πολύ πιο στενά με τις ευρωπαϊκές αρχές στην αντιμετώπιση των τζιχαντιστών, οι οποίοι αποτελούν κίνδυνο για την κοινωνία μας.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I think we all agree that Interpol and police co-operation across borders are extremely important for our security. However, when the Interpol system is abused by undemocratic regimes to silence and persecute legitimate voices and human rights defenders, we must all be deeply concerned. The exiled Turkish journalist, Can Dündar, is now facing a Red Notice request in Germany after the Turkish Government submitted a request, accusing him of propaganda. He is one of an increasing number of individuals facing this type of persecution from afar.

The Kazakh Government is another serial abuser of the Red Notice system, with more and more dissidents and opposition leaders being targeted or simply being unfortunate innocent bystanders. Although Interpol does respond to requests to review its decisions, we need much more robust guarantees and serious safeguards and we need accountability for decisions that put human rights at risk.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you very much for this interesting debate. Interpol Red Notices are a useful tool to seek the arrest of suspects and serious offenders. It is first and foremost for Interpol and its member countries to address weaknesses in the system. It is for EU Member States to assess what action they take when they encounter a Red Notice and to carefully consider such notices in light of their originating country.

Let me assure you that the Commission has followed and continues to follow this issue very closely. The Commission monitors in particular compliance by Member States with the principle of non-refoulement enshrined in EU law. This is to make sure that refugees are not returned if there is a risk of persecution.

Matti Maasilas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I would like to thank all the speakers, in particular Mr Moraes for the very pertinent questions about the situation. Indeed, we are in the situation where the EU Member States are members of another international organisation where there is no clear agreed common EU line or policy.

At the recent meeting of the Political Security Committee and the Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI), ideas were floated to address this situation. There were those who emphasised a need for a common approach, a need to share best practices. The Estonian Presidency invited all Member States to provide their ideas and to take this discussion further, even before the 20 November meeting with Interpol, to give ammunition to the Presidency at this meeting.

We are committed to keeping this important topic on the agenda and we will of course ask Interpol about its plans on how to improve the review of the notices – because that is one of the main issues, the way that Interpol *a priori* reviews those Red Notices – and we may also expect requests by Interpol to provide more resources for them to do so. So the topic is on the agenda and discussions will be taken further.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Muchas cosas no funcionan en Interpol. Interpol no puede ser usada con objetivos políticos, como una mera herramienta al servicio de los gobiernos represivos, sino que debe mantener sus normas de neutralidad, y ser usada para compartir información que permita detener a criminales reales, y no a periodistas díscolos. Interpol debe ser un mecanismo útil para compartir información, algo muy necesario y que se ha revelado insuficiente estos últimos años, con los ataques terroristas de Barcelona, París o Bruselas. Es inaceptable que en algunos países se haga un uso indebido del sistema de notificaciones rojas de Interpol con el único fin de reprimir la libertad de expresión o perseguir a opositores políticos. El Reglamento de Interpol en su artículo 3 es claro: prohíbe que se investigue a personas por motivos de raza, religión, etc. pero sabemos que esto no se cumple. Turquía utiliza las notificaciones rojas de Interpol de forma sistemática para perseguir a personas por motivos políticos. ¿Hasta cuándo seguiremos considerando al régimen autoritario de Erdogan como socio prioritario de la UE? Hasta que las cosas no cambien, no nos cansaremos de hacer esta pregunta.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

19. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

20. Sicherheit auf Europas Straßen (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über die Sicherheit auf Europas Straßen von Tomáš Zdechovský, Roberta Metsola und Michał Boni im Namen der Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten) (O-000060/2017 – B8-0601/2017) – (2017/2875(RSP)).

Tomáš Zdechovský, Autor. – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, již dva roky v okolí města Calais roste počet migrantů, kteří se chtějí nelegálně dostat do Spojeného království. K cestě chtějí využít čekající kamiony, do kterých se násilně vloupávají a nic netušící řidiči kvůli tomu čelí vysokým pokutám ze strany britských kontrol. Již v září 2015 byly zaznamenány první znepokojující případy českých, polských, rumunských, španělských, dánských, nizozemských a jiných řidičů, v jejichž zavazadlovém prostoru byli při kontrole na hranicích objeveni migranti. Zatímco francouzská kontrola v Calais nenašla v nákladovém prostoru kamionů žádné osoby, na britské straně při stejné kontrole objevili běžence, kteří bez vědomí řidičů pronikli do nákladového prostoru, protože se pokoušeli ilegálně dostat na území Velké Británie. V takovém případě byly britské úřady nekompromisní. Uložily pokutu řidiči, potažmo dopravní společnosti za převaděčství, ačkoliv prošli kontrolou ve Francii bez problémů a dodrželi veškeré bezpečnostní předpisy.

Tuto otázku vlastně odstartovala i situace z letošního jara, kdy zemřel polský řidič na základě toho, že mu do cesty byly vstaveny překážky na silnici. Vy jste ve své odpovědi Evropské komise napsali, že v současné době ani neexistuje žádný právní předpis EU, který by upravoval bezpečnost pozemní dopravy, která zůstává v pravomoci členských států. Ano, to je pravda. Ale na druhou stranu se domnívám, že bezpečnost řidičů a bezpečnost obyvatel EU je jednou ze sdílených kompetencí EU. Proto bych se chtěl obrátit na Vás s otázkou, jaká opatření v této souvislosti připravujete a jak efektivně předcházet těmto případům bezdůvodného obviňování řidičů z převaděčství.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, a year ago the Commission held an exchange of views on the impact of the migration crisis on the European commercial road transport sector and, in particular, on truck drivers in the Calais area. The Commission was aware then that the security threat to this vital sector was not only from irregular migrants, but also from organised crime seeking to steal vehicles and cargo for profit.

Accurate, up-to-date statistics are hard to find for criminal incidents affecting the road transport sector across all EU Member States. The most comprehensive data are collected by the Transported Asset Protection Association, which has recorded a 24% increase in the number of cargo crimes in August compared with August 2016. They recorded almost 8000 criminal incidents affecting hauliers over the five years from the start of 2012 to the end of 2016, with a rise of about 213% between the full-year figures for 2012 to 2016. About 4.3% of the incidents involved violence or threat of violence against the driver, although the figures suggest a downward trend.

Just over half of the incidents occurred in unsecured parking locations, with the majority happening at night. The worst hot-spots are motorway service stations or road laybys. It is important to add the caveat that these figures as they are based only on those reported to the Transported Asset Protection Association, and some EU Member States collect and report on many incidents compared with others. This data can therefore only be described as an indicative sample, and the actual number of incidents will be far higher.

Indeed, we must also sadly add another threat that has become all too apparent since the summer of last year, which is the hijacking of trucks by would-be terrorists to use them as a vehicle-ramming weapon against crowds of people. In these cases the threat to people's lives extends beyond the truck driver, as we have seen in numerous incidents across Europe this year.

We therefore take the matter very seriously, and within the limits of our competences continue to work with Member States and transport stakeholders to find viable and lasting ways to reduce the adverse impact of these threats on the critical road transport distribution chain.

The Commission believes in taking a holistic, rational and proportional approach in order to ensure high levels of security and safety in our road transport system, but with minimal disruption. We are taking action to help improve security for commercial road transport with a project underway, in partnership with the sector, to create a comprehensive security guidance toolkit so that everyone with a role to play in securing the road transport chain has the knowledge to better help protect it against a range of security threats and all kinds of unauthorised intrusions using best practice tips and guidance.

All relevant stakeholders have been consulted in the development of this toolkit. The Commission is now reviewing the delivery of the draft toolkit ahead of publication and dissemination over the coming months. This will include the translation of the toolkit into all Community languages and the creation of a website where additional information will be provided.

The use of digitally connected security systems will be a major enabler of the transformation of the current road transport system, including the development of new security solutions. In particular, the Commission supports Member State initiatives, such as the Swedish Government's response to the Stockholm attacks through the development of geo-fencing to automatically restrict commercial vehicles from entering centre city zones such as pedestrian areas.

The creation of safer and more secure truck parking areas along the trans-European transport network, the so-called TEN-T corridors, is a crucial element of the strategy to increase the security of drivers and cargo in road transport. The TEN-T Regulation specifically requires, in the TEN-T guidelines, that the corridor network is equipped with safe and secure parking areas approximately every 100 Km. To help make this a reality, the Commission has made EU funding available through our Connecting Europe Facility Programme over recent years to finance such parking places, and the Commission has provided almost EUR 30 million since 2015 to support nine secure parking projects.

The European Parliament additionally provided a budget of EUR 850 000 to the Commission earlier this year to be used towards further developing safe and secure parking areas across Europe. The Commission is using this funding to launch a twelve month study to identify the appropriate location of safe and secure parking areas and the best design for a parking reservation system. Most importantly, the study will deliver a concrete roadmap for the gradual completion of the network of safe and secure parking areas, including a description of the actions needed and their timing. The results of the study will constitute the basis for future work of the Commission to eventually ensure that drivers can rest in secure conditions and sleep soundly.

Improving the availability of secure truck parking is only part of the answer. Existing capacity needs to be optimised by information on the location and equipment of existing parking areas, as well as by optimising the parking spaces' specific methodologies.

On the basis of the Intelligent Transport Systems Directive, the Commission has adopted a delegated regulation on the provision of information services for safe and secure parking places for trucks and commercial vehicles. The delegated regulation indicates the way to collect, update, share and disseminate the necessary information on the location of the secure parking, including the provision of reservation services.

Емил Радев, от името на групата PPE. – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, „безопасни зони за паркиране“ в Европа в момента липсват почти в целия Европейски съюз. Необходимо е да бъдат създадени паркинги и места за почивка, снабдени със съответната технология за сигурност, както за водачите, така и за самите товари. Те трябва да обхванат както основните пътни артерии в Европа, така и ключовите пътни възли във всяка отделна държава членка.

Тази необходимост се подсилва допълнително и от предложените неотдавна промени, предвидени от някои държави членки, които въвеждат задължителни изисквания за почивка на шофьорите, при това при определени санитарни условия. Това на практика би означавало всеки един шофьор да „изоставя“ товара, който транспортира, и да отиде на хотел. Нещо, което в ежедневието на шофьора е немислимо, най-малкото поради липсата на сигурни и безопасни места, където превозните средства и товарът да бъдат оставени.

Но този въпрос е много по-комплексен. Той засяга също така и безопасността на пътя, както и намаляването на пътните инциденти и смъртните случаи, причинени от заспали на волана водачи. Защото загиналите по европейските пътища за миналата година например са общо 25 500 души, а според едно проучване във Великобритания, около 40% от инцидентите със заспали на волана шофьори включват водачи на камиони и товарни автомобили.

На второ място, обсъждайки въпроса с безопасността на пътя, е редно да бъде засегната и темата за гъстотата на пътната мрежа и трафика, а също така да се вземат предвид и стандартите за безопасност на автомобилния парк в Европа. Всички сме наясно, че държавите от Централна и най-вече Източна Европа имат нужда от допълнителна помощ под формата на европейски средства, за да наваксат с изграждането на своята пътна инфраструктура. Липсата на магистрали, обходни пътища за товарни автомобили и прилежащата им пътна инфраструктура, са допълнителна пречка пред решаването на този проблем и премахването на бариерите пред целостта на единния пазар. Нека си признаем – всяко забавяне, всяка пречка пред движението на дадена стока и услуга в рамките на Съюза е директна загуба за европейските фирми и конкурентоспособност.

Inés Ayala Sender, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, en este momento clave en el que estamos abordando la presentación del paquete legislativo más importante de los últimos años, relativo a la revisión de todas las normativas que organizan el transporte por carretera y donde precisamente hemos echado en falta más normativa —y más coraje también— en relación con la seguridad vial —aunque es verdad que esperamos que en la segunda parte del paquete aparezca el tema de la seguridad en las infraestructuras, aunque no es exactamente o no vemos, de momento, que pueda afrontar el problema actual—, necesitamos pues hablar precisamente y afrontar cuanto antes los incidentes que se están produciendo ya desde hace años.

Hablamos ahora de los últimos... Se ha hablado de los secuestros en caso de terrorismo, hemos hablado de los casos de Calais, como se planteaba en la pregunta. Pero nosotros también hemos tenido el caso de los camioneros españoles, que cada vez que cruzaban la frontera francesa eran también objeto de ataques por parte de los agricultores que no estaban contentos con la libre circulación de mercancías —para que nos vamos a engañar—. Es decir, que estos conductores están afrontando además nuevos retos.

Por lo tanto, si ahora se les va a exigir, como se está planteando, dormir lejos del camión, desde luego necesitamos llegar a compromisos serios y creíbles, no solamente sobre aparcamientos seguros, sino también y esencialmente para rehabilitar el sector, en vez de seguir denigrándolo como hasta ahora, y, sobre todo, para conseguir que haya más agentes de seguridad de tráfico en nuestras carreteras.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Nie pierwszy raz debatujemy w tej sali o bezpieczeństwie kierowców samochodów ciężarowych. Tylko w zeszłym roku co najmniej dwa razy apelowaliśmy do Komisji i francuskiego rządu o zdecydowane działania w Calais. Problemu nie udało się do tej pory w pełni rozwiązać, a cenę życia za tę nieskuteczność zapłacił polski kierowca ciężarówki. Kolejny polski kierowca poniósł śmierć w Berlinie, gdy islamski terrorysta kradł jego pojazd, żeby dokonać tchórzliwego ataku na bożonarodzeniowy jarmark.

Dlaczego Komisja tak mało miejsca poświęciła kwestiom bezpieczeństwa w swoich sławnych inicjatywach drogowych? Czy Pani Komisarz może wskazać, gdzie są zlokalizowane te bezpieczne parkingi i hotele, w których kierowcy według Komisji powinni odbierać dzienny odpoczynek? Może warto najpierw takie bezpieczne strefy parkowania zbudować, także dzięki finansowaniu z funduszy europejskich, a dopiero później zmieniać przepisy? Przedstawiony tu w maju pakiet legislacyjny nazwano „Europa w ruchu”, tylko czy na pewno jest to ruch ku bezpieczeństwu kierowców?

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, let us not be mistaken. We are not here to discuss today who attacked which driver and where and for what reasons. Nor are we here to discuss whether this debate is legitimate and valid. That would be to side-line the two important issues: on one hand, the lack of secure parking places and, on the other, the inability of the Member States to implement the legislation which is in place.

In this connection, it is worth mentioning that the driver is responsible for the truck and also for what the truck carries. As the Commissioner has already made clear, we have TEN-T guidelines, which say clearly that the Member States should be providing safe and secure parking facilities plus or minus every 100 kilometres. I would add that there is also an EU requirement for parking operators to provide information about the availability of these parking spaces, but Member States' compliance with this requirement is, if I may say so, basically a joke.

We can indeed ask how the Commission will safeguard security on European roads but we should not forget that Member States may be more to the forefront on this matter. They have to share information and make proper use of it, and they have to deliver for the TEN-T network.

I have a final remark to make to the Commission. We are in the situation that we are to be implementing legislation which we are soon to agree on, but we have a lack of parking places. Is it realistic to expect that we will be in a position to implement this legislation in the foreseeable future, in the next few years, if the Member States do not comply today with the legislation already in place? This is something we should bear in mind when we are negotiating and approving the new mobility legislation.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, je pense que mon intervention va être un peu en décalage. La sécurité sur les routes d'Europe, mais surtout vers l'Europe, est un vrai problème. Depuis une vingtaine d'années, Calais est un point de fixation qui illustre les conséquences des politiques européennes et surtout franco-britanniques. Le nombre de migrants, je vous rassure, chers collègues, a fortement diminué depuis la fin 2016. On est passé de 7 000 environ à quelques centaines, mais ce nombre tend à augmenter de nouveau.

Je compatis au sort des chauffeurs routiers, mais à Calais, au moins 150 migrants sont morts depuis 2002. On veut les priver d'abris et de nourriture. Un prêtre a dû s'opposer à la police pour permettre une distribution de repas sur le parvis de son église. C'est indigne et inhumain.

La justice a condamné la maire de Calais et l'État français pour qu'il soit enfin mis fin aux traitements inhumains et dégradants infligés à ces migrants.

Je pense que c'est en prenant en compte l'ensemble de ces situations que l'on pourra sécuriser le territoire pour ceux qui le traversent comme pour ceux qui y vivent, et éviter des drames, quels qu'ils soient.

Jean Lambert, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I want to pick up on the part of the question as it was written and to say that, if we are looking at Calais, it is a very longstanding issue. My first visit to the safe parking area there was some 15 years ago. It was an area which had been set up by the Calais Chamber of Commerce, and we have seen considerable growth of the infrastructure up there since, with steel fences, more police activity, and yet the problems persist.

All of us would agree that drivers should be able to operate safely, and we do need to tackle the criminal gangs who profit from desperate people here. We need to look at how we are doing in terms of cross-border police cooperation. But I also do not want to see any more dead unaccompanied minors falling from a truck when they should have been safe in the UK, had the Dublin system worked properly. So we do need a range of solutions to the problems we are looking at this evening, from asylum policy through to high technology.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, ohrozenie bezpečnosti nákladnej tranzitnej dopravy má niekoľko rovín, medzi ktorými musíme rozlišovať. V prvom rade treba povedať, že výkon dohľadu nad bezpečnosťou cestnej premávky a riešenie dopravných priestupkov, rovnako ako prevencia a stíhanie trestných činov ohrozenia majetku, zdravia a života sú výlučnou kompetenciou členských štátov Únie. No samotná oblasť dopravy a transeurópskych sietí spadá do skupiny zdieľaných kompetencií. Máme spoločné pravidlá pre bezpečnú prepravu pasažierov aj tovarov. Z európskeho rozpočtu sú spolufinancované cestné koridory. Tranzitná doprava má jednoducho európsky rozmer a Komisia by sa mala zaoberať problémami, ktoré ohrozujú jej plynulosť a bezpečnosť. Prijatie efektívnych opatrení na zvýšenie bezpečnosti kamiónov je veľmi dôležité aj z pohľadu blízkej budúcnosti. Už dnes sa vo viacerých členských štátoch testujú autonómne kamióny, ktoré by mali už o pár rokov začať jazdiť po európskych cestách. No zatiaľ čo umelá inteligencia môže výrazne znížiť nehodovosť a zvýšiť plynulosť cestnej premávky, je omnoho zraniteľnejšia voči nečakaným útokom.

Na záver je na mieste spomenúť ešte jeden veľmi citlivý rozmer európskej nákladnej tranzitnej dopravy. Je to skutočnosť, že väčšina vodičov je občanmi nových členských štátov. Bolo by veľmi nešťastné, ak by Únia zaváhala pri prijímaní opatrení na zvýšenie ich bezpečnosti. Preto som veľmi vďačná kolegovi, ktorí položili Komisii túto otázku, a pripájam sa k ich snahe ochrániť vodičov aj nimi prepravovaný náklad.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, la sicurezza di tutti gli utenti della strada è un argomento di primaria importanza e di cui discutiamo molto, soprattutto nella commissione per i trasporti e il turismo di cui faccio parte e da membro della stessa, posso assicurare che tale questione sarà largamente ripresa anche nel nuovo pacchetto di norme sulla mobilità che stiamo discutendo.

In particolare, gli autisti dei mezzi pesanti dovrebbero avere a disposizione delle aree dedicate per la sosta e il riposo, fornite di tutti i servizi ma soprattutto sicure. Essi devono poter riposare senza preoccuparsi né di difendere il loro carico da furti, né tantomeno della loro incolumità personale. I controlli da parte delle autorità sono purtroppo insufficienti in questo campo. L'Europa può fare molto a livello normativo, ma senza la collaborazione anche degli Stati membri, diventa difficile implementare le regole.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, разбирам и споделям притеснението за сигурността на шофьорите на камионите и на товара, който те транспортират. Те често стават жертва на набези от страна на нелегални имигранти, които в най-безобидния случай ги използват за безплатен транспорт до желаната от тях крайна точка. Това е причината, поради която съм много скептичен и категорично против желанието на лобистките интереси на част от държавите членки почивките на водачите да се извършват извън камионите.

Обществена тайна е, че по пътищата на Европа няма достатъчно хотели и охраняеми паркинги за извършването на такива почивки. Примери са Франция и Белгия. Там няма охраняеми хотели, а шофьорите се принуждават да напускат своите машини в нарушение на правилата.

Набезите върху товарите водят до увеличаване на застрахователните премии на товарите и/или дори отказ на застрахователните фирми да застраховат товари на камиони, преминаващи определени маршрути. С 200% е нараснала застрахователната премия за миналата година.

Призовавам Комисията да се откаже от тези свои желания, залегнали в проекта „Мобилност“, защото няма нищо по-важно от физическата сигурност на водачите на камионите.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señora comisaria, creo que es un acierto subrayar este problema en la agenda de la Comisión, en un momento que comenzamos el debate del paquete de transporte por carretera y en plena transición del concepto mismo de transporte, concebido como una suma de modos hacia un modelo integrado de movilidad.

Ahora que está en marcha la modificación del Reglamento sobre el tiempo de conducción y el descanso, que incide directamente sobre la seguridad de los conductores, la seguridad vial y las condiciones y la calidad del empleo en el sector, quisiera pedir que, en la modificación, o se eliminen o se precisen conceptos indeterminados, como qué se entiende por «hogar», por «descanso adecuado» y así otros muchos conceptos.

Esta cuestión está directamente vinculada a la que considero una necesaria definición de las «zonas de estacionamiento seguro» en términos de seguridad vial, pero también en términos de seguridad física y en materia de servicios para los conductores. Además, parece importante incidir, desde la perspectiva del transporte profesional, en impulsar una mayor coordinación entre las fuerzas de policía que se ocupan del tráfico y las que realizan los controles de seguridad en frontera a ambos lados de la misma, algo que puede evitar muchas congestiones.

Finalmente, esta reflexión debería incluir el fomento de los vehículos conectados, las ayudas a la conducción, los telepeajes y la gestión inteligente de las carreteras, incluida la información automatizada sobre zonas de estacionamiento seguro con herramientas compartidas que funcionen en el medio transfronterizo. Esto hará de la carretera algo más seguro.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πίσω από το πρόβλημα των οδηγών φορτηγών κρύβεται ένα μεγαλύτερο πρόβλημα: το μεταναστευτικό, το πρόβλημα των κλειστών συνόρων. Αυτό δεν το λένε ευθέως οι συνάδελφοι του Λαϊκού Κόμματος που υπέβαλαν την ερώτηση. Αναφέρονται σε επιθέσεις, αλλά υπονοούν τους απειλισμένους μετανάστες που είναι εγκλωβισμένοι σε σύνορα και λιμάνια. Άραγε, πόσοι μετανάστες πέθαναν από ασφυξία σε κρύπτες φορτηγών; Βεβαίως, οι οδηγοί φορτηγών έχουν την υποστήριξή μας, όχι μόνο για τα απάνθρωπα ωράρια, το στρες να είναι στην ώρα τους, τα κακά οδικά δίκτυα, τις επιθέσεις, αλλά και γιατί εξαιρούνται από την οδηγία για την απόσπαση των εργαζομένων. Όμως, όπως οι οδηγοί χρειάζονται ασφαλείς δρόμους, έτσι και οι πρόσφυγες χρειάζονται νόμιμους και ασφαλείς διαδρόμους διέλευσης, και εδώ δεν υπάρχει αντιπαλότητα μεταξύ τους.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Két évvel ezelőtt a calais-i kikötő környékén uralkodó szükségállapotok nyomán már felmerült a sofőrök biztonságának egyre súlyosbodó kérdése. Akkori írásbeli kérdésemre a Bizottság válaszában rámutatott a 2015. május 27-én elfogadott, migráncscsempészet elleni uniós cselekvési terv fontosságára a probléma leküzdéséhez. Két évvel később azt látjuk, hogy a kamionok terrorcselekmények végrehajtó eszközeivé, a hivatásos sofőrök pedig számos esetben áldozattá váltak. Mindez csak azt bizonyítja, hogy a Bizottság migránsválság kezelését célzó terve – más uniós kezdeményezésekhez hasonlóan – nem működik a gyakorlatban.

Beszélnünk kell a fuvarozók számának az állandó csökkenéséről, az utánpótlás hiányáról, a fuvarozók bérezéséről és más szociális kérdésekről, de mindez mit sem ér, ha sofőrök munkavégzésének biztonsági szintje annyira romlik, hogy lassan veszélyességi pótlékot kell fizetni azoknak, akik árut fuvaroznak Európa nagy kikötőibe, például Calais-ba. Mindeközben egyes tagállamok protekcionista intézkedéseket hoznak piacuk védelme érdekében, melyek aláássák a közös piacot, valamint az áruk és a szolgáltatások szabad áramlását.

Itt említhetnénk a hiányzó pihenőhelyeket, parkolókat. Azon kívül, hogy kevés van belőlük, nincs biztosítva bennük sem a sofőr sem a szállítmány biztonsága. Jól ismert tény, hogy gyakorlati, jogi és biztosítási kérdéseket is felvet a jármű elhagyása. Célunk az, hogy – különösen a hamarosan tárgyalásra kerülő mobilitási csomag révén – könnyítsünk a fuvarozók helyzetén és olyan körülményeket teremtsünk számukra, amelyek gyakorlati megoldást nyújtanak. Ezt valószínűleg a sofőrök is jobban értékelnék, mint a Bizottság és egyes tagállamok azon igyekezetét, hogy összkomfortos kabinjuk helyett kétes útszéli szálláshelyekre kényszerítsék őket!

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja mam odmienne zdanie co do słów, które tutaj padały na temat tego, jaką to katorzniczą pracę jest bycie kierowcą ciężarówki. Otóż nie, panowie, to nie jest wcale taka katorznicza praca. Czego natomiast byśmy oczekiwali, to pewnie minimum bezpieczeństwa, i to jest potrzebne. Minimum bezpieczeństwa zarówno w części inwestycyjnej, dlatego tak: droga i wzdłuż drogi, w tym także parkingi i usługa dodatkowa. Chciałbym widzieć na każdym parkingu radiowozy policyjne. Otóż rzadki jest to widok. Chciałbym widzieć na parkingu na przykład inspekcję transportu drogowego, która w każdym państwie istnieje. Jedna i druga instytucja najczęściej jest po to, żeby myśleć, jak ukarać kierowców, ale niekoniecznie po to, żeby im pomóc dla ich bezpieczeństwa, także dla bezpieczeństwa ładunku.

Jest faktem, że nie zawsze kierowcy są wyszkoleni, jest faktem, że są to kierowcy często pochodzący z państw, które oferują niższą płacę. Ale jest także faktem, że działają pod presją tej wielkiej taniej konkurencji.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ασφάλεια στους ευρωπαϊκούς δρόμους είναι πολύ σημαντικό θέμα και, φυσικά, πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε την ασφαλή διακίνηση των φορτηγών, τα οποία προκαλούν πάρα πολλά δυστυχήματα. Ταυτόχρονα, όμως, πρέπει να υπάρξει προστασία της ασφάλειας των οδηγών των φορτηγών αυτοκινήτων, καθώς και του εμπορεύματός τους.

Θα ήθελα όμως, κυρία Γιουρονά, να σας θέσω ένα σοβαρό θέμα που συμβαίνει στην Ελλάδα: αυτή τη στιγμή διεξάγεται πραγματικά πειρατεία από φορτηγά που έχουν βουλγαρικές πινακίδες, τα οποία επιτελούν εσωτερικό μεταφορικό έργο και παραμένουν πέραν των δέκα ημερών εντός της Ελλάδος, ενώ αυτό απαγορεύεται. Κάνουν εσωτερικά δρομολόγια και στην ουσία ανταγωνίζονται αθέμιτα τις ελληνικές επιχειρήσεις και δημιουργούν πάρα πολλά προβλήματα. Αυτό είναι ένα σοβαρό θέμα. Σας μεταφέρω την κραυγή αγωνίας των ιδιοκτητών και των οδηγών των ελληνικών φορτηγών αυτοκινήτων που δεν αντέχουν πλέον αυτόν τον αθέμιτο ανταγωνισμό από φορτηγά με βουλγαρικές πινακίδες τα οποία κυριολεκτικά κάνουν πειρατεία.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, cuando más de once millones de personas en la Unión Europea se ganan la vida en actividades relacionadas con el transporte de mercancías por carretera, se convierte en una obligación tener carreteras más seguras, zonas de descanso y aparcamientos seguros.

Pero no todo el problema se soluciona con una inversión para mejorar las infraestructuras: los tiempos de conducción y la calidad del descanso de los transportistas son pésimos. En muchísimas ocasiones, tras agotadoras jornadas de conducción, tienen que parar en cualquier lugar, sin derecho a un descanso digno, para continuar la marcha nada más despertarse. A esto se añaden los altos niveles de estrés que están teniendo los conductores por tener que vigilar la carga que transportan y, si no, hacerse cargo de los pagos y de las repercusiones que tiene perderla.

El peligro potencial que suponen estas situaciones es un problema para la seguridad en las carreteras, para los conductores y la sociedad. Hay que aumentar los controles, mejorar la legislación y, sobre todo, mejorar las condiciones de trabajo.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, embora nas últimas décadas se tenha registado, na União Europeia, um grande progresso em matéria de segurança rodoviária, o elevado número de vítimas mortais e de lesões graves continua a causar um grande sofrimento humano e custos económicos inaceitáveis, estimados em 100 mil milhões de euros anuais.

Em 2016, 25 mil pessoas perderam a vida nas estradas da União Europeia e outras 135 mil ficaram gravemente feridas. Dados da Comissão Europeia sobre a segurança rodoviária mostram uma diminuição de 2 % do número de vítimas mortais em 2016.

No entanto, e não obstante estes dados serem encorajadores, eles podem, contudo, ser insuficientes para a União Europeia alcançar o seu objetivo de reduzir para metade a mortalidade nas estradas entre 2010 e 2020. Para travar estes assassínios silenciosos foi assinada, em Malta, a Declaração de Valeta, que representa um compromisso comum dos Estados-Membros da União Europeia na promoção da segurança rodoviária e na redução da sinistralidade. Um dos principais objetivos é reduzir em 50 % o número de vítimas mortais em acidentes rodoviários em 2020, tendo como referencial o ano de 2010, e reduzir em 50 % o número de feridos graves em 2030 face a 2020.

O pacote denominado «Europa em Movimento» visa, em particular, tornar o trânsito mais seguro, no reconhecimento de que são necessárias ações de todos os intervenientes para reduzir os prejuízos e as mortes.

Senhora Comissária, a verdade é que, desde a aprovação deste pacote a 31 de maio, pouco se avançou na prevenção rodoviária e outras questões intimamente ligadas à segurança rodoviária continuam sem resposta, questões essas ligadas – como a Sra. Comissária aqui referiu – ao combate ao terrorismo e à falta de coordenação entre as polícias no combate ao crime.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, eu vreau să apreciez întrebarea pusă de colegi și cred că trebuie să o înțelegem corect. Aici este vorba de securitate și siguranță și există un complex de factori: calitatea drumurilor, infrastructura, parcări nepăzite, nerespectarea unor regulamente, pentru că, iată, sunt state care amendează șoferii care dorm în cabină ca să-și păzească marfa și sunt atacați sau găsesc a doua zi, dacă pleacă, camionul ocupat de altă persoană; încalcă regulamentul și amendează acești șoferi. Aici avem efecte economice, evident, cresc asigurările, unele firme de asigurări nu vor să mai asigure transportatorii și șoferii.

M-am întâlnit cu asociații ale transportatorilor, cu șoferi, toți se plâng de situația extraordinar de precară a siguranței în transport din punctul de vedere al parcarilor păzite, din punctul de vedere al lipsei de control, până la urmă, pentru că, așa cum spuneam aici, trebuie să avem și control la frontieră. Dar avem bandă de criminali, discutăm mai devreme, doamnă comisar la parchetul european, care fură din camioane pur și simplu.

Deci, aici avem nevoie de sprijinul Comisiei Europene, nu numai de cel al autorităților naționale.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Europa gli incidenti stradali sono una delle prime cause di morte, con più di 120.000 vittime all'anno. Dobbiamo essere realisti: non possiamo pensare di rendere attrezzate sicure tutte le autostrade d'Europa con un tratto di penna in pochi mesi. Occorre una cultura del lavoro che restituisca dignità e diritti ai trasportatori, con regole intelligenti che proibiscano turni di guida estenuanti, in particolare quelle a cui gli autisti sono obbligati per aggirare le norme sul cabotaggio e quelle a tutela del mercato unico.

Ma l'Europa deve anche puntare ad alzare la qualità media della sua rete viaria, senza trascurare le reti secondarie. Spesso nella stessa regione coesistono infrastrutture all'avanguardia e strade obsolete, poco illuminate e troppo trafficate e pericolose. Così come occorre rendere sicure le zone di parcheggio lungo le autostrade, spesso luogo di banali e grotteschi incidenti. Va predisposto al più presto un piano d'azione per rendere sicure le nostre strade: solo una sicurezza omogenea in tutta la rete viaria europea può abbassare il numero impressionante di vittime che ogni anno siamo costretti a contare.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Kan ik vandaag veilig mijn werk uitoefenen? Dat is wat veel vrachtwagenchauffeurs zich afvragen op het moment dat ze met hun truck door Europa rijden. Ik deel die zorgen van de vrachtwagenchauffeurs.

Het is dan ook om die reden dat ik met mijn collega Dennis de Jong de ministers van Verkeer van Nederland, België en Frankrijk heb aangeschreven en opgeroepen om maatregelen te nemen voor een veilige route naar Calais.

Mijn eerste vraag aan de commissaris is: is dit onderwerp nu in de Transportraad in september ook daadwerkelijk besproken?

Mijn tweede vraag zou zijn: als we nou in 2015 als Europees Parlement opgeroepen hebben tot meer veilige parkeerplaatsen, en de commissaris zegt dat er met Europees geld in de afgelopen periode negen aangelegd zijn, welke lidstaten moeten dan meer doen om de veiligheid van onze chauffeurs te garanderen? Want volgens mij hebben wij hier als Europees Parlement en Europese Commissie en de lidstaten een gezamenlijke opdracht.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, to byla velmi zajímavá debata. Já, když jsem konfrontován ve své zemi s experty na dopravu, tak všichni hovoří právě o bezpečných parkovacích zónách. Myslím si, že je to mimořádně důležité téma, které by měla řešit EU, protože pokud tyto parkovací zóny mají být určitým způsobem logicky rozmístěné po Evropě, pak toto musí koordinovat EU. Děkuji paní komisařko, že jste ve své řeči tomuto tématu věnovala relativně velkou pozornost, ale přesto si myslím, že do budoucna bude potřeba, aby Evropa zde sehrála ještě mnohem větší roli.

My asi nevyřešíme násilí na řidičích kamionů, to asi vždy bude spadat do kompetence jednotlivých národních států. Ale v oblasti celkové zvýšení bezpečnosti kamionové přepravy po evropském kontinentě a v oblasti zajištění určitého statutu pro jednotlivé, řekněme, řidiče kamionů můžeme sehrát svoji roli. A právě ta parkovací místa jsou, podle mého názoru, mimořádně důležitá.

Der Präsident. – Bevor ich Frau Kommissarin Jourová das Wort erteile, will ich sagen, dass wir eine sehr breite Debatte erlebt haben, von Flüchtlingen bis hin zu Kabotage. Ich will keines dieser Themen geringschätzen, aber ich will allen Rednern danken, die sich in ihren Wortbeiträgen auf den Kern der Anfrage bezogen haben.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I wish to thank the House very much for this important and interesting discussion. As I said at the beginning of this debate, for the Commission it is of the utmost importance that the road transport sector can function well and that the safety and security of drivers is ensured.

The road freight sector is facing a complex range of threats which continue to cause increased costs and delays, affecting the competitiveness and viability of the many small and medium-sized enterprises, which are the backbone of the sector. The Commission is working hard to find solutions to mitigate these security issues through a mix of interventions which include funding and the development of best practice guidance and tools to help the sector to improve its overall security.

This is in addition to actions that Member States and regional governments themselves must take to better secure their roads. There is no single magic solution that will solve all of these problems overnight, so the focus of the Commission will remain on working with our partners to collectively improve the security of Europe's roads in the long term.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

22. Schluss der Sitzung

Der Präsident. – Ich danke allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die diese Aussprache bis zum Schluss verfolgt haben. Auch den Diensten danke ich. Ich wünsche allen einen guten Nachhauseweg und eine gesegnete Nachtruhe.

(Die Sitzung wird um 21.48 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



C/2024/3012

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 5. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3012)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	3
2. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (Aussprache)	3
3. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache)	17
3.1. Lage von Menschen mit Albinismus in Malawi und anderen afrikanischen Ländern	17
3.2. Die Fälle der Wortführer der Krimtataren Ahtem Çiygoz und İlmi Ümerov sowie des Journalisten Mykola Semena	23
3.3. Lage auf den Malediven	31
4. Abstimmungsstunde	36
4.1. Lage von Menschen mit Albinismus in Malawi und anderen afrikanischen Ländern (RC-B8-0543/2017, B8-0543/2017, B8-0544/2017, B8-0546/2017, B8-0547/2017, B8-0551/2017, B8-0553/2017, B8-0554/2017, B8-0562/2017) (Abstimmung)	36
4.2. Die Fälle der Wortführer der Krimtataren Ahtem Çiygoz und İlmi Ümerov sowie des Journalisten Mykola Semena (RC-B8-0545/2017, B8-0545/2017, B8-0548/2017, B8-0552/2017, B8-0557/2017, B8-0559/2017) (Abstimmung)	36
4.3. Lage auf den Malediven (RC-B8-0549/2017, B8-0549/2017, B8-0550/2017, B8-0555/2017, B8-0556/2017, B8-0558/2017, B8-0560/2017, B8-0561/2017) (Abstimmung)	36
4.4. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (A8-0290/2017 - Barbara Matera) (Abstimmung)	37
4.5. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (A8-0251/2017 - Joëlle Bergeron) (Abstimmung)	37

Inhalt	Seite
5. Stimmerklärungen	37
5.1. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (A8-0290/2017 - Barbara Matera) .	37
5.2. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (A8-0251/2017 - Joëlle Bergeron)	40
6. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	42
7. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	42
8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	43
9. Standpunkt des Rates in erster Lesung: siehe Protokoll	43
10. Europäischer Aktionsplan für die Sozialwirtschaft (Aussprache)	43
11. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	50
12. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll	50
13. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll	50
14. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll	50
15. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll	50
16. Schluss der Sitzung	50
17. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode	50

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 5. OKTOBER 2017

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 9.00)

2. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Pierwszym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Joëlle Bergeron w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie systemów penitencjarnych i warunków panujących w zakładach karnych (2015/2062(INI)) (A8-0251/2017)

Temat jest mi bliski, bo za czasów komunizmu sam byłem krótko więźniem politycznym. Z zainteresowaniem będę więc tę debatę prowadził.

Joëlle Bergeron, rapporteure. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je vous remercie de me donner la parole pour vous présenter ce rapport d'initiative traitant des systèmes pénitentiaires et des conditions de vie dans les prisons en Europe.

Comme certains d'entre vous, j'avais des idées préconçues sur les prisons, la population carcérale et le personnel pénitentiaire. C'est pourquoi je suis allée voir concrètement ce qui se passe sur le terrain, en France et dans d'autres États membres, afin de prendre en compte l'avis de tous les intervenants: détenus, personnel, administration pénitentiaire, services d'insertion et de probation, responsables ministériels.

Je tiens d'ailleurs tout particulièrement à remercier M^{me} Chinnici et M^{me} Hautala qui m'ont permis de visiter des établissements dans leur pays respectif, c'est-à-dire l'Italie et la Finlande.

J'ai moi-même effectué un grand nombre de visites en France. Les intervenants du monde carcéral nous ont accordé beaucoup de temps afin de nous faire comprendre leur situation, les difficultés qui se posent à eux, et ils nous ont démontré qu'il y avait d'autres voies que le «tout carcéral».

La situation et les conditions de vie des personnes incarcérées sont un vrai problème humain. Je voudrais vous rappeler quelques chiffres: en 2014, selon les chiffres du Conseil de l'Europe, il y avait un peu plus de 1,6 millions de détenus en Europe. Ce chiffre inclut les personnes emprisonnées après condamnation, mais aussi celles qui sont en détention provisoire.

Toujours selon le Conseil de l'Europe, le taux de population pénitentiaire aurait diminué de 7 % entre 2013 et 2014. Cependant, la surpopulation n'en demeure pas moins une question centrale des systèmes pénitentiaires puisque, si le taux d'occupation carcérale est de 117 % en Europe, il est de plus de 200 % dans les maisons d'arrêts, et je vous rappelle que ces établissements mélangent les condamnés et les personnes en attente de condamnation.

La surpopulation carcérale entraîne des conditions de vie déplorables qui relèvent d'un traitement inhumain et dégradant au sens de l'article 3 de la convention européenne des droits de l'homme. C'est sur la base de ce texte et de ses recommandations que ce rapport a été élaboré.

À la surpopulation s'ajoutent tous les problèmes liés à la vétusté des structures pénitentiaires, au manque de soins et de suivi médical, à la violence entre détenus, mais aussi entre détenus et personnel pénitentiaire.

Ce personnel que j'ai rencontré, bien qu'il soit souvent en sous-effectif et se sente mal considéré, effectue sa mission avec un professionnalisme et une humanité impressionnants.

Cette prise de contact directe avec les gens de terrain, mais aussi avec des experts juristes et des associations qui suivent ces problématiques carcérales, m'a permis de réaliser la complexité de ce sujet et la nécessité d'aborder toutes les facettes de la vie carcérale, à savoir notamment: les conditions de vie et les soins des détenus; la protection des plus vulnérables (malades, femmes et mineurs); le maintien des liens familiaux des détenus; l'éducation, l'instruction et la réinsertion; la prévention, l'identification et le traitement de la radicalisation; la formation et les conditions de travail du personnel pénitentiaire.

Toutes ces problématiques sont liées les unes aux autres, et il en va du devoir des États membres de développer des politiques pénitentiaires respectueuses de la dignité de chacun sans négliger un traitement efficace et adapté de la délinquance.

Les faits sont têtus et prouvent que le système du «tout carcéral» peut ne pas être le plus efficace, voire, dans certains cas, être contre-productif. C'est pourquoi il me semble nécessaire d'encourager les bonnes pratiques existantes dans certains États membres, et notamment dans les pays scandinaves, qui privilégient la prévention, les peines alternatives, la prise en charge médico-sociale des détenus et la préparation à la réinsertion via des systèmes de prisons ouvertes.

Lorsque l'incarcération est indispensable, nous devons garder à l'esprit que la mission de la prison est aussi la préparation à la réinsertion des détenus pour éviter une récidive qui, dans certains cas, peut atteindre plus de 50 % dans les cinq ans qui suivent la sortie. Une réinsertion sociale réussie réduit la récidive.

Le fait que je ne sois pas partisane du tout carcéral ne veut pas dire pour autant que je sois naïve ou laxiste. Ma conception vise à donner un réel sens à l'incarcération. Il faut protéger les détenus vulnérables des détenus les plus dangereux si nous voulons éviter les risques de radicalisation et la chute dans le grand banditisme. Les mesures alternatives permettent d'éviter les contacts entre les petits délinquants et les détenus les plus dangereux.

En conclusion, je vous dirai que je suis consciente que tous les esprits ne sont pas encore formés à cette conception plus humaniste de l'univers carcéral. J'espère que le temps vous permettra d'évoluer sur la question. Il faut que les mentalités changent, que les volontés politiques s'affirment sans démagogie électorale.

Ce sujet nous concerne tous. La prison reflète l'état social et moral de notre société, mais également notre conception des droits fondamentaux de la personne.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank honourable Members for their report. Although detention conditions are primarily the responsibility of Member States, who have agreed to respect the existing Council of Europe standards on the matter, the Commission attaches great importance to respect for the fundamental rights of persons in detention in the European Union. Improving prison conditions has become a priority at EU level because, among other reasons, they affect the efficient operation of EU mutual recognition instruments such as the European Arrest Warrant and because of the danger of radicalisation in prisons. The Commission therefore fully supports this own-initiative report from the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE).

Increasing prisons' capacity is not the sole solution to overcrowding as the prison population tends to rise at the same rate as prison capacity. The focus should therefore rather be on the improvement of existing penitentiary structures, many of which in different Member States are obsolete and do not function properly in terms of rehabilitation services. To facilitate that we have undertaken a mapping exercise to see how different EU funds could be employed to improve the situation in prisons in the EU. I have raised this several times with Justice Ministers, who are not always fully aware of the possibilities the European funds on regional and cohesion policy offer in that regard.

But I would also like to mention the importance of alternatives to detention. Member States have committed themselves under the EU Framework Decisions I just mentioned to accept alternative sentences, both in the pre-trial and the post-trial stage. Even if the Framework Decisions oblige the Member States to adopt a certain number of alternatives, for these alternatives to be used you need a certain practice and a developed probation structure. That is what is lacking in many Member States. This is an area where a lot could be done at EU level. Some Member States are already well advanced in this area and others could learn from them. We could help to exchange best practices among Member States.

The last point I would like to touch upon is radicalisation. Some of the individuals involved in terrorist attacks in Europe were allegedly radicalised while serving prison sentences for other crimes. We need to find ways to prevent such violent radicalisation in our prisons and to help radicalised individuals to find other paths when they leave prison. Following our Ministerial Conference on the matter in 2015 and the linked Council conclusions, our priority is to use all available means, including financial, to support Member States to speed up the setting up of projects such as the development of deradicalisation and rehabilitation programmes in and outside prisons, risk assessment tools and training schemes for prison staff, judges and prosecutors in the Member States. To this effect we made EUR 6.5 million available in 2015 and 2016 under the Justice Programme and continue to do so in 2017 and 2018. Judicial training will remain an important factor. Prison staff and probation officers are covered by the judicial training course.

I would also like to remind you of the Commission's High-Level Expert Group on radicalisation that will allow for further discussion with Member States on the possible options for further and future more structured cooperation mechanisms in this area. One of the priority topics to be discussed is indeed radicalisation in prisons. I am planning to come back to this issue of radicalisation in prisons at a high-level meeting before the end of the year.

The Commission also pays particular attention to the children of parents in prison, of whom it is estimated that there are about 800 000 in the EU. Therefore, this year's European Forum on the Rights of the Child, which will take place from 6 to 8 November 2017, will have a focus on the deprivation of liberty of children and alternatives to detention. Furthermore, the situation of the children of parents in prison will also be addressed as one of the main topics.

Thank you again for your report as it supports our efforts in tackling the various aspects of detention in the EU.

Barbara Matera, *relatrice per parere della commissione per i diritti della donna e l'uguaglianza di genere*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli deputati, le donne rappresentano il 4,5% dei detenuti nelle carceri dell'Unione, un numero che oscilla intorno alle 25.000 unità. In numerose occasioni sono neo-mamme e madri di bambini. Per questo motivo nella mia relazione ho sottolineato la necessità che le carceri europee tenessero conto delle speciali esigenze di queste donne.

Trovo importante che gli Stati membri garantiscano il soddisfacimento di tutte le necessità igieniche e sanitarie delle donne, con riferimento alla salute ginecologica, alle cure pre- e post-natali, e ad adottare misure adeguate per far fronte ai livelli di sproporzionamento elevato, soprattutto nell'utilizzo di stupefacenti all'interno delle carceri.

Per far fronte a queste problematiche, ho richiesto la necessità che le carceri femminili siano dotate di personale prevalentemente femminile, in particolare per le speciali attenzioni che devono essere date alle donne in stato di gravidanza in carcere, durante e dopo il parto, fornendo spazi adeguati per l'allattamento, per l'assistenza infermieristica qualificata e specializzata.

Seguendo il principio secondo cui il minore non deve pagare per le responsabilità della madre, ho così ritenuto opportuno suggerire una riflessione su modelli alternativi di detenzione. Non chiediamo sconti di pena ma semplicemente condizioni più umane.

José Inácio Faria, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, antes de mais quero cumprimentar a minha colega Joëlle Bergeron pelo seu excelente trabalho. Muito obrigado.

Em 2014 havia mais de meio milhão de reclusos nas prisões da União Europeia, número que inclui as pessoas condenadas a cumprir uma pena definitiva e as que foram acusadas de um crime e se encontram em prisão preventiva que, de acordo com os dados do Eurostat, são mais de 20 % da população prisional total.

Embora as condições de detenção e a gestão das prisões sejam da responsabilidade dos Estados-Membros, a União tem também de desempenhar um papel necessário na salvaguarda dos direitos fundamentais dos detidos e na criação do espaço europeu de liberdade, segurança e de justiça. Há consideráveis diferenças entre os sistemas judiciais e penitenciários utilizados nos países da União, nomeadamente no que respeita à adoção de medidas alternativas, à detenção e a penas substitutivas das penas de curta duração.

Esta Casa aprovou, em 99, uma importante resolução sobre as condições das prisões na União, adaptações e penas de substituição. Passados quase 20 anos estamos de novo a discutir este assunto e muitas das premissas e situações então identificadas são as mesmas daquelas que aqui hoje discutimos.

Caros Colegas, creio que há necessidade de convergência das formas de exercício da justiça nos Estados-Membros, apesar das dificuldades que tal implica. Hoje é possível constatar graves problemas no sistema prisional, como disse a Sra. Comissária, de sobrepopulação carcerária, consumo de substâncias de uso ilícito, taxa alarmante de números de suicídios e a radicalização em muitas das prisões da União que são fenómenos muito preocupantes que requerem uma atenção particular.

Por tudo isto, caros Colegas, entendo que as instituições da União devem apoiar técnica e economicamente, tanto quanto possível, a melhoria dos sistemas e das condições prisionais, sobretudo nos Estados-Membros que enfrentam graves dificuldades financeiras. A situação nas prisões da Europa é preocupante e o Parlamento Europeu tem um papel indeclinável na inversão desta situação.

Caterina Chinnici, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria io desidero innanzitutto ringraziare la collega Bergeron per l'ottimo lavoro svolto e tutti i relatori ombra. Come emerso nel corso delle visite svolte dalla stessa relatrice in alcuni istituti penitenziari e come è stato giustamente evidenziato nella relazione, il sovraffollamento, condizioni di vita degradanti, la mancanza di attività formative, la carenza talvolta di personale specializzato sono aspetti purtroppo comuni a diversi Stati membri dell'Unione.

Tuttavia, il testo non si limita ad evidenziare i malfunzionamenti esistenti nei sistemi penitenziari europei, ma individua anche linee guida e buone prassi da attuare negli istituti di pena degli Stati membri. E se pure la gestione dei sistemi carcerari rientra nella competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri, l'Unione europea può e deve svolgere un ruolo chiave in materia di salvaguardia dei diritti fondamentali dei detenuti.

Il detenuto è prima di tutto un essere umano, titolare di diritti, la cui dignità deve essere sempre garantita e salvaguardata. Assicurare ad ogni detenuto condizioni di vita dignitose, non è soltanto un obbligo umanitario, ma costituisce il presupposto indispensabile per un percorso di recupero che trova nell'accesso a misure alternative, lo strumento più idoneo per consentirne la risocializzazione e il reinserimento nella vita civile.

I dati raccolti nel corso della stesura della relazione confermano appunto questa tesi: infatti, i condannati che hanno beneficiato di misure alternative presentano tassi di recidiva molto più bassi rispetto a chi sconta l'intera pena in regime di detenzione. Il crescente ricorso a pene alternative o a misure di comunità, comunque, dovrà essere accompagnato dalle necessarie riforme dei sistemi giudiziari, educativi e sociali, così come lei stessa, signora Commissaria ha sottolineato.

La buona riuscita dei processi rieducativi richiede anche però l'indispensabile contributo del personale di polizia penitenziaria, sempre in prima linea nel rapporto con i detenuti. Alla polizia penitenziaria vanno garantite risorse adeguate, supporto ed appropriata formazione, soprattutto alla luce delle nuove sfide cui i sistemi penitenziari degli Stati membri devono far fronte.

Penso in particolare al fenomeno della radicalizzazione, che non potrà essere adeguatamente prevenuto e contrastato senza adeguato monitoraggio e specifici programmi di trattamento penitenziario.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen, *for ECR-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Det er ikke og bliver aldrig en primær bekymring for mig at skaffe bedre forhold til Europas kriminelle, både fordi det først og fremmest er en opgave, der skal varetages af medlemsstaterne, og sekundært fordi vi først og fremmest bør stå på ofrenes side.

Når det er sagt, er det utroligt væsentligt, at medlemsstaterne tager deres ansvar på sig. Det vil være bedre, hvis alle medlemsstater f.eks. tog egne dømte borgere tilbage, som reglerne foreskriver, hurtigt og uden tøven. Det vil være godt, hvis den europæiske arrestordre kommer til at virke på en bedre og mere tilfredsstillende måde, og vi kan kun appellere til, at alle medlemslande inkl. dem, der har været med i lidt mindre end ti år, lever op til de fælles forpligtigelser, der er indgået for at have et velfungerende, åbent og transparent arbejdsmarked, hvor vi har tillid til, at vi samarbejder mod kriminaliteten. Det er det, der er hovedopgaven for europæiske politikere, både her i huset og i de forskellige nationale parlamenter.

Angelika Mlinar, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, in some EU Member States detention conditions fail to comply with international law and human rights standards, especially those included in the European Convention on Human Rights and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. I welcome that this resolution is addressing the main problems prisons in the EU face such as overpopulation, radicalisation of prisoners, outdated facilities, lack of medical care, violence, lack of resources, poor staff levels and violations of fundamental rights of prisoners.

Member States should exchange best practices and follow recommendations, especially concerning the modernisation of prisons and the development of educational and practical skills to facilitate reintegration. In addition, special attention should be paid to vulnerable, elderly and disabled prisoners and the specific needs of women as well as children. In this regard, it is vital to improve the training of prison staff also with the aim of countering radicalisation in prisons.

As a Member of the Committee on Women's Rights, I would like to address the importance of hygiene standards within prisons and the provision of health services such as pre- and post-natal care. In this regard, it is important to highlight that the automatic separation of a mother from her child creates an additional penalty and can cause major emotional disturbances. Therefore, I call on the Member States to enable mothers to stay with their children as long as possible by providing adequate spaces for breastfeeding and extending visiting and telephone time between children and their parents.

Josu Juaristi Abaunz, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, gracias a la ponente por su trabajo. Los derechos humanos de todos los ciudadanos deben ser garantizados. Los de los presos y presas también. En demasiadas ocasiones, las condiciones de vida en prisión llegan al trato inhumano o degradante. Es una muy buena noticia que este informe se base en el principio de reintegración. En él se habla de que la prisión preventiva debe ser una medida de último recurso, de que la cárcel es particularmente inadecuada, por ejemplo, para los presos gravemente enfermos, y sería el primer texto de la Unión en condenar la política penitenciaria de alejamiento que aplican algunos Estados miembros.

Como consecuencia de la política de dispersión que aplican los Estados español y francés, solo dos de los 314 presos y presas vascas de motivación política están en prisiones del País Vasco; veintiuno están gravemente enfermos. Este informe es un primer paso para pedir a la Comisión Europea que regule los derechos de los presos a nivel europeo y que establezca más garantías.

Eva Joly, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je voudrais d'abord rendre hommage à ma collègue, M^{me} Bergeron, pour son engagement sur ce sujet. On sent vraiment que ça lui tient à cœur, à juste titre. Un grand merci à vous.

À quoi sert la prison? Après-guerre, en France, la réforme Amor affirmait qu'elle devait simultanément protéger la société, respecter les détenus et favoriser leur réinsertion. Soixante-dix ans plus tard, en France et dans la majorité des États membres, elle ne remplit aucune de ces trois missions.

La prison ne protège pas la société, elle n'est qu'une illusion d'efficacité qui sanctionne surtout les populations précaires. Nos sociétés criminalisent de plus en plus des faits mineurs et condamnent à la prison plus souvent et plus longtemps. Cela est surtout vrai pour les petits délits, alors que les délits en col blanc sont encore largement tolérés et non poursuivis.

L'incarcération entraîne une désocialisation professionnelle et familiale, et potentiellement une resocialisation dans les milieux délinquants criminels, voire radicaux. La prison augmente également le risque de récidive. Est-ce vraiment cela protéger la société? Les détenus, loin d'être respectés, sont niés dans leur humanité. Partout, la logique sécuritaire s'est imposée, alors même que la criminalité diminuait. Le nombre de détenus a par conséquent explosé, la surpopulation carcérale a atteint des sommets et les conditions de détention se sont cruellement dégradées. Les maisons d'arrêt en France ont un taux moyen d'occupation de 170 %. Combien de condamnations de la CEDH faudra-t-il pour que les capacités d'accueil soient enfin respectées? Quand accepterons-nous de dépénaliser les infractions mineures?

Enfin, la réinsertion des détenus est loin d'être favorisée: 15 % seulement des détenus en France ont un travail en maison d'arrêt, il est très difficile d'y suivre un enseignement, ou même d'avoir accès à des livres, y exercer sa citoyenneté est un parcours de combattant. Faute de véritables programmes de réinsertion et de suivi personnalisé, la peine de prison est vide de sens. Emprisonner plus, c'est donc moins bien défendre la société.

D'autres réponses plus efficaces existent. Le rapport d'initiative présenté aujourd'hui formule de bonnes recommandations en ce sens. À nos gouvernements d'en tirer les conséquences.

À quoi sert la prison en Europe, en 2017? À faussement rassurer la société, certainement pas à la protéger. La prison aujourd'hui, c'est de l'argent perdu pour les contribuables, du temps perdu pour les prisonniers et peine perdue pour la société.

Laura Ferrara, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nonostante il tasso di occupazione delle carceri in Europa sia leggermente diminuito negli ultimi anni, rimane ancora gravissimo il disagio causato dall'eccessivo sovraffollamento dei penitenziari. Una situazione che diventa ancor più drammatica se si pensa alla vetustà della stragrande maggioranza delle carceri, alla carenza di adeguati servizi sanitari, alla violenza che spesso alberga nelle prigioni e, non ultimo, alle difficilissime e spesso sottovalutate condizioni di lavoro del personale penitenziario.

Come già ribadito da questo Parlamento, i diritti fondamentali dei detenuti devono essere garantiti dalle autorità nazionali. Pertanto, è necessario che gli Stati membri affrontino con urgenza il tema dell'abuso delle misure di custodia cautelare, così come quello delle misure alternative alla detenzione che favoriscono la rieducazione e il reinserimento sociale dei condannati, socialmente non pericolosi.

La relazione della collega Bergeron ha il pregio di mettere in risalto gli aspetti critici di una realtà che, di solito, siamo abituati ad ignorare, ricordando che la bussola che deve guidarci è sempre il rispetto dei diritti fondamentali e la salvaguardia della dignità umana dei detenuti.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, le rapport Bergeron ne présente rigoureusement aucun intérêt. Pétri de bons sentiments, il condamne la surpopulation carcérale et préconise de développer des peines alternatives à la prison. On croirait lire la loi Taubira. De façon surréaliste, le rapport Bergeron espère même «la mise en place d'une démocratie représentative dans les prisons».

Face à ce délire, digne de l'ultragauche, je tiens à rappeler que la politique pénitentiaire relève de la souveraineté des États et non de la compétence de l'Union européenne. C'est pourquoi le groupe Europe des nations et des libertés a déposé un projet alternatif de résolution qui appelle les États à assumer leur souveraineté et à prendre deux mesures radicales pour diminuer la surpopulation carcérale.

Premièrement, reprendre le contrôle de leurs frontières nationales pour empêcher certains criminels d'entrer et, deuxièmement, conclure des accords bilatéraux avec des pays tiers pour que les détenus étrangers y purgent leur peine.

Puisqu'il me reste cinq secondes, j'en profite pour signaler que ma collègue, Christelle Lechevalier, est présente ici même, aujourd'hui, en remplacement de Marine Le Pen, et lui souhaiter la bienvenue.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κατάσταση στα καταστήματα κράτησης σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη είναι πραγματικά τραγική: υπερπληθυσμός, ελλείψεις προσωπικού, απαρχαιωμένες εγκαταστάσεις. Στην Ελλάδα αντιμετωπίζουμε, επιπλέον, και το πρόβλημα του τεράστιου αριθμού αλλοδαπών κρατουμένων με ό,τι αυτό συνεπάγεται για τις συνθήκες που επικρατούν. Η έκθεση όμως ασχολείται μόνο με τις συνθήκες διαβίωσης των κρατουμένων. Εστιάζει μόνο στο πώς θα μειωθούν οι ποινές τους, αδιαφορώντας για τα θύματά τους. Αδιαφορεί για τους σωφρονιστικούς υπαλλήλους που η ζωή και η υγεία τους κάθε μέρα είναι σε κίνδυνο. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επέβαλε στην Ελλάδα περικοπή δαπανών, που είχε ως αποτέλεσμα την έλλειψη προσωπικού και την αδυναμία κατασκευής νέων εγκαταστάσεων ή εκσυγχρονισμού των ήδη υπαρχόντων. Με τον περιβόητο «νόμο Παρασκευόπουλου», τον υπ' αριθ. 4322/15 για την αποσυμφόρηση των φυλακών, περισσότεροι από 2.000 κρατούμενοι στην Ελλάδα αφέθηκαν ελεύθεροι. Κανείς δεν μπορεί να αμφισβητήσει πως το νομοθέτημα απέδωσε οικονομικά, αλλά μετά τις αποφυλακίσεις είχαμε δεκάδες περιπτώσεις καταδικών οι οποίοι κατέληξαν να διαπράττουν, εκ νέου, αξιοποιίνες πράξεις. Σας καλώ, λοιπόν, να αντιστρέψετε την οπτική σας γωνία, να υποστηρίξετε τη διάθεση νέων κονδυλίων και να επικεντρωθείτε σε μια πολιτική που θα προασπίζεται τα θύματα, την κοινωνία και όσους την υπηρετούν και όχι αυτούς που την υπονομεύουν.

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE). – Hr. formand! Nu håber jeg ikke, at denne betænkning ender som en papirflyver i Kommissionen!

Der er ingen tvivl om, at det er medlemsstaternes eget ansvar og også kompetence at sørge for, at der er orden i tingene. Jeg synes, det er bekymrende, fordi Kommissionen er traktatens vogter, at der er lande i Europa, medlemmer af EU, der decideret bryder menneskerettighedskonventionens artikel 3 den ene gang efter den anden.

Jeg vil sige, at jeg kommer fra et land, Danmark, hvor vi har denne problematik inde på livet, fordi Menneskerettighedsdomstolen i 2016 udtalte sig om den plads, en frihedsberøvet skal have at råde over, og Højesteret i Danmark på den baggrund har besluttet, at fire rumænske statsborgere ikke kan udleveres til afsoning i Rumænien, da der ikke kan garanteres dem et rum på 2-3 m². Højesteret har altså afgjort, at disse personer ikke kan udsendes, og at det vil være i strid med Menneskerettighedskonventionens artikel 3. Det er helt uhørt, at man har en europæisk udleveringsarrest, hvor man ikke kan udlevere en mand, der skal hjem og afsone 4½ år i Rumænien på grund af, at man ikke kan sikre vedkommende ordentlige forhold! Vi har folk, der er dømt for menneskehandel i Danmark, der ikke kan komme til Rumænien og afsone.

Vi har EU-regler om, at man skal modtage egne statsborgere til afsoning, hvis der er en reststraf på seks måneder. Her står vi altså med sager, hvor folk er idømt længere fængselsstraffe, og hvor det land, hvori kriminaliteten er begået, hænger på den, fordi der er EU-lande, som ikke har orden i sagerne, og dette er det efter min mening faktisk Kommissionens ansvar også at påpege.

Hvis et land kan være medlem af EU, kan det også sørge for, at Menneskerettighedskonventionen overholdes. Rumænien har faktisk i dette tilfælde tabt 89,9 % af sagerne ved Menneskerettighedsdomstolen. Jeg synes, det er beskæmmende, og det bør Kommissionen gøre noget ved.

(Taleren accepterede at besvare et blåt kort-spørgsmål i henhold til forretningsordenens artikel 162, stk. 8)

Paul Rübig (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich möchte den Kollegen Bendtsen zur sozialen Situation der Häftlinge fragen. Wenn jemand aus Rumänien in Dänemark eingesperrt wird, dann hat er natürlich auch mit der Sprache Probleme und hat dann auch im Gefängnis nicht die Möglichkeit, sich wieder zu resozialisieren.

Wäre es nicht ein Menschenrecht, dass ein Rumäne auch ein Recht hat, wieder in ein rumänisches Gefängnis zu gehen, weil dort natürlich die Kommunikation deutlich besser sein könnte und die Wiedersozialisierung in diesem Sinne auch?

Bendt Bendtsen (PPE), Blåt kort-svar. – Jo, det er jeg fuldstændig enig i, og derfor mener jeg, at man må sørge for, at rumænske statsborgere, der er dømt for kriminalitet i Danmark, kan komme hjem og afsone hjemme. Det er så ikke altid, at de vil det, fordi forholdene i de rumænske fængsler er så ringe, som de er for nærværende.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, dragi colegi, statisticile europene arată că, pe de o parte, numărul femeilor aflate în detenție crește într-un ritm mai rapid decât în cazul bărbaților și, pe de altă parte, rata de recidivă și de reînțoarcere în detenție poate depăși 50% în perioada de 5 ani după ieșirea din închisoare. Consider că este benefic pentru Uniunea Europeană să coopereze cu statele membre pentru a găsi soluții comune la nivel european privind dezvoltarea unui sprijin educațional și social în vederea pregătirii pentru eliberarea deținuților, precum și o supraveghere socio-judiciară după detenție, pentru a permite o mai bună gestionare a pedepsei, o reintegrare socială reușită și o reducere a riscului de recidivă.

Având în vedere că, în multe cazuri, femeile aflate în închisoare sunt singurele îngrijitoare ale copiilor, iar menținerea legăturilor de familie este esențială, consider că statele membre trebuie să se asigure că deținutele au contact regulat cu familiile: promovând vizite, apeluri telefonice și utilizarea comunicațiilor electronice.

Pe de altă parte, este nevoie să se evite situațiile în care deținutele sunt plasate în penitenciare dispersate în teritoriu și să se găsească soluții care să permită deținuților care se află departe de casă să fie mutate mai aproape, pentru a evita încălcarea articolului 8 din Convenția europeană a drepturilor omului, și anume dreptul la respectarea vieții private și de familie.

Nu în ultimul rând, vreau să mulțumesc raportoarei pentru abordarea avută în cadrul acestui raport.

Rikke Karlsson (ECR). – Hr. formand! Tak til fru Bergeron for denne meget fine betænkning. I forbindelse med behandlingen er det imidlertid vigtigt for mig at gøre opmærksom på, at der efter min mening mangler noget i betænkningen.

Der mangler nemlig vores fælles ansvar for mange af vores europæiske medborgere, som sidder fængslet i lande uden for Det Europæiske Fællesskab under vilkår, som efter min mening giver anledning til dyb, dyb bekymring. Her er der tale om forhold, der grænser til torturlignende tilstande. Jeg har så sent som i denne måned haft kontakt til en ældre dansk fange ved navn Anker Hansen, som sidder under forfærdelige forhold i Indonesien. Da han ikke haft adgang til den livsvigtige medicin, som han har brug for, sidder han nu så forkrøblet, at han ikke længere kan gå. Han risikerer at dø under de forhold, hvis ikke der gribes ind.

Uanset hvad et menneske har gjort, fortjener ingen at rådne op i et fængsel langt hjemmefra under usle omstændigheder, hvor grusom og nedværdigende behandling er en del af hverdagen. Der er behov for, at Europa-Parlamentet griber ind i forhold til de fanger, hvor vi ved, at menneskerettighederne overskrides hver eneste dag.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, as someone who has spent thirteen-and-a-half years in prison, I declare an interest in ensuring that prison systems and conditions are upheld to appropriate standards. Irish Republicans were interned without trial and endured awful prison conditions, those who went on hunger strike were vilified by the establishment, some prisoners lost their lives while being force-fed and, in 1981, Bobby Sands and nine other Irish Republican prisoners died on hunger strike. Those days will never be forgotten.

The Good Friday Agreement ensured the release of politically motivated prisoners to advance the peace process, but even in this era of the peace process Derry man Tony Taylor is detained without trial and should be released immediately. Palestinian prisoners are subjected to regular violations of human rights and Basque prisoners are held hundreds of miles from their families, who are unfairly punished by an inhuman dispersal policy. Prison systems must show that human rights are upheld and applied consistently. They should never be used as a weapon by any state. I want to thank the rapporteur for this report.

Przewodniczący. – To dużo, ja siedziałem znacznie krócej.

Christelle Lechevalier (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Madame le rapporteure, chers collègues, ce rapport constitue une attaque directe au fonctionnement de la justice.

Face à la surpopulation carcérale, qui nécessiterait la création de places de prison, vous proposez la limitation de l'incarcération. Alors que la sanction doit être appliquée dès les premiers faits de délinquance pour endiguer la récidive, vous encouragez le laxisme.

Un problème majeur est absent de ce rapport: le recul de la justice. Des centaines de milliers de peines prononcées ne sont pas exécutées, faute de place ou par complaisance, laissant les condamnés dériver ensuite jusqu'à la condamnation à des peines longues compliquant la réinsertion.

Ces premières condamnations non appliquées sont finalement préjudiciables à la justice, mais aussi aux condamnés et surtout aux victimes, grandes oubliées de ce texte.

Avec la même vision chimérique, vous remettez en cause l'incarcération préventive, indispensable à l'application de la justice, au détriment des victimes passées et des futures victimes que vous créez par laxisme.

Pour vous, les condamnés sont victimes de la société et les récidivistes, victimes du système carcéral. Pour nous, il est indispensable d'éviter la spirale de la récidive, par des peines courtes dès les premiers délits, l'application réelle des jugements prononcés, des peines-planchers pour sanctionner fermement la récidive et l'incarcération dans le pays d'origine des détenus étrangers.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, without doubt existing European Union policies, specifically human rights legislation and freedom of movement, are now actively contributing to the problems in prisons, and particularly those in the United Kingdom. No one ever dreamed when devising these so-called European Union pillars that they would be used to support mobile phone usage or drugs delivered by drones, or indeed facilitate the development of radicalisation and extremism, all adding to the enormous pressures on and dangers to prison staff.

It is important, though, to acknowledge that prisoners have broken a social contract and so their incarceration acts as protection for society, as well as punishment of the perpetrator. Overcrowding is a major issue: 5 000 of the 13 000 prisoners in United Kingdom jails are EU citizens. As soon as we can actually achieve a proper programme of deporting those, and not see them protected by European Union human rights legislation, that will go a long way to dealing with overcrowding.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Die Qualität einer Zivilisation erkennt man vor allem auch daran, wie ihre Gefängnisse aussehen, wie hoch der Anteil der inhaftierten Personen an der Bevölkerung ist, ob Gefängnisse auf Rehabilitation ausgerichtet sind oder bloß ein Rachegefühl bedienen, vor allem aber auch daran, ob die Menschenrechte unter solch extremen Bedingungen beachtet werden.

Die heutige Debatte über diesen gelungenen Bericht ist daher sehr wichtig, und nur wenn die Gefängnisse sich in diese Richtung entwickeln, werden wir auch zu einem Raum der Freiheit, der Sicherheit und des Rechts.

Ja, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, es gibt eine öffentliche Verantwortung. Daher sind alle Bestrebungen zurückzuweisen, die in Richtung Privatisierung des Strafvollzuges gehen. Das öffentliche Interesse muss im Mittelpunkt stehen, und im öffentlichen Interesse ist es, dass die Menschen nicht einfach weggesperrt werden, sondern dass ihnen ein Weg zurück aufgezeigt wird. Nur dann werden wir das bekommen, was wir alle wollen: mehr Sicherheit.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el último estudio sobre la realidad penitenciaria en el Estado español, llevado a cabo por la red de organizaciones sociales del entorno penitenciario es demoledor: en el Estado español hay más presos, durante más tiempo y por delitos menos graves que en el resto de Europa. Y eso que nuestra tasa de delincuencia es bastante inferior a la media europea.

La tasa de encarcelados en el Estado español está un 32 % por encima de la media europea, y la duración de las penas es más del doble que esta media, y esto es porque las sucesivas reformas del Código Penal han hecho que nuestro sistema sea cada vez más duro. El 65 % de las personas presas tiene problemas de drogodependencia, y uno de cada cuatro presos tiene problemas de salud mental.

En el Estado español se están utilizando las cárceles como un almacén en el que ocultar nuestros problemas sociales.

La prisión debe ser el último recurso. Las alternativas a la prisión, como la mediación para reparación de los daños causados, los servicios comunitarios o los tratamientos fuera de la cárcel para personas con problemas de salud mental o drogodependencia son la alternativa, y, por supuesto, la justicia social, la lucha contra la desigualdad y la fortaleza de los servicios públicos son la única manera de combatir los problemas sociales.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, en une minute, il faut choisir son message, et le mien sera de considérer que la privation de liberté devrait être utilisée pour protéger la société. Or, aujourd'hui, notre modèle carcéral n'est plus adapté. Il produit souvent ce qu'il entend combattre, c'est-à-dire la criminalité.

Je pense qu'il est temps de s'interroger sur notre politique en la matière et ce rapport le fait. Il n'y a jamais eu autant de détenus dans les prisons européennes, alors que la surpopulation carcérale a des effets dévastateurs. Or, ces prisonniers vont ressortir un jour. La question de leur réinsertion est donc essentielle. Le but des prisons n'est pas simplement de punir. C'est pourquoi il faut s'interroger sur ce que nous voulons, à savoir une société plus sûre dans laquelle les anciens prisonniers ne récidivent pas.

Prenons, en effet, exemple sur nos voisins scandinaves, qui assurent aux prisonniers des conditions de détention décentes et qui préparent leur retour à la liberté.

Pour lutter efficacement contre la récidive, une politique carcérale innovante est nécessaire. Il faut utiliser de nombreuses mesures de remplacement à la détention préventive, mais aussi avoir recours aux peines alternatives.

Il est temps d'envisager la politique carcérale comme un moyen de réinsertion dans la société et non seulement d'exclusion à tout prix.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, intervenendo alla fine di questo dibattito, voglio in primo luogo ringraziare la relatrice per l'importanza e l'accuratezza di questa relazione e mi associo a quello che hanno già detto le colleghe e i colleghi del mio gruppo che mi hanno preceduto.

Parlo quindi di quello che ho visto e vedo con i miei occhi. Ieri è uscito dal carcere di Amburgo, Emiliano Puleo, un ragazzo che è stato detenuto per mesi nel carcere di Amburgo, senza aver ricevuto ancora alcuna sentenza, alcuna condanna in via preventiva e cautelare.

La repressione del dissenso politico sta diventando sempre di più un'emergenza in Europa: così come ho già segnalato in una relazione alla Commissaria, in Italia esiste un crimine, una negazione dei diritti umani fondamentali, una forma di tortura chiamata carcere che è l'ergastolo ostativo.

Io credo che sia fondamentale che questo Parlamento prenda provvedimenti, utilizzi tutto il potere che ha a disposizione anche per garantire i diritti delle detenute, i diritti delle persone trans in carcere. Lo dico come relatrice ombra del parere della commissione FEMM, penso che da questo punto di vista questa relazione ci faccia fare un passo in avanti.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Jourová, en la pasada legislatura, como presidente de la Comisión de Libertades, Justicia e Interior, tuve el honor de presidir una misión europea de análisis del sistema penitenciario, el asunto que nos preocupa y del que me ocupé como ministro de Justicia de España durante mi mandato.

Hay 1 600 000 personas privadas de libertad, y la manera en que una sociedad trata a las personas privadas de libertad es, sin duda, un parámetro de medida de la calidad de esa misma sociedad y de su democracia. Por eso tenemos que preocuparnos de que el hacinamiento, que es especialmente sensible en algunos países —Portugal, Grecia, Francia, Bélgica, Hungría, Italia y también mi país, España—, no sea el poso en el que pueden producirse abusos de los derechos humanos como consecuencia de hacinamiento; tratos inhumanos y degradantes que se denuncian ante el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos por violación del artículo 3; prácticas de agresiones sexuales en las cárceles; falta de cuidados médicos, falta de servicios educativos y, sobre todo, falta de recursos.

Porque es imprescindible que los Estados democráticos inviertan adecuadamente en el sistema penitenciario. Por eso me sumo a la felicitación por el informe de iniciativa y apoyo, sobre todo, el vector dirigido a reforzar la reinserción, porque esta tiene que ser la orientación de las penas privativas de libertad, y apoyo, por tanto, especialmente, el párrafo que el informe dedica a las medidas alternativas a la privación de libertad: las medidas de régimen abierto.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, this debate on prison systems and conditions allows me to raise a very particular issue, and I am grateful to the Catholic bishops of England and Wales for coming to me and meeting me on this issue. In England and Wales there are over 4 000 EU citizens in prisons, and while in the Brexit negotiations there is a desire to include the treatment of these prisoners in the negotiations and have a settlement on it, it is not yet clear what that will mean. The Catholic bishops tell me that they are very much involved in the pastoral care of these prisoners.

The Home Secretary can deport EU citizens who commit offences but this is currently restricted by European law. Post-Brexit, EU citizens who have problems with the system in the UK after withdrawal are likely to fall under the provisions set out in the UK Borders Act of 2007, which contains far less restrictive grounds for deportation and requires deportation of foreign offenders sentenced to at least 12 months in prison. I think we need to understand that this is a very sensitive issue, and again I am grateful to the Church leaders for raising it.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, stimați colegi, în primul rând vreau să felicit raportoarea și să spun că este un raport necesar, îl susțin și îl voi vota. Avem nevoie de o schimbare a atitudinii, este un exces de arestări preventive, este o lipsă de răspundere a magistraților care, fără a avea probe suficiente, duc cetățeni în arest preventiv. Asta este dovedit, de fapt, prin faptul că foarte mulți arestați preventiv, ulterior, nu au nicio pedeapsă și câștigă la CEDO și se golesc bugetele naționale.

Îmi pare rău că anumiți colegi aruncă cu vorbe și pleacă. Colegul din PPE acuza România pentru faptul că nu își ia deținuții. E o decizie a Curții de Justiție a Uniunii Europene, dar de ce alte țări, ca Marea Britanie, un exemplu recent, găzduiește un evazionist din România, deși România îl cere în țară pentru a-l judeca. Iată că există două fețe și, doamnă comisar, dacă ar fi acea răspundere a magistraților, am putea să ajungem la soluții optime. Și este nevoie de programe de integrare în societate după ce acești oameni ies din închisori, nu, cum spunea un coleg, că ajutăm deținuții. Ajutăm societatea pentru a nu mai fi atacată de acești oameni care nu sunt integrați după aceea în societate, după ce își termină pedeapsa.

António Marinho e Pinto (ALDE). – As prisões têm como função a educação dos delinquentes de modo a que possam regressar ao convívio social libertos das tendências criminosas. Infelizmente, em muitos países da União Europeia, as prisões transformaram-se em verdadeiras escolas de criminalidade. Muitos reclusos que foram condenados por delitos ocasionais saem das prisões transformados em criminosos profissionais.

Por outro lado, os delinquentes são condenados pelos tribunais a uma pena que os priva da liberdade mas não os priva da sua dignidade enquanto seres humanos. Está demonstrado que os Estados-Membros, por si só, não evidenciam capacidade para alterar este estado de coisas. Só a criação, Senhora Comissária, de um modelo penitenciário europeu poderá alterar positivamente este estado de coisas. Esse modelo penitenciário europeu, único europeu, é também uma exigência da integração europeia.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, prison conditions and prison overcrowding are critical issues in many of our Member States. There really are too many people in detention facilities who reoffend and turn to more serious crime after being released. Too many commit suicide. Too many mentally ill people are locked in facilities that are not appropriate for their condition and too many of our young turn to violent extremism upon their release. Often detention in prison is the starting point of a vicious circle of imprisonment and crime.

This is why I welcome the report's call for improved prison conditions and dissemination of good practices and alternative punishments, individual social care of prisoners and insistence on social reintegration. Decreasing crime and increasing social cohesion takes more than improving conditions in prisons. The overarching aim should be to have a penal, educational and social paradigm shift, to turn away from punishment and to insist on the social rehabilitation and reintegration of the convicted. It would be nice to study the case of Japan and how they succeeded.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, il est clair effectivement que la promiscuité dans les prisons offre les conditions d'une forme de contamination entre détenus dont les méfaits ne sont pas tous de même nature ou de même importance.

Le risque est grand de voir les détenus condamnés pour des délits mineurs être entraînés vers une plus grande délinquance, voire vers la radicalisation.

C'est la raison pour laquelle les pays de l'Union européenne doivent privilégier les peines alternatives à la prison. Il en existe de nombreuses formules, dont le travail d'intérêt général.

Lorsque j'étais maire, je répondais toujours favorablement aux instances judiciaires qui me sollicitaient pour accueillir ces condamnés à des travaux d'intérêt général. À chaque fois, je me félicitais des résultats et de l'implication de mon personnel dans leur accompagnement.

Malheureusement, dans certains cas, il n'y a pas d'alternative à la prison, il faut alors créer les conditions d'accueil pour la réinsertion des prisonniers. La formation professionnelle à l'intérieur de la prison est évidemment un élément tout à fait essentiel de cette réussite.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κρατούμενοι αναβαθμίζονται εσχάτως σε θεσμικούς συνομιλητές βάσει προσηματικών θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων. Οι ανάγκες και οι προτάσεις των σωφρονιστικών υπαλλήλων απαξιώνονται μεροληπτικά και η διαδικασία των κρατών μελών επί του σωφρονιστικού τους συστήματος διαβρώνεται. Απάνθρωπα τα έργα ανακαίνισης και εκμοντερνισμού φυλακών, όταν οι Τράπεζες υπαρπάζουν περιουσίες των πολιτών. Εξευτελιστικό το άνοιγμα σωφρονιστικών εκπαιδευτικών εγκαταστάσεων, όταν παύουν σχολεία σε περιοχές στρατηγικής σημασίας. Παράλογη η υπόδειξη μη στερητικών της ελευθερίας ποινών με επίκληση τη χωρητικότητα των φυλακών. Επική και αδιανόητη γελοιότητα ο διαδερσκευτικός διάλογος εντός των φυλακών ως μέσο αντιμετώπισης της ρίζοσπαστικοποίησης. Εντέλει, επισημαίνω την αναγκαιότητα απομάκρυνσης εξτρεμιστών και λαθρομεταναστών από τον γενικό πληθυσμό των φυλακών, διαχωρισμού κρατουμένων, όπως ανηλίκων από ενήλικες, πρόσβασης σε αναγκαία ιατροφαρμακευτική κάλυψη, αντίστοιχη των υπολοίπων πολιτών, και συμπλήρωσης του συνόλου της αποδοθείσας ποινής έπειτα από δίκαια και αμερόληπτη δίκη. Οι φυλακές, βέβαια, δεν αποτελούν ξενοδοχεία πολυτελείας.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Commissaria Jourová, il sovraffollamento delle carceri europee è una delle grandi questioni irrisolte del nostro continente. Negli ultimi anni il sovraffollamento dei penitenziari è diventato una grande preoccupazione, fortunatamente, anche per il Consiglio d'Europa, che è impegnato a monitorare gli standard delle pratiche nelle carceri europee.

Le statistiche mostrano che molti paesi presentano tassi di sovraffollamento ancora molto alti, nonostante siano state intraprese politiche per il miglioramento delle condizioni. Io stesso nello svolgimento di attività istituzionali in Italia, ho svolto attività di monitoraggio sulla situazione sanitaria di istituti di pena e ho potuto verificare che tutte le problematiche dei vari istituti che ho visitato erano legate inesorabilmente al sovraffollamento.

In alcuni istituti la situazione è talmente grave che finisce per generare delle vere e proprie emergenze sanitarie, compromettendo la dignità, oltre che la salute di detenuti ed operatori penitenziari. Avere strutture con un numero limitato di detenuti, assicura condizioni detenzione dignitose e incoraggia la riabilitazione, la reintegrazione nella società. La privazione della libertà non può e non deve costituire una privazione della dignità. Ed è questa la direzione in cui l'Europa deve muoversi.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Kedves Kollegák! Sokan, sokféle okból és helyzetben vannak börtönben. Sajnos vannak olyanok, akik ártatlanul, vannak olyanok, akik fehérgalléros bűnözőként mondjuk a közpénzek fosztogatása miatt. Ilyenekből kevéssel találkozunk, és vannak olyanok, nagyon sokan, akik egész életükben, kisgyerek koruktól kezdve embertelen sorsot éltek, és ezzel összefüggésben váltak bűnelkövetővé. Nemrég olvastam egy nyilatkozatot egy büntetés-végrehajtási dolgozótól, aki a következőt mondta: azért szeretem a hivatásomat, mert nehéz helyzetben lévő embereknek tudok segíteni az életük újrakezdésében.

Ez az, ami mindenkivel kapcsolatban közös feladat, és ez az, ami a börtönnek a dolga lenne. Paradox módon, büntetőjogászként mondhatom, nagyon sok olyan ember van a börtönben, aki életében először, pontosan a büntetőeljárás során és a börtönben tapasztalta meg, hogy mit jelent emberi méltósággal rendelkező személynek lenni, merthogy életében először ott kezelik úgy. Az egész társadalomnak az érdeke, hogy miután ő kiszabadult, ne kövessen el újabb bűncselekményt, mert valahol végre megtanulta, hogy mit jelent emberhez méltó életet élni.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Ennek a mai vitának rendkívül sok tanulsága van, és én úgy gondolom, hogy Jourová asszony is, illetve a Bizottság szakemberei igencsak megfontolják azokat a javaslatokat, amiket itt fölvetettünk. Én szeretnék egy további aspektusra rámutatni, ami a vitában talán kevésbé jött elő – ennek ellenére meg fogom szavazni ezt a jelentést –, nevezetesen azokról a sorsokról szeretnék szólni néhány gondolatot, néhány szót, akik aztán tényleg ártatlanul vannak börtönben, ezek pedig a börtönben született gyerekek.

Nem kevés ilyen van, bár nem állnak rendelkezésre statisztikák, de újsághírek alapján gyakran olvasunk olyanokat, hogy valaki terhesen kerül börtönbe, és börtönben születik meg az illető gyerek. Ez a gyermek, ez egyértelműen azt az időt, amit az édesanya kapott, szinte ő maga is börtönben fogja tölteni, lett légyen az különleges intézet, vagy adott esetben az édesanya mellett hagyják. Én mindenképpen amellett törek lándzsát, hogy hagyjuk a gyermekeket az édesanyjuk mellett, akármi is történik, sőt az édesanyák esetében még a házi őrizet is alternatív módon szóba jöhet.

De legfőképpen az, hogy olyan árnyalt körülményeket kell teremteni, ahol a hasonló problémájú emberek vannak egy csoportban, és nem pedig összekeverve, például egy anyagiilokost egy közlekedési baleset elkövetőjével. Úgyhogy összességét tekintve előremutató ez a jelentés, nagyon köszönöm az előterjesztőknek, és mindenféleképpen javaslom, gondolkodjunk még nagyon sokat a gyerekekről, és nem csak az újszülöttekről, hanem azokról, akik egyébként még hasonlóképpen szóba jöhetnek ebben a tárgyban.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Rachida Dati (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, je tenais à remercier notre rapporteure, Joëlle Bergeron, pour le travail qu'elle a mené sur ce rapport.

Nous sommes ici, aujourd'hui, pour insister sur l'urgence de la situation préoccupante des prisons européennes.

L'exemple de la France est le plus emblématique de cet état alarmant des prisons en Europe: une surpopulation carcérale record avec plus de 10 000 places manquantes, des conditions de détention préoccupantes et indignes, près de 1 500 détenus considérés comme radicalisés, un personnel pénitentiaire méprisé, avec des conditions de travail totalement indignes. Et la France n'est pas un cas isolé.

(Le Président interrompt l'oratrice)

En mai 2016, j'ai envoyé une lettre et un questionnaire à l'ensemble des ministres de la justice des États membres pour avoir un état des lieux de la situation des prisons en Europe. Un tiers des pays sont en état de surpopulation carcérale et tous ont du mal à réinsérer leurs détenus, la plupart font d'ailleurs état d'un taux de récidive supérieur à 40 %.

Oui, la politique pénitentiaire est une compétence nationale, mais les défis que représente la dégradation de la situation sont les mêmes pour tous. Les exemples les plus criants sont la violence dans les prisons et la détention de détenus de plus en plus difficiles et dangereux, tels que les détenus radicalisés.

Nous devons trouver et promouvoir des lignes directrices communes. C'est notre responsabilité. La prison doit évoluer, s'adapter aux nouvelles formes de délinquance et de criminalité ainsi qu'aux nouveaux profils des détenus.

Dans ce rapport, je préconise d'ailleurs la mise en place de régimes de détention différenciés en fonction de la dangerosité des détenus. Il est aujourd'hui inadmissible que, dans les stratégies nationales et européennes de lutte contre le terrorisme, les prisons ne soient pas prises en compte. Elles sont pourtant au cœur du problème et constituent une partie de la solution.

Les attaques terroristes en Europe se multiplient, alors que la prison, avec internet, est le principal vecteur de la radicalisation. Nous ne pouvons pas rester inactifs.

Un autre aspect majeur à traiter sans plus attendre est la question de la réinsertion pour prévenir la récidive. Ces mesures de réinsertion doivent être absolument internalisées et débiter au cours de la détention.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, this is a very serious and important debate about very serious issues. I see two big problems here: one, which you have mentioned many times, is the lack of respect for the dignity of individuals, and this what we see by breaching human rights in European prisons. The second big issue was not debated here so frequently and this is the fact that we have many innocent people in European prisons. This is not only the case regarding people who are in pre-trial detention, where they have the right to the presumption of innocence. They have not been tried and they have the right to better conditions in European prisons.

When we debate this issue I am thinking about how we can help more because you have said many times, and I also said it at the beginning, that the EU has a quite weak competence here. I was exploring some legislative possibility to improve the situation of pre-trial detention, but we do not see enough space to do that, so we are focusing on three things: funding; training of professionals; and sharing, and helping to share, best practices.

On the question of funding, of course we see a lack of money here and when I discuss it with those responsible in the Member States – the experts – I sometimes hear varying information or suggestions. It is not politically popular to ask for money to improve the situation in prisons, because people will ask: why do you not give more funding to schools and hospitals? This is the reality, but this is not the answer. We have to look into it. I was addressed by 11 Ministers of Justice by letter, who asked the EU to help with funding and I replied with a very precise description of where and how EU funds can be used for improving the situation, and helping them to solve the most serious issues such as overcrowding and bad conditions. I see the possibility of using EU funds – the European Development Fund – for investments in prisons, for investments into technological or technical measures to introduce more alternative kinds of penalties. We see a lot of possibilities from the European Social Fund for better rehabilitation of inmates into normal life and for training practitioners working in prisons and in probation services. So there are possibilities, but we need to invest more political will in it.

My interest is also, as you have mentioned many times here, to have the European Arrest Warrant fully functioning. I am in continuous debate with the respective Member States where we have the problems on how to change the situation. So we are working, I think, exactly in the direction which many of you have suggested here. I have been in several prisons in European Member States. Everywhere, I saw the need to reorganise the service.

You mentioned several times that radicalisation is a problem here. Radicalisation is a very serious problem. We have seen the statistics which show that about 15% of radicalised people are radicalised in prisons, and so we see a clear need to work more on an individual basis and also on the reorganisation of working and structures in prisons to come up with effective solutions to this big problem.

We also see that more investments are necessary, and I have already spoken about financing. A change of approach is also necessary here and I see some very good examples. That is why sharing best practices is so important. Two weeks ago, I was in Austria, in the village of Gerasdorf, in a detention centre for young people, and I saw a very good example of how to work with young people who have the right to be given a second chance to get back to normal life. I saw a very good programme of requalification and I think that these are examples which should be followed in all the Member States. Again, political will and money are both necessary, so let us work in that direction. Thank you very much for these debates. Thank you for the report, Ms Bergeron, and let us continue working together on this issue.

Joëlle Bergeron, *rapporteure*. – Monsieur le Président, je n'ai pas grand-chose à ajouter. Le débat a été très intéressant et je vois que nous partageons pour la plupart la même vision des choses.

Je vais profiter de ces quelques instants pour remercier mes rapporteurs fictifs. Et ce n'est pas une formule, ce rapport n'aurait pas été ce qu'il est si Eva Joly, Rachida Dati, M^{me} Chinnici et d'autres encore, ne m'avaient pas apporté leurs compétences éclairées. Pour les trois premières, il s'agit d'anciens juges. Elles savent de quoi elles parlent, et elles en parlent sagement, intelligemment et humainement. Elles m'ont apporté sur beaucoup de points un éclairage très enrichissant.

Ce rapport m'a passionnée, et je suis assez fière de son contenu, parce que je me suis rendu compte que la défense de la dignité humaine et des droits de l'homme pouvait nous amener à dépasser nos sensibilités politiques et, surtout, vous, les vôtres. Je crois que c'est également un vrai succès de défendre les êtres humains avec la même volonté.

Je vais reprendre les paroles d'Eva Joly: «La prison ne protège pas la société or, évidemment, c'est son rôle». On lui demande avant tout de protéger les victimes de leurs agresseurs et le reste de la société. Or, dans l'état actuel des choses, la prison ne joue pas ce rôle-là.

Le mélange des prisonniers, surtout en maison d'arrêt, où, comme beaucoup d'entre vous l'ont rappelé, les prisonniers innocents sont mélangés avec des prisonniers qui, eux, seront condamnés parce qu'ils ont commis des méfaits, est très dangereux. Ce système criminalise les innocents, mais surtout, il met le personnel pénitentiaire en très grand danger.

Voilà, je crois que ce sujet est extrêmement vaste. Il y a évidemment le problème de la radicalisation, mais aussi l'incarcération de malades psychiatriques, qui devraient être soignés et celle de mineurs, qui devraient être éduqués et réhabilités.

Ce sont des problèmes énormes, et nous n'avons fait qu'effleurer la problématique. Il faudrait prendre les sujets un par un et prévoir pour chacun des mesures ad hoc.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się dzisiaj, tj. w czwartek 5 października 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Monika Beňová (S&D), písomne. – Správa o väzenských systémoch a podmienkach navrhuje viacero krokov, ako zlepšiť životné podmienky vo väzniciach, a súběžne aj zlepšenie procesu reintegrácie väzňov. Cieľom Európskej únie je podporiť členské štáty v ich snahách zlepšiť väzenské podmienky. Otváraním tejto témy môžeme efektívnejšie riešiť napríklad nedostatky procesu reintegrácie, ale hlavne bojovať s fenoménom radikalizácie. Príliš často sprevádzajú trest odňatia slobody životné podmienky, ktoré predstavujú neľudské alebo ponižujúce zaobchádzanie. Väzenské podmienky sú iba jeden aspekt celkovej problematiky väznenia. Dostupný a kvalitný tréning pre pracovníkov väzníc, ktorý presadzuje riešenia, môže taktiež viesť k postupnému zlepšovaniu väzenských podmienok. Na záver treba podotknúť, že tento problém sa nám nepodarí vyriešiť zo dňa na deň, ale napriek tomu otvorenie úprimnej debaty symbolizuje vývoj správnym smerom.

Ivan Jakovčič (ALDE), napisan. – Više od trećine država članica prepoznalo je da je prenapučenost zatvora u Europskoj uniji trajan problem, a stanje se u nekim državama članicama i dalje pogoršava što teško narušava kvalitetu zatvorskih uvjeta i ima teške učinke kako na zdravlje i dobrobit zatvorenika, tako i na sigurnost i dobrobit zatvorskog osoblja. Svaka bi država članica trebala poštivati zatvorska pravila koja proizlaze iz instrumenata međunarodnog prava i standarda Vijeća Europe jer lišavanje slobode ne znači i lišavanje dostojanstva!

Pri rješavanju problema prenapučenosti, povećanje kapaciteta zatvora nije jedino rješenje, već su potrebni kaznenopravni sustavi u kojima se vodi računa o reintegraciji i rehabilitaciji zatvorenika kako bi se na taj način zaštitio i zatvorenik, a i društvo te kako bi se postiglo smanjenje ponavljanja kaznenih djela. Osim toga, zatvorenicima je potrebno osigurati pristup obrazovnim i stručnim kvalifikacijama te poslu i osposobljavanju u cilju resocijalizacije te im na taj način pružiti mogućnost za život bez kriminala nakon isteka kazne.

Sa sigurnošću mogu reći da programi reintegracije zatvorenika u društvo unapređuju naša društva i da bi se sve države članice trebale pobrinuti da se programi toga tipa provode u svim zatvorskim ustanovama.

3. Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Aussprache)

3.1. Lage von Menschen mit Albinismus in Malawi und anderen afrikanischen Ländern

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest debata nad ośmioma projektami rezolucji w sprawie sytuacji osób z albinizmem w Afryce, w szczególności w Malawi (2017/2868(RSP)).

Bodil Valero, författare. – Herr talman! En av 20 000 personer i världen har albinism och bara i Nigeria lever omkring 2 miljoner av dem. Diskrimineringen av personer med albinism är ett allvarligt problem i Afrika söder om Sahara, men också i resten av världen. Cirka 600 attacker utfördes mot personer med albinism i sammanlagt 26 länder förra året.

I många fall har orsaken varit tron att deras kroppsdelar har egenskaper som ger lycka och välstånd. En vidskepelse som för oss är helt absurd och som man trodde inte kunde leva vidare i det i 21:a århundrandet. Även om ett antal länder faktiskt försöker sätta stopp för dessa fruktansvärda attacker och handel med kroppsdelar så saknas oftast adekvat lagstiftning för att faktiskt lagföra gärningsmännen. Också vittnesskydd är en nödvändig åtgärd för att få människor att våga vittna.

Det är absolut nödvändigt att berörda länder tar krafttag för att sätta stopp för dessa mord och för denna handel och för att lagföra brottslingarna. Men det preventiva arbetet är minst lika viktigt. Det behövs medvetandegörande insatser riktade till allmänheten som ger större kunskap, men också information om albinism och om varför vissa individer drabbas. Detta i kombination med ökade insatser för att skydda personer med albinism.

Det kan handla om skyddande boenden och det kan handla om ökad polisnärvaro, men inte minst handlar det om att arbeta mot den fattigdom och diskriminering som den här gruppen drabbas av mer än befolkningen i övrigt.

Hilde Vautmans, Auteur. – Mayeso Isaac, dat is de naam van het laatste slachtoffertje dat we kennen. Een onschuldig jongetje van 12 jaar, ontvoerd, verkocht en vermoord, waarschijnlijk omwille van zijn haar of zijn beenderen, uit bijge-loof dat dit magische krachten zou hebben. Dat is wat momenteel gebeurt.

De laatste 9 maanden wordt Malawi opnieuw getroffen door een golf van gruweldaden tegen mensen met albinisme. Ten minste twee zijn er vermoord en zeven andere worden luidens berichten gediscrimineerd en vervolgd. Zoals een collega al zei, weten we dat dit slechts het topje van de ijsberg is. We hebben al rapporten gezien van 600 mensen die gediscrimineerd, vervolgd en gedood worden.

Eén op 20 000 mensen in Afrika wordt getroffen door albinisme. Het is dus onze verdomde plicht om ook hun mensenrechten te beschermen. Het is niet omdat ze er anders uitzien dat ze vermoord mogen worden.

Collega's, laten we hier in dit Europees Parlement niet de houding aannemen: "het is ver van ons bed, het gebeurt maar in Afrika". Nee, wij moeten ervoor zorgen dat dit bijge-loof anno 2017 stopt. En dat kunnen we.

We moeten zorgen voor beter onderwijs. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat criminele organisaties die handel drijven in menselijke lichaamsdelen, omdat blond haar magische krachten zou hebben, aangepakt en bestraft worden. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat kinderen met albinisme beschermd worden en dat discriminatie de wereld uit geholpen wordt. Collega's, laten we ervoor zorgen dat de mensenrechten van iedereen op deze aardbol, ongeacht zijn of haar huidskleur, worden beschermd.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, autor. – Señor presidente, señorías, las cifras de asesinatos, agresiones y desapariciones de personas albinas en Malaui, Tanzania o Burundi son estremecedoras: en los dos últimos años, al menos veinte personas asesinadas y más de ciento quince han sido víctimas de algún tipo de agresión, sin contar aquellas que se encuentran en paradero desconocido.

El Gobierno de Malaui debe tomar medidas políticas y judiciales para acabar con estos ataques. Asimismo, la Unión Europea y los Estados Unidos, que son los principales donantes de este país, tienen que exigir el respeto a los derechos humanos en la región y especialmente la protección de este colectivo en riesgo.

Pero no podemos pedir simplemente el respeto a los derechos humanos de una forma abstracta. Creo que es fundamental también cuestionar un modelo económico de expolio de recursos neocolonial que mata de hambre, que defor-esta, que genera sequías e inundaciones, que merma cultivos y arruina cosechas.

Señorías, la violencia contra las personas albinas no es solo producto de la superstición y la brujería, sino es también un problema que se llama pobreza y desesperanza. Tendremos que atajar ambas.

Tunne Kelam, author. – Mr President, albinos in Africa face widespread discrimination and persecution. Last year alone, 172 albinos were murdered and almost 300 were attacked in hunts for their body parts. In Malawi, a new wave of killings and persecution has started in the current year, while the local justice system has failed to protect this vulnerable minority from criminal gangs.

We call on the Malawian authorities to their utmost to protect albino citizens, who clearly deserve strong state guaran-tees for safety, dignity and equality. I call on the Malawian Government to follow the positive examples of Tanzania and Mozambique, where action programmes have been started to promote public awareness and education and to protect co-citizens.

Soraya Post, author. – Mr President, I will speak Swedish now.

Kollegor och kommissionär Jourová! Ett brådsäkande ärende som detta vill jag ge min röst till, för personer med albinism i Malawi och i andra afrikanska stater. Hur är då situationen för närvarande? Jo, personer med albinism dödas och diskrimineras på daglig nivå. Inte ens döda får vara ifred från dessa människor som nyttjar deras kroppsdelar. Dessa människors liv står i riskzonen vart än de går.

Kvinnor och barn är ännu mer utsatta. Barn styckas och deras kroppsdelar säljs. Men hur kan vi då möta denna fasansfulla situation? Jag ber om bättre lagstiftning och ett bättre genomförande av befintliga lagar och handlingsplaner. Jag ber om bättre resurser och utbildning till polisen. EU:s institutioner kan inte blunda för detta. Vi behöver en övervakningsmekanism som följer denna utveckling. Det är dags att agera och reagera.

Jag vill också poängtera att strukturell diskriminering också måste mötas av större kunskap och ett förändrat synsätt. Vi kan inte låta människor fortfarande dö på grund av sin hudfärg 2017. Så Malawi och andra afrikanska stater måste alltså skydda alla sina människor som befinner sig där. Och vår uppgift är att se till att det blir så.

Charles Tannock, author. – Mr President, the plight of albino people in Malawi is a true tragedy. I still remember debating this same issue in relation to Tanzania almost a decade ago. The apparent killing of innocent albinos – or persons with albinism – and, tragically, mainly of children, for their body parts is still happening in many African states as well as Malawi, where there has been a recent spate and rise in the number of killings to more than 20. Other states reportedly affected include Burundi, Mozambique, Kenya, Nigeria and Zambia.

Already, this vulnerable community is at risk of the medical consequences of albinism in the tropics, including a high risk of fatal skin cancer, but they are also now being murdered – almost unbelievably – to satisfy demand for traditional medicine that is more akin to medieval sorcery.

The EU should not hesitate to campaign on the issue. I welcome the reforms of the penal code in Malawi. I also welcome the recent adoption of the regional action plan for 2017-2021 jointly by the African Union and the United Nations. This is a positive and concrete signal of commitment by African leaders to ending all discrimination against persons with albinism and to prosecuting all crimes and atrocities against this vulnerable group of people.

Ignazio Corrao, author. – Mr President, Malawi, along with other African countries, is facing an awful violation of human rights towards people with albinism, due to erroneous superstitions and beliefs about this rare genetic condition. Constantly targeted by gangs and individuals driven by ignorance and myths about the magical powers of their body parts, people with albinism are facing pretty much all kinds of human abuses, from mutilation, abduction, killings, rapes, to social discrimination and exclusion from access to basic public services.

Governments of these countries are facing an enormous struggle in order to stop these heinous crimes and to prosecute their authors. In this joint resolution, we call for the EU and its Member States to keep engaging with the countries affected, in order to effectively support their efforts to formulate policies addressing the special needs and rights of persons with albinism, by providing the necessary financial and technical assistance. Among others, I think that the creation of specific local task forces within the police with the specific aim of preventing and investigating these crimes could be a useful tool.

Mario Borghezio, autore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo argomento è stato un tabù per molti anni, durante i quali se ne sono interessati pochi europarlamentari, fra i quali il sottoscritto. È per questo che abbiamo voluto presentare un documento alla firma del nostro gruppo, per sottolineare il fatto che da tempo noi abbiamo denunciato questo problema, che evidentemente è stato considerato delicato, tabù, perché non n'è occupato mai seriamente nessuno. Ovviamente, non i governi africani che erano toccati direttamente perché sono ben 27 gli Stati dell'Africa subsahariana interessati da questo problema.

Certo, in alcuni di questi, il problema è maggiore. Si parla del Malawi. Il Presidente Mutharika è intervenuto per denunciare il fatto, anche se poi, concretamente, non ci sono misure atte a perseguire i trafficanti di parti di corpi e addirittura di corpi di defunti. È un commercio immondo, è un tabù, una cosa molto grave, una delle forme più ignobili di persecuzione veramente deleteria.

Argomento tabù, parallelamente al quale durante questa giornata di discussione sui diritti umani in Africa, il Parlamento avrebbe dovuto avere il coraggio di toccare anche un altro argomento tabù, che siamo pochi a sollevare in quest'Aula, cioè quello del razzismo antibianco. Ma in realtà parliamo di albinì e quindi in un certo senso, anche questo è razzismo antibianco: si tratta di soggetti deboli, di soggetti che vanno protetti, di soggetti nei confronti dei quali ci vuole un'azione concreta.

E allora l'Europa dovrebbe far sentire la sua voce molto più fortemente nei confronti dell'ONU, ma anche dell'Unione Africana, che ha tanti motivi per dovere ascoltare la voce dell'Europa. L'Unione africana concretamente si deve impegnare coi singoli governi e colpire là dove c'è copertura nei confronti di questi traffici che fanno vergogna a tutto il mondo.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Jak widać, stygmatyzacja to temat, który powraca od lat. Także na temat stygmatyzacji i naruszania praw podstawowych osób z albinizmem w Afryce dyskutowaliśmy na tej sali w lipcu zeszłego roku. Z przykrością trzeba stwierdzić, że brakuje postępów w zakresie poprawy ochrony prawnej i działań na rzecz ofiar oraz zapewnienia im odpowiednich mechanizmów odwoławczych i rehabilitacyjnych.

Osoby z albinizmem zamieszkujące Malawi – ale także Tanzanię, Mozambik – obawiają się, że zostaną uprowadzone przez gangi, zabite lub okaleczone, a to ogranicza ich poczucie bezpieczeństwa, swobodę poruszania i oczywiście – co chyba najważniejsze – dostęp do edukacji czy służby zdrowia. W kontekście regionalnego planu działań, o którym kolega Tunne Kelam wspominał, w czerwcu tego roku afrykańska komisja praw człowieka przyjęła taki plan, ale istotne jest, aby kraje, których ten okrutny proceder dotyczy, opracowały konkretne strategie skupiające się na działaniach edukacyjnych i podnoszących świadomość na temat albinizmu.

Sądzę także, że w obronie tej grupy ludzi kluczową rolę muszą odgrywać szczególnie władze lokalne oraz organizacje społeczeństwa obywatelskiego.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quello degli albinì è un dramma sconosciuto ma che provoca da anni centinaia di vittime. Eppure, la loro è una condizione genetica ereditaria che, al contrario, dovrebbe essere trattata adeguatamente anche dalle strutture sanitarie del Paese. Certo, non possiamo ignorare i progressi compiuti da alcuni Paesi, in primis la Tanzania, nel loro sforzo di inclusione, anche politica, di persona affette da albinismo.

Qualcosa si sta muovendo, anche grazie all'attività di sensibilizzazione dell'Unione europea e al Piano di azione regionale dell'Unione africana e delle Nazioni Unite, che costituisce un segnale positivo ma anche concreto di impegno da parte dei dirigenti africani.

Ricordo che la responsabilità primaria di uno Stato è di proteggere i suoi cittadini, compresi i gruppi vulnerabili. Chiediamo pertanto al governo del Malawi di garantire una protezione efficace alle persone affette da albinismo, al fine di difendere il loro diritto alla vita e la sicurezza personale. È inaccettabile che queste persone non siano solo oggetto di violenza estrema, ma anche vittime di persecuzione e di esclusione sociale.

Serve anche un'azione culturale, signor Presidente, che ponga fine alla stigmatizzazione di queste persone, a partire dalle scuole, un'azione rivolta a sradicare pratiche antiche e sedimentate, che oggi, nel 2017, non devono più trovare spazio in nessun concetto di modernità o tradizione. Gli albinì non saranno dimenticati né abbandonati al loro destino.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se tady připojím ve svém vystoupení k tomu, co říkali moji předřečníci. Je dobře, že dnes přijímáme usnesení, ve kterém jasně odsuzujeme praktiky vůči této skupině osob v Africe. Podle mého názoru je velmi správné, že v usneseních podrobně popisujeme, co vše se albínům v Africe a konkrétně v tomto případě v Malawi děje. Na druhou stranu musím říci, že to usnesení je hodně popisné a že by bylo dobré, aby Komise jako výkonný orgán EU ve své konkrétní diplomacii více řešila, jak tlačit na africké státy a v tomto případě na Malawi, aby albínům poskytly jasnou ochranu.

Zpráva jasně říká, jaké hrůzy se této skupině obyvatel dějí. Je nepochopitelné, že takovéto věci se mohou dít na počátku 21. století. A je naší morální povinností udělat maximum pro ochranu těchto lidí.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sytuacja albinosów w Afryce jest mroczna i przerażająca i bardziej przypomina średniowieczne praktyki niż współczesny problem. Niestety w wyniku wierzeń, że części ciała albinosów mają niezwykłą moc, cena za nie dochodzi na czarnym rynku do 75 tysięcy dolarów, co dla statystycznego Tanzańczyka oznacza 150 lat pracy. Pomimo iż za zabicie albinosa grozi kara śmierci, to wysokość tej kwoty, jak również bardzo niski odsetek zatrzymań sprawiają, że morderstwa czy też okaleczanie osób chorych na bielactwo zdarzają się często.

Należy zatem skoncentrować się przede wszystkim na działaniach edukacyjnych, aby przekonać ludność, że magiczna moc amuletów z albinosów jest zabobonem niemającym przełożenia na rzeczywistość. Ponadto należy również podjąć działania nacelowane na poprawę życia albinosów, zapewniając im dostęp do edukacji oraz opieki zdrowotnej, jak również wsparcie psychologiczne.

Chciałbym też zwrócić uwagę, że popularne zamykanie albinosów w ośrodkach daje obecnie niestety jedynie pozorne poczucie bezpieczeństwa.

Procedura catch-the-eye

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, Senhora Comissária, há mais de um ano aprovamos aqui uma resolução sobre as violações dos direitos humanos das pessoas com albinismo em África, nomeadamente no Malawi. Decorrido este tempo assistimos a um alarmante ressurgimento das assassínatos e ataques contra os albinos na África Oriental, no Malawi, na Tanzânia, na África do Sul ou em Moçambique.

Os albinos, incluindo muitas crianças, continuam a pagar um preço terrível pela sua condição. Além de rejeitados pelas suas próprias famílias são vítimas de grupos de criminosos e traficantes, muitas vezes protegidos pela polícia, que vivem da colheita de partes dos seus corpos para alimentar o macabro e muito lucrativo negócio das poções mágicas associados à crença de que possuem poderes mágicos.

Esta Casa não pode deixar de condenar veementemente a violência e a discriminação contra pessoas com albinismo, instando as autoridades destes países a porem termo à impunidade dos seus responsáveis e a apoiarem todas as campanhas que, através de ações de consciencialização das causas deste distúrbio congénito, permitam combater a discriminação, o preconceito e a superstição. Não podemos tolerar a continuação deste verdadeiro *apartheid* genético.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, espulsi dalle comunità e torturati, ma anche mutilati e uccisi e senza che ci siano pene certe per i persecutori: questa è la situazione delle persone affette da albinismo che vivono in molti paesi dell'Africa subsahariana, ma anche nel Pacifico e in India. La situazione è più grave nello stato del Malawi, dove ogni anno moltissime persone affette da albinismo vengono uccise e mutilate e le loro parti del corpo vengono vendute per essere utilizzate nelle pratiche rituali.

Amnesty International, nel suo rapporto «*We are not animals to be hunted or sold*», sostiene che dal 2014 sono aumentati i casi di rapimento e omicidio, costringendo gli albinos a vivere costantemente nel terrore. L'Unione europea e la comunità internazionale devono mettere in campo tutte le azioni possibili per garantire alle persone affette da albinismo il rispetto dei loro diritti e la dignità di essere umani.

Bisogna indurre in tutti i modi i governi dei paesi in cui si perpetrano questi delitti, come il Malawi, a offrire una protezione efficace alle persone affette da albinismo, proteggere il loro diritto alla vita e alla sicurezza personale.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υποστηρίζω το ψήφισμα, το οποίο άλλωστε έχω συνυπογράψει. Τα άτομα με αλφισμό υφίστανται πραγματικές διώξεις. Πρόκειται για τουλάχιστον 20.000 συνανθρώπους μας. Δολοφονίες, απαγωγές, ακρωτηριασμοί, ταπεινωτικές συμπεριφορές είναι αυτά τα οποία συμβαίνουν όχι μόνο στο Μαλάουι αλλά σε αρκετές αφρικανικές χώρες. Οι γυναίκες που γεννούν παιδιά με αλφισμό τα εγκαταλείπουν. Όλα αυτά συμβαίνουν, διότι υπάρχουν δεισιδαιμονίες, υπάρχει η μαγεία και θεωρείται ότι τμήματα των μελών των σωμάτων των αλφικών μπορούν να χρησιμοποιηθούν για να φτιαχτούν γιατροσόφια. Υπάρχουν «κυνήγοι» ατόμων με αλφισμό. Αντιλαμβάνεστε, λοιπόν, ότι πρέπει να σταματήσει αυτή η κατάσταση. Πρέπει να ποινικοποιηθεί η διακίνηση των ανθρώπινων μελών και πρέπει να ενθαρρυνθεί η δράση που έχει αναληφθεί στην Τανζανία, τη Μοζαμβίκη, τη Νιγηρία και την Κένυα και να προχωρήσουν οι χώρες στη λήψη μέτρων για την προστασία των ατόμων που πάσχουν από αλφισμό.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I, too, am deeply concerned and appalled by the situation of albino people in Malawi, Tanzania and other African countries. The ongoing stigmatisation, attacks, murder and selling of body parts, to which persons with albinism fall victim, are truly horrifying. Persons with albinism are marginalised, isolated and subjected to extreme violence and violations of their fundamental human rights.

I urgently call on the governments of the affected countries to bring the perpetrators to justice, and to end the impunity which they currently seem to enjoy. It is necessary that health care, education and employment opportunities are made more accessible to albino people and that victims are supported. The EU must stand strong and not allow these abuses of human rights to continue.

Lastly, I would like to congratulate my fellow MEPs for their work, and their speeches here today, to try and help bring these despicable practices to an end.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, effectivement, les personnes souffrant d'albinisme vivent souvent un enfer car la société n'est pas suffisamment informée. C'est particulièrement le cas au Malawi et dans un certain nombre de pays africains.

Il est donc de la responsabilité des États de faire preuve de pédagogie par rapport à cela, mais aussi de prendre des dispositions pour protéger ces populations fragilisées par des croyances hors de notre temps.

Il faut prendre en charge et protéger les victimes, notamment les femmes, souvent victimes de viols, car des pratiques superstitieuses voudraient que des rapports sexuels avec une femme atteinte d'albinisme guérissent du sida. Rendez-vous compte! Il faut aussi que les États portent une attention particulière aux enfants victimes de cette situation car ils deviennent souvent et fréquemment des souffre-douleur dans les écoles.

L'Union européenne peut et doit aider les États concernés à informer et à éduquer les populations sur cette question. C'est une nécessité absolue, car c'est la base de la solution durable. Cela n'exclut pas la responsabilité qui incombe aux États de protéger leur population.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, tento případ je skutečně ohavný jako stovky jiných, které se dějí. Já jsem až při čtení tohoto usnesení pochopil, že nečtu výjev z dávných staletí, ale že se jedná o aktuální situaci v některých afrických zemích. Myslím si, že se musíme zamyslet nad tím, jak můžeme bojovat s pověrami, protože vzděláváním – to je jedna z těch cest, která se nabízí –, to bude velmi dlouhá doba. Samozřejmě, že je nutné vzdělávat lidi v této oblasti, ale podle mého názoru ti lidé potřebují ochranu co nejdřív. Je třeba stanovit drakonické tresty, je třeba jednoznačně zvýšit ochranu ze strany právě vlád těchto dotčených afrických zemí, protože to je asi jediný způsob, jak dnes bojovat s tímto způsobem myšlení, s těmito pověrami, které mají možná dávný původ, ale do 21. století se skutečně nehodí.

(Fine della procedura catch-to-eye)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, honourable Members, I would like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to speak on a significant human rights issue. In recent years, we have registered a worrying increase in human rights abuses against people with albinism in Malawi and other sub-Saharan African countries.

These criminal and discriminatory incidents involve violent attacks, abductions, human trafficking and killings. When the subject was last discussed in this House, honourable Members drew attention to a number of crucial actions which needed to be pursued. These actions remain highly relevant today. That is why the EU has been engaging with the concerned countries, urging protection and policing in communities where attacks against albinos are rife, while encouraging the authorities to bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. This requires, inter alia, increased cooperation across borders because the problem often has a regional dimension.

At the same time, honourable Members, we have also supported your recognition of the need to tackle the roots of social stigma against people with albinism, as well as encouraging acknowledgement of their specific needs, be they medical, psychological, educational or social. This challenge requires a longer-term commitment, implying close cooperation with all the stakeholders, including civil society, which has a role to play in confronting social beliefs deeply entrenched in superstition.

On a more positive note, the international community is also increasingly mobilising against this situation. On 13 June, we marked International Albinism Awareness Day. That and the recent appointment of the first ever United Nations independent expert on the enjoyment of human rights by persons with albinism are important steps towards increasing awareness of this issue. Moreover, the governments concerned are demonstrating increasing recognition of the scale of this problem, which is a positive initial step.

We stand ready for further engagement with our partners, and, through our delegations, the EU will continue supporting local civil-society efforts. Our aim is that persons with albinism will be fully able to live in dignity, free from violence and discrimination.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà oggi.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – Troppo spesso in molti paesi africani, gli albinisti subiscono violenze fisiche e sessuali, vessazioni, persecuzioni, discriminazioni e in alcuni casi vengono persino uccisi. Inoltre le donne e i bambini affetti da albinismo, sono particolarmente vulnerabili all'esclusione sociale, bullismo e vivono spesso nel terrore di subire attacchi. Il Movimento 5 Stelle si è sempre schierato per combattere le violazioni dei diritti umani e per proteggere le minoranze da atti disumani, come quelli che sono costretti a subire gli albinisti in Africa. Bisogna esortare le istituzioni del Malawi ad affrontare e combattere le superstizioni dannose che portano alla discriminazione degli albinisti, attraverso campagne di informazione, collaborando anche con partner internazionali. L'UE deve avere un ruolo chiave nel supporto di queste azioni, monitorando e supportando gli Stati africani, per porre fine alle barbarie che gli albinisti sono costretti a subire.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD), raštu. – Albinizmas yra paveldimas genetinis sutrikimas, tačiau Malavyje ir kai kuriose kitose šalyse jis klaidingai suvokiamas. Dėl to yra žudomi ir žalojami žmonės, siekiant prisišaukti jėgą ir sėkmę. Albinizmo sutrikimą turinčios moterys prievartaujamos, nes manoma, kad lytiniai santykiai su jomis gali išgydyti nuo ŽIV ir AIDS. Žmogžudystės, luošinimas, diskriminacija, priekabiavimas ir stigmatizacija privertė šimtus albinizmo sutrikimą turinčių asmenų išsikelti į laikinas prieglaudas rajonuose, sumažėjo jų galimybės naudotis tokiomis pagrindinėmis paslaugomis kaip sveikatos priežiūra ir švietimas, galimybės įsidarbinti ir dalyvauti visuomenės gyvenime. Atsižvelgiant į tai, labai svarbu, kad Malavio vyriausybė imtųsi aktyvių veiksmų, siekiant apsaugoti albinizmo genetinį sutrikimą turinčius asmenis, užkirsti kelią smurtui prieš juos, suteikti visas būtinas medicinos ir psichologinės pagalbos priemones. Smurtas prieš albinizmo sutrikimą turinčius asmenis yra tarpvalstybinio pobūdžio, todėl, mano manymu, būtina stiprinti regioninį bendradarbiavimą šioje srityje, skatinti švietimo programas, kurios paneigtų vyraujančius mitus ir padėtų pažeidžiamai asmenų grupei socializuotis, tapti lygiaverčiais visuomenės nariais.

3.2. Die Fälle der Wortführer der Krimtataren Ahtem Çiygoz und İlmi Ümerov sowie des Journalisten Mykola Semena

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su cinque proposte di risoluzione sui casi dei leader tatar Akhtem Chiyyoz e İlmi Ümerov e del giornalista Mykola Semena in Crimea (2017/2869(RSP)).

Rebecca Harms, Verfasserin. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Vielen Dank für die Unterstützung dieser Entschließung. Sie ist sehr wichtig. Das Menschenrechtsbüro der Vereinten Nationen hat jetzt gerade erst im September einen Bericht verabschiedet, in dem von schwersten Menschenrechtsverletzungen auf dem besetzten Territorium der Autonomen Republik Krim und der Stadt Sewastopol berichtet wird. Das Menschenrechtsbüro der Vereinten Nationen erklärt, wie Krimtataren, Journalisten, Blogger und jeder, der auf der Krim Kritik an der Besetzung der Krim oder der Politik Putins äußert, festgenommen und eingesperrt werden kann. Es gibt Berichte darüber, dass Menschen verschwinden, dass Menschen vom Geheimdienst terrorisiert werden und in der Haft auch psychiatrisiert und gefoltert werden.

Am wichtigsten in dieser Entschließung, die wir heute verabschieden, ist, dass denjenigen, die in den Lagern und Gefängnissen Putins verschwinden, Namen gegeben werden, dass diese Personen auftauchen.

Darüber hinaus finde ich die Forderung sehr wichtig, dass unser Auswärtiger Dienst, unsere Botschaft und auch der Europarat und die Vereinten Nationen mehr Druck dafür machen, dass die Situation auf der Krim durch internationale Delegationen beobachtet werden kann. Es kann nicht sein, dass – so wie unter Stalin – wieder Menschen von der Krim in den Lagern – heute nicht Stalins, sondern Putins – verschwinden und wir in dieser Situation, obwohl Russland im Prinzip zum Europarat gehört, nichts machen können. Wir sollten die Forderung der Ukrainer unterstützen, dass sich die Generalversammlung der Vereinten Nationen nach dem Bericht, den ich am Anfang angesprochen habe, ausdrücklich mit diesen Problemen beschäftigt.

Ansonsten müssen wir dafür sorgen, dass die Sanktionen, die wegen der Besetzung der Krim erlassen worden sind, durchgehalten werden, dass wir wie die Vereinten Nationen weiter dabei bleiben, dass die Krim besetztes Territorium ist. Wir sollten die Unternehmer bestrafen, die mit der Brücke von Kertsch oder im Energiebereich diese Sanktionen brechen.

Petras Auštrevičius, author. – Mr President, the non-recognition of Crimea's occupation is not just a political declaration, it is an obligation to act. I call on the European External Service: each and every case of repressed Crimean dissidents must be followed by our action, I mean by asset-freezing and a travel ban against those who are responsible. I have got a note from independent Russian analysts who say that over 130 European Union companies still enjoy trading with Crimea. An absolute majority of them have a Cypriot legal registration. This scandalous and shocking political business scheme must be stopped immediately and investigated thoroughly. The Commission must act and take all legal measures against these sanctions-violators.

Soraya Post, author. – Mr President, dissent is not a crime. As a human rights defender, a feminist and coming from a minority myself, I must speak out against the dire situation in occupied Crimea. Today we highlight the cases of two Crimean Tatar leaders and one journalist. But the problem is much, much broader. There is a disturbing pattern of repression of independent voices. So often across the world minority groups are in vulnerable situations and we must secure their rights.

We demand that the de facto Russian authorities reverse their convictions. They must end the persecution and harassment of Crimean Tatars, human rights defenders, journalists, lawyers, and all other target groups. And as I said before, we must secure their rights.

Michael Gahler, Verfasser. – Herr Präsident! Ich bin sehr froh, dass wir heute in dieser Angelegenheit wieder einen breiten Konsens von fünf Fraktionen haben und dass wir damit klar machen, dass wir gemeinsam die Besetzung der Krim weiterhin für einen illegalen, völkerrechtswidrigen Akt halten und dass wir uns nicht nur abstrakt um Territorien kümmern sondern sehr konkret um Menschen, die unter dieser Besetzung leiden.

Es ist richtig, dass wir die Tatarenführer hier namentlich nennen: Ahtem Çiygoz, İlmi Ümerov und den Journalisten Mykola Semena. Sie – und auch ihre Angehörigen und auch Russland, alle – sollen wissen, dass diese Menschen nicht vergessen sind. Deswegen haben wir auch die anderen politischen Gefangenen, die auf der Krim von den russischen Behörden festgesetzt und verurteilt worden sind, in die Liste derer aufgenommen, die hier erwähnt sind. Wir verlangen ihre unmittelbare Freilassung, denn sie sind in der Tat politische Gefangene und haben nichts anderes verbrochen, als dass sie sich für die Unabhängigkeit ihres Heimatlandes und die Zugehörigkeit zur Krim eingesetzt haben. Wir sollten diese tapferen Menschen weiterhin beim Namen nennen und politisch und moralisch unterstützen. Ich glaube, das ist unsere Aufgabe hier.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, author. – Mr President, three years after the illegal annexation of Crimea, Russia is tightening its grip on the community of the peninsula by means of terror, massive violations of human, citizens' and political rights, and by means of killings, abductions, illegal detentions and deprivation of basic rights.

This policy is affecting, in particular, the indigenous community of Crimean Tatars. Their political representation, the Mejlis, was banned and two prominent Mejlis leaders, Mr İlmi Ümerov and Mr Akhtem Chiyyoz, were given lengthy prison sentences, as was Mr Mykola Semena, a journalist linked to Radio Free Europe. In our resolution we provide a long list of prisoners – political prisoners, prisoners of conscience – who are to be remembered. We also know the names of perpetrators of massive human rights violations, including judges sentencing, in the name of illegal Russian courts, the patriots of the Ukraine, of the Tatar community.

We need to broaden the group of people who are subject to our individual sanctions, to take restrictive measures against these people.

Dariusz Rosati, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, we are going to vote today on a resolution on the two Crimean Tatar leaders Akhtem Chiyyoz and Ilmi Umerov, and the journalist Mykola Semena, who have been sentenced to prison for simply expressing their views. We demand their immediate release. But our debate is more general. We are speaking here about ongoing grave abuses by the Russian Federation of human rights in the illegally annexed Crimea region of Ukraine.

The recently published UN Human Rights Council report about the human rights situation in Crimea states that imprisonments, arrests, tortures and abductions were amongst the actions targeted against people opposing the Russian annexation of Crimea. These inhuman and shameful practices demonstrate once again that Russia continuously violates international law and is a threat to European security. I therefore welcome the June prolongation of sanctions against Russia concerning its annexation of Crimea. The sanctions should be maintained and extended until the human rights of the people of Crimea are fully protected and Crimea is returned to Ukraine.

Tibor Szanyi, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, ever since the illegal annexation of the Crimean peninsula by Russia, this Parliament has been – and must remain – in the forefront of international protest against Putin's expansionism. As we insist on restoring the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine, we must see beyond the legal and military consequences and must keep reminding Europe and the world of the human suffering and injustice the local population must endure, particularly the most daring, who challenge and fight the illegal occupation.

This motion calls for our joint solidarity with the people of Crimea, especially of the local Tatar community whose members and leaders are Moscow's main targets in repressing and avenging opposition, similarly to representatives of the free press. The convictions and detentions of Tatar leaders – who as Mejlis leaders are actually our colleagues – Ilmi Umerov and Akhtem Chiyyoz, as well as the journalist Mykola Semena, must be reversed, their freedom and human rights restored.

However, their cases represent only the tip of the iceberg as far as Putin's reckless repression is concerned, marked by violence, torture, illegal detention and transfer of detainees to Russia. This motion recalls the names of many other Crimean Tatar and other victims and as MEPs, we must remain vigilant and active in updating this dire list and highlighting every single case of human rights abuse. Also the EU needs to further empower and supply the EEAS, and support the UN, the OSCE and the civilians in their monitoring and humanitarian efforts.

Indeed, Putin behaves in Crimea like the worst kind of occupation force, following the most appalling inhuman Stalinist patterns, ignoring all norms of international law of human rights and of decency. I believe Crimea is the testing ground, as far as Europe's tolerance and democratic determination is concerned. Let the Crimean Tatars' fate be a reminder of this to all, in or out of the EU, who still nourish illusions about Moscow's intentions, and who tend to regard the illegal annexation as a kind of *fait accompli*.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Russia's illegal occupation and annexation of Crimea continues, and so must the EU's resolve to protest about its action. Sadly, the situation is not getting any better. There are now new allegations of human rights violations in Crimea detailed in the UN Human Rights Agency's report. It is also the case that the Crimean minority group, the Tatars, continue to be persecuted, which echoes the treatment of their grandparents under Stalin. The imprisonment of prominent Tatar dissidents, Akhtem Chiyyoz, Ilmi Umerov and the journalist Mykola Semena, as well as the fact that the Tatars' Parliament, the Majlis, has been closed, is deeply alarming.

My group, the ECR, will continue to oppose Russia's actions via EU sanctions and international pressure. The indigenous Turkic-speaking population must be allowed to live peacefully in their homeland of Crimea, and any efforts by the Russian Government to force them to leave the peninsula through policies of persecution or withdrawal of their democratic rights is totally unacceptable.

Urmas Paet, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the situation in Crimea tends sometimes to be overshadowed by other developments, but we cannot let this happen. According to the latest UN report, the human rights situation in Crimea has significantly deteriorated under Russian occupation. There are arbitrary arrests and detentions, enforced disappearances, ill-treatment and torture. Also, the imposition of Russian citizenship has affected tens of thousands of people. Persons holding a residence permit and No Russian Federation citizenship in Crimea cannot own agricultural land, vote or be elected, register a religious community, apply to hold a public meeting, hold positions in the public administration, and so on.

The Russian Government has an obligation, as an occupying power, to uphold human rights for all and effectively investigate alleged torture, abductions and killings. But of course, the only fundamental solution lies in Russia ending the occupation of Crimea and returning it to Ukraine.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, žádné porušování lidských práv samozřejmě nemůže být tolerováno. Jistě je dobře, že se snažíme zabývat každým jednotlivým případem, ale mám obavu, abychom pro jednotlivosti nezapomínali na porušení práv a utrpení velkých skupin lidí. Stačí se podívat na Ukrajinu, kde již tři roky panuje vleklý konflikt s dopadem na miliony lidí. Jeho součástí je zabíjení, mučení a týrání lidí, jakož i likvidace nepohodlných novinářů. I podle zprávy Úřadu vysokého komisaře OSN z léta letošního roku, kterou kolegové zde také citovali, dochází: „K systematickému porušování práva na spravedlivý proces v případech souvisejících s konfliktem.“ Pravidelně zde na plénu pranýřujeme situaci na Krymu, je to evergreen. Podle mého názoru ale potřebujeme konečně přestat s politikou dvojího metru.

Bronis Ropė, Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu. – Krymas – tai saldis kąsnis Rusijai, kuri senokai į jį gviešiasi. Šis pusiasalis Rusijai visais laikais buvo labai svarbus strategiškai. Rusijos agresija prasidėjo dar XIX a. viduryje, tęsėsi XX a. pradžioje, o po Antrojo pasaulinio karo Stalinas deportavo visus Krymo totorius, nes jie neva bendradarbiavo su naciais. Ir dabar XXI a. Rusija vėl aneksavo Krymą. Tokia padėtis yra šurpiausia Krymo totoriams, kurių Kryme liko nedaug, tačiau jie yra šios žemės senbuviai, šeiminingai. Krymo totorių istorija yra daug kuo panaši į mano tautos istoriją, tačiau jiems teko patirti nepalyginamai žiauresnę ilgametę tremtį.

Turime aktyviau padėti Ukrainai susigrąžinti pusiasalį ir tokiu būdu kartu užtikrinti ramybę ir ateitį taip pat ir Krymo totoriams.

Marie-Christine Arnautu, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Malawi, Maldives, Crimée, que de sujets cruciaux pour les Européens que nous sommes censés défendre ici!

Mais il y a quatre jours, à Marseille, un islamiste a égorgé deux jeunes filles innocentes, qui s'ajoutent à la longue liste des centaines de victimes d'une guerre de religion qui tait son nom. Pourtant, elle se tient dans nos murs, où elle est menée par des ennemis qui n'ont rien à y faire, mais qui profitent de votre laxisme et de votre aveuglement pour commettre leurs crimes.

Ce matin, nous assistons donc à un réquisitoire anti-Poutine, au prétexte du sort de personnes qui ont été régulièrement condamnées pour troubles à l'ordre public, incitations à la subversion, menées antidémocratiques ou même, ironie du calendrier, si l'on pense à ce qui s'est passé dimanche dernier en Catalogne, pour tentatives d'empêcher, par la violence, la tenue du référendum sur l'autonomie de la Crimée.

Charité bien ordonnée commence par soi-même. Occupons-nous donc de la démocratie au sein de l'Union et, après seulement, vous pourrez donner des leçons à la terre entière.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodniczący! Ja nic nie rozumiem: wczoraj słyszę z ust pana Timmermansa, że najważniejsze są rządy prawa, a dziś chcecie zaprowadzić w Rosji ustrój totalitarny, by pan Putin mógł na wasze polecenie zmieniać wyroki niezależnych sądów. Wy pragniecie totalitaryzmu! O Krymie i Rosji nie wiecie nic. Ja byłem na Krymie, tam było 70 % Rosjan na okrągło, 10 % Ukraińców, 10 % Tatarów i 10 % Ukraińców mówiących po rosyjsku. To byli ludzie rządzący Krymem, bo tam, aby być u władzy, trzeba było być Ukraińcem. Teraz ci sami ludzie są już Rosjanami i ci sami ludzie rządzą na Krymie i tak samo traktują Tatarów. Cytuję za „The Guardian” pana Zaira Smiedlajewa, działacza tatarskiego, który za rządów ukraińskich był oskarżany o separatyzm, bo powiedział, że pewnego dnia Krym będzie tatarski. I on mówi tak: „Teraz ci sami ludzie z ukraińskich służb bezpieczeństwa, którzy grozili mi i oskarżali o separatyzm, noszą mundury rosyjskie. Popatrzcie, kto stał się separatystą!” Z Krymu do Moskwy jest dalej niż do Kijowa i to jest jedyne, co się zmieniło z punktu widzenia Tatarów krymskich.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, the alarming reports about the abuse of human rights in Crimea should not come as a surprise to anyone. Yet again, we observe how the Kremlin uses the judicial system as a tool to silence fair criticism and discontent among the people. Any state established upon the rule of law must ensure the protection of minorities and freedom of speech.

On these most fundamental human rights, the Russian Federation is falling short. As representatives of the EU, we must condemn the unjust sentencing and demand the immediate release of Crimean Tatar leaders, Akhtem Chiygoz and Ilmi Umerov. The charges against journalist Mykola Semena should be dropped. Moreover, the EU must condemn the persecution and unfair policies against Crimean Tatars and continue to defend the European security order as we have known it since World War II.

Kati Piri (S&D). – De Krim gaat nu al ruim drie jaar gebukt onder de Russische bezetting, waarbij mensenrechtenschendingen aan de orde van de dag zijn. Er is sprake van martelingen en willekeurige arrestaties.

De situatie van de Krim-Tataren is het meest schrijnend. De zaak Umerov, Chiygoz en Semena, die we hier bespreken, is exemplarisch. Zij betalen nu een hoge prijs voor het bekritisieren van de illegale annexatie. Na een schimmig proces zijn ze alle drie veroordeeld tot een buitenproportioneel lange gevangenisstraf.

Als EU is het onze plicht om op te komen voor journalisten en mensenrechtenactivisten, ook buiten onze grenzen. De Krim mag niet vergeten worden. De situatie van de inwoners van het illegaal geannexeerde gebied moet internationaal op de agenda blijven.

Daarom pleit ik er ook voor dat de EU Rusland hierop blijft aanspreken en zich hard maakt voor de vrijlating van deze drie mensen.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Krym jest terytorium okupowanym przez Rosję ze wszystkimi tragicznymi konsekwencjami, z jakimi okupacja się wiąże. To jest dla wszystkich nas jasne – z wyjątkiem pana posła Korwin-Mikkego. Aresztowania, prześladowania i represje polityczne to codzienność ludności tatarskiej, która wytrwale stara się bronić wartości, które podobno dla Unii Europejskiej są fundamentalne: praw człowieka i szacunku dla mniejszości.

Wzywamy Federację Rosyjską do uwolnienia tatarskich i ukraińskich więźniów politycznych, których jedyną winą jest wytrwały opór przeciwko bezprawiu. Bo Rosja tam jest bezprawnie, a Unia powinna stać na straży nienaruszalności granic. Oskarżenia i wyroki dla przywódców Tatarów krymskich Achtema Cziygoza, Ilmiego Umerowa oraz dziennikarza Mykoły Semeny to ważna, ale jedynie niewielka część prawdy o skutkach rosyjskiej okupacji Krymu. Wielu podobnych historii miałem okazję wysłuchać osobiście. Te same metody i te same represje Rosjanie stosowali przeciwko Polakom, Bałtom, Węgom czy Czechom w nieodległej wcale przeszłości. My to jeszcze pamiętamy.

Tylko stanowcza reakcja Zachodu i ciągła presja ekonomiczna mogą zakończyć tę tragiczną sytuację Tatarów na Krymie.

Илхан Кючюк (ALDE). – Г-н Председател, г-жо Комисар, ситуацията в Източна Украйна продължава да бъде нестабилна, несигурна и опасна. Липсата на политическа воля да се изпълнят напълно споразуменията от Минск превръща конфликта в замразен и на практика засилва тенденциите за разделяне.

Уви, в условията на опасност от военно изостряне човешките права винаги биват системно потъпквани. Такъв е и случаят в Източна Украйна, където правата на малцинствата биват системно погазвани, а дискриминационните действия срещу татарското население се превръщат в тежка реалност.

Г-жо Комисар, всички страни, упражняващи власт, трябва да се придържат към международните закони и норми и да гарантират изконните човешки права и свободи на всички граждани, независимо от техния етнически произход, пол и религия. Кримските татари са неизменна част от населението на Крим и техните културно-исторически ценности трябва да бъдат зачитани.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Pane předsedající, paní komisařko, dnes zde diskutujeme následky okupace části území Ukrajiny Ruskem. Rusko proti všem pravidlům mezinárodního práva okupuje Krym a Sevastopol. Připojení těchto území k Rusku nikdy neuznáme a tato území pro nás zůstávají územím Ukrajiny. Být na straně práva je pro kremelský režim zjevný zločin. Oběti lidské zvěle mají konkrétní jména obsažená v naší rezoluci, např. Oleg Sencov, Ilmi Umerov nebo Roman Sušenko a mnozí další. Nejen oběti, ale i ruská zvěle má svá konkrétní jména. Pachatelé těchto zločinů je třeba identifikovat a potrestat. V tuto chvíli je EU může přidat na své sankční seznamy.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rebecca Harms pięknie powiedziała, że ofiary nie mogą pozostać bezimiennymi, to najlepsze, co możemy od razu dla nich zrobić. Również prześladowane narody nie mogą pozostać bezimienni.

Historia Tatarów krymskich, historia Krymu w XX wieku to historia heroiczna, to jest opór wobec rewolucji bolszewickiej (pamiętajmy, że kontrrewolucja kończyła swój bohaterski opór właśnie na Krymie i Tatarzy w nim brali udział), to ukonstytuowanie się w państwo uznane przez Ligę Narodów, państwo Tatarów krymskich, to straszliwa, dzika deportacja w czasie wojny przez Stalina i to bohaterski powrót na swoje ziemie. Tak naprawdę los Tatarów krymskich jest testem, zawsze testem tego, co dzieje się na Krymie.

My nie możemy ich traktować tylko jako szczególny przypadek, jako społeczność, wśród której są ofiary, ale jako podmiot, który ma prawo wypowiedzieć się o przyszłości swojej ziemi.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, Chuir sé déistin orainn go léir nuair a d'ionsaigh na Rúisigh an Chrimé trí bliana ó shin; faraor, níl aon fhonn abhaile orthu. Chuige sin, tá siad ag teacht anuas go trom ar mhuintir na Crimé, go háirithe na daoine atá ag caint amach ina gcoinne. Tá trí shampla de sin againn ar maidin: an bheirt cheannaire Tatar agus an t-iriseoir Semen. Dá bhrí sin, is cóir dúinn brú a chur ar na Rúisigh an bheirt cheannaire a ligint saor agus dul ar ais go dtí na gclann agus na coireanna atá curtha i leith Semen, deireadh a chur leo.

Freisin, is ceart dúinn leanúint ar aghaidh leis an mbrú ginearálta, go háirithe mar a bhaineann le smachtbhannaí i gcoinne na Rúise go dtí go dtugann siad na cearta daonna do mhuintir na Crimé agus go dtéann siad ar ais abhaile.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, v záhlaví naší rezoluce jsou uvedena jména tří krymských Tatarů: Čijgoz, Umerov, Semen. Podle zpráv, včetně Úřadu vysokého komisaře OSN, víme, že těch, kteří jsou pronásledováni, zatýkáni, mučeni, unášeni nebo jsou nuceni odejít do exilu za kritiku ruské okupace Krymu, je mnohem více a stále jich přibývá. Evropský parlament nesmí k této situaci dál mlčet.

Během okupace byla silně potlačena svoboda médií, ta v podstatě přestala existovat a dnes jsou k dispozici pouze proruská zpravodajství. Máme zprávy o tom, že lidé na Krymu jsou nuceni spolupracovat s ruskými bezpečnostními složkami pod výhrůzkami. Něco takového si velmi dobře pamatujeme z doby totality v naší zemi do roku 1989. Stále ještě jsou však na Krymu lidé, kteří to nevzdali a brání lidská práva. Pro ně musí být podporou také naše usnesení a požadavek, aby byla zřízena mezinárodní pozorovatelská mise na Krymu v rámci OSN, která by podala zprávu o situaci.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vítám, že se touto rezolucí zastáváme lídrů krymských Tatarů. Jména Achtem Čijgoz a Ilmi Umerov pro nás nezůstávají neznámá. Právě tak jako novinář Mykola Semen.

Tato rezoluce má však mnohem hlubší význam, než je jenom odmítnutí nespravedlivých rozsudků. Tato rezoluce znovu evokuje naši paměť. Připomíná naši povinnost splácet dluh těm krymským Tatarům, kteří se v roce 1968 postavili proti okupaci mé země – Československa – sovětskou armádou. Připomíná, jak tragicky se může opakovat historie – byli to právě krymští Tataři, kteří už jednou byli podrobeni genocidě. Mám na mysli jejich násilné vystěhování z Krymu v roce 1944.

Tato rezoluce však má ještě jeden obecný smysl. Dokazuje, že Evropský parlament neuhýbá a stále nazývá věci pravými jmény: okupace Krymu je porušením mezinárodního práva.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, it is important that we keep on speaking out on the human rights violations that are happening on our doorstep in Ukraine and occupied Crimea. This resolution makes a clear call for the release of imprisoned Tatar leaders and activists. But we should not forget Ukrainian political prisoners in Russia, who have been languishing in prisons for years now. In particular, I have followed the case of the talented filmmaker Oleg Sentsov, who is in prison in Siberia, convicted on trumped-up charges.

We must send a message out from this House that we will not be quiet and we will not forget these people who have been locked away. The EU must continue to put more and more pressure on the Russian Government to end its human rights violations and let these people go.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, nas últimas semanas do passado mês de setembro Ilmi Umerov, destacado crítico da ocupação russa e líder do povo tártaro da Crimeia, o jornalista ucraniano Mykola Semena e o líder do Mejlis, Akhtem Chiygoz, foram condenados a penas de prisão acusados de ameaçar a integridade territorial da Federação Russa. As condenações destes três destacados críticos da anexação russa da Crimeia constituem o mais recente episódio de usurpação de direitos e liberdades fundamentais na península ucraniana e de instrumentalização do sistema judicial como ferramenta política de repressão daqueles que se opõem à ocupação e anexação russa. Esta não é a primeira vez que condenamos, nesta Casa, o recurso sistemático da Rússia a perseguições, torturas, prisões arbitrárias e execuções extrajudiciais para silenciar as vozes dissidentes e reduzir a população tártara da Crimeia à submissão.

Estas últimas detenções representam também mais uma grave violação do direito à liberdade de expressão, à segurança e a um julgamento justo garantidos pela Convenção Europeia dos Direitos Humanos, da qual a Federação Russa é signatária, e por isso apelamos à retirada das acusações e à libertação imediata de Akhtem Chiygoz, Ilmi Umerov e Mykola Semena.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já samozřejmě naprosto souhlasím s textem toho usnesení, protože je nepochybné, že v dané věci jsou ty rozsudky nelegitimní, jsou nespravedlivé, jsou porušením lidských práv. Okupace Krymu je obecně porušením mezinárodního práva, to je naprosto jasné a Rusko nemůže, podle mého názoru, využívat svoji justici k tomu, aby legitimizovalo tyto kroky. Rusko se stalo součástí vymahatelného okruhu mezinárodních práv a těch, které jsou zaručeny systémem Rady Evropy. A myslím si, že buď ta práva platí, nebo je to takový jídelníček, kdy platí jenom určitá část.

My bychom se měli snažit pomoci Radě Evropy k tomu, aby část své vymahatelné jurisdikce uplatňovala i vůči Rusku zabavováním podílů ruských společností. Musíme vyjádřit právě podporu Radě Evropy, protože ona má tento systém vybudovaný. My můžeme pouze dále trvat na tom sankčním seznamu. To je náš výraz solidarity za naše špatné svědomí, jak bylo jednostranně porušeno Budapeštské memorandum z roku 1994.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, the European Union and the international community do not recognise the illegal annexation of Crimea and continue to condemn the violation of international law, as well as the oppressive acts that represent a clear infringement of the human, civil, political and cultural rights of Crimean Tatars and other Crimean freedom fighters. Russia, as the occupying power of Crimea, has to respect international law.

At the same time, I call on the Commission to look thoroughly at and to address the situation in Ukraine, where recently the Ukrainian authorities took measures against the rights of national minorities in Ukraine. This is a terrible situation. While all of us here are fighting for the rights of Ukrainians in Crimea, Ukraine is taking measures against the national minorities in Ukraine, forbidding their right to learn in their mother tongue. This situation has to be addressed as well.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Ami a Krimben történik ezekben a hónapokban és években, az jól példázza, hogy milyen retorziókra számíthat egy nemzeti kisebbség, ha a politikai hatalom birtokosa ellenségnek minősíti. Az európai történelemben is találunk példákat erre, szerencsére ma már a Krimben alkalmazott módszerek elképzelhetetlenek lennének az Európai Unióban. Kérdéssel. Ez azonban nem jelenti azt, hogy a nemzeti kisebbségek maradéktalanul elégedettek a helyzetükkel az EU-ban, ellenkezőleg, egyértelmű igény mutatkozik rá, hogy az uniós intézmények foglalkozzanak azzal a mintegy 60 millió uniós polgárnak a speciális helyzetével, akik nemzeti vagy nyelvi kisebbséghez tartoznak az EU-ban.

A többség és kisebbség közötti párbeszéd beindításához hozzá kell járulnia az EU-nak, másképp mindig csak elítéljük az EU területén kívüli jogsértéseket, majd tudomást sem veszünk a saját problémáinkról. Majd ha eléggé elmérgesedik a helyzet, akkor párbeszédre hívjuk fel az érintett feleket, mint a katalán esetben. Talán hasznosabb lenne, ha a párbeszéd még azelőtt létrejönne, hogy az álláspontok megmerevednek és az egész EU-ra kiható következményekkel jár a problémák szőnyeg alá seprése.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, the human rights situation in the Crimean Peninsula has been deteriorating severely, as most recently documented in a report by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on 25 September. This report highlights the fact that Russian law has replaced Ukrainian law, in violation of international humanitarian law, that prisoners have been transferred to Russia (something which is prohibited under international humanitarian law), that there are systemic restrictions of fundamental freedoms, that there have been multiple failures to uphold the right to a fair trial and, not least, that there are arbitrary detentions, enforced disappearances, ill-treatment and torture.

The three cases before us regrettably illustrate very well the worsening situation. On 11 September, the Deputy Chair of the Mejlis, Akhtem Chygoz, was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment for participating in a pre-annexation rally held in support of the territorial integrity of Ukraine. On 22 September, the journalist Mykola Semena received a two-and-a-half-year suspended prison sentence merely for doing his job and, on 27 September, the Deputy Chair of the Mejlis, Ilmi Umerov, was sentenced to two years in prison for defending Ukraine's territorial integrity in television interviews.

These three cases are clear violations of fundamental freedoms, particularly that of expression. In addition, the EU does not recognise the illegal annexation and, therefore, we do not recognise the application of Russian law in the peninsula, including the politically motivated sentences given to Mr Chygoz, Mr Umerov and Mr Semena. The European External Action Service has issued a statement in each of these cases.

The EU also raises the issue of human rights violations and abuses in Crimea in public statements in international forums. EU officials regularly meet human rights defenders and journalists from Crimea, to be well informed about the situation on the ground. Currently, we are following closely the situation of four Crimean Tatars detained on Monday. All illegally detained Ukrainian citizens in Crimea and Russia should be released and their right to legal counsel and access to consular officers must be fully respected. Access to health care must be ensured, there should be full, free and unhindered access to the peninsula for international human rights personnel.

The EU remains unwavering in its support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine and does not recognise the illegal annexation of the Crimean Peninsula, which is a violation of international law.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà al termine della discussione.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR), *schriftelijk*. – Na de Europese schertsvertoning over het brutale geweld van Spanje ten aanzien van de vredelievende Catalanen kan men zich afvragen met welke geloofwaardigheid de EU mensenrechten verdedigt. Toch blijft het onze plicht om op te komen voor het lot van vervolgde politieke activisten waar ook ter wereld. Daarom steunt onze delegatie deze resolutie. De vervolging van Krim-Tataren door Moskou gaat onophoudelijk verder. Vandaag voegen wij twee van hun leiders en een journalist toe aan de lijst met politieke gevangenen. Ilmi Umerov, Akhtem Chygoz en Mykola Semena kwamen op voor hun volk, cultuur en toekomst. Voldoende om hen na een schijnproces tot zware straffen te veroordelen. Oude en zieke tegenstanders opsluiten is voor Poetin het cynische middel om de illegale annexatie en de culturele assimilatie van de Krim te handhaven. Het is tijd dat Rusland alle politieke veroordelingen intrekt en alle politieke gevangenen vrijlaat. Tot slot moeten de sancties tegen Rusland verder worden uitgebreid en dienen de rechters die betrokken waren bij deze schijnprocessen, gesanctioneerd te worden.

Monica Macovei (ECR), *in writing*. – The Russian occupation of the Ukrainian Crimean peninsula has inflicted grave human rights violations, especially concerning the rights of journalists and issues pertaining to freedom of speech. Crimean leaders, including Akhtem Chygoz and Ilmi Umerov, are being prosecuted for opposing Russia's annexation of Crimea. The same is true for journalists, like Mykola Semena, who has been a vocal critic of Russia's occupation and suggested that Ukraine should have blockaded the peninsula. He was convicted of acting against the 'territorial integrity of the Russian Federation', leaving him with a two-year suspended sentence and three-year ban on public activities.

While Semena does not have to serve a prison sentence, he is banned from public activities, including journalism, which takes away his freedom of speech and expression. If he violates this ban, he will be imprisoned by the Russian authorities. Ukrainian officials are working to bring Semena back to the Ukraine. There is a dire need to hold Russia accountable for their violations of human rights and to bring justice for the victims of these violations.

3.3. Lage auf den Malediven

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su sette proposte di risoluzione sulla situazione alla Maldive (2017/2870(RSP)).

Javier Nart, autor. – Señor presidente, hace más de 40 años España era un paraíso para el turismo: sol y paella. Pero, detrás del sol y de la paella, había una dictadura, había personas en la cárcel, había represión y no existía democracia.

Maldivas es exactamente lo mismo, pero mucho peor. Tenemos unas islas maravillosas, unos fondos submarinos extraordinarios, un régimen corrupto, represor y torturador. Las personas que van a Maldivas se olvidan de la gente de Maldivas, que es lo trascendente. Se ha presentado una propuesta de Resolución en la que se proponen sanciones particulares personales para los responsables de represión, pero no se ha aprobado, y es lamentable —y a uno francamente le duele el alma—, ya que había algo fundamental, que es una campaña de sensibilización para los turistas que quieren ir a Maldivas, a los que habría que decir que van al paraíso que es el infierno.

Charles Tannock, author. – Mr President, I am deeply concerned about the worsening situation in the Maldives. President Abdulla Yameen and his government seem focused on increasing their authoritarian rule. Opposition leaders have been imprisoned, parliamentarians and journalists have been intimidated and threatened, and news organisations has been forced to close. All of this is deeply alarming.

Added to this are the plethora of new laws that limit the freedoms of speech and of assembly, and there is now an end to a 60-year moratorium on the use of the death penalty. This all exhibits a deeply worrying trend towards a politicised judiciary and police, and it cannot be ignored that the Maldives now tops the table in terms of the number of ISIS recruits per capita of population. It is also deeply regrettable that the Maldives took the decision to leave the Commonwealth in 2016, demonstrating Yameen's unwillingness to cooperate with international partners.

We must now urge Yameen to uphold his country's constitution, to protect democratic rights and to restore fundamental freedoms in line with international law and conventions. All political prisoners held on fabricated charges should be released, and the Presidential elections in 2018 should be free, fair and inclusive. It is vital for the future of the Maldives and its people that freedoms of assembly and expression are upheld for all.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, auteure. – Monsieur le Président, loin de la destination de rêve qu'elle représente pour de nombreux touristes, notamment européens, les Maldives semblent de plus en plus s'enfoncer dans ce que l'on pourrait appeler une forme d'obscurantisme.

Les femmes en sont souvent les premières victimes, avec des condamnations à des coups de fouet et le port du hidjab, qui est de plus en plus répandu. Les enfants sont également touchés, avec une responsabilité pénale fixée à dix ans, et même à sept ans dans certains cas.

Journalistes et blogueurs sont particulièrement visés, notamment quand ils ne sont pas musulmans et, pire, quand ils sont athées. Yameen Rasheed, jeune blogueur de 29 ans, assassiné de 16 coups de couteau, en est un symbole. Il se savait menacé et avait porté plainte, mais en vain.

Parmi les autres victimes, on compte les avocats. Deux tiers des membres du barreau ont été suspendus en septembre et les prisons sont pleines de prisonniers politiques. Enfin, la peine de mort a été rétablie, même si aucune exécution n'a encore eu lieu, d'autant que cinq des 17 condamnés étaient mineurs au moment des faits.

L'Union européenne, premier partenaire commercial des Maldives, a les moyens d'agir dans l'intérêt de la population, encore faut-il en avoir envie!

Ignazio Corrao, author. – Mr President, we are here today discussing once again the situation in the Maldives, which not only has not improved, but has got even worse. Through our vote we will surely support this resolution. However, I would like to underline that we are not actually taking any steps forward in comparison with the previous resolution. Indeed, a crucial part of the previous resolution is missing, namely the travel ban.

I genuinely think that the travel ban approach is by far the most effective tool we can use to have a high impact on the Maldivian Government and to offer a concrete and solid response to those who are violating human rights and international law in the Maldives. Considering that hundreds of thousands of European tourists travel to the Maldives every year, and taking into account that the government is clearly not concerned about any international recommendations or admonitions, I strongly believe that the travel ban may be one of the best options we have at our disposal. Indeed, the travel ban will produce the dramatic loss of a huge market share for the travel industry, which would make them vulnerable and surely keener to respect human rights.

Tomáš Zdechovský, Autor. – Pane předsedající, Evropská unie už v procesu na Maledivách je poměrně dlouho aktivní, ale myslíme si, že není dostatečně. Proto jsme se shodli napříč politickým spektrem na této rezoluci, která je v mnohých ohledech jiná, protože jsou tam zohledněny věci, které jsme dříve neakceptovali a nereflektovali v našich rezolucích. Ano, velmi často je říkáno, že kritizovat umí každý, ale kritika musí být konstruktivní a pomáhat danému řešení. Ale situace na Maledivách bohužel přes naše konstruktivní nabízená řešení nemá žádná východiska. Musí být ustoupeno od stíhání lídrů opozice, znovuoobnovení trestu smrti. Musí být dodržovány mezinárodní závazky a také otázka náboženského respektu. Pokud toto Maledivy nebudou ani nadále dodržovat, je potřeba zvážit sankce, a to může být i ten zákaz cestování turistů z EU na tento přenádherný ostrov.

Soraya Post, författare. – Herr talman! Fru kommissionär! Min bild av Maldiverna var atoller med kritvit strand och böljande palmer – ett litet paradīs i vykortsformat. Det är bilden som den maldiviska regeringen vill att omvärlden ska få av landet. Och dom har lyckats. Över en miljon turister besöker årligen denna önation.

Det finns dock en annan sida som de styrande helst inte vill visa upp: att oliktankande politiker och det civila samhället utsätts för trakasserier, att journalister och parlamentariker blir fängslade på osakliga grunder, att regeringen på maldiverna vill återuppta dödsstraffet, till och med för barn under 18 år.

Som parlamentariker och feminist vill jag säga att ett tryggt civilsamhälle och en oberoende journalistkår är nödvändiga delar av en demokrati. Dödsstraffet är under alla omständigheter otänkbart och ska avskaffas, inte återupprättas. Och till Maldiverna vill jag säga: Lev upp till demokratiska principer, lev upp till ett genuint försvar av de mänskliga rättigheterna. Först då kan vi tro på ert paradīs i ett vykortsformat.

Jean Lambert, author. – Mr President, I speak in my capacity as chair of Parliament's Delegation for Relations with South Asia, which includes the Maldives. In fact, we have a visit planned there at the end of this month, but this resolution is separate in its motivation from that visit. However, we will welcome an opportunity to discuss our findings with everyone who is so concerned today on our return.

I think it is clear to say that we recognise the positive role that the Maldives is playing in terms of their international commitment on climate change and their cooperation with the European Union on issues of security, for example. However, as has been made very clear this morning, there are very deep concerns about issues of governance since the major constitutional changes of 2008. On our last visit, and since then, we have picked up on growing concern about the independence and impartiality of the judiciary at all levels, the recent suspension of one third of lawyers, the narrowing of the freedom of expression and the pressure on independent media.

The recent murder of the blogger that people have referred to actually sent shockwaves throughout the Maldives, as well as the rest of the world, because murder is so rare in that society. I think all of us, as MPs, would be worried if we saw most of our party leaders in jail, facing criminal charges. So we need productive political dialogue, and we need a strengthening of independent bodies, such as the Human Rights Commission, so that we can see democracy move forward in the Maldives, as we all hope.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, sous la présidence d'Abdulla Yameen, les Maldives sont en train de basculer d'un régime en cours de démocratisation à un régime autoritaire. Tous les signes sont là: la liberté d'expression sévèrement remise en cause, les journalistes menacés de mort, le système judiciaire de plus en plus contrôlé par le gouvernement. L'exemple de la suspension d'un tiers des avocats du pays n'est, dans ce contexte, que le dernier signe.

Le gouvernement en place fait d'ailleurs tout pour anéantir l'opposition politique, y compris en occupant militairement la scène parlementaire pour empêcher les votes qui ne lui conviennent pas.

Dans ces conditions, je soutiens l'introduction de sanctions individuelles contre tous ceux qui causent ces atteintes aux droits de l'homme. Je pense que ces sanctions ne devraient pas être levées tant que tous les prisonniers politiques ne sont pas libérés, mais aussi tant qu'un cadre démocratique minimal n'est pas restauré afin que les élections prochaines puissent se dérouler librement.

Wajid Khan, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, just a few days ago at the UN General Assembly, the Maldives Foreign Minister said the following words: 'Looking to cultivate a culture of respect for human rights at home and abroad is our goal. We believe we have been successful'. The Maldives Government wants us to believe that the country is a young democracy and a tourist paradise, but this just isn't the case. Recently one third of all practising lawyers were suspended for calling for the independence and impartiality of the judiciary. Numerous prisoners are currently under death sentence with serious concerns about the fairness of their trials, and at least five of those convicted are under 18 years old.

The blogger and prominent human rights defender Yameen Rasheed was killed in April. Sadly, he is another victim of the wider crackdown on the freedom of expression in the Maldives.

My Group is alarmed at the deteriorating situation, as well as the continued harassment of the media, political opponents and civil society. We ask the External Action Service and Member States to make full use of all instruments at their disposal in order to promote human rights and democratic principles. We call on the Maldives authorities to stop ruling with an iron fist and enter into a genuine dialogue with opposition parties and civil society, ensuring free and fair elections. We also urge them to reinstate the moratorium on the death penalty. It is time to back up words with action and to embrace human rights and justice. It is in the interest of all Maldivians.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, les Maldives: soleil, cocotiers, plages de sable blanc, eaux turquoises et hôtels paradisiaques. La carte postale est idyllique au recto, mais au verso, c'est la charia qui dicte sa loi.

La peine de mort y a été rétablie il y a trois ans, y compris pour les enfants. Le régime du président Yameen a «l'amabilité» de ne faire exécuter les sentences qu'à leur majorité. Les intimidations et les assassinats de journalistes et de blogueurs qui défendent la liberté d'expression sont nombreux: Ismail Hilath, Yameen Rasheed et tous les autres. Des avocats ont été suspendus pour avoir osé demander le respect de l'état de droit et Mohamed Nasheed, premier président démocratiquement élu, a été condamné à 13 ans de prison.

Les Maldives, c'est aussi l'un des plus gros fournisseurs, proportionnellement, de renforts djihadistes à l'État islamique, et je n'ai pas encore parlé des femmes, avec la lapidation publique des femmes adultères, le mariage précoce et les viols. La liste est interminable. Sous la plage, c'est l'enfer!

Alors, autant le savoir au moment de cliquer et de réserver ses vacances. Un million de touristes chaque année, c'est une arme de dissuasion massive quand la diplomatie échoue.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Maldive: quando il paradiso diventa un inferno. Abbiamo già trattato in quest'Aula il deterioramento delle libertà civili, le minacce, le torture che membri dell'opposizione e giornalisti, blogger, difensori dei diritti umani e normali cittadini stanno subendo nel meraviglioso atollo dell'Oceano Indiano, sogno di milioni di turisti ignari di cosa stia realmente accadendo.

Quando sembrava che la situazione non potesse peggiorare ulteriormente, è arrivata invece la dichiarazione del presidente Abdul Gayoom, che ha espresso chiaramente la sua intenzione di riprendere, da fine settembre, le esecuzioni capitali nel paese. Esecuzioni necessarie, a suo dire, a mantenere l'ordine pubblico e i valori delle Maldive. Se questa non è una linea rossa, cosa può esserlo, allora colleghi? Ripeto l'appello che già facemmo nel dicembre 2015, anche per contrastare la sordità selettiva che l'Unione manifesta sempre più spesso: servono sanzioni mirate verso i responsabili di questa deriva autoritaria e se non ci saranno progressi, dobbiamo avere il coraggio di mettere sul tavolo anche un divieto totale di viaggio per i nostri turisti.

E faccio un secondo appello agli Stati membri: informate i vostri cittadini che al di fuori delle gabbie dorate dei *resort* vacanze, si sta materializzando un inferno. E infine, un ultimo ammonimento: avete ignorato le nostre richieste ma ad oggi risulta penosamente chiaro come il «*business as usual*» non solo non rappresenti una strada percorribile ma venga interpretato dalla nostra controparte come un segno di debolezza, un avallo a continuare indisturbati le proprie politiche repressive verso la società civile che invece dovremmo difendere.

Perseverare, a questo punto sarebbe diabolico.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, I come to similar conclusions to this report in many ways, but for different reasons. I note that paragraph 15, the text on female genital mutilation, is calling only for laws to be enforced. It is a barbaric practice and, quite frankly, it is something which also happens in the European Union and gets brushed under the carpet. It even happens in my own country, and yet there are no successful prosecutions for it. So I would make exactly the same call to ourselves.

When it comes to the death penalty, I have to say that my opposition to the death penalty is one which is practical. Simply to say that: if there were the rule of law, if there were fair trials, if we knew that it was being done in a manner that actually represented justice for a lethal crime, then I would be saying that it is the sovereign democratic right of that country to take its own decision on that issue. My concern is that what is happening here is that we are speaking of the death penalty for children, of a politicised judiciary, and of a country where there is arbitrary detention, serious concerns over extrajudicial actions and the murder of anti-government bloggers, for example the case of Yameen Rasheed. So that is not really what is happening, and therefore I take a much dimmer view. We have a country which has left the Commonwealth and where there is a huge amount of recruitment going on for ISIS.

Finally, I will finish by just noting the bill on the protection of reputation and good name and freedom of expression, which seeks to clamp down on freedom of expression in that country. It is just so Orwellian to say that they have a law for freedom of expression, which is actually being used for completely the opposite purpose.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem požádal o vyjádření v rámci *catch-the-eye* z toho důvodu, že se celou dobu, kdy jsem v politice, věnuji trestu smrti ve světě a sleduji to, jak v poslední době narůstá zneužívání či využívání tohoto instrumentu, který my Evropané absolutně odmítáme. Trest smrti je nejzávažnější forma represe trestní justice, je to věc nevratná a je velmi smutné, že Maledivy jsou další ze zemí světa, která nechce respektovat moratorium na tento nehumánní trest a která chce trest smrti obnovit. Proto podporuji toto usnesení. Platí to, co říkali ostatní kolegové z hlediska rozpadu demokracie a právního státu na Maledivách, ale mě speciálně zajímá ten trest smrti. Ještě chci zmínit to, že Maledivy jsou připraveny popravovat mladistvé, což je zvláště nehumánní forma a zneužití tohoto trestu, a my proti tomu musíme protestovat, a proto podporuji toto usnesení.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι Μαλδίβες έχουν τις χειρότερες επιδόσεις, παγκοσμίως, στην προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων. Δεν υπάρχει ελευθερία έκφρασης, δεν υπάρχει δημοκρατικός πλουραλισμός, απαγορεύεται το δικαίωμα του συνέρχεσθαι, διώκονται οι αντιφρονούντες, οι δημοσιογράφοι, οι μπλόγκερ. Έχει ανακληθεί η άδεια 56 δικηγόρων. Οι πολιτοφύλακες προχωρούν ατιμώρητοι στη διάλυση των διαδηλώσεων. Μια κατάσταση απαράδεκτη, η οποία, βεβαίως, καταγγέλλεται από όλες τις πτέρυγες εδώ στο Κοινοβούλιο μας. Ταυτόχρονα, καταδικάζονται σε θάνατο ακόμη και νέοι κάτω των 18 ετών. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να ληφθούν πολύ συγκεκριμένα μέτρα απέναντι στην κυβέρνηση των Μαλδिवών. Επίσης αναπτύσσεται ο τζιχαντισμός, γεγονός ιδιαίτερα επικίνδυνο. Ταξιδεύουν αυτή τη στιγμή πάνω από 300.000 Ευρωπαίοι πολίτες μόνο από το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, τη Γερμανία, την Ιταλία και τη Γαλλία για τουριστικούς λόγους εκεί. Θα πρέπει να εκδοθεί ταξιδιωτική οδηγία που να απαγορεύει τις όποιες μετακινήσεις. Μόνο έτσι θα αναγκαστεί η κυβέρνηση των Μαλδिवών να βάλει τάξη στα του οίκου της.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, Maledivy jsou malý stát a již se k němu vracíme poněkolkáté na tomto plénu. To si myslím, že svědčí o mnohém. Nebe zalité sluncem, Evropané zde tráví svoji dovolenou a následně zjistí nebo vůbec nezjistí, že v tamějších kriminálech jsou nevinně zavřeni, že dochází k mučení, zastrasování, že dokonce mají nastat změny, které mají nově zavést popravu do právního řádu. Myslím si, že tyto věci by měli Evropané vědět, a proto souhlasím se svými kolegy, kteří hovořili o tom, že především máme my informovat evropskou veřejnost, to je naše i velmi silná karta v rámci diplomatického úsilí, které by měla Evropská komise a služby EU v této věci vynaložit. Já jsem přesvědčen, že můžeme donutit tento stát jednat o změnách, které jdou jednoznačně proti našemu přesvědčení, což je například určité poprava mladistvých.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, in 2008 the Maldives made a promising transition from 30 years of authoritarian rule to a democratic system, through multiparty elections. The EU is monitoring the human rights and political situation in the country and has expressed a number of concerns.

There is a worrying trend of reduced freedom of expression and freedom of association, highlighted most recently by the suspension of 56 lawyers for submitting a petition highlighting concerns with the judiciary. Opposition leaders are imprisoned or restricted in their movements. After the unprecedented lockdown of the parliament by security forces on 24 July 2017, there was an intensified crackdown on opposition legislators. Some journalists and media professionals also face intimidation and harassment.

On 25 July 2017 the EU delegation accredited to the Maldives, with nine other embassies, made a local statement to the effect that: 'It is essential that the freedoms of assembly and expression are upheld for all. Opposition politicians and members of civil society must be able to conduct their rightful duties without fear of intimidation or arrest.' In late August the authorities agreed to host an electoral follow-up mission. I welcome that decision, which shows the authorities' openness to discuss even challenging topics. Follow-up to the implementation of the previous EU recommendations would be a good framework for dialogue before the upcoming presidential election planned for November 2018.

There has been a de facto moratorium on the death penalty for more than 60 years. Whereas the current administration continues publicly to maintain a commitment to resuming executions, there has not been an execution for more than half a century. The European Union and its Member States will continue to hold a strong and principled position against the death penalty in all circumstances and all cases.

Several statements have been issued by the European External Action Service calling for the de facto moratorium on the death penalty to be upheld as a step towards its abolition. Radicalisation and criminality are on the rise in the Maldives. The brutal murder of blogger ...

(The President interrupted the speaker)

Mr President, radicalisation and criminality are on the rise in the Maldives. The brutal murder of blogger and human rights activist Yameen Rasheed in April 2017 testifies to this trend. On the other hand, the EU and the Maldives are strong partners in the fight against climate change, which remains one of the important areas of mutual interest. Member States have major investments in the tourist sector in the Maldives. Every year between 300 000 and 500 000 - European tourists travel to the Maldives. It is important, in the dialogue with the authorities, to ensure the safety and security of these tourists as well as Maldivian citizens, through cooperation to prevent terrorism and violent extremism.

To conclude, for several years we have held an annual dialogue to exchange views on issues of concern and issues of common interest. The last annual EU-Maldives policy dialogue was hosted by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Malé in May 2017 and we intend to maintain this dialogue.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà al termine della discussione.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan.* – Zabrinjavajuća je situacija kršenja ljudskih prava na Maldivima i postupno pogoršanje demokratskih standarda. Ne smije se zanemariti niti sve veća prisutnost autoritarnih tendencija na Maldivima, kao niti proglašenje novog zakona o klevetama koji kriminalizira „klevetnički” govor ili zakona koji zahtijeva pismeno dopuštenje policije za održavanje prosvjeda u Maléu.

Sloboda okupljanja i sloboda medija treba se jamčiti, a ne kršiti. Cenzuriranje medija je totalno neopravdano jer sloboda i neovisnost medija je fundamentalno oruđe demokracije. Europska unija mora promovirati vladavinu prava, pa i na Maldivima, svim dostupnim instrumentima kako bi se postojeći nedostatak neovisnosti pravosuđa mogao eliminirati. Promicanje demokracije, ljudskih prava i vladavine prava je temelj vanjske politike Europske unije.

Pozivam na pravično suđenje za uhićene novinare i političke protivnike jer su arbitražne presude neprihvatljive.

Podržavam prijedlog rezolucije u vezi kršenja ljudskih prava, demokratskih načela i vladavine prava te smatram kako je Maldivima potrebna razvojna pomoć EU-a te pomno praćenje stanja ljudskih prava i političke situacije u ovoj državi.

(La seduta è sospesa per qualche minuto)

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

4. Abstimmungsstunde

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest głosowanie.

(Wyniki i inne szczegóły dotyczące głosowania: zobacz protokół)

4.1. Lage von Menschen mit Albinismus in Malawi und anderen afrikanischen Ländern (RC-B8-0543/2017, B8-0543/2017, B8-0544/2017, B8-0546/2017, B8-0547/2017, B8-0551/2017, B8-0553/2017, B8-0554/2017, B8-0562/2017) (Abstimmung)

4.2. Die Fälle der Wortführer der Krimtataren Ahtem Çiygoz und İlmi Ümerov sowie des Journalisten Mykola Semena (RC-B8-0545/2017, B8-0545/2017, B8-0548/2017, B8-0552/2017, B8-0557/2017, B8-0559/2017) (Abstimmung)

4.3. Lage auf den Malediven (RC-B8-0549/2017, B8-0549/2017, B8-0550/2017, B8-0555/2017, B8-0556/2017, B8-0558/2017, B8-0560/2017, B8-0561/2017) (Abstimmung)

— *Po głosowaniu nad ustępem 14:*

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Mr President, my Group calls for an oral amendment for the deletion of paragraph 15. We have been advised by the External Action Service that it is factually incorrect. Oral amendment to delete paragraph 15, please.

(Poprawka ustna została przyjęta)

— *Przed głosowaniem końcowym:*

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Mr President, as a result of advice from the External Action Service, my Group has been asked to add the word 'former' before 'leader', as he is no longer technically the leader of his party. This is just a factual error which needs correcting.

(Poprawka ustna została przyjęta)

4.4. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (A8-0290/2017 - Barbara Matera) (Abstimmung)

4.5. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (A8-0251/2017 - Joëlle Bergeron) (Abstimmung)

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam głosowanie.

5. Stimmerklärungen

5.1. Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit: Europäische Staatsanwaltschaft (A8-0290/2017 - Barbara Matera)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Herr talman! Vet ni vad som är problemet med Europeiska åklagarmyndigheten? När vi pratar om detta så säger länder som Sverige, Malta, Polen och Ungern "Åh, vi vill inte lämna mycket makt till EU, det där är att göra ett federalt Europa" och så vidare. Sedan händer brottet naturligtvis. Sedan visar det sig att man inte kan utreda det för att det är övernationellt. Sedan klagar samma länder över att EU inte gör tillräckligt mycket mot kriminalitet, att EU inte är effektivt och så vidare. Det är helt fantastiskt. Kriminalitet och brott är nuförtiden transnationella. Det görs av gängen som rör sig över gränserna och utnyttjar vår svaghet, att inte kunna bekämpa sådana brott.

Vill man bekämpa det – och det handlar om trafficking, knark, smuggling, vapensmuggling – så måste man samarbeta på europeisk nivå. Att Sverige väljer att ställa sig utanför det samarbete är mig fullständigt obegripligt.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dovolu, abych zdůvodnila, proč jsem podpořila usnesení Evropského parlamentu k nařízení Rady, kterým se zavádí posílená spolupráce při zřízení Úřadu evropského veřejného žalobce. Boj proti poškozování rozpočtu a finančních zájmů EU je nesmírně důležitý právě proto, že jde o poškozování samotných evropských daňových poplatníků. Návrh na zřízení úřadu doznal výrazných pozitivních změn, jako je například decentralizace systému, vypuštění článku o jednotném justičním prostoru a další. Uvědomuji si, že posílená spolupráce v případě zakládání nové instituce není běžná, proto vyvstávají otázky. Na druhé straně nikdo nepochybuje, že tímto dojde k posunu ve věci zřízení Úřadu evropského veřejného žalobce, který by mohl přispět k posílení boje proti zneužívání evropských financí, což pokládám za klíčové.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Én magam is támogattam ennek a jelentésnek az elfogadását. Nagyon fontos intézménynek tartom az Európai Ügyészség létrehozását, annál is inkább, mert úgy látom, hogy ezt az élet kényszerítette ki, olyan szintű csalások történtek az Európai Unió költségvetésének terhére, ami nem engedte meg tovább azt, hogy ezeket az ügyeket csupán nemzetállami keretekben kezeljük.

Az különösen fájdalmas számomra, hogy van néhány ország, köztük saját hazám, Magyarország, amelynek a kormánya nem írta alá, illetve nem csatlakozik ehhez az együttműködéshez. Én nehéz szívvel, de azt tudom mondani, hogy mindazok, akik el akarnak bujkálni a közös európai ellenőrzés elől, azoktól vonjuk meg az azokat az összegeket, amiknek a felügyeletére egyébként ez az ügyészség is hivatott. Mindaddig egy vasat ne kapjanak, amíg be nem látják, hogy nekik is helyük van ebben az ügyészségi rendszerben.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la cooperación reforzada sería muy útil también para vigilar cómo se utilizan los fondos europeos en las distintas regiones de esta Unión, porque, por ejemplo, cuando llevamos toda la semana con nuestra atención en Cataluña, en otras regiones de España se aprovecha esto para reprimir de igual forma —es decir, con violentas cargas policiales— protestas ciudadanas legítimas, como la de los vecinos y vecinas de Murcia, que lo que están exigiendo es que no se parta su ciudad en dos con un muro de cinco metros de alto y nueve kilómetros de largo que dejará aisladas a más de cien mil personas para permitir la llegada de la alta velocidad.

Alta velocidad, por cierto, de la cual han desaparecido millones de euros por el camino y nadie sabe dónde ni cómo.

Yo desde aquí hago un llamamiento a la responsabilidad del Gobierno para exigir que cese inmediatamente la construcción de ese muro y se dé paso al soterramiento de las vías, tal y como llevan pidiendo los vecinos de Murcia más de treinta años y tal como se comprometió el Gobierno regional de Murcia en el año 2006.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO) will fill serious international gaps. The prevention and prosecution of offences against the EU budget and the financial interests of the EU are currently within the exclusive competence of Member States. The EU Anti-fraud Office OLAF, Eurojust and Europol do not have a mandate to conduct criminal investigations, and sometimes their opinions are ignored by national authorities. We have worrying information that, in some Member States, national investigators are under pressure from local politicians, and they are not interested in the proper investigation of the use of money from European funds.

We have now taken a small but very important step. We have started to create a European system. We should not be confused by the fact that only 20 EU Member States will participate in the creation of the EPPO or by the very limited nature of its mandate. As we have often seen in EU history, big reforms all start with very careful first decisions.

I voted in favour.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах за този доклад, защото подкрепям създаването на Европейска прокуратура и споделям необходимостта от институционални мерки на наднационалното европейско ниво за ефективно наказателно преследване на измамите и другите престъпления, засягащи финансовите интереси на държавите – членки на Европейския съюз.

България е част от тези 20 държави членки, които желаят да започнат засилено сътрудничество за създаването на такава служба. Радвам се да видя, че в своята препоръка комисията по граждански свободи, правосъдие и вътрешни работи одобрява решенията на Съвета. Защитата и наказателното преследване на престъпления срещу бюджета на Съюза и финансовите интереси на Съюза са от изключителната компетентност на държавите членки. ОЛАФ, Евроюст и Европол не разполагат с мандат за провеждане на наказателно разследване и функциониращата Европейска прокуратура ще запълни тази институционална празнина. Ще се радвам, ако това се случи по време на предстоящото българско председателство.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem tuto zprávu nakonec nepodpořil, zdržel jsem se. Otázkou evropského prokurátora se zabývám více než deset let. Měl jsem tuto tematiku na starosti v době, kdy jsem byl členem vlády v České republice, a musím říci, že stále i po těch deseti letech je zde celá řada významných odborných námitek proti tomuto institutu. Stále zde odborníci tvrdí, že zřízení nového úřadu může naopak vést k prodlužování některých trestních kauz tím, že ty kauzy se budou posílat „do Bruselu“, budou se připravovat spisy atd. Je třeba si uvědomit, že nakonec rozhodování o těch trestních kauzách bude mít stejně v rukou domácí národní justice jednotlivých členských států. To zkrátka zde zůstává, a pokud důvodem pro zřízení evropského prokurátora je nedůvěra k národním justičním systémům, k národním právním systémům, tak je třeba si uvědomit, že tento institut to jako takový nevyřeší. To je důvod, proč jsem se zdržel, a budu rád, když praxe mé námitky případně vyvrátí.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, já jsem hlasoval proti tomuto návrhu. Je asi známo, že jak moje politická frakce, tak moje vlastní strana se dlouhodobě staví proti zřízení funkce evropského prokurátora. Jsou k tomu jak důvody politické, tak důvody právní. Z těch politických důvodů bych uvedl především to, že se vlastně zřízením této funkce zavádí další federalizační prvek do soustavy evropských orgánů, a to je něco, co my nepodporujeme. Jsou tady samozřejmě i velmi relevantní právní námitky, především ty, že stejně v tom koncovém bodě to budou národní orgány, které budou zodpovídat za verdikt. A v každém případě nám připadá, že vybavenost národních orgánů – justičních, vyšetřovacích – je dostatečná a že jejich důvěryhodnost je natolik velká, že nemusí být podrobeny nějaké dodatečné kontrole nebo zřízení nějakého takového orgánu. Takže funkci evropského prokurátora říkáme ne.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, normally I abstain on matters that do not affect the United Kingdom. The European Public Prosecutor's Office is being introduced through enhanced cooperation, but, in this case, it will affect the United Kingdom because that Office will have the power to issue European arrest warrants and, consequently, the power to detain British citizens living in the UK. I therefore voted against this resolution, and I note that it is yet another situation where those who support European Union membership in the United Kingdom have been less than forthcoming about the true nature of the EU project.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I strongly and heartily support this proposal. We no longer have the luxury of turning a blind eye to the ongoing fraudulent use of the European Union's funds. It is estimated that the EU loses around EUR 600 million per year due to fraud. This cannot go on and on. By unifying the work of national prosecutors under the new European Public Prosecutor's Office, which will be leading the work of European delegated prosecutors, they will be able to perform investigations in a cooperative manner using the common procedures and remaining in line with national laws.

Such synchronised cooperation between the Member States will help to address systematic drawbacks and properly investigate and put an end to these crimes.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, supporters of this proposal tell us that crime does not recognise national borders. They say this as though it were an original insight. Of course crime crosses borders, and for many years democratic nation states have collaborated without supranational institutions. We have the Hague Convention; we have Interpol; we have extradition treaties; we recognise time spent in another country's prison.

This is not about cooperation; this is about the creation of a federal legal system and a federal prosecution service, giving the European Union the ultimate attribute of statehood, namely the ability to use coercive force against its own citizens. Yes, sure, starting with questions like fraud against the EU budget and racketeering is just the way the FBI and the federal prosecutors started in the United States. However, the eventual aim is of course for it to become the basis of a legal system for a country called Europe.

We absolutely believe in cooperation in the field of crime and policing. After the United Kingdom has left, you will be able to rely on our continued collaboration, but this is exactly why we are leaving.

Monika Smolková (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, boj proti podvodom v celej Európskej únii sa každým rokom stáva zložitejším a mnohokrát to vyzerá tak, že podvodníci a kriminálnici sú krok vpredu. Vedia využiť „diery“ v súčasnom systéme právnej legislatívy v jednotlivých členských štátoch, využívajú cezhraničné obchodovanie a rozdelia si svoje podnikateľské aktivity tak, aby nemohli byť trestne stíhaní vo viacerých členských štátoch naraz. Podporila som návrh uznesenia k návrhu nariadenia Rady, ktorým sa vykonáva posilnená spolupráca na účely zriadenia Európskej prokuratúry, a som rada, že Slovensko je medzi štátmi, ktoré tento návrh podporujú. Ročne Európska únia stráca na daňových podvodoch miliardy, ktoré by sme mohli investovať do mladých ľudí, pre rast zamestnanosti a odstraňovanie chudoby v EÚ, ale aj do tak potrebnej vedy a výskumu. Vytvorenie Európskej prokuratúry určite uľahčí a zefektívni aj prácu OLAF-u, Eurojustu a Europolu, ktoré nemajú mandát viesť vyšetrovanie trestných činov, ale vedia ich odhaliť a výsledky posunúť práve Európskej prokuratúre.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – J'ai voté contre cette proposition de Parquet européen, visant théoriquement, au moins dans un premier temps, les délits financiers relatifs au budget européen, mais l'on sait très bien que, comme l'ont dit plusieurs orateurs avant moi, il ne s'agit là que d'un début. Ce que l'on veut, c'est instaurer un véritable système qui, un jour peut-être, permettra de poursuivre les délits d'expression qui se sont abusivement multipliés dans le droit de certains États membres.

C'est ainsi que l'on poursuit et que l'on met en prison des centaines de personnes, notamment en Allemagne, parce qu'elles expriment des points de vue, paraît-il, dissidents sur l'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale.

C'est ainsi que l'on poursuit pour homophobie Jean-Marie Le Pen qui a déclaré que «les homosexuels, c'est comme le sel, s'il y en a un peu, cela met du piquant, s'il y en a trop, c'est indigeste», ou que l'on se donne le ridicule de le poursuivre également parce qu'il a dit que la présence des Roms était urticante à Nice.

Autrement dit, peut-être que demain, des parlementaires européens seront arrêtés en vertu d'un mandat d'arrêt délivré par le parquet pour de tels délits d'expression. Je suis persuadé que c'est la tendance vers laquelle on va, et c'est la raison pour laquelle je la combats.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Unia Europejska nieustannie rozszerza zakres swojej władzy na coraz to nowe dziedziny i nad tą ewolucją można by dyskutować, gdyby temu rozszerzaniu towarzyszyło więcej solidarności i odpowiedzialności. Ale jest przeciwnie – temu wszystkiemu towarzyszy coraz więcej arogancji. Niestety popis takiej arogancji dała pani komisarz Jourová, która po raz kolejny groziła de facto sankcjami albo używaniem selektywnej sprawiedliwości, jakimś specjalnym nadzorem, tym państwom, które nie przyjmą kompetencji Prokuratury Europejskiej. W tej sprawie moja grupa polityczna Konserwatyści i Reformatorzy zwracali się już do przewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej, tylko niestety widać, że – że tak powiem – pani Jourová po prostu głośno mówi to, co jej koledzy

w Komisji Europejskiej myślą po cichu albo czego wypowiedanie na głos pozostawiają innym. Tak naprawdę Unia Europejska prowadzona jest w fatalnym kierunku i tylko zmiana jej władz może naprawić nasze relacje.

5.2. Strafvollzugssysteme und -bedingungen (A8-0251/2017 - Joëlle Bergeron)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Curzio Maltese (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, il numero dei detenuti in Europa supera più di un terzo il numero dei posti disponibili. In alcuni Stati membri, compresa l'Italia, la situazione è drammatica.

Ho votato a favore di questa relazione, anche perché dichiara con chiarezza che non c'è alcuna correlazione tra la severità delle pene e il calo del tasso di criminalità. Lo scopo degli Stati, non è la vendetta, ma la sconfitta del crimine. E per raggiungere questo obiettivo non servono le pene più dure, ma più giuste e utili a recuperare i detenuti.

Deve essere chiaro che la privazione della libertà non deve degenerare nella privazione della dignità. Per questo è importante studiare misure alternative al carcere tradizionale, promuovere azioni di recupero culturale, formazione e istruzione che aprono ai detenuti nuove prospettive.

Ho conosciuto detenuti che erano *killer* mafiosi e oggi sono operai, artigiani, artisti e altri detenuti che non erano delinquenti, ma soltanto poveri che in carcere sono diventati mafiosi. La differenza è tra un'esperienza e una tortura.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I think that the main tasks of prisons are not only to be an instrument for punishment and isolation, but also to be institutions that prevent future crimes and help prisoners return to normal life. This cannot happen if the prisoners live in bad conditions, with overcrowded rooms, or if experienced prisoners are held in the same cells as young people convicted for minor crimes. We should establish dignified conditions of detention, create possibilities for socialisation, encourage rehabilitation and reintegration into society, develop educational facilities for prisoners, and ensure a safer living and working environment for both prisoners and staff.

I'm worried that the Latvian Government will postpone a project to build a new, modern prison in my country, and thus the closing of three old, overcrowded prisons. This is not an act of political wisdom, nor is it in the interest of the society. However, I voted in favour of this report yet again.

John Flack (ECR). – Mr President, this is the first time I have spoken here since taking my seat in July. I wanted to wait until I actually had something worth saying and something I could speak knowledgeably about – not as a prisoner, as has been the experience of some here, but as a long-serving British magistrate. I have visited many types of prisons, and have seen for myself the good, the bad and the downright frightening. These experiences have led me to vote against this report, not because of its good intentions, but because it does not adequately address the most urgent issue facing prisons across Europe, as well as in Norwich, Bedford, Chelmsford and in the other prisons across my region: that is the rise of radical and violent ideologies and terrorist radicalisation.

Secondly, in its utopian call for fewer prisons, it goes far beyond the competences of this Parliament. These are matters that should, and indeed must, be left to individual nation states. For these reasons, and several others, I voted against.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, гласувах против този доклад, защото колегата Бержерон се е съсредоточила върху подобряването на условията за живот, липсата на грижи и медицинско обслужване и реинтеграция на затворниците, но е обърнато много малко внимание върху проблема с нарастващия феномен на разпространяването на радикални и насилствени идеологии и терористичната радикализация в много затвори в държавите – членки на Европейския съюз.

Освен това, въпреки че в доклада изрично се посочва, че затворническите условия и управлението на затворите са отговорност на държавите членки, в много отношения той отива твърде далеч, като призовава държавите членки да приемат независими механизми за наблюдение на затворите, да се отделят адекватни средства за обновяване и модернизиране на затворите и да насърчават алтернативите за лишението от свобода.

Ето защо заради тези липси гласувах против доклада.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Mr President, first of all, if you want to have fewer prisons, you have to start by having fewer criminals. You need to cut the rate of offending. That means we need to be in a position where we can cut the rate of reoffending by people who come out of prison.

I believe fundamentally in rehabilitation. I believe that it is good for society if you can take people and put them back on the straight and narrow. If you want to do that, however, you have to do it with teeth. You have to make sure that people who get early release from prison have got three things: that they behave in prison; that they develop their education whilst in prison; and, fundamentally, that they get a job to go to, so they can break the cycle of reoffending when they come out. If we do all of those things, then, yes, of course society should invest in helping prisoners to rehabilitate.

We hear much about the carrot but we don't hear very much about the stick when it comes to anything related to our judicial system. I really do believe we need to make sure that those people who do not engage in the process have got tough prison conditions, and that prison then becomes for them a place of punishment.

Lastly, what we are completely missing in all of this is that this is not a matter for the European Union. It is for Member States to decide on their own prison systems.

Sylvie Goddyn (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la surpopulation carcérale et les mauvaises conditions de détention sont évidemment une réalité dans les prisons en Europe. Mon pays, la France, s'est illustré au fil de ses gouvernements successifs par une dégradation généralisée de sa capacité pénitentiaire.

Il est certes essentiel de moderniser et de rénover les prisons, pour autant, certaines solutions préconisées dans ce rapport me semblent dangereuses, notamment l'incitation au recours à des peines ou mesures non privatives de liberté, qui reflète, une fois de plus, le triomphe du laxisme pénal.

À l'heure du radicalisme islamiste, de l'explosion de la délinquance et du terrorisme, rien ne justifie l'aménagement des peines. On peut d'ailleurs regretter que, dans ce rapport, le phénomène de radicalisation ne soit jamais associé à l'islamisme. Aussi, comment voulez-vous combattre un problème sans même le nommer?

Je rappelle que l'islam radical a pris la vie de deux jeunes filles à Marseille, dimanche dernier, précisément parce que la société a oublié qu'il fallait enfermer durablement ou expulser les délinquants multirécidivistes.

C'est la raison pour laquelle j'ai voté contre ce rapport.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la situación de las prisiones en muchos Estados de la Unión es preocupante. Muchas prisiones se encuentran en situación de saturación o la han rebasado ya. Los recursos que se destinan, tanto a la reintegración de los presos como a programas de acompañamiento a la libertad condicional, son alarmantemente insuficientes. Solo un dato: la tasa de reincidencia excede el 50 % en algunos Estados de la Unión.

Desafortunadamente, la protección de los derechos fundamentales y de la dignidad humana, que son cruciales en cualquier sociedad democrática, ha sido repetidamente puesta en entredicho por el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos y el Comité Europeo para la Prevención de la Tortura y de las Penas o Tratos Inhumanos o Degradantes. Los sistemas centrados exclusivamente en torno al castigo son inefectivos y, a menudo, contraproducentes.

Creemos que nuestras sociedades merecen mucho más que poblaciones carcelarias crecientes y alarmantes tasas de reincidencia, y es por eso por lo que pedimos la implementación de sistemas de mediación y justicia reparativa, la implementación y adecuada dotación presupuestaria de programas de reintegración durante y después de la condena y el fin de los procesos de privatización de las prisiones públicas.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, Európsky parlament nemá kompetencie na stanovovanie štandardov pre väznice v členských štátoch. To si určujú samotné členské štáty, je to otázka subsidiarity, my sa nemôžeme snažiť ich určovať. Naše slovenské štátne väznice majú dva ciele: prevychovávať kriminálnikov a, samozrejme, potrestať ich, ale prevychovávať ich. Čo by malo trápiť Úniu je osobnostná zmena už tých ľudí, ktorí sú vo väzniciach, a prevencia radikalizácie. Majú sa zmeniť ku dobrému. Ale čo vidíme? Šírenie džihádizmu, a to je metlou súčasnej spoločnosti, ktorá spôsobuje teroristické útoky na civilné obyvateľstvá, a my musíme podporovať skupiny a opatrenia, ktoré dosahujú úspech v skutočnej zmene človeka v srdci a vo vnútri a v pozitívnom smerovaní ich života. Pracovníci kresťanských organizácií a kresťanskí kazatelia vidia, ako sa životy väzňov naprieč Európou už v minulosti menili vďaka moci evanjelia Ježiša Krista. Vidia túto premenu mužov a žien, ktorí dnes vedia pomáhať druhým, tak namiesto kazateľov džihádu potrebujeme v našich väzniciach evanjelium s odkazom nádeje a pokoja, lebo Ježiš Kristus je ten, ktorý mení život zločinca na človeka mieru, pokoja a lásky.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, los socialistas y, en particular, los socialistas españoles nos congratulamos por este informe de propia iniciativa sobre la situación penitenciaria en Europa. Y especialmente hemos apoyado el énfasis que pone en la reinserción y la resocialización de la población reclusa. Pero, precisamente en la votación final, hemos optado por abstenernos porque el apartado 29 de la Resolución, de manera indiscriminada y genérica y con un lenguaje duro, utiliza literalmente el verbo «condena» cuando se refiere a la política de distribución territorializada de los presos en todo el territorio nacional —lo que, con algún acento crítico, se conoce como política de dispersión o de alejamiento de presos—, como si eso infligiera un daño adicional y fuese incompatible con la resocialización. Todo lo contrario. Resulta que la resocialización es imposible cuando nos enfrentamos con la delincuencia organizada, la delincuencia que en Italia se llama de *stampo mafioso*, con la radicalización que produce el yihadismo y, lamentablemente, con la delincuencia terrorista —como hemos visto en España—, donde la dispersión territorializada de presos precisamente ayuda a la resocialización, y la concentración en una sola prisión produce el efecto contrario: la imposibilidad de la resocialización, la reeducación y la reinserción, precisamente porque se produce la radicalización de la población reclusa, dentro de las propias cárceles.

Es por esto que creemos necesaria esta explicación de voto en la votación final al haber sido imposible votar singularizada y separadamente el apartado 29.

Przewodniczący. – Niniejszym zamykam wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania.

6. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 12.45.)

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

7. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen)

8. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

9. Standpunkt des Rates in erster Lesung: siehe Protokoll

10. Europäischer Aktionsplan für die Sozialwirtschaft (Aussprache)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über den Europäischen Aktionsplan für die Sozialwirtschaft von Jens Nilsson, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, Marie-Christine Vergiat, Sven Giegold, Elena Gentile, Agnes Jongerius, Brando Benifei, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Ernest Urtasun, Evelyn Regner, Pina Picierno, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Jan Keller, Jean Lambert, Jean-Paul Denanot, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Nessa Childers, Nicola Danti, Patrizia Toia, Ramón Jáuregui Atondo, Renata Briano, Sergio Gaetano Cofferati, Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto, Guillaume Balas, Nicola Caputo, Simona Bonafè, Damiano Zoffoli, Enrico Gasbarra, Marita Ulvskog, Jytte Guteland, Olle Ludvigsson, Anna Hedh, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Elena Valenciano, Sofia Ribeiro, Heinz K. Becker, Georgi Pirinski, Enrique Guerrero Salom und Maria Arena (O-000070/2017 – B8-0602/2017) (2017/2877(RSP)).

Jens Nilsson, frågeställare. – Fru talman! I december 2015 antog rådet slutsatser om främjandet av den sociala ekonomin som en viktig drivande faktor för ekonomisk och social utveckling i Europa.

Det var en milstolpe, det var första gången medlemsländerna i rådet tog slutsatser om den här sektorn. Man gjorde det därför att man ser potentialen i den här sektorn när det gäller den sociala ekonomin, som täcker en stor mängd olika företagsmodeller – kooperativ, naturligtvis, ideella föreningar, ömsesidiga företag, stiftelser – och de fyller en viktig funktion för att uppnå flera av EU:s mål. Det säger alltså enhälligt de 28 länderna i slutsatserna. De säger också att den här sektorn bidrar till en smart och hållbar tillväxt för alla. En smart och hållbar tillväxt med jobb med schysta villkor, social sammanhållning, social innovation och miljöskydd.

Det här är ingen liten sektor i Europa, det finns två miljoner företag inom den här sektorn. De sysselsätter över 14,5 miljoner människor och står för 8 procent av EU:s totala bruttonationalprodukt. Verksamheter inom den sociala ekonomin återinvesterar alltid sin vinst, drivs primärt av sociala och miljömässiga mål och inte i första hand av vinstutdelning till passiva ägare. Det gör att de här företagen kan visa på ett gott exempel när det gäller att tackla en del av våra gemensamma utmaningar i Europa. De skapar högkvalitativa arbetstillfällen, stödjer integrationsprocesser av människor och främjar en ekonomi baserad på demokratisk delaktighet – och det är inte minst viktigt. Det här är något som parlamentet har framhållit tidigare, inte minst i betänkandet om en europeisk pelare för sociala rättigheter.

Den här sektorn betyder oerhört mycket på alla nivåer. Lokalt, för här mobiliseras människor för social sammanhållning i demokratiska strukturer. Som gammal borgmästare i min hemstad vet jag hur viktiga de ideella krafterna är, hur viktiga kooperativen är, hur viktig människors vilja att skapa ett gott samhälle lokalt är. En kommun som min skulle inte klara sig utan den här sektorn.

Regionalt betyder den väldigt mycket, skapar jobb och tillväxt. Många regioner har också den här sektorn som en strategisk tillgång i sitt utvecklingsarbete. Globalt betyder den här sektorn också mycket, det har vi fått kvitto på under den finansiella krisen. Och många säger nu, även OECD och andra, att den här sektorn har en stabiliserande effekt på en marknadsekonomi som är liberal och kanske inte alltid klarar av att vara så stabil som den borde vara. Inte minst som exempel: Det finns undersökningar som visar att företag i den här sektorn klarade den finansiella krisen mycket bättre än många andra sektorer. Se bara på de kooperativa bankerna, som rapporter har visat klarade krisen väldigt mycket bättre än många andra.

Under 2016 uppmanades kommissionen i Bratislavaförklaringen om den sociala ekonomin, som undertecknats av tio medlemsstater, och också i rapporten från kommissionens egen expertgrupp, GECES-gruppen, att utarbeta en europeisk handlingsplan för den sociala ekonomin. Med de uppmaningarna och med rådets enhällighet i de här frågorna så bordet det vara enkelt för kommissionen att säga: "Den här vägen ska vi gå".

I maj 2017 var det ett antal medlemsstater som antog Madridförklaringen, där kommissionen också uppmanas att ta fram en europeisk handlingsplan i sitt arbetsprogram för 2018. Det är för att stimulera en sektor som faktiskt främjar de sociala verksamheterna i Europa och dess innovationsförmåga.

Utöver det här så har ekonomiska och sociala kommittén i sitt yttrande om uppstarts företag och expanderande företag riktat en uppmaning till kommissionen om att sammanföra alla pågående och nya initiativ till stöd för sociala företag genom att utarbeta ett meddelande med en handlingsplan för den sociala ekonomin.

Det finns många som vill ha den här handlingsplanen. Det är många som ser att den här sektorn skulle kunna spela en väldigt aktiv roll i ett Europa som växer, och som växer på människors villkor. Den här sektorn skulle kunna bidra med väldigt mycket mer än vad den gör idag.

Så min fråga är: vad gör kommissionen med anledning av de här uppmaningarna från parlamentet, från rådet, från olika medlemsstater när det gäller att främja företag inom den sociala ekonomin? Planerar kommissionen att i enlighet med de här begärandena utarbeta en handlingsplan för den sociala ekonomin?

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I wish to thank all the Members for their questions on the social economy. Clearly, this is a key issue for all of us. First, the Commission agrees with Parliament on the importance of the social economy for Europe. Delivering on a more social and fair Europe is a key priority for the Commission. Earlier this year we launched a reflection paper on Europe's social dimension and the pillar of social rights. This has started a process with citizens, social partners and the European institutions and governments to find responses to the challenges our societies and citizens face. These challenges require innovative social and economic models to deliver more growth and well-being in Europe. The social economy is a core part of this move. It combines solidarity with innovative answers to societal challenges. It answers the growing demand among European entrepreneurs and consumers for a new way of doing business responsibly and sustainably.

Social economy is not another economy; it is part of the wider economy. It makes sense to invest in it, so we want to see the sector succeed.

We have been working with you and other stakeholders to promote the growth of the sector. Over the last years we have taken several measures and our 2011 Social Business Initiative. We have encouraged Member States to develop favourable conditions for the social economy and social enterprises to grow. For instance, the social economy and social enterprises are priorities of the European Social Fund.

We also recognise that there is untapped potential and barriers which hamper the development of the sector in many countries, so we are continuing to develop and implement new measures. The expert group on social entrepreneurship issued some recommendations and we are taking forward a number of them such as increasing visibility, making funds more easily available or enforcing and reinforcing the legal environment.

We have carefully analysed the different proposals presented in different EU political documents and intergovernmental declarations. As a result, we decided to launch a number of new actions to stimulate the development of the social economy. We announced these in our Start-up and Scale-up initiative last year. It would be important for any future initiative after 2018, such as a Social Business Initiative II, to be based on the evaluation of the situation after the current Start-up and Scale-up initiative has been fully implemented.

Our actions rest on five pillars: access to finance, access to markets, development of better framework conditions, new technologies and social innovation and the international dimension of social economic actors. We have made good progress but there are still a number of measures that we announced and that need to be implemented. We are currently working on finalising all this work so that the remaining measures will be implemented next year at the latest.

Given all this work, we think that it would be premature to launch an additional action plan for the social economy at this stage. We want to first deliver what we have promised and then let us see if more needs to be done. We are relying on the support of our informal task force on social economy and social enterprises, involving a number of Commission services.

Honourable Members, once again we fully agree with you on the importance of the social economy for Europe. The Commission adopted this week the Public Procurement Package and it will help also to boost social economy and social enterprises. We will continue to work with all stakeholders to ensure that the voice of the social economy is heard across the whole of Europe. We want to see more enterprises and more innovations change lives.

Michaela Šojdrová, za skupinu PPE. – Paní předsedající, děkuji paní komisařce za informace a opatření, se kterými já mohu vyjádřit souhlas. Chci připomenout, že sociální ekonomika je oblastí podnikání, které má velmi různorodou podobu v závislosti na právních systémech členských států a obecně lze sociální podnik charakterizovat tím, že veškerý vytvářený zisk investuje zpět do své hlavní činnosti. Sociální podniky jsou tedy založené na potřebě pomáhat konkrétním lidem, komunitám a začleňovat lidi do společnosti. Tím jsou sociální podniky důležité pro společnost a není náhodné, že se o nich bavíme také na evropské úrovni.

V závěrech Rady z prosince 2015, které jsou mimochodem velmi zdařilé, se uvádí, že sociální ekonomika přispívá k dosahování řady klíčových cílů EU a je také odvětvím, které přestálo hospodářskou krizi mnohem lépe než jiná odvětví a kterému se na evropské úrovni dostává stále většího uznání. Chtěla bych připomenout, že sociálních podniků evidujeme zhruba 2 miliony na evropské úrovni a zaměstnávají 14,5 milionu osob. To je myslím velmi silný sektor.

Domnívám se, že každý z nás zná některý ze sociálních podniků. Začleňují znevýhodněné osoby – zkrátka nějakým způsobem ohrožené – a vytváří velmi důležité podmínky pro jejich začleňování. Chtěla bych v této situaci podtrhnout také roli církví, které vytváří podmínky pro charitativní práci milionů lidí v celé Evropě. Dámy a pánové, já se domnívám, že dobrovolnou iniciativu podniků bychom měli podporovat a není v této chvíli nutný akční plán.

Ангел Джамбазки, от името на групата ECR. – Г-жо Комисар, когато говорите за европейски планове и за социална икономика, трябва да разгледате и да обсъдите най-вече огромния въпрос с драстичното разминаване в доходите и възнагражденията в източната част на Европа и в западната такава. Тази огромна разлика принуждава много млади хора от източната част на Европа да напускат родните си места и да се местят на запад, за да търсят там своето препитание, а това завърта и огромен демографски проблем в тези райони.

Именно тук е и ролята на Комисията и това трябва да напишете в плана си – това е едно от най-важните неща. За него трябва да се работи. Комисията е длъжна да санкционира държавите, които въвеждат протекционистична политика и пречат на развитието на бизнеса. Комисията е длъжна да реагира, когато например в Германия се приема законодателство, което е насочено срещу предприемачите от Изтока. Във Франция има подобно законодателство, в Белгия има подобно законодателство, в Италия има подобно законодателство, което пречи на фирми от Изтока да работят в общия пазар и така нарушава самата идея за единен общ пазар.

Това е задължението на Комисията – да съблюдава спазването на четирите основни свободи и на Договорите. Именно това е може би единствената важна задача, която би трябвало да преследва Комисията, когато говорим за социална икономика. Такива протекционистични мерки има в сферата на транспорта, в сферата на строителството... Фалшивата теза на президента Макрон за т.нар. социален дъмпинг всъщност е прикрит протекционизъм от страна на редица западни фирми. И това е вашата задача и вие трябва да се справите с нея. Обстоятелствата ще ви принудят да го направите. Това е бъдещето на Европа да се говори по тези въпроси.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, gracias por todos los esfuerzos que han realizado, pero creo que el plan de acción al que se refiere esta pregunta no es una opción, creo que es una obligación.

En el País Vasco, la economía social es una de las claves que permiten explicar por qué hemos aguantado la crisis mejor que en la economía española. Este es un modo de emprendimiento que fija mejor el empleo, que estimula más la incorporación de talento a los negocios y que genera un crecimiento sostenible, inteligente e integrador; aporta valores positivos al resto del sistema económico y ofrece esperanza, la otra forma de concebir y utilizar los beneficios, la de devolver al capital su papel de instrumento al servicio de la economía real y no al revés.

Por eso se necesita, para empezar, un marco legal y fiscal claro y homogéneo a nivel de la Unión, para la economía social y para todas sus formas de expresión, y ese es un obstáculo claro y real para el desarrollo de una forma de emprender y trabajar que se debería promover a nivel europeo y que puede aportar mucho al desarrollo 2020.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL. – Madame la Présidente, je tiens tout d'abord à remercier Jens Nilsson, car je crois que c'est à lui que nous devons l'inscription à l'ordre du jour de ce débat consacré à l'économie sociale et non aux entreprises sociales.

Oui, l'économie sociale est un secteur important qui n'a pas la reconnaissance qu'il mérite. Oui, c'est deux millions d'entreprises, 14,5 millions de salariés, 8 % du PIB de l'Union européenne, une forte résilience à la crise, comme vient de nous le dire M^{me} Bilbao.

Ce sont des entreprises qui se définissent d'abord par leur statut: coopératives, mutuelles, associations, fondations, et qui ne se réduisent pas seulement à des PME, Madame la Commissaire!

Elles peuvent avoir des tailles très différentes. Même si nombre d'entre elles se caractérisent par un fort ancrage territorial, leurs activités ne sont pas purement sociales et encore moins limitées aux seuls publics les plus défavorisés, même s'il ne fait nul doute que nombre d'entre elles ont une finalité sociale. Elles agissent dans tous les champs de l'économie.

La confusion, volontaire ou non, intentionnelle ou pas, entre économie sociale et entreprises solidaires ne doit pas non plus aboutir à ce que de grandes entreprises fassent du *social washing* à bon compte. Le chantier des *Social Impact Bonds*, en ce domaine, a donné lieu à beaucoup d'interrogations et à une nécessité de clarification. Certaines entreprises de l'économie sociale, notamment les plus fragiles d'entre elles, en cette période de pénurie d'argent public, ont besoin de nouvelles possibilités de financement. Des capitaux privés peuvent y pourvoir, mais des garanties sont alors nécessaires, et ces entreprises ont encore plus besoin d'accéder à des financements européens appropriés.

Je vais insister une fois encore sur la nécessité de travailler à un statut qui soit commun à l'ensemble de ces entreprises, à savoir un statut de société de personnes (en anglais, les *Personal Companies*). Un tel statut ne réglerait pas tout, mais c'est un des plus sûrs moyens de permettre à ces entreprises de faire reconnaître leur spécificité, de ne pas les obliger à se dissoudre dans le modèle dominant de la société de capitaux. Notamment quand elles exercent des activités transfrontalières, elles veulent étendre leurs activités à l'international. C'est un moyen de sauvegarder leur spécificité.

Les entreprises de l'économie sociale et solidaire privilégient le long terme et le réinvestissement des bénéfices, et non la course au profit et la rentabilité à court terme. Elles sont sans doute, de ce fait même, porteuses d'innovations sociales autant qu'économiques. Elles sont fortement créatrices d'emplois. Ce secteur, qui contribue de façon essentielle à la promotion d'un modèle de croissance et de développement plus durable et inclusif, non seulement dans l'Union européenne, mais aussi partout dans le monde, a besoin d'un cadre approprié pour se développer.

Alors il est temps aujourd'hui de développer et de proposer un plan ambitieux pour les entreprises de l'économie sociale et solidaire, dont la diversité doit être garantie, et j'aimerais savoir pourquoi, Madame la Commissaire, vous considérez qu'il n'est pas temps de le faire, comme vous venez de le dire?

Les contributions s'accumulent, les propositions de la Commission restent très en deçà de ce que nous pouvons attendre. Il est temps d'agir pour l'économie sociale et solidaire. Elle le mérite.

Joëlle Mélin, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, la question posée à la commission de promotion des entreprises de l'économie sociale, assortie d'un plan d'action européen, appelle de multiples remarques, nous en retiendrons quatre:

Premièrement, l'économie sociale dans son principe apparaît comme un instrument majeur et efficace de lutte contre le chômage. En effet, nombre d'Européens sont peu à peu laissés sur le bord du chemin. Cet état de fait est indéniablement l'un des effets pervers de la mondialisation en général, et de 70 ans de construction européenne en particulier, et ce indépendamment des crises économiques récurrentes. Chaque pays européen a donc tout intérêt à structurer durablement son économie sociale en fonction de ses caractéristiques.

Deuxièmement, l'élaboration d'un plan européen d'action ne peut se faire sans définir clairement le statut des entreprises sociales. Si nous considérons les fondements juridiques français, il faut impérativement que ces entreprises répondent à quatre principes: 1) un but autre que le partage des bénéfices; 2) une gouvernance transparente et participative; 3) une gestion orientée vers un développement d'activités; et 4) des réserves juridiquement impartageables. À la clé, un nombre d'emplois très important: 6 % du PIB français, 8 % du PIB européen. Cet encadrement réglementaire s'assortit, et là est la dérive, d'avantages fiscaux notables, qui de façon paradoxale, sont très avantageux pour le secteur bancaire, les mutuelles, les coopératives, les milieux socio-éducatifs et sportifs ou de distribution de soins. Très clairement, cette dérive révèle ainsi des chiffres d'affaires de plusieurs dizaines de milliards d'euros dans certains cas avec, on l'a dit, des avantages fiscaux colossaux. Tout doit être fait pour éviter ces dérives.

Troisièmement, la grande mutation de société du monde du travail en raison de la numérisation et de la robotisation qui rendent ce secteur incontournable.

Voilà pourquoi chaque État membre devra l'intégrer comme une de ses priorités et être inventif quant à toutes les formes qu'il pourra prendre.

Enfin, il apparaît très clairement à nos yeux qu'il s'agit d'un domaine relevant des prérogatives de l'État souverain et que, par définition même, la volonté de mettre en place une économie sociale européenne revient à créer une autre forme de multinationale, en l'occurrence des multinationales n'employant que des pauvres. C'est précisément la société *low-cost* dont nous ne voulons pas.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, en 2014, ici, à Strasbourg, plus de 2 000 entrepreneurs sociaux ont lancé un appel pour renforcer le rôle de l'économie sociale en Europe. Trois ans plus tard, il semble que cet appel n'ait toujours pas été entendu et que la Commission tarde à proposer un véritable plan d'action pour l'économie sociale. Aussi, nous devons reprendre à notre compte l'appel lancé à Strasbourg et soutenir cette forme d'économie qui met l'humain au centre du projet de l'entreprise.

Je souhaite insister sur plusieurs points. Tout d'abord, sur l'importance des coopératives dans l'agriculture. La Commission doit donner toute sa place aux organisations de producteurs dans la nouvelle politique agricole commune afin de leur permettre de mieux défendre et valoriser leurs produits.

Ensuite, je pense que nous devons faciliter le financement de ces modèles d'entreprise. À ce titre, j'espère que le nouveau fonds d'entrepreneuriat social, que nous avons voté il y a un mois, permettra de valoriser les investissements dans ce secteur.

Enfin, à l'heure du numérique et de l'économie des plateformes, nous devons être attentifs à la fausse économie solidaire, qui n'a de collaboratif que le nom, et qui permet en réalité de contourner la réglementation sociale.

Aussi, j'attends avec impatience les propositions de la Commission sur le sujet et j'espère qu'elles seront à la hauteur de l'énergie que des millions d'Européens consacrent à cette économie plus inclusive et plus durable.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodo predsjednice, ne mogu razumjeti kako Komisija ignorira činjenicu da 8 % europskog BDP-a i 14 milijuna ljudi koji rade u socijalnoj ekonomiji zaslužuju konzistentan europski akcijski plan u sinergiji sa zemljama članicama. Nikada nemojmo zaboraviti i sinergiju s onim što mogu doprinijeti europske regije, gradovi i općine u Europi, jer i one mogu itekako sudjelovati u socijalnoj ekonomiji.

Dapače, sudjeluju, i neka moja iskustva govore upravo u prilog tome koliko je bitno da se na lokalnom i regionalnom nivou uključi i država, a sada tvrdim i Europska unija, u rješavanje problema u socijalnoj ekonomiji. Ja ću istaknuti samo jedan od njih, jer nemamo vremena, a to je način financiranja i omogućavanja povoljnijeg financiranja takvih poduzeća. Tu mislim da Komisija treba odigrati važnu ulogu.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dane pokazują, że ekonomia społeczna w Unii Europejskiej funkcjonuje dobrze pomimo kryzysu gospodarczego, którego skutki nadal są odczuwalne w niektórych krajach. Sektor ten zatrudnia 14,5 mln osób i odpowiada za 8 % wzrostu gospodarczego Unii Europejskiej. Ekonomia społeczna generuje więc miejsca pracy, a co więcej, działa na rzecz długotrwałego włączenia społecznego. Sytuacja na europejskim rynku się poprawia. Poziom bezrobocia znacząco się obniżył i są kraje w Europie, gdzie mamy do czynienia z bezrobociem naturalnym, a więc takim, poniżej poziomu którego nie można zejść.

Niestety wskaźnik aktywności zawodowej w wielu krajach jest nadal niezadowalający i dotyczy to głównie kobiet, osób starszych i osób niepełnosprawnych. Osoby te stanowią ogromny potencjał, który nadal w Europie nie jest dostatecznie wykorzystany. Jestem przekonana, że gospodarka społeczna ma wypracowane instrumenty, aby te grupy społeczne zaktywizować. Warto je wykorzystać. Będzie to miało pozytywny wpływ na europejską gospodarkę, a także poprawi poziom włączenia społecznego w Europie. Konieczne jest więc uzupełnienie nowej strategii przemysłowej o plan działań na rzecz gospodarki społecznej. Dlatego też przyłączam się do apelu koleżanek i kolegów o jak najszybsze podjęcie działań w tym obszarze.

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, gospođo povjerenice, zahvaljujem gospodinu Nilssonu i kolegama iz Međuskupine za socijalnu ekonomiju na ovoj inicijativi. Istovremeno koristim priliku da zahvalim gospodinu Nilssonu što govoreći o liberalnom gospodarstvu nije koristio riječ neoliberalno gospodarstvo, koje se često u mojoj zemlji koristi vrlo neprecizno, bez pravog uvida što to zapravo znači.

Od svih ciljeva koji se žele postići Europskim akcijskim planom za socijalno gospodarstvo, meni je osobno najvažnija socijalna kohezija. Mislim da se razvojem suvremenog svijeta, a tako i Europske unije, gubi solidarnost – kako društvena solidarnost, tako i pojedinačna solidarnost. Zato je važno solidarno pomoći onima kojima je pomoć potrebna da zauzmu svoje mjesto u društvu i u svijetu rada.

Stoga u potpunosti podržavam stavove kolega i zastupničkog pitanja i pozivam Komisiju da što je moguće prije počne ostvarivati Europski akcijski plan za socijalno gospodarstvo.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I agree completely with the social economy model and I am glad my government does the same, and indeed they have a plan to extend it based on four foundations. Several Irish social enterprises work with marginalised members of our society, including persons with disabilities, to provide them with employment they cannot find elsewhere. During the summer I was pleased to attend what is called a 'social farming enterprise' where farmers invite people with disabilities on to their farm to work on a regular basis. This was on a farm in my own area, a cousin of my own, George Kelly from Beaufort, Co. Kerry. This is a great example of integrating people.

One area where this could also work, especially in Ireland, is in the area of wind farms. There is opposition to wind farms now because many people feel that individuals are getting the profits but the whole of society has to carry the burden of noise, etc. which they associate with it; but if it was based on a social economy model then they would all benefit. I think that is something that we will really encourage and I am glad to say, as a rapporteur for renewable energy, that they were including local energy communities in the clean energy package. That certainly could be worthwhile.

One area in which it was very successful in Ireland is the dairy co-ops. This is where farmers actually own the co-op, so the co-op works for the producers, the profits can be shared, they can come together to buy equipment etc., and it works extremely well. I think this is something we should be encouraging more.

Thank you very much, and thanks to the Commissioner for her good words at the beginning.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), *pitanje koje je podizanjem plave kartice postavio*. – Gospođo predsjednice, poštovani kolega Kelly – Vi ste govorili o svojem iskustvu ili barem ste govorili o tome kako osobe s invaliditetom rade u socijalnom gospodarstvu Irske. Ja osobno baš s tim osobama imam jako puno iskustva i zanima me da li u Irskoj postoje posebne beneficije za tvrtke koje zapošljavaju veći broj osoba s invaliditetom ili se baziraju uglavnom na poslovanju s osobama s invaliditetom, da li postoje beneficije u smislu manjih poreza, nekih olakšica – lokalnih, regionalnih, nacionalnih; da li ima tu nešto ili jednostavno nema takvih beneficija?

Seán Kelly (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – It is actually part of the plan by the government to extend the social model, so there would be tax breaks etc., and benefits for them. And indeed in the social economy, especially the social farming that I mentioned, the Minister has given it some financial help to encourage this and to expand it out further.

The answer is yes, but there is probably need for more. And when people see the benefits I think it would be easier to convince governments and others to put further finance there.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Priekšsēdētājas kundze! Komisāre! Pirmkārt, es gribētu pateikties manam kolēģim un draugam Jens Nilsson par to, ka viņš ir aktualizējis šo problēmu. Jo, godīgi sakot, mēs šeit, Eiropas Parlamentā, ne tik bieži runājam par sociālo ekonomiku, lai gan tas manā skatījumā ir viens no stūrakmeņiem. Tas ir tas, kas atšķir mūs un Eiropas Savienību no pārējiem, no trešajām valstīm. Mēs vienmēr esam tendēti uz to, lai netraucētu stiprajiem un palīdzētu vājajiem. Tas ir tas, kas ir vissvarīgākais.

Sociālā ekonomika nav Ziemeļkorejas tips vai plānveida ekonomika kā PSRS — es to atceros no savas bērnības — vai nav kaut kas, ko dalītu, un tamlīdzīgi. Sociālā ekonomika, pirmkārt, ir atbildība. Atbildība — un atbildība ir ne tikai no darba ņēmēju puses, bet arī no darba devēju puses, un tas ir labi, ka Komisija strādā šajā virzienā. Es negrāso šeit kritizēt Komisiju, jo zinu, cik daudz Komisija ir izdarījusi, lai šos plānus īstenotu.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you for your contributions to this important debate and also thank you Mr Nilsson for this question. If you allow me to be a little bit personal, I myself worked five years for the municipal office and I recognise very strongly that it is very important to develop the social economy at the local level – and not only at the local level – and to open the possibilities for people to start up entrepreneurial activities and keep them going.

I stressed at the beginning in the opening remarks that we, as the Commission, have fully recognised the importance of the European social model and of our social market economy. We recognise that the social economy is an instrument that brings solidarity and innovative answers to societal challenges that we face, and I also repeat again that the Commission has launched a number of new actions for the social economy as part of the 2016 communication on 'Europe's next leaders: the Startup and Scaleup Initiative'.

Let me stress again that we are focusing on five main pillars and actions, including: access to finance, access to markets, developing framework conditions and also using and developing new technologies and innovations. We will follow closely the developments of the social economy and social enterprises in Europe. We are committed to provide the appropriate policy for the social economy to help Europe achieve a more cohesive and inclusive society.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), *par écrit*. – L'économie sociale recèle un potentiel de croissance important, puisqu'elle représente déjà 8 % du PIB de l'Union européenne et emploie 14,5 millions de personnes. C'est donc un levier essentiel de création d'emplois et de lutte contre le chômage, ce qui doit évidemment susciter notre intérêt.

J'insisterai néanmoins sur la qualité des emplois créés: en effet, certains indicateurs français pointent vers un recours excessif aux emplois dits «atypiques», c'est-à-dire précaires, ainsi que des proportions de cadres et des rémunérations en dessous de la moyenne du marché du travail. À cette situation déjà préoccupante, il ne faudrait pas ajouter une concurrence entre États membres, qui aurait pour effet de tirer les salaires et les conditions de travail vers le bas.

C'est, hélas, ce à quoi pourrait nous conduire un statut juridique européen des entreprises sociales. En effet, dans certains États, notamment d'Europe orientale, l'économie sociale n'en est qu'à ses balbutiements. Un cadre européen serait susceptible de créer un appel d'air, d'autant plus que des fonds publics et des avantages fiscaux sont parfois en jeu. Une telle initiative est donc aussi dangereuse qu'inopportune, l'emploi demeurant, au reste, une prérogative des États membres.

11. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

12. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll

13. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll

14. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll

15. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll

16. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.40 Uhr geschlossen.)

17. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode

Die Präsidentin. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

C/2024/3017

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 23. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3017)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 23. bis 26. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode	3
2. Eröffnung der Sitzung	3
3. Erklärung der Präsidentschaft	3
4. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	4
5. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	4
6. Wahl eines Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	4
7. Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll	4
8. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	4
9. Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
10. Beschluss zur Aufnahme interinstitutioneller Verhandlungen (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll	4
11. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
12. Weiterbehandlung der Entschlüsse des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	4

Inhalt	Seite
13. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll	4
14. Große Anfragen (Artikel 130b GO) (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll	4
15. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	4
16. Arbeitsplan	4
17. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (Aussprache)	9
18. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels – Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen I (Aussprache)	28
19. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz von Hinweisgebern, die aus Gründen des öffentlichen Interesses Informationen offenlegen (kurze Darstellung)	39
20. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (kurze Darstellung)	45
21. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (kurze Darstellung)	51
22. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung	56
23. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	63
24. Schluss der Sitzung	63

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 23. OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 5 ottobre 2017.

2. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.04)

3. Erklärung der Präsidenschaft

Presidente. – Prima di dare inizio alla seduta odierna vorrei ricordare le vittime degli incendi boschivi che si sono verificati in Portogallo e in Spagna nelle scorse settimane. Come ho avuto modo di dire nel corso del mio intervento dinanzi al Consiglio europeo, il fenomeno è preoccupante e merita tutta la nostra attenzione.

Solo quest'anno, in Europa sono andati in fumo più di 750 000 ettari delle nostre foreste e più di 100 persone hanno perso la vita nel solo Portogallo. Per questo sono convinto della necessità e dell'urgenza di istituire un corpo di protezione civile europeo e di semplificare il contesto normativo, al fine di permettere alle popolazioni di ottenere un aiuto immediato in caso di bisogno.

Vi informo anche della decisione che abbiamo preso, di comune accordo con il Presidente Tusk e il Presidente Juncker, di devolvere alle popolazioni colpite dagli incendi boschivi la somma di denaro del premio «Principessa delle Asturie» per la concordia, assegnato quest'anno all'Unione europea, premio che ho avuto l'onore di ritirare venerdì scorso a Oviedo. Questo è un modo simbolico di manifestare la nostra vicinanza a quelle comunità e alle famiglie delle numerose vittime in Portogallo e in Spagna, in ricordo delle quali vi propongo di osservare ora un minuto di silenzio, durante il quale commemoreremo anche le vittime irlandesi dell'uragano Ophelia.

(Il Parlamento, in piedi, osserva un minuto di silenzio)

Desidero altresì informare l'Aula che domani, prima del voto, avrà luogo un minuto di silenzio in memoria della giornalista maltese Daphne Caruana Galizia, barbaramente uccisa la settimana scorsa in un attentato. Svolgeremo questa brevissima cerimonia domani, perché domani saranno presenti in Aula i familiari della vittima, che ho invitato: loro hanno accettato e saranno presenti in tribuna.

4. **Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**
5. **Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
6. **Wahl eines Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
7. **Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll**
8. **Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll**
9. **Unterzeichnung von nach dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten (Artikel 78 GO): siehe Protokoll**
10. **Beschluss zur Aufnahme interinstitutioneller Verhandlungen (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll**
11. **Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll**
12. **Weiterbehandlung der Entschließungen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll**
13. **Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**
14. **Große Anfragen (Artikel 130b GO) (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll**
15. **Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll**
16. **Arbeitsplan**

Presidente. – Possiamo ora alle modifiche all'ordine dei lavori.

Daniele Viotti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi dispiace interrompere, ma le notizie di queste ultime ore riportano che un giudice a Teheran ha condannato a morte Ahmadreza Djalali, un professore universitario che insegna all'Università di Stoccolma e all'Università di Torino, in Italia.

Ci siamo già occupati in questo Parlamento del caso del professore Djalali, perché abbiamo firmato una lettera insieme a moltissimi parlamentari per chiedere l'intervento del presidente della Repubblica islamica dell'Iran perché non si intervenisse in questo processo, che è un processo pieno di ombre in cui il professore è accusato soltanto di essere, in qualche modo, collaboratore di potenze straniere nemiche.

È un caso gravissimo; è stata emessa la condanna nei giorni scorsi e io chiedo a Lei di usare tutta l'influenza che può avere per capire cosa sta succedendo e per fermare questo ennesimo scempio alla democrazia.

Presidente. – On. Viotti, Lei sa che per l'Unione europea la lotta contro la pena di morte in tutto il mondo rappresenta una priorità, quindi farò tutto ciò che è in mio potere non soltanto per avere informazioni, ma anche per chiedere al presidente della Repubblica islamica dell'Iran di sospendere l'esecuzione del professore e quindi di fare in modo che non ci sia un'altra esecuzione nel mondo.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, you quite rightly called the House to order with regard to taking a minute's silence. Could I ask the Parliament to put my remarks on record. Perhaps you would like to join me in sending condolences to the 300 victims of an al-Shabaab terrorist bomb in Mogadishu in Somalia and to many, many hundreds of victims. Perhaps that could be added to the record of the Parliament.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Assolutamente sì, on. Carver, il Parlamento europeo si è sempre espresso contro il terrorismo. Ricordiamo le vittime non soltanto quando sono europee, ma vittime del terrorismo in tutto il mondo. Quindi mi associo alla sua osservazione: sarà sicuramente messa a verbale – credo a nome di tutto quanto il Parlamento – l'espressione di condanna per quanto successo a Mogadiscio.

Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 19 ottobre 2017 è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica.

Lunedì: nessuna richiesta di modifica.

Martedì: il gruppo Verts/ALE ha richiesto di aggiungere una risoluzione a conclusione della discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sulla lotta alle molestie e agli abusi sessuali nell'Unione europea, da votare durante questa tornata. Do la parola all'on. Ska Keller per formulare la richiesta del suo gruppo.

Ska Keller, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Mr President, we are going to discuss cases of sexual harassment, and, as you have surely seen, we also have reports about cases of sexual harassment happening inside the European institutions, including inside Parliament. So it is really important that we have a debate about it, but it is not enough just to talk about it. We should also put in writing what we are going to do about it – we as the European Union and as the European institutions – so that we commit ourselves to changing this horrible situation. We cannot and will not accept such harassment in this Parliament or elsewhere in the European Union.

(Applause)

Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, my Group has two requests relating to the same topic. First of all, we feel that, given the scale of the debate around the world on this topic, it should have a more prominent place on the agenda this week. We suggest that, rather than discussing it late on Tuesday night, we discuss it on Wednesday morning.

The second request – and Ska Keller has already referred to an article in *Politico* about harassment inside the EU institutions – is that, before the next part-session, you report to us first of all about what the situation is, and secondly, what measures you are going to take to make sure that it does not happen, that when it does happen people actually have somebody to turn to, and that there are procedures for tackling this.

Presidente. – Andiamo per ordine. Prima dobbiamo decidere se aggiungere una risoluzione a conclusione della discussione sulla lotta alle molestie e agli abusi sessuali all'interno dell'Unione, cioè la proposta dell'on. Ska Keller. Poi ci sarà la proposta dell'on. in 't Veld di cambiare la data. Ma prima dobbiamo decidere il contenuto, poi decideremo la data. Terza cosa, le rispondo direttamente, senza aspettare la prossima tornata.

C'è qualcuno che vuole parlare contro la proposta dell'on. Ska Keller? No.

La richiesta è posta in votazione.

La richiesta è approvata. Quindi la discussione sulla dichiarazione della Commissione sulla lotta alle molestie e agli abusi sessuali nell'Unione sarà conclusa da una risoluzione, da votare durante questa tornata.

L'on. in 't Veld ha chiesto di cambiare l'ordine del giorno e invertire il quinto punto di martedì con la discussione sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi derivanti da un'esposizione ad agenti cancerogeni o mutageni, che è prevista per mercoledì mattina. Ha chiesto cioè di avere la discussione sugli abusi sessuali il mercoledì, e di tenere invece il martedì sera la discussione sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi derivanti da un'esposizione ad agenti cancerogeni o mutageni.

C'è qualcuno che è contrario a questo cambiamento? Prego, on. Rodrigues.

Maria João Rodrigues, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, we prefer to keep the order as it is because the Ulvskog report is also very important. Of course we know that this debate is crucial for us but we do not agree to change the order.

Presidente. – Votiamo la proposta dell'on. in 't Veld.

La proposta è approvata.

Manfred Weber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die Kollegin Keller hat zu Recht darauf hingewiesen, dass wir in den letzten Tagen Medienberichte hatten, dass es auch im Haus Vorfälle gegeben hat. Ich möchte deswegen bitten, dass sich das Präsidium des Parlaments mit dieser Frage beschäftigt. Die Vorgänge müssen umgehend geklärt werden und ob es dazu Punkte gibt. Wir haben interne Strukturen, und wir können im Parlament nicht dulden, dass es zu sexuellem Missbrauch in irgendeiner Form kommt.

(Beifall)

Maria João Rodrigues, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, we are delighted and, of course, we also support this request made directly to the President in the Chamber.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je rejoins l'idée qui est défendue. Néanmoins, vu la gravité des faits qui se produisent, y compris ici, je trouve – et cela fera l'objet du débat de mercredi matin, cela figurera dans nos propositions et j'interviendrai en ce sens – qu'on ne peut pas être juge et partie en même temps. Dès lors, l'idée que je défendrai mercredi matin dans mon intervention sera de faire réaliser une étude par un cabinet extérieur, de manière à cerner exactement la réalité des faits, en toute objectivité. C'était le but de ma demande.

Presidente. – Risponderò poi alle sollecitazioni degli onn. in 't Veld, Weber e Martin.

La dichiarazione della Commissione sulla lotta alle molestie e agli abusi sessuali nell'Unione di martedì pomeriggio è scambiata con la discussione sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi derivanti da un'esposizione ad agenti cancerogeni o mutageni, attualmente prevista per mercoledì mattina, e ci sarà una risoluzione.

Per quanto riguarda le sollecitazioni che sono venute dagli onn. in 't Veld, Weber e Martin, il 14 aprile 2014 l'Ufficio di presidenza ha istituito un comitato consultivo per le denunce di molestie riguardanti assistenti parlamentari accreditati, da un lato, e deputati al Parlamento europeo, dall'altro. Il comitato ha due funzioni principali: prevenire qualsiasi comportamento di *mobbing* da parte dei deputati nei confronti di assistenti parlamentari accreditati e assistere il Presidente nel quadro di eventuali indagini.

La procedura interna per la risoluzione dei problemi di *mobbing* viene avviata a seguito di una denuncia formale di molestia psicologica o sessuale presentata da un assistente contro un deputato. Il comitato, dopo aver ascoltato l'assistente parlamentare, decide di avviare un'indagine se ci sono prove sufficienti. Le due parti sono invitate a presentare prove a sostegno delle rispettive posizioni. Al termine dell'indagine, il comitato trasmette le sue raccomandazioni al Presidente, che adotta una decisione. Tale decisione può consistere in una sanzione, ai sensi dell'articolo 166 del regolamento, mettendo l'Aula del Parlamento a conoscenza dei fatti.

Aggiungo che anche un assistente fa parte del comitato.

C'è poi un altro comitato che si occupa dei problemi che riguardano i funzionari.

Aggiungo inoltre che il comitato ha inviato l'anno scorso, a tutti i parlamentari, una documentazione, direi un volume, per combattere le pressioni e le molestie di tipo sessuale e non. È una guida che è stata inviata a tutti i deputati con i nomi, altresì, dei membri che fanno parte del comitato.

Questa sera naturalmente informerò il *Bureau*, l'Ufficio di presidenza del Parlamento, per valutare tutte le iniziative in proposito; ascolterò il Questore Morin-Chartier, che ha la responsabilità di guidare questo gruppo, per avere tutte le informazioni necessarie. Naturalmente chi ha subito molestie di questo tipo deve rivolgersi, come è previsto dalle nostre regole, a questo comitato che farà tutte le indagini necessarie.

Essendoci un comitato presieduto da un Questore eletto dalla Plenaria, non credo che debbano esserci, vista la sovranità del Parlamento, inchieste da affidare ad esterni. Le inchieste le deve fare il comitato *ad hoc*, presieduto da un Questore eletto dal Parlamento, e di questo comitato fa parte anche un assistente parlamentare.

Quindi tutto quello che si dovrà fare sarà fatto. È inaccettabile che accadano vicende di questo tipo, mi auguro che siano limitatissime all'interno del Parlamento. Poi vedremo la quantità delle persone, ma fino adesso non abbiamo un numero così elevato di denunce. Però anche se fosse un solo caso sarebbe, per quanto mi riguarda, inaccettabile.

Già ho detto in passato, quando ho dovuto prendere una decisione disciplinare nei confronti di un nostro collega, qual è la mia opinione sul ruolo delle donne nella società europea, quindi da questo punto di vista sarò inflessibile nell'infliggere sanzioni durissime nei confronti di parlamentari che avessero violato il nostro codice e le nostre regole.

Mercoledì: il gruppo Verts/ALE ha chiesto che la discussione congiunta sul sistema di ingressi/uscite, attualmente prevista per mercoledì mattina, sia rinviata a una tornata ulteriore.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to ask that we postpone this vote because the European Court of Justice decided in July that the Passenger Data Agreement with Canada cannot be concluded, and one of the main reasons was illegal data retention. The court made clear that data about European travellers cannot, in general, be retained for years by Canadian authorities. But now, with the entry/exit system, we would actually retain for years the personal data of Canadians coming to Europe – i.e. we would be doing exactly the same to our counterparts, and I really do not see how we could explain that to our Canadian partners.

Therefore, we have requested an independent legal analysis of the implications of the court decision, which we will publish tomorrow. That study says clearly that the entry/exit system poses serious problems because the data retention periods are far too long and not justifiable, and because rules on access by law-enforcement agencies are not specific enough – and I think that we as Parliament should not adopt EU legislation that will likely be struck down again by the Court.

At the very least, we would ask for help to postpone the vote until we can have more legal expertise on the matter and study it carefully. Therefore, we propose to postpone the vote.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor Presidente. En mi propio nombre, y en nombre de mi Grupo, rechazo esta pretensión del Grupo de los Verdes, por muchas y muy importantes razones, pero fundamentalmente por tres.

En primer lugar, porque el Reglamento contiene un robusto sistema de protección de datos. El señor Buttarelli —el supervisor europeo de protección de datos— es garante de la correcta utilización, retención, tratamiento y almacenamiento de los datos. Así se contempla en el Reglamento.

En segundo lugar, los servicios jurídicos de las tres instituciones —Servicio Jurídico del Consejo, de la Comisión y del Parlamento— han dicho, verbalmente y por escrito y también a petición del Grupo de los Verdes, han dicho categóricamente que el dictamen 1/15, que se refiere al PNR Unión Europea-Canadá, no tiene ningún impacto sobre el Reglamento por el que se establece un Sistema de Entradas y Salidas.

Y, en tercer lugar y muy importante. Recordarán todos con dolor —y sobre todo los colegas alemanes— que hubo un ataque terrorista contra el mercado navideño de Berlín. Pues bien, quiero decirles que el agresor, el terrorista, utilizó quince identidades diferentes. Si hubiese estado en vigor el Reglamento por el que se establece un Sistema de Entradas y Salidas, esto nunca hubiese sido posible.

Por tanto, señorías, les ruego que el miércoles pasemos a debatir y, en su caso, a votar el Reglamento por el que se establece un Sistema de Entradas y Salidas.

Presidente. – Pongo in votazione la richiesta del gruppo Verts/ALE, che chiede di rinviare la discussione sul sistema di ingressi/uscite, prevista per mercoledì mattina, ad una tornata ulteriore.

La richiesta è respinta, quindi l'ordine del giorno rimane immutato.

Mercoledì: il gruppo GUE/NGL ha chiesto di modificare l'ordine del giorno delle discussioni di mercoledì come segue: le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sui meccanismi di risposta agli incendi boschivi nella Spagna settentrionale e in Portogallo saranno il primo punto di mercoledì pomeriggio, prima della discussione su tematiche di attualità.

João Ferreira, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhor Presidente, já que hoje teve ocasião de prestar tributo às vítimas dos incêndios em Portugal e teve ocasião de assinalar como esta é uma questão da maior importância – e é, de facto –, perante estas tragédias, perante estas catástrofes, importa discutir não apenas o apoio que é necessário mobilizar, no imediato, para prestar às vítimas e às suas famílias, mas também discutir um quadro apropriado para a prevenção deste tipo de catástrofes ao nível europeu.

Este é um assunto que, por conseguinte, não diz respeito apenas aos dois Estados que, na semana passada, mais diretamente foram afetados pelos incêndios – é uma questão que diz respeito a todos.

Atendendo à importância do assunto – que o senhor mesmo sublinhou, e muito bem –, aquilo que pretendíamos era dar uma visibilidade e uma projeção a este debate que colocá-lo às dez da noite ou às onze da noite de quarta-feira não garante e, portanto, daí a proposta que fazemos de o alterar para primeiro ponto da ordem dos trabalhos da parte da tarde, ou seja, às três da tarde.

Marcel de Graaff (ENF). – Voorzitter, natuurlijk is het verschrikkelijk wanneer er mensen bij een bosbrand omkomen, maar hier is volgens mij toch sprake van een staaltje slappe symboolpolitiek. Ik heb de GUE/NGL-Fractie niet gehoord toen het ging over de verschrikkelijke aardbeving in Italië – die u toch ook persoonlijk aan het hart moet gaan. Maar nu het hierover gaat en wij toevallig het onderwerp voor het actualiteitendebat hebben ingebracht, moet het opeens verschoven worden en moet daar opeens een ander debat vóór geplaatst worden. Het is hier in dit Huis de gewoonte dat actualiteitendebatten als eerste aan de orde komen op de woensdagmiddag en ik zou u willen vragen deze gewoonte te respecteren. Ik weet dat er hier parlementariërs zijn die zich vergrijpen aan hun eigen assistenten – een stuitend gebrek aan respect voor de medemens. Ook hier in dit voorstel herken ik een dergelijk gebrek aan respect. Ik hoop dat we allen tegen stemmen.

Presidente. – Pongo in votazione la richiesta dell'on. Ferreira, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL, di cambiare l'ordine del giorno e anticipare al primo punto di mercoledì pomeriggio la discussione sugli incendi boschivi in Portogallo e in Spagna.

La richiesta è respinta, quindi l'ordine del giorno non viene modificato.

L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

17. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Mihai Țurcanu, a nome della commissione per il mercato interno e la protezione dei consumatori, sulla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che stabilisce norme relative alla messa a disposizione sul mercato di prodotti fertilizzanti recanti la marcatura CE e che modifica i regolamenti (CE) n. 1069/2009 e (CE) n. 1107/2009 (COM(2016)0157 - C8-0123/2016 - 2016/0084(COD)) (A8-0270/2017).

Mihai Țurcanu, raportor. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, distinși colegi, proiectul de regulament care stabilește normele referitoare la produsele fertilizante cu marcat european își propune să îmbunătățească actuala legislație în domeniu. Permiteți-mi, vă rog, să vă prezint câteva argumente care m-au făcut să cred în acest raport.

Vreau să precizez, în primul rând, faptul că acest regulament face parte din propunerea Comisiei privind economia circulară. Va impacta pozitiv toate țările Uniunii Europene, iar beneficiile aduse se răsfrâng în mai multe domenii de activitate.

Sectorul economic, în primul rând, este un bun motor prin care industria de profil este stimulată să devină mai competitivă. Printre obiectivele notabile ale acestui cadru legislativ este faptul că se va extinde sfera de produse fertilizante la cele obținute din materii prime secundare. Se vor reduce sarcinile administrative pe care le au producătorii, iar etichetarea va fi mai clară și mai cuprinzătoare.

De cealaltă parte, consumatorul, cel pe care dorim să îl protejăm, va avea parte de produse mai sigure. Dorim ca prezența metalelor grele și a contaminanților în produsele fertilizante să fie în limite care nu pun în pericol sănătatea omului.

Doresc să subliniez faptul că, în calitate de raportor, am făcut eforturi pentru a obține un consens cât mai larg, în ciuda pozițiilor contradictorii care persistă între țările Uniunii Europene pe această temă. Este datoria noastră să oferim consumatorului european produse alimentare sigure pentru sănătate și la un preț rezonabil.

Doresc să fac o trecere în revistă și a principalelor prevederi ale propunerii, și anume faptul că propunerea va permite tuturor produselor fertilizante, inclusiv celor derivate din deșeuri biologice și nutrienți reciclați, să beneficieze de marcajul CE, care să asigure libera circulație pe piața unică. Se vor introduce noi cerințe armonizate pentru toate produsele fertilizante cu marcat CE în ceea ce privește calitatea, siguranța și etichetarea. De asemenea, vorbim despre norme noi privind libera circulație a tuturor fertilizanților cu marcaje CE. Se va menține o armonizare opțională; spre exemplu, un producător care nu dorește ca produsul său să aibă marcajul CE, dar să aibă acces nelimitat la întreaga piață unică a UE, poate opta pentru respectarea normelor naționale, în conformitate cu principiul subsidiarității.

Am avut consultări cu reprezentanții delegațiilor naționale și grupurilor politice, am discutat cu exponenți ai industriei îngrășămintelor chimice ai statelor membre, precum și ai unor țări exportatoare de materie primă către Uniunea Europeană.

Mărti, dumneavoastră sunteți chemați să vă pronunțați prin vot asupra mai multor propuneri de limite ale concentrației maxime admise de cadmiu. Vă rog să aveți în vedere necesitatea reglementării cât mai urgente în acest domeniu, precum și nevoia industriei de profil de a avea timpul necesar pentru a se adapta la noile standarde.

Dragi colegi, nu avem dreptul să închidem peste noapte fabrici, să lăsăm fără loc de muncă mii de oameni. Nu avem dreptul să-i condamnăm pe fermierii europeni să cumpere produse fertilizante la prețuri care îi păgubesc. Dar nici nu putem permite în continuare ca solul și, implicit, agricultura europeană să evolueze haotic și nesustenabil, cu riscuri pentru siguranța noastră și a celorlalți consumatori.

Iată de ce consider că este necesară stabilirea, încă de la intrarea în vigoare a viitorului regulament, a unui nivel precis de cadmiu admis. De asemenea, trebuie să fim conștienți de faptul că este nevoie de un interval rezonabil de implementare. Cred în profesionalismul colegilor mei și doresc să ne armonizăm pozițiile pentru a putea să ne prezentăm cu fruntea sus în fața propriilor alegători.

Dragi colegi, dincolo de acest punct asupra căruia știu că mulți dintre dumneavoastră se vor pronunța în continuare, doresc să precizez faptul că raportul este, în mare măsură, rezultatul muncii depuse de precedentul titular al dosarului, doamna Gáll-Pelcz, până în momentul în care a părăsit Parlamentul European. Îi mulțumesc pentru efort. Le mulțumesc și colegilor care au contribuit cu sugestii și propuneri, în special domnului Andreas Schwab, pentru aportul său consistent în calitate de coordonator PPE în Comisia pentru piața internă.

Închei făcând apel la susținerea dumneavoastră, mai ales că vor urma negocieri cu Consiliul European. Avem nevoie, în perspectiva acestora, de un mandat cât mai solid din partea forului europarlamentar. Vă mulțumesc.

Elisabetta Gardini, *relatrice per parere della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io sono qui a testimoniare un lavoro che è stato laborioso, lungo e complesso. Questo regolamento l'abbiamo salutato con grande favore, perché va a ricomprendere sotto il marchio CE un vasto campo di fertilizzanti che prima ne rimanevano esclusi, però abbiamo anche alcune preoccupazioni. Noi, come commissione Ambiente, avevamo la competenza esclusiva per quanto riguarda i contaminanti e il punto su cui abbiamo più dibattuto è stato sicuramente quello del cadmio, come ha ricordato già il relatore Țurcanu.

Le mie preoccupazioni sono molto vive perché anche nei *fact sheet* della Commissione si valuta che già andare a un limite di 40 milligrammi richiederebbe grandi sforzi e maggiori investimenti in tecnologie, eccetera eccetera, ma la stessa Commissione riconosce in questi documenti che andare addirittura a 20 milligrammi, come ha proposto la Commissione e come ha confermato anche la commissione Ambiente, comporterebbe tali e maggiori investimenti nella decadmiazione e probabilmente, addirittura, necessiterebbe di un riassetto generale del mercato dei fertilizzanti.

Per questo io credo che la prudenza sia importante e che forse sia giusto darci un po' di tempo per riflettere, considerando che già a partire da 60 milligrammi siamo a metà del limite più basso che troviamo nel mondo. Voi lo sapete, dai 120 ai 150-160 parliamo di Stati Uniti, parliamo di Canada, parliamo di Australia: non parliamo certo di paesi che non hanno a cuore l'ambiente. Quindi mi unisco all'appello del relatore Țurcanu.

Jan Huitema, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling*. – Beste commissaris, geachte collega's, de moderne landbouw is in staat om met ecologische en technologische innovaties oplossingen te bieden voor klimaatverandering, een beter milieu en meer biodiversiteit. Daarvoor is het nodig om Europese regelgeving aan te passen. Door verouderde wetgeving is een boer bijvoorbeeld beperkt in het bemesten van zijn land met dierlijke mest, afkomstig van zijn eigen bedrijf. Het overschot aan dierlijke mest moet hij afvoeren. Om toch aan de bemestingsbehoeften van zijn gewas te voldoen, koopt hij kunstmest. De wereld op zijn kop. De boer moet zoveel mogelijk zijn eigen meststoffen kunnen gebruiken in plaats van kunstmest te kopen. Ter vergelijking jaarlijks importeren we 6 miljoen ton aan fosfaatkunstmest, terwijl we 2 miljoen ton fosfaat zouden kunnen terugwinnen uit organische bronnen, zoals mest en afvalstromen. Deze kringloop moeten we sluiten. Het milieu wordt daarmee minder belast en de uitstoot van broeikasgassen verminderd. Gelukkig wil de Europese Commissie dit mogelijk maken.

Daarnaast kan fosfaatkunstmest het kankerverwekkende cadmium bevatten. Dat is een groot risico voor ons milieu en de voedselveiligheid dat we niet kunnen toestaan. Ik stem daarom voor strenge cadmiumlimieten in kunstmest. Argumenten vanuit de industrie dat de prijs van kunstmest drastisch zal toenemen en de boeren het gelag betalen, is bangmakerij en door landbouweconomen tegengesproken. Sterker nog, het omgekeerde is waar. Ik wil niet dat boeren over een aantal jaar worden bestempeld als milieucriminelen, omdat er cadmium gevonden wordt in de bodem, of erger nog, in ons voedsel. Omdat ze meststoffen gebruiken die voldoen aan Europese regels, Europese regels die wij hier vandaag met elkaar maken. Bovendien biedt een nieuwe meststoffenverordening voldoende mogelijkheden voor alternatieven. Met de nieuwe meststoffenverordening komt er namelijk eindelijk meer ruimte voor organische meststoffen om te kunnen concurreren met kunstmest.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to express my thanks to Parliament for its strong support for the proposed Fertilising Products Regulation. In particular, I thank the rapporteur and shadow rapporteurs for all their valuable input.

The regulation is in many ways ground-breaking and also very complex. Being here today gives me a chance to recall its core principles. First of all, with regard to the potential of the circular economy, the proposed regulation is the first deliverable of the Circular Economy Action Plan. It is a very ambitious contribution to that. I say very ambitious because, for the first time, this regulation will open up the single market for products needed by European farmers in the 21st century.

The products I am talking about are innovative agro-chemicals produced from organic materials present in by-products and waste. Those products have enormous potential to make European agriculture more efficient and sustainable and to create jobs and opportunities for innovative businesses in Europe.

When organic materials available in Europe are recycled, European farmers get an outlet for agricultural by-products that would otherwise have been wasted. European fertiliser manufacturers become much less dependent on imported, scarce raw materials, such as phosphate, from other regions in the world and, in between, a market is created for innovative European recycling operators and technology providers. So this is a win-win for European farmers, fertiliser producers and innovative businesspeople.

In terms of a free market for responsible actors, we are trying with the proposed new regulation to free up the market as much as possible for products that can reform the European agro-industry. Gone are the days when fertilisers had to comply with narrow definitions set by the legislator, or when they had to be halted at every border between Member States for new certification. Nowadays, manufacturers have real freedom to adapt their products to farmers' needs, using a mix of conventional and innovative raw materials.

Farmers understand their own needs much better than any legislator. That is why we have proposed legislation which keeps farmers' choices as wide as possible. But this presumes that manufacturers take all responsibility for product safety. Spreading products on farmland can pose a risk to health and the environment. Known and unknown toxic contaminants can end up in our water, food and animal feed. So we have proposed that all agro-chemicals covered in the legislation must be subject to a chemical safety assessment under the general Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) legislation.

If this proposal is amended, nobody – neither the legislator nor the manufacturer – will be responsible for assessing the safety of using agro-chemicals on land, and crops. That could have dramatic impacts on the environment and on the safety of the food chain, so I urge the European Parliament not to water down our proposal on this point. European fertiliser producers are more than able to take on the responsibility that the new market freedom requires and European farmers and citizens have the right to expect.

Finally, this proposal not only provides new opportunities for the European agro-industry, it also provides you with an opportunity to limit emissions of toxic contaminants to farmland, drinking water and food. I would like to thank you for your general support for this part of our proposal. Together, we will raise environmental standards in an area in which Europeans are lagging behind the rest of the world. Future generations of Europeans will have their health better protected.

A particular concern for health and the environment is cadmium in phosphate fertilisers. As far back as 1988, a Council resolution called for a strategy to reduce cadmium in phosphate fertilisers, and the problem has far from disappeared since then. There are a few marginal scientific differences, but the overall picture is clear: the European environment and people are too exposed to cadmium, and the only remaining major polluter of food in the environment is the phosphate fertilisers industry. So it is time for phosphate fertiliser manufacturers make sure that some of the dirtiest phosphate rock is cleaned before it is used in fertilisers, or for them to replace it with cleaner recycled phosphates sourced from Europe. And they can do that. The market is already developing and we are ready to support it further.

Please remember that the limit values will also apply to imported phosphate fertilisers sold in the single market with the CE mark. This gives the European industry a golden opportunity to lead the world, not only as manufacturers of clean fertilisers with access to the single market, but also as technology providers to importers. So the industry should work with us, not against us. It is in their interest. It will help them to get a competitive advantage by developing clean technologies in innovative ways.

To conclude my opening remarks, let me thank you again for your support. I look forward to hearing your views.

Jarosław Wałęsa, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on International Trade*. – Mr President, there is one thing I do not understand: how come the Commission can ask for and pay for scientific research, and when the time comes to write European law, this research is thrown out with the garbage? The Smolders study, which should be the basis for the findings of the Commission and for our work as well, shows that 80 mg of cadmium per kilogramme in fertilisers does not lead to accumulation of cadmium in the soil. Don't make any mistakes: this proposal will not lead to lowering our dependence on imports of phosphate or phosphorus rock. We will be dependant on different sources. What we're doing right now is we're going to stuff euros into the Russian hands, and that's a fact. Please don't ask me to go back to my home country and tell those people who are going to lose their European jobs that we are doing this to help them out, because it is not true. It is not based on good science, it is not based on good economy, and it is just crazy. We should not propose such a law, because it does not make any sense.

Pilar Ayuso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, yo le doy la bienvenida a esta legislación, que está inscrita dentro del paquete de economía circular, porque propone fertilizantes orgánicos y reciclados reduciendo así la materia prima inorgánica. Y, además, se establecen criterios armónicos medioambientales y de seguridad alimentaria para impulsar el comercio de estos productos.

Todo eso está muy bien y es muy loable. Son objetivos estupendos y que tenemos que perseguir, pero a veces el fin no justifica los medios, sobre todo si estos medios con los que contamos no son viables ni asumibles desde el punto de vista práctico y económico para los sectores que tienen que asumirlos y aplicarlos.

Favorecer la expansión de materias orgánicas es muy positivo. Sin embargo, no podemos con ello pretender sustituir los productos minerales, al menos mientras no nos aseguremos de que aportan el mismo nivel y eficiencia en términos de fertilización de suelos. No hay que olvidar que los productos fertilizantes son esenciales y garantizan a los agricultores que sus cultivos reciben un aporte suficiente de nutrientes. Por otra parte, aunque es importante impulsar el uso de estiércoles como fertilizantes orgánicos, creo que no es este el reglamento para intentarlo, ya que afectaría directamente a la Directiva sobre los nitratos.

Quiero referirme también, como no, al contenido máximo de cadmio. Los límites de cadmio permitidos han generado un gran debate y tienen una gran trascendencia en la competitividad de la industria y de la agricultura, así como otras connotaciones geopolíticas, como se acaba de decir aquí. En mi opinión los límites propuestos por la Comisión son demasiado reducidos. Es más, yo diría que son inaceptables y hay que flexibilizar la propuesta: ochenta miligramos, como apuntan los informes científicos, sería una cifra razonable, máxime cuando ahora no tenemos ningún límite.

En cualquier caso, debemos impulsar este Reglamento para apoyar a la industria a fin de que sea más sostenible y más competitiva y fomentar el crecimiento económico sostenible y el empleo. Pero si llegamos demasiado lejos en algunos temas, tendremos que votar en contra.

Marc Tarabella, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, la proposition de règlement dont il est question aujourd'hui vise à garantir le fonctionnement du marché intérieur des produits fertilisants, tout en garantissant que les fertilisants marqués CE répondent aux exigences de protection de la santé humaine, animale et végétale et de sécurité de l'environnement.

Les engrais sont bien évidemment cruciaux pour la production agricole, mais leur utilisation peut également avoir un impact négatif sur l'environnement et la sécurité alimentaire, en particulier lorsqu'ils renferment des contaminants.

À l'heure actuelle, les fertilisants sont réglementés au niveau européen par le règlement de 2003. Mais, ce dernier ne couvre en réalité qu'une partie du marché des engrais, puisqu'environ 50 % de tous les engrais présents sur le marché européen sont exclus de son champ d'application.

En effet, le règlement existant concerne principalement les engrais conventionnels, dits «inorganiques», qui suivent un modèle d'économie linéaire, puisqu'il s'agit d'extraction de matières premières.

La proposition de règlement, quant à elle, amorce un virage vers l'économie circulaire, puisqu'elle vise à accroître la réutilisation des matières premières qui sont actuellement éliminées en tant que déchets.

Mettre les engrais organiques sur un pied d'égalité avec les engrais traditionnels peut réduire les déchets et l'impact environnemental de la fertilisation et de l'agriculture. On estime que la récupération des nutriments déjà présents dans l'Union européenne, par exemple sous la forme de déchets, pourrait remplacer environ 30 % des engrais inorganiques actuellement sur le marché – cela a d'ailleurs été précisé précédemment.

Il s'agit là d'un dossier très technique, avec un partage de compétences complexe entre les différentes commissions qui y participent. Les collègues et moi-même avons travaillé de concert afin d'obtenir un texte qui est à mon sens bien équilibré.

Je tiens d'ailleurs à remercier le rapporteur, M. Turcanu, qui a succédé à M^{me} Gall-Pelcz, qui avait fait un excellent travail, ainsi que mes autres collègues rapporteurs fictifs pour leur collaboration.

J'espère donc que le vote de demain confortera les acquis que nous avons obtenus par l'intermédiaire de la commission du marché intérieur et de la protection des consommateurs.

Pourtant, à l'heure actuelle, je suis interpellé par la possible réouverture de la directive «nitrates», qui a pourtant, dès le départ, été une ligne rouge pour mon groupe et qui, d'un commun accord, était inenvisageable dans ce rapport.

En effet, la directive «nitrates» comprend deux éléments majeurs: d'une part, le principe de fertilisation équilibrée et, d'autre part, l'obligation de limiter l'utilisation de fumier, permettant d'éviter l'élevage intensif et de favoriser une agriculture raisonnée. Il ne s'agit donc ni du lieu ni du moment pour amender à la va-vite une législation essentielle luttant contre la pollution des sols. J'ajoute que, si l'amendement «nitrates» devait passer – ce qui avait été proposé à diverses étapes du dossier –, je donnerais instruction à mon groupe de voter contre l'entièreté de ce rapport. Je pense que nous ne devons pas prendre ce risque.

Quant à l'épineuse question des seuils de cadmium, le compromis soutenu notamment par mon groupe me paraît être la solution la plus équilibrée, car il permet d'appliquer le principe de précaution en la matière, tout en donnant du temps à l'industrie pour se conformer à ces nouvelles exigences.

Edward Czesak, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Propozycja Komisji wprowadzająca drastyczne obniżenie dopuszczalnych norm zanieczyszczenia nawozów metalami ciężkimi, głównie kadmem, budzi kontrowersje. Projekt uderza bowiem bezpośrednio w przemysł nawozowy oparty na eksploatacji rodzimych zasobów skał fosforowych w wielu państwach Unii. Unijni producenci nawozów zmuszeni będą do znacznego zwiększenia kosztów produkcji poprzez albo kosztowną technologię oczyszczania rud z metali ciężkich, albo import rud mineralnych z niższymi poziomami zanieczyszczeń od któregoś z eksporterów globalnych. Mam tu na myśli głównie Rosję. W konsekwencji pogorszy to sytuację ekonomiczną przemysłu chemicznego w Unii Europejskiej i wpłynie na podwyższenie cen nawozów. Zagrozi to także znaczną likwidacją miejsc pracy. Normy zaproponowane w sprawozdaniu są drastyczne, a argument ochrony środowiska i zdrowia konsumentów, choć ważny, jednak nie ma jednoznacznych wyników badań wskazujących na potrzebę tak rygorystycznego limitowania zawartości metali ciężkich w produkcji nawozów.

Nowe regulacje muszą być realistyczne. Nie można wymagać od państw członkowskich, w których od dziesięcioleci działają potężne zakłady chemiczne – niektóre będąc głównym pracodawcą w regionie – żeby nagle z nawozów syntetycznych przerzuciły się na produkcję nawozów organicznych. Apeluję, by głosując, mieli państwo na uwadze, że przyjęcie sprawozdania narzucającego tak restrykcyjne normy środowiskowe dla rynku europejskiego znacznie utrudni naszym narodowym producentom funkcjonowanie na europejskim rynku nawozowym. Otworzy to także pole do niekorzystnych dla firm naszego rynku europejskiego działań zewnętrznych, szeroko rozumianych. Poprawki złożone przez grupę ECR obejmujące 80 ml/kg kadmu w nawozach fosforowych dają szansę, aby ostateczny kształt sprawozdania uwzględnił optymalnie realizację stopniowego ograniczania zawartości metali ciężkich w nawozach, ale też rozsądnie rozłożoną w czasie.

Kaja Kallas, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, there has been a lot of talk around cadmium, but I will not talk about cadmium: this proposal is not only setting the limits, it is also about opening new possibilities for European producers. Up until now, only mineral fertilisers have benefited from the CE marking and free access to the single market. Today, they are still the most widely used in Europe, but alongside the traditional products more and more companies are looking for new solutions. This partly reflects the global trend in rising environmental consciousness on the one hand, and a drive for increased efficiency on the other. Companies around the world realise that they need to find ways to do more with less.

In Europe, a lot of effort has been put into innovation. There is a strong drive in the fertiliser sector to find new sources of raw materials and make products that are more targeted and less wasteful. Often the solutions that are found are at the very forefront of science. By extending the scope of this regulation to such products, we will put in place the necessary framework to maximise the innovative potential of the fertiliser industry.

Unified European standards will give producers a clear set of targets to aim for. Removing national barriers from the market will give them access to enough customers to make their investments pay off. Moreover, by asking the Commission to keep looking for new component materials that could be added to the regulation, we recognise that a lot of the potential of this sector is still untapped. We should not only reward existing innovation by granting better access to the single market, we should also encourage further research by ensuring the possibility of updating the regulation in the future.

By allowing the Commission to revise the regulation, we are telling producers to think outside the box and to keep looking for new solutions. If we follow these principles, we can create legislation that is truly supportive of innovation.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, no domínio dos fertilizantes e no quadro da economia circular, achamos que se deve trabalhar para diminuir o emprego de fertilizantes químicos, desenvolvendo a agroecologia e promovendo uma maior inter-relação entre a pecuária e a agricultura, potenciando a utilização do estrume e fomentando a compostagem nas próprias explorações agrícolas, para que as agricultoras e os agricultores tenham cada vez uma menor dependência de fatores de produção do exterior e para evitar um maior impacto ambiental e contribuir para a luta contra as alterações climáticas.

Isto pressuporia também diminuir os custos de produção, o consumo de energias fósseis e o perigo da libertação de substâncias nocivas para o ambiente e a saúde, tanto das pessoas, como dos animais. No que se refere à rocha fosfatada, uma das matérias-primas fundamentais dos fertilizantes que a União Europeia importa, há que dizer que provém fundamentalmente de Marrocos, dos depósitos nos territórios ocupados no Sara Ocidental. Esta rocha apresenta também elevados níveis de cádmio, que se acumula no solo e na água e passa para a cadeia alimentar, causando problemas de saúde e ambientais.

Achamos que as instituições europeias têm que garantir a soberania do povo do Sara sobre os seus recursos, impedir que sejam espoliados por Marrocos e não ceder perante pressões externas quanto ao estabelecimento dos níveis admitidos de cádmio nos fertilizantes. Entendemos ser necessário pôr fim às importações de substâncias para a fabricação de fertilizantes. E as lamas de depuradora não devem ser permitidas nos fertilizantes. Para nós, a marcação CE deveria estar reservada exclusivamente aos produtos da União Europeia. A rotulagem deve ser clara, transparente e facilmente inteligível. Os rótulos devem ser escritos em todas as línguas oficiais dos Estados-Membros.

No procedimento de avaliação da conformidade, deve garantir-se que sempre prevaleça o princípio de precaução. Para isso, aos organismos de avaliação da conformidade devem ser públicos e basear-se em estudos e avaliações independentes, transparentes e públicas e ser atualizados continuamente. Só assim poderemos garantir que não se está a comercializar fertilizantes com a marcação CE que apresentem um risco para a saúde humana, animal ou vegetal, ou para o meio ambiente.

Bas Eickhout, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, we all know what we are trying to do here. We are trying to create one internal market for all fertilisers, because we know that until now the scope has been very limited. When we are doing that, then one of the key issues is going to be the level of cadmium that is allowed because we all know, it is a fact: cadmium is a heavy metal and carcinogenic to people. We know that, and we also know – this was already investigated by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) – that in 2009 Europeans' intake of cadmium was at the maximum limit set by EFSA, and the intake for some more vulnerable groups there was a higher of cadmium than was allowed.

These are concerning facts that need to be addressed, because we also know that of all the cadmium limits, until now only the fertiliser group has been exempted. If we are going to make a European regulation – and we know that there are many national applications in place – we have to take into consideration that the proposals by the Commission entail, for some countries, a dilution of the current cadmium limits. That is on the table, and then people are saying that this will hamper the fertiliser industry.

To them I say: 'excuse me, can we base this kind of debate on facts?' Wageningen University have been looking after the research and they say that the cost of meeting the cadmium limits that are being proposed would be minimal. And reducing cadmium limits would also be a stimulus for innovation: getting to clean fertiliser without cadmium would be an example of the circular economy. That is what we are trying to do here.

Most of the arguments you hear positing that this is impossible are predicated on a very old-fashioned idea that innovation is not happening. If we can be innovative Europe then we can be the selling market for clean fertilisers. That is what is at stake, and we don't want to hear any flippant discussions.

What is also very important is that in the end, if we are not doing this right, who will pay the price? It is the farmers still using the contaminated fertilisers, because they must use the market. And if we find out there is more and more cadmium in our soils, and who will be getting the blame? It is the farmers.

So if you are really concerned about the farmers, you have to make sure that the producers get the limits that they need to get. And that is at stake and all the other arguments are just fake.

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the onus of proof must always lie with those who impose the restriction. Regulation must not been made for regulation's sake, and the rule is made for people and not the other way around. Restrictions and prohibitions must be justified. This means a real risk to human health – not just a hazard. All actions are hazardous, and if that were the criterion we would all do nothing. We would still be living in caves with much shorter lifespans.

It also means looking at the real-world impact of this legislation. Are substitutes available? Can the damage of the restriction be mitigated? Have we used a sledgehammer to crack a nut? There is no clear evidence that we need to crack down hard on cadmium, and lots of economic consequences which are real and damaging. Fertilisers are a cost, but they allow modern agricultural productivity essential for the size of the world's growing population. I am a farmer, and I can tell you that no sensible farmer applies any fertiliser he does not regard as essential, and he selects the most cost-effective option.

We believe that the case for a 20 mg cadmium restriction has simply not been made. It will further burden EU agriculture with no identifiable benefit. Limits in the United States, Canada and Australia are over 120 mg, but their people are not suffering. So how can it possibly make sense to add to the cost, enrich the Russians, handicap EU production and reduce our competitiveness? Also, what are we going to do with all this cadmium that we do pull out of the phosphate, if indeed we do that? That is when it will become a real hazard.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, la mise à jour sur le marché des fertilisants porteurs du marquage «CE» est essentielle pour être conforme aux exigences de protection de la santé, de la sécurité et de l'environnement.

Actuellement, seuls les fertilisants traditionnels obtenus par extraction ou par des procédés chimiques bénéficient de l'accès au marché intérieur et ont le fameux label «CE», alors que 50 % des engrais actuellement sur le marché en sont exclus – organiques, sous-produits animaux ou agricoles, déchets biologiques. En conséquence, les engrais obtenus sur des principes de l'économie circulaire en sont pour l'instant exclus.

Cette initiative, ce texte a donc deux objectifs. Le premier est d'inciter à la production dans l'Union européenne d'engrais issus de matières organiques ou secondaires pour développer le modèle de l'économie circulaire en transformant des déchets en éléments nutritifs, réduisant ainsi la dépendance de l'Union européenne aux substances nutritives importées de pays tiers. Cette proposition vise à établir pour les engrais organiques des conditions de concurrence égales aux engrais minéraux.

Le second objectif est d'établir des taux limites de contaminants dans les engrais. Les taux proposés par la Commission sont irréalisables et dangereux pour l'industrie utilisant le phosphate comme source naturelle pour l'élaboration de ses engrais secondaires. L'industrie française des engrais organiques ou secondaires est très développée et a tout intérêt à bénéficier de l'ouverture du marché intérieur et de l'octroi du label «CE». Ces acteurs économiques subissent de facto une distorsion de concurrence face au marché des engrais minéraux et chimiques.

Le soutien obtenu par la société civile française sur ce dossier témoigne de l'enjeu réel pour ce secteur particulier de l'économie française, et je tiens ici à les remercier. En revanche, le soutien sur ce dossier de la part des députés français de tous partis politiques de cet hémicycle est toujours attendu de la part des acteurs de ce secteur.

Outre l'enjeu vital pour l'industrie française des engrais phosphatés, la proposition de la Commission aurait également la mauvaise idée de ne nous faire dépendre que d'une seule source d'approvisionnement de phosphates et l'effondrement du marché du phosphate nord-africain pourrait avoir de graves répercussions sur l'équilibre social de ces pays. L'intérêt géopolitique est également un enjeu important de ce texte.

Notre groupe a déposé des amendements visant à établir un taux de cadmium à 80 milligrammes par kilo, avec une diminution progressive sur quinze ans pour obtenir un taux de 60 milligrammes, délai raisonnable et pragmatique pour la recherche et le développement, notamment en techniques de décadmiation du phosphate. La délégation française du Front national ne saurait donc demain, lors du vote, choisir de sacrifier de trop nombreux emplois français par une logique idéologique et dépourvue de bon sens, en choisissant des taux de cadmium beaucoup trop faibles.

Il est sans doute préférable que l'industrie française des engrais secondaires et organiques accepte le statu quo en restant temporairement exclue du marché unique, plutôt que de risquer de voir nombre de ses collaborateurs être licenciés. L'instrumentalisation d'un besoin économique au profit d'objectifs contradictoires ne me semble pas le meilleur moyen d'aider le tissu industriel européen.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, the whole idea of the circular economy is just catching on, so it is appropriate that we try and implement it in the agriculture sector with fertilisers. Frankly, for a lot of farmers, they try to operate a circular economy on their farm where they have animals and cropping, and it can work really well. It can also work at the local level – amongst farmers who trade in livestock manure, and I think that is something we should encourage and promote.

In this case, what we are talking about is extending what can be used as a fertiliser ingredient. What we need from that is that it is effective – in other words, that it works at farm level and that it is safe and that we do not over-regulate.

What is very important is that fertilisers in the past account for 60% of the registered yield increase in the last 50 years, so we absolutely need fertilisers to grow crops. I have listened carefully to the robust debate about cadmium, and I think we have to make sure that what we aspire to is achievable and does not have unintended consequences.

I would say here that the cereal sector in Europe is under huge pressure. We import a large volume of cereals that will be produced without our control on the cadmium levels used in the fertilisers in third countries, and we need to be very mindful of the consequences of that on our production here. It is one of the things that we do repeatedly in Europe. I want us to be leaders in this field, but I do not want us to be so far ahead that we are behind. We do it in a whole range of products. If we can encourage the rest of the world to move with us, then I think we could all do that in a very coherent and supportive way. I fear, though, that in this case we will be so far ahead that we are behind and will cause problems on the single market for our farmers, and indeed for our consumers.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento che approveremo domani ci consegnerà un quadro normativo finalmente armonizzato in un settore, quello dei fertilizzanti, che – vorrei ricordare a tutti noi – rappresenta in Europa 100 000 posti di lavoro, centinaia di piccole e medie imprese, con un fatturato annuo che va dai 20 ai 25 miliardi di euro. A me preme sottolineare tre importanti risultati che da questo testo emergono.

Il primo è l'etichettatura a marchio CE visibile, leggibile e completa, che garantirà una maggiore tutela dei consumatori e, in primo luogo, degli agricoltori.

Il secondo: abbiamo garantito la promozione dell'utilizzo di materiali riciclati e organici per un ulteriore sviluppo dell'economia circolare e la riduzione della dipendenza dall'import di alcune materie prime da paesi terzi.

Infine, vi è quello che rimane il punto più sensibile del regolamento, ovvero la definizione dei valori limite armonizzati su alcuni prodotti contaminanti, quali il cadmio e il cromo. Credo che l'approccio che il nostro gruppo ha posto all'attenzione del Parlamento sia improntato alla ragionevolezza e all'equilibrio. Da una parte l'attenzione alla salute dei cittadini e alla sicurezza ambientale, dall'altra la necessità di tempi ragionevoli di adattamento del sistema industriale ai nuovi limiti previsti, nuovi limiti che, vorrei ricordare a tutti voi, in gran parte dei paesi europei sono nettamente inferiori al limite di partenza di questa direttiva, cioè ai 60 milligrammi che noi abbiamo messo come punto di partenza.

Credo che qualcuno potrebbe obiettare che i tempi avrebbero potuto essere più celeri per giungere a un quadro armonizzato a livello europeo. Tuttavia ciò che conta – io penso, colleghi – è avviare un percorso in Europa che, attraverso investimenti, ricerca e sviluppo, renda più competitivo questo settore e più ambientalmente sostenibili anche le nostre politiche.

Daniel Dalton (ECR). – Mr President, we welcome much of this report and the modernisation of the current regulation, but the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety has simply gone too far on cadmium levels, which they had competence on. Their proposal to lower the amount of cadmium fertilisers to just 40 mg in three years and then just 20 mg in nine years goes against scientific evidence and would have a dramatic effect on our ability to produce food. Our farmers need affordable and high-quality fertilisers. They directly increase the productivity of many crops. The Commission proposed 60 mg, even though they had evidence that 80 mg would do the job and lead to a reduction in the accumulation of cadmium in the soil.

Fertilisers, we should also remember, are only one reason that cadmium can end up in the soil and in diet: alone, they don't solve the problem. The EU imports 85% of fertilisers, and most of those inputs will not meet the 60 mg proposal, let alone the 40 mg target or the 20 mg target down the line. So, if this report goes through, our farmers will face massive cost increases, which will make our food even more expensive. I therefore urge colleagues to support the amendments tabled by the ECR Group, which sets a maximum level at 80 mg.

Fredrick Federley (ALDE). – Herr talman! Tack, kommissionen, för er närvaro vid den här väldigt viktiga debatten. Jag vill också tacka kommissionen för att ha varit väldigt öppen och tillgänglig under hela processen, där vi hanterat väldigt teknisk lagstiftning, men där har vi kunnat få snabba svar på viktiga frågor för att komma vidare i arbetet.

Först av allt är det viktigt att påtala de nya marknader som vi faktiskt kan komma att se. Det låter ungefär som om domedagen närmar sig när jag hör högerflanken debattera härinne. Men så är det inte alls. Först ska vi nog börja med att konstatera att det vi pratar om inte är några absoluta förbudsnivåer som sätter hinder och gränser. Är du från Storbritannien och vill tillåta 150 milligram kadmium i mineralgödsel kan du faktiskt göra det. Skillnaden är att du inte får sälja det under CE-märkningen, som är garantin för vad du får sälja på den europeiska marknaden. Det är vad vi faktiskt pratar om.

Men en del här, känns det som, är väldigt hårt tryckta av en industrilobby som vill komma åt hela den europeiska marknaden. Då måste vi ställa oss frågan: Vad ligger snittnivån på idag? Den ligger på 34 milligram. Alltså långt under de 40 milligram som vi siktar på att komma till om tre år. Samtidigt är det så att flera länder – Tjeckien, Slovakien, Finland, Sverige, Ungern med flera – har mycket lägre nivåer redan idag. Tre av dem har 20 milligram eller 22 milligram. Väl fungerande länder med väl fungerande jordbruksindustri. Det här tyder så klart på att det går att göra. Men då måste vi ha tydliga signaler, och även om jag tycker att vi i vår kompromiss här nu urholkar en hel del genom att vi förlänger tidsperspektivet till 16 år, kan det vara en kompromiss jag kan leva med för att vi ska få det här på banan.

Konsekvensen, om vi driver 80 milligram, handlar inte om er hemmamarknad, det handlar om vad Ungern ska behöva acceptera. Att ni fyrdubblar deras nivåer? Vad ska Finland behöva acceptera? Att ni fyrdubblar nivån av kadmium i deras mineralgödsel? Det kan vi inte göra. Vi måste vara mera progressiva än så. Tack kommissionen för ett gott samarbete och hoppas att vi får ett bra utfall vid omröstningen.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, senhor Comissário, qualquer intervenção neste domínio da disponibilização no mercado de produtos fertilizantes não deve perder de vista que a agricultura europeia dominante se afasta em aspetos fundamentais de um modelo de produção sustentável, ao que não serão alheias as políticas e orientações pre-valecentes na União Europeia, como é o caso da PAC, que carecem de uma profunda modificação.

Considera a relatora que os Estados-Membros devem ser livres de admitir adubos não harmonizados no mercado interno, sem retirar aos operadores económicos a possibilidade de optarem pelos benefícios de um quadro normativo harmonizado. Se nos parece, por um lado, avisado restringir os efeitos da harmonização, tornando-a facultativa, já, por outro lado, os critérios que terão presidido à elaboração do quadro normativo harmonizado afiguram-se-nos mais questionáveis.

Esperar-se-ia que estes critérios assegurassem elevados padrões de qualidade, segurança e proteção, quer do ambiente, quer da saúde pública, que estimulassem ou, pelo menos, não comprometessem a inovação de produtos e processos e que se alinhassem com o melhor conhecimento técnico e científico disponível, para além de não beneficiarem determinado tipo de interesses e operadores economicamente mais poderosos em detrimento de outros.

Levantam-se dúvidas legítimas de que assim seja.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich glaube, ein Ziel war ja ganz klar, dass wir eine einheitliche Regelung in Europa bekommen. Dem Ziel sind wir näher gekommen.

Aber gestatten Sie mir noch ein paar Worte zum Thema Cadmium. Mich wundert hier die Debatte von einigen Kollegen auf der anderen Seite tatsächlich. Jetzt messen wir uns – sie sind leider nicht mehr da – mit den USA und Australien und sagen, die haben höhere Werte – also wäre das ein Wettbewerbsnachteil für Europa. Wenn man das bei vielen anderen Sachen auch so machen würde, dann wären wir in unseren Verbraucher- und Umweltstandards weit zurück. Deshalb: Europa muss Trendsetter sein. Man muss vorangehen bei dem, was möglich ist. Und das, was der Unterausschuss bei Cadmium vorgeschlagen hat, ist halt eine Möglichkeit.

Alles, was irgendwann einmal in den Böden ist, wird auch einmal in die Nahrungsmittel kommen. Alles was wir vermeiden können, müssen wir jetzt vermeiden. Deshalb ist es eine Vorsorgemaßnahme, die vielleicht auch Geld kostet – keine Frage –, aber die langfristig zum Schutz der Umwelt gemacht werden muss. Wir wollen mehr natürliche Düngemittel + das muss Vorrang haben vor chemischen mineralischen Düngemitteln. Das ist ganz klar. Auch diese Zielsetzung unterstützen wir. Aber diese Mittel müssen auch sauber sein.

Gestatten Sie mir, einige Punkte anzusprechen, die wir nicht für wirklich gut gelöst halten. Einer ist, dass die Düngemittelverordnung auf keinen Fall dazu führen darf, dass höhere Nitratreinträge durch Gülle erlaubt werden. Die Gefahr besteht, dass die Nitratreichtlinie durch die Düngemittelverordnung abgeschwächt wird. Die Definition von tierischem Dünger in der Nitratreichtlinie darf durch die Düngemittelverordnung nicht angetastet werden. Es ist klar, dass der übermäßige Nährstoffeintrag zu Umwelt- und Gesundheitsschäden führt. Auch nachhaltige Landwirtschaftssysteme sollten nicht durch die Düngemittelverordnung geschwächt werden.

Ein Punkt der uns mit Sorge erfüllt, ist REACH. Die Düngemittelverordnung darf auch nicht genutzt werden, um die REACH-Verordnung zu umgehen. Es dürfen also keine chemischen Substanzen in Düngemitteln eingesetzt werden, die für die menschliche Gesundheit oder die Umwelt schädlich sein können. Der Verordnungsvorschlag für Düngemittel enthält einige Änderungsanträge, die es möglich machen würden, dass Düngemittel zum Einsatz kommen, die ohne ordentliches Risikomanagement zugelassen werden.

Auch bei Biostimulantien sehen wir mit Sorge, dass da nicht nur natürliche Substanzen eingesetzt werden, sondern im Endeffekt vielleicht auch ein Umgehungstatbestand geschaffen wird und Pestizide eingesetzt werden.

Einen besonderen Punkt möchte ich noch anmerken: Plastikfolien als Mulchfolien, die dann auf dem Acker verrotten sollen. Davor kann ich nur warnen. Das wird dazu beitragen, dass wir mehr Plastik im Boden und im Wasser haben.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il cibo che mangiamo è la principale fonte di contaminazione da metalli pesanti, tra i quali, in particolare, si trova il cadmio, classificato come cancerogeno. Ce lo dice l'EFSA, che ha anche stabilito livelli di assunzione massimi tollerabili nei suoi pareri scientifici. Uno studio dell'Istituto zooprofilattico sperimentale delle Venezie, nel 2015, ha rilevato che chi segue una dieta mediterranea vegetariana o vegana è anche più esposto ad alti livelli di cadmio e quindi a contaminazione.

Introducendo in questo nuovo regolamento dei limiti stringenti per il cadmio e per gli altri metalli pesanti, quali il mercurio, l'arsenico e il piombo, possiamo mettere al sicuro la salute dei consumatori europei. Non farlo oggi sarebbe folle e irresponsabile.

Abbiamo anche un'altra grande opportunità da cogliere, quella dell'economia circolare, per rendere un concetto fino ad oggi astratto un qualcosa di concreto. Questo regolamento cerca di trasformare i rifiuti in risorse e creare un mercato dei fertilizzanti organici per incentivare concimi naturali e puliti. E in questa maniera potremmo ottenere un duplice risultato: da un lato diminuire la dipendenza dell'Europa dalle importazioni di materie prime, quali le rocce fosfatiche, ingrediente principale dei fertilizzanti inorganici minerali, che però spesso acquistiamo da zone del mondo in cui non solo queste rocce sono contaminate e molto sporche, ma nei quali la loro estrazione viola i diritti umani. Dall'altro favoriremmo una vera transizione verso un'agricoltura sostenibile e naturale benefica per gli ecosistemi, l'ambiente e, ovviamente, l'uomo.

Stiamo parlando di un marchio CE e stiamo parlando di criteri stringenti per creare un nuovo mercato. Chi non li rispetta può star fuori e continuare un *business as usual*, ma dobbiamo mirare al massimo e al miglioramento della salute dei cittadini europei.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Philippe Loiseau (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, c'est avec mes préoccupations d'agriculteur que j'ai étudié ce rapport. Ne l'oublions pas, les agriculteurs sont les premiers utilisateurs de ces produits fertilisants, une profession qui se sent malheureusement parfois exclue des décisions de l'Union européenne, qui se sent également incomprise, et même méprisée. Je salue donc, pour une fois, la volonté d'avoir associé à ce texte notre voix, celle des députés de la commission de l'agriculture.

La seconde remarque porte, quant à elle, sur le rendement des fertilisants organiques. Il faut être sûr que ceux-ci soient aussi efficaces que les produits qu'ils sont censés remplacer. C'est une exigence non négociable, car pouvant remettre en cause la survie de l'agriculture, bien sûr, qui déjà doit faire face à une concurrence de produits importés ne respectant pas toujours les contraintes environnementales de l'Union européenne. L'objectif de dépendre moins des importations est donc particulièrement important et nécessaire.

Il est tout aussi capital que notre dépendance aux matières premières ne soit pas envers un seul pays, mais envers plusieurs, pour des raisons géopolitiques. Il est notamment question ici de cadmium. Si l'on abaisse trop le seuil autorisé dans les fertilisants, il est à craindre que la liste de nos pays fournisseurs se réduise à un seul. C'est un risque je ne souhaite pas prendre, personnellement, et un risque que nous devons éviter, je pense.

Sur cette même question du cadmium, l'Union européenne doit parvenir à un équilibre entre production environnementale et sanitaire et efficacité économique. La proposition de la Commission était bien trop stricte, je pense, en la matière. Notre groupe propose donc un amendement bien plus raisonnable, que j'espère voir soutenu lors des votes prochainement.

Enfin, j'en profite pour rappeler amicalement à la Commission son rôle: c'est d'abord de protéger les intérêts européens à la fois des particuliers et des professionnels. Certaines entreprises seraient ainsi fortement impactées par un seuil autorisé de cadmium trop bas. Ce sont, bien sûr, les emplois qui en pâtiraient en premier lieu. Que la Commission regarde donc ce qui se fait ailleurs! Il serait dangereux que les taux de cadmium autorisés dans les fertilisants deviennent en Europe les plus stricts du monde.

Je conclurai donc sur ce point, qui me paraît essentiel. Certes, l'Union européenne doit être protectrice sur le plan de l'environnement, mais elle ne doit pas pour autant bouleverser tout un marché par une mesure qui, en plus, ne changera pas radicalement la qualité des sols.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Erst einmal ein paar Worte zum Verfahren: Ich muss Ihnen ehrlich gestehen, ich war am Anfang ein begeisterter Anhänger des Verfahrens, dass die Ausschüsse getrennte Zuständigkeiten bekommen. Ich muss sagen, am Ende, wenn ich gerade auf dieses Dossier schaue, wäre es besser gewesen, wir hätten einen federführenden Ausschuss gehabt, weil der federführende Ausschuss letztendlich vielleicht die Kompromissbildung erleichtert hätte. Und ich muss wirklich die schüchterne Kritik an den Umweltausschuss richten, der zwar einen Beschluss gefasst hat, aber die Stichworte Arbeitsplätze, geologische Gegebenheiten, Rohstoffsicherheit, Praxistauglichkeit haben den Umweltausschuss nur am Rande interessiert. Und genau daran krankten wir ja, genau darum geht ja die Diskussion.

Dazu zwei Beispiele. Das erste Beispiel: Wenn man sich die Anträge anguckt – alle sind dafür, den Cadmiumgehalt zu definieren und zu begrenzen, und wir brauchen auch eine europäische Regelung. Das ist richtig. Wir streiten im Prinzip um 40 Milligramm. Das ist der Unterschied. Wenn man sich das einmal ausrechnet: Wenn man wirklich ernsthaft mit diesem Unterschied die Bodenqualität verbessern möchte, braucht man mehrere hundert Jahre. Das wäre genauso, als wenn jemand bei seinem Frühstücksei mit dem Salzstreuer den Eiweißgehalt beim Ei verändern will. Da passiert nämlich gar nichts. Also ich bitte ein klein wenig um Sachlichkeit und darum, zu schauen: Wie ist denn wirklich die Wirkung?

Das zweite Beispiel: In Mitteldeutschland, meiner Region, haben wir Kalklagerstätten. Das hat niemand verändert, das hat der liebe Gott so produziert, das hat man so hingestellt. Kalk ist ein Bodenverbesserer. Kalk dient ja dazu, dass man die Löslichkeit der Nährstoffe verbessert, aber die Schadstoffe im Boden bleiben. Wir wenden das natürlich schon seit Menschengedenken an. Die Regelung, die von der Kommission vorgeschlagen wird, unterstützt vom Umweltausschuss, würde dazu führen, dass wir die Kalklagerstätten um die Ecke schließen und unseren Kalk dann von weiter Entfernung herantransportieren müssten. Das ist an sich Unsinn, und deshalb bitte ich morgen in der Abstimmung sich nochmal die Kompromissanträge anzuschauen. Ob nun 80 oder 60 Milligramm – das wäre ein guter Kompromiss im Interesse der Rohstoffsicherheit und im Interesse unserer Landwirte.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Pane komisaři, já musím pochválit Evropskou komisi, protože skutečně ten návrh je dobrý. I kolegové zpravodajové udělali, myslím, výbornou práci a zůstává nám tady jenom otázka kadmia.

Hovořilo se tady hodně o průmyslu, o zemědělství, ale kromě kolegy Eickhouta málokdo hovořil o zdravotních dopadech. Kadmium je karcinogen, mutagen, reprotoxin, organotoxin a je akumulativní. Zdravotní důsledky můžou přijít ještě deset let potom, co došlo k intoxikaci. To je třeba si uvědomit jako první.

Potrava je hlavní zdroj kadmia pro evropskou populaci a je poměrně jasně řečeno i našimi agenturami, že příjem některých skupin kadmia v potravě je dvakrát vyšší než tolerovatelný. Takže je jasné, že je s tím potřeba něco dělat. A pro takové ty příliš složité a diskutující tady – co se nasype na to pole, to tam prostě je a to my sníme, protože z rostlin, z těch plodin, z té vzniklé potravy to kadmium prostě odstranit nejde. Takže tu expozici je potřeba redukovat u zdroje, tam, kde se to hnojivo vyrábí.

Ted' se podívejme na to, co navrhuje Komise – limit šedesát miligramů ihned. Hovořilo se tady o tom, jak je to složité, co je třeba dělat. Nic není třeba dělat! Průměr je dnes třicet čtyři miligramů, pro čtyřicet miligramů je možná potřeba začít míchat čistý zdroj se špinavým, pro dvacet miligramů je potřeba zavést průmyslově nějaké technologie. Za dvanáct let? Za dvanáct let, přátelé, doletíme na Mars, tak snad budeme umět vyčistit nějaké hnojivo od kontaminantů. Řada členských států už tyto limity má, takže debata o tom, že není zemědělství s těmi limity konkurenceschopné, je nesmysl. Je to dokázáno tím, že ty limity už jsou. Prosím, podpořme ten návrh Komise, je rozumný, je racionální, dosažitelný a vůbec o ničem dalším nedebatujme

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Voorzitter, mijn partij, NVA, trekt stevig aan de kar om onze economie meer circulair te maken. Een gelijk speelveld tussen organische en niet-organische meststoffen kan dat kringloopmodel versterken. Vlaanderen zet al 25 jaar in op biologische kringloop. In 2015 werd meer dan 800 000 ton van de bioafvalstroom omgezet in kwaliteitsvolle compost dat ik graag het zwarte goud noem. En verder werd 2,2 miljoen ton van andere bioafvalstromen omgezet in organische meststoffen.

Vandaag kunnen we die Vlaamse beste praktijken verankeren in Europese wetgeving door te kiezen voor ambitieuze Europese einde-afvalcriteria voor bioafval. Bioafval is een waardevolle grondstof met heel wat economisch potentieel, maar vandaag gaat nog altijd een derde daarvan verloren in de vuilniszak. We moeten het tij keren door bioafval gescheiden in te zamelen en te recyclen. Zo kunnen we een groot deel van de niet-organische meststoffen vervangen. Mijn delegatie steunt alvast ook de ambitie om cadmium stapsgewijs te verminderen.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, uvjeren sam da se europsko gospodarstvo može i mora bazirati na vrhunskoj kvaliteti i da samo vrhunski proizvod zaista može dugoročno opstati kao europski proizvod. Stoga sam uvjeren da upravo visoki standardi zaštite okoliša i sigurnosti hrane su preduvjet za našu dugoročnu konkurentnost.

Danas govorimo o onome što znači mogućnost izbora za poljoprivrednika i mislim da u tom elementu postoji upravo način da zadovoljimo sve interese u ovoj kući jer poljoprivrednici imaju pravo na svoj izbor, ali mi moramo, uvjeren sam u to, poticati upravo one koji žele maksimalno zaštititi okoliš i sigurnost hrane i, naravno, mislim da moramo i te kako poticati tehnologije i inovacije u poljoprivrednom sektoru. To je put po kojem, uvjeren sam, možemo naći zajednički dogovor.

Jiří Maštálka (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, nebudu obtěžovat číslý, která tady byla již řečena. Projednávání tohoto návrhu nařízení opět ukazuje, pro koho jsou důležitější obchodní zájmy a komu jde především o lidské zdraví a ochranu životního prostředí.

Nejvíce kontroverzní je samozřejmě téma limitů na kadmium. Tato látka, vysoce nebezpečná, představuje závažné riziko pro lidské zdraví. Kromě ovzduší se dostává do lidského těla také potravinami. Z fosforečných hnojiv se dostává do půdy a je přijímána rostlinami. Z nich ho již nelze nijak odstranit, takže jej vesele konzumujeme v našich potravinách. Jedná se přitom o velice jedovatý karcinogen, který se může podílet na vzniku rakoviny a osteoporózy. Tyto informace jsou veřejně známy, a přesto se pravice chystá prohlásit zvýšení limitu kadmia v hnojivech. To je naprosto neakceptovatelné. Nemůžeme přece dávat přednost ziskům z dovozu nekvalitních surovin před lidským zdravím.

Dále bych upozornil na to, že návrh nařízení opomíná některé jiné důležité aspekty, jako je například doplnění limitu pro celkový chrom. Současná praxe probíhá tak, že se do hnojiv přidává průmyslový odpad, jako jsou odpady z ocelářského nebo kožedělného průmyslu. Ty sice nejsou povoleny jako složkové materiály hnojiv, nicméně pro kontrolní orgány je až nemožné zjistit použití těchto materiálů v hnojivech.

Samostatnou kapitolou jsou pak biostimulanty. Jejich drtivá většina se pohybuje v šedé zóně, jsou vydávány za hnojiva nebo pomocné látky. Potřebujeme proto změnu definice přípravků na ochranu rostlin. Nejzásadnější je ovšem fakt, že současná situace s chybějícími limity rizikových prvků u hnojiv v Evropské unii je zcela nevyhovující.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Mr President, we all agree that cadmium content has to be limited – this is not the question we are talking about. The debate here is about the speed and the question of by how much we should reduce it. Seen from this perspective, I find the proposal put forward by the Commission and then changed by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety unacceptable, simply because it goes too far, is far too restrictive and is potentially harmful for EU industrial agriculture.

This is for three reasons. The first has already been mentioned: that there is no scientific evidence that would link the level of cadmium in fertiliser with the level of cadmium in food and crops. There is no solid scientific evidence that the limit of 80 mg or 100 mg leads to the accumulation of cadmium and not to the de-accumulation of cadmium. So we should be careful about making such statements.

The second argument is that the majority of fertiliser plants in Europe import their phosphate rocks from third countries. There is some cadmium content in these raw materials, but a feasible operational decadmiation technology does not exist and this technology cannot simply be developed overnight. So what is the alternative? The alternative would probably be either to go out of business or simply to look for some other sources of supply, but the single readily available source of supply is the Russian Federation.

That brings me to the third argument. The third argument is that for phosphate rock, which has been considered by the Commission as a strategic raw material, we do not want to rely on supplies from an unreliable partner. So, if you want to reduce cadmium content and at the same time not destroy our industry, we should think about extending the period of adjustment in order to give our industry time to develop technologies that would fulfil these noble goals as indicated in the Commission proposal.

(Applause)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente. Estamos centrándonos demasiado en el cadmio: es un elemento muy importante, pero no es el único.

Se trata de un Reglamento que va a modificar otro, catorce años después; que, además, está dentro del paquete de la economía circular, algo muy importante. Es el Reglamento que quedaba pendiente dentro de la economía circular y que va a regular el mercado interior y va a producir una armonización, por primera vez —por primera vez—, en el uso de los fertilizantes. Una armonización parcial, es verdad, pero muy, muy importante. Además, va a establecer condiciones para la comercialización de los productos y va a proporcionar más seguridad en el uso de estos.

Quiero decir que los fertilizantes son esenciales para las producciones agrarias, pero necesitamos fertilizantes que realmente sean útiles y, por lo tanto, que esté demostrada su eficacia y eficiencia agronómica.

Esto es algo muy importante porque, por primera vez, en este Reglamento se incorporan muchos fertilizantes nuevos: fertilizantes orgánicos y fertilizantes minerales o inorgánicos. Más del 50 % está ahora fuera de la reglamentación.

Bueno, estos fertilizantes orgánicos son muy importante dentro de la economía circular, pero si aprobamos en un Reglamento fertilizantes orgánicos que no tienen eficacia ni eficiencia agronómica, no son útiles para los agricultores y estaremos también contaminando.

Por tanto, seamos prácticos. El cadmio es un elemento sustantivo. Todos estamos de acuerdo en limitar los porcentajes de cadmio, pero vayamos a lo posible.

Creo que la Comisión ha ido mucho más lejos, y esto no es útil, esto no es útil para todos.

Tampoco estoy acuerdo con abrir la Directiva de nitratos que, para mi Grupo —como ha dicho el señor Tarabella— es una cuestión importante, y no lo vamos a permitir, al menos con nuestro voto.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Propozycja Komisji jest szokująca i absolutnie nie do przyjęcia. Jeśli chodzi o limity kadmu, obecnie przemysł europejski opiera się na surowcach afrykańskich o wysokiej zawartości kadmu. Dziś w Unii Europejskiej limity związane z ograniczeniem kadmu nie istnieją. Czas nazwać rzeczy po imieniu: skutkiem wniosku Komisji będzie wzrost zapotrzebowania na złoża niskokadmowe. Kto na tym skorzysta? To jest zasadnicze pytanie. Skorzysta głównie Rosja. Jestem przekonana, że już koledzy Putina zacierają ręce, bo Państwo szykują im naprawdę świetny biznes. Skorzysta również Finlandia, kraj pochodzenia komisarza Katainena. Konsekwencją wniosku Komisji będzie po pierwsze wzrost cen surowców, kosztów produkcji, cen nawozów, a w konsekwencji wzrost cen żywności.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, ce rapport est un rapport important pour l'avenir du secteur industriel et agricole. Il couvre des sujets bien plus vastes que la seule question du cadmium. Malheureusement, les discussions se sont cristallisées sur cette question.

Je déplore la position de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire. En effet, demander une diminution du taux dans l'engrais à 60 milligrammes par kilo maintenant, avec pour ambition d'ailleurs d'atteindre les 20 milligrammes par kilo dans quelques années, n'est absolument pas réaliste.

Il est primordial de fixer des objectifs, ambitieux certes, mais avant tout accessibles afin de donner un signal aux PME européennes. Il faut évidemment limiter l'utilisation des intrants dans nos sols, mais cela doit se faire de façon pragmatique. Toute mesure visant à la réduction de l'utilisation des engrais minéraux doit être accompagnée par la recherche et l'innovation et doit être encouragée.

La question du cadmium est un enjeu géopolitique et cela a été dit par nombre de mes collègues avant moi. Ainsi, si nous suivons le vote de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, nous nous retrouverons dépendants des sources d'approvisionnement en provenance de Russie et de Finlande.

Quant à la question des nitrates, je pense qu'il est très imprudent d'ouvrir cette question. Certes, la législation actuelle n'est pas parfaite, mais attention à ne pas ouvrir la boîte de Pandore. Je pense qu'il faut être attentif aux surtranspositions des législations européennes en droits nationaux, qui sont très souvent source de distorsion de concurrence. Aussi, chers collègues, je vous invite, lors du vote sur le rapport Turcanu, demain, à être attentifs et à considérer tous les secteurs concernés et pas uniquement ce rapport sous l'angle de la question du cadmium.

Catherine Stihler (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome the efforts of Parliament and the Commission to shift the balance to organic fertilisers while improving the Single Market for fertilisers. In line with the circular economy principle, we need to find an affordable way for our farmers to switch to more organic alternatives. However, since 80% of the EU market is inorganic fertilisers, we have a responsibility to our citizens and the environment to address maximum levels of contaminants in inorganic fertilisers.

Cadmium is a Class One carcinogen according to the World Health Organisation, and exposure can lead to pulmonary disorders, kidney disease, cancer, fertility problems and osteoporosis. We have been talking since 2003 of reducing cadmium in fertilisers and it has taken us 14 years to get us to the stage we are at today. I hope in the coming years we will see significantly lower cadmium levels than we see now across the EU and across the world and I welcome these proposals.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Voorzitter, we stemmen morgen over essentiële Europese wetgeving op het gebied van milieu en interne markt. De Europese kringlooeconomie moet ook bemestingsproducten omvatten. Daarover spreken we hier. Hoogwaardig mineralenconcentraat en andere organische mestproducten op basis van dierlijke mest moeten kunnen worden toegepast in geheel Europa als zij dezelfde werkzaamheid en milieueigenschappen hebben als minerale kunstmest.

Fosfaat wordt schaars. Herwinning uit mest en rioolwater door technologie loont en maakt ons onafhankelijk. Het is een goed signaal dat dit Parlement de terugwinning van struviet steunt en einde-dierlijkemestcriteria laat onderzoeken. De discriminatie van hoogwaardige organische bemestingsproducten op basis van mest moeten wij inderdaad gaan stoppen. Onze fractie heeft daarom nogmaals een amendement ingediend. Als u de circulaire economie, waterkwaliteit en Europese bodemgezondheid steunt, reken ik allemaal op uw steun.

In heel Europa vragen onze akkerbouwers en tuinders om kunstmest, bodemverbeteraars en innovatieve technieken. Laten we daarom voorkomen dat we voor onze voedselproductie geheel afhankelijk worden van de fosfaatmijnen van maar één land, en dan spreek ik over Rusland. Want naast organische meststoffen is betaalbare kunstmest onmisbaar voor onze Europese bijdrage aan de voedselproductie in de hele wereld. Geef vertrouwen aan onze innovatieve akkerbouwers, onze tuinders en meststoffenproducenten.

Tot slot, we spreken hier ook steeds over het openbreken van de nitraatrichtlijn. Het gaat erom de verouderde wetgeving bij de tijd te brengen, zoals de nitraatrichtlijn uit 1991, nu hopeloos verouderd en onnodig belemmerend voor hoogwaardige verwerkte meststoffen. En ik kijk naar de heer Tarabella. Als u datgene wilt bereiken wat u net heeft genoemd, zult u hiermee in moeten stemmen. Anders blijven we in dit Parlement praten, praten, praten, en komt er verder niks van de grond.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, en fait, ce rapport corrige une anomalie, puisque les substances organiques et sous-produits animaux ou végétaux sont utilisés pour amender les sols quasiment depuis que l'agriculture existe, mais aujourd'hui, le marché intérieur ne permet que la circulation des engrais chimiques. C'est donc une anomalie qui est corrigée et un vrai pas supplémentaire pour l'économie circulaire que de permettre désormais également le marquage et la libre circulation des engrais organiques et des sous-produits végétaux et animaux.

Sur le point qui a fait beaucoup débat – je veux parler bien sûr de la réduction du taux de cadmium –, je suis heureuse qu'on se fixe cet objectif de 20 milligrammes par kilo. Là aussi, j'entends la frilosité de certains collègues, mais j'aimerais qu'on se fixe un calendrier un petit peu plus ambitieux que ce qui a pu être discuté, puisqu'il y va de la santé des Européens.

Je vous invite donc demain à être très ambitieux là-dessus. Et puis, si l'industrie européenne vous est si précieuse, je vous invite aussi à prendre en compte ses intérêts lorsqu'on parle, par exemple, de défense commerciale. Cela me semble être plus intéressant que de les mettre en concurrence avec la santé des Européens. Mais, en tout cas, ce sont des avancées pour la santé et l'environnement que je nous invite à soutenir demain.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, fertilisers are a necessity for producers. In some cases, fertiliser can account for over half of the farmers' input costs – a price the farmer cannot control. Placing heavy limits on cadmium, despite the lack of scientific evidence to show this is necessary, will reduce supply and hike prices for farmers across the European Union. 80 mg per kilo with provisions to review would still allow risks to public health and the environment to be managed safely. Studies suggest that 80 mg per kilo on average is enough to stop cadmium accumulating in soil. Stronger limits are simply not supported by any available scientific evidence.

I would therefore urge Members to support amendments calling for a maximum cadmium level in phosphate fertiliser of 80 mg per kilo.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Każdy typ nawożenia musi być zrównoważony. Nie tylko nawozy pochodzenia nieorganicznego mogą być źródłem przenawożenia, ale również nawozy organiczne mogą być źródłem przenawożenia. W związku z tym musimy zwracać uwagę na to, co jest racjonalne w tej regulacji, przede wszystkim – że zwracamy się w kierunku gospodarki o obiegu zamkniętym, że chcemy więcej materii organicznej przywrócić glebom, ale jednocześnie chcemy, aby były stosowane te nawozy, które mają dobrą jakość. Wcale to nie oznacza, że rolnictwo zrezygnuje z nawozów pochodzenia nieorganicznego, że oprze się tylko i wyłącznie na nawozach organicznych, bo to jest niemożliwe ze względu na intensywność tej produkcji. W niektórych działach tylko nawozy organiczne są podstawą produkcji, bo te uprawy są przecież na sztucznych podłożach.

Dlatego chcę powiedzieć, że powinniśmy dążyć do tego, aby jak najwięcej nawozów organicznych było w obiegu, ale też musimy zadbać o jakość gleb, o mikroorganizmy. Nie możemy jednak przeregulować rynku. I tutaj jeżeli wprowadzimy te propozycje, które są związane z kadmem, no to sprawimy, że część naszego sektora nawozowego wypadnie nam z rynku, ponieważ koszty przekwalifikowania na produkcję o mniejszej zawartości wymagają nowych technologii, droższych technologii, w szczególności jeżeli chodzi o fosforyty z Maroka. A innym alternatywnym źródłem są fosforyty z Rosji czy ewentualnie niewielka ilość z Finlandii. Więc jeżeli chcemy odejść od zmonopolizowania rynku surowcowego przez tylko jeden kraj, to powinniśmy dopuścić scenariusz rozsądnego zmniejszania zawartości kadmu w nawozach i wtedy uzyskamy ten efekt, który jest związany z lepszą jakością nawozów, ze zmniejszeniem zanieczyszczeń, w tym również kadmem, ale też uzyskamy cenę, która będzie rozsądna dla przemysłu i również dla rolników, którzy mają te nawozy wykorzystywać w produkcji.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, l'agricoltura europea è chiamata a ricoprire un ruolo di primissimo piano nella sempre più pressante sfida globale dell'accesso al cibo. In questo senso, la disponibilità di prodotti fertilizzanti di qualità rappresenta una delle condizioni per lo sviluppo di modelli agricoli più produttivi e allo stesso tempo più sostenibili, che nel futuro dovranno essere in grado di produrre di più, utilizzando meno *input*.

Per questi motivi il regolamento di cui ci troviamo a discutere non può essere solo un'opportunità di armonizzazione a livello europeo delle norme sui fertilizzanti tradizionali; al contrario, deve rappresentare uno straordinario incentivo alla produzione di prodotti innovativi, efficaci e a ridotto impatto ambientale, in totale coerenza con il modello dell'economia circolare.

La posizione ambiziosa del Parlamento europeo dovrà quindi essere in grado di confermare il ruolo dell'Unione come capofila dello sviluppo sostenibile, garantendo allo stesso tempo la disponibilità di prodotti fertilizzanti a prezzi equi, senza creare ulteriori distorsioni di concorrenza a scapito dei nostri agricoltori.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, discutăm astăzi o propunere de legislație europeană de care piața îngrășămintelor din Uniunea Europeană are nevoie. Problema care, însă, a ridicat serioase îngrijorări este conținutul de cadmiu care a fost propus de către Comisie la șazeци de miligrame pe kilogram. Colegii mei au arătat că au îndoiești cu privire la existența unei fundamentări științifice certe cu privire la efectul acestei limite asupra sănătății oamenilor.

Propunerea Comisiei, așa cum este făcută, are două consecințe negative. În primul rând, fabricile care importă fosfați din nordul Africii, între care și România, nu au tehnologia necesară pentru a reduce conținutul de cadmiu. Și aici nu discutăm de o îmbunătățire simplă a tehnologiei. Am discutat cu fabrica din România: reducerea conținutului de cadmiu presupune a schimba complet liniile tehnologice din fabrica respectivă. În al doilea rând, a doua consecință negativă este că distorsionează competiția în economia Uniunii Europene, în piața fosfaților, a îngrășămintelor fosfatice, în sensul că aplicarea acestei limite a cadmiului va scoate total în afara pieței fabricile care folosesc materia primă din nordul Africii.

De aceea, cred că orice măsură, aici, trebuie însoțită de un număr de ani de tranziție suficient pentru a avea o cercetare științifică care să dea rezultate în acest domeniu. Vă mulțumesc.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Mr President, health, food safety and sustainable food production are all important aspects in relation to fertilisers. We have to state that these substances are crucial for agricultural production, but, as in many cases, their overuse can be dangerous. Therefore, the precautionary principle should be first, while mitigation can be realised by smart precision techniques.

I welcome the harmonisation steps between inorganic and organic fertilisers, and also the steps in the field of cadmium levels. Regarding the latter topic, I think that the proposed Commission timeline could be more ambitious, and I would be glad to introduce even lower levels in the EU. There are already existing low cadmium levels, for example in the case of Hungary, where the limit is set at 20%, and everybody is happy. I can imagine that gradually the levels can be reduced.

Because of all these aspects, I am going to support the good results achieved at committee level and also the more ambitious Socialist amendments.

Esther Herranz García (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, señorías, es importante alcanzar un acuerdo satisfactorio que permita la viabilidad de los fertilizantes en el mercado europeo, pero sin reducir la calidad de los productos destinados a los agricultores porque son productos imprescindibles para seguir produciendo alimentos a un precio razonable dentro de la Unión. Los fertilizantes orgánicos, aunque pudieran ser una solución a largo plazo, no han demostrado todavía ser una opción real que ofrezca los mismos estándares de exigencia que los fertilizantes minerales en cuanto a su composición de nutrientes.

Es muy importante alcanzar una solución para los límites de cadmio que no estrangule a los productores de fertilizantes minerales o aumente nuestra dependencia de importaciones procedentes de terceros países como Rusia y que tenga, al mismo tiempo, consideración con la salud pública.

Me gustaría destacar que no todos los suelos son iguales en Europa y que no todos presentan la misma absorción de cadmio, aspecto que lamentablemente no se está teniendo en cuenta en estas negociaciones, en las que se están barajando cifras políticas sin fundamentos científicos.

Me gustaría dar las gracias aquí a la señora Gardini porque ha desplegado grandes esfuerzos en un asunto muy difícil. Y saludo, desde luego, la enmienda que ha propuesto el Grupo Popular Europeo después de haber sopesado todos los intereses en juego. Creo que se trata de una enmienda equilibrada que no satisface las máximas aspiraciones de nadie, pero que es una forma de encontrar un compromiso.

Lamento la voz con que me estoy dirigiendo a ustedes en el Pleno, y sobre todo lamento que los intérpretes tengan que estar escuchándome así, pero estoy enferma.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, s-a vorbit foarte mult despre acest regulament și sigur că merită, este un regulament extrem de important. Ne-am blocat la aceste procente, însă, așa cum raportorul a arătat și alți colegi au arătat, există îmbunătățiri prin acest regulament pentru piața fertilizanților, pentru economia circulară. Însă, vreau să subliniez aici că, din păcate, Comisia nu a cuprins în estimare tot ce trebuia cuprins, de exemplu, ce impact ar avea asupra locurilor de muncă? Nu a spus nimic despre un studiu făcut la Universitatea din Olanda în 2016 — iată, constatările acestui studiu sunt relevante, dar sunt total în opoziție cu argumentele folosite de Comisie.

Eu, ca membră IMCO, sigur, vreau ca orice votăm aici să fie foarte bine echilibrat între protecția consumatorului și susținerea industriei. Sigur că sănătatea oamenilor este importantă, dar dezindustrializarea continuă. Nu pot să nu spun că, din păcate, dacă se va stabili acest procent ambițios... Aici nu vorbim de ambiție, vorbim de rezultate, de cercetare tehnologică și nu putem să impunem un prag peste care industria nu ar putea. De aceea, voi susține propunerea fără scădere graduală și o propunere de 80 de miligrame.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, em 2016, a Comissão adotou uma proposta que estabelece regras relativas à disponibilização no mercado de produtos fertilizantes com marcação CE, passando a abranger um leque mais amplo destes produtos e abrindo o mercado único para a livre circulação de produtos fertilizantes produzidos a partir de matérias orgânicas ou de matérias-primas secundárias.

Se é verdade que os adubos proporcionam benefícios relevantes quanto ao rendimento das colheitas, não é menos verdade que não podemos esquecer que existem importantes desafios em termos ambientais, de saúde pública e de segurança alimentar associados à utilização de adubos.

O principal objetivo do relatório é incentivar a produção de adubos em grande escala na União, a partir de matérias-primas orgânicas ou secundárias nacionais, em conformidade com o modelo de economia circular, transformando os resíduos em nutrientes para as culturas. No entanto, o atual regulamento não aborda as questões ambientais associadas à contaminação dos solos, das águas interiores e das águas marinhas e, em última análise, dos géneros alimentícios. E o cádmio é disso um triste exemplo.

Caros colegas, por tudo isto, entendo que os limites máximos de cádmio devem ser os mais baixos possíveis para, dessa forma, proporcionar um elevado nível de proteção para a saúde humana. E isto é o que eu tenho a dizer neste momento.

Massimo Paolucci (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il regolamento sui fertilizzanti è sicuramente un passo in avanti. Finalmente c'è un'armonizzazione delle norme, finalmente viene facilitato l'accesso al mercato di fertilizzanti innovativi, si promuove l'utilizzo di materiali organici e riciclati, finalmente etichette più chiare.

Purtroppo non c'è ancora accordo sui limiti per il cadmio. Sul cadmio alcuni colleghi ci hanno invitato a essere prudenti e ragionevoli. Io credo che non sia ragionevole minimizzare o far finta di non sapere che il cadmio è un metallo pesante gravemente cancerogeno che contamina acqua, terra e cibo. Io credo che non sia ragionevole far finta di non sapere che in tanti paesi europei i limiti nazionali sono più bassi, ad Est e ad Ovest: 20, 22. L'Italia, che eccelle nell'agricoltura, ha un limite di 50.

E allora è possibile, non proponiamo la luna. Applichiamo con determinazione il principio di precauzione. Cari colleghi, non dividiamoci: la proposta che abbiamo avanzato è ragionevole.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Domnule preşedinte, aş dori să felicit raportorul pentru munca la acest dosar şi pentru modul în care a gestionat sensibilitatea acestui subiect. Această iniţiativă duce, într-adevăr, la deschiderea pieţei unice pentru libera circulaţie a fertilizatorilor şi încurajează, mai ales, utilizarea fertilizatorilor din materiale reciclate şi organice, aduce produse sigure pentru sănătate şi, de asemenea, standarde de securitate, mai multă calitate, siguranţă şi mai multă claritate în etichetare. Discuţiile trebuie, însă, să continue, deoarece încă există discrepanţe atât la nivel european, cât şi între Uniunea Europeană şi statele din care importăm produse agricole sau produse finite. Noi ne dorim ca, la nivel de Uniune, să fim ambiţioşi, aşa cum bine s-a spus, dar, în acelaşi timp, trebuie să ţinem cont şi de realitatea din ţările din afara UE şi mai ales din regiunea Mercosur, pentru că aceste discrepanţe nu fac decât să creeze o concurenţă neloială în interiorul Uniunii şi asta va dauna agricultorilor europeni.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la proposta di regolamento va nella giusta direzione, incentivando la produzione su larga scala di concimi organici ricavati da rifiuti, in linea con il modello dell'economia circolare, e agevolandone l'accesso al mercato unico in condizioni di parità con i tradizionali concimi inorganici.

Sono positivi anche i limiti massimi per le impurità, come i contaminanti microbici, e il nuovo tenore minimo di nutrienti per categoria funzionale del prodotto, per garantire la qualità dei fertilizzanti con marcatura CE.

Tuttavia poteva e doveva essere fatto di più per assicurare la sicurezza dei fertilizzanti e per ridurre i limiti per i metalli pesanti, in particolare il cadmio, per ciascuna categoria funzionale. Ritengo la proposta della commissione ENVI ragionevole e ritengo accettabile anche quella della commissione esecutiva, ma il compromesso avanzato – addirittura sedici anni per la riduzione del cadmio a 20 milligrammi per chilogrammo di prodotto – ritengo che rappresenti più un regalo alle aziende produttrici che una posizione seria e responsabile per tutelare ambiente e consumatori.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα λιπάσματα αποτελούν προϊόντα για τα οποία απαιτείται να υπάρξουν αυστηροί κανόνες, προκειμένου να έχουμε προστασία της ποιότητας των τροφίμων, προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και της υγείας των καταναλωτών. Και νομίζω ότι η στήριξη της ευρωπαϊκής βιομηχανίας λιπασμάτων δεν θα πρέπει να αποβαίνει σε βάρος της υγείας των καταναλωτών, γι' αυτό πρέπει σίγουρα να υπάρξει μείωση της περιεκτικότητας σε κάδμιο. Θα ήθελα επίσης να σας επισημάνω, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, ότι είναι αναγκαίο να υπάρξει χρηματοδότηση ενός προγράμματος απονιτροποίησης της ελληνικής αλλά και υπόλοιπης ευρωπαϊκής αγροτικής γης. Αυτό είναι κάτι που περιμένουν οι Έλληνες αγρότες. Θέλουν πολύ μεγαλύτερες ενισχύσεις, για να έχουμε πραγματικά απονιτροποίηση της ελληνικής γης και στήριξη, φυσικά, των καλλιεργειών, οι οποίες δεν θα αποβαίνουν σε βάρος της υγείας των καταναλωτών. Τέλος, θα πρέπει να επισημανθεί ότι, ενώ απαγορεύεται στην Ελλάδα η εισαγωγή φθηνών βουλγαρικών λιπασμάτων, που όμως δεν τηρούν τις προδιαγραφές, επιτρέπεται η εισαγωγή προϊόντων από τη Βουλγαρία που καλλιεργήθηκαν με τα απαγορευμένα λιπάσματα.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, membre de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je vous remercie pour ce débat. Je commence par une clarification, cher Marc, en réponse à vos remarques. La Commission ne compte pas et ne souhaite pas rouvrir la directive «nitrates» avec cette proposition, je veux être clair sur ce point.

I am confident that the Fertiliser Products Regulation will be really a major contribution to the circular economy in Europe. It will help to turn waste management challenges into economic opportunities for farmers, innovative European technology providers, and manufacturers. It will help us to put more reliance on domestic sources over raw materials that are critical to our agri-industry and it will release agri-chemical manufacturers from many of the regulatory constraints that they are under today.

But we must make sure that this new framework does not create new risks. Instead, the regulation must hold manufacturers to account for the safety of their agri-chemicals. At the end of the day, the fertilisers market is a global commodity market, and European manufacturers can compete by adjusting rapidly to the high level of protection that the European farmers and citizens rightly expect.

I look forward to your continued support and to constructive discussions on how to strike the right balance.

Mihai Țurcanu, raportor. – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, am ascultat cu deosebit interes tot ceea ce s-a spus astăzi aici și vreau să vă asigur că voi ține cont de toate recomandările venite. Important acum este ca rezultatul de mâine să fie unul bun și, în negocieri, după cum am spus, voi ține cont de acest lucru. Rolul meu este să încerc să găsesc un numitor comun între statele membre care au poziții diferite în privința limitării nivelului de cadmiu, subiect fierbinte al acestui dosar.

Președinte. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc marți 24.10.2017.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – A közös piac kiteljesítése a terméshozzávalók szerepének tekintetében javítja az európai mezőgazdaság versenyképességét és lehetőséget ad egy közös egészségi minimum felállítására az unióban. A gazdaság élénkítése azonban nem lehet kizárólagos cél. Nem csak a szabályozás által közvetlenül befolyásolt munkavállalókat kell szem előtt tartanunk, hanem mindazokat, akik közvetve érintettek a kérdésben. Jelen esetben ez egy igen jelentős csoport: minden egyes európai polgár, akik nap, mint nap fogyasztanak az itt megtermelt élelekből. A jelentés legvitatottabb pontja, a foszfát-tartalmú műtrágyák kadmium szintje. A kadmium az emberi szervezet számára mérgező anyag, amely felhalmozódik az emberi testben és bizonyos szint fölött súlyos károsodást és rákot okoz. Mindannyiunk közös érdeke, hogy a műtrágyákon keresztül történő kadmium szennyezést a kritikus szint alatt tartsuk, még akkor is, ha ez a lépés a szennyező üzemek versenyképességének romlásához is vezet. A magyar szabályozás szigorú és előremutató a kadmium kérdésében.

Az Európai Bizottság által beterjesztett és az Európai Parlamentben szakbizottsági szinten elfogadott fokozatos kadmium szintcsökkentés éppen a jelenlegi magyar szinthez való igazodást írja elő. Ez a helyes irány és nem támogathatók olyan javaslatok, amely a magyar lakosság által fogyasztott élelemben megsokszorozza a rákkeltő anyagokat.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), písemně. – Vážení kolegové, máme před sebou novelu směrnice o hnojivých výrobcích, která klade důraz na přísnější ochranu půdních zdrojů a životního prostředí. Zavádí a snižuje povolené limity pro těžké kovy, jako je kadmium, arsen a chrom, a pro patogenní látky. Také zavádí biostimulanty a umožňuje výrobu CE hnojiv ze zpracovaných zemědělských odpadů, jako je statkový hnůj nebo kompost, a tím snižuje závislost na fosfátech dovážených do EU ze třetích zemí. Pro využití hnoje je důležitá i úprava směrnice o dusičnanech. Lepší využití odpadů a navracení látek zpět do koloběhu není jen logickým krokem dobrého hospodáře, ale i příležitostí k inovacím a novým technologickým postupům. Zároveň je však třeba naleznout takové řešení, které by bylo vyváženou pozicí mezi ochranou životního prostředí, závislosti na fosforu a účinností hnojiv. Oceňuji snižování administrativní zátěže a dobrovolnou harmonizaci – výrobcům stačí dodržet vnitrostátní předpisy. Nicméně nesouhlasím se začleněním mulčovací fólie do působnosti směrnice.

18. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels – Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen I (Aussprache)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind recomandarea pentru a doua lectură a Comisiei pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne, referitoare la infracțiunile și sancțiunile aplicabile în domeniul traficului ilicit de droguri [10537/1/2017 - C8-0325/2017 - 2013/0304(COD)] Raportor Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio (A8-0317/2017)

și raportul lui Michał Boni, în numele Comisiei pentru libertăți civile, justiție și afaceri interne, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de modificare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1920/2006 în ceea ce privește schimbul de informații, sistemul de alertă timpurie și procedura de evaluare a riscurilor pentru noile substanțe psihoactive [COM(2016)0547 - C8-0351/2016 - 2016/0261(COD)] (A8-0359/2016)

Michał Boni, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, it took three years to achieve the final version of the new psychoactive substances solution with the Council. We have overcome the deadlock thanks to efforts by all partners, especially the Maltese Presidency.

Why is this so important? Six hundred and twenty-eight new psychoactive substances were formally notified by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) in 2016 as dangerous for life and health, of which 100 were notified for the first time; 560 substances are now monitored. There were 254 victims of new psychoactive substances who died in EU in 2016 and 2017. In my country – Poland – alone, nearly 3000 citizens were poisoned by new psychoactive substances from January to August this year.

So it is a real challenge. New psychoactive substances are so readily accessible because of the new digital channels and lack of clear rules. It is a cross-border phenomenon, so our responses must be cross-border – European. It is our moral and political obligation to act.

Together, all Member States and our partners, as well as local authorities and NGOs, must act with determination to protect the health of our citizens, especially the young generation. And they must act as fast as possible, using scientific knowledge to build an early warning system and proper risk assessment arrangements – which are crucial for banning dangerous substances – coordinating far more effectively the measures taken by particular countries, using best practices, promoting the understanding of all threats related to the drugs and new psychoactive substances, giving the proper tools to the EMCDDA and supporting its organisational and financial capability.

The new procedure in the regulation will be as follows. Member States will ensure that the national focal points of the drugs network and of Europol provide the necessary information on the new psychoactive substances to the EMCDDA and Europol. The EMCDDA shall gather, together with Europol, all this information and communicate it to Member States and the Commission.

If there is a suspicion that the new psychoactive substance may pose health or social risks at EU level, the EMCDDA, the Commission or a majority of Member States can ask the EMCDDA to draft an initial report. The initial report shall give the first indication of the nature and scale of incidents, the chemical and physical description of the substance and the involvement of criminal groups in its manufacture. The report has to be prepared within five weeks.

If the initial report indicates that the substance may pose severe risks, the Commission requests that EMCDDA prepare a risk assessment report, which should include more in-depth analysis. This will be done by the Scientific Committee of EMCDDA in six weeks.

If the risk assessment report shows that the substance poses severe risks, the Commission prepares the delegated act to include this substance on the list of drugs. Member States have to ban this substance as soon as possible, but within six months at the latest.

So, as a result, we are shortening the procedure by well over a year, we will have more common European actions, a more precise risk assessment model and an early warning system. This regulation will be a complement to the European Union drugs strategy and is necessary to protect our citizens.

Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, *ponente*. – Señor presidente. Según el último Informe Europeo sobre Drogas 2017, presentado por el Observatorio Europeo de las Drogas y las Toxicomanías, las muertes por sobredosis han aumentado considerablemente debido a la falta de conocimientos sobre la peligrosidad de estas nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas.

En 2015, hubo entre los veintiocho Estados miembros de la UE, más Noruega y Turquía, un total de 8 441 muertes por sobredosis, en su mayoría relacionadas con la heroína y otras drogas. Las drogas estimulantes ilegales más consumidas en Europa son la cocaína, el éxtasis y las anfetaminas.

En mi país, España, se registraron en 2015 un total de 455 muertes inducidas por drogas —15 por cada millón de habitantes, frente a la media comunitaria de 21,3 por cada millón de ciudadanos—.

Aparte de las drogas convencionales que ya he mencionado —como la cocaína y heroína—, el consumo de nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas está aumentando cada año. En junio de este año, el comisario Avramopoulos expresó su preocupación por los jóvenes, quienes se encuentran expuestos a sustancias nuevas y peligrosas. Estas nuevas sustancias psicoactivas que son legales, también conocidas como drogas de diseño, son un grupo de compuestos químicos sintéticos o semisintéticos que se producen en laboratorios industriales, la mayoría de ellos en China o en India, y que están circulando en un mercado lícito. La popularidad de estas sustancias ha ido aumentando en Europa y en el resto del mundo debido a su disponibilidad en Internet y a que se venden fácilmente en establecimientos.

Cada año, muchos jóvenes —particularmente hombres— mueren por haber consumido nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas. El Observatorio Europeo de las Drogas y las Toxicomanías de Lisboa detectó el pasado año 540 nuevas drogas psicotrópicas en la Unión, y la tendencia sigue aumentando cada año.

El crecimiento de la venta en Internet de estos tipos de droga y la facilidad de elaborarlas han hecho más difícil que la Unión Europea pueda parar su producción. La Decisión marco de 2014 ya no era eficaz; por eso, era necesario un nuevo instrumento legislativo.

La Comisión elaboró en 2013 un nuevo Reglamento —el señor Boni es el ponente del informe sobre ese Reglamento-y, como consecuencia, una nueva Directiva para superar este desafío legal. Casi cinco años más tarde, finalmente, hemos llegado a un acuerdo.

El objetivo del paquete legislativo es reducir la disponibilidad de las nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas que presentan riesgos, lo que se llevará a cabo mediante una acción más rápida y eficaz a escala de la Unión en comparación con el instrumento que teníamos, de 2005, que no incluía el intercambio de información, la alerta rápida, la evaluación del riesgo ni el control de las nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas.

La Directiva, en particular, ha tenido como objetivo enmendar la Decisión marco 757/2004 para poder criminalizar las nuevas sustancias psicotrópicas. A partir de ahora los Estados miembros pueden adoptar las medidas necesarias para garantizar que los que la fabrican, los que la producen y los que la distribuyen —esta droga de diseño— sean castigados con penas máximas de cinco a diez años de privación de libertad. Tengo que recordar que esta Directiva no penaliza el consumo, sino el tráfico de esta droga.

Estos dos instrumentos —Directiva y Reglamento— han recorrido un largo camino. El Parlamento aprobó la propuesta en 2014 pero, hasta hoy, no hemos podido encontrar un compromiso satisfactorio. Ambos informes son un éxito, ya que hemos alcanzado un acuerdo que ayudará a todos los ciudadanos europeos.

Quiero finalmente expresar mi agradecimiento a la Presidencia maltesa por su excelente trabajo para encontrar un equilibrio entre el Parlamento y el Consejo. También quiero dar las gracias a la Comisión por su papel de apoyo durante todas las reuniones de los diálogos tripartitos. Y, por último, quisiera expresar mi gratitud al señor Boni por la cooperación tan fructífera que hemos llevado a cabo.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, our debate today is of great importance for our society, and especially our youth, who are our future. None of us here today can ignore this longstanding and continuously evolving threat affecting, directly or indirectly, the lives of millions of citizens in Europe.

More than 93 million Europeans have tried an illicit drug in their lives. Overdose deaths continue to rise. As the Commissioner responsible, I am fully committed to the fight against this threat, which cuts across all generations. Despite, as you know, my particularly heavy obligations and responsibilities in tackling the migration crisis and threats to our security, the fight against drugs – I can assure you – is a key priority for me. Today we are proving once more that Europe is not just about numbers. Europe has a social face, it cares about those in need and it works hard to crack down on unscrupulous criminal networks and their unethical businesses. Drugs is one of these.

I would like warmly to welcome the successful conclusion, after four years, of the intense and demanding interinstitutional negotiations on the New Psychoactive Substances Package. This result would not have been possible without the great contribution of the two rapporteurs, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio and Michal Boni. I would like to thank both of them personally for their constant efforts and support, and their commitment.

In addition to traditional illicit drugs, the number of new and very harmful substances being placed on the European market, often as legal alternatives, is dramatically increasing. Our European Drugs Agency is currently monitoring more than 620 new psychoactive substances that cause severe health problems or even death. In fact, one new psychoactive substance is detected every week.

Once the new legislation enters into force, we will leave behind lengthy procedures and will put in place an effective and efficient tool to tackle harmful new psychoactive substances. Information exchanges will improve and the role of the European Drugs Agency will be enhanced, including by working hand-in-hand with Europol. So far, the European Union has banned 19 new psychoactive substances and eight more are in the process of being banned.

I would like to thank you in advance for adopting your opinion tomorrow on a concrete case of a very dangerous new psychoactive substance, furanylfentanyl, which must be made subject to control measures. Today's package is part of a wider, comprehensive approach that this Commission has been working on for the past three years, in the context of the EU drugs strategy, in order to support Member States' efforts in the fight against drugs.

In July, the Council adopted the EU Drugs Action Plan for the period 2017 to 2020, on the basis of my proposal. This action plan enhances and updates existing actions, while it also identifies new priority areas such as online awareness-raising activities, targeting young people in particular, and exploring the potential connection between drug trafficking and the financing of terrorist groups, migrant smuggling and trafficking in human beings.

We are also working very actively on the new policy cycle on organised and serious crime, towards disrupting activities related to drug production, trafficking and distribution in the European Union. The EU is also in the lead in the worldwide fight against drugs, together with its global partners. For the first time, the Union is speaking with one voice on drugs-related issues in international forums. We hope this will also be the case at the next meeting of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

Obviously our fight against drugs is not finished with this legislation, but today we are sending a clear and strong message about our decisiveness and readiness to tackle new and very dangerous threats to our society. We must and we will continue our efforts in close and continuing cooperation with this House, the Member States and stakeholders. I am looking forward to the debate today and I thank you for the attention you are giving to European drugs policy.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. – Mr President, Commissioner, first of all I would like to congratulate Ms Jiménez-Becerril Barrio and Mr Boni on their very good reports. As rapporteur for the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety on the proposal for a regulation as regards information exchange, early warning systems and risk assessment, I confronted a harsh reality. There has been a rapid increase in the past years in the number and type of new psychoactive substances available and launched on the European drug market, with more than 600 substances being monitored by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs. Of even more concern than this is the unprecedented increase in substance use among young people, which is really very worrying.

I have stated, in the Environment Committee opinion, that the rapid growth of the market in these novel products makes it necessary to enhance monitoring and early warning systems so as to assess health, safety and social risks, in order to develop responses. Member States need to provide, without undue delay, all available information on detection and identification, use and patterns of use, prevalence of use, potential as well as identified risks and commercial, as well as medical and scientific, use of these substances.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Michaela Šojdrová, za skupinu PPE. – Pane předsedají, neustálý vývoj a dostupnost nových psychoaktivních látek představují na poli boje proti drogám významnou hrozbu. Je tedy na místě, aby vnitřní trh Evropské unie reagoval na tuto inovaci v oblasti vývoje drog.

Problém vidím zejména v syntetickém konopí, kde producenti po zákazu určité substance nepatrně změni složení látky a neustále se tak mění chemické vzorce. To umožňuje opětovnou dostupnost psychoaktivní látky na trhu v některé z členských zemí, v takzvaných *smartshopech*. Přitom se jedná o zdraví nebezpečné látky, na kterých lze vypěstovat závislost, zvláště u mladistvých. Účinná a fungující výměna informací ohledně těchto látek mezi členskými státy založená na systému včasného varování a hodnocení rizika je proto velmi žádoucí. Oceňuji poskytování informací mezi jednotlivými orgány bez zbytečného odkladu, například mezi Evropským monitorovacím centrem pro drogy a drogovou závislost a Europol.

Oceňuji také rozšíření pro posouzení rizika nejen zdravotního, ale také bezpečnostního spojeného s novými psychoaktivními látkami. Rovněž vzhledem k tomu, že se míra podobnosti chemických struktur nových psychoaktivních látek často obtížně určuje, centrum by mělo mít pravomoc stanovit, zda mohou být určité látky považovány za dostatečně podobné.

Cílem nařízení i směrnice je podpořit členské země v boji proti obchodu s drogami. Při respektu k subsidiaritě je i na evropské úrovni třeba využít zkušeností expertů a výměny informací pro efektivnější boj proti byznysu s drogami, které občany Evropské unie ohrožují. Proto děkuji Evropské komisi i oběma zpravodajům za jejich vytrvalou práci a věřím, že bude podpořena.

Anna Hedh, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att tacka föredragandena för ett väldigt gott samarbete och kommissionsledamot Avramopoulos för hans inlägg i debatten. Vi har nu tillsammans, trots att medlemsländerna har dragit ut på tiden, lett den här lagstiftningen i mål.

Antalet nya psykoaktiva substanser fortsätter att öka i Europa och orsakar dödsfall. Ungefär 600 substanser finns nu i EU:s databaser, och det finns inget som tyder på att problemet kommer att minska. Samvetslösa kriminella säljer substanserna, ibland under vilseledande beteckningar och i okontrollerade doser. Resultatet är potentiellt livsfarliga ämnen, som kan köpas av vem som helst. Självklart adresseras frågan i medlemsländerna, och det görs bra saker på nationell nivå, men för att kriminella grupper inte bara ska kunna byta medlemsstat krävs det europeiskt samarbete. Gemensamma databaser och kunskap är nödvändigt för att man snabbare ska kunna identifiera nya substanser och få en solid information om deras negativa hälsoeffekter.

Vad tillför då den nya lagstiftningen? Framför allt kommer paketet att innebära en förenkling av förfarandet på EU-nivå för att bedöma möjliga negativa effekter av ett nytt psykoaktivt ämne. Man kan snabbare fatta beslut om ett eventuellt förbud. Förfarandet kommer nu att vara nästan dubbelt så snabbt som tidigare. De nya bestämmelserna kommer dessutom att ytterligare minska den tid som medlemsländerna har för att genomföra EU-beslutet från tolv till sex månader.

Slutligen kommer paketet att förhoppningsvis förbättra informationsutbytet, inte minst mellan relevanta EU-myndigheter, i systemet för tidig varning och riskbedömning på EU-nivå. Allt detta är oerhört viktigt. Ju snabbare vi kan kartlägga en substans och vidta åtgärder, desto mindre spridning. Tiden är en viktig faktor och det är i förlängningen en fråga om liv och död. Jag välkomnar att vi imorgon ska anta detta paket och uppmanar alla medlemsländer att utnyttja dessa instrument till fullo.

Helga Stevens, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Voorzitter, collega's, psychoactieve stoffen zijn imitatiedrugs die een aanzienlijk negatief effect hebben op de volksgezondheid. Zo is er bijvoorbeeld de stof acrylfentanyl – een mondvol – een substantie die 50 keer sterker is dan morfine. Sinds de zomer van 2016 heeft die stof 40 slachtoffers gemaakt. Desondanks blijven Chinese producenten het gewoon online verkopen. Het is bovendien legaal in sommige lidstaten. De afgelopen tien jaar is het aantal varianten van psychoactieve stoffen op Europees niveau enorm toegenomen. In 2015 bijvoorbeeld werd gemiddeld om de drie dagen een nieuwe stof aangemeld in het EU-systeem voor vroegtijdige waarschuwing. Het probleem is dat het huidige Europese systeem achterhaald is, want het is enkel gericht op klassieke drugs. Bovendien laat het geen snel optreden toe, vandaar het voorstel voor een richtlijn waarover morgen wordt gestemd. Onder die nieuwe richtlijn blijven imitatiedrugs niet langer buiten schot in de gemeenschappelijke Europese aanpak in de strijd tegen drugs,

met als uiteindelijk doel te voorkomen dat er problemen ontstaan bij politionele en gerechtelijke samenwerking in de Unie.

De nieuwe richtlijn kort de termijnen voor een snel en doeltreffend optreden sterk in waardoor het EU-systeem voor vroegtijdige waarschuwing veel efficiënter zal werken. Iedereen is het erover eens dat gevaarlijke designerdrugs verboden moeten worden en van de markt moeten verdwijnen. Maar vandaag moet elke gevaarlijke stof die Europa wil verbieden een omslachtige wetgevende procedure doorlopen. Zo gaat er telkens kostbare tijd verloren. Morgen moet het Parlement zich bijvoorbeeld uitspreken over de stof furanylfentanyl. Dealers krijgen ondertussen vrij spel. Mensen worden ernstig ziek of gaan zelfs dood. En wanneer de betrokken stof uiteindelijk verboden wordt, is er al een nieuwe variant op de markt. Zo vechten we tegen de bierkaai. Met deze regels willen we hieraan een einde maken. Het is hoog tijd om de schadelijke drugs waarmee grof geld wordt verdiend, aan te pakken.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, quiero felicitar, en primer lugar, a la señora Jiménez-Becerril, por su trabajo, y también al señor Boni, a la Comisión y a todos los que han hablado antes que yo porque comparto fundamentalmente todo lo que han dicho. De hecho es repetir hablar sobre la detección de tantas sustancias psicotrópicas que tenemos, por una parte, que atender, evaluar y evitar que estén en el mercado, aunque una parte de lo que tenemos que hacer es educativo.

En los años 80 yo pude ver cómo varios jóvenes de mi entorno se convertían en esquizofrénicos o tenían ataques psicóticos por las drogas psicotrópicas que existían en aquel momento y cómo otros fallecieron después de su adicción a la heroína. Hay una parte de lo que tenemos que hacer que es reflexiva y una parte que tenemos que hacer que, por supuesto, tiene que ver con la educación, porque las cifras de lo que estamos hablando no son cifras, son personas: vidas quebradas, abandono escolar, tragedias familiares y sociales, intoxicaciones severas, complicaciones de salud —como ya he dicho— mental o física, y también la muerte de adolescentes que son casi niños. Así que el argumento a favor de una acción de detección y alerta más efectiva y más proporcionada sobre estas sustancias es absolutamente necesario.

Nosotros desde el Grupo liberal consideramos muy oportuno que se haya procedido a la revisión del mecanismo de alerta temprana sobre este tipo de nuevas sustancias, dada esa rápida evolución de la que estamos hablando y ese peligro cada vez mayor entre niños —prácticamente adolescentes, casi son niños— que tienen la posibilidad de conseguir estas drogas en internet, una gran accesibilidad, sin conocer los riesgos y los peligros.

Creemos necesaria una mayor cooperación de Europol con el Observatorio Europeo de las Drogas y las Toxicomanías y la Agencia Europea de Medicamentos. Tenemos que ir unidos en esto porque el problema rebasa las capacidades nacionales y debemos ayudar a superar la fragmentación, los obstáculos y las incertidumbres jurídicas. Llevamos esperando desde 2013 este paquete de medidas, así que esperamos que no haya más retrasos y que podamos aportar mucho, peleando muy poco y nunca más por la interpretación de nimiedades competenciales entre las instituciones. Necesitamos esta legislación.

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, o intercâmbio de informações entre Estados-Membros, a existência e o funcionamento de um sistema de alerta rápido e os procedimentos de avaliação dos riscos das novas substâncias psicoativas revestem-se de grande importância.

O Observatório Europeu da Droga e da Toxicodependência monitorizará atualmente mais de 450 substâncias. Nos últimos anos, registou-se um aumento sem precedentes do número, tipo e disponibilidade de substâncias psicoativas, realidade que coincide com a persistência de uma profunda e arrastada crise social, com níveis de desemprego, de pobreza e de exclusão social muito significativos, com o ataque continuado a direitos sociais e laborais, com a debilitação dos serviços públicos.

Para intervir sobre esta realidade complexa, é recomendável uma abordagem abrangente, que integre as vertentes da prevenção, da dissuasão, da redução de riscos e minimização de danos, até ao tratamento e a reinserção social. É necessário aprofundar o conhecimento sobre uma realidade em acelerada mutação, quer no que respeita às substâncias, quer aos hábitos de consumo e sua prevalência nos diferentes grupos da população.

É necessário identificar os constrangimentos no acesso ao sistema de prestação de cuidados de saúde e ampliar, diversificar e apetrechar devidamente a rede pública de serviços na área da toxicodependência, privilegiando uma resposta de proximidade. Um caminho que exige confrontar e reverter os efeitos das políticas de cortes na despesa pública que vêm sendo impostas pela União Europeia aos Estados-Membros.

Bodil Valero, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Det har skett en rekordartad ökning vad gäller antal, typ och tillgänglighet av nya psykoaktiva ämnen på den europeiska narkotikamarknaden. Michał Boni och andra har redan tagit upp den stora mängd substanser som för närvarande är under övervakning i systemet, men problemet är att vi ser en ständig ökning.

De nya psykoaktiva ämnena är en stor utmaning för folkhälsan eftersom de producerar liknande effekter som de traditionella drogerna men ännu inte är narkotikaklassade. Dessa så kallade nätdroger är lätta att köpa in för vem som helst över internet. Vissa av dessa starka psykoaktiva substanser får många allvarliga och ibland dödliga konsekvenser och används tyvärr av många ungdomar i delar av Europa som billiga droger. De uppfattas som förhållandevis säkra och lagliga alternativ till de etablerade olagliga drogerna.

Det beräknas att EU-medborgare spenderar över 24 miljarder euro på olaglig narkotika varje år, att minst 6 800 människor avled till följd av överdos i EU under 2014 och att uppskattningsvis 17,8 miljoner unga vuxna har använt narkotika under det senaste året. De mänskliga och sociala kostnaderna för narkotikamissbruk är mycket höga. Detta ställer krav på ett snabbare och effektivare gemensamt system än dagens, för att kunna begränsa tillgängligheten av sådana droger i våra samhällen.

Vi välkomnar därför den överenskommelse som institutionerna nu långt om länge ingått om det nya lagstiftningspaketet, som syftar till att väsentligt skynda på förfarandet på EU-nivå när det gäller riskbedömning och beslut om kontrollåtgärder. Vi stöder också beslutet att låta den rättsliga grunden handla om folkhälsa – det är mer naturligt, tycker vi – i stället för den interna marknaden, och vi är positiva till det mer vetenskapliga förhållningssättet i förslagen vid utredning av nya ämnens olika effekter. Förhandlingarna har ju som sagt pågått i mer än fyra år nu och vi har ingen mer tid att förlora. Vi behöver agera skyndsamt, effektivt och samordnat.

Margot Parker, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, combating the distribution of illegal drugs is a global issue that requires all countries to cooperate in order to effectively fight. How best to tackle this issue is, however, up for debate. Some countries have chosen to take a softer approach, whereas others – most notably the Philippines – enact a zero-tolerance policy on drugs. The EU, however, decides that the best way to tackle illegal drugs is via legislation. And whilst this may appear to show the EU taking the issue of drugs seriously, it fails to tackle the fundamental problems that facilitate the drug issues in the EU – that, of course, being the borderless Schengen area.

A Europe without borders not only facilitates the free movement of drugs, but also the free movement of weapons, terrorists, and illegal migrants. If the EU wishes to take the protection of its citizens seriously, it must dismantle Schengen, and it must dismantle it straight away.

(Applause)

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, είναι γεγονός ότι τα ναρκωτικά αποτελούν μια μάστιγα της σύγχρονης κοινωνίας, γι' αυτό όλα τα κράτη, τόσο σε εθνικό όσο και σε διεθνές επίπεδο, προσπαθούν να καθορίσουν τις ναρκωτικές ουσίες, να τις εντοπίσουν, να περιορίσουν τη διακίνησή τους, να περιορίσουν τον εθισμό των νέων από αυτές και να επιβάλουν ποινές στους διακινητές και τους εμπόρους. Δυστυχώς, με όλα αυτά τα μέτρα αντιμετωπίζονται μόνο οι συνέπειες της παράνομης διακίνησης των ναρκωτικών. Εάν θέλουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε στη βάση του και αποφασιστικά το πρόβλημα, θα πρέπει τα κράτη να ενισχύσουν το θεσμό της οικογενείας. Αυτό θα συντελέσει ώστε να διαπαιδαγωγηθούν σωστά τα παιδιά, μέσα σε ένα υγιές περιβάλλον, να μην έχουν ψυχολογικά προβλήματα και να μην αισθάνονται την ανάγκη να καταφύγουν στους τεχνητούς παραδείσους των ναρκωτικών. Πρέπει τα σχολεία να πληροφορούν τους νέους για τις καταστρεπτικές συνέπειες της χρήσης των ναρκωτικών. Επίσης, το κράτος πρέπει να φροντίσει να εξαλείψει την ανεργία των νέων, για να μην αναγκάζονται αυτοί να εθίζονται στα ναρκωτικά και να γίνονται υποχείρια των διακινητών και των εμπόρων. Τέλος, τα κράτη αλλά και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ως διεθνής οργανισμός, οφείλουν να προστατεύσουν τη ζωή των πολιτών τους και να συγκρουστούν με τα συμφέροντα των διεθνών καρτέλ ναρκωτικών, όσο ισχυρά και αν είναι αυτά, και να επιβάλουν εξοντωτικές ποινές στους διακινητές και τους εμπόρους.

Elena Gentile (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo di fronte a uno dei drammi del nostro tempo: l'uso e la dipendenza da sostanze psicotrope che minacciano la salute e la vita di milioni di persone. Questo tema incrocia il dramma esistenziale di giovani e adulti, ne minaccia l'equilibrio mentale, diventa occasione di malaffare e di traffici illeciti.

Il numero di sostanze è vertiginosamente in crescita e quindi mi pare non più rinviabile la decisione di rafforzare, rendendolo anche più capillare, il sistema di controllo e di allarme, accompagnando ai sistemi di controllo la ricerca sugli effetti e sugli esiti del sempre più frequente utilizzo anche di mix di sostanze.

Infine, e torno ancora su questo tema, la commercializzazione via internet di sostanze psicoattive dovrebbe essere tassativamente vietata, perché è accessibile a tutti e perché è anche, forse, più a buon mercato.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, psihoaktivne tvari i njihovi prekursori nikada se nisu proizvodili i globalno distribuirali većom brzinom nego danas. Veća dostupnost znanja i modernih tehnologija uza sve svoje pozitivne učinke donijela je i zloporabe poput primjene u proizvodnji i raspačavanju droga. Mi te zloporabe moramo zaustaviti, ali ne ograničavanjem dostupnosti znanja i tehnologije nego upravo suprotno, koristeći ih u razvijanju pametnih i učinkovitih politika te naprednih sustava za borbu protiv organiziranog kriminala.

Ovaj prijedlog koji je danas pred nama iznimno je kvalitetan jer uspostavlja primjeren i učinkovit okvir za rano otkrivanje, brzo prijavljivanje i eliminaciju novih psihoaktivnih tvari s europskog tržišta, a da pri tom ne ugrožava princip supsidijarnosti. Ovakav konstruktivan pristup trebali bismo primijeniti i u bilateralnim odnosima s trećim zemljama, koje često predstavljaju izvorište novih psihoaktivnih tvari i njihovih prekursora, kako bismo zaustavili ovo zlo već na njegovom izvorištu.

Tim Aker (EFDD). – Mr President, for the past 50 years, governments have thrown billions, even trillions, of dollars, pounds and even euros at the so-called war on drugs, and all it has resulted in is more ways for the drug traffickers and drug cartels to put different substances on the streets. And now we get these psychoactive substances. In my constituency, you go down some streets and you find these little gas canisters on the street.

Legislation like this – legislation like any in the war on drugs – is always reactive. You're trying to put the toothpaste back in the tube: you're trying to stop something that is already happening, and by the time you have stopped it another substance is on the street, another legal high.

Unless you recognise and look at the social problems behind it, unless you realise that throwing more money, more money and more money at the war on drugs is not working, unless new ways are found, then you are just going to be wasting taxpayers' money that could be spent on healthcare, education or defence, or on combating the problems and the criminality associated with drugs, but not necessarily addressing the drug problem itself.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αντιναρκοευτική πολιτική έχει χρεοκοπήσει και μόνο από το ότι στην Ολλανδία και την Τσεχία η χρήση κάνναβης ξεπερνά το 50% στους μαθητές, ακόμα και ηλικίας 13 ετών, ενώ στην Ελλάδα είναι μόλις 9% σύμφωνα με το Ευρωπαϊκό Κέντρο Παρακολούθησης. Οι πακτωλοί των μονοπωλιακών ομίλων για την προώθηση της αντιναρκοευτικής εκστρατείας μαρτυρούν την επιδίωξη να πειστεί ο λαός ότι, όχι μόνο δεν κάνουν κακό τα ναρκωτικά, αλλά έχουν και θεραπευτικές ιδιότητες. Μάλιστα, χωρίς επίσημες έρευνες για χρησιμότητα και παρενέργειες. Η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ με τη λεγόμενη «φαρμακευτική κάνναβη» ως Δούρειο Ίππο στοχεύει στην Ελλάδα στη νομιμοποίηση και απελευθέρωση των ναρκωτικών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προτείνει τώρα νέο «βάλε-βγάλε» από τις λίστες παράνομων ουσιών, που κρύβει παζάρια

μεγαλοσυμφερόντων. Τα δε μέτρα συντονισμού μηχανισμών καταστολής είναι η άλλη όψη της αδιέξοδης ευρωενωσιακής πολιτικής των κυβερνήσεων. Τα ναρκωτικά δεν είναι ελεύθερη επιλογή. Είναι καταναγκασμός της ταξικής, εκμεταλλευτικής κοινωνίας που πρέπει να ανατραπεί. Όχι σε όλα τα ναρκωτικά. Ζωή ολόκληρη, όχι με δόσεις.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio i colleghi relatori dei due dossier che oggi si discutono, con i quali si aggiorna il quadro legislativo europeo sulla lotta alla droga, criminalizzando il commercio illegale delle nuove sostanze psicoattive e psicotrope.

L'assoggettamento del traffico illecito di tali nuove sostanze a disposizioni di diritto penale costituisce certo un deterrente, finalizzato anche a porre dei limiti alla disponibilità e al consumo di sostanze talvolta estremamente pericolose per la salute dei nostri giovani.

Tuttavia, accanto agli interventi repressivi, è necessario predisporre misure di prevenzione e informazione proprio sugli effetti dannosi derivanti dall'uso delle nuove sostanze psicoattive. Occorre, quindi, porre in essere azioni coordinate fra gli Stati membri per armonizzare le legislazioni sostanziali nazionali e, naturalmente, così come giustamente sostenuto dalla proposta di regolamento, per garantire il più rapido scambio di informazioni sulle nuove sostanze che potrebbero essere classificate come psicoattive.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio i relatori del pacchetto sulle droghe. Le nuove sostanze psicoattive sono un fenomeno relativamente nuovo e l'Europa è stata la prima a muoversi in tal senso.

Tuttavia, oggi il fenomeno va considerato come un fenomeno globale ed è necessario rispondere rapidamente alle nuove sfide con nuove misure. Sicuramente non possiamo accontentarci del silenzio che c'è stato finora; non è accettabile il silenzio rispetto ad alcuni eventi internazionali, come la riunione ministeriale alle Nazioni Unite del 2019 per valutare se la comunità internazionale ha eliminato o ridotto sensibilmente la coltivazione, la domanda, la produzione, il traffico e il riciclaggio dovuti agli stupefacenti.

Non possiamo ignorare la società, che ci chiede di discutere apertamente e senza tabù sui derivati della cannabis, sostanza che impegna le nostre forze dell'ordine per l'80 % delle sue risorse. Tra l'altro, la legalizzazione della cannabis permetterebbe di sottrarre alla criminalità organizzata un mercato che genera un volume d'affari di 9,3 miliardi l'anno. Troppo spesso sono state anche sottovalutate le importanti proprietà farmacologiche di questa sostanza.

Ritengo pertanto opportuno l'avvio di un dibattito aperto nei prossimi mesi in seno al Parlamento sul ruolo dell'Unione in sede ONU e sulla necessità di dare alla cannabis uno statuto che sia più al passo con i tempi.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, așa cum a rezultat din dezbateră de până acum, era nevoie să venim cu o asemenea propunere. Comisia e foarte bine că a venit cu o asemenea propunere. Eu cred că datele statistice motivează acest lucru. În ultimii zece ani, s-a înregistrat o creștere masivă a noilor substanțe psihoactive atât la nivel lor global, cât și în Europa. Și, din păcate, nu există un semn de încetinire. În ultimii cinci ani, s-au descoperit 70 % din substanțele noi puse în circulație pe piață.

Este clar nevoie ca Uniunea Europeană să acționeze în ceea ce privește noile substanțe psihoactive. Statele membre, în mod individual, nu pot controla problemele cauzate de răspândirea noilor substanțe. Acțiunile naționale neocoordonate în acest domeniu pot produce efecte negative de domino, cum ar fi deplasarea substanțelor nocive dintr-un stat membru în alt stat. Grupurile infracționale ar putea profita de această situație și cel mai grav este că aici sunt atrași tinerii. Tinerii cad cel mai ușor în capcană. Este nevoie, evident, de o mai bună colaborare, de schimb de informații între Observatorul European pentru Droguri, Europol și Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente, dar este nevoie și de o preocupare pentru educația tinerilor.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi cinque anni è stato registrato un aumento senza precedenti del numero, del tipo e della disponibilità di nuove sostanze psicoattive in Europa, con oltre 100 nuovi stupefacenti identificati per la prima volta. L'Organizzazione mondiale della sanità afferma che le nuove sostanze psicoattive disponibili in Europa sono particolarmente pericolose per tossicità, interazione con altre sostanze e influenza sui processi mentali.

Il rapido aumento delle nuove sostanze psicoattive costituisce una nuova sfida per la definizione di una politica di lotta efficace contro l'uso di tali sostanze, in cui l'Unione europea deve essere in prima linea, sia attraverso l'azione di coordinamento di Europol sia attraverso il sistema di allarme rapido dell'UE, strumento essenziale perché in grado di consentire alle autorità nazionali di individuare le nuove sostanze e di agire prontamente per intercettarle e toglierle dal mercato.

È necessario dunque uno sforzo comune delle istituzioni europee, uno sforzo economico, logistico e politico, affinché le autorità nazionali e comunitarie siano dotate di strumenti adeguati per combattere la diffusione e lo sviluppo dei nuovi stupefacenti, sempre più difficili da individuare e purtroppo sempre più pericolosi.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, uvijek i svugdje, ali zaista uvijek i svugdje, činit ću sve da se droga makne, da droga nestane jer ona, ne treba puno ponavljati, koliko je zlo za čovječanstvo, koliko je zlo pogotovo za mlade. Nažalost, imam i loših iskustava. Neki su mi poznanici, znanci otišli zbog predoziranja. Ali, imam i pozitivnih iskustava. Iskustvo Istre na jednoj nižoj razini, ne na svjetskoj, ne na europskoj, ne na nacionalnoj, može pomoći jer ima dobrih primjera borbe protiv zlorabe droge, koordinirane akcije represivnih organa, ali i edukativnih, obrazovnih institucija, kao i zdravstvenih institucija kada već imamo ovisnike. Iskreni razgovori s ovisnicima mogu pomoći, ali na nama je da pokušamo sve ovo što se dešava efikasno sprečavati jer rapidni rast droga na žalost je nešto čemu danas svjedočimo.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is fairly obvious that, if there was no prohibition on the consumption of cannabis, the synthetic forms of cannabis would disappear from the market in the same way that the demand for melted-down boot polish plummeted after the repeal of prohibition of alcohol in the US. The choice we must make is that of allowing access to a relatively benign plant, which has had many, many studies carried out on it, or leave our young people to the mercy of a legal, untested cocktail of chemicals.

In Ireland alone, in the region of 100 000 people have a criminal record for possession of cannabis. It prevents them from travelling, from parenting and from access to decent employment. The law, rather than the drug, destroys their lives. This is the main reason why young people take these dangerous cocktails of drugs. The alternative is to face a life of ruin for taking a safer substance called cannabis.

The war on drugs is a war on people. It must end. Start it by legalising cannabis now.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση είναι μεν ευπρόσδεκτη, αλλά τα αποτελέσματά της όψιμα και ελλιπή. Δεδηλωμένη επιδίωξη αποτελεί μια απελευθερωμένη από τα ναρκωτικά κοινωνία, όχι η χαλαρή παθητική προσέγγιση με θεωρητικά μέτρα μείωσης των επιβλαβών συνεπειών της χρήσης. Η βραδύτητα απόκρισης, η αντικατάσταση ελεγχόμενων ουσιών με νομότυπες, μη ελεγχόμενες εναλλακτικές ουσίες και οι πρακτικώς κατασταλτικοί στόχοι μιας περιεκτικής αντιναρκωτικής πολιτικής επιβάλλουν την ενιαία, γενική και ευέλικτη διεύρυνση των ορισμών. Απαιτούνται η προληπτική, έγκυρη ενημέρωση των πολιτών, η υποστηρικτική αντιμετώπιση των χρηστών ως ασθενείς και η αυστηρή εφαρμογή ποινικών μέτρων σε όλα τα στάδια μέχρι τη διάθεση. Επιπλέον, πρέπει να υιοθετηθεί ο απόλυτος περιορισμός κάθε ουσίας ως προς την παραγωγή, την οποιαδήποτε διακίνηση και την κατοχή με πρόθεση διάθεσης, ώστε να καταναλωθεί για ψυχοτρόπες ιδιότητές της με ελάχιστες κατάλληλες εξαιρέσεις στη βάση ήδη εφαρμοσμένων προγραμμάτων.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, once again I would like to express my thanks to the European Parliament, and in particular to our two rapporteurs for their constructive work over the past year on this very important topic.

As has been said today, we need a strong response to the phenomenon of the number of new drugs being detected at EU level. We need – and, again it is something we will work on – swift, strong action to protect Europeans, in particular our youth and those who are vulnerable in our societies, from the extremely dangerous threat of harmful new psychoactive substances.

The proposed EU legislation will improve the speed of our action against these substances, enabling us to act even within weeks in the case of an immediate risk to public health. It also ensures that an effective process for exchange of information is in place, and that our European Drugs Agency has the competences and the resources to provide the relevant expert advice.

A long process in Parliament and in the Council is coming to a successful end, but the fight against drugs does not end here. We have a lot of work ahead. We have taken some important steps but there is still much to do: firstly to protect our youth, as I have said, and also to support the victims and to prosecute the criminals.

The Commission and I, personally, will stand by our Member States in tackling this sensitive issue. I count on your support and I am looking forward to an overwhelming majority for this important package in tomorrow's vote.

Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, ponente. – Señor presidente, desde aquí hoy estamos lanzando un claro mensaje sobre la necesidad de penalizar las nuevas drogas psicotrópicas porque creo que 540 nuevas drogas al año no son algo que debamos menospreciar, porque la vida de nuestros jóvenes está en riesgo y es nuestro deber como legisladores no seguir ignorando esta gravísima amenaza. No podemos seguir en este limbo jurídico en el que hemos estado hasta ahora. Realmente, a mí, estar cinco años tramitando esto, me parece una vergüenza; yo creo que realmente tendríamos que haberlo hecho mucho más rápido. Finalmente, como ya he dicho y gracias a la Presidencia maltesa, hemos agilizado el trámite, pero nos ha costado sangre, sudor y lágrimas.

Creo que nuestros jóvenes y la amenaza y el riesgo que estas nuevas drogas psicotrópicas suponen para los jóvenes necesitaban mucha más agilidad. Por lo tanto, gracias a todos los parlamentarios, creo que hemos visto aquí que estamos todos en el mismo barco. Creo que es necesario penalizar estas drogas porque, aunque también se ha hablado de no penalizarlas, yo creo que no, yo creo que el problema que tienen estas drogas es la ignorancia sobre su peligrosidad —nuestros jóvenes no saben, porque no hay información sobre esto—; cuando empiecen a penalizarse se hará mucho más difícil el camino de los criminales, como ha dicho el comisario. Creo que tenemos que ser más rápidos que ellos. Por lo tanto, hoy hemos dado un gran paso, pero desde luego vamos a dar muchos más, y quiero dar las gracias al señor Boni, al comisario, a mis asistentes, a los asesores y a todos los que han trabajado durante estos cinco años para conseguir que mañana el resultado de esta votación sea favorable. Estoy segura de que así será, porque es lo que hemos visto hoy aquí.

Michał Boni, rapporteur. – Mr President, again I would like to thank Teresa Jiménez and the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent cooperation. Commissioner, special thanks are due to the Commission because the Commission helped us to solve many problems, so thank you very much again.

And thank you very much to all participants in this discussion because I think that it was very multi-dimensional. The debate focused on many issues but the goal is clear: to restrict access to new psychoactive substances and drugs and understand how important this cooperation among all institutions – the EMCDDA, Europol, Member States – is in order, on the one hand, to fight against criminal organisations and punish the sale, distribution and production of those substances and, on the other, to halt the spread of those substances all over Europe.

The second key point raised during the discussion is the problem of awareness. It would be a very good opportunity when we start implementation of the directive and the regulation for the EMCDDA to do more, in cooperation with all countries, to raise awareness about new psychoactive substances and drugs and make those issues much more understandable for all social groups, especially the younger generation.

The last point is related to proper implementation, because having a good legislative framework and good cooperation is important, but we need to combine all such measures properly: legislation, cooperation between all institutions and awareness-raising.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 24 października 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), in writing. – It is estimated in official EU reports that in Europe there is a cocaine market of about 124 tonnes, worth about USD 34 billion, an increased use of narcotic drugs and higher health risks. It is clear that the criminal networks behind the illicit drug traffic demonstrate a resilient ability to adapt and diverge their modus operandi in order to make a widespread of drug use. In the cyclical search for drug supply and trafficking, criminal acts vary from funding with illicit capital to use of the latest technology to avoid being intercepted, and finally to money laundering.

Therefore, in order to combat illicit drug trafficking, the following actions are imperative: increase the criminal penalties; implement harsher laws for selling and buying drugs; and enhance international cooperation between authorities on drug trafficking, money laundering and tax evasion. I am confident that as we move forward by increasing international cooperation and by raising awareness of the health risks and legal consequences for the illicit drug trafficking, we will succeed in the field of illicit drug trafficking.

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – A kábítószeres világ egy gyorsan változó világ, mely egyre jobban veszélyezteti gyermekeink és fiataljaink testi és lelki egészségét. A drogkereskedők most már jelen vannak iskoláink környékén, ahol a fiatalok maguk egyre könnyebben juthatnak hozzá ezekhez a szerekhez. Integrált módon lehet csak fellépni a drog elleni küzdelemben: a megelőzés, a rehabilitáció, valamint a bűnüldözés is elengedhetetlen. Mindent meg kell tenni azért, hogy fiatalok, a tanárok és a szülők megfelelő felvilágosítást kapjanak. Továbbá elengedhetetlen, hogy a szintetikus szerek, amelyek talán a legmérgezőbbek, minél gyorsabban kerüljenek a tiltott drogok listájára. Minden elvesztett idő emberéletben mérhető ezen a területen.

19. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz von Hinweisgebern, die aus Gründen des öffentlichen Interesses Informationen offenlegen (kurze Darstellung)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest krótka prezentacja sprawozdania sporządzonego przez Virginie Rozière w imieniu Komisji Prawnej w sprawie uzasadnionych środków ochrony sygnalistów działających w interesie publicznym podczas ujawniania poufnych informacji posiadanych przez przedsiębiorstwa i organy publiczne (2016/2224(INI)) (A8-0295/2017).

Virginie Rozière, rapporteure. – Monsieur le Président, quand on présente un travail comme celui-là, il est d'usage de remercier les collègues pour le travail accompli. Je le ferais bien volontiers, mais je voulais commencer par remercier d'autres personnes. Dire merci à Antoine Deltour, merci à Raphaël Halet, merci à Irène Frachon, merci à Denis Robert, merci à tous ceux qui, un jour, font ce choix courageux qui est celui de parler. Cela n'est jamais un choix facile parce que, pour les lanceurs d'alerte, c'est faire le choix de la vérité, faire le choix de l'éthique, faire le choix de l'intérêt général, et c'est très souvent un choix qui se fait à ses propres risques et périls.

Je voulais aussi souligner que c'est la première fois que ce Parlement adopte un texte sur la protection des lanceurs d'alerte. C'est assez surprenant, parce que d'autres institutions ont déjà adopté des résolutions sur ce sujet; je pense, en particulier, au Conseil de l'Europe, qui a adopté une résolution en 2014, qui fixe des objectifs ambitieux et élevés, objectifs sur lesquels d'ailleurs nous nous sommes basés dans nos travaux.

J'ai parlé d'Antoine Deltour et de Raphaël Halet, et je voulais aussi souligner que, par contre, ce Parlement a souvent appelé à la protection des lanceurs d'alerte et que cela a souvent été dans le cadre des résolutions qui ont suivi l'affaire LuxLeaks. Je pense aux rapports des commissions spéciales TAXE 1 et TAXE 2.

Alors, oui, nous avons remercié Antoine Deltour et Raphaël Halet, nous avons même remercié Antoine Deltour avec le prix du citoyen européen. Nous avons pris des mesures pour lutter contre l'évasion fiscale grâce à lui – grâce à eux –, mais aujourd'hui, Antoine Deltour et Raphaël Halet ont été condamnés à de la prison avec sursis. Alors, nous, nous avançons, nous travaillons et nous améliorons le quotidien des citoyens européens dans la lutte contre l'évasion fiscale, mais eux sont toujours condamnés.

C'est particulièrement important aujourd'hui que ce Parlement appelle à adopter un instrument pour protéger les lanceurs d'alerte en Europe. Dans ce texte, nous posons un cadre qui peut servir de base à une protection efficace. En particulier, nous proposons une définition large des lanceurs d'alerte, en considérant que nous ne devons pas nous attacher à une situation particulière – salariés, sous-traitants, consultants –, mais plutôt à la nature de l'information qui est révélée, et donc considérer qu'à partir du moment où un lanceur d'alerte divulgue une information sur des agissements contraires à l'intérêt général européen, à ce moment-là, il doit être protégé.

Justement, quelle protection pour les lanceurs d'alerte? On sait que, très souvent, quand on parle, on est soumis à énormément de pression, voire à des représailles. Il s'agit donc de disposer clairement que ces représailles sont punissables pénalement et de veiller à ce qu'elles soient sanctionnées et à ce que le préjudice causé aux lanceurs d'alerte et à leur entourage soit pleinement réparé.

Nous souhaitons aussi que les lanceurs d'alerte puissent faire l'objet d'un soutien judiciaire financier lorsque c'est nécessaire. Nous voyons que, dans plusieurs cas, ils doivent faire face à des conditions de vie extrêmement dégradées, un travail perdu, une maison vendue, des ressources réduites au minimum. C'est pourquoi nous devons pouvoir également apporter un soutien financier dans certains cas, mais également une aide psychologique, parce que c'est à chaque fois une épreuve de se confronter à des organisations qui, elles, ont énormément de moyens – énormément de moyens d'action et de moyens de pression. Cette nécessité de rééquilibrer le rapport de forces, nous voulons aussi qu'elle soit prise en compte lorsqu'un lanceur d'alerte salarié fait l'objet de mesures à l'intérieur de son entreprise, pour qu'il appartienne bien à l'employeur d'apporter les garanties sur le fait qu'il ne s'agit pas là de représailles.

Nous faisons une proposition importante: nous voulons que soient mises en place des autorités indépendantes pour accueillir, aider et conseiller les lanceurs d'alerte. Nous l'avons dit, ils sont souvent en situation de fragilité et livrés à eux-mêmes face à des organisations puissantes et, donc, ce réseau d'autorités indépendantes, avec une autorité indépendante européenne qui pourrait assurer la coordination et une voie de recours pour les lanceurs d'alerte, nous semble particulièrement important.

Je veux prendre pour exemple un cas dont nous allons également discuter cette semaine, mais qui est d'une autre nature. Je pense à toutes ces personnes qui ont été confrontées aux dommages provoqués par le glyphosate. Je pense à M^{me} Grataloup, en particulier, qui a essayé d'alerter la compagnie Monsanto des méfaits, qui a essayé d'alerter les autorités nationales et qui n'a pas été entendue. C'est pour cela qu'une autorité indépendante chargée d'accueillir les lanceurs d'alerte serait un pas important.

Mais je voudrais aussi souligner, pour le coup, une tentative assez méprisable de certains collègues de l'autre côté de cet hémicycle, qui, la main sur le cœur, prétendent vouloir protéger les lanceurs d'alerte, mais qui, dans le même temps, voudraient dans ce rapport leur enlever toute possibilité d'avoir recours à la presse.

Or, il est évident que c'est précisément dans les cas les plus problématiques, dans les cas les plus lourds, dans les cas les plus graves – on parle de corruption, on parle de malversations –, qu'il est nécessaire d'alerter la presse; ce sont les cas dans lesquels les lanceurs d'alerte sont les plus exposés. Quel sens cela aurait-il de vouloir supprimer la protection des lanceurs d'alerte justement pour ces cas les plus graves qui nécessitent de s'adresser directement à la presse? Ce n'est ni plus ni moins que nier le droit des citoyens à une information de qualité et supprimer les sources du journalisme d'investigation.

Je trouve particulièrement regrettable que, alors que nous allons rendre hommage au courage de Daphne Caruana Galizia, demain à midi, certains collègues essaient d'empêcher les lanceurs d'alerte de s'adresser directement à la presse. J'espère que tout le monde saura voir clair dans leur jeu et dans les votes de demain midi.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já souhlasím s tím, aby byl legislativní rámec, tedy zákonná ochrana oznamovatelů, a to zejména na národní úrovni. Tyto osoby, *whistleblowers*, tedy oznamovatelé, kteří se rozhodnou zveřejnit důvěrné informace o nezákonném jednání, pomáhají bojovat proti podvodům, korupci a daňovým únikům.

Při prosazování regulace na evropské úrovni ale doporučuji, abychom byli velmi obezřetní. Například v oblasti anonymity bychom měli hovořit spíše o důvěrnosti, kdy identita bude známa, ale pouze dozorčím orgánům. Rovněž nesouhlasím se vznikem fondů na podporu *whistleblowers*, které by se plnily právě z toho, co se jejich činností získá. Tuto souvislost považuji za velmi nebezpečnou. Zkrátka, právo na ochranu oznamovatelů je důležité a je třeba při evropském rámci respektovat národní rámec a velmi citlivý přístup.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, whistle-blowers are essential for protecting the public interest, saving public money and ensuring transparency and integrity in public life. In the light of recent scandals, and particularly following last week's assassination of Maltese journalist Daphne Caruana Galizia, it is crucial that we adopt an EU-wide protection plan. When protecting whistle-blowers, we also protect journalists and their sources, we protect NGOs and freedom of speech, and we protect the truth.

I am proud that my group has played such an important role in promoting EU action for the protection of whistle-blowers, and I want to thank my colleague, Virginie Rozière, for her work on the report. Transparency, democracy, free press and high ethical standards – both in public and private organisations – are the values that we protect when we protect whistle-blowers. We need to stand strong on these, especially when faced with attempts to dilute the substance of the report by some other groups in this House, namely the EPP. We in the European Parliament should lead the way on greater transparency, not pull the curtains shut or close the door.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε μια φάση που πραγματικά η Ευρώπη έχει εκατομμύρια ανέργους, που έχουμε εκατομμύρια φτωχούς και ταυτόχρονα τεράστιο δημόσιο χρέος, είναι βέβαιο ότι θα πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί με αποφασιστικότητα η φοροδιαφυγή, η φοροαποφυγή και, φυσικά, η διαφθορά. Και στην πάλη αυτή, σε αυτόν τον αγώνα, σημαντικό ρόλο παίζουν οι καταγγέλλοντες, οι οποίοι είτε εργάζονται στον δημόσιο είτε στον ιδιωτικό τομέα, και αποκαλύπτουν πραγματικά τα σκάνδαλα τα οποία συμβαίνουν. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να υπάρξει μια προστασία για αυτούς τους ανθρώπους και επίσης να δοθεί η δυνατότητα να μπορούν να προσέρχονται αυθόρμητως. Αλλά, αν ξέρουν ότι θα τιμωρηθούν, προφανώς θα είναι πολύ δύσκολο να έχουμε τους καταγγέλλοντες. Είναι σημαντικό ότι είχαμε τη λίστα Φαλτσιάνι, αυτό που ονομάζεται στην Ελλάδα λίστα Λαγκάρντ, που αποκάλυψε τεράστια φοροδιαφυγή, η οποία έχει συμβεί και στην Ελλάδα. Προστασία, λοιπόν, των καταγγελλόντων χάριν του δημοσίου συμφέροντος και για αυτό θα πρέπει να υιοθετήσουμε έναν ευρύ ορισμό της έννοιας του καταγγέλλοντος, να λαμβάνουμε υπόψη κυρίως το είδος της πληροφορίας και, φυσικά, να υπάρχει και προστασία τους, ακόμη και οικονομική στήριξη, αν θέλουμε πραγματικά οι καταγγέλλοντες να προσέρχονται και να αποκαλύπτουν αυτά τα οποία συμβαίνουν σε βάρος του δημοσίου συμφέροντος.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, zviždači i zviždačice, i te kako trebaju i zaslužuju našu kompletnu zaštitu. Želim ovom prilikom zahvaliti se izvjestiteljici i svima koji su radili na ovom sjajnom dokumentu jer nam je on trebao već i ranije. Europski parlament uglavnom ne zaostaje kada su u pitanju teme javnosti, slobode, demokracije. Možda smo u ovom trenutku u ovoj materiji nešto malo zaostali, ali vjerujem da možemo i te kako napraviti brz i jasan napredak. Ovaj dokument nam upravo to i omogućava.

Sjećam se nekih primjera iz Hrvatske, vrlo famozan jedan primjer, jedne zviždačice vezano za najveću tadašnju hrvatsku kompaniju INA-u, industriju nafte, i znam što je sve prolazila i u kakvoj je situaciji sve bila, a sve je to činjeno u javnom interesu. Zato u tom kontekstu želim snažno podržati sve namjere koje imamo jer sam siguran da će se mnogo toga lakše otkriti ako Parlament potpuno jasno stane na stranu onih koji nam žele samo dobro.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, it is time for an end to the lip service when we come to talking about whistle-blowers. Everyone says they are wonderful; everyone says they are brave; everyone says they are exceptional. It's only when we get to a situation where people don't need to be brave to be whistle-blowers where it becomes normal to be a whistle-blower – then we can say that we have succeeded. At the moment, you have to be exceptional: if you become a whistle-blower in my country, you will be the one ending up digesting the whistle. You will end up unemployed; you will end up mentally destroyed. I have seen this on so many occasions. We have seen situations in my country where whistle-blowers in our police force have had false files and paedophilia charges put against them, since exposed. We have had members of our police force who have had rats hung on their door for exposing wrongdoing. We need to help these people. Either that, or we need to tell them, 'keep quiet, otherwise your life will be destroyed'. Hopefully this will change it. A good start.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da diversi anni il ruolo fondamentale svolto dagli informatori nella rivelazione di gravi violazioni dell'interesse pubblico è stato messo in evidenza da una serie di scandali in settori molto diversi, quali la tutela della sanità pubblica, l'ambiente e l'evasione fiscale.

La protezione degli informatori rappresenta uno degli strumenti più importanti per salvaguardare l'interesse pubblico. Purtroppo le protezioni offerte, laddove esistenti, sono inadeguate o troppo frammentate per poter garantire un quadro coerente all'interno dell'Unione europea. Sono state sviluppate numerose norme internazionali in materia di protezione degli informatori, sulle quali dovrebbe quindi basarsi una normativa europea.

Conformemente a tali norme, la definizione di informatore dovrebbe essere sufficientemente ampia da coprire un numero massimo di situazioni e proteggere, in tal modo, i dipendenti del settore pubblico e privato, i consulenti e i lavoratori autonomi. Anche il caso della giornalista e blogger Daphne Caruana Galizia, che era stata denominata la «donna Wikileaks», ci obblighi a fare tutto ciò che possiamo per proteggere gli informatori che lavorano per portare alla luce condotte sbagliate.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as Commissioner Moscovici told our committee last week, the European Parliament is leading the EU institutions in fighting tax avoidance and money laundering, but we would never have been able to do this without the work of Antoine Deltour: the LuxLeaks whistle-blower whose courage led to the setting up of a series of special tax committees. Daphne Caruana Galizia, the Maltese journalist who was killed by a car bomb last week, gave evidence to our committee about the tax affairs of the rich and powerful in Malta. These two brave people gave us the information we needed to challenge the corrupt and self-serving behaviour of the global plutocracy, behaviour that is shaking the very foundations of our democracy as people lose faith that the system works for them. One was found guilty and barely avoided jail. The other was viciously murdered.

This is the sort of courage it takes to be a whistle-blower in a world without protective legislation. How much corruption remains hidden because those who know about it are too afraid to come forward? The legislation that Parliament proposes today would offer whistle-blowers the protection they need.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le rivelazioni di *Panama Papers*, *Swiss Leaks* e *Lux Leaks* sono soltanto gli ultimi grandi scandali che hanno messo in luce sistemi di evasione fiscale, di frode transnazionale, di corruzione, resi noti grazie all'iniziativa coraggiosa di coloro che hanno sentito il dovere di denunciare condotte criminose, volte a danneggiare la collettività.

Al Parlamento europeo credo vada riconosciuto il merito di aver acceso i riflettori su un tema così delicato e attuale, mettendo in evidenza anche le differenze tra i sistemi nazionali degli Stati membri, in alcuni dei quali gli informatori non sono protetti o, talvolta, sono criminalizzati per l'azione svolta.

Ringrazio l'onorevole Rozière che, con il suo lavoro, ha evidenziato come sia ormai necessario un quadro normativo che preveda standard minimi per armonizzare il trattamento di tali casi e per tutelare gli informatori, attraverso l'istituzione di specifiche norme giuridiche, così da riconoscere il ruolo fondamentale nell'interesse pubblico.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parliamo di tutela dei *whistle-blower*, degli informatori, e quindi parliamo di lotta vera contro la corruzione, lotta vera per la trasparenza.

Ma, al di là delle parole, la realtà dei fatti ci racconta un sistema disomogeneo di norme, che varia da paese a paese: in questo momento nell'Unione europea ci sono paesi che hanno messo istituti veramente forti, veramente adeguati a quella che è la sfida, altri in cui addirittura gli informatori vengono criminalizzati, e ancor di più bisogna dire che questa tutela deve essere non solo formale ma anche sostanziale.

È quindi necessario garantire la possibilità, anche per gli informatori anonimi, di poter operare, è quindi necessario metterli al riparo da ogni forma di ritorsione da parte dei datori di lavoro e delle istituzioni presso cui lavorano, e per questo, a mio modo di vedere, è fondamentale arrivare a un'inversione dell'onere della prova. In caso di demansionamenti, in caso di comportamenti potenzialmente discriminatori, sono coloro che li hanno effettuati che devono dimostrare la propria buona fede e non l'informatore, al contrario, che deve dimostrare che ha subito un torto.

Oltre a questo, forse bisognerebbe pensare anche a dei fondi per andare a ovviare alle conseguenze economiche. Questo è quello che noi dobbiamo fare se veramente vogliamo parlare di tutela dei *whistle-blower*, altrimenti al coraggio delle loro parole noi faremo seguire solamente il silenzio della nostra indifferenza.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, meitä on järkyttänyt maltalaisen rohkean journalistin viikko sitten tapahtunut murha. Hän paljasti väärinkäytöksiä, korruptiota ja rikoksia. Tämä tapaus on ääriesimerkki siitä, kuinka väärinkäytösten ilmoittajien voi käydä, minkälaisia riskejä he ottavat ja miksi heitä pitää suojella.

Mietintö sisältää paljon hyvää, kuten anonyymit ilmoituskanavat ja taloudellisen tuen väärinkäytösten ilmoittajille. On itsestään selvää, että pienten, keskiuurten ja suurten yritysten toimintaedellytysten pitää olla tasapuolisia sisämarkkinoilla, on kysymys sitten verotuksesta, julkisista hankinnoista tai ympäristönormien noudattamisesta. Tarvitsemme selkeää lainsäädäntöä sellaisten henkilöiden turvaksi, jotka paljastavat näiden yritysten ja yhteisöjen väärinkäytöksiä ja rikoksia.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, zviždači imaju veliku važnost za svako društvo jer je riječ o ljudima koji ugrožavaju vlastitu dobrobit kako bi iznijeli skrivene informacije od javnog interesa. Za takvu im požrtvornost društvo prečesto ne izražava zahvalnost u onolikoj mjeri u kojoj zaslužuju i dozvoljava da budu marginalizirani.

Zaštita zviždača nameće se stoga kao nužnost želimo li ohrabriti građane da bez zadržke i straha otkrivaju informacije od javnog interesa. Prije svega ovdje mislim na kvalitetan zakonski okvir na nacionalnoj razini koji bi trebale usvojiti sve države članice.

No, moram naglasiti kako apsolutna zakonska zaštita zviždača kakvu zazivaju izjavitelji i dio kolega jednostavno nije moguća. Kad bismo drugu stranu, onu koja se smatra oštećenom, potpuno onemogućili u traženju pravde pred sudom, de facto bismo ozakonili zloporabu položaja, klevetu i svjesno kršenje ugovora.

Nisu svi slučajevi isti i ne bi bilo mudro skupno na njih primjenjivati posebna pravila. O tomu mogu li se ona primijeniti na konkretan slučaj zviždača ipak treba odlučivati sud.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τόσο στον δημόσιο τομέα όσο και στις μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις, υπάρχουν ορισμένα άτομα τα οποία εκμεταλλεύονται τη θέση τους και προβαίνουν σε παράνομες δραστηριότητες, όπως απάτες, φοροδιαφυγές, παράνομο πλουτισμό και άλλες ατασθαλίες, δημιουργώντας έτσι και συντηρώντας την γενικότερης μορφής διαφθορά. Αντιδρώντας σε αυτήν την απαράδεκτη κατάσταση, ορισμένοι έντιμοι πολίτες καταγγέλλουν όποιες παράνομες δραστηριότητες υποπίπτουν στην αντίληψή τους. Δυστυχώς, πολλές φορές οι άνθρωποι αυτοί πέφτουν θύματα της εντιμότητος και του θάρρους τους, διότι διώκονται από τις εργασίες τους, απειλείται η ζωή τους, η ζωή των μελών της οικογενείας τους, πολλές φορές χάνουν και τη ζωή τους και, γενικώς, υποφέρουν. Επειδή, με τις δραστηριότητες αυτές, οι άνθρωποι αυτοί βοηθούν το κράτος να λειτουργήσει, οφείλει το κράτος να τους προστατεύσει και να μεθόδευσει και να θεσμοθετήσει διαδικασίες οι οποίες θα συμβάλουν στην ενίσχυση της προθυμίας τους να καταγγέλλουν αυτές τις παράνομες ενέργειες. Εδώ όμως πρέπει να προσέξουμε να μην υποθάλψουμε περιπτώσεις ψευδούς καταμηνύσεως και αντεκδικήσεως. Δεν θέλουμε καταδότες, θέλουμε ανθρώπους οι οποίοι θα καταγγέλλουν παράνομες δραστηριότητες, ούτως ώστε να λειτουργεί σωστά το κράτος με τις αρχές της χρηστής διοικήσεως και του κράτους δικαίου.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, once again I would like to express my thanks to the rapporteur for this report, which is an important contribution to our debate. The Commission strongly believes that protecting those who raise the alarm helps detect serious violations of the law which would otherwise be difficult to identify. Whistle-blowing is an upstream component of the chain of actions necessary for an effective enforcement of the law and the safeguarding of the public interest.

Let me underline that we should protect responsible whistle-blowing which genuinely seeks to protect the public interest. It is essential to safeguard the rights and interests of entities affected by whistle-blower reports, such as their right of defence. The question is how best to achieve this objective, and how we can contribute at EU level. As you know, the Commission is currently finalising its assessment of the scope of such EU action. Our open public consultation conducted this year attracted a lot of interest. We received some 5700 replies, of which around 200 were from stakeholder organisations. The full results are available online, but let me underline that respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of protecting whistle-blowers.

Asked specifically in which areas the European Union should support Member States to better protect whistle-blowers, the top four areas they cited were: the fight against fraud and corruption, the fight against tax evasion and avoidance, the protection of the environment and the protection of public health and safety. To feed our assessment, we have also commissioned an external study. We are carrying out a detailed mapping of the legal situation across the European Union, including through targeted consultations with national authorities and other stakeholders.

The Commission will consider further actions in the first part of 2018. In this context, your report is very timely, and the solutions proposed will be taken into account in our work.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 24 października 2017 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Julia Pitera (PPE), na piśmie. – Ochrona sygnalistów wymaga przemyślanego i odpowiedzialnego określenia ram, w jakich osoba informująca o nieprawidłowościach ma być chroniona przepisami prawa. Przekroczenie tych ram może prowadzić do zdegenerowania systemu i stworzenia narzędzi, które mogłyby posłużyć władzy o ciągnotach autorytarnych do walki ze swoimi wrogami politycznymi. Pojawiające się co i raz koncepcje, by przenieść na oskarżanego o nadużycia obowiązek udowadniania swojej niewinności, zamiast domagać się od oskarżającego przedstawienia wiarygodnych dowodów świadczących jednoznacznie o winie, jest właśnie takim narzędziem.

Podobnie jak postulat utworzenia powszechnie dostępnych stron internetowych, pozwalających każdemu na anonimowe oskarżanie dowolnej osoby bez ponoszenia odpowiedzialności za ewentualnie wyrządzone krzywdy.

Również dziennikarze powinni nadal pozostawać chronieni przez prawo prasowe – nie powinien przysługiwać im status sygnalisty. Prawo prasowe bowiem pozwala, a nawet nakazuje dziennikarzom chronienie swoich informatorów, ale jednocześnie wymaga od nich rzetelnego sprawdzania pochodzących z takiego źródła informacji. W przeciwnym razie dziennikarstwo mogłoby się przemienić w arenę walki rozmaitych środowisk pomiędzy sobą. Tak więc dziennikarzom nie powinien przynależeć status sygnalisty.

Bądźmy więc rozważni, aby demonstrując wyborcom bezkompromisową wolę walki o uczciwość, nie wylać dziecka z kąpielą. By stworzony system ochrony sygnalistów realnie służył wspólnemu interesowi publicznemu.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), *în scris*. – În ultimii ani, denunțătorii din interiorul instituțiilor publice sau al companiilor au contribuit la dezvăluirea multor fraude sau comportamente ilegale. Însă este nevoie ca denunțătorii să fie protejați de posibile abuzuri. Din păcate, protecția oferită, în cazul în care există, este încă foarte insuficientă și prea fragmentată pentru a crea un cadru coerent în Uniunea Europeană. Trebuie să fie asigurată protecția confidențialității și ar trebui să fie introdusă o inversare a sarcinii probei; în același timp, ar trebui introduse dispoziții privind sprijinul financiar, psihologic, precum și privind despăgubirea prejudiciului. Însă este elementar să fie bine definit denunțul, astfel încât persoane care vor răzbunări personale sau promovări să nu se folosească de acest instrument în scopuri lipsite de etică.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Les lanceurs d'alerte sont essentiels dans une société démocratique; pourtant ils sont souvent menacés par les procédures judiciaires ainsi que par des représailles sur leur lieu de travail. Les législations nationales sont différentes d'un pays à l'autre et souvent inadaptées.

Nous exigeons de la Commission européenne une proposition de législation afin d'assurer la protection des lanceurs d'alerte à l'échelle européenne et ce, d'ici la fin de l'année. Le paradoxe aujourd'hui, c'est de constater que les lanceurs d'alerte sont victimes de menaces, de persécutions et de poursuites judiciaires alors que, dans le même temps, ceux qui sont dénoncés sont relativement protégés. Les lanceurs d'alerte sont les sentinelles de notre époque, et quand ils servent l'intérêt général, ils doivent être protégés convenablement.

20. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (kurze Darstellung)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest krótka prezentacja sprawozdania sporządzonego przez Laure Ageę w imieniu Komisji Zatrudnienia i Spraw Socjalnych w sprawie polityki gwarantowanego minimalnego dochodu jako narzędzia do zwalczania ubóstwa (2016/2270(INI)) (A8-0292/2017).

Laura Agea, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, cittadini, oggi è chiaro a tutti che la povertà è un problema europeo, causato proprio dalle politiche che questa Unione europea ha perpetrato per anni.

L'ultima speranza per mettere un freno all'emergenza della povertà è la volontà da parte di tutti i paesi di adottare un reddito minimo che restituisca vita e dignità ai quasi 120 milioni di cittadini europei che non riescono più ad arrivare alla fine del mese e lottano per sopravvivere.

Con questo documento l'Europa non potrà più girarsi dall'altra parte con indifferenza quando si parla della sofferenza dei suoi cittadini. L'Europa non deve più restare sorda di fronte alle richieste di aiuto che le famiglie e le imprese le rivolgono da anni. La Commissione europea affronti senza indugio la questione del reddito minimo, presentando quanto prima la proposta di una direttiva vincolante.

Oggi, secondo l'Osservatorio sociale europeo, diverse forme di sostegno al reddito esistono già in 26 Stati membri, e con rammarico devo aggiungere che nel mio paese non esiste un reddito minimo.

Noi vogliamo che l'Europa intervenga immediatamente con un quadro comune di norme che permetta l'armonizzazione dei diversi regimi vigenti con criteri di accesso comuni e validi per tutti come, ad esempio, basare il calcolo del reddito da erogare sulla soglia di povertà, che Eurostat fissa al 60 % del reddito medio nazionale. Non esistono cittadini di serie B, tutti devono poter beneficiare allo stesso modo dei regimi di reddito minimo.

Le parole non bastano più, bisogna mettere a disposizione le linee di bilancio del Fondo sociale europeo e del Programma europeo per l'occupazione e l'innovazione sociale per aiutare gli Stati membri a implementare regimi di reddito minimo. Si tratta di un approccio strategico e di visione, che consenta una vera e propria integrazione sociale. Non si tratta solo di soldi: i cittadini non chiedono elemosina, ma politiche di dignità.

Se si trovano i soldi per salvare le banche, tanto più pretendo che si trovino risorse per i figli di quest'Europa che è vittima, troppo spesso, di interessi scellerati. Questo nostro continente deve ritrovare il suo volto umano, assicurando assistenza sanitaria, alloggio, istruzione e dignità attraverso politiche economiche espansive a beneficio di tutti.

Vorrei concludere ringraziando il Commissario e i colleghi relatori, ma anche dicendo che questo lavoro, questo documento, porta la mia firma, porta la firma del Movimento 5 Stelle, ma racchiude i nomi di tutti i 120 milioni di cittadini europei per i quali è stato scritto. Il nostro impegno, la nostra dedizione e il nostro lavoro sono stati, sono e saranno sempre rivolti ai cittadini.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já nemůžu odolat, abych nereagovala na výzvu paní zpravodajky. Já jen chci upozornit, že Evropská unie nemůže nahradit rozhodování parlamentů a vlád členských států. Přesto univerzální minimální příjem je již v mnoha zemích realitou, jak ona sama přiznala, byť se třeba jmenuje jinak, například životní minimum, jako máme v České republice.

Je ale otázkou, zda má existovat nějaký minimální příjem definovaný na evropské úrovni. Já osobně s tím nesouhlasím, stejně tak jako nesouhlasím s definováním minimální mzdy na úrovni Evropské unie. Přijaté znění této zprávy je ale akceptovatelné, protože pouze vybízí všechny státy, aby zvážily nějakou formu minimálního příjmu. Osobně jsem proti tomu, abychom ve zprávě zmiňovali možnost směrnice Evropské unie o minimálním příjmu, a nesouhlasím s výzvou k založení fondu Evropské unie. Byla by to utopie a falešný slib voličům, který by Evropský parlament měl odmítnout.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i dati sulla povertà nell'Unione europea destano molta preoccupazione, dati che le politiche di austerità di questi anni hanno acuito: 119 milioni di persone dell'Unione europea, circa il 25 % della popolazione totale, sono a rischio di povertà ed esclusione sociale, e a questi dati vanno aggiunti gli elevati tassi di disoccupazione, soprattutto giovanile.

Una delle mie prime iniziative da parlamentare europeo è stata quella di interrogare la Commissione sulla grave condizione di milioni di cittadini europei che non riescono a soddisfare le proprie necessità primarie. Il reddito minimo di cittadinanza è una possibilità, anche se declinata con sfumature differenti nei vari Stati membri.

L'Europa deve saper costruire un sistema comune di *welfare* fondato sulla centralità e sul protagonismo di ogni cittadino europeo. È doveroso lanciare una strategia integrata di lotta alla povertà, basata su indicatori oggettivi e con una tempistica di realizzazione precisa, per far sì che siano rispettati gli obiettivi di Europa 2020.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η λιτότητα, η βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή έχουν πραγματικά οδηγήσει τεράστια τμήματα του πληθυσμού όλης της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στη φτώχεια και στην ανεργία. Έχουμε πάνω από 119 εκατομμύρια άτομα τα οποία βρίσκονται σε κίνδυνο φτώχειας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, δηλαδή περίπου το 25% του συνολικού πληθυσμού. Η ανεργία κυρίως πλήττει τους νέους και αυτό συμβαίνει σε όλον τον ευρωπαϊκό νότο, με την Ελλάδα να αναδεικνύεται πρωταθλήτρια στην ανεργία των νέων. Το 40% του ελληνικού πληθυσμού ζει κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας λόγω των μνημονίων τα οποία έχει επιβάλει η τρόικα που συνεχίζει τη φορομπηχτική πολιτική και ταυτόχρονα οδηγεί τους Έλληνες πολίτες μακριά από τα σπίτια τους, μια και τα κόκκινα δάνεια έχουν σαν αποτέλεσμα πλέον η τρόικα να επιβάλλει ηλεκτρονικούς πλειστηριασμούς και τα κοράκια να αρπάζουν τα σπίτια των Ελλήνων. Απαιτείται, λοιπόν, ένα σύστημα ελάχιστου εισοδήματος, απαιτείται ένας ελάχιστος ευρωπαϊκός μισθός, μπορεί να υπάρξει χρηματοδότηση μέσα από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινωνικό Ταμείο και μια οδηγία που να επιβάλλει υποχρεωτικά το σύστημα του ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente. Quiero apoyar la aprobación de un marco europeo que establezca las condiciones de una renta mínima a nivel europeo y que anime a los Estados a entender que este gasto es una inversión. Es la mejor respuesta conocida, después de un empleo digno y de calidad, para rescatar a las personas de la marginalidad, evitar las terribles secuelas personales que produce el desempleo, proporcionar una plataforma sólida para su reinserción laboral y combatir la pobreza.

Los datos hablan por sí solos: en el País Vasco creemos en la Europa social. Hemos hecho un esfuerzo sostenido e intenso. La renta de inserción que funciona en Euskadi, que no alcanza el 5 % de la población estatal, atiende al 20 % de los perceptores y supone casi cerca del 40 % del dinero que se gasta en este concepto en el Estado. Así, nuestra tasa de riesgo de pobreza no alcanza el 9 %, frente al 22,3 % que se registra en nuestro Estado miembro, y los mecanismos de inserción influyen decisivamente también en nuestros índices de paro, igualmente los más bajos del Estado.

Este es el camino.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, falar de políticas de rendimento mínimo é falar das verdadeiras causas que a justificam; é falar das razões por que vivem hoje na pobreza 125 milhões de pessoas na União Europeia, que produz 20 % do PIB mundial; é falar das razões por que são crescentes as desigualdades económicas e sociais, os níveis de exploração laboral ou a precariedade.

A resposta é clara: é na matriz capitalista da União Europeia e das políticas que têm promovido que estão as causas que justificam a necessidade destes instrumentos – instrumentos transitórios que são necessários, mas que não respondem às causas de fundo. Essas combatem-se com ruturas reais, com os estrangulamentos que as políticas da UE impõem aos Estados e impedem políticas de efetiva redistribuição da riqueza, a promoção do trabalho digno com direitos, os avanços de acordos de contratação coletiva, o aumento real de salários, o combate às desigualdades ou a garantia de serviços públicos, gratuitos e de qualidade, de saúde, segurança social e educação – enfim, políticas progressistas de desenvolvimento que deem resposta às necessidades dos trabalhadores e dos povos.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, we have a minimum wage in the United Kingdom. It is called a minimum wage, but it is less than the minimum amount a person can live on. Its spending value is lower now than it was nine years ago. In the UK, more than seven million people in working families protected by the so-called minimum wage live in poverty. The latest figures show that 1.1 million people in the UK are using food banks, over a quarter of whom are in work.

Only a real living wage will truly tackle in-work poverty. A living wage is a fundamental issue of social justice. It is the most basic economic protection there is. It is a guarantee by each state to its citizens that their work will earn them enough to live off. The introduction of the minimum wage across all EU states is welcome, but it is my sincere hope that we will set our sights on making a minimum wage a living wage.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η εσφαλμένη οικονομική πολιτική που εφήρμοσε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση την τελευταία δεκαετία υπήρξε αιτία εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίων, κυρίως στις χώρες του Νότου, να ζουν αυτή τη στιγμή είτε στα όρια της φτώχειας είτε μέσα στη φτώχεια και την ανεργία, κυρίως των νέων. Για αυτό, για να αντιμετωπιστεί αυτή η απαράδεκτη κατάσταση, πρέπει να καθιερωθεί ένα ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα σε όλες τις χώρες της Ευρώπης, ούτως ώστε να πάψει ο Ευρωπαίος να ζει εξαθλιωμένος. Στα πλαίσια αυτά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να αφήσει την κακεντρεχή και πέραν πάσης λογικής πολιτική της εφαρμογής των μνημονίων στην Ελλάδα, η οποία έχει οδηγήσει στην εξαθλίωση το μεγαλύτερο μέρος του πληθυσμού της χώρας. Είναι εντελώς υποκριτικό να συζητούμε εδώ για την καθιέρωση ενός ελαχίστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος του Ευρωπαίου πολίτη και, από την άλλη πλευρά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να βοηθάει τη Γερμανία να υφαρπάσσει τον επίγειο θαλάσσιο και υποθαλάσσιο πλούτο της χώρας. Είναι μια απαράδεκτη κατάσταση η οποία πρέπει οπωσδήποτε να λήξει.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D). – Señor presidente, hemos trabajado mucho y duramente para hacer este informe y por eso quiero dar la enhorabuena a la ponente, a mi compañera Laura Agea. Pero hemos trabajado mucho para solicitar tener un consenso, para solicitar a la Comisión Europea una directiva sobre rentas mínimas. Una propuesta, en definitiva, que cubra los huecos que hemos descubierto que existen tras la dureza de la crisis económica en nuestro modelo social, en nuestro Estado del bienestar.

Hemos de crear un nuevo sistema que proteja a las personas que después de más de dos años en el desempleo pierden su prestación y, por lo tanto, se quedan en los arcanes de la salida de la crisis, se quedan en los porcentajes de personas en riesgo de exclusión social.

Queremos una directiva que obligue a los Estados miembros a crear este sistema de rentas mínimas; que les obligue a dar una cuantía por encima del 60 % de la renta disponible de las familias de cada Estado miembro; que también incorpore políticas de inserción laboral y, por lo tanto, que haga, desde la iniciativa, desde la política, una sociedad más justa y más decente para la inmensa mayoría de los ciudadanos que esperan de esta Europa algo más que lamentos y algo más que porcentajes, en este caso de personas que viven en el umbral de la pobreza.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, a introdução e o reforço das políticas de rendimento mínimo, se devidamente combinados com outras medidas e políticas relativas ao mercado social e laboral, podem ser uma forma de combater a pobreza e promover a inclusão social e o acesso ao mercado de trabalho. Creio ainda que os regimes de rendimento mínimo podem também atuar como estabilizadores macroeconómicos automáticos na reação aos choques económicos.

Em 2015, 23,7% da população e 12,5% dos trabalhadores com mais de 18 anos na União Europeia estavam em risco de pobreza e de exclusão social.

Caros colegas, a Europa é uma das regiões mais prósperas do mundo, mas estes dados mostram uma crua e dura realidade que urge combater. O Observatório Social Europeu tem vindo a referir que 26 Estados-Membros dispõem já de regimes de apoio ao rendimento, subsistindo, porém, muitas diferenças entre os Estados-Membros relativamente ao tratamento das políticas de rendimento mínimo.

Por tudo isto, expresso a minha concordância com este relatório, que insta, designadamente, todos os Estados-Membros a introduzirem regimes de rendimento mínimo adequados, como última rede de proteção social, como forma de lutar contra a pobreza e assegurar uma existência digna a todos aqueles que não dispõem de recursos suficientes, e propõe que a Comissão pondere a criação de um Fundo Europeu adequado, numa base temporária, que funcione como um instrumento da política de coesão e de sociedade europeia.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα, αυτό το καμάρι της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και όλων των κομμάτων – φιλελεύθερων, σοσιαλδημοκρατών, ακροδεξιών και φασιστών – των ομορτυνιστών που το στηρίζουν, αποτελεί κορυφαίο δείγμα υποκρισίας για δήθεν κοινωνική ευαισθησία. Το λαϊκό εισόδημα, ρημαγμένο από απολύσεις, μειώσεις μισθών, συντάξεων, επιδομάτων, άγρια φοροεπιδρομή, χρηματοδοτεί αυτό το δίχτυ δήθεν ασφαλείας για ελεημοσύνη στις πιο ακραίες περιπτώσεις εξαθλίωσης και αποτροπή της έκρηξής τους. Μοιράζει δηλαδή τη φτώχεια μεταξύ φτωχών και ακόμα φτωχότερων με άδικτα τα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων. Αυτή η δήθεν ασφάλεια πλάσεται επίσης στους εργαζόμενους για να ανεχθούν περαιτέρω μειώσεις μισθών, κατάργηση των συλλογικών συμβάσεων εργασίας – βλέπε Γαλλία του Μακρόν, Ελλάδα του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ κ.λπ. Οι εργαζόμενοι να απορρίψουν αυτόν το Δούρειο Ίππο για τα τελευταία δικαιώματά τους. Να αρνηθούν το μικρότερο κακό που αποδεικνύεται πάντα μεγαλύτερο. Με οργάνωση και πάλι, να διεκδικήσουν αυξημένα επιδόματα ανεργίας για όλους τους ανέργους, σε όλη τη διάρκεια της ανεργίας, υπογραφή συλλογικών συμβάσεων εργασίας με αναπλήρωση των απωλειών και μισθούς που να καλύπτουν τις ανάγκες των εργαζόμενων.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, ideju o minimalnom dohotku kao negativnom porezu na dohodak koji bi zamijenio sve druge socijalne transfere i drastično smanjio administraciju ekonomska ljevica sve češće zloupotrebljava.

Cilj zajamčenog minimalnog dohotka, kako ga je zamislio Milton Friedman, nije uvođenje još jedne socijalne mjere na račun produktivnog dijela stanovništva, već upravo suprotno – pojednostavljenje socijalnog sustava i to na način da država svima, a ne samo nekima, osigura osnovne uvjete za život dok bi za sve ostale trebalo raditi.

Budući da se zaposlenjem ne bi gubilo pravo na minimalni dohodak kao što se danas u pravilu gubi na različite socijalne mjere, ljudi bi imali veći motiv tražiti posao kako bi dodatno zaradili. S druge strane, oni koji žele volontirati i baviti se humanitarnim radom imali bi više vremena za takve aktivnosti jer osnovni dohodak ipak imaju zajamčen.

Nažalost, u ovom se izvješću radi o nečemu sasvim drugome i ne bih ga mogla podržati čak i kad ne bi opasno narušavalo princip supsidijarnosti.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to express my thanks to Ms Agea for this comprehensive report, which looks into minimum income policies to address poverty.

There are now clear signs that Europe is recovering from the crisis. 2017 is the first year since 2008 when all European economies are expected to grow. The recovery is also reflected in the employment and social situation in Europe. Employment has reached the highest number ever recorded: 232 million in 2016. Unemployment rates are back to the pre-crisis level: 7.7% in August 2017. The number of people at risk of poverty and social exclusion decreased in more than half of the Member States in 2015 and is back to its pre-crisis level of 23.7%. However, we cannot be complacent, as thousands of our citizens – including people with jobs – are at risk of poverty and social exclusion.

Therefore, I welcome your report as it highlights this challenge. Poverty and inequality are not only detrimental to social cohesion, but also to sustainable economic growth. Addressing these challenges is at the core of the European Semester and the European pillar of social rights. The pillar includes, as key principles, the provision of adequate minimum income schemes, essential services and employment activation. In line with the active inclusion approach, all Member States currently have some form of minimum income scheme. However, their design and implementation vary greatly. Moreover, as the report also points out, income support should be accompanied by access to services and activation, such as lifelong learning, for workers, the unemployed and vulnerable social groups.

The European Semester has proved to be an effective framework to monitor and provide guidance to Member States in this area. The pillar will further strengthen these efforts by introducing a new social scoreboard. Moreover, we are currently working with the Member States on a benchmarking framework for minimum incomes. The Commission is also promoting mutual learning and the exchange of good practices among Member States, for instance within the Social Protection Committee, or by supporting the European Minimum Income Network, which aims at the progressive realisation of adequate and accessible minimum income schemes in Member States.

IN THE CHAIR: PAVEL TELIČKA

Vice-President

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 24 October 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – La crisi economica e i processi di globalizzazione sono all'origine di una sempre maggiore divaricazione tra ricchi e poveri, con una classe media europea che negli ultimi anni è sempre più scivolata verso l'indigenza. È quindi assolutamente prioritario che una forte rete di protezione venga messa in campo a livello europeo e il reddito di cittadinanza costituisca in questo senso una misura atta a ridare dignità ai tanti che si trovano oggi in estrema difficoltà. Si tratta di una battaglia che il M5S da sempre porta avanti in Italia, ma una direttiva europea in questo senso costituirebbe un importante intervento di giustizia sociale.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Η οικονομική κρίση άφησε μόνιμα στίγματα στην ευρωπαϊκή αγορά εργασίας με σημαντικό αντίκτυπο στον κοινωνικό ιστό. Τόσο τα ευρωπαϊκά θεσμικά όργανα όσο και οι εθνικές κυβερνήσεις έλαβαν και λαμβάνουν μέτρα για την μείωση των ποσοστών της φτώχειας και της ανεργίας. Η παρούσα έκθεση για το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα θέτει ως στόχο να παράσχει πρακτική καθοδήγηση ως προς τον τρόπο ταυτόχρονης παρέμβασης, αφενός, για την άμβλυνση του κοινωνικού αντίκτυπου της οικονομικής κρίσης και, αφετέρου, για την προώθηση ενεργών πολιτικών που αποσκοπούν στη δημιουργία θέσεων απασχόλησης και στη διασφάλιση βιώσιμης ανάπτυξης. Η Κύπρος ήδη εφαρμόζει με επιτυχία μέτρα για την υποστήριξη του ελάχιστου εγγυημένου εισοδήματος με στόχο την παροχή ενός δικτύου κοινωνικής ασφαλείας για τα άτομα που διατρέχουν τον κίνδυνο της φτώχειας. Συγκεντρώνοντας και εξορθολογίζοντας τους διαθέσιμους πόρους, μέσα από το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα η κυβέρνηση δημιούργησε ένα αποτελεσματικό δίκτυ κοινωνικής προστασίας, ενισχύοντας χιλιάδες Κύπριους που το είχαν ανάγκη και που προηγουμένως δεν είχαν καμία στήριξη από το κράτος.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), în scris. – Măsurile de austeritate care au dominat politica economică europeană din ultimii ani au dus la recesiune economică, creșterea ratei șomajului și reducerea posibilităților de a găsi un loc de muncă pentru mulți cetățeni europeni. Consider că statele membre și Comisia au nevoie de cifre actualizate privind venitul și condițiile de viață din țările UE, care să țină cont și de specificitățile naționale, pentru a pune în aplicare un buget de referință și un venit minim la nivel european, utilizate pentru a combate mai bine sărăcia și a testa robustețea nivelului venitului minim și a pragului amintit, dar respectând totodată principiul subsidiarității.

Ca atare, consider benefică propunerea raportorului referitoare la elaborarea unui concept la nivel european privind obiectivele comune pentru sistemele naționale de venit minim, pentru a crea condiții egale între statele membre. Pentru acesta ar fi utilă realizarea de către Comisie a unei evaluări a impactului sistemelor de venit minim în Uniunea Europeană, cu monitorizare și raportare periodică în perspectiva unor acțiuni viitoare. În plus, atunci când sunt vizate sistemele de venit minim, statele membre trebuie să ia în considerare pragul de risc de sărăcie stabilit de Eurostat la 60% din venitul mediu național echivalat disponibil (după transferurile sociale), împreună cu alți indicatori.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), na piśmie. – Zmniejszanie nierówności jest jednym z nadrzędnych celów Unii Europejskiej, zapisanym w traktatach. Dlatego też, mimo iż polityka społeczna pozostaje kompetencją państw członkowskich, także na poziomie unijnym należy podejmować zadania, które mają doprowadzić do większej spójności społecznej i podniesienia poziomu życia obywateli.

Propozycja ustanowienia dochodu minimalnego jest koncepcją, która zasługuje na uwagę, jednak należy mieć świadomość, iż różnice gospodarcze w systemach społecznych i prawnych między państwami członkowskimi sprawiają, iż niemożliwe byłoby wprowadzenie go na poziomie ogólnounijnym. Dlatego też mam wątpliwości co do wprowadzenia dyrektywy ramowej w sprawie dochodu minimalnego. Uważam ponadto, że osoby dotknięte ubóstwem i wykluczone z rynku pracy muszą przede wszystkim zyskać wsparcie w integracji społecznej, a także aktywizacji zawodowej.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), schriftelijk. – “De sociale kloof in Europa neemt toe. Tussen jong en oud. Tussen zuid en noord. Armoedebestrijding is een verwaarloosd kind geworden”. Dat waren mijn woorden twee jaar geleden. Ik vroeg toen om concrete voorstellen om de armoede te bestrijden. Ik ben blij dat wij vandaag een voorstel bespreken waarop wij sinds de crisis van 2008 wachten, namelijk een eerste stap richting een bestaansminimum voor alle Europeanen. Een goede zaak, want naar mijn mening moet iedereen in Europa kunnen rekenen op een fatsoenlijk bestaan.

In dit voorstel wordt ook gerefereerd aan een (onvoorwaardelijk) basisinkomen. Ik ben daar op voorhand geen voorstander van. Van iedereen mag namelijk verwacht worden dat er naar vermogen wordt bijgedragen aan het betaalbaar houden van collectieve voorzieningen voor mensen die bijvoorbeeld te maken hebben met ziekte of tegenslag. Uiteraard laat ik mij graag van het tegendeel overtuigen. Ik ben benieuwd naar de uitkomsten van de experimenten met een basisinkomen.

Veel Europeanen leven nog altijd in armoede. Dat kunnen wij niet accepteren. Het wordt tijd dat wij dit “verwaarloosd kind” bij de hand nemen en wat doen. Het garanderen van een fatsoenlijk bestaan in elke lidstaat is daarbij een goede eerste stap.

Dominique Martin (ENF), *par écrit*. – Si la lutte contre la pauvreté doit être un des objectifs les plus importants en Europe qui, rappelons-le, peine à se relever de la crise et des politiques d'austérité imposées par l'Union européenne, et ce malgré une reprise économique certaine, cela ne doit pas se faire au sacrifice de la souveraineté des États membres.

Or ce rapport a pour objectif d'instaurer un revenu minimum européen qui serait à la fois financé par les États membres (via le Fonds social européen) mais géré par les institutions européennes. Aussi, nous n'acceptons pas que les formes nationales de revenu minimum (comme le RSA en France) puissent être remplacées par un instrument supranational dont la France n'aura plus le contrôle.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Lesújtó képet fest a magyar minimálbér európai összehasonlításban. Majdnem mindenhon magasabb a minimálbér Európában, mint a magyar. Több tízezer forinttal keresnek többet a szlovákok, a horvátok és a lengyelek is. A németek háromszor, de még a szlovénok is kétszer annyit kapnak, mint a magyarok. A helyzet súlyosságát tovább fokozza, hogy Magyarországon 4 millióan élnek szegénységben, és majdnem 7 millióan élnek egyik napról a másikra, nulla megtakarítással. Egy német, vagy egy dán autószerelő ugyanazért a munkáért háromszor annyit keres, mint egy magyar.

Európai uniós minimálbért kell ezért meghatározni, amellyel ugrásszerűen növelhetnénk a magyar dolgozók munkabérét. Ha van uniós szinten garantált európai minimum jövedelem, drámaian javíthatunk a magyarok életszínvonalán, nem kellene többet azon aggódniuk, hogy kijönnék-e a hónap végéig. Ugyanakkor a minimumjövedelem biztosíthatná azt is, hogy egyenlő munkáért egyenlő bért fizessenek. Nem ér többet egy szlovák, vagy egy lengyel munkája, mint a magyaroké.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), *în scris*. – Sărăcia și excluderea socială, ale căror cauze și durată nu depind de voința persoanelor care se confruntă cu acestea, constituie înjosiri ale demnității umane și încălcări ale drepturilor fundamentale ale omului. Conform Eurostat, în 2016, în cele 28 de state membre din Uniunea Europeană, 23,4 % din populație, respectiv 117,5 milioane de persoane, erau supuse riscului de sărăcie și excludere socială, un nivel aproape similar cu cel de dinaintea crizei (2008).

Este cunoscut faptul că un obiectiv al Strategiei Europa 2020 este scoaterea din categoria celor expuși sărăciei și excluziunii sociale în UE a cel puțin 20 de milioane de persoane până în 2020. Cu toate acestea, organizațiile internaționale (FMI) au impus, în cazul unor state membre, politici de austeritate bugetară extrem de restrictive, prin care obligă la reduceri substanțiale ale cheltuielilor în domenii fundamentale, cum ar fi educația, sănătatea, justiția, cultura și ajutoarele și serviciile sociale. Astfel de opțiuni politice au dus la o creștere accentuată a sărăciei și a excluziunii sociale.

Ca atare, suntem de acord cu faptul că doar o economie prosperă, cu o rată de șomaj scăzută, cu sisteme de venit minim reprezintă cel mai eficient instrument pentru combaterea sărăciei.

21. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (kurze Darstellung)

President. – The next item is the report by Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on control of spending and monitoring of EU Youth Guarantee schemes' cost-effectiveness (2016/2242(INI)) (A8-0296/2017).

Derek Vaughan, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, youth unemployment has been one of the scandals of our time. Some of the youth unemployment rates in some Member States have been an absolute disgrace. Therefore, I am pleased that the EU has done its part to tackle this scandal through the Youth Guarantee Scheme and the Youth Employment Initiative. Between 2013 and 2017 youth unemployment has come down from 23.8% to 16.6%.

I am pleased that the EU has put his money where its mouth is. I am pleased we have put more money into the programmes to allow us to tackle this issue. I am also pleased that the programme was front-loaded and pre-financing was increased in order to tackle the problem when it was at its worst. I am also pleased that the EU has now agreed to extend the Youth Employment Initiative up until at least 2020. So all that is good.

However, more needs to be done. The programmes got off to a slow start. They were introduced quickly. Many Member States did not have the capacity or the structures to put in place the programmes, and it therefore got off to a slow start and youth unemployment still remains high. It is currently around 18%.

Therefore, I would urge Member States not to use EU funds to replace their own funds and programmes, but I would urge Member States to use their own funds to tackle youth unemployment, and not just rely on funds coming from the European Union. I would also urge Member States, companies and trainers to ensure they are offering a good-quality opportunity to young people and not just use them as cheap labour, as we have seen so often in the past.

On implementation and monitoring, because after all this is a Committee on Budgetary Control report, I want to say I am concerned that there is sparse data on the output and results of the programmes. Better systems need to be put in place so that the results can be properly measured. We need to know how effective and efficient these programmes are. I would also like to see better market analysis so relevant opportunities can be offered to young people. We want opportunities which would benefit young people, but also benefit the economy.

Finally, hopefully we will see an evaluation coming from the Commission soon on these important programmes. This will allow us to make adjustments to improve implementation of these programmes even further. As I said at the start, these programmes have been worthwhile. They have made a huge difference but there is still much to do.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, nezaměstnanost mladých je velmi vážné téma, je tedy naší povinností se tím zabývat. Podle nejaktuálnějších statistik Eurostatu se nezaměstnanost výrazně snížila. V srpnu 2017 bylo mladých do 25 let v Evropské unii 16,7 %, a to je skutečně pokles.

Věřím, že k tomu přispělo také právě čerpání z Evropského sociálního fondu, které pomohlo nalézt práci mnoha mladým nezaměstnaným. Je ale alarmující, že třeba v Řecku, ve Španělsku, v Itálii stále ta procenta dosahují čtyřiceti, třiceti procent. Nezaměstnanost mladých má obrovské negativní dopady na ekonomiku, ale i na samotné mladé lidi. Samozřejmě, hrozí zde jejich frustrace, radikalizace a každý mladý člověk, který nemůže nalézt práci, nás musí zajímat. Proto podporuji pokračování a zefektivnění těchto záruk za mladé.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, youth unemployment is a particularly worrying phenomenon. From the perspective of the wider economy it can have long-lasting effects on productivity and growth. From the perspective of individuals it can have the effect of excluding young people from the labour market for an extended period of time, which in turn can affect their job prospects for life.

Considering that youth unemployment in the EU reached an alarming high of 23.8% in 2013, I am convinced that we were right to prioritise this particular segment of the labour market. I also believe that the recent fall in unemployment rates was due in part to the Youth Guarantee, its success depending on national factors such as implementation capacity.

Although reduced, the youth unemployment rate still remains a concern that needs our particular attention. At the same time, however, we should not lose sight of the issue of general unemployment and the structural reforms needed to efficiently deal with it.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nell'ambito del piano europeo per la lotta alla disoccupazione giovanile, la «Garanzia per i giovani» ha l'obiettivo di finanziare politiche attive di orientamento, formazione e inserimento nel mercato del lavoro per i giovani inattivi.

Si tratta dunque di obiettivi fondamentali, considerando che il tasso di disoccupazione medio nell'Unione europea è del 17,8 %, con picchi del 45 % in Grecia, del 41,5 % in Spagna e del 35 % in Italia. La Corte dei conti europea, nella relazione sull'impatto delle politiche europee sulla disoccupazione giovanile, ha tuttavia evidenziato che in molti paesi il programma non ha assicurato l'effettivo inserimento dei giovani nel mondo del lavoro.

Per quanto riguarda l'Italia, già in passato ho segnalato la persistenza di criticità in talune regioni, con ritardi medi nei pagamenti intorno ai 64 giorni, anche se il dato che preoccupa di più è però quello sull'efficacia complessiva del programma, ossia l'impatto sulla disoccupazione giovanile nei singoli Stati. A fronte del 64 % in Irlanda e del 90 % in Francia, in Italia solo il 31 % dei giovani coinvolti ha trovato un'occupazione.

Vanno dunque definite strategie chiare e adeguate per correggere...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore.)

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα ποσοστά ανεργίας των νέων είναι τεράστια στην Ευρώπη, αλλά κυρίως στον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο. Πρωταθλήτρια, δυστυχώς, είναι η Ελλάδα με 45% κι αυτό κυρίως λόγω των μνημονιακών πολιτικών που έχουν επιβληθεί. Φυσικά υπάρχει και μετανάστευση των νέων. Πεντακόσιες χιλιάδες νέοι από την Ελλάδα έχουν αναγκαστεί, ακριβώς λόγω της σκληρής μνημονιακής πολιτικής, να μεταναστεύσουν. Είναι δεδομένο ότι χρειάζεται στήριξη του προγράμματος «Εγγυήσεις για τη νεολαία», καθώς επίσης και «Πρωτοβουλία για την απασχόληση των νέων». Οι «Εγγυήσεις για τη νεολαία» απαιτούν 50 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Τι ποσά όμως διατίθενται, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε; Ψίχουλα. Απαιτούνται πολύ μεγαλύτερα ποσά, αν θέλουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε πραγματικά τα προβλήματα της ανεργίας των νέων κι όλα αυτά σε μια φάση που ο κύριος Draghi έχει μέχρι στιγμής δαπανήσει 1,7 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ στην ποσοτική χαλάρωση. Επομένως, απαιτούνται τεράστια ποσά για να αντιμετωπιστεί η ανεργία των νέων και φυσικά εγκατάλειψη της πολιτικής της λιτότητας και της βίαιης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, program Jamstvo za mlade dao je određene rezultate, pogotovo u državama članicama koje su se teško oporavljale od krize i u kojima je nezaposlenost mladih godinama bila na rekordnoj razini.

Izjestitelj je dobro prepoznao izazove s kojima se program danas susreće, a rješenje bi moglo biti u prilagodbi preporučenih mjera lokalnom kontekstu uz veće uključivanje predstavnika poslodavaca i obrazovnih institucija s velikim lokalnim ili regionalnim utjecajem.

Smatram kako Jamstvo za mlade ima budućnost, ali pozivi na dodatna izdvajanja iz nacionalnih proračuna mogli bi se pokazati kontraproduktivnima. Budemo li poslodavcima uzimali više novca kroz poreze kako bismo financirali ovaj program, smanjit ćemo njihovu sposobnost rasta i zapošljavanja i tako ograničiti uspjehnost samog programa. Nemojmo upasti u tu zamku.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Thema EU-Jugendstrategie: Was haben wir dazu für tolle Sonntagsreden gehört. Leider sieht die Realität anders aus.

Folgendes hatte Europa versprochen: Die Jugendgarantie stellt sicher, dass allen jungen Menschen ohne Arbeit binnen vier Monaten eine Arbeitsstelle oder ein Praktikumsplatz beschafft wird. Dafür investieren wir insgesamt 6,5 Mrd. Euro. Wären wir hier kein Parlament, sondern ein Unternehmen, hätten viele von uns die Kündigung in der Hand.

Das sagt der Europäische Rechnungshof dazu, ich zitiere: „Mitte 2016 waren in der EU vier Millionen junger Menschen arbeitslos. Die politischen Entscheidungsträger sollten dafür sorgen, dass keine Erwartungen geweckt werden, die nicht erfüllt werden können.“

Als siebenfacher Vater erinnere ich immer gern an das achte Gebot: Du sollst nicht lügen. Mein Wunsch: Seien wir ehrlich zu den Leuten, dann steigt auch die Glaubwürdigkeit unserer Politik! Europa kann vieles, aber nicht alles lösen. Vielleicht erreichen wir sogar mehr, wenn wir weniger versprechen.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Gerbiamas Pirmininke, jaunimo nedarbas yra senas reiškiny. Ir dalis Europos Sąjungos valstybių narių jau daugelį metų susiduria su nepaprastai aukštu jo lygiu. Tai kelia ne tik dideles socialines problemas, bet yra ir labai nuostolinga ekonomiškai. Lietuvoje dėl nedarbo, nesimokančių ir mokyklose nedalyvaujančių jaunų žmonių 2008 m. buvo prarandama 0,7 proc. BVP, o jau 2011 m. – 1,1 proc.

Todėl labai svarbus yra Europos Sąjungos jaunimo garantinių iniciatyvų išlaidų kontrolė ir nuolatinė ekonominė vaisin-gumo stebėseną, savavališkai teikiant rekomendacijas ir konsultacijas kiekvienai paramos gavėjų grupei, kartu nustatant ir valstybės narės finansinio indėlio dalį. Manau, vieningai sutariama, kad jaunimo nedarbo mažinimo projektai, net ir trumpalaikiai, yra veiksmingi. Tyrimai rodo, jog trumpalaikis jaunimo užimtumas kur kas padidina tikimybę susirasti darbo ateityje.

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel mio paese la disoccupazione giovanile arriva quasi al 37 %, secondo gli ultimi dati, e la disoccupazione giovanile in Sicilia, una regione che abbiamo visitato proprio per controllare come venivano spesi i fondi della Garanzia per i giovani, arriva a un vergognoso 57 %. Capite come siano dati impressionanti e la cosa più impressionante, che ci ha impressionato e ha impressionato anche la Corte dei conti europea, è che la politica in questa regione non è stata in grado di mettere insieme un sistema di pagamenti efficiente. I giovani sono andati molto spesso a lavorare e hanno ricevuto i pagamenti dopo mesi.

Questa è una vergogna, una vergogna che si può ribaltare, assolutamente, mandando via certi partiti. E assolutamente bisogna anche investire, però, le politiche di austerità, perché capite che se non aiutiamo anche le imprese a creare domanda e a creare posti di lavoro duraturi non riusciremo mai a uscire da questo circolo vizioso della crisi. Quindi, da una parte liberiamoci dai partiti e dall'altra liberiamoci dall'austerità per creare domanda e posti di lavoro duraturi.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, προκαλούν οι πανηγυρισμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ για τη δήθεν πτώση της ανεργίας. Με ταχυδακτυλουργίες βαφτίζουν άνεργους ως μη ενεργά αναζητούντες εργασία. Μια ώρα απασχόλησης, και χωρίς αμοιβή ακόμα, αρκεί για να θεωρηθεί κάποιος εργαζόμενος, η δε εκ περιτροπής εργασία αυθαίρετα εξαιρείται της μερικής απασχόλησης. Και στην Ελλάδα, με πρωτιά στην ανεργία, το «εγγύηση για τη νεολαία» σημαίνει ολιγόμηνο διάλειμμα από την ανεργία, με 300-400 ευρώ, χωρίς συνταξιοδοτική ασφάλιση, επιδοτώντας την εργοδο-σία. Ανακύκλωση δηλαδή πάμφθηνων αναλώσιμων εργατών για τους επιχειρηματικούς ομίλους, σε αντικατάσταση κιόλας παλιό-τερων που στέλνονται στην ανεργία. Αυτή είναι η προϋπόθεση για την καπιταλιστική ανάκαμψη, που θα πληρώσουν πανάκριβα οι εργαζόμενοι με βίο αβίωτο, είτε έχουν είτε δεν έχουν δουλειά. Κανένας άνεργος χωρίς κάλυψη, επίδομα για όλο το διάστημα της ανεργίας, σε ύψος που να μπορούν να ζήσουν οι άνεργοι με τις οικογένειές τους. Μόνη απάντηση είναι η οργάνωση της εργατικής λαϊκής πάλης, για να μπουν εμπόδια στην καπιταλιστική εργασιακή γαλέρα. Να δυναμώσει και πάλι...

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή.)

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, providing young people with better opportunities has been a top priority for the Commission. I therefore welcome Mr Vaughan's report, which comes at the right time.

Four years into the launch of the Youth Guarantee and the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI), our efforts are now paying off. The Youth Guarantee has been an important policy driver to improve the transition of young people from education to work. Setting it up was not easy. It required commitment and political support from Member States and building new partnerships, as well as significant reforms of labour market, education and training policies.

But these efforts are now bearing fruit. Since its launch, around 18 million young people have registered and 11 million have received an offer. The youth unemployment rate decreased from a peak of 24% in January 2013 to 16.7% in August 2017. There are now two million fewer young unemployed in the European Union, and one million fewer young people who are not in employment, education or training – the so-called NEETs. The improving macroeconomic context certainly played a role, but young people have managed better on the labour market thanks to the Youth Guarantee. Public employment services have expanded their services and developed new approaches towards the hard-to-reach. Apprenticeship and traineeship reforms have taken place in many countries. The Youth Employment Initiative has directly helped at least 1.6 million young people to receive a job, training or further education.

As your report rightly points out, there are still challenges. We take due note of the European Court of Auditors' Special Report on the impact of these two projects on youth employment. The Youth Guarantee has done a lot to shift the focus to early intervention and not registered needs, and to ensure a new focus on outreach. But addressing young people in more vulnerable situations, who face multiple barriers, remains a challenge. We are committed to helping Member States by providing financial support and policy advice to ensure that all young people can have access to these opportunities. Through the Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI) Programme we are, for example, supporting out-reach and awareness-raising projects in four Member States and providing mutual learning opportunities.

Your report stresses the importance of cooperation between all partners as a crucial part of achieving this goal. Indeed, public employment services, education providers, social partners and youth organisations need to be involved so that we can reach out effectively to all young people and ensure that measures are sustainable and of high quality. Adequate investment is of course a prerequisite for achieving this.

Many of the measures of the Youth Guarantee would not have occurred without the European Union's financial support, namely the Youth Employment Initiative and the European Social Fund. In some Member States, the Youth Employment Initiative is funding the vast majority of youth guarantee measures and has been instrumental in setting up schemes. Despite a slow start, implementation of the Youth Employment Initiative sped up between 2015 and 2016: the number of young people supported by the Youth Employment Initiative tripled. The recently agreed increase of the Youth Employment Initiative's budget by EUR 2.14 billion will help to continue this effort, but I fully agree with you that Member States also need to invest in youth employment in order to effectively implement Youth Guarantee schemes and really reach all young people.

As regards monitoring requirements on the progress of the YEI, we have been providing guidance and requesting feedback from the Member States on data collection and monitoring. The provision of guidance will continue on a regular and ad-hoc basis. Collecting relevant information and feedback on the results on the ground is essential in order for us to be able to report on the achievement of the Youth Employment Initiative. To facilitate this dissemination of the Youth Guarantee's results, on 26 October we are organising a Youth Guarantee Learning Forum. This will bring together Youth Guarantee policy coordinators from Member States and YEI managing authorities to disseminate good practices, take stock of the lessons learned so far and come up with proposals for the future.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 24 October 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit. – Malgré son léger reflux, le chômage des jeunes reste, avec 18,8 % en 2016, à un niveau inacceptable. Il n'est, en outre, que le versant le plus visible d'une précarisation massive de la jeunesse européenne, qui hypothèque l'avenir de toute une génération et déstabilise l'équilibre socioéconomique des États concernés à travers les recettes fiscales et les systèmes de retraite, mais aussi la natalité, qui a lourdement chuté en France.

L'austérité imposée par la Commission rend illusoire tout investissement de 50,4 milliards d'euros annuels nécessaire au fonctionnement de la «Garantie pour la Jeunesse», instituée en 2013. En outre, l'absence d'une définition d'«offre de qualité» laisse la porte ouverte aux dérives associées aux mécanismes d'aide publique à l'emploi, de l'effet d'aubaine aux emplois sans perspectives. Ainsi, il est illusoire de penser que seul un mécanisme de soutien public permettrait aux quatre millions de jeunes Européens de sortir de l'ornière.

Il est impératif de traiter les causes du chômage des jeunes: d'une part, les lacunes de la formation secondaire et professionnelle et, d'autre part, la pression sur les coûts de personnel pesant sur les entreprises, soumises à une concurrence internationale impitoyable.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), na piśmie. – W swoim sprawozdaniu Trybunał Obrachunkowy wykazał, że we wdrażaniu unijnych programów gwarancji dla młodzieży poczyniono niewielkie postępy. Wystarczy wspomnieć, iż w całej Unii bezrobotnych jest ponad 4 miliony osób poniżej 25. roku życia. W niektórych państwach członkowskich bez pracy pozostaje aż jedna czwarta osób młodych.

W przypadku gwarancji dla młodzieży kontrolerzy Trybunału Obrachunkowego ustalili, że podstawowym źródłem niepowodzenia był brak strategii zawierających jasne cele pośrednie i końcowe. W wielu państwach członkowskich nawet nie została wystarczająco precyzyjnie określona grupa docelowa. Tym samym utrudnione było dotarcie do wszystkich osób potrzebujących oferty zatrudnienia, dalszego kształcenia lub praktyki zawodowej. Często też nie zbierano danych umożliwiających pomiar realizacji zgłoszonych rezultatów. Funkcjonowanie programów nie spełniło oczekiwań Komisji, ale przede wszystkim zawiodło osoby młode znajdujące się w trudnej sytuacji.

Konieczne jest więc wyciągnięcie wniosków z dotychczasowej praktyki i zastanowienie się nad tym, jak podnieść efektywność tych programów. Na pewno należy dokonać całościowego przeglądu kosztów związanych z gwarancjami dla młodzieży i dostosować programy do dostępnych środków finansowych. Ponadto Komisja powinna zadbać o to, aby państwa członkowskie uzasadniały, w jaki sposób finansowane przez Unię działania na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży będą odpowiadać na istniejące potrzeby. Zmiany te powinny zostać szybko dokonane, ponieważ nie możemy pozwolić sobie na zmarnowanie kolejnych lat.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Vaikka Euroopan unionin työttömyysaste on nyt alhaisimmillaan sitten vuoden 2008, pitkittynyt talouskriisi näkyy vielä liian monen nuoren elämässä ja tulevaisuuden mahdollisuuksissa. Paras vastaus nuorisotyöttömyyteen on osaaminen ja koulutus. Koulutus ehkäisee työttömyyttä tehokkaimmin. Kaikissa Euroopan unionin jäsenmaissa on edelleen parannettava sekä perusopetuksen laatua että jatkokoulutusmahdollisuuksia. Kyse on koko Euroopan kasvusta ja tulevaisuuden kilpailukykyä. Meillä on ratkottavana yhteisiä haasteita, kuten työvoiman ikääntyminen, ammattitaidon puutteet, teknologian kehitys ja globaali kilpailu. Lisääntynyt kansainvälinen kilpailu sekä digitalisaation ja robotisaation eteneminen tarkoittaa isoja muutoksia työelämässä. Koulutuksen on tarjottava jokaiselle nuorelle riittävä perusosaaminen ja valmiudet, mutta vähintään yhtä tärkeää on mahdollistaa osaamisen päivittäminen työuran aikana. On tärkeää, ettei yksikään nuori jää tyhjän päälle, vaan pääsee nopeasti kiinni oppimiseen tai työhön. Nuorisotakuun ja nuorisotyöttömyyden vähentämisen toteutumiseksi tarvitaan vielä monissa maissa järkevien koulutusjärjestelmien ja työmarkkinoiden uudistuksia. Jäsenmailta tarvitaan tehokkuutta nuorisotakuutoimissa ja niiden seurannassa. Investoiminen nuoriin ja koulutukseen on avain Euroopan parempaan tulevaisuuteen.

22. Ausführungen von einer Minute zu Fragen von politischer Bedeutung

President. – The next item is the one-minute speeches on matters of political importance (Rule 163). I would like to underline the word 'one', so please respect the time limit and I will try to be strict.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ostatni rok ujawnił skalę ingerencji służb Federacji Rosyjskiej w przebieg demokratycznych wyborów w wielu krajach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej. Ostatni przykład mieliśmy w ubiegłym tygodniu w Republice Czeskiej. Federacja Rosyjska wykorzystuje wielojęzyczne kanały telewizyjne, ośrodki analityczne, a także angażuje trolle i komputery zombie do prowadzenia dezinformacji i propagandy politycznej obliczonej na dyskredytowanie Unii Europejskiej, podważanie jej jedności i niszczenie współpracy między poszczególnymi krajami. Jednocześnie wspiera partie populistyczne i nacjonalistyczne. Moim zdaniem nie możemy pozostać obojętni wobec tej ukrytej agresji, która godzi w naszą wspólnotę, i dlatego chciałbym prosić Komisję o dokonanie gruntownej analizy tego zjawiska i zaproponowanie skutecznych narzędzi i sposobu przeciwdziałania tym niebezpiecznym praktykom Federacji Rosyjskiej.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, πρόσφατα συζητούσαμε για το μέλλον της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ο κύριος Juncker εξήγγειλε τη σύσταση Ευρωπαϊκής Εποπτικής Αρχής για τη συμμόρφωση των κρατών μελών γύρω από θέματα ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας και ιδιαίτερα την εφαρμογή δικαστικών αποφάσεων για να εξαλειφθεί το κοινωνικό ντάμπινγκ και πολύ σωστά το εξήγγειλε. Ωστόσο, εγώ, κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να εγείρω ένα τεράστιο θέμα που αφορά ευρωπαϊκές αποφάσεις, ευρωπαϊκών δικαστηρίων γύρω από θεμελιακά ζητήματα, όπως είναι η προστασία της ιδιωτικής περιουσίας, η οποία παραβιάζεται στο κατεχόμενο βόρειο μέρος της Κύπρου και ευρωπαίοι πολίτες, ανάμεσά τους και εγώ, δεν μπορούμε να απολαύσουμε την περιουσία μας, η οποία βρίσκεται σε έδαφος της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, εντός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά είναι υπό κατοχή των τουρκικών στρατευμάτων. Δεν θα έπρεπε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να προστατεύσει τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα των ευρωπαίων πολιτών στην Κύπρο;

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, σας μεταφέρω την κραυγή αγωνίας και διαμαρτυρίας των κατοίκων της Σάμου και των υπολοίπων νησιών του Αιγαίου που δεν αντέχουν πλέον άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Χθες, Κυριακή 21 Οκτωβρίου παραβρέθηκα στη Σάμο και μίλησα σε μια πολυπληθή συγκέντρωση των κατοίκων, οι οποίοι απαιτούν την αποσυμφόρηση του νησιού, την αποσυμφόρηση του «hotspot», όπου στοιβάζονται πάνω από 4.000 πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες, ενώ οι διαθέσιμες θέσεις φιλοξενίας στο «hotspot» δεν ξεπερνούν τις 800. Στη συγκέντρωση συμμετείχαν και αρκετοί από τους εγκλωβισμένους πρόσφυγες που ζητούν να πάνε σε άλλες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, είναι αναγκαία η λήψη μέτρων αποσυμφόρησης των νησιών του Αιγαίου. Να εφαρμοστεί η απόφαση του Συμβουλίου Επικρατείας για την προώθηση των παρανόμων μεταναστών. Τέλος, πρέπει να συνεχιστεί το πρόγραμμα μετεγκαταστάσεων από Ελλάδα σε άλλες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, δεδομένου ότι το προηγούμενο εκτελέστηκε μόνο κατά το 1/3. Είναι χαρακτηριστικό ότι, από τους 17.209 που έπρεπε να φύγουν από την Ελλάδα για τη Γερμανία, έχουν φύγει μόνο 4.447 άτομα...

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή.)

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, u tijeku je usvajanje paketa čiste energije u tijelima Europske unije, uključujući i Europski parlament. Mnoga su područja energetske politike u kojima se očekuju inovacije, i bez tih inovacija zapravo neće moći biti ni postignuti ciljevi koji su postavljeni u okviru te energetske politike. Ja bih samo želio ukazati na neke od tih područja kao što su, recimo, nova biogoriva, kao što su nove tehnike skladištenja energije, uključujući i baterije, i kao što su to novi materijali na području energetske učinkovitosti zgrada.

Ali, ono što želim posebno napomenuti i pozvati Komisiju da razvije posebne sektorske politike, na primjer na području transporta u okviru novih inovacija na području čiste energije, i još nešto što želim posebno naglasiti, a to je potreba da se ruralna područja ne izostave i da se ta šansa iskoristi s novim tehnologijama i da se smanji razvijenost na području sjeverne Europske unije.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, garantir o acesso da população a água potável e segura passa por agir face aos riscos e às ameaças de poluição das águas. Hoje, quero chamar a atenção da Comissão Europeia no sentido de abrir uma investigação independente sobre os resíduos perigosos que se estão a enterrar na antiga mina de Touro para determinar se estão a ser tratados corretamente e, assim, evitar a poluição das águas do rio Ulla e da ria de Arousa.

Fotos como estas mostram e fazem suspeitar que, possivelmente, os resíduos que se estão a enterrar nesta antiga mina não tenham o tratamento adequado. Por outro lado, quero chamar também a atenção para o perigo que o glifosato constitui para as águas e instar a Comissão Europeia a proibir definitivamente este herbicida.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente. Hoy hablo para expresar rechazo y estupefacción.

Rechazo. El Gobierno español conduce su campaña anticatalana por unos caminos que pueden coincidir con el delito de odio, no solo por denunciar y encarcelar a dirigentes sociales de trayectoria limpia, pacífica, ejemplar, sino por anunciar que va a eliminar completamente la autonomía de Cataluña.

El Gobierno puede estar en desacuerdo con el proyecto separatista, pero no puede, si es democrático, anular las decisiones de los ciudadanos catalanes que, democráticamente y por mayoría absoluta, han elegido a sus parlamentarios y a su Gobierno. Solo elimina la democracia quien se inspira en principios autoritarios y dictatoriales. Después de Franco, es la primera vez que ocurre en España.

Y estupefacción. ¿Cómo es posible que la democrática Europa apruebe métodos autoritarios en España cuando los denuncia acertadamente en otros países?

Soy diputado europeo y me avergüenza que mi Parlamento no se haya levantado aún decididamente frente a tanta indignidad. ¿Es eso diálogo? ¿Eso es lo que quiere Europa?

Yo estoy trabajando por una Europa distinta; la que veo ahora, cada día me gusta menos.

Ignazio Corrao (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io voglio denunciare in questa casa, in questa Aula dei cittadini europei, l'ennesima truffa nei confronti della democrazia che si sta verificando nel mio paese, in Italia.

In pratica, a pochi mesi dalle elezioni nazionali la maggioranza, che in Parlamento è stata eletta con una legge incostituzionale, sta cambiando le regole del gioco e lo sta facendo per tenere fuori l'unica forza di opposizione reale che c'è stata, ossia il Movimento 5 Stelle. Lo sta facendo utilizzando l'istituto della «fiducia», così come aveva fatto Benito Mussolini nel 1923 con la legge Acerbo, ossia la fiducia sulla legge elettorale.

Questo è un appello che faccio a voi, colleghi: è bene che se ne parli negli altri paesi, perché è una vergogna per la democrazia ed è qualcosa su cui chiediamo il vostro aiuto.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στην Ελλάδα, επτά χρόνια μετά και τρία μηνόμια ανεργίας, μείωσεων μισθών, συντάξεων, επιδομάτων, ελαστική απασχόληση, άγρια φοροληξία, η πλειοψηφία του λαού αδυνατεί να πληρώσει δάνεια και φόρους. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, το Διεθνές Νομισματικό Ταμείο και η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ στην αξιολόγηση του τρίτου μνημονίου συμφώνησαν για μια ακόμα κεφαλαιακή ενίσχυση των τραπεζών, ρευστοποιώντας τα κόκκινα δάνεια για να δοθούν νέα σε βιώσιμες, δηλαδή μεγάλες επιχειρήσεις, εξαφανίζοντας αυτοαπασχολούμενους και μικρές και πολύ μικρές επιχειρήσεις από την αγορά. Ήδη κατάσχονται χιλιάδες τραπεζικοί λογαριασμοί μισθοσυντηρητών, συνταξιούχων και αυτοαπασχολούμενων, επισπεύδονται χιλιάδες ηλεκτρονικοί πλέον πλειστηριασμοί λαϊκών κατοικιών ή η πώληση δανείων στα κοράκια των κερδοσκοπικών funds. Ουσιαστικά, καμιά προστασία δεν προβλέπεται ούτε καν για την πρώτη κατοικία, τον μισθό και τη σύνταξη. Η κλοπή της λαϊκής περιουσίας είναι τεράστια. Οι λαϊκές κινητοποιήσεις με

αίτημα «νομοθέτηση τώρα απαγόρευσης πλειστηριασμών της πρώτης κατοικίας, της κατάσχεσης μισθού και σύνταξης, διαγραφή τόκων και κούρεμα και πάγωμα δανείων» να δυναμώσουν με σύνθημα «κάτω τα χέρια από τα σπίτια και τον ιδρώτα του λαού».

Ivan Štefanec (PPE) – Vážený pán predseda. Denne cestujú tisíce našich občanov za prácou, vzdelaním, či turistikou do iných členských štátov. Mnoho z nich na to využíva leteckú prepravu. Títo občania musia mať za každých okolností istotu, že doletia bezpečne, načas a bez zbytočných výdavkov do svojho cieľa a naspäť. Nemôžeme akceptovať, aby letecké spoločnosti neinformovali o dlhodobom plánovanom rušení letov včas. Nemôžeme akceptovať, aby cestujúcim odmietali preplácať škody, ktoré im vlastnou vinou spôsobili. A nemôže akceptovať také situácie, že ľudia zostávajú zaseknutí na letisku v cudzej krajine, bez prostriedkov a bez informácií v ich rodnom jazyku.

Dámy a páni, pri dôraze na leteckú bezpečnosť a spoľahlivosť leteckej prepravy nám musí predovšetkým záležať na právach ľudí, ktorí ju používajú. Verím preto, že tak, ako tento týždeň budeme diskutovať o neakceptovateľnom zneužívaní postavenia veľkých spoločností voči menšej a lacnejšej konkurencii, budeme mať diskusiu veľmi skoro aj o výraznom zlepšení práv cestujúcich v leteckej doprave lebo naozaj je to... *(prerušené predsedačím z dôvodu uplynutia časového limitu)*

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Vážený pán predseda. Minulý týždeň sme si pripomenuli Svetový deň boja proti chudobe. Chcela by som v tejto súvislosti pripomenúť dva dôležité fakty.

Po prvé, stratégia Európa 2020 je v boji s chudobou neúčinná, tak ako kedysi Lisabonská stratégia. Čo je horšie, stále viac ľudí ohrozuje chudoba napriek tomu, že majú prácu.

Po druhé, prah chudoby je v každom členskom štáte iný. Vo Francúzsku alebo Nemecku sa za chudobného považuje človek s príjmom nižším ako tisíc euro mesačne. To je viac, ako mediánový príjem väčšiny občanov až v dvanástich členských štátoch.

Európa musí začať brať boj proti chudobe vážne. Príjmy takmer polovice jej občanov totiž nedosahujú ani hranicu chudoby v Nemecku a Francúzsku. Kým sa to nezmení, nikdy nad populistami nezvítazíme.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, hoy quiero trasladar aquí la grave situación de discriminación que sufre la región de Extremadura como consecuencia de la paralización de la línea de ferrocarril de alta capacidad y electrificada que se estaba planeando. Paralizar esta línea que une además Madrid con Lisboa con vistas al objetivo de mejorar el mercado único en el conjunto de la Unión es una mala decisión y espero que de ahora en adelante la Comisión y el conjunto de instituciones europeas ayuden a la puesta en marcha inmediata de esta línea central.

También querría, en relación con este asunto, destacar la necesidad de poner en marcha —para ello es necesaria la sensibilidad de la Comisión—, para Asturias, Galicia y Castilla y León, la conexión ferroviaria de los puertos marítimos de Vigo, La Coruña, Gijón y Avilés—, a fin de poder cerrar un bucle de comunicaciones en el conjunto del noroeste español. En los últimos años hemos hecho grandes avances en infraestructuras, pero necesitamos muchos más.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, my constituents are alarmed at the threat to Coleman's mustard factory after the announcement that Britvic, who share the same site, are closing their operations. Coleman's mustard is Norfolk through and through, and Norwich is where the jobs must stay. The 200-year-old larder staple is quintessentially East Anglian, made in Norwich with English mustard seeds from Norfolk, Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire, and it is enjoyed across the world. The decline of manufacturing jobs is not written in stone, and 10 000 people have already signed the EDP petition to say that we do not want to see much-needed jobs that are vital for the Norwich economy lost, and we do not want to see the 200-year Norwich and Coleman's link severed. So my message is clear: Norwich does not just have a fiery condiment: we have fiery campaigners too. So, Unilever, please come up with plans and reassurances that really cut the mustard.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Trzy miliony ludzi w Rumunii – to jest ogromna liczba jak na dwudziestomilionowy kraj – podpisało wniosek o przeprowadzenie referendum w obronie naturalnego ustroju rodziny opartego na małżeństwie i rodzicielstwie. To jest wspaniały przykład odradzania się społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, poczucia odpowiedzialności za dobro wspólne, odbudowy opinii chrześcijańskiej po dziesięcioleciach udręk komunizmu. Niestety ta wspaniała inicjatywa spotkała się z atakami również w tym parlamencie. Trudno w to uwierzyć, ale odezwały się głosy wzywające władze rumuńskie do przeszkodzenia w przeprowadzeniu tego referendum. To jest niestety kolejny bardzo groźny sygnał świadczący o narastaniu tego dryfu totalitarnego w naszych instytucjach, w strukturach władzy europejskiej. W tej sytuacji naszych rumuńskich przyjaciół trzeba zapewnić o jednym: nie jesteście sami, dobro zwycięży, jesteśmy z wami.

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, the ongoing elections in Kosovo and Macedonia and in the other Western Balkan countries clearly show that these countries are actually solving their serious problems in a serious way. Quite recently, we had the constitutional crisis in Macedonia and actually they solved it. On the other hand, we, the European Union, are not doing much more than talking. If you look at the money we are giving these countries you will find that the Member States that are receiving money are receiving EUR 3000 per capita. In the Western Balkans the best case figure is EUR 300, and in the worst case the figure is EUR 4 per capita, in Bosnia-Herzegovina. This is actually shameful. If we want enlargement, and if these countries are seriously doing something towards enlargement, then we have to play our part as well and increase that financial help.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, last week Ireland was hit by Storm Ophelia. Homes, farms, businesses roads, schools even sports stadiums fell victim to massive structural damage. Unfortunately, lives were also lost. Government politicians have been quick to call for applications to the European Solidarity Fund, although they are aware that the threshold has not been reached for this third consecutive catastrophic storm. One reason for this is that, in 2015, the threshold for Ireland to apply for Solidarity Funds was EUR 803 million. This year, however, the threshold is EUR 1.2 billion. The story is the same for the regional thresholds based on GDP: Irish regions have seen leaps of between EUR 58 million and EUR 333 million in the amount of damage they must incur to apply for funds between 2015 and 2017. This is a result of distorted GDP figures famously described as 'leprechaun economics', and we now need to cut out those figures. On the EU side, too, there is a need to review the Solidarity Fund, as it discriminates against rural and peripheral regions. It is harder for regions to meet the threshold if they have poorer infrastructure to begin with.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, every year 1.4 million Europeans develop some form of dementia, and the World Health Organisation estimates that 6.4 million people in the European Union are currently living with dementia, either the most common cause of dementia or Alzheimer's disease.

There is no cure to halt or treat the disease but there are treatments that delay progression or alleviate the symptoms. Emphasis is now being placed on the standard of care, ensuring dignity for those who have dementia, ascribing to a rights-based approach. There is also a gender dimension to dementia, with Alzheimer's disease mainly affecting women, and women play an important role in caring.

I think much more could, and should, be done at EU level to coordinate the research – into both care and prevention – that is being carried out at Member State level. We can improve diagnosis and post-diagnostic services if we foster dementia-friendly communities. I would suggest establishing an EU coordinator to ensure that this issue is addressed at the highest level, because a lot of information is not being shared across Member States.

Livia Járóka (PPE). – Nemcsak a fiatalok munkanélküliség kapcsán, hanem – ahogy Madame Záborská is már említette – a szegénység elleni küzdelem kapcsán is nagyon fontos, hogy előre tekintsünk a most, november 5. és 7. között Lisszabonban megrendezendő „Digitális summit”-ra, aminek kapcsán azért kértem szót, mert nagyon fontosnak tartom, hogy a fiatalok, és köztük is a legszegényebbek digitális tudásának mélyítésével hangsúlyosan javítsunk az integráción, a mely belső európai integráción.

Például Magyarországon a diákok 94%-ának van okostelefonja, és az EU megteremthetné, és már meg is teremtette 2019-ig, hogy a széles sávú, gyors internet még a legutolsó kis faluban is elérhető legyen, az utolsó gettókban is. Ideje, hogy az EU kifejlesszen olyan mobil alkalmazást, amelynek segítségével a legszegényebbek közül, a fiatalok közül igenis valós deszegregáció indulhat meg azzal, hogy a szolgáltatásokat ezekre a területekre visszük, mobil alkalmazások segítségével, a gyerekek kezébe. Nagyon fontos, hogy ne csak az oktatásban, hanem az egészségügyi megelőzésben is, a képzésekben, a munkahelyteremtésben játsszanak ezek szerepet a fiataloknál.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, it is an honour to speak for the first time in this Parliament as its newest Member, and in doing so let me first pay tribute to my predecessor, Glenis Willmott, who made a distinguished contribution to this Parliament, my Group and indeed my party.

I speak today on an issue that should unite this Parliament: the issue of mental health. This is our first plenary since World Mental Health Day and, as we see the impact of austerity bite, we see mental health services such as those in the UK stretched to breaking point. It is time for our Member States and their governments, and indeed this European Union, to redouble our efforts to improve that situation, to secure parity of esteem between mental health and physical health and to eradicate mental health stigma and discrimination.

Our job as parliamentarians is to be a voice for those who cannot be heard. On this issue, that task is more important than ever. Together, we can address this challenge and make sure those people who need a voice on this issue have many voices in this Parliament.

President. – Mr Palmer, welcome to this House. It is good to have you with us.

Catherine Stihler (S&D). – Mr President, as we live in an ever more deeply interconnected world, we rely more on online services. And it is not just our laptops or gadgets which are connected, it is public institutions, governments and our very own homes.

However we make sure we stay safe in this online realm, and that our personal or government data is not hacked into and our democratic processes are not tampered with, I believe the cybersecurity package presented by the Commission last month takes the right approach to ensure we have a concrete European response to potential cybersecurity threats.

International and operational cooperation amongst Member States is key, and can only be achieved by bridging the divides between the internal and external, the public and private and the civil and military that exist within our Member States and the EU. The creation of EU cybersecurity standards and certification frameworks will help businesses and citizens to understand when products are cybersecure and improve trust in digital services.

The interconnected world we live in is exhilarating, but it also poses potential challenges to every single one of us. I hope that this proposal will be debated thoroughly in this House.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, Hrvatska ispunjava svoje posljednje zadatke kako bi ušla u Schengensko područje. Koliko je to značajno za naše gospodarstvo pogotovo za turizam, podsjetit ću kako su u Istri na graničnim prijelazima u šestom mjesecu bile kilometarske kolone zato što Hrvatska nije članica Schengena. Zato pozivam Komisiju da učini sve, pa i nebirokratske mjere uz snažnu političku podršku da Hrvatska čim prije uđe u Schengensko područje, jer će to dodatno doprinijeti stabilizaciji stanja na zapadnom Balkanu.

Također, Hrvatska u ovom trenutku vrši prave ispravne pripreme za Eurozonu, za ulazak u Eurozonu, za proces ulaska u Eurozonu. I tu očekujem od Komisije snažnu podršku za našu zemlju, jer Hrvatska zaslužuje ući i u Schengensko područje i u Eurozonu. Učinite sve i političkim metodama da se taj problem čim prije razriješi za našu zemlju.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, de acordo com notícias vindas a público, a Comissão Europeia terá anunciado, na semana passada, a suspensão do terceiro pilar da União Bancária. Surpresa das surpresas, não terá havido consenso ao nível do Conselho relativamente a uma proposta que era já, ela própria, um recuo relativamente à tão propagandeada criação de um sistema comum de garantia de depósitos.

Era evidente, há muito tempo, que o Sistema de Garantia de Depósitos era a cenoura com que o pau da usurpação da soberania nacional, da centralização e da concentração bancária vinha acompanhado. Este é um desenvolvimento que não surpreende. Mesmo que o terceiro pilar tivesse avançado, isso não alteraria a natureza do projeto da União Bancária.

Mas aos que, ingenuamente, olharam para a cenoura e aos que deliberadamente com ela acenaram, aos que caucionaram o ataque às soberanias nacionais na supervisão e intervenção sobre os respetivos sistemas bancários, aos que assim defenderam a concentração monopolista à escala europeia, dizendo que o prémio de consolação seria aquilo que agora caiu por terra, impõe-se a pergunta: estão disponíveis para mudar de posição?

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, as eleições regionais venezuelanas, de 15 de outubro, cujo resultado Nicolas Maduro proclamou como uma vitória arrasadora, constituíram mais um triste episódio do longo processo de erosão da democracia naquele país.

Primeiro, assistimos a uma campanha eleitoral em que o oficialismo instrumentalizou vergonhosamente os meios de comunicação social públicos para favorecer os seus candidatos. Depois, após a votação, foram inúmeras as irregularidades denunciadas, incluindo mudanças de última hora e sem notificação pública de assembleias de voto ou ainda votos forçados em troca de alimentos.

O regime exige agora que os governantes eleitos prestem juramento perante a fraudulenta Assembleia Nacional Constituinte. Um ato eleitoral que deveria ter sido realizado no ano passado foi transformado, pelo PSUV, num plebiscito à sua ruínosa governação, que condicionará as eleições presidenciais de 2018.

Esta nova farsa e o preocupante impacto da crise humanitária devem fazer-nos aumentar a pressão contra o regime de Maduro e, por isso, repito que, face à gravidade desta crise política e humanitária, se torna urgente que a União adote medidas individuais e seletivas contra os seus responsáveis, incluindo pelos eventuais crimes contra a humanidade, segundo as palavras do Alto-Comissário para os Direitos Humanos da ONU.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Miközben az elmúlt időszakban a gyűlöletbeszéd elleni fellépés az online térben okoz komoly nehézségeket a hatóságoknak világszerte, Romániában a nyomtatott lapokban és az audiovizuális médiában váltak rendszeressé az országban élő magyar kisebbség elleni uszító üzenetek. Ezek a magyarokat becsmérlő, a tényeket semmibe vevő és az etnikai gyűlöletet feltüzelő üzenetek büntetlenül hangozhatnak el a román médiában, széles körben ismert televíziós műsorvezetők, újságírók vagy akár a tudományos élet ismert személyiségeinek szájából. A jelenség ma már a politikai életre is rányomja a bélyegét, gyakorlatilag megbénítva a többség és a kisebbség közötti – amúgy is akadozó és részleges – párbeszédet.

A társadalmi hatások egyértelműek, felmérések szerint a magyar kisebbség elutasíttasága növekedőben, a román politikai elit körében pedig senki sem emeli fel a szavát a jelenséggel szemben. Jövőre szeretné Románia fennállásának 100 éves évfordulóját ünnepelni, és ebben az országban száz éve élő másfél millió magyar felé azonban eddig csak kioktató vagy egyenesen ellenséges üzenetek érkeztek.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, Father Shay Cullen is an Irish priest working with vulnerable children in the Philippines since the early 1970s. In his experience, sex offenders travel from the European Union and beyond to the Philippines to abuse children, and he has many, many horrific cases which he is dealing with. He has called on my country, Ireland, and other countries in Europe to stop convicted child sex offenders traveling abroad, by taking their passports from them or preventing them from getting a passport. There is a precedent in this – Australia passed legislation in July to stop registered sex offenders from traveling by removing their passports.

We should heed the words of this priest – he knows what he is talking about. As we protect, or try to protect, our children in our own countries, the least we could do is afford the same level of protection to children elsewhere. Where we know a sex offender is convicted in our Member State, we should stop them traveling to do their evil deeds elsewhere.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, pesce spada con cadmio e metalli pesanti in eccesso, integratori e cibi dietetici con ingredienti e *novel food* non autorizzati, arachidi dalla Cina e peperoncini dall'India contaminati da aflatossine cancerogene, peperoni provenienti dalla Turchia con pesticidi oltre i limiti: questi sono solo alcuni dei prodotti più pericolosi per la salute elencati da Coldiretti, la maggiore associazione di rappresentanza dell'agricoltura in Italia.

I dati emergono da un dossier redatto sulla base dell'ultima relazione sul sistema di allerta rapido europeo, che registra gli allarmi per rischi alimentari verificatisi a causa di residui chimici, micotossine, metalli pesanti, inquinanti microbiologici, diossine, additivi e coloranti.

Occorrono maggiori garanzie per i consumatori europei, non possiamo affidarci unicamente al sistema di allerta europeo. L'Europa deve fare molto di più in termini di tracciabilità, etichettatura e trasparenza per impedire che prodotti potenzialmente pericolosi per la salute giungano sulle tavole di milioni di consumatori europei.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Domnule Președinte, dragi colegi, anul trecut, în 7 iulie, aici, la Strasbourg, lansam către dumneavoastră propunerea ca în condițiile post-Brexit să facem împreună un prim pas spre consolidarea unei Europe omogene, a celor 27, prin regândirea distribuției în teritoriu a instituțiilor Uniunii. La acel moment, v-am făcut cunoscută intenția mea de a declanșa și a susține relocarea de la Londra la București a Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente.

Azi vin în fața dumneavoastră și vă spun: colegii mei din guvernul României au pregătit una dintre cele mai bune oferte pentru relocarea EMA. Vă invit atât pe dumneavoastră, cât și pe factorii de decizie în chestiunea relocării EMA să priviți cu obiectivitate oferta României și, împreună, să ajungem la soluția corectă de relocare a agenției, al cărei loc poate fi la București. Relocarea în România a EMA ar putea fi primul semnal real privind coeziunea Uniunii Europene, dar și un semnal politic la fel de ferm în direcția combaterii ideii că membrii Uniunii Europene sunt egali doar pe hârtie. Relocarea EMA nu este doar un act administrativ generat de rezultatul Brexitului, ci este, în primul rând, o decizie cu o largă încărcătură politică, ale cărei consecințe se vor vedea ulterior.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, over the past months the level of violence across the Oromo and Ogaden regions of Ethiopia has hugely increased. Human rights groups continue to raise concerns over the use of excessive and unnecessary force by the state in response to peaceful protests. These developments take place after years of human rights violations by the state against Ogadeni, Somali and Oromo groups, including arrests and systemic violence against women, documented by the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation (UNPO). The recent outbreaks of cholera in the country have increased the uncertainty of the situation. I am ashamed that the European Union has not yet made a statement on this worrying situation. As Ethiopia's long-standing partner, the European Union should express its concern over the growing unrest and address the human rights abuses being perpetrated against minorities. Ethiopia is a crucial actor for security in East Africa. There must be a democratic and inclusive dialogue among groups in Ethiopia in order to de-escalate the tensions and bring about lasting peace and stability.

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, depuis 2010, ce qui devait être un plan de sauvetage de la Grèce s'est transformé en une succession de diktats économiques au nom du service d'une dette, dont on savait depuis le début qu'elle était insoutenable. Or, voici que nous apprenons que ces plans d'aide – aux conséquences catastrophiques pour le peuple grec – ont été l'occasion d'une lucrative opération pour la Banque centrale européenne, lui rapportant 7,8 milliards d'euros de dividendes et de rachat d'obligations à prix cassés.

Cette somme considérable doit être rendue sans condition au trésor grec, sans quoi les opérations de la Banque centrale ne sauraient être autre chose que de la spéculation et un instrument de punition collective.

D'autre part, la Grèce étant sortie depuis septembre de la procédure de déficit excessif, il est grand temps que l'Euro-groupe tienne ses engagements de novembre 2012 en matière de restructuration de la dette grecque. Ceci est une nécessité. Il faut rendre l'argent aux Grecs!

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente. La de hoy es la séptima noche de Jordi Sánchez y Jordi Cuixart en la cárcel: siete días y siete noches privados de su libertad, acusados de algo que no han hecho. Prisioneros políticos en plena Unión Europea del siglo XXI, porque no están en la cárcel por lo que han hecho, sino por lo que representan y lo que piensan y, mientras tanto, ilustres corruptos campan a sus anchas.

Si la verdad y la justicia importaran, estarían libres. Pero, ¿cómo va a importar la verdad si hasta el ministro español de Asuntos Exteriores afirma, con toda la desfachatez del mundo, que muchas de las imágenes de la violencia policial del 1 de octubre son falsas? Lo único que les importa es castigar a un país que ha osado votar, que ha osado ejercer el derecho a la autodeterminación a pesar de los porrazos. Y si para castigar tienen que poner en peligro la democracia y modelar a su antojo el Estado de Derecho, ningún problema: lo hacen tranquilamente, amparados como están por su nacionalismo de Estado.

Y a Europa, ¿le importa la verdad? ¿Le importan los derechos fundamentales o solo le importan en países lejanos y situaciones distantes?

(El Presidente retira la palabra al orador)

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ στην Ελλάδα, όσο και αν προκλητικά επιχείρησε να εμφανίσει την κυβέρνηση Τσιπρ από λύκο σε πρόβατο, ανέλαβε μεγάλες και επικίνδυνες δεσμεύσεις με την επίσκεψη Τσίπρα στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες. Χρονική επέκταση και αναβάθμιση της Σούδας και άλλων βάσεων, ώστε να υπηρετήσουν πιο αποτελεσματικά τα ιμπεριαλιστικά σχέδια, εξοπλισμοί 2,4 δισεκατομμυρίων για νατοϊκές ανάγκες, ενώ κανένας δεν μπορεί να εφυσυχάζει από τις κυβερνητικές δηλώσεις για τα πυρηνικά. Η προώθηση των συμφερόντων των μονοπωλίων των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών με επενδύσεις πατάει στα αποκαΐδια των εργατικών λαϊκών δικαιωμάτων. Η γεωστρατηγική αναβάθμιση των συμφερόντων της ελληνικής αστικής τάξης που χαιρετίζουν κυβέρνηση και όλα τα αστικά κόμματα εδραιώνει σε βάρος του λαού την Ελλάδα ως ορμητήριο ιμπεριαλιστικών επεμβάσεων και πολέμων. Ανάγκη αποτελεί να ενταθεί η καθημερινή λαϊκή πάλη για να καταδικαστούν οι νέες, ακόμα πιο επικίνδυνες συμφωνίες της κυβέρνησης ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες σε ρήξη με την εξουσία του κεφαλαίου και με τους ιμπεριαλιστικούς οργανισμούς, όπως το NATO και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

President. – Colleagues, the list has been completed. That concludes the item.

23. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

24. Schluss der Sitzung

(The sitting closed at 22.04)

—

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



C/2024/3018

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 24. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3018)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 23. bis 26. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	4
2. Schlussfolgerungen der Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom 19./20. Oktober 2017 und Vorstellung der Agenda der Staats- und Regierungschefs (Unsere Zukunft gemeinsam gestalten) (Aussprache)	4
3. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	37
4. Erklärung der Präsidentschaft	37
5. Abstimmungsstunde	38
5.1. Europa-Mittelmeer-Luftverkehrsabkommen EU-Marokko (A8-0303/2017 - Dominique Riquet) (Abstimmung)	38
5.2. Ermächtigung Frankreichs, auf in Guadeloupe, Französisch-Guayana, Martinique und Réunion hergestellten „traditionellen“ Rum ermäßigte Sätze bestimmter indirekter Steuern anzuwenden (A8-0304/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova) (Abstimmung)	39
5.3. Gemeinsames Unternehmen für biobasierte Industriezweige: Finanzbeiträge (A8-0293/2017 - Miroslav Poche) (Abstimmung)	39
5.4. Kontrollmaßnahmen für Furanylfentanyl (A8-0309/2017 - Michał Boni) (Abstimmung)	39
5.5. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (A8-0296/2017 - Derek Vaughan) (Abstimmung)	39
5.6. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels (A8-0317/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (Abstimmung)	39
5.7. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (A8-0270/2017 - Mihai Țurcanu) (Abstimmung)	39

Inhalt	Seite
5.8. Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen (A8-0359/2016 - Michał Boni) (Abstimmung)	39
5.9. Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik: Umsetzung der Anlandeverpflichtung (A8-0285/2017 - Alain Cadec) (Abstimmung)	39
5.10. Erneuerung der Genehmigung des Wirkstoffs Glyphosat (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0567/2017) (Fortsetzung)	39
5.11. Zulassung der genetisch veränderten Maissorte 1507 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0568/2017)	39
5.12. Zulassung genetisch veränderter Sojabohnen der Sorte 305423 x 40-3-2 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0570/2017) (Abstimmung)	39
5.13. Zulassung der genetisch veränderten Rapssorte MON 88302 x Ms8 x Rf3 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0569/2017) (Abstimmung)	40
5.14. Entwurf des Berichtigungshaushaltsplans Nr. 5/2017: Finanzierung des Europäischen Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung und Aufstockung der Soforthilfereserve (A8-0301/2017 - Jens Geier) (Abstimmung)	40
5.15. Inanspruchnahme des Flexibilitätsinstruments zur Bereitstellung der Finanzmittel für den Europäischen Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung (A8-0298/2017 - Jens Geier) (Abstimmung) . .	40
5.16. Reflexionspapier über die Zukunft der EU-Finanzen (B8-0565/2017) (Abstimmung)	40
5.17. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz interner Hinweisgeber, die im öffentlichen Interesse handeln (A8-0295/2017 - Virginie Rozière) (Abstimmung)	40
5.18. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (A8-0292/2017 - Laura Agea) (Abstimmung)	40
6. Stimmerkklärungen	40
6.1. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (A8-0296/2017 - Derek Vaughan)	40
6.2. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels (A8-0317/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)	42
6.3. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (A8-0270/2017 - Mihai Țurcanu)	43
6.4. Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen (A8-0359/2016 - Michał Boni)	45
6.5. Reflexionspapier über die Zukunft der EU-Finanzen (B8-0565/2017)	45
6.6. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz interner Hinweisgeber, die im öffentlichen Interesse handeln (A8-0295/2017 - Virginie Rozière)	46
6.7. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (A8-0292/2017 - Laura Agea)	47
7. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	49
8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	49

Inhalt	Seite
9. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	50
10. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll	50
11. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse: siehe Protokoll	50
12. Arbeitsprogramm der Kommission für 2018 (Aussprache)	50
13. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (Aussprache)	67
14. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll	92
15. Entlastung 2015: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Europäischer Rat und Rat (Aussprache)	92
16. Schutz von Journalisten und Verteidigung der Medienfreiheit in Malta: der Fall Daphne Caruana Galizia (Aussprache)	97
17. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (Aussprache)	108
18. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (Aussprache)	120
19. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	129
20. Schluss der Sitzung	129

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 24. OKTOBER 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.04)

2. Schlussfolgerungen der Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom 19./20. Oktober 2017 und Vorstellung der Agenda der Staats- und Regierungschefs (Unsere Zukunft gemeinsam gestalten) (Aussprache)

Presidente. – Il primo punto all'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio europeo e della Commissione sulle conclusioni della riunione del Consiglio europeo del 19 e 20 ottobre 2017 e la presentazione dell'agenda dei leader «Costruire insieme il nostro futuro» (2017/2745(RSP)).

Dopo le proposte del Parlamento europeo, che troverete nei vostri uffici in un riassunto, abbiamo ascoltato il discorso del Presidente della Commissione europea Jean-Claude Juncker sulle proposte della Commissione, e oggi ascolteremo il Presidente del Consiglio europeo in questo emiciclo, che vuole continuare a essere il luogo del dibattito sul futuro dell'Unione europea. Ecco perché, in occasione dell'ultima riunione del Consiglio europeo, ho invitato i capi di governo a partecipare a una serie di incontri in questo Parlamento con i rappresentanti dei cittadini europei.

Però, nel momento in cui in Europa si verificano cose che offendono la nostra sensibilità, io vorrei ricordare a tutti che non possiamo parlare del futuro della nostra Unione, del futuro dell'Eurozona, del futuro delle nostre Istituzioni, del futuro dei nostri cittadini, se non abbiamo la forza e la volontà di difendere i valori fondanti della nostra Unione. Si sta insieme, si è parte di una comunità se si condividono i valori, questo lo dobbiamo sempre ricordare.

E non posso quest'oggi non condannare fermamente ciò che è accaduto a Roma, in Italia, dove un gruppo di *hooligan* ha utilizzato l'immagine di Anna Frank per offendere tifosi di un'altra società sportiva. Utilizzare l'immagine di Anna Frank come un'offesa nei confronti di altri è un fatto molto grave.

Ognuno, nella nostra Unione, ha il diritto di essere praticante della propria religione. Le comunità ebraiche fanno parte della nostra Unione europea; io sono fiero di avere concittadini europei di religione ebraica e credo che l'antisemitismo debba restare soltanto un'orribile esperienza del nostro passato, un'orribile esperienza del secolo che si è concluso.

Donald Tusk, President of the European Council. – Mr President, as you know, I am obsessed by unity. This obsession was with me during the last European Council, but in fact it has been with me since the first days of my work in Brussels.

This is why I rejected the idea of removing Greece from the eurozone in 2015. And it is also why I pursued a common position of the EU vis-à-vis Russia during the conflict in Ukraine. For many months I was building agreement among the 27 in order to give Prime Minister Cameron arguments to stay in the EU, even though this meant that each of the 27 had to make a sacrifice. Unfortunately, this was not enough for the Brits. After Brexit, I worked towards creating unity of the 27 in the negotiations with the United Kingdom. We have shown also during the last European Council that no one can divide the 27 in these negotiations.

Striving for unity is also the main reason for creating the Leaders' Agenda. Last Friday, all the leaders agreed that the priority for them is unity among the 27. This was voiced in unison. On this most important issue to me, we reached full understanding right from the start. The Leaders' Agenda invalidated a dangerous assumption that together we can only stand still, and that we can only move forward when we divide. It is about reconciling dynamism and unity. About being ambitious and staying together at the same time. This, of course, does not rule out enhanced cooperation as the last resort, open to all, and in accordance with the Treaties.

My intention is to build on what connects, not on what divides. But it does not mean that we should not stand up with courage to the issues that are – or could be – divisive so that we can find common solutions to them. I will just mention migration, the EMU and Brexit.

When it comes to the migration crisis, I appealed from the very beginning to build Europe's response on what connects us: on the protection of our external borders. I did so being aware that there are also ideas that put Member States in a permanent conflict.

One such question is relocation: precisely speaking, the mandatory quotas. On this issue, consensus is as unlikely today as it was many months ago. But I do see a real chance of full agreement by June on matters like protecting external borders; decisive support for front-line countries (Italy, Greece, Spain and Bulgaria); strategy vis-à-vis Africa and adequate support for international organisations helping refugees and migrants – UNHCR, IOM and the World Food Programme; European management over return and readmission policy; and most of the elements of the Dublin reform. If on these matters we are really effective, we will be close to a lasting solution to the migration crisis.

As regards EMU reform, following the publication of the Five Presidents' Report no one should have any doubts what we need to do: everything is crystal clear. The problem is Member States' conflicting interests. One of the first effects of the Leaders' Agenda is the agreement to find potential solutions in the nearest possible future, despite these differences. I will do everything in my power to take the first very concrete steps by June towards establishing the European Monetary Fund and strengthening the stability of the Banking Union.

I still believe that this is possible. In June it will become clear if I am an incurable optimist. But one thing I can promise you today: if we do not reach agreement by June, I will say precisely why it was not possible, and who is responsible.

As for the Brexit negotiations, we have managed to build and maintain unity among the 27, but ahead of us is still the toughest stress test. If we fail it, the negotiations will end in our defeat. We must keep our unity, regardless of the direction of the talks. The EU will be able to rise to every scenario as long as we are not divided. It is in fact up to London how this will end: with a good deal, no deal or No Brexit. But in each of these scenarios we will protect our common interest only by being together.

We continue to look for the best way towards a Europe that is united, solidary and sovereign. Our quest must be accompanied by a constant and profound reflection on the essence of our community. I would like to say a few words on three of its dimensions.

First of all, we are a territorial community, which means that we have a common territory and common external borders. Our duty is to protect them. The migration crisis has made us aware, with full force, of the need to rebuild effective control of our external borders, while the aggressive behaviour of certain third countries, and the destabilisation around Europe, has made us aware of the need to defend our territory. For this reason, we want to launch Permanent Structured Cooperation on Defence, the so-called PESCO, by the end of this year. In order to protect our external borders, we must build a model of durable and efficient financing on a bigger scale than ever before. It should become a part of our discussions on the future MFF.

Secondly, we are a cultural community, which does not mean that we are better or worse – we are simply different from the outside world. Our openness and tolerance cannot mean walking away from protecting our heritage. We have the right and obligation to care for what distinguishes us from other cultures – not in order to be against someone, but to be ourselves. Without a feeling of superiority, but with a feeling of justified pride. I remember a great hashtag by one of your leaders, which said: 'I am European and I am proud'. This is why the first point on the Leaders' Agenda for our meeting in Gothenburg in November is culture and education.

Thirdly, we are a political community. It is high time we renewed our vows in the name of our political values enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union. Let me quote: 'The EU is founded on the values of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.' These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail.

I would like to remind all those in power, all the Member States, that by signing the Treaty you have also signed this article. So either you respect it, or you clearly say you reject it, with all the consequences of this fact.

Finally, I would like to refer to an issue it would be hard to avoid, being here in Strasbourg: the future composition of the European Parliament. For this topic, I have planned a special European Council in February next year. As you know, we must deal with this matter because of Brexit and because of the changing demography. I take all the proposals that have surfaced in this debate seriously; they are all interesting and pro-European ideas. I, personally, believe that the most natural solution would be to adopt a simple rule: fewer countries, fewer mandates. It is not only pragmatic and logical, but also what is expected by public opinion. Of course, such a solution in no way invalidates the idea of transnational lists. I am aware that this will be our common decision, since Parliament will be proposing and co-deciding on this matter. This is why I would like you to take such a possibility into account.

When I was here in March this year, you may remember that I recalled a proverb: 'If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together'. Today I feel we have a real chance to go together, far and faster.

(Applause)

Jean-Claude Juncker, *Président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, mon intervention sera brève parce que, à part quelques nuances peu importantes, je partage entièrement les points de vue qui ont été exposés par le président Tusk et je n'ai pas envie de paraphraser ce qu'il vient de dire, puisque je suis largement d'accord.

Je voudrais tout d'abord rappeler, dans un esprit de solidarité, la tragédie que le Portugal et que l'Espagne viennent de vivre. Ces feux terribles nous ont tous choqués, interpellés. Tel fut le cas également pour les pluies torrentielles qui ont frappé, il y a quelques mois, les trois pays baltes. La solidarité est une vertu clé de notre Union, et lorsque l'un d'entre nous se trouve confronté à des difficultés, il est évident, nécessaire, élémentaire, que l'Union européenne vienne en aide à celui qui souffre.

C'est la raison pour laquelle j'ai chargé le commissaire Stylianides de réfléchir d'ici un mois – en fait, avant la fin de l'année – au remodelage, à la réarticulation de nos mécanismes de protection civile, qui ne fonctionnent pas à 100 %. Il n'est pas normal que, lorsqu'un feu se déclenche un dimanche matin au Portugal, nous devions attendre le mercredi soir pour voir arriver à l'aide le premier avion européen. Il faut accélérer le processus.

D'ici là, nous allons déclencher, en vérifiant s'ils sont applicables, tous les mécanismes du Fonds de solidarité européen pour le Portugal, l'Espagne et les trois pays baltes.

Je ne développerai pas devant vous les propositions que la Commission a faites en matière de politique migratoire et de marché intérieur numérique. Toutes les propositions que la Commission a élaborées sont sur la table du Parlement et du Conseil et je voudrais vous inviter à accélérer les travaux, notamment pour ce qui est du régime d'asile commun. Nous perdons du temps et il est urgent que nous nous mettions d'accord sur l'ensemble de ces propositions. Je voudrais rendre hommage à la commission LIBE de votre Parlement, qui a pris, il y a une semaine, les bonnes décisions et je vous en félicite.

Nous avons parlé de l'Afrique. Nous parlons toujours de l'Afrique, et j'invite, à intervalles réguliers, les membres du Conseil, c'est-à-dire les États membres, à faire correspondre leurs actes à leurs paroles. Nous avons mis en place un Fonds fiduciaire d'urgence pour l'Afrique, doté de 1,8 milliard d'euros, avec l'espoir – je dois dire aujourd'hui naïf – de voir les États membres faire exactement le même effort. Ils ne l'ont pas fait, ce qui a pour conséquence que la Commission a dû augmenter sa part contributive à 2,9 milliards, à financer sur le budget européen.

Les États membres ont fait à ce jour l'effort considérable de mettre à la disposition de ce fonds 175 millions d'euros. C'est scandaleux. Parler de l'Afrique les larmes aux yeux, et ne pas faire ce à quoi on s'est engagé, c'est inacceptable.

(Applaudissements)

Pour ce qui est de l'Europe numérique, la Commission a proposé 43 initiatives, dont 24 de nature législative. À ce jour, le Conseil et le Parlement ont adopté six directives. Ce n'est pas, à vrai dire, ultra-impressionnant et donc il faudra – puisque tout le monde parle du numérique – faire en sorte que les choses avancent.

Même remarque pour tout ce qui relève des réseaux à haut débit et des réseaux fixes. Nous voudrions, pour ce qui est de la 5G, que nous accélérions les travaux qui nous permettront, d'ici 2020, de mettre à la disposition des opérateurs économiques des bandes du spectre radioélectrique. Ces décisions doivent être prises le plus rapidement possible.

Évidemment, nous avons évoqué entre nous la politique commerciale, à l'initiative de certains d'entre nous, dont notamment le président Macron. J'ai rappelé, à l'intention des membres du Conseil européen, que la Commission persiste à croire qu'il est nécessaire et urgent de conclure les accords commerciaux avec les pays du Mercosur. C'est un vaste ensemble économique. Ce sera le plus important accord commercial que l'Union européenne aura conclu jusqu'à ce jour.

Mais nous insistons sur la nécessité qu'il y a de mettre en place des mécanismes de réciprocité, qui vont prouver aux Européens et aux autres qui nous observent que l'Europe est ouverte, mais que l'Europe n'est pas offerte, et, par conséquent, il faut insister davantage sur les éléments qui reflètent la volonté de mettre en place des régimes réiproques.

Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! In wenigen Wochen werden wir uns in Göteborg treffen, um unter anderem und vornehmlich über Sozialpolitik zu reden.

Im November 2017 machen wir etwas, was wir uns im November 1997 vorgenommen hatten. Im November 1997 fand der erste Beschäftigungsgipfel der Europäischen Union statt. Ich bin wahrscheinlich der einzige, der sich daran erinnert, weil ich im Vorsitz war.

In den Schlussfolgerungen steht, dass einmal pro Jahr ein Sondergipfel zu Fragen der Beschäftigungspolitik stattfinden soll. Er findet jetzt 2017-20 Jahre später – statt. Ich kann mich über die Emsigkeit in Sachen Sozialpolitik nur wundern. Aber gut ist, dass dieser Gipfel stattfindet, und wir müssen dafür sorgen, dass die soziale Dimension Europas nicht ein frommer Spruch bleibt, sondern dass wir die sozialen Absichten – die es gibt – auch mit Inhalt füllen.

(Beifall)

In dem Sinne bin ich froh, zufrieden, fast glücklich darüber, dass es uns gestern im Rat gelungen ist, uns auf die Entsenderichtlinie zu verständigen. Nicht alles ist bei dem gefundenen Kompromiss perfekt, aber dass es überhaupt möglich war – auch mit Hilfe des Europäischen Parlaments, auch auf Druck des Europäischen Parlaments –, in Sachen Entsenderichtlinie zu Fortschritten zu kommen verdient Lob und Zustimmung.

Dass die Sozialminister sich gestern auch inhaltlich, von der Sache her und von der Form her auf den europäischen Sozialpfeiler, den die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, haben einigen können, ist auch eine gute Nachricht.

In Sachen Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion wird die Kommission am 6. Dezember ihre Endvorschläge vorlegen. Wir werden in Vorbereitung des Dezember-Gipfels hier im Hause über die Vorschläge der Kommission in Sachen Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion zu reden haben.

Heute nimmt die Kommission ihr Arbeitsprogramm für nächstes Jahr an. Dieses Arbeitsprogramm soll dazu führen, dass Europa einiger, stärker und demokratischer wird. Herr Vizepräsident Timmermans wird Ihnen, wenn ich richtig informiert bin, heute Nachmittag im Plenum das Programm der Europäischen Kommission vorstellen.

What should I say about Brexit? I would like to say that the Commission is not negotiating in a hostile mood. We want a deal. Those who don't want a deal, the «no dealers», have no friends in the Commission. We want a fair deal with Britain and we will have a fair deal with Britain. «No deal» is not our working assumption.

Le Président. – Monsieur le Président de la Commission européenne, en ce qui concerne le Portugal et l'Espagne, le Parlement partage votre position et la position de la Commission. Je souhaite vous informer que, hier, j'ai annoncé en plénière que, vous, le Président du Conseil et moi-même avons décidé de donner l'argent du prix Princesse des Asturies aux Portugais et aux Espagnols victimes de la tragédie qui a frappé ces deux pays il y a une semaine.

Manfred Weber, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, first of all, the European Council discussed the right priorities. First, about Brexit. We have unity, thanks to the engagement of all the leading figures and personalities. We underlined that there is not sufficient progress. We clarified that there is no cherry-picking possible. You are preparing a scenario for leaving without an agreement. I think that is a good step, and the business community – that is what we see from the London side – is getting more and more nervous, and the Brexiteers have no common plan for the future of their country, and especially the relationship towards the European Union. That is the outcome, and I look to what happens in the Council and we look to what happens in London. One thing is, additionally, clear for us as the European People's Party (EPP): if we are discussing about the treaty, the contents of which will, finally, be asked for in this House, then we are ready for a kind of a transitional period. But I have now to clarify that we cannot accept that a country outside the European Union will have the same conditions and the same status as a country inside the European Union, so there must be a difference. That is Brexit.

The second thing is about innovation. I thank Donald Tusk for this priority : that is our future, it is needed. Combine resources, strengthen our budget: that is what we need, and we need clear projects. One of these projects is Defence Union – this was also a discussion. The EPP is strongly in favour. We have a momentum on the table to go forward with our Defence Union. One aspect is important for us. On the one hand, that we discuss about funds, about better financing of our defence structure, but I think towards the people we also need visibility about what we are doing there. I can give you one concrete example which we are discussing in the EPP Group. There is a new threat about cybersecurity which is on the table. We think that small/medium countries and even the bigger countries in the European Union cannot defend themselves alone anymore in this globalised cyberworld. That means for us: let's combine our forces, let's really establish a European cyber-defence brigade where we have this at European level, and let's make it visible with officials and soldiers who have on their uniforms the European flag, to make people aware that Europe together can defend our cyber infrastructure.

Ein anderer Punkt war die Diskussion über die Türkei. Wir begrüßen als EVP-Fraktion die Kürzung der Beitrittsbeihilfen. Wir müssen gezielt deutlich machen, dass uns die Entwicklung in der Türkei beunruhigt und besorgt. Wir werden das im Europäischen Parlament beim Budget diese Woche auch tun: die Beitrittsbeihilfen kürzen. Insofern gehen wir doch Hand in Hand in die gleiche Richtung. Und natürlich müssen wir über einen gezielten Mitteleinsatz reden. Deswegen: Ein Bekenntnis zu den Mitteln für die Flüchtlinge ist auch notwendig.

Wir brauchen aber auch mehr Klarheit in den Beziehungen zur Türkei. Und da muss uns bewusst sein, dass wir eine Partnerschaft brauchen, aber die Vollmitgliedschaft kann kein weiteres Ziel sein, so wie es dieses Plenum mehrfach zum Ausdruck gebracht hat. Ich war überrascht, dass der türkische Staatspräsident vor Kurzem in Warschau war und dort die polnische Regierung, die sich ja so damit profiliert, gegen den Zuzug von Moslems aufzutreten, und stark gegen Islam und den Zuzug von Moslems polemisiert, der Meinung war, dass die Türkei aber Vollmitglied der Europäischen Union werden muss. Das hat ja zur Konsequenz, dass dann 80 Millionen türkische Staatsbürger die Freizügigkeit in der Europäischen Union bekommen – das heißt, sie dürfen sich frei ihren Wohnort in ganz Europa aussuchen. Aus meiner Sicht passt das nur schwer zusammen. Das darf man schon ansprechen.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir haben die Prioritäten auf dem Tisch liegen. Aber wir alle wissen, dass wir zu langsam sind im Umsetzen – das wurde besprochen. Ich möchte nur einen Punkt herausgreifen. Neben dem Afrikathema, das Jean-Claude Juncker dankenswerterweise sehr deutlich angesprochen hat, möchte ich einen zweiten Punkt herausgreifen. Wir haben bei uns nachzählen lassen: Es ist mittlerweile in der zwanzigsten Beschlussfassung des Europäischen Rates fixiert worden – zum zwanzigsten Mal! –, dass man einen engeren und stärkeren europäischen Grenzschutz aufbauen will. Zum zwanzigsten Mal ist das beschlossen worden! Und was haben wir erreicht? 1 500 Beamte! Ich habe das mal umrechnen lassen: Wenn man eine solche Distanz an der Grenze von Straßburg in Frankreich nach Brüssel hätte, dann würde alle 33 Kilometer ein Beamter stehen. Alle 33 Kilometer würde ein Grenzschutzbeamter stehen, mit dem, was wir heute aufgebaut haben. Und deswegen: Es wird geredet, aber leider Gottes viel zu wenig gehandelt.

Deswegen müssen wir die nächsten Monate nutzen, so wie unser Kommissionspräsident uns zu Recht ermutigt, jetzt zu liefern, jetzt Antworten zu geben. Und, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir haben ein Momentum auf dem Tisch liegen, dass die Menschen in Europa sehen – auch die Umfragezahlen zeigen, dass die Menschen das sehen –, wie wertvoll diese Gemeinschaft ist. Die Katalanen und auch die Briten zeigen uns, dass es ein Risiko ist, diese Europäische Union in Frage zu stellen. Deswegen müssen wir dieses positive Momentum zur Weiterentwicklung Europas jetzt nutzen. Und weil heute – das darf ich so sagen – auch der Deutsche Bundestag seine Konstituierung durchführt, möchte ich auch Richtung Berlin appellieren, dass die neue Bundesregierung in Berlin diesen positiven Mut aufnimmt, dieses positive Momentum aufnimmt, dass Europa in eine gute Zukunft geht.

(Beifall)

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Consiglio ha preso atto dello stallo sulla Brexit. Ha detto bene il Presidente Juncker: noi siamo favorevoli a un accordo, ma lo stallo è determinato dall'impreparazione del governo britannico.

Tuttavia il distacco del Regno Unito non è l'unica frattura che sta toccando l'Unione europea. Abbiamo altre fratture: dalla Catalogna fino al Nord Italia, ci sono forze al lavoro che fomentano le divisioni all'interno della nostra Europa. Si fa strada una sorta di egoismo dei ricchi, da una parte, una sindrome di Robin Hood alla rovescia, che vuole togliere alle regioni più povere per dare a quelle più ricche, e non mi stupisco che ci sia di mezzo la questione fiscale. Non c'è nulla di male a volere più autonomia – io sono un federalista, sono per un'Europa federale, quindi voglio maggiore autonomia – ma non a scapito della solidarietà. Ridistribuire risorse dalle regioni ricche a quelle più povere non è un atto di beneficenza, ma è il fondamento del patto di cittadinanza.

L'Europa rischia poi un'altra forma di secessione, più silenziosa e più drammatica: la secessione degli ultimi, il distacco di chi non ce la fa più. I dimenticati della globalizzazione si stanno ribellando contro l'ordine costituito negli ultimi vent'anni. E il paradosso – dobbiamo stare attenti a questo – è che a cavalcare l'onda di questa rivolta degli ultimi è proprio chi ha approfittato del sistema di questi anni: spesso sono i miliardari, i plurimiliardari, che danno voce alla rabbia degli ultimi. Crescono anche in Europa tanti piccoli Trump, come abbiamo visto nelle elezioni recenti in Repubblica ceca. Se non vogliamo un'Europa «trumpizzata», divisa e indebolita, bisogna agire da subito per sanare questa doppia frattura, territoriale e sociale.

Il Presidente Tusk ha presentato la sua proposta per una nuova agenda per il Consiglio europeo: più riunioni, un lavoro più efficiente e più efficace... benissimo, ma bisogna concentrarsi non solo sul metodo, ma sull'efficacia dei risultati. Il nostro Parlamento ha dato buona prova di sé: ha approvato la revisione delle regole di Dublino sulla richiesta di asilo – è un grande passo in avanti del Parlamento europeo, fatto insieme, un passo storico – e ha approvato la revisione della direttiva sui lavoratori distaccati, anche questo un grande passo in avanti del Parlamento europeo.

Quindi noi, come istituzione eletta democraticamente dai cittadini, stiamo rispondendo a domande precise che ci fanno i nostri cittadini su due temi fondamentali, e vogliamo che si proceda e si finalizino questi dossier con un accordo con il Consiglio. E vogliamo dare sostanza al pilastro sociale, che ha richiamato il Presidente Juncker. Dopo vent'anni si è fatto un Consiglio, ora non facciamo del pilastro sociale uno slogan, perché di slogan i cittadini ne hanno piene le tasche e le orecchie, hanno bisogno di misure concrete. Il distacco del lavoratore è una misura concreta, ma se diamo una risposta anche ai giovani disoccupati, se diamo una risposta agli emarginati, a chi non ha una casa, a chi è cacciato fuori dal progresso tecnologico e deve essere protetto dagli effetti della globalizzazione, allora riempiamo quella parola magica – «pilastro sociale» – di contenuti concreti.

Infine, un'affettuosa raccomandazione al Consiglio: sia zelante su queste cose e si interessi di meno su come deve essere composto il Parlamento europeo. Sarebbe ben strano che il Parlamento europeo dicesse al Consiglio come questo deve essere formato; non accettiamo che il Consiglio ci dica come dovrà essere il Parlamento europeo nel 2019.

Syed Kamall, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Gianni, I admire your idealism when you speak, and it is important that we all tackle poverty but I prefer community-led solutions rather than top-down. Let me just correct you on one of the myths that you highlighted, which is about Robin Hood's motivations. Let us remember that Robin Hood stole money from the tax collector to give the money back to taxpayers. Let us remember that when we are looking at the Robin Hood story.

Last week's Council meeting highlighted one simple fact: that the EU is sometimes in danger of allowing idealism to get the better of pragmatism. This is certainly true when looking at the European Council's and Parliament's positions on the migration package and negotiations with the UK.

The European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR) welcomes much of the Council's current strategy in tackling the migration crisis, closing trafficking routes across the Mediterranean, strengthening cooperation with international partners, returning unsuccessful applicants and strengthening the role of Frontex.

Two years ago the ECR published these papers that called for exactly these kinds of sensible measures. Maybe if they had been introduced at the time, then maybe there would be more confidence in our migration and asylum system today.

Instead, this Parliament appears to have a position on adopting a regulation that throws out the rulebook and long-established asylum laws to pursue a relocation system which has not exactly been a success, with proposals which mean that an asylum seeker would no longer have their application processed or even have a first admissibility check in the country that they arrive in and continuing to force quotas on countries which have already said that they do not support relocation.

This approach gives asylum seekers false hope and EU citizens false solutions. These proposals will not increase solidarity but they may increase voters' frustrations with politicians. Please let us rethink the unintended consequences of Parliament's proposals in a pragmatic way.

On the Brexit negotiations, let us be more pragmatic. As a British MEP, who leads one of the largest political groups in this House, who enjoys good relations with people on both sides of the negotiating table and who, like Jean-Claude, wants a mutually beneficial deal, I hope that we avoid becoming trapped by the sequencing of negotiations.

For there to be real progress, we must take a step back and look at the process as a whole. Just as there needs to be an understanding from the UK as to where the EU 27 are coming from, there also needs to be an understanding from the EU 27 as to where the British people are coming from.

The UK joined the EEC 40 years ago because more than anything it believed in open trade. That remains the UK's main motivation for its current relationship with the EU, and it will be a major motivation in creating the UK's future relationship with the EU and vice versa. So perhaps the more the EU talks about the issues that resonate with the UK, it may find that the UK is more willing to give concessions on the issues that the EU 27 care most about and prioritise.

On both migration and UK negotiations, we may all find that while idealism may be a wonderful way to view the world and sequencing may appear to be perfectly logical, it will be pragmatism that delivers the solutions that we all want to see.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I want to thank President Tusk for his intervention, and also for the publicity he has made for my hashtag campaign. Thank you. I am a proud European, so you are also an adept of it, Mr Tusk. And I have to tell you, after the State of the Union of our President of the Commission a few weeks ago, we got a speech at the Sorbonne by Emmanuel Macron, and we now have your agenda for the coming European Councils.

I have to confess that each time I have heard these proposals – this State of the Union, your agenda – I have felt an enormous excitement. The same eagerness that I felt when I was a young boy and was browsing through the colourful catalogues my mother received at the end of every year – the 3Suisses, was that in France? I think also in Luxembourg it exists. I think it is the Otto in Germany. The shiny things in these catalogues seemed always so far away, dreams on colourful paper, and to be very honest, that is rather what I am feeling today again – that we have great plans, that we have huge ambitions, but are we really ready now in this European Union to make the radical changes needed to make it happen? Because, Mr Tusk, there are a number of structural flaws in the European Union that we need to solve.

The first, as we know, is the unanimity rule that is still applied in the European Union, and especially in the Council, which has been blocking progress for decades now. The European Arrest Warrant has taken more than a decade to implement because of the unanimity rule; with the European Patents we had to wait more than 25 years because of the unanimity rule; the same is happening for the Energy Union – we do not have an Energy Union because of the unanimity rule; we do not have a fully-fledged Banking Union because of the unanimity rule. The Americans were capable in nine months to react to the financial crisis by cleaning up the banks, with an investment programme of USD 900 billion and with quantitative easing of USD 1.2 trillion, and we, after nine years, are still debating all this because of unanimity. Maybe it is a good moment to recall that, because with the posting of workers the Council has taken a position for once. Why? Because they did not apply unanimity. For once, they have voted in the Council and have reached a position. So that is the first thing to do. Are we ready? There is a proposal by Jean-Claude Juncker to massively use ‘passerelles’ to solve the problem. Are we ready to finish this unanimity rule inside the Council and inside our institutions?

The second flaw is structural weakness: we know that there is a long, endless list of things, of doubts, of earmarks, of exceptions in our institutions. Are we ready to finish this Europe à la carte instead of continuing it as we still do?

Finally, the third disease we need to cure is what I call the ‘Potemkin syndrome’ of the European Union: that we always make beautiful plans, but without creating the necessary instruments, the necessary tools, or the necessary budget to make it happen. Schengen without the border and coastguard; the euro without the Treasury; foreign policy without a European defence community. So the moment of truth, Mr Tusk, is coming on the day – which is coming very soon – when we will decide on the new Multiannual Financial Framework. Are we really ready to implement these ambitious plans of Jean-Claude Juncker, of Emmanuel Macron, and of your agenda? Then it is necessary that we also be ready to open this financial framework and to give more than the former 1%, which is ridiculous if we want to fulfil all the ambitions that we have today. It is not really even 1% if you deduct from that the contributions that we received from the Member States and are going immediately back to the Member States; it is only 0.14% to protect our citizens against external threats, to protect our citizens and our borders internally, and at the same time to also organise the Currency Union. With 1%, sorry, that is not possible. To those populists and nationalists who are always saying ‘oh, this European superstate’, to have a budget of 1% and then talk about the European superstate is ridiculous and makes no sense at all. But that is the moment of truth. The moment of truth will not be the whole list of summits; the moment of truth will be when we discuss the money – when we discuss the budget, and when we discuss the new Multiannual Financial Framework.

That brings me, finally, Mr Tusk, to the remark you made on the composition of Parliament and the announcement that there will be an informal summit on it on 23 February. Fantastic! Maybe there are other things that I could organise to have an informal summit about, but you have to know that the legislative initiative for the composition of the Parliament is of this Parliament and not the European Council. I have to tell you that.

(Applause from the House)

What I expect is for the European Council to back the proposal that will be made by a huge majority here in the House. That is what I expect! It will be a proposal based on the reduction of the number – that is a fair point. It will be a proposal that finally puts justice in the system with degressive proportionality, so that we do not take all five years to restart the work. And it will be – if everybody is of that opinion – a proposal in which we create a European democracy with transnationalists securing the *Spitzenkandidaten*.

If I may give you one little piece of advice – do not open again the *Spitzenkandidaten*. We decided here in 2014 that it is an enormous achievement of European democracy. It is because of the *Spitzenkandidaten* that we have our President, Jean-Claude Juncker, here, and we will not accept any more changes to this system and this achievement of European democracy.

Gabriele Zimmer, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Meine Herren Präsidenten! Der letzte Gipfel hat in einem Umfeld innerhalb der Europäischen Union stattgefunden, das deutlich gemacht hat, dass die voreiligen Einschätzungen noch vor wenigen Wochen – wir seien raus aus der Krise – nicht zutreffen. Wir haben seitdem die Wahlen in Deutschland gehabt, wir haben die Wahlen in Österreich gehabt, in der Tschechischen Republik, wir haben die Krise in Spanien – mit Blick auf Katalonien. All das zeigt, dass vieles noch in Bewegung ist, dass vieles auch am Brodeln ist und wir uns dem gemeinsam stellen müssen.

Nun haben Sie, Herr Präsident, vorhin deutlich gemacht, wie Sie sich vorstellen, dass der Rat künftig seiner Verantwortung besser nachkommen kann. Sie haben die Regierungschefs an ihre eigene politische Verantwortung erinnert und – so wie ich Sie verstanden habe – auch deutlich gemacht, dass es Ihnen darum geht, dass Verantwortung nicht ewig abgeschoben werden kann, dass wichtige Entscheidungen, die im Rat zu treffen sind, nicht im Nirwana verschwinden, nach dem Motto: *Lost in Translation*, oder im Bermudadreieck des Rates dann nimmer mehr auftauchen.

Sie stellen in Aussicht, dass auf der Basis von Ihnen vorgelegter *decision notes* innerhalb kürzester Zeit festgestellt werden kann, wo Einigung ist, und dort, wo Einigung aus Ihrer Sicht nicht erzielbar ist, schlagen Sie vor, dass dann mit der verstärkten Zusammenarbeit begonnen werden kann.

Für mich ergeben sich daraus jetzt folgende Fragen: Bedeutet das, dass Sie sich aus den Vorschlägen, die die Kommission im Frühjahr zu den fünf Szenarien unterbreitet hat, Elemente herausgenommen haben und bereits umsetzen, ohne dass es wirklich eine breite Debatte auch mit den Bürgern und Bürgerinnen in der Europäischen Union in den Mitgliedstaaten gegeben hat?

Herr Verhofstadt und andere haben auch auf Widersprüche hingewiesen, was die ganze Struktur der demokratischen Entscheidungsabläufe innerhalb der Europäischen Union betrifft. Ich würde deshalb auch gerne wissen, ob die Zustimmung zur Leaders'Agenda bedeutet, dass es eine Abkehr von der gescheiterten intergouvernementalen Methode gibt, die von Kanzlerin Merkel mal durchgesetzt worden ist und auf deren Basis beispielsweise ja auch der *fiscal compact* durchgesetzt worden ist – am Europäischen Parlament vorbei –, die aber die Kommission zur Durchsetzung dieser zwischenstaatlichen Abkommen verpflichtet?

Bedeutet das Bekenntnis zur politischen Verantwortung der Staats- und Regierungschefs im Rat, dass die Kompetenzen demokratisch nicht legitimierter Gremien, wie zum Beispiel der Finanzministerrunde der Eurogruppe, beschränkt werden, auf das notwendige Maß zurückgestutzt werden, und dass es künftig nicht mehr möglich ist, dass dieses Gremium, das sich auch dem Parlament gegenüber überhaupt nicht verpflichtet fühlt, in der Lage ist, Auflagen in Größenordnungen an Mitgliedsländer zu geben und dort das Leben von Menschen, von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, erheblich zu beeinflussen?

Wird innerhalb des Rates geklärt, wer künftig Koch und wer Kellner ist? Oder ist es nach wie vor möglich, dass Finanzminister ihrem Regierungschef sagen, was diese zu tun und zu denken haben? Welche Vorstellungen entwickelten die Ratsmitglieder, wie künftig die Zusammenarbeit mit dem Europaparlament und auch den nationalen Parlamenten in dieser sehr verkürzten Debattezeit, die sie angemahnt haben und die sie vorschlugen, denn konkret sein wird? Wie werden wir eingebunden? Was hat das für Konsequenzen, auch möglicherweise für die interinstitutionelle Zusammenarbeit? Es ist doch nicht mehr einfach so, dass Sie jetzt sagen können: Wir machen das jetzt so, fertig und basta. Das wird aus meiner Sicht so nicht gehen.

Auch gerade die Debatte um die soziale Säule, von der Sie gesprochen haben, hat ja gezeigt, dass es hier Klärungsbedarf gibt. Der Rat hat einen Vorschlag von uns entgegengenommen, die Kommission hat einen Vorschlag unterbreitet. Dann wird aber erst einmal monatelang diskutiert, wie denn das Parlament dann zum Schluss wieder mit eingebunden wird, wenn es mit unterzeichnen soll. Hier gibt es Klärungsbedarf, und das kann nicht einfach nur per Postulation von Vorschlägen sein.

Zum Brexit nur ganz kurz. Meine Fraktion bewegt zwei Dinge: Wir möchten gern geklärt haben, dass der Rat konkret definiert, was die Kriterien zwischen der Ratssitzung letzte Woche und der Ratssitzung im Dezember sind, so dass man dann feststellt, jetzt gibt es ausreichenden Fortschritt. Woran messen Sie das? Oder ist das mehr oder weniger so eine politische Verhandlungsmasse, und wir werden mal sehen, wohin es uns treibt?

Wir halten an zwei Punkten fest: Wir wollen nicht, dass die Bürger und Bürgerinnen in Großbritannien oder in einem anderen Mitgliedsland der Europäischen Union für das Nichtzustandekommen eines Vertrages, für einen *no-deal*, bestraft werden. Aber wir wollen einen Deal haben, bei dem gesichert wird, dass die *citizens' rights* und auch die Rechte der Bürgerinnen und Bürger in Nordirland letztendlich auch durchgesetzt werden und dazu gehört dann natürlich auch ein vernünftiges *financial settlement*.

Eine Bemerkung noch zur Migrationskrise. Ich habe vernommen, bis zum Juni gehen Sie davon aus, dass Sie einschätzen, zu bestimmten Elementen der Arbeit an der Migrationskrise weiterzukommen, eine bestimmte Einigung zu erreichen. Aber was ich vermisse, ist eine ganz klare Ansage: ein Ende der Unterstützung des libyschen Küstenschutzes, solange dieser nicht humanitäre Verpflichtungen einhält und internationale Seerettung beziehungsweise Seerecht blockiert, keine Kriminalisierung von Flucht und keine Kriminalisierung der internationalen, der privaten Seerettungsaktionen.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, cher Président Tusk, c'est toujours un plaisir de vous accueillir, et je suis sérieux, car nous sommes tous convaincus, ici, que la consolidation et l'approfondissement du projet européen ne se feront pas contre les États membres mais avec eux, et c'est vous qui en présidez le Conseil.

C'est pourquoi, après ce qui fut probablement le meilleur discours sur l'état de l'Union prononcé ici par le président - Juncker en septembre, je me réjouissais à l'idée de vous écouter évoquer ici votre vision de l'avenir de l'Europe. Je dois bien vous avouer ma déconvenue, parce qu'en fait de programme des dirigeants, ce que vous nous offrez, c'est un calendrier de réunions agrémenté des sujets que vous voulez traiter, un calendrier finalement comme celui que notre Parlement ou la Commission publie depuis des années sans que personne ne s'en émeuve.

Et donc grande nouvelle — haut les cœurs — le Conseil européen se met à organiser ses travaux. Qui sait, peut-être va-t-il bientôt rendre publics ses débats? Mais au-delà de la boutade, je veux pointer le contraste de plus en plus saisissant entre l'institution que vous présidez et celle à laquelle j'ai l'honneur d'appartenir.

Je voudrais prendre pour exemple la politique d'asile et de migration, sujet capital du sommet de la semaine dernière, au cours duquel vous avez réaffirmé – et on s'y attendait évidemment – l'option de l'Europe forteresse, prête à passer les accords les plus infâmes avec les régimes, voire les chefs de guerre, les plus détestables, pour qu'ils nous assurent que plus aucun de ces malheureux ne mette un pied, un orteil sur le territoire de l'Union européenne.

Mais, comme aucune forteresse, Monsieur Tusk, n'est impénétrable, il se fait qu'un certain nombre de nos États membres continuent à être confrontés au défi des migrations – je pense bien sûr à la Grèce, à l'Italie, à l'Espagne, à Malte ou à la Bulgarie – et ils sont laissés seuls vis-à-vis de ce défi. C'est bien sûr du règlement de Dublin dont je veux parler.

En juin 2016, la Commission européenne, présidée par M. Juncker, a fait une proposition visant à corriger ce système injuste. La semaine dernière, après un travail intense mené de main de maître par M^{me} Cecilia Wikström, ici, le Parlement a amélioré le texte initial pour que désormais les États membres assument de manière solidaire la réponse au défi des migrations et l'accueil des demandeurs d'asile.

Cher Monsieur Tusk, j'étais en salle de presse du Conseil la semaine dernière et je suis allé vous écouter à la conférence de presse. J'avoue que j'ai été sidéré de vous voir affirmer benoîtement que le Conseil se saisirait du problème en décembre, dans l'idée d'arriver peut-être à une conclusion à la fin du premier semestre 2018, c'est-à-dire deux ans après la proposition faite par la Commission et huit mois après l'accord obtenu ici au Parlement européen. Très sincèrement, quand j'entends parler de «*Leader's Agenda*», je pense que les termes d'«agenda des suiveurs» serait beaucoup plus approprié.

Je voudrais continuer en évoquant la lutte contre une concurrence fiscale débridée. Ici encore, alors que la Commission et le Parlement veulent avancer, le Conseil que vous présidez est le garant d'un immobilisme dont les seuls bénéficiaires sont ceux qui devraient être les plus gros contribuables – je pense évidemment aux multinationales et aux grandes fortunes.

Vous me direz que, sur un autre sujet épineux – la question des travailleurs détachés, qui empoisonne depuis des années le débat européen –, le Conseil a pu s'accorder hier soir. Je m'en réjouis, mais c'est sur un texte nettement moins protecteur que celui adopté par le Parlement sous la houlette de Mmes Morin-Chartier et Jongerius. Soyez certains que nous défendrons bec et ongles notre texte, qui vise d'abord et avant tout non pas à protéger le marché intérieur, mais à protéger les travailleurs de l'exploitation.

Monsieur Tusk, je vois que cela vous intéresse... Je vois que cela vous intéresse, Monsieur Tusk, mais enfin continuez, il n'y a pas de problème.

Le Parlement rassemble des personnes issues des mêmes pays et des mêmes familles politiques que le Conseil. Alors expliquez-moi comment il est possible, dans ce Parlement, de traiter de sujets aussi compliqués que ceux dont vous traitez et d'arriver à des accords à la fois ambitieux et soutenus par de très larges majorités, chose qui se révèle souvent difficile, voire impossible au Conseil.

Et je me prends à rêver de chefs d'État et de gouvernement déterminés à prendre de la hauteur. Ils auraient pour boussole la conviction qu'il n'y a, au XXI^e siècle, de souveraineté que partagée et que leur mission est la protection du bien-être de tous et pas d'une minorité. Armés de leur courage – parce qu'après tout, ce sont eux qui sont investis de l'autorité politique suprême dans chacun de leur pays –, ils sauraient chaque fois que nécessaire donner les impulsions requises pour dépasser les égoïsmes nationaux et les mesquineries politiciennes. Au lieu d'incarner la force de l'immobilisme, ce seraient eux qui pousseraient la Commission à faire preuve d'encore plus de célérité et d'ambition pour apporter des solutions innovantes aux défis de ce siècle.

Je pense, par exemple, à la numérisation de l'économie. Comment fait-on pour éviter de créer un «cyberprolétariat»? Je pense évidemment à la question de la transition écologique de nos sociétés qui devrait être la stratégie maîtresse de l'Union. Ce serait le Conseil qui mettrait au défi le Parlement d'aller plus vite pour trouver un accord afin qu'on soit en mesure de négocier.

Alors permettez-moi de conclure en citant un compatriote, Jacques Brel: «Rêver un impossible rêve, [...] tenter, sans force et sans armure, d'atteindre l'inaccessible étoile, telle est ma quête». Telle est notre quête! Ne me dites pas, Monsieur Tusk, qu'elle est vaine.

Raymond Finch, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, I say to President Tusk that we see that yourself, Mr Barnier and President Juncker have all stated that there is some progress being made in negotiations with Prime Minister May, and that the EU will evaluate progress on each of these issues in December.

However, the underlying meaning of this progress is plain for all to see. The meaning is that the British Prime Minister is conceding ever more ground to the EU, rather than standing up for that which the people of the UK voted.

The people of my nation voted not just to leave the EU 28, but to regain our sovereignty. What Mrs May is doing is quietly surrendering, so that we will end up neither leaving nor sovereign. We will remain subservient to the EU, both financially and legally, a nation condemned to serfdom by its own leaders.

For this I do not blame the EU or its negotiators. You are only pursuing your perception of the interests of your project. For this, I condemn the UK Government. By its supine behaviour it has forfeited the trust of the British people, whether they originally voted either to leave or to remain. More than that, it has betrayed those who voted her into power at the last election, this Conservative Party that won the election with the slogan 'Brexit means Brexit'.

The fact this government is slowly backtracking on its commitment to the British people must stick in the craw of those who voted for it. Although the EU is, in the way it is conducting these negotiations, breaking the United Nations Declaration on Principles of International Law, which clearly states that no state may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another state in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind. And indeed its own Treaty commitments to sincere cooperation and the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade.

The fault lies with Her Majesty's Government for not having the courage of our convictions, and saying 'enough is enough'. The other side is not seeking negotiation but capitulation, and walking away.

Whatever the financial settlement Mrs May finally agrees to pay, whether it is GBP 100 or GBP 100 billion, it will simultaneously be too much and too little: too little for those in the EU who seek to punish us for having the temerity to seek our own path. For those ideologues no punishment is too great for those who seek self-determination. And too much for those of us who wish nothing more than to be good friends, neighbours, allies and partners of those we leave behind.

Because this extortion will poison UK-EU relations for years to come. For the good of us all we should now shake hands and walk away.

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, chers collègues, les relations commerciales ont largement figuré au menu du Conseil européen.

Monsieur Juncker, vous avez déclaré que vous ne voudriez pas, je cite, que nos concitoyens considèrent tout accord commercial comme un attentat contre nos principaux intérêts. Mais il ne tient qu'à vous, Monsieur Juncker, d'éviter que les traités de libre-échange soient négociés en catimini contre les intérêts vitaux de nos peuples, comme cela a été le cas avec le CETA.

Aujourd'hui, il y a quelques minutes seulement, vous nous disiez que vous souhaitiez en faire autant avec le Mexique ou le Mercosur, c'est-à-dire que vous allez à nouveau placer notre agriculture, notamment, en situation de concurrence déloyale face à des pays qui ne respectent aucune des règles, ni sanitaires, ni sociales, ni environnementales, provoquant ainsi la mort de pans entiers de notre économie.

Je vous rappelle qu'en France, il y a des suicides d'agriculteurs chaque semaine. Il serait temps d'en finir avec ces folles politiques, qui sont évidemment en infraction totale avec nos droits et nos intérêts vitaux.

Concernant le détachement des travailleurs, tout le monde a bien compris que l'accord négocié hier ne constitue en rien une avancée significative et ne règle rien au fond du problème. Des secteurs clés, comme le transport routier, par exemple, ne sont même pas concernés, et vous ne remettez pas en cause l'aspect central que revêt le paiement des cotisations sociales dans le pays d'origine, qui crée évidemment une concurrence déloyale, et fait que le salarié détaché coûte 1,5 fois ou, parfois, 2 fois moins cher qu'un travailleur local. Vous organisez ainsi la concurrence déloyale intra-Union européenne, le dumping social et, par là-même, la préférence étrangère dans nos pays.

Enfin, s'agissant de la Turquie, vous évoquez, je cite, une réduction des fonds de préadhésion. Je vous rappelle que la Turquie bénéficie par ailleurs de sommes considérables de la part de l'Union européenne pour une maîtrise des flux migratoires, qui ne donne souvent pas de résultat significatif. C'est un régime autoritaire islamiste.

Quels que soient les accords qui peuvent exister, notamment en matière économique, avec la Turquie, il faut maintenant que notre position soit claire. La Turquie n'a pas vocation à entrer dans l'Union européenne. Il faut mettre un terme aux accords de préadhésion ou d'adhésion. La Turquie n'est européenne, ni par sa position géographique, ni par son histoire, ni par sa culture.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Problem migracji polega na nieprzestrzeganiu zasad układu z Schengen, który – miałem nadzieję – przetrwa nieunikniony upadek Unii Europejskiej. Przyczyną jest panujący w Unii Europejskiej rasizm. Gdy przyjdzie mieszkaniec Australii, Ameryki czy, nie daj Boże, Rosjanin i chce bez dokumentu przekroczyć granicę Schengen, to się go zatrzymuje siłą, a w ostateczności – nawet strzela. A jeżeli przyjdzie dziesięć tysięcy Somalijczyków, Nigeryjczyków czy mieszkańców Nigru, to się ich wpuszcza i załatwia się im bez pytania wszystkie dokumenty. Prawo ustępuje przed siłą. Unia jest słaba w stosunku do silnych, ustępuje przed masą. Jest silna w stosunku do słabych. I to jest upadek, jeżeli prawo ustępuje przed siłą. A towarzyszowi Pittelli chciałem wyjaśnić, że on ma rację. Socjalizm polega na rabowaniu biednych i dawaniu bogatym. Dlatego właśnie tacy bogaci jak Buffett popierają socjalizm, popierają lewicę, a nie, broń Boże, wolny rynek. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Präsident des Europäischen Rates, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Einmal bin ich nach den beiden Darlegungen von Herrn Juncker und Herrn Tusk doch eigentlich glücklich und ein bisschen optimistisch geworden. Es wird langsam auch auf der Seite der Exekutive, auf der Ratsseite begriffen, dass man den Fortschritt Europas und den Kampf gegen demokratiefeindlichen Populismus nur gewinnen kann, wenn wir in bestimmten Bereichen Fortschritte machen – Fortschritte, die unsere Bürger auch als mehr Sicherheit verstehen.

Eine anständige Afrikapolitik ist Sicherheitspolitik; eine anständige Sozialpolitik – und deswegen Glückwunsch zur Entsenderichtlinie und zu den sozialen Pfeilern – ist auch Sicherheit, Sicherheitsgefühl für den Bürger. Das gilt insbesondere bei den Fortschritten in der Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik. Und das, was wir mit PESCO machen, das ist erst ein lahmer Anfang, aber wir sollten hier vorangehen. Und deswegen sollten wir endlich nicht bei 1 % des Haushalts stehenbleiben, sondern die vollen 1,24 % ausnutzen, die im Grundsatz schon genehmigt sind. Und ich meine, dass das von uns deutlicher gemacht werden muss.

Lassen Sie mich aber einige Bemerkungen zum Brexit machen. Ich möchte mich beim Rat bedanken, aber insbesondere auch bei der Kommission und bei Michel Barnier, dass das Mandat beibehalten und eine klare Linie gezeigt wird. Wenn die Tories Schwierigkeiten haben, insbesondere bei den Finanzverpflichtungen, zu einer Einigung zu kommen, die verhandlungsfähig ist, dann ist das für uns kein Anlass, im Interesse der europäischen Bürger dieses klare Verhandlungsmandat zu verlassen. Ich meine, dass wir konstruktive Verhandlungen haben wollen. Wir wollen ein anständiges Ergebnis haben, wir wollen gute Beziehungen in der Zukunft haben, um den Schaden des Brexit so gering wie möglich zu halten. Aber die Verpflichtungen, die man hat, Herr Kamall, als *trade-off* für bessere Handelsbeziehungen zu nutzen, das scheint mir ein etwas seltsamer Eingangspunkt zu sein.

Über die *sequences* hatten wir uns geeinigt. Ich meine, aus diesem Grunde heraus sollte man sich jetzt bewegen, damit wir im Dezember zu der Entscheidung kommen könnten, dass die zweite Phase eingeleitet wird. Und dabei bin ich mir nicht ganz sicher, Herr Kamall, wer in dieser Frage die Rolle des Robin Hood spielt.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – Surely, Mr Brok, it is not a matter of right that the European Union demands this money, it is a matter of necessity. Would you not agree with me? Because you are broke.

Elmar Brok (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Coburn! Wenn ich mir die Haushaltsverschuldung per capita anschau, habe ich den Eindruck, dass Großbritannien in einem größeren und schwierigeren Problem steckt als die meisten europäischen Länder, denn Ihre Staatsverschuldung pro Jahr ist höher als im Durchschnitt der Mitgliedstaaten.

Der zweite Punkt ist: Wenn man Schulden hat, muss man Schulden bezahlen. Das gehört zur Politik eines ehrbaren Kaufmanns. Sie haben Bestellungen mit uns gemeinsam vorgenommen, dann müssen Sie diese Bestellungen auch mitfinanzieren. Das ist eine normale Art und Weise, wie Dinge auseinandergerechnet werden müssen, und ich glaube, dieses müssten Sie entsprechend anerkennen. Die Europäische Union ist kein Golfklub, den man einfach so verlassen kann und dann seinen Beitrag noch ausbezahlt bekommt. Hier haben Sie Verpflichtungen übernommen, Verpflichtungen für die Bürger Ihres Landes und unserer Länder, und diesen Verpflichtungen gegenüber den Bürgern müssen Sie nachkommen. Und dann sind wir bereit, faire Verhandlungen zu führen.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, the European Union needs this ambitious road map to meet the future challenges. That is for sure. We can see a promising alignment of the European institutions – Parliament, Council and Commission – but let me be clear: we need to deliver on the road map with concrete measures.

This means that if we want to have a real social pillar we need to translate these into measures, making sure that all people in employment, whatever their job, can count on a decent labour contract and full access to social protection. If we want to have a real reform of the eurozone in order to promote growth and convergence, we need to provide the eurozone with the fiscal capacity to help and support Member States in this direction.

If we want to have a real European asylum system, the Council should adopt the recent reform of the Dublin system just adopted by the European Parliament. If we want Europe to promote a better world order, then yes, we need to use trade agreements, but we need to push the Sustainable Development Goals together with these agreements.

These are very concrete measures to deliver on the road map with credibility, but the main test will be the next European budget, because all this ambition needs to be matched by a real overhaul of the Community budget in a way that enables us to meet these new priorities.

Finally, like many other groups, the S&D Group is underlining here that we see the system of *Spitzenkandidaten*, the choice of the present European Commission by electing him or her in the European Parliament, as a major democratic development, which must be completely respected. This is our wish and our warning.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR). – Madam President, there is not much that can be said about the last Council meeting. Nothing really happened that would amount to a breakthrough, Brexit being a case in point. On the other hand, this need not be a bad thing, considering that the hyperactivity of the European institutions usually creates more problems than it solves.

On the positive side, immigration seems to be treated with conspicuously more sense than in the past. The President of the Council himself has admitted that mandatory relocation was not a good idea. It took him a lot of time to admit what many governments had said right at the outset. He should have listened to us, not those he usually listens to.

There is also the problem of Nord Stream 2, this notorious and politically hostile Russian-German energy enterprise. As might have been expected, the Council failed to give a sufficiently strong signal to the Commission to dump it, the German Government being clearly supportive of Nord Stream. The Commission, which so eagerly roars like a lion when confronted with weaker partners, in cases like Nord Stream seems to behave more like a sheep; pardon the comparison. I conservatively predict that it will continue to do so.

Let me now reply to Mr Weber. I want to thank him for pointing out the alleged – I would say – inconsistency in Polish politics and, by way of courtesy, I would like to reciprocate though he is not here.

I wonder which is the real thing: what Mr Weber, representing the ruling party in Germany says here, criticising Nord Stream or the German Government policy that relentlessly carries out this impossible and politically dangerous project? So which is the real thing? Is it confusion or is it maybe, as some say, a deliberate strategy?

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Madam President, migration and the need for reform of the Common European Asylum System was discussed last week in Council. This was very timely, to say the least, not least since the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs adopted, on Thursday, with a very large majority, our position on the necessary reform of the Dublin Regulation.

I have managed to gather behind me and to unite this House in a very bold proposal, creating a truly European Asylum System, and we have managed to do so through long negotiations and by listening to each other.

Now I think it is high time that you, in Council, do exactly the same: listen to each other and start paying respect to each other, leaving national egoism behind. This belongs to history and not to the current situation in Europe. We can never create a functioning Common European Asylum System as long as every Member State is obsessed with their own national situation.

We now need to create a fair system that works for all of Europe, with all its Member States. And such a system has to include automatic relocation of asylum-seekers and must be based on the principle of solidarity, as in Article 80 of our Treaties. The goal has to be to fix the asylum system, not merely to find some watered-down compromise that can reach unanimity in Council.

It is high time that you take a qualified majority vote on this, because otherwise we will never change reality. I welcome that Council has signalled that it will continue working on this and set the goal of reaching a mandate before the spring. Negotiations in trilogues will be long and difficult, but I look forward to opening those trilogues sooner rather than later.

The European Parliament has delivered, and it is now high time that you do the same. We owe it to the citizens of Europe who expect this from us.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, έχει λεχθεί σε αυτή την αίθουσα ότι ένα πρόβλημα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης είναι η ανάγκη της ομοφωνίας. Αυτό το έχει πει ο κύριος Verhofstadt, δεν έχει σημασία ότι δεν είναι στην αίθουσα. Έχει δικιο ο κύριος Verhofstadt όσον αφορά την ανησυχία του, έχει άδικο όμως όσον αφορά το συμπέρασμά του, γιατί η ανάγκη της ομοφωνίας υπάρχει εκεί όπου τα κράτη μέλη δεν είναι ίσα και, ως είμαστε ειλικρινείς, δεν είμαστε όλοι ίσοι σε αυτή την αίθουσα. Η χρησιμοποίηση του παραδείγματος των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών μου φέρνει στη σκέψη το εξής: ακούσατε ποτέ τη Γιούτα, που είναι πολιτεία που παράγει πετρέλαιο, να διαμαρτύρεται προς την Τζόρτζια, που παράγει μόνο φιστίκια; Ήρθε εδώ ο Κύριος Πρόεδρος πριν μερικά χρόνια και υπέστη εκ μέρους και δια της επιβολής του Eurogroup το κούρεμα της κυπριακής οικονομίας ουσιαστικά και επέστρεψε πίσω λέγοντας: «Ήρθα στις Βρυξέλλες αξιόπιστος και επέστρεψα αναξιόπιστος». Σήμερα τον συγχαίρει ο κύριος Schäuble για την απόφασή του εκείνης της εποχής. Συγχαίρει ο ηγεμονεύων τον υποταχθέντα για το γεγονός ότι συνεμμορφώδη προς τας υποδείξεις. Δεν έχει λεχθεί μία φράση από τον κύριο Juncker ή από τον κύριο Tusk για την Τουρκία. Η μέση κατάσταση, η «in limbo» κατάσταση που επικρατεί μεταξύ Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και Τουρκίας είναι ό,τι χειρότερο. Πρέπει να είμαστε καθαροί. Ή προχωρούμε ή διακόπτουμε. Η μέση κατάσταση τους στέλνει το μήνυμα ότι «τους δουλεύουμε» και εμείς λαμβάνουμε το μήνυμα ότι «μας δουλεύουν».

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, supongo que estamos de acuerdo en que la situación en Cataluña es importante, pero me temo que en relación con ella la Unión Europea va acumulando errores.

Uno. En el último Consejo Europeo la cuestión no estuvo en el orden del día. Todavía se defiende la idea de que se trata de una cuestión interna y se olvida que es interna de la Unión Europea.

La Catalogna non è, come ha detto l'on. Pittella, una frattura, è un impegno di maggior democrazia.

Dos. La Comisión aplaude las medidas del Gobierno español para suplantar la democracia en Cataluña y dirigirla desde Madrid como si Cataluña fuera una colonia. Se suplanta la democracia y aplauden, ¿cómo es posible?

Tres. Como presidentes del Consejo, de la Comisión y del Parlamento, los tres han recibido el premio Princesa de Asturias en España. Después de escuchar sus discursos de agradecimiento se comprende que les hayan dado el premio, pero no se entiende que se lo hayan dado a la concordia, ¿qué concordia?

Cuatro. Como eurodiputado, me siento desprotegido por el presidente de mi Parlamento y lamento que no esté él presidiendo. Él, a semejanza del rey de España, ha abandonado su función de mediador imparcial. Al presidente le correspondería hablar y mediar con todos los diputados de las distintas opciones, que no son solo los españoles. Es una lástima que algunos le sintamos tan lejos y es inaceptable.

Por todo ello y por mucho más, no les puede extrañar si en el pueblo catalán, tradicionalmente proeuropeo, empiezan a surgir graves dudas sobre la Europa que ustedes presiden. ¿Es esta la Europa que se preocupa por los ciudadanos, por la diversidad y por la democracia? Desde luego, no lo parece. La democracia debe estar al servicio de las personas para dar paso a más democracia sin suprimirla ni golpearla ni encarcelarla.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Stanislav Polčák (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Pane kolego, já jsem se chtěl zeptat: Nemyslíte si, že by v této debatě měla Evropské unie respektovat vnitřní ústavní poměry Španělska? Nemyslím si, že je vhodné do této debaty vnášet tento rozměr. Rád bych slyšel Vaši odpověď na tuto otázku.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – First, the European Union is concerned about all Member States, and it discusses events in Hungary and in Poland first, not just those in Spain. Second, the Spanish Constitution has been interpreted in the way the Spanish Government has said, but over 600 experts have said that having a referendum in Spain is allowed.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Svarbiausia problema, nusversianti Europos Sąjungos ateitį, šiandien yra Katalonijoje. Tiksliau, Europos vadovų pozicijoje, kad žmonės neva griauja demokratiją. Išgirskime pagaliau Europos intelektualus, kurie sako, kad tikroji Europa yra tautų bendruomenė, turinti savo kalbas, tradicijas, sienas. Ne primesta imperinė vienybė, kuriama melu ir netgi fizinės jėgos naudojimui, yra Europos Sąjungos ateitis. Ne šeimos kaip vyro ir moters sąjungos niekinimas, ne krikščionybės pakeitimas surogatine religija su deklaruojamu solidarumu. Bet atjauta ir atsigręžimas į svarbiausius Europą vienijančius dalykus yra vienintelis mūsų išlikimo bendrijoje kelias. Nustokime kalbėti, kad įvykiai Katalonijoje yra tik Ispanijos vidaus reikalas. Prisiminkime JAV prezidento Wilsono kalboje nusakytą idėją dėl kiekvienos tautos galimybės apsispręsti dėl savo valstybės.

Mieli Europos Sąjungos vadovai, sėskite prie derybų stalo kartu su Ispanijos ir Katalonijos politikais ir padėkite jiems rasti optimaliausią ir taikią išeitį iš dabartinės situacijos. Pone Junkeri, pone Tuskai, Jūs galite, Jūs privalote tai padaryti.

Marcel de Graaff (ENF). – Voorzitter, elke conclusie van de Raad is verkeerd, maar de conclusie ten aanzien van Turkije is werkelijk volledig onacceptabel. De Raad debatteert over Turkije en concludeert dat de lidstaten de migrantendeal volledig moeten uitvoeren en blijk moeten geven van volledige toewijding aan deze samenwerking. Wat een hypocriete bende!

Voorzitter, Turkije is een islamitische dictatuur. Het is een land dat minderheden uitmoordt, dat de vrije pers vervolgt en dat de politieke oppositie in de gevangenis gooit. De conclusies hadden moeten zijn: de EU moet elke toetredingssteun aan Turkije stoppen, Griekenland moet elke migrantenboot naar Turkije terugstelen en de migrantendeal moet in de prullenbak. En ten slotte had de Raad moeten besluiten de buitenlandse financiering van moskeeën, van islamitische opleidingsinstituten en van islamitische ngo's te verbieden. En ik dring er bij de Raad op aan, mijnheer Tusk, om de volgende keer deze conclusies over te nemen.

(De spreker gaat in op een “blauwe kaart”-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Taking into consideration the importance of Turkey for the European Union's security and stability, do you not think it is better to cooperate, to have cooperation of some kind with Turkey instead of having Turkey as an enemy, or as a foe, of the European Union? Do you not think it is better to cooperate with Turkey?

Marcel de Graaff (ENF), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Voorzitter, samenwerken met Turkije kan op vele manieren. Hier gaat het over toetreding van Turkije tot de Europese Unie. Dat willen wij absoluut niet. Samenwerken met Turkije, ja, handel drijven met Turkije. Maar is Turkije een betrouwbare militaire partner? Turkije heeft inmiddels ook al S400-wapensystemen gekocht van Rusland. En dat is ons NAVO-lid, onze NAVO-partner. Ik zou willen zeggen: Turkije is dusdanig onbetrouwbaar dat je daar geen zaken mee moet doen.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Madam President, most of us watching from the United Kingdom were pleased to see that the Council meeting ended up in a better mood, and a better spirit, of cooperation than what we have previously seen. I welcome the progress that seems to have been made in moving towards trade negotiations, hopefully in December.

The United Kingdom seeks a deal that is mutually beneficial. It seeks a deal that recognises a strong, independent United Kingdom, cooperating and working beside a European Union. That cooperation can be in areas of defence, areas of the economy and things that are important to all of us.

Can I say, in respect of Northern Ireland, that I fear that these institutions are in danger of overreach? The guarantors of the Belfast Agreement are the British and Irish Governments, not the European institutions. While Europe has been enormously helpful in building peace, we need to remember who are the primary operators and the primary legislators in this particular area. It is most important.

President. – Mr Coburn wants to ask a blue-card question but he has already had a blue card. I am going to be a bit restrictive on this occasion, so one blue card only. I apologise but I have made my decision.

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Najbardziej pożądanym dobrem publicznym współczesnej Europy jest poczucie bezpieczeństwa. To jest największy deficyt naszych czasów i najważniejsze pole starcia z lewicowym i prawicowym populizmem, który żyje z podsycania ludzkich lęków. Jest to też najlepsza miara wiarygodności instytucji europejskich. Czytając pod tym kątem konkluzje ostatniej Rady, można być umiarkowanym optymistą, dlatego że chaos z roku 2015 w roku 2017 zamienia się w zarządzanie migracjami. Zamiast leczenia objawów pod presją czasu i wydarzeń pojawia się prewencja, sięganie do źródeł problemu, odgadywanie nowych zagrożeń, a nie tylko automatyczna relokacja, która moim zdaniem nie ma wielkiej przyszłości w Unii Europejskiej. Wyrażam satysfakcję, że uczestniczy w tym Parlament Europejski, wnosząc dobry wkład w reformę prawa azylowego.

Teraz kilka zdań o Agendzie przywódców w aspekcie, który najbardziej mnie interesuje, a mianowicie przyszłości budżetu unijnego. Nietrudno zauważyć, że kalendarz Agendy przywódców nie do końca pokrywa się z orędziem o stanie Unii i z rezolucją, którą przyjmie dzisiaj Parlament, a która wyraża pragnienie, by dokończyć negocjacje i zawrzeć porozumienie na okres po roku 2020 przed wyborami europejskimi w 2019 r. Uczestniczyłem w tych rozmowach, dzieląc się własnymi wątpliwościami i pamiętając, że ostatnio zajęło nam to dwa i pół roku. Ale widzę w tym stanowisku Parlamentu coś więcej niż pobożne życzenia, widzę w tym determinację, aby pokazać, że Unia potrafi działać i zawierać kompromisy w najtrudniejszych sprawach. To jest takie europejskie „yes, we can”. Dlatego wiedząc, że nie zrobimy tego bez liderów, bez szefów rządów, konieczne należy uzgodnić scenariusze pomiędzy instytucjami europejskimi, żeby iść razem i iść szybko.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Lani ob tem času so se migranti zbudili na otoku Lezbos v globokem snegu. Temperature so zdrsnilo skoraj na minus 18 stopinj. Nekateri od njih so na grških otokih ujeti že skoraj dve leti. In evropski voditelji vztrajate, da dogovor s Turčijo deluje in da boste po zahodno-balkanski poti zaprli tudi osrednjo sredozemsko pot.

Namesto da bi vzporedno s financiranjem in urjenjem libijske obalne straže pospešeno iskali tudi varne in pravne poti za ljudi, ki so upravičeni do mednarodne zaščite, vso pozornost namenjate temu, kako migrantom preprečiti pot v Evropo. Namesto premalo ali nič pa bi se lahko ukvarjali z radikalno reformo evropskega azilnega sistema.

V Parlamentu smo prejšnji teden sprejeli dober predlog, po katerem breme ne bo več le na državi vstopa. Strinjali smo se, da je nujen stalni in avtomatski mehanizem premeščanja ljudi, v katerem bodo sodelovale vse države članice. Ta dogovor zdaj pričakujemo tudi od evropskih vlad.

Zaradi nedelujoče evropske azilne politike imamo notranji nadzor meja v vrsti schengenskih držav. Maja letos je komisar Avramopoulos dejal, da bodo lahko Avstrija, Nemčija, Danska, Švedska in Norveška le še enkrat podaljšale notranje kontrole, da bo to zadnjič. Pol leta pozneje Avstrija ohranja notranji nadzor na meji s Slovenijo, za kar ni absolutno nobenega razloga. Zato vaši zaključki, spoštovano predsedstvo, da ste zavezani Schengenu, niso iskreni in žal mi je, da je tako.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR). – Madam President, I would like to remind the House that I was against Brexit. Mr Brok, you mentioned the term 'golf club'. Let me also remind you that the European Union was, from the viewpoint of the British, once a football club. If the management of the club changes the football club to a golf club, then I wonder who has really left whom.

I think it is time that we also criticised the negotiation strategy of the Commission and the Council. It is illogical, it is dangerous, and I think it is unfair. It is illogical because the EU insists on a financial offer by the British Government before any agreement on trade. I just wonder, Mr Juncker, would you ever agree on a price for something when you do not know what you are buying.

It is dangerous because everybody here agrees that peace in Ireland must be preserved at all costs. Nowhere in the world is there a border arrangement without a trade or customs arrangement. How will you ever get such an agreement without negotiations on trade?

Finally, it is grossly unfair. Mr Tusk, you have mentioned European values many times. Let me remind you of the fact that democracy, freedom of the press and human rights are not European values; they are universal values. I would also like to remind you that we have British values, one of which is fairness, and it is about time that you recognise fairness as a European value.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Elmar Brok (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Henkel, wer hier handelt, das will ich jetzt gar nicht von Ihnen wissen. Aber jede Entwicklungsphase der Europäischen Union – von der Einheitlichen Akte, die von Mrs. Thatcher vorangetrieben worden ist, von Maastricht, von Nizza, von Amsterdam bis zum Vertrag von Lissabon – ist mit qualifizierter Mehrheit im *House of Commons* ratifiziert worden.

Deswegen kann man nicht sagen, es sei ihnen aufgezwungen worden. Sie haben es mitverhandelt, und sie haben es in ihrer Volksvertretung beschlossen. Erzählen Sie nicht solche Geschichten von damals.

Hans-Olaf Henkel (ECR), blue-card answer. – The British entered the European Union under three conditions: subsidiarity, self-responsibility for a country's debts and competition. You can find all three factors in the Lisbon Treaty.

In the course of various attempts to save the euro, these three principles have been grossly violated, and that led to a continuous centralisation and bureaucratisation of the European Union, and that finally contributed to Brexit.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, διάβασα και άκουσα με προσοχή τα συμπεράσματα του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου και τις θέσεις της Επιτροπής. Για την PESCO και τα θέματα ασφάλειας και άμυνας θα συζητήσουμε εκτενώς τους επόμενους μήνες. Για τις σχέσεις με την Τουρκία αφιερώνεται μία πρόταση που δεν λέει τίποτα παρά για τα επανειλημμένα ψηφίσματα του Κοινοβουλίου. Όσον αφορά στο προσφυγικό, τέσσερις σελίδες με στόχο μια Ευρώπη-φρούριο και μία μόνο παράγραφος με αοριστίες για την αντιμετώπιση των αιτιών που γεννούν μετανάστευση και πρόσφυγες. Περιγράφετε συνεργασίες με τη Λιβύη και γειτονικές χώρες στα όρια της αποσταθεροποίησης και τις εκβιάζετε με τα κονδύλια ανάπτυξης, το εμπόριο και τις θεωρήσεις με στόχο τον εγκλωβισμό προσφύγων και μεταναστών σε καταυλισμούς-στρατόπεδα. Γνωρίζετε ασφαλώς ότι αυτό είναι μια ωρολογιακή βόμβα που σύντομα θα εκραγεί και το σκληρό τίμημα θα το πληρώσουμε όλοι μας. Η πολιτική σας διχάζει. Διχάζει την Ευρώπη και δυστυχώς κάποιοι συνεχίζουν να επενδύουν σε πρόσκαιρα κέρδη. Είμαι περίεργη λοιπόν για το όραμα ποιας Ευρώπης θα μιλάτε τότε στους λαούς.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, señor Tusk, señor Juncker. Escuchando al portavoz de la Comisión —el señor Margaritis—, ayer, parecería que ustedes dan la cuestión catalana por cerrada: se aplica el 155 y aquí no ha ocurrido nada. Nada más lejos de la realidad: estamos a tres días de un auténtico desastre.

La intervención de la Generalitat supone la intervención de una institución restablecida antes de la promulgación de la Constitución de 1978 y nos va a llevar a una crisis política, social, de enormes dimensiones y, además, se va a añadir eso a las detenciones de dos personas de la sociedad civil catalana que son dos detenciones injustas y arbitrarias.

Y, por otro lado, seguimos teniendo encima de la mesa también una posible declaración unilateral de independencia que no genera consenso en la sociedad catalana y que también es un gravísimo error.

Estamos a tres días del desastre, y yo les digo que hay muchos ciudadanos en Cataluña angustiados que esperan una respuesta. Si nuestros gobernantes son incapaces de dialogar, de hablar y de llegar a algún consenso que establezca una salida negociada, los ciudadanos de Cataluña esperan del presidente del Consejo, de su Consejo y de su Comisión Europea una respuesta a la altura.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Madam President, I would briefly like to say something about the asylum policies. Mr Tusk very proudly announced that they will, at some point in 2018, agree on border control, but that is actually not the same as a proper asylum policy. Fortress Europe: that is what the Council is trying to build – keeping people out – and it is remarkable that this House, with 751 MEPs representing more than 200 political parties, is able to come to agreement. We are one legislator and the Council, with 28 individuals, is totally unable to reach agreement on one of the most important challenges of this moment.

I think that is totally irresponsible and only shows the total bankruptcy of the intergovernmental method. I really hope that the Council is now going to move forward on the files that have been adopted here – Dublin, the reception conditions – because we have been waiting. We voted on reception conditions almost half a year ago. The Council is completely paralysed and we cannot wait until next summer for a solution. We need a decision by the Council now; it is their responsibility.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). – Fru talman! Vad gäller sammansättningen av parlamentet, som Donald Tusk nämnde, är det så att jag håller med Donald Tusk när han säger att färre länder också ska innebära färre platser. Det är sunt förnuft, och det uppskattas av folket också.

Toppmötet i Göteborg står för dörren, som vi vet. Jag tror ni alla vet att jag är djupt kritisk till EU, men jag är också en pragmatisk människa. Så länge mitt land Sverige är medlem måste något göras för att stoppa den sociala dumpning vi ser på arbetsmarknaden. De som säger att vi har ordning och reda på svensk arbetsmarknad, de har nog inte varit ute på rätt länge och besökt den svenska arbetsmarknaden. De har förmodligen inte heller sett hur den inhemska transportmarknaden, till exempel, slås sönder av utländska aktörer som lönedumpar sönder de svenska företagen. Byggbranschen är översvämmad av oseriösa aktörer som utnyttjar arbetskraft på ett hänsynslöst sätt. Människor offras på profitens altare, och det kan jag inte ställa mig bakom. Jag skulle helst se att Sverige lämnade detta hus och samarbete, men så länge vi finns kvar här måste vi ändå se till att vi får ett slut på denna cirkus. Kom gärna till Sverige; när ni är i vårt land ska ni konkurrera under samma kostnadsbild som de svenska företagen har.

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wenn wir jetzt den Blick zurückrichten auf die Debatte des Rates vom 19. Oktober und feststellen, dass Migration wiederum eines der dominanten Themen war, dann kann man nur sagen: Es fehlt hier an Entschlossenheit, es fehlt hier an Durchsetzungsstärke, und es fehlt auch an Selbständigkeit, denn wiederum setzt man auf die Türkei, wissend, dass die Türkei kein verlässlicher Partner ist. Es wäre doch viel schlauer, wenn man endlich auch eine Verwirklichung der Pläne, die es seit längerem gibt, in den Regionen selbst nach Betreuungsmöglichkeiten zu suchen, anstrebt. Es kam aus Deutschland, von Innenminister Schily, von Innenminister de Maizière, es wurde im Bereich der Kommission angedacht, in den Regionen selbst Betreuungsstätten zu finden. Man tut es nicht. Richten wir den Blick auf Libyen beispielsweise, wo man mehr Hilfe braucht, richten wir den Blick auf den Libanon, wo es mehr Hilfe bedürfte. Schauen wir, ob wir Abkommen schaffen mit Tunesien, mit Algerien, mit Marokko, um hier die Menschen in der Region zu halten und nicht eine Politik des Exodus von Afrika Richtung Europa zu ermöglichen.

Zweiter Punkt: die Türkei, die auch Thema war. 640 Millionen an Vorbeitrittshilfe werden gezahlt; bis 2020 sind es, glaube ich, über vier oder viereinhalb Milliarden Euro, obwohl Erdoğan selbst sagt, er möchte nicht mehr in die EU und auch hier der Ruf, die Verhandlungen abubrechen, immer stärker wird. Daher: Bitte folgen Sie dem Ruf, brechen Sie die Verhandlungen der Europäischen Union mit der Türkei über eine Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union ab!

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, Halloween is nearly here and, on cue, the European Union rises to the occasion with two positions and two leaders. Truly, European Union Jekyll and Hyde politics is alive and kicking. What have we learned in the last couple of weeks? We have learned that insufficient progress should be translated as 'give us more money'. With Ms Merkel looking to finance budget matters, trying to handle a EUR 100 billion deficit in her own country and knowing that No Member State will cover the deficit created by the Brexit negotiations, it is no wonder that is happening.

Then we get this document and all those arch-federalists here, I am sure you are delighted with the fact that Mr Juncker and President Macron have authored this. For anybody proud of their country and proud of sovereignty, this is not the document that Brexit supports and, thankfully, Brexit will happen.

Franck Proust (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, le dernier Conseil européen a montré que les chefs d'État ou de gouvernement ont compris les messages que nous envoyons depuis des mois.

L'accord trouvé hier soir au Conseil sur la révision de la directive sur le détachement des travailleurs le montre. La lutte contre le dumping social et la concurrence déloyale est la priorité en Europe. Nous allons y parvenir grâce, notamment, au travail mené par notre collègue Élisabeth Morin-Chartier.

En matière de contrôle de flux migratoires et de lutte contre l'immigration illégale, il s'agit d'insister sur le renforcement et l'application des accords de réadmission avec des pays étrangers et, surtout, de conditionner les aides européennes à des résultats tangibles, car les pays tiers ont aussi une part de responsabilité.

Renforcer les moyens de l'Agence européenne de garde-frontières et de garde-côtes est aussi fondamental pour continuer à mieux protéger nos frontières. Les citoyens attendent aussi des résultats concrets pour leur sécurité. La Commission a récemment annoncé la mobilisation d'un fonds de plus de 100 millions d'euros pour financer des équipements de lutte contre les menaces dans des lieux publics. Il faut s'en réjouir.

Cette sécurité accrue passera aussi par la construction d'une défense européenne digne de ce nom. Mais, pour que l'efficacité soit de mise, il faudra que la coopération structurée permanente lancée en juin dernier soit une réalité partagée par tous les États membres, en parallèle à l'élaboration d'un programme européen de développement industriel dans le domaine de la défense.

Je déplore, cependant, le manque de clarté dans nos relations extérieures. Dans les conclusions du Conseil, une seule ligne est dédiée à notre relation avec la Turquie. Bien que des intérêts communs nous rassemblent, trop de différences fondamentales nous séparent de ce pays. Sortons enfin de l'ambiguïté et de l'hypocrisie. Les citoyens et les acteurs économiques attendent de la clarté. Disons une bonne fois pour toutes que le partenariat avec la Turquie ne passera pas par une adhésion à l'Union européenne.

Enfin, pour le Brexit, il y a certes de la diplomatie, mais aussi une dimension politique. Respectons pleinement nos lignes rouges et, surtout, divorçons d'abord avant de stabiliser une relation d'avenir. C'est en étant clairs sur ce que nous sommes et sur ce que nous voulons que nous ferons avancer une Europe avec cohérence.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Madam President, the EU's security and defence is not only PESCO, but PESCO is certainly an essential element of today's European security and defence and is a powerful tool to help in the long path towards truly integrated European defence. This is why we strongly welcome what we hope can be considered a promise that, by the end of this year, PESCO will become a reality.

Until recently, the logic of national sovereignty prevailed over the logic of integration in the defence field, but in the current circumstances the EU can no longer afford this. Now that all the necessary work has been done to prepare the framework for PESCO, it is time for the Member States to take the final step and notify their readiness to take part in permanent structured cooperation. As I will never stop repeating, we are well aware that some Member States are more ready and more capable of joining PESCO from the outset, but that must not prevent the others from joining as soon as they are ready, on the basis of the same predetermined criteria applying to all forms of enhanced cooperation. Accordingly, I will invite the national parliaments, firstly, to debate and follow the implementation of the common security and defence policy and PESCO with a view to defining space for further progress on integration. Secondly, I will invite the European Parliament to strengthen its partnership and cooperation with the national parliaments in the area of defence and PESCO.

I have one final question for President Tusk. When will the Council implement the Commission's proposal to invite Romania and Bulgaria to join Schengen as soon as possible as full members? This is becoming a sort of Carthage for Romanians and Bulgarians.

Sander Loones (ECR). – Dank u wel, mevrouw de Voorzitter. Mijn mailbox zit de laatste tijd vol met berichten over Catalonië en over Turkije. Vorige week was er dan die top van de Europese regeringsleiders in Brussel en daar is gesproken over Turkije en over het feit dat meneer Erdoğan niet tot de Europese Unie kan toetreden. Een goeie zaak. Eindelijk zou ik zeggen. Al mag het best nog wel wat meer zijn.

Maar over Catalonië, over Catalonië is geen woord gesproken. In Europa worden nochtans vaak en veel dure woorden gebruikt over vrije meningsuiting, over politieke vluchtelingen, over democratie, over respect voor de rechtsstaat. Europese politici zijn er vaak als de eersten bij om de wereld lessen te leren. Vingertje in de lucht. Maar vandaag wordt de rechtsstaat aangevallen onder onze neus, in de Europese Unie. Mensen worden politiek gevangengenomen, hier in Europa. En daarover geen woord. Geen woord in de conclusies van de Europese Raad. Geen woord ook hier deze week op de agenda van dit Parlement in Straatsburg. Wel in bedekte termen zonet een verklaring van meneer Tusk – gelukkig maar. Maar voor de rest toch vooral zeer selectieve verontwaardiging. En dat toont toch de hypocrisie aan in deze Europese instellingen. Daar is maar één term voor: schande!

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τα αποτελέσματα της συνόδου αρχηγών κρατών και κυβερνήσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης την προηγούμενη εβδομάδα δεν συνιστούν ουσιαστικό βήμα προόδου στα ανοιχτά ζητήματα που αντιμετωπίζει η Ένωση. Τα αποτελέσματα της συνόδου είναι ως επί το πλείστον γενικόλογες επαναλήψεις γνωστών πολιτικών, τη στιγμή κατά την οποία τα προβλήματα οξύνονται. Ιδίως ως προς το μεταναστευτικό, απαιτείται περισσότερη τόλμη και περισσότερη αλληλεγγύη μεταξύ των κρατών μελών. Η μετανάστευση και οι προσφυγικές ροές δεν είναι πρόβλημα μόνο της Ελλάδας ή της Ιταλίας. Είναι πρόβλημα της Ευρώπης και η Ευρώπη πρέπει να τα διαχειριστεί σε κεντρικό επίπεδο. Θέλω πάντως να εκφράσω την ικανοποίησή μου για τη δήλωση του προέδρου Tusk ότι το Συμβούλιο εξουσιοδότησε την Επιτροπή να εξετάσει τον περιορισμό της προενταξιακής χρηματοδότησης της Τουρκίας. Το καθεστώς Ερντογάν απομακρύνεται ολοένα περισσότερο από τις δημοκρατικές αρχές και η Ευρώπη πρέπει να αντιδράσει ανάλογα.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli anni 2016 e 2017 quasi 300 000 migranti, più della metà di quanti ne sono arrivati in tutta Europa, sono sbarcati in Italia e circa il 60 % di loro non ha diritto a una qualche forma di protezione internazionale.

Oltre alle solite affermazioni di principio del Consiglio europeo, non si riesce a prendere alcun impegno concreto su come deve essere ripartita l'accoglienza solidale tra Stati membri, soprattutto a causa di quei paesi che chiudono le porte ed elevano barriere, mentre in Parlamento viene propagandata come rivoluzionaria una riforma di Dublino che cancella solo sulla carta il principio del paese di primo arrivo.

Con l'introduzione di criteri e filtri che lasceranno i migranti economici nei primi paesi di arrivo, di un meccanismo di ricollocamento che non sarà né immediato né automatico e che si attiverà solo dopo verifiche di sicurezza e dopo l'esame preventivo della domanda di asilo, senza la previsione del tasso di disoccupazione per ridistribuire i richiedenti asilo, questa disunione europea perde un'altra occasione per dare piena attuazione ai principi di solidarietà ed equa ripartizione delle responsabilità previsti dall'articolo 80 del trattato.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Voorzitter, met de ietwat bombastische term “*Leaders Agenda*” heeft meneer Tusk hier het belangrijkste principe daarvan toegelicht: *the preservation of the unity*. Laat mij toe om te zeggen dat het een totaal achterhaalde en gescleroseerde visie is, die *the preservation of the unity*. De nieuwe tijd, waarvoor ik pleit, is er een die zich kant tegen centralisering en tegen bureaucrativering en die teruggrijpt naar de oorsprong van de Europese samenwerking, namelijk uitgaan van de eigen identiteit en de samenwerking op basis van subsidiariteit. De verschillen die de kracht van Europa vormen, die moeten voorrang hebben op deze rare, ietwat rare *unity*.

Ik keer mij dus namens steeds meer volkeren tegen de versnelling die u hier hebt uitgeroepen na de Franse, na de Nederlandse, na de Duitse verkiezingen. U vergeet even dat er inmiddels ook nog Oostenrijkse en Tsjechische verkiezingen zijn bijgekomen die allemaal één ding illustreren: de kracht van de nieuwe tijd. Daartegen moet u zich niet verzetten. U moet daarin meegaan en u moet minder Europese Unie hebben in plaats van meer.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta. Gracias por su agenda, señor Tusk. Europa se ha construido desde la política y desde la ambición y solo con política y con ambición podremos tener un futuro seguro.

Sesenta años después de la firma de los Tratados de Roma los europeos seguimos siendo diferentes, pero ahora somos iguales. Hemos aprendido a vivir y a convivir bajo las mismas leyes, con los mismos derechos y hasta con la misma moneda. Hemos aprendido a llamarnos ciudadanos antes que enemigos; hemos aprendido a escucharnos antes que a acusarnos y hemos aprendido a construir puentes en lugar de levantar muros. No pasa nada porque reconozcamos que lo hemos hecho bien.

Sin embargo, hoy —y esto es política como hace cien años—, tenemos que enfrentar el fantasma del nacionalpopulismo, que todo lo envenena, como hoy ocurre en mi país, España. Hoy, como hace cien años, hay políticos insensatos capaces de poner en riesgo a sus ciudadanos por el soberanismo y la supremacía étnica. Hoy, como hace cien años, volvemos a oír hablar de nuevas fronteras, de nuevas segregaciones culturales y de nuevas divisiones lingüísticas. De nuevas naciones.

Por eso hoy, como en el 56, debemos recordar que la prosperidad y el bienestar de Europa dependen de la paz y la seguridad, pero que no puede haber paz ni seguridad sin leyes ni Estado de Derecho; que la democracia solo es verdadera cuando pueden votar todos los ciudadanos y que las instituciones, por muy legítimas que sean, no son un fin en sí mismas: están para servir a los ciudadanos.

Los demócratas luchamos por la Europa de la integración y del euro; del programa Erasmus; la del espacio Schengen; la de las veinticuatro lenguas de este Parlamento y la que lidera el gasto social en el mundo. Desde que el ser humano existe, nadie ha tenido la calidad de vida de que disfrutaban los europeos del siglo XXI.

Debemos construir esa Europa, seguir construyendo esa Europa, para que no se convierta en el futuro en un sueño que no terminó de ser. Si no somos conscientes del peligro que entraña el nacionalpopulismo no habrá un error del pasado que no volvamos a cometer. El futuro de Europa es más Unión Europea y no más nacionalismo.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der vergangene Gipfel wird nicht in die Geschichte eingehen. Wieder einmal bewahrheitet sich, dass bei großen Fragen, wo sich die Selbstdarsteller im Scheinwerferlicht tummeln – wie bei der Migration – nichts weitergeht. Die vier Seiten Schlussfolgerungen sind enttäuschend: nicht mehr als eine Auflistung der vergeblichen Bemühungen, keine Zukunftsperspektiven und keine Sensibilität für die Vorgänge. Das Wort Flüchtlinge kommt kein einziges Mal vor.

Ganz anders ist das Ergebnis bei Fragen über die Ausführungen zum digitalen Europa, wo die Sacharbeit im Vordergrund steht. Hier werden konkrete Schritte vorgegeben, Perspektiven formuliert, wie bei den Fragen einer fairen Besteuerung der IT-Firmen oder bei Cybersecurity. Dieser ergebnisorientierte Pragmatismus bringt uns weiter. Es wäre gut, wenn auch bei den spektakulären Fragen weniger Aktionismus und mehr Pragmatismus vorherrschen würde.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Mevrouw de Voorzitter, twee opmerkingen van mijn kant over de Turkije-discussie tijdens de laatste bijeenkomst van de Raad.

Ten eerste, de Europese Unie wenst het gesprek met Turkije te blijven zoeken. In dat geval verwacht ik dat van Europese zijde de geloofsvrijheid van Turkse christenen zal worden geagendeerd, want de druk op hen neemt allengs toe – dat hoorde ik vorige week nog – inclusief recente pogingen tot kerksluitingen in Izmir.

Mijn tweede opmerking, mevrouw de Voorzitter, is meer een vraag en wijst op een tegenstrijdigheid in het Europese beleid. Hoe consistent is een Europees beleid dat Turkije enerzijds – begrijpelijk genoeg – wil korten op pretoetredingsgelden of die wil ombuigen naar de *civil society* vanwege – ik citeer kanselier Merkel – de absoluut onbevredigende situatie van de mensenrechten, en dat anderzijds Turkije via Europese banken ruimhartig financieel bijstaat bij de bouw van de trans-Anatolische gaspijplijn? De Raad zal zich over deze inconsistenties moeten buigen en ook de Commissie.

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the Good Friday Agreement recognises that there are unique circumstances that require special arrangements regarding the North of Ireland. That Accord essentially conferred a special status regarding the political and constitutional framework on which the six counties of the North operate. That Agreement is the basis on which we have been building peace in Ireland. Anyone who now says that there must be no special provisions for the North of Ireland in any Brexit deal is not only ignoring the realities of the Good Friday Agreement, but is in fact trying to undermine it.

It is disappointing that the British Government is cherry-picking the Peace Agreement, but it would be worse, it would be a travesty, if EU negotiators allowed them to do so by agreeing to the removal of European legal protections for the North of Ireland. As someone from the border region, I tell Parliament today, I tell the Council and the Commission that our community will not accept any return to the days of physical manifestations of the border in Ireland, knowing as we do the economic, political and social catastrophe that that would be. All of Ireland must remain in the Customs Union and the single market, and all of Ireland must have the protections of EU law. The EU must stand firm on these positions.

Laurențiu Rebega (ENF). – Doamna Președinte, domnilor Președinți, când a creat Uniunea Europeană, Dumnezeu s-a gândit să dea celor trei instituții principale următoarele calități: știință, putere și voință. Dar a venit diavolul și i-a spus: „Doamne, e prea mult.” Iar Dumnezeu a spus: „Bine, atunci să aibă numai câte două din aceste calități.”

Consiliul European are putere și știință, dar, din nefericire, nu are voință. Lucrările de săptămâna trecută au demonstrat acest lucru. În dosarul Europa digitală, da, s-au făcut câteva progrese. În privința PESCO, s-au formulat numai intenții bune. În chestiunea refugiaților, ca și în cazul Brexit, se vorbește despre progrese, dar se recunoaște că nu sunt semnificative. În privința reformei Uniunii Europene nu avem, însă, nimic. Or, aceasta este principala noastră problemă.

Înainte lucrărilor s-a vorbit despre un *roadmap*. Foarte bine, dar problema este că nu avem încă acest *road*. Până nu vom decide cu toții: Consiliul, Parlamentul, Comisia Europeană, să construim acest drum, Uniunea va bate pasul pe loc, iar drumul începe cu o reformă, oricât ar fi ea de dură și de costisitoare.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Madam President, I have three messages: one for all colleagues, one for President Tusk and the other for the Commission. I will be very sharp, very loud and very clear.

To all colleagues, I am shocked and ashamed when I hear that there are in this House Members of this Parliament who think that there is no respect for fundamental freedoms in Catalonia. Only a person who does not know Spain, who does not know Catalonia, can think there is no strict respect for rule of law and fundamental rights. I would like to live in a global world where human rights are as well respected as they are in Catalonia, even today.

The second message is to President Tusk. I am very worried about this idea of an extraordinary Council on the composition of the European Parliament. This is a competence and a power of our Parliament that then has to be approved by the Council, it is true, but we have made huge progress.

I, as a professor of constitutional law who teaches his students about the English revolution, say that we will not give up, we will not resign, and we will define our own composition because we feel we are the sovereign representatives of the European people. The Council should be aware of this in any case.

Finally, the third message. I would like to say to the Commission that I put all my hope in establishing a European civil protection force. That should be a body like the coast guard that could be a cornerstone of our future defence framework.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Az '56-os magyar forradalom és szabadságharc ünnepe alkalmával engedjék meg, hogy Albert Camus 1957 októberében írt sorait idézzem: „A magára maradt Európában csak úgy maradhatunk hívek Magyarországhoz, ha soha és sehol el nem áruljuk, amiért a magyar harcosok életüket adták. Nehéz minékünk méltónak lenni ennyi áldozatra, de meg kell kísérelnünk, feledve vitáinkat, revidelve tévedéseinket, megsokszorozva erőfeszítéseinket, szolidaritásunkat egy végre egyesülő Európában.”

És most Schengen: jogos azoknak az európai polgároknak a felháborodása, akiket közvetlenül érint a schengeni belső határellenőrzés fenntartása. Mindenki megérti az egyes országok aggodalmait, de vegyük észre, hogy itt az Európai Unió egyik legfontosabb vívmánya sérül folyamatosan. Miközben az európai intézmények nem fogalmaznak egyértelműen, és tulajdonképpen elismerik, hogy a jelenlegi helyzet a végtelenségig fenntartható, a polgárok ebből annyit érzékelnek, hogy a külső határokon mindenki bejöhet, és a belső határokon viszont visszaállítják a határellenőrzést. Ha az államok képtelenek garantálni a biztonságot a szabadon átjárható belső határok mellett, akkor valahol súlyos hiba csúszott a rendszerbe.

Románia és Bulgária schengeni térséghez való csatlakozását még mindig ellenzik egyes tagállamok, miközben a külső határok biztonságos ellenőrzésében nem ezek az országok teljesítenek alul, hanem olyanok, amelyek már a schengeni övezet tagjai.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Flucht und Migration gehören zu den großen Herausforderungen unserer Zeit – auch für uns.

Dieses Parlament hat sich nach schweren Verhandlungen auf eine Reform des Dublin-Systems verständigt: mehr gemeinsame Verantwortung, Staaten mit Außengrenze nicht allein lassen. Doch es fehlt eine Position des Rates. Der Eindruck: Zu viele ergeben sich den lauten Rufen von Populisten und Extremisten. Öffentlich erkennbar: Abschottung, Zäune, Türkei-Deal, Vereinbarung mit Libyen, Forderungen an Transitländer.

Mit Blick auf Armutsmigration müssen wir gemeinsam mit den Herkunftsländern erreichen, dass diese ihre Bürger zurücknehmen und weniger Menschen auf der Suche nach einer Perspektive ihr Land verlassen. Da stimme ich dem Rat zu. Wir müssen im Dialog mit diesen Staaten bei Entwicklung, Handel, Visa und anderen Bereichen zu neuen Lösungen kommen. Der Rat könnte da vielleicht konkrete Vorschläge machen.

Gestalten wir also unsere Zukunft für uns und für unsere Nachbarn.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Madam President, I'm here supposed to talk about Brexit, and I will do that, but before that I would like to make a short comment about the basis of our community identified by Donald Tusk. And yes, we are a territorial community; yes, we have a cultural identity; yes, we are a political community. I also would like to stress and reiterate that we are seen in the world as one of the most civilised jurisdictions, because of our social model: the social market economy – a market economy but not a market society. Europe is a place where every child goes to school, every sick person has health care, every elderly has a pension, and labour rights are protected. This is always fundamental to recall for us.

On Brexit, we welcome the Article 50 conclusions of the European Council, which are fully in line with our Parliament resolution. We recognise the progress and the new dynamic put in place by the Florence speech of Theresa May, but also we see that we are not yet there to open the second phase, as sufficient progress has not yet been reached. We look forward to the next weeks and months of negotiations in order to arrive there, and that requires to fully recognise the UK financial obligations, to fully safeguard the rights of citizens, and to fully agree on the common principles on the Irish issue. We are at touching distance, yes, but we also need to arrive to a conclusion and we encourage our UK counterpart to be constructive at the negotiations table.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, I came here mostly to listen, not just to speak for 90 seconds, and these were two hours very well spent. Let me just remind you of a few words that were said in the debate.

Let me start with three words said by our three Presidents. These were: values, unity and solidarity. I guess that most of us believe that this is the essence, the core of our common Europe, and we must find a way to convince more national politicians and, more generally, as many people as possible to see things the same way.

How can we do this? We know it is not easy, but let me borrow two words that were said by the heads of two of our parliamentary groups, the words are visibility and results. We must find a way to reach the results that will be visible and that will allow people to understand the benefits of the European Union.

Lastly, let me also mention two words whose results are more difficult to grasp. These are pragmatism and unanimity, also used by the Chairs of our groups. Concerning pragmatism, let me say that sometimes it is a good thing, but I don't think that it is good for the sake of so-called pragmatism to obey the rules, the principles and common sense. And this is, I guess, quite important. Unanimity is also a tricky word, because we must find the right balance between unanimity and unity in order to reach the visible, optimum results that will ensure our Union has support in the minds of its people.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Tusk! Ich habe stundenlang gerätselt, wen Sie meinen konnten, als Sie eine *Leaders' Agenda* vorgelegt haben: Das Parlament oder die Spitzen der Kommission – bis ich herausbekommen habe, dass Sie diejenigen meinen, die in unserem europäischen Zug im letzten Wagen sitzen und mühsam immer mitgeschleppt werden müssen. Nun gebe ich auch denen recht, die sagen, es reicht nicht, immer auf den Rat zu schimpfen. Deshalb mein Appell auch an uns hier im Parlament: Wir müssen die innenpolitischen Diskussionen auch bei uns zu Hause führen, um unsere Regierungen in Berlin, in Budapest und wer weiß wo davon zu überzeugen, dass sie mit uns diesen Weg gehen. Wir können uns nicht darauf verlassen, dass es reicht, sozusagen alleine hier weise Beschlüsse zu fassen.

Und wenn das geschieht, dann bin ich sicher, gibt es auch im Rat eine bessere Chance. Und deshalb ist meine Bitte an Sie, sich nicht im Februar über uns den Kopf zu zerbrechen, sondern lieber diesen Sondertermin zu nutzen, um die Fragen, die Sie selbst aufgezählt haben, zu lösen.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Уважаеми г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Туск, уважаеми г-н Тимерманс, разбирам г-н Туск и Ви съчувствам много често в това, че имате много сложна задача да намерите компромис между страни, които имат различни желания, особено когато имаме процедура за единодушно взимане на решения, което спира доста добри инициативи и прави Европейския съюз доста неефективен.

Справедливо е тези страни, които искат повече интеграция в определена сфера, да имат тази възможност да го направят, а тези, които не искат, да не спират страните, които имат възможност или искат да тръгнат напред в определена сфера. Европа на различни скорости, само когато те са доброволни и всяка страна, която е покрила съответните критерии да може да стане част от съответната интеграционна стъпка, било то Шенген, Евроната, Обща прокуратура, било то Отбранителен съюз, Банков съюз, само да изброя някои от тях.

България и Румъния трябва да бъдат допуснати в Шенгенското пространство и това ще увеличи нашата обща сигурност, а не намалява както някъде се чуват такива приказки. Призовах не само тук, но и новото правителство в Нидерландия да направи съответната стъпка и по вода, и по въздух 2018 година България и Румъния да са част от това пространство.

Една дума за Евроната. Същите критерии би трябвало да се прилагат и за Евроната. Страни, които са покрили критериите, имат желание да влезнат в механизма ИРМ 2, това да се случи и за тях. Такава страна е България. Между другото всички страни с изключение на Дания и на Обединеното Кралство са заявили политически, че ще влезнат в Евроната.

По отношение на отбраната, тук съм за много по-сериозни, ефективни действия по отношение на общия отбранителен съюз. Ако през 50-те години се беше случила тази Европейска отбранителна общност, сега нямаше да говорим за това и толкова бавно да имаме възможност за обединяване на нашият отбранителен капацитет.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, it was decided as expected that insufficient progress had been made in the negotiations. This was a statement of the blatantly obvious. Yet when this Parliament said the same thing just two weeks prior to that, with most British MEPs voting in favour of Parliament's resolution, two Conservative MEPs were suspended by their party for daring to tell the truth.

This gives us a clue as to why progress is so minimal in the negotiations: the divisions within the governing Conservative Party. Theresa May spends more time negotiating with her party than negotiating with the European Union. And some of her party actually want Brexit without a deal. They present this as a negotiating tactic. If Britain threatens to leave without a deal the EU will give us what we want. Yet, as everybody knows, this will be hugely economically damaging to Britain. That tactic amounts to holding a gun to your own head and saying, give me what I want or I will shoot myself. It will not work. But they do not actually want it to work. Those people want a Brexit without a deal because they want to create maximum distance between Britain and its neighbouring countries. No matter how damaging that is, no matter how costly that is, that is what they want.

Nobody should have any illusions as to where the responsibility lies and I think that President Tusk was quite right when he said it is up to Britain. In his words: 'It's up to Britain to choose a deal, no deal or No Brexit'. You were right, President Tusk.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich möchte dort anknüpfen, wo Kollege Verhofstadt, Herr Rangel, aber auch Herr Fleckenstein sich eingebracht haben.

Der Sondergipfel, den Sie für Februar angesprochen haben, Herr Präsident Tusk. Wenn schon einen Sondergipfel über diese Frage, dann sollten Sie einen zur Stärkung der europäischen Demokratie einberufen. Wir müssen über die Zukunft der europäischen Demokratie reden. Wir müssen die Gewaltentrennung stärken. Ein Problem der Gewaltentrennung ist, dass im Rat die Regierungen auf der einen Seite Exekutive und auf der anderen Seite Legislative sind, dass die Einstimmigkeit und der Intergouvernementalismus die nationalen Parlamente und das Europäische Parlament schwächen.

Und daher müssen wir darüber reden, wie wir gemeinsam die Institutionen stärken, um unserer demokratischen Verpflichtung gerecht werden zu können. Die Frage des Afrikafonds, die Frage des Außengrenzschatzes, die Frage der Migrationspolitik hängen doch auch damit zusammen, dass sie primär nationale Kompetenz sind, aber wir ein gemeinsames europäisches Problem haben. Daher Ja zu einem Sondergipfel über die Zukunft der europäischen Demokratie und eine Diskussion darüber, was wir im Rat zu ändern haben, damit die Europäische Union im Zusammenspiel der Institutionen handlungsfähiger ist und die Beschlüsse auch tatsächlich rasch umsetzen kann.

Ich möchte daher auch sagen: Wir benötigen nicht nur Geld für Afrika, wir benötigen eine gemeinsame Außen-, Sicherheits-, Verteidigungs-, Entwicklungs- und Investitionspolitik. Ja, wir benötigen den Außengrenzschatz, aber wir benötigen dafür die europäische Kompetenz, das Geld und das Personal. Dafür bitte ich Sie, Sorge zu tragen.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, qual è l'unità di misura con cui valutiamo i risultati di un Consiglio europeo? La visione strategica, la velocità nelle decisioni, la risolutezza nell'affrontare i problemi, la solidarietà tra gli Stati membri? Se questi fossero i criteri siamo lontani dall'essere soddisfatti, a partire dai temi dell'immigrazione dove, oltre a consumate e ormai inutili espressioni di solidarietà, i progressi appaiono impercettibili.

Avete la possibilità, signor Presidente del Consiglio, di smentirmi, approvando non in tempi biblici la riforma del regolamento di Dublino, come ha fatto il Parlamento la settimana scorsa.

Anche sul digitale serve uno scatto in avanti, nonostante i primi frutti della strategia avviata nel 2015 dalla Commissione europea. In questo settore serviranno visione, velocità, risolutezza e solidarietà, a partire dalla definizione di un regime fiscale equo per gli operatori del web. In questo senso, salutiamo con favore l'iniziativa di alcuni paesi, Germania, Francia, Italia e Spagna in testa, ma a cui altri hanno già aderito, e auspichiamo una risposta rapida e ancor più ambiziosa a livello di Unione.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, mir, sloboda, demokracija se ne podrazumijevaju. Oni su plod naših zajedničkih stremljenja i plod uživanja europskih i zajedničkih općih vrijednosti: Schengen, eurozona, 24 jezika, princip solidarnosti – sve su to vrijednosti koje želimo i dalje uživati. Gospodin Kovačev je spomenuo Bugarsku i Rumunjsku, ja ću spomenuti Hrvatsku. I mi želimo biti članica Schengena i nadam se da ćemo u tome zajedno uspjeti.

Ne mogu ne izraziti još jedanput žaljenje zbog Brexita, ali isto tako, kad je on već tu, želim izraziti da je potreban pošten razlaz i da je potrebno ispoštovati financijske obveze i sve ostale obveze koje su preuzete. Isto tako ne mogu ne izraziti žaljenje zbog stanja u Kataloniji.

Gospodine Tusk, nakon govora Junkera o stanju Unije, nakon Macronovog interesantnog govora, dolazi vaša Leaders' Agenda. Ja sam vrlo optimistična, vi najavljujete puno tema, ali isto tako potrebno je naći realna rješenja za realne probleme naših građana kako bi osjetili što to mi zapravo svi zajedno radimo, kako bismo rješavali probleme, a najveći problemi trenutno su strah od sigurnosti ili nesigurnosti, zatim migracije, ali i nezaposlenost u Europi, koja još uvijek vlada, posebice u nekim novim europskim zemljama.

Stoga s nestrpljenjem očekujem raspravu o temama koje ste najavili: o eurozoni, o migraciji i izmjeni azila, koju smo ovdje u našem Parlamentu donijeli, novu politiku azila. Također očekujem i ostale teme, a posebice temu zajedničke europske obrane. Nadam se da ćemo zajedno uspjeti i da ćete vi naći kompromis unutar Vijeća.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πέρα από τα οικονομικά ή άλλα συμφέροντα, το μέγιστο συμφέρον είναι η αποτελεσματική εφαρμογή της ευρωπαϊκής νομιμότητας και του κράτους δικαίου. Αυτός είναι ο πυρήνας της ύπαρξής μας στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Στο τελευταίο όμως Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο, η Τουρκία πέρασε και πάλι αλώβητη. Απλά σχεδιάζεται η περικοπή μερικών εκατομμυρίων, αλλά ταυτοχρόνως της παρέχουμε αρκετά δισεκατομμύρια.

Κύριε Juncker (ο οποίος δεν είναι εδώ αλλά θα του μεταφερθεί το ερώτημα), συνεχίσετε να στηρίζετε την αναβάθμιση της τελωνειακής ένωσης της Τουρκίας χωρίς καν να έχει εκπληρώσει τις ευρωπαϊκές της υποχρεώσεις που περιλαμβάνουν και την αναγνώριση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας; Αυτό είναι ένα κύριο ερώτημα. Κύριε Tusk, στο Συμβούλιο, με δική σας ανακοίνωση αργότερα, είπατε ότι ακούσατε τις ανησυχίες του κύριου Προέδρου για τις νέες παραβιάσεις των δικαιωμάτων των εγκλωβισμένων από την Τουρκία στην Κύπρο. Σας ερωτώ: και εγώ μπορώ να ακούω τις ανησυχίες του οποιουδήποτε. Τι κάνετε καθώς παραβιάζεται το κράτος δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο κατεχόμενο μέρος της Κύπρου;

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente Tusk, giovedì in commissione LIBE abbiamo approvato con ampia maggioranza un'ambiziosa riforma di Dublino, che il Parlamento porta al negoziato con il Consiglio sfidando gli egoismi nazionali, ma con cui lanciamo anche un segnale forte ai cittadini europei. Almeno una delle tre istituzioni mette in campo soluzioni comuni basate sulla solidarietà. La più grande svolta è che abbiamo finalmente cancellato il criterio ipocrita del primo paese di accesso e lo abbiamo sostituito con un meccanismo permanente di ricollocaimento, cui devono partecipare tutti gli Stati membri.

Noi siamo pronti. Consiglio, dove sei? Su quali elementi avete trovato accordo? È vergognoso che la discussione su Dublino slitti in primavera e che abbiate passato un anno e mezzo con la proposta della Commissione sul tavolo a occuparvi solo di eternalizzare le nostre frontiere, mentre sulla solidarietà interna non siete stati in grado di fare un solo passo avanti.

Mi faccia un favore, Presidente Tusk: ha detto che ricorderà ai governi che firmando i trattati hanno firmato anche l'articolo 2. Ricordi loro che vale anche per l'articolo 80, che vuole solidarietà ed equa condivisione delle responsabilità. Vuole essere guardiano dell'unità europea, come dice? Allora faccia sua la proposta del Parlamento, perché non c'è unità senza solidarietà. Non sono le quote a non avere futuro, Presidente, ma un'Unione basata sull'unità di mera facciata.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitam zemlji predsjedavateljici na impresivnim rezultatima u digitalizaciji nadajući se usvajanju direktiva koje će cijeloj Europskoj uniji, urbanim i ruralnim dijelovima, planinskim područjima i otocima omogućiti zajedničku digitalnu budućnost s jednako dostupnim sadržajem i uslugama.

Pozdravljam podršku Vijeća „povratku Schengena“. Ulazak u Schengen je strateški cilj Hrvatske. Nadam se da će, nakon što zadovoljimo kriterije, europske institucije spriječiti moguću političku blokadu našeg ulaska. Vjerodostojnost Europske unije ovisi i o tome hoće li biti uklonjena bodljikava žica koju su na naše granice razvukli upravo naši susjedi – zemlje članice Europske unije.

Podržavam start PESCO-a i dodatnu obrambenu koordinaciju, posebno jače uključivanje malih i srednjih poduzeća u zajedničke projekte financirane europskim fondovima i programima.

Dobro je što će već sljedeći sastanak programa čelnika biti posvećen socijalnoj Europi, poslovima i rastu. Raduje i samit EU – Zapadni Balkan, ali rasprave trebaju biti fokusirane na proširenje, a ne samo na pomoć ovim zemljama u slučaju nove migrantske krize.

Kati Piri (S&D). – Madam President, after a three-hour discussion by EU leaders on Turkey, the only sentence that made it to the conclusions was: ‘The European Council held a debate on relations with Turkey’. On such an important topic, it would have been good to start seeing strategic thinking on the part of our Heads of State. It is clear what EU leaders do not want – no opening of accession chapters, no modernisation of the Customs Union, no lifting of the visa requirement for Turkish citizens, no harsh words on fundamental human rights abuses – but all these noes do not add up to a strategy on how to make an attempt to keep Turkey anchored to the EU.

On the eve of the Summit, another low point was reached in Turkey with the arrest of Osman Kavala, a leading activist in building a more tolerant and open Turkey. How is the EU showing its solidarity with civil society in Turkey and with millions of citizens who are going through very difficult times? Cutting back on pre-accession funding is no more than logical in the light of current events, but a good signal would be to use that money to help Turkey’s democrats. They are the ones who deserve our fullest support.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta. Hoy nadie puede negar que Europa está ante grandes dificultades y también amenazas, amenazas como los egoísmos y la falta de solidaridad.

Falta de solidaridad con los de fuera, con quienes llaman a las puertas de Europa huyendo del hambre, huyendo de las guerras y se encuentran con una parte de Europa que no entiende que son necesarias medidas comunes para hacer frente a estos desafíos, a los desafíos de la inmigración y de los refugiados.

Pero también egoísmo y falta de solidaridad dentro del propio seno de la Unión Europea, porque hoy, en Europa, hay quienes aprovechan fracturas sociales creadas para levantar fronteras, para atacar los principios fundamentales de la Unión Europea, de la solidaridad, de la cooperación. Y frente a eso, solo hay una posición. Frente a los que quieren levantar fronteras —y por encima de cualquier otra diferencia— solo hay una posición, y es la defensa del Estado democrático, social y de Derecho. En esa posición tiene que estar la Unión Europea y quienes apoyamos este proyecto.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αγαπητέ φίλε, Πρόεδρε του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου κύριε Tusk, πραγματικά χαίρομαστε γιατί τονίζετε τις ευρωπαϊκές αρχές και αξίες που είναι τα θεμέλια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, και η ισχύς της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης βασίζεται πάνω στις αρχές της. Όμως, η Τουρκία παραβιάζει συλλήβδην αυτές τις αρχές και τις αξίες. Υπάρχει μία χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, η οποία υφίσταται την καταπάτηση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, υφίσταται τις απειλές της Τουρκίας. Γνωρίζετε πολύ καλά από την ενημέρωση από τον Πρόεδρο της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας ότι απαγόρευσαν ακόμα και στους εγκλωβισμένους την ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια. Η Τουρκία συνεχίζει να προκαλεί προς όλες τις κατευθύνσεις και εμείς ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλουμε να υπερασπιστούμε τις αρχές και τις αξίες μας. Και υπεράσπιση αρχών και αξιών σημαίνει ότι δεν πρέπει να δεχτούμε και να αποδεχθούμε τους εκβιασμούς και τις απειλές της Τουρκίας για οποιαδήποτε χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Δεν πρέπει να εγκρίνουμε προενταξιακά κονδύλια για την Τουρκία και να την επιβραβεύσουμε. Δεν πρέπει να αναβαθμίσουμε την τελωνειακή της ένωση και δεν πρέπει να ανοίξει κανένα κεφάλαιο, εάν η Τουρκία δεν συμμορφωθεί με αυτές τις αρχές και τις αξίες. Χαίρομαστε γιατί και εσείς και ο κύριος Timmermans, ο οποίος είναι παρών, γνωρίζετε πολύ καλά ότι στην τελευταία προσπάθεια για επίλυση του Κυπριακού η Τουρκία φέρει ακεραία την ευθύνη, παρά τις προσπάθειες του Προέδρου της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας για επίλυση του κυπριακού προβλήματος.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, vicepresidente Timmermans. He escuchado con atención y con preocupación el debate sobre las conclusiones del Consejo en materia de migraciones, porque por todos lados se respira el rechazo a las migraciones bajo el estigma de su irregularidad, y sobre todo la obsesión por el retorno de los migrantes irregulares, que llega incluso a incitar a la cooperación reforzada con Libia, ignorando que es un Estado inexistente y que es el punto de partida de una tragedia hacia el Mediterráneo y el punto de llegada de una tragedia no menor en el desierto que conduce al tráfico ilícito de personas.

Y todo esto en una suspensión continuada de Schengen, y sin ninguna referencia ni a los refugiados, ni a las vías y canales legales que siguen siendo necesarios, vinculados a la política de reasentamiento, pero sobre todo con la instauración de visados humanitarios. ¿Schengen suspendido todavía, *sine die*, prolongándolo hasta el año 2020? No habrá una Europa que los ciudadanos puedan apreciar y recompensar con su voto si no hay una defensa de la libre circulación de personas y de la Europa social, que brilla por su ausencia en estas conclusiones del Consejo. Y los ciudadanos votarán en el año 2019. No lo perdamos de vista.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Tusk, αναφερθήκατε στο θέμα της ενότητας και της αλληλεγγύης, αλλά δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει αλληλεγγύη αυτή τη στιγμή από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όταν έχετε αυτή τη στάση απέναντι στην Τουρκία. Η Τουρκία η οποία παραβιάζει τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο, παραβιάζει τα χωρικά ύδατα της Ελλάδος, απειλεί με *casus belli* την Ελλάδα, έχει καταλάβει το 37% του εδάφους της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Επομένως για πια αλληλεγγύη μιλούμε; Τι αποφάσεις πήρατε στο τελευταίο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο; Είναι δεδομένο ότι πρέπει να υπάρξει άμεση διακοπή των ενταξιακών διαπραγματεύσεων της Τουρκίας και πάγωμα όλων των κονδυλίων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Επιπλέον, τι αλληλεγγύη υπάρχει στο προσφυγικό για την Ελλάδα; Πρέπει να συνεχιστεί η διαδικασία μετεγκαταστάσεων, διότι το πρόγραμμα τελείωσε και έχει εκτελεστεί μόνο κατά το 1/3. Και η Γαλλία και η Γερμανία μόνο κατά το 1/3 εκτέλεσαν αυτό το πρόγραμμα. Άλλες χώρες καθόλου. Χρειάζεται συνέχιση και επέκταση του προγράμματος μετεγκαταστάσεων. Η Ελλάδα δεν αντέχει άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Voorzitter, voorzitter Tusk, commissaris, *proud to be a European!* Dat ben ik ook. Een trotse Europeaan. Maar ik zou nog trotser zijn, voorzitter Tusk, indien we sneller en veel verder vooruit zouden kunnen gaan. U zei: “Als we snel willen gaan, moeten we alleen gaan”. Neen, ik zou graag snel en verder met z’n allen vooruitgaan, naar een veiliger Europa, met stevige buitengrenzen, met een Europese defensie-unie, – wat mij betreft – een echt Europees leger, naar een echt Europees asiel- en migratiebeleid, collega’s, de hervorming van Dublin, aandacht voor de kindermigratie. Dat heb ik hier vandaag niet gehoord. Nog steeds tienduizend vermiste migrantenjongeren in Europa, in erbarmelijke omstandigheden in kampen. Daar moeten we iets aan doen. En collega’s, velen hebben het hier gezegd, dit Turkije hoort niet thuis in de Europese Unie. Collega’s, laten van dit moment en van de Brexit gebruik maken om Europa te hervormen, naar een kleinere Commissie, weg van de eenparigheidsregel en natuurlijk graag met één zetel voor het Europees Parlement.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα αποτελέσματα της Συνόδου Κορυφής αποδεικνύουν δυστυχώς πως η επίσημη πολιτική της Ένωσης συνεχίζει να καταστρατηγεί τις διακηρυγμένες αρχές της αλληλεγγύης και να ακολουθεί πολιτικές ενάντια στα συμφέροντα των λαών. Στη μετανάστευση συνεχίζεται η εμμονή στη δημιουργία της Ευρώπης-φρούριο, της προώθησης απελάσεων, της στήριξης στρατιωτικών επιχειρήσεων. Αντί να δοθεί έμπρακτη στήριξη στα κράτη που δέχονται τα μεγαλύτερα κύματα προσφύγων, ζητείται πλήρης εφαρμογή της απαράδεκτης συμφωνίας επιβράβευσης της Τουρκίας, στην οποία δόθηκαν ήδη 2,9 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Αντί να στηριχτούν οι γείτονες χώρες, επιδιώκεται να καταστούν συνοριοφύλακες. Αντί το Συμβούλιο να προτείνει επενδύσεις για προώθηση της πραγματικής οικονομίας, για ανάπτυξη κοινωνικών πολιτικών καταπολέμησης της φτώχειας και δημιουργίας νέων θέσεων εργασίας, ζητεί να επιταχυνθούν οι διαδικασίες για περαιτέρω στρατιωτικοποίηση της Ένωσης, για ενίσχυση της αμυντικής βιομηχανίας και χρηματοδότηση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Άμυνας. Οι προτάσεις που προωθούνται όχι μόνο δεν θα ωφελήσουν τους λαούς της Ευρώπης, αλλά θα στηρίξουν νέους πολέμους με καταστροφικές συνέπειες για τους λαούς και τους λαούς της Ευρώπης.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για μία ακόμη φορά το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο συζήτησε τα σοβαρά θέματα που αντιμετωπίζει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, χωρίς όμως να έχει μία πραγματιστική πρόταση για να μπορέσει να τα επιλύσει. Αυτός, άλλωστε, είναι και λόγος για τον οποίον τα θέματα αυτά έχουν βαλτώσει. Καμία πρόοδος στις διαπραγματεύσεις για το Brexit. Καμία πρόοδος στο μεταναστευτικό. Μοναδική και θλιβερή κατάληξη να έχει μεταβληθεί η Ελλάδα σε ένα στρατόπεδο συγκεντρώσεως δύστυχων ανθρώπων οι οποίοι πίστεψαν ότι ήρθαν στη Γη της Επαγγελίας και έχουν καταντήσει να ζουν κάτω από άθλιες συνθήκες, διότι πολύ απλά η κατεστραμμένη οικονομικά αλλά δεν μπορεί να τους αντέξει άλλο. Η Τουρκία εξακολουθεί να προκαλεί. Εξακολουθεί να στέλνει νέα κύματα λαθρομεταναστών στην Ελλάδα. Δεν αναγνωρίζει την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία. Παρόλα αυτά, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν έχει το θάρρος να της κλείσει την πόρτα και να πάψει να τη χρηματοδοτεί. Τέλος, σε μία περίοδο οικονομικής κρίσεως που πάνω από 120 εκατομμύρια πολιτών της Ευρώπης, κυρίως στον Νότο, βρίσκονται στα όρια της φτώχειας ή κάτω απ' αυτά, συζητάμε για αύξηση των στρατιωτικών δαπανών με αιτιολογία το να αντιμετωπίσουμε την απειλή στον κυβερνοχώρο. Μία κατάσταση, μία δικαιολογία που φέρνει μόνο χαμόγελα ειρωνικά και σε αυτούς που ξέρουν από άμυνα και σε αυτούς οι οποίοι δεν γνωρίζουν.

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Evropska politična skupnost med različnimi narodi in kulturami Evrope predpostavlja razumevanje in odgovornost drug do drugega in stremi k ohranjanju kulturnih razlik in kulturne identitete Evrope. In na nas je, da to skrbno varujemo za prihodnje rodove.

Prizadevanja glede povečanja nadzora nad zunanji mejami in zmanjšanju nezakonitih tokov pri sredozemski poti moramo utrditi ter jih preusmeriti v dolgoročno vizijo. Zato pa bo potrebno okrepiti sodelovanje z državami izvora in državami tranzita. Skupni azilni sistem je potrebno urediti skupaj z digitalno prihodnostjo za Evropo, ki mora biti več kot le digitalni enotni trg.

Evropa se mora pripraviti na izzive digitalne tehnologije. Odpraviti moramo vse ovire in omejitve, s katerimi se soočajo državljani in digitalna ter zagonska podjetja, da bomo v največ možni meri izkoristili ves potencial, ki ga ponuja digitalni razvoj.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule Tusk, sunt bucuroasă să aud că doriți unitate, doriți o singură Uniune Europeană, nu două, nu trei, nu mai multe. Dar mînea este la dumneavoastră: președintele Comisiei, Juncker, a declarat deschis, aici, că se dorește o singură Uniune, că dorim ca și statele membre care întrunesc condițiile, România și Bulgaria, să fie în Schengen. Parlamentul a votat o rezoluție. Deci, dumneavoastră veniți să ne dați sfaturi? Domnul Președinte Juncker spune că este bine ca vorbele să fie urmate de fapte și așteptăm acest lucru. Este nevoie să nu uităm niciodată că, pentru a fi o Europă unită, nu dezbinată, trebuie să existe coeziune socială, și de acest lucru cred că trebuie să ne ocupăm mai mult.

Uniunea Europeană este un teritoriu care trebuie apărut și, de aceea, este nevoie să fie un singur spațiu. Și, domnule președinte Tusk, cred că este nevoie să vedem că aceste state, care sunt discriminate, se află în prima parte a clasamentului țărilor proeuropene și este bine să ținem cont de acest lucru. Trebuie să respectăm cetățenii proeuropeni și să luptăm împotriva euroscepticismului. De aceea cred, domnule Tusk, că este important să aveți unitate în Consiliu și nu să ne spuneți nouă ce trebuie să facem. Nu ne dați sfaturi. Legat de numărul de mandate, sigur, s-a spus aici, Parlamentul este cel care va decide, dar, iată, de această dată sunt de acord. Pleacă un stat, trebuie să reducem numărul de parlamentari. Vă mulțumesc.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente. Como ha dicho el señor Verhofstadt, ha llegado la hora de la verdad. Estamos construyendo una nueva realidad que requiere revisar en profundidad conceptos políticos y formas de organización que debemos superar si queremos que Europa sea la casa de todos.

Construir la CECA parecía utópico, pero acabó con el peligro de volver a las bayonetas. No lo olvidemos, porque hoy los egoísmos nacionales vuelven, se abren paso en los conceptos cada vez más rancios sobre identidad, nación y soberanía, sobre participación ciudadana que bloquean soluciones hacia arriba y hacia abajo.

Necesitamos otra estructura institucional para estimular la unión del mercado de la energía, para acabar con el dumping social interno u organizar la acogida de refugiados. Necesitamos más valores europeos frente al brexit o ante un problema como el de Cataluña.

Si nos creemos el lema «Unidos en la diversidad», ¿es mejor una intervención militar en suelo europeo, porque lo autoriza la Constitución española, o ayudar a que se resuelva hablando un problema político? ¿Cómo sumar esa diversidad sin resolver la propia?

Estas son las cuestiones a las que también, señor Timmermans, usted tiene que dar respuesta.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, o cinismo das palavras redondas não esconde o verdadeiro significado da abordagem dita pragmática à situação dos migrantes que continuam a tentar chegar à Europa. Expulsão de refugiados, desrespeitando normas do direito internacional e revelando quão fundo vai o compromisso da União Europeia com os direitos humanos, complacência ou mesmo cumplicidade perante as brutais agressões de que muitos deles são vítimas nas fronteiras da União Europeia e a chantagem para com os países africanos – ou fazem o trabalho sujo de travar os que fogem da miséria e da guerra ou a União Europeia fecha-vos a torneira dos fundos.

Quanto à União Económica e Monetária, a estratégia continua a ser a de acenar com a cenoura e esconder o pau. A cenoura que nunca vem, seja o terceiro pilar da União bancária, que agora, sem surpresa, caiu por terra, seja um mirífico Fundo Monetário Europeu. O pau, esse é certo, uma ainda maior concentração de poder, usurpação de soberania, dependência económica e subordinação política.

Uma última palavra em relação aos incêndios de que falou Jean-Claude Juncker, em Portugal. A solidariedade é devida, sim, senhor, mas a solidariedade exige adicionalidade e não uma mera reprogramação dos Fundos Estruturais.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, what our citizens expect of us is that we provide European answers where European answers are necessary, that we provide the answers that will allow them to regain control of their destinies individually and collectively, that we provide the answers for issues that are manifestly beyond the control of individual Member States. That is our mission.

If we are to be successful in our mission we, the three institutions represented here today, need to act collectively. If we are successful in providing answers that work for our citizens, Europe will be rewarded for it. If we are not successful in providing these answers we will all share the blame.

The blame-game here – saying ‘Parliament did the right thing’, ‘the Commission did the right thing’, or ‘the Commission failed’, ‘Parliament failed’ or ‘the Council failed’ – is useless because our citizens do not distinguish between our institutions. They will say that Europe has failed. So, in that sense, we are in this together.

Two of the institutions now represented here today only have limited time left before the next elections and before the next Commission will come in. We need to make the best use possible of that limited time. That is why in a moment I will go to the College meeting to decide on the Commission Work Programme for next year, and then present that programme here in Parliament this afternoon.

I think the work programme will contain the concrete steps that will allow us to deliver on the promises we are making to our citizens, and it will allow us to use the 18 months that we have left in our mandates to effectively show that Europe can come up with answers when it is called upon to do so.

Donald Tusk, *President of the European Council*. – Mr President, I would just like to clarify a few misunderstandings. The leaders' agenda is not an alternative version of the State of the Union address. It is a plan on how to organise the work of the European Council in the next two years. The leaders' agenda is not about changing the Community method. It is an attempt to speed up decision-making processes under binding rules while respecting the competences of all institutions, and that includes the competences of the European Council.

According to the Treaty, when it comes to the composition of the European Parliament, we – this House and the European Council – must work out a common solution. It is not our pleasure or ambition, but our formal obligation. I am the last one to want to violate the Treaty and our rules. By the way, the composition of the European Parliament will not be the only topic for the extraordinary European Council in February. We will also deal with the MFF. I personally consider the MFF to be an even more important part of our meeting in February.

As for the Spitzenkandidaten, the European Council was not the weak link in 2014. Jean-Claude Juncker was elected by 26 to 2 votes in the European Council, whereas in Parliament he got 422 out of 729 votes. So it is easy to imagine a situation in which it would be more difficult for the winning Spitzenkandidat to win sufficient support in the European Parliament than in the European Council.

Presidente. – Ringrazio il Presidente del Consiglio europeo. La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), *per iscritto*. – La netta vittoria dei populistici nelle recenti elezioni in Repubblica Ceca ci dice che «la finestra di opportunità» aperta all'indomani della Brexit è annunciata dal Presidente Juncker nel suo discorso sullo Stato dell'Unione non sarà di lunga durata. Accolgo con soddisfazione l'adozione dell'agenda dei *leader*, che organizza la tempistica del lavoro per i prossimi due anni. Ciò che non mi convince è il modo in cui vengono affrontati i temi. Quello dell'immigrazione ci accompagnerà ancora a lungo, ma occorrono ulteriori sforzi per stabilire una presenza permanente dell'UE in Libia e fornire finanziamenti adeguati e mirati per progetti collegati alla migrazione nell'Africa settentrionale. Il Parlamento sta accelerando sulla modifica del regolamento di Dublino. Non c'è lo stesso impegno da parte degli Stati membri. Mi lascia perplesso anche l'apertura nei confronti del Regno Unito. Allo stato attuale il riconoscimento del debito da parte della *premier* May non si è ancora tradotto in un fermo e concreto impegno a onorare tali obblighi nella loro totalità e proprio ora non possiamo permetterci equivoci.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Rada Europejska w gronie 27 państw członkowskich 20 października dokonała podsumowania stanu negocjacji z Wielką Brytanią oraz postanowiła rozpocząć przygotowania do drugiego etapu rozmów w sprawie brexitu. Z zadowoleniem przyjmuję poczynione do tej pory postępy, niewielkie co prawda, ale po serii zupełnie nieudanych spotkań cieszy nawet drobny, kompromisowy krok.

Niemniej jednak konieczne są dalsze wysiłki na rzecz zabezpieczenia praw obywateli, zarówno unijnych, jak i brytyjskich, oraz rozwiązania kwestii zobowiązań finansowych Zjednoczonego Królestwa wobec UE, nie zapominając przy tym o drażliwej „brexitowej” sytuacji Irlandii.

Rada Europejska zwróciła się do władz Wielkiej Brytanii o zapewnienie pewności prawnej oraz o zagwarantowanie wszystkim obywatelom oraz członkom ich rodzin odpowiedniej pomocy prawnej i socjalnej. Cieszy mnie fakt, że Wielka Brytania deklaruje chęć wywiązania się ze swoich zobowiązań, w tym także finansowych podjętych w trakcie członkostwa w UE. Negocjacje cały czas trwają. Mam nadzieję, że na szczycie w grudniu będziemy mogli przejść do kolejnej fazy rozmów, która przyniesie więcej konkretnych rozwiązań.

Ana Gomes (S&D), *por escrito*. – Os líderes europeus enganam-se e enganam os cidadãos se julgam gerir o afluxo migratório empurrando responsabilidades para o Estado falhado na Líbia e deitando dinheiro a regimes africanos opressivos, fazedores de migrantes e refugiados: uma das ditaduras mais apoiadas e financiadas pela UE está em vias de desintegrar a Etiópia, com consequências dantescas para África e a Europa, e ninguém na UE sequer nota... Enganam-se os líderes europeus, e enganam, se pretendem dar segurança e proteger os cidadãos, mas ao mesmo tempo mantêm políticas neoliberais desreguladoras que permitem a máfias criminosas, incluindo terroristas, tirar partido da selva fiscal na UE, dos buracos no sistema IVA, dos paraísos fiscais *offshore* e *onshore*, para fazer dinheiro, branquear capitais e capturar governos e instituições.

O cobarde assassinato da jornalista Daphne Caruana Galizia mostra que o mal está cá dentro. E não se confina a Malta!

Tunne Kelam (PPE), *in writing*. – The positively pragmatic approach by the Estonian Presidency has focused on the main issues the EU has to tackle (digitalisation and migration among others) and on providing practical suggestions to meet the challenges and needs. The spirit of the Tallinn digital summit finds a strong response in the conclusions, endorsing the list of conclusions and suggestions made by the Estonian Prime Minister.

Specially important is the call for boosting the development of e-governance in Europe, following the already existing principles of Estonian e-society, such as once-only, one-stop government, and ensuring accessibility. In a joint effort between all the institutions, this has to be put into practice in the shortest time possible, as it would provide the best service to citizens. It is vital that current negotiations on legislation, i.a. on geo-blocking, the Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMSD), and future negotiations for example on e-privacy, are led in a practical, consensual manner to enable real solutions in near future. The digital single market should mean losing all digital barriers for citizens and businesses. I look forward to seeing the free movement of data as the fifth freedom decided at the next Council.

David McAllister (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Zu Beginn der Brexit-Verhandlungen hat sich die Europäische Union mit dem Vereinigten Königreich darauf verständigt, dass substanzielle Fortschritte in den wichtigsten Fragen der Trennung notwendig sind, bevor über die zukünftigen Beziehungen verhandelt werden kann. Insbesondere bei den Bürgerrechten, der Grenzsituation zwischen Irland und Nordirland und den finanziellen Verpflichtungen des Vereinigten Königreichs wurde dieser Fortschritt noch nicht erzielt. Die britische Regierung muss nun konkrete Vorschläge auf den Tisch legen, wie sie sich die Trennung vorstellt. Als Europäisches Parlament haben wir genau das in unserer Entschließung vom 3. Oktober gefordert. Es gilt nun, gemeinsam nach vorne zu schauen und, wo es möglich und notwendig ist, Brücken zu bauen, damit im Dezember die zweite Phase der Verhandlungen eröffnet werden kann.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), *písomne* – Vítam, že stanoviská krajín západnej a strednej Európy v otázkach migrácie sa začínajú zblížovať. Je potrebné pokračovať v rokovaníach a nájsť prijateľné riešenie, aby sme sa mohli zaoberať problematikou, ktorá posunie Európsku úniu vpred, ako je napríklad digitalizácia, či spolupráca v oblasti energetiky. Digitalizácia nám totiž prinesie celý rad výhod, ako sú rast a vyššia zamestnanosť, či globálna konkurencieschopnosť. Európska rada apeluje na členské štáty, aby urýchlili legislatívny proces v danej oblasti. Významný pokrok nastal aj v oblasti bezpečnosti a obrany, kde sa štrukturálna spolupráca PESCO stáva čoraz reálnejšou. V oblasti vonkajších vzťahov je potrebné venovať viac pozornosti predovšetkým vzťahom s Tureckom a KĽDR, kde nám nie je ľahostajná otázka jej jadrového programu a dodržiavaniu dohody o iránskom jadrovom programe.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Jogos, bár megkésett ambíciója Európa vezetőinek, hogy a döntéshozatal felgyorsításával és jobb tematizálásával reagáljanak a közös kihívásokra, amint azt most a „Leader's Agenda” elfogadásával vállalták. A döntéshozatal lassúságára és az esetenkénti politikai bénultságra azonban nem a csúcstalálkozók szaporítása a válasz, hanem az uniós egység helyreállítása és fenntartása, a közösségi módszer erősítése, a többségi döntéshozatal általánossá tétele. Ebben a Parlamentben is többen és sokszor felhívtuk rá az EiT elnökének és a Tanács képviselőinek figyelmét, hogy a közös politikai akarat és cselekvés igazi akadályát az EU-n belül keressék: az olyan Európa-ellenes, nacionalista, saját hatalmi törekvéseiket a közösségi érdeket elé helyező kormányfők képeiben, mint a jelenlegi lengyel és magyar rezsim vezetői. Ilyenek sajnos a jövőben is lehetnek, s a közös migrációs politika akadályozásához hasonlóan más fontos, közös jövőnket meghatározó kérdésekben is az európai építkezés gátjai lehetnek. Önöknek az EiT-ben, a legmagasabb politikai szinten erre kell határozott politikai és intézményi megoldást találniuk, amit az európai polgárok az EP révén egyre türelmetlenebbül számon kérnek majd. Az uniós egység következő ilyen tesztje igen közeli: a göteborgi csúcs, illetve a szociális Európa megvalósításának valóban történelmi súlyú kérdése.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), *por escrito*. – O Conselho Europeu abordou, na sua reunião de 19 e 20 de outubro, temas chave para a consolidação do futuro da União Europeia, como a adequação da política de migrações tendo em conta a experiência da sua aplicação, o avanço no processo de conclusão da União Económica e Monetária, a posição negocial no quadro do Brexit e a avaliação do nível de concretização da União Digital.

Tomou ainda posições corajosas e ambiciosas, que sublinho, de solidariedade e apoio a Espanha e Portugal, no quadro dos incêndios florestais ocorridos nesses países. Sublinho, em particular, o compromisso do Conselho no sentido de concretizar o Fundo Monetário Europeu e a União Bancária até junho de 2018 e o empenho da Comissão Europeia em apoiar os processos legislativos que permitirão concretizar a União Digital e o Mercado Único Digital, bem como dar conteúdo prático ao pilar social da União Europeia. Sublinho ainda a decisão de manter uma posição de unidade e defesa dos interesses dos cidadãos da UE no processo negocial associado ao pedido de saída do Reino Unido.

(La seduta, sospesa alle 11.54)

3. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.06)

4. Erklärung der Präsidentschaft

Presidente. – Come Presidente, come cittadino e come giornalista voglio esprimere la mia indignazione per il brutale assassinio di Daphne Caruana Galizia.

(Applausi)

Era una donna coraggiosa, una grande giornalista. Ha interpretato l'essenza di questa professione: indagare per scoprire la verità sui fatti, senza avere paura di nessuno, e non ha avuto timore di fare fino in fondo, con coerenza, il proprio dovere. In trent'anni di carriera non si è mai persa d'animo, ha continuato a fare luce sull'opacità, tirando dritto, rispondendo soltanto ai suoi lettori, gli unici a cui sentiva di dover rendere conto. Con questo spirito ha pubblicato più di ventimila articoli, denunciando abusi di potere, corruzione e malgoverno. Come ogni vero giornalista, è stata la sentinella, il soldato schierato in prima linea nella difesa dei nostri valori.

È soltanto grazie a una stampa libera e indipendente se noi possiamo avere e difendere la democrazia, lo Stato di diritto, la libertà di espressione e tutti i diritti fondamentali su cui poggia la costruzione europea e la nostra stessa civiltà.

La nostra Unione è molto più di un mercato, di una moneta o di una banca. È il riflesso di questi valori, della nostra identità, con al centro la dignità e la libertà della persona. Per difenderla ogni giorno, fuori e dentro l'Unione, dobbiamo affermare l'indipendenza della stampa. Sono fiero di questo Parlamento, che si è sempre schierato con forza su questo fronte.

L'omicidio di Daphne non deve rimanere impunito. Con quale credibilità potremmo continuare a difendere i giornalisti del mondo se non riusciamo a dare loro protezione e giustizia a casa nostra? Mi aspetto che le autorità maltesi compiano ogni sforzo per fare luce su questa vicenda. Ogni pista deve essere seguita, e ritengo necessario coinvolgere anche Europol nel quadro di un'inchiesta internazionale dove tutte le forze di polizia possano portare il loro contributo per far arrestare e condannare i colpevoli.

(Applausi)

È questo coinvolgimento internazionale che ho sollecitato durante l'ultima riunione dei capi di Stato e di governo dell'Unione europea. L'esempio che ci ha dato Daphne non deve essere dimenticato. Per questo motivo ieri sera l'Ufficio di presidenza ha deciso di intitolare a Daphne Caruana Galizia la sala stampa del Parlamento europeo qui a Strasburgo.

(Applausi)

Abbiamo qui con noi in tribuna la sua famiglia. Al marito, ai tre figli ed alla nuora voglio esprimere la nostra vicinanza, insieme a quella di migliaia di maltesi che domenica sono scesi in piazza per chiedere giustizia e ricordare il suo impegno. A fianco di questi maltesi c'è mezzo miliardo di cittadini europei.

(Il Parlamento, in piedi, applaude la famiglia della giornalista Daphne Caruana Galizia)

Questo applauso, cari familiari di Daphne, rappresenta un messaggio molto chiaro: il Parlamento europeo non smetterà di occuparsi dell'omicidio di sua moglie, di vostra madre, di sua suocera finché non si scoprirà la verità. Non rimarremo in silenzio finché non verranno scoperti i mandanti e gli assassini di questo omicidio. Chiedo ora a tutti voi di alzarvi in segno di rispetto per questa donna e di raccoglierci in un minuto di silenzio in memoria di Daphne Caruana Galizia.

(Il Parlamento, in piedi, osserva un minuto di silenzio)

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – *(inaudible as microphone not switched on)* ... EUR one million for finding, killing or handing over to the police the murderers of Ms Daphne Caruana Galizia.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank Herr Kollege Korwin-Mikke.

Virginie Rozière (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, une précision: nous venons de rendre hommage à M^{me} Galizia et nous sommes tous terriblement touchés par cet assassinat. Cet hommage était nécessaire, mais l'hommage que nous pourrions réellement lui rendre est peut-être de passer des paroles aux actes. Dans quelques minutes, nous allons voter pour protéger les lanceurs d'alerte. Des amendements ont été déposés pour priver les lanceurs d'alerte de protection quand ils s'adressent à la presse. Si vraiment nous prétendons protéger la presse, votons contre ces amendements 2, 3 et 4 dans quelques minutes.

(Applaudissements)

5. Abstimmungsstunde

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Abstimmungsstunde.

(Abstimmungsergebnisse und sonstige Einzelheiten der Abstimmung: siehe Protokoll.)

5.1. Europa-Mittelmeer-Luftverkehrsabkommen EU-Marokko (A8-0303/2017 - Dominique Riquet) (Abstimmung)

— *Vor der Abstimmung:*

Maroš Šefčovič, Commission. – Mr President, the Commission would like to underline that the Aviation Agreement with Morocco has already been applied for more than 10 years and has never given rise to practical difficulties. Its entry into force will guarantee that both parties will apply the same level of high standards and will benefit from the new market opportunities. The wording used in this Agreement is similar to that used in the EU-Morocco Fisheries Agreement signed around the same period.

The question on the geographical scope of the Fisheries Agreement and the validity of the conclusion of that Agreement are currently sub judice and only the Court of Justice can determine these matters with binding force.

5.2. Ermächtigung Frankreichs, auf in Guadeloupe, Französisch-Guayana, Martinique und Réunion hergestellten „traditionellen“ Rum ermäßigte Sätze bestimmter indirekter Steuern anzuwenden (A8-0304/2017 - Iskra Mihaylova) (Abstimmung)

5.3. Gemeinsames Unternehmen für biobasierte Industriezweige: Finanzbeiträge (A8-0293/2017 - Miroslav Poche) (Abstimmung)

5.4. Kontrollmaßnahmen für Furanylfentanyl (A8-0309/2017 - Michał Boni) (Abstimmung)

5.5. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (A8-0296/2017 - Derek Vaughan) (Abstimmung)

5.6. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels (A8-0317/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio) (Abstimmung)

5.7. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (A8-0270/2017 - Mihai Țurcanu) (Abstimmung)

— Zum Schluss der Abstimmung:

Mihai Țurcanu, raportor. – Domnule Președinte, în primul rând, mulțumesc colegilor prezenți astăzi la acest vot important. Doresc să fac referire la aplicarea articolului 59a din Regulamentul de procedură al Parlamentului European, și anume remiterea mandatului la comisia competentă pentru negocieri interinstituționale.

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag auf Rücküberweisung in den Ausschuss an.)

5.8. Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen (A8-0359/2016 - Michał Boni) (Abstimmung)

5.9. Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik: Umsetzung der Anlandeverpflichtung (A8-0285/2017 - Alain Cadec) (Abstimmung)

5.10. Erneuerung der Genehmigung des Wirkstoffs Glyphosat (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0567/2017) (Fortsetzung)

5.11. Zulassung der genetisch veränderten Maissorte 1507 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 - GO) (B8-0568/2017)

5.12. Zulassung genetisch veränderter Sojabohnen der Sorte 305423 x 40-3-2 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0570/2017) (Abstimmung)

- 5.13. Zulassung der genetisch veränderten Rapssorte MON 88302 x Ms8 x Rf3 (Einwände gemäß Artikel 106 GO) (B8-0569/2017) (Abstimmung)
- 5.14. Entwurf des Berichtigungshaushaltsplans Nr. 5/2017: Finanzierung des Europäischen Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung und Aufstockung der Soforthilfereserve (A8-0301/2017 - Jens Geier) (Abstimmung)
- 5.15. Inanspruchnahme des Flexibilitätsinstruments zur Bereitstellung der Finanzmittel für den Europäischen Fonds für nachhaltige Entwicklung (A8-0298/2017 - Jens Geier) (Abstimmung)
- 5.16. Reflexionspapier über die Zukunft der EU-Finanzen (B8-0565/2017) (Abstimmung)
- 5.17. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz interner Hinweisgeber, die im öffentlichen Interesse handeln (A8-0295/2017 - Virginie Rozière) (Abstimmung)
- 5.18. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (A8-0292/2017 - Laura Agea) (Abstimmung)

Der Präsident. – Damit ist die Abstimmungsstunde geschlossen.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

6. Stimmerklärungen

6.1. Kontrolle der Ausgaben und Überwachung der Kostenwirksamkeit der EU-Jugendgarantie (A8-0296/2017 - Derek Vaughan)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Głosowaliśmy dzisiaj bardzo wiele ważnych spraw: społecznie, gospodarczo, ekonomicznie, politycznie, ale to głosowanie należy uznać za bardzo istotne, dlatego że dotyczy młodych ludzi w wieku 15-25 lat, a więc w tym czasie, kiedy młody człowiek kształtuje się, jakim właściwie bardzo często pozostaje już do końca życia. A więc kwestie związane z nauką, oświatą, wychowaniem, w końcu z pracą mają w tym czasie zasadnicze znaczenie. Dlatego jest szczególnie istotne aby program unijny, pakiet na rzecz zatrudnienia młodzieży, w tym gwarancje dla młodzieży, był efektywnie wykorzystywany. W minionych latach doprowadziliśmy do radykalnego spadku bezrobocia wśród młodych ludzi z prawie 24% do niespełna 17% oczywiście dzięki wsparciu unijnemu, ale także dzięki rozwojowi gospodarczemu. To jest kierunek, którego oczekujemy w przyszłości, i powinniśmy dbać, aby ten spadek był jeszcze głębszy.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Europa il 17 % dei giovani non ha un lavoro e questa percentuale, purtroppo, è più che il doppio in alcune regioni – la mia per esempio, la Sicilia.

La disoccupazione giovanile è la più grande emergenza politica ed economica che l'Europa, secondo me, deve affrontare. La Garanzia per i giovani è uno dei più importanti programmi dell'Unione europea per creare offerta di lavoro, un programma che, però, spesso funziona meglio nella teoria che nella pratica.

Ho votato a favore di questa relazione perché l'attuazione della Garanzia per i giovani deve essere migliorata con scelte strategiche, mirate soprattutto al buon utilizzo dei fondi. I dati, infatti, ci dimostrano che gli *stage* in azienda, i tirocini, seppur formativi, non creano quasi mai vera occupazione, perché alla fine del periodo fissato le aziende non assumono i giovani.

Sono efficaci invece i programmi sull'autoimprenditorialità, giusto per fare un esempio, sulle *start-up*. Migliorare la spesa di Garanzia per i giovani vuol dire perciò far sì che le amministrazioni facciano scelte strategiche per offrire un sostegno vero all'occupazione dei giovani.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule Președinte, în 2016, 4,2 milioane de tineri din Uniunea Europeană nu aveau un loc de muncă, deci erau șomeri. Asta înseamnă că noi trebuie să modificăm legislația privind folosirea fondurilor pentru ajutarea acestor tineri să-și găsească un loc de muncă. Cei care nu beneficiază de aceste fonduri sunt mai ales cei care nu urmează o școală sau un program de dezvoltare profesională, nu au acces la informații și nu știu ce să facă.

O altă soluție care cred că ar duce la scăderea șomajului în rândul tinerilor este admiterea în școlile profesionale sau în facultăți – deci specializarea – pe baza unor criterii de merit, de capacitate, de dedicație, de talent, pentru că suntem diferiți și nu putem face toți aceleași lucruri. Unii sunt buni la medicină, alții sunt buni să fie ingineri, alții au talent să fie profesori și dăruire să fie profesori și, în acest fel, atunci când termini o facultate, sigur primești un loc de muncă, pentru că te duci la un interviu la care se vede că ești talentat și vrei acea meserie. Altfel, s-ar putea să avem prea mulți dintr-o anumită categorie, care evident că nu-și vor găsi un loc de muncă. Mulțumesc.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, vótáil mé leis an 451 feisire a vótáil i bhfabhar an moladh seo inniu agus an ceart againn is dóigh liom. Dar ndóigh, tugadh an scéim seo isteach i lár cúlú eacnamaíochta nuair a bhíomar ag déileáil le fadhbanna móra: a lán daoine as obair agus go háirithe an t-aos óg. Bhí orthu, mar shampla i mo thír féin, dul ar imirce, mo mhac féin san áireamh, mar ní raibh jabanna ar fáil acu. Ansin tháinig an scéim seo isteach, agus gan dabht ar bith chabhraigh sé go mór lena lán tíortha chun rudaí a fheabhsú. Chímid go bhfuil na daoine óga a chuaigh thar lear: tá seans acu teacht ar ais, go háirithe i mo tír féin agus tá áthas orainn faoi sin.

Ach ag an am gcéanna, tá sé róluath chun deireadh a chur leis an scéim trasna na hEorpa ar fad, agus mar a deirtear anseo, caithfimid na constaicí atá ann a dhíbirt agus seans a thabhairt do chuile duine jab lán aimseartha a fháil.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σήμερα στην Ελλάδα δόθηκαν τα στοιχεία για την απασχόληση και τα νέα δεν είναι καθόλου καλά. Το 1/3 των μισθωτών λαμβάνει μισθό 394 ευρώ και από αυτούς το 22% είναι ηλικίας μέχρι 29 ετών. Παρά το γεγονός λοιπόν ότι τα στατιστικά δείχνουν ότι από τότε που εφαρμόστηκε το πρόγραμμα «Εγγυήσεις για τη νεολαία» η ανεργία μειώθηκε από 23,8% τον Απρίλιο του 2013 σε 16,6% τον Απρίλιο του 2017, η Ελλάδα παραμένει δυστυχώς πρωταθλήτρια στη νεανική ανεργία. Σε αυτό, έρχεται να προστεθεί και η φυγή των εκατοντάδων νέων προσοντούχων στο εξωτερικό. Είναι η ώρα, λοιπόν, να απαντήσουμε σε αυτό που στην Ελλάδα ονομάζεται «γενιά των 360 ευρώ». Είναι η ώρα να τους δώσουμε την ευκαιρία να έχουν βιώσιμες θέσεις απασχόλησης, ερευνώντας πώς αυτό μπορεί να γίνει. Με άσκηση, πρακτική, με βιώσιμο τρόπο και με αμοιβαία επωφέλη τρόπο, τόσο για τους νέους εργαζόμενους, όσο και τις επιχειρήσεις. Με βιώσιμες θέσεις εργασίας, με κίνητρα για τις επιχειρήσεις, με μείωση του κόστους ανά εργαζόμενο και με τελική αύξηση στην αμοιβή τους. Είναι απαραίτητο τελικά να έχουμε ένα βιώσιμο παραγωγικό μοντέλο που θα βασίζεται σε αυτούς τους νέους ανθρώπους, όχι μόνο γιατί αξίζουν μια ευκαιρία, αλλά γιατί αξίζουν ένα σπουδαίο ευρωπαϊκό μέλλον.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, ovo izvješće je izuzetno važno zato što daje jasnu poruku da je program Garancija za mlade isplativ program. Naravno, isto tako se traži od svih nas da mu povećamo efikasnost, da što više mladih zaista bude dugotrajno zaposleno i da to bude njegov glavni rezultat.

Međutim, dokaz da je on isplativ je 14 milijuna mladih ljudi koji su prošli nove oblike edukacije, dodatne oblike obrazovanja, dva milijuna mladih koji su se uspjeli zaposliti zahvaljujući aktivnostima iz ovog programa. Uvijek treba težiti boljem i kvalitetnijem rezultatu. Dakle, trebamo naravno jačati i dalje male i srednje poduzetnike, a mlade poticati na samozapošljavanje i obrazovanje koje će im omogućiti da odmah dođu do posla, a ne da se obrazuju tek kada završe školu i počnu raditi.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Jeg hilser på enhver måde velkommen, at vi får undersøgt, hvorvidt de programmer, som EU finansierer, også lever op til deres formål. Det gælder ikke mindst inden for ungdomsgarantien. Alt for ofte oplever vi, hvordan rapporter fra Revisionsretten, der rejser en kritik af de forskellige programmer, bare bliver pakket væk og ikke bliver effektueret; at man ikke tager bestik af dem, og at man ikke følger op på den kritik, som bliver rejst. Det er der ingen, der kan være tjent med, hverken de unge, som i dette tilfælde har brug for midler til at komme ud i verden og lære både om livet og om deres uddannelse, men mindst af alt skatteyderne, som oplever, at deres penge ikke bliver brugt effektivt til det formål, som de er afsat til. Det er fuldstændigt uacceptabelt, og derfor bør vi i langt højere grad følge op på den kritik, der kommer, især fra Revisionsretten, men også fra alle andre, der sidder og arbejder med disse programmer og ved, hvordan tingene kører ude i virkeligheden.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Szavazatommal támogattam az európai ifjúsági garanciarendszerek kiadásainak ellenőrzéséről és költséghatékonyságának figyeléséről szóló jelentést. Valóban fontos eredmény, hogy a garancia alkalmazásának négy évében több mint 7 százalékponttal csökkent az ifjúsági munkanélküliség aránya. Azonban osztom az előadó aggodalmát azzal kapcsolatban, hogy 2016 közepén még mindig 4,2 millió 25 év alatti fiatalnak nem volt munkája az EU-ban.

Egyetértek azzal a megállapítással, hogy a tagállamoknak mihamarabb növelniük kell a helyi szintű foglalkoztatási közszolgálatok hatékonyságát, illetve be kell vonniuk az ifjúsági szervezeteket a döntéshozatalba. Továbbá támogatom, hogy a tagállamok adjanak átfogó képet az ifjúsági garancia végrehajtásának költségeiről.

Végül főleg a magyarországi oktatási és ifjúságpolitikai helyzetet figyelembe véve döntő fontosságúnak tartom a nemzeti oktatási rendszerek hiányosságainak kijavítására tett javaslatot, hiszen a strukturális munkaerőhiányhoz kapcsolódó problémák egyértelműen visszavezethetők az elhibázott oktatáspolitikai döntésekre.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Уважаеми г-н Председател, младежката гаранция изигра ключова роля в борбата с младежката безработица в Европейски план. На територията на Европейския съюз все още има 17,2% безработни младежи, а този процент никак не е малък.

Докладът на Европейската Сметна палата алармира, че към момента е трудно да се даде реалистична оценка за постигнатите резултати, липсват системи за мониторинг и механизми за проследяване на участниците, които излизат от схемата за младежка гаранция. Същият доклад констатира, че от младежката гаранция предимно се възползват висококвалифицирани млади хора за сметка на по-ниско образованите и тези, които са в неравностойно положение.

В България ситуацията е сходна. Данните сочат, че мерките до този момент са предимно насочени към млади хора със средни и висши образования за сметка на нискоквалифицираните, които не се регистрират в бюрата по труда. Смятам, че една реалистична оценка трябва да се базира не само на количествени, но и на качествени показатели. За да има реална добавена стойност, младежката гаранция трябва да бъде преди всичко приобщаваща.

6.2. Strafbare Handlungen und die Strafen im Bereich des illegalen Drogenhandels (A8-0317/2017 - Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il mercato degli stupefacenti, purtroppo, evolve davvero in modo veloce e grazie all'e-commerce nascono ogni giorno nuove droghe, sostanze psicoattive, droghe sintetiche non ancora vietate perché veicolate, per l'appunto, attraverso un mondo che corre più in fretta di leggi e di sanzioni: il mondo del web. Ed è in questo limbo che la criminalità fa affari.

Ho votato a favore di questo regolamento perché il traffico di stupefacenti, più di ogni altro, ha carattere internazionale e transfrontaliero e per questo le azioni di contrasto devono essere certamente europee. È necessario andare avanti con misure per vietare la produzione, la fabbricazione, la messa a disposizione sul mercato, l'importazione nell'Unione e poi il trasporto e l'esportazione. Serve migliorare il sistema di allerta rapido nel caso in cui gli stupefacenti siano veicolati sul web e servono norme di diritto penale per punire produttori, fornitori e distributori.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Agenția Europeană pentru Medicamente ne spune că, numai anul acesta, peste cinci sute de tineri au devenit dependenți de substanțele psihoactive, care se procură foarte ușor. Tocmai de aceea, numărul lor crește în fiecare an, în fiecare lună.

Substanțele psihoactive trebuie definite ca droguri și trebuie interzise. Raportul cere sancțiuni minime, deci sancționarea lor cu limite minime la sancțiuni, și aplicarea unitară în statele membre. Aici eu am o părere diferită de raportor, în sensul că, înainte de sancționare și de condamnare pentru cei care sunt numai consumatori, trebuie să asigurăm îngrijire medicală și tratament medical, pentru că scopul este să-i facem bine, nu neapărat să se ducă la închisoare sau să fie sancționați și apoi să continue să ia droguri.

Subliniez un alt aspect bun al raportului, și anume cooperarea dintre Europol și statele membre și Agenția Europeană de Droguri, evident, prin care se face schimb de informații pentru aceste tipuri de infracțiuni. Traficanții, însă, trebuie pedepsiți, nu consumatorii – ei trebuie îngrijiți medical.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Jeg tror, at alle hilser varmt velkommen, at der bliver slået hårdt ned på den narkotikahandel og det misbrug af unge mennesker, der foregår, især rundt omkring i Unionen, og jeg vil gerne føje min stemme til, at vi nu får opdateret listen over narkotiske stoffer. Det er ekstremt vigtigt, at både vi som medlemslande men også som Union gør alt, hvad vi kan for at sikre os imod dette stof. Jeg kan dog ikke lade være med at sige, at med de åbne grænser og med det generelle forbud, der er imod grænsekontrol landene imellem, så har man givet narkohandlerne en enorm håndsrækning. Vi ved allesammen godt, at den ydre grænse overhovedet ikke er så sikker, som den burde være. Der er bare ikke mange her i salen, der tør sige det. Men det er et faktum. Og det, at man ikke har en national grænsekontrol, er derfor en foræring til dem, der ønsker at ernære sig ved illegal handel i narkotika, våben eller menneskesmugling, eller hvad det måtte være, og så hjælper det ikke, at listerne er opdateret, hvis markedet i øvrigt er fuldstændigt tilgængeligt, og der er huller ved den ydre grænse. Det skal vi have med, når vi taler om disse ting.

Stefano Maullu (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che mai come in questo momento sia opportuno parlare di droghe: di droghe che sfuggono al controllo che le agenzie e i governi possono effettuare, di droghe che minano la salute dei nostri ragazzi e che, soprattutto, creano un'instabilità nella società. Sono droghe che spesso trovano la loro collocazione attraverso il mercato nero e anche attraverso il web, che diventa lo strumento più semplice per poterle acquistare, e questo senza limiti di età e senza alcun controllo effettivo.

Credo che questo provvedimento, e soprattutto la categorizzazione di queste droghe, inserendole sotto questo vero e proprio profilo, sia uno dei provvedimenti più immediatamente recepibili da questo Parlamento proprio per poter garantire che la giusta repressione vada fino in fondo, soprattutto per salvaguardare gli elementi più deboli della società, che sono spesso coloro che diventano preda di questi mercati illegali, mercati che diventano poi strumento non semplicemente di morte, ma di guadagno.

6.3. Düngeprodukte mit CE-Kennzeichnung (A8-0270/2017 - Mihai Țurcanu)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Rosa D'Amato (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione nasceva dalla volontà di incrementare l'uso dei fertilizzanti organici, contribuendo così allo sviluppo dell'economia circolare, e di ridurre la dipendenza dell'Unione europea da fertilizzanti importati da paesi terzi.

Abbiamo chiesto di estendere la scelta degli agricoltori europei ai fertilizzanti da materie organiche riciclate, ma anche su un tema così importante l'Europa arriva in ritardo. Ben il 50 % dei concimi attualmente sul mercato sono esclusi dal campo di applicazione della normativa esistente. Quest'Aula avrebbe potuto e dovuto osare di più: legiferare a favore degli agricoltori in modo chiaro e offrire loro la possibilità di riciclare le sostanze nutrienti in modo più sostenibile. I fertilizzanti per l'agricoltura biologica devono essere classificati in modo chiaro, evitando di fuorviare l'utente con etichette complesse.

Ho presentato emendamenti in commissione Agricoltura per sottolineare la specificità della loro natura e del loro utilizzo da parte degli agricoltori, sottolineando le difficoltà nell'individuare l'esatta percentuale di sostanze dannose per la salute e l'ambiente. Ho chiesto l'introduzione di una *green label* per i fertilizzanti particolarmente poveri di inquinanti, inquinanti che impoveriscono il terreno ed espongono la nostra agricoltura a diverse fitopatie, come nel caso del CoDiRO, erroneamente conosciuto come *Xylella fastidiosa*.

Per questi motivi il nostro supporto non vi è stato e quindi abbiamo dovuto votare contro.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, o meu voto foi no sentido favorável, porque se trata de uma iniciativa fundamental para melhorar as normas de segurança dos produtos fertilizantes e reduzir os limites dos metais pesados, especialmente do cádmio, que são um verdadeiro e comprovado risco para a saúde humana e animal.

Os adubos proporcionam benefícios relevantes quanto ao rendimento das colheitas, mas não podemos esquecer que existem importantes desafios em termos de ambiente, da saúde pública e da segurança alimentar associados à sua utilização.

O atual regulamento não aborda as questões ambientais associadas à contaminação dos solos, das águas interiores e das águas marinhas e, em última análise, da cadeia alimentar. Esta proposta vem introduzir limites de cádmio harmonizados para os adubos fosfatados, com vista a minimizar o impacto negativo da utilização de adubos no ambiente e na saúde humana.

Estou convicto de que a aprovação desta proposta tornará possível proporcionar um melhor nível de proteção da saúde humana e animal, da segurança alimentar e da proteção do solo e da água.

Morten Messerschmidt (ECR). – Hr. formand! Jeg bliver ofte beskyldt for af mine modstandere, hvoraf der så ikke er nogen i hvert fald fra den danske delegation til stede her i salen, at jeg aldrig er for noget i EU. Derfor glæder jeg mig over at kunne bekendtgøre, at jeg faktisk har stemt for denne betænkning. Det giver god mening i et indre marked at have fælles CE-regler, der siger, hvilke varer der må handles, og hvilke varer der ikke må. Faktisk mener jeg, at hvis EU havde holdt sig til kun at regulere et indre marked, så tror jeg, EU ville have været en fantastisk succes. Jeg tror nærmest, jeg kunne være blevet overtalt til at stemme »Ja« tilbage i 1972, da danskerne stemte om sagen, hvis jeg vel at mærke havde været født dengang, fordi et EU som et indre marked – hvor man kan handle sammen, hvor varer, kapital og arbejdstagere kan bevæge sig frit, mens man respekterer de enkelte landes forskelligheder, men ikke blander sig i udlændingepolitik, udenrigspolitik, finanspolitik, grænsekontrol osv. - ville have været en fantastisk succes. EU er i sin nuværende form blevet sin egen værste fjende, fordi man vil alt det, som ikke er Europa, men som er nationalstaterne. Havde man holdt sig til det, som denne betænkning handler om, så var meget undgået.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Jelenleg a műtrágyák belső piacon való rendelkezésre állására vonatkozó jogszabályi keret szinte kizárólag bányászott, vagy vegyileg előállított szervetlen agyagokból készült műtrágyákra vonatkozik. A javaslattervezet egy jogszabály helyébe lép, és a terménövelő termékek szélesebb választékát fogja magában foglalni, megnyitva az egységes piacot a szerves vagy másodlagos nyersanyagokból készülő terménövelő termékek szabad forgalmazása előtt. Mindezeket pedig úgy, hogy a szabályokat EU szinten hangolja össze.

Aláhúzom egyúttal, hogy az egészségügyi és élelmiszerbiztonsági szempontokat és a fenntartható élelmiszer-termelést is szem előtt kell tartanunk a műtrágyákkal kapcsolatban. Természetesen ezek az anyagok a mezőgazdasági termelés számára elengedhetetlenek, de mint minden mást, ezeket is túl lehet adagolni. Éppen ezért az elővigyázatosság elvét szem előtt kell tartanunk, és a precíziós gazdálkodást kell erősítenünk. A jelentés e téren is kihangsúlyozza a bizottsági javaslatot, ezért a szavazatommal támogattam.

6.4. Informationsaustausch, Frühwarnsystem und Risikobewertungsverfahren für neue psychoaktive Substanzen (A8-0359/2016 - Michał Boni)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Oczywiście głosowałam za sprawozdaniem, które uwzględnia nowe substancje psychoaktywne, a także wprowadza system wczesnego ostrzegania i określa procedury penalizacji. Jednak pomysłowość ludzka może być wprost proporcjonalna do długości list zakazanych substancji. Dlatego korzystając z możliwości wyjaśnienia głosowania, chciałam przypomnieć osiągnięcia Islandii w profilaktyce uzależnień wynikające z tworzenia zdrowych alternatyw, które w przypadku tego kraju przyniosły zaskakująco dobre efekty. Nadużywanie narkotyków bowiem w ciągu dwudziestu lat spadło z 42 % do 5 % w 2016 r. Przyczyniło się do tego wprowadzenie ogólnonarodowego programu zapobiegawczego, współpraca rodziców, nauczycieli i naukowców, edukacja, ale i propagowanie zajęć pozalekcyjnych i sportu, poświęcanie dzieciom więcej uwagi i czasu, zastosowanie kontroli, zakazów, pomocy finansowej. Przypadek ten powinien stanowić dla wszystkich inspirację w zakresie profilaktyki.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, votei a favor desta resolução no reconhecimento de que é necessário um combate sem tréguas às novas substâncias psicoativas, que representam uma grave ameaça sanitária de alcance transfronteiriço. O seu consumo compromete a saúde e provoca a morte de milhões de pessoas todos os anos, afetando os seus processos mentais e cognitivos, de acordo com a Organização Mundial de Saúde.

O consumo de substâncias entre os jovens é um importante problema de saúde pública mundial, agravado pelo facto de haver um número cada vez maior de novas substâncias psicoativas disponíveis, lançadas no mercado de drogas da União Europeia.

Estima-se que mais de 450 substâncias estejam a ser monitorizadas pelo Observatório Europeu da Droga e da Toxicodependência. O rápido aumento das novas substâncias psicoativas impõe novos desafios às sociedades e é urgente o reforço do sistema de vigilância e de alerta rápido na União, simplificando os procedimentos para assegurar maior eficácia e celeridade no combate a esta ameaça.

O papel cada vez mais importante da Internet na oferta e comercialização destas drogas e das redes sociais, cada vez mais ativas na compra e venda de droga, lançam novos desafios que implicam novas e ágeis respostas, como esta resolução é disso expressão.

6.5. Reflexionspapier über die Zukunft der EU-Finzen (B8-0565/2017)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, when the UK leaves the EU, it will leave a hole of 14-19% in the EU budget. It will be a major shock for some countries, especially net receivers. Some governments in these countries, for example in Hungary, are almost unwillingly part of the EU. They don't like the Union and they don't like the criticism we are delivering from here, but they are laughing all the way to the bank.

The question is, what will they do when there is no money in the bank? Will they continue to laugh or will they reconsider their membership and, by doing that, cause the next crisis in the EU?

There is no doubt that we have to reform the EU budget. We do not know the missing numbers, but we know that we cannot do business as usual. Somebody was saying that we have to do less, but I beg to differ. We probably have to be more efficient and focus more, but it is time to start doing that now. The sooner, the better.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, unsurprisingly, as a Brit and as a United Kingdom Brexit supporter I voted against this. I was able to do so because, if you look at the European Court of Auditors' report of 2016, it highlights all sorts of issues which are best summarised as: 'bloated', 'running out of control', 'high levels of financial mismanagement and criminality', and 'eye-watering levels of bureaucratic costs'. And the detail is there for you to look at yourselves: 3.1% of total payments made in error, meaning that EUR 4.2 billion went missing. A huge increase in the amount of money allocated to administering the EU – up to EUR 9.4 billion. And then it talks about the future of EU obligations and it talks about a figure of EUR 238.8 billion, but admits it could actually be as high as EUR 262 billion.

When you look at a paper that merely says for the EU that 'we're going to pat ourselves on the back for a job well done', stresses the minimal impact of EU contributions and overlooks all of the financial mismanagement, it is not a paper you can support or vote in support of.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το μέλλον των οικονομικών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης θα πρέπει να μας προβληματίζει, διότι αν και βρισκόμαστε σχεδόν στη μέση του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου, τα δεδομένα είναι ιδιαίτερα δυσάρεστα. Πρώτα και κυρίως, έχουμε χώρες οι οποίες ακόμη δεν έχουν βγει από την κρίση, όπως είναι η πατρίδα μου, η Ελλάδα, και χρειάζονται στήριξη με άμεσες επενδύσεις που θα εμπλέκουν και ευρωπαϊκά χρηματοδοτικά εργαλεία. Μετά, έχουμε την ένταξη των προσφύγων, που φαίνεται πως σε πολλά κράτη μέλη δημιουργεί σημαντικά προβλήματα με οικονομική απήχηση. Τρίτον, έχουμε το αποτέλεσμα των διαβουλεύσεων για το Brexit, που ακόμα δεν έχει φανεί και που πιθανότατα θα δημιουργήσει κενό στα υπεσχεθέντα. Μέσα σε αυτό το πλαίσιο, είναι απαραίτητο να ιεραρχήσουμε τις προτεραιότητές μας. Καταρχήν, να περιφρουρήσουμε την πολιτική συνοχής σε συνδυασμό με το σχέδιο Juncker και την προσέλκυση επενδύσεων από τον ιδιωτικό τομέα. Μετά, να συνδέσουμε την πορεία των διορθωτικών αλλαγών με επιβράβευση των χωρών που βρίσκονται σε κρίση. Και, τρίτον, να θυμόμαστε: όλοι εκείνοι που δεν τα καταφέρνουν προσβλέπουν στους κοινοτικούς πόρους για να μετεκπαιδευτούν και να ξαναβρούν δουλειά, για να στείλουν τα παιδιά τους σε παιδικούς σταθμούς, για να έχουν ένα κατώτατο εισόδημα. Για το κοινό μας μέλλον, πρέπει από τώρα να φροντίσουμε τα οικονομικά μας.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I take it as a privilege to be the last speaker on this issue. Since we really need to rethink very comprehensively EU finances so we can more effectively address the emerging crisis in the EU and the EU neighbourhood, better match the political goals of the European Union and its actual needs, a wider debate on the future for the European Union budget and its purpose is still very much needed. Although I would like to support the Commission's claim, reiterated by Parliament, and the EU budget first and foremost needs to reflect the future of the EU priorities, our citizens' priorities, having said this, I hope that cohesion policy and agricultural policy will remain among those priorities.

Moreover, I welcome the claim that the EU budget should be based on such principles as EU value, added value, transparency and flexibility, in addition, taking into account the amount of the EU challenges, foreseeable future priorities and the UK's withdrawal.

6.6. Legitime Maßnahmen zum Schutz interner Hinweisgeber, die im öffentlichen Interesse handeln (A8-0295/2017 - Virginie Rozière)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Torej, ali ni dovolj, da postavljamo žvižgače na zatožno klop in so potrebne žrtve, kot je primer uboja odlične novinarke pred kratkim, primer Malta in *Panama papers*. Torej, ali bodo potrebne tudi nove žrtve, preden se zganemo in ustrezno zaščitimo žvižgače tudi v evropskem prostoru.

Zeleni smo že leta 2016 predlagali sprejetje direktive, ki bi uredila področje žvižgačev in jim nudila ustrezno pravno varstvo, nudila anonimnost in ustrezne mehanizme, ki bi hkrati pomenilo tudi večjo varnost pri njihovem delovanju, ker nenazadnje žvižgači odkrijejo več kot 40 procentov vseh primerov finančnih goljufij. Zato so zelo pomemben dejavnik načela pravice vedeti. In tudi zato še enkrat pozivam Komisijo, da v čim krajšem možnem času sprejme ustrezno zakonodajo za njihovo zaščito, ki jo bo lahko Evropski parlament potrdil, in s tem prepreči nove žrtve in nova šikaniranja.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Temat, który teraz omawiamy jest ważny, bowiem nie ulega wątpliwości, że uczciwych sygnalistów, działających w dobrej wierze, a przede wszystkim bezinteresownie, należy chronić. By jednak tak było, to ewentualne normy prawne powinny być precyzyjne i mieć charakter zawężający, a nie rozszerzający. Propozycje, które złożono w Parlamencie Europejskim niestety są rozwiązaniami, które mogłyby doprowadzić do bardzo wielu patologii, i to jeszcze bez żadnych konsekwencji. Dlatego też uważam, że być może lepiej będzie dla tej ważnej i słusznej idei, jeśli to Komisja Europejska przygotowuje i przedstawi Parlamentowi Europejskiemu wniosek ustawodawczy w tej sprawie. Być może wtedy będziemy mieli bardziej wyważoną, bardziej racjonalną podstawę do dyskusji na ten temat.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Avertizorii de integritate sau *whistleblowers*, cum sunt numiți și cunoscuți în toată lumea, sunt angajați în instituții publice sau private și sunt oameni care doresc respectarea legii. Ei vor să spună în afară, către instituțiile statului sau către jurnaliștii de investigații, toate încălcările legale din instituțiile în care lucrează. Statul este primul interesat să afle ilegalitățile dintr-o instituție, mai ales că aceste ilegalități privesc achiziții publice, furt de bani, corupție și așa mai departe. Cu toate acestea, nu există protecție. Cei mai mulți își pierd locul de muncă. Avem reguli pe hârtie și în Uniunea Europeană, dar viața este făcută o mizerie pentru ei, sunt muțați, sunt scoși în concedii medicale și așa mai departe. De ce nu-i protejăm pe acești oameni – cei care din interior ne dau informații tocmai ca să recuperăm prejudiciile, să scăpăm de infractori și să-i pedepsim? Acești oameni, repet, trebuie protejați și grija statului trebuie să fie prima, statul este primul interesat să-i protejeze. Or nu se întâmplă asta în foarte multe state membre și nici în Uniunea Europeană. Să începem noul an cu un regulament orizontal pentru toate statele membre cu protecția *whistleblowers*.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Szavazatommal támogattam a vállalatok és állami szervek bizalmas információit közérdekből bejelentő személyek védelmére szolgáló jogszertű intézkedésekről szóló jelentést. A magyar kormány tevékenységének ismerete is megerősíti azt a tényt, hogy az EU egyik jelenleg legsúlyosabb problémája a korrupció. Ahogy azt a jelentés is megjegyzi, az évi 120 milliárd euróba kerül az Európai Uniónak.

Ezért lenne fontos, hogy a jelentés felhívásának megfelelően a Bizottság, a megfelelő jogalap értékelését követően, még az idei év vége előtt terjesszen elő egy olyan átfogó, közös jogalkotási keret létrehozására, amely magas szintű védelmet biztosít majd az állami, mind pedig a magánszektorban, valamint a nemzeti és európai intézményekben, így az érintett nemzeti és európai szervezetekben, hivatalokban és ügynökségekben a visszaéléseket bejelentő személyek számára.

Elkeserítő, hogy valamikor már a visszaéléseket felkutató személyek testi épsége, élete is veszélyben van. Éppen ezért külön felhívom az Európai Unió szerepének fontosságára a figyelmet a visszaélést bejelentő személyek védelme kapcsán, különös tekintettel az olyan tagállamokból származó bejelentőkre, ahol a korrupció az állami végrehajtó szervek és a kormány egészét áthatja.

6.7. Strategien zur Sicherstellung des Mindesteinkommens als Mittel zur Armutsbekämpfung (A8-0292/2017 - Laura Agea)

Ustne wyjaśnienia dotyczące głosowania

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this timely debate and vote on minimum income schemes, not least when the British Government is making such a hash of universal credit, a policy meant to help but which, in reality, is forcing people further into poverty, debt and even homelessness, a policy that is disincentivising work. It needs to pause and think again.

In contrast, a couple of weeks ago I was delighted to visit Rapid Drop in Peterborough in my constituency. From Wembley Stadium to Zagreb Airport to Tivoli Gardens you can find the products of this thriving fire sprinkler business, which does not, however, only improve safety in buildings. It cares about the security of its employees too and is proud to be a living wage company, paying people enough so that they can really get by. Its subcontractors, cleaners and maintenance workers get the same treatment too. According to the Living Wage Foundation, more than half of living wage employers report that the scheme has improved both recruitment and retention. It is good for business, good for employees and good for society. A win-win-win situation.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho votato a favore della relazione Agea in quanto è in continuità con la risoluzione del 2010 sul *minimum income*.

È un passo in avanti, ma sicuramente molti sono i passi in avanti ancora da fare, sia da parte del Parlamento sia da parte della Commissione che, anziché spiegare ed esplicitare un fragile pilastro sociale, potrebbe emanare una direttiva sul reddito minimo.

Io non smetterò di battermi, come ho fatto dall'inizio di questa legislatura, per un reddito di autodeterminazione, come autorevolmente lo chiama il movimento femminista, perché in questo continente sia garantito il diritto all'esistenza in maniera incondizionata e universale. Il reddito di autodeterminazione e il salario minimo europeo sono le precondizioni per una cittadinanza sociale europea e perché il progetto europeo possa avere un futuro.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente. Creo que hay que felicitar por este informe, y he votado a favor porque un régimen de renta mínima en todos los países de la Unión es una herramienta básica, una herramienta de cualquier Estado social, del bienestar y de una sociedad democrática avanzada. Y ya era hora, ya se echaba de menos una posición de esta Cámara al respecto que permita una mejor coordinación.

Como el propio informe reconoce, la pobreza y la exclusión social no son problemas individuales, son problemas sociales, colectivos, que se deben atajar de manera colectiva. La renta mínima es una herramienta para luchar contra la pobreza y construir sociedades más justas e igualitarias, pero una herramienta, también, que beneficia a la sociedad en su conjunto. Para que la economía funcione, las personas tienen que tener capacidad de consumo: es así de sencillo. La rueda tiene que girar o se parará para todos.

En mi país, el mes pasado, el Partido Popular en el Gobierno presentó una enmienda a la totalidad ante una iniciativa legislativa popular para fijar una prestación de ingresos mínimos de 426 euros. Esperamos que la voz de Europa la escuche, no solo cuando les sirve de excusa para aplicar recortes y desmontar nuestros servicios públicos, sino también cuando se envía un mensaje nítido como el de hoy con este informe.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ludzka aktywność, w tym praca, zapewnia człowiekowi równoprawny udział w społeczeństwie, jest przede wszystkim motorem jego rozwoju osobistego, ale także podstawą sukcesu jego rodziny. Nie ma więc nic gorszego jak wywoływanie bierności lub podtrzymywanie bierności człowieka w społeczeństwie. Rozdawnictwo pieniędzy, bez obowiązku nauki, bez obowiązku pracy, bez obowiązku aktywności społecznej, może więc wywoływać postawy bierne i postawy roszczeniowe. Skutkiem ubocznym tego rodzaju propozycji może być także dodatkowy impuls migracyjny. Dlatego też choć sama idea jest szczytna – wszystkim równo, bez względu na to, czy zasługują czy nie zasługują, bo są ludźmi, bo są obywatelami, bo są mieszkańcami Europy – powinna być jednak oceniona negatywnie.

Thomas Mann (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Im Bericht Agea geht es nicht um den Mindestlohn; der wird von den Mitgliedstaaten festgelegt und von den Sozialpartnern verhandelt. Hier geht es um Mindesteinkommen, damit Armut erfolgreich bekämpft werden kann, damit die Eingliederung in die Gesellschaft gelingt, damit soziale Teilhabe stattfindet. Deshalb habe ich für den Bericht gestimmt. Die Betroffenen brauchen echte Chancen, um in die Arbeitswelt hineinzukommen, es muss dafür gesorgt werden, dass sie Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen haben. Und auf der nationalen Ebene brauchen wir verbesserte Regeln für die Sozialhilfe und den Sozialschutz.

Vor allem geht es aber um eine faire Steuerpolitik in den Mitgliedstaaten. Und da ist es wirklich noch im Argen: Maßnahmen gegen Steuervermeidung, Maßnahmen gegen Steuerhinterziehung. Deshalb haben wir im Abschlussbericht des Panama-Papers-Untersuchungsausschusses, dem ich anhöre, in der letzten Woche zentrale Forderungen erhoben.

Und schließlich muss es den Akteuren gelingen, im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters einen Austausch über erfolgreiche Verfahren zu haben, von Sozialinvestitionen bis hin zum leichteren Zugang zu den qualifizierten Dienstleistungen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, Vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo, dar ndóigh, agus molaim go mór an rapóir-téir, mo chara Derek Vaughan ón mBreatain Bheag as an dea-obair a rinne sé.

Meastar go bhfuil suas le 120 milliún duine san Aontas in ocras agus deighilte amach ón saol sóisialta de bharr an cúil eacnamaíochta. I mo thír féin, ceaptar go bhfuil suas le trí cheathrú milliún duine sa bhfadhb chéanna. Dá bhrí sin, ní féidir linn a bheith sásta faoi sin agus go háirithe ós rud é go bhfuil an cúil eacnamaíochta taobh thiar dinn anois, tá súil againn. Caithfimid tús áite a thabhairt don fhadhb seo agus cabhrú leis na páistí, mná, daoine le máchail, daoine difhostaithe atá sa bhfadhb uafásach seo. Tá na scéimeanna bunioncaim an-tábhachtach agus i mo shaol féin tá mo pháirtí, Fine Gael, agus an rialtas ag déanamh a ndíchill chun cabhrú leis na daoine seo agus déanfaidh siad níos mó amach anseo. Ach i ndeireadh na dála, caithfimid bunioncam a tabhairt dóibh agus, freisin, saol gníomhach nádúrtha sóisialta a bheith acu chomh maith.

Μαρία Σπυράκη (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, προσυπογράφω απολύτως τα όσα είπαν πριν από λίγο οι συνάδελφοι Kelly και Mann. Είναι πράγματι απαραίτητο να υπάρχει το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα στις κοινωνίες μας και ειδικά στην πατρίδα μου, στην Ελλάδα, θα σας πω δύο αριθμούς: 274.000 νοικοκυριά επωφελούνται από το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα, 611.000 συμπολίτες μου. Δυστυχώς για μας όμως αυτά τα νούμερα αυξάνονται και εδώ πράγματι πρέπει να δούμε την προτεραιότητα της πολιτικής μας. Είναι αναμφισβήτητη προτεραιότητα να στηρίξουμε όσους πλήττονται από τη φτώχεια και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό. Είναι όμως απαραίτητο ταυτόχρονα να ενθαρρύνουμε την κοινωνική τους επανένταξη, με την απρόσκοπτη πρόσβαση στην αγορά εργασίας και είναι απαραίτητο να προωθήσουμε πολιτικές δια βίου μάθησης, μετεκπαίδευσης σε νέες δεξιότητες και απόκτησης προσόντων που θα επιταχύνουν την επανένταξη στην αγορά εργασίας των ανθρώπων που αισθάνονται ότι η δουλειά τους απέρριψε. Μόνο έτσι μπορούμε να πετύχουμε βιώσιμα αποτελέσματα για την αντιμετώπιση του φαινομένου της φτώχειας. Μόνο έτσι τα προγράμματα αυτά, ακόμη και το ελάχιστο εγγυημένο εισόδημα, θα μπορέσουν να πάρουν τον χαρακτήρα κοινωνικής επένδυσης.

Rupert Matthews (ECR). – Mr President, this report started life as a perfectly reasonable study into the levels of poverty across the European Union and ways in which they might be alleviated. Due to amendments, the report now demands that a centralised European Union fund be set up to run an EU-wide minimum income scheme which would be laid down centrally. It is yet another power-grab by Brussels at the expense of the Member States, this time set up as a policy against poverty.

The report fails to recognise that each Member State needs to have different measures in order to meet its own unique challenges and different causes of poverty, which is why I voted against the motion.

Once Britain is outside the European Union we will be free to take such measures for ourselves. Just one more reason why I believe that Brexit will be a success.

7. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 14.04)

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(The sitting resumed at 15.03)

9. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**10. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll****11. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse: siehe Protokoll****12. Arbeitsprogramm der Kommission für 2018 (Aussprache)**

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on the Commission work programme for 2018 ((2017/2746(RSP)).

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I have just come from the College meeting where we agreed on our Work Programme for 2018 and I am pleased to be here to present it to you straightaway, this afternoon.

The Work Programme is the Commission's commitment to you, and to Europeans, about what we will do in the coming year. It is a crucial period because together we have just over 18 months to show results before our citizens go to the ballot box to re-elect this House. There are no surprises in what we announce today. The Work Programme reflects fully the ambition, content and tone of Jean-Claude Juncker's State of the Union speech and the letter of intent we sent you in parallel.

At the same time, our Work Programme has certainly been enriched by, and builds on, the fruitful exchanges we have had in this Chamber with the Conference of Committee Chairs and the Conference of Presidents, as well as on our exchanges with the Member States in line with the Interinstitutional Agreement on Better Law-Making. We have also discussed with the Council and have had contributions from the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. I would like to thank you for the excellent cooperation we have had and continue to enjoy. We need to build on this in the decisive months to come. I think we have now established, after three years, quite a routine in doing this and it is working well.

The Work Programme sets out an agenda for a more united, stronger and more democratic Europe. It has a twofold focus. First, we set out a limited number of new proposals, which we will deliver by May 2018 so that the legislative work here and in the Council can be finished before the elections. The Commission has already tabled more than 80% of the proposals needed under the 10 priorities set out by President Juncker in 2014. Now we will focus on getting the remaining proposals on the table and working with you and the Council to see them adopted.

Our focus is on the limited number of proposals needed to complete the strategies we have set out. To boost jobs, growth and investment, we will pursue work to deliver on the circular economy action plan and to complete the digital single market, the energy union, the capital markets union and the banking union. We will propose the creation of a dedicated euro area budget line within the EU budget, along with other measures to complete the economic and monetary union, including transforming the European Stability Mechanism into a European Monetary Fund.

To create a deeper and fairer internal market with a strengthened industrial base, we will present an initiative on fair taxation in the digital economy and a proposal to improve the EU food supply chain. We are – like you – looking forward to the proclamation of the European pillar of social rights next month.

We will follow up with a social fairness package that creates a European labour authority to help address labour mobility and social security challenges. We will improve the rules requiring employees to be properly informed about their contracts and will present an initiative on access to social protection so that everyone who works, whether in traditional or new jobs in the gig economy, can contribute and have access to social protection.

We will also table targeted new measures to complete the security union, in particular as concerns the fight against terrorism and ensuring the interoperability of stronger and smarter databases for our border migration and security needs. We will strengthen the Union's Civil Protection Mechanism so that we are better prepared to help in situations such as the tragic and devastating forest fires we have seen recently in Portugal and Spain.

We will continue to work on our comprehensive approach to migration with an emphasis on returns, protecting our external borders, solidarity with Africa, opening legal pathways and, above all, agreeing on Dublin reform and the Blue Card proposal. We will set out our ideas about how to modernise our visa policy. We will keep up the focus on migration management in our relations with third countries and we will deliver on the global strategy, whilst also pursuing a balanced and progressive trade policy to harness globalisation.

The second focus of our Work Programme is more forward-looking and aims to shape the Union until 2025. This vision is based on three principles which must always anchor our Union: freedom, equality and the rule of law. A more united Union will require opening the Schengen Area fully to Romania and Bulgaria, as well as a credible enlargement perspective for front-runner candidates in the Western Balkans. By the way, the Schengen area should also be opened to Croatia if it can fulfil the requirements.

To build a stronger Union, we will table a proposal for the future multiannual financial framework, including own resources. We need a budget that helps us to meet citizens' expectations of an EU that delivers on the things that matter most and that contributes to the long-term sustainability of the Union. We will also propose more efficient decision-making for the single market and certain foreign policy decisions. We will adopt a reflection paper on a sustainable European future and a communication on the future of EU energy and climate policy and propose an extension of the tasks of the European Public Prosecutor's Office to also tackle terrorism.

For a more democratic Union, we will make proposals for the creation of a permanent and accountable European Minister of Economy and Finance and an initiative on further enhancing subsidiarity, proportionality and better regulation in the daily work of the European Union. We will also propose an initiative on strengthening the enforcement of the rule of law.

Furthermore, since what matters is results on the ground, the Work Programme sets out the Commission's commitment to step up its work on the enforcement of EU law, working closely with national authorities and the various European networks. In parallel with our Work Programme, we are also presenting today a communication on completing the Better Regulation Agenda. Our work here is grounded on strong stakeholder involvement, including the input of the REFIT Platform.

Given the forthcoming European Parliament elections, we are now firmly in a period where we need to deliver. Priority legislative files need to be adopted and, where possible, implemented before the end of Parliament's mandate. The Joint Declaration on EU legislative priorities, signed by the Presidents of the three institutions last December, has proved valuable in helping us to find shared priorities and stick to them. The Commission looks forward to an agreement later this year on the new Joint Declaration shaping our common work for 2018 and we can then also take stock of what we did on the basis of the Declaration of 2017.

We need to use the current momentum to ensure real progress in order to finish what we have started and to deliver on our positive agenda because, when you rise for elections in a year and a half's time, the success of the EU will not be judged on the number of proposals that the Commission has launched. We will be judged collectively on the answers we have delivered and how we have responded to the big challenges like climate change, globalisation, the security of our citizens, migration, jobs and growth, on which Europeans expect effective European solutions.

József Szájer, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I would again like to thank First Vice-President Timmermans for the gesture of immediately coming to us with the adopted Commission Work Programme. I am saying this because I am sure that some of our other colleagues will tell you that we do not do anything about this, except what you have said, but I think it is much worse if you know it from secondary and later sources, and we will definitely be able to learn about the details later on. However, on the general lines, I think it is very important in this last point to make some of the points of procedure clear.

This year, Parliament failed to adopt a joint declaration on the Commission Work Programme, so you had to do it without Parliament's help, in a way. Next year – because it is close to the election year – and the year after there is no need, according to the interinstitutional agreement, to have such a resolution. I think it is a very difficult and tiresome exercise, but we should use these two or three years to rethink what is the best way. Would it be best to influence Commission decisions and to have a general resolution on the whole thing every year with tiresome negotiations and with no consequences? It depends on us (I am saying this to the colleagues here), but we can also maybe find other, more flexible ways to influence this.

The EPP welcomed the Commission's proposal that less and better regulation is better for the legislation than in previous years, and I appreciate the discipline which the Commission brought to this process by really restraining itself. Having this figure which you mentioned – 80% – is really remarkable. Never before has the Commission, with such a high level of complacency, already reached the level of the programme which they were putting forward at the beginning of the term. That also goes to show that there is a clear attempt – albeit not always successful – to concentrate on the most important things.

On behalf of the EPP, we agree on the content in most cases, especially in the area of jobs: that we still have to deliver to enable companies to compete in domestic and global markets. In the area of migration, we are still in the midst of negotiations and resolutions here in Parliament. But to concentrate on fighting the root causes of migration and to use the private sector in the financing of this kind of migration crisis is key in achieving development objectives, as is much closer cooperation with the neighbourhood.

In the area of longer-term goals, the debate on the future of the European Union has started. It was launched by the Commission, and I would like to thank them for that. I would just say on behalf of my Group that we are happy to engage in this debate in the future.

Maria João Rodrigues, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the presentation by the First Vice-President of the Commission on the Commission Work Programme is welcome, because we need an ambitious road map for the European Union. But we also need to have it really delivered, and delivered with credible solutions.

We all know that this is the last shot for this European Commission, and let me be precise on what our demands are: to have real, fair and credible solutions. Yes, we do need a European Social Pillar, but let me be precise: the pillar needs to be translated in outstanding measures, notably making sure that everybody in employment – in whatever kind of job – can count on a decent labour contract and on full access to social protection.

When it comes to the reform of the eurozone, we need a eurozone not only with stability, but with roles and conversions – this means having a European semester working in this direction, a fiscal capacity supporting investment and supporting upward conversions, and a Minister of Economy and Finance who should be accountable to this European Parliament.

On migration, the long-term crisis in front of us and behind us can only be responded to via the proper reform of the European asylum system, legal corridors for legal migration, and a much stronger partnership with Africa. We also know that when it comes to the role of Europe in supporting the multilateral system and an open world order, a lot depends on the kind of trade agreements we are able to do. The kind of trade agreements that we are pushing for are those which should be inspired by sustainable development goals, and all these must be translated into the European budget. This will be our last chance to redirect the European Union. This is our expectation.

Anneleen Van Bossuyt, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Ik denk dat iedereen het erover eens is dat de prioriteiten van Europa inderdaad jobs, veiligheid en migratie zijn. Wat migratie betreft, verwachten wij eindelijk actie van commissaris Mogherini in verband met het afsluiten van de terugnameakkoorden, waarover al heel lang gesproken wordt.

Wat veiligheid betreft, hebben we meer Europese samenwerking nodig. Ik denk aan het aanpakken van cybercriminaliteit. De helft van de misdrijven vandaag de dag zijn immers cybermisdrijven en voor veel Europeanen is dit een grote bron van zorg. Daarnaast moeten we op het vlak van defensie nauwer gaan samenwerken. Hier is het industrieel ontwikkelingsprogramma voor de Europese defensie een goed voorbeeld van.

Wat jobs betreft, liggen er nog heel veel mogelijkheden in de verdere uitbouw van de digitale interne markt. Hier wachten we onder meer op de voorstellen van de Commissie rond het *business-to-business platform* en op verdere samenwerking van de Commissie bij het afronden van de dossiers rond *geoblocking* en de onlineverkoop. Ik hoop ook dat de Commissie bij de voorstellen rond het nieuwe meerjarig financieel kader meer geld vrijmaakt voor Europees onderzoek. Want 1 euro die hierin geïnvesteerd wordt, levert een economische meerwaarde van 11 euro op. Dat lijkt mij dus een goede investering. Laten we op deze zaken focussen en niet op zaken waarvan geen burger wakker ligt, zoals een Europese minister van Financiën of transnationale lijsten.

Sophia in 't Veld, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, thank you, and thank you, Commissioner. I have only just received the text, so I have not been able to read all the details yet, but I am going to say something which may shock you. Indeed, I intend to praise you for what you have just said – yes, I know you are going to need months of therapy to get over it. Nevertheless, we do seem to be past the stage of thinking that delivering results lies in scrapping red tape. What you have just told us here sounds like a vision for the future, and, unlike some other people, I do not believe that you need to see an eye doctor if you have vision.

On migration, the Commission has done what it needs to do. Parliament has done its homework. It is actually those who are absent who have not done their homework. As we said this morning, migration is more than Fortress Europe, for the question is not only how we keep people out, but also how we are going to process people, the rapid inflows of migrants.

I am very, very pleased to hear that you are going to work on a mechanism for the enforcement of the rule of law: that is, of course, most welcome, but in the short term there are also things that we need to do. For example, I would be really, really pleased if the Commission were to reinstate the corruption reports: we have just seen last week in Malta what corruption and in particular those who are investigating corruption can do. We urgently need a strong tool for investigating corruption and also the rule of law – in Poland, for example. What does it mean if the Commission has more or less concluded that the judiciary in Poland is no longer independent? What does that mean for cooperation? What about the European arrest warrant, ECRIS, the Schengen Information System – are we going to use Polish material? What are we going to do? And finally, I am very curious to see the details of your proposals for a Minister of Economic Affairs and Finance, which, to my mind will contribute greatly to a more accountable and transparent European Union.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Timmermans, οι πολίτες δεν αρκούνται πια σε ευχολόγια, θέλουν συγκεκριμένες πράξεις με μετρήσιμα αποτελέσματα στη ζωή τους. Ζητούν πράξεις που να ενισχύουν την απασχόληση, που να μειώνουν τις ανισότητες, που να ενισχύουν την κοινωνική συνοχή. Ζητούν η Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινωνική Χάρτα να αποκτήσει υπόσταση πραγματική και να φέρει αποτελέσματα στη ζωή τους, μειώνοντας την ανεργία, την επισφαλή και κακοπληρωμένη εργασία, καταπολεμώντας τη φτώχεια και τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό. Και, μέχρι τώρα, και η Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινωνική Χάρτα και ο ευρωπαϊκός κοινωνικός πυλώνας είναι απλώς μια ετικέτα. Ζητούν το Σύμφωνο Ανάπτυξης και Απασχόλησης να γίνει πραγματικά Σύμφωνο Ανάπτυξης και Απασχόλησης και όχι ένα δόγμα εμμονής σε μια μονομερή λιτότητα και σε μια δημοσιονομική ακαμψία. Ζητούν μια ενιαία ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική ασύλου και μια αλληλέγγυα Ευρώπη στο προσφυγικό, που δεν θα φορτώνει στη χώρα μου την Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία όλα τα βάρη, αφήνοντας στο απυρόβλητο χώρες όπως η Ουγγαρία και η Πολωνία, που αρνούνται να τιμήσουν τις δεσμεύσεις τους. Εάν προχωρήσουμε προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση, και έχετε μεγάλη ευθύνη να το κάνετε πράξη και όχι μόνο λόγια, αυτό θα είναι η καλύτερη απάντηση στην ευρωπαϊκή άκρα δεξιά, που επιδιώκει μια Ευρώπη αδύναμη, διαιρεμένη, δέσμια εθνικισμών με οξυνόμενες διαρκώς κοινωνικές και περιφερειακές ανισότητες.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, we are very much looking forward to Commissioner Timmermans' proposals and I am sure, Commissioner Timmermans, that on a lot of them we will work together with you. A few others we might not like so much, but that's life! I still want to point out some of the areas where we think that we absolutely need more progress and some of them have already been mentioned by colleagues.

Number one: the rule of law. We have a dramatic situation in a couple of Member States. I think we all agree that we need to stand firm and that we need to be coherent in what we are doing if we want to achieve a good result and we should never let go, we should never give up on such a fundamental thing as making sure that the safeguards against arbitrary leadership, and even despotism, are not endangered in Europe, and this goes to the very heart of the European project.

In Parliament we are currently working towards asking for Article 7.1 to be triggered against Hungary and I think that the Commission must do the same now also with regard to Poland. So you will come to the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs – we are looking forward to your report – but we need to get active on that as well. As has been mentioned, I am glad that you are also taking that up, to look too into other measures, measures that have been proposed by Parliament in the past and which are more sophisticated, more varied as well, and I think we need to go ahead with that to make sure that we are firm and strong on our European core principles and values.

I also would like to mention the whole issue of sexual harassment because no woman should ever have to put up with such treatment – not on the street, not at work and not in this House or in any European institution. I really would like to applaud all of the women who in the past weeks have taken the courageous step – because it is an incredibly courageous step – to go out and say ‘this is what happened to me’. We must make sure that it is not just a matter of individual courage but that we actually also do something against sexual harassment.

I would also say generally about sexism because sexism is what enables sexual harassment in the end, and there we really need to do more. We need to do more, we can do more as the European Union. I would like to see this play a part in the Work Programme too, that there will be initiatives, because I think we should not just have a debate and then say ‘okay, well, next time we will have another debate’, but we should really get serious about this and say we do not accept it any longer.

Next on social justice, and colleagues have also mentioned that. I think social justice is absolutely key if we want to take the European Union further and I think most of us here want that. We want to protect European citizens but that also means social protection. To have a proclamation on the European Pillar on Social Rights, as is envisaged, is absolutely great and fantastic but proclamations alone are simply not enough.

I think, for example, that the Commission should propose a framework directive on an adequate minimum income for all Europeans or different minimum incomes. We Greens have also proposed an EU sustainability and prosperity pact for the European Monetary Union (EMU) and the EMU must go hand in hand with a binding roadmap for social, economic and environmental convergence. I think the issue of tax justice also forms part of the whole social justice package; the income part, so to say. All companies must contribute their fair share to welfare in the European Union and therefore we also need to look at minimum tax for companies and common tax instruments because tax fraud and evasion must be fought with all consequence.

Lastly, on climate change, we do need much more effort. If we want to reach our targets then we have to get serious. We have to adjust our targets upwards and that is, I think, what we need to do because, as you rightly said, this is the last year before the European elections. We want people to vote and we want them to know why we make a difference.

Peter Lundgren, för EFDD-gruppen. – Fru talman! Ja, det är alltså 18 månader kvar tills det är dags att hålla Europaparlamentsval igen. Jag kunde inte låta bli att se att man nu har tagit fram en publikation som låg här utanför. Man skriver bland annat i den om ett mer demokratiskt Europa, det vill man skapa. 33 procent säger man har en positiv bild av EU. Det är ju en försämring jämfört med de 42 procent som deltog i förra valet, och jag är säker på att det blir ett dåligt val denna gång med. Man har en lista för att göra EU mer populärt, med elva punkter. Man utelämnar såklart. Man tar bara med PPE, S&D och ALDE. Man tar inte med ECR och de gröna och såklart inte EFDD eller ENF. Och hur rättfärdigar man att Macron lyfts fram som EU:s nya ledare, eller bedriver han redan kampanj för att ersätta Jean-Claude Juncker 2019? Det här är så illa, att jag får visa vad jag tycker om demokratin i detta hus, och det är det här [ljudet av ett papper som rivs]. Det finns ingen demokrati i det här huset längre.

Olaf Stuger, namens de ENF-Fractie. – We praten vandaag over het werkprogramma van de Commissie. Maar wat werkt er nu eigenlijk echt? Natuurlijk, we zien de heer Juncker aan het werk: duidelijk aangeschoten zoent en tikt hij erop los alsof de hele me too-hype niet bestaat. We zien de heer Timmermans bezig, bestraffend naar de landen die opkomen voor hun eigen bevolking, zoals Polen, Hongarije en Slowakije. Let wel, Voorzitter, dit zijn democratisch gekozen leiders, die op de vingers worden getikt door mensen hier op wie niemand heeft gestemd. Niemand.

Klimaat is ook zo'n onderwerp waarbij het craquelé in je bril springt als je dat leest. We gaan de opwarming van de aarde met enkele duizendsten van graden tegen als we de CO₂-uitstoot met de helft laten dalen. Dat kost honderden miljarden aan belastinggeld. Dat werkt dus ook niet.

Ik sluit af met het onzalige plan om te gaan werken aan een Europese minister van Financiën. We zien in de verschillende landen de desastreuze gevolgen van een falende euro. Door het bijdrukken van 80 miljard per maand wordt de munt kunstmatig gestut. Dat is natuurlijk een onhoudbare constructie. Als de euro straks weer op eigen benen moet staan, dan breekt de hel pas echt los en is het leed niet meer te overzien. Dit werkt dus ook alleen maar in de fantasie van de mensen daar vooraan in de bankjes. Het enige wat echt gaat werken, is dit mislukte experiment opdoeken en de besluitvorming terugbrengen waar ze hoort, namelijk bij de democratisch gekozen parlementen in de lidstaten.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είμαι πεπεισμένος πως το 2018 θα είναι ακριβώς όπως και όλα τα προηγούμενα χρόνια της παρούσας Επιτροπής. Εξαγγείλατε πάλι πολλά, αναλύσετε μεγάλα σχέδια και στόχους. Όμως πάλι τα αποτελέσματα θα είναι κατώτερα των προσδοκιών μας. Όπως τα προηγούμενα χρόνια, έτσι και το 2018, δεν θα δώσετε λύση σε κανένα από τα μεγάλα προβλήματα της Ευρώπης, σίγουρα όμως θα κατηγορείτε όσους είναι αντίθετοι από εσάς ιδεολογικά σαν λαϊκιστές και οι λαοί της Ευρώπης θα συνεχίσουν να υφίστανται τα λάθη των πολιτικών σας επιλογών. Μετά από τόσα χρόνια οικονομικής κρίσης, δεν έχει επανέλθει η ανάπτυξη, συνεχίζεται η λιτότητα και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τείνει να γίνει Ευρώπη δύο ταχυτήτων. Η λαθρομετανάστευση εξακολουθεί να είναι ένα τεράστιο πρόβλημα, ειδικά για τις χώρες του Νότου. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση παραμένει ένας οργανισμός απρόθυμος να επιβάλει περιορισμούς ακόμα και στα υπό ένταξη κράτη, όπως η Τουρκία. Αντίθετα, ο Ερντογάν δείχνει να μπορεί ανά πάσα στιγμή να εκμεταλλεύεται και να απαξιώνει τους ευρωπαίους πολιτικούς. Τέλος, το μόνο θετικό μέχρι σήμερα ήταν πως η παράλογη και στρατευμένη ιδεολογικά πολιτική σας έπεισε τους πολίτες του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου να απαλλαγούν οριστικά από τα δεσμά της Ένωσης. Ελπίζουμε σύντομα να τους ακολουθήσουν και οι υπόλοιποι λαοί της Ευρώπης.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Vice-Presidente, Caras e caros Colegas, todos temos a obrigação de proteger a vida humana. Sei que a competência da proteção civil está nas mãos de cada Estado-Membro, mas a União Europeia também deve ajudar. E espero que, em 2018, haja a concretização de uma força rápida de intervenção na área da proteção civil.

Também é urgente a prevenção e os Fundos Estruturais disponíveis em cada Estado-Membro são importantes para essa mesma prevenção. A solidariedade, um fundo de solidariedade para fazer face aos danos, é urgente que funcione rapidamente, até porque essa solidariedade tem de se sentir.

Também em 2018, Sr. Vice-Presidente, vai haver a proposta para a apresentação do novo quadro financeiro plurianual. É um quadro financeiro plurianual que tem de estar à altura dos seus objetivos e isso significa que tem de ter meios financeiros em consonância com os objetivos a que se propõe.

Precisamos destes meios e também precisamos de uma outra coisa: é que novas prioridades têm de ter um financiamento adicional. Espero que haja um quadro financeiro plurianual para mais de 7 anos, para dar previsibilidade, com a flexibilidade que se exige para podermos responder a imprevistos.

Também espero uma nova rubrica para a segurança e a defesa e também gostava, para finalizar, que o Sr. Vice-Presidente nos dissesse, se é que já tem essa informação, relativamente à linha consagrada no orçamento para a zona euro e para aqueles que querem aderir à zona euro, qual é o montante que está previsto para essa linha orçamental que vai estar dentro do orçamento da União Europeia.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Eine der vornehmsten Aufgaben dieser Kommission in den nächsten Wochen und Monaten wird es werden, die Europäische Union als ein demokratisches Projekt zu verteidigen. Warum sage ich das? Ja, natürlich ist unsere Fraktion dafür, dass wir bei der Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion voranschreiten. Natürlich, wir wollen einen europäischen Währungsfonds. Aber das kann doch keine zwischenstaatliche Angelegenheit werden. Oder wollen Sie mit 19 Finanzministern – oder besser noch mit 27 – regeln, in welcher Weise wir auf die Schocks dieser Welt reagieren sollen und was wir für Maßnahmen wo abstimmen und wie lange das dann dauern soll?

Wir haben diesen Unsinn bei der Troika erlebt. Wir haben erlebt, wieviel Unsinn in die Welt kommt – gut gemeint, aber schlecht gemacht –, wenn es keine parlamentarische Kontrolle gibt. Wir stehen Ihnen zur Verfügung, weil wir diese Vertiefung wollen. Wir wollen die Verbesserung unserer wirtschaftspolitischen Instrumente. Aber die Kommission muss aufstehen und ihre eigene Rolle verteidigen.

Wir wollen auch nicht, dass die Übersicht über die mitgliedstaatlichen Finanzen auswandert aus der Kommission; sie gehört in die Kommission. Ihr Chef heißt Juncker und nicht Regling. Wir haben Sie hier gewählt und Herrn Juncker und die Kommissionskolleginnen und Kollegen. Aber wir haben hier nicht Herrn Regling gewählt. Es braucht demokratische Kontrolle – es braucht das Europäische Parlament. Dabei wollen wir Sie gerne unterstützen, heute und auch in Zukunft; ich danke dafür.

Ich will einen letzten Satz sagen, vielleicht auch im Namen der Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Ich möchte mich aus gegebenem Anlass einmal bei den Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetschern bedanken. Sie machen einen großartigen Job. Sie machen das nicht nur heute, sondern sie machen es das ganze Jahr. Herzlichen Dank dafür.

President. – We can agree with that as regards the interpreters. Our thanks to them.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Voorzitter, Europa moet het vooral van zijn soft power hebben en het sterkste soft power-instrument dat Europa heeft, is handel. Op mondiaal gebied is Europa in de handel echt een heel belangrijke speler. Het systeem van handelspreferenties is specifiek bedoeld om landen aan te sporen de eerbiediging van de mensenrechten te verbeteren. Laten we vooral dat specifieke doel niet vergeten.

Een van de landen die momenteel het GSP+-handelsvoordeel geniet, is Pakistan. Helaas worden in Pakistan de mensenrechten met voeten getreden, ook door de overheid. Immers, waarom staat er nog altijd de doodstraf op blasfemie? En waarom zit Asia Bibi al 7 jaar in een dodencel? Ik roep de Commissie op tot een serieuze evaluatie van de handelsvoordelen voor Pakistan en ik schat in dat deze voordelen helaas het verschil niet hebben kunnen maken. Als dat zo is, dan moet die GSP+-status worden bevroren of ingetrokken. Ten slotte ben ik van mening dat het mandaat van de speciale gezant voor godsdienstvrijheid komend voorjaar moet worden verlengd.

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Madam President, as the Chair of the Conference of Committee Chairs I would like to thank you, Vice-President Timmermans, and all of the Commissioners for a very good and fruitful cooperation that has improved throughout the years. On a practical note, I hope that the Commission will expedite any remaining legislative proposals and present them to the co-legislators at the latest by April 2018 to give us a fair chance to conclude before the end of this mandate.

It is abundantly clear from the Eurobarometer of May this year that citizens expect the Union to deliver in areas like migration, defence, the environment and foreign affairs – more than two-thirds of citizens have asked the European Union to deliver on that. We also know that 81% of citizens underline the importance of the free movement of citizens in the Union: speaking about migration, last week this House managed to unite 751 MEPs from five Groups that consist of more than 200 political parties. Council, though, was not present here today. They could not up until now unite 21 Ministers. I find that quite remarkable, and I urge the Commission to give them a push in the right direction when it comes to pushing this area to a qualified majority vote.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, mais uma vez, a Comissão insiste em apresentar as mesmas propostas e os mesmos caminhos: perda de soberania económica, monetária, fiscal e bancária em benefício das grandes potências europeias, a austeridade, o empobrecimento, a exploração, a concentração da riqueza para uns, a miséria e a incerteza para os demais, mais investimento na indústria da guerra e em medidas securitárias e a supressão dos direitos de asilo e dos refugiados. Mais do mesmo, sem que se retirem quaisquer lições das políticas que impuseram e querem continuar a impor.

As necessidades, essas, são claras e evidentes: o reforço dos fundos para a coesão, contrariando as crescentes assimetrias, a necessidade de defesa da democracia no quadro da soberania dos Estados, a defesa de políticas de desenvolvimento progressistas que respondam às necessidades dos povos e que façam uso dos recursos e capacidades em proveito próprio, apoios aos países afetados por catástrofes e direcionados para mecanismos de prevenção, a necessidade de apoiar a recuperação dos setores produtivos em países como Portugal, com apoios direcionados à pesca, à agricultura e à indústria, apoios que se canalizem prioritariamente para as micro, pequenas e médias empresas, apoios e políticas que favoreçam necessárias políticas públicas em setores estratégicos, como a energia, os transportes e as comunicações, apoios e políticas assentes na oferta de serviços públicos, gratuitos e de qualidade, em setores como a saúde, a educação e a justiça, apoios que reforcem a capacidade de produção científica e de investigação, políticas que promovam a criação de empregos, o trabalho com direitos, a contratação coletiva, o aumento de salários, a redução de horários e uma segurança social pública e universal.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président Timmermans, il ne vous a pas échappé que nous n'en avons pas fini avec les extrêmes droites et les nationalismes de gauche et de droite.

Ils prétendent rassembler – nous le savons – les perdants de la mondialisation et les perdus de l'Union européenne, mais l'Europe d'aujourd'hui déçoit aussi les plus convaincus. Comment leur en vouloir? Le néolibéralisme comme horizon, l'austérité comme solution et la technocratie comme méthode déçoivent forcément l'ensemble des citoyens européens, y compris les plus convaincus, et rendent nos institutions détestables.

La question de la mondialisation – on le sait – est un enjeu majeur de souveraineté. Évidemment, sans Europe, nous serons balayés par la mondialisation, mais quand l'Union européenne devient une petite mondialisation libérale et qu'à travers ses accords de libre-échange, elle met en concurrence les salariés, les territoires et, aujourd'hui, de manière croissante, les choix de société, elle met à portée de canon de quelques multinationales le climat, la santé, l'environnement, la protection des données personnelles ou les services publics. Évidemment, à ce moment-là, l'Europe ne remplit pas sa mission.

Monsieur Timmermans, il faut changer notre politique commerciale pour qu'enfin les droits sociaux, environnementaux et humains priment sur le droit du commerce et sur celui des investisseurs. Si nous ne réussissons pas cela, l'Europe sera diluée dans son essence même. L'Europe est une communauté de droit. Si les citoyens ne sont pas coacteurs de ce droit et que ce sont les multinationales qui décident, il n'y aura plus d'Europe.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sull'immigrazione l'unica cosa che ci propone l'Unione europea è l'affidamento a personaggi straordinari come da una parte Erdoğan e dall'altra parte i galantuomini delle milizie libiche, che dovrebbero garantire la sicurezza dei cittadini europei. Bel programma e tanti auguri!

Noi euroscettici siamo soliti attaccare l'Unione europea dicendo che è una costruzione estranea al sentire dei popoli. Ne abbiamo la prova: è successo alla Catalogna e, a poche settimane, in un'altra delle aree – come la Catalogna – più produttive, di gente onesta, che lavora e che produce: in Lombardia e nel Veneto milioni e milioni di persone vanno a votare, vogliono un referendum. È una grande manifestazione, esattamente come quella di Barcellona, di voglia di libertà, di democrazia diretta, di partecipazione e di rappresentanza.

C'è una grande crisi di rappresentanza in questa Europa, che voi dite proiettata verso più democrazia. Ma se adesso non ne parliamo, se nel vostro documento non esaminate neanche lontanamente la questione catalana, la questione del nord Italia e la questione delle minoranze che chiedono rappresentanza, quale sarebbe questa nuova democrazia? Non ne avete il coraggio, siete lontani dal sentire e l'unica soluzione è l'Europa dei popoli e delle regioni, non quella della burocrazia, delle banche e delle multinazionali che vi stanno molto a cuore.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pan Verheugen powiedział dwa dni temu w wywiadzie, że musimy zwiększyć konkurencyjność, bo przegrywamy z krajami Dalekiego Wschodu. Otóż ja czytam ten program Komisji Europejskiej. Słucham tych wypowiedzi. One wszystkie idą w dokładnie przeciwnym kierunku. Przecież jeżeli – jak chce tutaj mój antykolega – chcemy, żeby prawa socjalne, prawa człowieka miały pierwszeństwo przed prawami ekonomicznymi, to oczywiście będzie niemożliwe konkurować z nikim. Prawda? Państwo musicie zrozumieć: Europa kiedyś przodowała. Byliśmy motorem rozwoju całego świata dzięki temu, że rządziły wartości europejskie. One są dokładnie odwrotne niż wartości unijne. Jeżeli chcemy znów wrócić na przodujące miejsce, musimy odrzucić wszystkie *acquis communautaire*. Musimy odrzucić demokrację. Jak można wierzyć, że większość – głupich jest więcej niż mądrych – podejmie rozsądne decyzje? Przecież widzicie państwo wyniki nie tylko ostatnich wyborów, ale również wyniki decyzji podejmowanych przez demokratycznie wybierane rządy. Musimy iść dokładnie w przeciwnym kierunku. Ja wierzę, że Europa się odrodzi, że zrzuci okupację Unii Europejskiej i znowuż powstanie wolna Europa.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Commissaris, vicevoorzitter Timmermans. Ik wil u graag complimenteren met uw verhaal over de voortgang, maar toch wil ik een uitnodiging aan u overreiken. 2018 wordt hét jaar van het MFK met tientallen uitvoeringsverordeningen die voor de periode na 2020 moeten worden voorgelegd.

Wat is nou onze ervaring? In de afgelopen periode hebben we gezien dat zij te laat kwamen om daarmee daadwerkelijk bij de aanvang 2014, 2015 en 2016 te beginnen. Dit had bijvoorbeeld op een aantal terreinen, zoals het cohesiebeleid en de tweede pijler landbouw, tot gevolg dat die uitgaven pas heel laat op gang zijn gekomen. Dat moet nu beter. Dat moet nu sneller. Dat kan ook als de verordeningen in één keer, midden 2018, worden gepresenteerd. Als we dat niet doen, dan krijgen we een herhaling van datgene wat we gezien hebben, namelijk dat uitgaven heel laat in de periode, in de 5 of 7 jaar, worden gedaan.

We zagen vorige keer dat er een geweldige stapel van onbetaalde rekeningen kwam. We zien nu al dat in 2016 8 miljard euro naar de lidstaten teruggaat. Ook dit jaar zal dat deels gebeuren en we krijgen een geweldige lawine van rekeningen, straks in 2019 en 2020. En dan spreken niet over de Brexit. Dus inderdaad, betere regelgeving en ook tijdige regelgeving om in 2019 te kunnen laten zien dat het Parlement die richting ook echt geeft. Het kan niet zo zijn dat we midden 2019 met elkaar in een situatie komen van debatten die niet zijn afgerond en dat 2020 en 2021 slechte jaren worden. Dat is mijn oproep: tijdige regelgeving.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Madam President, the Commission's annual work programme is a key tool to addressing shared European challenges. Sadly, I have to say tax fraud, tax evasion and money laundering remain an enormous shared problem in Europe, costing EU Member States what amounts to EUR 2 000 on average per citizen in lost taxes every year. I therefore welcome the initiative on taxation of the digital sector, but I think we have to do much more.

I have spent the last few years working as a co-rapporteur for the Parliament's inquiry committee into the Panama Papers. Our investigations show how unregulated intermediaries in Europe and in offshore tax havens help the super-rich hide their wealth in tax havens. We have to stop this shadowy industry of tax dodging, and also stop the corrupt global elite that are doing this.

That is why we, the Socialists and Democrats, want to break new ground to put an effective end to tax fraud, money laundering and tax havens by introducing a common EU licence for wealth managers, tax advisers and other intermediaries, so that licences can be instantly revoked throughout the EU in the event of illegal actions.

Only a common system with EU licences will make sure that we can put an effective stop to the industry of tax fraud in Europe. I hope that the Commission supports this idea in the next year's work programme.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Jean-Claude Juncker az uniós csúcslélelt munkavacsorán találkozott a visegrádi négyek vezetőivel. A Bizottság munkaprogramja szempontjából nagyon fontos lenne a renitensnek nevezett országok álláspontjának megértése, annak tudomásul vétele, hogy ezek az országok nem fogadják el a Bizottság migránspolitikáját.

Jean-Claude Juncker már 2014-ben, amikor még senki sem hallott az úgynevezett „Soros-tervről”, világossá tette, hogy a népességfogyással szembenéző Európa számára a megoldást a migránsok betelepítésében látja. Az EP jelentése pedig azt hangsúlyozza, hogy a migrációra pozitív eseményként kell tekinteni. Ha ez így lenne, akkor miért kell kötelező befogadási kvótákat előírni?

Az októberi tagországi választások alapján Juncker elnöknek az ilyen tárggyú vacsorákhoz egyre nagyobb asztalra lesz szüksége. De az is jó lenne, hogyha meg is tudná emésztetni azt, amit ott elébe táltak.

Albert Deß (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident! Ich begrüße den Vorschlag der Kommission, dass alle noch zu erwartenden legislativen Vorschläge spätestens bis Mai nächsten Jahres vorzulegen sind. Dies muss auch den Vorschlag zum MFR nach 2020 umfassen, damit unverzüglich umfangreiche interinstitutionelle Verhandlungen aufgenommen werden können. Das Ziel muss es sein, diese Verhandlungen bis zum Ende der laufenden Wahlperiode erfolgreich abzuschließen. Alle erdenklichen Anstrengungen müssen unternommen werden, um eine neue Zahlungskrise abzuwenden, auch durch einen Beschluss über die angemessene Höhe der Mittel für Zahlungen in den kommenden Haushaltsplänen. Ein strukturierter Dialog über die Gesamtmittelausstattung, die politischen und finanziellen Prioritäten, die Gestaltung und Flexibilitätsbestimmungen des künftigen MFR ist unabdingbar. Ein Standpunkt zur Laufzeit des Finanzrahmens muss erreicht werden.

Die EVP-Fraktion hat sich eindeutig dafür ausgesprochen, dass die Kommission einen legislativen Vorschlag zur Lebensmittelversorgungskette vorlegen soll. Daher freue ich mich sehr, dass diese Forderung eine breite Mehrheit im Parlament und in der Kommission gefunden hat und im Arbeitsprogramm, im Legislativvorschlag vorgesehen ist. Der Vorschlag muss eine Rahmenregelung auf EU-Ebene zu unlauteren Handelspraktiken enthalten, und die amtierende Präsidentin hat hier sehr massiv mitgewirkt.

Ich fordere die Kommission auch auf, einen legislativen Vorschlag zur Weiterentwicklung der Gemeinsamen Agrarpolitik vorzulegen. Hier ist auch ein konstruktiver Dialog notwendig. Herr Timmermans, die Landwirtschaft sorgt dafür, dass in Europa über 41 Millionen Arbeitsplätze vorhanden sind. Wir geben 32 Cent pro Einwohner und Tag dafür aus, dass wir diese Arbeitsplätze sichern und jeden Tag über eine halbe Milliarde Menschen genügend Lebensmittel erhalten. Ich glaube, das ist ein geringer Betrag, der auch in Zukunft dafür vorgesehen werden muss.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président, la Commission présentera en mai prochain le projet de cadre financier pluriannuel pour l'après-2020, afin de permettre un débat fructueux et partagé sur l'avenir financier de l'Union. Or, le fameux programme des dirigeants présenté par le Conseil prévoit une conclusion des négociations fin 2019, ceci au mépris du Parlement et de la Commission, car, en accord avec le commissaire Oettinger, nous avons élaboré un calendrier qui ouvrait la possibilité d'un accord entre Parlement et Conseil début 2019.

Je rappelle l'article 312, paragraphe 5, du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne: «tout au long de la procédure conduisant à l'adoption du cadre financier, le Parlement européen, le Conseil et la Commission prennent toutes mesures nécessaires pour faciliter cette adoption».

Le Conseil ne respecte pas ses obligations en envisageant une conclusion des négociations au moment où le Parlement et la Commission seront en pleine reconstitution. Il ne respecte pas le Parlement quand il imagine que son consentement ne sera qu'une formalité.

J'en appelle donc au président de la Commission pour dire, avec le Parlement, au président du Conseil: «Amendez votre programme!». Ne donnons pas le sentiment d'une Union qui attend toujours le dernier moment. J'en appelle à la Commission, gardienne des traités, pour tout faire afin que les négociations soient démocratiques et fructueuses.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Tu w skrócie stanowisko mojej grupy politycznej w odniesieniu do priorytetów programu prac Komisji Europejskiej na 2018 r. z perspektywy działań Komisji Rozwoju, komisji DEVE. Popieramy ustanowienie mechanizmów nadzoru implementacji celów zrównoważonego rozwoju przez Unię Europejską, jak i państwa członkowskie, zgodnie z nowym europejskim konsensusem w sprawie rozwoju. Jesteśmy świadomi obecnej ograniczonej zdolności Europejskiego Funduszu Rozwoju do wspierania inicjatyw dotyczących jednocześnie bezpieczeństwa i rozwoju. Opowiadamy się za ustanowieniem nowego instrumentu finansowania, pozwalającego na kompleksowe wsparcie działań na rzecz demokracji, dobrego zarządzania i ochrony praw człowieka. Nawiązując do postulatu dotyczącego przeciwdziałania przyczynom migracji, ponownie wyrażamy poparcie dla innowacyjnych metod rozwiązywania kryzysu migracyjnego, proponując i promując współpracę z sektorem prywatnym, umożliwiającą rozwiązywanie problemów ekonomicznych leżących u podstaw migracji. Z perspektywy stosunków Unii Europejskiej z państwami Afryki, Karaibów i Pacyfiku, jak wiemy, rok następny jest momentem, w którym powinniśmy rozpocząć negocjacje w sprawie partnerstwa, które zastąpi umowę z Kotonu. Nasza współpraca z partnerami afrykańskimi powinna zakładać większą regionalizację i wspieranie odporności państwowej, a także być oparta przede wszystkim na dialogu politycznym i wspieraniu rozwoju oraz handlu.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Vice-président, nous sommes ici pour parler du programme de travail de la Commission pour l'année 2018.

J'éprouve un certain malaise car, pendant ce temps-là, le président Tusk a proposé au Conseil européen une feuille de route, non pas pour être en harmonie et mettre en œuvre ce programme de travail – s'en servir –, mais en donnant l'impression de vouloir mettre en œuvre un agenda parallèle.

Je voudrais dire que la même chose semble se retrouver au niveau des propositions que vous allez faire dans le domaine économique et monétaire, où vous vous proposez de transformer le Mécanisme européen de stabilité en un Fonds monétaire européen – proposition qui devrait être sur la table le 6 décembre –, tandis que le président de l'Eurogroupe vient d'être recruté par le Mécanisme européen de stabilité lui-même pour réfléchir à cette réforme, ce qui pose tout de même question quant à la crédibilité des institutions dans leurs rôles respectifs.

Quelle sera la proposition sur la table? Je vous mets en garde contre ce que nous sentons venir: une proposition dans laquelle la Commission serait au final dessaisie de ses compétences en matière de supervision budgétaire au bénéfice du Mécanisme européen de stabilité, la Commission restant, elle, seule compétente pour mettre en œuvre des réformes structurelles dans le cadre d'une conditionnalité macroéconomique que ce Parlement européen a toujours refusée.

Andrzej Grzyb (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Chciałem podziękować za tę prezentację celów Komisji na rok 2018. Jest wiele ważnych kwestii, które Komisja postawiła, proponując jak gdyby bycie wielką w sprawach wielkich, takich na przykład jak unia energetyczna, kontynuacja tego projektu, Unia Obrony, w tym obrony granic Unii Europejskiej czy agenda cyfrowa i łączące się z nią oraz z Unią Obrony cyberbezpieczeństwo. Bardzo jestem zadowolony z faktu, że jest deklaracja w sprawie rozszerzenia o kraje Bałkanów, przynajmniej o jeden z krajów Bałkanów i prace nad tym.

No i jest coś, co bardziej – że tak powiem – dzieli czy jest kontrowersyjne – to jest kwestia specjalnej linii budżetowej dla strefy euro. Musimy o tym dyskutować. Ale też zaproponowano między innymi pakiet „mobilność a zmiany klimatyczne”, który jest potrzebny, ale też budzi wiele kontrowersji, bowiem przyszłe regulacje dotyczące kwestii emisji powinny być skorelowane z długoterminową wizją transformacji sektora samochodowego w kierunku bezemisyjnym. Tu nam potrzeba pewnej mapy drogowej do elektromobilności, która jest ważna, potrzebna i przyszłościowa. Musi ona jednak brać pod uwagę również rozwój rodzimego europejskiego przemysłu samochodowego – w moim kraju to jest ponad dwieście tysięcy miejsc pracy i oni chcieliby wiedzieć, jak ma wyglądać ten projekt transformacji.

No i być może sprawa mała: to jest kwestia dyrektywy Parlamentu i Rady z 2001 r. w sprawie czasu letniego. W moim kraju, na przykład, toczy się dyskusja i jest wielka aprobata dla tego, aby podejść do rezygnacji z tej dorocznej dwukrotnej zmiany czasu. To nie jest tylko kwestia mojego kraju, ale również, na przykład, wielu innych krajów europejskich, które podnoszą zasadność. Wydaje mi się, że skoro ta debata się rozpoczęła, to również należałoby się do niej odnieść.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome the Commission Working Programme on the EMU and also the key choice that has been made for the Community method. This has a number of implications, and I would like to focus on them, in particular on two implications.

First, the ESM integration into EU law is really essential. It is essential because with Article 352 of the Treaty we will have full EP involvement via the consent procedure; it is essential because it will ensure EP scrutiny to the new body; it is essential because this is the only way to obtain the meaningful budget line that is in your programme; and it is also essential if we want to fully safeguard Commission competences on economic policy coordination and budgetary surveillance, including by avoiding to building up a parallel capacity to do Article 4 reports by the ESM.

Second, on the Fiscal Compact incorporation: incorporation requires reform which means also that full co-decision procedure and double legal basis are necessary.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Ir-riforma hija ta' importanza assoluta, u t-triq għal Unjoni li hija aktar magħquda, b'saħħitha u aktar demokratika tista' titqies bħala pass pożittiv biss jekk l-Unjoni Ewropea u l-istituzzjonijiet kollha tagħha, inkluż l-aġenziji, igawdu l-fiduċja tal-pubbliku.

Qiegħda nitkellem b'mod partikolari dwar l-iżviluppi riċenti dwar il-glyphosate u anki dwar endocrine disruptors għaliex dawn iqajmu thassib serju dwar il-mod ta' kif qegħdin jahdmu l-aġenziji tal-Unjoni Ewropea dwar il-kimiċi u anki dwar is-sigurtà tal-ikel. Xogħolhom għandu jkun li jipprovdu data xjentifika li hija indipendenti u konklużjonijiet li ċ-ċittadini jistgħu jafdaw dwar is-sigurtà tal-kimiċi li niġu f'kuntatt magħhom.

Id-dipendenza tal-ECHA u anki ta' EFSA fuq studji li jingħataw mill-industriji qed joħolqu sfiducia serja u dan qed iqajjem mistoqsija dwar l-indipendenza u anki l-affidabilità ta' dawn l-aġenziji. Fil-fatt l-aġenziji qegħdin jgħidu li huma jseguw r-regoli. Jekk dan huwa l-każ, allura għandna nerġghu nħarsu lejn ir-regoli, u l-programm ta' hidma tal-Kummissjoni 2018 għandu jindirizza dan.

Claude Moraes (S&D). – Mr President, clearly, such a big proportion of the Commission Work Programme lies in the field of migration, fundamental rights and security because that is where our clear challenges lie, and it is appropriate that Vice-President Timmermans is here today.

On migration, after all the difficulties of relocation and after all the work we have done with the Commission here in Parliament, we now need to seize the challenge of Dublin. Let's get the mandate from the Council and let's get the mandate from the Member States. So much hard work was done here. This will also release the asylum package qualifications, the Asylum Support Office, and all of the files that come behind this and create a package in the run-up to the European elections in 2019. That is a prize that is worth seizing.

On fundamental rights and the rule of law, we want to see a proposal for a democracy, rule of law and fundamental rights pact, and that is something that I know the Commissioner will also want to see. On security, which is also close to the hearts of our citizens, ETIAS, ECRIS and SIS II must also have impact assessments to make better implementation key. We want quality legislation. We do not want legislation just in name, but in quality that will last and that will have privacy at its heart, but which will also be effective for the security of our citizens.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident Timmermans! Unter Punkt 15 des Arbeitsprogramms steht: Auslieferung der *Trade for All* strategy.

Ich glaube, wir können nicht nur ausliefern. Wir müssen auch noch ein bisschen Gewürz in die Handelspolitik bekommen. Nicht nur eine normale Pizza, sondern eine *spicy* Pizza muss dabei rauskommen.

Drei Punkte seien dazu genannt. Die Handelsabkommen, die auch aufgezählt sind, sind nicht hinsichtlich der Quantität, sondern hinsichtlich der Qualität zu bewerten. Ich glaube, heutzutage müssen wir auch die Frage der Steuervermeidung, die Frage der Korruption hineinbringen, so dass es letztendlich ein gutes Abkommen ist und nicht nur die Anzahl von Abkommen zählt.

Zweitens: Wir haben einen Vorschlag für ein multilaterales Investitionsgericht. Das müssen wir in der Tat puschen, damit wir hier eine Reform hinkriegen. Heißt aber auch, Herr Timmermans, dass wir die 1 200 bestehenden europäischen Investitionsabkommen auf den Prüfstand stellen und entsprechend auch ändern, insbesondere die Energiecharta, denn sonst sind wir unglaublich, wenn wir zwei Maßstäbe haben.

Drittens: Wir müssen *enforcement* durchsetzen. Es kann nicht sein, dass bei der finanziellen Unterstützung Konditionalitäten nicht berücksichtigt werden – der Rechnungshof hat ja einen Bericht vorgelegt – und auch Arbeitnehmerrechte müssen durchsetzbar sein. Sie haben das in einer Rede im Mai gesagt: *Enforcement* ist der dritte richtige Schritt für mehr Gewürz bei der Handelspolitik.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, pochi mesi fa il Presidente Juncker, rivolgendosi a quest'Aula, ci illustrava uno scenario su cui costruire il fondamento della nostra Unione: la libertà, l'uguaglianza e lo Stato di diritto.

Oggi le sue parole vanno nella stessa direzione e infondono in noi un cauto ottimismo. Lei ci conferma che la sua visione dell'Europa corrisponde alla nostra e che i mesi che ci separano dalla fine della legislatura saranno decisivi per consolidare le fondamenta di un'Europa più unita, più forte ma anche più democratica, in grado di influire davvero sulla scena internazionale e, soprattutto, di affrontare con i suoi alleati, insieme, le principali sfide globali che ci attendono da qui ad alcuni anni.

Signor Presidente, consideri quest'Aula il suo principale alleato, ma soprattutto le abbiamo già dato prova che non ci tiriamo mai indietro, soprattutto dopo aver approvato Dublino.

Io lanciao qui un appello per continuare sulla strada della...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratrice)

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Pane předsedající, před několika týdny jsem tady na plénu uvítala slova předsedy Komise, že v Evropské unii nesmí existovat spotřebitelé druhé kategorie. Sociální demokraté očekávají, že v avízovaném balíčku nové politiky pro spotřebitele přejde Evropská komise od slov k činům.

Začnu bojem s dvojí kvalitou výrobků. Díky úsilí věnovanému popsání této praxe již víme, že dvojí standardy existují. Dozorové orgány nyní potřebují jasné a účinné nástroje, jak jí čelit. Chceme lepší veřejná opatření k prosazování práv spotřebitelů. Nezákonné praktiky všeho druhu vyžadují rychlou odpověď a věřím, že zde důležitou roli sehraje nařízení o spolupráci dozorových orgánů.

Dalším problémem jsou omezené možnosti nápravy. Je proto načase představit návrh systému kolektivní právní ochrany spotřebitelů. Musíme také konečně řešit nerovnováhu mezi podniky v potravinářském řetězci. Nekalé obchodní praktiky mezi jednotlivými aktéry jsou zde dlouhodobě závažný problém, který vyžaduje legislativní opatření na evropské úrovni, a jsem ráda, že jste tuto problematiku zmínil.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Тимерманс, г-н Юнкер нееднократно е заявявал, че младите са основен приоритет на неговата работа. Естествено е да очакваме конкретни инициативи в тази насока и в работната програма на Комисията за 2018 година. Какво означава това в конкретика?

Първо, предложението за нова Младежка стратегия, която да адресира реалните нужди на Европейската младеж. Макар и да бележи спад в сравнение с 2014 година, към днешна дата младежката безработица остава неприемливо висока. Всеки млад европеец трябва да има шанса за професионална реализация тук в Европа, а не извън нея.

На второ място, говорейки за професионална реализация, няма как да не споменем дефицита на дигитални умения, който представлява сериозна пречка. Ще очаквам от комисаря Габриел да насочи усилия не само към осигуряването на дигитална инфраструктура, а най-вече към развитието на дигитални умения на европейските граждани. При условие че 40% от европейците нямат базови дигитални умения, за кого ще работи този единен цифров пазар?

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente, cuando uno vuelve la vista atrás a 2014, comprueba cómo una parte del programa inicial de la Comisión se ha visto alterada por la sucesión de crisis que han sacudido a la Unión Europea: bajo crecimiento y alto desempleo, crisis de la deuda, inmigración y refugiados, terrorismo e inseguridad.

Hoy parece que algunas de estas nubes desaparecen y que el horizonte es algo más claro; por eso, la Comisión presenta unas propuestas de futuro, y en esas propuestas de futuro hay un nexo común: la seguridad.

Pero nada ofrece más seguridad a los ciudadanos que un robusto sistema de protección social.

Por eso, la propuesta que nos ha planteado en torno al pilar social suena bien, la música es buena. Es necesario que la letra la acompañe pero, sobre todo, que el ritmo de aplicación sea lo suficientemente intenso para que, antes de ir a las próximas elecciones, los ciudadanos comprueben que Europa piensa en ellos y les protege.

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen zum *Catch-the-eye-Verfahren*, und ich muss Ihnen leider sagen, dass ich etwa doppelt so viele Meldungen habe und deshalb etwas reduzieren muss. Ich bitte um Verständnis.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank Vice President Timmermans. The line that caught my ears, and indeed my eye, was about the food supply chain. A few of us, many years ago, started talking about unfair trading practices, and this chamber voted by 600 Members for the Commission to take action. So you did listen, and I am really looking forward to seeing the details of that proposal. I hope as many Members support the initiative, which I believe has to be very strong and very tough.

I also want to take the opportunity to say that we are doing things in this House which are having a negative impact on food production and conventional agriculture, like the votes on plant protection products and on other technologies around agriculture and our trade policy is also having an impact. So when we look at the food supply chain initiative, which I welcome, we are going to have to take a holistic look at what we want for food production in Europe and how we intend to support that type of food production and be careful how we advance.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule Președinte, domnule comisar, sigur, sunt de acord cu ceea ce ați prezentat, este foarte important ce face Comisia ca program pentru 2018, pentru că se apropie finalul mandatului acestei Comisii. Eu, ca cetățean român, m-aș bucura ca în 2018, când țara mea are două evenimente importante (sărbătorește centenarul și este anul dinaintea președinției), cetățenii din țara mea să se bucure de toate drepturile de cetățeni europeni.

Pe de altă parte, așa cum spuneți, domnule comisar, avem nevoie de o Uniune mai unită. Este foarte important acest lucru; este, cred, principalul obiectiv, pentru că pe toate le putem face dacă suntem uniți, dacă avem aceleași obiective: o Europă unde să avem o mai bună coeziune socială, să avem mai puțină populație săracă, needucată, bolnavă. Sunt obiective prioritare pentru noi, pentru grupul din care fac parte. Dorim o Uniune Europeană etică, așa cum ați spus și dumneavoastră, echitabilă, dar pentru aceasta trebuie măsuri concrete, la care să le măsurăm rezultatul.

Mă bucur că ați vorbit, domnule Timmermans, de echitate. Oamenii așteaptă acest lucru, și cetățenii europeni doresc o mai mare siguranță a frontierelor. Mulțumesc.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Timmermans, θα επικεντρωθώ στο θέμα των μετεγκαταστάσεων. Την Κυριακή 22 Οκτωβρίου είχα πάει στη Σάμο, ένα από τα νησιά του Αιγαίου. Στα νησιά του Αιγαίου έχουν εγκλωβιστεί αυτή τη στιγμή περίπου 20.000 πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες. Επίσης, στην Ελλάδα συνολικά υπάρχουν περίπου 70.000 πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες. Το θέμα της μετεγκατάστασης δεν έχει προχωρήσει, διότι εκτελέστηκε το πρόγραμμα μόνο κατά το εν τρίτον, δηλαδή, από τις 17.209 άτομα που έπρεπε να πάρει η Γερμανία, έχουν μετεγκατασταθεί 4.447. Στη Γαλλία έχουν μετεγκατασταθεί 3.948, ενώ έπρεπε να πάρει 12.599 άτομα. Αντιλαμβάνεστε ότι απαιτείται, στη νομοθετική δράση που αναλαμβάνεται, να επεκταθεί το πρόγραμμα μετεγκαταστάσεων, να μην σταματήσει, να συνεχίσει, διότι μόνο έτσι μπορεί να υπάρξει μια αποφασιστική και αποτελεσματική λύση.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Marias. Ich darf darauf hinweisen, dass es parlamentarisch nicht üblich ist, dass von der Besuchertribüne Zustimmungs-, Beifalls- oder Missfallensbekundungen gegeben werden.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητέ κύριε Timmermans, θα συμφωνείτε μαζί μου ότι δεν υπάρχει δημοκρατία χωρίς καλή οικονομία. Δεν υπάρχει «rule of law» με ανεργία, με τόσα εκατομμύρια Ευρωπαίους κάτω από το όριο της φτώχειας και κακοπληρωμένες θέσεις εργασίας. Δεν υπάρχει «rule of law» όταν δεν μπορείτε να κάνετε τίποτα εναντίον κρατών που συμπεριφέρονται τόσο εγωιστικά απέναντι σε άλλα κράτη μέλη. Και αναφέρομαι, βέβαια, στην Πολωνία και την Ουγγαρία, με την απαράδεκτη συμπεριφορά τους στο θέμα των μεταναστών. Έχετε προτείνει τη δημιουργία του θεσμού του Υπουργού Οικονομικών. Σε ποιους όμως θα λογοδοτεί; Όπως το Eurogroup που δεν έχει καμιά λογοδοσία απέναντι στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο και τους εκλεγμένους αντιπροσώπους των λαών; Ποια θα είναι η δημοκρατική του νομιμοποίηση; Ποιος ο ρόλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου απέναντι σε αυτόν τον άνθρωπο που θα διορίσετε;

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane místopředsedo Komise, v červenci jsme hlasovali o usnesení Evropského parlamentu s podnětem pro pracovní program Komise. Toto usnesení se bohužel nepodařilo přijmout. Ve Vašem projevu jste zmínil důležité cíle, jako jsou digitalizaci vnitřního trhu či komplexní přístup k migraci. Úplně na začátku jste hovořil o demokratičtější Evropě. Tento cíl je také pro mne alfou a omegou veškerého snažení.

Některé třetí země a nestátní subjekty vynakládají stále větší úsilí s cílem zpochybnit za pomoci prostředků hybridní války, včetně dezinformací, legitimitu demokratických institucí v rámci Evropské unie. Komisi jsme v našem usnesení vyzývali, aby výrazně posílila svou odolnost vůči hybridním hrozbám a zlepšila svou schopnost reagovat přiměřeně na falešné zprávy a dezinformace. Evropský parlament vznesl tento požadavek opakovaně v mnoha zprávách i na různých fórech. Odpovídající reakce se však zatím nedostavila. Věřím, že se tak stane v nejbližší budoucnosti.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Én úgy vélem, hogy a Juncker-bizottság egész mandátumának az eredményességét két olyan területen bekövetkező véleményalkotás fogja leginkább meghatározni, amely szerintem az európai polgárok zömét leginkább érdekli. Az egyik a szociális Európa ügyét szolgáló intézménycsomag, így az EU szociális pillérének beindítása, amit, azt hiszem, valamennyien nagyon várunk, az igazságos és kiegyensúlyozott európai munkaerőpiacok feltételének kialakítása, a munkavállalók szociális és jogi helyzetének javítása s egységesítése, az Unió munkaügyi hatóságának felállítás, és még egy sor, az európai baloldal által régóta szorgalmazott, s most az Elnök Úr által is prioritásként kezelt kezdeményezés és feladat elvégzése.

A másik: végre konkrét és hatékony közösségi lépések az alapjogok és a jogállam tiszteletben tartásának és gyakorlati működésének garantálása érdekében. Egyformán valamennyi tagállam tekintetében, beleértve az uniós szolidaritás érvényesítését, ha kell, kikényszerítését, illetve hiányának szankcionálását.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened very carefully to the contributions from this House on the Commission Work Programme for next year, and I retain a few things from our discussion.

First of all, I sense that we share a sense of urgency – that we understand that the challenges Europe faces are daunting – and I also see that the vast majority of this Parliament wants to act, and wants us to try and help our citizens regain control over their destinies with measures at a European level that can no longer be taken only at the national level. There is a part of this Parliament that believes in fleeing in a form of nostalgic nationalism, talking people down all the time as though we are on the brink of extinction; as though everything is going wrong, etc. Yes, the challenges are daunting. Yes, we are coming out of a deep economic crisis that has increased disparities in Europe, and that has not led to the convergence we want. But we do have a new sense of shared destiny, which was expressed also in the European Council.

But one thing that perhaps did not get enough attention in that European Council is that if you want that sense of purpose to be translated into concrete measures, you need the co-legislators. You need someone to make a proposal, and you need Council and Parliament jointly to take a decision so that you can implement it. And that is why the Commission Work Programme is not just a bureaucratic exercise; it is a concrete translation of the ambitions that are formulated in this House, in the European Council, and in the Commission. I believe speeches will not solve problems; even the most brilliant speech does not solve a problem. Concrete steps forward on social policy, on the digital single market, on completing the internal market and the banking union, on making sure that the very fundamental issue of the rule of law is something we strengthen in Europe and do not weaken in Europe, and on the fact that we need to deliver concrete results – and we do not have much time left until the next election – that is what we have reflected in the Commission Work Programme.

Yes, there are disagreements amongst us, but this is the Commission's proposal, and we will look for a majority in this Parliament in a debate. That is how democracy works. I even heard somebody say that the only legitimate democracies are at the national level. What nonsense: every single Member of this House has been elected directly by European citizens and therefore has a mandate to decide with the Council on legislation that affects every single European citizen, and I think we need to understand this responsibility we have. We need to be able to face our voters in 2019 with something we have accomplished and with a plan for the future, and for those of you who have raised the issue of governance in the economic and monetary union, saying that this cannot be a bureaucratic process: that is exactly why the Commission has made this proposal. This should be discussed and mandated in this Parliament if we take these major decisions.

So that is the gist of our proposal for next year, and let me end on one thing: I believe it is also a matter of honour that we acknowledge that some of the problems we face are very, very complicated to solve, but we will not let them go. I refer to what the honourable Member Mr Marias has said: the situation on the Greek islands is still unacceptable, completely unacceptable, and this Commission will never let go of its responsibility to make sure that we solve it. And I do agree with those of you who have said that this requires pan-European solidarity by all Member States. I believe we are in our full right to demand this responsibility in Member States. And responsibility also means that we adhere to the truth, that we do not tell fairy tales about a secret plan to 'Brusselise' – or whatever they call it – European populations, or about a secret plan to force people to take migrants. This is not the case.

The only plan we have is to provide European citizens with the tools so that they can shape their futures and their destinies on the basis of their values, and we need to do this collectively. Globalisation will not go away if we take refuge in nation states only. Globalisation can only be harnessed if we as Europeans, act together with a common sense of purpose.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Europos Komisijos Vicepirmininkas, pristatydamas 2018 m. Komisijos darbo programą, pažymėjo, kad Komisija ketina kitais metais pristatyti socialinio teisingumo paketą, kuriame bus siūlymas sukurti Europos darbo jėgos instituciją, padėsiančią spręsti darbo jėgos judumo ir socialinės apsaugos problemas. Labai sveikinu tokią Komisijos iniciatyvą, kuri yra svarbus žingsnis siekiant sukurti Europos socialinį ramstį, ir nekantriai jos laukiu, tačiau manau, kad to negana. Norėčiau pabrėžti, kad Europai reikia ne deklaratyvaus, bet veiksmingo Europos socialinio ramsčio, kuris užtikrintų, kad visi darbuotojai, nepriklausomai nuo darbo pobūdžio, turėtų deramas darbo sutartis ir tinkamą socialinę apsaugą. Tačiau Komisijos planuose pasigendu ir kai kurių kitų svarbių iniciatyvų, kurias Parlamentas prašo parengti ir pateikti jau ne pirmus metus. Pavyzdžiui, nors jau daugelį metų kviečiu Komisiją ir valstybes nares sukurti Europos vaikų garantiją, pagal kurią būtų galima taikyti konkrečias, finansiškai pagrįstas priemones, kurios padėtų įveikti vaikų skurdą visoje Europoje, ateinančių metų programoje tai ir vėl nėra numatyta. Taip pat nėra numatyta jokių priemonių dėl kovos su moterų ir vyrų atlyginimų ir pensijų skirtumais. Tai – problema, apie kurią kalbame jau daug metų, ir prašome pateikti iniciatyvas, padėsiančias įveikti šiuos skirtumus Europos lygiu.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), por escrito. – El programa refleja el contenido del discurso sobre el Estado de la Unión de Jean-Claude Juncker y la carta de intención que la Comisión envió al Parlamento. Establece una agenda para una Europa más unida, fuerte y más democrática. Con un número limitado de nuevas propuestas, que entregarán en mayo de 2018 para que el trabajo legislativo en el PE y en el Consejo pueda finalizar antes de las elecciones. La Comisión ya ha presentado más del 80 % de las propuestas necesarias en virtud de las 10 prioridades establecidas por Juncker en 2014. Ahora se centrarán en las propuestas pendientes, para impulsar el empleo, el crecimiento y la inversión, para crear un mercado interior más profundo y más justo con una base industrial reforzada, y en nuevas medidas específicas para completar la unión de seguridad. El segundo enfoque del programa de trabajo es más prospectivo y tiene como objetivo dar forma a la Unión hasta 2025. Tres principios que siempre deben ser el ancla de la Unión: la libertad, la igualdad y el Estado de Derecho. Una Unión más unida exigirá la apertura total del Espacio Schengen a Rumanía y Bulgaria, así como una perspectiva de ampliación para los candidatos en los Balcanes Occidentales.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Refletindo a crise de um processo de integração capitalista esgotado, que pouco tem para oferecer aos trabalhadores e aos povos senão mais do mesmo – mais retrocessos no plano social, mais injustiças e desigualdades, mais divergência económica, mais ataques à democracia e ao direito dos povos decidirem de forma livre e soberana o seu destino –, a Comissão Europeia apresenta um Programa de Trabalhos para 2018 que não constitui surpresa, mas que, nem por isso, deixa de constituir motivo de preocupação.

O sentido geral é o da continuada perda de soberania por parte dos Estados, especialmente dos Estados periféricos, em benefício das grandes potências europeias que controlam as instituições da UE. Mais neoliberalismo. Mais mercado único. Mais investimento para a indústria do armamento; uma deriva militarista e securitária, com consequências ao nível da supressão de direitos; continuado ataque ao direito de asilo, aos refugiados, aos mais elementares valores da solidariedade e do humanismo. Esquecido fica o que era verdadeiramente necessário. O reforço da coesão e dos seus instrumentos. O apoio aos setores produtivos dos países mais afetados pela divergência – agricultura, pescas e indústria. Mais emprego com direitos. A defesa dos serviços públicos e das funções sociais dos Estados. Investimento na prevenção de catástrofes, no ambiente, na ciência e tecnologia.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), por escrito. – El programa refleja el contenido del discurso sobre el Estado de la Unión de Jean-Claude Juncker y la carta de intención que la Comisión envió al Parlamento. Establece una agenda para una Europa más unida, fuerte y más democrática. Con un número limitado de nuevas propuestas, que entregarán en mayo de 2018 para que el trabajo legislativo en el PE y en el Consejo pueda finalizar antes de las elecciones. La Comisión ya ha presentado más del 80 % de las propuestas necesarias en virtud de las 10 prioridades establecidas por Juncker en 2014. Ahora se centrarán en las propuestas pendientes, para impulsar el empleo, el crecimiento y la inversión, para crear un mercado interior más profundo y más justo con una base industrial reforzada, y en nuevas medidas específicas para completar la unión de seguridad. El segundo enfoque del programa de trabajo es más prospectivo y tiene como objetivo dar forma a la Unión hasta 2025. Tres principios que siempre deben ser el ancla de la Unión: la libertad, la igualdad y el Estado de Derecho. Una Unión más unida exigirá la apertura total del Espacio Schengen a Rumanía y Bulgaria, así como una perspectiva de ampliación para los candidatos en los Balcanes Occidentales.

Krystyna Łybacka (S&D), na piśmie. – W ramach programu prac Komisji na 2018 rok zwracam uwagę na rolę Unii Europejskiej we wspieraniu państw członkowskich w reformowaniu i modernizacji systemów edukacyjnych. Zgodnie z zasadą pomocniczości Unia powinna w większym stopniu angażować się w ten proces oraz współpracować z państwami członkowskimi w identyfikowaniu i wprowadzaniu głównych reform, które pozwolą na wykształcenie wśród Europejczyków umiejętności i kwalifikacji niezbędnych do funkcjonowania w dynamicznej, szybko zmieniającej się rzeczywistości społeczno-gospodarczej. Kluczowym celem powinno być dla nas oferowanie wysokiego poziomu edukacji w całej Unii. Współczesna edukacja, również akademicka, to nie tylko przekazywanie wiedzy i osiągnięć nauki, to również uczenie umiejętności selekcjonowania i praktycznego wykorzystania wiedzy. Dążenie do poprawy jakości edukacji to ciągle zadanie, które wymaga zaangażowania wszystkich zainteresowanych stron, doskonalenia i adaptacji. Istotne są nowe rozwiązania dydaktyczne wspierane technologią cyfrową, które pozwolą na spersonalizowany model kształcenia sprzyjający interdyscyplinarności. Konieczna jest także zmiana zarządzania systemem kształcenia ukierunkowana na promowanie edukacji wysokiej jakości oraz włączenia społecznego. Zwracam także uwagę na wsparcie nauczycieli i dążenie do doskonałości w nauczaniu. Finalnie konieczna jest także szybka i skuteczna strategia integracyjna w związku z napływem uchodźców.

Evelyn Regner (S&D), schriftlich. – Wir diskutieren heute das letzte wichtige Arbeitsprogramm dieser Legislaturperiode. Und die BürgerInnen der EU erwarten vor allem eines: Dass wir endlich anpacken! Europa wird sozial sein, oder es wird nicht sein. Die Überschriften der Sozialen Säule müssen mit konkreten Gesetzesvorschlägen gefüllt werden, denn Europa braucht mehr als einen unverbindlichen Sozialknight. Dazu gehören eine Rahmenrichtlinie für menschenwürdige Arbeitsbedingungen, eine Grundsicherung für Kinder in Armut, die Verankerung der Sozialpolitik im Europäischen Semester und die Schaffung europäischer Mindeststandards. Die europäische Arbeitsmarktbehörde ist hier ein wichtiger Schritt! Wir müssen außerdem die Multis dazu zwingen, ihre Steuern zu zahlen. Die Ableitungen aus dem Panama-Untersuchungsausschuss müssen als Fahrplan für die Kommission gelten. Die Rücknahme der Europäischen Ich-AG aus dem Arbeitsprogramm ist ein Riesenerfolg. Nur durch den Druck von uns SozialdemokratInnen haben wir den Widerstand im EU-Parlament aufbauen können und somit die Kommission zur Besinnung gebracht. Herr Kommissionspräsident Juncker hat uns davor gewarnt, dass es in Europa keine BürgerInnen zweiter Klasse geben darf. Also packen wirs an, damit wir das Wohlstandsversprechen wieder für alle einlösen!

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE), pisno. – Spoštovani, ob pregledu programa dela Evropske komisije 2018 lahko ugotovim, da v večjem delu odraža potrebe časa in se sooča z izzivi, ki Evropsko unijo čakajo v prihodnjem letu oziroma v prihodnje.

Vsekakor pa je na tem mestu potrebno poudariti, da program ne izpolnjuje pričakovanj, ki se nanašajo na demografske spremembe v Evropi, medgeneracijsko sodelovanje, starajočo se družbo in seveda položaj starejših v družbi. V tem delu program ocenjujem kot premalo ambiciozen.

V Evropskem parlamentu me veseli trend, da vse več poslank in poslancev Evropskega parlamenta spoznava, da so demografske spremembe in pravice starejših v Evropi področje, ki bo predstavljalo enega največjih izzivov za države članice ter Evropsko unijo. Žal tega trenda ni opaziti v programu Evropske komisije za leto 2018.

Pri pravicah starejših gre dostojanstvo in gre za osnovne človekove pravice, ki so univerzalne ali, če hočete, evropske. Zato načelo subsidiarnosti ne more biti razlog, da na tem področju na nivoju Evropske unije ni narejeno, kar državljani EU pričakujejo. Zato pozivam Evropsko komisijo, naj nameni več pozornosti izzivu starajoče se družbe ter skupaj z državami članicami končno pristopi k pripravi in sprejemu strategije, ki se bo odzvala na demografske spremembe na nivoju Evrope. Starejši si to zaslužijo!

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A Comissão Europeia apresenta um Programa de Trabalhos para 2018 que não constitui surpresa, refletindo a crise de um processo de integração capitalista esgotado, que pouco tem para oferecer aos trabalhadores e aos povos senão mais do mesmo – mais retrocessos no plano social, mais injustiças e desigualdades, mais divergência económica, mais ataques à democracia e ao direito dos povos decidirem de forma livre e soberana o seu destino.

O sentido geral é o da continuada perda de soberania por parte dos Estados, especialmente dos Estados periféricos, em benefício das grandes potências europeias que controlam as instituições da UE. Mais neoliberalismo. Mais mercado único. Mais investimento para a indústria de armamento; uma deriva militarista e securitária, com consequências ao nível da supressão de direitos; continuado ataque ao direito de asilo, aos refugiados, aos mais elementares valores da solidariedade e do humanismo.

Esquecido fica o que era verdadeiramente necessário. O reforço da coesão e dos seus instrumentos. O apoio aos sectores produtivos dos países mais afetados pela divergência – agricultura, pescas e indústria. Mais emprego com direitos. A defesa dos serviços públicos e das funções sociais dos Estados. Investimento na prevenção de catástrofes, no ambiente, na ciência e na tecnologia.

13. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (Aussprache)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Tagesordnungspunkt folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Siegfried Mureşan und Richard Ashworth im Namen des Haushaltsausschusses über den Standpunkt des Rates zum Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Union für das Haushaltsjahr 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (11815/2017 — C8-0313/2017 — 2017/2044(BUD))

Siegfried Mureşan, rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to welcome Minister Kivine from the Estonian Presidency and Commissioner Oettinger to the European Parliament. The position of the European Parliament on the 2018 budget of the European Union which we are going to vote on tomorrow proposes to you a realistic and honest budget of the European Union. We propose a budget which is innovative, which is future oriented and which enables the European Union to provide the prospect of prosperity and safety for its citizens.

The priorities of the budget for next year in the eyes of Parliament should be firstly growth and jobs, and secondly, the safety, the security of citizens. We want to achieve this by investing in research and innovation, infrastructure, small and medium-sized enterprises, the Erasmus programme; we want to strengthen measures on combating youth unemployment, we want to stand by the side of young farmers. In order to provide for more security, we want to strengthen the agencies of the Union which have responsibility for justice and home affairs, these being: the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), Eurojust, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO), Frontex, Europol.

We want to do more in terms of defence at European level because it makes much more sense to spend money once at European level for defence and then share the benefits of our work, of our cooperation, amongst 28 Member States, many of us being also in NATO and NATO saying it is good that the European Union does more on defence together, that Member States of the Union are also cooperating together. This is a new task for the Union. It is a future-oriented task.

Commissioner, I believe that the draft budget which you presented at the end of May is a very good starting point for the upcoming negotiations between Council and Parliament that will start tomorrow with our vote and which will go on for 21 days. The draft budget is a very good starting point because the Commission is the institution best placed to evaluate the implementation of projects and the real needs on the ground. Beyond this draft budget, in order to achieve the priorities of Parliament which I have just outlined, the European Parliament proposes to increase financing by EUR 22.5 million for COSME. This is the programme which is financing small and medium-sized enterprises. It is there that the job creation process is taking place.

We propose to finance the European Research Council by EUR 15 million more; the SME instrument by EUR 10 million more because there is a very high demand, it has a very good implementation rate; the Marie Curie Excellency Research Programme, because there are many good research projects applying, by EUR 10 million; and EUR 32 million for Erasmus. As we know, 80% of research and innovation programmes under Horizon 2020 would not take place unless they were financed at European level, so there is a clear added value there. In terms of strengthening the agencies of the Union we want EUR 10 million for Europol, EUR 26 million for EASO and EUR 3 million each for Eurojust and CEPOL.

In terms of external relations, because it is in the fundamental interest of the Union to be surrounded by safe countries, we believe we have to allocate our resources primarily to the immediate neighbourhood. It is there that the big risk for the Union is coming from. So we propose to use the resources existing in the budget to finance the southern Mediterranean appropriately and to increase funding there by EUR 120 million. We propose EUR 27 million more for the Eastern Neighbourhood and EUR 35 million more for the Western Balkans.

When it comes to our relations with our partner Turkey, with which we have jointly managed to overcome the migration and refugee crisis, I want to say the following very briefly: as long as Turkey is drifting apart from European standards, we should make sure that particularly the pre-accession funds targeted at supporting political reforms in Turkey should be reduced because, in terms of political reforms, Turkey is moving for the time being into a direction which is completely opposite to European standards.

I am looking forward to the debate, and to the upcoming negotiation with the Council and the Commission in the coming three weeks.

Richard Ashworth, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I want to put on record my thanks to my co-rapporteur Siegfried Mureşan, and I want to compliment him on his very sensible approach and the excellent work that he has done. I also want to record my thanks to the shadow rapporteurs for their continued support throughout the process.

Members will recall that, in April this year, this House agreed to increase the European Parliament budget for next year by 2.3%. Bearing in mind the effect of inflation and the cyclical cost of preparations for the 2019 elections, I thought 2.3% was reasonable and responsible. It has therefore been my intention that an increase of 2.3% be taken as the benchmark against which all other institutions would be measured, and the level be the target for the overall budget increase. I was particularly pleased to note that the Council followed our lead when they too set their budget at an increase of just below 2.3%.

However, it has not been possible or indeed desirable to peg all individual institution budgets at that level. I have had to take into account a number of exceptional cost demands for 2018. First, the Court of Justice and the Court of Auditors. Both have significantly increased workloads, as well as a number of significant security issues which will have to be addressed. Second, the Data Protection Supervisor. He has been tasked with a new role for which we will have to make provision. Thirdly, the question of strategic communications. I am aware that many in this House consider this to be a key priority, and I know that this view is shared by a number of the Member States. So, to meet that expectation, we shall have to oppose the cuts which are currently proposed by Council when it comes to the coming negotiations.

Finally, the EU Special Representative. Both Parliament and the EEAS have been pressing for some time to transfer the cost of special representatives over to the EEAS budget. Clearly, this would be budget-neutral, and so in our proposals Parliament has indicated that it is willing to make provision to cover this transfer in the 2018 budget.

I recommend to Parliament that these cost increases are both reasonable and justifiable, but I would, however, wish to remind Members of the importance of exercising fiscal discipline in order to keep public expenditure under control. To that end, I have identified a number of areas where cost savings could be made. Specifically, I would give the example that I propose a freeze on the budgets of the Committee of Regions and the Economic and Social Committee, and while I am grateful to those groups who have supported this initiative, I am disappointed that the larger groups were not prepared to do so.

Colleagues, in voting on this budget and resolution, this House will set the mandate for the forthcoming negotiation with the Council. I look forward to that negotiation and I look forward to reporting a favourable outcome in November.

Märt Kivine, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, it is a great pleasure and opportunity to address you for the second time during this budget process, as I did on 12 September.

I wish to reiterate the same main points I made at the time: that the Council will continue to prioritise the highest European added value points in its 2018 budget proposal, as it has already been doing. And we intend to do that during those three weeks that, Mr Mureşan has already highlighted, stand ahead of us. We stand to stimulate jobs and growth, bolster security and work with migration.

At the same time, as you have noticed, the Council has expressed a clear determination to see sufficient margins in the 2018 budget, as this is only prudent. In its deliberations, the Council has scrutinised the implementation capacity extremely carefully to ensure the realistic and efficient use of EU citizens' funds. Consequently, after the Council adjustments none of the priority areas will see a drop in funding relative to the 2017 budget.

I will take, and I have taken, due note of various amendments to Council positions that Parliament has discussed and will discuss. Allow me to make a few very brief remarks in this connection. We are extremely pleased to see that the financial gap between the Council position and Parliament's position is lower than in many previous years. The Council is, however, extremely concerned about significant increases to certain appropriations proposed by the European Parliament that go beyond the ceiling fixed in the Multiannual Financial Framework.

Second, the alarmingly high rate of under-implementation of the Union's budget, as confirmed by the last amending budget of 2017, and the payments forecast for the next year, as recently published by the Commission, argue for taking a very frugal approach in order to preserve the credibility of both the budget process and the participating institutions. That said, our course of action over the coming weeks has been set out in order to reach a balanced and satisfactory agreement on the 2018 budget.

The Council is set to keep to the schedule agreed between our institutions on budget negotiations and to reach an agreement within the deadlines laid down in the Treaty.

Günther Oettinger, *Mitglied der Kommission*. – Herr Präsident, lieber Herr Minister Kivine, liebe Berichterstatter Mureşan und Ashworth, Damen und Herren Abgeordnete, meine Damen und Herren! Ich will den beiden Berichterstattern meine Anerkennung aussprechen für die Qualität ihrer Vorarbeit. Sie haben in einem beeindruckenden Maße eine breite Position des Parlaments herbeigeführt. Ich danke Ihnen auch für die Änderungen, die Sie vorschlagen, denn mit Ihren Änderungen könnten Kürzungen vom Kommissionsentwurf vermieden werden, ja in einigen Bereichen gehen sie sogar über den Mittelansatz, den die Kommission vorgeschlagen hat, hinaus.

Wir alle haben uns, glaube ich, mit diesem Haushalt 2018, der vielleicht der letzte normale Haushalt sein wird, der noch nicht in irgendeiner Form vom Brexit berührt sein wird, zwei Schwerpunkte vorgenommen: Wachstum und Beschäftigung – wir sollten alles tun, damit die zarte Pflanze eines Wachstums in den meisten europäischen Regionen und mehr Arbeitsplätze in vielen Regionen gestärkt werden – und zweitens, das Thema Migration sowie äußere und innere Sicherheit auf europäischer Ebene erfolgreich anzugehen.

Wenn man die Unterschiede zwischen Rat, Parlament und dem Ansatz der Kommission nimmt, sollte eigentlich in den nächsten drei Wochen bei dem vorhandenen guten Willen aller Beteiligten eine Einigung auf einen Haushalt 2018 im Vermittlungsausschuss möglich sein.

Parlament und Rat haben in einigen Programmen unterschiedliche Vorstellungen, was den Finanzbedarf angeht. Zum einen beim Thema Wettbewerbsfähigkeit und Forschung, zum zweiten bei der Beschäftigungsinitiative für junge Menschen und zum dritten beim Thema der europäischen Außenhilfe. Die höheren Ansätze des Parlamentes sind für uns nachvollziehbar. Wir wollen trotzdem hier erwähnen, dass es ja gerade auch mit der Halbzeitprüfung Vereinbarungen zwischen Rat und Parlament gibt, die man auch im Haushalt 2018 nicht aufgeben sollte.

Die Aufstockungen: zum ersten Wettbewerbsfähigkeit. Das Parlament stellt eine Aufstockung um 1,4 Mrd. EUR in Rubrik 1A für die Wettbewerbsfähigkeitsprogramme vor. Dies unterstützen wir nachdrücklich, denn wir können im Haushaltsvollzug der letzten Jahre nachweisen, dass zum Beispiel Horizont 2020 oder die *Connecting Europe Facility* hocheffiziente Investitionsprogramme sind, mit denen wir einen Mehrwert auf europäischer Ebene im Interesse der Mitgliedstaaten, unserer Wirtschaft, unserer Menschen nachweisen können. Deswegen bin ich nachdrücklich an dieser Aufstockung interessiert.

Die erforderlichen Mittel für Wachstums- und Beschäftigungsprogramme wollen Sie sicherstellen und steigern. Auch dies ist begrüßenswert. Wir sollten trotzdem hier an frühere Vereinbarungen denken und uns daran halten.

Die Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung junger Menschen: Uns allen bleibt der weitere Abbau der zu hohen Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, der in den meisten Regionen begonnen hat, ein zentrales Ziel. Wir haben deswegen ja in der Halbzeitprüfung die Verlängerung der Beschäftigungsinitiative beschlossen und eine Aufstockung der Mittel in den Jahren 2017-2020 um insgesamt 1,2 Mrd. EUR vorgesehen. Weitergehende Mittel sollten wir in den nächsten Tagen prüfen, entlang der bestehenden Arbeitslosenquote und entlang der Absorptionsfähigkeit in den Mitgliedstaaten, das Geld auch sinnvoll ein- und umzusetzen.

Beim Europäischen Solidaritätskorps schlägt das Parlament vor, im Augenblick noch keine Mittel zu veranschlagen. Dies respektieren wir, da der Gesetzgebungsprozess noch nicht so weit ist und deswegen noch abgewartet werden muss. Wir sollten aber in jedem Fall alles tun, damit keine Unterbrechung in der Startphase unseres Europäischen Solidaritätskorps eintritt, und damit junge Freiwillige, die sich gemeldet haben und die mitmachen wollen, auch ohne Unterbrechung ihre Bereitschaft zum Ehrenamt einlösen und realisieren können.

Die Außenhilfe der Europäischen Union, Rubrik IV – Europa in der Welt, Global Europe: Hier gehen wir die Ursachen von Flucht und Migration an. Auch hier sind die Aufstockungen nachvollziehbar. Sie schlagen parallel gewisse maßvolle Kürzungen bei dem Heranführungsprogramm, bei den Vorbeitrittshilfen für die Türkei vor. Das kann ich politisch durchaus nachvollziehen. Mir ist sehr wichtig, dass wir beim Thema Türkei-EU-Abkommen handlungsfähig bleiben. Sie werden gelesen haben, dass sechs Mitgliedstaaten – nämlich Österreich, Dänemark, Finnland, Frankreich, Schweden und Deutschland – uns jetzt gebeten haben, die Fortführung des Flüchtlingsabkommens EU-Türkei zu ermöglichen. Ich kann Ihnen berichten, dass die drei Milliarden, die uns durch Umschichtung im europäischen Haushalt und durch frische Mittel aus den Mitgliedstaaten bereitgestellt worden sind, in Form von *commitments* jetzt weitgehend ausgeschöpft sind; die *payments* folgen Zug um Zug nach. Wenn wir aber glaubwürdig bleiben wollen, wenn wir für Flüchtlinge aus Syrien, Irak, Afghanistan, die in der Türkei derzeit hausen und leben, Menschenwürde kofinanzieren wollen, dann müssen wir jetzt über die nächsten drei Milliarden sprechen. Dies wird sicherlich ein Schwerpunkt unserer Beratungen im Vermittlungsverfahren in den nächsten Tagen sein.

Alles in allem: Ich sehe keine fundamentalen Gegensätze, sondern guten Willen, zu einer Einigung zu kommen. Ich darf noch erwähnen, dass unser Berichtigungsschreiben Nummer 1 vom 16. Oktober die Landwirtschaftsausgaben zum Gegenstand hat und hier von uns aus Gründen der Aktualisierung gewisse Umschichtungen vorgesehen sind und namentlich auch eine Aufstockung der Beträge für Junglandwirte darin enthalten ist.

Ich freue mich auf eine Debatte heute und dann auf gute Beratungen, Herr Minister und verehrte Berichterstatter, unter Ihrer Führung in den nächsten Wochen, mit dem Ziel, dass wir in wenigen Wochen einen stabilen Haushaltsrahmen für das nächste Jahr haben werden.

Barbara Matera, *relatrice per parere della commissione per i diritti della donna e l'uguaglianza di genere*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlo come relatrice per parere della commissione FEMM.

Siamo riusciti nell'intento di destinare una linea di bilancio separata per Daphne III nell'ambito del programma «Diritti, uguaglianza e cittadinanza». Il programma Daphne destina risorse finanziarie alla protezione dei bambini, dei giovani e delle donne contro tutte le forme di violenza e ha come obiettivo quello di raggiungere un elevato livello di protezione della salute e del benessere. Soprattutto alla luce di una violenza subita ogni giorno da tante donne in tutta Europa, c'è stata l'esigenza di porre proprio delle linee di bilancio e l'attenzione dei colleghi della commissione per i bilanci dell'Unione europea.

Nella nostra commissione la maggioranza dei colleghi si è espressa per continuare a finanziare anche l'Istituto per l'uguaglianza di genere, così da poter utilizzare tutte le sue competenze e risorse per l'istituzione di un Osservatorio europeo sul femminicidio e sulla violenza contro le donne. Infine, per incentivare la partecipazione femminile all'economia, abbiamo condiviso l'esigenza di stanziare fondi per sostenere l'imprenditorialità femminile nel programma COSME.

Barbara Spinelli, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs*. – Mr President, I am intervening on behalf of Ms Hübner, Chair and Rapporteur of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, who unfortunately cannot be present. I am very pleased that in its reading on the 2018 Budget, Parliament is defending the spending for programmes that encourage citizens' participation in the democratic life of the Union, such as Europe for Citizens, the European Citizens' Initiative and the line dedicated to communication of Commission Representations with citizens. 2018 is the year where preparations for the European elections in 2019 will be in full swing, and we should take this opportunity to inform citizens of their rights and the impact their vote carries for themselves and for Europe as a whole. This was the main concern of our committee, and I am glad the Committee on Budgets took our suggestions into consideration.

Charles Goerens, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission du développement*. – Monsieur le Président, j'ai peu de sympathie pour le Conseil, qui réduit le budget dédié à l'aide au développement de 90 % pour ce qui est des crédits d'engagement, et de 20 millions pour ce qui est des crédits de paiement.

Par ailleurs, les États membres sont accusés par la Commission de contribuer trop peu au Fonds fiduciaire pour l'Afrique. Or, en 2015, lors de la conférence internationale sur le financement de l'aide publique au développement, l'Union européenne, conformément aux conclusions du Conseil de la même année, renouvelle son engagement de porter à 0,7 % l'aide publique au développement au plus tard en 2030.

Cet engagement est une promesse en l'air, contredite par les faits. Cette promesse n'engage pas ses auteurs, mais ceux qui y croient. Ce comportement est inadmissible, et d'autant plus qu'il est en porte-à-faux avec les déclarations récentes de l'UE dans le cadre du consensus européen pour le développement, ou lors des journées européennes pour le développement.

Il serait judicieux, Monsieur le Président, d'exiger des États membres qui ne tiennent pas leurs engagements qu'ils viennent s'expliquer devant la commission du développement du Parlement européen.

Morten Løkkegaard, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Kultur- og Uddannelsesudvalget*. – Hr. formand! Vi støtter tilgangen om at fastfryse de tildelte midler til den europæiske solidaritetsfond fra Erasmus+, som Kommissionen har lagt op til, indtil det nødvendige lovgivningsmæssige grundlag forelægges. I tillæg til det finder vi det i udvalget nødvendigt at tilføre 50 mio. EUR som forudset til Erasmus+ allerede i 2018. For at adressere den kroniske underfinansiering af både det kulturelle underprogram under Et kreativt Europa og Europa for Borgerne-programmet, så støtter jeg ordførerens tilgang med at booste finansieringen til disse programmer. Jeg vil også gerne støtte, at der gives flere penge til budgetposten for multimediale foranstaltninger for at sikre en underskov af uafhængig dækning af EU-stof af tilstrækkelig høj kvalitet. Endelig vil jeg til slut gentage min intention om at indføre aktiviteterne fra den meget succesfulde forberedende aktivitet En ny fortælling om Europa inden i Erasmus-programmet som ungdomsprogram.

Cristian Dan Preda, *raportor pentru avis Comisia pentru afaceri externe*. – Domnule președinte, am fost raportorul pentru avis în Comisia pentru afaceri externe pentru bugetul 2018. Comisia și Consiliul au cerut reduceri de o jumătate de miliard de euro în privința politicii externe. Comisia noastră a fost împotriva acestei poziții și le mulțumesc colegilor din Comisia pentru bugete care au susținut poziția AFET.

În AFET am subliniat trei domenii de mare importanță: primul este susținerea vecinătății Uniunii Europene atât în est, cât și în sud; al doilea domeniu este finanțarea corectă a politicii externe și de securitate comună; și, nu în ultimul rând, a treia prioritate: susținerea politicii de extindere în Balcanii de Vest. În ceea ce privește Turcia, Comisia AFET a fost foarte clară: vrem ca o parte din fondurile de aderare să meargă către societatea civilă pentru a ne putea asigura că vom avea în viitor, poate, o Turcie democratică la masa discuțiilor.

Alain Cadec, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission de la pêche*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, comme tous les ans, la procédure budgétaire est l'occasion pour les commissions parlementaires de présenter des projets pilotes en vue d'améliorer les politiques publiques de l'Union.

Cette année, la commission de la pêche a proposé un projet pilote pour améliorer la gestion du bar dans l'Atlantique. Ce poisson est pêché non seulement par les pêcheurs professionnels, mais aussi par des pêcheurs récréatifs. Il importe donc de mettre en place des mesures de gestion adaptées à cette réalité, qui permettent à tous les acteurs d'avoir leur place dans cette pêche.

Le projet pilote de la commission de la pêche permettra de tester des moyens de contrôle innovants pour la pêche récréative du bar. Cela permettra au législateur d'envisager l'introduction d'un carnet de pêche mensuel pour les pêcheurs de loisir afin de remplacer les actuelles limites journalières. Ce projet pilote permettra également d'améliorer la collecte des données sur les stocks de bar. Il devra aussi accompagner la mise en place de plans de gestion pluriannuels.

Concrètement, il s'agit de programmer des mesures de gestion des pêches sur le long terme afin d'assurer une nécessaire visibilité aux pêcheurs professionnels. Cela est indispensable pour atteindre les objectifs de la politique commune de la pêche.

Szanyi Tibor, a Mezőgazdasági Bizottság véleményének előadója. – Elnök Úr! A jelentést a Mezőgazdasági és Vidékfejlesztési Bizottság részéről előadói minőségben segítetttem. Így a szakterületért felelős kollégákkal együtt a mezőgazdaság és vidékfejlesztés költségvetésben betöltött kulcsfontosságú szerepét erősítettem. Ez a terület, tehát az agrárterület hozzájárul az EU alapvető célkitűzéseéhez, éppen ezért nem engedhetünk meg semmiféle költségvetési csökkentést vagy átcsoportosítást.

Az olyan területek, mint például az aktív gazdálkodók, a termelői csoportok, a küzdelem a tisztességtelen kereskedelmi gyakorlatok ellen, a piaci megfigyelőközpontok ügye, növény- és egészségügyi intézkedések, és az okos megközelítés jelentős biztonságot és kitörést nyújtanak Európa elnéptelenedő vidéki térségeiben, és egyben biztosítják Európa élelmiszertermelő képességeinek fenntartását.

Külön ki kell emelnem a kísérleti projektek és az előkészítő intézkedések szerepét, amelyek politikai prioritások kialakításában és új kezdeményezések előkészítésében kiemelten fontosak. Olyan állandó uniós tevékenységeket és programokat alakíthatunk ki, ezek által, mint például a „Smart villages” – „Okos falvak” koncepció.

Deirdre Clune, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs. – Mr President, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs reached political consensus on the opinion that lines should be maintained at the level that has been proposed by the Commission and as has been said, 2018 will be a pivotal year for the Union. As we approach the end of this mandate, we must ensure that we leave a good framework in place. That means funding must be maintained for important employment lines like the European Social Fund (ESF), and the year-on-year increases that have been proposed in smart and inclusive growth and indeed in economic, social and territorial cohesion are welcomed.

In particular, the Committee wanted to ensure that youth employment initiatives were protected and that funding for the Youth Guarantee has been held and that funding increases for the Youth Employment Initiative are agreed as a matter of urgency. The proposal for establishing the European Solidarity Corps was welcomed by the Committee which made it clear that the funding should not come from established priority funds like the ESF but should come from the global margin for commitments.

We also welcomed the proposed increase to the maximum envelope of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund (EGF). However, we would stress the need for flexibility in this area, in its applicability criteria, because unemployment numbers can affect smaller rather than larger Member States to different degrees.

Jerzy Buzek, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy. – Mr President, this is the last budget of the EU 28 and we need successful implementation of our ambitious policies because there are citizens' expectations. So, in this context, the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy regrets the significant cuts in Horizon 2020. We cannot expect the EU to be more innovative and competitive when our framework programme is used as a financial source for other projects, no matter how important.

Another issue: cuts to COSME and the Council's reductions to the SME instruments: to create an SME-friendly business environment it is crucial to provide the necessary financial instruments.

Last but not least, financial resources for the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT), the Agency for the Cooperation of Energy Regulators (ACER), the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA) and the European Global Navigation Satellite Systems Agency (GNSS).

Markus Ferber, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Ratspräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir im Wirtschafts- und Währungsausschuss haben nur ein kleines Budget zu administrieren.

Das Wichtigste bei uns sind die drei Aufsichtsbehörden. Wir sind uns – glaube ich – im Klaren, dass die drei Aufsichtsbehörden finanziell gut ausgestattet sein müssen, um ihr Mandat zu erfüllen. Aber sie sollten sich auf ihr Mandat beschränken und nicht darüber hinausgehen.

Die Prämisse muss immer sein, dass es ein Budget nur für Aufgaben gibt, die auch vom Gesetzgeber her gedeckt sind, und das erfordert Mandatstreue der Aufsichtsbehörden. Hier sehen wir durchaus noch Verbesserungsbedarf.

Wir finden es richtig, dass die Kommission für die *review* der drei Aufsichtsbehörden vorgeschlagen hat, dass hier auch die Industrie einen Beitrag leisten soll. Wir wollen aber sicherstellen, dass auch weiterhin das EU-Budget mit herangezogen wird, um die Aufsichtsfunktionen wahrnehmen zu können.

Letzter Punkt: Eine der drei Aufsichtsbehörden wird ja nach dem Votum der Briten London verlassen müssen. Hier wollen wir schon, dass jetzt auch für das Haushaltsjahr 2018 erste Mittel bereitgestellt werden, damit der Umzug der Europäischen Bankenaufsicht geschmeidig erfolgen kann.

Joachim Zeller, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltskontrollausschusses*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Minister, Herr Kommissar! Im Haushaltsjahr 2018 treffen sich zwei zeitliche Linien. Die EU-2020-Strategie, der gegenwärtige MFF, die gegenwärtige Förderperiode und die Amtszeiten von Parlament und Kommission nähern sich ihrem Ende. Gleichzeitig gilt es, die Grundlagen zu legen für die europäische Politik nach 2020. Bilanz und Ausblick treffen aufeinander. Darum ist es notwendig, aus Sicht der Haushaltskontrolle zu überprüfen, ob unsere Anstrengungen und Instrumente die vereinbarten Ziele erreicht haben. Gleichzeitig gilt es festzustellen, wie wir uns neu ausrichten.

Zum Beispiel: 80 % der Direkthilfen in der Landwirtschaft gehen an 20 % der Zahlungsempfänger. Haben wir so die Einkommen, insbesondere kleineren der Agrarbetriebe, stabilisieren können? Eine Vielzahl von Finanzinstrumenten macht es fast unmöglich, die notwendige parlamentarische Kontrolle des Haushalts aufrechtzuerhalten.

Erhebliche Beiträge des Unionshaushalts fließen in Treuhandfonds. Sie entziehen sich aber bisher einer sinnvollen Überprüfung durch das Parlament.

In diesen und ähnlichen Fragen, die wir in unserer Stellungnahme niedergelegt haben, erwarten wir 2018 mehr Transparenz.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Petr Ježek, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs*. – Mr President, it is clear that there are not enough funds available to deal with the migration crisis as well as the security challenges we currently face in the EU. Indeed, polls have suggested that these areas are the ones Europeans expect the EU to do much more on.

As rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs on the 2018 budget, I advocated that further money be allocated to deal with these crucial areas. In addition, we pushed for more funds for the agencies which are at the forefront of the Union's response. We also need to ensure that the agencies in the area of justice and home affairs are adequately staffed. Therefore, we advocated that these agencies be exempt from the staff reduction targets of 5% under the multiannual budget.

In tomorrow's vote I call on our colleagues to give the rapporteurs a strong mandate for their discussions with national governments in order to ensure that the Union and its agencies can respond in the most effective way possible to the challenges we face.

Reimer Böge, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für internationalen Handel*. – Herr Präsident! Der internationale Handel und die damit einhergehenden Abkommen können ein entscheidendes Instrument der Außenpolitik sein, indem sie Wachstum und Beschäftigung in die Regionen dieser Welt tragen.

Sie haben aber auch, wenn sie offen und regelbasiert sind, damit zu tun, dass Werte und Prinzipien einer offenen globalen Gesellschaft eröffnet werden. Wenn wir jetzt in den nächsten Jahren eine ambitionierte Strategie des Handels für alle mit vielen neuen ergänzenden Handelsabkommen haben werden, dann ist es wichtig, dass wir erstens die Kommission mit genügend *man and woman power* ausstatten, nicht nur zu verhandeln, sondern auch nachzuvollziehen und zu schauen, wie sich Handelsabkommen entwickeln. Wir müssen dafür Sorge tragen, dass die Mittel für Handelshilfe ein unverzichtbares Instrument sind, um Strukturen und Projekte gerade in weniger entwickelten Ländern voranbringen zu können, damit sie Nutzen aus diesen Entwicklungen ziehen.

Ich glaube auch, dass die technische Unterstützung und die Wirtschaftshilfe für unsere direkten Nachbarn im Osten und im Süden der Europäischen Union von großer Bedeutung sind.

Ein Letztes, Herr Präsident: Wir werden längerfristig auch darüber zu reden haben, die Makrofinanzhilfen, die besser ausgestattet werden sollten, in das europäische Nachbarschaftsinstrument aufzunehmen, um die Kohärenz der Maßnahmen der Europäischen Union zu verstärken.

Искра Михайлова, *докладчик по становището на комисията по регионално развитие*. – Г-н Председател, от името на Комисията по регионално развитие изразявам нейното становище като докладчик по бюджет 2018 година. Ние подчертаваме значението на политиката за сближаване като основна политика за публични инвестиции на Съюза, основаваща се на солидарност и допринасяща създаването на растеж и работни места.

Подчертаваме необходимостта да се осигури подходящо ниво на бюджетни кредити за покриване на плащанията по политиката на сближаване, за да се докаже способността на Съюза да изпълнява ангажиментите си и да се засили доверието в него. Отбелязваме неприемливите забавяния при изпълнението на текущите програми, които до момента подкопават ефективността и изразяваме загриженост относно малкия брой подадени искания за плащания по програмите за периода 2014-2020 година.

Призоваваме Комисията да продължи да поставя акцент върху резултатите от изпълнението на бюджета на Съюза и подкрепяме всички стъпки, предприети към основан на резултати подход. Приветстваме новия финансов пакет в размер на 140 милиона, създаден за улесняване на изпълнението на Програмата за подкрепа на структурни реформи.

Paul Rübиг, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Berichterstatter! Ich glaube, für uns alle ist es wichtig, dass auch der Haushalt des Europäischen Parlaments Prioritäten setzt. Wir beginnen damit: Wie vom Rat gewünscht, wird die Dienstpostenreduzierung von 1 % pro Jahr natürlich auch von uns eingehalten; es wird interne Umschichtungen geben. Aber ich glaube, dass dieses Ziel natürlich nicht nur ein Ziel für die europäische Ebene ist, sondern es wäre auch sehr erfreulich, wenn die Finanzminister zu Hause in ihren eigenen Ländern die 1%-Dienstpostenreduktion durchführen würden, um zu zeigen, dass es mit dieser Äußerung wirklich ernst ist.

Wir haben natürlich auch die Vorbereitung der nächsten Wahlen zum Europäischen Parlament 2019 im Fokus. Wir wollen vor allem die Demokratie in Europa schützen. Wir wollen nicht, dass Kräfte, die gegen die Demokratie sind und nur in Militär investieren, uns hier die *soft power* Europas schwächen. Wir wollen außerdem unsere Verwaltung deutlich effizienter gestalten, das heißt, wir haben das Konrad Adenauer-Projekt in Luxemburg dementsprechend forciert. Wir wollen die Digitalisierung von Abläufen und die Fortsetzung der Einführung der irischen Sprache dementsprechend konsequent umsetzen und auch die Studien über Brexit und die Förderungen von grünem Transport dementsprechend überprüfen.

Auch im Parlamentshaushalt für die Abgeordneten gibt es einiges zu tun. In den letzten Jahren hat sich hier im Haus sehr viel Bürokratie breitgemacht, mit vielen Überprüfungen und Audits. Das erfordert bei den Abgeordneten zusätzliche massive Aktivitäten. Auch die Beamten im Parlament werden hier dementsprechend belastet. Wir sind deshalb dafür, dass wir wieder zu den Pauschalssystemen zurückkehren, dass Pauschalen bezahlt werden. Das ist effizient, das ist kostenwirksam und für den Steuerzahler die beste Variante. Die Pauschalen sind auch bei uns in den Mitgliedstaaten selbstverständlich. Wir wollen niemandem eine Pauschale wegnehmen, wir wollen dieses System forcieren.

Letzter Punkt: Ich glaube, dass wir jetzt vorgeschlagen haben, dass Praktikanten im Auswärtigen Europäischen Dienst bezahlt werden müssen. Das finde ich richtig, aber diese Haushaltszeile muss man auch dotieren, damit wir jungen Menschen die Chance geben, den europäischen Dienst kennenzulernen und für den *added value* von Europa zu arbeiten.

Daniele Viotti, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, consentitemi di partire con un ringraziamento non rituale al relatore, il collega Mureşan, per il lavoro che ha fatto e per come ha voluto coinvolgere tutto il Parlamento e tutti i gruppi politici nella costruzione di questo bilancio, che presentiamo oggi e che voteremo domani. Lo ringrazio per la sua disponibilità e per aver compreso e interpretato le richieste che arrivano dai cittadini e anche per aver presentato oggi il bilancio.

Io lo dico in modo molto sincero, perché non ci siano fraintendimenti: penso che siamo tutti d'accordo in quest'Aula, almeno noi parlamentari, che questo non è ancora il bilancio che noi desideriamo, perché non possiamo pensare che un bilancio pari all'1 % del Pil dell'Europa sia qualcosa di soddisfacente e che dia delle risposte alle sfide che noi abbiamo. E non sono sfide di poco conto: il lavoro, la crescita, l'aiuto alle nostre piccole e medie imprese, un'economia che risponda alle sfide ambientali che abbiamo, le risposte sulla crescita, i temi legati ai flussi migratori, i trasporti, la difesa comune, come ci chiedete.

Con questo bilancio proviamo a dare alcune risposte, cerchiamo di dare quelle risposte che, secondo noi, dal nostro punto di vista, i cittadini ci chiedono: i 600 milioni di euro in più che mettiamo sull'iniziativa per i giovani, gli aumenti per ripristinare le cifre corrette che la Commissione aveva messo su Orizzonte 2020, sul CEF, tutto questo significa dare delle opportunità alle nostre imprese, alle nostre università, ai nostri enti di ricerca, ai comuni e alle regioni, questo significa.

Allo stesso modo sul tema delle migrazioni proviamo a fare un ragionamento, finalmente, che esca dalla logica della crisi, perché non si può più parlare di crisi migratoria, si possono invece dare delle risposte che siano durature nel tempo, sia per quanto riguarda gli aiuti umanitari, sia per quanto riguarda l'accoglienza nei nostri paesi e quindi avere delle risorse anche per la solidarietà – anche se la solidarietà, onestamente, non la si può comprare e non ha una cifra, quella ce la si deve dare.

Vede, ministro Kivine, io ho sentito le Sue parole: Lei è preoccupato, ha detto di essere preoccupato per gli aumenti proposti dal Parlamento. Io onestamente sono preoccupato dall'aumento e dai numeri sulla disoccupazione, tanto per farLe un esempio. E credo che la conciliazione che andremo ad aprire fra poche settimane sia una fase in cui noi dobbiamo cercare delle risposte a quelle preoccupazioni e non alle preoccupazioni di regole di bilancio.

Inoltre vedo che siamo tutti preoccupati anche di come stanno prendendo sempre più piede i populismi, i partiti antieuropei, ecc. Provo a darvi una soluzione, provo a dirvi quale può essere la risposta: tornare a fare politica. Tornare a fare politica e dare risposte ai problemi concreti e veri dei cittadini.

Io penso, signor ministro, che ci siano queste opportunità nella fase di conciliazione che si sta aprendo. Sta a voi. Non voglio mancare di rispetto, ma sono un po' stufo – credo che lo siamo tutti – di sentire i capi di Stato e di governo che ci dicono che quest'Europa non funziona, e poi quando c'è l'opportunità di mettere in piedi qualcosa, di dare delle risposte e di avere un'Europa che funziona, poi non c'è la volontà politica di dare queste risposte.

C'è un accordo, c'è la possibilità di un accordo – ci stiamo arrivando, possiamo farlo. Quello che Lei chiama un accordo soddisfacente ed equilibrato, signor ministro, dev'essere un accordo soddisfacente per i cittadini ed equilibrato per le risposte alle sfide che ho elencato.

Bernd Kölmel, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Wenn wir über das Budget 2018 reden, dann erleben wir das gleiche Spiel wie jedes Jahr: Die Kommission macht einen Vorschlag, der Rat kürzt diesen Vorschlag, und das Europäische Parlament erhöht das Ganze wieder, regelmäßig sogar über das Niveau der Kommission hinaus. Man muss kein Prophet sein, um zu sagen: Am Ende, nach allen Verhandlungen, werden wir wieder sehr nahe beim Vorschlag der Kommission sein.

Wir haben hier einen entscheidenden Fehler in unserem ganzen Prozess, der darin begründet ist, dass man speziell hier im Europäischen Parlament glaubt, immer noch mehr Geld rufen zu können. Wir sollten uns endlich klarmachen: Das ist Geld der europäischen Steuerzahler; über das können wir nicht endlos verfügen, sondern wir sollten das Geld in diesem Rahmen nutzen, wie es uns zur Verfügung gestellt wird, und das ist nun mal in der Regel irgendwo in der Nähe des Kommissionsvorschlags beziehungsweise des Vorschlags des Rates.

Entscheidend ist für mich nicht der Ruf nach mehr Geld, sondern dass wir unser Geld entsprechend sinnhaft, zielgerichtet, fokussiert einsetzen. Dazu gehört insbesondere, dass wir ausreichende Mittel haben für die Migrationskrise, aber auch für den Bereich der Sicherheit, der Forschung, und letztlich der Wettbewerbsstärkung. Der Wettbewerb wird durch Dauersubventionen nicht gestärkt, sondern, im Gegenteil, sogar geschwächt. Deshalb plädieren wir dafür, dass wir Dauersubventionen abschaffen, von kleinen Ausnahmereichen wie zum Beispiel dem Umweltschutz abgesehen. Stattdessen müssen wir Subventionen eher degressiv ausstatten. Das wäre eine Stärkung des Wettbewerbs, das wäre echte gelebte Subsidiarität, dass wir wieder zur Freiheit und Selbstverantwortung der Mitgliedstaaten übergehen.

Deshalb werden wir diesen Entwurf nicht mittragen können. Dennoch danke ich ganz herzlich sowohl dem Herrn Kommissar für seinen Entwurf als auch den Berichterstattern für die hervorragende Arbeit.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Paul Rübig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Herr Kölmel! Meine Frage ist: Wir haben ja auch hier im Parlament beschlossen, dass Praktikanten bezahlt werden müssen, also wir wollen die unbezahlten Praktika abschaffen. Jetzt haben wir im Auswärtigen Dienst eine Erhöhung dieser Summe vorgesehen. Glauben Sie, dass es gerechtfertigt ist, in diesem Bereich Praktikanten zu bezahlen?

Bernd Kölmel (ECR), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – Herr Rübig, vielen Dank für diese Frage. Selbstverständlich ist es absolut in Ordnung, dass man Praktikanten bezahlt, so wie man jeden, der eine Leistung erbringt, bezahlen sollte, und zwar angemessen bezahlen sollte. Wenn Sie sich allerdings die finanziellen Summen hier mal in der Dimension vorstellen – wir reden hier über ein Budget im Volumen – je nachdem, ob Sie die Verpflichtungen nehmen oder die Zahlungsmittel – von 160 Mrd. EUR –, da, glaube ich, können wir mit den Praktikantengehältern keine Sanierung unseres Budgets herbeiführen.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta.* – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, kiitän esittelijä Mureşania hyvästä ja tehokkaasta yhteistyöstä. Me olemme mielestäni saaneet muodostettua tasapainoisen kannan. Panostamme kestävään kasvuun, nuorisotyöttömyyden hoitoon ja pk-yritysten mahdollisuuksiin luoda uusia työpaikkoja. Nämä kaikki ovat erittäin tärkeitä Euroopan tulevan kasvun elinehtoja.

Olen tyytyväinen siihen, että kannassamme on vaatimus EU:n ilmastorahoituksen kasvattamisesta. Emme voi jäädä jälkeen itsellemme asettamistamme tavoitteista emmekä kansainvälisistä sitoumuksista. Komission on annettava realistiset esitykset tavoitteiden saavuttamiseksi.

Haluan muistuttaa, että olemme budjettivallan käyttäjinä paljon vartijoina. EU:n hyväksyttävyyttä mitataan kansalaisten silmissä usein sen kautta, miten unioni käyttää rahojaan, miten tehokkaasti, oikeudenmukaisesti, avoimesti ja tuloksekkaasti. Täällä parlamentissa vallitseva kanta on pitkään ollut, että EU:n budjettia voidaan jatkuvasti kasvattaa. Esitämme hanakasti lisäyksiä, mutta säästökohdeiden etsimisessä emme ole kyllä kunnostautuneet, se meidän on sanottava. Monissa jäsenmaissa todellisuus on kuitenkin toinen. EU-budjetin kasvattamiseen suhtaudutaan hyvin suurella varauksella. On ilmiselvää, että säästöjä on tehtävä Britannian lähdettyä tai lähtiessä.

Toivon, että seuraavia vuosibudjetteja ja erityisesti seuraavaa rahoituskehystä silmällä pitäen kokoonnumme yhteen miettimään myös kohteita, joista voimme säästää tai käyttää olemassa olevia rahoja tehokkaammin. Unionin prioriteetit muuttuvat ja uusiin prioriteetteihin on oltava tarvittava rahoitus. Tämä ei kuitenkaan voi tarkoittaa sitä, että prioriteetit pelkästään lisääntyvät. Uusien painopisteiden rahoittamiseksi on löydettävä myös vastaavia säästöjä.

Liadh Ní Riada, *thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL*. – A Uachtaráin, ba mhaith liom mo bhaochas a ghabháil leis an Uasal Rubik chomh maith as an tacaíocht a léirigh sé don teanga Ghaeilge san óráid a bhí ar bun aige. Cé go gcuirim fáilte roimh ghnéithe áirithe de bhuiséad 2018, níl an méadú suarach seo sásúil agus tá an Pharlaimint agus an Coimisiún aontaithe ar an bpointe seo agus tuigeann siad go bhfuil gá le hinfheistíocht atá níos réadúla.

Tá imní orm nach bhfuil a dhóthain i mbuiséad 2018 chun stop a chur le himirce daoine oilte. Níl a dhóthain anseo chun forbairt a dhéanamh inár gceantair tuaithe ionas go mbeadh deis acu slí bheatha a chruthú agus an tuath a tharrtháil. An fhadhb is mó agus an cheist is mó maidir leis an mbuiséad seo ná cá bhfuil an tiomantas agus gealltanais á léiriú i dtaobh fostaíocht a chruthú. Cá bhfuil an gealltanais i dtaobh ár ndaoine óga, cá bhfuil an gealltanais i dtaobh tacú lenár SMEnna, lenár n-iascairí? Is baolach gur easpa tola atá ann arís agus arís eile. Mar fhocal scoir a chairde, táim ag iarraidh ar gach feisire anseo tacú le leasú 17 sa vóta ar bhuiséad 2018 amárach agus tacaíocht agus teachtaireacht láidir a thabhairt do mhuintir na hÉireann go bhfuil tacaíocht acu ón teach seo maidir leis an bpróiseas síochána in Éirinn agus le Comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta, go háirithe i gcomhthéacs Brexit. Go raibh míle maith agat.

Indrek Tarand, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I am glad to take the floor to share my agreement with the position taken so far by this Parliament. Our Group very much welcomes the increase to the Commission's budget, with EUR 2 billion in commitments and EUR 3.3 billion in payments and other good things mentioned by rapporteur Mr Mureşan earlier in his speech.

Of course, one can argue that the budget is still not green enough, and I hope that next year the Commission will come up with a better proposal, but in that context, I would like to underline the great help and understanding given by the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) Group and in particular by Mr Deprez and Ms Jäätteenmäki to improve their understanding in the budget to address the climate change policies.

I will not pursue in this debate my stance on some of the other institutions' budgets and their questionable techniques in assuring the funds they want. Mr Ashworth as a co-rapporteur mentioned them all, and I am a man who remembers – or perhaps in this context, does not forget – so that is why I will wholeheartedly support the position of Mr Ashworth taken in this aspect. And of course in the end of my intervention I have an appeal for the Council Presidency: however small and pressed you feel there between Berlin, Paris, Rome, Madrid and Warsaw, always remember the national epic of the Estonian nation: 'Kalevipoeg'.

'Ülemaks kui hõbevara, kallimaks kui kullakoormad tuleb tarkus tunnistada.'

Jonathan Arnott, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, a bit like a merry-go-round at a fairground, everything comes back around – regular as clockwork – once a year. In fact, I could probably save myself a couple of minutes and simply play a recording of last year's speech, because the issues are pretty much the same this year as they are every year.

We know the drill: I could very easily say that these are our taxes, that we voted for Brexit, or that the EU is not spending its money efficiently or effectively, but I will not repeat and rehearse all the old arguments. I would note, though, that when politicians focus on the EU budget as a share of gross national income (GNI), that does not tell the whole story to the general public because the percentage of government spending is, of course, much higher than the percentage of GNI, and of course other government spending may well entail compliance costs with EU legislation.

When I spoke on this subject in committee, and indeed it has been the same in this debate today, I pointed out that the language that we use in these debates seems to be always the language of 'cuts' – it is all about how much a proposed cut here or a cut there is supposed to be. But, actually, what we are talking about here is still an increase, and the discussion is whether it is an above-inflation increase or a below-inflation increase.

What I want to see are genuine cuts, and for two reasons. One is that, with Brexit coming, there will, at one time or another – depending on how negotiations go – eventually be a shortfall. Two, I believe that on many projects it is just better and more efficient to cut out the middleman and for nation states to do things directly themselves.

For saying that in committee, I was accused of populism, so I thought I would take a look at the word 'populism'. I looked it up in the dictionary, and it tells me that populism is support for the concerns of ordinary people and the quality of appealing to – or being aimed at – ordinary people. It just strikes me that only in this place could caring about ordinary people possibly be construed as being some kind of insult.

André Elissen, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, vandaag bespreken wij het EU-budget 2018. Tot mijn spijt bevat het nog steeds de grootst mogelijke onzinnige uitgaven. Om enig tegenwicht te bieden aan het eurofiele feestje heb ik samen met collega's een aantal amendementen ingediend. Ik geef een aantal voorbeelden. Stoppen met Europese fondsen voor de bestrijding van werkloosheid, economische recessie, armoede, de migratiecrisis en de veiligheidsbedreigingen. Laat dit vooral gewoon over aan de soevereine staten.

Het Jeugdwerkgelegenheidsinitiatief heeft volledig gefaald bij het oplossen van de jeugdwerkloosheid en moet direct worden gestopt.

Ondanks immense uitgaven door de EU in de afgelopen jaren is er nog steeds geen oplossing gevonden voor de grootscheepse migratie en mensensmokkel in Europa.

En ten slotte, de houding van de EU ten aanzien van Turkije is hypocriet en laf. Turkije mag nooit lid worden van de EU. De onderhandelingen moeten daarom worden stopgezet en er mogen geen miljarden meer naar Turkije gaan. Als het aan mij en mijn partij ligt, stoppen wij vandaag nog met de ondoelmatige, geld verspillende Europese Unie en het Parlement. Deze begroting sterkt mij in die overtuiging.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, I acknowledge that this is a budget about normal budgetary procedures and is in a pre-Brexit scenario. For my part, I believe it should be directed at growth, jobs and prosperity, and not the usual list of unnecessary items. However, in voting to leave the European Union, the British electorate declared that Brussels could no longer demand their taxes or dictate the spend.

Our legal obligations to the EU budget should end in March 2019. That is not to say that we will cut and run: we should honour existing commitments under a fair and reasonable settlement. However, this cannot be done in isolation. The block on trade talks is about coercion and not cooperation. It is detrimental to mutual progress, and we should find ways of moving forward.

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Senhor Representante do Conselho, caras e caros Colegas, mais uma vez, temos o Parlamento unido e com prioridades claras: queremos mais emprego e, nomeadamente, emprego jovem, queremos solidariedade externa e interna, queremos uma economia competitiva e queremos coesão social e territorial.

Também se repete o facto de o Conselho, mais uma vez, fazer cortes, e cortes sem nenhuma racionalidade. O Conselho chega a cortar nas suas próprias prioridades – cortes contra as suas proclamações e cortes contra os seus próprios compromissos.

Não é aceitável, por exemplo, cortar o Horizonte 2020, que tem uma excelente execução, que é o maior programa de investigação do mundo e que é essencial para a inovação e para a competitividade da nossa economia. Desafio a que nos expliquem porque é que cortam 491 milhões de euros em autorizações e 111 milhões de euros em pagamentos neste programa.

A iniciativa Emprego Jovem deve ser melhorada, mas tem de continuar. O apoio à espinha dorsal da nossa economia, que são as PME, também tem de ser incrementado.

A política de coesão é essencial. A solidariedade externa também é importante. E depois, Sr. Comissário e Conselho, é essencial aumentarmos a execução da política de coesão. É também essencial termos os pagamentos suficientes para o objetivo destes programas, que estão nas mãos e na gestão dos Estados-Membros.

O orçamento da União Europeia é apenas 1% do rendimento nacional bruto. Seria interessante perguntarmos quanto é que custaria à União Europeia não ter este orçamento. Não tenho dúvidas de que seria um custo muito superior a este 1% do rendimento nacional bruto, o que prova a necessidade de o aumentarmos, mas também a importância e o valor acrescentado deste mesmo orçamento.

Jens Geier (S&D). – Herr Präsident, lieber Herr Kommissar Oettinger, Herr Minister, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben heute bei den Abstimmungen eine Entschließung zum nächsten mittelfristigen Finanzrahmen angenommen, und in dieser Entschließung wird erneut betont, dass der Haushalt der Europäischen Union zurzeit unterfinanziert ist.

Vor dem Hintergrund ist mir noch einmal besonders wichtig, hier zu unterstreichen, dass neue Aufgaben, die die Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union übertragen, eben auch nur mit zusätzlichem Geld zu finanzieren sind. Dabei denke ich besonders an die Forderung nach zusätzlichen Anstrengungen im Bereich der gemeinsamen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik.

Der Kollege Kölmel von den Konservativen hat gerade in seinem Beitrag gesagt: Wir sollen mit dem Geld auskommen, das uns zur Verfügung gestellt ist. Das ist eine hehre Forderung. Wenn ich mir vorstelle: Wir haben einen Topf Suppe, und um den herum sitzen die Esser, und sie werden so gerade eben satt. Und dann kommt ein zusätzlicher Esser dazu, das ist in dem Fall die Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik, aber die Suppe wird nicht mehr. Dann werden eben nicht mehr alle satt, und insofern kann man eben mit dem Geld nicht immer auskommen, das einem zur Verfügung gestellt wird.

Besonders deutlich wird das, wenn wir auch an den Europäischen Fonds für strategische Investitionen denken. Wir alle wollen, dass dieser Fonds Erfolg hat. Wir alle wollen aber auch, dass es Investitionen in Innovation und Forschung gibt – sogar der Rat will das. Kollege Fernandes hat da gerade auch völlig richtig darauf hingewiesen.

Ich kann daher nicht nachvollziehen, Herr Minister, warum Sie sich hier über die Erhöhungsvorschläge des Europäischen Parlaments an zusätzlichen Anstrengungen in Höhe von 416 Mio. Euro in der Forschungspolitik und über 800 Mio. Euro für bessere Verkehrswege und transnationale Stromtrassen in Europa besorgt zeigen. Das sind eben Investitionen in die Zukunft und in Arbeitsplätze in der Europäischen Union, und darauf sollten wir uns verständigen.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Bernd Kölmel (ECR), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Geier, nur eine kurze Frage. Sie fragen zu Recht nach: Ja, wo soll man denn kürzen? Wären Sie mit mir einer Meinung, dass man den Bereich der Wettbewerbsstärkung kritisch hinterfragen müsste, wenn es Bereiche gibt, die seit Jahrzehnten gefördert werden und offensichtlich die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit bisher nicht gesteigert wurde?

Jens Geier (S&D), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich habe keine genauen Vorstellungen, an welchen Bereich Sie dabei denken. Wenn wir in Deutschland so eine Diskussion unter solchen Vorzeichen führen, dann denkt man im Allgemeinen an die Agrarpolitik.

Ich sage nicht, dass es nicht möglich ist, in diesem Haushalt einzusparen. Aber ich sage, wenn die Mitgliedstaaten sich auf eine Position stellen und sagen, wir wollen nicht mehr in den Haushalt einzahlen, wir wollen aber, dass der Haushalt immer mehr leistet, dann sind an bestimmten Punkten Spannungen eben unvermeidbar.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! W debacie nad projektem budżetu na 2018 r. chciałbym zdecydowanie poprzeć stanowisko Parlamentu, polegające na anulowaniu wszystkich cięć dokonanych przez Radę w projekcie przedstawionym przez Komisję. Na podkreślenie zasługuje również próba zwiększenia przez Parlament środków na zobowiązania na kwotę blisko 2 mld euro ponad pułapy zaproponowane przez Komisję, w tym 366 mln na inicjatywę na rzecz zatrudnienia ludzi młodych, a także odbudowę środków programów „Horyzont 2020” i „Łącząc Europę”.

Na poparcie zasługuje również zwiększenie środków w dziale „Bezpieczeństwo i obywatelstwo” o kwotę 110 mln euro, ponieważ chociaż liczba imigrantów przybywających do krajów unijnych spadła, to przez dziewięć miesięcy przybyło ich ponad sto tysięcy, co stwarza konieczność dodatkowego wsparcia dla krajów, które ich przyjmują. Także wzmocnienie działu „Globalny wymiar Europy” dodatkową kwotą 300 mln euro stworzy szansę na hojniejsze niż do tej pory wsparcie funduszy powierniczych krajów afrykańskich, służących wspieraniu ich rozwoju, a tym samym zapobieganiu kolejnym falom imigracji z Afryki do Europy.

Jean Arthuis (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, nous voterons demain notre propre vision du budget 2018. En ma qualité de président de la commission des budgets, je veux rendre un hommage tout particulier à nos rapporteurs, Siegfried Mureşan et Richard Ashworth, pour leur excellent travail.

Je soutiens les deux axes majeurs que notre rapporteur général a souhaité donner à ce budget, la croissance et l'emploi, notamment la formation professionnelle des jeunes, d'un côté, et la sécurité et les flux migratoires, de l'autre.

Je souligne principalement les compléments de dotations nécessaires dans des programmes particulièrement performants, comme Horizon 2020 et Erasmus+, ainsi que dans des agences qui montent en puissance dans le domaine de l'asile, du contrôle des frontières extérieures et de la coopération policière. Erasmus+, dont on a célébré avec éclat le trentième anniversaire, génère des frustrations puisque plus d'une demande sur deux est écartée faute de crédits.

Les paramètres de la négociation qui s'annonce sont assez simples: pas de révision du cadre financier, pas d'arriérés de paiement. Mais rien n'est joué et, si nous voulons conduire la conciliation en novembre et la conclure, je conseille vivement à la Présidence de s'émanciper des éternelles contradictions internes au Conseil, entre le rigorisme à courte vue des contributeurs nets et les intérêts acquis des pays bénéficiaires, entre les coupes sombres dans les programmes d'avenir et la sous-utilisation des crédits de cohésion – puis-je souligner que nous allons rendre 10 milliards d'euros en cette fin d'année 2017 du fait de la sous-consommation? –, entre les grandes déclarations du Conseil européen et les faiblesses de la solidarité européenne sur le terrain.

N'oublions pas que ce budget, du fait du Brexit, sera peut-être le dernier financé par 28 États membres sur douze mois. C'est dire combien il est urgent de convenir de l'avenir que nous entendons donner à l'Europe. Quel budget pour quelle Europe? À ce stade de la procédure budgétaire, nous restons confiants, nous sommes impatients de voter des budgets donnant à l'Union des moyens de préparer notre avenir et de nous protéger, des budgets parlant aux Européens, des budgets démontrant à l'opinion publique l'effectivité de la valeur ajoutée européenne.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, pese a la propuesta de aumento del presupuesto para 2018, seguimos sin dar la talla. En este presupuesto sacrificamos fondos de migración y asilo a favor de una política nefasta de control migratorio que intentan disfrazar como cooperación al desarrollo, pero que es una política indigna de tal nombre.

En cuanto a las inversiones, ustedes mantienen su plan Juncker, dando financiación a inversiones privadas que seguramente se iban a hacer igualmente, y cuando deciden invertir, como con el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa», lo hacen en grandes infraestructuras de energías fósiles, es decir, más y más gasoductos.

Sin recursos, señorías, no hay una política real. Por ejemplo, sin inversiones, tras los planes de empleo juvenil, no habrá nuevo empleo juvenil. Sin inversiones apropiadas, seguiremos con un modelo productivo nefasto y destructor de puestos de trabajo. Lo que hace falta es un plan público de inversión para Europa.

Estos presupuestos solo sirven para ensuciar la atmósfera, engordar las cuentas de las grandes empresas energéticas y alimentar los falsos fantasmas de la inmigración. Europa no necesita más o menos velocidad, sino que lo que necesita es una dirección distinta.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, as we are approaching the final period of the current multiannual financial framework (MFF), we would like to see a budget that finally gets closer to our priorities in terms of EU policies which are: full and higher-quality employment, solidarity towards poorer territories, but also to those citizens that have to endure harsher economic and social conditions across the EU, commitment towards sustainability of our planet, and tackling real sources of instability and inequalities across the world.

Therefore, we basically support the deal reached in the Committee on Budgets, according to which we reinforce programmes such as COSME, Horizon 2020, Erasmus+, or the Youth Employment Initiative, as well as climate related programmes like LIFE +, further measures on migration and refugees, and so on.

I hope that Parliament's position, which is a bare minimum to us, to our Group, will not be yielded during conciliation and I thank the rapporteurs for their work.

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi duole far notare a quest'Aula che anche quest'anno non è stato fatto alcuno sforzo per cercare di ridurre i costi della politica.

Il Parlamento, infatti, vuole ripristinare la maggior parte dei tagli fatti dal Consiglio per molte voci sulle quali si poteva prevedere un risparmio concreto e consistente, soprattutto sulle spese di natura amministrativa. Lo stesso Parlamento ha previsto un innalzamento dei propri costi, incrementando il proprio *budget* del 2,3 % rispetto al 2017. Parliamo di quasi due miliardi, anche quest'anno, sulle spalle dei contribuenti. Ogni anno i costi della politica purtroppo aumentano, la doppia sede di Bruxelles e Strasburgo continua a costare centinaia di milioni l'anno e, anche se c'è una maggioranza in questo Parlamento e tra gli Stati membri, non la si vuole eliminare. I finanziamenti europei per i partiti e le fondazioni sono continuati ad aumentare, passando da meno di 17 milioni nel 2009 a una proposta di quasi 52 milioni per il 2018. Questa linea di bilancio, che il Movimento 5 Stelle giustamente non utilizza, dovrebbe essere completamente annullata.

È ancora troppo forte, tra l'altro, il divario tra i privilegi di chi fa politica e gli enormi sacrifici richiesti ai cittadini. Basti pensare al privilegio dei membri di questo Parlamento: è prevista una pensione senza versare un euro di contributi, tutta a carico dei cittadini sulle cui spalle, invece, si fanno delle riforme delle pensioni, come in Italia la riforma Fornero.

Oltre agli sprechi amministrativi bisogna tagliare, secondo noi, i progetti inutili e dannosi, quali la tratta ferroviaria Torino-Lione, che non porta alcun valore aggiunto per la cupola, anche criminale a volte, degli appalti e subappalti pubblici, che, nelle opere infrastrutturali in Italia, si è visto come lavori molto bene. Per non parlare poi del fallimento del piano Juncker, che non ha portato nessuna addizionalità con i suoi progetti.

Infine c'è un punto per noi fondamentale, che è quello relativo agli allevamenti e ai finanziamenti ai tori. È importante che non si finanzia più questa voce perché è una tradizione medievale, che non supporta in alcun modo i principi fondanti dell'Unione europea, e continuando a permettere la regolarità di questi finanziamenti continuiamo a finanziare una pratica barbara e medioevale.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D), question «carton bleu». – Cher collègue, vous parlez de désinvestissement, et notamment du Lyon-Turin. Pensez-vous que c'est en s'abstenant d'investir que l'Union européenne va donner du travail à ses enfants et, d'une manière générale, permettre le développement économique?

Marco Valli (EFDD). *Risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu».* – Bisogna fare una valutazione d'impatto ambientale ed economico quando si spendono tanti soldi. Il progetto Torino-Lione pone sul piatto decine di miliardi di euro per i prossimi anni. Io credo che ci siano altre priorità rispetto a quest'opera inutile, quando si potrebbe soprattutto, spendendo meno, mettere a posto la linea già esistente.

Questo tipo di progetti megainfrastrutturali di solito fanno guadagnare i grandi subappaltatori che poi dopo, molto spesso, hanno sotto anche il crimine organizzato, per quanto riguarda l'Italia, e le aziende che lavorano, anche transfrontalieramente, tra Francia e Italia. Quindi bisogna valutare meglio i progetti infrastrutturali, tra cui la Torino-Lione, che non andrebbe finanziata.

Barbara Kappel (ENF). – Herr Präsident, Herr Minister, Herr Kommissar! Im Haushaltsjahr 2018 werden Maßnahmen der Union finanziert, die in erster Linie in wirtschafts- und sozialpolitischer Hinsicht für nachhaltiges Wachstum und mehr Beschäftigung stehen. Erreicht werden soll dies durch mehr Investitionen in Bildung, in Forschung und Entwicklung, in Infrastruktur, in Klein- und Mittelbetriebe.

Ich möchte hier zwei Schwerpunkte hervorheben, die der Berichtsentwurf des Parlaments vorsieht. Es sind dies die Mittelaufstockung für die Jugendbeschäftigungsinitiative von 366,7 Mio. EUR auf insgesamt 600 Mio. EUR und die Wiederherstellung der Budgets der *Connecting Europe Facility* und von Horizont 2020. Diese beiden Programme wurden zugunsten der Mittelausstattung des EFSI-Garantiefonds gekürzt; allein bei Horizont 2020 sah der Ratsvorschlag Kürzungen im Ausmaß von 500 Mio. EUR bei den Verpflichtungen und 120 Mio. EUR bei den Zahlungen vor, und das, obwohl derzeit pro Jahr 150 Mrd. EUR bei F&E in Europa fehlen und 83 % der im Rahmen von H 2020 finanzierten Projekte ohne EU-Förderung nicht möglich gewesen wären.

Mehr Mittel soll es laut Parlament auch für andere Programme geben, die Wachstum und Beschäftigung schaffen. Es sind dies Erasmus+ mit plus 32 Millionen, COSME mit plus 22,5 Millionen und die REC. Wesentlich ist auch die Bereitstellung finanzieller Unterstützung für Klein- und Mittelbetriebe. Das ist der wichtigste Treiber für Wachstum und Beschäftigung in Europa. Entsprechende Haushaltslinien auch für den Ausbau der digitalen Infrastruktur und für die erfolgreiche Implementierung des Projekts WiFi4Europe.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, așa cum s-a mai spus în această sală, am votat astăzi o poziție a Parlamentului European referitoare la noul CFM, referitoare, bineînțeles, la comunicarea dumneavoastră. Cred că este o poziție foarte solidă și foarte bună, care cred că vă poate sprijini în elaborarea noii propuneri pentru CFM. Colegii noștri cred că au lucrat foarte bine. Este aici un coleg, celălalt nu știu dacă este în sală. Cred că vă va ajuta, de asemenea, să veniți mai repede decât s-a anunțat, adică în mai 2019, cu această propunere.

Referitor la bugetul pe 2018, colegii noștri au făcut, iarăși, o treabă foarte bună și cred că direcția principală a bugetului este dezvoltarea economică, locuri de muncă, lucruri de care are nevoie Europa în acest moment. Sper ca, la conciliere, dumneavoastră să sprijiniți Parlamentul, pentru a nu se mai întâmpla ca de obicei, cu Consiliul nevrând să dea absolut nimic, ci încercând doar pe principiul de a-și micșora contribuțiile naționale să micșoreze diverse direcții care sunt importante, inclusiv Erasmus, și să sprijiniți Parlamentul, care dorește să fie un buget pentru oameni.

Aș vrea să sprijin, de asemenea, câteva cereri ale Comisiei pentru transport. În primul rând, recuperarea banilor din CEF pentru FC, lucru foarte important pentru Comisia pentru transport. Ați văzut că lucrările au avut mult succes și că au fost foarte mulți participanți la licitații și aș vrea doar să atrag atenția asupra unui lucru foarte simplu: nu înțeleg de ce nu se pot găsi sume foarte mici de bani, sub zece milioane de euro, pentru a se putea completa acoperirea sistemului EGNOS, sistem care este vital pentru transportul aerian.

Isabelle Thomas (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais, à mon tour, féliciter nos rapporteurs, Siegfried Mureșan et Richard Ashworth, qui ont fait un remarquable travail et qui ont travaillé en bonne intelligence avec la majorité du Parlement.

Avant de passer au budget, je profite de la présence des représentants du Conseil pour vous demander, Mesdames, Messieurs, de bien vouloir modifier le programme des dirigeants. En effet, il a été validé en faisant fi et au mépris du respect du Parlement et de la Commission, proposant de conclure le futur cadre financier pluriannuel fin 2019, c'est-à-dire au moment où il y aura, à la fois, constitution du Parlement et de la future Commission. Merci d'entendre cette demande.

En ce qui concerne le budget, je voudrais insister sur deux points. Le premier est un principe simple: la cohérence. Nous partageons avec la Commission et le Conseil la plupart des priorités pour 2018: l'investissement, l'emploi, la croissance durable, la gestion des défis migratoires. Preuve en est que nous prévoyons d'augmenter ces lignes budgétaires. C'est pourquoi, pour maintenir cette cohérence, nous ne pourrions accepter aucune diminution de ces montants lors des négociations.

Le second point est notre détermination dans la lutte contre le chômage des jeunes, ce fléau qui affecte l'avenir même de l'Union européenne. Monsieur le Commissaire, je ne voudrais pas qu'il y ait de mauvaise interprétation sur ce que nous proposons. En aucun cas nous ne proposons une avance, un *frontloading* en 2018 des crédits prévus par la révision du cadre financier pluriannuel afin de relancer l'initiative pour les jeunes.

Ce que la majorité de ce Parlement veut, c'est que l'Union européenne investisse un demi-milliard d'euros dans la garantie jeunesse pour 2018. On annonce des milliards pour soutenir les industries stratégiques, des milliards pour relancer les investissements, très bien! Alors pour 2018, il faut un demi-milliard contre cette catastrophe sociale qu'est le chômage des jeunes, un demi-milliard pour la solidarité et pour préparer l'avenir. Ce sera, soyez-en sûr, un point sur lequel le Parlement se montrera intransigeant dans les négociations à venir.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, I would also like to congratulate both rapporteurs. I think we are all well aware that the months and few years ahead could be quite rough, and we will have quite a rocky road to travel. Not only is the overall budget going to be under pressure, but with the UK leaving, the remaining 27 will probably also have problems, as the UK may have.

As it stands, with the UK's departure the CAP budget is going to be hit particularly hard. That is something I would certainly want to see put right, because this is just one of the many areas that the 27 Member States will have to face up to.

However, I have always put on record that Europe, through the budget, has been extremely positive for my region of Northern Ireland, and I hope that will continue. But I fail to see how that can continue if the UK is not here to represent its regions.

I hope that this message will get back to Mrs May, that when she makes her proposals for continuing aid it is taken into account. Because if you do not have representation it is very difficult to make sure matters are managed properly.

Gérard Deprez (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, mes félicitations tout d'abord à nos deux rapporteurs, Siegfried Mureşan et Richard Ashworth, qui ont fait – nous en convenons tous – un travail remarquable.

Pour ma part, je ne vais pas répéter ce qu'ont dit avant moi, et excellemment, le président de notre commission et plusieurs intervenants. Je veux me limiter à saluer quelques avancées que je considère comme significatives dans le projet de budget pour 2018.

Je veux saluer le renforcement des crédits affectés à la recherche en matière de défense. C'est une nécessité impérieuse dans l'état actuel de déstabilisation de nos flancs est et sud et nous devons progresser vers une Union européenne de défense.

Je salue la réduction ou la réaffectation des aides de préadhésion dont bénéficie actuellement la Turquie. Il est temps de montrer à M. Erdogan que sa dérive autoritaire n'est pas supportable et qu'il doit arrêter d'insulter les dirigeants européens.

Je salue le renforcement, demandé d'ailleurs par les citoyens de tous nos pays, des moyens consacrés à la lutte contre le terrorisme. Europol, en particulier, a besoin de plus de personnel et de plus de crédits opérationnels pour améliorer la coordination entre les forces de police et de sécurité de nos États membres.

Je salue, enfin, le fait que la résolution qui nous est proposée demande expressément, sur ma proposition, la création d'un mécanisme d'aide financière pour les victimes d'attentats terroristes. Notre solidarité financière ne peut se limiter aux conséquences des incendies, des tremblements de terre et des inondations. Dans une Europe qui se veut une Europe des valeurs, le sang qui coule mérite au moins autant d'attention que les dégâts des eaux.

Marie-Pierre Vieu (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, le budget est la transcription comptable de nos priorités politiques. En période de difficile reprise de l'activité économique, il me paraît important et positif que l'Union donne la priorité à la recherche, à l'éducation, au changement climatique et, bien sûr, à la lutte contre le chômage des jeunes. Je pense que là réside la valeur ajoutée européenne qui, face au repli identitaire et aux tentations nationalistes, peut faire contrepoids à l'obsession de l'austérité qui caractérise les politiques budgétaires de ces dernières années.

Je voudrais néanmoins faire deux remarques essentielles sur le budget proposé. D'une part, je suis contre le financement croissant d'une Europe militariste et sécuritaire, car la recherche militaire et le cofinancement de renvoi de migrants ne peuvent constituer la base d'un projet européen mobilisateur.

D'autre part, la politique de libre-échange, dont les traités heurtent de plein fouet les politiques industrielles et agricoles, annule tout ou partie du bénéfice de celles-ci. Priorité donc à l'écologie, à la démocratie et à la sécurisation des parcours de vie.

Marco Zanni (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ancora una volta nella procedura di bilancio c'è poco coraggio e la dimostrazione che l'Unione europea è un progetto fallimentare, un progetto che non avrà un grande futuro.

Come al solito assistiamo a questa negoziazione, a questo dibattito dove la Commissione chiede più risorse – ogni anno chiede di aumentare la dotazione di bilancio – e il Consiglio e gli Stati membri vogliono tagliare e si rifiutano di dare maggiori risorse, anzi ne vorrebbero alcune indietro.

Credo che questa sia veramente la dimostrazione che questo progetto non può andare avanti. Dobbiamo domandarci perché gli Stati membri non vogliono investire ulteriori risorse nel bilancio ma vogliono trattenerle sul territorio nazionale per investirle in altra maniera, senza mandarle in maniera complessa a Bruxelles. Ci sarà un motivo se preferiscono non investire in uno strumento che oggi non dà i risultati sperati in termini di crescita, in termini di nuovo sviluppo, in termini di creazione di posti di lavoro.

La realtà è che il bilancio dell'Unione europea oggi brucia miliardi di euro in progetti fallimentari, che hanno fallito nel raggiungere quegli obiettivi che ci erano stati promessi – parlo del piano Juncker, parlo dei miliardi bruciati per la Garanzia per i giovani, parlo, ad esempio, dei nuovi progetti sulla difesa comune o sul supporto di fondi per l'Africa. La mia domanda è: se facciamo così fatica già a raggiungere risultati entro i nostri confini, figuriamoci quali possono essere i risultati andando a operare in altri paesi.

E ovviamente c'è un continuo incremento delle spese amministrative. Cosa fa l'Unione europea? Decide di chiedere più soldi per la propaganda, per comunicare ai cittadini – che hanno scoperto l'inganno dell'Unione – quanto l'Unione europea è bella e quante cose belle fa. Questo non è il modo di procedere, e lo vedremo nei prossimi mesi.

Λεωτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταρχήν οφείλουμε πραγματικά να ευχαριστήσουμε και να συγχαρούμε τους συνεισηγητές, τον κύριο Ashworth και τον κύριο Siegfried Muresan, οι οποίοι επιτέλεσαν εξαιρετικό έργο στην προσπάθειά τους να καταστήσουν τον προϋπολογισμό πιο ανθρώπινο, πιο κοινωνικό, να ανταποκρίνεται στις προσδοκίες των πολιτών κι αυτό το μήνυμα πρέπει να πάρει και η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, αλλά και το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο. Θεωρώ ότι είναι πολύ σημαντικό αυτός ο προϋπολογισμός να επικεντρωθεί στην ανάπτυξη των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων, στην απασχόληση των νέων, να δημιουργήσει ώθηση και ανάπτυξη ιδιαίτερα σε μικρές χώρες που δεν έχουν την ίδια πρόσβαση και την ίδια δυνατότητα που έχουν οι μεγάλες χώρες και να έχουν την ευχέρεια και τη δυνατότητα να αντλήσουν κονδύλια και κεφάλαια μέσα από τον προϋπολογισμό. Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, οι ίδιες οι αρχές και οι ίδιες οι αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δεν μου επιτρέπουν να ψηφίσω έστω και ένα ευρώ για την Τουρκία. Δεν μπορεί μια χώρα που παραβιάζει και ισοπεδώνει αρχές και αξίες και προσβάλλει συνέχεια την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να λαμβάνει και χρηματοδότηση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Αγαπητέ φίλε Επίτροπε, κύριοι του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, πρέπει να στείλετε το μήνυμα ότι και οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες φορολογούμενοι, εάν ερωτηθούν, δεν θα δεχθούν να φύγει έστω και ένα ευρώ για να χρηματοδοτήσει την Τουρκία καθ' οιονδήποτε τρόπο. Μία χώρα η οποία παραβιάζει ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, κατέχει τη δική μου τη χώρα, χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, παραβιάζει αρχές και αξίες. Δεν νοεί λύση του κυπριακού προβλήματος χωρίς να κρατήσει κατοχικά στρατεύματα, εγγυήσεις και επεμβατικά δικαιώματα, προκαλεί αποκάλυπτα, παρεμπόδισε ακόμα και ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια για την

Τουρκία. Και εδώ πρέπει να επισημάνω ότι δεν μπορούμε την ίδια στιγμή που δίνουμε σχεδόν 150 εκατομμύρια για τους Τουρκοκύπριους, οι ίδιοι να συναινούν στο να παρεμποδίζεται η βοήθεια προς τους εγκλωβισμένους μας. Και θέλω πραγματικά να καλέσω και όλους τους αγαπητούς συναδέλφους να στείλουμε το μήνυμα ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι ισχυρή και καμία Τουρκία δεν μπορεί να την εκβιάζει, καμία Τουρκία πραγματικά δεν μπορεί να έχει τόσο απαράδεκτη συμπεριφορά. Και ένα τελευταίο: είναι σημαντικό το κεφάλαιο της ευρωπαϊκής άμυνας και ασφάλειας, το στηρίζουμε, στηρίζουμε τον ευρωπαϊκό στρατό, γιατί μόνον έτσι Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα θωρακιστεί και θα παράσχει ασφάλεια και εγγύηση σε όλες τις χώρες μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και στη δική μου την πατρίδα που διατρέχει σημαντικό κίνδυνο από την Τουρκία.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, demain – je l'espère en tout cas –, notre Parlement européen votera un refus clair des coupes sombres proposées par le Conseil dans le budget général 2018. Ce vote sera un signe fort, en opposition à une position incompréhensible et – j'oserais le dire – irresponsable, en décalage complet avec les besoins réels des citoyens européens.

Aujourd'hui, je dois vous le dire, je suis inquiet. Certes, nous renforçons les sommes allouées à l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes, certes, nous actons une aide substantielle aux jeunes agriculteurs qui s'installent, certes, notre position reflète une aide explicite à toutes les politiques durables dans les secteurs de l'emploi, de l'énergie et de l'inclusion sociale et, pourtant, aujourd'hui, je suis inquiet. Je suis inquiet que la conciliation budgétaire à venir ne se transforme en mascarade et que les États membres nous contraignent à l'adoption d'un budget, une fois de plus, au rabais.

Je souhaite rappeler que le budget 2018 — comme les autres d'ailleurs — ne pourra pas être voté sans l'accord du Parlement européen. Si sa voix devait ne pas être entendue, notre chambre devrait, je le crois, envisager de le refuser.

Sander Loones (ECR). – Turkije en de Europese Unie, het is niet bepaald een *love affair*. Integendeel, het is in het beste geval misschien een verstandsrelatie omdat Turkije nu eenmaal ligt waar het ligt en in deze onzekere geopolitieke tijden is dat een relevante afweging. Tegelijk denk ik echt dat het tijd is om eerlijk te zijn. Is het belangrijk dat Turkije niet verder afglijdt? Is het belangrijk dat Turkije niet kiest voor Rusland? Ja, dat is belangrijk. Maar betekent dit dat Turkije dan zomaar eventjes lid moet worden van de Europese Unie? Neen. Neen. Het is tijd dat we dat erkennen en dat ook consequent doortrekken.

Dat betekent ook dat we moeten stoppen met centen te geven aan Erdoğan onder de Europese noemer van toetredingssteun. Maar wat stel ik vast? Ook in deze Europese begroting zal volgend jaar opnieuw 589 miljoen euro richting Erdoğan gaan onder de noemer van toetredingssteun. Dat moet eruit. Daar moeten wij mee stoppen. De burgers verwachten meer van ons. Wij moeten hun dat ook leveren.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, este orçamento está condicionado por um quadro financeiro curto face aos objetivos proclamados pelas instituições da União Europeia e que reflete uma profunda crise de confiança que levou os Estados-Membros a cortar neste plano plurianual.

Um quadro financeiro que corta na coesão e na política agrícola comum em favor das rubricas ligadas à defesa e ao armamento e a que este orçamento dá, naturalmente, expressão, como é o caso do Serviço para a Ação Externa, que pretende recrutar cinco mil pessoas. Um orçamento que atribui à Turquia o dobro do que está previsto para o programa Erasmus, em virtude de um negócio concluído pela Alemanha à revelia dos restantes de Estados-Membros, mas a que ninguém se opôs. Um orçamento que aposta nos instrumentos financeiros e na condicionalidade dos apoios, ao mesmo tempo que corta nas verbas atribuídas à investigação.

Em suma, trata-se de um orçamento que não apresenta soluções consistentes para relançar o investimento e contrariar a rota de divergência social e económica que se acentua com o aprofundamento deste processo de integração capitalista da União Europeia.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Dominique Bilde (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, ce budget dénote, une fois de plus, une absence flagrante de vision à long terme, en édulcorant les conséquences financières du Brexit, qu'il conviendrait pourtant d'anticiper.

Même constat concernant les fonds destinés à la sécurité et aux migrants, puisque le Parlement européen table sur une baisse des arrivées de migrants. Or, celles-ci sont reparties à la hausse ce mois-ci. L'Union européenne risque donc de devoir ponctionner ses fonds d'urgence, faute de solution pérenne.

Ce manque d'anticipation se reflète également dans les coupes budgétaires qui touchent le cœur d'un véritable projet européen d'avenir: la recherche et la formation. Ainsi le programme Erasmus+ voit-il ses financements amputés au profit d'un corps européen de solidarité, dont on devine qu'il bénéficiera essentiellement aux ONG d'aide aux migrants.

Je ne soutiendrai donc pas ces arbitrages, qui sont symptomatiques d'une Europe sans projet, enfermée dans le court-termisme et la fuite en avant.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, bugetul general al Uniunii Europene pentru exercițiul financiar 2018 pare a fi unul echilibrat, deși a avut un start mai puțin dorit, în condițiile în care Consiliul a operat tăieri în anumite domenii-cheie, dar care au fost parțial corectate pe parcurs, motiv pentru care îi felicit pe cei doi raportori.

Consider, însă, că este extrem de important să fim ancorați în realitățile de pe teren atunci când discutăm de eficiența cheltuielilor pe termen lung. Nu este suficient să bifăm o cheltuială aferentă unui domeniu fără să evaluăm, în mod concret, impactul acestor cheltuieli și, mai ales, beneficiile și durabilitatea investițiilor. În domeniul agriculturii, trebuie să avem în vedere provocările majore ale acestui sector plecând de la fenomenul unei îmbătrâniri agresive, de la lipsa forței de muncă, până la căutarea de noi piețe de desfacere. Tocmai de aceea, sunt de părere că programul privind instalarea tinerilor fermieri trebuie să fie sprijinit mai departe, ca o garanție a prevenirii depopulării spațiului rural. În același timp, trebuie să asigurăm durabilitatea acestor ferme pe termen mediu și lung, prin identificarea de noi piețe în condițiile în care ne confruntăm mai departe cu embargoul rusesc.

Cu toate acestea, apreciez că trebuie să fim extrem de atenți cu acordurile comerciale care sunt încheiate la nivelul Uniunii Europene, referindu-mă, în special, la cel cu țările din Mercosur. Un astfel de acord este de natură să ne creeze dificultăți majore, având în vedere faptul că fermierii din aceste țări nu sunt obligați să respecte nicio limită la cadmiu, la glifosat sau la antibiotice, ceea ce le permite obținerea unui preț de cost pe unitatea de produs mult sub cel obținut de un fermier european, iar acest lucru afectează pe termen lung durabilitatea investițiilor europene în agricultură. Cred că sectorul agricol, cercetarea și inovarea în acest domeniu trebuie să cunoască mai departe o finanțare consistentă, astfel încât să putem asigura atât o eficiență a fermierilor, cât și protejarea intereselor consumatorului, care să poată beneficia de produse calitative la prețuri accesibile.

Luigi Morgano (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la posizione del Parlamento sul bilancio europeo per il 2018 è chiarissima sul versante culturale: rafforziamo i programmi per l'educazione, la formazione, i giovani e la cultura, non usiamo Erasmus+ come un tesoretto da cui attingere secondo le necessità.

Ripristinare la dotazione di bilancio stornata verso il Corpo europeo di solidarietà non è una contrarietà all'iniziativa, ma adottare e riaffermare il giusto ordine delle cose. Allo stesso modo è più che mai opportuna la proposta formalizzata di aumentare i finanziamenti previsti in particolare per il settore gioventù di Erasmus, una posizione unanime della commissione CULT, che si inserisce nella strategia volta a raggiungere con i finanziamenti Erasmus sempre più ragazzi e giovani fuori dai percorsi formativi tradizionali. Donde l'indicazione è di moltiplicare la dotazione di Erasmus+ nel prossimo quadro finanziario e farne un programma per tutti gli europei.

Sul piano più generale, poi, se vogliamo un'Europa più all'altezza delle proprie ambizioni, comincia con il bilancio 2018 un percorso verso un significativo aumento delle dotazioni del prossimo quadro finanziario, da ottenere in misura maggiore con risorse proprie. È una scelta non più eludibile.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162,

paragrafo 8, del regolamento)).

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – In the annual budget report, the Council proposes to cut EUR 240 million in payments, and you call another EUR 750 million proposed by the Council unjustified. Normally economic liberals want to cut taxes. In the European Parliament, they want to do the opposite. Guy Verhofstadt in the 1980s and 1990s was called the 'baby Thatcher of Belgium', and he believes now that we need special European supranational taxes. Surely you would agree with me that taxpayers in Europe are fed up having their pockets picked just to pay for more grandiose and mad projects? Surely you agree with me, sir?

Luigi Morgano (S&D), Risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Mi pare che stia ponendo un problema di natura più generale. È chiaro che, se si va verso la direzione delle risorse proprie, si diminuiscono quelli che sono i trasferimenti dagli Stati membri. Questa è una scelta di campo, ma anche per rafforzare l'Unione europea.

Penso che Lei non sia d'accordo perché ha chiaramente una posizione politica preconcepita; purtroppo il dialogo, quando ci sono preconcetti, è molto difficile. Non sto sostenendo per nulla, con la mia posizione, quanto Lei ha detto.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Oettinger! Ich möchte hier nur ganz kurz auf drei Themen eingehen: Erstens, die Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in der Europäischen Union. Diese hat für meine Fraktion und mich besondere Bedeutung. Deshalb freut es mich, dass wir immerhin eine Aufstockung der Gelder für den Kampf gegen die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit auf 600 Mio. EUR erreicht haben, auch wenn ich mir mehr gewünscht hätte.

Zweitens: Finanzierung des Europäischen Solidaritätskorps. Die Idee des ESK begrüße ich; es bringt junge Menschen zusammen und stärkt die europäische Solidarität. Als Haushaltsberichterstatter für dieses Thema ist es mir aber wichtig, auch an dieser Stelle noch einmal zu betonen, dass neue Initiativen neues Geld verlangen.

Drittens möchte ich den Punkt der Armutsbekämpfung weltweit ansprechen. Wir haben die verantwortungslose Kürzung um 6 % bei den Entwicklungsausgaben verhindert. Mit der Mittelerhöhung in Rubrik IV des Budgets – Europa in der Welt – haben wir bereits jetzt ein erstes richtiges Zeichen gesetzt. Letzte Woche hatten ich und viele Kolleginnen und Kollegen viele ONE-Jugendbotschafter da, die sich für die Bekämpfung der Armut weltweit einsetzen, und sie fordern uns auf, im Bildungsbereich und Entwicklungsbereich 100 Mio. EUR mehr auszugeben – ich finde: eine angemessene Forderung.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Mr President, in my view, this budget will be the biggest jewel of Europe's crown next year – not because it is one of the biggest ever proposed, but because it is reflecting European cities, European regions and European citizens' needs – and I am underlining this: needs, not wishes!

EUR 2.5 trillion in 20 years are invested in European regions. No one has ever been even close to this, and it was the right thing to do. Moreover, this institution has always been one of the most ambitious when it comes to the budget – the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do to ask to restore all cuts proposed by the Council. It was the right thing to do even to increase the draft budget proposed by the Commission, because a great step forward needs brave investment, not cuts.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la crescita sostenibile e l'occupazione, in particolare quella giovanile, la sicurezza e i cambiamenti climatici devono rimanere le priorità della nostra agenda. Vanno pertanto respinti i tagli proposti dal Consiglio, che si è detto a parole pronto a spendere nei settori in cui i Fondi europei garantiscono maggiore valore aggiunto, salvo poi proporre una serie di tagli.

Se l'Unione europea vuole essere credibile deve investire nella ricerca, nell'innovazione e nelle politiche di contrasto alla disoccupazione, dotando di maggiori fondi i programmi come *Connecting Europe Facility* e *Horizon 2020* e destinando risorse adeguate alle iniziative per l'occupazione giovanile, senza trascurare le politiche agricole e quelle di coesione, che sono i veri assi portanti dell'economia europea.

Vanno inoltre destinate maggiori risorse per gestire sia la dimensione interna che quella esterna della crisi migratoria e dei rifugiati, al fine di dar seguito alle politiche intraprese in questo campo. In fase di conciliazione, dunque, occorre che il Parlamento abbia le idee ben chiare sulle reali priorità da perseguire.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ξανά «στο ίδιο έργο θεατές», σε έναν προϋπολογισμό λιτότητας, σε έναν προϋπολογισμό που στηρίζει τη βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή, έναν προϋπολογισμό που δεν διαθέτει κονδύλια για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, για το χτύπημα της φτώχειας, δεν διαθέτει κονδύλια για την ανάπτυξη. Έναν προϋπολογισμό που δεν ξεπερνά τα 150 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ, τη στιγμή που ο κύριος Draghi έχει διαθέσει μέσω της ποσοτικής χαλάρωσης 1,7 τρισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Αντισταβάνεστε ότι η διαδικασία αυτή δεν μπορεί να προχωρήσει. Ταυτόχρονα, είναι ένας προϋπολογισμός που δίνει χρήματα στην Τουρκία, μια χώρα η οποία κατέχει το 37% της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας, μια χώρα η οποία απειλεί την Ελλάδα, μια χώρα η οποία παραβιάζει τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο. Πώς είναι δυνατόν να δώσουμε χρήματα στον Ερντογάν, ο οποίος είναι ιδιαίτερα επιθετικός; Ένας προϋπολογισμός που δίνει χρήματα στην Αλβανία, η οποία καταπιέζει την ελληνική εθνική μειονότητα στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο, που γκρεμίζουν τα σπίτια της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας. Είναι δυνατόν να ψηφίσουμε ένα τέτοιο προϋπολογισμό;

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Voorzitter, beste commissaris, geachte collega's, het Europees Parlement moet veel kritischer kijken naar haar uitgavenpatroon. Nu geldt het beschikbare budget als uitgangspunt. Dit geeft de perverse prikkel om het budget ook daadwerkelijk volledig uit te geven. Hierdoor worden geen of nauwelijks prioriteiten gesteld. Anders dan in nationale parlementen lijkt het in dit Huis politiek niet interessant om geld over te houden dat terugvloeit naar de belastingbetaler. Natuurlijk zijn er zaken die we op Europees niveau moeten aanpakken, zoals terrorisme, het verbeteren van de Europese interne markt en het bewaken van de Europese buitengrenzen. Ik zie echter dat veel geld wordt verspild aan politieke paradepaardjes. Denk hierbij aan gratis treinkaartjes, een Europees museum en zelfs een extra budget voor het verzenden van kerstkaarten.

Er moet anders worden omgegaan met het geld van de belastingbetaler. Ik stel daarom een Europese "zalmnorm" voor: de inkomsten mogen de uitgaven niet langer bepalen. Het Parlement moet eventuele tegenvallers zelf opvangen. Als er meer geld wordt uitgegeven aan de ene kant, zal er ergens anders op moeten worden bezuinigd.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αν μου επιτρέπετε στην αρχή θέλω να κάνω μια έκκληση προς τους εκπροσώπους του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος, για να μην πω ότι θέλω να διατυπώσω μια ένσταση. Έρχονται εδώ κάθε χρόνο και υποστηρίζουν αύξηση των κονδυλίων και, στη συνέχεια, όταν πάνε στις συζητήσεις που ακολουθούν, υποστηρίζουν αυτό με το οποίο διαφωνούν εδώ. Υποστηρίζουν δηλαδή τη μείωση των κονδυλίων. Αυτό γίνεται πάντοτε. Δεν μπορούμε να κάνουμε λαϊκισμό εδώ και να πηγαίνουμε εκεί που θα ληφθούν οι αποφάσεις και να κάνουμε κάτι διαφορετικό από αυτό που στηρίζουμε εδώ. Το δεύτερο, κύριε Oettinger, θέλω μια καθαρή απάντηση στο εξής: αφήσατε ένα υπονοούμενο για την επιχειρούμενη μείωση των κονδυλίων προς την Τουρκία και αναφέρομαι στα κονδύλια που σχετίζονται με την ενταξιακή πορεία. Είπατε συγκεκριμένα «καταλαβαίνω το θέμα των κονδυλίων προς την Τουρκία». Αυτό το «καταλαβαίνω» εμένα με βάζει σε κάποιους προβληματισμούς. Συμφωνείτε ή έχετε μια διαφορετική άποψη; Και δεν αναφέρομαι στα κονδύλια που έχουν να κάνουν με τους πρόσφυγες. Αναφέρομαι στα κονδύλια που έχουν να κάνουν με την ενταξιακή πορεία. Θέλω να ξέρω αν διαφωνείτε τελικά με αυτό ή όχι.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο προϋπολογισμός του 2018 αποτυπώνει πλήρως τις άστοχες πολιτικές προτεραιότητες της Ένωσης, την ισλαμοποίηση και τον αποχριστιανισμό της Ευρώπης, την αύξηση της τρομοκρατίας και της λαθρομετανάστευσης, την ανεξέλεγκτη δράση των ΜΚΟ και, φυσικά, τον έλεγχο και επιτροπεία των αδύναμων οικονομικά κρατών. Δαπανώνται κονδύλια σε χώρες γειτνιάζουσες, αδιάφορες, αν όχι εχθρικές, όπως η Τουρκία, με πρόσχημα την ασφάλεια της Ένωσης, και όχι σε κράτη μέλη που υποφέρουν. Δεν είναι αυτή η Ευρώπη που επιθυμούν οι πολίτες. Μια Ευρώπη που, ενώ όλοι αντιλαμβανόμαστε ότι οδηγείται στην καταστροφή, η πολιτική ελίτ της ασχολείται μόνο με τη διαχειριστική οικονομική τακτοποίηση της Ένωσης και των κρατών μελών. Βασικές αρχές λειτουργίας της Ένωσης καταστρατηγούνται, ενώ σε τομείς όπως η κοινωνική ασφάλιση, οι συντάξεις, τα συστήματα υγείας και η εκπαίδευση, η Ένωση επεμβαίνει καταχρηστικά, αν και απαγορεύεται ρητά από τις Συνθήκες. Οι πολίτες των κρατών μελών δεν θα μείνουν άπραγοι σε αυτό το πολιτικό πραξικόπημα που συντελείται. Ειδικά ο ελληνικός λαός, ο οποίος επί επτά συναπτά χρόνια βιώνει τη δήμευση αλληλεγγύης και την επικουρικότητα των εταιρών μέσω της επιβολής μνημονίων και της ύφεσης.

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – V Evropski uniji se moramo pregristi skozi številne izzive, zato potrebujemo proračun, ki ni brezobzi tiger. Proračun se mora odzivati na izzive, ki izhajajo iz kompleksnega geopolitičnega okolja, še vedno šibkega gospodarstva v Evropski uniji kot tudi podpirati pripravljenost Evropske unije za prihodnost.

Podpiram dodatna sredstva za varnost in za mlade. Boljši varnostni položaj v Uniji nam ne bo kar zastonj padel z neba, ampak je treba dati pristojnim institucijam primerna sredstva za delo. Mladi imajo še zmeraj resne probleme pri zaposlovanju tako na trgu dela kot pri oblikovanju družine in reševanju stanovanjskih problemov. Pomoč mladim, da se osamosvojijo je investicija v našo prihodnost in v prihodnost Evropske unije.

Sem pa proti znižanju sredstev, kot to želi Svet na področju raziskav, inovacij in infrastrukturnih vlaganj. 500 milijonov evrov danes manj za program Horizon 2020 je kot da bi evropske raziskovalce parkirali na odstavnih pasih.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σε αυτόν τον προϋπολογισμό υπάρχουν κονδύλια για τα οποία αξίζουν συγχαρητήρια στους εισηγητές, για παράδειγμα, για την ανάπτυξη, την απασχόληση, την ασφάλεια και τη διαχείριση της μετανάστευσης, και ιδιαίτερα για την ανεργία των νέων, η οποία παραμένει μάλιστα στην Ευρώπη, και προσδοκούμε ότι δεν θα υπάρξουν περικοπές όταν περάσουμε στο επόμενο βήμα της διαπραγματεύσεως. Ωστόσο, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, και απευθύνομαι και εγώ προς την Επιτροπή, με εντυπωσιάζει η επινόηση επιχειρημάτων υπέρ της συνέχισης των κονδυλίων για την Τουρκία και για τον Ερντογάν. Με εντυπωσιάζει το γεγονός ότι, ενώ γνωρίζουμε όλοι μας τη συμπεριφορά του Ερντογάν, συνεχίζουμε να τους ανταμειβουμε. Γνωρίζουμε τη συμπεριφορά της Τουρκίας και εντός, αλλά και στο κράτος μέλος που λέγεται Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, και προς την Ελλάδα. Ερωτώ, λοιπόν: πώς αποφασίζουμε σε ποια κράτη επιβάλλουμε κυρώσεις και ποια κράτη ανταμειβουμε, όπως κάνουμε στην Τουρκία σήμερα;

Milan Zver (PPE). – Hvala lepa, predsedujoči, da ste mi omogočili, da spregovorim na to temo. Jaz sem stalni poročevalec Evropskega parlamenta za Erasmus+ in se počutim dolžnega, da se zahvalim vsem tistim kolegom, ki so podprli povečanja naslednjega proračuna na področju Erasmus+, ki je dejansko zgodba o uspehu, dobro funkcionira. Zadnja tri leta je ta program zelo uspešen, lahko tudi rečemo, da je nekako najboljša naložba v prihodnost Evropske unije.

Vendar na nekaterih podprogramih je še vedno *success rate*, torej uspešnost, relativno nizka, celo 24 odstotkov prijav je ponekod sprejetih in to pomeni, da se več kot tri četrtine prijav zavrne in to seveda ni dobro.

Torej potenciali Erasmus+ so veliko večji, kot je finančna zmogljivost ta hip evropskih inštitucij, zato še enkrat hvala vsem, ki ste podprli povečanje proračuna za Erasmus+.

Ivana Maletić (PPE). – Gospodine predsedniče, pozdravljam povjerenika Oettingera, glavna poruka proračuna za 2018. godinu je da iako su sredstva ograničena želimo jasno pokazati da možemo i želimo odgovoriti na izazove koji su pred Europskom unijom, i to se kroz proračun vidi. Dakle, u prvi plan se stavljaju i sigurnost i stabilnost i izazovi poput nezaposlenosti mladih, borbe protiv siromaštva, potrebe za novim znanjima i vještinama, inovacijama, ulaganjem u srednje i malo poduzetništvo.

Druga poruka je da želimo ubrzati kohezijsku politiku, provedbu projekata, jer su to projekti koji su vidljivi u svakodnevnom životu naših građana i potrebni za jačanje europskog gospodarstva. Treća poruka je da nikako ne želimo smanjiti iznose za Obzor 2020. i instrument za povezivanje Europe, jer su upravo ti programi ključni za osnovnu infrastrukturu, temeljnu za postizanje snažnijeg rasta, a to nam je krajnji cilj.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Günther Oettinger, Mitglied der Kommission. – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben alle Ihre Anliegen und Ihre Schwerpunkte, Prioritäten und was Ihnen wichtig ist und was Sie kritisch sehen, notiert und werden die Position des Parlaments nach Ihrer Abstimmung und Entscheidung morgen dann sehr gründlich auswerten.

Bevor die Konzertierung beginnen wird, werden wir dem Rat und dem Parlament eine detaillierte schriftliche Stellungnahme zuleiten, in der wir aufzeigen, was die Auswirkungen von Änderungsanträgen in beide Richtungen sind.

Ich werde dabei auch dem Thema Heranführungshilfen für die Türkei besondere Beachtung schenken und Ihnen aufzeigen, welche Projekte wir in den letzten Jahren finanziert haben und wie die Ausgangslage für 2018 bei den Heranführungshilfen ist, um mit Ihnen zu besprechen, welcher Handlungsspielraum der Kürzung besteht.

Wir glauben, dass wir mit dieser Stellungnahme die Beratungen erleichtern, und ich bin mir auch entlang der heutigen Debatte sicher: Wir haben eine gute Chance, termingerecht einen neuen Haushalt 2018 zu erhalten.

Märt Kivine, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, thank you for this opportunity to listen to the extremely succinct points made by the committees, the surprisingly balanced views made by the political groups and the extremely rich interventions by the Members.

Highlighting or commenting any of one would do gross injustice to the others, so I will not do that. I will just reiterate the Council's willingness to work really hard with the rapporteurs appointed by Parliament and Commissioner Oettinger to turn this summer of discontent into an autumn of conciliation.

Siegfried Mureșan, raportor. – Domnule președinte, vă mulțumesc. Mulțumesc mult comisarului Oettinger și ministrului Kivine pentru spiritul constructiv al intervențiilor domniilor lor. Aș dori să mulțumesc în mod deosebit și colegilor din Parlament, raportorilor din umbră de la toate grupurile politice, cu care am lucrat foarte bine. Această poziție clară și puternică a Parlamentului nu ar fi fost posibilă fără sprijinul lor. De asemenea, aș dori să mulțumesc raportorilor opiniilor diverselor comisii parlamentare pe care i-am ascultat astăzi.

Poziția Parlamentului este extrem de bine fundamentată. Toate cererile de alocare de mai multe resurse pentru anumite linii bugetare sunt bine fundamentate și, colegii din Parlament știu, mereu m-am gândit de trei ori înainte de a accepta o cerere a bugetului, fiindcă, într-adevăr, prioritatea noastră trebuie să fie de a gestiona cu atenție, cu maximă cumpătare banul public. De aceea, dorim să alocăm banii în exact acele domenii unde cetățenii așteaptă ca Uniunea Europeană să livreze: creștere economică și creare de locuri de muncă, pe de o parte, și siguranța cetățeanului, pe de altă parte. Tocmai pentru a atinge aceste obiective am propus și un pachet de proiecte-pilot și acțiuni pregătitoare care să reflecte voința politică a majorității membrilor Parlamentului European. Vă mulțumesc tuturor. Aștept cu nerăbdare discuțiile, negocierile din conciliere în cadrul următoarelor douăzeci și una de zile.

Richard Ashworth, rapporteur. – Mr President, the annual budget is always a complex process and this 2018 budget, being the last year before Brexit and the last before the set of European elections in 2019, will bring its own unique challenges.

I want to thank colleagues for their comments this afternoon and I have taken on board the views that they have expressed. It serves to remind us what a wide range of spending priorities there are in this Parliament and it serves to remind us of the strength of expectations there are within the committees.

Tomorrow we vote on a mandate. It is a mandate which will take us into the budget negotiations with the Council. I hope that we have a clear mandate because then we, the rapporteurs, will go into negotiations united, we go into the negotiations with a clear set of priorities and we go into the negotiations with the determination to ensure that we deliver value for money, and added value, not just to the Member States but to European citizens.

Paul Rübig (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte nur mitteilen, dass wir für morgen, für den Haushalt über 1 800 Änderungsanträge haben und über 120 *roll call votes*, von denen eine das Haus im Durchschnitt 400 Euro kostet. Ich finde das skandalös. Ich glaube, dass wir eine Abstimmung in diesem Rahmen nicht durchführen sollten. Ich bitte darum, dass man sich das Haushaltsverfahren, wie es derzeit läuft, überlegt. Das ist für die Steuerzahler völlig unakzeptabel.

Președintele. – Mulțumim, vom transmite mai departe propunerea.

Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Votul va avea loc miercuri, 25.10.2017.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – Az Európai Parlament plenáris ülése a héten a 2018. évi uniós költségvetésről szóló álláspontjáról szavaz: az EP jelentősen emelné az uniós forrásokat. Külön öröm számunkra, hogy a Költségvetési Bizottság után várhatóan a plenáris ülés is elfogadja azon javaslatomat, hogy a kohéziós forrásokat 240 millió euróval, az Európai Bizottság 2018-as tervezetének megfelelő szintre kell emelni. Mivel a kormányzati erőfeszítéseknek köszönhetően 2018-ban is rekord összegű fejlesztési forrás érkezik majd hazámba, fontos, hogy elegendő pénz álljon rendelkezésre az uniós költségvetésben. Az Európai Bizottságnak 2018-ban is maradéktalanul ki kell fizetnie a Magyarországnak járó pénzeket. Az Európai Parlament ma szavazott arról az állásfoglalásáról, amely az Európai Bizottság uniós pénzügyek jövőjéről szóló reflexiós anyagához kapcsolódik. A 2020 utáni keretokról szóló parlamenti tárgyalások során is az a legfontosabb feladatunk, hogy minél több uniós fejlesztési forrás érkezzen a magyar gazdaságba és biztosított legyen a hazai agrárium EU támogatása.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE), in writing. – Tomorrow Parliament will vote for the EU budget for 2018 which includes a budget line for EU Strategic Communication and equips the EEAS with adequate staff and tools to face the challenge of disinformation from third states and non-state actors. I hope the Council will listen to this call and will allocate adequate resources.

Pavel Poc (S&D), písemně. – Ministři členských zemí si rádi přivlastňují úspěchy, které dosahují jen na základě evropské spolupráce či na základě činnosti a tlaku, který vyvíjíme my v Evropském parlamentu. Poměrně nepříjemným překvapením pak bývá, že v případě, jako je návrh rozpočtu, pak navrhuji škrtu u programů, které mají právě tu nejvyšší úspěšnost a přidanou hodnotu. Jsou to programy, které Evropanům slíbili a se kterými oni logicky počítají. Jsem rád, že Rozpočtovým výborem prošel návrh, jenž zohledňuje závazky, které jsme učinili, a cíle, které musíme dosáhnout. Příkladem je navýšení prostředků ve vědeckém a výzkumném programu Horizont 2020. Ten je mimo jiné primárním zdrojem financování evropského výzkumu rakoviny. Za sebe bych ještě rád dodal, že nesouhlasím s tím, že Komise předložila návrh rozpočtu, který nezohledňuje výsledky zprávy Účetního dvora. Ačkoliv Unie přislíbila, že do roku 2020 vydá na opatření spojená se změnou klimatu 20 procent svých financí, neustále se pohybujeme pod tímto limitem. Podobný scénář vidíme i v případě ochrany biodiverzity, kde by dle Komise došlo k nárůstu jen ve výši 0,1 procenta. Jsem přesvědčen o tom, že evropský rozpočet by měl proporcionálně promítat problémy, hrozby a rizika, kterým Evropani aktuálně čelí, a vyzývám proto Radu, aby tohle vzala v potaz v průběhu dialogu.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), *na piśmie*. – W obliczu stojących przed Unią wyzwań dyskusję budżetową uznaję za kwestię kluczową w ramach definiowania strategii politycznej UE. Zaznaczam, że zachowując dyscyplinę budżetową, należy wykorzystać niezbędne środki finansowe z budżetu Unii, tak aby sprostać priorytetom politycznym i umożliwić UE wywiązanie się z konkretnych zobowiązań. Kluczowe pozostają dla mnie kwestie wzmocnienia gospodarki, konkurencyjności, zatrudnienia, w szczególności ludzi młodych, oraz bezpieczeństwa.

Nie należy jednak zapominać o edukacji i kulturze bezpośrednio powiązanych ze wzmocnieniem konkurencyjnej gospodarki opartej na wiedzy. Jako członek komisji CULT oraz wieloletni sprawozdawca budżetowy tej komisji ze szczególną mocą pragnę tym samym podkreślić rolę adekwatnego wsparcia dla programów w dziedzinie kultury i edukacji oraz apeluję o przydzielenie wystarczających środków na zobowiązania i płatności dla tych programów, aby zapewnić odpowiednią do stawianych przed nimi celów realizację oraz zaradzić problemowi ich niskich poziomów powodzenia, spowodowanych niedofinansowaniem. Programy te wyraźnie wykazały bowiem swoją europejską wartość dodaną oraz cieszą się niesłabnącą popularnością wśród beneficjentów.

Za kwestię wymagającą priorytetowych działań, nie tylko w ramach tegorocznej procedury budżetowej, ale również w ramach każdej następnej, uznaję przeciwdziałanie wystąpieniu kolejnego kryzysu w zakresie płatności. Przypominam zatem, że każdemu podwyższeniu poziomu środków na zobowiązania powinno towarzyszyć odpowiadające temu zwiększenie środków na terminowe płatności.

14. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll

15. Entlastung 2015: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Europäischer Rat und Rat (Aussprache)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul lui Bart Staes, în numele Comisiei pentru bugete, referitor la descărcarea de gestiune pentru execuția bugetului general al Uniunii Europene aferent exercițiului financiar 2015, secțiunea II – Consiliul European și Consiliul (COM(2016)0475 - C8-0271/2016 - 2016/2153(DEC)) (A8-0291/2017).

Bart Staes, Rapporteur. – Voorzitter, meneer de Raadsvoorzitter, beste collega's, voor het zevende jaar op rij kan ik helaas jullie niet aanbevelen kwijting te verlenen aan de Raad. Kwijting verlenen, beste collega's, dat is niet iets abstracts. Dat is het eindresultaat van een grondige oefening, een oefening in toezicht en controle door het Parlement op hoe het geld van de Europese begroting, en dus van de Europese burger en belastingbetaler is besteed over het voorbije jaar. Werden de juiste procedures gevolgd? Kan gestaafd worden hoeveel geld waar werd ingezet? En bovendien, zorgden de ingezette middelen ervoor dat de burger waar voor zijn geld kreeg? Het uitgangspunt van elke goede en degelijke kwijting moet zijn dat iedereen die geld uit de Europese begroting uitgeeft, op een transparante wijze moet worden gecontroleerd ten aanzien van de manier waarop dat gebeurde en ook of dat op een verantwoorde manier gebeurde.

Overeenkomstig de Verdragen van de Europese Unie is het Europees Parlement verantwoordelijk voor deze oefening. De Raad doet in dezen een aanbeveling aan het Europees Parlement. Helaas weigert het Europees Parlement nu al sinds 2011 aan de Raad kwijting te verlenen en dit op basis van het feit dat er een machtsstrijd gaande is tussen het Parlement en de Raad, en ook op basis van het feit dat het Parlement de gewoonte heeft om alle instellingen waaraan het kwijting moet verlenen, vragen te stellen, zowel schriftelijk als mondeling.

De Raad stelt zich op een zuiver legalistisch standpunt en is van mening dat het Europees Parlement eigenlijk alleen maar kwijting moet verlenen aan de Commissie. Dat strookt niet met de praktijk. Het Parlement stelt vragen aan de Commissie, stelt vragen aan de secretaris-generaal van het Europees Parlement, stelt vragen aan het Economisch en Sociaal Comité, aan het Comité van de Regio's, aan alle agentschappen. De Raad daarentegen weigert onze vragen te beantwoorden. De Raad weigert dus de dialoog.

Het moet gezegd – ik geef het toe: er is vooruitgang. De Raad presenteert steeds meer en meer informatie op zijn website waardoor we beetje bij beetje te weten komen wat er met de begroting van de Raad, de Raad van Ministers en de Europese Raad gebeurt. Toch bleven tot vorig jaar de verhoudingen tussen het Parlement en de Raad van Ministers bijzonder gespannen. Laat ons wel wezen: alleen dialoog leidt uiteindelijk tot een oplossing.

Bij de aanvang van mijn mandaat als rapporteur ontmoette ik dan ook de secretaris-generaal van de Raad. Mevrouw Gräßle, voorzitter van de Commissie begrotingscontrole, deed hetzelfde. Wij wilden te weten komen wat de contouren zijn om tot een *modus vivendi* te komen, om de verhoudingen tussen Parlement en Raad te verbeteren als het gaat over het verlenen van kwijting.

Na lange en uitgebreide gesprekken met mijn schaduwrapporteurs, in nauw overleg met de voorzitter van de Commissie begrotingscontrole en in nauw overleg met de coördinatoren van alle fracties in de Commissie begrotingscontrole, zijn we tot een akkoord gekomen. Dat akkoord werd vorige donderdag voorgelegd aan de Conferentie van Voorzitters en sindsdien hebben wij als Commissie begrotingscontrole een mandaat om in onderhandeling te treden met de Raad van Ministers, ikzelf als rapporteur, mevrouw Gräßle als voorzitter van de Commissie begrotingscontrole en in aanwezigheid van Klaus Welle, secretaris-generaal van het Europees Parlement.

Wat zijn die contouren? Wat is dat mandaat?

1. Raad en Europees Parlement spelen een verschillende rol in de kwijting. Het Europees Parlement verleent kwijting. De Raad geeft een advies, geeft een aanbeveling aan het Europees Parlement over de kwijting.

2. De erkenning dat de Raad en het Europees Parlement dit moeten doen op basis van correcte feiten en correcte informatie.

3. We vragen de Raad toe te zeggen dat ze antwoorden op de schriftelijke en mondelinge vragen die het Europees Parlement hen stelt. In ruil zeggen wij als Europees Parlement: als jullie, Raad, vragen hebben voor het Europees Parlement, dan zijn wij bereid die vragen te beantwoorden in een vorm van goede wederkerigheid.

Het resultaat van dit mandaat en van de onderhandelingen zou moeten zijn dat de spanning tussen Parlement en Raad wordt opgelost en dat we in een open en transparante manier met elkaar kunnen omgaan, zodat de burger ook te weten komt tijdens de kwijtingsoefening hoe er omgegaan wordt met de 540 miljoen euro die de Raad jaarlijks spendeert.

Ik hoop, meneer de Raadsvoorzitter, dat ons aanbod een aanbod zal zijn waarbij we tot dialoog kunnen komen, waarbij we eindelijk ons conflict kunnen oplossen en een kwijting tussen Raad en Parlement op een behoorlijke manier kunnen oplossen.

Märt Kivine, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, as a Council President I have the somewhat ambiguous pleasure of standing in front of you and speaking on the matter. However, I will try to be as to-the-point as I can and, taking it from where the honourable rapporteur ended, from the Council's position we also see a faint glimmering, a sparkle of hope, in moving things towards improvement.

Going through my formal statement, it is my duty as President of the Council to identify the two aspects of this reiterative annual process: both going through the same procedure as every year, but also now seeing some potential for movement.

The Council's position, however, stands. It says that the Council has always scrupulously respected Article 319 of the Treaty according to which the European Parliament, acting on a recommendation from the Council, gives a single discharge to the Commission. As you know, over recent years the Council has considerably improved access to relevant information about the activities, the governance and the financial management of the institution. This is, by the way, recognised in the text of the resolution you will be voting on.

As in previous years, the European Court of Auditors did not detect any serious weaknesses in respect of the issues examined for the Council.

In 2011, the Council transmitted to Parliament the draft memorandum of understanding in order to organise better the cooperation between our two institutions during the discharge procedure. The Council has always been open to discuss concrete issues and concrete drafting. I understand today that the Conference of Presidents has recently agreed on a mandate in this regard and we think this could be a new momentum. I hope that our institutions will have the opportunity to discuss this soon.

Marian-Jean Marinescu, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule Președinte, am ascultat cu atenție răspunsul președinției. Eu cred că trebuie făcute mult mai multe eforturi în a ajunge la un acord între Parlament și Consiliu, un acord cumva artificial pentru că, până la urmă, tratatul spune foarte clar: trebuie să ne ocupăm de acest *discharge* și pentru Consiliu.

Cred că anul acesta Parlamentul a făcut eforturi mari. Am avut un grup de lucru și, cu ajutorul raportorului și al celorlalți raportori ai grupurilor politice, am reușit să ajungem la o propunere, cred eu, decentă și normală – repet încă o dată, în conformitate cu ceea ce spune tratatul – și care va da posibilitatea să se arate clar publicului ce se întâmplă cu banii publici care sunt repartizați Consiliului.

Restul cred că sunt lucruri care nu trebuie să se întâmple între două instituții care, de fapt, sunt responsabile pentru acordarea descărcării bugetare, conform tratatului, și cred că trebuie să trecem peste acest lucru. Așa cum am mai spus de mai multe ori în plen, în alți ani, cu ocazia descărcării bugetare, de atâta timp nu se acordă descărcarea bugetară Consiliului, nimic nu se întâmplă, până la urmă această procedură intră în derizoriu pentru că de ce am face la alte instituții descărcare dacă tot nu se întâmplă nimic cu neacordarea descărcării bugetare pentru Consiliu. Deci, cred eu că trebuie să fim până la urmă două instituții serioase, care trebuie să îndeplinim prevederile tratatului.

Inés Ayala Sender, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, sí, este año 2017, el Tribunal de Cuentas nos ha ofrecido la posibilidad de una DAS por fin no negativa. En cambio, en el caso del Consejo, y a pesar de los esfuerzos que les reconozco al señor Staes y a la señora Gräßle, va a ser el octavo año en el que denegamos y no pasa nada.

Sin embargo, como somos optimistas, creemos que en este momento hay pequeños pasos, pero que son significativos. Como se ha dicho, hay un nuevo secretario general con mandato hasta el 2020, el señor Tranholm-Mikkelsen, en el Consejo, que ya en 2012 hizo los mayores esfuerzos a la cabeza de la Presidencia danesa en el caso de la aprobación de la gestión de 2010.

Hay un mandato también de la Conferencia de Presidentes a un grupo de trabajo parlamentario —de este Parlamento— que debe ser capaz de reconstruir la confianza y la cooperación entre instituciones, tan fundamentales en aras de mayor transparencia. Y hay algunos movimientos de acercamiento que se han conseguido como parte de los informes anuales de actividades de partes del Consejo —direcciones generales—.

Son pequeños pasos, es verdad, pero son necesarios para rehacer la confianza y quién sabe si algún día, al final, en el Acuerdo interinstitucional tendremos unas directrices claras para esta aprobación de la gestión.

Ryszard Czarnecki, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, I feel like I am experiencing déjà vu during today's debate. The lack of cooperation from the Council, and the difficulties repeatedly encountered in the discharge procedure that we have because of that fact, keep on going. First, the Council continues to be silent in relation to the remarks made by us in our discharge resolution from April, reiterated from previous years. Then, neither have the budget of the European Council and the budget of Council been separated, nor has the Council joined the Union transparency register. The Council's whistle-blowing rules continue to be publicly unavailable and the detailed anticorruption guidelines do not exist.

Regarding building policy, the information provided on the Council's website does not include details about the cost incurred in relation to the Council's buildings, and that is unacceptable. We know, of course, that there is a critical exchange of information on buildings policy between the building departments of Parliament and the Council, but the exchange should definitely become regular and detailed information should be given to Parliament in the Council's Annual Financial Report. Here, I would like to recall once more that we need progress reports on building projects with a breakdown of the costs incurred to date, together with information on the costs related to the delayed completion of the Europa building.

Hannu Takkula, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, to my great regret we are again forced to refuse regarding the granting of discharge to the European Council and the Council because of the lack of information and communication. This ongoing disagreement about the legal competence to provide the discharge is an unfortunate situation which remains unsolved. I am pleased to note that there has actually been some discussion between Parliament and the Council on the matter, but I still find it an insufficient basis for granting discharge.

When it comes to discharge procedures regarding the Commission and other European institutions, we have a certain set of rules that must be followed and there shall be no exceptions or privilege for any institutions. Transparent governance when using European taxpayers' money is a fundamental right and the current unsolved situation severely undermines this right. We should be able to guarantee that all of the European Union institutions use EU citizens' money transparently. As for Parliament, it is currently unable to scrutinise how the Council budget is spent. The situation allows unfortunate grounds for questions on the use of the budget.

Discharge is not a voluntary procedure but an official procedure to make sure that the EU budget is used in the way it is meant to be used. I hope that the dialogue between Parliament and the Council will continue and that this issue can be solved in a way such that in the future there is a possibility to grant discharge to all European institutions.

Jonathan Bullock, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I am in the unusual position for a UKIP MEP to be in favour of this proposal; the proposal being to refuse to grant a discharge to the EU Council. Every year, the Parliament looks through the books of each of the EU institutions and agencies to approve them, and every year, these bodies comply with the process, with the exception of the Council. Why does the Council not comply?

The EU Treaties may say that the Parliament only grants discharge to the Commission, but I think there is a moral obligation to comply with what is essentially a transparency process. When you look at why the Council may not want to go along with this, you see that just last week, on the day that Brexit negotiations continued, the Council put out a public tender for 4000 bottles of champagne.

Well, Mr President, perhaps we in Britain could have our share of that; I think it works out at about 500 bottles by our budget contribution to celebrate Brexit. We would even settle for 148 bottles, if we divided equally between the countries. That would be enough to celebrate Brexit! But seriously, when half of Europe is in some form of crisis and with austerity biting, you are ordering four thousand bottles of champagne.

This needs to be stopped; this needs to be audited, this needs to be looked at by the Parliament, and we must have this transparency over the budget and use of taxpayers' money in this Council.

President. – Probably 3 900 would have been more appropriate.

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, Herr Ratspräsident! Ich möchte mich an Sie wenden, Herr Ratspräsident. Wir freuen uns, dass Sie hier sind: Herzlich willkommen. Wir haben hier schon Ratsentlastungen debattiert, und die Ratspräsidentenschaft war nicht da. Ich möchte es Ihnen ganz hoch anrechnen, dass Sie gekommen sind.

Ich möchte Sie bitten, im Rat Einfluss zu nehmen, so dass wir wirklich endlich zu einer Lösung kommen können, denn der Rat macht es sich ein bisschen einfach. Sie haben nach dem Vertrag die Verpflichtung, uns eine Entscheidung zur Entlastung vorzuschlagen. Wir bitten Sie doch darum, dass Sie die ganze Arbeit machen und nicht immer nur die halbe Arbeit.

Wir werfen Ihnen seit Jahren Arbeitsverweigerung vor. Sie machen keinen Entlastungsvorschlag für die anderen Institutionen. Sie machen keinen Entlastungsvorschlag fürs Parlament. Die Gegenseitigkeit, die Sie im *memorandum of understanding* einfordern, Sie hätten sie längst, würden Sie Ihre Möglichkeiten nach dem Vertrag wahrnehmen und niemand könnte Sie daran hindern. Niemand. Niemand würde Sie im Übrigen auch daran hindern.

Den Vorschlag der einen Entlastung, dieser Vorschlag bildet einen Vertragsstand von vor 60 Jahren. Die Bestimmung der Entlastung wurde niemals upgedated und das ist ein Versäumnis aller Arbeitsgruppen, die sich bis jetzt um den Vertrag gekümmert haben. Sie fordern uns eigentlich auf, die Kommission nicht mehr zu entlasten, wenn wir Sie nicht entlasten wollen. Ich meine, Herr Kommissar, das machen wir mal, dann werden wir sehen, was in diesem Europa los ist!

Das heißt, ich möchte Sie doch bitten, ernsthaft daran teilzunehmen. Wir haben ein Mandat des Hauses, und wir sind dazu gewillt. Wir kennen die Zwänge des Rates, aber wir möchten auch darum bitten, ernstgenommen zu werden. Nehmen Sie uns doch auch ernst. Die Sache mit den Champagnerflaschen, die ich gar nicht so sehr mein Problem. Das möchte ich gar nicht wissen. Es gibt wahrscheinlich wenig langweiligere Haushalte als den Haushalt des Rates.

Aber es ist eine grundsätzliche Frage für uns, und die grundsätzliche Frage kann auch nur lauten, dass doch bitte Beamte nicht über Parlamentarier befinden dürfen. Das ist ein Unding. Mit einem solchen Vorschlag würde kein Ratsbeamter in seinem Mitgliedstaat seinem nationalen Parlament gegenüberreten. Aber hier werden solche absurden Forderungen gestellt, denn mit uns kann man es ja machen.

Wenn wir bereit sind, wirklich ernsthaft eine Lösung voranzubringen, bin ich mir sicher, dass wir auch eine Lösung bekommen werden. Deswegen mein Appell an Sie.

Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D). – Domnule președinte, în Parlamentul European și, în general, în instituțiile europene, ne-am plăns foarte des că cetățenii europeni nu știu ce facem noi în Parlamentul European. Astăzi am sentimentul că e foarte bine că nu știu ce facem în Parlamentul European, pentru că, dacă ar ști că noi, în Parlamentul European, avem astfel de discuții despre cum o instituție europeană este în conflict cu altă instituție europeană doar pe un subiect atât de minor, dar sensibil în același timp – Consiliul nu dorește să ne lase să aflăm cum sunt cheltuiți banii publici, banii europeni, Consiliul este împotriva transparenței – atunci credeți-mă că și mai puțini cetățeni europeni ar avea încredere în instituțiile europene, și mai puțini cetățenii europeni s-ar prezenta la vot. Eu cred că avem o problemă mult mai gravă decât aceea a unei descărcări bugetare. Este o problemă de democrație, este o problemă de transparență, este o problemă de respectare a tratatelor Uniunii Europene, ceea ce este mult mai grav.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Συμβούλιο και το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο θεωρεί ότι είναι κράτος εν κράτει, ότι μπορεί να κάνει ό,τι θέλει, ότι δεν ελέγχεται καθόλου, ενώ είναι δεδομένο ότι τα άρθρα 316, 317 και 319 της Συνθήκης για τη λειτουργία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δίνουν το δικαίωμα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να χορηγεί απαλλαγή για κάθε τμήμα του προϋπολογισμού. Και αυτό σημαίνει ότι χορηγεί απαλλαγή και για τις δραστηριότητες του Συμβουλίου και του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου. Αλλά όταν το Συμβούλιο δεν έρχεται, δεν συζητά, δεν δίνει πληροφορίες, είναι προφανές ότι «γράφει στα παλιά του τα παπούτσια» τα δικαιώματα που έχει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Φέτος βλέπουμε μια μικρή διαφοροποίηση: τουλάχιστον είναι εδώ το Συμβούλιο. Πέρυσι δεν είχε έρθει καν. Θέλουμε όμως να υπάρχουν συγκεκριμένες ενέργειες και αρμοδιότητες και ταυτόχρονα επιμένουμε ότι θέλουμε συγκεκριμένη πληροφόρηση. Δεν μπορεί να δοθεί απαλλαγή στις δραστηριότητες του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου και του ίδιου του Συμβουλίου. Ταυτόχρονα, πρέπει να ελέγξουμε και τη δράση του Eurogroup, το οποίο χρησιμοποιεί τις εγκαταστάσεις του Συμβουλίου, χρησιμοποιεί τη διερμηνεία. Ένα όργανο που δεν ελέγχεται από κανέναν, το Eurogroup, το οποίο λαμβάνει αποφάσεις εις βάρος των ευρωπαϊκών λαών.

Miroslav Poche (S&D). – Pane předsedající, my už jsme si pomalu zvykli na to, že zpravodaj, který ve Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu dostane za úkol zpracovat účetní závěrku Rady, nás posléze informuje, že opět nebude možné uzavřít účetnictví z důvodu nedostatečné spolupráce ze strany Rady.

A mě to každý rok udivuje. Jak je možné, že orgán, jehož existence je s tou naší tak úzce provázána, není ochoten respektovat základní kompetence, které Evropský parlament má? Jak bychom reagovali, kdyby se takto chovala jakákoliv jiná instituce? Já vítám a silně podporuji, že se minulý týden Konference předsedů rozhodla pověřit Výbor pro rozpočtovou kontrolu vyjednáváním dohody s Radou o formě spolupráce při přípravě následující účetní závěrky.

Pokud hovoříme o dohodě, nesmí to být synonymum pro ústupek ze strany Evropského parlamentu, co se týká rozsahu a hloubky poskytovaných informací. Pro Radu platí povinnost transparentního hospodaření s veřejnými zdroji, stejně jako to platí pro všechny ostatní evropské instituce. Evropský parlament proto musí trvat na svých požadavcích. Je to jak naše privilegium, tak naše povinnost a naše odpovědnost vůči veřejnosti. Stejně tak bych uvítal, kdyby jednání zahrnovala i zapojení Rady do transparentního rejstříku.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Mr President, thank you for giving me this opportunity. Sorry for being late. Dear Council, here we are again. I regret to have to give the same speech pretty much year after year. I will try to be a little bit more civilised this year than I have been on some occasions.

But the truth is that we have been refusing to grant the discharge to the Council for seven years in a row now, and whatever the reasons and the logic behind this, the fact of the matter remains that the taxpayers in the European Union deserve to have a transparent and open system. And they really deserve to have an end put to this farce of democracy, I have to say.

So I would like to join the words of Madam Grässle, auf Deutsch, bitte, in English, please, in Finnish, olkaa niin hyviä ja katsokaa tätä asiaa kansalaisten näkökulmasta.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Märt Kivine, neuvoston puheenjohtaja. – Voin vain luvata, että vien tämän viestin kollegoilleni neuvostoon. Se on ainoa asia, jonka täällä hetkellä voin ehdottomasti luvata.

In addition to that strange language, I wish to it make it very clear and to reiterate that at this current point the Council stands behind its interpretation of Article 319.

Bart Staes, Rapporteur. – Voorzitter, heel kort. Ik denk dat het een vruchtbaar debat was. De Raad heeft duidelijk gezien dat er eendracht is in dit Europees Parlement. Wij willen vooruit. We hebben een mandaat. Ik denk dat we genereus zijn in wat we zullen aanbieden. Ik hoor dat de Raad tot een dialoog wil overgaan. Ik hoop dat dit leidt tot een akkoord, zodat mijn opvolger die de kwijting zal moeten behandelen over het voorbije jaar, erin zal slagen om het Parlement wél een gunstige aanbeveling te doen. Ik hoop écht dat dialoog leidt tot een oplossing van dit conflict dat, zoals meneer Sarvamaa zei, geen “klucht” mag blijven.

Președinte. – Dezbaterăa a fost încheiată.

Votul va avea loc miercuri, 25 octombrie 2017.

16. Schutz von Journalisten und Verteidigung der Medienfreiheit in Malta: der Fall Daphne Caruana Galizia (Aussprache)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterăa privind Declarațiile Comisiei și Consiliului referitoare la protejarea jurnaliștilor și apărarea libertății mass-mediei în Malta: cazul lui Daphne Caruana Galizia (2017/2896(RSP)).

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, today's debate has been triggered by the horrific assassination of Ms Daphne Caruana Galizia.

First of all, I wish to express my sincere condolences to her family, friends and colleagues. The circumstances of the death of Ms Caruana Galizia have rendered us speechless, but this debate shows that we shall not remain silent. We strongly condemn this barbaric crime. The perpetrators must be brought to justice. The mission of journalists requires personal devotion and courage, and those who have these qualities deserve our deepest respect and protection.

Media freedom is an indispensable pillar of our democratic societies. Journalists are the guardians of properly functioning democracies. Where there is no freedom of speech and people have to fear for their life every time they criticise something, there is no democracy. For this reason freedom of expression, media freedom and pluralism are guaranteed in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. They are among the core basic democratic values on which the European Union is founded. These freedoms are an obligation for our governments. It is an absolute priority for all democracies to protect journalists also from financial or political pressure. The importance of media pluralism as a prerequisite of the rule of law and democracy was underlined by the Council in its annual rule of law dialogue last week.

Let me be clear: attacks on media representatives to silence their voices are unacceptable everywhere in the world. If they occur, we have to act immediately: condemn the crime, find and punish the perpetrators and re-establish the confidence of our citizens in the functioning of our democratic institutions. I am convinced that we are all aware of the responsibility of our governments for the protection of journalists and the defence of media freedom.

We commend and trust in the Maltese authorities in ensuring that justice is delivered. As the Presidency, we would like to join other Member States, which offered help to the Maltese authorities in the investigation of this appalling crime. We owe this to the memory of Ms Caruana Galizia and to all journalists serving our societies.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, a renowned and brave journalist died in the most brutal and shocking manner in Malta last week.

A wife, a mother, a mother-in-law, a friend, a neighbour, a colleague. Daphne Caruana Galizia appears to have been killed because someone wanted to stop her from reporting. And it happened right here, in the European Union!

Let me first express my deepest condolences to her family and loved ones. Your loss, I cannot imagine. I did not have the privilege to know Daphne personally but a few things stand out – her courage and doggedness in the pursuit of the truth, her readiness to ask the questions that really matter about politicians of all colours.

The very heart of democracy is that those who the people choose to lead them are also accountable to them. Journalists such as Daphne represent us all when they ask the difficult questions and when they keep digging even if it becomes uncomfortable and dangerous to find the truth.

When I attended the spontaneous vigil last Wednesday in Brussels, when I stood here in silence with you earlier today in the presence of Daphne's family, to whom I have had the chance to express my condolences in person this morning, my deep concerns about what this tragic event represents in terms of our democratic values were dwarfed by the immediate human tragedy: the three sons and a daughter-in-law suddenly and violently losing a mother, and a husband prematurely and painfully losing his beloved wife.

At the European Council last week and again this morning, President Tajani made a strong call for a detailed in-depth international investigation. On behalf of President Juncker and all my colleagues in the College, I can say that the Commission very much agrees that ensuring an independent and thorough investigation of the facts and bringing those responsible to justice must be the top priority for now.

Prime Minister Muscat gave such an assurance to his fellow leaders on Thursday and the eyes of Europe and the world are now on Malta to ensure this is the case. I welcome the fact that the Maltese authorities have engaged with their counterparts in Europe and beyond, including forensics experts from the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, and wherever useful, Europol and Eurojust are there to help.

We know that good journalism can be a dangerous job. Last year 72 journalists were killed worldwide and more than 50 others have died so far this year. But the targeted and brutal manner of Daphne's killing and the fact that it happened here on the soil of one of our Member States profoundly shocks. Even here in Europe, too many journalists are threatened every day. The campaign 'Mapping Media Freedom' has already reported more than 300 alerts of threats to journalistic freedom in the EU since the beginning of the year and more than 3 000 since the beginning of the project.

I pay tribute to all those who have stood up and asked the tough questions. Since – and I say this as a politician and democrat among politicians and democrats – since professional journalism is a necessary job because it ensures that all of us who are entrusted with certain responsibilities are also scrutinised for how we exercise them, that perhaps matters now more than ever, as we find ourselves in an era where anyone can publish their views online, where facts and fiction are sometimes mixed, where false information is repeated ever louder.

I have said before in this House that everyone is entitled to her or his own opinions, but no one is entitled to their own facts. That is what journalists do. They are the human face of stubborn facts. That is their job, their mission. A free media is the watchdog in our democracies.

Healthy democracy requires a free and pluralistic media, free from state intervention and from undue political or commercial pressures. Ed Murrow put it well when he said that every healthy democracy needs a good dose of itching pills, and as President Juncker said last week, the right of a journalist to investigate, to ask uncomfortable questions and report effectively is at the heart of our values and needs to be guaranteed at all times.

Under the Treaties, the Commission has limited powers in this area. We can, however, encourage and guide, which is why last year we chose to devote our annual colloquium on fundamental rights to the theme of media pluralism and democracy. Three quarters of respondents to the public consultation covering all our Member States in preparation for the colloquium said that they were aware of or have experienced limitations on journalistic activities by state measures, and more than two thirds of respondents said they have experienced or are aware of censorship and self-censorship. Such findings are very worrying. If journalists have to fear for their lives just for doing their job, they cannot operate with a level of freedom and independence that is essential for the media in any democracy, in any rule-of-law based society.

Media freedom and pluralism are fundamental rights enshrined in Article 11 of the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights and constitute essential foundations of our democratic societies. It is the duty of the Maltese state to investigate and prosecute this case in accordance with its constitution, its legal order and international human rights obligations. The Maltese authorities and institutions must deliver on their commitment to do everything in their power to ensure that the perpetrators will be brought to justice.

Malta needs to show to Europe and the world that its rules and regulations are healthy and robust. This is why it is important that the Maltese Government has indicated that the investigation and prosecution should be allowed to run their full course, that if problems of a more general or systemic nature are brought to light, they should also be addressed, regardless of the consequences.

Today's debate proves once more that the eyes of Europe stay firmly fixed on Malta, because the murder of a brave journalist such as Daphne is a direct concern for us all. We will, it is our duty, continue to stand up for our shared values. Why? Well, for the sake of Daphne, her loved ones and everything she stood for, for the sake of the European Union and everything it stands for.

Esteban González Pons, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente. Esta mañana me he reunido con el viudo y los hijos de Daphne Caruana y luego he llorado. Ojalá todos los grupos hayan tenido oportunidad de escucharles. Daphne Caruana dedicó toda su vida al periodismo; alzó la voz donde otros no se atreven; se enfrentó a gobiernos, políticos, empresas y mafias, sin importar cuántos fueran ni cómo de poderosos. Como dijo uno de sus hijos, se interpuso entre el Estado de Derecho y aquellos que querían violarlo, y por eso la asesinaron. Murió con más de 42 procesos judiciales abiertos y sin tener siquiera acceso a sus cuentas bancarias. Acosada. Antes de asesinarla le hicieron la vida imposible a ella y a su familia; de alguna manera, empezaron a matarla cuando aún estaba viva.

No han matado a gobernantes, no han matado a jueces, no han matado a policías. Han matado a una periodista. Y cuando en un Estado los gobernantes, los jueces y los policías viven felices mientras mueren asesinados los periodistas, quiere decir que la democracia está fracasando.

La desaparición de Daphne Caruana es mucho más que el trágico asesinato de una periodista incómoda. Es un mensaje. Es una llamada al silencio. Es una amenaza directa a todos los que, como ella, ejercen con libertad e independencia el periodismo. Es un ataque a la libertad de expresión. No puede haber verdadera democracia sin prensa libre.

A Daphne le fallamos. Le falló la Unión Europea, de la que no le sirvió ser ciudadana en suelo europeo. Nada ni nadie la protegió lo suficiente, en especial las autoridades y el Gobierno de Malta, que deberían haber garantizado su seguridad y la de su familia. No lo hicieron. Tristemente, el asesinato de Caruana no es un caso aislado, como no lo son las cartas que están recibiendo algunos medios de comunicación en Malta amenazando con litigios millonarios por daños. Eso también es una coacción.

Asesinatos en México, asesinatos en la India, detenciones en masa en Turquía de periodistas; hasta en los Estados Unidos el presidente se permite cuestionar el patriotismo de algunos periodistas.

Nuestro problema es que Malta está en el corazón de la Unión Europea y nos demuestra que nosotros, nosotros, no estamos libres de esta amenaza global contra el periodismo. El asesinato de Daphne Caruana es una sombra que cae sobre nuestra conciencia de orgullosos europeos.

La Unión Europea no puede por tanto callar por más tiempo ante lo que está sucediendo en Malta. Nuestro silencio es la victoria de los asesinos de Daphne y la derrota de las instituciones democráticas. Por eso mi Grupo ha pedido a la Comisión Europea que garantice una investigación judicial plenamente independiente. Queremos saber quién lo hizo. Queremos saber por qué lo hizo. Y queremos saber quién le protege y que todos ellos vayan a la cárcel.

E invito a la Comisión a que investigue urgentemente la situación del Estado de Derecho en Malta. Como Daphne nos recordó en sus últimas palabras, la situación es desesperada. Todos, la Comisión también, debemos preguntarnos si hicimos lo suficiente.

Señorías, ayer mismo, otra periodista fue apuñalada en una emisora de radio en Rusia. Los periodistas rusos dicen al mundo: nadie nos defiende. Bien, nosotros no defendimos a Daphne, y por eso a sus hijos y con el corazón en la mano en esta sala, les pido perdón y les digo: ¡ojalá pudiera asegurar que nunca más volverá a ocurrir, que su madre será la última! Pero no puedo.

Tenemos que luchar por la libertad de expresión todos los minutos, todas las horas, todos los días y en todos los países del mundo, sabiendo que la lucha será a muerte y que nunca terminará. Sin buen periodismo ni buenos periodistas ninguna democracia está completa. Por eso, a la democracia europea ya siempre le faltará Daphne. Su lucha no termina nunca.

Gianni Pittella, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'uccisione di Daphne Caruana Galizia è un attacco alla democrazia europea. Ha detto bene Frans Timmermans: uccidere una giornalista per il suo lavoro vuol dire attaccare la libertà di informazione e di pensiero, che è un valore fondamentale dell'Unione europea. Chiunque abbia ordinato ed eseguito quest'attentato è un nemico dell'Europa. Dobbiamo prendere i responsabili il prima possibile: l'Europa e gli Stati membri mettano a disposizione degli inquirenti maltesi i migliori investigatori, lo hanno chiesto il primo ministro e il governo maltese.

Ma oltre alle verità giudiziarie c'è una risposta politica che interpella tutti noi. Quando, una settimana fa, ho visto le scene dell'attentato ho subito pensato al mio paese, all'Italia, alle bombe della mafia che uccisero i giudici Falcone e Borsellino. Quelle bombe segnarono un punto di svolta nella lotta contro la mafia siciliana e lo Stato italiano vinse la sua battaglia perché si dimostrò spietato e unito. Oggi c'è bisogno di essere uniti, tra di noi. Tutti coloro che amano la libertà di pensiero e la democrazia siano uniti in questa lotta.

E non è vero che il Parlamento europeo è stato silente su questi temi. Il Parlamento europeo ha istituito un anno fa una commissione d'inchiesta sui *Panama leaks*, che nel corso dei suoi lavori aveva incontrato Daphne. La scorsa settimana sono state approvate le prime conclusioni dell'inchiesta: battaglia contro la mafia internazionale, lotta contro il riciclaggio per stanare i flussi illegali (siamo uniti su questo!), *black list* dei paradisi fiscali e sanzioni per chi è complice di questi. Sono queste le cose che la commissione speciale ha chiesto e che l'Europa deve fare ora.

Dobbiamo difendere meglio la libertà di chi fa informazione, io condivido questo imperativo e questa preoccupazione. Il giornalismo, soprattutto quello di inchiesta, sarà sempre scomodo, deve essere scomodo, perché è contropotere e senza quel contropotere la democrazia e lo Stato di diritto sono più deboli. Abbiamo bisogno di poteri e contropoteri, questa è la democrazia.

Bisogna quindi creare le condizioni perché i giornalisti lavorino in tutta Europa e nel mondo – e nel mondo! Anche i giornalisti russi, ovunque – in condizioni di sicurezza, perché le loro fonti siano protette. Giusto stamattina abbiamo votato una risoluzione in cui chiediamo alla Commissione europea di presentare una proposta sugli informatori, sulla protezione degli informatori, che sono una fonte importante per scoprire i colpevoli.

Andiamo avanti su questa strada, e anch'io voglio salutare e dare il pensiero del mio gruppo politico, e anche mio personale, ai familiari di Daphne e ribadire che è un dovere morale, prima che politico, fare in modo che questa perdita così dolorosa e così efferata nel suo svolgimento non sia vana.

Monica Macovei, în numele grupului ECR. – Un WikiLeaks într-o singură femeie: Daphne Caruana Galizia. A murit în cruciada împotriva corupției din Malta. Daphne a scris în aprilie că soția primului-ministru maltez are un cont deschis în Panama în care depunea și banii primiți ca mită din Azerbaidjan. Acum o săptămână, Daphne a fost aruncată în aer cu tot cu mașină. Nu înțeleg de ce noi cerem guvernului maltez să investigheze. Cine să investigheze? Primul-ministru? Când Daphne a fost omorâtă pentru că scria împotriva primului-ministru? Hai să nu mai glumim. În primul rând, acest prim-ministru și tot guvernul trebuie să-și dea demisia.

La înmormântarea ei, fiul a spus: „Mama a fost ucisă pentru că a ales să stea între statul de drept și cei care încercau să-l atace. A devenit o țintă și pentru că era singura care mai făcea asta.” Asta se întâmplă atunci când instituțiile statului sunt incapabile. Ultima persoană rămasă în picioare este, adeseori, un jurnalist. Ceea ce-l face să fie prima persoană care moare.

Mafia nu s-a oprit niciodată. Avem guverne care astăzi sunt grupuri de crimă organizată și transmit mesajul: cine mai vorbește și scrie despre banii noștri ascunși, corupția și fraudă noastră, așa va păți. S-au construit în timp imperii ale corupției, apărute de ziduri de fier. Singura soluție este să pornim acum operațiunea cu mâinile curate, condusă de guvernele care vor și care trebuie să se alieze cu jurnaliștii liberi și cu oamenii cinstiți și să înfrângă guvernele care nu vor.

Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to pay tribute to Daphne Caruana Galizia. Her name has been mentioned several times here today and I would also like to give my condolences to her family. I met her sons this afternoon and I was really impressed by their wisdom and their strength, but if you read about her life, that's not surprising. She was an exceptionally courageous and strong woman, and I think that we have to show the same courage, because I think we are all united today in shock, in grief and in our wish to uphold freedom of the media, freedom of expression. But we also have to act.

The first one to act, obviously, is the Maltese Government: they will have to investigate her murder and make sure that the murderers do not get away with impunity. But also those who actually wanted her gone should not get away with impunity, because this was not just a murder tackling an individual person – she was exposing corruption and crime. We should investigate that as well, because this is not a mere Maltese problem: this is a European problem. We are talking about international networks of corruption and crime, money-laundering, hiding criminal money, and so on. So I think there is a task here for the European Union, and I think the European People's Party just suggested that we investigate the rule of law in Malta – that was a kind of general statement, but I do think it is very important that we get clarifications from the Maltese Government about the allegations of corruptions which she was investigating. We have to continue that investigation, and I would suggest that first of all – in the very short term, within the next couple of weeks – that we organise an ECON-LIBE hearing and invite experts on the Maltese situation; on the investigations into corruption and crime. But I think we should also look into ways of continuing that and deepening that investigation and make sure that we eradicate corruption and crime and money laundering from the European Union, and Malta is part of the European Union.

Finally, Commissioner, you said that the European Commission doesn't have the competences to actually intervene, and I don't think (as Mr González Pons said) that it is for the European Commission to conduct a police investigation into a murder. But you can investigate allegations of corruption, and you can indeed investigate allegations that, for example, the judiciary or the police is not independent, because if one Member State – whether it is Malta, Poland, Hungary, France or indeed the Netherlands or Romania – does not uphold the European standards when it comes to the rule of law, that means that there is no rule of law in the European Union. We have an area of freedom, security and justice, so if one Member State doesn't function in this respect, then the whole system fails. So it is in everybody's interests that we investigate. Is that painful? Yes it is. But this is a political union: we all have to make sure that these problems are eradicated, and I think we owe it to Daphne. We cannot just make statements here; we have to be courageous and go against those who actually do not wish us to investigate.

This has to be done, and I hope that we are going to find agreement amongst all the political groups for the exact instruments – the appropriate instruments – in honour of Daphne.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, lo primero, como no podría ser de otra forma: desde nuestro Grupo queremos mostrar nuestra plena solidaridad y nuestro abrazo fraterno con los familiares de Daphne y con sus seres queridos; pero también darle ese abrazo a todas las Daphnes del mundo que todavía siguen perseguidas.

Señorías, hay que recordar que los paraísos fiscales en el seno de la Unión Europea son un hilo negro que une el fraude fiscal con las redes de criminalidad, corrupción y persecución a periodistas y filtradores. El caso de Daphne Caruana es un dramático ejemplo de la complicidad entre los intereses de las redes criminales y las oligarquías.

Hay que recordar que comisiones de investigación, como la de los papeles de Panamá, son posibles gracias al trabajo de periodistas como Daphne, que revelaron las cuentas de Panamá de varios ministros malteses. Su investigación amenazaba muchos intereses que incluso muchas veces se defienden también desde este hemiciclo, como son la opacidad fiscal, el secreto bancario o la libre circulación de capitales.

Entendemos que es imprescindible poner los derechos de los denunciantes por encima del interés privado de las empresas. Hoy hemos aprobado un informe exigiendo una legislación que proteja y abarque el conjunto de actividades de denunciantes y periodistas. También, en el informe que presentará la Comisión PANA hemos solicitado que se establezca una agencia y canales de comunicación específicos para proteger a quien arriesga su vida para sacar a la luz pública información que beneficia al conjunto de la sociedad. Esperemos que todos los grupos de esta Cámara voten a favor de estas medidas.

Y también queremos lanzar un mensaje claro a la Comisión: que aplique cuanto antes lo que hemos aprobado en esta Cámara, asegurando la integridad y los derechos de denunciantes y periodistas, evitando así convertirse por omisión en cómplices de nuevos casos como el de Daphne.

Sven Giegold, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, 16 October 2017 has been the saddest day for me personally as a Member of this Parliament. First of all, our sincere condolences go to the family of Daphne, whom I got to know as one of the most courageous people in the fight for justice and the rule of law in Europe.

The way in which Daphne was killed tells us a lot about the unjust and criminal system which she was fighting. Daphne was killed in the open, there was no hiding. Her murderers did not even try to make the attack appear to be an accident. On the contrary, this was a brutal demonstration of power by those who consider themselves above the law.

It is very clear why the murderers did not place a bomb under the car of the police chief or the attorney general. It was Daphne who shed light on a system of money-laundering and corruption in Malta, and not these authorities.

Let me just name a small selection of illegal, or at least illegitimate, activities that Daphne has made public: letterbox companies owned by members of the government; the sale of passports to so-called investors; tax avoidance for multinational companies; online gambling based on weak supervision and hyper-low taxation.

All these cases have one thing in common. Malta has sold its sovereignty to dirty money. Malta has replaced the rule of law with a culture of impunity for the powerful, and fiddling between political and financial elites.

This is Europe, not Russia. Europe must act when fundamental rights are at stake. It is now up to us to finish Daphne's fight, and therefore we would like to suggest five concrete steps.

First, an international investigator has to be appointed who will be fully involved in the ongoing investigations on money-laundering and corruption in Malta. Second, Malta should take that opportunity finally to join the European Prosecutor. Third, we demand a serious investigation by the European Commission on the rule of law in Malta and systematic Treaty infringement procedures to enforce anti-money laundering law everywhere in Europe. Fourth, we also support Daphne's family in their demand for the Muscat government to step down because of its failure in enforcing the rule of law in Malta. And lastly, we are proposing the introduction of a European Galizia prize here in this House for investigative journalists, modelled on the Sakharov Prize.

The murderous attack on Daphne was an attack on European values, our fundamental principles. Let us not forget that people who suffer from corruption in their countries put their hopes in Europe. Let us not disappoint these citizens. Let us not disappoint Daphne and her family. Let us act together to defend our fundamental principles of democracy, the rule of law and justice.

Ignazio Corrao, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, diceva bene il presidente Pittella quando rilevava che l'esplosione di una bomba ci manda indietro a tempi bui per il nostro paese: le uccisioni di giudici, le attività della mafia. Però purtroppo devo ricordare che i mandanti di quegli omicidi e di quelle stragi, i veri mandanti, noi in Italia ancora non li conosciamo, e anzi forse quei mandanti siedono ancora in Parlamento o stanno in posizioni di potere.

Questa è una cosa che dobbiamo ricordare quando parliamo di Daphne Caruana Galizia, che è venuta in questo Parlamento. Quando ci è venuta veniva già minacciata, veniva isolata, veniva uccisa in vita, come qualcuno ha giustamente detto. È stata lasciata sola, è stata uccisa nel modo più barbaro, dando un segnale a chiunque, dicendo «attenzione, se toccate questi nervi scoperti vi succede qualcosa del genere», perché questo le è stato fatto: è venuta qui, ha raccontato tante cose, ha accusato anche politici maltesi, l'ha fatto nella sua vita, ha toccato nervi scoperti, ha toccato delle cose sensibili e dobbiamo stare attenti adesso, dobbiamo dare una risposta diversa rispetto a quelle che sono state date finora.

Perché se è vero che il Presidente Tajani oggi si è impegnato davanti ai familiari, dicendo che ci sarà un'investigazione e che verranno trovati esecutori e mandanti, noi dobbiamo impegnarci tutti affinché questo avvenga veramente, altrimenti questo Parlamento farà una figura ridicola, quindi ricordiamocela questa cosa.

Mario Borghezio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non si può non esprimere, e noi lo esprimiamo come gruppo, un grande rispetto anche per la cerimonia, per le parole sentite e nobili con cui questa mattina ha introdotto questa giornata il Presidente di questo Parlamento.

Diversa è invece la valutazione politica che, a mio avviso, bisogna fare con severità circa la situazione che ha reso possibile questo omicidio, che a noi italiani ricorda tante cose – io vorrei anche ricordare il precedente di un altro grande giornalista, il giornalista De Mauro, che fu veramente una delle prime vittime di questa strage infinita di operatori del giornalismo, degli eroi del giornalismo d'inchiesta.

Il problema è molto chiaro e semplice da esporre. Questa Commissione ha le carte in regola per impegnarsi, come abbiamo sentito, visto che non sta facendo e non ha fatto nulla di serio per svuotare quei pozzi neri, ospitati nei paradisi fiscali, della finanza occulta, parallela, attraverso la quale viene veicolato il denaro, i miliardi dei traffici di droga, del petrolio, del contrabbando e di tutto quello che questa giornalista coraggiosa aveva denunciato?

Non avete le carte in regola!

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (ΝΙ). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η τραγική δολοφονία της Daphne Caruana Galizia έφερε στην επιφάνεια ένα σοβαρό πρόβλημα αιώνων, το οποίο δυστυχώς υπάρχει και σήμερα: την ελευθερία του Τύπου. Ανέκαθεν, οι εκάστοτε εξουσίες προσπαθούσαν να ελέγξουν τους δημοσιογράφους. Συνήθως αυτό το έκαναν δωροδοκώντας τους και, όσους δεν υπέκυπταν στους εκβιασμούς, τους απειλούσαν, ασκούσαν βία επάνω τους και, πολλές φορές, τους δολοφονούσαν. Στη σημερινή εποχή, η προσπάθεια καταργήσεως της ελευθερίας του Τύπου μετέρχεται και άλλες μεθοδεύσεις, όπως συλλήψεις και καταδικές δημοσιογράφων και εκδοτών, κλείσιμο εφημερίδων, και απαγόρευση λειτουργίας μέσω κοινωνικής δικτύωσης, όπως κάνει ο Πρόεδρος Ερντογάν στην Τουρκία. Ακόμη και στην Ελλάδα, μόνο ορισμένοι γενναίοι δημοσιογράφοι δίνουν βήμα στους βουλευτές, ευρωβουλευτές και στελέχη του κόμματός μας, της Χρυσής Αυγής, της τρίτης πολιτικής δύναμης της χώρας, επειδή φοβούνται ότι θα τους απολύσουν οι εργοδότες τους. Όλα τα κράτη οφείλουν να συνειδητοποιήσουν ότι δημοσιογράφοι ασκούν λειτουργία και πρέπει να τους προστατεύσουν, ώστε να εκτελούν απερίσπαστοι το έργο τους κατοχυρώνοντας, έτσι, την ελευθερία του Τύπου, που είναι βασική αρχή της λειτουργίας της δημοκρατίας. Εύχομαι το αίμα της Daphne να είναι το τελευταίο που χύνεται στον βωμό της ελευθεροτυπίας διεθνώς. Ας είναι αιωνία η μνήμη της.

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened carefully to the contributions from the Members of this Parliament. Today, for the Commission, is about honouring the memory of Daphne, it is about sharing our grief in this Parliament. But I fully recognise that the only way we can really honour her memory is by following up on the issues that underlie the assassination.

This starts, of course, with a full investigation of what has happened and bringing to justice those who are responsible. As I said in my contribution, if in this investigation, and in the course of this analysis, things are brought to light that are of a more structural nature or that warrant other actions, the Commission will certainly not hesitate to assume its responsibility, where we have a responsibility. Let me also add that in our Work Programme for next year we have insisted on the need, jointly with the European Parliament, to come up with a better protection of whistle-blowers. This is also an important step we need to take.

My colleague Věra Jourová promised to the Special Committee of Inquiry on Money Laundering, Tax Avoidance and Tax Evasion (PANA) in July that we would also step up our efforts to implement the decisions we have taken on fighting money laundering. I can, for instance, give as an example that we have now – let me just check the numbers – we have opened infringement cases that concern 14 Member States which have not notified laws transposing the 4th Directive and two Member States whose laws clearly show that these were not sufficient to transpose the Directive. We will continue this work in close contact also with this Parliament. We are always prepared to engage directly with the Maltese authorities at a political level to make sure that they implement the rules that we agreed at European level.

Let me end on the following. The effect of such a public display of barbarism – which this assassination was – the intended effect, of course, is to intimidate, to make sure that no investigation is carried out any more, that nothing is pursued, that others will be self-censoring their own investigation.

I think this is the biggest challenge we face: that we are not intimidated by what was done; that we as Europeans collectively accept the responsibility in the EU to make sure that we are not intimidated; that institutions can function independently; that perpetrators are brought to justice; that if this is linked to organised crime or to corruption, that this is pursued. And this Commission will leave no stone unturned in that area to make sure that this atrocious, barbarous assassination does not lead to the conclusion which is clearly wanted by those who perpetrated it, namely that we don't dare ask questions or we don't dare investigate. This will not happen. This is a promise I make on behalf of the Commission, and this is how we will pursue the issue in close cooperation also with the Maltese authorities and other bodies that could be implicated in the investigation.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, just as First Vice-President Timmermans has just done on behalf of the Commission, on behalf of the Council I can assure you that we will follow the developments closely, and I will pay particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate.

The Estonian Presidency, and the Council as a whole, attach great importance to the protection of journalists and the defence of media freedom. We are all shocked by the appalling circumstances of the death of Ms Daphne Caruana Galizia. Words of condemnation are never sufficient. We are confident that the Maltese law enforcement authorities are capable of upholding the rule of law in the face of this atrocious murder and will conduct the investigation, with international assistance if needed.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE), *in writing*. – When journalists are afraid, democracy is in danger, the ‘rule of people’ becoming the ‘rule of crooks’. Daphne Caruana Galizia is the 10th journalist to die in 2017, mainstreaming the terror for those who fight the most in the name of transparency. The real justice that can be brought to these reporters is to show that we really need their work and manifest our democratic values by blaming the demonisation of journalists and fully support these professionals in executing their democratic duty without any fear or intimidation.

Miriam Dalli (S&D), *bil-miktub*. – Il-qtil ta’ Daphne Caruana Galizia huwa delitt orribbli, li qatt ma jista’ jkun ġustifikat. M’huwiex attakk biss kontra persuna individwali, imma kontra Malta, l-Ewropa u l-valuri tal-Maltin kollha. M’ghandniex inhallu dan l-att fahxi jimmina d-demokrazija f’pajjiżna. Lanqas ghandna nhallu l-konsegwenzi tiegħu jaqsmu lil pajjiżna u lill-poplu Malti. Magħquda flimkien, irridu niżguraw li ssir ġustizzja. M’huwiex aċċettabbli li Malta tispicċa ostaġġ ta’ min irid juża attakk terroristiku biex jagħmel il-ħsara lil pajjiżna u lill-poplu tagħna. Niddeploraw il-fatt li hemm min ha din l-opportunità biex jitfa’ dubju fuq l-impenn tal-awtoritajiet Maltin lejn il-valuri demokratiċi tar-rule of law u l-libertà tal-espressjoni. Dawn il-valuri jsawru d-demokraziji moderni, effettivi u b’saħħithom. Bħala pajjiż demokratiku Malta dejjem iddefendiethom. Hekk se jibqa’ jsir. Il-gvern Malti għamel tajjeb li, waqt li mmobilizza r-riżorsi kollha disponibbli halli l-każ jiġi investigat bl-akbar reqqa, talab l-ghajnuna tas-servizzi Ewropej tas-sigurtà biex il-hatja ta’ dan l-assassinju xokkanti jinqabdu. L-appoġġ li wrew il-forzi politiċi Ewropej f’dil-Kamra biex anke jghinu fl-investigazzjonijiet li qed isiru huma tal-akbar inkoraġġiment għall-poplu Malti. Hi haġa tajba li l-Unjoni Ewropea tkun magħquda mal-poplu Malti f’dan il-mument diffiċli. Min jipprova jfixkel din l-ghaqda b’diversivi partiġġjani, qed ifixkel il-kawża tad-demokrazija, tal-ġustizzja u tal-espressjoni hielsa f’Malta u fl-Ewropa.

Eugen Freund (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Meinungs- und Pressefreiheit gehören zu den wichtigsten Grundlagen einer Demokratie. Dass freie Meinungsäußerung auch tödlich ausgehen kann, hat uns letzte Woche der grausame Mord an der Aufdeckerjournalistin und Bloggerin Daphne Caruana Galizia in Malta vor Augen geführt, die an der Aufarbeitung der Panama-Papers beteiligt war. Dieses traurige Ereignis zeigt erneut auf, dass Journalisten, Blogger und all jene, die den Mut aufbringen, verdeckte, im öffentlichen Interesse stehende Machenschaften aufzudecken, besonderen Schutz durch entsprechende Gesetze verdienen. Gerade als ehemaliger Journalist ist es mir ein besonderes Anliegen, darauf hinzuweisen. Im Europäischen Parlament haben wir Sozialdemokraten für den verstärkten Schutz von Whistleblowern gestimmt. Whistleblower helfen, Korruption und zwielichtige Geschäfte aufzudecken. Dass sie dafür oft strafrechtlich verfolgt werden, dass ihr Job, ihre Freiheit und manchmal sogar ihr Leben auf dem Spiel stehen, darf nicht passieren. Umso unverständlicher erscheint da die Haltung der ÖVP, die einerseits bei der Gedenkveranstaltung hier im Parlament Betroffenheit zeigt, andererseits aber nicht für den Schutz von Whistleblowern stimmt. Setzen wir gemeinsam ein Zeichen für die Meinungsfreiheit und sorgen wir dafür, dass der Schutz von Journalisten und von all jenen, die Missstände aufdecken, in der EU verstärkt wird!

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), *írásban*. – Daphne Caruana Galizia meggyilkolása egyszerre szomorú és elrettentő kifejeződése annak, hogy a hatalom mi mindenre képes az igazság elhallgatására érdekében. A független újságírás legkisebb korlátozása is súlyos veszély az állampolgárok szabad információhoz való jogával szemben. Ahol pedig előfordulhat, hogy egy újságíró az életével fizet a korrupció és a hatalom visszaéléseinek leplezéséért, ott a demokrácia alapjai rendülnek meg.

A hatalom agressziója a szabad és független hírközléssel szemben sosem maradhat megválaszolatlanul! A máltai kormálynak le kell mondania, miután képtelen volt a korrupciós vádakát tisztázni. Az Európai Bizottságnak pedig azonnali és átfogó vizsgálatot kell kezdeményeznie az elkövetők felelősségre vonásának érdekében!

Néhány uniós tagállamban már megkezdődött, sőt évek óta zajlik a sajtó szabadságának szisztematikus ledarálása. Ezekben az országokban média függetlenségének és sokszínűségének kiirtása a hatalom érdeke. Ez nem fájulhat odáig, hogy ne érezhessék magukat biztonságban azok, akik az igazságot próbálják a nyilvánosság elé tárni!

Sürgős és hatékony fellépésre van szükség annak érdekében, hogy az újságírók megfélemlítése sehol se válhasson eszközzé a hatalom kezében az igazság elrejtésére. Mivel az átláthatóság és a független, szabad média alapvető értékek, melyek megőrzése immáron sajnálatos módon folyamatos megerősítésre szorul, a zöld frakció Daphne Caruana Galizia nevével fémjelzett díjat javasol a tényfeltáró újságírók munkájának elismeréséért és védelméért.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na písmie*. – Łączę się w smutku z rodziną ś.p. Daphne Caruany Galizii, która poświęciła swoje życie w poszukiwaniu prawdy, tropiąc korupcję na najwyższych szczeblach władzy, ujawniła dane z tzw. dokumentów panamskich, które opisują proces lokowania środków finansowych w różnych rajach podatkowych. Domagam się przeprowadzenia rzetelnego śledztwa i doprowadzenia winnych przed sąd.

Jednym z najważniejszych sposobów wykrywania nielegalnych działań, w szczególności takich jak nadużycia finansowe i korupcja w sektorze prywatnym i publicznym, przestępczość zorganizowana, oszustwa podatkowe i unikanie opodatkowania jest działalność sygnalistów. Sygnalizowanie nieprawidłowości jest powiązane z wolnością prasy oraz ma podstawowe znaczenie dla wydobywania na światło dzienne działań nielegalnych lub działań, które szkodzą interesowi publicznemu. Należy podkreślić, że działalność takich dziennikarzy śledczych jak ś.p. Daphne Caruana Galizia służy umacnianiu demokracji, przejrzystości polityki i gospodarki oraz informacji publicznej, jak również że powinno uznawać się ich za niezbędne podmioty w zapobieganiu nielegalnym działaniom.

Marlene Mizzi (S&D), *bil-miktub*. – Il-qtil ta' Daphne Caruana Galizia huwa delitt orribbli, li qatt ma jista' jkun ġustifikat. Mhuwiex attakk biss kontra persuna individwali, imma kontra Malta, l-Ewropa u l-valuri tal-Maltin kollha. M'ghandniex inhallu dan l-att fahxi jimmina d-demokrazija f'pajjizna. Lanqas ghandna nhallu l-konsegwenzi tieghu jaqsmu lil pajjizna u lill-poplu Malti. Maghquda flimkien, irridu niżguraw li ssir ġustizzja. M'huwiex aċċettabbli li Malta tispicċa ostaġġ ta' min irid juża attakk terroristiku biex jagħmel il-hsara lil pajjizna u lill-poplu tagħna. Niddeploraw il-fatt li hemm min ha din l-opportunità biex jitfa' dubju fuq l-impenn tal-awtoritajiet Maltin lejn il-valuri demokratiċi tar-rule of law u l-libertà tal-espressjoni. Dawn il-valuri jsawru d-demokraziji moderni, effettivi u b'saħ-hithom. Bħala pajjiz demokratiku Malta dejjem iddefendiethom. Hekk se jibqa' jsir. Il-gvern Malti għamel tajjeb li, waqt li mmobilizza r-riżorsi kollha disponibbli halli l-każ jiġi investigat bl-akbar reqqa, talab l-ghajjnuna tas-servizzi Ewropej tas-sigurtà biex il-hatja ta' dan l-assassinju xokkanti jinqabdu. L-appoġġ li wrew il-forzi politiċi Ewropej f'dil-Kamra biex anke jghinu fl-investigazzjonijiet li qed isiru huma tal-akbar inkoraġġiment għall-poplu Malti. Hi haġa tajba li l-Unjoni Ewropea tkun maghquda mal-poplu Malti f'dan il-mument diffiċli. Min jipprova jfixkel din l-ghaqda b'diversivi partigġ-jani, qed ifixkel il-kawża tad-demokrazija, tal-ġustizzja u tal-espressjoni hielsa f'Malta u fl-Ewropa.

József Nagy (PPE), *írásban*. – Nem hagyhatta szó nélkül az Európai Parlament a máltai neves oknyomozó újságírónő, Daphne Caruana Galizia felrobbantását. Mert hogyan akarhatjuk mi Putyintól vagy Erdoganától, hogy ne üldözzé a médiát, ha eltűrik, hogy az EU-ban megölhetnek egy újságírót, mert túl közel került a kormány korrupciós ügyeihez? Az Európa Unió a sajtószabadság mintaképének tartja magát, amire az újságírók megfélemlítése óriási fenyegetést jelent. Máltának az elkövetők nyomára bukkásával és felelősségre vonásával kell erre a szörnyű tette válaszolnia, hogy visszaszerezze az újságírók és az emberek bizalmát.

Urmās Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Daphne Caruana Galizia mörvajuhtum on šokeeriv. Meediavabadus peab olema tagatud iga ELi liikmesriigi territooriumil, ilma et ükski ajakirjanik peaks enda turvalisuse pärast kartma. Daphne Caruana Galiziale sai tema töö saatuslikuks, mis taas kord tõestas, et uuriv ajakirjandus kahjuks ka ELi pinnal võib olla ohtlik töö. Malta valitsus peab juhtumit võtma täie tõsiduse ja vastutusega. 2017. aastal on 42 ajakirjanikku üle maailma surma saanud, kaks nendest ELi liikmesriikides.

Alfred Sant (S&D), bil-miktub. – Il-qtil ta' Daphne Caruana Galizia huwa delitt orribbli, li qatt ma jista' jkun ġustifikat. Mhuwiex attakk biss kontra persuna individwali, imma kontra Malta, l-Ewropa u l-valuri tal-Maltin kollha. M'ghandniex inhallu dan l-att fahxi jimmina d-demokrazija f'pajjiżna. Lanqas ghandna nhallu l-konsegwenzi tieghu jaqsmu lil pajjiżna u lill-poplu Malti. Magħquda flimkien, irridu niżguraw li ssir ġustizzja. M'huwiex aċċettabbli li Malta tispicċa ostaġġ ta' min irid juża attakk terroristiku biex jagħmel il-hsara lil pajjiżna u lill-poplu tagħna. Niddeploraw il-fatt li hemm min ha din l-opportunità biex jitfa' dubju fuq l-impenn tal-awtoritajiet Maltin lejn il-valuri demokratiċi tar-rule of law u l-libertà tal-espressjoni. Dawn il-valuri jsawru d-demokraziji moderni, effettivi u b'saħħithom. Bħala pajjiż demokratiku Malta dejjem iddefendiethom. Hekk se jibqa' jsir. Il-gvern Malti għamel tajjeb li, waqt li mmobilizza r-riżorsi kollha disponibbli halli l-każ jiġi investigat bl-akbar reqqa, talab l-ghajnuna tas-servizzi Ewropej tas-sigurtà biex il-hatja ta' dan l-assassinju xokkanti jinqabdu. L-appoġġ li wrew il-forzi politiċi Ewropej f'dil-Kamra biex anke jghinu fl-investigazzjonijiet li qed isiru huma tal-akbar inkoraġġiment għall-poplu Malti. Hi haġa tajba li l-Unjoni Ewropea tkun magħquda mal-poplu Malti f'dan il-mument diffiċli. Min jipprova jfixkel din l-ghaqda b'diversivi partigġjani, qed ifixkel il-kawża tad-demokrazija, tal-ġustizzja u tal-espressjoni hielsa f'Malta u fl-Ewropa.

Csaba Sógor (PPE), írásban. – A mai, gyorsan változó világunkban a média működése is alapjaiban változott meg, egyvalami azonban állandó maradt: a törvénytelenések elkövetőinek félelme a nyilvánosságtól, a közvélemény ítéletétől. Ami Máltán történt Daphne Caruana Galiziával azt mutatja, hogy az újságírók továbbra is veszélynek vannak kitéve még az Európai Unióban is.

A Panama-iratok körüli botrány az átláthatóságnak egy új korszakát jelzi, amelyben fény derülhet egy másik világra, ahol az állampolgárok nagy többsége számára elképzelhetetlen anyagi források vándorolnak az elit tagjai között. A mai kor eszközeivel ezek a titkok nem maradnak titkok többé, és Daphne Caruana Galizia tragikus halála csak még inkább ráirányítja a figyelmet az offshore világ törvénytelenégeire és arra, hogy a demokratikusan választott európai kormányoknak ebben a tekintetben is felelősségük van a polgárral szemben.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), in writing. – It is tragic that in this day and age we still need to condemn the killing of journalists, and reaffirm our commitment to the freedom of the press. We no longer live in the medieval ages where people with power simply killed their opponents or people they did not like. These kinds of actions have no place in our societies, not in Russia, nor in the European Union. Media freedom is essential for a democracy to function; corruption will flourish if there is no one to cast a light on it.

This barbaric crime was committed to silence a particular journalist, but we must not forget the wider implications of this murder: the chilling effect on other journalists. Journalists should not have to fear for their lives, otherwise the perpetrators and oppressors get an even bigger victory, and democracy with the rest of society suffers. This is why the investigation has to be conducted with utmost seriousness, in order to bring the perpetrators to justice as soon as possible.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na piśmie. – Zabójstwo maltańskiej dziennikarki śledczej Daphne Caruany Galizii to skandal i atak na fundamentalne europejskie wartości, tj. wolność słowa i rządy prawa. Prawo dziennikarza do prowadzenia śledztw, do zadawania niewygodnych pytań i uświadamiania leży w centrum naszych wartości i musi być zawsze zagwarantowane. Wolność słowa to prawo do wygłaszania własnych poglądów i przedstawiania naszego rozumienia rzeczywistości. Bez niezależnego i rzetelnego dziennikarstwa żadna demokracja nie jest kompletna. Jeżeli dziennikarze nie mogą przekazywać informacji w obawie o zagrożenie swojego życia, to oznacza, że jesteśmy skonfrontowani z istotnym ograniczeniem wolności prasy i z dramatyczną regresją demokracji. Zdrowa demokracja wymaga wolnych i pluralistycznych mediów, wolnych od interwencji państwa, nacisków politycznych i handlowych.

To bardzo niepokojące, że taki skandaliczny akt przemocy pojawił się w Europie. Władze Malty muszą teraz udowodnić, że tego rodzaju zbrodnie nie mogą być dokonywane bezkarnie. Dlatego niezwykle ważne jest, aby szybko i dokładnie przeprowadzić międzynarodowe dochodzenie ws. tego haniebnego przestępstwa. Teraz liczy się to, aby wymierzona została sprawiedliwość. Musimy powstrzymać atak na wolność słowa i bronić dziennikarzy na świecie. Dziennikarze powinni czuć, że mogą realizować swoją funkcję komentowania spraw publicznych, informowania opinii publicznej, przekazywania informacji i idei w sposób wolny od gróźb, nękania lub zastraszania i nie są ścigani za wyrażanie poglądów, które nie stanowią podżegania do przemocy.

17. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Marita Ulvskog, a nome della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali, sulla proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica la direttiva 2004/37/CE sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi derivanti da un'esposizione ad agenti cancerogeni o mutageni durante il lavoro (COM(2016)0248 – C8-0181/2016 – 2016/0130(COD)) (A8-0064/2017).

Marita Ulvskog, föredragande. – Herr talman! I morgon kommer vi att rösta för en betydligt starkare arbetsmiljölagstiftning i EU. Det är inte vilken lagstiftning som helst, utan en som handlar om att skydda arbetstagare, miljontals arbetstagare i Europa, från cancerframkallande och mutagena ämnen.

Vi har väntat tio år på detta. Den tidigare kommissionen fick inte mycket gjort, tyvärr. Lyckligtvis har den nuvarande kommissionen agerat annorlunda. Vi har från parlamentets sida alltså välkomnat kommissionens förslag och i utskottsarbetet har vi gjort allt vi kan för att göra förslaget ännu starkare.

Fakta är följande: Mer än hälften av alla arbetsrelaterade dödsfall är kopplade till cancer. Cancer är den enskilt tyngsta och mest omfattande arbetsmiljörelaterade dödsorsaken. Så kan vi inte ha det. Inte i ett modernt samhälle som sätter människovärdet högt. Vi ska inte acceptera att konkurrera med dåliga villkor, med farliga arbetsmiljöer; det kan aldrig vara ett konkurrensmedel för EU. Vi ska konkurrera med att vara absolut skickligast och bäst på det vi gör, inte med att människor ska dö av sina jobb.

Utöver den enorma personliga kostnaden är också den uppskattade kostnaden för medlemsländerna 334 miljarder euro årligen. Det är alltså vad cancer kostar. Det är en sanslös förlust, inte bara i människoliv utan också i samhällskostnader.

I morgon kommer vi att rösta om tretton nya gränsvärden för cancerframkallande och mutagena ämnen som finns på arbetsplatserna. Det är elva nya ämnen och två stycken som revideras. Det är ämnen som finns i en lång rad industrier och på en lång rad arbetsplatser, bland annat byggindustrin, träindustrin, pappersindustrin, i produktion av allt från lösningsmedel, papper, möbler, leksaker, bilar, flygplan. Sexvärt krom, kvartsdamm och hårt trädammer är några av de viktigaste ämnen som nu regleras, med tanke på hur många arbetstagare som är exponerade för just dessa gränsvärden.

Jämfört med kommissionens ursprungliga förslag, som redan det var en stor förbättring, lyckades parlamentet kräva ytterligare förbättringar i förhandlingarna. Det, herr talman, det kan vi vara stolta över. Vi har under hela processen betonat vikten av att utgå från försiktighetsprincipen. Vi måste sätta arbetstagarnas hälsa och säkerhet i första rummet. Kommissionen föreslog tretton nya gränsvärden, som i sig kommer att rädda mer än 100 000 personer över 50 år. Det är en siffra som inte ens tar hänsyn till de förbättrade hälsokontrollerna eller de gränsvärden som vi har åstadkommit i förhandlingarna. Hälsokontrollerna i direktivet har nu kommit ikapp asbestdirektivet. Arbetstagare kommer tack vare parlamentet att ha rätt till hälsokontroller även efter det att de har lämnat den arbetsplats där de har exponerats.

I överenskommelsen med rådet så ingår det även skärpta gränsvärden på just sexvärt krom och hårt trädamm i förslaget. Detta är ämnen som orsakar så pass allvarliga cancerformer som lymfosarkom och lungcancer. Vi har även kommit överens om att kommissionen framöver måste se över lagstiftningen för att utvärdera om direktivet ska breddas för att inkludera även reproduktionsstörande ämnen, det vill säga ämnen som kan skada fertiliteten hos både män och kvinnor och ofödda barn. Det är min och utskottets mening att dessa ämnen är så pass allvarliga att de bör omfattas av direktivets allra strängaste formuleringar.

Detta kommer kommissionen att återkomma till, förhoppningsvis innan mandatperioden är slut. Jag vill betona det goda samarbetet som har legat till grund för att vi nu kan anta revideringen av detta direktiv. Det förslag som vi har framför oss är ett resultat av konsultation med de sociala parterna och forskare.

Och jag vill tacka alltså kommissionen, rådet, de sociala parterna, forskarna som bidragit under hela processen och jag vill såklart också tacka skuggföredragandena i mitt eget utskott, i synnerhet Claude Rolin från PPE-gruppen som nu tar över som föredragande för den andra revideringen av denna lagstiftning. Det är inte alltid vi kan jobba tillsammans i den här kammaren – och det ska man inte alltid behöva göra – men det har vi gjort. Jag tycker vi har gjort det på ett riktigt bra sätt, förutsatt nu att den här lagstiftningen går hela vägen. Symboliskt tror jag att det är viktigt att samsas och samla sig när man har en stor och viktig uppgift framför sig, och det har vi gjort.

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the investment of this Commission in a more social Europe has many facets. There is the principle of equal pay for equal work at the same place, which has yesterday been embraced by a large majority from East and West in the Council, but this Commission has also reinvigorated the promotion of workers' health and safety. The protection of workers' health and safety at work has therefore also been included as one of the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights which was also embraced yesterday by the Council, to be proclaimed in November by the three institutions

The fight against occupational cancer is also a matter of priority for me personally. Cancer kills more workers than any other work-related disease and causes many families enormous suffering. I am pleased that the Council and the European Parliament have reached a timely compromise on our first proposal to update the Directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens and mutagens at work. This agreement between the co-legislators confirms the strong political commitment by all the European institutions to fight against work-related cancer. It should also pave the way for the second and third batches with a view to continue enhancing the protection of workers.

I would like to thank once again the rapporteur Ms Ulvskog for her commitment during the interinstitutional negotiations. This indeed enabled us to reach agreement on this file at first reading. It is only fair to say that the negotiations were not easy. For Parliament, one of the key points in the discussions was to include reprotoxic substances in the scope of this directive. In the end, a fair compromise was reached with the Council. The deal was a review clause which says that 'not later than the first quarter of 2019 the Commission shall assess the opportunity of amending the scope of this directive to include reprotoxic substances'.

I can assure you that the Commission will deliver on this clause. This, however, as you all know requires comprehensive analytical work. Another difficult element in the negotiation was the exposure limit values to Chromium VI, respirable crystalline [silica] and hardwood and softwood dusts. In the end, an agreement was reached in line with the results of the scientific research and the discussions we had with the social partners. Thank you for all your work; I think we can be happy about the results and we will continue to cooperate further.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, *Συντάκτης της γνωμοδότησης της Επιτροπής Νομικών Θεμάτων*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση που συζητούμε σήμερα σχετίζεται με έναν από τους μεγαλύτερους κινδύνους για εκατομμύρια εργαζόμενους παγκοσμίως. Την ύπαρξη καρκινογόνων παραγόντων στους χώρους εργασίας. Ο καρκίνος είναι η κύρια αιτία θανάτων που συνδέονται με την εργασία και περίπου 20 εκατομμύρια εργαζόμενοι στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εκτίθενται σε καρκινογόνους παράγοντες. Τα προτεινόμενα μέτρα στοχεύουν στη βελτίωση της προστασίας της υγείας των εργαζομένων, μέσω της μείωσης της έκθεσης σε χημικούς παράγοντες και γι' αυτό πρέπει να τα υποστηρίξουμε. Θεωρώ όμως ότι χρειάζεται παραπέρα επέκταση του προστατευτικού πλαισίου με στόχο τη συμπερίληψη επιπλέον παραγόντων που απειλούν την υγεία και τη γονιμότητα του ανθρώπου. Επίσης χρειάζεται μείωση των οριακών τιμών παραγόντων που ήδη προβλέπονται, όπως της σκόνης σκληρού και μαλακού ξύλου, της εισπνεύσιμης σκόνης κρυσταλλικού διοξειδίου του πυριτίου και ενώσεων του χρωμίου. Η υγεία πρέπει να έχει πάντα την προτεραιότητα.

Claude Rolin, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, demain, nous nous prononcerons effectivement sur la révision de la directive sur les substances cancérigènes et mutagènes. Ce sera un pas important. Pas tellement parce que c'est une priorité pour la Commission, mais surtout parce que, chaque année, entre 100 000 et 150 000 travailleurs se voient diagnostiquer un cancer d'origine professionnelle. Nous ne pouvons pas accepter que des travailleurs détruisent leur santé ou perdent leur vie en voulant la gagner.

Avant toute chose, permettez-moi de remercier vivement la Commission, et plus particulièrement M^{me} la Commissaire, Marianne Thyssen. Alors que de nouvelles substances ont vu le jour, il nous aura fallu attendre dix ans avant que cette directive soit soumise à révision. Au travers de sa proposition, la Commission met fin à cet immobilisme.

L'accord institutionnel qui sera soumis au vote demain allie à la fois ambition et pragmatisme. Ambition, car il fixe des normes strictes en matière d'exposition professionnelle. Pragmatisme, parce qu'il prévoit des périodes transitoires permettant aux entreprises de s'adapter et de se mettre en conformité avec les nouvelles règles.

J'aurais effectivement souhaité que les substances reprotoxiques soient directement couvertes par cette directive. Cela n'a pas été possible, mais je me réjouis cependant que la Commission et le Conseil aient pris conscience de cet appel du Parlement et statuent à ce sujet dans les mois à venir.

Enfin, je souhaiterais insister sur deux éléments. En ce début d'année, la Commission a déposé une seconde proposition de révision de cette directive. Je souhaite que la Commission ne s'arrête pas en si bon chemin. Cette directive doit être revue régulièrement, au regard des évolutions scientifiques et technologiques, afin d'avancer et d'améliorer la protection des travailleurs. En tout cas, et dans la même philosophie que celle adoptée par la rapporteure sur ce premier train de mesures, nous allons poursuivre avec cette qualité de collaboration avec vous, Madame la Commissaire.

Je salue aussi les partenaires sociaux qui, de manière préventive, négocient des accords sectoriels visant à mieux protéger les travailleurs face aux substances cancérigènes, notamment l'accord NEPSI qui, pour moi, est vraiment un accord qui montre le chemin à suivre.

En matière de santé et de sécurité au travail les maîtres mots, pour moi, doivent être «prévention et concertation».

Brando Benifei, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo dieci anni dall'ultimo aggiornamento normativo sulle sostanze cancerogene, finalmente facciamo un passo avanti. Il lavoro della relatrice, la collega Ulvskog, è davvero degno di nota. Con l'accordo raggiunto al trilogico possiamo dire di aver aggiunto un tassello nella battaglia contro il cancro, che rimane la seconda causa di morte sul lavoro in Europa, come ricordava bene la Commissaria Thyssen.

Trattando molte sostanze che interessano diversi settori produttivi, siamo stati obbligati a uno sforzo per garantire l'equilibrio dei vari interessi in gioco, a partire ovviamente dalla salute dei lavoratori. Risulterà fondamentale vigilare affinché le norme siano messe adeguatamente in pratica, coinvolgendo le parti sociali. Un ottimo esempio è l'accordo Nepsi, un'eccellenza nel dialogo sociale e settoriale. Con la salute dei lavoratori non si scherza e dunque continueremo a fare la nostra parte come Parlamento europeo.

Anthea McIntyre, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, it is very important that workers can be confident that they are working in a safe environment and that their exposure to carcinogens is very carefully controlled. So the first thing we must ensure is that exposure limits are actually measurable in the workplace.

Now the limits originally set out in the Commission proposal were the result of many years of detailed work including evaluations and fitness checks, and frankly it was easy for me, coming from the UK, to agree to the majority of the proposed limits, as we already have these lower limits in Britain. But as well as enforcing the exposure limits, Member States should be encouraging businesses to strive for the lowest levels possible, lower, in fact, than the levels set in legislation.

I am really concerned by claims that a consequence of Brexit will be a race to the bottom for workers' rights and health and safety standards in the UK. But in fact the UK has the highest health and safety standards. We have one of the lowest fatality rates among Member States, second only to Malta, and our rates of work related ill-health, and of workers reporting that their jobs risk their health, are lower than most other Member States'.

So, to conclude, there is an established and rigorous process for setting limits to ensure that they are evidence-based, proportionate, measurable and achievable, and as policymakers we must respect this.

António Marinho e Pinto, *em nome do Grupo ALDE*. – Senhora Comissária, Senhor Presidente, meus Caros Colegas, saúdo este relatório e a relatora sobre a proteção dos trabalhadores sujeitos a riscos relacionados com a exposição a agentes cancerígenos durante a jornada de trabalho, em primeiro lugar, porque se acolhe expressamente o princípio da precaução, com um sentido que, grosso modo, se pode resumir na seguinte proposição: em caso de dúvidas sobre os efeitos de certas substâncias para a saúde das pessoas, deverá evitar-se a exposição dos trabalhadores a essas substâncias, mesmo que tal implique a sua supressão dos locais de trabalho. Em segundo lugar, porque a Comissão assumiu também o compromisso de proceder, até ao final do primeiro trimestre de 2019, a um estudo sobre a inclusão dos produtos reprotóxicos numa futura revisão da diretiva.

Essa revisão justifica-se por se recear que as reprotóxicas podem comportar riscos para a saúde reprodutiva, nomeadamente para o desenvolvimento do feto, bem como durante o período de aleitamento. Há, contudo, Senhora Comissária, Senhor Presidente, uma preocupação que, não tendo sido suscitada especificamente pelo conteúdo deste relatório, está sempre presente nos debates políticos que implicam questões científicas. Refiro-me à frequência com que, sobre as mesmas matérias, se obtêm pareceres científicos de sentido diametralmente oposto.

Como é que pode haver cientistas que atestam que determinadas substâncias não são prejudiciais para a saúde humana, enquanto outros garantem precisamente o contrário? É necessário denunciar e combater aqueles que instrumentalizam a ciência aos interesses económicos espúrios de certas empresas e de certos empresários.

Em época de *fake news*, é preciso também combater estes falsos relatórios e estas mentiras sob a capa da ciência. Muito obrigado.

Patrick Le Hyaric, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, une contradiction majeure est ici révélée. En effet, comment affirmer le projet d'une Europe qui protège quand plus de 100 000 travailleurs perdent la vie à cause de cancers professionnels? On ne mesure pas assez, je crois, les souffrances endurées, les déchirures pour les familles.

Le texte que nous allons voter peut constituer un progrès dès lors qu'il va permettre d'imposer la limitation à l'exposition des travailleurs à onze substances cancérigènes supplémentaires. Encore faudra-t-il organiser une réelle mise en œuvre rapide et mettre en place une surveillance effective de la santé des travailleurs tout au long de leur vie.

Cela est d'ailleurs bien contradictoire avec ce qui se décide dans certains pays, dont le mien, en France: la fin de la médecine du travail, la limitation du nombre d'inspecteurs du travail et la suppression des comités d'hygiène et de sécurité dans les entreprises. Or, ce sont bien de vies humaines dont nous parlons ici.

Il faudra aller plus loin et plus vite, notamment par la mise en place d'une protection contre les substances reprotóxicas, qui éviterait fausses couches, malformations congénitales et divers problèmes de santé pour les futurs enfants des ouvriers exposés, et protéger rapidement les 19 millions de travailleurs exposés aux émissions issues du diesel. Entre la santé maximale et la maximisation des profits, nous devons choisir toujours la santé, toujours la vie des travailleurs. N'attendons pas dix ans de plus pour le faire!

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, alors que personne ne devrait voir sa santé menacée dans le cadre de son travail, le cancer, deuxième cause de décès en Europe, est la principale cause de mortalité liée au travail. Cent mille travailleurs en meurent chaque année, alors que tous les cancers liés au travail peuvent être évités.

Nous pouvons, certes, être fiers de cet accord qui permet justement de protéger des millions de travailleurs exposés chaque jour à des substances particulièrement toxiques, comme le chrome VI ou les poussières de bois. Fiers parce que nous offrons, enfin, dans cette révision de la directive 2004, la possibilité d'une surveillance prolongée, même après l'exposition d'un travailleur ou d'une travailleuse à une substance, car le cancer se déclare souvent plusieurs années après l'exposition.

Mais j'appelle la Commission à aller plus loin. L'objectif formulé d'étendre la directive à plus de 50 nouvelles substances est encore loin d'être atteint: onze substances dans le premier volet en faveur duquel nous voterons demain, seulement cinq dans le deuxième proposé récemment, sans même les vapeurs diesel auxquelles sont confrontés trois à quatre millions de travailleurs chaque année.

Il reste du chemin à parcourir en seulement 18 mois avant la fin de votre mandat. Dans ce rapport, vous vous engagez à revoir la question des reprotoxiques d'ici à 2019. Laissez-moi vous rappeler que plus de 1 % des travailleurs y sont exposés, soit entre un et trois millions chaque année en Europe, car, face aux États qui traînent les pieds, qui préfèrent parfois protéger les lobbys industriels plutôt que la santé de leurs citoyens, nous avons besoin de la Commission, qui doit prendre enfin une initiative claire. Parce qu'une Europe qui protège, c'est d'abord une Europe qui protège la santé de ses citoyens.

Piernicola Pedicini, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche noi sosteniamo questa proposta della Commissione perché, di fatto, migliora la protezione dei lavoratori sul luogo di lavoro rispetto all'esposizione a sostanze cancerogene e a sostanze mutagene. Pertanto siamo anche favorevoli alla proposta della commissione EMPL del Parlamento di includere nel campo di applicazione di questa direttiva anche le sostanze che risultano dannose per la riproduzione dei lavoratori.

Ricordiamo che stiamo parlando di sostanze che hanno un effetto soglia e quindi, di fatto, anche esposizioni minime a tali sostanze creano un rischio non trascurabile, per quei lavoratori, di sviluppare patologie oncologiche nel corso della vita. Purtroppo i dati sono allarmanti, l'avete già detto: il 53 % dei decessi sull'attività lavorativa sono attribuibili al cancro, ma ci sono 100 000 o anche più casi che si registrano sul territorio dell'Unione europea. Quindi ci troviamo di fronte a una vera e propria emergenza sanitaria, che ci deve vedere impegnati con il massimo dello sforzo, senza nessun tipo di incertezza e tentennamento.

Fino ad ora, purtroppo, l'esperienza dei lavoratori ha preceduto la ricerca scientifica: questo è successo nel campo del carbone, è successo nell'industria dell'amianto ma anche nella manipolazione delle sostanze radioattive. Adesso basta, i lavoratori non possono essere trattati come se fossero delle cavie. Quindi investiamo nella ricerca di soluzioni innovative, di soluzioni alternative che possano proteggere i lavoratori e le loro famiglie dalla maledizione del cancro.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση για την προστασία των εργαζόμενων από καρκινογόνους παράγοντες στην εργασία, πέρα από την πρόσθεση ορισμένων ουσιών προς έλεγχο και την αλλαγή ορίων έκθεσης σε αυτές, είναι ένα ακόμη ευχολόγιο. Οι ευχές, βέβαια, σταματάνε εκεί που αρχίζει το κέρδος της επιχείρησης. Αυτό είναι που καθορίζει τα όρια, αφού τα προστατευτικά μέτρα περιορίζονται από την οικονομική εφικτότητα, όπως λέγεται το κόστος τους, τις συνθήκες ισότιμου ανταγωνισμού, κ.λπ. Η καρκινογένεση, η πρώτη αιτία θανάτου, αποτιμάται σε δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ ζημίας για την οικονομία και όχι σε ανθρώπινες ζωές. Η καπιταλιστική βαρβαρότητα στο απόγειό της. Αυτή τη βαρβαρότητα δοκιμάζουν οι εργάτες παντού, και στην Ελλάδα, της εντατικοποιημένης εργασίας υπό τον εκβιασμό της απόλυσης. Στα χρόνια των μνημονίων, τα εργατικά ατυχήματα – στην πραγματικότητα εργοδοτικά εγκλήματα – εκτοξεύθηκαν χωρίς να υπολογίζονται οι καρκινογενέσεις. Η οργανωμένη εργατική πάλη για ανθρώπινες συνθήκες δουλειάς, για την υγεία και τη ζωή των εργατών θα φέρει αποτελέσματα αν στοχεύσει στην αιτία του κακού: τα κέρδη και την εξουσία των καπιταλιστών.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Bezpieczne warunki pracy, szczególnie bezpieczeństwo zdrowotne, to jeden z kluczowych warunków godnej pracy i sprawiedliwego zatrudnienia. Mamy to zapisane w Karcie Praw Podstawowych Traktatu, a więc można to traktować także jako prawo człowieka. I w tym kontekście fakt tego sprawozdania, którego bardzo gratuluję sprawozdawczyni, i ten przegląd dyrektywy uważam za bardzo istotny, ponieważ rozwój nauki pozwala nam w tej chwili w zasadzie dość często robić przeglądy, które zarówno pozwolą zweryfikować listę substancji szkodliwych, karcenogenów czy mutagenów, jak i mogą pozwolić zweryfikować te dopuszczalne poziomy, którymi się posługujemy. I te sprawy są bardzo istotne.

Za szczególnie ważną w tym sprawozdaniu uważam – zresztą zgodnie z wcześniejszymi wezwaniami Parlamentu Europejskiego – tę propozycję poszerzenia zakresu dyrektywy o czynniki działające szkodliwie na rozrodczość. Niepłodność, choroby układu rozrodczego, zaburzenia laktacji lub wadliwy rozwój płodu to są jedne z potencjalnych efektów działania substancji szkodliwych, a także są to jedne z najsilniejszych obaw pracowników kontekście styczeńności, ekspozycji na substancje szkodliwe w miejscu pracy. I ochrona prawna, i związana z nią profilaktyka dotycząca okresu ciąży nie obejmuje tego czasu, który dotyczy okresu przed zająciem w ciążę lub w ciążę na bardzo wczesnym etapie, gdy jeszcze ona nie jest formalnie stwierdzona i zgłoszona. I z tego powodu regulacje, które pozwoliłyby już wcześniej tę profilaktykę prowadzić, są bardzo oczekiwane.

Dzisiaj wiemy, że tych substancji potencjalnie szkodliwych, które działają szkodliwie na układ rozrodczy, na rozrodczość, jest co najmniej kilkadziesiąt, więc bardzo ważne jest, żeby je skatalogować, żeby je analizować i stopniowo wprowadzać do tej dyrektywy.

Ta kwestia dotyczy około trzech milionów pracowników, którzy są narażeni na działanie tych substancji, ale percepcja tego problemu jest o wiele ważniejsza, gdyż niepłodność jest poważnym problemem w Europie. Co piąta para w Europie nie może mieć dziecka, więc percepcja tego jest – tak jak powiedziałam – zupełnie inna.

Dodatkową wartością sprawozdania są te części, które dotyczą ulepszania metod zbierania danych i wymiany dobrych praktyk między państwami członkowskimi oraz zapisy dotyczące skuteczniejszej kontroli, częstszej kontroli zdrowia pracowników.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Danke an Sie, Frau Kommissarin, für Ihren Einsatz bei der Entsenderichtlinie, aber natürlich auch hier beim Kampf gegen die Karzinogene. Dank möchte ich auch insbesondere Marita Ulvskog aussprechen für ihre geleistete Arbeit bei diesem wichtigen Bericht.

Die Gewinner dieser Woche sind eindeutig die Arbeitnehmerinnen und die Arbeitnehmer. Krebs – das kann man gar nicht oft genug wiederholen – ist die häufigste Todesursache bei arbeitsbedingten Todesfällen in Europa. Jeder Tote ist ein Toter zu viel. Diese Todesfälle können und müssen wir vermeiden. Mit der geleisteten Arbeit ist hier jetzt einiges auf den Weg gebracht. Für 50 krebserregende Stoffe sollen verbindliche Arbeitsplatzgrenzwerte umgesetzt werden, anstelle der momentanen fünf.

Und ich bin natürlich auch froh, dass wir den Rechtsrahmen der Richtlinie um fruchtbarkeitsschädigende Substanzen erweitern können. Zwei bis drei Millionen Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer sind den reprotoxischen Stoffen ausgesetzt, und der rechtliche Schutz war natürlich bisher mehr schlecht als recht. Das wird sich in Zukunft ändern.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Nikogo nie trzeba przekonywać, że narażenie pracowników na substancje rakotwórcze i mutagenne w środowisku pracy to kluczowy problem bezpieczeństwa i higieny pracy. Nie ma nic cenniejszego niż zdrowie pracownika. Dlatego zapewnienie wszystkim narażonym pracownikom kontroli zdrowia przez całe życie czy też włączenie reprotoksyn, czyli substancji działających szkodliwie na rozrodczość, w zakres dyrektywy jest w pełni zrozumiałe.

Ważne też, by znać maksymalne wartości dopuszczalnych stężeń narażenia zawodowego dla benzenu, chlorku winylu, pyłów drewna twardego, ołowiu i jego związków nieorganicznych oraz azbestu. Ważne, by restrykcyjne wartości dopuszczalne, na przykład dla związków chromu, ołowiu, pyłu drzewnego czy też krzemionki krystalicznej, były przestrzegane we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Ważne, by monitoring tych substancji był wiarygodny, prawdziwy i porównywalny, by stale edukować pracowników w tej kwestii. Ważne wreszcie, by chronić zwłaszcza grupy szczególnego ryzyka: kobiety w ciąży, kobiety karmiące, osoby niepełnosprawne i młodociane.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el cáncer es la primera causa de la mortalidad laboral en la Unión Europea. Cada año se atribuye al cáncer el 53 % de las muertes laborales, según los datos de la propia Comisión. Seguimos teniendo una información escasa sobre sustancias carcinógenas y niveles de exposición. Además, aparecen riesgos nuevos como los nanomateriales, que siguen sin estar evaluados.

A pesar de conocer la relación que existe entre los disruptores endocrinos y el cáncer, la Comisión Europea sigue sin cumplir la sentencia del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea y establecer una clara y ambiciosa regulación de los mismos. No se están analizando cómo las condiciones laborales precarias —como la rotación de empleos, tiempos parciales con horarios fragmentados— hacen que se puedan tener múltiples exposiciones a sustancias cancerígenas y, además, estas mismas condiciones dificultan el acceso a servicios de prevención, por otra parte afectados por la reducción de los presupuestos dedicados a la misma.

No se cumple en muchos países con la normativa de la OIT sobre la notificación obligatoria a los trabajadores expuestos a los carcinógenos, y eso tiene especial relevancia en las pequeñas empresas. Y, a pesar de estos datos, seguimos avanzando muy escasamente a la hora de establecer regulaciones que eviten que estas muertes se sigan produciendo.

Hay que crear registros nacionales con datos desglosados por sexo, edad y puestos de trabajo. Hay que evitar la exposición, pero también sustituir las sustancias cancerígenas, ampliar los servicios médicos especializados y aumentar las inspecciones de trabajo, entre muchos otros aspectos.

Pero quiero destacar, para acabar, que además hace falta establecer planes, estrategias para la reincorporación laboral de los trabajadores afectados por el cáncer originado en el trabajo, ya que estos terminan por sufrir discriminaciones laborales y, en el peor de los casos, pérdida de empleo.

Georges Bach (PPE). – Herr Präsident, geehrte Frau Kommissarin Marianne Thyssen! Die Europäische Union hat weltweit mit die höchsten Gesundheits- und Sicherheitsstandards bei der Arbeit, und darauf können wir stolz sein. Dies bedeutet aber nicht, dass wir uns auf dem bereits Erreichten ausruhen und gemütlich zurücklehnen können. Die Arbeitswelt entwickelt sich immer weiter, neue Technologien, neue wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse, neue Studien legen dar, dass Stoffe, die jahrelang ohne Bedenken genutzt wurden, krebserregend sind und tausende Menschen das Leben kosten. Asbest ist das bekannteste Beispiel für eine solche Entwicklung.

Aus diesem Grund begrüße ich und beglückwünsche ich die Kommission, dass sie den Forderungen nach einer Überarbeitung der Richtlinie nachgekommen ist. Ich möchte nicht im Detail auf die einzelnen Stoffe eingehen; das haben die Kollegen zur Genüge getan. Wir müssen an dem Gedanken festhalten, dass Maßnahmen zum Schutz der Gesundheit der Arbeiter Investitionen sind und nicht ausschließlich als Kosten zu betrachten sind. Investitionen, die den Arbeitern und deren Gesundheit zugutekommen, haben nicht nur positive Auswirkungen auf die Produktivität der Unternehmen, sondern auch auf die Gesellschaft insgesamt.

Natürlich müssen sich die Unternehmen – vor allem kleine und mittlere – auf die neuen Vorschriften umstellen. Vernünftige Übergangsfristen sind deswegen vorgesehen. Das Vorsorgeprinzip erscheint mir in diesem Bereich sehr wichtig, und ich begrüße zudem die Tatsache, wie manche Kollegen das schon gesagt haben, dass reprotoxische Stoffe im Kompromiss berücksichtigt wurden. Ich hoffe, dass das so schnell wie möglich in den Geltungsbereich aufgenommen wird.

Zum Schluss möchte ich hervorheben, dass auf Druck des Parlaments die ärztliche Überwachung auch über das Ende der Arbeit hinaus und zum Schutz der Gesundheit der Betroffenen als notwendig erachtet wird. Nochmals meinen Dank an die Kollegen, auch für die zügige Arbeit. Wir haben hier in etwas mehr als einem Jahr ein ordentliches Dossiererarbeitet. Ich beglückwünsche nochmals die Kommission, auch dafür, dass sie die nächstfolgenden Schritte schon so weit etabliert hat.

Георги Пирински (S&D). – г-н Председател, благодарение на категоричната позиция на Европейския парламент и лично на докладчика Марита Улвског бе постигнато съгласие за по-строги ограничения за някои от най-често срещаните канцерогени, задължение на Комисията да докладва за въздействието на вещества, увреждащи репродуктивните способности на хората, най-късно до началото на 2019 година, както и въвеждане на задължително здравно наблюдение на изложените на риск работници, в това число и след приключването на трудовата им дейност.

Резултатът е много по-добра превенция и възможност да бъдат спасени поне 100 хиляди живота допълнително, както и здравно наблюдение за над 20 милиона работници, изложени на въздействието на ракообразуващи вещества. Сега отговорност на държавите членки е своевременно да приложат тези нови изисквания.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Mr President, I want workplaces to be safe, irrespective of their setting. I want to maintain the EU's reputation as a setter of very high standards, but I guess that on the day when this Parliament voted to disregard the overwhelming majority of scientific evidence and restrict the authorisation of glyphosate, perhaps it should come as no surprise that we are being asked to vote to lower acceptable limits on chromium 6, which similarly have no scientific basis.

In order to ensure ongoing protection and confidence in the system, and that is what this legislation is all about, we should ensure that decisions on substances and levels are robust and not political. They should be based on the scientific evidence.

I therefore regret the inclusion of this item in an otherwise largely sensible and commendable trilogue conclusion and I can only come to the conclusion that, sadly, I will not be able to vote in favour. I will have to abstain on that basis.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Dla nas wszystkich kwestia zdrowia i bezpieczeństwa pracowników jest kluczowa i traktujemy ją priorytetowo. Dlatego też od samego początku delegacja polska w grupie PPE popierała projekt Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie ochrony pracowników przed zagrożeniem dotyczącym narażenia na działanie czynników rakotwórczych lub mutagenów.

Limity zaproponowane przez Komisję Europejską były oparte na rzetelnych analizach oraz na wypracowanym porozumieniu pomiędzy partnerami społecznymi. Niestety podczas prac nad tą dyrektywą w Parlamencie pojawiły się próby drastycznego zaostrzania limitów zawartych we wstępnym projekcie, niekoniecznie wynikające z konieczności ochrony zdrowia. Konsekwencje takiego restrykcyjnego podejścia mogłyby być bardzo niebezpieczne. Zbyt wiele jest przypadków, gdy w sytuacji braku możliwości spełnienia wygórowanych wymogów część firm zaczyna naruszać prawo, i ma to bardzo negatywne skutki dla zdrowia pracowników.

W większości przypadków udało nam się znaleźć rozsądne rozwiązania, jednakże nie mogę zgodzić się na rozwiązania zaproponowane przede wszystkim w przypadku pyłów drewna twardego. Limit, który znalazł się w wypracowanym kompromisie, jest zbyt restrykcyjny. W moim kraju tartaki oraz producenci wyrobów z drewna to głównie mali i średni przedsiębiorcy i nieuzasadnione zmniejszenie pyłów drewna do dwóch miligramów na metr sześcienny jest dla nich nie do spełnienia. Podobnie ma się sytuacja dotycząca chromu. Jestem przekonana, że jako Parlament powinniśmy opierać nasze decyzje na podstawie rzetelnych badań naukowych i przede wszystkim zachęcać przemysł i naukowców do poszukiwania alternatywnych materiałów i sposobów produkcji, a przedsiębiorcom, szczególnie małym i średnim, dać czas na dostosowanie. Dziękuję sprawozdawczyni za jej zaangażowanie w prace nad sprawozdaniem.

Siôn Simon (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this measure as far as it goes and congratulate Parliament's rapporteur on a good piece of work which extends the scope to reprotoxics, which was a good thing to do, and which I understand meant that she felt it could not be extended further. But I have to say that we have to do something – if not in this measure, then in other measures – but we have to do something to address the exposure of healthcare workers to the dangers of the carcinogenic drugs that they administer.

There are hundreds and thousands of healthcare workers in the United Kingdom alone dying from leukaemia, suffering miscarriages and having appalling healthcare outcomes that are entirely preventable. The technology to prevent this exists quite easily, and is only not happening because of cost. That has to change. It is indefensible.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, le cancer ne s'arrête pas aux portes de l'entreprise. Dans l'Union européenne, il est même la première cause de mortalité liée au travail.

L'accord trouvé, qui révisé certaines valeurs limites d'exposition aux substances cancérogènes et en intègre de nouvelles, est donc le bienvenu. Il contribuera à mieux protéger nos travailleurs dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. Il fixera aussi à nos petites et moyennes entreprises des objectifs accessibles.

Parmi les éléments de l'accord, je voudrais insister sur le travail qui a été réalisé concernant la poussière de silice, présente dans la majorité des industries de manufacture et de construction, et qui a suscité de nombreux débats. De mon point de vue, la valeur que nous avons trouvée est ambitieuse mais pragmatique, et représente une avancée notable pour la santé humaine.

Elle doit aller de pair avec la poursuite de bonnes pratiques en matière de prévention. Elle doit aussi s'accompagner de programmes de recherche ciblés sur les processus de réduction ou de substitution, lorsque cela est techniquement faisable. Il nous faut également une meilleure collecte de données, des études et un suivi sur le long terme.

Actuellement, la Commission européenne travaille sur de nouvelles propositions pour couvrir davantage d'agents cancérigènes. Je salue cette démarche, qui devrait être négociée avec les partenaires sociaux pour coller à la réalité, car je crois que c'est ainsi que nous pourrions garantir l'efficacité des solutions proposées.

Elena Gentile (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono convinta che tra gli obiettivi più qualificanti per le istituzioni europee e per questo Parlamento vi sia quello del lavoro: non solo lavoro equamente retribuito, non solo politiche che offrano a tutti gli europei la possibilità di costruire il proprio progetto di vita, ma anche e soprattutto lavoro di qualità per la salute e il benessere, appunto, dei lavoratori.

Non vi è dubbio: l'esposizione a sostanze cancerogene è la prima causa di malattia e di morte tra i lavoratori non protetti. Vorrei inoltre sottolineare il rischio a cui vengono esposti le lavoratrici gravide e tutti i lavoratori e le lavoratrici se esposti ai mutageni interferenti endocrini.

Far prevalere dunque il principio dell'approccio precauzionale è una scelta di buon senso, oltre, ovviamente, a sottolineare la considerazione della necessità di promuovere una valutazione dei costi che incidono pesantemente sulla spesa sanitaria, ma anche su quella sociale.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, ochrana zdraví lidí a pracovníků je prioritou pro nás pro všechny a vzhledem k volnému pohybu pracovníků po Evropské unii je samozřejmě vhodné, aby existovala jednotná úprava v oblasti požadavků na pracovní prostředí.

Podle statistik je v Evropě rakovina druhou nejčastější příčinou úmrtí. Je zřejmé, že dlouhodobé vystavování určitým látkám na pracovišti je rozhodně jedním z rizikových faktorů. Podle údajů Evropské agentury pro bezpečnost a ochranu zdraví při práci dojde ročně v Evropské unii až ke stotisícům úmrtí způsobených rakovinou nabytou při povolání. Zdravotní problémy a tyto ztráty jsou samozřejmě na lidských životech nenahraditelné, ale dají se vyčíslit také ekonomicky, údajně ztrátou čtyř až šesti procent hrubého domácího produktu.

Nová právní úprava má tedy zajistit lepší ochranu zdraví pracovníků snížením jejich vystavení závadným chemickým substancím na pracovišti. Vyjednaná podoba je vyváženým kompromisem i pro zaměstnavatele, kteří budou nakonec muset realizovat tato opatření. Směrnice navrhuje limity, jež jsou poměrně striktní, a vytváří prostor pro ještě další zpřísnění, zejména u látek, jako je krystalický oxid křemičitý, šestimocný chrom a dřevní prach. Je správné, že byl obojí druh dřevního prachu zařazen také mezi tyto škodlivé látky a nízké limity jsou vzhledem k prokázané škodlivosti oprávněné. Tento kompromis podporuji.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Auch ich möchte mich zuerst einmal bei all den Verhandlerinnen und Verhandlern bedanken, denn ich glaube, das Paket, das wir nun auf dem Tisch liegen haben, ist eines, auf das wir recht stolz sein können. Wir haben in den letzten Jahren einiges dazu beigetragen, die Gesundheit der Europäerinnen und Europäer zu verbessern. Ich denke in diesem Zusammenhang an die Tabakprodukterichtlinie, ich denke aber auch an die Begrenzung der Emissionswerte bei Kfz. Denn all dies hat dazu beigetragen, dass vor allem der Lungenkrebs hier aktiv bekämpft wird.

Und wenn wir heute von den zusätzlichen Kosten sprechen, die durch die Umsetzung dieser veränderten Richtlinie auf Unternehmen zukommen könnten, dann dürfen wir die Kosten des Nichthandelns nicht außer Acht lassen. Denn nicht zu handeln würde nicht nur weiter großes menschliches Leid über die Europäische Union bringen, sondern es würde auch unsere Gesundheits- und vor allem unsere Krankensysteme schwer belasten, und das geht auch zulasten der Unternehmerinnen und Unternehmer, das geht zulasten des Standortes EU. Das heißt, hier haben wir viel für die Menschen getan, wir haben hier aber auch viel für den Wirtschaftsstandort Europa getan.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter, iedere ochtend ga je fluitend naar het werk en op het moment dat je kan genieten van je pensioen, wordt er asbestkanker vastgesteld. Kanker nota bene als gevolg van het werk dat je gedaan hebt. Het gebeurt in Europa elk jaar duizenden keren. Daarom ben ik zo verheugd over het verslag van mijn collega Ulvskog. Ik denk dat daar goede normen in staan, strengere normen over schadelijke stoffen die vrijkomen bij industriële productie, waaronder chroom(VI).

En toch, er zijn industrieën die zich enorm verzet hebben tegen deze nieuwe regels, die hun werknemers liever blijven blootstellen aan schadelijke stoffen, omdat dat goedkoper is. Diezelfde industrieën hebben de Commissie tien jaar lang dwarsgezet over de strengere regels die de Commissie wilde voorstellen. Ik denk dat dat beschamend is. Ik had nooit gedacht dat ik degene moest zijn die het bedrijfsleven moest bijspijkeren over de economie, maar laat ik dan zeggen: met dode werknemers kun je een bedrijf niet winstgevend maken. Het zou de bedrijven passen als ze nu zouden aandringen om met de nodige spoed te werken aan de omzetting van deze nieuwe regels.

Procedura catch-the-eye

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il cancro costituisce la principale causa di mortalità connessa al lavoro nell'Unione europea, ben il 53 %, un valore dunque molto preoccupante in una società avanzata come la nostra, che dovrebbe assicurare la salute dei cittadini e dei lavoratori. La tutela della salute sui luoghi di lavoro deve divenire effettivamente una priorità nell'agenda europea.

Accolgo dunque positivamente la revisione della direttiva sugli agenti cancerogeni e mutageni, in quanto è essenziale per una migliore protezione dei lavoratori. Tuttavia, credo che il principio di precauzione vada applicato in maniera più incisiva nel nostro ordinamento. Vanno anche valutate più attentamente le singole sostanze potenzialmente cancerogene non ancora figuranti tra quelle sottoposte ai limiti di esposizione: penso, ad esempio, agli interferenti endocrini.

C'è bisogno di una più stretta cooperazione tra Unione europea e Stati membri, che dovrebbero assicurare dati più chiari ed esaustivi per consentire alla stessa Unione di promuovere le migliori prassi.

Va infine ampliato il campo di applicazione della direttiva anche agli agenti reprotossici, trattati in maniera troppo debole dalla direttiva sugli agenti chimici nonostante siano molto pericolosi per la salute umana.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο καρκίνος συνιστά βασική αιτία θανάτου χιλιάδων εργαζομένων, ήτοι από δύο έως τρία εκατομμύρια εργαζόμενοι εκτίθενται σε τοξικές ουσίες. Ο αμίαντος είναι μια κλασική περίπτωση, όπως και η ξυλόσκονη, το χρώμιο IV και το κρυσταλλικό διοξείδιο πυριτίου. Επομένως, πρέπει να ληφθούν σοβαρά μέτρα προκειμένου να αντιμετωπιστούν τα προβλήματα που δημιουργεί η έκθεση σε καρκινογόνους παράγοντες στον χώρο της εργασίας. Και είναι δεδομένο ότι η οδηγία 98/24/EK δίνει ελάχιστη προστασία στους εργαζομένους. Απαιτείται λοιπόν μία αυστηροποίηση της νομοθεσίας, πολύ συγκεκριμένοι κανόνες για τις οριακές τιμές, διεύρυνση του πεδίου εφαρμογής με συμπερίληψη νέων ουσιών που προκαλούν καρκίνο, ιδιαίτερη προστασία των εγκύων γυναικών, και υποχρεωτική δια βίου ιατρική παρακολούθηση των εκτεθειμένων εργαζομένων. Διότι πρέπει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να περάσει το μήνυμα ότι η υγεία των εργαζομένων είναι πάνω από τα κέρδη των επιχειρήσεων.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, 100 000 people die each year in Europe because of work-related cancer diseases. Whilst the Commission proposal is a good first step, we must broaden the scope of the directive, as suggested by the rapporteur, to allow for the inclusion reprotoxic substances, a growing problem in workplaces – especially for women. The French Agency for Food, Environment, Safety and Health indicated that 180 000 French workers have been exposed to such substances, which can cause all manner of reproductive issues for both female and male workers.

Improving workers' health protection by reducing occupational exposure to chemical agents that may cause cancer or mutations should take into account specific issues and real situations, including adopting a gender perspective. I particularly want to highlight the role of trade unions and workers' federations, who have been fighting for years on this issue and have provided excellent evidence for the drafting of this report and the preparation of this debate.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el cáncer es la principal causa de fallecimiento relacionado con el trabajo, con más de 100 000 muertes en la Unión Europea. Por ese motivo debemos felicitarnos por este informe y una mayor regulación para prevenir el cáncer en el ámbito laboral. Es un paso adelante que en esta propuesta se incluyan sustancias tóxicas para la reproducción, pero tenemos que seguir trabajando para proteger a las trabajadoras embarazadas desde las primeras semanas de gestación y prevenir los desequilibrios hormonales producidos por estas sustancias.

Este informe contiene muchos elementos positivos. Sin embargo, señorías, de poco sirve este trabajo de regulación sobre seguridad y salud en el trabajo si después no se cumplen y no se aplican los protocolos. Es el caso de los cuarenta y nueve trabajadores que en diciembre de 2012 sufrieron la intoxicación por mercurio más grave de Europa en la fábrica Asturiana de Zinc. Un accidente repleto de negligencias: desde la evaluación del riesgo hasta los equipos de protección y además una medicación que se les suministra demasiado tarde. A día de hoy sufren graves consecuencias y ni siquiera están recibiendo la asistencia médica que necesitan. Siguen luchando y desde aquí los apoyamos para que reciban esa atención médica. Pero casos como este no pueden volver a repetirse.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο καρκίνος είναι η δεύτερη αιτία θανάτου στην Ευρώπη και η πρώτη που σχετίζεται με την εργασία. Δυστυχώς, οι άσχημες συνθήκες εργασίας εκθέτουν τους εργαζομένους σε ουσίες οι οποίες είναι επικίνδυνες για την υγεία τους, καθώς επίσης και σε ουσίες οι οποίες είναι επικίνδυνες για την αναπαραγωγική δυνατότητά τους. Σε μια εποχή κατά την οποία η υπογεννητικότητα αποτελεί τεράστια απειλή ακόμη και για την ύπαρξη όλων των χωρών της Ευρώπης, και με δεδομένο ότι ο καρκίνος ο οποίος συνδέεται με την εργασία είναι δυνατόν να προληφθεί, πρέπει τα κράτη της Ευρώπης να αντιδράσουν. Οφείλουν να επιβάλουν στις επιχειρήσεις να βελτιώσουν τις συνθήκες εργασίας και να προστατεύσουν τους εργαζομένους από την επαφή με ουσίες οι οποίες είναι επικίνδυνες για την υγεία τους. Πρέπει επίσης να προστατεύσουν τη γονιμότητα ανδρών και γυναικών, και να παρακολουθούν κυρίως τις εγκύους γυναίκες από την πρώτη στιγμή της κύησης τους. Τέλος, πρέπει να παρακολουθούν όλους τους εργαζομένους που έχουν έρθει σε επαφή με καρκινογόνες ουσίες εφ' όρου ζωής. Στο σημείο αυτό, δεν πρέπει να ληφθούν υπόψη τα οικονομικά κόστη, τα οποία συνεπάγονται όλες αυτές οι δραστηριότητες. Η ζωή του ανθρώπου δεν αποτιμάται σε χρήμα.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, protecting people in the workplace is of the utmost importance, and while much has improved, 53% of work-related deaths are still caused by occupational cancer. In the days before the EU, it was the trade unions who stood up to protect workers from carcinogenic substances like asbestos, and now – thankfully – there is a directive with specific exposure limits. As a proud union man myself, I want to thank them for the role they have played and continue to play.

So about this report, which places limit values and 13 further carcinogens: given that around 50 carcinogens account for 80% of total exposure in the workplace, it is very welcome that the Commission plans to introduce limits for additional substances. Regular healthcare checks after exposure must continue for as long as it is necessary.

Finally, it is my hope that workers in manufacturing, construction and many other sectors will continue to be protected after Brexit because, after all, they are the lifeblood of our economy.

(Fine della procedura catch-the-eye)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, once more, I would like to thank the rapporteur and the shadows for reaching a balanced compromise that will clearly make a difference for workers' protection from now on. As always, we take note of your questions and remarks and, as I said, our work will not stop here. This legislative proposal is a first step in a series of forthcoming initiatives in this area.

I am pleased that in June this year the Council reached a general approach on our second proposal to amend the Directive. This confirms the political commitment of both the Commission and the Member States to fight occupational cancer. I count on the European Parliament to adopt its position on this second batch so that the interinstitutional negotiations should start as soon as possible.

Dear Members of Parliament, some of you mentioned diesel engine exhausts and that this is one of the 25 chemical agents evaluated that are of a major concern for causing occupational cancer. Why have we not yet proposed an occupational exposure limit (OEL)? Diesel engine exhaust is a complex issue, in particular in terms of defining exposure and identifying adequate measurement methods. It contains different components depending on the type of engine used. Identifying the engines that produce carcinogenic exhaust requires further analysis. The Commission is continuing its efforts to find the most appropriate action, and has the intention to include diesel engine emissions (DEE) in its forthcoming second phase consultation of the social partners with a view to considering to address DEE in the fourth batch.

Work-related cancer is a real tragedy for workers and their families, and is at the same time a heavy burden for the whole of society. We now have a chance to make a real difference in people's lives. The Commission counts on your support on these legislative files that aim to further fight occupational cancer. I invite you also to continue our constructive cooperation.

Thank you very much, and congratulations on the results of the triologue.

Marita Ulvskog, föredragande. – Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att säga att alla de gränsvärden som är med i vår överenskommelse är gränsvärden som på vetenskaplig grund redan finns i vissa av medlemsländerna, oftast de rikaste medlemsländerna. Det betyder att i de länder i EU som haft en svårare väg att gå till ekonomisk styrka saknar man det skyddet. Och nu föreslår vi alltså att samma ambitionsnivå som vi har i de rikaste delarna av EU ska finnas i hela EU. Det här säger jag i polemik med en ledamot som inte finns kvar här längre, som tyckte att det var ett elände att de skulle tvingas in i denna icke-cancerogena kraftmätning som vi ägnar oss åt.

Denna lagstiftning är ju, som flera av er har påpekat och som kommissionär Thyssen också har gjort, den första av flera. Från parlamentets sida kan jag lova att vi kommer att vara väldigt besvärliga. Vi kommer att ligga på för att det ska komma så snart som möjligt, med så många viktiga ämnen som möjligt. Jag uppfattar det som att kommissionär Thyssen sade fjärde omgången för dieseln. Vi kommer nog att försöka jobba för att det blir en snabbare tidtabell för dieseln, för det är ett av de ämnen som är kolossalt viktigt och där det också är så att de sociala parterna är djupt engagerade i saken. Men så här långt har vi kommit en liten bit på väg. Vi har mycket kvar att göra, och från utskottets sida kommer vi att kämpa vidare med denna fråga som är så konkret och där det faktiskt går att göra fantastiskt stor skillnad genom att samarbeta om att rädda liv.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 25 ottobre 2017.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Ádám Kósa (PPE), írásban. – A munkavállalók és családtagjaik számára a rák nemcsak jelentős életminőség-romlást, hanem a közegészségügyi ellátásra fordított közvetlen költségeket, valamint közvetlen és közvetett anyagi veszteségeket is okoz. A munkahelyen szerzett rákos megbetegedések az egész gazdaságban is éreztetik hatásukat, hiszen csökkentik a munkaerő-kínálatot, és megterhelik az államháztartást is, hiszen több egészségügyi ellátásra kell fordítani forrásokat. Továbbá meg kell óvnunk az idősödő munkavállalók produktivitását egy fenntartható társadalom érdekében. Ugyanakkor az újabb, például a mutagénekkel, valamint a reprodukcióképességet befolyásoló előírásoknak és határértékeknek reálisnak, észszerűnek és valósnak kell lenniük.

Álláspontom szerint a csomag elfogadásával nem sikerül mindezen szempontokat egyszerre érvényesíteni, hiszen a reprodukzív képességet csökkentő anyagokkal kapcsolatos szabályozás egy külön jogszabályért kiáltana annak összetettsége miatt, illetve nem megoldott az életen át tartó ellenőrzés feltételrendszere sem, ami a KKV-kat hozza nehezebb helyzetbe.

Romana Tomc (PPE), pisno. – Vsako leto v Evropski uniji umre več kot 100000 ljudi zaradi posledic raka, ki je povezan z delovnim mestom. Že več kot 10 let čakamo, da se spremeni zakonodaja na tem področju. Revizija obstoječih pravil bo zagotovila tudi večjo zaščito delavcev.

Zahtevamo celovite preglede delavcev, tudi po njihovi upokojitvi, saj se nekateri simptomi pokažejo šele nekaj let po tem, ko so bili izpostavljeni tveganju. Izpostavljenost substancam, ki povzročajo raka, moramo znižati na minimum. Vsako novo raziskavo, ki pokaže nova tveganja, je potrebno vključiti v zakonodajo.

(Le seduta è sospesa per pochi minuti).

18. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (Aussprache)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla relazione di Soraya Post, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sugli aspetti relativi ai diritti fondamentali nell'integrazione dei rom nell'Unione europea: lotta all'antiziganismo (2017/2038(INI)) (A8-0294/2017).

Soraya Post, rapporteur. – Mr President, my name is Soraya Post and I am a Roma woman from Sweden belonging to the Sinti group. I was born condemned.

I have been a human rights activist for 40 years. So in 2014, when I got elected to represent the Swedish Feministiskt initiativ, I took on the mission of safeguarding the principles of democracy, of spreading and defending fundamental human rights, gender equality and the respect of the basic values of our EU Treaties.

One of my goals with this report is to place the situation of the Roma on the political agenda and to make real, tangible change at last.

The EU is at a very critical point at the moment, and the destiny of 12 million people is not a priority. This clearly goes against the values of the EU. But this neglect is not a new phenomenon. It has been going on for 800 years. And the result is that now, in 2017, the situation of the Roma people is not better than in third countries. And, as I said, following my mission, I want to fight against injustice and inequality.

This is not an easy task. The last time we had a debate on Roma issues in this Chamber in April, three MEPs took the opportunity to spread hate speech. And, although we have strengthened the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament, the President of the European Parliament failed to react, failed to condemn and sanction hate speech. I was not very surprised.

Roma people have been neglected, discriminated against, stigmatised, excluded and dehumanised for 800 years. We have never been good enough for European societies to accept us as equal citizens with guaranteed equal access to our fundamental human rights. The result is clear to see in all the shocking reports of the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights and NGOs.

Anti-Gypsyism, the specific form of racism directed against the Roma, was first recognised in the European Parliament in 2015 through our resolution. Anti-Gypsyism, however unconscious it might be, can be revealed in the EU acquis as well, which often fails to take into consideration the realities and challenges of Roma, who are unable to enjoy the same rights and opportunities and the same level of protection as other EU citizens.

Until we manage to remedy anti-Gypsyism, the root cause of the unacceptable situation that Roma are still facing in Europe in 2017, we will not see any improvement, even if the European Commission initiates good programmes.

Is there a need to improve this situation? Yes. Is there a way to improve this situation? Yes. Is there a way out of mistrust from both sides? Yes, of course there is.

My report, which has been the first European Parliament report addressing anti-Gypsyism on a wide scale, lists 12 pages of demands and recommendations, of which I will only mention a few. We demand the setting up of truth and reconciliation commissions at Member State and EU-level to acknowledge the persecution, exclusion and disownment of Roma throughout the centuries: to document these in an official white paper and to make the history of Roma part of the curricula in schools, which is crucial for creating trust.

We deplore the violation of the right of Roma to free movement. We also call on the Member States of origin to take their responsibility to combat poverty and exclusion of all their citizens, and on the Member States of arrival to increase cooperation across borders to combat discrimination and exploitation and prevent exclusion continuing in the country of arrival. We demand active, meaningful participation for Roma at all levels.

We call on the Court of Auditors to check the performance of EU programmes, as they seem to fail to reach out to the most disadvantaged. We call for compensation for Roma women having been subject to forced sterilisation. We call for the continuation of an improved EU framework for national Roma integration strategies after 2020.

We call on the Commission for the introduction of anti-discrimination indicators in the field of education, employment, housing and health, as anti-Gypsyism undermines the successful implementation of the national Roma strategies. And we call on the Commission to treat anti-Gypsyism as a horizontal issue and develop an inventory of practical steps to combat anti-Gypsyism.

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to start by thanking the rapporteur and Parliament for the continued support to the Roma integration process. The 2011 resolution of the European Parliament played a key role in the launching of the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies up to 2020. Today, I particularly want to thank Soraya Post for her relentless and tireless work in this field – not only in this report, but for the work you do in general.

This report, as the rapporteur says, rightly highlights anti-Gypsyism, which is being felt in our society through anti-Roma hate speech, growing terms of segregation and forced evictions. Anti-Gypsyism and socioeconomic exclusion go hand in hand, so we must tackle these together. Many parts of the report confirm the conclusions we also made in the mid-term review – improvements in education, this is key of course. Fewer Roma leave school early and more Roma children participate today in early childhood education. However, segregation in education has persisted, and the situation has deteriorated. In several Member States, the majority of Roma children attend classes where most – or almost all – classmates are Roma. Educating Roma children in segregated settings prevent them from equal chances to participate in later higher quality education and from gaining access to the labour market, and this is why the Commission launched infringements: to ensure effective, equal access for Roma to a quality, inclusive, mainstream education.

I am also grateful that the report recognises existing efforts and calls for continued action from the Commission's side in several areas. For instance, it explicitly calls for the extension of the Joint Programme on Access to Justice for Roma and Traveller Women, piloted since last year in five Member States by the Commission and the Council of Europe. The aim is to empower Roma women, improve their access to justice and fight the multi-faceted discrimination that they encounter. These are all priority areas highlighted by the report.

The report's call for setting up a truth and reconciliation commission is welcome. These bodies, focusing on national histories and engaging directly with societies, are of course best placed at national level. This process should be Roma-led, with the involvement of other stakeholders as well. Thus, and given its mandate, the newly set-up European Roma Institute of Arts and Culture could be well positioned, rather than the Commission playing a leading role in this process, and we are of course ready to support this.

There are many very valuable proposals in this report. We would like to thank again the rapporteur and the Committee for the work that you have done, and we look forward to the discussion.

Malin Björk, *föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för kvinnors rättigheter och jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män*. – Herr talman! Först och främst vill jag säga tack till dig Soraya Post. Vi är lyckligt lottade i parlamentet som har dig som leder detta arbete. Jag är glad att ha fått leda arbetet i jämställdhetsutskottet där vi har tagit fram rekommendationer som specifikt tar upp den utsatta situationen för kvinnor och flickor. Det är ju så att den strukturella antiziganismen drabbar kvinnor och flickor alldeles extra hårt.

Situationen är oacceptabel, men framför allt kan man känna att det som är mest oacceptabelt är frånvaron av politisk handling. Det är det som detta betänkande försöker komma till rätta med. I jämställdhetsutskottet vill vi se riktade satsningar för att stärka romska kvinnors rättigheter och situation, och det är en viktig del av det politiska svaret för att bekämpa antiziganism. Vi vill se satsningar på god hälso- och sjukvård, särskilt sexuell och reproduktiv hälsa och rättigheter, god abortvård, bra preventivmedel, god mödravård. Det borde vara en självklarhet, men det är det inte idag.

Barn ska ha rätt till skolgång, också när de reser runt och när de jobbar i Sverige till exempel. Att satsa på romska kvinnor, som jag sade, är en del och ett viktigt och konkret sätt att bekämpa strukturell antiziganism. Kollegor, antiziganismen, precis som Soraya Post sade, den är odemokratisk, den är ovärdig och vi kommer inte att ge oss förrän den är utrotad.

Pál Csáky, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Az Európai Néppárt nevében üdvözlöm ezt az anyagot. Fontosnak tartom, hogy egy ilyen dokumentum megszületett az Európai Parlamentben. Köszönöm az együttműködést Post asszonynak, aki visszaigazolhatja, hogy az Európai Néppárt nagyon aktív volt a módosító javaslatok kidolgozásában, és a jelentés végső formájának kialakításában. Ennek a jelentésnek a lényege az, hogy új megközelítést próbáljon bevenni az eddigi roma-politikákba. Évek és évtizedek óta szinte minden tagállam napirendjén szerepel a roma integráció kérdése. Különböző megközelítések, meglátások, ötletek, stratégiák láttak napvilágot, de áttörés sajnos nem következett be a kérdésben.

El kell mondjuk azt, hogy a téma európai szintre emelése se hozta el eddig a belé vetett reményt, bár be kell vallani, hogy előrelépés történt, és nélküle még rosszabb lenne a helyzet. A mostani jelentés lényege abban áll, hogy a cigányellenességre, mint jelenségre helyezi a hangsúlyt. Amíg ez ellen a jelenség ellen harcolunk, és hozunk olyan intézkedéseket, amelyek a lakhatás, a foglalkoztatottság és az egészségügy, valamint az oktatás terén pozitívak lesznek, addig van esély arra, hogy ki tudjunk kerülni a jelenlegi helyzetből. Ugyanis amikor a társadalom rétegeibe már mélyen beleivódott a romaellenesség, akkor nagyon nehéz más területeken is előrelépni.

Fontosnak tartom végezetül azt is, hogy a kérdés közép-kelet-európai összefüggései is bekerültek az anyagba. Én magyar, szlovák és cseh szakértők véleményét kértem ki, és dolgoztam be, és örülök annak, hogy a romatelepek, roma „settlement”-ek kérdése, amelyek elsősorban Románia, Bulgária és Szlovákia problémái, is helyet kaptak, és megoldási javaslatok kidolgozására szólítjuk fel az említett három ország kormányát.

Josef Weidenholzer, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Wir führen heute eine sehr wichtige Debatte. Roma und Sinti sind die größte ethnische Minderheit in Europa – 20 Millionen leben in allen Mitgliedstaaten. Sie sind also die einzige paneuropäische Minderheit. Viele Mitgliedstaaten haben weniger Einwohner. Roma sind seit vielen Generationen diskriminiert. Sie waren während der NS-Zeit einem grausamen Holocaust ausgesetzt, über den viel zu wenig gesprochen wird.

Europa hat nicht zuletzt deswegen eine politische Verpflichtung gegenüber dieser Volksgruppe. Besonders die Grundrechtecharta verpflichtet uns dazu, gegen jede Diskriminierung und Herabsetzung aufzutreten. Der Bericht von Soraya Post ist ein sehr wichtiger Beitrag, weil er einen ganzheitlichen Ansatz verfolgt und die Aufgabe der Integration der Roma unter das Primat der Grundrechte stellt.

Ja, es geht um viel mehr als nur um sozialpolitische Maßnahmen, für die in effizienter Weise genügend Mittel zur Verfügung gestellt werden müssen. Es geht um einen inklusiven Ansatz, der die Roma als wichtigen und gleichberechtigten Teil der Bevölkerung behandelt – ohne Diskriminierung. Es ist daher auch verwerflich, Roma gegen sogenannte einheimische Arme auszuspielen. Hilfsbedürftig sind alle, die der Hilfe bedürfen, ob dies beim Zugang zum Arbeitsmarkt, im Bildungsbereich oder bei der Wohnungssuche ist. Es haben die gleichen Grundsätze für alle zu gelten.

Es ist Soraya Post zu danken, dass sie diesen Ansatz gewählt hat und ihn mit Verve vertritt. Den zivilisatorischen Fortschritt eines Landes kann man daran erkennen, wie dieses Land mit seiner Roma-Bevölkerung umgeht, und da ist noch sehr viel zu tun. Da müssen wir vor allem auch den Antiziganismus bekämpfen.

Branislav Škripek, *za skupinu ECR* – Vážený pán predsedajúci. Oceňujem vznik tejto správy. Ďakujem aj pani Soraya Post, že tomu venovala veľa úsilia a že sme na stretnutiach dlho preberali rôzne zmeny v tejto správe. Ako tieňový spravodajca chápem potrebu jednať s diskrimináciou, ktorá je kľúčová pre každú vyspelú spoločnosť. Ale chápem to aj preto, že s touto komunitou ľudí na Slovensku som sa stretal a aktívne som s ňou mohol pracovať. A videl som aj rôzne zaujímavé veci.

Musím zdôrazniť na tomto mieste, že pred Bohom sme si všetci rovní vo svojej ľudskej dôstojnosti, a preto postaveniu Rómov v Európe, ako aj ich zapojeniu do fungovania spoločnosti, musíme venovať náležitú pozornosť a musíme urobiť veľa preto, aby oni dobre fungovali v spoločnosti v každej jednej krajine, zvlášť v našich členských štátoch.

My na Slovensku máme veľký problém. Naša komunita Rómov je obrovská a sme malou päť a pol miliónovou krajinou. Máme päťsto tisíc Rómov, ktorí sa hlásia ako Rómovia. A napriek tomu si myslím, že táto správa málo ovplyvní životy Rómov, pretože málo zdôrazňuje nutnosť angažovať sa, pre nich samotných. A ja ich vidím ako podstatnú súčasť riešenia. Oni musia vedieť, ako byť zapojení do tohto procesu. My na Slovensku máme dobré príklady, keď Rómovia zobrali svoj osud do rúk a jednoducho zodpovednosť za svoje životy a výsledky sa dostavili. Za pomoci rôznych kresťanských organizácií prejavili veľkú schopnosť začať pomáhať sebe, svojim slabším, chudobnejším a stali sa ľuďmi nádeje. A to nielen pre Rómov, ale aj pre ľudí naokolo.

Takže teším sa na obdobie, keď Rómovia nebudú problém, ale oni budú prinášať riešenia nezamestnanosti a komunitného rozvoja budovania rodín.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Marina Albiol Guzmán, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, la realidad es que el pueblo gitano sigue sufriendo la discriminación y el racismo en nuestros países, la discriminación en el acceso a la vivienda, la segregación en las escuelas —que en países como Hungría, Bulgaria o Eslovaquia llega al 60 %—, una mayor tasa de encarcelamiento o la esterilización forzosa.

Todo esto no son casos puntuales. El antigitanismo impregna nuestra sociedad y, por tanto, también nuestras instituciones estatales y europeas y también los medios de comunicación. Ahí tenemos el ejemplo de España, donde programas televisivos, como *Los Gipsy Kings* o *Mi gran boda gitana*, colaboran en el mantenimiento de estereotipos y fomentan el discurso de odio.

Este informe reconoce el antigitanismo como una forma sistémica de racismo, un reconocimiento imprescindible para poder empezar a cambiar todo el enfoque de las políticas. Imprescindible es, por ejemplo, acabar con las políticas de austeridad y recortes en los servicios públicos garantes de la equidad. Nunca conseguiremos la igualdad si el Estado no pone los mecanismos para garantizarla.

Y en la lucha contra la *romafobia* deberíamos empezar por este Parlamento, donde en demasiadas ocasiones hemos escuchado discursos estigmatizantes, incluso llamadas a la violencia, sin que se produzca después condena alguna por parte de esta Cámara.

Bodil Valero, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Jag vill också börja med att tacka Soraya Post för ett oerhört bra betänkande och också skuggföredragandena för ett bra samarbete. Vi har mycket att skämmas för i Europa när det gäller hur vi hanterat och i många fall fortfarande hanterar romerna i våra länder. Därför är det viktigt att vi uppmärksammar inte bara medlemsländerna och kommissionen utan också oss själva på de fördomar som vi många gånger lärt oss sedan barnsben. Vi måste förstå var de kommer ifrån för att kunna förändra.

Vi måste också inse att den långa diskriminering romerna utsatts och utsätts för har ett pris. Priset handlar i första hand om att vi faktiskt erkänner vad vi gjort och gör och att vi ber om ursäkt för det. Upprättelse är avgörande för att nå försoning och för att skapa förtroende. Ett viktigt steg vore att utse den 2 augusti till minnesdag för förintelsens offer och också gottgöra de överlevande.

Det är mycket kvar att göra i Europa och i världen. Dagens debatt löser inte romernas problem men den är ett steg på vägen mot ett mer inkluderande och accepterande Europa, där romer inte tillåts särbehandlas och där medlemsstaternas regeringar fullgör sina skyldigheter att ge alla medborgare en likvärdig behandling. Men för att nå resultat behövs en starkt skyddslagstiftning med grund i de olika konventioner vi redan har och EU:s grundvärderingar. Ekonomiska incitament har inte hjälpt hittills, men det vi kanske allra mest behöver arbeta med är en attitydförändring hos oss, majoriteten.

(Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 162.8 i arbetsordningen.)

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Paní kolegyně, já souhlasím s tím, že je řada věcí, které se mají zlepšit, ale nesouhlasím s tím, že bychom se měli jen stydět. Tady pan kolega Škripek před chvilkou upozornil na to, že je řada věcí, které se podařily. Já se vás chci zeptat: Vy se skutečně musíte jen stydět nebo máte i příklad dobré praxe? Neříkejte mi, že ve Vaší zemi se vůbec nic proti diskriminaci romských občanů neudělalo.

Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE), svar ("blått kort"). – Självklart finns det många exempel på god praxis. I Sverige har vi arbetat väldigt aktivt, också bland annat med vitboken. Men vi har 800 eller kanske fler år bakom oss där vi har mycket att skämmas för och där vi fortfarande inte har gjort upp med vår historia, också till exempel när det gäller tvångssteriliseringar etc. I vissa länder har vi faktiskt tagit ett steg för att komma till rätta med denna försoning men det är oerhört mycket kvar att göra. Det finns det som är bra, som pågår, men det finns mycket som vi har att skämmas över och där vi fortfarande inte har bett om ursäkt.

Gilles Lebreton, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, les Roms suscitent souvent un sentiment de rejet en Europe. Ils sont même victimes de discriminations dans certains États. Ils sont pourtant présents en Europe depuis plusieurs siècles, car leurs ancêtres originaires de l'Inde y sont arrivés dans le sillage des Mongols, mais leur mode de vie nomade ne leur a jamais permis de s'intégrer.

Le rapport Post a donc raison de se préoccuper de leur sort; certaines de ses propositions sont raisonnables. Il invite, par exemple, les États à condamner certaines pratiques barbares, comme la stérilisation forcée des femmes roms ou le retrait illégal d'enfants roms à leurs parents. Il a également le mérite de demander à l'Union de priver de certains financements européens les États qui persécutent les Roms.

Le rapport Post présente, hélas, aussi plusieurs défauts. Il instrumentalise, par exemple, les Roms pour porter une nouvelle attaque contre la liberté d'expression des eurodéputés nationalistes. Par ailleurs et surtout, il condamne l'approche qui consiste à tenter d'assimiler les Roms, qu'il qualifie de «paternaliste». Or, je suis favorable à la politique d'assimilation des Roms par leur État de nationalité, car j'observe que, partout dans le monde, le communautarisme déstabilise et fragmente les sociétés.

Respecter les Roms suppose leur assimilation et non leur condamnation pour l'éternité à rester un groupe à part.

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Vážená pani predsedajúca. Víтам, že predložená správa pripomína aj historický dlh, ktorý majú väčšinové spoločnosti voči Rómom. Je dôležité, aby sme pripomínali stáročia segregácie a predsudkov, ktoré opakovane vyúsťovali až do násilia, od pogromov až po systematické vraždenie Rómov vo vyhľadzovacích táboroch.

Len cez spoznanie tejto stránky minulosti dokážu predovšetkým mladšie generácie pochopiť aj zodpovednosť väčšiny, ku ktorej patria, za súčasný stav vzájomného spolužitia.

Jeho najviditeľnejším prejavom je existencia vylúčených komunít vo viacerých členských štátoch. Sú to práve obrazy zo života v extrémnej chudobe, ktoré živia predsudky o Rómoch, nedôveru a pocit nadradenosti u príslušníkov väčšiny. Situácia sa zlepšuje, ale stále ešte nie je dobrá. Chudoba je dedičná. Dieťa, ktoré sa narodí v podmienkach skutočnej chudoby, má štatisticky len malú šancu získať kvalitné vzdelanie a dobre platenú prácu. Boj proti extrémnej chudobe je preto základnou podmienkou integrácie. Tento boj sa netýka len Rómov, ale všetkých, ktorí žijú na okraji spoločnosti a nedokážu sa postaviť na nohy vlastným silami.

Historické spytovanie svedomia väčšiny vo vzťahu k Rómom by preto malo byť nezávislé od praktických krokov na riešenie chudoby a sociálneho vylúčenia. Únia a jej členské štáty majú záväzok voči každému občanovi Európskej únie, že urobia všetko preto, aby mohol žiť dôstojne. Aby bola rešpektovaná jeho ľudská dôstojnosť. Bez ohľadu na to, či je Slovák, Maďar, Francúz, Róm alebo Nemec.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, es verdad: el pueblo gitano —nada menos que 20 millones de personas en territorio europeo— ha sido históricamente asediado por los estereotipos más humillantes, y se les ha relacionado, en un discurso estigmatizador, con la delincuencia, con la falta de formación o con la conflictividad social.

Y hemos tenido que escuchar aquí, en este Parlamento Europeo, las expresiones más miserables de esos prejuicios por parte de algunos discursos realmente condenables que hubieran recibido y merecido sanción parlamentaria de inmediato. Pero ese discurso ha contribuido a su exclusión social y, por tanto, es imprescindible tomar conciencia de hasta qué punto hace falta un relanzamiento de la voluntad de integración de los europeos y de sus Estados miembros para promover oportunidades laborales y educación y combatir el déficit de incorporación a los ciclos formativos, mirando particularmente a aquellas personas más vulnerables —mujeres, menores—, que sufren, por tanto, un doble déficit de exclusión social. Y quiero agradecer el trabajo hecho por nuestra compañera Soraya Post, que honra este Parlamento Europeo con su compromiso contra el antigitanismo y contra toda forma de *romafobia*.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru formand! Udfordringerne omkring romabefolkningerne i Europa er historiske og dybe, men ændrer ikke på, at det først og fremmest er en national opgave at stå for integrationen af romabefolkninger i de forskellige nationalstater. Det ændrer heller ikke på, at selvom vi fra EU's side allerede har brugt en hel del midler på at løse denne problemstilling, så er vi ikke kommet så langt, som man kunne have håbet. Der bør derfor være en refleksion her i huset over, om flere penge virkelig er den bedste vej at gå, når det handler om at forbedre romaintegrationen i de enkelte nationalstater. Endelig er erfaringerne fra mit eget hjemland, Danmark, hvor vi ikke historisk har haft en romabefolkning, at der finder et misbrug sted af EU's regler for vandrende arbejdstagere for en gruppe af romaer, der kommer, og ikke har et reelt ønske om arbejde, men bruger systemet til at oprette lejre i Danmark. Det er ikke intentionen med de vandrende arbejdstagere. Det er derfor heller ikke noget, der skal accepteres af Den Europæiske Union.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Kolegyně a kolegové, Romové jsou naši spoluobčané a já osobně mám mezi nimi řadu přátel. Mají svoje tradice, jazyk, mentalitu. Ale především mají stejná práva a stejné povinnosti jako všichni občané EU. Jsem si vědoma toho, že v některých oblastech jejich integrace probíhá velmi pomalu. Přetrvávají překážky a ty jsou ale obvykle na obou stranách. Samozřejmě, že svoji odpovědnost za prosazování práv má stát a Evropský parlament se právem obrací na členské státy s řadou požadavků na zlepšení situace romských spoluobčanů, zejména v zemích, kde se integrace nedaří.

Předložená zpráva vyznívá velmi kriticky, jako by všechny státy v EU jen nečinně přihlížely diskriminaci svých občanů. Jako by vše bylo jen negativní, ale to není pravda! Musím se důrazně ohradit z pozice poslankyně za Českou republiku. Osobně jsem 3 roky pracovala na projektu Rovnost a kvalita ve vzdělávání a monitorovala jsem vzdělávání znevýhodněných dětí, tedy i romských. Mohu potvrdit, že některé malé romské děti jsou diskriminované, ale především svými vlastními rodiči, kteří je nevedí do mateřské školy, nevedí je do základní školy. Neříkám, že všichni rodiče, protože znám mnoho rodin, kde se situace mění. Ale pokud se více než 50 % romských dětí nepřipravuje na základní školu, pak v ní také neuspěje a předčasně ukončí docházku. Abychom tomu zabránili, tak jsme v letošním školním roce zavedli povinné předškolní vzdělávání od 5 let, zavedli jsme podpůrná opatření, která mají pomoci překonat tyto překážky při integraci znevýhodněných dětí. Změnili jsme legislativu, navýšili jsme rozpočet, abychom těmto dětem pomohli k lepšímu startu do života, než měli jejich rodiče.

V letošním roce česká vláda rozhodla o úpravě pietního místa památky romského holokaustu, o vykoupení vepřína v Letech. Jsem hrdá na to, že to je ministr za KDU-ČSL, který tuto historickou křivdu napraví. Kolegyně a kolegové, mějme odvahu kritizovat, ale uznat také příklady dobré praxe.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Mindannyian tudjuk, hogy Európa legkiszolgáltatottabb és minden szempontból leghátrányosabbban megkülönböztetett kisebbsége egyben Európa legnagyobb, számarányát tekintve legnagyobb kisebbsége is. Az európai romákról van szó, akik ugyanolyan polgárai az Európai Uniónak, mint közülünk bárki más. Mégis gyakran egészen más, embertelen, megalázó körülmények között kényszerülnek élni. A romákat ki lehet telepíteni, ha egy önkormányzat úgy kívánja, a roma gyerekeket lehet lepusztult iskolákban, szegregált osztályokban tanítani, a romáktól meg lehet vonni akár önkényesen is a szociális segélyeket, s alig emel valaki szót az érdekükben.

A roma emberek jelentős része számára Európa nem védelmet, biztonságot, hanem megaláztatást, kirekesztettséget és reménytelenséget jelent. Olyan sokszor mondtuk már el, hogy mindez elfogadhatatlan, morálishoz is, politikailag is. Mégis alig történik valami, pedig nincs másra szükség, mint az emberi méltóság tiszteletben tartására, a befogadó társadalom megteremtésére, és a romáknak az európai társadalmakba való befogadására.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, колеги, уважаема г-жо докладчик, намирам доклада за изключително едностранчив, небалансиран и правещ неверни внушения. Отправят се обвинения и критики към държави членки за различно третиране, предразсъдъци, умишлено лишаване от достъп до образование, жилища и като цяло потъпкване на различни видове права. Не съм съгласен с направените внушения в доклада, както и с предлагането на общ подход и общи скоби.

Давам няколко примера, абсолютно неразбираеми за мен: „дискриминация за жилищно настаняване, насилствено изселване на расова основа и разрушаване на домовете, без да се даде алтернатива“. Уважаеми колеги, чували ли сте за частна собственост? И как бихте реагирали, ако някой се насели във Вашия дом? Предполагам по различен начин. „40% от анкетираните се налага да катерят през огради, да пресичат магистрала или да се сблъскват с бездомни кучета в ежедневните им усилия да си набавят вода“. Сериозно ли някой твърди това? Това е абсолютно несериозно.

„Няколко болници в Унгария, Румъния и България разполагат със сегрегирани и неотговарящи на стандартите родилни отделения.“ Твърдя, че това нещо трябва да бъде доказано. Чух тук, че се правела насилствена стерилизация. Това е клевета и лъжа. „Насилствено опериране.“ Колеги, това е писано в ерата на Оруел, това е културен марксизъм и недопустим болшевизъм.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dyskryminacja Romów jest faktem i to faktem zawstydzającym. Mimo specjalnych programów i polityki wydatkowania pieniędzy nie osiągnęliśmy satysfakcjonujących efektów, takich jakich oczekiwaliśmy, bo wciąż duża część społeczności romskiej cierpi z powodu biedy, z powodu bezrobocia, żyje w złych warunkach, i sprawozdanie to dość precyzyjnie opisuje. Jest tam wiele liczb, które dokładnie ilustrują ten stan rzeczy. Ponadto na te wszystkie niemożności nakładają się stereotypy i uprzedzenia, przez co tworzy się błędne koło, z którego bardzo trudno wyjść. A przecież romska tożsamość, romska historia i romski holocaust nie powinny być tylko i wyłącznie tematem rozmów ekspertów, ale powinny być po prostu częścią naszego życia.

Dlatego z uznaniem przyjmuję omawiane dzisiaj sprawozdanie, gdyż prezentuje ono nowe podejście, nowy język w odniesieniu do kwestii Romów, a także podkreśla wagę wzajemnego zaufania i zachęca państwa członkowskie i Komisję Europejską do jego budowania. Uważam, że jest to klucz do rozumienia tego sprawozdania i jego przesłania. To sprawozdanie stawia za cel aktywne uczestnictwo Romów w życiu społecznym, politycznym i kulturalnym poprzez konsultacje z przedstawicielami romskiej społeczności, wspieranie przywództwa, kształcenie i wspieranie młodych liderów społeczności romskiej, a przede wszystkim przejście z postawy paternalistycznej do pełnego partnerstwa. Pierwszym krokiem w tym kierunku jest proponowany w sprawozdaniu audyt programów realizowanych w państwach członkowskich. Programy te są od lat realizowane z pełnym zaangażowaniem, dlatego warto się im przyjrzeć, aby zobaczyć, dlaczego nie są one tak efektywne, jak byśmy chcieli, i poszukać nowych rozwiązań, m.in. poprzez włączenie w tę ocenę romskich beneficjentów.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök asszony! A jelentés valóban átfogó, a romainTEGRÁCIÓS folyamat és cigányellenesség részletes áttekintésén alapszik. Külön kiemelném a Bizottság felhívását gyakorlati lépések kidolgozására a cigányellenesség leküzdésére, illetve a felszólítást a nemzeti romainTEGRÁCIÓS stratégiák, sikeres helyi gyakorlatok és programok alapján történő elkészítésére. Minden országon belül sürgősszerű a sajátos helyzethez megfelelő gyakorlatok alkalmazása.

Romániában jelentős előrelépés az elemiiskola-elhagyók arányának csökkenése, azonban majdnem célszerűtlen, ha mindez nem terjed ki a kötelező 10. osztályig, ami a legtöbb munkavállalás feltétele. A diákokat mentesíteni kell a családeltartás terhéértől, továbbá roma szakértők és iskola mediátorok hozzájárulását látom szükségesnek. Ugyanakkor a beavatkozási tervek nem az egyént, hanem a családot kell megcéllozzák, különben szimbiózis alakul ki a gyereknevelési támogatás és a családeltartás között.

Javasolnám a támogatáshoz való egyenlő hozzáférést és a teljes közösség bevonásával és fejlesztésével való romainTEGRÁCIÓT, ellenkező esetben az intézkedések akár konfliktusokat is eredményezhetnek. Ugyanakkor a szociális támogatásokat a munkaerőpiacra való bevonás aktív eszközeként kellene biztosítanunk, hisz csakis így érhetjük el a passzív támogatások csapdájából való kitörést.

Livia Járóka (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Köszönöm a bizottságnak a kedves szavait is, és örülök, hogy Cecilia Malmström van itt, aki annak idején rengeteget segített a romastratégiánál, és már akkor tudtuk, hogy a digitalizáció elengedhetetlen azért, hogy az „anti-gipsism” ellen küzdeni tudjunk, a cigányellenesség ellen. Ezért szeretném javasolni azt, hogy az egyenlőség előmozdításával foglalkozó nemzeti szerveknél, továbbá az Equinet rendszerénél igenis vezessenek be digitalizált esetbejelentési lehetőséget.

Úgy látom, hogy azért olyan nagy a romaellenesség ma Európában, mert nincsenek közös helyek. Az én szüleim közös munkahelyen ismerkedtek meg, ma a közös iskolák, a közös munkahelyek hiányoznak. Tehát az első, amit meg kell teremtenünk, a közös helyek. Közös a történelmünk, közös a gazdaságunk, 800 éve együtt vagyunk európaiak. A romák nem indiaiak, európaiak, jogunk van a saját történelmünk megírásához, és annak tanításához a gyerekeinknek, szükséges, hogy a saját nyelvünkön is taníthassák a gyerekeinket, és javasolom azt, hogy nézzük meg, hogy melyek azok az országok, ahol tényleg erős romaellenesség van. Akkoriban Magyarországot megtámadták a Magyar Gárda miatt, mi meg beszüntettük a Magyar Gárdát egyből, de megdöbbenő számomra, hogy az Önök országában, Svédországban például a náci párt ugyanúgy megfélemlített az utcán, és ez nagyon.... (az Elnök megvonta a szót a képviselőtől)

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, Roma, across Europe, including in my country, face countless problems such as unemployment, poor access to public services, notably education, health and housing, multiple forms of discrimination and social, cultural and economic exclusion.

This situation has worsened in the UK since the referendum with Roma children in Manchester, for example, too afraid to play outdoors because of racist attacks. I fully support Soraya Post's position and agree that the problems related to Roma discrimination must be addressed through a rights-based approach.

We are talking about the respect of the human rights of Roma people who have been living in Europe for centuries. The EU has a responsibility to go beyond the social inclusion aspect. We need a global strategy and a transversal approach if we really want to make a difference.

I want to focus particularly on Rome women who find themselves at the intersection between anti-Gypsyism and sexism. As a founder of the Elie Wiesel parliamentary network to raise awareness of genocide, I particularly welcome Soraya's call for a truth commission on the Roma Holocaust.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η αδιγγανοφοβία είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη σε πάρα πολλά κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Οφείλεται σε προκαταλήψεις και στερεότυπα. Μην ξεχνούμε τα δεκάδες πογκρόμ, ιστορικά, που έγιναν κατά των Ρομά και, φυσικά, δεν ξεχνούμε τα εκατομμύρια των Ρομά που δολοφονήθηκαν στα στρατόπεδα συγκέντρωσης των ναζί. Επομένως, χρειάζεται να ληφθούν μέτρα για τη στήριξη των Ρομά, να υπάρξει καταπολέμηση των διακρίσεων, να αντιμετωπιστούν τα στερεότυπα και να υπάρξουν διαδικασίες ενσωμάτωσης. Κι αυτό μπορεί να γίνει κυρίως με την εκπαίδευση και με τη δημιουργία συνθηκών εμπιστοσύνης. Ταυτόχρονα, πιστεύω ότι πρέπει και η κοινότητα των Ρομά να αναλάβει τις δικές της ευθύνες, δεν πρέπει να αποτελεί αντικείμενο εκμετάλλευσης, κυρίως διαφόρων πολιτικών κομμάτων που τους χρησιμοποιούν μόνο για τις εκλογές, προκειμένου να πάρουν ψήφους. Ταυτόχρονα, δεν πρέπει να πέφτουν θύματα επιτήδειων που παίρνουν τα δικά τους κονδύλια και τα αξιοποιούν χωρίς αυτά τα κονδύλια να πηγαίνουν υπέρ των ιδίων των Ρομά. Πρέπει, λοιπόν, να δούμε σοβαρά όλες αυτές τις πλευρές.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE). – Először is szeretném megköszönni a kiváló jelentést Soraya Post asszonynak, és a roma érdekek védelmében folytatott munkája során az együttműködést is. Én egyetlen elemére szeretném felhívni a figyelmet ennek a jelentésnek. Elhangzottak itt a mai vitában olyan vélemények, hogy a Bizottságnak, az európai intézményeknek nem kéne beleszólniuk a tagországok ügyeibe, és nem kéne a roma integráció kérdéséhez hozzászólniuk, ezek tagországi, tagállami feladatok.

A Bizottság azonban beleszól ezekbe az ügyekbe, több módon. Többek között az európai forrásoknak az erre a célra való elkülönítésével és folyósításával. Azonban azok a pénzek, amelyek – azok az európai pénzek, amelyeket a tagállamok használnak föl a roma integráció, a roma felzárkóztatás céljaira –, ezek nagyon sokszor nem érnek célt. Nem a ténylegesen legkiszolgáltatottabb csoportokhoz jutnak el, nem megfelelőképpen használják fel a tagállamok, kézenkőzön eltűnnek, ezért a Bizottságnak mindent meg kell tennie annak érdekében, hogy ezek a pénzek célszerűen, hasznosan a roma közösség érdekében kerüljenek felhasználásra.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Cecilia Malmström, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it is extremely timely that we have this comprehensive report on anti-Gypsyism, which not only describes the problem but also comes with concrete ideas.

The Commission supports the creation and development of national Roma platforms to ensure the inclusive involvement of stakeholders in both implementation and in monitoring. As you know, this year we launched the Roma civil monitor project and it is supposed to promote civil society capacity building. Today, over 90 NGOs are involved. Roma participation here is, of course, a key element.

We also support the efforts of the European Parliament and the proposal in the report to commemorate the Roma Holocaust, and we have called upon Member States to commemorate this on 2 August. As you know, the Commission has participated in several events on 2 August, but also 27 January, which is Holocaust Memorial Day, in order to commemorate the victims of the Roma Holocaust, and I think that would be a good thing.

Lately, efforts have been made to try to improve the effectiveness of the different funds with increased Roma participation, as well as increased efforts to make sure that they reach the intended recipients and to fight fraud in this regard.

As you know, we have a variety of legal tools to fight discrimination and hate speech, and we will continue to do so. These are good, they are very good. We will continue to open infringement proceedings against those countries which discriminate, for instance, against Roma children in education. We had a few other cases as well that we are looking at and we will continue to do so. That is the role of the Commission and we will take that role very seriously.

So, we have tools of many kinds, but as Ms Post correctly says, legal tools, laws, all that is important, but what is most important is people's attitudes. So we need to keep on fighting hate speech and pure discrimination of course, that goes without saying. But what is also very important is awareness-raising, information, education, inclusion and measures to prevent daily prejudices and the stereotypes that also lead to hate speech and hate crime.

In this fight there are a lot of things to do, but I think the report is a very important tool, and I want to thank Ms Post for the work that she has done.

Soraya Post, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank all colleagues for their comments and for all their dedicated work. I would also like to show my gratitude to my shadows – Bodil Valero, Cecilia Wikström, Marina Albiol, Pál Csáky and Branislav Škripek – and their advisers, assistants, and the secretariat of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs (LIBE).

I would also like to thank the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM), which gave a lot of input, so I feel very comfortable not putting all my energy into all that, because I know they will do their work. I am also very grateful for the input received from experts and NGOs, who are working day by day to make the desperately needed changes.

It is our obligation as politicians to safeguard the human rights of all people. Otherwise, we cannot uphold the values of the EU or talk about democracy. All EU citizens have a responsibility to act and to react to injustice. We have to show will and commitment to make a change. Twelve million Roma are considered second-class citizens, and 800 years of human rights deprivation and harassment is enough. We cannot stay in the Middle Ages in 2017. I hope you all agree.

So let us make this change together because we can only do this together, with huge trust in each other, if we want to make a change.

I wanted to respond to Mr Dzhambazki's input and tell him that I did not expect him to like my report.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mercredi.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), *písemně*. – Zpráva paní Sorayi Postové obsahuje spoustu zajímavých tvrzení převzatých z různých článků, které vesměs, bez ohledu na zkoumání důvodů, zobrazují subjektivní názory autorů. Klasickým příkladem je libovolné stanovení toho, kdo je považován za Roma. Zpravidla jsou takto politicky nekorektně označovány všechny sociálně vyloučené osoby v daném státě. V ČR se v roce 2010 přihlásilo k romské národnosti něco přes 5 000 občanů, ve speciálním školství přitom studovalo přibližně 500 dětí romské národnosti. V bodě 20 zprávy jsou vyzývány členské státy, aby v souvislosti s migrací řešily předpojatost vůči romským uprchlíkům a žadatelům o azyl ze zemí západního Balkánu, mezi nimiž je co do počtu mnoho Romů, což může souviset s konkrétními faktory ovlivňujícími místní romskou komunitu. V bodě 21 je vyjádřeno hluboké znepokojení množstvím Romů bez státního občanství v Evropě. Autorka zcela pomíjí existenci desítek tisíc neobčanů v Lotyšsku a Estonsku. V bodě 29 jsou členské státy vyzývány, aby v rámci policejních sil zřídily jednotky pro řešení zločinů z nenávisti. Domnívám se, že takový přístup by zakládal nerovnost před zákonem a že je tedy v rozporu se základními normami EU. V EU žije 90 uznaných národnostních menšin a autorka si zřejmě se záměrem očernit určité státy EU vybrala právě jednu z nich.

19. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

20. Schluss der Sitzung

(La séance est levée à 21 h 34)

—

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos

C/2024/3019

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 25. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3019)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 23. bis 26. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	4
2. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll	4
3. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisedaten von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen – Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisystems (Aussprache)	4
4. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (Aussprache)	23
5. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	41
6. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	42
7. Abstimmungsstunde	42
7.1. Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (Abstimmung)	42
7.2. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (A8-0299/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan, Richard Ashworth) (Abstimmung)	43
7.3. Entlastung 2015: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Europäischer Rat und Rat (A8-0291/2017 - Bart Staes) (Abstimmung)	43
7.4. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (A8-0064/2017 - Marita Ulvskog) (Abstimmung)	43
7.5. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisedaten von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen (A8-0057/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)	43

Inhalt	Seite
7.6. Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisystems (A8-0059/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)	44
7.7. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (A8-0294/2017 - Soraya Post) (Abstimmung)	44
8. Stimmerklärungen	44
8.1. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (A8-0299/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan, Richard Ashworth)	45
8.2. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (A8-0064/2017 - Marita Ulvskog)	47
8.3. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisedaten von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen (A8-0057/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)	48
8.4. Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisystems (A8-0059/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)	49
8.5. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (A8-0294/2017 - Soraya Post)	50
9. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	51
10. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	51
11. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	51
12. Bekämpfung der illegalen Einwanderung und des Menschen Schmuggels im Mittelmeerraum (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)	51
13. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (Aussprache)	72
14. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung – Aufsichts anforderungen an Kreditinstitute und Wertpapierfirmen (Aussprache)	82
15. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien – Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (Aussprache)	92
16. Neutralität von Flugbuchungssystemen und Einschränkung des Zugriffs auf Fluginformationen (Aussprache)	105
17. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll	111
18. Verfahren zur Reaktion auf die Waldbrände in Nordspanien und Portugal (Aussprache)	111
19. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	124
20. Mittelübertragungen: siehe Protokoll	124
21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	124

Inhalt	Seite
22. Schluss der Sitzung	124

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 25. OKTOBER 2017

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

(The sitting opened at 9.01)

2. Verhandlungen vor der ersten Lesung des Parlaments (Artikel 69c GO): siehe Protokoll

3. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisedaten von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen – Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisystems (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the joint debate on:

— the report by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data and refusal of entry data of third country nationals crossing the external borders of the Member States of the European Union and determining the conditions for access to the EES for law enforcement purposes and amending Regulation (EC) No 767/2008 and Regulation (EU) No 1077/2011 (COM(2016)0194 – C8-0135/2016 – 2016/0106(COD)) (A8-0057/2017), and

— the report by Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EU) 2016/399 as regards the use of the Entry/Exit System (COM(2016)0196 – C8-0134/2016 – 2016/0105(COD)) (A8-0059/2017).

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, ponente. – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, me gustaría dar las gracias a todos los actores implicados, especialmente al comisario Avramopoulos, a la Presidencia maltesa, a todos los ponentes alternativos y también a los servicios jurídicos.

La Comisión Europea lanzó su propuesta legislativa definitiva en abril de 2016, después de que en 2013 se preparara el terreno en ámbitos de estudio complementarios, proyectos piloto, proyecciones presupuestarias y estudios de diferentes alternativas, como los datos biométricos o la arquitectura del sistema.

Se aborda la tarea legislativa porque se han detectado lagunas técnicas en la gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión. Actualmente, las fronteras exteriores son controladas por guardias de fronteras que verifican la autenticidad de los pasaportes y visados para aquellos nacionales de terceros países que quieren entrar en la Unión Europea para 90 días en un período de 180, pero no existe ningún procedimiento para controlar a los que, agotado el plazo autorizado, permanecen en territorio europeo de forma irregular.

Así, nuestro Reglamento establece un sistema centralizado de gestión y control, a través del cual se verifica la autenticidad de los documentos de viaje de los nacionales de terceros países con el registro de los datos alfanuméricos, de los datos biométricos y la información sobre la fecha, la hora y el lugar de entrada y salida. También se crea una calculadora para el cálculo real de los 90 días autorizados.

En cuanto a los objetivos del Reglamento, son dos: en primer lugar, mejorar la gestión de las fronteras exteriores y prevenir la inmigración irregular y facilitar la gestión de los flujos migratorios; y, en segundo lugar, contribuir a la prevención, detección e investigación de delitos terroristas y de otros delitos penales graves. Este segundo objetivo es también crucial, ya que ayudará a detectar criminales con múltiples identidades falsas, como fue el caso del terrorista que atentó en el mercadillo navideño de Berlín, que había entrado y salido de nuestras fronteras con quince identidades diferentes.

Pero el acceso a la información sobre las entradas y salidas por parte de las autoridades policiales de los Estados miembros y de Europol se hará en condiciones estrictamente definidas. Esto es fundamental porque el Acuerdo interinstitucional garantiza el pleno respeto de los derechos humanos, como los relacionados con la intimidad, la protección de datos de carácter personal y los principios de necesidad, proporcionalidad y legalidad. Para garantizarlo, será el Supervisor Europeo de Protección de Datos el responsable de supervisar las actividades de tratamiento de datos del sistema.

Además, se crea el acceso central de entradas y salidas, que es el soporte técnico de la Agencia eu-LISA —su responsable—, bajo la vigilancia del Supervisor Europeo de Protección de Datos. Y, además, habrá un sitio web donde los pasajeros podrán comprobar su período de estancia.

El período de retención de datos será de tres años para aquellos pasajeros de buena fe y de cinco años para los que hayan superado el período legal de estancia.

También me gustaría destacar el ámbito territorial del sistema, que son las fronteras exteriores de los Estados miembros que aplican el acervo de Schengen y también aquellos países que, aunque no lo aplican, han superado la evaluación. Me refiero específicamente a Bulgaria y Rumanía: este Parlamento ha defendido desde el principio la necesidad de incluir a estos dos países. Y quiero señalar que, por supuesto, en cuanto se pueda, se contará también con Croacia.

Para ello, fue necesario dar acceso pasivo al VIS a Bulgaria y a Rumanía, y fue votado por abrumadora mayoría en el pasado Pleno. Es necesaria también, señorías, la interoperabilidad entre el SES y el VIS para que el sistema pueda verificar que el visado con el que se intenta entrar en la Unión Europea es un visado legal y auténtico. A los tres años de la utilización del sistema, la Comisión hará una evaluación sobre su uso.

Por último, quiero destacar que el Reglamento entrará en vigor en 2020 y, para alcanzar esa fecha, son necesarios muchos procedimientos que desde el punto de vista de la implementación deben cumplirse —hablamos de licitaciones, contrataciones, desarrollo de programas, tests, etcétera—.

En conclusión, considero que es fundamental que aprobemos hoy y no más tarde el Sistema de Entradas y Salidas. ¿Por qué? Porque mejorará la identificación y la autenticidad de los documentos de viaje y, por lo tanto, identificaremos más fácilmente a criminales con identidades falsas; sustituirá el sellado; sabremos en tiempo real quién se ha quedado en nuestras fronteras de manera irregular; protegeremos mejor la libertad de tránsito en el espacio Schengen; mejorará la facilitación de entrada y salida —es decir, menos colas—, y contribuirá a más protección y a una mejor gestión de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión.

En conclusión, se entrará más rápido y más seguro.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, our debate today, ahead of the vote, is inevitably on an important priority, for, as we all know, it is linked to Schengen. Preserving and strengthening Schengen is one of the Commission's – and my personal – priorities.

Schengen is a great achievement of European integration. As Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra said – and as I have repeatedly said many times in this Chamber – we need a unified Schengen, which should include Bulgaria and Romania and, soon, Croatia too. In order to ensure that the Schengen area of free movement is sustainable and secure, it is essential that we manage, protect and secure our external borders effectively and that we have full knowledge of who is coming in.

It is in this spirit that we have proposed the Entry/Exit System. Its overall objectives are to improve the management of external borders, to prevent irregular migration and to facilitate the management of migration flows. It will enhance cooperation and facilitate information exchange between our Member States. I would like to express my thanks to Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra and the shadow rapporteurs for their hard work and for the agreement reached with the Council.

This new instrument will bring several urgently needed improvements. First of all, it will enable us to monitor better the rules on short stays. The Entry/Exit System will calculate the duration of third country nationals' authorisation for short stays in the European Union. It will alert border officials if a third country national is about to exceed 90 days in any 100-day period – for example, if someone makes several trips to the European Union. The Entry/Exit System will also check that the duration of the stay corresponds to the visa issued.

Second, the Entry/Exit System will reduce the time needed to cross the border and will reduce the workload of border guards. The Entry/Exit System will allow Member States to automate most data and information-capturing steps as well as data verifications. Visitors to the European Union will benefit from process accelerators and self-service systems. For the border guards it will mean more time to focus on the most important parts of the border-check assessments. That is also why the Schengen Borders Code had to be amended. In addition, Member States may also create national facilitation programmes on a voluntary basis to further facilitate border crossings of pre-vetted frequent travellers. The compromise proposed describes the conditions these programmes must meet.

Third, as the Entry/Exit System will record travel document identity data, including biometrics, this will improve the detection of document and identity fraud and therefore increase security.

Fourth, this system will support the competent authorities in combating terrorism and serious crimes. When necessary, these authorities will be able to access data in the system if all strict conditions are met.

Lastly, the provisions on data protection are aligned to the new data protection framework and to the rulings of the Court of Justice. The current text includes all the necessary data protection safeguards.

The coming into force of the legislation will be timely, so we can rapidly start to develop the system and get it up and running by 2020 at the latest. I am looking forward to the debate and I thank the honourable Members for their continued constructive shaping of European legislation in the area of border management.

Barbara Kudrycka, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Wszyscy wiemy, jak ważny jest powrót do pełnego funkcjonowania strefy Schengen. Często to powtarzam – to jeden z kluczowych symboli wspólnej Europy i wielki sukces integracji, nasz sukces. Nie możemy tego zaprzepaścić. Dlatego dzisiaj gratuluję Agustínowi Díaz de Mera sprawozdania, które jest kolejną cegiełką w tzw. pakiecie inteligentnych granic. Zapewniając rejestrację każdego przekroczenia unijnej granicy przez obywateli państw trzecich, a także rejestrację ich danych biometrycznych, eliminujemy istniejącą wcześniej lukę w zapewnieniu lepszej ochrony granic zewnętrznych Unii i zapewnieniu nam bezpieczeństwa. To ogromny krok naprzód.

Co niezmiernie ważne, system wjazdu i wyjazdu umożliwia dostęp do bazy wiz i *vice versa*, a to zredukuje powielanie informacji i zapewni spójność danych o osobach przekraczających nasze granice. To pomoże też skrócić procedury graniczne. Nasza europejska otwartość i gościnność bywała nadużywana przez osoby wjeżdżające na teren Unii Europejskiej ze złymi intencjami, m.in. członków organizacji przestępczych czy terrorystycznych. Nowy system pozwoli nas przed tym skuteczniej ochronić. Systematyczne rejestrowanie wjazdów i wyjazdów ułatwi też identyfikację takich osób oraz ich sposobu przemieszczania się. Co ogromnie ważne, ten system nie zmusza nas do rezygnacji z wartości i swobód, które stanowią istotę Unii, przede wszystkim bezpiecznej Europy, Europy bez granic.

Oczywiście nasza wspólna praca nad wzmocnieniem Schengen trwa, kontynuujemy prace nad systemem ETIAS, wzmocnieniem mandatu agencji eu-LISA oraz czekamy na propozycje Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie interoperacyjności baz danych. Skuteczność nowych baz danych, w tym niezawodne działanie systemu wjazdu i wyjazdu, będzie zależała od ich maksymalnego wykorzystania i pełnej integracji, między innymi dzięki możliwości ich jednoczesnego przeszukiwania.

Dlatego chciałam jeszcze raz pogratulować Agustínowi Díaz de Mera. Jesteśmy dzisiaj bliżej osiągnięcia tej trudnej równowagi między swobodą przemieszczania się i bezpieczeństwem Europejczyków.

Tanja Fajon, v imenu skupine S&D. – Zahvala poročevalcu Agustinu de Mera za izvrstno sodelovanje, tudi drugim poročevalcem v senci in ekipam.

Za nami so več kot štiri leta napornih pogajanj, izmenjav mnenj ter obiskov na terenu. Pred seboj imamo enega najbolj težkih, tehnično in politično občutljivih dosjejev kot tudi enega finančno najtežjih projektov, ki jih bomo v Evropski uniji uvedli z letom 2020. Upravljanje z mejami tako z novim sistemom evropeiziramo in prilagajamo potrebam 21. stoletja.

Prehrojena pot je bila zelo dolga in v marsičem se s poročevalcem nisva strinjala. Še vedno me močno skrbi, da glavni namen nove tehnologije ne bo upravljanje in lažje prehajanje meja. Vse bolj se zdi, da je poglobitveni namen postal zgolj in samo boj proti terorizmu.

Pogovori so večinoma potekali ob temeljni predpostavki, da je vsak potnik, ki dopotuje v Evropo, potencialni zločinec ali terorist, ki mu moramo preprečiti vstop. Navkljub pogosto težkim razmeram v govorih smo v skupini socialistov in demokratov uspeli v besedilu uredbe preprečiti najslabše. Skrajšati ... Uspelo nam je vzpostaviti pomembno ločnico med kategorijami potnikov, skrajšati čas hrambe podatkov, uspelo nam je dodatno omejiti dostop za organe pregona ter oklestiti stroške.

A kljub pozivom Parlamenta na drugi strani ni bilo veliko razumevanja za večjo zaščito zasebnosti posameznikov, za enoten sistem tudi ne-schengenskih držav ter za odpravo ločenih vizumskih sporazumov, ki osnovni namen preračunavanja bivanja v Uniji postavljajo na glavo.

Pod velikimi političnimi pritiski držav članic s tem sistemom uvajamo v schengenski pravni red, lahko rečem, kar tudi precejšen kaos. Žal mi je, da je moč argumenta in razuma ob aktualnih razmerah v Evropi in vzponu populizma večinoma zamenjal argument nerazumevanja in moči. Tvegamo do neke mere, da kakovost zakonodaje nadomešča tudi količina. Na žalost v Parlamentu ni bilo posluha za dodaten premislek.

Kar me posebej te dni bremeni in iskreno priznam, je julijska odločitev Evropskega sodišča, da sporazum med Kanado in Unijo o prenosu podatkov potnikov krši temeljne pravice. Informacije bi po omenjenem sporazumu hranili pet let, kar ni več skladno s potrebami boja proti terorizmu. Dvornov o hrambi podatkov žal tudi v tem kompromisu, ki je na mizi, nismo odpravili.

Zato socialisti in demokrati z dopolnilom predlagamo, da skrajšamo obdobje hrambe podatkov za *bona fide* potnike na 178 dni. To je razumna poteza in pozivam kolege, da jo opoldne na glasovanju podprejo. Pametne meje, kolegi, bodo pametne le, če bodo okrepi sorazmerni, delujoči in pa predvsem prijazni do potnikov.

(Govornica se je strinjala, da bo sprejela vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka (člen 162(8)))

Milan Zver (PPE), Vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka. – Kolegice, spoštovano kolegice Fajonovo, bi samo rad vprašal, ali je to relativno odklonilno stališče stališče nje osebno, ali je to stališče poslanske skupine socialistov in demokratov.

Tanja Fajon (S&D), Odgovor na vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka. – Kot sem omenila v nastopu, je moja poslanska skupina v vsem času podpirala uvedbo sistema *entry/exit*, vstop/izstop iz Evropske unije. Uspeli smo zagotoviti nekaj pozitivnih elementov, pa vendarle je uvedba tega sistema do neke mere tveganje, ker postaja predvsem sistem, mehanizem v boju proti terorizmu.

Želim predvsem, da smo razumni, da imamo sorazmerno tehnologijo, ki je predvsem namenjena cilju. To je lažje potovanje potnikov, ki vstopajo in izstopajo Evropske unije (*predsedujoča je prekinila govornico*), hkrati pa bolj varne meje.

Jussi Halla-aho, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, there are no internal border checks in the Schengen area. Therefore, the external border is a common concern for all Member States. We must have an effective way to monitor who comes in and who goes out if we want to prevent illegal immigration, cross-border crime and terrorism.

At the same time, the number of legitimate travellers into the European Union keeps growing. With the tools that we have now, more security means longer queues and more waiting for the bona fide traveller. The Entry/Exit System (EES) is one answer to this challenge.

The EES is not a political project. It does not change the rules that concern entry, immigration, asylum or repatriation. This must be made clear. It is a technological update, something that brings our border management into the 21st century. It is a tool that helps us to enforce the rules that we already have. The EES should have been in place before, and as a precondition to, the abolition of internal border checks.

There has been much political opposition to the EES over the years, very often based on misconceptions. I truly hope that those who want Schengen to survive in the long term, who want a safe Europe and smooth travel flows, support the outcome of the interinstitutional negotiations. For the ECR, it was particularly important that law-enforcement authorities have reasonable access to the data stored in the EES and that data retention periods are sufficient for the system to benefit legitimate travellers on the one hand, and to make life harder for those who do not respect the rules on the other. We regret that the Registered Traveller Programme was not included in this proposal.

Finally, I want to thank the rapporteur, Mr Díaz de Mera, for his great professionalism, patience, determination and constructive approach.

Angelika Mlinar, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, for his open and very cooperative attitude. He was always seeking the broadest majority, and he defended Parliament's mandate in an impeccable manner. Thanks to our common work, we improved the text proposed by the Commission, making a clear distinction between *bona fide* travellers and over-stayers and lowered the data retention period for *bona fide* travellers.

The Entry/Exit System is an important and truly European project aimed at strengthening security at our borders and ensuring systematic and reliable identification of over-stayers. At the same time, it is reinforcing internal security and strengthening the fight against terrorism and serious crime.

My Group welcomes the text as agreed in the interinstitutional negotiations and will vote in favour of it in plenary. However – and this is my personal opinion – this legislation has a big impact on the fundamental rights of third-country nationals travelling to Europe, especially when it comes to the extensive data retention period. I believe that we should be very careful when designing a system with such a broad scope. We, as legislators, should make sure that the fundamental rights acquired is respected without relying on the ex-post check of the Court of Justice, which I believe will come back negative in this case.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Madame la Présidente, ce texte est le premier volet du paquet «Frontières intelligentes», tout un programme. Cette nouvelle gestion des frontières, ce sont de nouveaux fichiers numériques, de nouvelles connections et plus de données et, notamment, désormais, des empreintes palmaires et des images faciales.

Au départ, ces textes devaient faciliter le passage des frontières pour les 50 millions de ressortissants des pays tiers qui se rendent chaque année dans l'Union européenne. Au final, c'est d'abord et avant tout, comme viennent de nous l'écrire les autorités françaises, un outil pour repérer les personnes en situation irrégulière, via un système d'alerte automatique signalant tout dépassement du séjour autorisé. Il s'agit de favoriser les retours et donc les expulsions.

Je ne suis pas satisfaite de la façon dont nous avons travaillé sur ce texte qui, sous des apparences très techniques, cache une réalité politique lourde. Sous couvert d'un droit à la sécurité, bien légitime, on va multiplier les accès des forces répressives à des données sensibles, y compris en coopération avec les pays tiers, et peut-être avec le Soudan, comme on vient de l'apprendre du gouvernement français. Certes, quelques garde-fous ont été posés, mais ils sont insuffisants et très en deçà des principes de proportionnalité et de nécessité tels que définis par la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne.

Sur ces bancs, nous refusons cette Europe bunkerisée, qui bafoue ses propres valeurs, qui joue avec les peurs, et fait d'une toute petite partie de ceux qui migrent vers l'Europe des boucs émissaires, au mépris des textes internationaux.

Cette fuite en avant liberticide ne résoudra rien. Elle sert des intérêts industriels bien précis et elle fait, comme nous le voyons, élection après élection, le lit des nationalismes, des populismes et de l'extrême-droite. Après le Conseil et la Commission, le Parlement s'y enfonce. Le réveil risque d'être brutal.

(L'oratrice accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Bill Etheridge (EFDD), blue-card question. – It seems from your speech that you seem incredibly uncomfortable with monitoring and understanding who it is who is entering Europe. If this is the case, I wonder: in your own home, would you open the doors to anybody without knowing who they were? Surely you need to know who is coming, why, how long they are going to stay and what their purpose is? Is this not just a natural thing, that people all over Europe would legitimately ask for their politicians to be pushing for them?

(Applause)

Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL), réponse «carton bleu». – Je vous remercie de cette question. Sur ces bancs, notamment, il est très facile, très souvent, de mélanger les extrêmes. Vous venez de faire la démonstration qu'entre extrême droite et extrême gauche, il y a une différence bien nette.

Non, je n'ai pas peur. Non, je n'ouvre pas ma porte à tout venant, mais je regarde qui je fais rentrer et je n'ai pas besoin de mettre en cause les droits de l'homme et la protection des données de façon systématique et généralisée.

Jan Philipp Albrecht, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, of course we need to know who is coming into our European Union, into our Schengen Area. But what do we have to do for that? We have to check their passports, and that is exactly what we are doing. We have a system, the Schengen Information System (SIS), in which – if it worked perfectly – we would have information about every suspicious person, every risky person, and at the outer borders of our common Schengen Area there would be checks against every traveller, and everyone would be checked. We would know who is coming in. If this system worked, no doubt we would have a better, more secure environment in our European Union.

What are we doing? We are not fixing the system, which is not working because some of the Member States' authorities are not thoroughly working with the system and feeding information into it. At some of the outer borders the checks are perhaps not working, yet we are building a completely new database – a database which does not focus, like the Schengen Information System, on risky persons or on suspicious persons, but one which just retains the data of completely irrelevant and innocent travellers – travellers like businesspeople, travellers or tourists who are coming to the European Union. We are welcoming them, and now are registering them for up to four years along with their sensitive personal data, their biometrical data, but without any suspicion and without any risk.

Not only is that unnecessary because of the Schengen Information System, it is also not necessary to check visa over-stayers. If you really want to keep track of visa over-stayers, you need to know not only that there is a visa over-stayer, but also where the visa over-stayer is. But with this system you do not keep track of any visa over-stayer in the European Union. You just know that they have not left. There is no added value in this system. It will cost EUR one billion – that is the estimation of a study of this House. It will be an unnecessary collection of much information about travellers who are completely innocent. In July, the Court of Justice ruled that the Canadian authorities, in the case of PNR data, are not allowed to retain the data of travellers longer than the time of their travels in Canada. They have to delete the data after the exit, unless there is a risk or a suspicion. What we expect from the Canadian authorities with regard to our citizens, we should also respect with regard to citizens of third-countries like Canada.

We propose to limit the collection to 181 days, which is the longest any non-EU national can stay in the European Union, and after that only on risk or suspicion. We hope that you will vote in favour of that to make a legal proposal here.

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, the proposals for an Entry/Exit System using biometric data is not an unreasonable one on the face of it. The US has got a system and Britain has got a system already, and it is not unreasonable for European countries to want to have their own, similar systems. This proposal is for the Schengen area, of which Britain is not a member, so technically it will not affect us – but in reality it will. When Britain leaves the European Union – when that happy day arrives – then we will actually be a third country. Biometric data on our citizens will be gathered and will be shared with the EU's Member States and its crime agencies. This biometric data can be accessed by all EU countries, as well as by those crime agencies. Some of those countries are deeply and institutionally corrupt and untrustworthy. The EU has been building its legal institutions and crime agencies for some years, and a few years ago I published a short study which explained how that could easily develop into an EU police state. UKIP is not opposed to countries having biometric data systems, but they should be under the control of national governments, and they should only be shared with foreign states where we can be reasonably assured that that information will not be misused. We certainly cannot say that about this system.

Auke Zijlstra, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, ergens onderweg is de Europese Unie van de oplossing het probleem geworden. In mijn Commissie LIBE zie je de toekomst van de EU verschijnen: een litanie van wetten die de soevereiniteit van lidstaten aantast en de heiligheid van de EU benadrukt. De nationale parlementen gaan straks helemaal nergens meer over: niet over monetair beleid, niet over sociaal beleid, niet over privacy, niet over strafwetgeving, niet over migratie, en ook niet over wie er wel en niet in hun land mag verkeren. Het nu gepresenteerde inreis-uitreisstelsel is daar een heel mooi voorbeeld van: lidstaten verliezen hun vrijheid om de buitengrenzen te controleren en in plaats daarvan komt er dan een systeem van scanners en databases.

Er zijn meerdere doelen geformuleerd, waaronder het bestrijden van terrorisme en zware misdaad. Ging dat vóór Schengen niet goed dan? In het nieuwe systeem worden van toeristen weliswaar de paspoorten gescand voordat ze de EU in mogen, maar terroristen die illegaal met bootjes arriveren, kunnen zo doorlopen. Dus hoe helpt dit dan? Bovendien blijken aanslagplegers later altijd al bekend bij de geheime diensten, maar werden ze gewoon niet opgepakt, want ja, we slagen er ook niet in om te bedenken hoe we om moeten gaan met de islam. En misdaad, ja, dat is in Nederland in groeiende mate een gevolg van rondreizende bendes die door het ontbreken van binnengrenzen juist alle ruimte krijgen. Dus waarom is dit beter? Wie wil dit?

Het nieuwe systeem zou ook moeten helpen tegen illegaliteit, omdat de computer op een gegeven moment weet wanneer iemand langer is gebleven dan mag. Maar illegalen gaan helemaal niet meer weg. Ze worden ook niet uitgezet. Ook daar hebben we geen oplossing voor. Dus waarom dan toch dit systeem?

Voorzitter, dit systeem gaat niet helpen tegen terrorisme. Het helpt ook niet tegen misdaad. Het helpt niet tegen illegaliteit. Het kost wel héél veel geld. En nog veel belangrijker: het ontnemt de lidstaten opnieuw macht, macht om problemen wél aan te pakken. Dus, Voorzitter, het lijkt mij helder dat wij zullen tegenstemmen.

(De spreker gaat in op een “blauwe kaart”-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Pane kolego, můžete nám, prosím, konkrétně na třech bodech upřesnit, jak díky tomuto systému ztratíme suverenitu? Kritizujete také, jakým způsobem nespolupracují tajné služby. Váš předřečník tady hovořil o tom, že bychom měli mít kontrolu nad vlastními údaji členských států. Není právě tento ochranný způsob Velké Británie překážkou pro to, abychom si tyto informace vyměňovali?

Auke Zijlstra (ENF), *“blauwe kaart”-antwoord*. – Ja interessante vraag. Hoe verlies je soevereiniteit als er een Europese wet is die vertelt dat lidstaten verplicht lid moeten zijn van Schengen – in ieder geval de nieuwe lidstaten, en wij zijn ook verplicht lid – die vertelt dat wij op grond daarvan de binnengrenzen niet mogen controleren, alleen onze buitengrenzen, dat er nu een systeem is dat voorschrijft hoe dat moet plaatsvinden en op welke manier, en wie dat dan betreft, en hoe lang dat moet bewaard blijven, en wanneer dat het wordt weggegooid? Het lijkt mij... alleen al deze opsomming geeft aan dat wij dus nergens meer over gaan. Dat lijkt mij een verlies van soevereiniteit.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η εφαρμογή της πολιτικής του «ξέφραγου αμπελιού» αποτυπώνεται σε αίμα ανύποπτων αιώνων ανθρώπων και σπορά φόβου στους πολίτες των κρατών μελών. Εσωτερικοί εχθροί και πολέμιοι του εθνικισμού απεργάζονται σχέδια άλωσης της Ευρώπης ενάντια στα δικαιώματα των γηγενών Ευρωπαίων και εις βάρος της εθνικής ασφάλειας και του κράτους δικαίου. Όσο οι πολιτικοί προωθούν την εθνική ισοπέδωση μέσω της πολιτικής των ανοιχτών συνόρων και της ανεξέλεγκτης ανεκτικότητας, τόσο θα αυξάνεται η ηθική συναυτουργία και η εγκληματική συνυπευθυνότητα στη σφαγή, κυριολεκτικά και μεταφορικά, των λαών της Ευρώπης. Η άμεση επαναφορά του ελέγχου στα εξωτερικά σύνορα της Ένωσης και η πλήρης κατάργηση της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν είναι πιο επίκαιρα και αναγκαία, ως πρώτα βήματα καταπολέμησης της λαθρομετανάστευσης, της τρομοκρατίας και του διασυνοριακού οργανωμένου εγκλήματος. Τα κυρίαρχα κράτη χρειάζονται ισχυρά και ασφαλή σύνορα, εκρίζωση των αποσταθεροποιητικών και αντεθνικών πυρήνων και εμπέδωση του κλίματος τάξης και ασφάλειας ως πρωταρχικές παράμετροι ανάπτυξης, ειλικρινούς συνεργασίας και αλληλεγγύης μεταξύ των εθνών.

Monika Hohlmeier, *Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses.* – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit einer gewissen Fassungslosigkeit höre ich der extremen Linken und extremen Rechten zu und denke mir, dem Berichterstatter und den Schattenberichterstattern ist eine gute Verhandlung gelungen, denn sie ist sehr vernünftig ausgefallen.

Wir sichern die Außengrenzen, um zu verhindern, dass kilometerlange Staus durch Kontrollen an den Innengrenzen stattfinden. Niemand wünscht sich diese kilometerlangen Staus zurück. Wir möchten, dass die Menschen in der Europäischen Union frei reisen, Dienstleistungen erbringen und ihre Wirtschaftsgüter transportieren können, und wünschen uns nicht mehr den Separatismus und den Nationalismus früherer Jahrhunderte und Jahrzehnte zurück.

Ich glaube, dass ein europäisches System auch das effektivste und das günstigste ist und wir können damit die Einreise und die Ausreise kontrollieren. Das heißt, es ist nicht ein Instrument des Terrorismus, sondern es ist ein Instrument allgemein für die Sicherheit, in vielfältiger Hinsicht, und auch dafür, ob jemand rechtmäßig auf dem europäischen Territorium ist oder ob er ausreisepflichtig ist.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI), *ερώτηση με «γαλάζια κάρτα».* – Κυρία Hohlmeier, σας άκουσα να λέτε και να υπαινίσσεστε ότι για όλα τα δεινά φταίνε οι ακροδεξιοί, οι εθνικιστές και οι ακροαριστεροί. Όταν ερχόμαστε στο Στρασβούργο από την Ελλάδα, πριν βγούμε από το αεροπλάνο μας ζητάνε την κάρτα επιβίβασης. Όταν φτάνουμε στο αεροδρόμιο περνάμε έναν δαιδαλό για να ελέγξουν τα διαβατήρια μας. Για ποια Σένγκεν μιλάμε και για ποια ενιαία Ευρώπη όταν υπάρχει Ευρώπη δύο ταχυτήτων;

Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“.* – In Griechenland am Flughafen bin ich selbst erst gewesen, und ich habe sehr einfach ein Flugzeug betreten und innerhalb der EU reisen können. Das war ziemlich unproblematisch, und es gab die üblichen Kontrollen, die wir am Brüsseler Flughafen zur Sicherheit der Menschen ganz normal erleben.

Ich wüsste nicht, welchen Sonderkonditionen Griechenland unterstehen würde. Ich glaube, dass es vernünftig ist, an Flughäfen Sicherheitskontrollen für die Sicherheit von Flugzeugen zu machen, damit die Sicherheit von Passagieren und Flugzeugen gewährleistet ist. Ich glaube, dafür ist jeder dankbar, und jeder will das auch.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodo predsjednice, najprije se želim zahvaliti gospodinu Díazu de Meri na ovom vrlo stručnom i profesionalnom izvješću i na predanom radu. Isto tako mi je bilo drago čuti od našeg povjerenika Avramopoulou da će i Hrvatska, ukoliko ispunimo kriterije, a nadamo se da hoćemo do kraja 2018. godine, biti dijelom Schengena.

To nam je jako važno, jer imamo ogromnu vanjsku granicu, a rekli smo da je ovaj projekt, odnosno ovo izvješće, upravo za bolju zaštitu vanjskih granica. Dakle, na schengenskim granicama se ne treba pokazivati putovnica ukoliko usvojimo ovaj projekt. Ja ga ne vidim kao politički projekt, smatram da je on isključivo za unapređenje provjera na vanjskim granicama, ali isto tako je vrlo bitan za provjere onih građana trećih zemalja koji u određenoj zemlji borave dulje no što su na to dobili pravo vizom.

Stoga maksimalno podržavam ovaj projekt, budući da ste rekli da će 2020. stupiti na snagu, ja vjerujem da ćemo do tada i mi, Hrvatska država, biti članicom Schengena i da ćemo moći pristupiti ovom velikom projektu. A onima koji dvoje između zaštite podataka i ljudskih prava i borbe protiv terorizma i sigurnosti, poručujem da je sigurnost građana na prvom mjestu i želimo da sigurnost građana Europske unije bude na prvom mjestu, i stoga zaista još jedanput čestitam i drago mi je da smo postigli konsenzus. Vjerujem da ćemo velikom većinom izglasovati ovaj prijedlog.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Bessere Gesetzgebung muss mehr sein als eine nette Phrase: Gute Gesetze – gut gemacht. Was bedeutet das für *Entry/Exit*? Die Stellungnahme des Europäischen Gerichtshofs vom Juli zum Kanada-PNA hat Zweifel an der Rechtmäßigkeit dieses Textes klar bestätigt. Die Speicherung der Daten von Menschen, die völlig unbelastet sind, ist nicht verhältnismäßig, ist nicht mit unseren Grundrechten und dem Recht auf Privatsphäre vereinbar. Das gilt dann auch für andere Maßnahmen.

Unsere juristischen Dienste blieben in ihrer Bewertung der Bedeutung des Urteils für *Entry/Exit* mehr als vage. Eine überzeugende Einschätzung sind sie bis heute schuldig geblieben. Nicht besser steht es um die wenig überzeugenden Antworten der Kommission auf unsere Fragen hierzu. Gute Gesetzgebung würde bedeuten, sich etwas Zeit zu nehmen, um rechtliche Bedenken klar aus dem Weg zu räumen oder schlicht die Speicherfristen von unverdächtigen Personen mindestens deutlich zu kürzen, wie es ursprünglich auch die Kommission vorgeschlagen hatte.

Das können wir diese Woche noch erreichen. Wir hätten dann die Gewissheit, alles getan zu haben, damit dieser Text auch einer Prüfung vor dem Gerichtshof standhält. Die praktische Anwendung von *Entry/Exit*, absehbar für 2020, wäre weiter möglich. Bessere Gesetzgebung: Hoffentlich mehr als nur eine Phrase.

Helga Stevens (ECR). – Voorzitter, collega's, via het nieuwe digitale inreis-uitreissysteem, met als Engelse afkorting EES, willen we beter opvolgen wie de EU binnenkomt of verlaat. Omdat alles digitaal verloopt, moet dat normaal gezien vlot gaan. Dit komt het toerisme naar de EU zeker ten goede.

Het EES registreert de datum, tijd en plaats van binnenkomst en vertrek van reizigers. Zo lopen bijvoorbeeld visumhouders die langer in de EU blijven dan toegestaan makkelijker tegen de lamp. Het EES is ook belangrijk in de strijd tegen terrorisme. Het systeem zal toelaten buitenlanders te identificeren die hun documenten hebben vernietigd of van wie de paspoorten werden gestolen. Het is ook een opsporingsinstrument, want verdachte personen kunnen getraceerd worden via de plaats van binnenkomst of via hun vingerafdrukken. Het komt er nu op aan om alle databanken up to date te houden en effectief informatie te laten delen.

Daarom steunt de N-VA dit voorstel volledig. De veiligheid van onze burgers en het tegengaan van illegaal verblijf zijn absoluut prioritair voor de N-VA.

Gérard Deprez (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, mon groupe – et je remercie ma collègue, Angelika Mlinar de l'avoir affirmé d'emblée, malgré ses réserves personnelles – est en faveur de l'accord intervenu entre le Parlement européen et le Conseil.

À nos yeux, le renforcement de l'identification des personnes qui entrent et sortent de l'espace Schengen est un corollaire obligé de la liberté de circulation à l'intérieur de cet espace. Grâce au système d'entrée/sortie muni de portiques automatiques, nous espérons – et ce sera sans doute le cas – réduire les temps d'attente lors des contrôles aux frontières, renforcer la qualité de ces contrôles en détectant plus facilement les fraudes documentaires et les fraudes à l'identité. Cela nous permettra de calculer automatiquement la durée du séjour autorisé de chaque voyageur et de vérifier si elle est respectée.

Bien sûr, je n'ignore pas qu'après l'avis de la Cour de justice sur l'accord PNR avec le Canada, il était légitime de se poser des questions sur la compatibilité de certaines dispositions du système d'entrée/sortie avec le respect de la charte des droits fondamentaux. Ces interrogations, je le répète, étaient pertinentes et légitimes. J'estime toutefois – et l'écrasante majorité de mon groupe est du même avis – qu'après l'analyse des conclusions qui a été faite par notre service juridique, nous pouvons procéder sereinement à l'approbation de l'accord intervenu.

Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist wohl meiner ostdeutschen Biografie geschuldet, dass ich ein ausgeprägtes Misstrauen gegenüber solchen Datensammlungen habe. Wenn der Bürger allgemein und in dem Fall qua Einreise in die EU zum Verdachtsobjekt wird, dann stimmt etwas nicht und rechtsstaatliche Prinzipien werden auf den Kopf gestellt.

Abgesehen von meiner Phobie gegenüber Datensammlungen, bei denen massenhaft und anlasslos personenbezogene Daten gehortet werden, gibt es ja noch den EuGH. Sie erinnern sich dunkel: Das waren diejenigen, die das Fluggastdatenabkommen mit Kanada in den Orkus geschickt haben. Wir bezweifeln, dass das Ein- und Ausreisensystem mit der Grundrechtecharta vereinbar ist, und sind gegen eine Vorratsdatenspeicherung von unbescholtenen Reisenden, die überhaupt keinen nachweisbaren Nutzen hat, aber eine Milliarde Euro verplempert.

Wenn Sie unbedingt etwas gegen Terrorismus oder insbesondere gegen die sogenannte illegale Migration machen wollen, dann, bitte schön, schaffen Sie doch ein humanes Asyl- und Einwanderungssystem – das wäre ja schon mal was. So, wie das Ein- und Ausreisensystem jetzt beschaffen ist, dürfte es ganz locker auf dem EuGH-Tisch landen. Dafür werden wir tun, was wir können.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Monika Hohlmeier (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich habe nur eine sehr präzise Frage: Warum hat man bei Datensammlungen zu Steuerzahlern und bei ständigen Kontrollen unangekündigter Art – was ein Generalverdacht gegen Steuerzahler ist – überhaupt keine Bedenken, während man bei normalen Kontrollen an Grenzen plötzlich so große Probleme hat? Also ich empfinde den Widerspruch als etwas seltsam.

Cornelia Ernst (GUE/NGL), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich weiß zwar nicht, wie Sie zu diesem Vergleich kommen, aber okay. Steuern müssen gezahlt und dürfen nicht hintertrieben werden. Dafür sollten wir alles tun und dafür wird viel zu wenig gemacht. Auch hier in Europa gibt es Steueroasen, und ich würde mich freuen, wenn Sie mit uns gemeinsam etwas gegen die Steueroasen machen würden. Das hat aber damit nichts zu tun, hier geht es um unbescholtene Reisende. Es ist doch nutzlos, es bringt auch gar nichts im Sinne der Sache. Insofern, glaube ich, sind Sie da auf dem falschen Weg.

Tim Aker (EFDD). – Madam President, it seems the European Union has developed an alarming set of contradictions. It was only a few years ago that Angela Merkel and other European leaders said ‘come ye, come ye’, and the great waves of migration began, and we have seen the consequences as the infrastructure in Italy, Greece and Hungary is crumbling before our eyes. And now it says ‘oh no, there is a problem, so we need this Entry/Exist System’, and Mr Juncker gave the game away at his State of the Union speech that he wants a ‘united states of Europe’, he wants a country called Europe, and this is just the first part of the plan.

But there is the other contradiction when you say you want borders at the European level but then you have the Schengen zone, which means that there is an internal free-for-all. It seems the European Union is riddled with panic. It is seeing parties that love country, nation and sovereignty rise across the European Union, and it hasn't got a clue how to stop them. I am just glad that we are walking away from this, and I encourage many others to follow our lead.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, la présente proposition de règlement vise à créer un système européen d'entrée et de sortie de l'espace Schengen. Ce système pose deux problèmes à mes yeux.

D'abord, c'est un énième replâtrage de Schengen. L'objectif est, en effet, de faciliter l'entrée dans l'espace Schengen en réduisant le temps d'attente aux points de passage frontaliers. Je ne peux donc cautionner une telle réforme, car je ne veux pas fluidifier le système Schengen, mais le supprimer.

Par ailleurs, c'est une réforme qui va inscrire tous les entrants dans des fichiers informatiques interconnectés sous prétexte de lutter contre le terrorisme. Or, je pense que le meilleur moyen de lutter contre le terrorisme consiste à surveiller les suspects et les fichés S et non à perdre son temps à fichier des millions d'honnêtes gens.

Vous sacrifiez la liberté et vous n'aurez même pas la sécurité.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Madam President, given recent events it is right to consider measures that allow for the smooth passage of legal, short-term travellers while continuing to enhance the security of European borders. I am confident that in negotiating Brexit, the United Kingdom Government will be keen to work with its European partners to ensure continued cooperation to keep our borders safe and secure.

My constituents in Northern Ireland know well the scourge of terrorism. Close cooperation between partners, both within the EU and beyond, whether through Interpol, Europol or on a bilateral basis, is vital in building our security. When we consider the last century or even more recent times, there have been few more reliable and willing contributors to the defence of Europe than the United Kingdom.

I trust that colleagues here in Brussels recognise this and will work closely with the British Government to keep that mutually beneficial relationship beyond Brexit.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caras e caros Colegas, começo por agradecer o excelente trabalho levado a cabo pelo relator Agustín Díaz de Mera, cuja seriedade e competência há muito admiramos.

O Sistema de Entrada e Saída pretende também contribuir para o esforço coletivo de mais segurança nas nossas fronteiras. Por esse motivo, o sistema é bem-vindo. Contudo, disse diversas vezes e desde o início que tenho dúvidas sobre o valor acrescentado deste sistema. Ele pretende, sobretudo, detetar os *overstayers*, ou seja, os nacionais de países terceiros quem excedem o período do seu visto.

Esta informação será, sobretudo, quantitativa, mas não permitirá localizá-los. Tenho dúvidas que o seu elevado custo encontre justificação na sua mais-valia. Tenho dúvidas quanto à sua implementação, tenho dúvidas sobre o seu real valor acrescentado, sobretudo à luz dos sistemas de informação já existentes e no terreno, como o SIS (o Sistema de Informação de Schengen). Temos de olhar para a gestão das nossas fronteiras de uma forma integrada. Os sistemas de informação devem estar ao serviço desta estratégia.

Mas sejamos claros: a despeito de qualquer dúvida, não é legítimo considerar que este sistema é afetado pelo acórdão do Tribunal de Justiça sobre o acordo PNR entre a União e o Canadá. Confio na solidez do texto negociado e termino como comecei: não tenho dúvidas sobre o trabalho levado a cabo pelo relator em nome deste Parlamento.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Zu den Fragen, über die die Menschen mit Recht besorgt sind, gehört der Schutz der Außengrenzen. Warum so vieles bisher nicht funktionierte, hängt auch mit den nationalen Engstirnigkeiten zusammen. Daher ist es richtig und überfällig, zu einem gemeinsamen *Entry/Exit* zu kommen. Das ist ein notwendiger Schritt, den wir gerne mitgehen.

Es sind aber auch Zweifel angebracht. Oft tendieren wir dazu, Verantwortung an *big data* zu delegieren, in der Hoffnung, dass sich dann alles automatisch regelt. Das ist ein Irrtum.

Es ist aber auch der Schutz der Grundrechte, der Anlass zur Sorge gibt. Die Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben sich hier sehr bemüht, diesen Bedenken Rechnung zu tragen. Es bleibt aber die offene Frage, ob wir nicht nach dem Kanada-PNA-Urteil des EuGH die Speicherfristen verkürzen sollten, und zwar ganz konkret auf 181 Tage.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Fru formand! Det, vi forsøger i dag, er at reparere på endnu et europæisk prestigeprojekt, nemlig Schengensamarbejdet, der ligesom euroen, da den blev implementeret, ikke have de nødvendige lov-mæssige rammer til at virke effektivt. Derfor er vi så nødt til nu, 17 år efter, at reparere på det, vi den gang indførte, fordi det har vist sig, at den ydre Schengen grænse ikke har været hverken effektiv eller i stand til at dæmme op for terrorisme, massemigration og andre ting, som man ville forvente, at grænsekontrol kunne udføre. Derfor er vi på det sidste forsøg. Hvis vi ikke nu får repareret de ydre grænser, så vil Schengen kollapse, og så er det bedre at gå tilbage til et system med nationale grænser og national grænsekontrol, særligt når man ser på den store modvilje, der er her i salen for at iværksætte helt nødvendige tiltag, som et ind- og udrejse system. Så er det tankevækkende at tro på, at den eksterne grænse nogensinde kommer til at blive effektivt beskyttende for den europæiske befolkning.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, dieses System ist auf jeden Fall mal eine wesentliche Verbesserung des Status quo, und dafür bin ich dem Kollegen Díaz de Mera, den ich sehr schätze, sehr dankbar.

Es ist erstmalig eine Verbesserung des Status quo. Denn was ist denn der Status quo? Der Status quo ist eigentlich totales Chaos, und was macht denn das Wesen eines Staates aus? Das Wesen eines Staates macht ja gerade aus, dass er seine Grenzen schützt und gleichzeitig auch kontrolliert, wer ins Land einreist und wer das Land verlässt. Das ist etwas ganz Logisches.

An die Grünen gerichtet: Ihr könnt ruhig Eure Politik so weiter verfolgen; immer wieder die gleichen Vokabeln: Hetzer, Panikmache und Angstmache. Dann werdet Ihr, denke ich, nur das Schicksal der österreichischen Grünen erleiden, die bei der letzten Nationalratswahl aus dem Parlament geworfen wurden.

Aber in diesem Sinne haben wir ja erlebt, dass bei der Flüchtlingskrise Millionen Menschen nach Europa gekommen sind, die nirgendwo registriert wurden, die niemand kontrolliert hat und die nun im Land und in Europa sind. Insofern ist dieses System also ein notwendiger Schritt. Wir warnen nur davor, dass es nicht zu einer übermäßigen Kontrolle der EU Bürger führen darf.

Heinz K. Becker (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, wert Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir stimmen über einen großen Schritt Europas ab. Ein sehr guter Kommissionsvorschlag wurde vom Berichterstatter der Europäischen Volkspartei zu einem effektiven Instrument geformt, das mit moderner Technik einerseits wirksam gegen illegale Einreise nach Europa vorgeht und damit mehr Sicherheit an den EU-Außengrenzen schafft und zugleich Reisenden aus Drittstaaten – speziell Touristen und Geschäftsleuten – eine deutlich erleichterte und schnellere Grenzkontrolle bietet.

Mit modernsten elektronischen Systemen gehen wir konsequent gegen jene vor, die legal einreisen wollen, aber dann illegal länger bleiben und die EU nicht verlassen. Alle relevanten Datenbanken werden vernetzt und zeigen bei der Grenzkontrolle sofort irreguläre Vorkommnisse und Beobachtungen eines irregulären Status auf. Mehrfachidentitäten und Einreise mit falschen Papieren werden zukünftig praktisch ausgeschlossen.

Meine Forderung im Interesse der Sicherheitsbedürfnisse unserer Bürger ist, dieses System noch effizienter zu nutzen und auch zur Aufklärung der Schwerstkriminalität und zur Terrorbekämpfung einzusetzen. An einem Mordtatort sichergestellte Fingerabdrücke und biometrische Daten sollten in Echtzeit abgeglichen werden.

Noch eine Ermahnung an die linksgrünen Träumer hier im Haus mit spezieller Datenphobie: Vertrauen Sie der von uns gestalteten demokratischen Arbeitsweise in Europa!

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

President. – Mr Szanyi has a blue card but, Mr Szanyi, you are also on catch-the-eye, so do you wish to ask the question? Mr Becker, will you accept the question? So no, Mr Szanyi is not going to ask a question.

There is a blue-card question from the Greens Group; do you accept this question, Mr Becker? Yes.

Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. –

Sehr geehrter Herr Becker! Sie haben den Kollegen von der FPÖ eben gehört. Sie übernehmen die gleiche Rhetorik wie die Rechtspopulisten und Hassredner in diesem Hause, und Sie stärken sie damit. Sind Sie sich eigentlich der Tatsache gewahr, dass das, was in Österreich passiert ist, eine Problematik ist, die wir in ganz Europa haben?

Wenn Sie diese Redeweise hier im Europäischen Parlament weitertragen, dann unterminieren Sie unsere Werte in der Europäischen Union und unsere gemeinsame Stärke.

President. – Please stop heckling. Thank you. I am not sure that was a question about the issue we are debating, but perhaps Mr Becker would choose to answer?

Heinz K. Becker (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ja, ich erkenne einfach eine wirkliche – wie ich es ja vorhin schon sagte – Phobie, eine manische Angst vor der Verarbeitung von Daten, die in unserem Rechtssystem keinesfalls verbrecherische – wie Sie unterstellen – Dimensionen hat. Und die politische Lage ist die: Sie verlieren laufend Wahlen, das macht Sie besonders anfällig für spezielle Aggressivität. Bleiben wir – so, wie es hier im Parlament üblich ist – sachlich und arbeiten wir an den gemeinsamen Lösungen für die Bürger Europas!

President. – Mr Albrecht, one moment. Ms Sippel, you have a point of order?

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte lediglich alle Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier im Hause bitten, wenn wir über ein solches Thema reden, über das Thema zu reden, über Fakten zu reden, und hier nicht zu polemisieren und zu politisieren. Das hilft in der Sache nicht weiter.

President. – Please, colleagues, we are now in a debate. We will now move on to our next speaker.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, teniendo en cuenta los recientes y graves errores cometidos en el marco del intercambio de información sobre nacionales de terceros Estados que viajan al espacio Schengen, el Sistema de Entradas y Salidas constituye un instrumento importante para mejorar la protección de las fronteras exteriores y contribuir a la prevención e investigación de delitos de terrorismo y de otros delitos penales graves.

El Sistema de Entradas y Salidas reemplazará el tradicional sistema de sellado de pasaporte por uno adaptado al uso de las nuevas tecnologías. Asimismo, retendrá los datos personales de los nacionales de terceros que viajan a la Unión con un visado de corta duración, incluidas una imagen facial y huellas dactilares.

Durante el periodo de retención de los datos personales, los organismos encargados de la aplicación de la ley tendrán acceso a esa información, siempre que se cumplan ciertos criterios establecidos. Por ello, el resultado del informe es positivo, ha sido fruto del consenso y de la necesidad de fortalecer el control de las fronteras en el actual contexto de lucha contra el terrorismo.

Ulrike Trebesius (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Das Schengen-System droht aktuell zu scheitern. Mehrere Staaten haben die Anwendung ausgesetzt, weil zu viele Migranten, Kriminelle oder gar Terroristen innerhalb der EU unterwegs sind. Die Außengrenzen werden nach wie vor nicht überall angemessen geschützt. Aus diesen Gründen ist das *Smart-Border-System* und *Entry/Exit-System* unterstützenswert. Es wird uns helfen, zumindest die Kriminalität und die illegale Migration, die uns über die Außengrenzen hinweg erreicht, einzudämmen. Aus meiner Sicht ist das aber nicht genug, um das Schengen-System zu retten.

Illegale Grenzübertritte in die EU sind weiterhin an vielen Stellen möglich. Die Kriminalität, die von Personen innerhalb der EU ausgeht, wird so auch nicht eingedämmt. Die EU-Mitgliedstaaten sollten das Recht bekommen, nach Bedarf die biometrische Identifizierung aller Ausländer, die sich auf ihrem Gebiet aufhalten – und damit meine ich auch EU-Bürger in einem anderen Staat – einzufordern.

Wenn Bürger sich etwa beim Grenzübertritt innerhalb der EU oder bei einer Polizeikontrolle in einem anderen Staat biometrisch ausweisen müssten, wäre das kein unangemessener Eingriff und würde den Behörden gerade in Zeiten des grenzüberschreitenden Terrorismus deutlich helfen.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, ik kom uit Limburg, een prachtige grensprovincie in Nederland, ingeklemd tussen België en Duitsland. Welke kant ik ook oprijd vanaf mijn voordeur, ik kom altijd snel een grens tegen. Ik ben me dus als geen ander bewust van de enorme luxe die de open grenzen met zich meebrengen, en die zal ik ook altijd verdedigen hier.

Maar er zijn ook zorgen. Als wij die verworvenheid van het vrije reizen binnen Europa willen behouden, zullen we gezamenlijk het beheer en het management van onze buitengrenzen moeten verbeteren. Dat doen we via de gezamenlijke grens- en kustwacht. Dat doen we via de controle van EU-burgers aan de buitengrenzen. Dat doen we straks via ETIAS. En dat doen we vandaag met een belangrijke stap: via het inreis-uitreisysteem.

Eindelijk brengen wij het grensbeheer van de EU naar de 21e eeuw, van middeleeuwse stempels naar computers en scans. Ik feliciteer collega Díaz de Mera dan ook met dit mooie resultaat. Het is een efficiënte en doeltreffende manier om te controleren wie echt Europa binnenkomt en hoe lang men wil blijven. We verkleinen de tijd die nodig is om die grens over te gaan, waardoor we het makkelijker maken voor reizigers met goede bedoelingen om naar Europa te komen, en door het gebruik van vingerafdrukken en gezichtsscans maken we het veel moeilijker om identiteitsfraude te plegen. Recente gebeurtenissen in Europa geven daar alle aanleiding toe. Bezoekers hebben er baat bij. De burgers van de Europese Unie hebben er baat bij. Iedereen heeft hier baat bij.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule Președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, doresc de la bun început să felicit raportorul și raportorii din umbră și pe toți membrii Comisiei LIBE. A fost o muncă în comisie și votul arată că s-a ajuns la o propunere de regulament echilibrată, care cu siguranță aduce îmbunătățiri sistemului de intrări-ieșiri.

Noul sistem va putea verifica dacă persoanele non-europene care intră în spațiul UE respectă perioada autorizată de sedere și, sigur că, așa cum spunea un coleg, este foarte costisitor sistemul. Eu vreau să spun că viața oamenilor este cea mai importantă și nu există o comparație de preț.

Mulțumesc, de asemenea, raportorului că a susținut intrarea României și Bulgariei în acest sistem, pentru că, da, granițele Uniunii Europene sunt importante și pentru cele două țări membre ale Uniunii Europene. Sunt convinsă că votarea acestui regulament va contribui la o mai bună verificare a identificării și să nu uităm că orice drept de circulație aduce și o obligație: să respectăm regulile, și cred că este importantă această verificare la frontieră și pentru combaterea terorismului, dar nu numai. Mulțumesc.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, διαφωνώ με την αφαίρεση κυριαρχικών εξουσιών από τα κράτη μέλη, τα οποία πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να ελέγχουν τα σύνορά τους. Επιπλέον, το υπό συζήτηση σύστημα ελέγχου εισόδου και εξόδου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα πρέπει να λειτουργήσει σεβόμενο τα προσωπικά δεδομένα, την αρχή της αναλογικότητας, αλλά και τη νομολογία του Δικαστηρίου των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων. Ταυτόχρονα όμως, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, πρέπει να διασφαλιστεί η νομιμότητα λειτουργίας της Σένγκεν εδώ, στη Γαλλία. Όπως γνωρίζετε προκειμένου να έρθουμε αεροπορικώς από την Αθήνα εδώ στο Στρασβούργο υφιστάμεθα διαβατηριακό έλεγχο εδώ και δύο χρόνια. Δεύτερον, αύριο όπως συμβαίνει κάθε φορά όταν λήγουν οι εργασίες της ολομέλειας, θα περιμένουμε τεράστιες ουρές στο αεροδρόμιο για να γίνει διαβατηριακός έλεγχος από έναν αστυνομικό. Αυτό είναι νόμιμο; Πρώτῳ επίσης, είναι νόμιμο, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, να μας ζητούν πριν βγούμε από το αεροπλάνο, εδώ στο Στρασβούργο, να επιδείξουμε boarding pass; Αυτό είναι ιδιαίτερα πρωτότυπο. Θέλω να αποκαταστήσετε τη νομιμότητα της λειτουργίας της Σένγκεν εδώ στο Στρασβούργο. Όλοι οι ευρωβουλευτές είναι στις ουρές για διαβατηριακό έλεγχο. Είναι απαράδεκτο αυτό που συμβαίνει εδώ στο Στρασβούργο.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми дами и господа, през последните години Европейският съюз предприе редица мерки за подобряване на европейската сигурност и по-специално сигурността по външните граници и борбата с незаконната миграция. Новата система за влизане/излизане е точно такава мярка, която ще позволи на правоприлагащите органи автоматично да изчисляват продължителността на престоя на гражданите на трети държави, за да установят дали е надвишен разрешеният им престой в Европейския съюз.

За моята страна България – като пазител на една от най-тежките външни европейски граници – това досие е от изключително значение, защото то неминуемо ще подпомогне работата на българските органи по охрана на границата. Считаю за голям успех факта, че новата система ще бъде ефективно използвана на българска територия, въпреки липсата на пълноправно членство на страната в Шенген. Включването на България в географския обхват на системата, въвеждането на единно калкулиране на разрешения престой на територията на целия Европейски съюз, а не само в Шенгенското пространство, и получаването на пасивен достъп до Визовата информационна система ще допринесат за повишаване на сигурността на всички европейски граждани. Нека все пак не забравяме, че сигурни външни граници като българските означават повече сигурност вътре в Европа.

Новата система за влизане/излизане е изключително важна и в контекста на взаимосвързаността на европейските системи за охрана на границите и е от особено значение за доброто функциониране на Шенгенската информационна система за целите на връщането на нередовни мигранти.

В тази връзка бих искал да Ви призова да подкрепите постигнатото споразумение във вида, който беше договорен в рамките на трестранните преговори. Благодаря на докладчика Диас де Мера за отличната работа.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo ancora una volta dato prova di grande responsabilità portando avanti, pur nelle nostre divisioni, un sistema di modernizzazione della gestione delle frontiere esterne dell'Unione.

È di questo che si tratta, della registrazione elettronica dei dati in ingresso e in uscita dei cittadini di paesi terzi nello spazio Schengen. È per tale motivo che i dati personali registrati nel sistema di ingresso non dovrebbero essere conservati più di quanto strettamente necessario agli scopi del trattamento dei dati.

Chiediamo quindi proporzionalità agli obiettivi perseguiti ma chiediamo anche che le autorità, nell'utilizzo del sistema, rispettino scrupolosamente la dignità e l'integrità delle persone i cui dati vengono richiesti. Non accetteremo nessun tipo di discriminazione basata su sesso, razza, religione, colore della pelle o di altro tipo. Il sistema deve essere usato per le sue finalità e in nessun caso, per nessun motivo, per negare ai richiedenti asilo vie sicure ed efficaci di ingresso nel territorio dell'Unione per esercitare il loro legittimo diritto alla protezione internazionale.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, poštovani povjereniče, čestitam kolegi Augustinu Díazzu de Meri na iscrpnom izvješću na koje, nažalost, imam određene primjedbe. Države članice koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama Europske unije više su izložene sigurnosnim prijetnjama zbog njihove duge vanjske granice te zbog njihove otvorenosti prema prijetnjama koje dolaze iz trećih država. Stoga smatram kako bi se njima trebala dati posebna pažnja unutar uredbe o uspostavi sustava ulaska i izlaska za registraciju podataka o ulasku i izlasku državljana trećih zemalja koji prelaze vanjske granice Europske unije. Iako je ovaj Prijedlog uredbe imao za cilj uspostavu učinkovitog mehanizma za dodatno jačanje sigurnosti unutar Europske unije, s njegovog aspekta implementacije postoje određeni nedostaci koji bi i te kako mogli ugroziti sigurnost Europske unije.

Ono što vidim kao ključan nedostatak u ovom Prijedlogu jest nejednak tretman svih država članica u primjeni ovog mehanizma tj. primjena u državama članicama Schengena, dok se implementacija odgađa u državama koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama Europske unije, koje uključuju Hrvatsku. Primjena ove uredbe u državama članicama koje nisu u schengenskom prostoru može utjecati na nemogućnost registracije boravka državljana trećih zemalja, a samim time eventualni propusti mogli bi predstavljati prijetnju za države na vanjskim granicama, njihove građane, ali i za sve ostale.

Nejednaka primjena uredbe, odgoda primjene u državama članicama Europske unije koje se nalaze na vanjskim granicama, čekaju na punopravno članstvo u schengenski prostor.

(predsjednica je oduzela riječ govornici).

Catch-the-eye procedure

Ivica Tolić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitke izvijestitelju i zahvala povjereniku i izvijestitelju koji su spomenuli nužnost što skorijeg ulaska u EES članica koje još nisu u schengenskom prostoru. Ovo je sustav unapređenja i sigurnosti Europske unije, ali dok se on ne primjenjuje u svim članicama ne možemo, nažalost, govoriti o zaštiti vanjskih granica Europske unije nego o zaštiti schengenskog prostora.

Baš zbog toga što je riječ o sustavu koji će olakšati borbu protiv terorizma, organiziranog kriminala, nezakonite migracije i koji će olakšati prekogranični promet, treba od početka operativne primjene uredbe uključiti sve zemlje članice – zaštititi vanjske granice. Jedino će tako ova uredba imati puni smisao i pozitivne učinke na unutarnju sigurnost Europske unije i na prekogranični promet također.

Hrvatska čini 1350 km vanjske granice Europske unije i, ako nije u ovom sustavu, to ranjivom čini cijelu Europsku uniju, ne samo Hrvatsku.

Emilian Pavel (S&D). – Doamna Președintă, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, astăzi vom vota pentru sistemul de intrare și ieșire în spațiul Schengen. Ne-am luptat pentru un astfel de sistem european unic de intrare și ieșire care să cuprindă și România și Bulgaria și este foarte bine că am reușit să le obținem.

Stabilirea acestui sistem a mai facilitat accesul României și Bulgariei la sistemul de informare privind vizele. Oficializăm, astfel, rezultatul multor luni de negocieri la care ați participat foarte mulți dintre dumneavoastră și vă felicit pentru rezultat. Oficializăm, de asemenea, și sunt foarte mândru de acest lucru, încă un pas spre integrarea deplină a României și Bulgariei în Spațiul Schengen. Cele două țări merită și îndeplinesc toate criteriile posibile pentru aderarea la Schengen. Mai mult, încă de dinaintea aderării la Uniunea Europeană și mai ales după aceea, ele au acționat în permanență și în conformitate cu prevederile acordului Schengen și pentru respectarea și consolidarea acestuia.

Consiliul Uniunii Europene, impulsionat de Parlament și de Comisie, domnule comisar, trebuie să facă noi pași să acționeze pentru recunoașterea unei realități incontestabile, aceea că locul nostru este în Schengen.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodo predsjednice, kao zastupnica iz Hrvatske, članice s najduljom vanjskom kopnenom granicom, iznimno sam zadovoljna time što Unija konačno na konstruktivan način pristupa izazovima migracije te nastoji uvesti reda u sustav i zaštititi svoje vanjske granice. No, dobro zakonsko rješenje ne može dati rezultata ako ga se dosljedno ne primjenjuje pa očekujem kako će se uredba, suprotno nekim najavama, od početka operativne primjene ipak provoditi i na vanjskim granicama, kako joj i samo ime nalaže.

Nejednaka primjena na članice Schengena i države poput Hrvatske, koje to još nisu, obezvrijedila bi naša nastojanja da se bez diskriminacije zaštite interesi svih članica i podigne razina sigurnosti u cijeloj Europskoj uniji. Operativni izazovi koji bi proizišli iz nejednake primjene ove uredbe također nisu zanemarivi i zato smatram da bi nam jednaka primjena trebala biti apsolutni prioritet.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mevrouw de voorzitter, commissaris, een Europese Unie zonder binnengrenzen is natuurlijk alleen maar mogelijk met sterke, slimme buitengrenzen. Vandaar dat ik dit nieuwe inreis-uitreisstelsel alleen maar kan toejuichen. Het zal gedaan zijn met het systeem van paspoorten stempelen aan de grenzen, met de lange wachtrijen, en we zullen de bonafide reizigers sneller toegang kunnen geven tot het grondgebied.

Maar waar het mij vooral ook om gaat, is dat we de malafide reizigers, de illegale migratie, de terroristen met dit systeem veel beter kunnen gaan tegenhouden, kunnen gaan opsporen. We gaan gegevensuitwisseling stimuleren en we gaan vooral zorgen dat we door sterke buitengrenzen ons huidige systeem van vrij reizen binnen de Europese Unie kunnen behouden. Wij zullen dit alvast van harte steunen.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, για να εφαρμοστεί η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν πρέπει να υπάρχει σωστός και αποτελεσματικός έλεγχος στα εξωτερικά σύνορα. Από τη στιγμή όμως κατά την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, στα πλαίσια της αφαιρέσεως αρμοδιοτήτων από τα εθνικά κράτη, δεν επέτρεψε σε αυτά να ελέγχουν τα σύνορά τους και ανέλαβε η ίδια να κάνει αυτό το πράγμα, έχουμε πλήρη αποτυχία. Λάβετε υπόψη τα παραδείγματα της Ιταλίας και της Ελλάδος. Όταν ανέλαβαν να φυλάξουν τα σύνορα των χωρών αυτών κάποιοι άχρηστοι και ευρωβόροι οργανισμοί, όπως είναι ο Frontex, η ακτοφυλακή και η Ευρωπαϊκή Συνοριοφυλακή έχει δημιουργηθεί αυτό το χάος, με αποτέλεσμα στην πράξη η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν να καταρρεύσει. Επί δεκαετίες ολόκληρες ο έλεγχος γινόταν από τις εθνικές αρχές χωρίς κανένα πρόβλημα. Άλλωστε είναι πολύ αφελές να πιστεύουμε ότι ο τρομοκράτης και ο παράνομος μετανάστης θα έρθει από τα επίσημα σημεία ελέγχου. Ας είμαστε ειλικρινείς, κύριε Επίτροπε. Και μόνο το γεγονός ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση προσπαθεί με ένα λάθος να διορθώσει ένα άλλο λάθος που κοστίζει 1 δισεκατομμύριο, αυτό σημαίνει σαφή ομολογία αποτυχίας. Θα το πείτε αυτό στους συμπατριώτες μας, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε;

President. – Mr Epitideios, your time of one minute is up, please stop speaking. I would ask you to respect the request of the Chair to keep to your time. Mr Sógor, I am sure you will respect the one minute.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Madam President, in 2015 alone more than 50 million non-EU nationals visited the EU, crossing the external border of the Schengen area more than 200 million times. These passenger flows are expected to increase substantially in the future too. A system of stamping passports, a legacy of the past century, is inefficient, slow to cope with the increase in traveller numbers, unreliable, and inadequate in addressing the complex security challenges we face today.

The basic building blocks of the Entry/Exit System (EES) – precise and rapidly delivered information, better monitoring of the authorised stay, more efficient border checks and automated border controls – will further bring our border controls into the 21st century. As to the link between border controls and internal security, I very much welcome the rapporteur's work on granting security forces access to the EES with the aim of fighting serious crime and terrorist threats.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Bármilyen döntés születik is az állásfoglalási indítványról, az mindenképpen súlyosan érinti egyrészt az Unió biztonságát, másrészt a jó szándékú utazók, turisták jogait, adataik védelmét.

Bárhogy határozunk azonban, az bizony pótcselekvés és látszatintézkedés marad mindaddig, amíg az EU eltűri azt a biztonsági rést a schengeni határvédelem rendszerén, amit az úgynevezett letelepedési kötvények, a pénzért árult uniós állampolgárság gyakorlata jelent. A leggyengébb láncszem pedig e rendszerben Magyarország, ahol a kormány az elmúlt években laza feltételekkel ellenőrizetlen háttérű, sokszor okkal bűnöző-, vagy terrorgyanúsnek vélt harmadik országbeli személyek ezreit látta el magyar, tehát uniós állampolgársággal, sőt, nem ritkán nemzetközileg körözött egyének is európai papírokat kaptak.

A magyar példa két szempontból kirívó: a tranzakciók bevétele nem közvetlenül az államkasszát gyarapítja, hanem nagyrészt kormányzati vezetőkhöz köthető off-shore vállalkozásokat. Kettő: ugyanez a magyar kormány eközben gátlatlan kampányt folytat minden idegen ellen.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their contributions to this debate and their comments. Our external border management is the nexus of our policy on security and migration and the European Union is implementing several initiatives in this domain. I therefore welcome the negotiations starting today – indeed now – between this House and the Council, and I hope a compromise will be reached soon.

The compromise on the Entry/Exit System will modernise and strengthen the Schengen area's external management. It will help Member States to deal with increasing traveller flows without having to increase the number of border guards. It will also promote mobility between the Schengen area and third countries in a secure environment, while contributing to the fight against terrorism and serious crime, and safeguarding fundamental rights.

I want to be clear on a point that was mentioned earlier. The Court of Justice opinion on the EU-Canada Passenger Name Record (PNR) Agreement does not have any direct and binding legal effect on the Entry/Exit System. The Court ruled on a specific legal situation, which cannot be automatically extrapolated to other situations. There are significant differences between PNR and the Entry/Exit System. The legal basis, the purpose and the scope of data gathered, and the basis and rationale in respect of retention periods are not comparable.

I am glad that this long process is now coming to an end and that we can soon start developing the system. I therefore encourage the honourable Members to support these important pieces of legislation when they vote later today.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, ponente. – Señora presidenta, muchas gracias, señorías, por este debate tan rico. Da idea de lo que digo el hecho de que haya habido 44 intervenciones: las agradezco todas. Doy las gracias a todos aquellos que han apoyado el informe, a los que han apoyado mi trabajo, a los que han manifestado elocuentes silencios. Todos, en definitiva, han contribuido a enriquecer este debate.

Quiero terminar, señora presidenta, con una cita literal de los servicios jurídicos de las tres instituciones para que, de una manera diáfana y clara, quede establecido que no ha habido ninguna ambigüedad en el pronunciamiento de los tres servicios jurídicos con referencia a la sentencia 1/15 del Tribunal de Justicia en relación con el convenio internacional entre la Unión Europea y Canadá PNR.

Dice literalmente el informe de nuestros servicios jurídicos interinstitucionales: «La sentencia 1/15 no tiene impacto directo ni automático en el SES debido a muchas diferencias entre el sistema y el PNR. En particular, al respecto, a los objetivos, el ámbito y los datos personales recogidos».

President. – The joint debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Wednesday, 25 October 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), *schriftelijk*. – Het nieuwe grenscontrolesysteem voor reizigers die naar de Schengenzone reizen, laat ons toe de bescherming van de buitengrenzen te verscherpen en de gaten in het net te dichten. Zolang we niet weten wie onze grenzen binnenkomt, kunnen we de veiligheid van onze burgers niet garanderen. Dit geautomatiseerde systeem komt in de plaats van het handmatig afstempelen van paspoorten. De verstrengde grenscontrole registreert de biometrische gegevens (vingerafdrukken en gezichtsscans) en in- en uitreisdata van de meer dan 50 miljoen reizigers die jaarlijks naar de Schengenzone reizen en vergelijkt die info met gegevens uit Europol, Europese en nationale databanken. Het laat zo toe om verdachte personen met een valse identiteit meteen aan de grens te stoppen. Zo maken we het terroristen onmogelijk onder de radar de Schengenzone in te reizen en zich dan ongemerkt van de ene naar de andere lidstaat te verplaatsen.

Monika Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Systém vstup/výstup je najmä elektronickou databázou na evidenciu času a miesta prekročenia hraníc a trvania pobytu občanov tretích krajín na území Schengenu. Starý tzv. pečiatkový spôsob fungovania pohraničných kontrol sa v súvislosti so zvýšením počtu cestujúcich, ale aj s výzvami, akými sú napríklad nárast migrácie či medzinárodný organizovaný zločin, ukázal ako nepostačujúci. Nový systém prináša dôkladnú identifikáciu osôb na základe odoberania biometrických údajov. Policajné orgány, ale aj iné bezpečnostné zložky získajú v prípade potreby detailnejší prehľad o pohybe občanov tretích krajín na území Schengenu. Ich kontrola bude posilnená. Žiaden členský štát Európskej únie si v oblasti boja proti terorizmu, či potláčania organizovanej trestnej činnosti neporadí sám. Prehľbovanie vzájomnej spolupráce a podpora rozvoja tzv. inteligentných hraníc sú tak v boji proti aktuálne existujúcim hrozbám nanajvýš potrebné.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Свидетели сме на безпрецедентен миграционен поток от трети страни към Европейския съюз. През 2015 г. повече от 50 милиона души са посетили ЕС. И докато ръстът на туризма е положителен за нашите икономики, то според ФРОНТЕКС има увеличение в нелегалното преминаване на външните граници на ЕС, като само за 2015 г. броят на тези преминавания е повече от 1.8 милиона. Ясно е, че този факт налага засилване на сигурността по нашите външни граници. Снемането на биометрични данни, предвидено от изменението на Регламент (ЕС) 2016/399 във връзка с използването на Системата за влизане/излизане, е стъпка в правилната посока. Това би попречило на нелегални мигранти да изхвърлят паспортите си твърдейки, че са бежанци. Също така, снемането на биометрични данни би създавало една неоспорима база данни с информация за потенциални терористи, които се опитват да влязат в ЕС. Искам да спомена и още нещо. Картата на Европейския съюз не е завършена докато България и Румъния не станат част от Шенген. Вече изпълняваме всички условия за влизане в зоната и фактът, че нелегалното преминаване през България е сведено до минимум, е безспорното доказателство за това. Ние защитаваме външните граници на ЕС с достойнство и смятам, че е редно да бъдем възнаградени за нашите усилия.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D), *písomne* – Zavedenie používania biometrických údajov osôb pri cezhraničnom prekračovaní vonkajších hraníc bude mať viacero pozitívnych vplyvov. Okrem plynulejšej a efektívnejšej kontroly na hraniciach Schengenu sa zároveň zlepší a posilní kontrola pohybu osôb v rámci Únie. To vzhľadom na zvyšujúcu sa migráciu obyvateľstva prispeje k vyššej bezpečnosti a včasnejšiemu zachyteniu možného ohrozenia. Je dôležité, aby biometrické údaje boli používané výlučne v súlade s cieľmi tohto opatrenia a aby boli jasne zadefinované podmienky, za akých je možné sprístupniť tieto údaje orgánom presadzovania práva v súvislosti s bojom proti cezhraničnému zločinu a terorizmu.

Marijana Petir (PPE), *napisan.* – Republika Hrvatska je obavila sve potrebne pripreme i spremna je učiniti korak dalje u svojoj pripadnosti europskoj obitelji i postati članicom Schengenskog prostora. To je dobro i za Hrvatsku i za ostale države članice. Osim što će ulazak u Schengenski prostor ukloniti granične kontrole sa zemljama članicama Europske unije, kao i kontrole putovnica u zračnim lukama pri putovanju iz i prema zemljama koje pripadaju Schengenskom prostoru, ovime će se osnažiti i sigurnost na vanjskim granicama Europske unije.

Najduža vanjska granica Europske unije je upravo granica Republike Hrvatske s Bosnom i Hercegovinom stoga je i Europskoj uniji u interesu da tu granicu još snažnije zaštiti i to čim prije. Hrvatska bi također morala imati pristup sustavu ulaska/izlaska za registraciju podataka o ulasku i izlasku državljana trećih zemalja koji prelaze vanjske granice EU-a te se nadam da ćemo do početka primjene ovog sustava i mi biti dio Schengenskog područja i aktivan dionik sustava.

Europska unija mora osigurati ravnopravan tretman prema svim svojim državama članicama i ne smije diskriminirati zemlje koje se nalaze na putu ka Schengenu, stoga očekujem da i Hrvatska automatski postane dio sustava ulaska/izlaska kako bi mogla kvalitetnije prikupljati podatke i sudjelovati u njihovoj razmjeni.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D), *în scris.* – Într-un context geopolitic volatil, marcat recent atât de criza migraționistă, cât și de o creștere a numărului de atacuri teroriste, este important ca Uniunea Europeană să aibă frontiere „smart”, eficiente și integrate pentru a gestiona fluxurile de oameni care tranzitează teritoriul său. În calitate de raportor din partea Grupului S&D din Comisia de Bugete a PE pe propunerea Comisiei pentru instituirea unui sistem armonizat în ceea ce îi privește intrarea și ieșirea cetățenilor non-UE în spațiul comunitar, consider că realizarea acestui lucru ar ajuta semnificativ statele membre să gestioneze în mod uniform și, totodată, în timp util granițele externe ale UE.

Având în vedere că prin acest raport s-a stabilit că România și Bulgaria sunt parte integrantă a sistemului EES, iar Schengen reprezintă un reper al unității și al cooperării europene, solicit liderilor europeni să urgenteze finalizarea procesului de aderare al acelor țări. Acestea au dovedit deja că îndeplinesc toate condițiile pentru o participare core-spunzătoare la Spațiul Schengen. Securitatea europeană nu se poate înfăptui decât printr-o colaborare strânsă între statele membre, iar acest lucru presupune în primul rând un tratament egal al acestora.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu.* – Tema, kuria šiandien buvo kalbėta, buvo kruopščiai paruošta Piliečių laisvės, teisingumo ir vidaus reikalų komiteto, nes pranešimas liečia labai svarbius ES valstybių narių saugumo ir asmenų privatumo aspektus. Per pastaruosius keletą metų ties Europos Sąjungos išorės sienomis padidėjus keleivių srautams tapo akivaizdu, kad dabartinės sienų kontrolės sistemos yra neveiksmingos, ir ši padėtis galėtų tapti dar sudėtingesnė atsižvelgiant į pabėgėlių antplūdį. Privalome modernizuoti savo keliautojų valdymo sistemas, kad jos būtų darnesnės ir veiksmingesnės, taip pat saugesnės. Kontrolė negali būti grindžiama vien tikrinant keleivių pasus ir juose esančius antspaudus, kurie ne tik gali būti suklastoti arba neįskaitomi, bet ir būti pernelyg didelė našta sienos apsaugos institucijoms – trukdyti joms sutelkti dėmesį į tikrus savo darbus ir taip kelti pavojų saugumui. Europos atvykimo ir išvykimo sistemos nustatymas bus naudingas keleiviams, nes sutrumpės jų laukimo sienos perėjimo punktuose laikas. Tai taip pat atneš naudą valstybėms narėms, nes jos greičiau sutvarkys su *bona fide* keleiviais susijusius formalumus ir kartu padidins ES išorės sienų saugumą.

Janusz Zemke (S&D), *na piśmie.* – W ostatnich kilku latach pogorszyło się w UE poczucie bezpieczeństwa obywateli, co wiąże się m.in. ze wzrostem liczby nielegalnych imigrantów oraz z przypadkami zamachów terrorystycznych. Jednym z warunków ograniczenia tych niepokojących zjawisk jest przyjęcie systemu wjazdu na terytorium UE. Zgłoszone propozycje poprawiają w moim przekonaniu system identyfikacji osób przybywających do UE.

Szczególnie ważna jest tutaj identyfikacja nielegalnych imigrantów dzięki tworzeniu ogólnoeuropejskich baz danych biometrycznych. Te bazy danych umożliwią śledzenie historii podróży obywateli państw trzecich, uwzględniając także osoby podejrzane o popełnienie przestępstwa. Rzecz w tym, by proponowane rozwiązania jak najszybciej weszły w życie, by państwa członkowskie nie tylko gromadziły konieczne dane na własne potrzeby, ale także dzieliły się tymi informacjami z wszystkimi państwami członkowskimi i instytucjami UE odpowiadającymi za walkę z terroryzmem jak Europol czy Eurojust.

4. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (Aussprache)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Commission statement on combating sexual harassment and abuse in the EU (2017/2897(RSP)).

Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, this Chamber has already debated the issue of violence and harassment against women on many occasions. We on the Commission side have highlighted the seriousness of the problems with statistics and studies. We know that at least one in every three women has been a victim of some sort of physical or sexual violence.

But these statistics do not tell enough personal stories, and the reason we are debating this today is because of the global 'Me Too' movement. Real stories have exploded in social media and other communication forums during recent weeks, stories that have been kept locked in in the memories and the hearts and minds of millions of women across the world, who have been suffering, who have been silently trying to forget or cope with this or ignore the pain.

Women who have been in some form or other harassed by their boss, by their colleague, by their teacher, their neighbour or a stranger in the street. These stories shout to us. It is a feminist outcry from all across the world from women who say: 'enough! This is enough! We refuse to be silent, we refuse to accept this.'

This is an impressive movement, and we can only listen to those stories and try to reach from the stories to some action. We must continue to work towards eradicating this problem. Workplaces all over the world, including in the European Union and EU institutions must look at how we can address this. Are we doing enough? Are there enough tools to listen to their signals, to catch those stories, to act in an appropriate way? This is work that needs to be done by men and women together.

Since the creation of the Daphne funding programme in the 1990s, the EU has supported the work of NGOs at grass-roots level and of national local authorities, because this debate is much broader. We need to empower volunteers and professionals to work with victims and perpetrators when it comes to sexual violence. Local actors are best placed to tackle the problem on the ground. Without them, victims would be all alone.

We set aside EUR 6 million last year and have set aside EUR 12.7 million this year, and projects across the EU have been a lifeline for many organisations who would otherwise not be able to do their work. In September, in partnership with the United Nations, the EU launched a major spotlight initiative, with an initial investment of half a billion euros, to eliminate all kinds of violence against women and girls around the world.

Thanks to the budget that you have advocated, we will come up with an EU survey on gender-based violence, to be carried out by national statistics institutes and led and coordinated by Eurostat. Together, we have dedicated this year to focused actions to combat violence against women. Many things happened this year and are still happening.

The Commission, for example, launched a campaign which is engaging and supporting professionals, Member States and NGOs in combating the problem. Under that campaign, we set aside EUR 4 million for national campaigns and selected 10 different national projects that are now kicking off. To give an example, we are funding a campaign in association with the Italian football league, focused on passing the message to football fans that violence against women and girls is not acceptable.

From a regulatory perspective, as you know, the EU's accession to the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence (Istanbul Convention) is an important step forward. This convention brings binding rules on a wide aspect of the types of violence, including sexual harassment and abuse.

Sexual harassment is already sanctioned in EU legislation, but victims – as we have seen lately – do not come forward or cases are not reported or not brought to court. And here we must look at how we can work with national equality bodies to address this problem, so that we contribute, in time, to the support given to those victims.

The model structures of the Istanbul Convention and the EU Victims Directive, with a strong focus on victim support and on the training of police, can make a difference here. We need to keep an eye on implementation, and that is why, under the Victims' Rights Directive, we have already launched an infringement case for non-transposition of this Directive. We are continuing our compliance check and looking at how the Directive is actually applied on the ground in Member States.

Today you have raised a broad problem that has got legitimate attention through the recent 'Me Too' movement. Here we need to go forward, hand-in-hand, we need to work – everybody, especially men – to say no to harassment, no to violence against women. So thank you very much for putting this on the agenda today.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Molestowanie seksualne to rodzaj przemocy wobec kobiet – mówi o tym wiele ustaw i umów międzynarodowych. Zjawisko jest tak powszechne, że prawie go nie zauważamy. Trudno znaleźć kobietę, która nie doświadczyła zaczepek, obraźliwych żartów, niechcianych esemesów, niechcianych propozycji w miejscu pracy, a czasami gorszych rzeczy. Skoro to zjawisko jest tak powszechne i tak stare, możemy się zastanawiać, dlaczego akurat dzisiaj o nim mówimy i dlaczego akurat wczoraj, dzisiaj i pewnie jutro wszystkie media i internet o tym piszą. Przecież nie weszła w życie żadna nowa ustawa, nie nastąpił żaden przełom w procedurach. Po prostu czara się przełala, przerwano znowu milczenie. Ofiary molestowania zaczęły mówić anonimowo, w tłumie, jednocześnie i ta synergia sprawiła, że głos stał się znowu słyszalny.

Dzięki temu również wszystkie instytucje zajmujące się rozwiązywaniem problemu molestowania ujrzały światło dzienne. Dowiadujemy się, że istnieją, jaka jest ich struktura, jak są finansowane, jak działają, na ile są skuteczne, co jest największą przeszkodą w zgłaszaniu przypadków molestowania. Dowiadujemy się, że możliwe jest zachowanie prywatności i poufności. Dowiadujemy się także, że większość przypadków, o których piszą media, nigdy i nigdzie nie została zgłoszona w obawie przed wstydem i utratą pracy, a jeśli sytuacja miała miejsce w ważnej instytucji, jak na przykład parlament, dochodzą inne bariery: obawa przed posądzeniem o niełojalność, o szkodzenie firmie, o obniżanie jej prestiżu. Analizujemy więc zachowanie, możliwości i bariery, które napotykają ofiary molestowania. Znowu, jak zwykle gdy chodzi o przemoc, nasza uwaga skupia się na ofiarach. Tymczasem naszej uwadze umyka istotny wątek zewnętrznego kontekstu, w jakim dochodzi do aktów przemocy i molestowania. Mało mówimy o sprawcach i mało mówimy o świadkach przemocy.

W niedawnym wywiadzie francuski minister finansów zapytany, czy złożyłby doniesienie na kolegę, gdyby wiedział, że dopuszcza się on molestowania, bez wahania odpowiedział, że nie, oczywiście, że nie. Odpowiedź francuskiego ministra nie powinna nikogo zaskakiwać, bowiem wszyscy tak robią – zamykają oczy i jest to pierwsza rzecz, z którą należy skończyć. Nie odczuwam dziś satysfakcji, że tak mało uwagi poświęcamy sprawcom molestowania, i nie odczuwam satysfakcji, że mówimy dzisiaj także o Parlamencie Europejskim, w którym stanowi się prawo i mówi o sprawiedliwości społecznej. Mamy przecież procedury, regulaminy i narzędzia, więc uważam, że należy ich w końcu użyć.

(Mówczyni zgodziła się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Gerard Batten (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – You spoke a great deal, madam, about cases not being brought to court and cases being blocked. You are well aware that the press are now talking about cases of sexual harassment in this Parliament. The press have picked that up.

I was made aware several months ago on the grapevine, by a very reliable source, that this was going to hit the newspapers very soon, so much so that I actually mentioned it on the *Daily Politics* programme some months ago. And then it did not hit the press and nothing happened.

My equally reliable source told me that the proceedings had been in some way impeded and blocked by Mr Schultz, who had been instrumental in intervening and stopping that happening. Are you aware of that and will this House take that into account in this discussion?

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Oczywiście nie mogę się wypowiadać o konkretnym przypadku, bo nie znam historii, o której Pan mówi. Mogę tylko powiedzieć, że w Parlamencie, i tym, i we wszystkich innych parlamentach, a także w większości instytucji i firm, również prywatnych, istnieją komisje, procedury, które mogą pomóc w przypadkach molestowania. Problem polega na tym, że to jest zjawisko ukryte i że te przypadki nie są zgłaszane, ponieważ istnieje powszechna społeczna zgoda na to, żeby to zjawisko pozostawało ukryte. I to właśnie należy zmienić.

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, gracias señora comisaria por su intervención. Según la Agencia de Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea, cerca del 45 al 55 % de las mujeres europeas han sufrido acoso en algún momento de su vida. Les voy a decir unas frases que seguro que les resultan familiares: «Era un secreto a voces, le gustaba provocar», «pero, ¿te has dado cuenta de cómo vestía?».

Estas frases son cómplices y pretenden quitar importancia a unas conductas que tienen su origen en una sociedad desigual, donde una parte considera y establece relaciones de poder sobre otra. De ahí nace el acoso sexual.

Y, por desgracia, esta realidad no se escapa de ningún lugar ni espacio, ni siquiera de las instituciones públicas, ni siquiera de este Parlamento. Podríamos ponernos una venda en los ojos y pensar que no tiene nada que ver con nosotros y que no es necesario hacer ningún problema de ello; o por el contrario, podemos dar visibilidad a esta situación e intentar poner soluciones encima de la mesa.

Hoy el propio Parlamento tiene instrumentos para responder a este tipo de situaciones, pero es evidente que no están funcionando, y por eso pedimos en la Resolución que los reforcemos, con asesoramiento externo, para evaluar de qué manera puede mejorar y resultar realmente útil a las víctimas.

Debemos ser solidarios y estar del lado de las víctimas. Que no sientan vergüenza. Que no tengan miedo a perder sus puestos de trabajo. Que dejen de sentir culpa por algo de lo que solo es responsable quien acosa y quien agrede. Por ello, pongamos en marcha los instrumentos necesarios para resolver estas situaciones, para que la sombra de duda no aceche sobre todos, sino que recaiga única y exclusivamente sobre los acosadores. Ni un ataque más a la dignidad de las mujeres. Ni un silencio cómplice. Ni un mirar hacia otro lado. Porque no estáis solas: «Yo también», «Me too».

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Dziś mówimy o bardzo ważnej sprawie, jaką jest wykorzystywanie seksualne kobiet i molestowanie. Mówimy o tych sprawach w kontekście Unii Europejskiej. Mówimy, że do takich czynów dochodzi również w Parlamencie Europejskim, i jest to dowód na to, jak kompletnie niewydolna jest nasza instytucja, że to tutaj, w sercu rzekomej demokracji, w Parlamencie Europejskim, dochodzi do molestowania kobiet.

Myślę, że nasza dzisiejsza debata powinna dać siłę kobietom do tego, aby głośno krzyczały i mówiły „nie”. Siła płynąca z naszej debaty powinna odnieść taki właśnie skutek: kobiety powinny mieć odwagę mówić o tym, że są wykorzystywane, jeśli rzeczywiście taki proceder ma miejsce. Myślę również, że konsekwencją tej debaty nie może być tylko zlecenie audytu w sprawie molestowania w Parlamencie Europejskim. Myślę, że powinniśmy my, wszystkie panie, upomnieć się o młodociane dziewczynki poddawane przymusowym małżeństwom z dorosłymi mężczyznami. Upomnijmy się również o nie. Może ktoś przeprowadzi audyt i zobaczy ich ból.

Angelika Mlinar, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! In den letzten Tagen drehte sich in den sozialen Medien alles um sexuelle Belästigung am Arbeitsplatz, weil Tausende mutige Frauen ihre Erfahrungen geteilt und die weite Verbreitung des Problems aufgezeigt haben. Dennoch hat es mich überrascht, dass dieses Faktum von der Öffentlichkeit als etwas Neues und Überraschendes wahrgenommen wurde. Plötzlich sind alle schockiert und beklagen Verhaltensweisen, die schon immer existiert und das Leben vieler Frauen beeinträchtigt haben.

Social-Media-Kampagnen alleine sind nicht genug. Was sich verändern muss, ist unser Umgang mit Macht und letztlich das Machtgefüge selbst und das Bewusstsein, dass sexuelle Übergriffe ein Ausnutzen einer Machtposition sind. Allen Männern ins Stammbuch geschrieben: Sexuelle Gewalt ist kein Ausdruck von Stärke, sondern ein Ausdruck von Schwäche. Sexistische und diskriminierende Verhaltensweisen dürfen niemals und nirgends toleriert werden. Wir müssen von einem Hashtag „MeToo“ zu einem Hashtag „NotMe“ kommen.

Malin Björk, för GUE/NGL-gruppen. – Fru talman! "#MeToo" har varit en ögonöppnare för många. Det är bra så, men vi som arbetar med dessa frågor vet att detta är en del av våra liv, det är riskbedömningar vi gör, det är ett konstant gränssättande som vi gör. "#MeToo" visar för mig också att det handlar om systerskap, och jag vill ge allt stöd till dem som utsätts och utsatts. Vi ska stötta varandra och inte minst stötta dem som nu pratar om det och bryter tystnaden om vad som händer i detta hus. Det stödet vill jag ge kollegorna som nu bryter tystnaden, också dem som namnger sina förövare.

"#MeToo", det är också viktigt att se att det handlar om strukturella problem, inte – som vissa här i huset ibland försöker göra gällande – att det rör vissa kulturer eller vissa religioner. Nej, det är ett strukturellt machokulturproblem här i Europa, i vårt hus, i våra samhällen. "#MeToo"-kampanjen visar också att vi måste utkräva ansvar av män. Om du inte är en del av lösningen är du en del av problemet. Det är dags att sluta hålla varandra om ryggen. Jag säger det till alla mina manliga kollegor: Det är dags att sluta hålla varandra om ryggen. Om du inte säger till och säger emot när någon trakasserar eller betar sig sexistiskt, då är du en del av machokulturproblemet.

Det här är också en kampanj för förändring. Vi är faktiskt lagstiftare och policymakers här i detta hus. Vi skapar förändring och vi ska börja med att göra rent hus här hos oss själva och rösta i morgon om åtgärder för att komma till rätta med de övergrepp som har skett här. Samma här, vi måste visa att vi är en del av förändringen, att vi är en del av lösningen.

Terry Reintke, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, 'Me too!' I have been sexually harassed, just like millions of other women in the European Union and I think it is about time that we very clearly say that we should not be ashamed but that the perpetrators should be ashamed.

Sexual harassment is such a widespread problem all over the European Union, and we will need legislative steps to combat it. Accession to the Istanbul Convention is a first step but, in order really to do something about this, we will need a directive on the fight against violence against women.

The shocking reports about events in this Parliament also give us the duty to do something about this matter. So we will need specific measures to work on, and improve, the mechanisms for fighting sexual harassment in this House.

One last point. Yes, this is about women, but it is not a women's issue. We need men to speak up. So, to all of the men in this Chamber and to all of the men in the European Union, I would say: 'You cannot be complacent anymore. Speak up, stand up against sexual harassment. We cannot take this, we need to fight it together.'

Daniela Aiuto, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in commissione FEMM ci occupiamo quotidianamente di tematiche quali quelle degli abusi sessuali e di ogni altra forma di violenza nei confronti delle donne, anche sul posto di lavoro.

Si tratta di una triste realtà, che coinvolge ogni ambito lavorativo, e il Parlamento europeo, ahimè, come ogni altro luogo di lavoro, non è immune da tali comportamenti deprecabili.

Molti di voi si sono indignati per le notizie divulgate dai giornali, per questo velo di omertà che è caduto sull'istituzione di cui facciamo parte. Molti altri hanno trovato il coraggio di denunciare piccoli e grandi accadimenti riconducibili all'abuso sessuale, che senza questa inchiesta giornalistica sarebbero rimasti nel silenzio e nell'oblio.

Saltare sulla sedia dinanzi ad accuse di tal specie è una reazione comprensibile, così come è comprensibile, da parte dell'istituzione, fare chiarezza e pulizia immediata per non rischiare di vedere la propria autorevolezza e il proprio onore intaccati da azioni infamanti compiute da singoli personaggi.

Ma cerchiamo di non essere ipocriti e di non fare, come spesso accade, una giustizia di serie A e una di serie B. La stessa indignazione, la stessa risolutezza e immediatezza nei provvedimenti, la stessa severità e tolleranza zero verso tali nefandezze devono essere applicate sì all'interno del Parlamento europeo, ma parimenti e con lo stesso vigore in tutti i luoghi di lavoro, sia pubblici che privati.

È bene dare il buon esempio, è bene agire con fermezza, ma non dimentichiamoci che questo Parlamento è lo specchio di quello che accade fuori, nel mondo reale, dove una sottocultura basata sullo sfruttamento sessuale permea ogni ambito.

In quante università, ad esempio, giovani studentesse devono subire molestie sessuali da parte di qualche docente indegno? In quanti uffici, anche pubblici, le dipendenti sono oggetto di attenzioni particolari dei loro dirigenti? E a quante donne viene offerto un posto di lavoro, oggi più che mai spesso un miraggio in realtà ancora devastate dalla crisi economica, in cambio di prestazioni non propriamente definibili di tipo professionale?

Viene rabbia a pensare che per ogni denuncia, che poi per clamore finisce sui giornali, vi sono centinaia di casi che rimangono nel silenzio per paura, per vergogna, per senso di colpa.

Ecco, potremo dire di aver agito per il meglio e di aver fatto il bene delle donne e anche degli uomini vittime di tali comportamenti osceni quando agiremo nei confronti di ogni forma di abuso sessuale all'interno dei confini dell'Unione europea con la stessa solerzia con la quale stiamo agendo oggi per controbattere a quello che avviene dentro casa nostra.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, l'affaire Weinstein a permis de révéler aux yeux du monde les exactions sexuelles commises par quelques prédateurs influents sur les femmes qui les entourent et avec qui ils travaillent. Elle a permis à ces femmes de prendre plus librement la parole et de réclamer justice. Nous devons faire tout ce qui est en notre pouvoir pour permettre aux femmes victimes de tels actes de violence d'obtenir justice et réparation.

Cependant, aussi horribles que ces actes puissent être, ils ne peuvent justifier la mise au pilori sur la place publique de présumés coupables. Il est capital, aujourd'hui plus que jamais, d'appeler au respect de l'état de droit. Les femmes doivent pouvoir porter plainte sans crainte et les accusés se défendre au tribunal.

Le fameux «#balancetonporc» est révélateur de l'erreur que nous ne devons pas commettre: confondre lynchage médiatique et justice. Ce hashtag est aussi la porte ouverte à la délation publique, et aucun État de droit ne saurait le tolérer. Je crois, enfin, que nous ne devons pas traiter cette question à la manière de ce hashtag, en faisant de chaque homme ou de chaque garçon un porc en puissance.

Chers collègues, plutôt que d'accabler l'ensemble des hommes, regardons le problème en face. Rendons à nos garçons et à nos filles adultes de demain leur innocence. Par exemple, en France, un enfant sur trois de moins de 13 ans a déjà visionné un film pornographique. Protégeons-les de cette violence qui fait de la femme un objet de jouissance sexuelle, qui abîme nos enfants et qui fait du Hollywood de Weinstein la norme en matière de relations hommes/femmes.

Je souhaite également, dans un registre un peu plus politique, condamner le sectarisme de certains parlementaires de cette assemblée, qui ont exclu mon groupe politique de la résolution, affaiblissant de facto la voix du Parlement européen. Ce comportement inadmissible compte tenu du sujet ne m'empêchera pas de voter en faveur de cette résolution qui mérite autre chose que cette mesquinerie politique.

Diane James (NI). – Madam President, from media attention this week we finally know that there is a problem with sexual harassment in this Chamber. But the focus, seemingly, is on sexual harassment of women by male MEPs only.

That totally ignores – and I mean ignores – what could be going on. I am only suggesting, but I understand it does go on. Therefore, sexual harassment should not be gender-specific. We have got to address this. Ms Malmström, the rapporteur, spoke very eloquently about what needs to happen, but what is clear is that we do not currently have a process with which individuals and alleged perpetrators can engage, and ask for a suitable investigation.

I believe that the vote we are going to have tomorrow morning is bringing this forward too quickly. We have not addressed sufficiently the scale of what is going on and the nature of what is going on. I would suggest we go forward on this with responsibility given to the Quaestors.

Barbara Matera (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ci troviamo ancora una volta a parlare di una tematica che affligge profondamente l'Unione europea e le sue istituzioni. In seguito al caso Weinstein molte donne hanno finalmente avuto il coraggio di denunciare molestie e abusi subiti, perfino tra queste mura, troppo spesso.

Le donne in tutto il mondo hanno paura di parlare. Il 13 % delle donne in Europa hanno dichiarato di aver subito, almeno una volta, una violenza nella propria vita. Allora ad oggi lo strumento più efficace per la lotta alle molestie e agli abusi sessuali è la convenzione di Istanbul. Quest'ultima introduce la criminalizzazione della violenza contro le donne, la violenza psicologica, lo *stalking*, la violenza fisica, quella sessuale, tra cui lo stupro e le molestie.

Non esiste ancora in tutta Europa una legislazione, ecco perché oggi voglio insistere ancora sulla convenzione di Istanbul. Le leggi penali degli Stati membri contrastano la violenza in linea di principio, ma esistono ancora numerosi ostacoli e quindi, di conseguenza, non c'è una protezione omogenea delle vittime.

Quello che chiedo, per il Parlamento e per l'Unione tutta, sono pene certe e punizioni esemplari. Kofi Annan dice che la violenza contro le donne è una delle violazioni dei diritti umani, forse la più vergognosa, perché non ha confini geografici, sociali o culturali. Fin quando questa esiste e viene perpetrata in tutto il mondo non possiamo aver raggiunto livelli alti di sviluppo, di pace, di sostenibilità e di accettabilità.

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir verneigen uns heute zunächst vor dem Mut der Betroffenen, weil es nicht einfach ist diese Vorgänge anzusprechen, aufzustehen und darüber zu reden. Aber diese mutigen Menschen schaffen den Raum für eine zwingend notwendige Debatte. Es geht um mehr als individuelles Fehlverhalten. Es geht um eine Dimension, die uns leicht auffällt, die wir leicht erschließen können, wenn wir ganz einfach uns die Äußerungen des gegenwärtigen US-Präsidenten anschauen, wie man mit Frauen umgehen darf.

Was zeigt uns das? Es ist dieses Klima der Zulässigkeit, diese Kultur der Zulässigkeit von Übergriffen. Es hat immer etwas zu tun mit dümmlichem Dominanzverhalten, mit Gewalt, mit dem Versuch des Missbrauchs, aber mit Unterdrückung. Es ist immer etwas Herrschaftliches darin. Die Ursachen dieses Verhaltens müssen wir aufdecken. Wir müssen miteinander reden und dem eine Kultur des Respekts, eine Kultur der Würde entgegensetzen. Das gilt für dieses Haus, das gilt für Europa.

Eine Bitte zum Schluss, Frau Präsidentin, das ist mir ein sehr persönliches Anliegen. Lassen Sie uns nicht vergessen – heute an diesem Tag –, was an den Außengrenzen Europas, in den Flüchtlingslagern und in den Auffanglagern passiert, wie Mädchen, junge Frauen, wie Kinder missbraucht werden, und welchen Skandal wir offenen Auges zulassen! Würde und Respekt muss auch in unsere Entwicklungspolitik und in unsere Flüchtlingspolitik einkehren. Das gehört zu der Debatte heute dazu.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Madam Chairman, the culture in the entertainment world seems to be that those – particularly women – who want to work in the industry, are preyed upon by powerful individuals, mostly men, who can make or break their careers.

The term 'casting couch' is so well known that it has entered the English language. So this is not a new concept, and I'd like to thank all those brave women who have come out in the 'Me Too' campaign. I would particularly like to thank the brave employees of this Parliament who have spoken out in recent days.

It is really important, I believe, to seize the momentum, and do something in our own workplace and I'd like to see the resolution concentrate on that aspect. The structure is in place and I'd like to thank our Quaestor, Ms Bearder, for sending round a note yesterday that showed us that the structure is there. But people still don't feel confident to use that structure, and that's the real problem: that we don't take it seriously enough.

So if there's fear of losing a job we can actually individually as MEPs do something, certainly for our accredited parliamentary assistants. I'd like to pledge here and now, I, as a Member of this Parliament: if there is an assistant out there who feels they are going to lose their job, come and work in my office then temporarily, I will offer you a safe haven. And I'd like other Members to join me in that pledge.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Madam President, I believe we are the first parliament in Europe publicly to debate the issue of sexual harassment and intimidation. Unfortunately, it is necessary. We have to talk about how we put into practice what we preach, and provide a free and safe working environment for the people who work for us and for all Europeans.

Yes, we have a harassment committee, a complaints procedures and so on, but why have only 10 cases been brought forward since 2014? That means that the threshold is too high and that procedures alone are not enough. In recent days, after the 'Me too' campaign, I have been getting the following question, often from men: 'I am not so sure anymore what I can and cannot do. When do I cross the line?'

I would say it is easy. If you have a daughter, just ask yourself how you would want your daughter to be treated. That is the way you are going to treat other people. It is not just about violence, but also about sexism and sexist remarks. They are not harmless. Sexist jokes are not funny, they are just sexist, and they lead to harassment and violence. I have one final comment: to be clear, women and men decide for themselves. Of course, what consenting adults do between one another is not our business, but when a girl says 'no', it means no.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il femminismo mi ha insegnato a partire da me: *Me too*. Avevo 19 anni, all'università. Lui ne aveva circa 70, un compagno professore, un compagno intellettuale. Mesi dopo ho fatto l'esame con un altro professore e la soddisfazione di quel 30 e lode preso con un altro professore, dopo avergli detto di no, non me la scordo, così come non mi scordo tutto il tempo che ci ho messo a capire cosa fosse successo quel giorno, la vergogna, la rabbia. E soprattutto non dimenticherò mai le donne che mi hanno aiutato a superare quello schifo.

Me too. We together. Credo che sia importante, oggi, come parlamentari, con la presenza della Commissaria, dire «*we together*» contro la violenza maschile sulle donne. Dalle donne la forza delle donne, donne che si danno forza. «Non una di meno» è oggi un movimento politico globale, una forza politica globale, che scenderà in piazza di nuovo il 25 novembre contro la violenza maschile, contro lo sfruttamento, contro il razzismo. Perché molte donne non denunciano? Perché la solidarietà e la complicità *machista* è ancora troppo forte, dobbiamo lottare contro la cultura *machista*, dobbiamo ratificare la convenzione di Istanbul, dobbiamo fare di più. *We together*.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, mostrar la repulsa por los hechos denunciados y realmente dar las gracias a todas aquellas mujeres que se han atrevido a denunciarlo, porque es imprescindible que esto salga absolutamente a la luz.

Este es un fenómeno muy extendido: el 55 % de las mujeres en la Unión Europea denuncian haber sido víctimas de acoso sexual; el treinta y pico por ciento denuncia que este acoso ha venido por parte de compañeros, jefes, amigos de trabajo... Por lo tanto, estamos hablando de un fenómeno muy extendido a consecuencia de un patriarcado insufrible.

Pero, hoy, quisiera hacer dos reflexiones que tienen que ver con esta Casa.

La primera es que, de todos los casos que han salido en la prensa —más de cien en las instituciones europeas—, ¿cuántos han sido denunciados oficialmente en los mecanismos que tenemos en esta institución? Poquísimos, prácticamente ninguno. Tenemos que encontrar vías para que esto pueda ser denunciado.

Y la segunda reflexión que quiero hacer, compañeros: esto es responsabilidad también nuestra y, hoy, en este debate, en el que va a haber más de cuarenta intervenciones, solo hablaremos cinco hombres. ¡Esto no puede ser! Esto también es responsabilidad nuestra, tenemos que denunciar cuando veamos estas situaciones que pasan cerca nuestro. Comprometámonos también nosotros contra la violencia sexual.

Margot Parker (EFDD). – Madam President, sexual harassment is, shockingly, all too common in today's society and in this European Parliament. Whilst statistically women are over five times as likely as men to experience sexual assault, it is important to note that sexual harassment and abuse affects both men and women.

We have all heard the stories and rumours that have been going on for many years. The very place that claims to legislate against this sort of disgusting behaviour is turning a blind eye to its practice. The idea that MEPs or staff are using their positions of power to perpetrate abuse is shameful and unacceptable.

I want some clarification. Can the members of the Bureau tell us all they know about their in camera meeting at the end of last year regarding 15 MEPs who are accused of sexual harassment? These files should be opened up to public scrutiny. Please action this immediately.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca. Nedávne odhalenia v médiách a na sociálnych sieťach ukazujú, že sexuálne obťažovanie je problémom Európy, jej členských štátov, ale aj inštitúcií.

Tak ako pri násilí na ženách, aj tu musíme hovoriť nielen o pomoci obetiam a trestaní páchatel'ov, ale aj o prevencii. A jedinou účinnou prevenciou je výchova od detstva k rešpektovaniu dôstojnosti každého človeka. Páchatelia sexuálneho obťažovania často zneužívajú svoje postavenie a funkciu, zatiaľ čo obetiam, ktoré sa rozhodnú toto konanie oznámiť, hrozí výpoveď, preradenie na iné miesto a záznam v osobnom spise, ktorý je prekážkou v ich ďalšej kariére.

Ako poslanci môžeme len apelovať na členské štáty, aby vo svojich výchovných programoch zdôrazňovali potrebu rešpektovať ľudskú dôstojnosť každého a pomáhali obetiam. No môžeme urobiť viac pre pomoc obetiam a potrestanie páchatel'ov sexuálneho obťažovania a násilia na pôde tohto parlamentu. Vedomie, že nevhodné správanie bude mať vážne dôsledky, napríklad aj v podobe zrážok z platu v prospech obete, by nepochybne malo preventívny účinok. Zároveň by takéto odškodnenie aspoň čiastočne kompenzovalo znevýhodnené postavenie obeti.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, ces dernières semaines, des milliers de femmes ont dénoncé le harcèlement sexuel dont elles sont victimes à travers les hashtags «#MeToo», «#MoiAussi» ou «#BalanceTonPorc».

Grâce à elles, les violences basées sur le genre apparaissent au grand jour. Oui, il s'agit d'un fléau qui sévit dramatiquement dans toute l'Europe. Une femme sur deux a déjà été victime de harcèlement sexuel. Celui-ci est trop souvent considéré comme une affaire privée et bien trop facilement toléré, d'autant que le dépôt de plainte relève trop souvent du parcours de la combattante.

Tous ces témoignages appellent une réponse politique. Je m'adresse ici à la Commission, à la Présidence et aux États. La convention d'Istanbul est le premier traité juridiquement contraignant au niveau international sur la lutte contre les violences faites aux femmes. La convention commence par ces mots: «La violence à l'égard des femmes doit être comprise comme une violation des droits de l'homme.» C'est grave et cela doit être fermement puni. Ce qui n'est plus tolérable, c'est l'impunité des auteurs. L'article 40 de la convention prévoit précisément des sanctions pénales en cas de harcèlement sexuel.

Dans notre rapport voté en septembre dernier, nous exhortons les États membres à accélérer les négociations pour que l'Union européenne ratifie cette convention plus vite, afin d'agir maintenant et plus efficacement pour les droits des femmes. Je demande aussi aux États qui ne l'auraient pas encore fait – et je salue l'Estonie, qui vient de le faire – de ratifier cette convention d'Istanbul, car l'adhésion de l'Union ne les dispense pas de leurs obligations.

Je finis en rappelant que la violence contre les femmes est enracinée dans notre société. Nous avons besoin d'un changement profond des mentalités et des comportements pour nous en affranchir durablement. Les femmes et les filles doivent être protégées partout et tout le temps.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci. Peniaze, sex a moc. Toto je bezbožná trojica hriechu, ktorá pošpiňuje mnohých lídrov a je to jedovatý kokteil, ktorý láka mnohých ambiciózných ľudí, ale len ľudí s komplexami.

Ale tuto sa hovorí o mačizme, že zlí sú tu muži. Ale ja si myslím, že to tu chcete aj tak stereotypizovať, pretože aj ženy obťažujú a viete, že medzi nahlásenými prípadmi, aj v inštitúciách, sú aj prípady obťažujúcich žien. Prosím vás, nehovorte len o mužoch.

A takisto sa sexuálne obťažovanie deje aj medzi homosexuálmi, aj v tejto komunite, a o tom sa proste mlčí.

A my musíme zastaviť proces, ktorý z mužov a žien robí objekty. Objekty, ktoré následne, proste vo fantázii, využívame. A je to výbuch pornografie, vzťahov bez záväzkov, odmietnutie sexuálnej morálky. To sú tragické následky, ktoré teraz vidíme, že sa tu dejú.

Takže či je to inštitúcia Európskej únie alebo Hollywood, my musíme požadovať rešpekt pre mužov aj ženy ako osoby, žiadať sebaovládanie a dôraz na rodinu. Pretože to sú veci, ktoré zdravo vedia zastaviť sexuálne vyčíňania.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el acoso sexual sigue existiendo porque sigue existiendo el miedo, porque el miedo sigue haciendo callar a las víctimas. Y ese silencio es el muro que protege a los acosadores, es su escudo de impunidad.

Las víctimas de acoso sexual tienen miedo de ser señaladas, estigmatizadas, de perder su trabajo, de no ser creídas. Pero, ¿por qué tiene que aguantar y callar una mujer? ¿Por qué no tiene miedo el acosador? ¿Cómo es posible que una ley europea que protege desde el año 2002 y que considera que esto es un delito no asuste lo suficiente a los que perpetran ese delito? ¿Por qué no tienen miedo esos delincuentes? ¿Por qué no les aplicamos rigurosamente la ley y nuestro rechazo?

El 55 % de las mujeres de la Unión dicen que han sido acosadas sexualmente alguna vez. Si vamos a mujeres directivas subimos a un 75 %. Esto ocurre en todas partes, en cualquier entorno y también aquí en nuestra casa, en el Parlamento. Y esto es intolerable, y no lo vamos a aguantar más. Esta es una labor conjunta. Las víctimas que han abierto esta brecha de silencio deben tener toda nuestra protección, y todos los que estamos aquí debemos denunciarlo y decir, claro que sí, «Yo también».

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ευτυχώς αυτή τη φορά δεν κρυβόμαστε πίσω από το δάχτυλό μας. Παραδεχόμαστε ότι η σεξουαλική παρενόχληση υπάρχει και στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ενώ θα έπρεπε να είναι από τους πιο προστατευμένους εργασιακούς χώρους στον κόσμο, όπου οι γυναίκες πλειοψηφούν και το μορφωτικό επίπεδο είναι υψηλό. Σκεφτείτε, συνάδελφοι, πόσο χειρότερα είναι τα πράγματα για μια γυναίκα πρόσφυγα σε έναν καταυλισμό ή για μια εσωτερική οικιακή βοηθό. Ας αρχίσουμε από εδώ, από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Πρώτα χρειαζόμαστε ξεκάθαρο μηχανισμό προστασίας των θυμάτων της παρενόχλησης για να αντιμετωπίσουμε τον φόβο, αλλιώς δεν θα την καταγγείλουν. Έπειτα για να μην αποδεχόμαστε τη μεροληψία, χρειάζεται δημοκρατική σύνθεση των επιτροπών που εξετάζουν τις καταγγελίες μεταξύ ευρωβουλευτών και συνεργατών. Τέλος, απαιτούμε έλεγχο των καταγγελιών παρενόχλησης στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο από ανεξάρτητη επιτροπή ειδικών για να μην νομιμοποιείται το κουκούλωμα.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! "#MeToo." Ja, jag har också blivit utsatt för sexuella trakasserier och övergrepp. Det är väldigt smärtsamt att se den personen, mäktigt, fortsätta precis som förut. Min överväldigande känsla just nu är ändå solidaritet och glädje. Äntligen pratar vi om dessa smärtsamma minnen som vi alla delar. Vi måste bryta tystnaden och det är det vi gör idag.

Jag vill se fler män som förebilder i denna kamp. Det här är inte kvinnors ansvar. Vi behöver fler män står upp i det offentliga rummet och säger stopp när trakasserier och övergrepp pågår. Vi behöver fler män som kommer ut och berättar om sina övergrepp och sina erfarenheter som förövare. Vi behöver också fler män som bryter destruktiva mansnormer som handlar om aggressivitet, dominans, helt enkelt mer jämställdhet i samhället, och det kommer på riktigt att förändra våra samhällen.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, the Weinstein case has given confidence to many to come out and to speak and to tell their story of how they have been treated. Sexual harassment should not be tolerated in any form: it is an abuse of a powerful position. I would like to pay tribute to all those brave women who have come out and told their story; they have facilitated others in coming forward, and I think it has been a very important step. We should look at the role the media has played in this – both traditional media and, indeed, social media – in giving young women in general (and it mostly is young women) the confidence to come and tell their story.

But we need to ask ourselves how the structures that are in place in this Parliament have not facilitated those women to come forward. They do not have confidence; they do not feel comfortable; and, most importantly, they do not feel safe in coming forward to the structures that are in place. That is a question for all of us. The EU Employment Equality Directive is designed to protect employees from sexual harassment, and that legislation must work for all employees in every workplace across Europe. Here in Parliament, we need to provide a safe workplace free from harassment of any kind, and we need to provide the structures and the proper reporting mechanisms so that individuals can come forward in a situation where they feel safe. I think the onus is on all of us to ensure that, and to ask questions as to why that has not been happening to date.

Vilija Blinkėvičiūtė (S&D). – Ačiū, Pirmininke. Seksualinis priekabiavimas yra visuotinai žalojantis reiškinys. Jis balansuoja tarp sugriautos karjeros, jei auka nepasiduoda priekabiavimui, didelės psichologinės traumos, jei auka jam vis dėlto pasiduoda. Nors atvejai, kuomet seksualinio priekabiavimo auka praneša apie įvykį atitinkamoms institucijoms, priekabiautojas yra nubaudžiamas, o nukentėjęs žmogus – ta auka – sėkmingai išlaiko savo karjerą, ko gero, yra vienetiniai, tai yra piktnaudžiavimo valdžia problema, kurios rezultatas – žmogaus teisių, moters teisių, pažeidimas.

Deja, toks reiškinys, tokia problema yra ir mūsų Europos Parlamente, kas galėtų pagálvoti. Ir todėl pritariu, kad Europos Parlamente būtina atlikti nepriklausomą tyrimą, pasitelkti išorės ekspertus, nes akivaizdu, kad esama skundų sistema Parlamente šiuo metu tiesiog veikia nepakankamai efektyviai, ir mes privalome sukurti efektyvų mechanizmą, kuriame dirbtų profesionalūs teisininkai ir psichologai, kurie konsultuotų mūsų darbuotojus. Galų gale, būtina numatyta ir sankcijos tiems, kurie mano, kad gali piktnaudžiauti savo valdžia. Taip, Europos Parlamentas turi elgesio kodeksą, administracijos darbuotojai turi Europos Parlamento Vidaus etikos taisykles. Tačiau to tikrai nepakanka. Abiejuose šiuose dokumentuose turi atsirasti rimtos sankcijos už seksualinį priekabiavimą, to ir linkiu, kad būtų ne tik kalbos, bet ir darbai.

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). – Madam President, all forms of harassment are wrong and must be stopped, but sexual harassment is particularly pernicious. This Parliament has a committee that deals with harassment cases when MEPs are involved, and I sit on that committee.

We have a constant stream of cases, but coming forward is very distressing for the victims. Disclosure is a professional and financial risk for them, so victims don't come forward and their cases go unreported. So we don't see the full extent of the case.

The situation is not acceptable. We cannot be complacent. We must get better – better at preventing harassment in the first place by introducing mandatory MEP training, better at encouraging the victims to come forward by giving guarantees that they will not lose their jobs, and better at acting swiftly once the investigation has been completed, with sanctions imposed against the MEPs.

We have a long way to go, as do many large institutions. This Parliament must demonstrate that we are a fair, safe and respectful place for all to come and work at.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, al comienzo de la sesión decidimos incluir este debate de forma urgente ante las informaciones aparecidas en la prensa, que definen a este Parlamento como un semillero de acoso sexual. A algunos les pillaré, desde luego, por sorpresa, pero para la mayoría de las mujeres en esta institución sabemos de lo que se está hablando: es un secreto a voces.

Tenemos que agradecer la valentía de las mujeres que se han atrevido a denunciar y a todas las participantes de la campaña «#Me too», pero aquí no se trata de hacer declaraciones hoy, de votar una resolución mañana y olvidarnos del tema. Por eso, instamos de nuevo a la Comisión Europea a que proponga una Directiva para combatir la violencia contra las mujeres y también a todos los Estados miembros a que ratifiquen e implementen el Convenio de Estambul.

Sabemos que la mayoría de casos no son denunciados por miedo al estigma social, pero, sobre todo, también por miedo a perder el puesto de trabajo. En este Parlamento existe un comité que da seguimiento a las denuncias de acoso entre asistentes y eurodiputados, pero la mayoría está formado por eurodiputados, y por eso es de entender el miedo a denunciar por parte de las víctimas. No olvidemos que la precariedad laboral es un gran motivo que fomenta el abuso.

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, il y a deux hommes parmi mes collaborateurs. Est-ce qu'il m'est arrivé un jour d'enfermer l'un d'entre eux dans mon bureau, de serrer l'un d'eux contre un placard ou de leur pincer les fesses dans un ascenseur? Jamais, jamais de la vie! En revanche, cela arrive à tant de femmes ici, au Parlement européen. Alors, il va falloir balayer devant notre porte.

Le monde politique est fait par et pour des hommes. Combien d'entre vous savaient? Combien n'ont rien dit face à de tels comportements inadmissibles? Le pouvoir donne à tant d'hommes un sentiment d'impunité intolérable.

Il faut que cela cesse. Pas demain. Maintenant! Pour toutes les filles et femmes d'Europe, nous devons agir vite, faire de la prévention partout et tout le temps, donner plus de moyens à la justice et former les services de police, parce que, chers collègues, la peur et la honte doivent changer de camp.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Madam President, I have one minute and 30 seconds. I will speak in Hungarian.

Néhány hete is beszéltünk a nők elleni erőszak elleni harc fontosságáról, és az elmúlt napokban még szélesebb nyilvánosság számára vált világossá, milyen komoly, mégis milyen régóta szőnyeg alá söpört problémáról van szó. Az Unióban több mint 250 millió nőt érint az erőszak valamilyen formája, a nők egyharmadát legalább egyszer érte felnőtt életében fizikai erőszak.

Nemcsak a következő nemzedéknek van szüksége oktatásra a nők elleni erőszak kapcsán, nemcsak a fiataloknak, hanem mindenkinek! Ez a kérdés a tiszteletről szól, arról, hogy képesek vagyunk-e tisztelni egymást emberként, képesek vagyunk-e tiszteletben tartani egymás döntéseit, akaratát, függetlenül attól, hogy nők vagy férfiak vagyunk. Soha, egyetlen nőnek sem szabad megalázva éreznie magát azért, mert nőnek született.

Fél éve indítottunk egy kampányt Erdélyben, Romániában, annak érdekében, hogy felhívjuk a figyelmet a nők elleni erőszak elleni harcra, szigorúbbá téve a törvénykezést, tájékoztatva a nőket jogaikról és lehetőségeikről – a napokban diákok számára is képzéseket indítottunk.

Mint láhattuk, a nőkkel szembeni visszaélés megszüntetésében óriási szerepe van a nyilvánosságnak, a médianak, a reklámoknak, éppen ezért támogatást kell nyújtanunk minden tagállam számára, hogy a civil szférával együttműködve konkrét intézkedéseket hozhassanak. Az áldozattá vált nőknek azonnali védelmet szavatoló intézményekre, ingyenes jogi tanácsadásra és tájékoztatásra és megfelelő anyagi biztonságra is szükségük van.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio innanzitutto ringraziare tutte le donne che, attraverso le loro denunce, hanno aperto un dibattito che ha evidenziato ancora tutte le difficoltà, tutto lo squilibrio, di un dibattito che vede ancora le donne vittime due volte: la prima quando vengono abusate e la seconda quando vengono giudicate, quando vengono giudicate ancora per come si vestono, per come si comportano, per le loro sacrosante ambizioni.

E allora queste donne, cari colleghi, parlano di ciascuna di noi, parlano di tutte noi, che in qualsiasi condizione di censo, di classe, di religione o di razza siamo sottoposte a violenza fisica o verbale, subdola o esplicita, ma che comunque rimane un limite intollerabile alla nostra libera espressione, alla nostra carriera, alla nostra vita, in definitiva.

Noi abbiamo il dovere di andare oltre questa indignazione, abbiamo il dovere di produrre un pensiero nuovo che riguardi, cari compagni e cari colleghi, soprattutto gli uomini: gli uomini devono smetterla di pensare che il problema della violenza sulle donne sia un problema delle donne. Al contrario, è un problema che riguarda soprattutto gli uomini, ed è bene dirlo con chiarezza. È un problema di tutti, anche di questo Parlamento, che deve dare un messaggio chiaro di attenzione e di presenza e dire con una voce sola: *Me too*.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Mevrouw de Voorzitter, commissaris, collega's, die #MeToo heeft ons vele schokkende verhalen gebracht, uit alle sectoren en helaas ook uit dit Parlement: masturbaties op het bureau, aan de vrouwen zitten in de liften, ... het zijn verhalen die anno 2017 niet meer zouden mogen bestaan. Het moeilijke is natuurlijk dat het vaak gaat over machtsrelaties. Want wat doe je als je baas aan je zit, maar je houdt van je job, je hebt een lening af te betalen en je hebt kinderen op te voeden?

Ik vind en ik hoop dat die #MeToo die het taboe doorbroken heeft een aantal dingen teweegbrengt. Ten eerste dat vrouwen hun rug rechten, dadelijk zeggen "nee", "no", hun knie gebruiken als het nodig is. Ten tweede dat mannen beseffen dat ze te ver gaan en massaal zeggen "not me", "I will not do this".

Ten slotte, mevrouw de Voorzitter, roep ik ertoe op – ik dacht altijd het Europees Parlement zijn werknemers genoeg beschermt, maar ik vrees dat we niet genoeg doen als ik die verhalen lees – dus laten we tot actie overgaan en de slachtoffers hier in het Parlement beschermen.

(De spreker gaat in op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement)

David Coburn (EFDD), *blue-card question*. – Sexual harassment should never be tolerated, and I am sure you agree with me. Whether in the streets of Cologne or in the corridors of power in Brussels it is absolutely intolerable, regardless of sexual orientation. However, some liberals here are in favour of stereotyping. Ms Vautmans, did you not say something that was, I believe, reported in 'Politico' – that sexual harassment is commonplace in southern and eastern Europe? Is that not stereotyping people? I do not think that is quite right. If a right-wing Eurosceptic had said such a thing, everyone would go crazy here. Would you take that back? [...]

(The President cut off the speaker)

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE), *blue-card answer*. – I don't think I said it here, but I told it to a journalist who wrote it very harshly, and more harshly than I said it. I only said that here in the Parliament you have a mix of cultures and some cultures are more open and warm, and more open to touching people. Other cultures have different opinions on that.

I never wanted to stigmatise any culture. It happens in every culture, it happens in every sector and it happens in every place. The only thing I wanted to say is: maybe some cultures have to think a little bit more before they touch a woman.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Paní komisařko, téměř 25 % žen v Evropské unii po patnáctém roce věku zažilo fyzické nebo sexuální násilí ze strany svého partnera. Já bych jim chtěl tímto vyjádřit svou hlubokou solidaritu. Téměř polovina žen v Evropské unii se po dobu svého života stala obětí slovního, fyzického obtěžování či obtěžování po internetu.

Šokuje mě, že více než jedna čtvrtina Evropanů si myslí, že sexuální styk bez souhlasu partnera lze ospravedlnit. Více než jedna pětina Evropanů si myslí, že ženy si svá tvrzení o zneužití nebo znásilnění často vymýšlejí nebo je zveličují. Oběti násilí často tento trestný čin nehlásí. Osoby v jejich okolí se někdy zdráhají samy zasáhnout, byť o té situaci ví. Problémem jsou také sexuální formy kybernetického obtěžování. Ať jsou to sms zprávy nebo sexuální e-maily. Před pár dny sama komisařka Jourová oznámila „mee too“.

Je třeba změnit rozšířené vnímání ve společnosti, že takové chování je normální, či vyvolávání pocitu viny v obětech, že za takovéto obtěžování si mohou samy. Je to problém i evropských institucí, jak bylo řečeno. Evropská unie by měla přistoupit k Úmluvě Rady Evropy o předcházení násilí páchanému na ženách a domácímu násilí a boji proti němu (Istanbulské úmluvě). Myslím si, že je to naše skutečná povinnost, jak zasáhnout....

(Předsedající odebrala řečníkovi slovo.)

Anna Hedh (S&D). – Fru talman! I vårt arbete som Europaparlamentariker är det oerhört viktigt att vi tar alla former av diskriminering, trakasserier och förtryck på största möjliga allvar och faktiskt agerar för att bekämpa denna form av våld. Vi har möjlighet att lagstiftningsmässigt förbjuda diskriminering men vi har också en stor opinionsbildande roll som Europaparlamentariker att faktiskt säga: Nu räcker det!

Vi kommer inte att kunna lagstifta bort dessa beteenden helt och hållet. Därför krävs det att vi agerar genom andra kanaler för att förändra de normer, strukturer och maktförhållanden som resulterar i att kvinnor utsätts för denna form av förtryck. Jag vill också vara väldigt noga med att påpeka en sak. När vi nu ber alla som har utsatts för olika former av diskriminering och trakasserier att stiga fram ska vi också vara medvetna om de anställdas situation i vårt eget hus. Alla de som jobbar för oss Europaparlamentariker och Europaparlamentet måste känna att de kan berätta om sina upplevelser utan att riskera att bli avskedade.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, je pense que, dans ce Parlement européen, il n'y a pas plus de harcèlement qu'ailleurs, mais il n'y en a pas moins non plus. À travers ce débat en toute transparence, je m'apprêtais à dire que nous prenions la mesure de notre responsabilité, mais apparemment pas pour tout le monde. Monsieur Škripek, combien de fois avez-vous été agressé sexuellement?

Donc n'oublions pas que nous sommes sous les feux des projecteurs et que ce que nous déciderons ici aura des répercussions sur le reste de la société. Évidemment, nous ne sommes pas coupables de ce qui se passe, mais nous avons la responsabilité collective d'y mettre un terme. Si nous ne le faisons pas, alors nous serions coupables.

Nous faisons donc trois propositions: premièrement, il faut mettre fin à la précarisation des contrats de travail de nos assistants en leur donnant une vraie possibilité de dénoncer. N'oublions pas que 95 % des femmes sont licenciées lorsqu'elles dénoncent. Deuxièmement, un audit externe devrait évaluer l'ampleur du phénomène et l'efficacité des mesures qui sont prises, pour faire ressortir la culture de l'institution et non pas pour dénoncer des cas personnels; et, enfin, un comité spécial sur le harcèlement sexuel devrait être mis en place.

Biljana Borzan (S&D). – Gospodo predsjednice, ovo je veliki test za Parlament da pokaže da smo spremni i sami primijeniti preporuke koje šaljemo. Ovo je vrlo važan trenutak kada se šalje dugoročna poruka žrtvama zlostavljanja, kako u Europskom parlamentu tako i u cijeloj Europskoj uniji. Prijedlog europskih pučana da se formira istražno tijelo unutar Parlamenta smatram neprihvatljivim. Na taj način šalje se poruka da se nešto možda želi zataškati, a to je najgora poruka koju u ovom trenutku možemo poslati.

Pozivam kolege da podrže prijedlog socijalista i demokrata da se osnuje tijelo vanjskih stručnjaka koji će istražiti optužbe. Ne možemo poslati našim asistentima brošuru od petnaestak stranica i reći da smo problem riješili. Neki žele prikazati da je Istambulska konvencija ta koja šteti obitelji i ženama. Ovdje treba reći jasno i glasno: nasilje je to koje šteti ženama i obitelji. Moramo stvoriti siguran okvir za prijavu, osnažiti žrtve, a s druge strane oštrim kaznama pokazati da Parlament ima nultu toleranciju za nasilje.

Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, notre institution a un devoir de sollicitude — c'est ainsi que les choses sont appelées juridiquement — envers chaque membre de cette institution. Le harcèlement sexuel est donc un problème dont nous devons nous saisir. D'une part, nous devons sortir les femmes de l'humiliation et de la honte dans lesquelles elles se trouvent et, d'autre part, nous devons tous ensemble cesser de fermer les yeux.

Oui, je préside le comité de lutte contre le harcèlement. Je suis PPE et j'y travaille avec mes collègues avec énergie, mais je crois qu'il faut que nous progressions sur trois points.

Le premier point, c'est la libération des témoignages. Je propose que nous mettions en place un réseau de personnes de confiance qui, dans la proximité des uns et des autres, vont écouter les victimes pour pouvoir les aider à parler. Cela, c'est la première chose. Les choses ne sont pas dites, les victimes ont honte, elles ne parlent pas et il faut qu'elles puissent parler. Je traite les cas qui arrivent, mais il faut que cette parole soit libérée.

Deuxièmement, il faut un médiateur entre l'institution – cette maison – et les victimes. Je ne suis pas pour qu'il y ait deux comités de lutte contre le harcèlement et je vais vous expliquer pourquoi. C'est tout simplement parce qu'entre le harcèlement psychologique, Madame la Présidente, et le harcèlement sexuel, la limite est tellement ténue. Cela commence par l'un, cela finit par l'autre et, donc, bien sûr, il y a une vraie cohésion entre les deux et il ne faut pas multiplier les structures. Ce n'est pas ce dont nous avons besoin; ce qui importe, c'est que ces structures fonctionnent de façon objective. Nous y avons des experts.

Enfin, Madame la Présidente, je tiens à ce qu'ici chacun soit informé, que les députés sachent ce qu'ils risquent, ce qu'ils font et qu'ils aient conscience que cela n'est pas déontologiquement soutenable.

Interventions à la demande

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Ostro obsojam kakršnokoli spolno nadlegovanje. Do teh zavrženih dejanj moramo imeti ničelno toleranco. Spolno nadlegovanje je problem, pred katerim si ne smemo zatiskati oči, s tem namreč problema ne zmanjšujemo ali odpravljamo.

Pomembno je, da žrtve spregovorijo ter da jih potem tudi primerno zaščitimo. Namreč velikokrat je prisoten strah pred izgubo službe ter stigmatizacijo žrtve. Zato je pomemben pravilen pristop in ozaveščanje v smislu prepoznavanja spolnega nadlegovanja. Potrebujemo hitre in odločne ukrepe, tako na ravni Evropskega parlamenta kot na ravni sodišč.

Zato pozdravljam, da na tokratnem plenarnem zasedanju govorimo o tej pomembni temi. O tem namreč ne smemo molčati. Varovati moramo človekovo dostojanstvo in človekove pravice.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le molestie e gli abusi sessuali che ancora avvengono, tanto nel contesto familiare quanto negli ambienti di lavoro, e oggi anche attraverso la rete e le nuove tecnologie (penso ad esempio al cosiddetto *revenge porn*), rappresentano una delle più odiose forme di violazione dei diritti umani.

Cito solo un dato, fornito dalla FRA: una donna su dieci ha subito forme di violenza sessuale fin dall'età di quindici anni. Sono abusi che spesso causano alle vittime conseguenze traumatiche di lungo periodo e, altrettanto spesso, non vengono denunciati perché accompagnati da pressioni psicologiche o dal timore di quelle forme di vittimizzazione secondaria derivanti da atteggiamenti o comportamenti di rimprovero nei confronti delle vittime.

A fronte di tale situazione le istituzioni europee devono adoperarsi per un'azione più efficace di contrasto al fenomeno. È necessario, ad esempio, che la Commissione prosegua gli accertamenti e gli interventi per far sì che tutti gli Stati membri diano piena attuazione alle direttive sulle vittime di reato ed è fondamentale che tutti gli Stati membri ratifichino e applichino la convenzione di Istanbul.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, me parece muy oportuno un mayor esfuerzo público contra el acoso sexual en el trabajo, otra manifestación de la desigualdad. La mayor aportación institucional debe ser el apoyo a las víctimas y la lucha contra la impunidad. Someter a los acosadores, tras un proceso con todas las garantías, a la vergüenza pública. Pero sin el compromiso militante de hombres y mujeres en su vida personal, sin una actitud firme ante las cadenas de chistes que ofenden a las víctimas, sin otro tratamiento para la imagen de las mujeres en los medios y hasta en materia escolar, seguiremos así. Necesitamos otras actitudes, otras herramientas, otro compromiso cotidiano.

Aquí hay simplemente poder y dominación. Animemos a la empatía, porque mientras haya hombres tan inconscientes como para decir entre carcajadas que les gustaría sufrir acoso sexual porque son así de machos, así de atractivos, así de malos —que pregunten a los pocos que lo han sufrido a ver qué les parece—, porque mientras vergonzosos *realities* televisivos sigan ganando dinero mientras apoyan estereotipos y esquemas de dominación, tendremos la batalla perdida.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la campaña «#YoTambién», tras el escándalo de acoso en Hollywood, ha sacado a la luz millones de testimonios de mujeres y ha hecho visible algo que ya sabíamos, que el acoso sexual está en todas partes y es ejercido por personas cercanas y desconocidos de todas las edades, colores y clases, en situaciones cotidianas y que no lo son tanto, en la calle, en el transporte público, en el lugar de trabajo o de estudio, en espacios con marcadas relaciones de poder.

Señorías, el acoso sexual puede ser habitual, puede ser común, pero no es normal: es violencia. Se debe visibilizar, se debe castigar y se debe erradicar. Y, señorías, es una vergüenza, como ha revelado esta campaña, como recogen *The Times* y otros tantos diarios en todo el mundo, que el acoso sea una práctica habitual en este Parlamento.

Seamos ejemplares: empecemos por esta Cámara. Garanticemos la denuncia con garantías; hagamos una investigación en profundidad sobre las situaciones de acoso, pongámosle nombre y apellidos y seamos ejemplares con las sanciones.

Están aquí, están entre nosotros; son violentos, son peligrosos y no pueden quedar impunes.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η σεξουαλική παρενόχληση στον χώρο της εργασίας είναι μια κακή συνήθεια που πρέπει να εξαλειφθεί. Πρωτίστως, πρέπει να εξαλειφθεί εδώ μέσα στον χώρο των Κοινοβουλίου, όπου οι ευρωβουλευτές έχουν αυξημένες δικαιοδοσίες, οι δε βοηθοί εξαρτώνται πλήρως από αυτούς σε ό,τι αφορά τη διατήρηση της εργασίας τους. Κατά την άποψή μου, ένας ευρωβουλευτής ο οποίος εκμεταλλεύεται τη θέση του και καταπιέζει ή εκμεταλλεύεται σεξουαλικά τις βοηθούς του είναι πρωτίστως δειλός. Για να αντιμετωπίσουμε αυτό το πρόβλημα σφαιρικά, θα πρέπει να εξετάσουμε και να καταδικάσουμε βεβαίως και την περίπτωση σεξουαλικής παρενόχλησης γυναικών προς άνδρες, αλλά και ανδρών προς άνδρες. Τέλος, θέλω να ρωτήσω την κυρία Επίτροπο τι νόημα έχει η ενημέρωση των οπαδών των ποδοσφαιρικών ομάδων για τη βία κατά των γυναικών. Από μικρό παιδί παρακολουθώ ποδόσφαιρο, βρίσκομαι στα γήπεδα και δεν έχω διαπιστώσει βία κατά των

γυναικών. Όταν υπάρχουν συμπλοκές, συμπλέκονται οπαδοί των δύο ομάδων άνδρες, όχι γυναίκες και άνδρες.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodo predsjednice, šokirana sam navodima koje sam pročitala u medijima vezano uz optužbe za seksualno napastovanje asistentica od strane pojedinih zastupnika u Europskom parlamentu te se zalažem za provođenje temeljite istrage kako bi se cijeli slučaj rasvijetlio, a počinitelji sankcionirali. Niti jedna institucija na svijetu gdje mnogo ljudi radi zajedno, nažalost, nije pošteđena zlorabe položaja i neprimjerenog ponašanja pa tako niti europske institucije.

Međutim, važno je primjereno odgovoriti na takva zlodjela kako se ona ne bi ponavljala. Pohvalne su kampanje poput Metoo koje omogućavaju kreiranje sigurne platforme na kojoj se žrtve osjećaju dovoljno sigurno podijeliti svoja iskustva, što inače zbog straha ili nepovjerenja u sustav ne bi imale hrabrosti učiniti.

Zlostavljanje ima korozivan učinak na cijelo društvo i obveza je svih nas reagirati na sve oblike zlostavljanja, nasilja i zlorabe položaja. Samo otvorenosti, podrškom i hrabrošću moguće je provesti promjene koje su potrebne kako bi se svaka vrsta neprimjerenog ponašanja mogla iskorijeniti.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, like many, I was shocked by the Harvey Weinstein scandal. I was shocked by the violence of the stories told by the victims, but I was not surprised. Some people have said they were surprised by the number of victims who subsequently spoke out online, using the 'Me Too' hashtag, but I was not surprised. Most women and girls have been victims of sexual harassment or assault at some point in their lives.

The fact that this recent crop of appalling revelations comes from within my own sector, the creative industries, is doubly distressing. The myth of the casting couch was never a myth, but rather an institutional practice which has its parallels in the boardrooms and staff rooms of all workplaces, including both the public and private sector and in the community and voluntary sector too. Trade unions have a particularly important role to play in establishing systems and support for reporting and dealing with abuse, but the education of boys and men should play an important role in the fight against sexual harassment and abuse. Instead of telling girls how to dress or behave, we should educate boys about consent.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, yesterday the sentencing of a journalist, who was regarded as eminent and highly respected, for child sex abuse offences has been criticised for the leniency of the conviction and sentence. He received two and a half years, and the chief executive of the Dublin Rape Crisis Centre has led complaints about this. I suppose what that shows is that even when the law takes its course, society and families are not always satisfied by the outcome. That is something we need to be conscious of.

I visited a women's refuge recently in my constituency and sexual violence is all too prevalent, but I am glad to say that there is help and support available, and people should reach out for that support. I would ask colleagues in this House, staff and Members, to put their faith in Elisabeth Morin-Chartier, our colleague who takes on her shoulders an enormous responsibility and does it with great effect. Please, if you have not approached her, do! She will listen. She will act.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Madam President, a recent EU survey on harassment and abuse gave some shocking findings, not least that 55% of women have experienced sexual harassment. It must be called out for what it is: a brutal form of discrimination, a basic assault on human dignity, and both a cause and a consequence of persistent inequalities between men and women.

I welcome this debate today, but it must form part of a long-term, serious effort to tackle this scourge because there is a long road ahead. Sexual harassment knows no class or culture and is not confined to the home or the workplace. As such, it is the job of every employer, family member, colleague and friend to stand up for all people who are affected.

For our part, here in this Chamber, we must ensure that the information, the support and a zero-tolerance approach in dealing with this are in place. Be it in Hollywood or in our own communities across the European Union, including my constituency in the UK, sexual harassment is a cancer that must be stopped.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, θεωρώ ότι το σημερινό θέμα συζήτησης είναι πάρα πολύ σημαντικό, όχι γιατί αυτή τη στιγμή το συζητούμε και δίνουμε ακόμη ένα κίνητρο στα θύματα να καταγγέλλουν και να διεκδικούν τα δικαιώματά τους, αλλά γιατί είναι ένα θέμα το οποίο υπήρχε, υπάρχει και δυστυχώς θα υπάρχει, όσο υπάρχουν χαλαρές συνειδήσεις και νοσηρές νοοτροπίες. Και τούτο παρά το γεγονός ότι εδώ και δεκαπέντε χρόνια υπάρχει ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία. Όμως όταν μιλούμε για παρενόχληση μέσα στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, παρακαλώ να είναι πολύ συγκεκριμένες οι καταγγελίες, να υπάρχει βούληση από την Επιτροπή να καταδικάζονται άμεσα, διότι διαφορετικά δίνουμε την εντύπωση ότι μπορεί προς τα έξω να νομίζουν ότι ο ναός της δημοκρατίας που είναι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο χαρακτηρίζεται από ανήθικες συμπεριφορές.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, l'égalité des droits, la non- discrimination et l'égalité des genres sont des valeurs fondamentales de l'Union européenne. Aujourd'hui, de nombreuses femmes victimes de harcèlement sexuel témoignent d'atteintes à ces valeurs.

En tant qu'homme, je dois dire mon dégoût de ces comportements. La dignité des hommes, c'est en effet de respecter la dignité des femmes, et ceci en toute circonstance et en tout lieu, que ce soit dans les situations d'embauche, au bureau, à l'usine, dans les transports, et même au Parlement européen, ce qui m'indigne, je dois le dire, tout particulièrement. C'est la tolérance zéro qui s'impose dans ces circonstances, comme dans celles, d'ailleurs, de discours de haine entre personnes de même sexe ou de sexe opposé.

Au fond, c'est par l'éducation que nous apporterons les meilleures réponses à cette question. Mais, pour ceux qui seraient imperméables à ces enseignements, ou qui auraient du mal à maîtriser leurs pulsions, c'est bien entendu à une justice indépendante d'intervenir. Protéger les dépôts de plaintes et juger rapidement constituent des mesures de nature, me semble-t-il, à lutter contre ce triste phénomène.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nelle ultime settimane, per effetto di scandali venuti alla ribalta sui media, si discute finalmente con la necessaria aberrazione della violenza sulle donne.

L'ho già detto in altre occasioni e voglio ribadirlo in quest'Aula, anche alla luce delle ultime assurde notizie che riguardano questo Parlamento: ogni tipo di violenza contro le donne, in ogni forma essa venga perpetrata, va condannata e punita senza «se» e senza «ma», anche qui, anche in Parlamento.

In Europa quasi il 25 % delle donne ha subito violenza fisica o sessuale, ma il dramma nel dramma è che più di un europeo su quattro ritiene ancora oggi che un rapporto sessuale non consensuale possa essere in qualche modo giustificato. I tempi sono maturi per affrontare il tema dalla violenza sulle donne con determinazione, garantendo l'applicazione delle misure esistenti e lavorando affinché i principi contenuti nella convenzione di Istanbul vengano recepiti rapidamente dalle legislazioni nazionali di tutti i paesi membri.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, seksualno uznemiravanje i zlostavljanje ničim se ne može opravdati. Kad je riječ o institucijama Europske unije i zlostavljanju na radnom mjestu, žalosno je da je potreban velik javni skandal kako bi nadležni adresirali ovaj problem.

Ako je istina da se to godinama događalo i u ovoj zgradi i da su žrtve često bile obeshrabrene u prijavljivanju jer je stvorena klima u kojoj je takvo primitivno ponašanje bilo manje ili više prihvatljivo, treba pokazati da ono to nije i da mora biti strogo kažnjeno.

Svi koji prijave uznemiravanje ili zlostavljanje trebaju biti maksimalno zaštićeni tako što će im biti zajamčeno da zbog prijave neće izgubiti posao te im mora biti pružena stručna pomoć.

Želimo li Europu u kojoj se ljudi u nepovoljnijem socioekonomskom položaju neće doživljavati kao roba i tretirati nedostojno čovjeka, Europski parlament mora voditi primjerom i zato odgovorno ponašanje mora početi ovdje i danas.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Vielen Dank für die Möglichkeit, hier heute sprechen zu dürfen. Frau Kollegin Reintke hat in ihrer Rede gesagt, dass das Problem der sexuellen Belästigung nicht nur ein Thema für Frauen ist und nicht sein darf, und damit hat sie doch gerade den Punkt getroffen: Sie hat Recht. Dass heute fast nur Kolleginnen gesprochen haben, ist doch Teil des Problems, dem wir uns gegenübersehen.

Sexuelle Belästigung geht fast immer von Männern aus. Daher müssen wir Männer sagen: Nicht mit uns. Daher bin ich heute hier und würde mir wünschen, dass viel mehr Kollegen das heute tun würden. Auch hier im Haus sehen wir doch die Vorgänge und müssen kritisch hinterfragen, was dort passiert ist. Dass wir ein Beschwerdegremium haben, das mit MEPs ausgestattet ist, wo Frauen sich beschweren können, wenn sie Opfer von sexueller Gewalt, Opfer von Machtausübung werden, das kann doch nicht der richtige Ansatzpunkt sein.

Der Mut der Betroffenen muss sich auszahlen, und neben der Annahme des Berichtes morgen müssen wir weiter aktiv werden.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Doamna Președintă, doamna comisar, dragi colegi, o dezbateră utilă, s-a dovedit din luările de cuvânt. Și, iată, am obținut, totuși, o solidaritate din partea colegilor bărbați care au luat cuvântul, dar, așa cum doamna comisar prezenta, este nevoie să ne adresăm noi, ca eurodeputați, în țările noastre și să găsim o sinergie între organizațiile neguvernamentale, între societatea civilă. Femeile care declară această violență trebuie să fie protejate. Avem nevoie de proiecte pentru educație, educație și infrastructură, pentru că nu le putem lua din viața de familie unde, câteodată, chiar acolo suportă abuzuri sexuale sau de la serviciu dacă nu găsim și o infrastructură unde să le adăpostim pe aceste femei și, apoi, asistența judiciară: multe nu pot să susțină un proces judiciar pentru a-și găsi dreptatea. De aceea, cred foarte mult că trebuie să avem un parteneriat și la nivel național. Nu este suficient numai aici. Felicitări și este doar începutul, trebuie să continuăm.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I think that every woman in this House – and quite a lot of men – have a story to tell on this, either a personal experience or someone that is close to us: stories about sexual harassment, sexist comments, and possibly even violence and rape.

This is not new. It didn't start with the 'Me Too' movement. It has been going on for decades, for centuries, but the novelty this time is that there is a global movement of women crying out: 'this is not acceptable'. Many men as well. This is not something we will continue to accept. We do not accept that this is hidden – the shame and the silence around this phenomena – and that is so powerful. That is why I thank you for this debate.

There are a lot of laws in the European Union. There are projects, there are directives and there are codes of conduct. These are important. The arsenal of legal and policy measures at the EU level covers most of the actions to support Member States in their work in fighting all kinds of violence against women and girls. Now we need to focus on implementation, and here there is work to do. We also need to dedicate all our efforts to complete the accession of the Istanbul Convention.

We also need to look at ourselves. What are we doing? The Commission has a helpline. We have strong rules to protect whistle-blowers who come and alert us on this. We have a network of confidential counsellors who can support women and girls – and men – who are victims of this. We have internal campaigns and courses and formal action. We will subject all this to external evaluation. Possibly we can do more.

I am sure that in the European Parliament you have your own rules and you are looking at them. Possibly you can do more on a formal basis. But the most important thing, as this campaign signals, is to support the victims, to say that what they have experienced is not OK and that we will go with them.

The majority of the men in this House and elsewhere, who would never dream of harassing a woman, you need to speak out. You need to support this woman and say that what their colleague did is not OK and that they will walk with her and support her in making sure that justice is brought on this.

So let's support each other. Let's encourage the network to function in this regard. Let's make sure that not only is this 'Me Too' campaign heard all across the world, but also that it is also transformed into action, where hopefully this will eventually lead to the eradication of this violence.

The problem is much broader, as we have discussed. We will do what we can from the Commission side. Member States have their role to play, but the most important is a change of attitude, and here we can all contribute.

Thank you very much for having this debate. I think it is of extreme importance, but let us not let the work stop after the vote tomorrow.

La Présidente. – J'ai reçu, conformément à l'article 123, paragraphe 2, du règlement sept propositions de résolution.

Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – Con questa risoluzione si condanna ogni forma di violenza sessuale e di molestia fisica o psicologica, incoraggiando gli Stati membri ad adottare ulteriori misure, per porre fine alle molestie sessuali, in modo efficace. Fondamentale è la prevenzione e la sensibilizzazione, perché bisogna agire anche contro le forme emergenti di violenza, come ad esempio, quelle attuate online. Anche all'interno di questo Parlamento vi sono purtroppo troppi casi di molestie: occorrono misure adeguate per contrastare questo triste fenomeno e per sostenere le vittime.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), por escrito. – En pleno siglo XXI en una sociedad tan avanzada como la europea, nos encontramos con que el acoso sexual es una práctica común y generalizada que sufren muchas mujeres, la mayoría en silencio porque sienten vergüenza, tienen miedo y no se atreven a denunciar los incidentes, ni siquiera a hablar con sus personas más allegadas. Basta ya de silencios cómplices y de dudas irrazonables, no hay excusa que valga, los acosadores deben ser castigados. El acoso tiene su origen en una sociedad desigual, donde una parte establece relaciones de poder sobre otra. Necesitamos una estrategia europea para combatir todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres, incluidos el acoso y abuso sexual. Por desgracia, esta realidad no se escapa de ningún lugar ni espacio, ni siquiera de las instituciones públicas como este Parlamento, que aunque tiene instrumentos para responder a este tipo de situaciones, es evidente que no están funcionando. Por eso necesitamos asesoramiento externo, para evaluar de qué manera se pueden mejorar esos instrumentos para que sean realmente útiles a las víctimas. Ni un ataque más a la dignidad de las mujeres. Ni un silencio cómplice. Ni un mirar hacia otro lado. No estáis solas: «Yo también», «Me too».

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – En pleno siglo XXI en una sociedad tan avanzada como la europea, nos encontramos con que el acoso sexual es una práctica común y generalizada que sufren muchas mujeres, la mayoría en silencio porque sienten vergüenza, tienen miedo y no se atreven a denunciar los incidentes, ni siquiera a hablar con sus personas más allegadas. Basta ya de silencios cómplices y de dudas irrazonables, no hay excusa que valga, los acosadores deben ser castigados. El acoso tiene su origen en una sociedad desigual, donde una parte establece relaciones de poder sobre otra. Necesitamos una estrategia europea para combatir todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres, incluidos el acoso y abuso sexual. Por desgracia, esta realidad no se escapa de ningún lugar ni espacio, ni siquiera de las instituciones públicas como este Parlamento, que aunque tiene instrumentos para responder a este tipo de situaciones, es evidente que no están funcionando. Por eso necesitamos asesoramiento externo, para evaluar de qué manera se pueden mejorar esos instrumentos para que sean realmente útiles a las víctimas. Ni un ataque más a la dignidad de las mujeres. Ni un silencio cómplice. Ni un mirar hacia otro lado. No estáis solas: «Yo también», «Me too».

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), schriftlich. – In meinen Augen ist es bezeichnend, dass wir in fast jeder Plenarsitzung in irgendeiner Form über die Gewalt gegen Frauen diskutieren. Es zeigt mir, dass die Gewalt gegen Frauen immer noch, auch in Europa, alltäglich ist. Denn sexuelle Belästigung ist meistens Gewalt gegen Frauen – Machtpositionen werden dazu genutzt, Frauen einzuschüchtern und zu unterdrücken. Wie massiv das Problem ist, zeigt, wie oft der Hashtag „MeToo“ geteilt wurde. Ich hoffe, dass wir ein Bewusstsein dafür schaffen können, dass sexuelle Belästigung kein Kavaliersdelikt ist, dass wir in diesem Haus Regelungen finden, die das Schweigen der Belästigten brechen. Ich wünsche mir, dass wir bald einen Hashtag „MeNot“ haben – unter dem Frauen schreiben, dass sie noch nie sexuell belästigt wurden.

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D), *por escrito*. – En pleno siglo XXI en una sociedad tan avanzada como la europea, nos encontramos con que el acoso sexual es una práctica común y generalizada que sufren muchas mujeres, la mayoría en silencio porque sienten vergüenza, tienen miedo y no se atreven a denunciar los incidentes, ni siquiera a hablar con sus personas más allegadas. Basta ya de silencios cómplices y de dudas irrazonables, no hay excusa que valga, los acosadores deben ser castigados. El acoso tiene su origen en una sociedad desigual, donde una parte establece relaciones de poder sobre otra. Necesitamos una estrategia europea para combatir todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres, incluidos el acoso y abuso sexual. Por desgracia, esta realidad no se escapa de ningún lugar ni espacio, ni siquiera de las instituciones públicas como este Parlamento, que aunque tiene instrumentos para responder a este tipo de situaciones, es evidente que no están funcionando. Por eso necesitamos asesoramiento externo, para evaluar de qué manera se pueden mejorar esos instrumentos para que sean realmente útiles a las víctimas. Ni un ataque más a la dignidad de las mujeres. Ni un silencio cómplice. Ni un mirar hacia otro lado. No estáis solas: «Yo también», «Me too».

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – En pleno siglo XXI en una sociedad tan avanzada como la europea, nos encontramos con que el acoso sexual es una práctica común y generalizada que sufren muchas mujeres, la mayoría en silencio porque sienten vergüenza, tienen miedo y no se atreven a denunciar los incidentes, ni siquiera a hablar con sus personas más allegadas. Basta ya de silencios cómplices y de dudas irrazonables, no hay excusa que valga, los acosadores deben ser castigados. El acoso tiene su origen en una sociedad desigual, donde una parte establece relaciones de poder sobre otra. Necesitamos una estrategia europea para combatir todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres, incluidos el acoso y abuso sexual. Por desgracia, esta realidad no se escapa de ningún lugar ni espacio, ni siquiera de las instituciones públicas como este Parlamento, que aunque tiene instrumentos para responder a este tipo de situaciones, es evidente que no están funcionando. Por eso necesitamos asesoramiento externo, para evaluar de qué manera se pueden mejorar esos instrumentos para que sean realmente útiles a las víctimas. Ni un ataque más a la dignidad de las mujeres. Ni un silencio cómplice. Ni un mirar hacia otro lado. No estáis solas: «Yo también», «Me too».

Tonino Picula (S&D), *napisan*. – Ako je itko u Europskom parlamentu ili bilo kojoj drugoj europskoj ili drugoj instituciji zlopotrijebio svoj položaj nauštrb tuđeg dostojanstva, onda za to moraju odgovarati i snositi ozbiljne sankcije kako počinitelji tako i oni koji su znali i šutjeli.

Zlostavljanje na poslu, ili bilo gdje drugdje, ne smije i ne može biti prihvatljivo ni u jednom obliku. Osobe koje su doživjele bilo kakav oblik zlostavljanja na radnom mjestu i drugdje treba ohrabriti da zlostavljanje prijave policiji. Na nama ostalima je da im pružimo podršku, a zlostavljače odstranimo s odgovornih funkcija u Europskom parlamentu u kojem većina svoju dužnost obavlja časno, odgovorno te uz neprocjenjivu pomoć članica i članova svojih timova.

(La séance est suspendue à 11 h 57)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

5. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.02)

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, rubo solo pochissimi secondi perché volevo informare l'Aula che il 17 dicembre 2015, proprio qui, abbiamo approvato una risoluzione sul caso di Ibrahim Halawa, cittadino irlandese arrestato e imprigionato in Egitto.

Ieri, dopo quattro lunghi anni di dura detenzione, Ibrahim è finalmente tornato in Irlanda, libero. Notizie di questo genere sono purtroppo rare e per questo vanno sottolineate con forza, perché rappresentano un grandissimo segnale di speranza per tante persone: attivisti, difensori dei diritti umani, giornalisti o avvocati imprigionati ingiustamente ovunque.

E se da un lato accogliamo con soddisfazione la decisione della Corte di giustizia egiziana di far decadere tutte le accuse nei confronti di Ibrahim, dall'altro non possiamo dimenticare i tanti che sono ancora oggi reclusi in Egitto. Per questo motivo è doveroso che il Parlamento europeo continui a chiedere con determinazione al governo egiziano di procedere alla liberazione di tutti coloro che sono incarcerati solo per aver esercitato il loro libero diritto di pensiero, espressione e associazione.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Mr President, yesterday we held a minute's silence in honour of Ms Daphne Caruana Galizia. After that, I proposed that we offer a EUR 1 million prize for the murderers of Daphne Caruana Galizia, dead or alive.

I was told by Mr Rainer Wieland that this was impossible because there is no provision in the budget to offer a prize for the murderers, dead or alive. I want to have a budget in which we can offer a prize for the murderers, dead or alive.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, molto brevemente, vorrei segnalare a quest'Aula che il 6 e 7 dicembre prossimi si terrà l'udienza dei presidenti dell'HDP e che viene chiesta una vigilanza da parte delle istituzioni europee sullo svolgimento di questi processi.

Al momento non si hanno notizie sulla salute del presidente Öcalan. Quest'Aula si è occupata molto di Turchia e penso che debba continuare a occuparsi dei diritti del popolo curdo.

6. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

7. Abstimmungsstunde

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

7.1. Entwurf des Gesamthaushaltsplans der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Siegfried Mureşan, rapporteur. – Mr President, I have to inform you of two technical corrections to be applied to two amendments on the budget tabled by the Committee on Budgets, in line with the actual committee vote. The first technical correction please is line 09047705, it is Amendment 1 735. The final level of payments should be read as: EUR 1 250 000.

The second technical correction is in line 240107, Amendment 1 838. The final total amounts, including the 10% reserve, should be at the level of the draft budget. These are the two technical corrections which I have to introduce to you ahead of the vote.

Other than this, I would like to thank all colleagues who have worked on Parliament's position on the EU budget for 2018, all shadow rapporteurs, all rapporteurs of the opinions of the specialised committee.

It is important that we are sending today a clear and strong message to the Council by supporting the budget with a large majority. What we have agreed and what we are voting today is a budget for a strong, future-oriented Union, a Union which can offer a perspective of prosperity and safety to the citizens. So thank you very much to all colleagues who have worked and supported me in this.

(Il Parlamento approva le modifiche)

— *Dopo la votazione:*

Märt Kivine, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me congratulate the European Parliament on adopting just now the Council position on the draft budget for the financial year 2018.

From the Council perspective I take note of the pertaining differences between the positions of the Council and Parliament. Therefore, in my capacity as a President of the Council I would agree that the President of the European Parliament convenes the conciliation committee, as required under Article 314 (4)(c) of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union.

(Il Presidente ne prende atto)

7.2. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (A8-0299/2017 - Siegfried Mureşan, Richard Ashworth) (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione sull'emendamento 17:*

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I would like to draw your attention to, and try and get your support for, this oral amendment. I know we have the support of the Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D) and the European Free Alliance Group (Verts/ALE), and this was indeed accepted by the rapporteur. It is basically concerned with peace and stability, something I think this House should be supportive of. It is highly concerned with the rise of instability and uncertainty, both within and outside the Union, and insists on the need for a renewed focus on the Union's approach to cohesion, integration, peace, sustainable development and human rights. It calls upon the Commission and the Member States to connect and boost efforts towards further sustaining peace and conflict prevention, and recalls the worldwide inspiration brought about by the Good Friday Agreement, while acknowledging the unprecedented challenges and pressures in the aftermath of the United Kingdom 2016 referendum. It calls upon the Commission and Member States to enhance their support for reconciliation to secure peace and stability and Ireland.

I would therefore urge you, colleagues, to please support this amendment.

(L'emendamento orale è accolto)

7.3. Entlastung 2015: Gesamthaushaltsplan der EU – Europäischer Rat und Rat (A8-0291/2017 - Bart Staes) (Abstimmung)

7.4. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (A8-0064/2017 - Marita Ulvskog) (Abstimmung)

7.5. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisenden von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen (A8-0057/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione sull'accordo provvisorio:*

Tanja Fajon, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, on behalf of the S&D Group, under Rule 59(3) of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure, I request that the plenary vote on the amendments before the final vote on the provisional agreement.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, ponente. – Señor presidente, mis palabras, brevísimas, no son para limitar ni bloquear el derecho de voto y el derecho de enmienda que asiste a todos los Grupos de la Cámara. Mi palabra es simplemente para indicar que los que apoyen al ponente y al Grupo Popular deben votar en contra de esta pretensión por una elemental razón. La razón es que romperíamos un acuerdo interinstitucional que ha costado cuatro años en conseguirlo. Con una sola de esas enmiendas que se vote favorablemente romperíamos el acuerdo interinstitucional. Así es que, por favor, voten en contra de esa pretensión.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta)

7.6. Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisystems (A8-0059/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra) (Abstimmung)

7.7. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (A8-0294/2017 - Soraya Post) (Abstimmung)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señor presidente, solamente quiero denunciar que justamente coincidiendo con la presentación de este informe tan importante de la señora Post, se ha puesto una exposición ahí fuera sobre los gitanos en Perpiñán que reproduce todos los arquetipos y los estereotipos que queremos abandonar precisamente con informes como el de la señora Post.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, c'est moi l'organisateur de cette exposition. Je vous invite tous à aller la voir, elle se déroule à côté du restaurant des députés. Pour une fois, au Parlement européen, nous parlerons des gitans. Et effectivement, grâce à Marine Le Pen, il y a une exposition sur les gitans et je la remercie. Je vous invite tous à venir tout à l'heure visiter cette exposition.

Et à ces...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

— *Dopo la votazione:*

Soraya Post, rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to express how proud I am of this Chamber today. To you who really took your responsibility as politicians to vote in favour of no more exclusion of the 12 million EU citizens with Roma ethnicity, it is a good start, taking your responsibility. Thank you very much.

I would also like to thank my shadow rapporteurs – Pál Csáky, Bodil Valero, Cecilia Wikström and Marina Albiol – and all the people included in this. For me it is a step forward; thank you very much.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il turno di votazioni.

(La seduta è sospesa per qualche minuto)

8. Stimmerklärungen

8.1. Gesamthaushaltsplan der Europäischen Union für 2018 — alle Einzelpläne (A8-0299/2017 - Siegfried Mureșan, Richard Ashworth)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, návrh rozpočtu na rok 2018 je podle mého názoru vyvážený a zohledňuje všechny politické priority, které chce Evropská unie následovat. Jedná se o posílení klíčových programů pro růst zaměstnanosti a pro růst Evropské unie. Zároveň však za stěžejní považuje i nadále bezpečnost Evropské unie a zastavení nelegální migrace. Je nutné posílit také programy bezprostředního sousedství s Evropskou unií, posílit evropské agentury, a to hlavně působící v oblasti spravedlnosti a vnitřních věcí, jako je Europol, Eurojust, EASO a CEPOL. S tím souvisí samozřejmě i vhodné navýšování prostředků na Fond pro vnitřní bezpečnost (ISF) a Azylový, migrační a integrační fond (AMIF).

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem také dnes podpořila mandát pro jednání trialogu k rozpočtu na rok 2018, zejména proto, že obsahuje navýšení klíčových alokací pro podporu hospodářského růstu, tvorbu pracovních míst, zvýšení bezpečnosti a ochrany vnějších hranic a celkového dohledu nad migrací. To považuji, já osobně, za velmi důležité.

Je zde navýšení u programu Erasmus+, Horizon 2020, EaSI, tedy programů, které se týkají vzdělávání, zaměstnanosti a sociálních inovací. Evropa pro občany a Kreativní Evropa je také velmi důležitá z hlediska angažovanosti občanů a z hlediska podpory kultury. Chceme podpořit samozřejmě výměny studentů, vědců, umělců, ale také vyšší zaměstnanost. Navýšení prostředků na bezpečnost a kontrolu migrace se týká agentur Europol a Eurojust a také vnitřní bezpečnosti, kterou rovněž považuji za velmi důležitou. Proto jsem podpořila rozpočet.

Jana Žitňanská (ECR). – Vážený pán předsedající. Takto pred rokom vystúpila na plenárnom zasadnutí Európskeho parlamentu komisárka pre dopravu a podporila návrh, aby každý mladý Európan dostal zdarma k svojim osemnástym narodeninám sieťový cestovný lístok Interail. Dnes sa na tento účel schválilo niekoľko miliónov eur. Hoci tento projekt vyznieva lákavo, obávam sa, že nie všetci mladí ľudia, ktorých sa týka, ho budú môcť aj využiť.

Ešte v minulom roku som sa obrátila na Komisiu s otázkou, ako to bude v prípade mladých so zdravotným postihnutím. Mnohí z nich totiž potrebujú bezbariérové prostredie alebo aj asistenta. Pokiaľ ide o bezbariérovosť, v odpovedi sa Komisia odvolala na smernicu o prístupnosti, ktorá však, ako vieme, ešte nemá definitívnu podobu. A na otázku, či aj asistent mladého so zdravotným postihnutím, ktorý nemusí mať práve osemnásť rokov, dostane cestovný lístok zdarma, Komisia neodpovedala.

Preto aj touto cestou chcem apelovať na kompetentných, aby v prípade tohto projektu nezabudli na tých, ktorí na rozdiel od mnohých svojich zdravých rovesníkov, ktorí nemajú problém si cestovanie zaplatiť samy, neboli opäť raz vylúčení a odsunutí na okraj záujmu.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο συγκεκριμένος προϋπολογισμός του 2018 αποτυγχάνει να καλύψει τις πραγματικές ανάγκες των πολιτών της Ένωσης. Και το ερώτημα που προκύπτει είναι αν αυτή την Ευρώπη ονειρεύονται οι πολίτες της. Μια Ευρώπη που, ενώ όλοι αντιλαμβάνομαστε ότι οδηγείται στην καταστροφή, η πολιτική ελίτ ασχολείται με τη διαχειριστική, οικονομική τακτοποίηση της Ένωσης και των κρατών μελών. Κυρίες και κύριοι, όταν οι ισοσκελισμένοι προϋπολογισμοί αποτελούν μοναδικό αυτοσκοπό, η πρωτοβουλία, η επανοητικότητα και η καινοτομία καταστρέφονται. Όταν το χρήμα αποτελεί επιδίωξη, η αξιοπρέπεια και η ηθική παραμερίζονται. Και όταν η κυριαρχία των κρατών μελών υπαρπάζεται και η ομοιογένεια των εθνών αλλοιώνεται, η Ευρώπη πεθαίνει. Γι' αυτό και καταψήφισα.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Zgłoszono blisko 2 400 poprawek i na szczęście tymi poprawkami nie zniszczono budżetu. To na granicy cudu, to była duża praca Komisji Budżetowej, ale także nas tu, na tej sali plenarnej. To, co mnie najbardziej cieszy, to to, że zwiększono zaledwie o 2 mld budżet ogólny, a także o 2 mld zobowiązania, które są zobowiązaniami najczęściej wymagalnymi. To nieduża korekta, patrząc na budżet wielkości 164 mld euro. To, co mnie najbardziej jednak cieszy, to to, o czym mówiła już koleżanka Šojdrová, czyli uratowanie programu stypendialnego Erasmus+, który nie tylko został uratowany, ale poprawiono jego kondycję. Kreatywna Europa w trzech podprogramach kluczowych także odniosła w tej materii sukces, czyli się obroniła. I programy pilotażowe – jedynie 4 z 16 nie uzyskały akceptacji, ale chcę za te 12 bardzo serdecznie podziękować.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, como cada año, abordamos el presupuesto de la Unión Europea y, como cada año, vuelvo a votar en contra del mismo, y los motivos para votar en contra se van acumulando.

Con este presupuesto no se cumplen los objetivos de crecimiento y empleo, y mucho menos de un empleo de calidad. No sirve para corregir el efecto negativo de los recortes —la mal llamada «austeridad»— y con este presupuesto tampoco se solucionan los problemas de cohesión social ni territorial. Es más, se refuerzan los desequilibrios existentes.

Me dirán que el presupuesto de la Unión Europea no financia gastos de protección social, pero supuestamente tampoco lo hace de defensa y, sin embargo, las partidas de inversión en defensa y gasto militar crecen. Nos dicen que no hay más recursos, que hay que ajustar los existentes pero, sin embargo, los gastos para defensa son nuevos, en aras de una supuesta seguridad.

La seguridad se consigue con un empleo de calidad y con derechos, con presupuestos para la inclusión social, con políticas públicas, trabajando para terminar con la pobreza y las desigualdades, pero para esto no hay nada nuevo en este presupuesto.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this document, agreeing especially with the rapporteur's reservations regarding the Commission's cuts foreseen under Heading 4 expenditure (global Europe). Such reductions, I am afraid, are in contradiction with the EU objectives set out in its global strategy. We have to find the resources to be allocated from the EU budget in order to address the newly arising challenges when there are direct repercussions on our long-term security. One such complex challenge is the information warfare. Therefore, via the budgetary procedure, I, along with other colleagues, called for the allocation of adequate resources for the development of such capabilities – both inside the European Union (strengthening the external service StratCom team), and via the delegations of the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood and the Western Balkans.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταψήφισα τον γενικό προϋπολογισμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης του οικονομικού έτους 2018, διότι δεν ανταποκρίνεται στις ανάγκες που υπάρχουν σήμερα στην ευρωπαϊκή κοινωνία. Πρώτα από όλα, δεν διαθέτει κονδύλια για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας, ιδίως της ανεργίας των νέων. Δεύτερον, δεν ρυθμίζει θέματα που έχουν σχέση με τις ανισότητες, τη φτώχεια, τον κοινωνικό αποκλεισμό. Δεν λαμβάνει μέτρα για να υπάρξει σύγκλιση μεταξύ των περιφερειών. Επιπλέον, διαθέτει κονδύλια για την Τουρκία, μια χώρα η οποία απειλεί την εθνική ασφάλεια της Ελλάδος, παραβιάζει τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο, έχει θέσει ως βασικό της στοιχείο το casus belli απέναντι στην Ελλάδα και έχει καταλάβει το 37% του εδάφους της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας. Ταυτόχρονα, ο προϋπολογισμός ενισχύει την Αλβανία, μια χώρα η οποία είναι επιθετική απέναντι στην Ελλάδα και καταπιέζει τα δικαιώματα της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, вчера г-н Тимерманс представи работната програма на Комисията за 2018 г. под мотото „Програма за по-силна, обединена и демократична Европа“. Не виждам как точно Европа ще стане по-обединена и демократична, след като програми като „Еразъм+“, „Творческа Европа“ и „Европа за гражданите“ са хронично слабо финансирани.

„Еразъм+“ е най-успешната програма на Европейския съюз, въпреки това договорените 50 милиона евро в рамките на бюджета 2018 – 2020 г. при преразглеждането на многогодишната финансова рамка не фигурират в проектобюджета за 2018 г. Изглежда политическият ангажимент за стратегически инвестиции в младите хора са само празни думи. В допълнение към това средствата за новия Европейски корпус за солидарност идват отново предимно от програмата „Еразъм+“. Аз съм убеден в добавената стойност за младите хора от инициативи свързани с доброволството, но когато г-н Юнкер лансира нови инициативи го призовавам да съблюдава да не са в ущърб на „Еразъм +“ – програма, която и без това не е достатъчно съфинансирана.

John Howarth (S&D). – Mr President, today I have voted for those elements of the budget that provide strong support to the programmes, from which the United Kingdom benefits most and which contribute to a strong, sustainable and stable Europe.

The Parliament's budget sets the framework for further negotiations between the European Union institutions. I have voted to restore cuts proposed by the Council, which fell disproportionately on areas from which world-leading UK institutions gain substantial benefit.

I voted to support Labour Party priorities, such as tackling youth unemployment, strengthening research and boosting programmes such as Horizon 2020, from which UK organisations are leading beneficiaries. The budget proposals, for which I have voted, continue to strengthen the EU's negotiating response to the challenges of migration and security. I have voted against increasing the administrative budgets of the Parliament and Commission.

I believe there is considerable scope for savings, not least through the creation of a single-seat Parliament. I have also voted for greater transparency for MEPs, the Labour MPs, implement ourselves, if we can, you can.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem podpořil tento návrh rozpočtu pro mandát k jednání trialogu. Chci říci, že se jedná, podle mého názoru, o maximum možného. Jedná se o kompromis, který reaguje částečně na nové výzvy, jimž Evropa čelí, a zároveň vychází z pravidel víceletého finančního rámce. Až bude změněn víceletý finanční rámec, můžeme možná více promítnout nové výzvy, jimž Evropa čelí, do konkrétního návrhu rozpočtu. Je to oblast práva a bezpečnosti, zejména ochrana vnějších hranic a obecně bezpečnost z hlediska terorismu, posílení aktivit, které napomáhají bezpečnosti evropských občanů.

K demokratizaci Evropy: byl zde již zmíněn program Erasmus, evropský sbor solidarity, to jsou samozřejmě dobré iniciativy, bylo by lépe, kdyby se na ně našlo více peněz. Bohužel tomu tak dnes není. Já bych chtěl říci, že kvituji s povděkem, že politika soudržnosti nebyla v tomto rozpočtu zásadně oslabena.

8.2. Schutz der Arbeitnehmer gegen Gefährdung durch Karzinogene oder Mutagene (A8-0064/2017 - Marita Ulvskog)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! To troszeczkę pretekst, ale chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na sposób procedowania w tej sprawie – sprawie dotyczącej bezpieczeństwa rozumianego wraz z higieną pracy. Komisja przedłożyła dobrą propozycję, umiarkowaną, rozłożoną w czasie, natomiast w toku negocjacji dość nagle wprowadzono zmiany, które dla wielu podmiotów gospodarczych oznaczają katastrofę. Skraca się czas dostosowania warunków wykonywania określonej pracy, zwiększa się oczekiwania dotyczące ochrony w miejscu pracy i w rezultacie zaskakuje się podmioty gospodarcze nagłością sytuacji zapowiadaną przecież w oficjalnych przekazach jako zdecydowanie łagodniejszą.

Jeszcze raz chcę zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że jako parlamentarzyści powinniśmy pracować tak, aby podmioty gospodarcze, obywatele Unii Europejskiej, nie byli zaskakiwani naszymi decyzjami.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-н Председател, аз подкрепих този доклад, защото вярвам, че на работниците трябва да се предоставят нормални и безопасни условия на труд. Това включва и защитата на работниците от рискове свързани с излагането им на канцерогени и мутагени по време на работа. Раковите заболявания са втората най-честа причина за смърт в Европа и най-честата причина за смърт свързана с работа. Всички ракова заболявания в тази връзка са предотвратими.

Наличието на осъвременена и точна законодателна рамка в Европейския съюз ще допринесе за по-добра превенция на този вид заболявания, свързани с работата. Годишните разходи за държавите членки се оценяват на 334 милиарда евро. Смятам за недостойно отношението на колегите от десноцентристките политически групи, които сметнаха предложените стандарти и условия на труд в сектор „селско стопанство“ за прекалено високи и гласуваха против текст в защита на тези, които градят европейското земеделие. Приетият доклад е стъпка в правилната посока.

8.3. Einführung eines Einreise-/Ausreisystems (EES) zur Erfassung der Ein- und Ausreisedaten von Drittstaatsangehörigen an den EU-Außengrenzen (A8-0057/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já si myslím, že žijeme v 21. století, a proto je nutné nespolehat na razítka v pase, ale je nutné vytvořit nový elektronický systém, který zkontroluje vstup a výstup občanů třetích zemí do Evropské unie. Tento systém podle mě tak, jak byl navržen, a tak, jak došlo k jeho schválení, pomůže k tomu, aby Evropa byla poměrně stabilní a silný přístav. Pomůže k tomu, aby se tady lidé cítili bezpečně a aby nedocházelo k případům některých lidí, kteří nelegálně vstupovali do Evropské unie na čtrnáct různých dokladů a pobývali zde déle, než jim přísluší podle platných evropských zákonů. Proto jsem tuto zprávu podpořil a myslím si, že to je dobrý krok k zajištění bezpečnosti občanů Evropské unie.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, I voted against this proposal. Attempts to shore up the external borders of the European Union are a classic case of trying to close the stable well after the horse has bolted.

The inability of the European Union to shore up its borders during the migrant crisis has ensured that there are already millions of migrants in the European Union, broadly unchecked and unverified, able to float around the continent causing potentially great societal damage.

This attempt by the European Union to introduce chip technology at the borders will cost billions, be a nightmare to manage and leave the security of the European Union wide open to cyberattack. And what's the point, anyway? The migrants are already here.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěla vysvětlit, proč jsem podpořila nové nařízení, kterým se zřizuje systém vstupu a výstupu. Toto nařízení přináší řadu opatření, jako je například prodloužení doby pro uchovávání uložených údajů až na pět let. Využívá samozřejmě nové moderní digitální technologie. Věřím, že tento nový systém opravdu zlepší správu vnějších hranic a zajistí vyšší úroveň vnitřní bezpečnosti a tím omezí ilegální migraci. Zajistí také poskytování přesných informací o osobách, které překračují délku povoleného pobytu. Naopak pro legální cestující dojde k usnadnění vstupu na území Evropské unie. To by mělo samozřejmě snížit čas na jejich odbavení. Domnívám se, že spuštění tohoto systému vstupu a výstupu by mohlo být významným krokem směrem k návratu důvěry občanů Evropské unie v jejich bezpečnost.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταψήφισα τη θέσπιση συστήματος εισόδου- εξόδου διότι η δόκιμη απόκριση στις ανάγκες που δημιουργεί η πραγματικότητα δεν καλύπτεται από τις ενέργειες Επιτροπής. Το προτεινόμενο σύστημα εισόδου- εξόδου χρήζει συνολικής επανεξέτασης, όπως και η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν. Δεν αρκεί η δημιουργία μητρώου υπηκόων τρίτων χωρών, η αυστηροποίηση των διαδικασιών διέλευσης των συνόρων, η διαλειτουργικότητα των συστημάτων και η πρόσβαση σε αυτά, ακόμη και από τις αρχές επιβολής του νόμου. Επιπλέον, απαιτείται η άμεση επαναφορά του ελέγχου στα εσωτερικά σύνορα της Ένωσης και η συνολική επανεξέταση της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν, ως πρώτα αναγκαία βήματα καταπολέμησης της λαθρομετανάστευσης, της τρομοκρατίας, της τζιχάντ και του οργανωμένου διασυνοριακού εγκλήματος.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, cijenim potporu svoje grupe provedbi ove uredbe i na vanjskim granicama Unije, a ne samo Schengena. No, nije prihvatljiv kompromis koji uključuje samo članice u primjeni schengenskog acquisa, a ne i one u procesu ispunjavanja schengenskih kriterija.

Ovaj prijedlog isključuje Hrvatsku, najmlađu članicu s ujedno najduljom vanjskom granicom, i to nakon što je Hrvatska u lipnju uspješno implementirala schengenski informativni sustav. Od tada su hrvatske granične službe obavile 74 milijuna pregleda i otkrile preko 4 000 počinitelja raznih prekršaja u članicama Europske unije.

Primjena ovakve uredbe onemogućuje promjenu valjanosti schengenske vize, koju Hrvatska priznaje jednakovrijednom Hrvatskoj. Zbog nemogućnosti uvida u novi sustav hrvatske granične službe mogle bi propustiti osobu s nevažecom vizom. Ulazak u Schengen strateški je cilj Hrvatske.

Uspješno ispunjavanje svih kriterija očekujemo sljedeće godine. Zbog toga, ali i zbog načela jednakopravnosti građana ovaj prijedlog treba obuhvatiti sve članice već od početka primjene. Sigurnost treba biti dostupna svim našim građanima bez iznimke.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταψήφισα το σύστημα εισόδου-εξόδου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρώτα από όλα γιατί θεωρώ ότι υπαρπάζει κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα των κρατών μελών, χωρίς μάλιστα αυτά να έχουν συναινέσει, χωρίς να υπάρχει η συναίνεση των εθνικών κοινοβουλίων. Θεωρώ σημαντικό να μπορούν τα ίδια τα κράτη να διαφυλάσσουν τα σύνορά τους και δεν είναι κάποιο δικαίωμα που μπορεί να εκχωρηθεί στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Επιπλέον θεωρώ αποκλειστικό δικαίωμα των κρατών να ξεκαθαρίζουν ποιοι πολίτες τρίτων χωρών μπορούν να εισέρχονται στην επικράτειά τους με βίζα ή χωρίς βίζα. Το σύστημα αυτό υπαρπάζει όλα αυτά τα κρατικά δικαιώματα. Επιπλέον, εδώ έχουμε ένα σύστημα όπου, επί του πρακτέου, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα καθορίζει το ποιοι πολίτες τρίτων χωρών θα έχουν υποχρέωση βίζας και ποιοι όχι. Να υπενθυμίσω ότι πρόσφατα η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είπε ότι δεν χρειάζεται να έχουν βίζα οι Κοσοβάροι όταν εισέρχονται στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, τη στιγμή που γνωρίζουμε ότι το Κόσοβο είναι η σφηκοφωλιά των τζιχαντιστών.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, podle mne je bezpečnost skutečně jednou z klíčových oblastí Evropské unie, které musíme věnovat pozornost. Správa vnějších hranic a systém na to navázaný je její zásadní součástí.

V rámci schengenského prostoru je žádoucí, aby byl vytvořen jednotný systém s elektronickým záznamem přesného času a místa, kdy vstoupí a vystoupí státní příslušníci třetích zemí do evropského prostoru, udělení povolení ke krátkodobému pobytu a hlídání dodržování délky jejich povoleného pobytu. Ty známé excesy vstupu na padělané pasy a překračování povolené délky pobytu by měly být tímto návrhem potlačovány. Neříkám, že zcela vymizí, ale nepochybně je to krok správným směrem.

Také jsem toho názoru, že by mělo být jasně stanoveno, které orgány jednotlivých členských států budou mít k systému skutečný přístup. Zpracovávání údajů by mělo být přiměřené svému účelu, aby nebyly přesahovány kompetence.

8.4. Änderung des Schengener Grenzkodex in Bezug auf die Nutzung des Einreise-/Ausreisensystems (A8-0059/2017 - Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, the current EU border control system is inadequate to meet the challenge of the ever-growing traveller flow to the Schengen area, with the expected number of arrivals by third country nationals on short-term visits estimated at up to 300 million by 2025. Therefore, I congratulate the authors of this proposal, which is aimed at improving and modernising traveller management systems. Establishing a European Entry/Exit System to register travellers' data will both enable tighter border security and reduce waiting time for bona fide passengers. Needless to say, this system will allow the EU to manage immigration better and will indicate transnational threats – ultimately resulting in improved internal security.

At the same time, we must not forget proportionality, and we must carefully set the time frame for how long personal data can be held in the system, in order to protect people's privacy.

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, podpořila jsem toto nařízení, které souvisí s modernizací a také s bezpečností ochrany a kontroly na hranicích schengenského prostoru. Toto nařízení o Schengenském hraničním kodexu specifikuje konkrétní požadavky v systému vstupu a výstupu, specifikuje požadavky na kategorie vkládané do systému, na jeho technickou strukturu, na pravidla týkající se jeho provozu, používání, interoperability s dalšími informačními systémy v členských zemích.

Oceňuji také to, že dochází k zavedení norem pro systémy automatizované hraniční kontroly, zvyšují se tím požadavky na dostatečnou kvalitu sbíraných dat pro použití při automatizovaném porovnání biometrických prvků, což se týká například obličejů, otisků prstů. V každém případě jde o zlepšení kvality při kontrole a ochraně schengenského prostoru.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wielokrotnie podkreślałem, że nie ma dylematu, co jest ważniejsze: bezpieczeństwo fizyczne obywateli czy też bezpieczeństwo danych osobowych tych samych obywateli, że te dwa elementy muszą być traktowane identycznie poważnie i są wzajemnie dla siebie niezbędne. Mówię o tym także dzisiaj, dlatego, że ta propozycja, by przechowywać dane o przelotach przez 3 lata dla tych wszystkich, którzy otrzymali prawo do pobytu, i 5 lat dla tych, którzy nie otrzymali, w tym pierwszym elemencie jest słuszna, w tym drugim proponowany okres może okazać się za krótki. Zwłaszcza że musimy pamiętać, iż odmowy udzielenia wizy, pobytu na terenie Unii Europejskiej są różne – od czasu do czasu czysto techniczne, a od czasu do czasu związane z dowodami

na kontakty z grupami terrorystycznymi. Uważam, że w tym drugim wypadku ten czas powinien być zdecydowanie dłuższy.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταψήφισα την έκθεση διότι θεωρώ ότι η συμμετοχή της Ελλάδος στη Σένγκεν μετατρέπει την πατρίδα μου σε έναν μαγνήτη προκειμένου να έρχονται χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες, που όλοι θεωρούν ότι μπορούν μέσω Ελλάδος, παίρνοντας έγγραφα βραχείας διέλευσης τύπου Σένγκεν να φτάσουν στις άλλες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Το ερώτημα είναι γιατί άραγε χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες διακινδύνευσαν να πνιγούν στο Αιγαίο προκειμένου να έρθουν στα νησιά του Αιγαίου και δεν πήγαν χερσαία στη Βουλγαρία. Για τον απλό λόγο ότι Βουλγαρία δεν ήταν μέλος της Σένγκεν. Επομένως, όσο η Ελλάδα παραμένει στη Σένγκεν θα είναι μαγνήτης για να έρχονται χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες. Θεωρώ λοιπόν αναγκαίο ότι να αποχωρήσει η Ελλάδα από τη Σένγκεν. Με τον τρόπο αυτό θα πάψει να είναι μαγνήτης για τους πρόσφυγες και τους παράνομους μετανάστες και θα μπορέσει έτσι να αντιμετωπίσει την κατάσταση που έχει δημιουργηθεί. Στην Ελλάδα πλέον έχουμε χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες και η Ελλάδα δεν αντέχει άλλο αυτή την κατάσταση.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já s návrhem vyjadřuji souhlas, byť jsem měl odlišná hlasování v některých drobných případech, které nejsou možná úplně drobnostmi, a je třeba je zde asi zmínit.

Já nejsem toho názoru, že ty lhůty pro zachovávání údajů při povolení pobytu anebo dokonce při nepovolení pobytu jsou dostatečné. Podle mého by měly být minimálně dvojnásobné a to z toho důvodu, že ochrana osobních údajů nemůže rozhodně převážet zájem na uchovávání těchto záznamů. Podle mého názoru je důležité, aby tyto lhůty byly prodlouženy, protože se jedná o bezpečnost občanů. Dále je pro správné fungování systému nezbytné, aby byly přijaty a následně dodržovány patřičné technické normy a byl zajištěn dostatečný počet zaměstnanců, kteří budou u automatizované hraniční kontroly asistovat. Také je vhodné, aby pro tento účel byl vyčleněn dostatek peněz v rozpočtu, jinak nebude možné tato opatření realizovat.

8.5. Grundrechtsaspekte bei der Integration der Roma in der EU: Bekämpfung des Antiziganismus (A8-0294/2017 - Soraya Post)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, pokud chceme Romy skutečně začlenit a chceme opravdu s romskou otázkou něco dělat, musíme změnit přístup k romské otázce. Musíme více klást zodpovědnost na samotné Romy, ne na to, abychom se je my snažili násilně začleňovat do majoritní společnosti.

Já jsem několik let pracoval s Romy. V současné době jako poslanec EP se stále snažím pokračovat v této práci. Vidím, že i řada Romů pochopila, že vnější motivace smrdí. Proto je potřeba tyto lidi opravdu motivovat k tomu, aby oni chtěli studovat, vzdělávat se a být součástí naší společnosti. Romové jsou šikovní lidé, řada Romů je velmi dobře vzdělaných, ale bez toho, aniž bychom dali impuls a uznali jejich odlišnost, nebude toho začleňování možné.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, os ciganos fazem parte da cultura e dos valores da Europa, mas todos sabemos que existe uma hostilidade latente em relação aos ciganos, em todos os níveis da sociedade europeia e em todas as zonas geográficas da Europa.

Votei, assim, a favor desta resolução, no reconhecimento de que os ciganos devem ser considerados pessoas vulneráveis e que a Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais da União Europeia proíbe qualquer forma de discriminação. O caso especial das mulheres e das raparigas que são vítimas de discriminação, que alimenta um círculo vicioso de desigualdade, exclusão e marginalização, deve ser cuidadosamente acompanhado e combatido.

Com efeito, em 2016, apenas 16 % das mulheres de etnia cigana tinham emprego, 72 % das raparigas ciganas não estudavam nem trabalhavam e 71 % das mulheres ciganas com idades compreendidas entre os 18 e os 24 anos abandonaram precocemente a educação ou a formação.

Caros colegas, esta resolução que hoje aprovamos manifesta profunda preocupação com a discriminação dos ciganos e propõe medidas relevantes de acesso dos ciganos aos cuidados de saúde, aos serviços sociais, à educação, à justiça, às oportunidades de emprego e à habitação. Acredito que a concretização destas ações é, sem dúvida, expressão de uma Europa justa, humanista e inclusiva.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Če priznamo ali ne, so Romi seveda pomemben del evropske kulture in vrednot in prispevajo seveda k prepoznavnosti tudi kulturnemu bogastvu, skupni zgodovini Unije. Zato je seveda zelo pomembno, kakšen odnos in kakšno sožitje ustvarimo s to skupnostjo na različnih koncih Evropske unije, torej v različnih državah.

Predvsem pa se zavzemam in mislim, da je to tudi zelo pomembno, da se vzdržimo kakršnegakoli nasilja in da poskušamo preprečevati nasilje nad romsko skupnostjo in spodbujati tudi mlade, da razumejo, da so Romi tudi del evropskega širšega prostora in da pravzaprav s sobivanjem krepimo ne samo kulturno, ampak tudi sobivanjsko kulturo, kar je tudi značilnost Evropske unije.

Presidente. – Con questo si concludono le dichiarazioni di voto.

9. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(La seduta è sospesa alle 13.52)

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

10. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Ședința a fost redeschisă la ora 15.02)

11. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

12. Bekämpfung der illegalen Einwanderung und des Menschensmuggels im Mittelmeerraum (Aussprache über ein aktuelles Thema)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind Lupta împotriva imigrației ilegale și a introducerii ilegale de persoane în zona Mării Mediterane. Dezbateră tematică (articolul 153a din regulamentul de procedură) (2017/2898(RSP))

Aș vrea să informez colegii deputați că, pentru această dezbateră, nu se aplică procedura „catch the eye” și nu se acceptă cartonașe albastre.

Matteo Salvini, autore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlo alla Commissione, parlo a quest'Aula affollata: siamo in 26, non so se da casa ci stanno seguendo, quindi evidentemente il tema dell'immigrazione illegale scalda i cuori dei colleghi eurodeputati.

Proverò a ripetere quello che come Lega e come europarlamentari italiani ripetiamo da qualche anno, con scarso successo: queste politiche assenti e fallimentari sull'immigrazione clandestina stanno facendo il male dei popoli europei e il male dei popoli africani. Chi sta governando l'Europa, con la complicità di alcuni governi – fra cui quello italiano – sta facendo gli interessi delle mafie, degli scafisti, degli schiavisti e delle multinazionali dello sfruttamento.

Parliamo di numeri: negli ultimi tre anni nel Mediterraneo sono morte almeno 15 000 persone, solo in Italia sono sbarcati più di 600 000 presunti rifugiati, che rifugiati non sono, sono scomparsi 30 000 bambini che alimentano un mercato della prostituzione che ormai non conosce regole, e dopo tre anni ci ritroviamo a parlare di quello che dovremmo fare. Cosa dovremmo fare? Non lo fa l'Europa, lo faranno i governi nazionali, compreso quello italiano, se la Lega vincerà le elezioni: proteggere i confini; interrompere i contatti fra le navi delle ONG – che questa istituzione europea continua a finanziare – con gli scafisti; garantire quote di immigrazione legale e positiva per quegli uomini e quelle donne che portano realmente un valore aggiunto alle nostre società, come funziona in Canada, in Australia, in Svizzera e nei paesi evoluti.

Per il momento noi stiamo importando schiavi, fannulloni o delinquenti. In Tunisia nel 2017 sono usciti di galera più di 4 000 delinquenti grazie ai premi e agli indulti delle autorità tunisine. Ebbene, questi stanno arrivando tutti in Italia. L'Italia ha il record di detenuti tunisini: il 67 % dei detenuti tunisini di tutta Europa è in Italia. Quindi al di là del Mediterraneo aprono le galere e noi in Italia apriamo le porte di casa nostra.

Io spero che questa Commissione si svegli, non ne ho tanta convinzione, e a questo punto faremo noi, agevolando l'arrivo di donne e bambini che fuggono davvero dalla guerra – donne e bambini, che in giro per l'Italia e per l'Europa non si vedono, o si vedono troppo poco – e, soprattutto, agevolando l'arrivo di immigrazione legale dai paesi più vicini ai nostri valori, e penso ai paesi di cultura cristiana. Qua si garantiscono i diritti di chiunque, ancora oggi ci si è occupati dei diritti dei rom, perché se ogni mese a Strasburgo non ci si occupa dei diritti dei rom qualcuno non è felice.

Ricordo che i paesi islamici adottano una dichiarazione dei diritti islamici dell'uomo che prevede che la giustizia sia applicata solo in base a quello che prevede la legge islamica, che prevede che la libertà di pensiero sia applicata solo nei limiti di quanto previsto dalla legge islamica, che a proposito della parità di genere, su cui giustamente si scrive tanto, nel matrimonio, all'articolo 19 della dichiarazione islamica dei diritti dell'uomo, si dice che gli uomini hanno una certa supremazia sulle donne. E allora: ti metto in galera se me lo consente la legge islamica, puoi dire quello che vuoi se te lo consente la legge islamica, uomo e donna hanno gli stessi diritti ma l'uomo vale qualcosa in più.

Penso sia giunto il momento di rimettere delle regole per chi vuole entrare in Europa: lo deve fare legalmente, lo deve fare positivamente. Per il resto esiste la regola dell'espulsione, del respingimento, della difesa dei confini. Se non vogliono farlo la Commissione europea o l'Unione europea perché rispondono agli interessi e alle logiche delle multinazionali, lo faranno i popoli, che si svegliano e votano in Germania, in Olanda, in Francia, in Austria e presto anche in Italia.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, speaking in this very room yesterday, the President of the European Council, President Tusk, said that protecting our external border is the cornerstone of resolving the migration crisis. There are many aspects to this, but the fight against irregular migration and people smuggling has been at the forefront of agendas of both the European Council and the Council for a while now.

It remains at the top of our agenda even though we have seen a dramatic reduction of almost 70% in the number of irregular migrants since spring 2016. Our aim is to ensure the effective control of our external borders and stem illegal flows into the EU. We are determined to break the business model of smugglers and reduce the high number of human beings losing their lives while crossing the Mediterranean Sea in unseaworthy boats and flimsy dinghies.

To achieve these aims, we reaffirm our commitment to strong cooperation with international partners, as well as with countries of origin, transit and destination. On both the central and the eastern Mediterranean migratory routes, the EU and its Member States have taken decisive action to reach these objectives.

Since spring 2016, we have implemented the EU-Turkey statement to address the flows from Turkey into Greece. We have taken a number of measures to reduce the irregular migratory flows, to break the business model of smugglers and human traffickers, and to advance the effectiveness of returns.

At the peak of the crisis, in October 2015, 216 000 arrivals from Turkey to the EU were registered over a period of one month. Subsequently, average monthly arrivals into the EU in the period from April 2016 to September 2017 were reduced to 2 465.

On the central Mediterranean route, we commend the significant contribution made by Italy, including on a bilateral level. Over the summer, a number of initiatives were taken by the Presidency, the Member States and the Commission to complement the bilateral actions taken by Italy. I refer here in particular to the Commission's Action Plan of 4 July and the respective Presidency implementation plan.

Let me highlight some of the achievements so far. We have intensified efforts to train the Libyan coastguard so that the Government of National Accord can improve the control of its territorial waters. The extension of the mandate of EUNAVFOR MED operation Sophia until 31 August 2018 enables us to continue this task in a sustainable way. In the EUR 46 million EU Trust Fund programme for border and migration management in Libya, adopted in July this year, about EUR 30 million are dedicated to the training, equipment and maintenance needs of the coastguard.

We continue to promote the development of local communities across the migratory routes in Libya. Under the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, projects worth EUR 42 million have been contracted for this purpose. Since last year, we have more than doubled our financial support for the work carried out by UNHCR and IOM to provide adequate reception conditions for migrants and persons falling under the international protection mandate in Libya, and to coordinate assisted voluntary returns from Libya and Niger to countries of origin.

We wish to reinforce our support to the most vulnerable groups by setting up a voluntary resettlement scheme, as presented by the Commission in September in its recommendation on enhancing legal pathways for persons in need of international protection.

Six countries along the central Mediterranean route are among priority countries for resettlement, including Libya. Some Member States have already submitted ambitious pledges. There are many more strands that we are working on. I think it is important to bear in mind that they are nearly all medium- to long-term measures, for which patience and resilience by the EU are required.

Another limitation we should take into account is the unstable political and security situation in Libya, preventing our full presence in the EU delegation and EU Border Assistance Mission in Tripoli and in the field. We are working very closely with our Libyan interlocutors to bring about change in this country. In addition, our aim is to intensify our cooperation and, based on the European Council conclusions from 19 October this year, to rapidly establish a permanent EU presence in Libya.

Let me mention some of the actions to fight people smuggling. In the framework of the Malta Declaration of 3 February 2017, we now have a very efficient system for the monitoring of departure points in third countries. Furthermore, the identification, detection and tracking of suspicious vessels has improved. Frontex complements the EUNAVFOR MED operation Sophia, to which it provides solid intelligence.

Europol's European Migrant Smuggling Centre focuses its activities on the central Mediterranean route in order to target and disrupt supplies to smugglers. In an effort to further disrupt the business model of people smugglers and human traffickers, the Council introduced restrictions on the export and supply to Libya of inflatable boats, also known as dinghies, and outboard motors. Finally, the Council adopted the EU's priorities for the fight against organised and serious international crime between 2018 and 2021. This was done in May 2017. They will include the fight against the facilitation of irregular immigration.

In conclusion, despite the encouraging developments mentioned, the EU remains vigilant on all migration routes and continues a comprehensive, pragmatic and resolute approach by using all the relevant EU policies, instruments and tools.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, the fight against illegal immigration and people smuggling is, and remains, one of the key features of our comprehensive migration policy. As outlined in the mid-term review of the European Agenda on Migration, the implementation of the Action Plan on Smuggling adopted in May 2015 and of the measures to address illegal immigration remains a priority.

We all know that while the irregular flows towards Europe are decreasing overall, we have to remain vigilant. This is why we will pursue our actions to build a proper management of migratory flows to the EU to prevent irregular immigration and fight smugglers. To tackle illegal immigration along the central Mediterranean, cooperation with the Libyan authorities remains an important element. The training and equipment of the Libyan coastguard prevents illegal immigration and helps save lives at sea. This year alone, the Libyan coastguard brought back to the Libyan shores more than 16 000 migrants.

The EU has also engaged with the Libyan authorities to allow international organisations, mainly the IOM and the UNHCR, to assist vulnerable migrants in Libya before they embark to Europe. As a result, this year the IOM has assisted 8438 migrants to return safely to their countries of origin. The Commission also supports the UNHCR's plan to evacuate vulnerable migrants out of Libya for onward resettlement.

We also continue to help Sahel countries to better manage the borders and enforce their capacities in relation to the fight against migrant smuggling and trafficking of human beings. The Niger Project is very encouraging. More than 100 offenders have been arrested and brought to justice in the first half of 2017. More generally, in the first quarter of this year, we proposed a revision of Immigration Liaison Officers Regulation to support actions to counter migrant smuggling in third countries. This will allow exploiting the full potential of the network of European immigration liaison officers, who have been deployed in 12 priority countries to coordinate closely the work of Member States on the ground.

To prevent smuggling and illegal immigration, we also have to use all our leverage to improve the readmission rates of countries of origin and show more solidarity with Africa to address the root causes of migration. To this effect, EUR 2.85 billion has been made available by the EU Trust Fund for Africa. The refugees who need protection will be offered alternative solutions to smuggling. By enhancing safe and legal pathways, persons in need of protection will no longer have to rely on smugglers and risk their lives to find protection in the EU. This is why the Commission recommends that Member States increase their resettlement efforts by at least 50 000 persons over the next two years.

We are also exploring how we could enhance the legal pathways for migrants who are not in need of protection. The Commission is ready to coordinate pilot projects with select third countries in 2018.

Moreover, to clamp down on migrant smuggling networks, Member States need to increase their capacity to investigate this crime, for which timely and practical information sharing is key. National investigators must talk to each other and fully use the resources provided by the European Migrant Smuggling Centre at Europol. Indeed, the European Migrant Smuggling Centre at Europol, launched in 2016, has shown substantial added value in providing operational support to Member States in fighting smuggling. It has provided support and conducted proactive high-profile investigations against criminal networks, with 68 cases reported this year so far, and 93 cases in its first year of operation leading to 147 arrests in 2016, and over 167 so far.

Finally, we must address all the factors in our system that fuel irregular immigration, such as undeclared labour, by better enforcing the Employers Sanctions Directive.

To conclude, let me stress that we will continue to fight this ruthless business in order to save lives, to prevent irregular immigration, and to provide protection for those in need.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αντιπρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, η λαθραία διακίνηση ανθρώπων στη Μεσόγειο συνεχίζει σήμερα να αποτελεί μια άκρως κερδοφόρα επιχείρηση του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος, με τζήρους που φτάνουν τα 5 και 6 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ ετησίως, και να διαδραματίζει καταλυτικό ρόλο στην έξαρση της μεταναστευτικής κρίσης. Είναι τραγικό ότι η Μεσόγειος έχει μετατραπεί τα τελευταία χρόνια σε τόπο εκμετάλλευσης της ανθρώπινης δυστυχίας με τον χειρότερο τρόπο. Στους 22,5 χιλιάδες ανέρχονται οι θάνατοι και οι εξαφανίσεις μεταναστών παγκοσμίως από την αρχή του 2014 έως τον Ιούνιο του 2017, ενώ οι περισσότεροι θάνατοι καταγράφονται στη Μεσόγειο. Τον προηγούμενο χρόνο μάλιστα έφτασαν τους 5.143, ο μεγαλύτερος αριθμός που έχει καταγραφεί ετησίως από το 2000 μέχρι σήμερα. Η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα, λόγω γεωγραφικής θέσης αποτελεί σταυροδρόμι στη λαθραία διακίνηση ανθρώπων και, παρά τις πρωτοβουλίες που έχουν αναληφθεί, οι οποίες είναι σημαντικές, δεν έχουμε καταφέρει ακόμη να ελέγξουμε το φαινόμενο. Μόνο τον Αύγουστο, Σεπτέμβριο και Οκτώβριο φέτος έφτασαν στα ελληνικά νησιά περισσότεροι από 10.000 άνθρωποι. Αξίζει να σημειωθεί ότι οι διακινητές αλλάζουν γρήγορα διαδρομές, ενώ οργανώνονται και διαφημίζονται μέσω του Διαδικτύου. Γι' αυτό, η καταπολέμηση του εγκλήματος λαθρεμπορίας ανθρώπων επιτυγχάνεται κυρίως από τον περιορισμό της ζήτησης από τους ίδιους τους μετανάστες. Η ανάπτυξη νόμιμων οδών μετακίνησης προς την Ευρώπη είναι ο μόνος ενδεδειγμένος τρόπος για

να το πετύχουμε και στηρίζουμε δυνατά αυτή την προσπάθεια. Η ενίσχυση της συνεργασίας με τρίτες χώρες καταγωγής και διέλευσης, η επαναδιαπραγμάτευση του Δουβλίνου και η προώθηση ευρωπαϊκού πλαισίου επανεγκατάστασης προσφύγων αποτελούν τον κεντρικό άξονα των προσπαθειών μας. Η αλληλεγγύη, η αμοιβαία εμπιστοσύνη στην ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών και στην αποτελεσματική συνεργασία μεταξύ των δικωτικών αρχών είναι το κλειδί για να θέσουμε υπό έλεγχο αυτό το εγκληματικό και αποκρουστικό φαινόμενο. Αρκεί να συμφωνήσουμε ότι η ευθύνη ανήκει σε όλους μας.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, a veces la democracia tiene estas cosas. Con las reglas democráticas de este Parlamento, el Grupo proponente de este debate, que se sienta aquí fundamentalmente para intentar acabar con la Unión Europea, tiene la posibilidad de proponer un debate cuyo enfoque es absolutamente lamentable, moralmente indigno, xenófobo, racista y profundamente antieuropeo. El propio título del debate destila ideología anti-inmigración y trata de situar el marco de la discusión en términos que el Grupo socialista, desde luego, rechaza.

Algunos creen que llamándole a la inmigración «ilegal», están categorizando a los propios seres humanos, como si hubiera categorías de «personas legales» y «personas ilegales». Verán, señores proponentes, no se lucha contra la inmigración. La inmigración se regula, se gestiona, se ordena, y se lucha contra la injusticia; y se lucha por la dignidad de los seres humanos que se ven obligados a migrar. Digan ustedes la verdad. La inmigración no supone una crisis en este momento. La inmigración ha hecho este continente y muchos otros, es un fenómeno humano eterno, y lo que hay que hacer es ordenarlo, no luchar contra los seres humanos.

Nosotros, el Grupo Socialista, no nos vamos a dejar amedrentar por los debates que ustedes proponen, porque nos parecen la peor versión de la política, aquella que se alimenta de difundir falsedades, de extender el miedo para tratar de sacar algún rédito electoral. Nosotros estamos aquí para salvar los valores que ustedes combaten, los valores de la solidaridad, del Estado de Derecho, de la dignidad de las personas, de las convenciones internacionales, de las que somos firmantes todos nosotros. Europa no está siendo invadida. Europa necesita la inmigración, por más que ustedes no quieran comprenderlo.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, c'est certainement l'un des débats les plus importants de la mandature. À quoi sert un tel débat si nous ne pouvons pas apporter la contradiction? J'ai voulu poser une question «carton bleu», ce qui m'a été interdit. Donc, finalement, vous restez entre vous. Nous ne sommes pas ici en démocratie. Vous restez sur des clichés.

Je crois qu'il faut défendre aujourd'hui les nations contre ce problème de l'immigration et je suis vraiment révolté que nous ne puissions pas intervenir.

Președinte. – Pentru informarea dumneavoastră, domnule Ferrand, această decizie prin care această dezbatere – ieri a fost o altă dezbatere unde s-a aplicat același lucru – se desfășoară fără „catch the eye” și fără cartonașe albastre este o decizie luată în unanimitate de conducerele tuturor grupurilor politice, iar eu am primit această înștiințare, pe care am obligația să v-o aduc la cunoștință la începutul dezbaterii, ca să știți toată lumea care sunt regulile jocului astăzi.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, de N-VA pleit al geruime tijd voor push-backs op zee. Wij willen niet dat bootvluchtelingen automatisch naar de EU worden gebracht. Wij willen niet dat illegaal Europa bereiken wordt beloond met een verblijfsrecht en allerlei voordelen. Trouwens, push-backs waren vóór 2012 mogelijk in de Middellandse Zee, maar in 2012 maakte het Europees Hof voor de Rechten van de Mens daar een einde aan. Zo ontstond het dogma van het recht op asiel in Europa. Zo wordt het Frontex bijna onmogelijk gemaakt om de Europese grenzen te bewaken en de instroom te stoppen.

Daarenboven besloot het Europees Parlement onlangs om de lidstaten te verplichten om per jaar tweehonderdduizend vluchtelingen over te brengen uit het Midden-Oosten. Ook werd beslist dat in ruil geen druk mag worden gezet om een terugnameakkoord af te sluiten. Dat betekent dat illegalen en/of criminelen ook niet terug kunnen worden gestuurd. De stemming hierover in de Commissie binnenlandse zaken verliep niet helemaal volgens de regels – met dank aan links, dat anders altijd zo hamert op respect voor die regels. En dat terwijl er in Duitsland en Oostenrijk stemmen opgaan om een absolute maximumlimiet op de opvang van vluchtelingen in te stellen – iets waarvoor de N-VA al jaren pleit en ook zo'n idee dat stevast wordt weggezet als onmogelijk door linkse politici, maar nu toch zijn intrede doet, zij het voorlopig enkel in de nationale politiek. Gelukkig kunnen we nog rekenen op de lidstaten voor meer realiteitszin.

Cecilia Wikström, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, let us be very clear on a number of points. First of all, despite all problems and challenges in Europe, we are on the best continent – one of the best places – on the planet in which to live. This is naturally why a lot of people from all around the world would like to make our continent their home, in order to enjoy the freedom and prosperity that we all enjoy and that exist here. Let us also be clear that this has not always been the situation. From the mid-1800s until 1920, about 1.5 million people from my country, Sweden, or at that time one third of the population, left for the USA in order to escape difficulties such as religious persecution and poverty.

Secondly, human beings are migratory to the very core of our nature. If we see no prospect for the future where we are, we move. Nevertheless, in the EU, we must obviously have a policy of regulated migration for the foreseeable future. Anything else would be irresponsible, but it would be equally irresponsible to cut ourselves off from the rest of the world: we all live in a globalised village today.

The right to asylum and international protection is an individual human right that every Member State of the Union has signed up to defend. The only way to find out if a person qualifies for international protection is for them to go through the asylum process. Everyone that asks for asylum has the right to apply, but not everyone has the right to obtain international protection (asylum).

Public support for the asylum system will depend on our ability to complete the ongoing work on the common European asylum system, so as to put the EU's house in order and make sure that the procedures are fair and efficient throughout all the Member States. We must also do much better in returning those who do not qualify for international protection in a dignified manner. That would restore the credibility of the system.

The most important measure to discourage people from dangerous trips across the Mediterranean would be to say that it is difficult to obtain international protection.

There are no shortcuts here: only hard work. We need to put a resilient common European asylum system in place, and once again to deserve the respect – and live up to the expectations – of the citizens out there.

Barbara Spinelli, *a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei rivolgere alla Commissione e al Consiglio tre domande sulla battaglia per bloccare l'arrivo di migranti forzati in Europa.

La prima riguarda la lotta prioritaria agli *smuggler*, concordata con Libia, Niger e Ciad. Cominciamo a conoscerne l'esito: impauriti dalle autorità nigerine, gli *smuggler* mollano i migranti nel deserto o li conducono su strade dove manca l'acqua. Il risultato è che i morti nel deserto aumentano esponenzialmente, non arrivano al Mediterraneo. Secondo Danziger, responsabile OIM per l'Africa centroccidentale, sono ormai il doppio dei morti in mare, circa 30 000 in quattro anni.

La seconda domanda concerne le coste libiche, dove regna una guerra tra bande. Come distinguere lo *smuggler* dalle milizie o dalle guardie costiere che Unione e Italia formano e pagano? Secondo l'Alto commissariato ONU, gli abusi nei centri di detenzione sono spaventosi.

La terza domanda riguarda le garanzie sull'assistenza UNHCR in Libia. Secondo l'Alto commissario a Tripoli è un'assistenza più che precaria. La Libia non ha firmato la convenzione di Ginevra, né ha un memorandum con l'UNHCR.

Di questa Africa, trasformata in nostra prigionie, di questi morti, l'Unione è responsabile. Penso che un giorno pagheremo le colpe di cui ci stiamo macchiando. All'onorevole Salvini vorrei dire una cosa che Lei sa: nell'UE avete più sostegno di quel che dite di avere.

Judith Sargentini, namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, met uw welnemen wil ik het woord richten aan meneer Salvini, een collega die hier het debat gestart is. Meneer Salvini, uw land is een groot exporteur van tomaten en wij in de rest van Europa, wij koken met die tomaten. Ik heb het net nog even nagekeken: in een supermarkt in Nederland kost een blik gepelde tomaten 39 cent. Maar het kan nog goedkoper. Zo'n klein blikje tomatenpuree om de saus echt lekker te maken, kost 18 cent.

En waarom vertel ik u dit? Omdat de afgelopen week een officier van justitie in Italië een boer in het zuiden van Italië veroordeeld heeft tot schuld aan doodslag op een migrantenarbeider, een man uit Sudan, meneer Abdullah Mohammed, die een hartaanval kreeg bij het plukken van tomaten. Hij plukte die tomaten onder verschrikkelijke omstandigheden, zeven dagen per week, twaalf uur per dag, in de zon. Als u dat weet en u weet dat er geen echte arbeidsinspectie plaatsvindt in de landbouw in Italië, en wij allemaal maar 39 cent per blik tomaten betalen, dan is volgens mij het echte probleem bij het tegengaan van irreguliere migratie en smokkelen het feit dat wij niet willen betalen voor onze producten, dat wij de controle hier niet op uitvoeren. De enige manier om die producten zo goedkoop te houden is mensen uitbuiten.

En u knikt. Ik ben daar blij om. Maar het is úw winst en het zijn úw arbeidsinspecteurs die er niet komen kijken. Willen wij wat doen aan irreguliere migratie, dan zullen wij mensen netjes moeten betalen en de controle moeten opvoeren. Zolang dat niet gebeurt, is er een enorme *pullfactor* die niet weggaat.

Kristina Winberg, för EFDD-gruppen. – Herr talman! I Sverige kallar vi dem papperslösa. Personer som har fått avslag på avslag på sin asylansökan och skulle ha lämnat vårt land, helst i förgår. Ordet papperslösa kan lätt förvirra, de har ju fått papper efter papper om att de har fått avslag på sin asylansökan.

Dessa personer som borde lämnat våra länder får, hör och häpna, tillgång till vår välfärd såsom sjukvård, tandvård och i vissa fall försörjningsstöd, många gånger mer fördelaktigt än våra stackars pensionärer som har det tungt. En reform som vi i Sverigedemokraterna är ensamma om att vilja upphäva.

Att dessa personer går under jorden och många gånger är omöjliga att utvisa vet vi. De lever i ett skuggsamhälle där vi vet att många av dem jobbar svart, begår brott och utför terror. Titta bara på vem det var som utförde terrordådet i Stockholm i våras där fem personer miste livet. Personen levde illegalt i Sverige och blev radikaliserad. Myndigheterna hade ingen som helst koll på personen i fråga.

Varje medlemsstat måste påskynda utvisningarna för annars ökar riskerna som jag nämnde tidigare. Vi måste också bli bättre att hålla dem som fått avslag på sin asylansökan i förvar. Sverige kan och bör inte vara en bankomat för all världens lycksökare. Den svenska regeringen bör agera mycket hårdare omedelbart, annars byter vi i Sverigedemokraterna ut dem nästa år och gör jobbet själva!

Nicolas Bay, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, jeudi dernier, la commission LIBE a adopté un dangereux rapport de M^{me} Wikström, qui sera prochainement débattu en plénière.

Ce texte a pour objet de modifier le fameux règlement Dublin, actuellement «Dublin III», qui prévoit notamment la prise en charge du demandeur d'asile par le premier pays dans lequel il arrive. Ainsi, aujourd'hui, si un clandestin arrive, par exemple, en Italie, c'est l'Italie qui traite sa demande. Si le même clandestin arrive ensuite en France, celle-ci a le droit de demander son expulsion vers l'Italie.

Avec ce rapport, le règlement se transformerait en un mécanisme automatique de répartition des clandestins. Ce «Dublin IV» prévoirait ainsi que l'on propose à un candidat au droit d'asile quatre pays dans lesquels il pourrait s'installer en attendant le traitement de sa demande. Le simple fait que les demandeurs d'asile puissent choisir l'État dans lequel leur demande sera traitée est à proprement parler grotesque. Fui-ils réellement la guerre de façon transitoire comme on le prétend ou veulent-ils simplement choisir le système social le plus avantageux?

Le rapport de M^{me} Wikström vise au final à instaurer un véritable droit d'asile à la carte. L'asile a été dévoyé, il est totalement dénaturé par des critères de plus en plus souples et laxistes, et est malheureusement devenu une filière à part entière de l'immigration illégale.

Je voudrais terminer en répondant brièvement à M^{me} Valenciano. Par vos propos, vous avez apporté la démonstration que votre approche est purement idéologique, que le simple fait de décrire la réalité vous est absolument insupportable et que, vous et le groupe que vous représentez, n'avez aucune solution pour régler le problème de l'immigration illégale en Europe.

Președinte. – Fac un apel la toți colegii să încercăm să rămânem concentrați pe problemele de substanță din dezbateră noastră și să evităm cât mai mult adresările către ceilalți colegi.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök úr! A témából adódik, hogy nem tudunk teljesen eleget tenni az elnök úr kérésének, hiszen itt most a múlt és a jövő csatázik. A múlt, amikor is a magukat baloldalinak és liberálisnak valló politikusok és úgymond értelmiségiek megszokták azt, hogy az ő megmondó embereik, az ő észosztóik tematizálják a közbeszédet a migráció kérdésében. A jövő viszont az, ami ma is történik, hogy őszintén, az európai lakosság többségének a tapasztalatait visszatükrözve és véleményét kimondva beszéltek itt olasz képviselőtársaink, hozzájuk csatlakoztak svédek és mások. Itt vannak a visegrádi négyek, itt van az én hazám, Magyarország.

Kimondjuk azt, hogy igenis, Európa külső határait meg kell védeni, igenis a migrációt a gyökérokoknál kell kezelni, és ott, helyben. Köszönjük azt a rengeteg támogatást, amit magyarként kapunk azért, hogy a hazánkat és Európát megvédjük, és örülünk, hogy egyre több szövetségünk van.

Barbara Kudrycka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rozmawiamy dzisiaj o walce z przemytnikami, o niszczeniu łodzi, rozbijaniu siatek przemytników. Po ponad półtora roku działalności Europejskiego Centrum Zwalczania Przemytu Migrantów możemy pogratulować Europolowi, Frontexowi i narodowym służbom granicznym rezultatów wspólnej pracy.

Jednak przemysł nie jest źródłem problemu, a rezultatem wcześniejszego braku całościowego podejścia do problematyki migracji, szczególnie w zakresie skutecznego leczenia przyczyn masowych wyjazdów z kraju pochodzenia. Dlatego dobrze, że w tej sprawie dużo zaczęło się zmieniać. Nie ulega wątpliwości też, że presja migracyjna uległa znacznemu zmniejszeniu w ostatnim roku. Widać więc wyraźnie, że europejskie zarządzanie w zakresie migracji zaczyna przynosić sukcesy. To dobry znak. Najważniejsze jest jednak, abyśmy kontynuowali wspólne wysiłki w tych dziedzinach, w których jesteśmy wszyscy zgodni – to jest w zakresie skutecznej ochrony zewnętrznych granic Unii: wsparcia zarówno finansowego, jak i osobowego i profesjonalnego dla krajów granicznych, realizacji programów powrotowych oraz europejskiej strategii dla Afryki. Ta ostatnia jest szczególnie ważna.

Według UNHCR wiele osób z Afryki subsaharyjskiej nie podjęłoby skrajnie niebezpiecznej wędrówki do Libii, a dalej do Europy, gdyby znana im była skala ryzyka i dostępne programy ochrony. Dlatego tak bardzo potrzebne są wszelkie działania oparte na funduszu powierniczym dla Afryki. Fundusz powierniczy dla Afryki powinien przede wszystkim także pomóc w poprawie warunków w obozach libijskich, które rzeczywiście są dramatyczne. Nie możemy być głusi na raportowane przypadki przemocy, gwałtów, tortur, notorycznego łamania praw człowieka. Dlatego należy wspierać działania międzynarodowych organizacji pozarządowych na terenie tych obozów. Skoro robimy dla zażegnania kryzysu imigracyjnego tak wiele, stać nas również na to.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gemeinsam wollen wir doch irreguläre Migration in der EU einschränken, bestenfalls verhindern. Deshalb brauchen wir neben einer gemeinsamen Asylpolitik eine Migrationspolitik, die legale Einwanderung zulässt. Das ist gut für beide Seiten. Es ermöglicht uns eine Steuerung und zeigt den Menschen, die bei uns eine bessere Zukunft für sich und ihre Kinder suchen, einen möglichen Weg auf.

Dieser Weg klappt nicht immer – vielleicht nicht beim ersten Anlauf –, aber er ist eine Alternative zu dem oft aussichtslosen Versuch, Asyl zu erschleichen oder vor allem auf der Flucht das eigene Leben aufs Spiel setzen.

Wir brauchen eine Politik, die die Ursachen für Flucht und Migration bekämpft. Die nachhaltige Bekämpfung von Fluchtursachen wie Klimakatastrophen, Instabilität und kriegsbedingter Armut muss durch ein vernetztes Denken von Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, humanitärer Hilfe und gemeinsamer Sicherheitspolitik erfolgen. Dazu gehört auch, dass wir unsere eigene Handelspolitik, unsere eigenen Subventionen radikal dahingehend überprüfen, inwieweit sie zu Armut und Ungleichheit beitragen.

Vor allem müssen wir glaubwürdig bleiben. Wir haben einen *Africa TrustFund*, der sollte am Anfang zweimal 1,8 Mrd. Euro haben. Das Ergebnis ist für uns, die EU, ganz in Ordnung: über 2,5 Mrd. sind drin. Die Mitgliedstaaten haben –aber auch nur mit Hilfe der Schweiz und Norwegens – gerade einmal 176 Mio. eingezahlt. Ich frage mich: Wie viele Millionen Flüchtlinge müssen noch nach Europa kommen, damit diejenigen in den Mitgliedstaaten aufhören zu schwatzen und endlich handeln? Es wird höchste Zeit.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Mr President, there will be smuggling in the Mediterranean for as long as illegal crossing is rewarded. The demographic and socioeconomic trends in Africa and the Middle East guarantee that people will keep coming indefinitely and in large numbers. We have the tools to manage the influx: the problem is that we do not have a political decision on what we want to achieve.

Europe cannot afford this kind of immigration, socially or economically. We have failed in integrating the immigrants that we already have, and that failure will become catastrophic as the numbers grow. So, we must stop the flow. Migrants who are rescued at sea must be returned to the port of departure, and not brought to European ports. This will also stop smuggling, because nobody wants to pay for nothing, and it will stop the tragedies at sea.

Angelika Mlinar (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Wie schon mehrmals an dieser Stelle erwähnt, ist das beste Rezept gegen unkontrollierte und illegale Zuwanderung ein System, das legale Migration ermöglicht und gleichzeitig die davon zu trennenden Flüchtlingsströme koordiniert. In der Debatte werden diese beiden unterschiedlichen Phänomene permanent und leider viel zu oft vermischt.

In der Reform des Dublin-Abkommens ist eine gemeinsame europäische Asylpolitik auf dem Weg. Was aber noch unbedingt notwendig ist, ist eine gemeinsame europäische Migrationspolitik, die auch diesen Namen verdient. Nur wenn wir uns weiter in diese Richtung bewegen, können wir den Menschensmuggel beenden, Leben retten und von den wirtschaftlichen Vorteilen profitieren, die die koordinierte und kontrollierte Einwanderung für unsere Volkswirtschaften mit sich bringt.

Das Europäische Parlament ist bereit dazu. Und ich appelliere hier und an dieser Stelle an die Regierungen und auch an die Ratspräsidentschaft, die nötigen Schritte zu setzen und gemeinsam mit dem Europäischen Parlament und der Europäischen Kommission ein europäisches Migrationssystem zu beschließen. Das ist nämlich das, was die Menschen von der Europäischen Union und von uns allen erwarten.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, este es un debate propuesto por el grupo de extrema derecha con el título de «Lucha contra la inmigración ilegal».

Ilegales pueden ser las armas, la violencia, las cosas, pero no las personas. Y si ustedes llaman ilegales a las personas que vienen a buscar una vida mejor a Europa es porque nuestros Gobiernos se han otorgado la potestad de decidir quién puede salvarse o quién debe morir, negándoles la ciudadanía a millones de personas.

Son ilegales para que así, cuando interese, se les cierren las puertas y mueran en el Mediterráneo, sean encerrados en un CIE o sean devueltos en caliente en una valla. Son ilegales también para que, cuando interese, se les abran las puertas y puedan ser explotados sexualmente o trabajar en condiciones de semiesclavitud.

Pero a quien habría que encerrar en un CIE es a personajes como la señora Le Pen o a todas aquellas personas que piensan que por haber nacido en Europa o ser blancos tenemos más derecho a comer que el resto. Y el muro lo vamos a construir —claro que sí—, un muro por el que ustedes no pasarán, un muro de solidaridad antifascista.

James Carver (EFDD). – Mr President, the issue of people smuggling and illegal immigration in the Mediterranean is, in essence, a simple one. The first step that we must undertake is to ask why this happens. Firstly, we must acknowledge the phenomenon of economic migration. European nations are wealthier and generally more stable and enjoy greater social benefits.

By contrast, many African nations are poor, some politically unstable, many with lower health-care standards, and little chance of social benefits. Secondly, there are vast amounts of money to be made by people smuggling. Indeed, the last Europol report estimated that turnover in this area was between EUR three and six billion per annum. This has led to an increase in modern slavery.

Something has to be done. With no effective control over our borders we remain vulnerable to terrorism. Also, we must address the increasing detrimental health issues, such as the fact that in 2014, 80% of tuberculosis sufferers in London were born abroad and a third of London boroughs were in that year's World Health Organisation high incidence threshold. This necessarily contributes to the greater pressure on our own health services.

Secondly, we must ensure that people smuggling is halted, the perpetrators' vehicles confiscated and destroyed, and any NGOs found to have assisted in this despicable trade must lose all public funding and, like the people caught people smuggling, also face prosecution.

Illegal immigrants are something very different to refugees. They should be turned away at the borders as a measure to send a message back to their homeland that such a journey will not be rewarded. Only by taking such a stance will we then be able to address the issue of support for genuine refugees.

Auke Zijlstra (ENF). – Voorzitter, minder dan drie procent van de migranten kreeg in Italië de vluchtelingenstatus, maar van 14 000 afgewezen migranten werden er maar 120 uitgezet. Zonder een effectief uitzetbeleid blijven mensen op bootjes stappen met een grote kans op de verdrinkingsdood.

Voorzitter, we moeten mensensmokkelaars vervolgen. We moeten illegaliteit strafbaar stellen. We moeten iedereen die op zee gered wordt, terugbrengen, onmiddellijk, en zeker niet toelaten tot de Europese Unie. Maar vooral moeten wij meer en sneller en onverbiddelijk uitzetten. De EU-wetgeving zit ons daarbij al in de weg, maar nu heeft dit Parlement vorige week voorgesteld om iedereen die arriveert automatisch toe te wijzen aan een land.

Een dergelijke lokroep is bijna kwaadaardig. Geen enkel beleid werkt nog als het Parlement dit soort dingen gaat doen. Voorzitter, hoeveel levens mag dit nog kosten?

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι πολεμικές συγκρούσεις ουδέποτε σταμάτησαν· το αντίθετο. Γι' αυτό ενισχύονται και πάλι τα κύματα προσφύγων, ενώ διαιωνίζεται ο εγκλωβισμός στους στα ελληνικά νησιά σε απάνθρωπες συνθήκες τύπου Μόριας στη Λέσβο. Ακέραιες και μεγάλες οι ευθύνες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης. Οι δε κατευθύνσεις της τελευταίας συνόδου κορυφής συμπυκνώνονται στη θέση «κρατήστε με κάθε τρόπο τους πρόσφυγες εκτός της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης». Τις «fast track» απελάσεις τις ονομάζετε κομπιά «επιστροφές» που θρέφουν τα δίκτυα των διακινητών που κατά τα άλλα πολεμάτε και ενθαρρύνουν τους φασίστες. Ενισχύετε το σύστημα φακελώματος Σένγκεν εισόδου-εξόδου, το επερχόμενο νέο σιδερόφρακτο Δουβλίνο και νέο σύστημα ασύλου. Από τη μία, επιλεγμένοι πάμφθηνοι εργαζόμενοι που θα γίνονται δεκτοί και, από την άλλη, στο όνομα της πρόληψης μετανάστευσης, μεγάλες «μπίζνες» σε Αφρική και Μέση Ανατολή. Μονά-ζυγά δηλαδή στην υπηρεσία των μονοπωλίων. Είναι αναγκαίο να δυναμώσει η αλληλεγγύη των λαών για να φτάσουν οι πρόσφυγες μετανάστες στη χώρα τελικού προορισμού τους, παλεύοντας κατά των ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων, του ΝΑΤΟ, της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και της εκμετάλλευσης.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, l'immigration clandestine est tout d'abord un drame humain. Il s'agit d'un geste de désespoir, qui est exploité par des trafiquants de toutes sortes. La situation des réfugiés et des migrants détenus actuellement par des passeurs dans la ville de Sabratha en Libye en est l'illustration.

La lutte contre l'immigration illégale en Méditerranée doit se faire sur deux fronts. Il s'agit d'abord de stopper les trafiquants, non seulement en les arrêtant en mer, mais surtout en adoptant des sanctions contre les chefs de ces régions. Les stopper signifie également soutenir le processus de paix en Libye, car les passeurs font fortune et opèrent grâce au vide politique et sécuritaire. Le nouveau plan de paix proposé par l'envoyé spécial des Nations unies va dans le bon sens. Il faut que nous aidions ce pays à sortir du blocage.

Le deuxième front est celui de la solidarité, qui n'est pas une option mais un devoir. Malheureusement, les chiffres parlent d'eux-mêmes. Nos États membres ne remplissent pas leurs obligations dans le cadre du mécanisme de relocalisation des réfugiés se trouvant en Italie et en Grèce, pourtant adopté en septembre 2015. La Hongrie et la Pologne n'ont accueilli aucun réfugié, la République tchèque en a accueilli 12, la Slovaquie 16 et l'Autriche 15.

La solidarité est également quasi inexistante lorsqu'il s'agit du Fonds d'urgence pour l'Afrique. Celui-ci a atteint ses limites et, si les États membres ne contribuent pas davantage, nous ne pourrions plus poursuivre nos politiques de retour volontaire, de sécurité aux frontières, d'éducation, de formation professionnelle. Comment proposer une alternative à ces candidats à la migration sans moyens financiers?

Nous sommes face à une vision très court-termiste alors que l'Union européenne a besoin d'une vision stratégique pour faire la différence et résoudre ce problème.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, it is a very important debate, but look around the room: there are, what, 50 colleagues here? The European governments are focusing on pushbacks to the Mediterranean. We are not seriously addressing the despair of thousands of migrants that are crossing the Mediterranean. Almost half of them do not get international protection in Europe – that is what really worries me. Thank you, Mr Salvini, for stressing the importance of opening safer and legal ways to Europe for people that are in need for international protection. But your Group, which bases itself on anti-immigrant and xenophobic rhetoric, does not match your words with actions. You constantly vote against the European solutions that we are working on in this House too.

It is clear that Italy cannot handle the situation alone. It is clear that we need a true European asylum system. We did our job here in the Parliament, and I blame the European governments for not moving forward. Yes, we have to improve our policy of return, but it can only be successful if we also establish efficient resettlement schemes. What about the fund for Africa? Members States promised the money, but where is this money today? What about the smugglers? We have the measures to fight against human trafficking. Where their smuggling profits going to? The Mediterranean remains a deadly sea, and I have to say, seriously, that I am ashamed of that.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, salvarea de vieți pe mare și combaterea traficului cu ființe umane trebuie să fie în continuare prioritățile în actuala criză a migrației din Mediterană. Cei traficați sunt adesea supuși riscului de a fi torturați, de a fi omorâți. De asemenea, la baza traficului cu ființe umane stă întotdeauna corupția. Unii pot să nu mai ajungă, practic, de cealaltă parte a continentului, acolo unde vor să ajungă. Și atunci, practic, traficul cu migranți nu pune în pericol numai viața lor, ci sprijină și actele teroriste, pentru că, prin traficul de migranți, de exemplu, se finanțează terorismul. Deci, trebuie să oprim acest trafic, să-i ajutăm pe cei care au nevoie de protecție să ajungă în Europa și, repet, să oprim traficul de ființe umane, inclusiv tăierea fondurilor teroriste.

Aș mai spune un singur lucru: ceea ce am decis să adoptăm în Parlament, după cotele obligatorii, a fost totuși procedura de relocare, care înseamnă că ne ducem acolo și îi alegem noi pe cei pe care îi aducem, așa cum face și Canada și cum fac alte țări, după ce verificăm aspecte de securitate, sănătate și trecutul penal, dacă există sau nu.

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I am sorry, ENF Group, but this is neo-fascism and racism dressed up in suits. You should not be able to set the agenda or frame our political responses, let alone frame our future. You should stop putting people against each other and stop lying about migrants and refugees, and you should stop confusing migrants and terrorists. It is beyond all dignity and sense.

Smugglers exist because there is a lack of legal pathways. To externalise borders – in the way that some people here want to do – is not to save people. It increases death in the Mediterranean and in the Sahara. Yes, the left wants other responses. We want to close detention centres, we want to stop chasing people who are in an irregular situation and to stop the obsession with deportations. We want to open more legal pathways.

We have had two votes in Parliament that point to the possibility of humanitarian resettlement and the shared responsibility for receiving more refugees in Europe. Now it is up to the Council to deliver.

To flee is not a choice. Nobody is illegal.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señor presidente, cada día cuenta y a día de hoy, 25 de octubre de 2017, la gran vergüenza de Europa sigue siendo la falta de vías seguras de entrada para los refugiados, pero también de un sistema ordenado para la entrada de la migración. Voy a poner un ejemplo: hay 5 000 refugiados que malviven en Moria, en Lesbos, y sufren de depresiones, intentos de suicidio, conflictos por las condiciones inhumanas. Los que llegaron a las islas griegas tras el 20 de marzo de 2016 están excluidos del plan de reubicación. Están atrapados sin esperanza.

Y muchos Estados miembros no están a la altura ni del desafío histórico —porque este es uno de los desafíos del siglo— ni de sus compromisos políticos. Cuando los principios y valores de la Unión se tambalean, nos queda aferrarnos al Estado de Derecho y, si este se vulnera, aplicar sanciones. Esta, señorías, es una de las razones del fracaso que tenemos. No hay mecanismos de sanción a los Estados, que sí pueden hacer más esfuerzos, que pueden hacerlos también por otros medios (visados de estudio, visados de trabajo, procedimientos rápidos de reagrupación familiar), pero miran a otro lado cobardemente.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'immigrazione illegale e il traffico di esseri umani nel Mediterraneo sono soprattutto un gigantesco *business*, che inizia nei paesi di origine dei flussi migratori e che continua nei paesi europei di destinazione, in quei centri di accoglienza troppo spesso oggetto di mala gestione e di speculazione sui fondi pubblici. Un fenomeno che finisce con l'alimentare lo sfruttamento sessuale, il caporalato, oscuri interessi e attività illecite gestite da gruppi criminali.

È per questo che riteniamo fondamentale avere delle vie legali e sicure di accesso all'Unione europea, la quale deve essere coinvolta nel riconoscere già nei paesi di origine o di transito chi ha diritto a forme di protezione internazionale.

Istituire delle vie legali di accesso all'Unione europea significa avere un'alternativa legale, significa che coloro che scappano da guerre e persecuzioni avrebbero la possibilità di non mettere la propria vita nelle mani di criminali senza scrupoli, significa contrastare il traffico di esseri umani, le traversate e i morti in mare e la pressione dei flussi migratori sulle frontiere esterne.

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, du détroit de Gibraltar aux îles grecques, de Lampedusa aux rivages de Calabre, l'Europe subit une déferlante migratoire et, depuis plusieurs années, pour des raisons basement économiques, l'oligarchie européenne organise sciemment cette invasion.

Mais pourquoi vous obstinez-vous donc à ne pas reconnaître que les milliers de clandestins qui meurent chaque année en tentant la traversée sont victimes de vos propres politiques? Il y a 100 ans, la funeste révolution bolchévique plongeait la Russie dans un régime totalitaire, violent et liberticide. Plusieurs pays ont suivi cette terrible voie. Celle choisie par l'Union européenne est aussi néfaste que celle prise par l'ex-Union soviétique. Les peuples de l'Est qui ont subi le joug communiste ne s'y trompent pas, eux.

Finissons-en avec ces politiques d'immigration sapant la cohésion de nos peuples et mettant gravement en péril notre civilisation. Ayez enfin le courage de prendre des mesures dissuasives, de mettre fin à la collusion entre trafiquants et ONG pseudo-humanitaires et de renvoyer les embarcations clandestines. Bref, ayez le courage d'avoir du courage.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αντιμετώπιση του μεταναστευτικού αποτελεί τη μεγαλύτερη διαχρονικά αποτυχία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως. Μία αποτυχία τις συνέπειες της οποίας υφίστανται οι σημερινές γενεές και δεν ξέρουμε πόσες ακόμη στο μέλλον. Από τη στιγμή κατά την οποία η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έπεσε θύμα του λαϊκιστικού συνθήματος «δεν θα κάνουμε την Ευρώπη φρούριο» και αφαίρεσε από τις χώρες υποδοχής και των εξωτερικών συνόρων, δηλαδή την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα, το δικαίωμα να προστατεύσουν τα σύνορά τους, προέκυψε αυτή η πλημμυρίδα, αυτή η εισβολή των παρανόμων μεταναστών, η οποία δημιουργεί τα προβλήματα που αναφέραμε. Κατ' αυτόν τον τρόπο, οι άνθρωποι αυτοί ζουν κάτω από άθλιες συνθήκες και στην Ελλάδα και στην Ιταλία. Έτσι, οι λαϊκιστές πέτυχαν μια μεγάλη νίκη. Δεν έγινε η Ευρώπη φρούριο, έγινε όμως ένα τεράστιο στρατόπεδο συγκεντρώσεως εξαθλιωμένων και δυστυχών ανθρώπων που ζουν κάτω από άθλιες συνθήκες. Όμως, οι λαϊκιστές της αριστεράς δεν φιλοξενούν τους ανθρώπους αυτούς στα σπίτια τους, ούτε τους τροφοδοτούν. Αυτό το κάνουμε εμείς, οι οποίοι αγαπούμε με την πατρίδα μας και οι οποίοι θα τη σώσουμε την πατρίδα μας διότι έχουμε αποτελεσματικό και ορθό τρόπο αντιμετώπισεως...

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)

Kinga Gál (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Az embercsempészet felszámolásához az illegális migrációt az Unió határain kívül kell megállítani. Csak olyan menekültügyi rendszer lehet hatékony, amely szét tudja választani az illegális gazdasági bevándorlókat a valóban menekültstátuszra jogosultaktól még az Unión kívül.

Kristálytisztává kell tenni, hogy csak a valódi menekültek léphetnek, vagy kaphatnak menekültügyi státuszt az Unió területén. Minden más megoldást az Unióba való meghívásként értelmeznek az illegális migránsok ezrei. Ennek elérése céljából a menekült központokat az Unió határain kívül kell felállítani, ahol lehetővé kell tenni a menedékjog iránti kérelmek feldolgozását. Közben pedig mindenek fölött védenünk kell az Unió külső határait. Ebben segítenünk kell pénzügyileg is a külső határokat védő tagállamokat, különben további emberéletek lesznek a tenger vagy a sivatag áldozatai, mert mára köztudott: az embercsempészet még a drogkeresedelemnél nagyobb biznisszé nőtte ki magát az elmúlt években. Csak így zúzhatjuk szét a migrációs válságból egyre többet profitáló embercsempészek üzleti modelljét és növekvő befolyását.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Úr! Nem szeretünk erről beszélni, de mindannyian tudjuk, hogy a Földközi-tenger az elmúlt évek során menekültek tízezreinek a tömegsírjává vált. Néha fölkapjuk a fejünket egy-egy borzalmas tragédia kapcsán, de aztán minden megy tovább úgy, mint azelőtt ment. Mára világosan kell látni, hogy zsákutcába jutottunk. Nyilvánvaló, hogy az embercsempészet ellen minden rendelkezésünkre álló eszközzel harcolni kell. De azt is világosan kell látni, hogy sem a legelrettetőbb határvédelem, sem a menekülteket segítő NGO-k elleni indokolatlan vádaskodás nem fogja ezt a helyzetet föl- vagy megoldani. Azt kellene végre megértenünk, hogy pusztán a határok lezárásával, a minél szigorúbb ellenőrzéssel nem fogjuk tudni megoldani ezt a helyzetet.

A közös európai menekültügyi politika csak akkor lesz képes működni, ha a tagállamok végre félreteszik az önös szempontjaikat, és valóban közös politikát akarnak. Amíg egyszerűen tudomásul vesszük azt, hogy vannak tagállamok, amelyek minden következmény nélkül megtagadhatják a közös politikában való részvételt, addig nem fog történni az égvilágon semmi. Tusk úrnak a visegrádi országok elutasító menekültügyi politikájával kapcsolatos megértő megjegyzései pedig csak a közös európai politikai ellenzőit segítik.

Az Európai Parlament az elmúlt másfél év során számos jelentést, indítványt terjesztett elő, készített elő, amelyeknek az implementálása megteremthetné a szabályozott legális utakat kínáló bevándorlás és menekültügyi politika kereteit. Hogy nem történik semmiféle-fajta előrelépés, annak egyetlen oka van, nevezetesen, hogy a Tanács semmiféle hajlandóságot sem mutat komoly tárgyalásokra, képtelen egységes álláspontot kialakítani. Pedig minden további késedelem az embercsempészek malmára hajtja a vizet, és tudnunk kell, hogy senki, de senki sem bújhat ki a közös felelősség alól, még a Tanács sem.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, Mr Preda is mistaken. Poland has accepted around one million migrants without relying on the EU mechanism. On the eve of the EU-Africa summit, I acknowledged the heart-breaking poverty and the huge violence on the continent. I therefore welcome the Trust Fund for Africa and other endeavours to diminish both disasters.

Based on said experience, I pay tribute to Europol, Frontex, EUNAVFOR MED operation SOPHIA, NATO and EU Member States, such as Italy and Greece, for their endeavours to manage the migration problem and to eradicate both illegal migration and the criminal activity associated with it.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όσο συνεχίζονται με ευθύνη της Ένωσης οι πόλεμοι, οι ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβατικές πολιτικές, η φτώχεια, η καταπάτηση του δικαιώματος των λαών για κυριαρχία επί των φυσικών τους πόρων και οι επιπτώσεις από τις κλιματικές αλλαγές, όλο και περισσότεροι άνθρωποι θα αναγκάζονται να μεταναστεύουν. Αυτοί που αποκαλείτε παράνομους μετανάστες είναι οι άνθρωποι που εξαναγκάστηκαν να αφήσουν τα σπίτια τους για να γίνουν θύματα των διακινητών στη Μεσόγειο, για να σώσουν τα παιδιά τους. Όσο η Ένωση συνεχίζει να τους αντιμετωπίζει ως εγκληματίες, το μόνο που θα κατορθώνει είναι να ενισχύονται τα ακροδεξιά κινήματα και να αυξάνονται τα κυκλώματα των διακινητών. Πόσοι ακόμα πρόσφυγες πρέπει να πεθάνουν αβοήθητοι για να πάνσουν οι ξενοφοβικές ρατσιστικές προεγγίσεις της Ένωσης; Η συνεχιζόμενη τραγωδία θέτει όλο και πιο επιτακτικά την ανάγκη η Ένωση να προχωρήσει σε μια ριζική αναθεώρηση της μεταναστευτικής πολιτικής, να καταπολεμηθούν δηλαδή οι αιτίες που δημιουργούν τη μετανάστευση και το προσφυγικό. Για μας πρέπει να καταργηθεί ή να αρθεί άμεσα η απαράδεκτη συμφωνία ανταλλαγής προσφύγων με την Τουρκία, να ενισχυθεί η ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια, να καταργηθεί το Δουβλίνο II, να δημιουργηθούν ασφαλείς και νόμιμες οδοί και να υπάρξει ένα δίκτυο ανακατανομής και μετεγκατάστασης των προσφύγων.

Patrick O'Flynn (EFDD). – Mr President, irregular or illegal immigration is a political disaster. It undermines the positive case for controlled immigration, it is corrosive of public trust and it rewards law-breakers, as opposed to honest applicants who have stuck to the rules. It follows that facilitating or encouraging, even indirectly, the flow of irregular migration is the height of political irresponsibility.

Yet this is what many senior European politicians have done: from Mrs Merkel inviting everyone to Germany and then seeking to strong-arm her neighbours into bailing her out, to those campaigning against the Dublin rules that quite reasonably expect asylum applicants to lodge their claims in the first safe country they reach.

The answer to the Mediterranean migration crisis is not to force other EU countries to take in those being sheltered by Italy or Greece. That will merely add to the pull factors which already lure so many young men from Africa and the Middle East to Europe. No, the solution is to intercept the boats coming from Libya and elsewhere, and to escort them back to their points of embarkation.

Irregular migrants need to be seen to be losers – not losers of their lives, like so many have been in recent years – but losers in their battle to circumvent the rule of law. Only that way will public confidence be restored.

Angelo Ciocca (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi tre anni l'Europa ha speso, ha buttato, qualcosa come oltre 20 miliardi di euro di faticose tasse dei cittadini europei in politiche folli di accoglienza.

Allora è doveroso chiedersi: quali sono stati gli effetti? Le risposte sono sotto gli occhi di tutti: più povertà, più insicurezza, più delinquenza, più attentati. Allora serve riflettere se i 20 miliardi spesi in questi tre anni sono stati una cura o hanno alimentato la malattia del problema. Bisogna riflettere se i 20 miliardi di un bottino così ricco sono stati un elemento che ha alimentato il *business* dell'accoglienza, che ha determinato gli effetti negativi di questa accoglienza.

E direi che sbagliare è umano ma perseverare è diabolico, quindi è fondamentale smettere di buttare denaro pubblico nell'accoglienza criminale e continua e cambiare politiche. Dico «sì» a tendere la mano, a investire in aiuto a 2 euro al giorno nei paesi di provenienza; dico «no» a buttare 40 euro al giorno in accoglienza folle in questo paese.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawa jest poważna, słucham tego z rozbawieniem. Po pierwsze, chciałbym wyjaśnić lewicy, że nielegalny imigrant nie ma nic wspólnego z rasizmem. To jest po prostu człowiek, który nie ma ważnego paszportu i wizy. Sam byłem kilka razy nielegalnie w jakimś kraju. W Stanach Zjednoczonych jest kilkaset tysięcy nielegalnych imigrantów z Polski i nie ma w tym oczywiście żadnego rasizmu.

Po drugie, odnoszę wrażenie, że lewica tak nienawidzi przedsiębiorczości, że bardziej martwi ich fakt, że przemytnicy zarabiają na tym procederze, niż interesuje ich problem imigrantów. Nawet pan Preda wyraził się, że nienawidzi przemytników, którzy na tym procederze zarabiają pieniądze. Po prostu nienawidzi kapitalizmu.

A teraz pomówmy o sprawie poważnie. Przyczyną zła są zasiłki. Socjalizm jest to ustrój, w którym bohaterstwo pokonuje się trudności nieznane w żadnym innym ustroju. Gdyby nie było zasiłków socjalnych, nie byłoby imigrantów. Nie byłoby również demoralizacji Europejczyków, którzy pobierają te same zasiłki. Czas zlikwidować zasiłki socjalne i problem imigrantów zostanie sprowadzony do normalnych rozmiarów: będą przyjeżdżali tylko ci imigranci, którzy chcą uczciwie pracować.

President. – If only it were so simple.

Barbara Matera (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'invasione a cui abbiamo assistito negli scorsi anni ha reso il dibattito infuocato e ci ha diviso immensamente. Il valore aggiunto di un accordo di compromesso, basato su una condivisione delle responsabilità, era e resta l'unica soluzione possibile.

L'Italia come territorio di confine ha messo in gioco la propria stabilità interna per arginare i flussi. Abbiamo più volte richiesto l'intervento della comunità internazionale e dell'Unione per aiutarci a fronteggiare questa emergenza. Sono convinta che il vero fenomeno da contrastare è la criminalità organizzata, che lucra sul traffico e finanzia il terrorismo.

Secondo dati forniti dalla Commissione europea il 79 % delle vittime di traffico sono destinate a prostituzione e sfruttamento sessuale, ma se da un lato dobbiamo con forza condannare i trafficanti e proteggere le vittime, dall'altro se non ci fosse la domanda non ci sarebbe mercato. E allora, in questo caso, sono sempre stata una *fan* e ho sempre apprezzato il modello nordico e, soprattutto, la criminalizzazione del cliente: più siamo rigidi e con noi stessi e meno interessi ci saranno in gioco.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea negli ultimi anni ha dimostrato tutta la propria fragilità politica nel fronteggiare più che una crisi migratoria una crisi che definirei istituzionale nella gestione del flusso dei migranti. Non si risponde al tema dell'immigrazione illegale pensando a politiche di chiusura e di esternalizzazione del controllo delle frontiere nei confronti di chi fugge da guerra e miseria.

Il Consiglio, nel recente *summit*, ha dichiarato di essere pronto a vigilare su tutte le rotte migratorie, ma si continua a sottovalutare il fatto che le nuove rotte verso l'Europa potrebbero rivelarsi più pericolose delle precedenti e soprattutto si continua a non vedere che, nel frattempo, a fare le spese di una politica non all'altezza sono decine di migliaia di migranti vittime di stupri, detenzioni illegali e abusi di ogni sorta.

Ora appare evidente, a differenza di ciò che immagina nella sua complessa attività onirica l'onorevole Salvini, la necessità di un cambiamento di approccio, che affronti le sfide strutturali che sono alla radice di questo processo, quali il sottosviluppo, la crescita demografica, le disuguaglianze, l'assenza di opportunità, i cambiamenti climatici, e la necessità di governare tale processo attraverso il rafforzamento della legislazione comune in materia di asilo e immigrazione.

Solo un approccio coordinato, basato sui principi di solidarietà, condivisione equa delle responsabilità e forti investimenti finanziari, potrà fornire risultati tangibili in questa sfida decisiva per la stessa Europa.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Wir sprechen hier über Menschen schmuggel. Wir sprechen über das Schlepperwesen.

Die Regelverstöße, die Gesetzesverstöße, die hier so viele Redner beklagt haben, das ist ja nur eine Seite der Medaille. Die andere und viel fürchterlichere Seite der Medaille ist der Verlust an menschlichem Leben, den wir sehen: wenn Menschen von Schleppern in Boote geschickt werden, die nicht seetüchtig sind, wenn sie zum Teil bewusst in den Tod getrieben werden, weil das Steuer festgestellt wird, wenn zu wenig Trinkwasser an Bord ist und ähnliche Dinge mehr.

Gegen dieses Schlepperunwesen, gegen diese Kriminellen, gegen diese Mörder muss man etwas tun. Da vermisste ich die Initiativen. Warum gehen wir nicht so vor, wie wir auch mit der Ergreifung von Mördern in der Europäischen Union umgehen, indem wir Belohnungen aussetzen für diejenigen, die zur Ergreifung dieser Mörder beitragen? Warum loben wir nicht Geld – viel Geld – für all diejenigen Flüchtlinge aus, die, bevor sie ein solches Boot betreten, Anzeige erstatten und sagen: Da sind die Schlepper – nehmt diese Leute fest.

Warum kooperieren wir in den entsprechenden Ländern nicht mit den Polizeibehörden, indem wir sagen: Wir loben das Geld aus, ihr nehmt die Leute fest, und dann führen wir sie der Gerechtigkeit zu?

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, la inmigración podrá darse por vía legal o por vía irregular, pero nunca jamás un ser humano puede ser considerado ilegal. Estas categorías solo generan peligrosos muros invisibles contruidos sobre la estigmatización de la población migrante, como, por ejemplo, el vergonzante título de este debate, que destila la xenofobia propia de los fascistas con corbata. Esto también lo hace la Unión Europea, que constantemente habla también de migrantes ilegales.

La solución es dar un giro de 180 grados a la política exterior migratoria y de fronteras de la «Europa fortaleza», que es la que realmente estimula el negocio del tráfico de personas en el Mediterráneo. Las mafias son el incendio que tenemos que apagar, pero las políticas migratorias de la «Europa fortaleza» son las gasolinas que mantienen vivo ese incendio.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident, meine Damen und Herren! Zuerst einmal müssen wir eine gemeinsame Definition haben, und deswegen ist es wirklich an der Zeit, ein gemeinsames europäisches Asylrecht zu schaffen und auf diese Art und Weise eine gemeinsame Definition zu haben und dies möglicherweise auch mit einem Einwanderungsgesetz zu verbinden.

Zweitens möchte ich sagen: Frau Merkel hat nicht alle eingeladen, sie lässt aber auch Menschen nicht sterben. In Polen sind eine Million Arbeitsmigranten aus der Ukraine, so wie Hunderttausende von Arbeitsmigranten aus Polen in Deutschland sind – bitte das nicht anrechnen.

Zu den Fragen selbst möchte ich noch einmal sagen: Wir müssen deutlich machen, dass diejenigen, die vor Krieg flüchten, und diejenigen, die im klassischen Asylsinne um ihr Leben fürchten müssen, Schutz haben. Das ist menschliche und rechtliche Verpflichtung! Wir müssen sehen, ob das an anderer Stelle gemacht werden kann als auf unserem Boden. Aber wir haben hier einen grundsätzlichen Anspruch, den man nicht leugnen kann und bei dem man nicht alles unter ein Dach bringen kann.

Wir müssen feststellen, dass wir bei einem illegalen Eintritt natürlich die Außengrenzen schützen müssen, was wir in diesem Europäischen Parlament seit Jahren fordern, seit 15 Jahren bereits, schon im Verfassungskonvent – es haben damals Mitgliedstaaten nicht mitgemacht wegen Kompetenzwut Europas – ein Scheitern der Mitgliedstaaten in dieser Frage, und zwar aller miteinander – und wir müssen sehen, dass wir besser die Ursachen bekämpfen. Besser, um fähiger zu sein, Kriege zu beenden und eine anständige Afrikapolitik zu machen und nicht eine solche lausige wie bisher.

Und wir müssen mit den Küstenländern kooperieren. Wir haben mit der Türkei eine Vereinbarung, und die Türkei geht gegen die Menschenhändler vor. Deswegen gibt es aus der Türkei heute 92 % weniger Flüchtlinge als vor drei Jahren. Gleichzeitig unterstützen wir die Flüchtlinge in der Türkei. Das ist der richtige Weg, und hier haben wir erste Ansätze in Bezug auf Afrika; mit Libyen ist es unter Umständen sehr viel schwerer, aber hier sind Fortschritte vorhanden, die sich sehen lassen. In diesem Sommer waren es 81 % weniger Flüchtlinge aus Afrika als im Sommer zuvor, aber wir können auch Griechenland und Italien nicht ohne Solidarität lassen.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa, dopo una latitanza molto lunga, sta ora facendo alcuni progressi e noi chiediamo che gli Stati membri, la Commissione e il Consiglio si impegnino molto rapidamente a mantenere le promesse.

Ma per molto tempo, dicevo, il mio paese, l'Italia, è stato lasciato solo, quel paese qui criticato per un misero ed evidente scampolo di campagna elettorale, qui in Europa, per l'Italia.

Soli abbiamo fatto la ricerca, l'accoglienza, il salvataggio. Altro che parlare di *business*: si offendono quelle migliaia di cittadini, quelle associazioni, quel volontariato, anche cattolico in gran parte, quegli enti locali che hanno saputo accogliere. Abbiamo fatto tutto il lavoro anche sui paesi di transito e di origine, con faticosi accordi; abbiamo orgogliosamente dettato l'agenda in Europa per la politica della migrazione, affrontando l'emergenza e risalendo alle cause. Il *Migration Compact*, il piano per l'Africa e il piano Juncker ci sono perché qualche paese li ha chiesti; abbiamo lavorato per la riforma di Dublino, altro che fare qualche sparata e poi andarsene. Qui, giorno per giorno, nelle commissioni e nel rapporto quotidiano con i colleghi, abbiamo ottenuto alcune cose.

E mi lasci dire un'ultima parola, Presidente, con un po' di generosità come ha fatto con il collega Brok. Ho sentito evocare persino i valori cristiani per selezionare chi far entrare e chi no. Ora, io sono cristiana, e a me la religione ha insegnato l'apertura e l'accoglienza, non il rifiuto e magari l'odio per il diverso.

President. – One word about timing. When you are in a position such as this, you are above all a timekeeper. But we are in a parliament in which communication is the most important thing, so we must strike a balance between keeping to the time and permitting and facilitating communication.

That is why I am trying not to stop immediately when the time is over, and to let the person finish the ideas, because in the end the communication amongst ourselves is the most important thing. If I don't manage to keep that balance all the time, well, it happens and I apologise for that. But this is my philosophy, so you should know that and we should all contribute towards making this work.

Roberts Zīle (ECR). – Mr President, I will try to keep this communication in order.

Vicepriekšsēdētāja kungs! Diemžēl tik daudz laika vajadzēja, lai vairāk Eiropas līderiem 2015. gada migrācijas krīze liktu saprast, ka tā lielā mērā ir krimināla biznesa organizēta krīze, un saprast to, kādi soļi būtu jāseker. Risinājumi, kas tika piedāvāti, manuprāt, neiztur kritiku, kaut vai piemērs ar pārvietošanas shēmu. Mana valsts, Latvija, kvotu ietvaros pieņēma samērā daudz migrantu, bet neviens no viņiem nav palicis Latvijā, jo viņi, protams, aizbrauca uz tām dalībvalstīm, par kurām bija samaksāts kriminālajiem noziedzniekiem un kurās viņi vēlas dzīvot, visbiežāk — uz Vāciju.

Tātad šāda sistēma neder, un tā tikai radija spriedzi daudzu Eiropas dalībvalstu starpā. Par šeit dzirdēto jauno piedāvājumu — par legālo imigrāciju. Vai mēs padomājam — ja mēs paņemsim labākos cilvēkus No Āfrikas valstīm, tad ko mēs atstājam tajās valstīs? Kas paliks? Mēs īstenībā ciniski iztukšosim Āfrikas valstu nākotni, ja mēs tādā veidā rīkosimies.

President. – Perfect timing!

Milan Zver (PPE). – Migrācija šo pēc terorisma najbolj pereče vprašanje evropske javnosti. To moramo razumeti kot naročilo politiki, da naredi vse, kar je mogoče, da se nezakonite migrācije zajezi.

Statistika kažejo, da smo v zadnjem letu in pol nekoliko uspešnejši v boju proti ilegalnim migrantom ter zlasti tihotapcem. Mnogi se skrivajo za nevladnimi organizācijām in rekrutirājo migrānte za donosen posel. Učinkovit nadzor zunanje meje postāja eksistencialno vprašanje Evropske unije. V zadnjem āsu sprejemamo vrsto ukrepov kot na primer paket pametnih meja, reformirāmo azilni sistem, krepimo, āprav poāsi, evropsko mejno in obalno stražo. Vsekākor morāmo poveāati āpornost Unije in drāzav ālanic na prihodnje krize.

Obstāja realna moānost, da se bo spet āprla balkānska pot. Sistem vracānja iz Grāije v Turāijo ne deluje dobro, ker grāiski organi niso sposābni procesirati drugostopenjskih pritoāb glede prošenj za mednarodno zašāito. Zato se kapacitete na otokih nevarno krāijo. Poslādiāno se ponovno āpira verjetnost selitve na grāisko kopno in potem seveda nadalje na sever. Tihotāpci, ki rekrutirājo v Turāiji, so spet dejāvnēji. Kako nestābilni ādnosi so s turāisko vlādo pa tako āli tako vemo. Zato bi morāli opozoriti balkānske drāzave na nevarnost novih valov ilegalnih migrācij.

Upāma, da se bo Unija in njene drāzave ālanice tokrat drāgāāe ādzvale na ta posel, ād katerega imājo koristi ā tihotāpci in drāzave, ki āe āalj āsa destabilizirājo Evropsko unijo.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Seāor presidente, como ponente permanente de ayuda humanitaria de este Parlamento, rechazo el enfoque que ha dado quien ha propuesto este debate. Un enfoque de xenofobia cultural envuelto en algunas pinceladas de cristianismo farisaico. Este es un asunto complejo y no puede abordarse simplemente tratando los sīntomas de uno de sus componentes.

Necesitamos una respuesta global que aborde las causas con inversiones potentes en los paīses de origen y trānsito; que abra vīas para el acceso humanitario y tambiān para la inmigrāciān āordenada; que combata a los traficantes y los persiga; que respete los derechos humanos de quienes llegan a nuestras fronteras y que promueva polīticas de integrāciān en los paīses donde esos emigrantes se establezcan. Ese es un enfoque global y es un compromiso para toda la Uniān Europea.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, нелегалната миграция е заплаха. Заплаха е за правовия ред, за сигурността на държавите членки на Европейския съюз. Тези, които подкрепят нелегална имиграция, те вършат престъпления. Незаконното, нелегално минаване на граници на всяка една държава навсякъде по света е престъпление и това би трябвало да го знаят добре културните марксисти и болшевиките от другата страна на залата. Нещо повече, те го знаят, но се правят, че не разбират.

Когато една неправителствена организация подпомага нелегалната емиграция, подпомага незаконното преминаване на граници, тя също извършва престъпление. И тук идва и другият въпрос: Къде е отговорността на така наречените лидери на Европейските държави? Отговорността на г-жа Меркел, която като истински популист първо покани всички, след това се отрече от думите си. Къде е отговорността на тези, които казват, че някой насила трябва да приеме някого в дома си? Нима тези наши колеги, днеска в залата, са приели поне един нелегален имигрант в техния дом? Не, не са. Затова говоренето по този начин е лъжа и лицемерие, и на това трябва да се сложи край.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, het is niet de eerste keer dat we dit debat voeren en het zal ook niet de laatste keer zijn. De strijd tegen illegale migratie, het aanpakken van mensensmokkel en het beschermen van onze buitengrenzen blijft onverminderd belangrijk, ook nu de instroom de laatste maanden sterk is afgenomen. Want die instroom is afgenomen, en dat komt ook door de inspanningen hier op Europees niveau, inspanningen die in de toekomst broodnodig blijven.

Maar inspanningen is misschien een beetje een lastig woord voor de aanvragers van dit debat. Het is ook veel aantrekkelijker om vanuit het extreemrechtse hoekje daar in het Parlement een beetje boos te doen, kritiek te leveren en vooral voor veel belastinggeld lucht te verplaatsen tussen Brussel en Straatsburg. Maar de Europese burger schiet daar niks mee op. Verbeterde registratie van asielzoekers: u stemt daartegen. Buitengrenzen beter beschermen: u stemt daartegen. Reisdocumenten voor de terugkeer van illegale migranten: tegen. Een PNR-richtlijn voor onze veiligheid: tegen. Politiesamenwerking versterken: tegen. Een inreis-uitreisstelsel, vuurwapenrichtlijn, EU-terreurrichtlijn: tegen, tegen, tegen. En weet u wat het ergste is? Als we dit soort wetgeving in onze parlementaire vergaderruimtes bespreken, dan komt u over het algemeen niet eens opdagen. Óf u vindt het eigenlijk niet belangrijk genoeg, óf u bent gewoon te lui om te werken. Een beetje roepen langs de zijlijn zonder ooit ook maar iets bij te dragen, daar bent u heel goed in. Maar het is gelukkig een politiek businessmodel dat z'n beste tijd gehad heeft. Onze burgers verdienen beter.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volete davvero combattere il traffico di esseri umani ed evitare lo sfruttamento? C'è solo un modo per farlo: aprire vie legali e sicure per l'accesso all'Unione e a tutti gli Stati membri. Solo così si eviterà che l'unico punto di accesso all'UE siano Italia e Grecia su rotte pericolosissime affidate ai trafficanti.

È molto ipocrita parlare di immigrazione irregolare quando né per chi chiede asilo né per chi cerca di sopravvivere alla fame ci sono modi di venire legalmente, perché le politiche di immigrazione degli Stati membri sono del tutto inadeguate, compresa quella italiana, che l'on. Salvini conosce bene perché si chiama Bossi-Fini.

La destra è regina d'ipocrisia, perché quando votiamo soluzioni di equa condivisione delle responsabilità sull'accoglienza, che renderebbero il fenomeno facilmente gestibile per tutti, come su Dublino, non partecipa al negoziato e poi vota contro. Ecco, fa la voce grossa contro gli irregolari, ma non contro chi li impiega nelle proprie aziende, dice «aiutiamoli a casa loro» e poi vota contro gli aiuti allo sviluppo. Se cercate le ragioni per cui le persone scappano le troverete molto più vicino a voi di quanto pensiate. Ad esempio, lo sapete che i paesi africani negli ultimi cinquant'anni hanno perso mille miliardi di dollari di evasione ed elusione fiscale delle multinazionali?

Servono politiche europee coerenti in materia di sviluppo e commercio. Ecco, c'è molto da fare in casa nostra per affrontare le ragioni delle partenze.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Słuchając wystąpienia przedstawiciela Rady i Komisji, Pana Komisarza zastanawiałem się, dlaczego niektóre tak oczywiste środki zostały zaproponowane i są stosowane tak późno. Wszyscy pamiętamy rok 2015, w którym usłyszeliśmy od bardzo ważnej polityk europejskiej, że nie da się chronić granic jej kraju, granic zewnętrznych Unii. Od tego czasu wiele się zmieniło. To efekt oporu społeczeństw krajów członkowskich i ostatnich wyborów w wielu tych krajach. Nie da się lekceważyć głosu narodu w tak fundamentalnej sprawie. Pozostaje tylko mieć nadzieję, że także z propozycji reformy konwencji dublińskiej znikną oderwane od życia utopijne treści, gdyż nie możemy zaprosić do Unii Europejskiej milionów ludzi, by potem sprawdzać indywidualnie ich uprawnienia do uzyskania azylu. Przypomnę jeszcze, że sprawy związane z legalną imigracją należą do kompetencji państw członkowskich, a nie Unii Europejskiej.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, caros e caros Colegas, lutar contra a imigração ilegal e o tráfico de seres humanos tem de ser uma prioridade. E não apenas no Mediterrâneo. Mas o grande desafio do Mediterrâneo está no fluxo de refugiados que fogem da guerra e sobre os quais nós temos um dever de proteção.

Infelizmente, dezenas de milhares de pessoas morreram, nos últimos anos, ao procurar refúgio no nosso Continente.

O verdadeiro debate, a discussão honesta sobre o Mediterrâneo, tem de centrar-se na resposta à crise humanitária, na luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos e na criação de vias legais de acesso.

Foi por isso que, logo em 2013, impusemos que Busca e Salvamento fossem prioridades nas operações da Frontex. Foi por isso que capacitámos melhor esta agência e a Europol para o combate ao tráfico. E também foi por isso que, recentemente, este Parlamento aprovou a sua posição para um mecanismo de reinstalação de refugiados de países terceiros e para o novo regulamento de Dublin.

O Parlamento teve razão quando insistiu numa abordagem holística e não unisectorial com o relatório das colegas Metsola e Kyenge. Salvar vidas, vias legais de acesso e luta contra o crime: estas têm de ser todas, sem exceção, as nossas prioridades.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, oko sto tisuća migranata stiglo je samo ove godine u Italiju, a libijska obalna straža presrela je 16,5 tisuća migranata. Uvjeti života onih koji stignu u Europu već su dovoljno teški, a dolazi zima. Prije dva tjedna, samo u jednoj akciji spašeno je preko 600 migranata, od čega 200 djece. Svi su oni povjerali svoje živote i živote svojih obitelji krijumčarima ljudi. Ove godine čak 2 500 migranata smrtno je stradalo u Sredozemnom moru, koje već dugo predstavlja najsmrtonosnije more na svijetu.

Istodobno, jedino konkretno oko čega se Vijeće usuglasilo su mehanizmi za jaču kontrolu vanjskih granica. Prošlotjedni zaključci o sredozemnoj ruti prepuni deklaracija to najbolje dokazuju. Krajnje je vrijeme za konkretnu solidarnost među članicama, ali i konkretne mehanizme jačanja europske zajedničke i sigurnosne politike. Europska unija treba evoluirati od donatora do kreatora međunarodne politike – *from payer to player*. Mora osnažiti svoju prisutnost na razorenim područjima. Dugoročno rješenje uvijek je tamo gdje problem nastaje.

Frank Engel (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, je commencerai par dire que j'ai déjà entendu des discours plus désagréables de notre collègue Salvini. Il a eu la bonté, aujourd'hui, de nous dire que, désormais, il est en faveur de la migration légale, ce qui est mieux que d'être en défaveur de toute forme de migration, et qu'il accepte l'existence de femmes et d'enfants, au moins, qui, véritablement, fuient guerre, misère, menaces, mort et absence de perspectives, et que ceux-là ont besoin de la protection que nous avons le droit et le devoir de leur conférer. C'est un progrès, pour la Lega Nord, ce n'est pas mal!

Je dois quand même dire que nous continuerons probablement encore pendant très longtemps à nous pencher sur les prétendues causes profondes de la migration, alors que nous semblons passer à côté de quelques aspects essentiels de cette affaire.

Avec tous les fonds que nous avons mis en œuvre et que nous mettons actuellement en œuvre en Afrique, nous avons levé actuellement, si tout va bien, 5 milliards qui, nous l'espérons, vont se multiplier pour constituer 40-45 milliards à l'horizon 2020, pour être investis en faveur du développement de l'Afrique.

La Chine, à elle seule, a investi en 2016 plus de 40 milliards en Afrique, et continuera, bien évidemment, de le faire de plus belle en 2017, en 2018, en 2019, en 2020. Ce n'est pas un hasard si les Africains regardent vers nous avec plus de scepticisme, sur le plan du développement, que vers la Chine, à l'heure actuelle. Ce n'est pas bon pour nous et ce n'est pas bon pour nos desseins en ce qui concerne la migration en Afrique. Il faudra revoir notre copie.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Sur President, fil-fatt illum qeghdin nitkellmu dwar il-ġlied kontra t-traffikar tal-persuni, u ġlied bħal din trid tibda minn fuq l-art u mhux tiffoka biss fuq il-baħar. Għalfajn qed ngħid hekk? Għax l-Unjoni Ewropea kkoncentrat hafna drabi, u wisq, l-isforzi tagħha fuq missjonijiet navali imma r-riżultat li dawn l-operazzjonijiet hallow ma kienx dak mistenni.

Perežempju Operation Sophia ġiet mahluqa biex tkisser il-mudell kummerċjali tat-traffikanti tal-persuni. Izda t-traffikar ta' nies qed ikompli bla xkiel fil-baħar Mediterranju. Jidher bl-aktar mod ċar li t-traffikanti tal-persuni qed ibiddu l-pjan kummerċjali tagħhom skont kif l-Unjoni Ewropea tkun qed twieġeb għall-kriżi tal-immigrazzjoni. Aghar minn hekk, ifisser ukoll li l-kriminali wara dawn iċ-ċrieki tat-traffikar ta' persuni, li huma mifruxa u pankontinentali, qegħdin dejjem ikunu pass 'il quddiem.

Ahna nistghu u għandna l-obbligu li nkissru dan il-mudell kummerċjali ta' kriminali li qed jagħmlu tant flus minn fuq it-traffikar ta' persuni. U allura, huwa proprju għal din ir-raġuni li nemmen li l-Unjoni Ewropea trid tiffoka l-isforzi tagħha fuq il-Libja u fuq l-Istati Membri billi tinvestiga, jekk hemm bżonn anke bl-ghajnuna ta' forzi internazzjonali, dawn iċ-ċrieki kriminali.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, návrhy na řešení migrační krize se množí jako houby po dešti. Na jedno však všechny tyto diskuse zapoměly. Je to potřeba osobní empatie politiků. Obávám se, že nedostatek osobního citění a autopsie brzdí i řešení takových problémů, jako je migrace.

Jsou to novináři, kteří se objeví v místě vznikajícího konfliktu během několika hodin či dní, zatímco politici se odhodlají ke zkoumání vzniklého problému na místě často, až když se požár rozhořel. Dovolte mi příklad. Kocem svého předsednictví zakázal Martin Schulz odjezd delegace poslanců Evropského parlamentu do ukrajinského Donbasu. Odvolával se na obavu o jejich bezpečnost. Jakoby v té době na Donbase nepracovaly stovky novinářů, jakoby tam nežily stovky tisíc lidí včetně žen a dětí. Předseda Evropského parlamentu zabránil poslancům EP, aby si empatii uprostřed tak zásadního konfliktu uvědomili.

Totéž uprchlíci ve Středomoří. Naprostá většina migrantů je pašována z Libye. Jen v centru pašeráků v přístavu Sabratha čeká dnes na přepravu na dvacet tisíc lidí. V západní Libyi včetně Sabrathy přitom operují desítky novinářů. A já se ptám: Jak je to možné, že delegace Evropského parlamentu v Libyi, de facto velvyslanectví Evropského parlamentu v Libyi, nemá stálé zastoupení na území Libye, nýbrž v Tunisu? Odpovědí mi může být: V Tripolisu není bezpečno. Pravda.

Odvahu, dámy a pánové! Odvahu vyžaduje i politika řešení migrační krize, včetně té ve Středozemním moři.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já myslím, že kolega Štětina mi tak trochu nahrál, protože já jsem na rozdíl od mnohých po řadě uprchlických táborů skutečně jezdil. A skutečně jsem tyto uprchlické tábory navštívil a měl jsem možnost se setkat i s lidmi, kteří byli obětí různých pašeráků. A většinou to byli lidé, kteří byli nevzdělaní, velmi chudí a kteří toužili vlastně přijít do Evropy a žít jako jejich příbuzní, kteří sdíleli třeba i záměrně nebo omylem fotografie nebo nějaká videa, která ukazovala, že v Evropě je skvělý život. Tito lidé většinou naletěli. Naletěli nejdříve slibu nějakých pašeráků, pak svým domněnkám a své nevzdělanosti a svým pocitům, že někde se budou mít lépe.

Já si myslím, že tak jako dneska se podařilo v některých členských státech vytvořit weby, které informují o tom, jaká je skutečná situace v Evropské unii, tak bychom měli i jako Evropská unie se snažit působit na lidi, kteří jsou obětmi pašeráků, aby nechodili do evropských států a nedávali peníze těmto organizovaným skupinám, protože ty neustále rostou. Když se podíváme na satelitní snímky v Libyi, kde, jak říkal kolega, je velice nebezpečno, tak můžeme vidět, jak domy některých pašeráků neustále rostou.

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you for this debate. There seems to be a broad consensus on the need to step up the fight against smugglers and irregular migration. We are on the right track, but we have to remain vigilant and implement all actions to stem irregular migratory flow towards Europe.

We can assure that the Commission will continue its work to save lives, to put in place safe and legal pathways, to fight smuggling and to protect our external borders and return irregular migrants. To that end, we will strengthen our cooperation with key third countries.

At the same time, let me stress that we also need to make progress on managing migration within Europe. In this respect, Member States will have to notably streamline their return procedure, in line with the Return Directive. We also have to work on the reform of common European asylum system. As you know, there is no single, no simple solution. We have to work on all sides.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, the EU migration policy needs to be sustainable. Our challenges are manifold but our goals are clear: to gradually put in place a proper asylum and migration policy with effective control of our external borders. We will pursue the work already underway, bearing in mind that, in order to be successful, all elements must be pursued jointly and all must deliver on their commitments. Greece and Italy, in particular, are very much on the frontline, with thousands of irregular migrants arriving every month. That requires the continued expression of solidarity from all stakeholders.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Caterina Chinnici (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Dopo anni di emergenza in Italia sembra delinearsi una significativa riduzione degli sbarchi, segno che la nuova via di apertura e dialogo con la Libia sta portando alcuni risultati e pertanto rappresenta uno strumento politico idoneo per gestire le cause della migrazione alla fonte. Lo stesso Consiglio europeo di pochi giorni fa ha dichiarato piena condivisione all'azione del mio Paese, riconoscendo il significativo contributo apportato dall'Italia nella gestione del fenomeno migratorio.

Tuttavia, è necessario che l'Unione elabori presto una strategia di lungo termine, tra l'altro più volte richiesta da quest'Aula, nella quale lo sviluppo e la crescita economica degli Stati africani siano finalmente posti al centro dell'azione politica, perché la gestione sostenibile della migrazione di certo non può più basarsi esclusivamente su iniziative di natura emergenziale.

La politica migratoria dell'Unione, e dei suoi Paesi membri, non dovrà però, in alcun modo, comportare il rischio di una compressione dei diritti fondamentali di tutte quelle persone, e fra questi molti minori, che cercano di arrivare sulle coste europee per sfuggire a gravi conflitti, persecuzioni o discriminazioni, ma anzi, al contrario, dovrà essere rivolta a contrastare sempre più efficacemente il traffico di esseri umani e le organizzazioni criminali che lo gestiscono.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), *in writing*. – Unfortunately, recent reports from international organisations and NGOs have stressed the unpleasant fact that African migrants who are trying to reach Europe through the Mediterranean are being sold like commodities by militants/smugglers in modern-day slave markets in Libya. Victims of human trafficking note that first their captors beat them and then force them to call their families and ask for a ransom. Those who cannot pay their captors are reportedly killed, left to starve to death, forced to work or are sold as slaves for up to USD 500. Many women and even children have been exposed to sexual exploitation.

I strongly condemn people smuggling in the Mediterranean. It is despicable and shameful for the EU to look on as humans are sold as a commodity just few hundred kilometres from the European shore. In this context, I believe that the fight against networks of migrant smugglers and human traffickers needs to be stepped up through a stronger focus on measures aimed at tackling these crimes, including cross-border cooperation between Member States, institutional reforms and capacity building. In addition, the EU should facilitate its cooperation with its neighbours in order to address the priorities of the Joint Valetta Action Plan.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR), *γραπτώς*. – Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να στρέψει το βλέμμα της και την προσοχή της στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, τα οποία απειλεί καθημερινά ο Erdoğan να γεμίσει ξανά με πρόσφυγες και κυρίως με παράνομους μετανάστες, στα νησιά του Αιγαίου όπου έχουν εγκλωβιστεί χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και κυρίως παράνομοι μετανάστες και των οποίων οι κάτοικοι δεν αντέχουν πλέον αυτή την κατάσταση. Εάν επισκεφθεί κανείς αυτά τα νησιά, οι κάτοικοι θα του πουν ότι η κατάσταση έχει φτάσει στο απροχώρητο. Στη Σάμο, η κατάσταση είναι εκρηκτική. Το ίδιο συμβαίνει και στη Λέσβο, το ίδιο και στη Χίο. Και εκεί οι κάτοικοι αντιδρούν. Δεν αντέχουν πλέον άλλους παράνομους μετανάστες, διότι οι περισσότεροι που συγκεντρώνονται εκεί είναι παράνομοι μετανάστες. Γι' αυτό απαιτείται η λήψη μέτρων και η βαριά τιμωρία όσων εμπλέκονται σε δουλεμπορικά κυκλώματα και δίκτυα τα οποία μεταφέρουν κατά εκατοντάδες τους παράνομες μετανάστες στα νησιά του Αιγαίου.

Artis Pabriks (PPE), *in writing*. – The situation in the Mediterranean has showed that unfortunately people smugglers are often a few steps ahead of the EU. It has turned the migration crisis into a very profitable business. The migratory pressure on the EU external borders is constant and will continue in the foreseeable future as there are considerable economic and political differences between the EU and its neighbourhood. In order to curb, manage illegal migration we need to, first of all, strengthen the EU external border. It is our duty to our citizens to keep our border safe. Second, we need to focus our efforts to restore and strengthen state structures in countries like Libya. Third, we must strengthen the cooperation with African countries, provide our assistance but also ask them to take back their nationals who travelled to EU illegally and do not qualify for asylum. Fourth, we need to give the possibility for people who are in need for

international protection to apply for asylum outside the EU, to avoid their dangerous journey to Europe in the hands of people smugglers. Until we have fulfilled these preconditions, it will be very difficult to agree on any relocation schemes across the Member States.

13. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Gunnara Hökmarka w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie polityki gospodarczej strefy euro (2017/2114(INI)) (A8-0310/2017).

Gunnar Hökmark, rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commission for its presentation, and also thank the shadow rapporteurs, who have been working very closely with politically very difficult items. Stability needs a dynamic economy in Europe. If we are to have stable societies and stable social development, we need to have a more dynamic economy that fosters growth. But a dynamic economy also requires stability in terms of public finances, legal certainty and opportunities for new enterprises, innovation and investment.

It is important that, when raising the European Union growth targets, we improve people's living and social conditions. We will secure stability on the financial markets, but we will also lay the ground for the future competitiveness of the European economy, because if we cannot be in the lead, and if we cannot have the investments we need, then we will lose.

We have an economic recovery going on in the European Union, but it is slow and it is not enough. Investments are not catching up, although it is very much based on a unique monetary policy. We have lower unemployment than back in the days of 2008 before the crisis, but on the other hand, the GDP per capita is not very much above what we had before the crisis.

It is important to note that we have lower deficits, lower debts, more growth and lower unemployment. We should know first of all that this is not enough, but also that there are huge differences between the Member States. Some are still suffering from very high unemployment. Some are still dealing with major deficits. We have very different performances in the economies of the European Union.

This proves one thing, and that is the good news. The good news is that we are not doing as well as we can. It would have been depressing if this was the best we could do. But we can do better. We see that through the differences, the fact that some Member States are developing better as regards labour markets, employment and investment. For me and for us behind the report, this illustrates the need to have a look not only on the aggregated level, but also at each Member State.

We need to have cohesion in economic growth, and therefore we need to have cohesion in structural reforms. We need to have a target of potential growth of 3% for every Member State in order to achieve 1% higher growth. We need to reform labour markets. We need to reform other markets, meaning more competition. We need to have budgetary reforms opening up for lower taxes, especially on jobs and investments, and we need to ensure that we in the European Union can achieve an internal market fostering an economy that can be a global leader.

We can achieve a lot if we look at the reality now and at the need for structural reforms and stability at the same time, then we will deliver splendid economic development for the citizens of the European Union, but we need to take action. That is the main message in this report.

Yana Toom, rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs. – Mr President, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs adopted 45 suggestions into this resolution, but I only have time for a few remarks. Unemployment rates have not yet returned to pre-crisis levels and the youth unemployment rate remains unacceptably high. Labour market conditions and performance still show substantial differences across Member States. Poverty remains high as well.

We need continuous efforts to achieve a balance between the economic and social dimensions of the European semester policies. The efficiency and effectiveness of labour market policies should be increased. The Committee calls for the continuation of the youth employment initiative while taking into account the latest findings of the Court of Auditors' Special Report. We need an integrated anti-poverty strategy. In this regard, the Committee underlined the role of Member States' minimum income schemes.

We require investment in skills development, particularly digital skills and programming. Otherwise, the Union's competitive position may be undermined. Better skills-matching and improved mutual recognition of qualifications is necessary to address skills shortages and mismatches.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it is a pleasure to be here today to discuss this important and timely topic of the economic policies of the euro area. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Hökmark, and all the shadow rapporteurs for the report.

As you rightly point out in the report, economic recovery in the euro area is continuing and strengthening. It has become increasingly broad-based across countries. All 28 Member States are back to growth. We are witnessing steady employment growth with unemployment at its lowest level in eight years and improving business sentiment, with confidence at its highest in a decade. We see that our economic policy priorities of supporting investment, structural reforms and responsible fiscal policies are delivering results.

But, despite this robust recovery, we still see subdued core inflation, wage growth that does not reflect labour market developments, large current account surpluses in some euro area Member States, high debt levels and persistent investment gaps. Most importantly, we see persistent economic and social divergences in the euro area. These make it harder to manage our economy and mean that the recovery is not benefiting all European citizens equally.

The years prior to the crisis saw a trend of real convergence within the euro area. However, it partly masked the boom phase of the boom-bust cycle that unravelled later. But this convergence trend was brought to a halt by the crisis, and since then we have been witnessing persistent divergences. I agree with you that the euro area harbours untapped economic potential and that we have to deploy all our efforts to increase potential growth, while making growth more inclusive.

Achieving sustainable and inclusive growth is the ultimate aim of everything we do in the European Semester. This must be done by taking into account and tackling the individual structural weaknesses of our Member States. We see positive tendencies in the EU economy, but there is no time to relax. We should aim at strengthening the resilience of our economies, boosting productivity, growth and inclusiveness. Reforms must combine the goals of creating efficiency and stability with a strong focus on fairness and empowering people over their lifetime by making them ready to face changes.

As you know, in November the Commission will issue the Annual Growth Survey and a proposal for a recommendation for economic policy in the euro area. The recommendation aims to identify common challenges in the euro area, and this will serve as guidance for consequent country-specific recommendations.

At the same time, we must continue to work on deepening and strengthening our economic and monetary union. This is precisely about addressing the current lack of convergence in the Union. A well-functioning economic and monetary union should become our main tool for renewed convergence in the euro area. Future reforms should make sure that economic and monetary union delivers on its original objectives: growth and jobs, as well as economic, social and territorial cohesion.

The new architecture should create stronger incentives for reforms and support national policies with new instruments at European level. In all, it must be able to deliver on the initiatives for a deeper and fairer EMU, as announced by President Juncker in his State of the Union speech and in the Commission's work programme.

The forthcoming EMU package, which we will present on 6 December, will comprise a number of these initiatives. We will propose to bring the European Stability Mechanism into the European Union legal framework in order to make it more democratically accountable and, at the same time, to strengthen its role and improve decision-making procedures.

We will propose the creation of a dedicated euro area budget line within the future EU budget in order to provide for four functions: structural reform assistance, stabilisation function, a backstop for a banking union and a convergence instrument to give pre-accession assistance for Member States on their way to euro membership. We will also propose incorporating the substance of the Treaty of Stability, Coordination and Governance in the EMU into the EU framework, as was initially agreed in 2012.

With a view to 2025, the Commission will also set out views on the possible creation of a permanent European Minister of Economy and Finance and present exploratory work for the possible development of the euro area safe asset. We will also continue our work towards completing the banking union and capital markets union.

Our economic and monetary union will only become stronger if solidarity and responsibility go hand in hand. So we need to work closely together towards this ambitious and important objective of deepening the EMU and making it more resilient. I look forward to hearing your views on this very topical report.

Sofia Ribeiro, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, é muito satisfatória a diminuição, na União Europeia, da taxa de desemprego e de desemprego jovem para cerca de 9,5% e 19,4%, respetivamente. Mas não podemos baixar os braços.

Apesar das melhorias, ainda existem 14 milhões de jovens europeus sem trabalho, que não estudam nem estão em formação. Isto é terrível e inaceitável. Para além do tremendo impacto social, tem um custo de 153 mil milhões de euros para a União Europeia, sabendo que a aplicação mais ampla da Garantia Jovem em toda a União nos custaria muito menos.

Urge sermos mais incisivos com a sua implementação, reforçando-a a nível nacional, regional e local, conscientes da importância que esta garantia tem na preparação dos jovens para o mercado de trabalho.

Por outro lado, urge também reforçar a sua monitorização para evitarmos mecanismos que falsificam os números do emprego com recurso a estágios e outros programas de formação, criando a ilusão de uma retoma que, na verdade, é demasiado frágil, sem garantias de sustentabilidade.

Temos de estar preparados para o futuro. Devemos ser exigentes na aposta na educação e na formação, em especial no desenvolvimento das competências digitais, para fazermos face aos novos desafios. Esta é uma condição essencial para a defesa do modelo social europeu, que passa pela sustentabilidade dos nossos sistemas de segurança social. É precisamente na defesa deste modelo social europeu, num equilíbrio com a sustentabilidade económica, que deve assentar o Semestre Europeu.

Neste sentido, propusemos um procedimento por desequilíbrios sociais que, apesar de não punitivo, tem como objetivo fortalecer a vertente social das políticas europeias, por forma a criarmos um verdadeiro pilar social europeu que garanta o futuro da União, que garanta o futuro dos nossos jovens.

Pedro Silva Pereira, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, este é um momento importante para a governação democrática da União Económica e Monetária. Na verdade, através do relatório que, hoje, aqui discutimos, o Parlamento Europeu, eleito diretamente pelos cidadãos, pronunciou-se sobre a orientação da política económica da zona euro.

Quero saudar o relator, Gunnar Hökmark, porque, apesar das nossas diferenças políticas – que são, obviamente, muitas –, tivemos, mais uma vez, oportunidade de manter um trabalho construtivo para um relatório equilibrado e globalmente positivo. Creio que é o que temos hoje diante de nós: um relatório equilibrado e globalmente positivo.

É importante começar por reconhecer os sinais de recuperação económica a que temos vindo a assistir na zona euro. Temos hoje mais crescimento, menos desemprego, menos défice e dívidas públicas mais controladas. Mas a primeira mensagem deste Parlamento é uma mensagem de alerta. A recuperação económica europeia que temos é ainda insuficiente, demasiado frágil e desigual.

Apesar do Plano Juncker e da viragem de página da austeridade em alguns países, esta recuperação da economia está ainda demasiado apoiada numa política monetária expansionista do Banco Central Europeu que não pode durar para sempre.

É por isso que a segunda mensagem deste relatório e deste Parlamento é que precisamos urgentemente de superar o défice de investimento que ainda existe na economia europeia.

Há, com certeza, muitas alterações estruturais para corrigir a arquitetura da zona euro e defender as nossas economias da especulação nos mercados de dívida soberana, mas a prioridade ao investimento é incontornável.

Precisamos de um reforço do Plano Juncker, com uma mais justa distribuição geográfica, mas precisamos também de uma política orçamental diferente, que faça pleno uso das cláusulas de flexibilidade, e esta é uma questão central.

A constatação de facto deste relatório é que, enquanto a Comissão Europeia propôs uma política orçamental moderadamente expansionista, vamos continuar a ter uma política orçamental essencialmente neutral. É isto que precisamos de corrigir para devolver à economia europeia a ambição de convergência e a ambição de crescimento económico e de investimento.

Νότης Μαριάς, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Dombrovskis, η οικονομική πολιτική της ευρωζώνης που στηρίζεται στη λιτότητα και στη βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή έχει αποτύχει. Το αποδεικνύει η οικονομική διάλυση του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου, που γέμισε με εκατομμύρια φτωχούς και με τεράστιες στρατιές ανέργων. Το αποδεικνύει η Ελλάδα, την οποία η τρόικα μετέτρεψε σε ένα απέραντο κοινωνικό νεκροταφείο, με συντάξεις και μισθούς πείνας, με τη λεηλασία της δημόσιας περιουσίας, με την αρπαγή των σπιτιών των Ελλήνων από τα «κοράκια». Το αποδεικνύει η Γερμανία, η οποία συσσωρεύει τεράστια εμπορικά πλεονάσματα λόγω της ευρωζώνης. Ταυτόχρονα, τα δομικά και θεσμικά ελλείμματα της ευρωζώνης εντείνουν τα οικονομικά αδιέξοδα, αυξάνουν τα ελλείμματα καθώς και το τεράστιο δημόσιο και ιδιωτικό χρέος. Επιπλέον, κύριε Dombrovskis, το μοντέλο ανταγωνιστικότητας που εσείς προωθείτε στηρίζεται στο Σύμφωνο Euro Plus το οποίο οδηγεί στην κινεζοποίηση των ευρωπαϊκών μισθών και στην αύξηση της δυστυχίας. Χρειάζεται αλλαγή πορείας. Χρειάζεται δίκαιη κατανομή του παραγόμενου πλούτου, διαγραφή του επονειδιστού χρέους και αύξηση των κοινωνικών δαπανών.

Lieve Wierinck, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Beste voorzitter, geachte commissaris Dombrovskis, beste collega's, eerst en vooral zou ik de heer Hökmark willen bedanken voor zijn inspanningen bij de samenstelling van het verslag. Tevens dank aan de andere schaduwrapporteurs voor de positieve en productieve samenwerking. Het resultaat is een duidelijk compromis waar een grote meerderheid achter kan staan.

Elk jaar investeren we veel tijd in het analyseren van onze economie en proberen we te bepalen hoe we het beter kunnen doen. Het belangrijkste resultaat zijn de landenspecifieke aanbevelingen. Ik zou de lidstaten dan ook willen vragen deze uit te voeren. Over vele maatregelen kan je natuurlijk verschillende visies hebben, maar een hoge schuldenlast is een risico en een hypotheek op de toekomst. We moeten ervoor zorgen dat onze kinderen en kleinkinderen hier de rekening niet van moeten betalen. We moeten niet minder uitgeven, maar anders. We moeten meer investeren in onderzoek en innovatie om zo onze competitiviteit te bewaren. De economie moderniseren, administratieve lasten verlagen en de belasting op arbeid verminderen, om zo meer investeringen aan te trekken, wat de groei zal stimuleren. Investeren in innovatie zal de werkgelegenheid en de welvaart voor de toekomst verzekeren. Landen die het minder goed doen, budgettair of op het gebied van competitiviteit en productiviteit, moeten meer inspanningen doen. De nadruk moet worden gelegd op onderwijs en vaardigheden (skills). En de financiering voor bedrijven en kmo's moet worden verbeterd. Daarentegen, lidstaten die het goed doen, mogen zeker niet gestraft worden.

Ten laatste zou ik graag het volgende willen benadrukken: de basis van een economie is een gezonde balans tussen inkomsten en uitgaven, dus een gezonde fiscaliteit. Dit is de verantwoordelijkheid van de lidstaten.

Het semester is een document dat een breed beeld geeft van onze economie. Werkgelegenheid maakt hier, zoals vele andere aspecten, een deel van uit. In de toekomst moeten economische en monetaire zaken de basis van het verslag blijven.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Dombrovskis, όπως κι εσείς ομολογήσατε, στα χρόνια της κρίσης αυξήθηκαν επικίνδυνα οι ανισότητες, τόσο οι κοινωνικές όσο και οι περιφερειακές. Αντί για σύγκλιση έχουμε απόκλιση ανάμεσα στους πλούσιους και τους φτωχούς, τον Βορρά και τον Νότο. Γι' αυτό και χρειάζεται εμβάθυνση της πολιτικής και οικονομικής ενοποίησης της ευρωζώνης, αλλά με επίκεντρο τη μείωση της ανεργίας, την ενίσχυση μιας ανάπτυξης που να στηρίζει κυρίως τους ασθενέστερους και την κοινωνική συνοχή. Και γι' αυτό απαιτούνται μέτρα: ενίσχυση του Ταμείου Juncker, περισσότερα κονδύλια για τη μείωση της ανεργίας των νέων, ενίσχυση του ρόλου της Τράπεζας Ευρωπαϊκών Επενδύσεων, τόνωση της ζήτησης και των επενδύσεων σε χώρες όπως η Γερμανία που έχει θηριώδη πρωτογενή πλεονάσματα σε βάρος του ευρωπαϊκού Νότου, και επίσης ευρωπαϊκές λύσεις για το χρέος που είναι ευρωπαϊκό πρόβλημα. Κύριε Dombrovskis, είναι ώρα για πράξεις και όχι για λόγια και ευχολόγια σε ένα πνεύμα «business as usual». Αυτό σας

ζητάει το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Ernest Urtasun, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the rapporteur for the cooperation. Even though we had too many divergences to have an agreement on that particular file, the spirit was constructive, and I would like to thank you for that.

We are very critical of the assessment that we will do in the Semester. We believe that, in a way, we are supporting the implementation of a policy mix that is failing; one that basically says 'cut public expenditure, implement supply-side structural reforms, and everything will be fine'. We believe that the flaws and problems of the European economy are still very big, and we need to correct that. Once the action of the ECB diminishes, our economies are probably still not ready to continue in a sustainable path for growth.

We are, in that sense, too complacent with the report regarding the current state of the euro area economy, and we remain too silent on the institutional reforms required for its future at the current juncture. Furthermore, the environmental and sustainability angle is missing, as the need to increase resource efficiency and to adapt the economy to the fight against climate change is not mentioned in the report. We also have, in the text, a strongly productivist narrative insisting on the need to achieve high GDP growth rates and to increase, as a priority, price competitiveness.

There is no mention, as Mr Papadimoulis was saying, of the issue of macroeconomic and financial imbalances inside the eurozone, and we know that the macroeconomic imbalances procedure should be used by the Commission in a much more decisive way, taking into account the imbalances that we have inside the euro area.

Finally, there is also no mention of the issues related to taxation and no mention of the CCCTB or the need to advance in other fields regarding taxation. So my Group remains very critical both on the process of the Semester and on the report of its assessment this year, and that is why we cannot support the report this time.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Marco Valli (EFDD), *domanda «cartellino blu»*. – Ringrazio il collega che ha citato la procedura sugli squilibri macroeconomici.

Volevo chiedergli, appunto, se non crede che sia arrivato il momento di procedere anche con delle sanzioni verso questi paesi, visto che sono proprio i paesi più rigoristi che chiedono molto spesso ai paesi periferici di rispettare le regole e poi solo loro i primi a non rispettarle, oppure ricevono continuamente raccomandazioni molto blande.

Non è il caso di chiederlo al Commissario, visto che è qua e dovrebbe risponderci?

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Sí, estoy de acuerdo con el diputado Valli en que hay un procedimiento que se puede activar en caso de desequilibrios muy grandes, a través del MIP.

Tenemos, en estos momentos, un desequilibrio por la balanza comercial muy sostenido, un superávit muy sostenido por parte de algunos Estados miembros durante mucho tiempo. Y le hemos preguntado muchas veces a la Comisión Europea cuáles son los criterios, básicamente durante cuánto tiempo y a qué nivel debe estar ese nivel de superávit para que ellos activen el MIP. Y, hasta ahora, no responden a ello.

Pero estoy totalmente de acuerdo con el diputado en que esa cuestión debería activarse, porque es uno de los desequilibrios principales que tiene en estos momentos la zona del euro.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io ritengo che, come ogni volta nella procedura del semestre, ci sia una relazione inaccettabile, che vede un compromesso principale preso tra socialisti e popolari dall'inizio di questa legislatura nei confronti di una politica dell'austerità fallimentare, che viene esaltata come meritevole dai dati positivi che ci sono in questi momenti, quando è palese che i dati sono positivi per un andamento macroeconomico positivo in seguito alle politiche monetarie espansive portate avanti da tutte le banche centrali.

L'esaltazione delle riforme all'interno di queste relazioni è scandalosa, proprio perché le riforme che sono state portate avanti sono volte verso la svalutazione salariale. Non è questo il modo di bilanciare quegli squilibri, come il surplus tedesco, che stanno fagocitando la domanda interna dell'eurozona e soprattutto dei paesi del Sud.

Bisogna denunciare queste cose e bisogna applicare le tanto sbandierate regole, perché il surplus di alcuni paesi, tra cui Germania e Olanda, è arrivato a livelli inaccettabili, e quindi bisogna affrontare di petto il problema, evitando, come al solito in queste relazioni, di non parlarne perché non piace ai popolari e ai socialisti tirar fuori la verità sugli squilibri macroeconomici dell'area euro.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento)).

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), *blue-card question*. – Mr Valli, I would like to thank you for accepting the blue card.

I couldn't let that pass; when I listen to you, it is as if it is always the fault of someone else when a Member State has economic problems. Couldn't you accept that all Member States need to look at the reforms: budget reforms and structural reforms in order to achieve higher levels of growth? Don't you see that the differences between different Member States tell you something that we need to do, that we cannot just spend and spend more than we have because we will not get more money by that?

Marco Valli (EFDD), *risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu»*. – Io credo che ci siano molte differenze tra gli Stati membri, però non ritengo che le riforme che vengono spinte dalla Commissione europea, che sono volte molto spesso nei paesi periferici alla svalutazione salariale, siano un modo giusto per risolvere gli squilibri interni all'eurozona. Questa è la politica perpetrata. Abbiamo un livello di sotto-occupazione veramente scandaloso, soprattutto in paesi come l'Italia dove sono state applicate le riforme del mondo del lavoro.

Nel momento in cui ci sarà una marcia indietro sulle politiche monetarie vedremo i soliti squilibri dell'area euro venire fuori, quindi sarebbe opportuno mettere fine a questi squilibri con misure concrete nei confronti dell'area valutaria per renderla ottimale, cosa però molto difficile.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, qui oggi si parla delle politiche economiche della zona euro. Io credo che l'unica riforma, per quanto riguarda la zona euro, che vale la pena discutere sia lo smantellamento di Maastricht.

Maastricht, quello che è venuto dopo e quello che è stato fatto in preparazione di questo trattato e dell'Unione economica e monetaria europea, oggi rappresentano il problema principale non solo per gli Stati del Sud ma per tutta l'Europa. L'euro e l'Unione economica e monetaria, per loro natura e per loro architettura, alimentano le divergenze non solo tra gli Stati membri ma anche all'interno delle varie classi sociali degli Stati membri. La riprova l'abbiamo dalle votazioni in vari paesi: è quello che è successo in Germania, dove la popolazione più povera e più sconfitta da queste politiche della Germania dell'Est ha votato per partiti considerati estremisti.

Io credo che sia arrivato il momento di sederci attorno a un tavolo e pensare a come smantellare questa moneta unica, che non funziona, e a far ripartire l'Europa su un percorso di crescita e di sviluppo omogeneo e in cooperazione tra Stati sovrani.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, επιτέλους πρέπει να παραδεχτούμε ότι η Οικονομική και Νομισματική Ένωση, η οποία, σημειωτέον, επιβλήθηκε με μη σύννομες διαδικασίες με τη Συνθήκη του Μάαστριχτ, έχει προκαλέσει σε πολλά κράτη μέλη, και ειδικά στη χώρα μου, καταστροφικές οικονομικές, κοινωνικές και πολιτικές συνέπειες. Οι δείκτες ανεργίας, ειδικότερα των νέων, έχουν διαρθρωτικά υψηλά ποσοστά, ολόκληρες κοινωνικές ομάδες φτωχοποιούνται, ο αριθμός των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων αυξάνεται ραγδαία, επενδύσεις δεν πραγματοποιούνται λόγω της παρατεταμένης ύφεσης και οι ρυθμοί ανάπτυξης του ΑΕΠ συνεχώς μειώνονται. Η δημοσιονομική και νομισματική πολιτική πρέπει να αποτελεί αποκλειστική ευθύνη των κρατών μελών χωρίς περιορισμούς και παρεμβατισμούς από την Ένωση, όπως γίνεται με τις υπογραφές μνημονίων ή τις συστάσεις ανά χώρα. Σε πνεύμα πλήρους σεβασμού στις δημοκρατικές αρχές και στην αρχή της εθνικής κυριαρχίας. Επιπλέον, πρέπει να προβλεφθεί ένας επίσημος δημοκρατικός, εφικτός, απλός και ταχύς μηχανισμός ομαλής οικειοθελούς αποχώρησης ή αυτοεξ-αίρεσης από την ΟΝΕ και το ενιαίο νόμισμα.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident Dombrovskis! Der Hökmark-Bericht kommt zum richtigen Zeitpunkt. Wir haben in allen Mitgliedstaaten ein moderates Wachstum, die Arbeitslosigkeit sinkt konsequent, und wir haben die Erwartung und Hoffnung, dass sich auch die öffentlichen Defizite im Euro-Raum weiter reduzieren.

Es gibt aber noch genügend unausgeschöpftes Potenzial, und wir haben viel Luft nach oben, denn die Mitgliedstaaten haben immer noch erst zwei Drittel ihrer länderspezifischen Empfehlungen umgesetzt. Wir wissen, dass mehr Struktur-reformen und mehr private und öffentliche Investitionen mindestens ein um 1 % höheres Wachstum bedeuten würden. Wir wissen aus dem Monti-Bericht, dass die Vervollständigung des Binnenmarkts mindestens 3 % mehr Wachstum bedeutet, wenn wir nur das tun, was wir schon beschlossen und was wir uns vorgenommen haben.

Ich meine daher, dass der Bericht den Finger in die richtigen Wunden legt und die richtigen Herausforderungen und den Handlungsbedarf anspricht, denn das Europäische Semester gibt der Kommission zwar die Möglichkeit, den Finger in die Wunden zu legen, der Widerspruch zwischen Daten und Zielen wird aber immer deutlicher sichtbar.

Das Europäische Semester ersetzt nicht, die Währungsunion auf dem Boden des Gemeinschaftsrechts zur Wirtschaftsunion weiterzuentwickeln. Es ersetzt nicht die Schaffung eines europäischen Wirtschafts- und Finanzministers. Es ersetzt nicht die Tatsache, dass wir den ESFM auf Gemeinschaftsrecht zum europäischen Währungsfonds machen. Setzen wir auch den Bericht ergänzend um, dann tragen wir zur Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion und zu ihrer Erweiterung für mehr Wachstum und Beschäftigung bei.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, en évoquant le rapport de notre collègue Othmar Karas sur la recommandation pour la zone euro, vous avez en fait également abordé la question de la réforme que nous attendons pour le 6 décembre, à l'initiative de la Commission, sur l'approfondissement et l'achèvement de l'Union économique et monétaire.

Permettez-moi d'en dire un mot, car je crois que, dans cette perspective, cette recommandation pour la zone euro, pour une fois – pour la première fois –, tient vraiment compte de ce concept auquel nous accordons beaucoup d'importance, à savoir la question de la position agrégée de la zone euro.

Si l'on veut disposer d'un véritable outil de pilotage de la zone, il faut tirer tout le fil que l'on peut de cette notion. De ce point de vue, vous avez évoqué les inégalités existant à l'intérieur de certains États membres et entre les États membres. C'est pour cela qu'il nous faut nous servir de cette position agrégée de la zone euro pour recenser les points où les États membres peuvent avoir des marges de manœuvre et où on doit pouvoir mobiliser à la fois l'investissement public et l'investissement privé. C'est comme cela que nous pourrions aller de l'avant.

Vous avez aussi évoqué l'intégration du pacte budgétaire ou TSCG dans le droit de l'Union. Vous le savez, nous avons eu un débat ici il y a quelque temps. Nous ne l'accepterons pas dans n'importe quelles conditions. Une marge de flexibilité pour corriger les travers économiques contenus dans ce traité est absolument indispensable, y compris si vous voulez consolider cet état de santé des politiques des économies de la zone euro dont vous vous réjouissez.

Voilà, Monsieur le Président, les quelques contributions je voulais apporter à ce débat.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, euroalueen elpymisestä huolimatta talouspolitiikka on ollut tehotonta alentamaan nopeasti työttömyyttä.

Perusongelmaa eli yhtenäisvaluuttaa ei edes mainita mietinnössä, kuten ei valuuttakursseja ylipäättään, vaikka niillä on ollut keskeinen vaikutus euroalueen elpymisessä. Erilaiset ehdotetut ja toteutetut rakenteelliset uudistukset eivät ole korvanneet tai tule korvaamaan jäsenmaiden valuuttakurssipolitiikan puuttumista, mikä estää nopeat kilpailukyvyyn korjaukset eri maiden välillä.

Talouden joustavuuden lisäämisessä on käytännössä kyse usein palkkojen laskusta, mikä on hidas, tuskallinen ja riskialtis keino palauttaa menetetty kilpailukyky, eikä välttämättä edes mahdollinen. Valitettavasti tämä asia sivuutetaan kokonaan mietinnössä. Mielestäni mietinnössä tulisi käsitellä kaikkia keskeisiä talouspoliittisia kysymyksiä.

Enrique Calvet Chambon (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente —que no me presta atención, pero bueno —, el Semestre Europeo nos indica que hemos conseguido un cierto saneamiento financiero estable —esperemos que no sea frágil—; que mejoran las notas de empleo —sabemos que de aquella manera—; que hay cierto crecimiento —no es como para tirar cohetes, esperamos que los nubarrones no lo oscurezcan—.

Yo me voy a concentrar en la falta de percepción de la sociedad, en muchas zonas de Europa, de esas mejorías. Le voy a decir que hay tres razones fundamentales: una es la dificultad de resignarse a que no serán las cosas como antes, pero no podemos hacer gran cosa; la otra es la dualidad del mercado de trabajo y generaciones perdidas como los *ninis* —podemos hacer mucho y hay que meterlo en el Semestre Europeo—; y la tercera y fundamental es el crecimiento inaceptable ahora de las desigualdades.

Y para eso necesitamos políticas de distribución fiscales, políticas de inversión y políticas de renta en todo el Semestre Europeo orientadas, obsesivamente, a reducir la dinámica desigualitaria.

Bernard Monot (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, au nom de l'emploi, ce rapport d'initiative de la zone euro, d'inspiration suédoise, soutient un ordolibéralisme germanique des plus stériles et aveugles. Ce rapport vient certainement en appui d'une ligne dure en vue du prochain paquet «zone euro» de la Commission.

La question principale est surtout de savoir si le Fonds monétaire européen in fine se retrouvera ou non en charge de la surveillance budgétaire des États membres, comme le veut l'Allemagne, laquelle disposera ainsi d'un outil redoutable de mise sous tutelle des finances publiques des autres pays européens. C'est une menace politique inacceptable pour une nation qui veut être indépendante.

Au final, nous rejetons donc complètement ce rapport. En réalité, il serait plus efficace et urgent de combattre le surplus de la balance du commerce extérieur allemand, qui vampirise la croissance économique du reste de la zone euro.

Nous proposons donc les alternatives suivantes: que l'Allemagne fasse des dépenses d'investissement dans la zone euro; que les entreprises allemandes acceptent de revaloriser les salaires de leurs employés afin de relancer la demande intérieure allemande; et que le plan d'assouplissement quantitatif de la BCE soit transformé en programme de monétisation de la dette publique des États par les banques centrales nationales.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la perte de confiance dans le marché européen à la suite de la crise de 2008, mais aussi la réduction des dépenses publiques ont eu des effets directs sur la croissance européenne, qui, aujourd'hui, demeure lente et surtout – vous l'avez dit, Monsieur le Commissaire – n'est pas une croissance inclusive, au vu des grandes disparités aujourd'hui en Europe.

En matière d'emploi plus particulièrement, si l'on note une hausse du taux d'emploi, il apparaît néanmoins que cette hausse ne concerne pas tous les pays, ni toutes les régions d'Europe. On note surtout qu'elle s'accompagne de plus d'emplois précaires et n'a pas permis de renverser la courbe de chômage des jeunes. Aujourd'hui, certaines régions d'Europe affichent un taux de chômage des jeunes supérieur à 30 %.

Alors, il est vrai que nous devons offrir mieux. Nous avons avancé quelques propositions: premièrement, augmenter les investissements publics et privés, créateurs d'emplois dans les régions qui ne bénéficient pas des effets de la relance; deuxièmement, donner de l'importance à l'éducation et à la formation dans le cadre du Semestre européen; troisièmement, renforcer la garantie «jeunesse»; quatrièmement, souligner l'importance des négociations collectives pour améliorer le pouvoir d'achat des travailleurs; cinquièmement, lutter contre la polarisation des revenus et renforcer les systèmes de protection sociale; et, enfin, travailler sur l'équilibre entre vie privée et vie professionnelle.

Tout cela doit pouvoir être fait par l'intermédiaire de discussions dans le cadre du Conseil «Emploi, politique sociale, santé et consommateurs» (EPSCO), qui me semble devoir être associé au Semestre européen.

Richard Sulík (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci. Akákoľvek hospodárska politika eurozóny je skreslená monetárnou politikou Európskej centrálnej banky. ECB už vykúpila verejný dlh za viac ako dvetisíc miliárd EUR a jej suma, jej bilančná suma, je viac ako štyridsať percent HDP eurozóny. Toto je v časoch mieru rekord. Európska centrálna banka momentálne vykupuje štátne dlhopisy v sedemkrát väčšom objeme ako je čistý prírastok dlhu. Pritom Európska centrálna banka nesmie vykupovať verejný dlh. Zároveň sú úrokové sadzby dlhodobo na nule, čím znevýhodňujeme tých, ktorí šetria a hospodária zodpovedne a naopak zvýhodňujeme dlžníkov. Európska centrálna banka je mimo akejkoľvek demokratickej kontroly a predseda komisie Juncker sa tvári, že tento obrovský problém sa ho netýka.

Je síce pekné, že sa tu venujeme hospodárskej politike eurozóny, no oveľa dôležitejšie je venovať sa monetárnej politike a vyčíňaniu Európskej centrálnej banky.

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this report on the euro area, and in particular that it points to the danger of complacency. However, I fear the danger of complacency is much more profound than this report is able to express.

There is a danger of complacency in the financial sector as the memories of the crisis fade. This week the Commission withdrew the banking structural reform proposal, to the great applause of the European Peoples' Party and Gunnar Hökmark, and globally significant banks and their lobbyists are having quite a party knowing that the taxpayer will continue to be on the line when things go wrong.

Also, there is a real danger of complacency with regard to the future of the euro area. It is regrettable that the report does not elaborate on the rather plausible scenario of interest rates going up within the next 18 months, which would stand to put a lot of pressure on countries that have below-average growth and above-average debt levels.

I fear, while I welcome the 6 December package that the Commission has pointed to, that this package is unlikely to be sufficient. Member States – France and Germany in particular – need to use the present window of opportunity to really move the currency union to the next level. Stopping short of that, there is a real danger that complacency will be our peril.

Luigi Morgano (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nella relazione si indica che bisogna interpretare le regole del patto di stabilità in maniera intelligente. Lo dico perché la flessibilità è la regola, non una gentile concessione.

In questi anni il semestre europeo ha mostrato i suoi limiti, infatti i dati macro restano disomogenei. Se vogliamo tornare a convergere dobbiamo mettere crescita economica, inclusione sociale e convergenza nel cuore del semestre. Ovviamente le regole del patto e la moneta unica non possono, da sole, risolvere i problemi strutturali dell'area euro. È perciò decisivo assumere alcune chiare decisioni a livello politico.

Ce ne sono parecchie: in particolare, visto il tema, un orientamento di bilancio aggregato della zona euro positivo; una capacità di bilancio per l'eurozona che sostenga gli investimenti e un meccanismo contro la disoccupazione, quest'ultimo finanziato con risorse proprie dell'Unione, per evitare un peso eccessivo sui bilanci nazionali; poi ripensare l'architettura istituzionale dell'area euro.

Questo è anche il momento di prendere atto che durante le fasi negative del ciclo serve la possibilità per l'Unione europea di avere un deficit e di emettere titoli pubblici a rischio zero. Lo dico perché in questo momento il rischio è decidere di non decidere e questo potrebbe rischiare di farci ripiombare nella crisi dalla quale faticosamente è iniziata l'uscita.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Mr President, what we are doing here has got to be judged politically. Social items in the European semester should have been given more priority. We have grown used to the idea that populist discourse, populist and extremist movements, have grown as a consequence of the 2008 crisis. The austerity, the rigid budgetary rules that were introduced in the Eurozone, were meant to reengineer growth and prosperity. Meanwhile, established centrist parties – especially on the left – lost huge amounts of votes. They expected to get them back when growth reappeared.

This semester's premises seem to show that it has done so. Growth has reappeared. But the political situation remains bleak. A few weeks ago, President Juncker said that the window of opportunity had opened for new steps in the European construction to be taken fast. Following the German, the Austrian and the Czech elections, matters look murkier. Is it that voters disbelieve that growth is back, or is there something within the present growth that they do not like? Are social disparities decreasing, or are they widening?

Politically, we need replies to these questions, which again means that the European semester should make the content of its social chapters more relevant and more effective.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la politica economica di *austerità* ha mostrato tutti i suoi limiti. Per raggiungere livelli di crescita significativa occorre legare alla stabilizzazione dei bilanci nazionali maggiori investimenti e riforme strutturali, nonché modulare misure di intervento per singoli Stati membri. Ma, come ha ricordato il presidente Draghi qualche giorno fa, per rendere socialmente accettabile il percorso di riforme strutturali occorre che esso sia accompagnato da politiche economiche inclusive e con effetti redistributivi.

Nella zona euro permane una carenza di investimenti. In alcuni Stati gli investimenti hanno già superato i livelli pre-crisi, ma in altri ristagnano o non procedono alla stessa velocità, in particolare nel Sud Europa, dove preoccupa il tasso di disoccupazione, specie giovanile.

Sono dunque necessarie ulteriori misure per colmare il divario di investimenti accumulato dallo scoppio della crisi. Potenziare e rendere più efficiente il programma «Garanzia per i giovani», ma anche investire di più e meglio nella formazione, nella ricerca, nei giovani talenti e nelle *start up* innovative rappresentano le irrinunciabili coordinate di un'efficace politica economica nella zona euro.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, as a direct result of an ECB diktat to bail out two non-systemic banks, Ireland is forced to borrow and burn billions. We're talking about policies of the eurozone: this is a policy of the ECB. In 2015, the Irish Central Bank destroyed EUR two billion; in 2016, EUR three billion; in 2017 so far, EUR 2.5 billion, and another EUR four billion to come. That is EUR 8.5 billion in the last three years.

This is an ECB policy, a policy to pay back a debt that was never Ireland's. Many here may say, 'sure, can't we afford it, isn't our economy booming?' Yes, if you accept that one can eat GDP, but GDP growth in Ireland's case is totally unconnected to ordinary people's wealth. It does not trickle down. We have record hospital waiting lists. We have record homelessness. We cannot afford the most basic climate change mitigation measures, yet it is the policy of the ECB that my country should continue to borrow and burn billions. And you know what? No one here gives a damn.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Labai tikiuosi, kad Didžiosios Britanijos sprendimas pasitraukti iš Europos Sąjungos mus privers susitelkti įveikti įvairias politines rizikas. Populizmo ir protekcionizmo banga dar neatsitraukė, turime būti budrūs, o jos priežastys visiems puikiai žinomos – didele pajamų nelygybė, socialinė atskirtis, pabėgėlių krizė, terorizmas, atskirtis tarp Rytų ir Vakarų Europos Sąjungos šalių narių, išorės gresmės. Turime dirbti ir įveikti šias problemas, kas gerins socialinį ekonominį klimatą bei skatins ekonomikos augimą. Ir tam visai nebūtina skubėti ar priversti įsivesti eurą visas šalis nares, kurios jo dar neturi. Mums visiems labai svarbus tvarus ir socialiai atsakingas euro zonos bendradarbiavimu paremtas ekonomikos augimas.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to start by welcoming the first report expressly dedicated to the eurozone. Following the Commission's first proposal for a eurozone fiscal stance, I support a positive fiscal stance that will allow Member States to invest more and that directly contributes to the increase of growth and employment. In order to build a stronger Europe, we need to create a more social Europe and to lay the ground for social growth based on a general approach, but also on a country-specific approach. Therefore, we need to ensure that the fiscal policies are led with the necessary flexibility at EU level. Member States must have freedom to manoeuvre in their fiscal policies, especially when considering the needed structural reforms to be implemented.

We need to strengthen our fiscal sustainability, vital for our future cohesion. Structural economic reforms should increase EU sustainable growth potential, real economy convergence and social cohesion by reducing economic inequalities and strengthening labour markets through inclusion policies that favour investments.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank you for the fruitful debate we had today and I would like to acknowledge the work of the committees involved in the drafting of this report.

Hearing your views here today was useful and enlightening ahead of the start of the new European semester cycle. As I mentioned, in November we will issue the proposal for a recommendation on economic policy of the euro area. Indeed, this recommendation, as a number of you have noted, will aim to identify common challenges for the euro area and will serve as a guidance for the subsequent formulation of country-specific recommendations.

One of the key messages from the debate is that cyclical conditions are improving and the economic upswing is strengthening. There are still significant economic and social challenges, and there is no time for complacency.

So, let me reiterate that we must create the conditions to support inclusive and balanced growth, further reduce unemployment and promote investment. We must strengthen the resilience of our economies and restart the process of economic and social convergence in the euro area. For this, the better use of our existing tools of economic policy coordination is essential, but not sufficient. The euro area is now much better equipped to face challenges than it was before the crisis, but we have to make sure that we address the remaining important gaps in our economic governance and the institutional state of the Economic and Monetary Union.

Honourable President, honourable Members, thank you once again and I look forward to continuing cooperation throughout the European semester cycle.

Gunnar Hökmark, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner and not only the shadow rapporteurs, but all of those who have participated in this debate. I think there are mainly two lines that have been presented here.

Some think that we can solve the problems by spending more and ignoring the fact that sometimes there is no more money to spend. Some underlined the need for fiscal stability and structural reforms. This goes rather broad, because in the agreement in the report we see the need for balancing some of those. But I would like to warn against those who always say that someone else has the responsibility when it does not go well in a certain Member State. It is not about good luck. It is about good reforms, good management and good governance. Sometimes, I would like not least the friends over there, but maybe also the friends over there, to think whether we are doing as well as we can.

Commissioner, I think that some of the good news that we can take from this debate is the fact that we are not doing as well as we can. We can do much better. We can set the targets for higher growth. Each Member State should have the target of a potential growth of at least three percent and make the reforms that can provide the jobs, the growth and the investment that can give Europe a lead. I think it is time for us not only to take action, but also time to take responsibility. That applies to all of us – none less and none more – but we all need to have the courage to make the reforms we need for a stronger Europe.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we czwartek 26 października 2017 r.

14. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung – Aufsichts- anforderungen an Kreditinstitute und Wertpapierfirmen (Aussprache)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest wspólna debata nad:

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Paula Tanga w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie ustanowienia wspólnych zasad dotyczących sekurytyzacji, utworzenia europejskich ram dla prostych, przejrzystych i standardowych sekurytyzacji oraz zmiany dyrektyw 2009/65/WE, 2009/138/WE, 2011/61/UE i rozporządzeń (WE) nr 1060/2009 i (UE) nr 648/2012 (COM(2015)0472 – C8-0288/2015 – 2015/0226(COD)) (A8-0387/2017) oraz

— sprawozdaniem sporządzonym przez Othmara Karasa w imieniu Komisji Gospodarczej i Monetarnej w sprawie wymogów ostrożnościowych dla instytucji kredytowych i firm inwestycyjnych (COM(2015)0473 – C8-0289/2015 – 2015/0225(COD)) (A8-0388/2017).

Paul Tang, rapporteur. – Mr President, it is good to have this debate just before the vote tomorrow. And the question is: has a toxic product turned into a medicine for the European economy? That is the question we have to ask ourselves and our voters – our public. I dare to say yes, in the realisation that any medicine can be toxic if it is taken in excess. A medicine can be toxic if it is taken in an uncontrolled manner, meaning that you have to take control. I will come back to that.

I am happy to have had the debate not only now, but also on many occasions in this House. It is an extremely important topic if only because of its history. We know that the financial crisis started with toxic products – mortgages – in the USA and then almost blew up the entire system. This was a major blow to the financial sector, the economy and people's everyday lives. I am happy that we have had this debate, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the people that worked on this, and of course the shadows, especially Othmar Karas – who you could say is my co-rapporteur – as well as the people from the Commission and the Council. I ask forgiveness for having sometimes been strong-headed and a bit stubborn, but I hope I have never been narrow-minded.

The start of this discussion, which was almost two years ago, was with a proposal from the Commission and also the proposal from the Commission tried to draw lessons from the crisis, for example by defining clear responsibilities for issuers and investors. The issuers have to disclose information and the investors have to do due diligence. No longer can someone say 'I didn't know what I was selling', or 'I didn't know what I was buying'.

But another question we had in the debate in Parliament was 'are these all the lessons that we need to learn from a financial crisis?' Put differently – more technically – what you want is a deep and liquid market at all times, in good times and in bad times. The European Parliament has added some of these lessons.

Firstly, an issue that is not at the core of our discussion: sustainability. We added sustainability by including characteristics of houses and cars. This also shows that we have to do this more consistently as legislators – both the Commission and the Parliament. I know that the Commissioner is working on that, and I very much support it. More at the core of this file was the prudential framework and strong supervision, giving clear roles to the ESRB and to the ESMA. This is important when you want to control the market.

The second was transparency: data repositories now giving a role to European Data Warehouse. There was also a discussion on the retention rates – the skin in the game. As I learnt, through discussions in this House and outside this House, it was not just about the rate, it was about the method. There is still an important difference between a horizontal and a vertical method, because it is not about the rate, it is about the incentive. The European Parliament has taken a good position by differentiating between the two, but we also know that we will have a review later. This is the part that the European Parliament has to take a very close look at.

Finally, let me say that this is also for the supervisors. They have an important role to monitor and control this market.

Othmar Karas, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident Dombrovskis, meine Damen und Herren! Die neuen Regeln für Verbriefungen sind ein wichtiger Schritt auf dem Weg zur Schaffung einer europäischen Kapitalmarktunion, eine gute Nachricht für den Finanz- und Wirtschaftsstandort Europa und ein Erfolg für das Europäische Parlament. Durch die Umwandlung von Forderungen in handelbare Wertpapiere streut die Verbriefung Risiken, damit diese von jenen getragen werden, die dazu am besten in der Lage sind. Sie schafft neue Investitionsmöglichkeiten, und sie verbessert die Kreditvergabe an Haushalte und Unternehmen.

Bei der Regulierung gab es zweierlei in Einklang zu bringen: Zum einen wollen wir eine wichtige Lehre aus der Finanzkrise ziehen und die Finanzstabilität sicherstellen, zum anderen wollen wir den europäischen Markt wiederbeleben und den Emissionsrückgang von 42 % im Vergleich zum Vorkrisenniveau adressieren.

Wir haben jene Ziele erreicht, für die sich das Europäische Parlament von Beginn an intensiv eingesetzt hat, und ich darf mich bei Kollegen Tang und den anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen im Ausschuss recht herzlich bedanken. Wir schaffen einfache, transparente und einheitliche Regeln – ein sicheres Vehikel, das hilft, die Realwirtschaft zu finanzieren sowie Vertrauen im europäischen Verbriefungsmarkt sowohl zwischen Banken als auch anderen Finanzinstrumenten wieder herzustellen.

Für das Erreichen dieser Ziele greifen die beiden gemeinsam verhandelten Rechtsakte – ich bin ja Berichterstatter und EVP-Rapporteur – Hand in Hand. Wenn wir sie uns als Auto vorstellen, dann wäre wohl das neue Rahmenwerk für alle Verbriefungen die Karosserie und die Überarbeitung der Eigenkapitalverordnung dessen Motor. Damit der Motor läuft, haben wir als Parlament dafür Sorge getragen, dass wir mit einer risikogerechten Kapitalbehandlung für STS-Verbriefungen die Ausgaben hochwertiger Produkte fördern, dass wir eine Abweichung von Basel bei der Hierarchie der Ansätze unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen ermöglichen, um europäische Besonderheiten zu berücksichtigen, dass wir Anreize für KMU-Verbriefungen ausbauen und dass wir Wiederverbriefungen verbieten, damit Kreditrisiken nicht mehr von Investoren verschleiert werden können. Für eine robuste Karosserie haben wir den Risikoselbstbehalt in Einklang mit globalen Standards auf 5 % festgeschrieben, ein Verbriefungsregister für mehr Transparenz geschaffen, die Durchführung von Auto-Verbriefungen sichergestellt und eine umfassende Überwachung des Verbriefungsmarkts durchgesetzt.

Mit diesem Gesetzespaket – verbildlicht in Karosserie und Motor – zeigen wir, dass wir es ernst meinen, gemeinsam klarere, transparentere und strengere Regeln einzuziehen und das Vertrauen in den Markt wieder zurückzugewinnen, damit Gift zur Medizin werden kann und wir bis zu 150 Mrd. EUR an zusätzlichen Finanzmitteln für die europäische Wirtschaft mobilisieren, die wir neben den Reformen dringend benötigen, um Wachstum und Beschäftigung in Europa wieder zu einer Dauererrungenschaft zu machen.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, today's debate and your vote tomorrow concern one of the first proposals put forward as part of our capital markets union, and it is an important one. By defining criteria for simple, transparent and standardised securitisation (STS), we can revitalise European capital markets' securitisation in a sustainable way. There is a broad consensus among regulators, supervisors and companies that this would benefit the European economy. It would free up more lending for investment and help manage risk in the banking sector.

Securitisation allows banks to convert pools of individual loans into bonds, which are then sold to other institutions or long-term investors. This helps banks free up capital set aside for existing loans and, in this way, securitisation supports more lending to the wider economy and gives investors access to more investment instruments. Securitisation is believed by many to have been the trigger for the financial crisis in the US. While EU securitisation has performed well overall during the crisis, the crisis still reveals flaws in the way securitisation was regulated and supervised.

At the moment securitisation in the EU is very low. Last year, issuance of securitised products in Europe was not even at half of its 2007 level. Given its important role in financing the real economy, in 2015 the Commission put forward a framework for revitalising the market in a prudent way. By rebuilding issuance back to the pre-crisis levels, we could generate an additional EUR 115 billion of yearly funding for households and companies.

After two years of discussions, I am happy to say that the final result is both balanced and ambitious. It will help restore an important funding channel for the EU economy, while learning from the mistakes of the past. The new regulation sets out specific criteria for securitisations to help investors understand the nature and the risk of what they are investing in. The qualifying securitisations would be simple. For example, only comparable loans can be brought together in one product, and the repackaging of other securitisations would generally not be allowed.

They would also be transparent, meaning that the right information is available for investors to assess risk and for supervisors to properly monitor markets. Building on the Parliament's proposal, the package now includes an ESMA-supervised data repository to ensure the transparency of STS securitisations. Securitisations would be standardised to make them easy to identify and understand.

Our proposals contain appropriate safeguards. The issuer would need to retain at least 5% of the securitised asset. This is to ensure that their incentives are aligned with those of the investor. Underlying assets would also need to be creditworthy according to existing EU rules.

Finally, we are introducing new capital requirement rules for those banks that invest in securitisation in order to promote a stable and resilient banking sector. These requirements build on global standards and will fully reflect the lower risks associated with the STS securitisation.

So we have done important work to agree on the final text. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the European Parliament and, in particular, the Chair of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Roberto Gualtieri, the rapporteurs, Paul Tang and Othmar Karas, and the shadow rapporteurs. Let us now conclude this important chapter in building the capital markets union so that the benefits to businesses and households can be quickly realised.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan, în numele grupului PPE. – Domnule președinte, într-adevăr, prin acest pachet legislativ cu privire la securitizare facem un pas important în direcția realizării a ceea ce chemăm Uniunea Europeană a piețelor de capital. De ce spun acest lucru? În primul rând, pentru prima dată, introducem reguli comune cu privire la securitizare, nu numai pentru toate statele membre, dar și pentru toate categoriile de activități financiare, fie că este vorba de bănci, asigurări, managementul activelor și alte activități.

În al doilea rând, aceste reguli asigură transparența, standardizarea, dar și protecția necesară în activitatea de convertire a unor active financiare, prin securitizare, în noi produse financiare care sunt oferite investitorilor. În acest sens, al prudenței, subliniez în mod deosebit trei măsuri cuprinse în acest pachet legislativ: reținerea a cel puțin 5 % din risc de către cei care inițiază securitizarea, condiții stricte prin care noile produse financiare, rezultate prin securitizare, pot fi oferite micilor investitori și, în fine, interzicerea operațiunilor de securitizare succesivă pentru același activ financiar. Să nu uităm, criza financiară a început exact în zona securitizării, a exceselor în cadrul economiei SUA.

Mulțumesc raporturilor și Comisiei pentru acest pachet legislativ.

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Jonás Fernández, en nombre del Grupo S&D. – Señor presidente, la verdad es que llegamos ya a este debate después de largo tiempo negociando ambos Reglamentos, el de las titulizaciones STS y el que varía sus requerimientos de capital.

Muchas veces los ciudadanos con los que me reúno en Asturias, en España, me preguntan qué hacemos en esta Cámara. Incluso el público que está hoy aquí con nosotros nos pregunta qué es eso de las titulizaciones, o en qué trabajamos cada día. Y he de decir que a veces resulta muy difícil explicar cuál es nuestro trabajo, en qué afectan a su día a día los reglamentos, las directivas que aprobamos y debatimos en este Parlamento.

Yo creo que aprobamos hoy dos Reglamentos muy importantes, porque muchas familias están pensando, por ejemplo, en comprar un coche que, probablemente, deseen financiar. O muchas pequeñas empresas están teniendo problemas para que sus entidades bancarias les adelanten el cobro de las facturas o les permitan colocar papel comercial. Y estos dos Reglamentos vienen a ayudar a esas personas.

Estos dos Reglamentos van a permitir que las pequeñas empresas que, en los grandes mercados organizados, no tienen acciones, que no pueden emitir bonos en los mercados de capital internacional, puedan colocar con mayor facilidad ese papel comercial a través de sus propias entidades bancarias, porque estas van a poder titularlo, van a poder colocarlo después en esos mercados internacionales. Además van a permitir que, a esos hogares que están pensando en comprar coches o en comprar otra serie de bienes que necesiten financiar, se les pueda financiar con mejores tipos de interés, con un mejor tratamiento.

Por lo tanto, hoy damos un paso muy importante, porque creemos que necesitamos activar esa capacidad de financiación a la economía real y lo hacemos. Y lo hacemos con prudencia, porque hemos logrado que la Junta Europea de Riesgo Sistémico analice los mercados de capitales para evitar burbujas como la que vivimos en la crisis pasada. Y lo conseguimos también para que los requerimientos de capital o el coste para los bancos de realizar este tipo de operaciones sean un poco menores, pero siempre sujetos a criterios de calidad muy restrictivos sobre ese tipo de créditos: calidades importantes, calidades elevadas para no volver a cometer los errores de la crisis pasada.

Además, con esos dos Reglamentos ayudamos a crear ese mercado de capitales europeo. Porque defendemos que las agencias de calificación, que siempre discriminan por la calidad del soberano, tengan un papel menor y los inversores internacionales se fijen exclusivamente en el riesgo de los créditos pequeños. Miren exactamente cuál es el riesgo para evitar la discriminación entre los países del Norte y los países del Sur. Así que vamos a aprobar esos dos informes, y creo que, a partir de mañana, los ciudadanos europeos lo van a notar en el día a día.

Kay Swinburne, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteurs Mr Tang and Mr Karas on their reports. Securitised products can be incredibly complicated financial products, yet in the past they had an overly simplified reputation and consequently enjoyed widespread use.

Post-financial crisis, the use of securitisation has severely diminished across Europe, however. I therefore commend the effort shown by this Parliament to encourage understanding and rebuild trust and confidence in these instruments. I am pleased that we have managed to bring this report closer to international standards and ensure that the EU is not placed at a competitive disadvantage globally. However, I personally believe that we could have been even more ambitious in this proposal and, indeed, with the Capital Markets Union project as a whole, as this is an area in which our level of achievement does not so far seem to match up to our rhetoric.

For CMU to work, it needs decisive action, not purely discussion and then compromise. We need an overhaul of national tax laws that favour debt over equity-financing, a reaffirmation of a commitment to global, supervisory cooperation and standards globally. Furthermore, a cultural shift here in Europe from savings to investment is critical.

The aims of CMU need to guide our hand in all ongoing legislation. We need consistency across all legislative files. The EMIR review, for example, needs to be very specifically about finding solutions to the unintended consequences and burdens that we have placed upon non-financial companies. Therefore, the classification of securitisation special purpose entities as financial counterparties, for example, as recently released in the Commission draft report, seems to contradict and threaten what we have achieved in the securitisation legislation. We need to be careful going forwards.

Petr Ježek, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, colleagues, the simple, transparent and standardised (STS) securitisation regulation is a key milestone as we move towards a capital markets union. I believe that carefully monitored, high-quality securitisation can serve to benefit business across Europe. In the EU as a whole, we are too reliant on loans and other forms of funding from banks. Capital markets give businesses a new avenue for funding for their activities. The diversification of funding is important to help deliver more growth for the European economy.

During our negotiations on this regulation, we tried to find the right balance between the lessons learned from the financial crisis and having a framework which ensured that we did not stifle the potential of the securitisation market. We have agreed to have a sensible level of skin in the game, with the risk retention rate for banks of 5%. We have recognised the specificities of the asset-backed commercial paper (ABCP) market, particularly as regards pools of car loans and leases. We have enhanced the transparency of securitisation markets, notably through the establishment of data repositories which will enable competent authorities to have a full overview of the products in the market. We have ensured that those who are responsible for originating securitisation products take full responsibility for the products' place in the marketplace. They will not be able to shift responsibility to empty shelves such as special-purpose vehicles. In the Capital Requirements Regulation (CRR) file we have adjusted the prudential requirements by adding a new hierarchy approach and a more risk-sensitive prudential treatment of STS securitisation. In my view, the text we will vote on tomorrow is sensible, prudent, and most of us will give European companies more possibilities to grow.

Νικόλαος Χουντής, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στο όνομα της κεφαλαιακής επάρκειας των ελληνικών τραπεζών, στο όνομα της απελευθέρωσης της αγοράς τιτλοποιημένων δανείων και στο όνομα της διαχείρισης των μη εξυπηρετούμενων δανείων, πραγματοποιείται η καταλήστευση της λαϊκής κατοικίας στην Ελλάδα. Οι ελληνικές τράπεζες, μετά από τρεις ανακεφαλαιοποιήσεις που στοίχισαν στον ελληνικό λαό πάνω από 50 δισεκατομμύρια, βρίσκονται και πάλι σε δυσμενή θέση με κόκκινα δάνεια στους ισολογισμούς τους που αγγίζουν τα 102 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Η τρόικα και η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έχουν συμφωνήσει να βγάλουν στο σφυρί ακόμα και την πρώτη κατοικία μέσω ηλεκτρονικών πλειστηριασμών και της πώλησης σε ειδικά funds – τα «κοράκια» δηλαδή – των κόκκινων δανείων. Αδιαφορούν για τον ελληνικό λαό που υποφέρει, αδιαφορούν για τις επιπτώσεις της επτάχρονης οικονομικής κρίσης και των πολιτικών των μνημονίων που έχουν οδηγήσει στη φτώχεια, την εξαθλίωση, την ανεργία και την καταστροφή της παραγωγικής βάσης της χώρας. Ο ελληνικός λαός, κύριε Πρόεδρε, με σύνθημα «κανένα σπίτι στα χέρια τραπεζίτη», λέει όχι στους πλειστηριασμούς της λαϊκής περιουσίας και κατοικίας, και υπερασπίζεται το σπίτι του, τη δουλειά του και την αξιοπρέπειά του.

Molly Scott Cato, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, it is now nearly a decade since the financial crisis devastated European economies. At the heart of that crisis was the process of repackaging debt to turn it into new assets, a highly lucrative business, but one that created risks to our financial system when unscrupulous traders bundled bad debts with good, kept the profits and socialised the risks.

Today we are debating an attempt by the European institutions to restart this process of securitisation and to give it a seal of approval as STS: simple, transparent securitisation. Sadly, most in the Parliament and Council of Ministers who have agreed on this new legislation seem not to have learned the lessons of the crisis. Greens attempted to limit the damage securitisation might do by proposing that banks share much more of the risk of the loans that they sell off to ensure that they keep adequate skin in the game. They should be discouraged from investing in each other securitisations and should ensure that the products are as simple as possible. This would mean that investors can access the highest-quality information about what is actually in the box, including to what extent the securitisation contributes to sustainability goals.

Rather than strengthening standards against a repetition of past problems, the already unsatisfactory proposal from the Commission was watered down in favour of banks and other lenders of specific kinds of loans, specifically car loans, which many have warned may represent a subprime-style bubble. Negotiations with the Council, where Member States demonstrated even less concern for the safety of the financial system, delivered a result that represents a bad deal for ordinary citizens.

This legislation is the latest example of political amnesia and regulatory rollback with the EU's political leadership favouring the narrow interests of an oversized financial system over the need to promote financial stability, funding to entrepreneurs and small businesses and quality jobs in the real economy. We regret that it will be passed tomorrow and we will certainly vote against it as a group.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'avidità del sistema finanziario e l'incapacità della politica di reagire ci hanno portato alla crisi del 2008-2009, dove c'era stato un utilizzo sconsiderato di questi prodotti di cartolarizzazione dei crediti. Mi sembra un po' assurdo che oggi si tenti di rilanciare l'economia proprio utilizzando cartolarizzazioni che, nonostante un titolo che sembra poco aggressivo (cioè «semplici, trasparenti e standardizzate»), di fatto non lo saranno perché si utilizza uno strumento sbagliato per cercare di rilanciare l'economia. In realtà quello che si rilancerà saranno gli utili dei fondi speculativi, molto interessati ad acquistare queste cartolarizzazioni e a gestirle.

Infatti da una parte la Banca centrale europea continua a dare requisiti di capitale sempre più alti per mandare in crisi le banche che prestano il denaro all'economia reale e dall'altra c'è la Commissione europea che spinge per velocizzare questo processo e incentivare i loro utili.

Ecco, con questo sistema non andremo da nessuna parte. Bisognerebbe partire da una separazione vera bancaria, ma purtroppo ieri ci ha messo una pietra tombale la Commissione europea, eliminandola definitivamente dal suo programma. Bisogna cambiare rotta perché con questi strumenti si rischiano altre crisi sistemiche.

Barbara Kappel, *im Namen der ENF-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission! Erst kürzlich hat der amerikanische Finanzminister eine Reihe von Vorschlägen zur Reform des US-Kapitalmarkts gemacht – auch solche zur Verbriefung. Es stört ihn dabei, dass die Reformen nach der Krise Verbriefungen im Vergleich zu anderen traditionelleren Finanzierungsformen – wie etwa Bankeinlagen – benachteiligen. Es stört ihn auch, dass Darlehenshöhen abgesichert werden müssen, wenn sie verbrieft und gebündelt werden, als wenn sie einzeln in den Bankbilanzen aufscheinen.

Europa geht hier einen anderen Weg. Im September 2015 veröffentlichte die Kommission erstmals den Vorschlag in Bezug auf STS-Verbriefungen, das heißt Verbriefungen, die simpel, transparent und standardisiert sind. Nun haben sich Parlament, Rat und Kommission auf die Rahmendaten einer neuen Verbriefungsregulierung geeinigt, die aus zwei Regelwerken besteht, die heute diskutiert werden. Es sind dies die Verbriefungsverordnung – die Kriterien für alle Verbriefungen, insbesondere STS-Verbriefungen, Anforderungen zur *due diligence* und zum Risikoselbstbehalt – und zweitens die Anpassungen bei der Eigenkapitalverordnung (CRR) zur Umsetzung der überarbeiteten Baseler-Verbriefungsregeln für Institute.

Für Banken ergeben sich aus der Überführung der Baseler-Regelungen zwar Erhöhungen der Risikogewichte, diese werden aber zukünftig geringer ausfallen, wenn sie STS-Kriterien erfüllen. Das heißt, die STS-Kriterien schaffen Anreize, um den europäischen Kapitalmarkt sicherer und robuster zu machen.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, uno de los principales pilares de la unión de los mercados de capitales es el esfuerzo por revitalizar el mercado de la titulización con el fin de mejorar la financiación de nuestra economía.

El paquete regulatorio que mañana aprobaremos establece normas comunes para todas las titulizaciones y constituye un marco para que los productos de titulización sean, a pesar de las dudas de algunos, seguros, simples y transparentes, y estén normalizados y suficientemente supervisados. Estas nuevas normas ayudarán a los inversores a evaluar mejor los riesgos relacionados con la titulización, tanto en los propios productos como en las distintas categorías de productos.

En 2014 vimos cómo el mercado de las titulizaciones se redujo casi un 50 % con respecto a su pico de 2007, y esto llevó a que muchas pymes no logaran la financiación que solicitaban.

Este acuerdo contribuye a crear nuevas posibilidades de inversión en toda la Unión y ofrece una fuente adicional de financiación para la economía, especialmente a las pequeñas y medianas empresas y a las empresas de nueva creación.

Gracias a la reactivación del mercado de titulizaciones, lograremos unas fuentes de financiación más diversificadas y menos dependientes del sector bancario, contribuyendo así a la estabilidad y resistencia general del sistema financiero.

Las previsiones de la Comisión muestran que, si el volumen de la titulización de la Unión Europea alcanzara el nivel medio anterior a la crisis, podría generar entre 100 000 y 150 000 millones de euros más de financiación. Las principales favorecidas serían las pequeñas y medianas empresas, que son el motor de la economía europea.

En conclusión, un mercado de titulizaciones bien estructurado contribuirá a mejorar la eficiencia y la estabilidad del sistema financiero, proporcionar oportunidades de inversión y crear beneficios para los ciudadanos y las empresas, con préstamos más baratos y más accesibles. Bienvenida esta propuesta y enhorabuena al equipo negociador por su gran trabajo.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, vous le savez, pour le groupe socialiste, l'idée que l'urgence était de relancer le marché de la titrisation, quand on sait la responsabilité de ce marché dans la crise dont l'Europe n'est pas encore totalement sortie et dont elle continue à subir certains des effets, n'allait pas de soi.

Nous avons mis un certain nombre de conditions et accueilli l'idée d'une rétention par les banques, afin d'affiner leur responsabilité dans la production de ces produits financiers. Sur ce point, nous avons été un peu déçus, le rapporteur l'a dit. Pour autant, je salue sa détermination, qui nous permet d'avoir une législation qui avance sur trois points très significatifs pour notre groupe, que je veux rappeler ici.

D'abord, un rôle explicite pour le superviseur européen AEMF afin qu'il puisse être engagé dans une médiation obligatoire en cas de désaccord entre les différentes autorités compétentes. Cela va au-delà de ce que souhaitait le Conseil et je crois que c'est une bonne approche pour ne pas se perdre dans des conflits sans fin.

La deuxième avancée que je veux souligner – elle est aussi le résultat de notre détermination –, c'est de faire en sorte que cette titrisation ne puisse pas être basée dans les paradis fiscaux, notamment ceux figurant dans la liste des pays recensés par le GAFI comme ne contribuant pas à la lutte contre l'évasion fiscale, dans le cadre des conventions de l'OCDE.

Troisième point, qui nous tient tout autant à cœur, c'est l'idée – le rapporteur l'a rappelé – que, s'agissant des hypothèques ou des prêts automobiles, on intègre des critères environnementaux – d'une certaine manière, nous avons anticipé les travaux que vous menez maintenant au sein de la Commission européenne –, que nous avons également introduits dans le cadre des PRIIP, et que nous continuerons à promouvoir, afin que les marchés financiers apportent également leur contribution au développement durable de notre planète.

Stanisław Ożóg (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pomimo braku entuzjazmu delegacja polska grupy EKR zdecydowała się poprzeć projekt planu ramowego. Z jednej strony doceniamy fakt, że sekurytyzacja może zwiększyć wydajność i stabilność systemu finansowego oraz stworzyć dodatkowe źródła taniego finansowania dla MŚP, ale z drugiej strony system ten ma poważne wady. Ryzyko kredytowe jest tutaj jedynie przenoszone z instytucji bankowej na niebankową, co utrudni instytucjom nadzoru kontrolę operacji finansowych. O jakiej, w takiej sytuacji, przejrzystości – Szanowni Państwo – my mówimy? Drugim istotnym zagrożeniem jest możliwość manipulacji przez banki rankingiem tych sztucznie generowanych instrumentów, ponownie bez kontroli zewnętrznej. W mojej ocenie projekt wymaga stałego nadzoru i oceny wpływu, by jego jedynym beneficjentem nie okazał się znowu potężny sektor bankowy, ale by zabezpieczał przede wszystkim ostateczne interesy odbiorców usług kredytowych, to jest przedsiębiorców i klientów detalicznych.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Mr President, Commissioner, securitisation is a measure that allows for the transformation of illiquid financial assets into fully tradable financial instruments. In this way, asset-backed securities deepen the liquidity of financial markets and increase the capacity of banks to extend more credit. Moreover, they allow the risk and term structure of available marketable financial instruments to better adjust to the different risk preferences of individual investors. In this sense, securitisation is able to contribute to financial stability and the more efficient allocation of resources across the economy. However, securitisation may carry also risks. Investors may not have access to full information about the underlying assets and their quality. Securitisation may also involve deals that are overly complex and even opaque.

This may result in excessive risk taking by investors and may lead to accumulation of systemic risk in the entire financial sector. The idea behind the two legislative measures we are discussing today is to reduce these risks and to promote a safe and liquid market for securitisation in the EU. Firstly, the regulation strengthens requirements for due diligence and imposes minimal risk-retention standards to ensure that banks retain a net material interest in asset-backed securities they issue. Secondly, there is a ban on re-securitisation. Thirdly, all underlying documentation relevant for any transaction is made readily available to investors. Fourthly, the crucial amendment to the CRR ensures that the capital treatment of securitisation for banks better reflects the risks involved.

Mr. President, I would like to express my thanks to both rapporteurs and to the European Commission for their work. When adopted, this package will not only help us establish a clear set of criteria to identify simple, transparent and standardised securitisations, but it will also contribute to building the Capital Markets Union in Europe.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, we have heard that 10 years ago a major US bank announced losses of USD 8.4 billion in a quarter due to subprime mortgages. The following months were the start of the subprime crisis due to the meltdown of securitisation products affecting European banks. The rest, we all know, is history.

But here we are today debating a new securitisation proposal that should ensure the impact of any future crisis is limited. So my congratulations to the rapporteurs, Paul Tang and Othmar Karas, for getting this complex regulation agreed. I do welcome the fact that it makes financial instruments safer and more transparent, and that there will be greater standardisation. This is a real step forward, and it ensures that an important source of capital can support SMEs in the European economy. It will also bring more substance to the CMU initiative. So there are three points that stand out for me: a new macroprudential framework to ensure efficient oversight of the securitisation market to detect new bubbles; the creation of a data repository to increase transparency for investors and making it mandatory for insurance to make the information public; and a more sustainable financial system.

Nonetheless, Commissioner, I believe there are issues that you still need to be addressing. How do you see the impact of this new regulation in the context of Brexit, given the high level of activity that takes place in the UK and how confident are you that history will not repeat itself, given the trends in the US towards deregulation?

Sander Loones (ECR). – Wanneer banken een heleboel leningen herverpakken om die vervolgens te verpatsen aan andere financiële spelers, dan noemen we dat securitisatie – effectivisering in correct Nederlands. Heel complex allemaal, maar wel zeer belangrijk. Als je bijvoorbeeld kijkt naar de film “The Big Short”, dan wordt daar mooi in uitgelegd hoe die effectivisering mee aan de basis lag van de financiële crisis in de Verenigde Staten. Een goeie film trouwens, een absolute aanrader, Oscar gewonnen ook, een film met Ryan Gosling en met Christian Bale.

Maar we moeten dus oppassen met die financiële trucjes, met die techniekjes, en daarom vind ik het ook echt belangrijk dat het Europees Parlement maatregelen voorstelt om dat eenvoudiger te maken en vooral ook transparanter te maken. Dat is de enige manier om ervoor te zorgen dat ons financieel systeem sterker wordt, stabiel wordt, en we er tegelijk voor kunnen zorgen dat er toch voldoende middelen gepompt worden in onze economie en in het bijzonder ook in onze kmo's.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Hr. Formand! Hr. Kommissær! Handelen med finansielle ydelser, særlige lån, obligationer, værdipapirer og andre opfindsomme måder at rejse kapital på er en risikofyldt affære. Gevinsterne og fordelene kan være enorme, men det kan tabene og konsekvenserne også. Mens man i årene op til finanskrisen havde alt for travlt med at afregulere finanssektoren, har vi i dag travlt med at rydde op efter fortidens laden stå til. Med disse nye reguleringer rydder vi op i nogle af lommerne af finansverdens vilde vesten, der stadigvæk eksisterer. Det er næppe særlig populært på direktionsgangene, men det er sundt for både samfundsøkonomien og i sidste ende for branchen selv. Opskriften er ligetil. Du tager et ordentlig skud gennemsigtighed, nye krav om oplysninger om de reelle ejere, slut med skjulte bagmænd. Vi stiller også krav om dokumentation for, hvor disse selskaber har hjemme. Slut med skjulte skuffeselskaber. Desuden stiller vi krav om oplysninger om præcis, hvor mange penge der er involveret i disse konstruktioner. Dertil en god sjat regulering i form af forbud mod at operere fra skattely og lande med kunstig lav skat, forbud mod at operere fra lande, der ikke samarbejder om udveksling af skatteoplysninger, og sidst, men ikke mindst, strengere straffe for dem, der ikke kan finde ud af at følge de fælles regler, både kontante bøder på op til halvanden million kroner, men også bøder fastsat ud fra en procentdel af virksomhedens omsætning og rige privatpersoners indkomst. Det er rigtig godt og tiltrængt nyt i kampen for bedre regulering af finansmarkederne.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, a titularização está na raiz do processo de financeirização da economia e no coração da bolha especulativa que rebentou em 2008 e mergulhou a Europa e o mundo numa crise social e económica, cujo impacto ainda permanece nas nossas economias. A titularização consiste num instrumento criado pelos banqueiros para limpar os seus balanços, reunindo créditos mais ou menos duvidosos e criando produtos financeiros que nunca foram, nem serão, simples e muito menos transparentes.

Este relançamento do mercado de titularização representa um passo na direção errada. A Europa não precisa de mais finança. A Europa precisa de mais economia real, mais emprego e mais desenvolvimento. Falar de falta de liquidez quando o BCE anda, há meses, a encharcar a Europa com a compra de ativos é, no mínimo, estranho. Em suma, aquilo de que precisamos é de um sistema financeiro público e ao serviço da economia das empresas e dos trabalhadores. Mas este objetivo não cabe nesta União Europeia neoliberal ao serviço da finança e das grandes empresas multinacionais.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Dombrovskis, το πρόβλημα με τα κόκκινα δάνεια έχει χτυπήσει ταβάνι στην Ελλάδα ξεπερνώντας τα 100 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ. Οι πρόσφατες ανακοινώσεις του κυρίου Draghi για αυξημένες προβλέψεις στους ισολογισμούς των τραπεζών λόγω κόκκινων δανείων δίνει στις εμπορικές τράπεζες το άλλοθι να τιτλοποιήσουν και να πουλήσουν άρον άρον τα κόκκινα δάνεια στα ειδικά funds, δηλαδή στα «κοράκια» και μάλιστα, αντί πινακίου φακής. Από τον Μάρτιο του 2016, είχα προτείνει να ισχύσει στην Ελλάδα το κυπριακό μοντέλο που καθιερώνει δικαίωμα προτίμησης του δανειολήπτη να αγοράσει το δανειό του στην τιμή πρώτης προσφοράς που κάνουν τα «κοράκια». Ταυτόχρονα, είχα προτείνει τη δημιουργία ενός ταμείου σωτηρίας των δανειοληπτών προκειμένου οι Έλληνες να μπορέσουν να σώσουν τα σπίτια τους από τα «κοράκια», προκειμένου να μπει τελεία και παύλα στους ηλεκτρονικούς πλειστηριασμούς. Έτσι, 4,5 δισ. ευρώ από τα 25 δισ. ευρώ που περισσεύουν από το τρίτο δανειακό πακέτο των 86 δισεκατομμυρίων μπορούν να χρηματοδοτήσουν το ταμείο διάσωσης δανειοληπτών για να μην περάσει κανένα σπίτι στα χέρια τραπεζίτη.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, first of all, I'm grateful for your engagement and support in the whole process that gets us to the positive result, and I hope that tomorrow's vote will confirm this.

With your support, we now have a clear set of rules to ensure that simple, transparent and standardised securitisation benefits the real economy. The new rules will clearly differentiate between those products which satisfy the criteria and those that do not. This works towards an important funding channel for the EU economy, without endangering financial stability.

Paul Tang, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, thank you to all the contributors to this debate. It is interesting to hear that we still have a difference of opinion, and I think that these proposals – with good work from Othmar Karas – that we have brought together have been able to unite Parliament, but not entirely. Let that also be a warning that there are still some doubts that have been part of the debate.

There are opportunities that are emphasised: it could be an opportunity for refinancing the European economy, especially when the policy of cheap money will end one day. Securitisation will then be an important way of financing, but there are not only opportunities – there are also threats. I would like to call also on the supervisors that have been given an important role in this piece of legislation to take on the duty of closely monitoring and following the market, especially when the market starts – it is crucial that it starts in the right way, and that the market gets functioning. This is what I would like to see: if you want to develop a strong market, you also need a strong government and strong supervision. This is what I hope for, because we will see these markets start – maybe not today, maybe not tomorrow, but the day after tomorrow, when opportunities to finance become scarcer and securitisation becomes more attractive.

Finally, I would like to say that this debate will continue. We have a review, issues have been addressed in the debate, and the European Parliament should follow this market closely at the appropriate times – and I am sure that we will.

Othmar Karas, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Es ist nahezu alles gesagt. Aber es hat die Debatte doch eines gezeigt: dass wir in der Lage sind, ernsthaft miteinander zu diskutieren, obwohl es sich um ein so komplexes Thema handelt. Das ist Parlamentarismus. Wir müssen uns mit den Sorgen und Ängsten und mit den Chancen und Hoffnungen ernsthaft auseinandersetzen und gemeinsam nach Lösungen suchen, und das haben wir hier gemeinsam getan.

Ich möchte den zweiten Punkt aufgreifen. Auch wenn wir jetzt die Ergebnisse der beiden Berichte und des Trilogs loben, so ist das eine Einzelmaßnahme, die alleine unsere Probleme nicht lösen kann. Wir benötigen die Kombination der verschiedenen Maßnahmen, und wir benötigen vor allem die Umsetzung dieser Maßnahmen. Ich will nicht die Hoffnung machen, dass wir mit diesen Regeln alleine das Problem, das wir haben, lösen und alle Lehren aus der Krise gezogen haben. Es ist wiederum ein kleiner Mosaikstein gelungen.

Zum Dritten: Die Debatte hat deutlich gezeigt: die Ursachen der Krise, auf der anderen Seite die Risiken der Verbriefungen und auf der dritten Seite die Chancen. Wir haben versucht, die Risiken zu minimieren, die Chance zu nutzen und Vertrauen durch diese Regelungen zurückzugewinnen. Wir hoffen, dass uns das mit diesem Paket gelungen ist, und wir werden das bei der Evaluierung sehen.

Aber es wurde gute Arbeit gemacht, und ich bitte die Kolleginnen und Kollegen, morgen diesen beiden Berichten ihre Zustimmung zu geben, als einem wichtigen Beitrag zur Schaffung einer Kapitalmarktunion, die weiterentwickelt werden muss.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

15. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien – Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (Aussprache)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate conjunto sobre:

— el informe de Daniel Caspary, en nombre de la Comisión de Comercio Internacional, sobre el mandato de negociación para las negociaciones comerciales con Australia (2017/2192(INI)) (A8-0311/2017), y

— el informe de Daniel Caspary, en nombre de la Comisión de Comercio Internacional, sobre el mandato de negociación para las negociaciones comerciales con Nueva Zelanda (2017/2193(INI)) (A8-0312/2017).

Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, maybe the plenary is so efficient today that people have not had time to go down the stairs, but for those Honourable Members who are here, I would like to talk about Australia and New Zealand tonight. As you know, they are friends, allies and partners of the European Union. We share a lot with them – our norms, our values, different approaches – and strengthening that relationship is a priority.

The EU has signed political framework agreements with both countries to further strengthen the partnership on the basis of these values: respect for democratic principles, human rights, fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, promotion together of international peace and security, and also our joint work to strengthen the multilateral system and global rule-based trade. The EU has a healthy and mature trade and investment relationship with both these countries. We are one of the biggest partners of Australia and New Zealand in the trade of goods, services and foreign direct investment.

Australia and New Zealand have concluded foreign trade agreements with China, with ASEAN, with Japan and with Korea. They are part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership with 11 countries, and they are moving ahead. These developments have put European exporters of goods, services and investors in a comparatively less favourable situation compared to their competitors in other countries. The Commission has carried out an impact assessment, clearly showing the benefits of these agreements for European producers and consumers. The already considerable EU exports to both countries, on a par with our exports to Canada, could increase by a third in the long term.

The submission to the public consultation and the Commission's impact assessment paid particular attention to some significant sensitive sectors in European agriculture in the context of these free trade agreements, and also what we do on our broad agenda: dairy, beef, sheep meat and sugar. The Commission made it absolutely clear to our partners in Australia and New Zealand that agricultural sensitivities must be taken into account in these negotiations. No full liberalisation can be imagined. The Commission has therefore proposed that the negotiating directives specifically include this aspect to ensure that the future agreement will not cause any disruption in the EU, including in our outermost regions.

On 13 September, as you recall, the Commission adopted recommendations for negotiating authorisations and directives for free trade agreements with Australia and New Zealand. An important difference with our recent practice is that these recommendations do not cover investment protection. That does not mean that we will not negotiate investment protection agreements with Australia and New Zealand, but it does not have to be right now. We are reflecting, following the opinion of the Court of Justice on the Singapore Free Trade Agreement, and we are engaged in a discussion with Member States about the future architecture of the EU trade and investment agreement. We have also taken into account what some Member States said, namely that if investment protection is proposed additionally, then Parliament should of course be consulted on that aspect as well.

I just want to end with a few words on transparency. This is something that you, this Chamber, often – and very rightly so – demand of the Commission. As I strongly support transparency as well, we have made these recommendations public to the world. We invited Member States to engage early with their national parliaments so that there could be an early discussion on these two negotiations and of course also to facilitate your work on this and to give the general public an idea what trade negotiations are about and what is in this agreement. This is to strengthen, not to undermine, the important work that you do in this regard.

These proposed directives are now under discussion in the Council. I hope that they will soon give us the authorisation to launch these negotiations without delay. In this context, we in the Commission very much welcome your contribution – the debate tonight and the votes you will have tomorrow on this – which contribute to giving us a clear steer of the priorities of Parliament in the upcoming negotiations. We will of course, as always, keep you closely informed about developments as we take these initiatives forward.

The free trade agreements will help EU companies to have better access to the markets in Australia and New Zealand. These trade agreements can create jobs, bring about benefits to consumers and also support workers' rights and environmental and climate change objectives. This initiative is framed by our strategy to promote openness based on values and standards with like-minded partners committed to progressive rules for global trade. This is another part of our work to build bridges, not walls, with a circle of friends who share our values and this is also very much a political message, as well as an economic and trade policy question.

I very much look forward to the debate tonight.

Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, in Vertretung des Berichterstatters. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es tut mir leid, dass ich im letzten Moment hier reingerannt bin. Aber wir haben in unserer Fraktion gerade zeitgleich eine Diskussion über dieses Dossier gehabt. Ich sehe, dass hier nach mir zwei Vertreter des Landwirtschaftsausschusses sprechen werden, und gerade ging es zwischen Handel und Landwirtschaft hitzig zu. Deswegen habe ich ein bisschen die Zeit vergessen.

Ich möchte hier im Namen des Berichterstatters Daniel Caspary gern um Unterstützung für die Empfehlungen an den Rat über das Mandat für die Handelsverhandlungen der EU mit Australien und mit Neuseeland werben. Es ist eine alte Forderung der EVP-Fraktion, aber auch des Parlaments, Freihandelsverhandlungen mit diesen Staaten zu beginnen.

Wir wissen alle, dass wir, nachdem sich jetzt die Vereinigten Staaten aus TTIP zurückgezogen haben, in eine ganz andere geopolitische Situation haben und es der richtige Moment, für die EU ist zu zeigen, dass wir für Freihandel sind. Aber wohlgemerkt – und da spreche ich auch an die Kollegen des Landwirtschaftsausschusses an – für Freihandel auch zugunsten unserer Landwirtschaft.

Wir haben schon mit mehreren Ländern des asiatisch-pazifischen Raums Verhandlungen angefangen bzw. Abkommen abgeschlossen. Es ist also logisch, dass wir es jetzt mit diesen beiden machen.

Drei Punkte möchte der Berichterstatter besonders hervorheben. Erstens: Am 13. September hat die Kommission Mandate vorgelegt, die sich ausschließlich auf Handels- und Investitionsliberalisierungsabkommen beziehen. Die Mandate umfassen ausschließlich Inhalte, die in der Kompetenz der Europäischen Union liegen. Das ist der Ansatz, den die Fraktion und auch das Parlament unterstützen sollten, da somit die Handlungsfähigkeit der europäischen Handelspolitik sichergestellt ist.

In diesem Sinne haben sich auch die Fraktionen geeinigt, das Thema Investitionsschutz in den Berichten außen vor zu lassen. Sollte allerdings entweder der Rat das Thema Investitionsschutz den Mandaten hinzufügen oder die Kommission einen Vorschlag für ein zweites Abkommen, inklusive Investitionsschutz, vorlegen, wird sich das Parlament dann auf jeden Fall dazu positionieren. Ich füge hier hinzu: positionieren müssen.

Das Thema Landwirtschaft ist im Handel mit Australien und Neuseeland ein sensibles Thema. Dementsprechend haben sich auch hier die Fraktionen auf einen Kompromiss geeinigt, der dieses sensible Thema angemessen berücksichtigt.

Drittens: Durchsetzungsmechanismus im Nachhaltigkeitskapitel. Das ist ein strittiges Thema zwischen den beiden großen Fraktionen – auch alle anderen Fraktionen haben dazu unterschiedliche Meinungen. S&D fordert einen sanktionsbasierten Mechanismus, die EVP sieht solch einen Ansatz kritisch. Als Kompromiss haben wir uns auf eine Formulierung zwischen den beiden großen Fraktionen geeinigt, wie wir sie schon in anderen Entschlüssen verabschiedet haben, zum Beispiel in der Entschlüsselung für die Verhandlungen mit Chile.

Ich hoffe, dass die anderen Fraktionen uns folgen werden. Ich möchte hier auch im Namen des Berichtstatters den Kollegen des Landwirtschaftsausschusses, aber auch allen Kollegen, die fürchten, durch Globalisierung und Freihandel könnte unser Kontinent sich zu viel verändern, ganz deutlich sagen: Wir werden auch im Handelsausschuss dafür sorgen, dass unsere Standards, seien es Sozialstandards, Umweltstandards und Verbraucherschutzstandards, gewährleistet werden.

Момчил Неков, докладчик по становището на комисията по земеделие и развитие на селските райони. – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, уважаема г-жо Малмстрьом, Нова Зеландия и Австралия са наши традиционни партньори и има потенциал да намерим общи пресечни точки за ръст. При все това, една пълна либерализация и то прилагаша се в кратки срокове, би действала пагубно, особено в сектор „земеделие“ в Европа. Изказвам подкрепата си за доклада относно Нова Зеландия, за това продукти като овчето месо, млечните продукти и бих добавил и меда, да бъдат разгледани като чувствителни и да има по-специален подход за тях например чрез квоти или преходни периоди. Високите европейски стандарти за хуманно отношение към животните и европейските географски означения също трябва да намерят достойно място по време на преговорите.

Обръщам се с призив за европейските производители, притеснени от Брекзит и ефекта му. Сега съществуващите квоти за внос на продукти, реализирани традиционно на британския пазар, трябва да бъдат преразгледани и намалени разумно на база пазарно присъствие, например с близо 40% за овчето месо. Без промяна при тях ще има сериозен натиск върху европейските производители, а не можем да допуснем те да бъдат жертва на решението на британците да напуснат ЕС.

James Nicholson, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development*. – Mr President, it has been clear for some time that Europe has been keen to open trade talks with Australia and New Zealand. I am firmly of the belief that ambitious, balanced and comprehensive free trade arrangements with Australia and New Zealand can be of mutual benefit to both sides. However, any deal must respect the sensitivities of European agriculture, and I welcome the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development has the opportunity to come forward with this opinion.

Producers across Europe are not anti-free trade. All they ask is a level playing field, treating as sensitive products that would be exposed by EU producers to excessive unsustainable pressure. For instance, by introducing transitional periods, appropriate quotas and factoring in respect for seasonal cycles, which we expect to see particularly for the lamb sector.

Can I also say that agriculture cannot be made the bargaining chip of these negotiations. The Commission needs to keep the European agri-foods sector and MEPs informed of all aspects of negotiations, and I thank my shadow rapporteurs for Australia and New Zealand and Mr Andrieu for putting forward these opinions. May I say to Ms Quisthoudt-Rowohl – whom I have known for a long time in this chamber as she entered the same time as I did, that, although she's not listening at the moment – that she doesn't have to fear agriculture as much as she thinks.

Christofer Fjellner, *för PPE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Det borde vara en självklarhet för EU att teckna frihandelsavtal med två likasinnade länder som Australien och Nya Zeeland. Det här är trots allt två av väldigt få länder som möter EU:s fulla tullmur. Det är två av väldigt få länder som vi inte har något avtal med. Andra sådana länder är Ryssland, China, Taiwan och Nordkorea, och Australien och Nya Zeeland förtjänar inte att vara i det sammanhanget.

Den stora konfliktfrågan vi har är givetvis hur vi ska hantera känsliga sektorer. I den här resolutionen krävs det att vi ska undanta känsliga sektorer, men det tycker jag vore helt fel. Jag förstår om man vill undanta känsliga produkter, men sektorer? Vi vet vad vi pratar om: jordbrukssektorn. Jag tycker att vi måste ha bättre självförtroende när vi pratar om handel med jordbruk i Europaparlamentet. Vi är världens största exportör av jordbruksprodukter. Vi har hittills vunnit på handel med jordbruksprodukter. Jag är övertygad om att vi kommer att göra det även i framtiden, särskilt med Australien och Nya Zeeland. Därför föreslår jag att vi ska se positivt på det, i stället för att oro oss för handeln med Australien och Nya Zeeland.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Werte Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Australien und Neuseeland sind hochentwickelte Staaten, die unsere Werte teilen. Deshalb muss es ja auch möglich sein, dass wir ein faires, ausgewogenes Abkommen auf hohem Niveau mit hohen Standards abschließen können.

Die Verhandlungen müssen transparent ablaufen, weil alle, das Europäische Parlament, die nationalen Parlamente und die Öffentlichkeit, ein Recht darauf haben, umfassend informiert zu werden. Ich bin optimistisch: Wie die Kommissarin schon gesagt hat, wurden erstmalig die Mandatsentwürfe veröffentlicht. Ich appelliere auch an den Rat, dem nachzukommen und die Verhandlungsmandate, wenn sie dann verabschiedet worden sind, auch zu veröffentlichen. Zudem muss auch weiter das Europäische Parlament gestärkt und in den Verhandlungsprozess eingebunden werden, und zwar von der Verabschiedung der Mandate bis zum Abschluss der Verhandlungen.

Ein grundlegender Pfeiler der Handelspolitik ist auch ein starkes, durchsetzbares Nachhaltigkeitskapitel, das dem Schutz der Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer, der Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten und der Umwelt dient. Bei Verstößen oder auch bei Nichteinhaltung von Bestimmungen soll es als letzte Möglichkeit einen Sanktionsmechanismus geben. Soziale, arbeitsrechtliche und ökologische Standards müssen besser durchsetzbar sein.

Nutzen wir die Chance für ein Vorzeigeabkommen mit Australien und Neuseeland, von dem alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger gleichermaßen profitieren! Diese Abkommen könnten ein Modell für künftige Abkommen sein, wenn die Verhandlungen nicht mehr hinter verschlossenen Türen geführt werden, sondern transparent sind, und die Frage der Nachhaltigkeit denselben Stellenwert erhält wie der Abbau von Tarifen.

David Campbell Bannerman, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr. President, it seems odd that only the ECR Group seems to recognise that Australia and New Zealand are different countries with separate trade deals, and not one nation as this debate suggests.

I would not advise calling an Australian a New Zealander, nor a New Zealander an Australian, especially not if they play rugby for the All Blacks, but I do welcome doing free trade agreements with both these great, independent and democratic trading nations. It is well overdue.

Now existing bilateral arrangements and regulatory cooperation make the case for a deeper agreement to be negotiated relatively easily. I note that the New Zealand deal may be based on around 80% of the recent Canada or CETA trade deal, which is considered to be a gold standard.

My group does take issue with two key points in the report though. Firstly, the inclusion of a sanctions-based mechanism on the trade and sustainable development – or TSD – chapter. This is an ineffective approach which discourages goodwill and damages engagement in negotiations.

Secondly, the exclusion of the so-called ‘sensitive’ agricultural sectors from the report. Australia and New Zealand have the right to promote their agricultural exports, and it is a sorry state of affairs when the EU embraces protectionism.

Our partners have made it clear that they would enter negotiations with an open mind and it is a shame the European Commission is not doing the same.

(Applause)

Hannu Takkula, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, rouva komissaari, arvoni kollegat, Australia ja Uusi-Seelanti ovat kaksi erillistä maata, kuten kaikki tiedämme, mutta molempien kanssa ollaan tekemässä omaa sopimusta.

Nämä molemmat maat ovat kuitenkin arvopohjaltaan yhteneväisiä Euroopan unionin kanssa. Voi sanoa, että kun jaamme samat arvot, on luontevaa myös syventää niiden kanssa kauppasuhteita entisestään. Meillä on myös nykyään tuomioistuimen lausunto niistä rajoista, joiden mukaan meidän tulee kauppasopimuksissa liikkua, joten voimme taata sopimuksen ripeän ratifioinnin ja soveltamisen aloittamisen.

Olen pääosin tyytyväinen tähän mietintöön, mutta haluan nostaa esille kaksi kohtaa, joissa uskon, että voimme vielä hiukan hioa tekstiä parempaan ja tasapainoisempaan suuntaan.

Tahtoisin poistaa viittauksen herkkien maataloussektorien poistamiseen mandaatista. Minusta on itsestään selvää, että komissio voi neuvottelujen aikana rajata maataloussektoreita ulos ja sen tarvittaessa tekeekin, mutta lähtökohta, että jätetään osa sektoreista mandaatin ulkopuolelle, ei ole pragmaattinen lähestymistapa, ja tästä syystä tahtoisin poistaa tämän kirjauksen.

Lisäksi, mitä tulee kestävän kehityksen kappaleiden mahdollisiin sanktioihin, henkilökohtaisesti pitäisin tältäkin osin pragmaattista lähestymistapaa oikeana. Ensin pitää selvittää, miten tämä on teknisesti mahdollista, ja sitten vasta siirtyä tähän käytäntöön.

Nämä kirjaukset kuitenkin kuuluvat jo riitojen ratkaisujen piiriin. Toivon siis hyvää ja tasapainoista sopimusta ja luotan komissaariin ja hänen joukkoihinsa, että he pystyvät tämän tekemään, jotta saadaan sellainen vapaakauppasopimus, joka hyödyttää molempia osapuolia. Niin kuin sanoin, erittäin tärkeää on myös muistaa kauppasopimuksia tehdessä, että kysymys on pohjimmiltaan arvoista ja arvopohjaisista sopimuksista ja kun Uuden-Seelannin ja Australian kanssa tässä toimimme, me jaamme saman arvopohjan. Tältä pohjalta on hyvä edetä.

Patrick Le Hyaric, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, les négociations avec l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande ne sont pas, comme vous le dites, un partenariat. Elles constituent la fuite en avant libre-échangiste dans la guerre économique des multinationales, sans aucune considération pour les petits producteurs agricoles européens.

Alors que nous n'avons pas encore réglé les différends à l'Organisation mondiale du commerce sur la répartition des quotas d'importations agricoles qui vont découler du Brexit, voilà que nous négocions avec deux géants agricoles parmi les plus compétitifs au monde et, de surcroît, dans des secteurs qui sont déjà en crise dans l'Union européenne, notamment tout le secteur de l'élevage et de la production laitière.

Poursuivre ces négociations après le CETA et donner suite à la volonté de la Commission de lancer un autre traité, avec le Mercosur, c'est à coup sûr signer la mort d'une agriculture paysanne, garante d'une alimentation de qualité et d'emplois. Nous défendons la coopération avec l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande, mais nous refusons ce libre-échangeisme mortifère.

(L'orateur accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Christofer Fjellner (PPE), *blue-card question*. – I would just like to pose one question to the last speaker.

I wonder if you are aware of the fact that France, which you represent, is a net exporter of agricultural products, and yet you seem to want to roll back agricultural trade in general as you think it doesn't benefit the farmers. But don't you think the French farmers happen to be one of the biggest winners, due to the fact that you are one of the biggest exporters? Who do you really represent when coming with such claims?

Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Dans mon pays, plus du tiers des agriculteurs gagnent moins de 350 euros par mois et on compte un suicide d'agriculteur tous les deux jours. Par conséquent, en matière de bénéfice pour l'agriculture française, on repassera.

Deuxièmement, du fait des importations de Nouvelle-Zélande, d'Australie, notre production ovine est totalement démantelée. La combinaison entre l'accord avec le Mercosur, les quotas d'importation qu'on vient d'accepter pour le Canada et cet accord-là va détruire littéralement notre élevage bovin.

Nous sommes exportateurs de produits agroalimentaires, mais notre agriculture française et particulièrement les petits et moyens paysans sont en train de mourir, et je ne veux pas que ça continue.

Klaus Buchner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Soll dieser Apfel hier in Zukunft aus Neuseeland kommen? Dann hat er mehr Flugmeilen hinter sich als mancher Minister.

Die EU will neue Freihandelsabkommen mit Australien und Neuseeland abschließen. Morgen werden wir im Plenum darüber diskutieren und auch abstimmen. Dabei stellt sich die Frage: Brauchen wir diese Abkommen überhaupt? Unsere Industrie will sicher Maschinen, Autos usw. exportieren. Australien will zum Beispiel Schafffleisch, Kohle, Uran und Erze exportieren, Neuseeland Fleisch, Milchprodukte und andere landwirtschaftliche Produkte.

Ist es wirklich sinnvoll, z. B. die Milch oder die landwirtschaftlichen Produkte um den halben Erdkreis zu transportieren, wo wir doch selber so viel davon haben? Wir haben einen Milchsee, wir haben genügend Schafffleisch. Wir brauchen diese Produkte nicht. Aber in diesen Ländern wird billiger produziert als bei uns, weil sie niedrigere Tierschutzstandards haben. Das bedeutet, dass unsere Landwirtschaft Jobs verlieren wird.

Es ist nicht wahr, dass wir – zumindest auf allen Ebenen – durch diese landwirtschaftlichen Produkte neue Jobs schaffen. Im Gegenteil. Schauen wir doch, wie es bei NAFTA gegangen ist, dem Abkommen zwischen den USA, Kanada und Mexiko. Dort sind 800 000 Jobs verloren gegangen – vor allem in der Landwirtschaft.

Abgesehen davon geht es bei diesen Abkommen ja nicht nur um den Handel; den könnte man leichter regeln, wenn man die Zölle abschaffen und gleiche Standards schaffen würde. Dazu brauchen wir diese Abkommen nicht.

Moderne Freihandelsabkommen beinhalten ganz andere Dinge: Sie schränken – zumindest in gewissem Maße – unsere Gesetzgebung ein. Mir zergeht noch immer auf der Zunge, wie die Formulierung im CETA-Abkommen ist. Dort heißt es ausdrücklich, dass unnötige Schranken für Handel und Investitionen abgebaut werden müssen bzw. keine neuen kommen dürfen. Was unnötig ist, bestimmen nicht wir hier im Parlament, sondern das bestimmen irgendwelche Industrielken. Das bedeutet einen ganz tiefen Eingriff in unsere Souveränität, in unsere Freiheit. Man kann es anders ausdrücken: Man kann sagen, dass durch diese Freihandelsabkommen die neoliberale Wirtschaft bei uns eingeführt wird.

Nathan Gill, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, yes trade talks with Australia and New Zealand will be a litmus test for the EU and the UK to see how each fares after the so-called divorce.

It is no surprise that the EU has chosen these countries to kick off post-Brexit talks and wants to complete a trade deal as soon as possible. I suspect it may be a case of one-upmanship. As it is said, if you cannot do trade with New Zealand, you cannot do it with anyone, as New Zealand is one of the most liberal trading nations in the world.

In fact, no other country has so many mutual regulatory agreements with the EU already in place than New Zealand, preparing the ground for a swift and a smooth FTA. No other country that is but the UK.

Like our self-determining Commonwealth cousins we are also champions of free trade. Yet the UK starts from a position of even greater commonality with the EU, following decades of harmonised legislation. So do a good deal with New Zealand and Australia. Prove to the world that the EU is serious about free trade. But be warned, you must also do a good deal with Britain. The eyes of the world are watching, and if another nation sees petty, preferential or protectionist treatment to spite a Britain that simply wants to govern itself, as indeed they do in Wellington and Canberra, it will be Brussels that is judged, not Brexit.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ENF*. –Monsieur le Président, Madame le rapporteur, est-il nécessaire, aujourd'hui, de rappeler au sein de cette assemblée, comme certains l'ont fait, que l'Australie est le troisième exportateur mondial de viande bovine et le troisième exportateur mondial de sucre, qu'elle est en position dominante dans le secteur du lait et des céréales, et un colosse mondial sur le plan de l'exportation de produits agricoles? Quant à la Nouvelle-Zélande, c'est un des principaux pays exportateurs de viande ovine.

Bovins, ovins, céréales, sucre, voilà d'ores et déjà tous les secteurs qui vont être touchés invariablement et directement en France et en Europe, sans évoquer l'empreinte carbone, puisque les steaks dans nos assiettes auront fait 15 000 kilomètres, alors même que nous avons des viandes de belle et saine qualité ici, chez nous, et que, parallèlement à cette absurdité, l'Union européenne prône le respect de l'environnement en toute occasion.

Mais, ce qui nous inquiète le plus encore, c'est la menace qui pèserait sur la santé des consommateurs puisque, je vous le rappelle, ces deux pays autorisent le clonage d'animaux à des fins alimentaires.

Nous ne voulons plus de ces négociations qui, à l'instar de celles sur le TAFTA, sont menées par la Commission dans l'opacité la plus totale, où ni les parlements nationaux, ni les gouvernements n'ont été autorisés à accéder aux documents, alors qu'ils étaient disponibles pour les grands patrons des multinationales, pour la bonne et simple raison, me direz-vous, qu'ils faisaient partie des négociations et de la rédaction. Aujourd'hui, pouvez-vous simplement ou seulement nous garantir que les parlements nationaux seront consultés, et à quel moment?

Enfin, ce système d'arbitrage nous dirige vers un système régi selon les principes du *Common Law*, où le texte ne sera pas figé, puisqu'il sera amené à évoluer en fonction des décisions prises et des intérêts particuliers des multinationales, et de cela, nous n'en voulons pas.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, yo también quiero felicitar al señor Caspary por su trabajo en esta materia y me voy a referir esencialmente a Australia. Es un país importante en una región tan dinámica económicamente como Asia y el Pacífico. Australia tiene una economía muy desarrollada y abierta, y la Unión Europea es ya el segundo exportador a Australia después de China. Un acuerdo de libre comercio equilibrado y mutuamente beneficioso incrementará nuestras relaciones económicas y comerciales con ese país.

Con Australia, además, acaba de firmar la Unión Europea el llamado *Framework Agreement*, el Acuerdo Marco. Con este Acuerdo y el futuro acuerdo comercial tendríamos una plataforma muy sólida para profundizar nuestra relación con Australia, país lejano pero muy cercano desde el punto de vista de la historia, los principios y los valores.

Australia es, en Asia el Pacífico, un aliado natural, por así decirlo, de la Unión Europea. Ayudemos a reforzar esta relación. Además, la futura Europa de los veintisiete tiene también que estar muy presente en Australia.

Por otra parte, la economía europea y las empresas europeas necesitan los mercados exteriores. Por eso, señora comisaria, yo le animo a que siga su línea de tejer esa extensa red de acuerdos comerciales, y que el acuerdo con Australia sea uno de ellos.

Alessia Maria Mosca (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la politica commerciale, pur non potendo da sola risolvere tutte le questioni del nostro tempo, è uno strumento potente e apprezziamo quindi lo slancio impresso dal Presidente Juncker sul commercio durante il discorso sullo stato dell'Unione.

L'Unione europea, nel vuoto lasciato dagli Stati Uniti, deve sfruttare l'impeto e affermarsi come il principale attore globale in materia commerciale. Accogliamo quindi positivamente la richiesta relativa al lancio dei negoziati con Australia e Nuova Zelanda perché crediamo nella possibilità di stabilire con essi regole comuni, virtualmente globali, che promuovono un modello di sviluppo sostenibile.

Crediamo però che debbano essere sempre tenute in conto alcune considerazioni e che si debba insistere: per prima cosa, perché al rinnovato impegno della Commissione in materia di trasparenza segua una pari disciplina da parte del Consiglio; secondo, affinché siano sempre considerati gli effetti sul nostro mercato interno degli accordi, al fine di intervenire in caso di sbilanciamenti, specie nella fase transitoria di aggiustamento; terzo, perché il capitolo sullo sviluppo sostenibile sia uno strumento di intervento efficace e vincolante; quarto, perché durante tutta la fase dei negoziati il Parlamento sia subito parte del processo, sia costantemente tenuto al corrente e partecipi attivamente al fine di rendere sempre più effettiva la partecipazione democratica, nel pieno espletamento delle sue funzioni e perché vengano date le necessarie rassicurazioni ai cittadini, ma anche per informarli sulle potenziali opportunità che si apriranno; quinto, affinché sia garantita la massima reciprocità non solo in termini di accesso al mercato ma anche in materia di appalti pubblici, qualità e sicurezza dei prodotti nel trattamento riservato alle autorità nazionali.

Infine ci auguriamo quindi che i negoziati e l'accordo possano essere la cornice per un dialogo che migliori le reciproche potenzialità e prevenga le distorsioni.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, it has been a long time, but finally we've got there, and I have to say that I am very happy that we are about to start negotiations about free trade agreement with Australia and New Zealand for at least three reasons.

One is that what we have here are two like-minded partners, very stable countries and the fastest-growing developed economies. Free trade agreements with them will definitely help to deliver jobs, growth and investment and will benefit EU businesses and citizens alike.

Secondly, I see a window of opportunity for the entire European Union to promote free trade worldwide, after the United States became a bit more hesitant in that direction, and I think that we should take advantage of that.

And thirdly, last but not least, as a rapporteur for the free trade agreement between the EU and Vietnam, I can only welcome the fact that we are opening up new opportunities in the Pacific region, and it can only be good news that we will cooperate more with the most dynamic economic region in the world.

Monika Vana (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Es kann nicht sein, dass die essenzielle demokratiepolitische Kontrollfunktion des Europäischen Parlaments und der nationalen Parlamente bei der Gestaltung von Handelsabkommen umgangen wird, unter dem Deckmantel, dass hier im Verhandlungsmandat nur EU-Kompetenzen berührt seien. Die Erfahrungen aus TTIP, CETA und TiSA zeigen, dass bei Verhandlungen von Handelsabkommen wenig bis keine Rücksicht auf die Interessen der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger genommen wird und auch wir als Europaabgeordnete von den Verhandlungen ausgeschlossen sind.

Wir Grüne fordern deshalb ein interinstitutionelles Abkommen, damit sichergestellt wird, dass das Europaparlament bei Freihandelsabkommen in Zukunft Mitgesetzgeber wird und aktiv die Interessen der Bürger und Bürgerinnen vertreten kann. Auch die nationalen Parlamente müssen zum Verhandlungsmandat Stellung nehmen können, bevor der Rat der Kommission das Mandat erteilt.

Wir Grüne wollen eine gerechte und faire Regelung für die Weltwirtschaft, die nicht von Großkonzernen und Gewinnmaximierung diktiert wird. Wir wollen die Ausnahme der öffentlichen Dienstleistungen aus dem Verhandlungsmandat, und wir wollen die Umwelt-, Sozial- und Konsumentenstandards schützen, denn sie sind keine Handelshemmnisse, sie sind wichtige Errungenschaften für Europas Bürger und Bürgerinnen.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissario, l'Australia e la Nuova Zelanda sono certo paesi lontani ma sono e possono essere anche partner commerciali di primo piano per l'Europa e per l'Italia e soprattutto, in alcuni casi, sono partner vantaggiosi. Noi italiani esportiamo in Nuova Zelanda due volte di più di quanto importiamo (400 milioni contro 200) e in Australia addirittura sette volte più di quanto importiamo (3,5 miliardi contro meno di 500 milioni). Indubbiamente, inoltre, questi paesi rivestono un ruolo di ponte per l'Europa verso la regione asiatica e del Pacifico.

Se queste sono le premesse, un trattato commerciale può essere un'opzione importante da sostenere. Abbiamo però posto una condizione inderogabile, su cui non possiamo in alcun modo transigere: proteggere l'agricoltura, l'allevamento e il settore lattiero-caseario. Questi paesi, infatti, sono tra i primi produttori mondiali di latte e di carne: la Nuova Zelanda, ad esempio, ha una media di 419 capi a mandria, contro i 36 europei, ed esporta all'estero l'88 % della sua produzione. Senza tutele in questi settori, quindi, per noi non ci potrà essere alcun tipo di accordo. Domani però noi non voteremo un trattato con questi paesi, ma solo le direttive per negoziarlo efficacemente.

In questi mesi qui al Parlamento europeo abbiamo negoziato duramente, ci siamo battuti con fermezza per fare in modo che il trattato finale contenga una tutela delle indicazioni geografiche, clausole di salvaguardia, contingenti tariffari e misure speciali di tutela, come richiesto anche dalle associazioni di categoria. Abbiamo voluto fissare dei paletti che proteggano i settori sensibili dell'agricoltura e del latte, abbiamo chiesto equità, trasparenza e garanzie per i diritti e per gli interessi dei cittadini.

A questo punto non resta che augurarmi che il Consiglio faccia la cosa giusta, che ascolti le nostre parole e che, quando rilascerà il mandato a negoziare, preveda una competenza mista di Stati membri e Unione europea, senza eludere così i processi democratici nazionali. Per noi i diritti dei cittadini e i diritti dei consumatori non sono in alcun modo negoziabili.

Franz Obermayr (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Mit Abbruch der transpazifischen Partnerschaftsverhandlungen durch Trump im Januar dieses Jahres ergibt sich natürlich eine handelspolitische Nische für die Union, und die sollte natürlich auch genutzt werden. Auch im Hinblick auf die *Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership* – China, Japan, Indien etc. – ergibt sich hier eine Brückenfunktion, die ebenfalls vorteilhaft sein könnte. Allerdings fallen mir schon einige Formulierungen in diesem Mandat auf, das sehr viel Raum für Interpretationen offen lässt. Zum Beispiel wird festgehalten, dass durchsetzbare Zusagen im Bereich der Energie – aber auch staatseigener Unternehmen – als solches wichtig sind, und das lässt natürlich sehr viel offen.

Weiters: Eine große Sorge ist natürlich die Flut der landwirtschaftlichen Produkte, die in Australien und Neuseeland erzeugt werden und die natürlich auch importiert werden sollen, und schließlich die umstrittenen Schiedsgerichtsabkommen, die wieder in diesem Mandat drinnen sind, was natürlich nicht nachvollziehbar ist.

Es verbleibt somit viel Hoffnung, aber auch der bittere Geschmack und die vage Hoffnung, dass hier bei transparenten Verhandlungen doch einige kritische Punkte noch herausverhandelt werden können, und das wäre natürlich gerade für unsere Bürger und für zukünftige Verhandlungen sehr, sehr wichtig.

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Współpraca między Unią Europejską a Nową Zelandią i Australią jest na bardzo dobrym poziomie. Wymiana czy obroty między obu stronami to w sumie ok. 58 miliardów euro: 8 miliardów przypada na Nową Zelandię, 45 na Australię, ale wszystko to nie stanowi granic możliwości naszych stron. W tym krótkim wystąpieniu nie chciałbym jednak poświęcać czasu sprawom ekonomicznym. W wystąpieniu pani komisarz spodobało mi się stwierdzenie, że chcemy tą umową, a także tymi umowami, budować mosty, a nie mury. Słyszałem tutaj bardzo wiele wystąpień wpisujących się w budowanie murów, a nie mostów, jakie Unia Europejska chce budować na świecie po to, żeby tworzyć świat oparty na wzajemnym zrozumieniu, wzajemnej współpracy i współdziałaniu, świat, który oparty jest na pokoju i budowaniu dobrobytu.

David Martin (S&D). – Mr President, this for me is a bittersweet moment. I have argued in this Parliament for over 20 years for free trade agreements with Australia and with New Zealand, and they have finally arrived. Negotiations are about to begin, and by the time these negotiations are complete, I am afraid that my country will no longer be part of the European Union and thus unable to take advantage of the free trade agreement.

It is also a bittersweet moment though because the Committee on International Trade – of all committees – has, in my opinion, produced quite a protectionist resolution, and I hope we can amend some of that tomorrow. It is quite right, as colleagues have said, that we should want to defend certain sensitive products, make sure we have quotas on certain products, and make sure we negotiate safeguards for certain products, but to ask for a whole sector to be excluded from negotiations is a crazy way to begin negotiations, especially if that sector is the key sector for our negotiating partners. Why would the Australians or the New Zealanders make concessions to us on GIs, on non-agricultural market access or on sustainable development, which is so important to my group, if we are not even prepared to start talking about agriculture? It is a cloud-cuckooland position to have.

(Applause.)

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Zabierając głos w debacie poświęconej mandatowi Komisji do negocjacji handlowych z Australią i Nową Zelandią, chcę zdecydowanie podkreślić, że nie można zgodzić się na poświęcenie europejskiego rolnictwa na ołtarzu umowy handlowej z tymi krajami. Australia jest rynkiem 23 milionów konsumentów, Nowa Zelandia jest rynkiem 4,5 miliona konsumentów, natomiast Unia Europejska licząca 27 państw (bez Wielkiej Brytanii) jest rynkiem 440 milionów konsumentów, a więc rynkiem dwudziestokrotnie większym. A ponieważ zarówno Australia, jak i Nowa Zelandia to kraje o dużej produkcji rolniczej, prowadzonej w specyficznych warunkach klimatycznych, o dużo niższych kosztach produkcji niż w Europie, w ponad 70% eksportowanej, zagrożenie dla europejskich rolników jest w tej sytuacji oczywiste.

W związku z tym w umowach handlowych z tymi krajami, oprócz ograniczeń wymienianych już na tej sali, konieczne jest umieszczanie klauzul ochronnych, które będą automatycznie uruchamiane, jeżeli przywóz produktów rolnych z Australii i Nowej Zelandii przekroczy ustalone limity, co może spowodować poważne zakłócenia równowagi na europejskim rynku produktów rolniczych.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, coming from Ireland, which has very close links – both culturally and in other matters – with Australia and New Zealand, I can see the logic of doing a trade agreement with them.

Indeed, right now our President, Mr Higgins, is in Australia, and he opened our first embassy in New Zealand today. One-in-six New Zealanders claim Irish ancestry, so it is logical that we should – and particularly at the time of Trump's actions in the United States – try to expand free trade with places with will be beneficial to us and to them.

Unfortunately, the timing here isn't the best, with Mercosur and Brexit, the agricultural community is very concerned, and their concerns must certainly be taken on board and they must be brought on board if this agreement is to go ahead. You cannot force something through if one sector doesn't see it doing them any advantage, or worse, doing them a disadvantage.

So, I would think that it is right we should negotiate, but we have to do so and ensure that we get a very balanced, acceptable deal at the end of the day with our good friends from the southern hemisphere.

Emmanuel Maurel (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je m'en excuse d'avance auprès de mon collègue David Martin, pour qui j'ai une réelle affection, mais j'ai un point de vue très différent par rapport à ce qui vient d'être exprimé, parce que je crois qu'au-delà de notre débat sur l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande, la question qui se pose, c'est cet activisme débridé de la Commission, pour qui négocier des accords est devenu une sorte de réflexe pavlovien.

D'ailleurs, Madame la Commissaire, un de vos collègues a dit qu'il faudrait signer un accord tous les six mois si c'était possible. La question c'est: pourquoi? Je ne suis pas le seul à poser cette question. Il y a des millions d'Européens qui ont des inquiétudes et qui ne comprennent pas forcément pourquoi.

Dans le cas d'espèce, pour l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande, on fait valoir que ce sont des alliés historiques et qu'il faut faire preuve d'ouverture. Mais c'est un peu court, parce que les gains économiques escomptés sont minimes, voire nuls. En revanche, les risques sont réels – cela a été dit, mais je le répète –, pour les secteurs du lait, de l'élevage et du sucre, et il faut bien peu connaître la situation de certains pays, Monsieur Fjellner, pour croire qu'il n'y a pas un modèle agricole qui va être menacé, car c'est le cas des petites exploitations qui sont menacées par ce type d'accords.

Alors, franchement, quand on parle de changement climatique, n'oublions pas qu'il s'agit d'intensifier des échanges avec des pays qui sont à plus de 10 000 kilomètres d'ici; sur le plan de l'empreinte carbone, je ne crois pas que ce soit bon. Donc, faites une pause. Faites une pause et rassurez nos concitoyens plutôt que de les inquiéter.

Artis Pabriks (PPE). – Mr President, on 21 September, the provisional agreement between Canada and the European Union came into force. We can already see how beneficial and right this agreement was. We can also see that many of those who opposed this agreement were actually basing their opposition on false facts or were simply not well enough informed. I am afraid – and I would also like to give a warning – that once we start to open these negotiations with such countries as New Zealand and Australia, we have to keep in mind that there are certain lessons we should learn from previous paths.

First of all, I would like to say that, as America is now hesitant about doing trade deals, we, the European Union, should go forward. Secondly, I would like to say that there is no place for the exclusion of a number of sectors, or certain sectors, from these trade deals. If those people who are trying so hard to stand by our farmers are so afraid of New Zealand, they should rather direct their energy to giving right and just subsidies to such countries as Latvia and Lithuania, because even inside the European Union we still have no justice in agriculture. We can make a nice and good deal where both sides can benefit.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a Austrália e a Nova Zelândia são dos poucos países do mundo com as quais a União não tem, ou não está a negociar, um acordo comercial ou de investimento. Temos agora finalmente a oportunidade de mudar esta situação absurda com o lançamento destas negociações, que já vem tarde.

A Austrália e Nova Zelândia são aliados e parceiros relevantes da União, que partilham connosco os mesmos valores, incluindo a ambição de um elevado nível de proteção social e ambiental e de um sistema de comércio global regulado.

Temos, por isso, todas as condições para celebrar acordos progressistas, de nova geração, que promovam o desenvolvimento sustentável, e ao Parlamento Europeu cabe assegurar a transparência, mas também a salvaguarda dos interesses europeus, incluindo em domínios sensíveis que é claro que é preciso negociar, como as indicações geográficas, os sectores da carne, do leite, dos cereais e do açúcar. Se fizermos assim, se fizemos acordos progressistas e equilibrados, estaremos então à altura da exigência dos cidadãos europeus.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, nous le savons, dans cette négociation – je m'adresse là aussi à M^{me} la commissaire –, l'agriculture est sans conteste la partie la plus sensible de notre projet ou de ces projets d'accords.

La Nouvelle-Zélande est le premier producteur de viande ovine et un grand exportateur de produits laitiers, affichant les prix de production les plus bas du monde. L'Australie est le troisième exportateur mondial de viande bovine et bénéficie de coûts de production de 70 % inférieurs à ceux de l'Union. Il en va de même pour le sucre, et surtout les sucres spéciaux, pour nos régions ultrapériphériques. Viande, lait ou sucre, il s'agit là de secteurs particulièrement fragilisés et très sensibles au sein de l'Union européenne.

Par ailleurs, accord après accord, le cumul des concessions de l'Union devient insoutenable pour certaines filières, sans oublier les répercussions du Brexit. Ces réalités ne doivent pas être oubliées par nos travaux et doivent absolument être prises en compte par la Commission et le Conseil. Dans ces accords, l'agriculture ne doit pas servir de monnaie d'échange. Aussi, je crois qu'il est impératif que ces filières sensibles – viande, lait ou sucre – soient exclues des négociations en cours concernant l'Australie et la Nouvelle-Zélande.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Mr President, Australia and New Zealand are among the fastest growing developing open and dynamic economies. Both countries have concluded numerous trade agreements with other partners. As the European Union does not have preferential bilateral trade arrangements with either of them, EU businesses have comparably less favourable conditions to access these markets. Our relationship with Australia and New Zealand has evolved over the past decades from a basic economic one into a strategic, political one that is based on common values, social and environmental standards, data protection, food safety requirements and so on.

Certainly, there are sensitive sectors in the EU Member States' economies, like the meat and dairy sectors, so their interests and concerns have to be reflected in the trade agreement, and we have the necessary instruments available to achieve that. It is also extremely important that negotiations are conducted in a transparent way and a strong sustainability chapter is a must.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esprimo preoccupazione, che poi è la stessa di milioni di cittadini europei, relativamente ai potenziali rischi dei nuovi accordi commerciali con l'Australia e la Nuova Zelanda, innanzitutto perché l'agricoltura non dovrebbe essere utilizzata come moneta di scambio per ottenere maggiore accesso al mercato per i prodotti non agricoli e per i servizi.

Il principio di precauzione, su cui si basa la regolamentazione dell'Unione europea in materia di sicurezza dei prodotti alimentari, e l'approccio «dai campi alla tavola», che stabilisce norme dell'Unione europea più rigorose, vanno garantiti nel quadro di entrambi gli accordi.

Richiamo l'attenzione sulla natura sensibile di alcuni settori dell'agricoltura europea, quali quelli della carne bovina e delle carni ovine e caprine, dello zucchero, dei cereali e dei prodotti lattiero-caseari, molti dei quali hanno recentemente attraversato gravi crisi, necessitando dell'introduzione urgente di regimi di sostegno eccezionali.

L'Unione dovrebbe astenersi dal prendere impegni di qualunque sorta relativamente a questi prodotti agricoli, per i quali sarebbe a mio avviso comunque necessario l'inserimento di misure di salvaguardia bilaterali pertinenti ed efficaci, di periodi di transizione e di quote adeguate.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συμφωνία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με την Αυστραλία και τη Νέα Ζηλανδία θα μπορούσε να ενισχύσει τις οικονομικές σχέσεις της Ελλάδος με τη Νέα Ζηλανδία, και κυρίως με την Αυστραλία, όπου υπάρχει και λειτουργεί μια δυναμική και πολυάριθμη ελληνική ομογένεια. Η συμφωνία καλύπτει πάρα πολλούς κλάδους της οικονομίας και φυσικά καλύπτει τον τομέα της γεωργίας, της κτηνοτροφίας, της παραγωγής κρέατος, των γαλακτοκομικών προϊόντων, τομείς στους οποίους είναι πάρα πολύ ισχυρές η Αυστραλία και η Νέα Ζηλανδία. Γι' αυτό και υπάρχει αναγκαιότητα να έχουμε μέτρα προστασίας της γεωργίας και της κτηνοτροφίας στην Ελλάδα στις άλλες χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, καθώς και να υπάρξει προστασία των προϊόντων ονομασίας προέλευσης, όπως η φέτα, οι ελιές Καλαμών και ο κρόκος. Και, έτσι για να μην έχουμε καταστάσεις όπως είχαμε με τη CETA, θα πρέπει να υπάρχει διαφάνεια κατά τη διαπραγμάτευση και να ξεκαθαριστεί ότι, καθώς πρόκειται για μικτή συμφωνία, πρέπει να έχουμε την εμπλοκή και τη συμμετοχή των εθνικών κοινοβουλίων και πρέπει, για να ισχύσει η συμφωνία αυτή, να κυρωθεί από τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια, να μην πάμε σε μια διαδικασία όπως πήγαμε στη CETA με δήθεν προσωρινή εφαρμογή της συμφωνίας χωρίς να έχει κυρωθεί από τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια. Το ξεκαθαρίζουμε αυτό από την αρχή για να μπορούμε να προχωρήσουμε ομαλά κατά τη διάρκεια της διαπραγμάτευσης.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Mr President, it is a shame that the huge European Union is afraid of the small New Zealand, lying 10 000 miles from Europe. It is a shame that the European Union, who takes care of the poor people, now takes interest in the producers – not of the poor people, who want to have cheap New Zealand butter. New Zealand's butter is very good, and I want to eat cheap New Zealand butter.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já snad poprvé ve své kariéře zde v Evropském parlamentu budu souhlasit s panem Korwin-Mikkem.

Já považuju Nový Zéland za zemi, která je nám skutečně velmi blízká, kulturně i politicky. Pokládám za téměř nemožné, aby úroveň obchodu dosahovala pouze osm miliard EUR ročně. Myslím si, že bychom měli skoncovat s protekcionismem. Určitě mají existovat pojistky pro obchod, ale není možné, aby obchod vázl právě na protekcionismu, to je určitě doba minulé.

Chtěl bych připomenout, že právě éru pana prezidenta Trumpa bychom měli využít k tomu, abychom navázali mezinárodní vztahy, včetně volného obchodu, s těmito zeměmi, o kterých se jedná už dvacet let. Já myslím, že je načase vyjednat dobrou férovou dohodu, která bude obsahovat určité pojistky, ale není možné určitá odvětví zcela vyloučit z tohoto volného obchodu.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, as so many of you have said we are talking about two friends and allies – New Zealand and Australia – who share not only values, our commitment to rule of law, human rights and progressive trade, but also a strong commitment to upholding international organisations and global rules when it comes to trade. And in this world today that is not negligible: we need friends like that.

Our current exports to these countries are more than our exports to Canada, and they can be much bigger. We have done very thorough preparatory work with both Australia and New Zealand: they are aware of the debate here in Europe; they are aware of our sensitivities; they are aware of the political discussions in some of the countries relating to trade.

Of course we cannot exclude the whole agricultural sector – that makes absolutely no sense – but we are aware of the sensitive parts of this. But it needs to be put in perspective: it is worth noting that New Zealand and Australia already today benefit from preferential access to the EU for sensitive products because of WTO quotas. And while for beef the small country-specific quotas are almost entirely used, the use of quotas for sheep meat and dairy have declined the past years – and that means that Australia and New Zealand have found new, other, more attractive markets for their exports, and have diverted their exports increasingly to other countries in Asia, where they have trade agreements.

In the case of New Zealand, about two-thirds of our imports are agricultural goods. Sheep meat makes one-third of EU agricultural imports from New Zealand, and it already today enters duty-free as a result of a historical and very large tariff-rate quota.

In the case of Australia, agriculture is less than one-sixth of our total imports, and the biggest import is oilseed – canola – mostly used for biodiesel production in the EU. We actually have a growing surplus in agricultural trade, and especially in high-value added processed agricultural products. So we do have sensitive products – absolutely – and there are ways to deal with that, with tariff rate quotas, phasing-ins, etc. But we also have offensive interest, and not least if we can get New Zealand and Australia to accept the geographical indications which mean so much for our agricultural sector.

On transparency: yes, you can rely on the Commission – we will do this in utmost transparency, continuing the tradition to publish documents and to liaise with you in different areas. We sent the draft mandates from the Commission directly to the national parliaments so that they can start yesterday looking into them, setting up the different committees or sectors, etc., to be able to follow closely these relations and these negotiations. Of course they should be involved. They don't necessarily have to vote in the end, but they should be involved, much more than in the past – that is a national responsibility as well. And, as you know, we are setting up a permanent advisory group for all our trade agreements where businesses, trade unions, environmental organisations and consumer organisations will be involved, because we do want to listen to their advice, and that is part of the new, more inclusive trade policy.

New Zealand and Australia are, of course, two different countries: different traditions, different politics. We started the process at the same time. We have finished the scoping. We finished the Commission's work of proposing the mandate at the same time, and I guess – but I'm not sure – that the Council will allow us to start the negotiations at the same time, as you have chosen to deal with the report at the same time. But each country will have their own path of negotiation. If we are ready with one country then we will conclude with that country; it will not have to wait for the other one. And, as I said, in this process rest assured that the European Parliament will be fully aware.

Thank you very much for this debate, and I hope that you vote wisely tomorrow morning.

Christofer Fjellner, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, on behalf of the rapporteur, Daniel Caspary, I would like to thank Ms Malmström for her presentation. One thing that I am a little bit sad about – and which is sad about this debate – is the fact that it does not in any way reflect the trade that we have today with Australia or New Zealand. 99% of this debate – maybe a little more – was on agriculture, but if we take Australia – that everybody is concerned with – around ten percent of our trade with Australia is agriculture. And do you know what? In agricultural trade with Australia, we are winning. We import around EUR 1.9 billion worth of agricultural products from Australia, but we export EUR 3.1 billion worth of agriculture products.

So those of you who are set on voting tomorrow to exclude a sector – the agriculture sector – please think twice. Think of what we could be losing. We live in dramatic times. In the United States of America, Donald Trump has withdrawn from his commitment to do free trade in the region. In dramatic times, when the winds of change are blowing, some build walls and others build windmills. Let's be optimistic, not protectionist, when we do this. If not, Europe will be losers and that is not at all what I want us to do in trade policy.

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana.

16. Neutralität von Flugbuchungssystemen und Einschränkung des Zugriffs auf Fluginformationen (Aussprache)

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre la pregunta con solicitud de respuesta oral (O-000075/2017) presentada por Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, Luis de Grandes Pascual, Wim van de Camp, Claudia Schmidt, Georges Bach, Elissavet Vozemberg-Vrionidi, István Ujhelyi, Maria Grapini, Rolandas Paksas, Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska, Rosa Estaràs Ferragut, Deirdre Clune, Kateřina Konečná, Andor Deli, Marek Plura, Gabriele Preuß, Olga Sehnalová, Birgit Collin-Langen, Matt Carthy, Paul Rübig, Nessa Childers, Seán Kelly, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Claudia Țapardel, Isabella De Monte, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Peter Kouroumbashev, Ivo Belet, Miltiadis Kyrkos, Ivica Tolić, Lucy Anderson, Fernando Ruas, Massimiliano Salini, Georgi Pirinski, Inés Ayala Sender, Antonio López-Istúriz White, Roberts Zīle, Salvatore Domenico Pogliese, Franck Proust, Renaud Muselier, Kostadinka Kuneva, Pavel Telička, Merja Kyllönen, Ivan Štefanec, Anneleen Van Bossuyt, Artis Pabriks, József Nagy, Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, Eduard Kukan y Daniel Dalton, a la Comisión: Neutralidad de los sistemas de reserva para el transporte aéreo (GDS) y restricciones al acceso a la información de vuelo

(O-000075/2017 - B8-0604/2017) (2017/2900(RSP))

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar, Autora. – Senhor Presidente, agradeceria em primeiro lugar aos colegas que apoiaram esta minha proposta e que nos permitiu aqui hoje estarmos a debater a neutralidade dos sistemas de reservas das companhias aéreas e a restrição do acesso às informações de voo.

Assistimos hoje a práticas que violam a legislação atual sobre o código de conduta para os sistemas informatizados de reserva, código que tem por objetivo, como sabemos, a prevenção de abusos em matérias de concorrência e a garantia de prestação de informações neutrais aos consumidores. Assistimos também a práticas que restringem o acesso às informações de voo, aos motores de busca e às agências *online*. Limita-se a possibilidade da comparação dos preços. No final, são os consumidores que saem penalizados com menos opções de voos e veem acrescidos os custos dos bilhetes.

A referência, hoje, é a Lufthansa, que desde 2015 aplica uma taxa de 16 euros na compra de bilhetes fora do seu próprio *website*. A partir de novembro, serão a British Airways e a Ibéria a aplicar uma taxa adicional de 9,50 EUR. A Comissão está, desde julho de 2015, a analisar várias denúncias efetuadas por associações do setor do turismo e viagens.

Passaram dois anos. Caros Colegas, Senhor Comissário, não foi apresentada qualquer resposta nem houve nenhuma ação. Cabe à Comissão garantir o direito dos consumidores e dos viajantes europeus e obviamente estas práticas põem em causa a liberdade de escolha do consumidor. Não podemos admitir numa Europa a 28 um peso e duas medidas.

Senhor Comissário, não podemos esperar mais dois anos. Está ou não a Lufthansa a violar o Direito da União? Quando é que a Comissão vai pôr termo a estas práticas ilegais das companhias aéreas? E, por favor, faça-nos o ponto de situação relativamente a estas queixas que chegaram à Comissão em 2015.

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank the Honourable Members who put forward these questions. I am taking the floor on behalf of my colleague, Commissioner Bulc, who unfortunately has had to return to Brussels.

There are three important questions being asked in relation to ticket distribution in the airline sector and the charges that can be incurred by the travelling public. These questions address concerns about the consumer's access to unbiased travel information and the possibility to freely compare and use different distribution channels. The Commission is aware that the Lufthansa Group has added a so-called 'distribution cost charge' on tickets purchased through computerised reservation systems, while allowing travel agencies to book tickets for several cooperating airlines directly on the airline group's own platform without any surcharge being added. We also know that other airlines have announced that they intend to do the same.

The Commission has received four complaints against the introduction of these distribution cost charges. The complainants consider the airline's own platform to be a CRS (central reservation system) and claim that, as such, it should comply with Regulation No 80/2009. This is a complex case and the Commission investigations are still ongoing on the basis of the regulation.

In the Aviation Strategy adopted in December 2015 at the initiative of Commissioner Bulc, the Commission considered that the EU rules governing airline ticket distribution might no longer entirely reflect market reality and that several evolutions should be taken into account when considering whether the legislation remains appropriate: first, the engagement of airline ownership in the CRS; second, increased access to the internet; third, the development of alternative distribution channels; fourth, the regulation of CRS in other geographical markets.

The Commission is carrying out a comprehensive evaluation of a regulation on common rules for the operation of air services in the EU. The regulation includes provisions on price transparency. We have also launched an evaluation of the regulation establishing a code of conduct for CRS systems. The results of those two evaluations are expected next year. They will not only assess the performance and effects of its provision, but also pay specific attention to the technological changes and challenges in the market. These evaluations will allow the Commission to determine whether EU action is needed to continue to guarantee that EU consumers have adequate access to travel services and unbiased travel information.

Thank you once again for your questions, and I look forward to your follow-up remarks.

Wim van de Camp, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Meneer de voorzitter, dank u zeer. Ik dank ook de commissaris voor zijn antwoord in eerste termijn op de vragen van mijn collega Cláudia Monteiro. Voorzitter, het is een bekend feit dat de EVP-Fractie de Europese luchtvaart een warm hart toedraagt. Wij hebben de luchtvaartstrategie hier behandeld onder leiding van collega Pavel Telička en we zijn op dit moment bezig met de bilaterale luchtvaartverdragen, allemaal om de Europese luchtvaartindustrie verder te helpen.

Ik vind wel dat daar wat tegenover moet staan. Zeker als het gaat over de bescherming van de consument. De commissaris zei het al: we hebben een verordening uit 2009 en sinds een paar jaar wordt die door een grote speler op dit veld niet meer toegepast, en dat vinden wij jammer. Het gaat hier om transparantie voor de consument. Het gaat hier om objectieve prijsinformatie. Maar het gaat niet alleen over de consument, het gaat ook over de reisbureaus en de reisagentschappen. Het feit dat de commissaris nu bepaalde acties aankondigt – ja, ik moet bijna zeggen, het is het gebruikelijke antwoord van DG MOVE: “We zijn ermee bezig. Het kan nog even duren, maar u wordt t.z.t. geïnformeerd.”

Wat ik niet begrijp, is dat in de tussentijd die luchtvaartmaatschappijen niet op de vingers worden getikt. Ik bedoel, wij kunnen hier wel praten met DG MOVE en de plaatsvervangend commissaris voor Verkeer en Transport, maar we willen toch graag daden zien. Kan er nou niet op korte termijn eens even met die grote Duitse luchtvaartmaatschappij worden gesproken? Dank u zeer. O nee, ik heb nog een minuut. Volgens mij was dit het, dank u wel.

Isabella De Monte, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, la protezione dei consumatori e la sana concorrenza sono principi fondamentali ed essi devono essere rispettati, anche quando si parla di aviazione e di biglietti aerei.

La distribuzione e il marketing sono sempre più digitali e la quantità di informazioni disponibile rende difficile per l'utente comparare prezzi e offerte. Sappiamo che alcune compagnie aeree applicano rincari di 16 euro se il biglietto non è acquistato direttamente dal loro sito o dal loro centro prenotazioni e ciò causa discriminazione e aumenti indiretti delle tariffe.

La Commissione sta pensando a una revisione del regolamento (CE) n. 80/2009, che tutela gli utenti dagli abusi nella distribuzione dei biglietti aerei. C'è quindi un'opportunità d'oro di rafforzare le regole esistenti per far sì che i consumatori possano fare scelte informate basate su dati attendibili.

E, per concludere, le regole sulla trasparenza sono di vitale importanza per la scelta consapevole del consumatore.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, well I'm sorry Commissioner that it is you and that you have to listen to my remarks, as I know it is not your portfolio, but I need to say that I've been living in an illusion. I thought that we have an internal market, that we want to foster the internal market, and that we want transparency and neutrality. However, at the same time we have one carrier that will introduce a EUR 16 surcharge, which in reality means EUR 32, and I wonder why? Extra costs since it goes via different web portal? What does it mean? I, as a consumer, will pay EUR 32 more. Is there any justification?

Secondly, if I am a well-informed consumer of course I will not choose any other than the Lufthansa website. So this is a serious issue that we have known about for two years. For one year it has been under investigation by the Commission with zero results, and I need to say, Commissioner, that unfortunately your reply is completely dissatisfactory.

I really wonder whether there is a lack of cooperation among the stakeholders of the company which means that we don't have a decision yet. If so, which are the ones that are not cooperating? Is it because you know there is no case at all? We should know; there should be a decision if there is no case at all after one year and if the rules are insufficient. What is it that doesn't really work? What are the rules?

Or is it maybe, without any disrespect, is it because it's Lufthansa? We really need other carriers to do the same so that we can really investigate and pursue the issue of the case. We've been discussing in this plenary with a good understanding with the Commission; we want to proceed with integrated ticketing, which means dismantling barriers, but this is exactly the opposite. So I must say, Commissioner, please pass on the message to my good friend Commissioner Bulc that this is insufficient. I would be ready, with my staff, to investigate it within a few weeks because the case is crystal clear.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Coraz większa popularność latania wynika w dużej mierze z możliwości prostego i szybkiego rezerwowania biletów. Istniejące otwarte globalne systemy dystrybucji pozwalają wybierać najlepsze oferty dzięki opcji porównywania cen za bilet na tej samej trasie u różnych przewoźników. Oznacza to ogromne korzyści, w tym przede wszystkim faktyczne oszczędności przy planowaniu podróży.

Z punktu widzenia konsumenta wprowadzenie dodatkowych opłat za korzystanie z porównywarek cen czy usług agentów sprzedających bilety różnych linii oznacza dostęp do mniejszej oferty oraz wyższe ceny biletów. Można uznać, że taka opłata ma charakter dyskryminacyjny i niepokojąco brzmią zapowiedzi jej wprowadzenia przez kolejne linie lotnicze. Również praktyki linii lotniczych z państw trzecich w tym obszarze noszą znamiona nieuczciwej konkurencji.

Cieszę się, że wreszcie Komisja zauważyła problem, chociaż skargi na to rozwiązanie pojawiły się już dwa lata temu, gdy Lufthansa wspomnianą opłatę wprowadziła. Mam nadzieję, że pan komisarz przyjrzy się temu i zbada tę sprawę dokładnie.

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αναρωτιέμαι: τι άλλο πρέπει να γίνει για να δράσει επιτέλους η Γενική Διεύθυνση Ανταγωνισμού; Η πρόσθετη χρέωση που αυθαίρετα αποφάσισε να επιβάλει το 2015 η Lufthansa επιβαρύνει υπερβολικά τους επιβάτες και ταυτόχρονα τους εκβιάζει, γιατί, αν οι επιβάτες θέλουν να αποφύγουν την πρόσθετη χρέωση, πρέπει να κάνουν κράτηση μέσω της δικής της πλατφόρμας χωρίς να μπορούν να κάνουν σύγκριση τιμών. Αν αυτό δεν είναι ο ορισμός του μονοπωλίου και του αθέμιτου ανταγωνισμού, τότε τι είναι; Γιατί λοιπόν η Επιτροπή, εδώ και δύο χρόνια, κάνει τα στραβά μάτια σε αυτόν τον μονοπωλιακό εκβιασμό σε βάρος των καταναλωτών, των ταξιδιωτικών πρακτόρων, του τουρισμού και όλου του κλάδου των μεταφορών;

Jakob Dalunde, *för Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Vi diskuterar nu flyget och hur konsumenter inte får den information som de förtjänar. Jag tänkte också lyfta in klimataspekten i denna fråga. Återigen hamnar kunder i kläm på grund av girighet från flygbolagen. Att ta ut oskäligen avgifter för att konsumenten inte bokar biljetten på flygföretagets egen webbplats är inte okej. Det här sätter också fokus på frågan om vilken information konsumenterna har rätt till. För oss gröna är det självklart att alla konsumenter har rätt till tydlig och fullständig information om vilka priser som gäller när man bokar sin resa, och denna information ska vara tillgänglig från första steget, oavsett vilken plattform man använder för att boka resan. Bolagen ska inte heller få ta ut oskäligen avgifter för påhittade kostnader.

Klimatet kan också vinna på mer information. Vad menar jag med det? Jo, information om vilken effekt flygresorna har på klimatet är ett viktigt komplement till ekonomiska styrmedel för att kunden ska kunna fatta kloka beslut om sitt resande. Mellanlandningar är ett exempel på någonting som ökar climateffekten, och vilken typ av flygplan ett flygbolag använder gör också skillnad. Vi tycker att det är viktigt det regelverk som denna fråga handlar om ger konsumenten tydlig information för att kunna fatta sina beslut. Vi gröna vill utvärdera regelverket för att ge skydd åt Europas konsumenter och stöd för att de ska kunna fatta kloka och klimatsmarta beslut.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Postęp technologiczny, rozwój usług internetowych, a także dostępne rozwiązania mobilne pozwalają konsumentom na zakup online dogodnego dla siebie biletu lotniczego, a kluczową rolę podczas procesu rezerwacji stanowi rzetelna i wiarygodna informacja o końcowej cenie biletu, a jego finalny zakup zawsze jest poprzedzony – jak pokazuje praktyka, ale także zdrowy rozsądek – porównaniem cen biletów pomiędzy różnymi alternatywami. Doliczenie dodatkowych opłat przy zakupie z wykorzystaniem globalnych systemów dystrybucyjnych, a także brak rzetelnej informacji po pierwsze stanowi nieuczciwą konkurencję, a po drugie narusza prawa pasażerów i nic nie tłumaczy tego typu praktyk stosowanych przez niektóre linie lotnicze.

Tak samo jak trzy tygodnie temu apelowaliśmy tutaj na tej sali o egzekwowanie praw pasażerów Ryanaira, których loty zostały odwołane, tak samo dzisiaj apelujemy za pośrednictwem pana komisarza Stylianidesa do pani komisarz Bulc o podjęcie decyzji, ale nie decyzji, której podejmowanie będzie trwało dwa lata albo więcej lat, tylko decyzji szybkiej, na którą czekają pasażerowie i mieszkańcy Unii Europejskiej. Zwracamy się o dokładne zbadanie sprawy chociażby w kontekście rozporządzenia w sprawie kodeksu postępowania dla komputerowych systemów rezerwacji.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, domnule comisar, dragi colegi, deși vorbim de doi ani despre această practică, timp în care mai multe sesizări au fost înaintate Comisiei, inclusiv de către mine, avem zero soluții și acțiuni concrete, iar numărul companiilor care restricționează accesul la informație este în creștere.

Într-o economie globalizată și tot mai digitală, practici restrictive, precum introducerea de taxe suplimentare pentru rezervarea biletelor prin agenții sau platforme online sunt ilogice și perdante. În secolul al XXI-lea, consumatorii au dreptul să fie pe deplin informați cu privire la serviciile pe care le achiziționează și să poată face o comparație între tot ceea ce este disponibil pe piață, iar aceste schimbări trebuie să se reflecte inclusiv în modelul de business al companiilor.

Ca membru în Comisia pentru transporturi și copreședintă a Intergrupului pentru turism îmi doresc ca aviația europeană să devină o poveste de succes, mai ales în contextul competiției acerbe cu alte regiuni și state terțe. Dar acest succes se poate realiza doar prin menținerea unor standarde înalte pentru consumatori, standarde care încep cu accesul la informație și posibilitatea alegerii celei mai bune oferte în baza raportului preț, buget disponibil, orar de zbor și timp economisit.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, en asuntos como este, señor comisario, es en los que la Comisión y las instituciones europeas nos jugamos nuestra credibilidad.

Estamos ante empresas que se asocian para impedir el normal funcionamiento de los negocios 2020, como los distribuidores globales de billetes o los comparadores de precios. Ambos se basan en crear valor analizando datos públicos que están en internet, como son los precios y trayectos de las líneas aéreas, y crear un nuevo servicio útil y muy barato para el usuario.

Frente a este tipo de iniciativa de la economía digital, varias aerolíneas se asocian con el fin exclusivo de construir una posición dominante y abusar de ella, sin ofrecer, además, ningún nuevo servicio, ventaja o descuento a sus propios clientes.

Esta especie de arancel es, en mi modesta opinión, un ataque a los derechos de los consumidores, pero además es incompatible con la libre competencia y letal para los emprendedores que, sobre la base del conocimiento, la innovación y la imaginación, crean valor donde no lo había.

Por eso, para garantizar la salud del mercado interior y, especialmente, para proteger nuestra principal fuente de riqueza y empleo, abogo por aplicar medidas ejemplares para impedir este tipo de prácticas. Pero de manera inmediata, señor comisario. Hoy no hemos tenido la respuesta que esperábamos.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Lėktuvų bilietų kainodaros manevrai ir jų įsigijimo per skirtingas rezervavimo sistemas ypatumai neretai kelia nuostabą vartotojams. Todėl naujų papildomų mokesčių įvedimas tikrai nepalengvins kelionių planavimo ir bilietų įsigijimo procesų. Jeigu vis daugiau oro bendrovių pradės įvedinėti mokesčius už bilietų platinimą per kitas jų nekontroliuojamas sistemas, keleiviai ne tik susidurs su bilietų kainų augimu, bet ir iš esmės praras teisę laisvai lyginti ir naudotis įvairiais platinimo kanalais. Taip pat kelia nerimą informacija, kad trečiųjų šalių oro vežėjai vis dažniau kainų palyginimo svetainėse nusprendžia pateikti nepilną informaciją apie savo skrydžius, versdami keleivius pasirinkti brangesnius ir ne visada patogesnius jungiamuosius skrydžius.

Europos Komisija turi imtis priemonių, kad vartotojai būtų apsaugoti nuo tokių abejotinių oro vežėjo iniciatyvų bei būtų užtikrintas bilietų platinimo kanalų skaidrumas.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, I say to the Commissioner: transparency in whatever market ultimately benefits consumers and increases market efficiency. It is very important – and has been a long-established goal of this Parliament – to enhance knowledge of consumer rights, to strengthen the enforcement of those rights and to integrate consumers' interests into key sectoral policies.

We need to empower consumers through access to choice, information and awareness of their own rights. And the fair and open competition in the EU's aviation sector has always been to the ultimate benefit of the consumer.

Parliament here has been one of the strong and key components of Europe's open and connected aviation market. Regulation 80/2009 and the code of conduct for computerised reservation systems oblige all systems to be neutral and the owners not to discriminate.

These rules have all helped to facilitate the transition from an aviation market that had minimum competition and high prices to a market today where many consumers can afford to fly thanks to more choice and to more transparency. And large airlines have a strong market position. They then have the power to charge higher prices, which is only compounded by a lack of transparency. And for the same reasons there is also a vested interest for these large airlines to limit price market transparency.

So we need answers, I, like others, am frustrated at the time it is taking to come to a conclusion on this matter. But we need to know – yes or no – whether it is in contravention: whether or not it is giving consumers the entitlements to which they are obliged.

Olga Sehnalová (S&D). – Paní předsedající, opatření, která ztěžují internetovým stránkám srovnávání cen letenek, zavedli v poslední době nejen dopravci z Evropské unie, ale i ze třetích zemí. Dodatečné poplatky za prodej letenek prostřednictvím jiných distribučních systémů značně omezují cestující, kteří kvůli tomu nemohou správně porovnávat ceny letů u všech leteckých společností. Všichni cestující musí mít možnost vybrat si svobodně a transparentně tu nejvýhodnější nabídku, tak jak to upravuje nařízení o kodexu chování pro používání počítačových rezervačních systémů. Je potřeba chránit zájmy spotřebitelů a zajistit, aby rezervační systémy nabízely informace nestranně. Komise by proto měla pravidelně sledovat, jestli nedochází k diskriminačním postupům prostřednictvím počítačových rezervačních systémů, a v případě, že zjistí porušení pravidel, by měla proti těmto praktikám leteckých společností jednoznačně a rychle zasáhnout. Takové vyšetřování ale nemůže trvat nekonečně dlouho.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, matkailu on nimenomaan yksi niistä aloista, joka on hyvin nopeasti muuttunut internetin ansiosta, ja yhä suurempi osa muun muassa juuri lentolipuista varataan nyt suoraan internetin kautta.

Kuluttajien kannalta se on tarkoitannut merkittävää parannusta aikaisempiin aikoihin. Juuri nämä monet syntyneet uudet palvelut, joissa pystytään vertailemaan lentolippujen hintoja, ovat hyödyttäneet sekä kuluttajia että ilman muuta myös lentoyhtiöitä, koska kuluttajat ovat voineet verrata muun muassa hintoja, nopeutta ja erilaisia reittivaihtoehtoja ja myös lentoyhtiöt ovat pystyneet täyttämään paikkansa tehokkaammin ja löytäneet ehkä sellaisia asiakkaita, jotka muuten eivät olisi tuota yhtiötä valinneet.

On ihan selvää, että tällaiset digitaaliset palvelut eivät voi pyöriä, elleivät kaikki ketjun osapuolet saa omaa ansiotaan oikeudenmukaisesti tuosta ketjusta. Sen vuoksi on tärkeää, että Euroopan parlamentti ja Euroopan unioni huolehtivat siitä, että meillä on reilu kilpailuympäristö ja riittävästi läpinäkyvyyttä ja avoimuutta ja että määräävää markkina-asemaa ei käytetä esimerkiksi sillä tavalla, että asetetaan epäreiluja sopimusehtoja.

Tässä uudessa tilanteessa on todella tärkeää, että komissio käy nyt huolellisesti läpi syntyneet käytännöt. Tiedämme, että toisaalta lentolippujen jakelua ovat dominoineet muutamat isot GDS-jakeluyhtiöt ja nyt myös lentoyhtiöt ovat kehittäneet omia järjestelmiään ja avoimia standardeja, jotka mahdollistavat, että niihin pääsevät entistä tehokkaammin mukaan myös muut yhtiöt ja jakelukanavat. Koko ala on digitalisaation seurauksena nyt isossa muutoksessa ja on tärkeää, että varmistamme reilun kilpailuympäristön.

Петър Курумбашев (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, първо искам да отбележа, че е забележителна практика комисарят по хуманитарна помощ да отговаря по транспортни въпроси и може би си струва като цяло Европейската комисия да презглежда тази практика.

Забележително е също така, че след 2 години Европейската комисия е успяла да отбележи факта, че въведената от Луфтвайза практика, трябва да се разследва. Знаете ли, че и други авиокомпании, които не са в Европейския съюз, са готови да подготвят такава практика, както вече и някои хотелски вериги? Смятате ли че има неутралност на информацията и на резервационната система? Аз Ви казвам, че няма. Действието на тази авиокомпания подобрява ли конкуренцията? Аз Ви казвам, че не подобрява. В полза ли е на малките и средни предприятия, на малките пътнически агенции това действие? Аз Ви казвам, че не е. В полза ли е на потребителите? Аз Ви казвам, че не е. В полза ли е на единния цифров европейски пазар? Аз отново Ви казвам, че не е. И Ви моля за Ваш ясен отговор, както и за ясно изявление от страна на г-жа Булш.

Róza Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE). – Madam President, I agree with Mr Telička that it is really high time that we discuss this issue in the plenary session, and I thank all colleagues and all Members who brought up this question. It is extremely important for consumers and for a well-functioning digital single market to have neutral, independent access to the search systems of air transport services. The consumers cannot be discriminated against online, and their choice of best offers cannot be restricted by business models. Transparency and neutrality in the search for flights increased competition and made travel within the EU affordable for many Europeans.

We should therefore protect and promote this, and I appeal to the European Commission to undertake all possible efforts to protect the transparency and neutrality of searches and of free competition in the aviation market.

We will continue a discussion on this subject in our working group on the digital single market, which I chair, and precisely during our next meeting on 22 November, and you are all invited to join us. But let us not forget that this is not the only problem that consumers encounter when booking flights. They are often geo-blocked and have to pay a higher price because of their place of residence, or – to put it more precisely – because of the temporary location based on their IP address. This must not take place in our single market.

We are now working on the geo-blocking regulation, and this regulation will enable us to get rid of this kind of discrimination – at least on independent distribution channels, I am sure. I really do hope that we will be able to reach an agreement on this with the Estonian Presidency very soon.

Interventions à la demande

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci říci, že si samozřejmě velmi vážím leteckých dopravců, nicméně to, co je předmětem současné rozpravy, ve mně vyvolává velké obavy.

Pokud připustíme tento princip, že bude porušována neutralita informací, a to beztestně, bez zásadního dohledu ze strany příslušného GR MOVE, tak si myslím, že to je skutečně skandální. Měli bychom trvat na dodržování pravidel, a pokud jsou spotřebitelé tlačeni k určitému způsobu chování, tak se podle mého názoru jedná o nekalou soutěž. Jedná se o porušování pravidel hospodářské soutěže. Spotřebitel má právo na úplné informace a ne, že se po nich má pít jen určitou zvolenou formou a cestou. Myslím, že k tomu bylo řečeno již poměrně hodně.

Já si myslím, že nejdůležitější je, aby v Evropské unii platil princip padni komu padni. Pokud je tento princip porušován, tak to skutečně vyvolává zásadní otázky, zdali platí rovnost práv v Evropské unii.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατά τη διάρκεια της προηγούμενης συνόδου εδώ είχαμε συζητήσει για τη Ryanair. Η κατάσταση που είχε δημιουργήσει ήταν απαράδεκτη. Τώρα λοιπόν συζητούμε για τη Lufthansa, η οποία επιβάλλει ειδικό τέλος 16 ευρώ, αν η αγορά του εισιτηρίου δεν γίνει από το δικό της ιστότοπο. Είναι προφανές ότι έχουμε μία παραβίαση του δικαιού των καταναλωτών. Είναι προφανές ότι πρόκειται για αθέμιτο ανταγωνισμό αλλά κυρίως, κύριε Στυλιανίδη, εγώ θεωρώ ότι είναι εκμετάλλευση της δεσπόζουσας θέσης που έχει η Lufthansa στην αεροπορική αγορά. Διότι πρόκειται για μία τεράστια, για μια πολύ μεγάλη εταιρεία. Επομένως, πρέπει να κινήσετε τις αντιμονοπωλιακές διαδικασίες, διότι μόνο έτσι θα καταλάβει. Επιπλέον, θέλω να ερευνήσετε και το εξής: η Lufthansa είναι και μέτοχος στη Fraport. Η Fraport είναι μια τεράστια εταιρεία που διαχειρίζεται το αεροδρόμιο της Φρανκφούρτης και έχει αρπάξει και τα 14 περιφερειακά αεροδρόμια στην Ελλάδα, ενώ έχει και άλλα αεροδρόμια συνολικά. Γίνεται λοιπόν μια συνεργασία της Fraport με τη Lufthansa και ενισχύεται έτσι η δεσπόζουσα θέση της στην αεροπορική αγορά. Να πάρετε μέτρα για το θέμα αυτό, σας παρακαλώ.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank our colleagues for their contribution to this very interesting debate just now. Colleagues, I understand your concerns and I can promise you that I will make sure to relay all these concerns to my colleague, Commissioner Bulc. As I said on behalf of my colleague in my opening remarks, the Commission is currently investigating the four complaints received, so I would not like to say anything which might prejudice the outcome. I note your concerns and your criticism, which will be very constructive as we continue to evaluate the regulation, in particular as we evaluate the provision on price transparency.

Our debate here this evening has been useful and informative as we try to find a way forward in order to ensure that consumers are treated fairly and continue to benefit from safe and convenient transport. In conclusion, let me assure you that the interests of the travelling public are what is driving the Commission's work in this area.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Andor Deli (PPE), írásban. – Az, hogy egyes légitársaságok 18 eurós pluszdíjat számolnak fel abban az esetben, ha nem a légitársaság által ellenőrzött foglalási rendszeren keresztül vásárolnak jegyet az utasok, negatív hatással van nemcsak az utasokra, hanem hosszú távon az európai légi közlekedésre is. Hiszen ez a lépés a szabad versenyt és az egységes piac vívmányait fenyegeti a repülés-tájékoztatás korlátozása pedig jelentősen sérti az utasok szabad választáshoz való jogát.

A probléma nem új keletű, az utankénti 18 eurós díjat az egyik legnagyobb légitársaság-csoport már két évvel ezelőtt bevezette. A Bizottság pedig ugyan elkezdett vizsgálni, de két év alatt sem jutott előrébb. Úgy gondolom, hogy az ilyen piackorlátozó jelenségek ellen határozottabb fellépésre van szükség. Nap mint nap tapasztalhatjuk, hogy a közúti közlekedés terén tapasztalható nemzeti protekcionista intézkedések mekkora károkat okoznak. Ezért idejében kell reagálni annak érdekében, hogy elkerüljük az egységes európai piac csorbulását a légi közlekedés terén.

17. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

18. Verfahren zur Reaktion auf die Waldbrände in Nordspanien und Portugal (Aussprache)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur les déclarations du Conseil et de la Commission sur les mécanismes de réaction aux incendies de forêts dans le nord de l'Espagne et le Portugal (2017/2899(RSP)).

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, this year a number of countries in southern Europe have experienced particularly severe and devastating forest fires. Many people have lost their lives. Portugal and Spain have been among the most affected countries. On behalf of the Council, I would like to express my deepest condolences and sympathy to the relatives of the victims, to thank the countries which have provided assistance and also to thank the Commission for its coordination efforts. Last but not least, let me warmly thank all the firefighters for their huge commitment and effort.

As honourable Members are aware, the Union Civil Protection Mechanism, which we jointly adopted in 2013, provides for a number of measures to prevent, prepare for and respond to disasters. This includes the European Emergency Response Capacity, which is a voluntary pool of Member States' assets pre-committed for immediate deployment inside or outside the EU. Several Member States have registered their forest fire fighting capacities in this pool. These resources have been deployed a number of times to provide assistance in combating forest fires across southern Europe. However, despite significant efforts at national and EU level to prevent forest fires, we have to stay prepared and ready to respond in a more efficient manner to these catastrophes. At the same time, a swift and efficient response is dependent on costly, and therefore limited, resources. EU solidarity might prove its limits when similar disasters occur simultaneously in a number of countries.

Of course, when the Commission proposes the mobilisation of the EU Solidarity Fund, the Council will examine such a proposal as a matter of utmost urgency.

Finally, the Council has attentively examined the Commission's recent interim evaluation report on the Union Civil Protection Mechanism. It includes a number of recommendations for further application of the mechanism. Some of them are particularly relevant for the prevention of, and response to, forest fires. This evaluation has marked the starting point of reflections on the future framework of the Union Civil Protection Mechanism which the Council will continue in the coming months. In this context, the Presidency has taken note with interest of the recent announcement, reiterated yesterday by President Juncker, of an upcoming Commission proposal to revise the Union Civil Protection Mechanism. We look forward to bringing debates on this matter forward.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me also start by expressing once again my condolences to the families and the loved ones of all those who perished in the terrible fires of last week. Also, to those who have lost their homes in Portugal and Spain.

It is unfortunately not the first time this year that this region has been affected by deadly forest fires. I also wish to pay tribute to the heroic firefighters – brave men and women – and ordinary citizens that stepped in to help.

In 2017, the forest fire season has been one of the worst in the last decade; southern Europe has been very exposed. Helping Member States affected to fight forest fires has been a priority for the European Union. The truth is that national capacities alone are not enough. Climate change makes weather conditions more extreme in natural disasters more often. This is the harsh reality.

The European Union civil protection mechanism was activated 16 times because of forest fires in Europe since mid-June. We have never seen so many activations in so little time. Capacities such as firefighting aircraft, firefighters and vehicles were deployed on nine occasions. As Commissioner for crisis management, I warmly thank all the EU Member States that offered assistance through the mechanism. This is a true example of European solidarity.

We did our best to provide support with the means at our disposal, but let me be clear: the mechanism has specific legal and practical limitations. Our role, our mandate, is to coordinate – as my dear colleagues already said – and help with the transport costs only. We don't have our own means, therefore we have to admit that sometimes our contribution is not sufficient. I would like to be very sincere: sometimes it was too little and too late. This is why we have already been exploring in the previous months ways to strengthen the mechanism. It was one of my top priorities.

President Juncker mandated me – and I want to thank him for this – to come forward with concrete proposals next month on how, together with our Member States, we can do more to better respond, prevent disasters and be better prepared for them.

This is not only – I would like to clarify this – about forest fires: just days ago, we had hurricanes hit Ireland and the UK. Floods have struck eastern and northern European Member States in the recent past, and earthquakes have consistently shaken Italy and Greece and other countries. So we owe this initiative to our citizens, to the European citizens.

It is now a priority of the Commission work programme, which we adopted yesterday. The proposals will be on the table before the end of November. There are three areas that I want to explore. First, through additional financial support we must increase capacities to act rapidly and effectively. Second, prevention and preparedness need to be at the core of the initiative: enhanced prevention and preparedness should be a precondition for additional support. Finally, we must improve the efficiency of the mechanism to enable a faster deployment of assistance during emergencies.

In order to do this, I will need your support. Time is of the essence. The beginning of the next flood season has already started. The forest fire season has been dramatically extended this year, and the next one is in a few months from now. It is therefore crucial that we act fast, in a spirit of solidarity and efficiency. I know I can count on the European Parliament to be a strong ally to support our proposals, because we must rapidly offer solutions to our citizens. They expect more from us as European institutions.

In addition to the EU actions in the field of civil protection, let me also mention another important tool: the European solidarity fund. As you know, the European solidarity fund can provide valuable financial assistance to help cover a part of the cost created by disasters. Support is subject to fulfilling two conditions. First, total direct damage should exist as a threshold which is specific for each Member State or region; second, national authorities have to submit an application within 12 weeks of the start of the disaster.

Portugal has already submitted an application covering the forest fires that occurred between June and August. The Commission will soon finalise its assessment; we are working on the basis of significant support from the solidarity fund. In parallel, we are currently discussing with Portugal the possibility to extend their application to also include the most recent fires of October. For the recent fires in Spain, notably in Galicia, the damage has not been fully assessed yet. The Commission stands ready to provide guidance and support to the Spanish authorities, should they intend submitting an application.

In terms of operational programmes, the Commission also rapidly adopted the proposal from Portugal to modify the original 2014-2020 central operational programme through internal relocation of the European regional development fund, ERDF.

We added two new actions. First, the replacement of the productive capacity of the SMEs that were lost during the fires, with a total ERDF budget of EUR 25 million. Second, the replacement of public municipal infrastructure equipment with a maximum budget of EUR 20 million. In addition, in Portugal, the operational programme for sustainability and resource efficiency provides the possibility to finance a range of investments to strengthen disaster resilience, prevention and preparedness. In Spain, the operational programme Galicia provides the possibility to finance investments in early detections, prevention and civil protection.

Paulo Rangel, *em nome do Grupo PPE*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais, queria, naturalmente, exprimir a minha profunda consternação com as vítimas mortais, quer dos incêndios de junho quer, em particular, dos incêndios do fim de semana de 15 de outubro em Portugal e em Espanha, e também todos os danos materiais que, obviamente, muito prejudicam a vida de centenas, senão mesmo milhares, de famílias.

Em segundo lugar, queria agradecer a solidariedade europeia que está a ser demonstrada desta forma rápida e eficiente que aqui deixou clara o Sr. Comissário, que está a ser demonstrada também pela vontade de reformar o mecanismo de proteção civil e que está a ser demonstrada também pela vontade de, eventualmente, todas as medidas que venhamos a tomar para reordenar a floresta – porque há, aqui, um problema estrutural – poderem ter uma contabilização em termos de défice que possa favorecer a situação portuguesa em termos europeus.

Queria, no entanto, chamar a atenção para o facto de que, aqui, nesta mesma Casa, no discurso do Estado da União, fui a única pessoa que pediu que se criasse uma Força Europeia Proteção Civil, na sequência do relatório Barnier de 2006, e que, em Portugal, ao longo destes meses, chamei a atenção para o facto de o Estado português e o Governo português terem desinvestido na proteção civil e estarem a descuidar a situação e, naturalmente, como mostram os relatórios técnicos entretanto apresentados, houve falhas graves também do Governo português, que são de lamentar e que poderiam ter evitado alguns dos efeitos mais nefastos desta situação – e isso não pode deixar de ser assumido.

Aqui, no entanto, queria deixar um repto, e um repto, digamos, de maior alcance: é que, para lá das medidas de emergência, mesmo ao nível do mecanismo de apoio na proteção civil e no combate a fogos, terramotos, acidentes nucleares, acidentes industriais e inundações, sejamos capazes de criar uma verdadeira força europeia de proteção civil, de ação rápida em todo o espaço europeu, e que possa até servir de ajuda a países em desenvolvimento, que sofrem muitas catástrofes e que não têm meios nenhuns.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, mais de uma centena de mortos, muitas centenas de feridos, a destruição de património natural e construído de valor incomensurável, imagens de dor, sofrimento, valentia, bombeiros que foram heróis – tudo isto é memória, é sentimento forte e precisa de uma resposta à altura.

As instituições as europeias têm manifestado consciência da gravidade daquilo que sucedeu em Portugal e Espanha. Quero agradecer, em nome de Portugal e dos portugueses, o gesto profundamente simbólico da doação às vítimas do montante do prémio Princesa das Astúrias da Concórdia, atribuído à União Europeia.

Estamos perante um desafio sistémico. Precisamos de responder no ordenamento florestal, no combate à desertificação dos territórios, no reforço da prevenção e na atualização dos mecanismos de prevenção e socorro. Cada país tem que fazer o que tem que fazer e a Europa pode ajudar e pode complementar – e tem-no feito.

Sublinho a disponibilidade das instituições para acionar de forma mais ágil os mecanismos de apoio. Eventualmente, Sr. Comissário, a candidatura conjunta de Portugal e Espanha pode ajudar a tornar mais rápida a resposta do fundo de solidariedade. É óbvio que a não contabilização do investimento de recuperação e prevenção para efeitos de défice estrutural é uma medida apropriada, inteligente e que deve ser aplicada.

Em julho debatemos aqui outro ciclo de catástrofes. Nessa altura, defendi a necessidade de criar um mecanismo europeu de proteção civil permanente. O que agora ocorreu mostra que é absolutamente fundamental fazê-lo.

O Presidente da Comissão Europeia reconheceu ontem, neste mesmo hemiciclo: se temos uma união da defesa Sr. Comissário, se temos uma união da segurança, também temos de ter uma união da Proteção Civil. É assim que se faz a Europa: é respondendo às necessidades das pessoas quando elas precisam de ajuda, de forma solidária. É preciso começar a agir agora. Este é o segundo debate em quatro meses. Não tenhamos de fazer um terceiro a discutir o que vamos fazer.

António Marinho e Pinto, *em nome do Grupo ALDE*. – Senhora Presidente, a tragédia dos incêndios florestais em Portugal deve-se à convergência de vários fatores, entre os quais estão o predomínio maciço do eucalipto, a ineficácia dos organismos de combate aos fogos, as alterações climáticas e as políticas dos sucessivos governos, que têm incentivado o despovoamento e o abandono do interior do país.

O Estado português falhou rotundamente no combate aos fogos florestais, porque ele próprio foi capturado por poderosas teias de interesses privados que dominam os partidos do chamado «arco da governação». Nunca os portugueses pagaram tantos impostos como hoje, mas nunca o Estado foi tão ineficaz na prestação dos serviços públicos que dele se pode legitimamente exigir.

A tragédia dos fogos florestais é, assim, também uma das consequências mais evidentes do facto de os organismos encarregados de prevenir e combater esses fogos terem sido ocupados e dirigidos por pessoas sem as necessárias qualificações para essas funções – e isso porque o amiguismo e o clientelismo político se tornaram a filosofia oficial da governação do meu país.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, este cenário dramático, como foi aqui dito, resulta em parte de circunstâncias climáticas específicas, mas não podem passar em branco as políticas de abandono do mundo rural e a ausência total de estratégias adequadas para a nossa floresta.

Importa, neste momento, mobilizar todos os apoios possíveis para a reparação dos imensos prejuízos, cujo balanço ainda está por fazer, e, para isso, precisamos de agilizar e adaptar os fundos e que os mesmos cheguem ao terreno nas próximas semanas.

Importa também libertar Portugal das amarras do euro, que limitaram Portugal na sua capacidade de investir e realizar ações de prevenção estrutural da floresta há tanto reclamadas, quer por especialistas quer pelos do meu partido.

Em suma, o que sublinhamos aqui não é mais do que já foi concedido a outros países, ou seja, que a despesa necessária à reconstrução das regiões atingidas por esse flagelo não seja contabilizada para o défice das contas públicas no quadro da governação económica.

Florent Marcellesi, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, ante todo quiero mostrar mi solidaridad a las familias de las personas muertas y a los centenares de heridos en Galicia y en Portugal.

El cóctel de los superincendios —verdadero drama social y ambiental— es bien conocido —fuego intencionado, abandono rural, recortes en prevención y extinción de incendios y cambio climático—. Seamos claros: España y Portugal no arden de forma espontánea, en el noroeste español, por razones criminales o culturales, hasta el 70 % los incendios es intencionado.

Además, hemos abandonado el monte. Hoy desarrollo rima con despoblación, falta de gestión preventiva y de ordenación del territorio, y la Península Ibérica está sufriendo ahora mismo la peor sequía de los últimos veinte años (altísimas temperaturas y el primer huracán jamás registrado tan al este en el Atlántico).

¿Qué podemos hacer? Solo se podrá terminar con el drama de los hiperincendios con la persecución de los responsables, políticas de prevención, la concienciación ciudadana y una planificación territorial a largo plazo. Dediquemos más medios a las fiscalías de medio ambiente para que quienes prenden fuego al monte puedan ser identificados y condenados.

Prioricemos las inversiones en zonas de alto riesgo de incendio y una mayor prevención a través del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural. Recuperemos los presupuestos anteriores a la crisis, porque, guste o no, tendremos que ampliar la campaña de alto riesgo y el operativo contra incendios a todo el año.

Prohibamos los eucaliptos y otras especies inflamables en el entorno de núcleos y ciudades para reducir el riesgo para las poblaciones locales. Pongamos en marcha una política de gestión del paisaje a través de quemas prescritas, explotación forestal sostenible o ganadería extensiva. Aprobemos, por fin, en España una ley de cambio climático, a la altura del reto del cambio climático. Tengamos más ambición en la Unión Europea y establezcamos una política de prevención de incendios forestales que prepare los montes al contexto del cambio climático. De hecho, apostemos por un mundo rural y unos montes diversos y ecológicos con empleo, riqueza y vida.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señor ministro, gracias también por sus condolencias y sus explicaciones sobre los pasos que va a dar la Comisión Europea respecto del mecanismo de protección civil y del Fondo de Solidaridad.

Yo quiero empezar manifestando mi sentimiento de pesar a nuestros vecinos portugueses por el elevado número de víctimas mortales sufrido. También en Galicia, mi tierra, hemos tenido que lamentar cuatro fallecidos: mi más sentido pésame a sus familias. Y quiero añadir algunos datos sobre Galicia.

Los fuegos fueron el resultado de una actividad incendiaria intencionada, no fruto del azar. Las fuerzas de seguridad y la justicia están ahora investigando la autoría de estos incendios. Unas manos criminales aprovecharon las condiciones meteorológicas extremas del domingo día 15: temperaturas altísimas para octubre precedidas de una prolongada sequía y vientos fortísimos por el efecto del huracán Ofelia. Ese día hubo muchísimos fuegos —125—, triplicaron el número de los que se presentan los días de más riesgo de los peores meses de agosto. Además, la mayoría prendió por la tarde y noche, para que los medios aéreos de extinción no pudieran utilizarse. Aun así se apagaron muchos fuegos, pero, algunas circunstancias tan difíciles, especialmente el viento, hicieron imposible apagarlos todos.

Señor comisario, los bosques gallegos no arden de forma casual, los queman manos criminales. No se trató de un problema de carencia de medios, nunca hubo tantos medios operativos como este mes de octubre: 5 600 personas, 350 brigadas, 220 camiones motobomba y 40 grandes palas o buldóceres, además de una veintena de medios aéreos. A ello hay que agregar los importantes efectivos de la Unidad Militar de Emergencias.

Tampoco es un problema surgido del tipo de especies arbóreas. Por ejemplo, Orense, la provincia de Galicia más afectada estos días, carece prácticamente de eucaliptos.

Estamos esencialmente ante un problema de delincuencia criminal, que aprovechó unas circunstancias meteorológicas extremas.

Termino manifestando mi agradecimiento al presidente Juncker por su compromiso expresado ayer en este hemiciclo de estudiar cuanto antes la aplicación del Fondo de Solidaridad a estos graves incendios.

José Blanco López (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hace apenas diez días Galicia volvió a ser pasto de las llamas. Miles de hectáreas de alto valor ecológico ardieron. Pueblos y ciudades fueron cercados por el fuego. Se perdieron viviendas y negocios. Y, lo más trágico, se perdieron vidas humanas. Mis condolencias.

Y si en algún lugar sabemos de las consecuencias del fuego es en Galicia. Lo fácil ahora es hablar de tramas que queman el monte, de incendiarios que se deben castigar, pero ese no es el problema de fondo. Galicia arrastra graves problemas que su Gobierno no enfrenta: despoblación y abandono del medio rural, falta de ordenación territorial, errónea política forestal, falta de prevención.

Lo que ocurrió en la terrible oleada de incendios del año 2006 es que veníamos de varios años de gobierno que miraron para otro lado en cuanto a la ordenación del territorio y política forestal. Y ahora sucedió lo mismo. Urge, por lo tanto, que los Gobiernos se tomen en serio las medidas integrales para combatir y prevenir los incendios y urge que se tomen medidas y se abandone la inacción frente al cambio climático.

La Unión Europea también debe ser más beligerante para hacer frente al desafío del cambio climático, para reorientar sus políticas. Se debe reorientar el Fondo de Solidaridad para que sea efectivo a la hora de paliar las consecuencias del desastre causadas por el cambio climático. Se debe mejorar la financiación que recibe la Red Natura 2000 para conservación y se debe reforzar el Mecanismo Europeo de Protección Civil para mejorar la capacidad y rapidez de respuesta. El cambio climático no admite excusas. Exige compromiso.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, el pasado mes de junio debatimos sobre los incendios que asolaron Portugal y que se cobraron la vida de sesenta y cuatro personas. La mayoría de los diputados coincidíamos en demandar una política forestal centrada en la prevención. Cuatro meses más tarde, nos encontramos lamentando una nueva tragedia: Galicia, Asturias y Portugal han ardido de nuevo y su infierno ha dejado una hilera de desolación y de muerte.

España no es Portugal, y los dispositivos de extinción no son comparables, pero la política forestal de décadas basada en el pino y en el eucalipto es un riesgo añadido a la meteorología. No podemos dejar de perseguir las plantaciones ilegales, se han dejado de limpiar muchos bosques y hay mucho abandono. Necesitamos sistemas de información también que se apoyen en las nuevas tecnologías pero, al menos en España, seguramente el gran problema es la criminalidad, seguramente el negocio de la madera quemada, donde hasta ahora ha habido ignorancia o tolerancia perezosa.

Y ahora voy a lo nuestro. El señor Juncker entonó el *mea culpa* esta semana sobre el Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión Europea. Dijo que no puede ser que un incendio empiece un domingo y el primer avión de la Unión Europea llegue el miércoles. ¿Ha fallado la coordinación? ¿Pasaremos de las palabras a los hechos, señor comisario?

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, em primeiro lugar, queria expressar a nossa solidariedade para com as vítimas dos incêndios florestais. Em segundo lugar, na Galiza, assinalamos o abandono do meio rural que provocam as políticas agrárias como uma das principais causas do avanço dos incêndios, que se agrava com as alterações climáticas.

Sr. Comissário, achamos que a Europa tem de fazer muito mais. Deixamos aqui algumas ideias para outra política para combater os fogos florestais.

Em primeiro lugar, o apoio decidido às explorações agrícolas atuais e à instalação de pessoas agricultoras em todo o território.

Em segundo lugar, recuperar as terras agrícolas florestadas, eliminando eucaliptos e pinheiros nos arredores das casas e aldeias e pondo fim à monocultura destas espécies. A vida das pessoas tem de ser a prioridade.

Em terceiro lugar, queremos apoio económico para recuperar as florestas autóctones e para introduzir, nos montes, rebanhos de ovelhas, cabras ou vacas.

O serviço de extinção de incêndios deve ser totalmente público e há que dignificar a profissão de bombeiros e bombeiras.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, neste momento, que é de dor, apresento condolências e agradeço as condolências deixadas. Mais do que causas: essas ficam para o debate interno.

Peço-lhes que percebam as consequências. Falar destes incêndios em Portugal, como em Espanha, mas em Portugal, é falar de vidas perdidas, muitas. Mais de 100, quando uma só vida já seria demasiado. É falar de empresas destruídas. É falar de postos de trabalho extintos. É falar de aldeias seculares em cinzas, pedaços da nossa história. É falar de metade da floresta ardida este ano na União Europeia. É falar de gente que perdeu tudo, gente pobre, velhos sem forças para refazer aquilo com que antes já só subsistiam, velhos e pobres que, muitas vezes, combateram sozinhos o fogo. É falar de ajuda a quem sofre realmente. É esta ajuda que dá sentido à União Europeia e, neste momento em que o meu país sofre e justifica apoio, peço, aqui, igualmente à União Europeia que, se se diz flexível e disposta a interpretações inteligentes a propósito de regras do défice, não pode dar menos quando em causa estejam a interpretação de mecanismos de solidariedade, sob pena de renegar a sua própria essência.

Teoriza-se sobre uma força europeia de proteção civil – não se inventa pólvora, está desenhada desde 2006 num relatório de Michel Barnier. Execute-se.

Repito aqui também o que, por carta, já apelei ao Presidente do Parlamento Europeu: empenhem-se, usando o dinheiro naquilo que mais importa. Ajudem na reconstrução de vidas e, se considerarem insuficientes as medidas existentes, mobilizem-se para que sejam dotadas ou para que se criem novas medidas.

Termino dizendo que é nos momentos de tragédia que se forjam as grandes lideranças. Saibamos todos estar à altura destes tempos difíceis.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, la verdad es que las condiciones climáticas que enfrentamos en los días peores del fuego son condiciones no comunes en estas fechas, pero es verdad que, detrás de todos los incendios que arrasaron Asturias, están incendiarios, están comportamientos criminales que hay que perseguir.

Pero, con independencia de perseguir a todas las personas que están cometiendo actos delictivos prendiendo el monte, prendiendo el bosque en Asturias, necesitamos mejorar las condiciones de prevención, porque el cambio climático es un reto al que tenemos que responder de manera global, como ha dicho el comisario. Porque no solamente es el fuego, son las inundaciones. Necesitamos esas medidas preventivas.

Agradecemos y esperamos esa mejora del sistema de protección civil europeo, pero necesitamos claramente mejorar los sistemas de prevención y ahí necesitamos más apoyo de Europa. Y en estos momentos necesitamos apoyo de Europa para flexibilizar el uso del Fondo de Solidaridad, que tenemos que poner en funcionamiento ya. Y termino agradeciendo a la Unión la donación del importe del Premio Princesa de Asturias a las personas que han sufrido esta grave crisis, estos graves fuegos en Asturias.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, quiero empezar expresando mi solidaridad con las víctimas y familias de esta ola de incendios y mi profundo pesar por los daños emocionales, medioambientales, económicos y sociales que esta tragedia está produciendo. Pero a continuación les pido la aplicación urgente del mecanismo europeo de solidaridad en caso de tragedias naturales y la aceleración de todas las iniciativas en marcha para mejorar la coordinación transfronteriza y la prevención.

En el caso gallego, por ejemplo, no parece estar operativo un plan de vigilancia con drones cofinanciado por la Comisión. Hay denuncias por el abuso en el cultivo de especies de crecimiento rápido muy combustibles y también por la escasa coordinación y poca previsión tras conocerse cinco días antes que el calor y el viento podían incrementar el riesgo y la lesividad de los incendios.

Por eso, señor comisario, hay que activar las ayudas, controlar mejor los programas que se cofinancian, impulsar la cooperación transfronteriza en materia de protección civil y extremar la vigilancia para ponérselo difícil a los pirómanos y para que nadie pueda hacer negocio, ni apagando incendios ni con la madera quemada.

Estas son las inquietudes de nuestros amigos de Compromiso por Galicia.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, otra vez ardió Asturias. Y no es la primera vez que el fuego devastador deja arruinada a la gente de mi tierra. Por eso y como el monte, nosotras también ardimos, pero de rabia, porque ya cansa que siempre se echen balones fuera. Esto no se soluciona solamente hablando de pirómanos, como hicieron algunos de los diputados aquí hoy, o como hizo la ministra de Agricultura española, la señora García Tejerina. Hay que asumir responsabilidades políticas.

Señorías, los incendios son la fiebre de un territorio enfermo, son consecuencia del cambio climático y de la ausencia de políticas sensatas de gestión forestal que dejen de poner en el centro y de fomentar el monocultivo del eucalipto, entre otras especies. Pero también es consecuencia de un desarrollo económico devastador que deja fuera de la tierra y de la ganadería a la gente y obliga a las personas a abandonar los pueblos y las huertas, porque, como vemos, este abandono es doloroso en tanto en cuanto pone en peligro la vida de la gente y del planeta.

Debemos hacer una reflexión colectiva: más participación ciudadana, más valor a quienes cuidan de los montes y de las aldeas, más valor a quienes nos alimentan, y más valor, sobre todo, al patrimonio más importante que tenemos como humanidad, que son nuestros montes, nuestras aldeas y nuestros bosques. Porque para apagar los fuegos lo que hace falta es avivar los pueblos.

Pilar Ayuso (PPE). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, deseo transmitir mis condolencias a los familiares de las víctimas y, por supuesto, condenar lo sucedido.

El 15 de octubre ardían Galicia y Portugal. En Galicia hubo cuatro muertos y 35 000 hectáreas quemadas; en Portugal, cuarenta y tres muertos y 150 000 hectáreas quemadas. Sin embargo, el contingente de extinción era prácticamente el mismo.

En Galicia, dos tercios del presupuesto se destinan a la prevención de incendios y un tercio al combate. En España, se destinan unos 2 000 millones de euros anuales a la extinción de incendios —solo Estados Unidos tiene un presupuesto equivalente por habitante—. Además, este presupuesto se ha aumentado casi en un 20 % en el año 2012, y se ha perfeccionado la coordinación con las comunidades autónomas y la política forestal.

No es un problema de este Gobierno, como acaba de decir el señor Blanco —que ya se ha ido—. Y, a propósito, le recuerdo que, en agosto de 2006, en Galicia ardieron 110 000 hectáreas con su partido gobernando en Galicia y en España. No es ese el caso.

En este caso, sin embargo, no se ha tratado de incendios forestales, sino que han sido auténticos incendios criminales. La sequía, el viento y la alta temperatura pueden explicar la propagación de un incendio, pero no explican su inicio.

Lo que no se explica es que, concurriendo todas estas condiciones meteorológicas, se iniciaran tal cantidad de incendios simultáneamente, a la caída de la tarde y en zonas periurbanas y espacios naturales: esto solo puede ser intencionado.

Quiero acabar reiterando que en España estamos bien preparados para luchar contra los incendios, y la propia Comisión Europea lo reconoce. Ahora bien, luchar contra este tipo de crímenes medioambientales, que ocasiona tragedias humanas, es otra cosa bien distinta.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, en Asturias llevamos ya noventa y seis incendios en cuarenta y un municipios de los setenta y ocho que tenemos. Desde luego, algunos han sido provocados, pero hay una responsabilidad política también. Una de las causas principales es la pésima gestión del territorio y de los medios públicos, al desatender, por ejemplo, la limpieza de los montes y en especial la de las franjas cortafuegos, y al aplicar también unas políticas laborales inaceptables a los medios de extinción de incendios, con contratos temporales intermitentes, en vez de disponer de plazas públicas estables. Y, además, se han suprimido las torres de vigilancia. Estas son las consecuencias de los recortes.

La causa está también en las políticas de la Unión y en especial en la PAC, que han provocado el despoblamiento de las zonas rurales y el abandono del campo y de los bosques. Ni siquiera la propia gente del medio rural, ya envejecida, puede entrar a limpiar los montes por la aplicación también de las normas subsidiarias en los parques naturales.

Eso sí, cuando faltan bomberos, desde luego, se envía al ejército. Para eso sí hay dinero. Demasiada policía y muy pocos bomberos, señor comisario. Y por si fuera poco, en nuestra región, en Asturias, hay una investigación abierta también por malversación de los fondos del FEDER que deberían haber sido destinados a la reforestación y a la limpieza de los bosques.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Ik ben de enige die niet uit het Iberisch Schiereiland komt die hier nu spreekt, maar rampen zoals deze en alle andere vormen zijn inderdaad een kwestie van Europese solidariteit. Het kan een overstroming zijn, het kan een brand zijn of andere situaties. Daarom, vanuit die optiek en naast mijn medelijden en ook de pieteit jegens de overledenen, wil ik toch een paar enigszins kritische kanttekeningen maken.

Op de eerste plaats: voor het eerst – en ik schrik daar wat van – hoor je dat er een gemixte vorm is tussen klimaatverandering en tussen datgene wat door burgers wordt aangericht. Ik vind dan ook, als we aan hulpverlening doen – en dat moeten we natuurlijk doen, prima voorstel, commissaris – dan moeten we ook een rapportage van de lidstaat vragen hoe men in dat evenwicht tussen preventie, tussen hulpverlening en herstel werkt. U zei ook dat we de mogelijkheid hebben geschapen om uit het Europees Regionaal Ontwikkelingsfonds 95 % Europese gelden vrij te maken. Een deel daarvan wordt nu al gebruikt. We kunnen meer doen, er zit meer ruimte in. Maar nu wil ik ook weten hoe dat plattelandsbeleid, dat plattelandsherstel, hoe dat wordt gedaan. Dat is niet even kortstondig hulp verlenen. Dat zijn structurele maatregelen om het platteland inderdaad ook weer veilig te maken voor de mensen, en dat moeten we terugvragen. Niet alleen maar aanbieden, maar ook als het ware een evenwicht zoeken.

Ten tweede zegt u dat men een plan heeft ingediend ten aanzien van die eerste branden – dat hebben we toen hier besproken. Nu gaan ze zeker over die drempel heen. Wilt u dat snel behandelen en zo snel mogelijk inderdaad afwerken. Ik dank u wel.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, non c'è dubbio che nel Parlamento Lei avrà un alleato. Il Parlamento ha lavorato già nella scorsa legislatura con grande entusiasmo per realizzare questo meccanismo di protezione civile europea e le catastrofi naturali che tanti Stati membri hanno affrontato, e continuano ad affrontare, ci dicono che serve una risposta più forte. Siamo perfettamente consapevoli che quello che c'è non basta.

Come Lei ha detto, le capacità nazionali da sole non bastano e lo dimostrano, come ha ricordato, le 16 volte in cui il meccanismo è dovuto intervenire durante quest'estate soltanto per gli incendi. Bisogna migliorare la capacità di reagire, bisogna che prevenzione e preparazione siano le nostre priorità. I cittadini europei sono dalla nostra parte, stanno con noi, ci chiedono questo, vogliono qui vedere più Europa, molta più Europa.

Anch'io credo che sarebbe una cosa bella, forse, avere un meccanismo di protezione civile europeo vero e proprio, però sappiamo anche che la responsabilità primaria per rispondere a questi disastri è degli Stati membri, tant'è che nella scorsa legislatura la sussidiarietà ha dovuto essere la nostra stella polare per poter mettere in campo questo meccanismo.

Allora io credo che, se questo deve e può essere il nostro obiettivo, bisogna anche essere molto pragmatici e quindi penso che dovremmo cominciare da quello che Lei ha detto, perché noi dobbiamo assolutamente migliorare rapidamente. Quindi quello che è già in campo lo possiamo migliorare, possiamo migliorare la collaborazione tra e con gli Stati membri, possiamo semplificare le procedure, dobbiamo aumentare il cofinanziamento e gli strumenti di finanziamento ma soprattutto, ripeto, dobbiamo fare presto. Buon lavoro!

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, uma palavra inicial, como não podia deixar de o fazer, para endereçar o sentido pesar às famílias de todos quantos perderam prematuramente a vida em Portugal e também em Espanha.

A perda de mais de 100 vidas, nestas circunstâncias, é caso de que não há memória em Portugal. O Estado português falhou numa das suas tarefas fundamentais: não assegurou a proteção das pessoas. É lamentável e é censurável.

Legitimada pelos cidadãos que me elegeram, não poderia deixar de dar voz ao manifesto descrédito dos portugueses no Estado. Precisamos e queremos respostas e soluções. A solidariedade europeia tem de fazer-se sentir. A resposta a situações de emergência tem de ser imediata. Não precisamos de discutir mais mecanismos. É urgente apresentar a remodelação necessária na proteção civil, que já detetámos não estar a funcionar bem.

Andamos há uma década a discutir a importância de uma força europeia de proteção civil, capaz de intervir em caso de catástrofe no espaço comunitário. Esta é a hora de a União mostrar ainda mais a sua capacidade de garantir a proteção de todos os cidadãos europeus.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, portugueses e galegos, enlutados e atordoados, confrontam-se com o resultado de décadas de má gestão das florestas, de desordenamento do território, de despovoamento do interior e abandono das populações rurais, de captura do Estado por interesses e de desinvestimento na prevenção e na proteção civil, agravados pelo impacto das alterações climáticas.

Em Portugal já temos diagnóstico, recomendações de especialistas e decisões governamentais para apoiar as vítimas, reconstruir o que tem que ser reconstruído e corrigir o que tem que ser corrigido. Para as levar à prática precisamos de cidadãos atentos a vigiar e a pedir contas; precisamos de solidariedade europeia, que deve ser, antes de mais, permitir que o esforço nacional de investimento na reconstrução e reorientação não conte para o défice estrutural; precisamos da ativação rápida de todas as ajudas financeiras; precisamos, claro, de uma verdadeira força europeia de proteção civil, que tenha meios para chegar a tempo; precisamos de uma Comissão Europeia atenta e interveniente, porque este desafio geracional para Portugal e Espanha é, obviamente, também um desafio para toda a União Europeia.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, εκφράζουμε τα συλλυπητήριά μας στους συγγενείς των θυμάτων στην Πορτογαλία και τη βόρεια Ισπανία. Είναι δεδομένο ότι πρόκειται για μια πολύ μεγάλη καταστροφή. Ταυτόχρονα, η συζήτηση αναδεικνύει την αναγκαιότητα να υπάρξει ένα ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα πολιτικής προστασίας, να υπάρξουν τα μέσα. Και θα έλεγα, κύριε Στυλιανίδη, ότι θα μπορούσε να γίνει ένας συνδυασμός: να υπάρξουν αυξημένα κονδύλια στο Ταμείο Αλληλεγγύης και να αλλάξουν λίγο και οι προϋποθέσεις, οι οποίες είναι αρκετά αυξημένες. Πρέπει να υπάρξει, υποτίθεται, καταστροφή στο ύψος του 1,5% του ΑΕΠ. Υπάρχουν διαδικασίες τέτοιες που καλύπτουν μόνο τις υποδομές. Δεν καλύπτουν καταστροφές που έχουν υποστεί ιδιώτες ή αγρότες. Άρα λοιπόν χρειάζεται μια συνολική αλλαγή της νομοθεσίας σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για να μπορούμε να καλύπτουμε αυτές τις καταστροφές που προκύπτουν. Επίσης, θα πρέπει να μην μετρήσει στο έλλειμμα το ενδεχόμενο κονδύλιο που θα δώσει είτε η Πορτογαλία είτε η Ισπανία από εθνικά μέσα για να αντιμετωπίσει αυτές τις καταστροφές.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedkyně, já bych chtěl na začátku svého vystoupení vyjádřit účast rodinám pozůstalých a obrovsky ocenit soudržnost lidí, kteří byli dotčeni touto katastrofou.

Zároveň bych chtěl říci, že si myslím, že platí základní heslo, kdo rychle dává, dvakrát dává. Myslím si, že to je naše výzva. Evropský fond solidarity byl již v tomto volebním období upravován, jeho pravidla pro vydávání těchto prostředků, ale myslím si, že je možné učinit více. Zaprvé, více alokovat zdroje v tomto Fondu solidarity a zadruhé, být ještě rychlejší a efektivnější. My nemůžeme bojovat se zločinci, kteří zapalují lesy, ale můžeme více posílit naši prevenci. To si myslím, že je velmi podstatné a mělo by se to promítnout do našeho využívání půdy i do správy a rozvoje venkova.

Já bych chtěl zároveň ke konci říci, že ty protipožární ochrany jsou věci jednotlivých států, ale fond efektivní reakce, to by měla být společná úloha nás všech.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, firstly, my sincere sympathy to my colleagues from the Iberian Peninsula on what they have suffered as a result of the forest fires in Spain and Portugal. I would also like to commend the Commissioner for his genuine affinity and empathy with those who suffered, and for his desire to help. That is as it should be, and he is portraying a very human face for what is often seen as a bureaucratic Commission. Certainly not in his case.

In my own country, we had some very serious flooding recently as a result of Hurricane Ophelia, the worst storm we have had in over 50 years – followed on last week by another storm, Storm Brian. Five people were killed during that, and a huge amount of damage was done. Having discussed it with him, I know the Commissioner would like to help us, but there may be difficulties in terms of the high threshold that it takes to qualify and I think that is something we need to look at going forward. We should reduce the threshold and definitely increase the funding for the Solidarity Fund, because this is one way of really showing citizens that we care for them – especially in their hour of need.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I say to the House: dear colleagues, thank you so much for your participation and your contribution to this timely debate. I have taken very careful note of your suggestions and your proposals, which will definitely feed into my reflections and proposals to the College next month.

Thank you so much for your support and your encouragement in reaching this very critical objective, namely to give to our citizens a real European response to these unprecedented natural disasters inside Europe.

I would like to respond to some of your observations. First of all, as I said, we need to take a comprehensive approach. I want to come forward with proposals, not only in response to the forest fires – as I said – but also to hurricanes, earthquakes and floods. This is quite important for me.

To do this we need – as I said – at least three things. I would like to stress this because it is a sort of strategic plan. First, additional financial support, to be better equipped to respond to disasters. I am sure that we all agree on this.

Second, we need to put more emphasis on prevention and preparedness, with better links to the structural funds. I thank you because I saw again that we agree on this. For me, increased prevention and preparedness should be a precondition for any extra support.

Finally, the third point is that we of course need to improve the efficiency of the mechanism, so that we can deploy assistance more rapidly during emergencies. This is quite important, and this why I accepted that sometimes our response was not as fast as the emergency required.

My dear friends, we are not starting from zero in terms of coordinating the civil protection activities of our Member States. In my contact with the Council and our Member States through the EU Civil Protection Mechanism, some Member States are now already pre-committing capacities, such as firefighters, for rapid deployment. This is quite important.

We certainly need to be able to deploy more firefighting teams when requested. This will be an important element of our work. I would also like to respond to the idea of new planes. We all agree that there are not enough planes and capacities to deal with the increasing number of forest fires. One of the objectives of the revision is to address this gap and develop additional operational capacities. We will look at all options in order to find the most efficient solution.

The mandate that I received from the College, President Juncker and the Council is very clear. We must provide better support to our citizens at times of crisis and emergency, with maximum efficiency and minimum bureaucracy.

As I said, we are not starting from zero in terms of coordination. The experience of the Civil Protection Mechanism is positive, but it has its shortcomings. We will therefore come forward with concrete proposals in order to deliver these rapid and tangible results on the ground, and tangible European solidarity to our citizens.

So we need to be better prepared for future natural disasters and to have more capacity to respond to the next natural disaster. Time is of the essence. We should be in place to help our citizens practically. At least this is our duty as representatives of the European people.

Thank you again for your support and your suggestions.

Matti Maasilas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, dear Members, after having listened to this debate all I have to say is that I am looking forward to action and to receiving proposals by the Commission – and from what I heard from Commissioner Stylianides, right now I feel quite encouraged already about the path that we have chosen in order to tackle these issues.

I can reiterate that the Council will give high priority to these proposals when they come.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Francisco Assis (S&D), *por escrito*. – A tragédia dos fogos florestais, que, uma vez mais, se abateu sobre Portugal, causando mais de uma centena de vítimas e danos materiais de elevadíssima dimensão, provocou em todos nós uma profunda dor.

Quero exprimir a minha solidariedade aos familiares das vítimas deste infausto acontecimento que causou perdas absolutamente irreparáveis. A União Europeia, através de Jean-Claude Juncker, Presidente da Comissão Europeia, e Antonio Tajani, Presidente do Parlamento Europeu, exprimiu já uma sentida solidariedade para com o povo português. Registámos esses gestos, que muito nos sensibilizaram.

Importa agora prosseguir com a tarefa de promoção de mecanismos integrados a nível europeu no domínio da proteção civil, de modo a garantir, no futuro, uma resposta mais eficaz a desastres com as características do agora ocorrido.

Desta forma poder-se-á obstar à repetição de situações trágicas como a que acabámos de presenciar. Estou certo de que será esse o caminho escolhido pelos governantes dos diversos Estados-membros e pelos restantes decisores europeus.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – La semana pasada asistimos con horror a los más de 200 incendios registrados en España y Portugal, que acabaron calcinando miles de hectáreas, provocando daños ecológicos incalculables y que acabó con la vida de decenas de personas. En Galicia, los incendios fueron especialmente numerosos. La Xunta no tuvo un plan efectivo contra los incendios, llevando a cabo una política forestal devastadora e incluso despidiendo a 436 brigadistas de los equipos forestales, aun cuando sabían que el riesgo de incendios era muy alto, por la inusual falta de lluvia. Las pérdidas, tanto humanas como materiales y ecológicas que tardarán décadas en recuperarse, tienen culpables. Y mucha de la culpa por omisión es del Gobierno de Galicia, del PP, que no invierte en políticas activas en materia de extinción de incendios, ni de prevención de incendios, algo que los expertos estiman clave para acabar

con esta triste tradición de incendios en nuestros montes cada verano. Y desde aquí quiero agradecer al pueblo *galego*, que no dudó en participar heroicamente en la extinción de los incendios, al ver que la ayuda o no llegaba, o era totalmente insuficiente. Quiero también desde aquí enviar todo mi apoyo a las familias víctimas de estos incendios.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Tras los desoladores incendios acaecidos en el norte de España y en Portugal, son imprescindibles mecanismos articulados de ayuda por parte de la UE. El principal mecanismo de ayuda es el Fondo de Solidaridad de la UE, el cual fue creado para intervenir en caso de catástrofes naturales graves. Para que sea efectivo, los daños han de superar un porcentaje del PIB de la región o país en cuestión.

También hay otras acciones que pueden entrar en juego, ya que alrededor del 90 % de los fondos de la Unión destinados a los bosques provienen del Fondo Europeo Agrícola de Desarrollo Rural (Feader), fondo que contempla una medida para la reparación de daños causados a los bosques por incendios, desastres naturales y catástrofes. Los fondos regionales FEDER y el programa LIFE son otra posibilidad.

A pesar de estas ayudas, los socialistas hemos pedido que se reorienten las prioridades del Feader y de la PAC. A su vez, apostamos por revisar el Fondo de Solidaridad para que sea efectivo, aumentar la financiación que recibe la Red Natura —el programa LIFE no es suficiente— y reforzar el Mecanismo de Protección Civil de la Unión Europea.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), *por escrito*. – La serie de incendios criminalmente provocados en las últimas semanas han dejado en el sur de Europa, particularmente en España y Portugal, un rastro de desgracia humana y destrucción ambiental intolerable. Sólo este año se han quemado en la Unión 750 000 hectáreas y han muerto más de 100 personas por esta causa. Quisiera agradecer la iniciativa simbólica del presidente del parlamento europeo, Antonio Tajani, de donar los 50 000 euros del último premio a la concordia Princesa de Asturias a las víctimas de los incendios. Asimismo, me sumo a las propuestas de mis colegas en el Parlamento para mejorar nuestro mecanismo de protección civil contra los incendios y asegurarnos de que el fondo de solidaridad europeo cumple más eficazmente con su cometido. Una Europa vertebrada y unida no puede permitirse tener eslabones débiles que ponen a prueba su patrimonio natural y humano de modo tan dramático. Los desafíos del cambio climático y de la delincuencia interesada que tanto impactan en el medio ambiente, en especial en el mundo rural, exige no dejar a los Estados y a los ciudadanos solos. Necesitamos avanzar hacia una respuesta europea común contra el terrorismo ambiental.

Carolina Punset (ALDE), *por escrito*. – Un cúmulo de circunstancias negativas causó 146 incendios durante un mismo fin de semana en Galicia, todos ellos achacables al ser humano. Además, 2017 será el año más cálido desde que existen registros, debido al innegable efecto invernadero incrementado por nuestro estilo de vida dependiente de los combustibles fósiles. El abandono de la tierra, la escasa conciencia ambiental y los efectos negativos del fuego como instrumento destructor hacen el resto. A esto sumamos un modelo forestal, carente de la adecuada planificación y basado en monocultivos de pirófitas como el eucalipto, y la desastrosa gestión autonómica de los medios de prevención. Despreocupada ante un otoño con temperaturas de hasta 35 °C, y criticada por los sindicatos, la Xunta de Galicia despedía a 465 brigadistas que finalizaron sus contratos, justo 15 días antes del sombrío fin de semana. El medio ambiente no se percibe como fuente de riqueza, y esa tarea pedagógica es una labor esencial de las administraciones. En España, corresponde a la autonómica, con plenas competencias ambientales transferidas, asumir la obligación de la planificación, conservación y la prevención con un horizonte a largo plazo. Es lamentable que los incendios actuales se repitan durante décadas ante la pasividad de la administración.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D), *por escrito*. – Os incêndios que assolaram Portugal nos passados dias 14 e 15 de outubro causaram a perda de quatro dezenas de vidas humanas e milhões de euros de prejuízos materiais. Além disso, infligiram um duro golpe na floresta portuguesa. Neste particular, merece destaque a vasta área ardida, o equivalente ao total registado em Portugal em muitos dos anos anteriores.

Estes infelizes acontecimentos convocam uma discussão profunda acerca dos motivos, da resposta imediata, mas também do que poderemos fazer para evitar que tragédias como esta se repitam no futuro. Tem-se aventado, com cada vez mais frequência, a possibilidade de se constituir uma força europeia de proteção civil. Tal reflexão deve, desde já, merecer acolhimento, pois tratar-se-ia de uma forma eficiente de garantir uma resposta rápida e adequada às necessidades de apoio de emergência aos Estados Membros. Acresce que esta força estaria, no fundo, a corporizar um dos princípios fundacionais da União: a solidariedade.

É claro que outras medidas devem ser tomadas. Até porque, bem sabemos, não basta lamentar as tragédias, há que evitá-las. E, no caso português, isso passa por um esforço de reordenamento florestal, que só logrará o sucesso se partir de um amplo consenso político nacional.

19. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

20. Mittelübertragungen: siehe Protokoll

21. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

22. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 21.23 Uhr geschlossen.)

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



C/2024/3020

3.5.2024

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 26. OKTOBER 2017

(C/2024/3020)

EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT

SITZUNGSPERIODE 2017-2018

Sitzungen vom 23. bis 26. Oktober 2017

STRASSBURG

Inhalt	Seite
1. Eröffnung der Sitzung	4
2. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll	4
3. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll	4
4. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
5. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll	4
6. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (Aussprache)	4
7. Durchführung der Umwelthaftungsrichtlinie (Aussprache)	19
8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	32
9. Sacharow-Preis 2017 (Bekanntgabe der Preisträger)	32
10. Abstimmungsstunde	33
10.1. Wahl eines Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments (Abstimmung)	33
10.2. Durchführung der Umwelthaftungsrichtlinie (A8-0297/2017 - Laura Ferrara) (Abstimmung) ...	34

Inhalt	Seite
10.3. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung (A8-0387/2016 - Paul Tang) (Abstimmung)	34
10.4. Aufsichtsanforderungen an Kreditinstitute und Wertpapierfirmen (A8-0388/2016 - Othmar Karas) (Abstimmung)	34
10.5. Achtung des Privatlebens und Schutz personenbezogener Daten in der elektronischen Kommunikation und Aufhebung der Richtlinie 2002/58/EG (Verordnung über Privatsphäre und elektronische Kommunikation) (A8-0324/2017 - Marju Lauristin) (Abstimmung)	34
10.6. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (RC-B8-0576/2017, B8-0576/2017, B8-0577/2017, B8-0578/2017, B8-0579/2017, B8-0580/2017, B8-0581/2017, B8-0582/2017) (Abstimmung)	35
10.7. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (A8-0310/2017 - Gunnar Hökmark) (Abstimmung)	35
10.8. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien (A8-0311/2017 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung)	35
10.9. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (A8-0312/2017 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung)	35
10.10. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (A8-0265/2017 - Kostas Chrysogonos) (Abstimmung)	35
11. Stimmerkklärungen	35
11.1. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung (A8-0387/2016 - Paul Tang)	35
11.2. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (RC-B8-0576/2017, B8-0576/2017, B8-0577/2017, B8-0578/2017, B8-0579/2017, B8-0580/2017, B8-0581/2017, B8-0582/2017)	36
11.3. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (A8-0310/2017 - Gunnar Hökmark)	36
11.4. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien (A8-0311/2017 - Daniel Caspary)	37
11.5. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (A8-0312/2017 - Daniel Caspary)	38
11.6. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (A8-0265/2017 - Kostas Chrysogonos) .	38
12. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll	38
13. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung	38
14. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll	38
15. Standpunkt des Rates in erster Lesung: siehe Protokoll	39
16. Große Anfragen (Aussprache)	39
16.1. Koordinierte Bemühungen auf EU-Ebene zur Erhöhung der Durchimpfungsrate	39

Inhalt	Seite
17. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll	46
18. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll	46
19. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll	46
20. Schluss der Sitzung	46
21. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode	46

AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE VOM 26. OKTOBER 2017

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1. Eröffnung der Sitzung

Η συνεδρίαση αρχίζει στις 9.00.

2. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

3. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll

4. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 106 GO): siehe Protokoll

5. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 105 Absatz 6 GO): siehe Protokoll

6. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση σχετικά με την έκθεση του κ. Κώστα Χρυσόγονου, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Νομικών Θεμάτων, σχετικά με τον έλεγχο της εφαρμογής του δικαίου της ΕΕ το 2015 (2017/2011(INI)) (A8-0265/2017)

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, Εισηγητής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρίες και κύριοι ευρωβουλευτές, θέλω αρχικά να ευχαριστήσω όλα τα μέλη της Επιτροπής Νομικών Υποθέσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου που συνέβαλαν στην ολοκλήρωση της έκθεσής μου για την εφαρμογή του ενωσιακού δικαίου το έτος 2015. Ο τακτικός και συνεπής έλεγχος της εφαρμογής του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου έχει καίρια σημασία για την εύρυθμη λειτουργία των θεσμών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και για τη βελτίωση των πανθομολογούμενων αδυναμιών της. Η σχετική έκθεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής επικεντρώνει την προσοχή της στην τυπική εφαρμογή της ευρωπαϊκής νομοθεσίας από τα κράτη μέλη. Από την άλλη πλευρά όμως υποτιμά, φοβάμαι, τους ουσιαστικούς κινδύνους παραβίασης των θεμελιωδών ευρωπαϊκών αρχών και αξιών, οι οποίοι έχουν εμφοιλοχωρήσει σε πρακτικές των οργάνων και της ίδιας της Ένωσης. Οι κίνδυνοι αυτοί οφείλουν να επισημανθούν, αν θέλουμε να αντιμετωπίσουμε αποτελεσματικά τις προκλήσεις του μέλλοντος.

Οι βασικοί τομείς στους οποίους η έκθεση της Επιτροπής καταγράφει ότι σημειώθηκαν οι περισσότερες διαδικασίες για παραβάσεις κατά κρατών μελών λόγω καθυστερημένης μεταφοράς ευρωπαϊκών κανόνων στην εσωτερική έννομη τάξη τους το 2015 είναι οι τομείς της κινητικότητας των εργαζομένων, των μεταφορών, της ενέργειας και του περιβάλλοντος. Αν και το έτος 2015, για πρώτη φορά από το 2011, ο αριθμός των νέων καταγγελιών για παραβάσεις του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου παρουσιάζεται μειωμένος, εκφράζονται ανησυχίες ότι σημαντικός αριθμός νέων καταγγελιών αφορά ευαίσθητους τομείς, όπως είναι η απασχόληση, οι κοινωνικές υποθέσεις, η κοινωνική ένταξη, η επιχειρηματικότητα και η δικαιοσύνη. Η ευθύνη πάντως των κρατών μελών για την εφαρμογή του ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου δεν απαλλάσσει σε καμία περίπτωση τα θεσμικά όργανα της ίδιας της Ένωσης από τον καθήκον τους να τηρούν και αυτά το ενωσιακό δίκαιο και να ενεργούν με βάση αυτό. Οι θεσμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ακόμη κι όταν δρουν ως μέλη μιας ομάδας διεθνών δανειστών, δεσμεύονται από τις Συνθήκες της Ένωσης και από τον Χάρτη

Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων. Η πρακτική ενωσιακών θεσμών να υπογράφουν ως δανειστές μνημονιακές συμφωνίες με κράτη μέλη βάσει των οποίων αυτά αναλαμβάνουν την υποχρέωση να εφαρμόσουν επαχθή μέτρα λιτότητας, χωρίς οι συμφωνίες αυτές να υπόκεινται στο ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο, είναι κατακριτέα. Επαχθή μέτρα, όπως συνεχείς περικοπές μισθών και συντάξεων, συνεχείς αυξήσεις φόρων και εισφορών που απορρέουν από αυτές τις συμφωνίες, και σε ορισμένες περιπτώσεις παραβιάζουν και συνταγματικά δικαιώματα, στερούνται βασικών προστατευτικών δικλείδων. Τις δικλείδες αυτές τις παρέχει και το ενωσιακό δίκαιο, καθώς και η ενσωματωμένη στο πρωτογενές δίκαιο Χάρτα των Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Επισημαίνεται ακόμη ότι, εξαιτίας της επιβολής ουσιαστικών περικοπών στη διοίκηση, τη δικαιοσύνη, την υγεία και την κοινωνική πρόνοια μέσω τέτοιων μέτρων, υποχωρεί τελικά η προστασία θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων και αρχών, όπως το δικαίωμα στην υγεία, το δικαίωμα στην εργασία, η προστασία της αξιοπρέπειας του ανθρώπου και εν γένει υπονομεύεται το κοινωνικό κράτος. Τέτοιες πρακτικές δεν συνάδουν συνεπώς με τον νομικό πολιτισμό της Ένωσης. Συγχρόνως πρέπει να υπογραμμιστεί και το έλλειμμα εφαρμογής των κανόνων που διέπουν το άσυλο και τη μετανάστευση από τρίτες χώρες στην Ένωση. Τούτο ισχύει ιδίως για τον μηχανισμό μετεγκατάστασης προσφύγων, καθώς ορισμένα κράτη μέλη δεν τηρούν την εν λόγω συμφωνία. Έτσι όμως υπονομεύεται η θεμελιώδης αρχή της ευρωπαϊκής αλληλεγγύης και συνεργασίας και πλήττεται το κύρος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Εν κατακλείδι, η εφαρμογή του ενωσιακού δικαίου πρέπει να είναι συνολική και όχι επιλεκτική, αν η Ένωση θέλει να πείσει τους πολίτες της ότι σέβεται τις αρχές της και έτσι να βελτιώσει τις μακροπρόθεσμες προοπτικές της δικής της βιωσιμότητας.

Vytienis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, in Europe the strength of the law has replaced the law of the strong. Our Union is not a state, but it is a community of law. Proper application of the law ensures that individuals and companies can enjoy their rights, that they obtain legal certainty in their daily lives and obtain rapid and effective redress if rights are violated.

Together with the Council, the European Parliament can adopt the best law in the world, but unless it is properly applied it will not change anything, so on behalf of First Vice-President Frans Timmermans, I welcome the fact that this House so strongly shares the Commission's view that making sure that European Union law is properly implemented, and effectively complied with, has to be permanently among our top priorities. For that reason, this Chamber's continuous work on our annual reports is particularly important.

There have been a number of significant developments since 2015. I think these developments respond to a great number of the issues have raised. In particular, Members call for strengthened enforcement and monitoring of the implementation of the European Union legislation in key policy areas. Since 2016, the Commission's new enforcement policy does exactly that. We have put forward a more strategic, effective and proportionate approach to our infringement policy to allow us to deliver on our policy priorities. Importantly, we will now launch infringement procedures without first relying on the EU pilot mechanism, unless recourse to this mechanism is seen as useful in a particular case.

On transparency, we have taken concrete measures to provide more information about infringement decisions. In 2014 we set up a centralised platform for proactively disseminating information on infringements on our Europa website in all Union languages, and we are making an ongoing effort to improve the accessibility and user-friendliness of this website even more.

We will continue to provide Parliament and the public at large with information on the follow-up given to complaints and Parliamentary petitions in our annual reports. We must do this, of course, while respecting confidentiality with regard to the Member States in infringement procedures as recognised by the Court of Justice.

In recent years this House has dedicated considerable energy to better regulation and the Commission very much welcomes that. Our shared aim, reflected in the Institutional Agreement on Better Law-making, is to ensure legislation is prepared in an open, transparent way using the best evidence available and valuable stakeholder input.

We also focus on ways to support Member States in their implementation of European rules and are pleased to see that Parliament supports these efforts. We also pay particular attention to the national authorities who have key tasks under EU law, such as national competent authorities, national data protection supervisory authorities and national rail, energy and telecoms regulators. We will continue to work in partnership with them through the range of networks we have in place.

As you will know, we reported on the latest developments on better regulation in a communication adopted this Thursday alongside the Commission Work Programme for 2018.

I also support your call for a more active role for national parliaments in the dialogue on the European Union's legislative proposals. The Commission has invested heavily in the political dialogue with national parliaments, as well as the formal consultation mechanisms set out in the Treaty.

Over the last three years, Members of the Commission have visited national parliaments more than 650 times. They also participated in more than 300 interactive citizens' dialogues in more than 80 cities and towns across 27 Member States.

Finally, we will continue to strengthen our cooperation with the European Network of Ombudsmen, which the European Ombudsman coordinates and which promotes good administration in the application of EU law at national level.

There are nevertheless two issues which we have also discussed in the past and where we do not fully agree.

First, your call for an increased role for Parliament in monitoring the implementation of EU law. Without prejudice to the essential democratic control by Parliament, it is the Commission which oversees the application of European Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

The infringement procedure has a specific bilateral nature recognised in the Treaty. It is conducted solely between the Commission and the Member State concerned. There are thus legal limits as regards the role of Parliament in this process.

Second, you call again for a legislative proposal on administrative procedures under Article 298 of the Treaty. I would like to stress two points here. Firstly, the Commission has already created a strong framework to protect complainants. Our Code of Good Administrative Behaviour and the Communication on relations with the complainant offer a number of guarantees that safeguard complainants' rights throughout the entire procedure. Secondly, as the EU administers a range of diverse, often highly-specialised activities, we need sector-specific rules. Citizens and businesses concerned by such specialised activities are guaranteed specific administrative rights which are guaranteed by the Court of Justice of the European Union.

Against this background, the Commission still remains to be convinced of the added value of a legal instrument that would codify administrative law.

The effective application of European Union law is essential to deliver the benefits of European policies to citizens, businesses and public administrations. The Commission welcomes the fact that it has such a strong partner as the Parliament in ensuring that the laws you pass are implemented properly so that they really deliver positive benefits on the ground.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski, autor projektu opinii Komisji Spraw Konstytucyjnych. – Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo dziękuję panu posłowi Christogonosowi za opracowanie opinii. Nasza opinia jest opinią pomocniczą i ujmuje cały proces stosowania prawa w szerszym aspekcie.

Po pierwsze, chcemy zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że dobrze stosowane prawo wymaga, by już w fazie projektowania aktów prawnych – jest to przede wszystkim apel do Komisji Europejskiej – prawo było oszczędne, niezbiurokratyzowane, spójne i zrozumiałe dla obywateli. Czym lepsze będą projekty w fazie wyjściowej, tym lepsze będzie stosowanie prawa.

Ta sama uwaga dotyczy transponowania dyrektyw do porządku krajowego: nie należy obciążać ich dodatkową treścią, która komplikuje prawo i mnoży biurokratyczne bariery. Komisja AFKO kładzie nacisk na przejrzystość całego procesu jako warunek kontroli ze strony opinii publicznej i zapewnienia prawa obywateli do informacji o procesie stanowienia prawa.

Przywiązujemy bardzo dużą wagę do umocnienia roli parlamentów narodowych jako partnerów instytucji europejskich. Kładziemy pod rozagę rozluźnienie przepisów, tak aby parlamenty narodowe, w pierwszej fazie wczesnego ostrzegania i stosowania zasady pomocniczości, miały większe możliwości niż dotychczas. Będzie to z pożytkiem dla dobrego stosowania prawa. Są to zasadnicze kwestie, które podnosi komisja AFKO.

Cecilia Wikström, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Petitions*. – Mr President, the Committee on Petitions, for which I am chair, is, at its very best, a tool that bridges the gap between the EU institutions and the citizens. The Treaties guarantee all citizens the right to petition my Committee on the difficulties and problems that they face in their everyday life. In 2015, we received 1 431 petitions. Some of them refer to clear violation of EU law. The most common concerns remain within the areas of the environment, justice, fundamental rights and the internal market.

Altogether, this shows us at least three different things. Firstly, that we have a long way to go before EU legislation is applied equally all over the European Union, in every Member State. Secondly, it shows us the importance of petitions as a monitoring tool at grassroots level: the petitioners raise our awareness not only of violations of EU law, but also of deficiencies and loopholes that exist in the legislation. Thirdly, it shows that the EU is crucial in securing the wellbeing of its citizens where the nation state fails or ignores its responsibilities.

We must remember that the application and the implementation of EU law is ultimately the responsibility of the Member States. As the number of infringement procedures initiated by the Commission was still at a high level in 2015, I would strongly urge the Member States to look into this and into their performance when it comes to implementation of EU law.

We must ensure that the rights and the opportunities offered by EU legislation are maximised to benefit all the citizens of the Union, irrespective of which Member State they happen to live in.

Daniel Buda, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Domnule președinte, în primul rând, doresc să-mi exprim aprecierea pentru munca colegilor și a raportorului. Transpunerea unitară și la timp a legislației la nivelul întregii Uniuni este absolut necesară, astfel încât cetățenii din toate statele membre să beneficieze concomitent de avantajele politicii Uniunii Europene. Raportul realizat de Comisie a dezvăluit faptul că există în continuare, în majoritatea statelor membre, probleme legate de aplicarea legislației europene. Transpunerea tardivă sau incorectă a acestor norme afectează în mod negativ securitatea juridică și împiedică cetățenii să beneficieze, efectiv și în mod egal, de pe urma drepturilor care le sunt recunoscute la nivel european.

Apreciez că, în acest context, Comisia trebuie să identifice punctual domeniile în care există dificultăți privind transpunerea legislației, pentru a identifica soluțiile care se impun și nu doar să ofere o privire de ansamblu. De asemenea, doresc să subliniez rolul procedurilor *EU Pilot*, care vizează o cooperare mai strânsă între Comisie și statele membre, pentru a remedia încă din faza inițială situațiile de încălcare a legislației Uniunii Europene, fără a se recurge la procedurile oficiale de constatare a neîndeplinirii obligațiilor.

Fiecare stat european trebuie, însă, să se abțină de la o supra reglementare la nivel național, deoarece aceasta duce automat la complicații administrative, care au un impact negativ asupra vieții cetățenilor. Mai mult, o legislație națională stufoasă, incoerentă și des schimbată pune în pericol eficiența politicilor Uniunii Europene în diverse domenii, cum ar fi politica de coeziune și politica agricolă comună. Acest aspect se regăsește mai ales în domeniul reglementării procedurilor de absorbție a fondurilor europene, unde statele membre adaugă condiționalități suplimentare, dincolo de regulamentele și directivele europene. Consider, astfel, că este necesară intervenția Comisiei în sensul limitării unor astfel de supra-reglementări.

Asigurarea aplicării la timp și în mod corect a legislației Uniunii în statele membre rămâne o provocare considerabilă și permanentă. Trebuie să reținem, însă, că acest lucru contribuie semnificativ la creșterea investițiilor, la creșterea economică, dar și la creșterea numărului locurilor de muncă. Tocmai de aceea, grupul meu politic și eu personal, considerăm că se impune respingerea prin vot a tuturor amendamentelor care combat legitimitatea politicilor europene

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Zwei Zahlen sind besonders interessant: Zum einen ist festzustellen, dass im Jahr 2015 erstmals seit 2011 die Zahl der neuen Beschwerden von Bürgern, Unternehmen oder Organisationen über potenzielle Verstöße gegen das EU-Recht zurückgegangen ist. Das ist erfreulich, wenn gleich zirka 3 500 Beschwerden im Jahr noch immer recht viel sind. Und dann die zweite Zahl: Im selben Jahr – 2015 – leitete die Kommission 742 neue Vertragsverletzungsverfahren gegen die Mitgliedstaaten ein.

Die verspätete beziehungsweise die nicht ordnungsgemäße Umsetzung von europäischen Gesetzen hat zweifelsohne negative Auswirkungen auf die allgemeine Rechtssicherheit und auch auf die Wettbewerbsbedingungen im Binnenmarkt. Und wenn man dann noch feststellen muss, dass ausgerechnet im Beschäftigungsbereich auch 2015 wieder die meisten Beschwerden wegen der Verletzung des EU-Rechts eingegangen sind, dann braucht man sich auch nicht darüber zu wundern, weshalb die Bürgerinnen und Bürger wahrnehmen, dass sich ihre sozialen und Arbeitnehmerrechte nicht verbessern.

Wir erleben es ja immer wieder, dass bei Problemen lautstark auf „die da in Brüssel“ verwiesen wird. Ach, das ist ja so einfach und so unglaublich populär, Brüssel zum Sündenbock zu erklären. Aber so darf das nicht weitergehen. Es ist höchste Zeit, dass, wenn über die Europäische Union und ihre Probleme gesprochen wird, ganz konkret Ross und Reiter benannt werden, das heißt, klar gesagt wird, wer wofür zuständig ist und die politische Verantwortung trägt.

Die Kommission ist verantwortlich für Gesetzesvorschläge und wacht als Hüterin der Verträge über die Einhaltung europäischen Rechts, und die Mitgliedstaaten sind verantwortlich, einmal beschlossene europäische Gesetze auch fristgerecht umzusetzen und ordnungsgemäß anzuwenden. Dieser Verantwortung dürfen sie sich nicht entziehen. Sie müssen ihre Pflichten endlich wahrnehmen, damit wir alle die Vorteile der europäischen Gesetzgebung wahrnehmen können.

Abschließend möchte ich mich beim Berichterstatter, Herrn Chrysogonos, für seine hervorragende Arbeit und die gute Zusammenarbeit bedanken.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, поздравявам колегата Хрисогонос за работата по доклада. Адаптирането на законодателството на държавите членки към нормалната правна система на Съюза е сложен процес, който изисква време. Много често то причинява редица трудности, които не винаги могат да бъдат решени в точните срокове. От друга страна, забавянето на транспонирането на правото на Съюза не позволява на частните лица и предприятия да се възползват от европейските норми, като обърква прилаганите правила и оказва отрицателно въздействие върху функционирането на вътрешния пазар на Съюза.

Приветствам становището на докладчика, че отговорността за правилното прилагане на правото на Съюза се носи не само от държавите членки, но и от институциите на Съюза, които трябва да се съобразяват с принципите на субсидиарност и пропорционалност. Подкрепям мнението на докладчика, че включването на националните парламенти в диалога относно съдържанието на законодателните приложения ще насърчи по-ефективното прилагане на правото на Европейския съюз. Не съм съгласен, обаче, с аргументите му относно процедурата за миграцията и предоставянето на убежище.

На края искам да подчертая, че Комисията е пазител на договорите, но това не ѝ дава право да се намесва във вътрешните работи на демократично избраните правителства на държавите членки.

Jean-Marie Cavada, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport est vraiment très utile et je veux d'abord remercier notre collègue, M. Chrysogonos, pour toutes les nuances qu'il a apportées et l'effort qu'il a accompli afin que ce soit un rapport fondamental, parce qu'il montre que la responsabilité des États est de mieux en mieux prise en compte et que cette affaire progresse pour que nous ayons une cohérence dans l'Union européenne.

Évidemment, ce rapport reflète aussi le fait que les efforts que les États membres ont fait, vont faire et, en tout cas, doivent faire sont tout à fait fondamentaux pour la relation démocratique entre nos institutions et les électeurs, les citoyens de l'ensemble de l'Union.

Je vais émettre d'abord une restriction avant d'apporter mon appui total. Je ne partage pas toutes les idées qui sont dans ce rapport, et notamment, chers collègues, lorsque le rapporteur établit un lien de causalité entre les mesures financières restrictives imposées par l'Union à certains États membres et l'application incorrecte du droit de l'Union, ou bien lorsqu'il est déploré que les réexamens annuels, par la Commission, la Banque centrale européenne ou le Conseil, des programmes d'ajustement économique destinés aux membres de la zone euro ne soient pas faits de manière – je dirais – démocratique.

En réalité, sur le fond, je vais appuyer ce rapport, que je voterai bien évidemment. Sur un certain nombre de points essentiels, il dit vraiment très bien les choses: sur le respect des droits fondamentaux qui me semblent la pierre angulaire, sur la crise migratoire, sur la responsabilité des États membres qui ne respectent pas les quotas d'accueil des réfugiés, ce qui est une lourde tâche sur notre comportement, et puis sur les infractions au droit de l'environnement. Sur ces points-là, je crois que notre rapporteur a mis en lumière, de façon compréhensible par tout le monde, comment nous devons avancer dans la transposition du droit européen dans les États membres et l'expliquer aux électeurs.

Jiří Maštálka, *za skupinu GUE/NGL*. – Pane předsedající, s velkým zájmem jsem si přečetl zprávu kolegy Chrysogonose o uplatňování práva v Evropské unii za rok 2015. Musím říci, že údaj o počtu 3 450 stížností adresovaných Komisi pro možné porušení práva v Evropské unii mě nepříjemně překvapilo. Možná to svědčí o tom, že přijímaná legislativa je složitá a nesrozumitelná. V době narůstajícího euroskepticismu bychom měli vést diskuse zejména o tom, jaké právní předpisy jsou nadbytečné a zatěžující a které naopak na evropské úrovni občanům prospěšné. To znamená, jaká společná unijní legislativa může zlepšit kvalitu života a zajistit hospodářský rozvoj.

Například evropská spolupráce při odstraňování genderové nerovnosti v platovém ohodnocení, které v Evropské unii činí až 16 %, může být jedinečně prospěšná. Taková nerovnost je samozřejmě neospravedlnitelná. Jsem i toho názoru, že bychom se měli více soustředit na uplatňování principu subsidiarity a proporcionality. Větší zapojení vnitrostátních parlamentů považuji rovněž za nezbytné. Vnitrostátní parlamenty musí mít možnost vyjádřit názor již v rané fázi legislativního procesu, je třeba revidovat takzvaný systém včasného varování a zajistit tak lepší uplatňování postupu žluté karty.

Nechceme další nadbytečnou regulaci a větší administrativní zátěž. Při vytváření právních předpisů musíme dbát na větší zapojení sociálních partnerů, občanské společnosti, organizací na ochranu spotřebitelů. Cílem je transparentnější a otevřenější legislativní proces, jednoduchá, jasná a srozumitelná legislativa, která sníží byrokracii.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the principle of the rule of law, as recalled in Article 2 of the Treaty of the European Union, is the foundation of the Union. The principle of legality, as a corollary to the rule of law, requires that activities of the Union's administration are carried out in full accordance with the law.

With the development of the competencies of the European Union, citizens are increasingly confronted with the Union's institutions and procedures in their daily lives. Despite this increase, the procedures remain opaque, rules unclear and the people do not know what their rights are or if there is a remedy. In other words, alongside the expansion of administrative procedures, the EU has failed to ensure that the procedural rights that are affected will be adequately protected. Yet, in a Union under the rule of law, it is necessary that procedural rights and obligations be clearly defined and complied with. It remains the case that the Union lacks a coherent and comprehensive set of codified rules of administrative law. Not only does this enable poor, non-transparent and inconsistent administration, it makes it difficult for citizens to understand their administrative rights under Union law.

The right to good administration requires that administrative acts should be taken by the Union's administration pursuant to clear and accessible administrative procedures which guarantee impartiality, fairness and timeliness. In its resolution of 15 January 2013, the European Parliament called for the adoption of a regulation on a European law of administrative procedure, to legally guarantee the right to good administration, by means of an open, efficient and independent European administration. However, despite the fact that the motion for a resolution was adopted in plenary by an overwhelming majority, Parliament's request has not been followed up by a Commission proposal. Last year, I asked my colleagues in the Committee on Legal Affairs to draft the regulation together with me if the Commission would not do it, and we did it. The text was endorsed by the Committee in June last year and the European Parliament in its plenary adopted it. It called for the Commission to come forward with a comprehensive legislative proposal.

Mr President, the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon would give us the full obligation to implement the right to good administration and I am extremely disappointed to hear once again from the Commission, as we heard, that the Commission still remains to be convinced about the need for a unified law on administrative procedure.

Jane Collins, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, all Member States have very distinct legal cultures. The legal system of the UK is very different to the rest of continental Europe. A blanket policy cannot work in this Union.

It saddens me to see that this report is calling on the Commission to urge Member States to ensure the strict enforcement of EU rules on the free movement of persons. The EU cannot force an EU migration policy on countries which are already dealing with very difficult internal problems, such as housing and financial commitments. I also note with concern that the emphasis of this report is on bringing sovereign nation states 'back into line'. The report's references to ensuring the EU institutions themselves comply with EU law could almost be obligatory. This is not a periphery matter. This report, like the EU institutions themselves, has failed to consider who guards the guards.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, le rapport Chrysogonos fait le point sur l'application par les États européens du droit de l'Union en 2015.

Il répond aux canons habituels de la langue de bois, en chantant les louanges de la Commission de Bruxelles et en se félicitant de la marche irrésistible de l'Union vers l'avenir radieux d'une Europe fédérale. Il n'y manque rien, pas même l'allégeance aux lobbies, pudiquement rebaptisés «organisations de la société civile», ni l'hommage au Comité des régions, dont le travail de sape est en train de démolir l'Espagne. Bel exploit en vérité!

Mais la réalité est têtue. Voilà que soudain le rapport se trouble! Au paragraphe 31, il se déclare préoccupé par l'austérité infligée par l'Union à la Grèce. Il est vrai que l'auteur du rapport est grec et qu'il est difficile d'ignorer le saccage dont son pays est victime. Il finit même par avouer, au paragraphe 33, son inquiétude face au refus de certains États d'Europe de l'Est d'appliquer les relocalisations de migrants ordonnées par la Commission.

Tout cela est pathétique! Au lieu de faire allégeance à la Commission, l'auteur du rapport aurait mieux fait de s'attaquer à Schengen, dont la faillite est responsable de la submersion migratoire que connaît son pays, la Grèce.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Biztos Úr! Önhöz van kérdésem, kérem, hogy legyen szíves válaszolni. Hogyan döntenek el azt, hogy az európai uniós normák tényleges vagy állítólagos megsértése esetén mikor indítanak eljárást, és mikor nem. Mint ahogy az a jelentésükből is kiderül, nem haboznak eljárást indítani soha, például az én hazám, Magyarország ellen, amikor az Európai Unió – sokszor önkényes – migrációval kapcsolatos normáit nem tartjuk be, mert szeretnénk megvédeni a hazánkat.

Úgy tűnik, hogy soha nem indítanak viszont eljárást akkor, amikor a másik oldalon óriási lobbik vannak a bankvilág részéről. Gondolok itt elsősorban a devizahiteles ügyekre. Az én hazámban, Magyarországon most sok tízezer emberrel szemben áll fenn a végrehajtás, az otthonuk elvesztésének a veszélye.

Hogyha az ember megnézi az európai uniós fogyasztóvédelmi normákat, ez csak néhány közülük. Nem is kell jogásznak lenni, hogy lássuk, hogy ezek a devizahiteles banki ügyletek élesen szembe mentek minden európai uniós fogyasztóvédelmi normával, mint ahogy az is, hogy most ezek az emberek végrehajtás alatt állnak, miközben az Európai Unió bíróságának eljárása ezekben az ügyekben még folyamatban van. Szíveskedjen tájékoztatni a magyar közvéleményt arról, hogy mi az Európai Unió álláspontja ebben a kérdésben! Köszönöm!

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Pane předsedající, Evropská unie je společenstvím práva a já jsem ráda, že můžeme tuto zprávu, kterou připravil pan Chrysogonos, diskutovat a děkuju mu za práci na ní odvedenou.

Chtěl bych říci, že jak řekl i pan Maštálka, existují příklady legislativy, kde by skutečně Evropská komise mohla navrhnout jejich změnu, například nesmyslná směrnice o střídání zimního a letního času je horkým kandidátem na změnu, protože byla prokázána nejenom její škodlivost, ale i to, že nepřináší nic dobrého.

Za druhé, nemohu se ztotožnit s návrhem skupiny konfederace Evropské sjednocené levice a Severské zelené levice na změnu, který říká, že uplatňování právních předpisů Evropské unie je v rozporu s blahobytem naprosté většiny obyvatel Evropy. Za první, věcně to není pravda, protože právo Evropské unie přispívá k evropské integraci a ta přispívá k blahobytu naprosté většiny obyvatel Evropy. Za druhé, nesouhlasím s tím, aby právo, včetně evropského práva, bylo využíváno jako nástroj třídního boje. Toho jsem si v mládí, kdy jsem studoval na komunistické právnické fakultě, užil dost.

Claudia Țapardel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, domnule raportor, stimați colegi, în calitate de raportor social democrat pe avizul Comisiei pentru afaceri constituționale, îmi exprim preocuparea în legătură cu implementarea la timp și în mod corect a dreptului comunitar în legislația națională. Acest lucru continuă să fie o provocare majoră din cauza numărului mare de proceduri de infringement, un lucru care, bineînțeles, are un impact negativ asupra finalizării pieței unice interne.

Într-adevăr, responsabilitatea principală pentru implementarea și aplicarea corectă a dreptului Uniunii revine statelor membre. Cu toate acestea, instituțiile Uniunii Europene, și anume Comisia, trebuie să se asigure că instrumentele puse la dispoziția statelor membre, precum manuale, grupuri de experți, platforme online speciale, sunt suficiente și răspund cu adevărat la problemele de transpunere a legislației. În plus, sunt dezamăgiți de faptul că, în materie de transpunere a prevederilor legislative, cele trei domenii în care statele membre au făcut cel mai mult obiectul procedurilor de *infringement* au fost sectorul transporturilor, energie și mediu. Totuși, nu trebuie să uităm că aceste sectoare sunt caracterizate de o anumită specificitate. În acest sens, am invitat Comisia să explice motivele acestei situații.

Consider că, pentru respectarea termenelor de transpunere, Comisia ar trebui să stabilească și termene de implementare realiste, încă din faza pre-legislativă, deoarece capacitatea administrativă și nevoile în materie de infrastructură diferă de la un stat membru la altul. Așadar, în mod evident, și eforturile depuse în vederea ajustării legislației naționale ar putea solicita unor țări un dublu de acțiuni sau măsuri, mai ales că, în anumite situații și în cazul anumitor state membre, Comisia vine cu condiționalități suplimentare, care afectează capacitatea respectivelor state să implementeze legislația europeană sau să beneficieze de utilizarea fondurilor și finanțărilor europene, iar acest lucru afectează în mod direct investițiile și locurile de muncă și, implicit, economiile naționale și cea europeană.

Un aspect pozitiv este, totuși, faptul că acest raport reflectă și o poziție care încurajează o mai bună legiferare la nivelul Uniunii Europene, *better law-making*, și aceasta este procedura spre care trebuie să ne concentrăm pe viitor.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Die Kommission ist die Hüterin der Verträge.

So weit, so gut, oder genauer gesagt müsste man sagen: So weit, so schlecht. Denn wenn ich zwei große und wichtige Bereiche nehme, zum Beispiel die Migration und die Eurozone, dann sehe ich nicht, dass die Kommission ihrem Auftrag nachkommt, die Einhaltung dieser Verträge auch wirklich durchzusetzen.

Wir haben eine Vereinbarung von Dublin, und da ist klar geregelt, wie man sich im Migrationsbereich verhalten muss. Dagegen wird permanent verstoßen. Das ist eine der Hauptursachen, weshalb wir in der EU in einer so großen Krise sind. Wenn ich den Vertrag von Maastricht nehme, dann muss ich sagen: Es ist doch ein Unding, dass dagegen dutzendmal – ja sogar weit über hundertmal – verstoßen wird, ohne dass es zu Sanktionen kommt. Das dürfte sich die EU nicht bieten lassen.

Erst recht nicht, dass wir eine europäische Institution haben – mit der Europäischen Zentralbank –, die im Prinzip macht, was sie will. Sie überschreitet ihr Mandat, sie führt Maßnahmen durch, die in keinsten Weise nachhaltig sind, und die Bürger der EU, die Steuerzahler, werden hierfür die Lasten tragen müssen. Ich bitte die Kommission, hier für Abhilfe zu sorgen.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, lo primero de todo, quisiera dar las gracias y agradecer el trabajo de nuestro compañero Chrysogonos, ponente de este informe.

Dice el artículo 42 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales que toda persona física o jurídica tiene derecho al acceso a la documentación de la Unión Europea. Desde la Comisión de Peticiones, reiteramos que debemos hacer efectivo ese derecho. Necesitamos conocer los datos de los procedimientos de investigación —no le estoy hablando de los procedimientos de infracción, sino de investigación— abiertos por la Comisión Europea en relación con las peticiones.

Pero, más aún, necesitamos tener acceso a los expedientes de esos procedimientos cuando se trata de peticiones que están abiertas y tenemos que dilucidar sobre ellas. Si no es así, estamos minando la credibilidad de estas instituciones europeas, que ya está bastante dañada y de lo cual somos todos y todas conscientes.

Eleonora Evi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le petizioni sono uno strumento indispensabile per informare le istituzioni europee sulle gravi carenze nell'applicazione del diritto dell'Unione. È fondamentale, quindi, ascoltare la voce dei cittadini e agire concretamente per tentare di trovare delle soluzioni. Solo così possiamo davvero contribuire a risolvere i problemi dovuti alla cattiva applicazione del diritto dell'Unione ed evitare situazioni dove la giustizia sociale, i diritti fondamentali e la tutela dell'ambiente sono negati.

Vorrei fare degli esempi, in particolare relativi alle gravi carenze nell'applicazione e nell'attuazione della legislazione ambientale e sulla qualità dell'aria. Penso ad esempio al mio paese, all'Italia, nei cui confronti da anni ormai sono in piedi delle procedure d'infrazione che riguardano i superamenti degli inquinanti atmosferici che causano, ogni anno, il triste primato dell'Italia di 86 000 morti premature a causa dell'inquinamento atmosferico.

È ovviamente un problema inaccettabile, che va gestito a livello di Stato membro, ma per il quale anche la Commissione europea ha grandi responsabilità. Penso allo scandalo *dieselgate*, penso a quanto è successo proprio nel 2015, quando la Commissione europea, però, si è guardata bene dall'esercitare pienamente, tempestivamente e in modo efficace i suoi poteri di controllo per scongiurare l'immissione sul mercato di auto diesel non conformi in materia di omologazione. Si è evidentemente dato ascolto agli interessi lobbistici delle case automobilistiche e non alla salute dei cittadini.

Voglio ricordare anche i ritardi accumulati in altre procedure di infrazione, in altri ambiti del diritto dell'Unione. Penso, ad esempio, a quello sull'abuso dei contratti a termine nel settore del pubblico, che condanna migliaia e milioni di cittadini al precariato e, infine, la mancata ricollocazione dei migranti, uno scandalo per questa Europa. Chiudo ricordando le moltissime petizioni in tema di benessere animale. È inammissibile che la strategia dell'Unione sia ancora ferma e non trovi concreta applicazione.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, efectivamente, aplicar eficazmente el Derecho de la Unión Europea tiene que ser una prioridad para todas las instituciones, porque aumenta el sentimiento de pertenencia y de confianza de la ciudadanía europea hacia sus instituciones. Realmente es muy importante en estos momentos que se aumente esta confianza; además, consigue que no haya desigualdades y favorece mucho la seguridad jurídica.

La Comisión, sin duda, es responsable de aplicar y hacer cumplir la legislación europea. Y por eso quiero alentar a la Comisión a que tenga un papel activo en esa misión y que sea para ella una prioridad política. Sin duda la supervisión del cumplimiento de esta legislación con el diálogo estructurado antes de abrir un procedimiento de infracción favorece que no haya estos procedimientos y que se pueda aplicar de manera satisfactoria.

Los Estados miembros también tienen una altísima responsabilidad. Para ello es necesario que se haga la transposición y que la transposición se haga en unos plazos realistas, que hagan que se pueda realmente ejecutar y aplicar ese Derecho de la Unión.

En la Comisión de Peticiones —lo decía su presidenta— hemos podido ver muchísimas peticiones en torno a derechos humanos, a justicia, a mercado interior y, sobre todo, a medio ambiente y accesibilidad. Temas que preocupan a la ciudadanía y que efectivamente tienen que ver con la dificultad a la hora de poder aplicar esa legislación europea. Es una oportunidad para conseguir que este sentimiento de pertenencia de la ciudadanía europea hacia esos valores europeos sea una realidad.

Comparto en líneas generales el informe del ponente, menos en una cuestión: criticar las decisiones legítimas europeas —lo han dicho algunos compañeros aquí— y, aprovechando que el Pisuerga pasa por Valladolid, hacer críticas de sesgo ideológico en un informe que lo que pretende es valorar la aplicación de la legislación europea, no tiene mucho sentido.

Yo creo que lo que tenemos que hacer con este informe es ver de qué manera podemos mejorar la aplicación de esta legislación y reforzar, sobre todo, la credibilidad en las instituciones europeas. Utilizar el informe para cuestiones ideológicas nos produce justamente el efecto contrario. Creo que es el momento de ajustarnos al debate, de ser serios y de generar esas confianzas.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quello fatto dal collega Chrysogonos e dai suoi collaboratori è un ottimo lavoro, che consente di affrontare compiutamente il problema che stiamo discutendo.

Ora è molto importante legiferare bene, sempre. È altrettanto importante però controllare poi che le leggi vengano applicate tempestivamente e correttamente: tempestivamente perché, negli elementi rilevati in continuazione nel corso degli ultimi anni, lo scostamento tra il momento dell'approvazione della norma e la sua attuazione, anche quando questa avviene, è secondo me sinceramente eccessivo, soprattutto per alcuni temi. Poi abbiamo visto come per altre materie, in verità, l'applicazione sia erratica o addirittura inesistente.

È indubbiamente positivo che il numero di infrazioni rilevate o di ritardi appurati sia calato nel corso degli ultimi anni. Non è tranquillizzante, però, che quello che rimane sia prevalentemente legato alle condizioni legislative che riguardano il lavoro e i diritti delle persone che lavorano. Occorre in questo molta determinazione da parte della Commissione: non si può accettare che, ad esempio, in una materia delicatissima come quella dell'immigrazione ci sia un sottrarsi agli obblighi precedentemente discussi e concordati.

Esattamente come la stessa cosa non è accettabile per quanto concerne uno dei temi più delicati emersi nel corso degli ultimi mesi, quello del fisco. Il fisco è diventato strumento di concorrenza tra i paesi dell'Unione. Il rispetto delle norme, anche se questa è una materia che ancora attiene alla competenza degli Stati membri, è indispensabile. Dunque è molto importante che ciò venga rimarcato, che si attuino i provvedimenti del caso. Allo stesso modo credo, infine, che sia molto utile far sì che i parlamenti nazionali affrontino con la stessa convinzione e con la stessa determinazione i temi che abbiamo discusso questa mattina.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det er symptomatisk for dagens debat, der handler om, hvordan vi som Parlament og Kommissionen skal sikre overholdelsen af EU-lovgivningen, at vi viger uden om alle de centrale problemer. De centrale problemer er, at der er en klar dobbeltstandard i EU i forhold til, hvilke overtrædelser Kommissionen tager alvorligt, og hvilke overtrædelser man ikke bryder sig om at tage op. Vi kan bare se på hele euroområdet, hvordan lande som Frankrig og Tyskland år efter år har overtrådt de regler, man selv har implementeret for euroområdet, uden at Kommissionen har lagt an til en traktatsag på den baggrund. Som min kollega nævnte tidligere, så er Dublinkonventionen og Tysklands brud på den, midt under den største flygtningekrise i Europas nyere historie, også et eksempel, hvor man har svigtet. Så lad os nu gøre op med dobbeltstandarderne. Hvis EU skal være et samfund baseret på lige regler for alle, så skal Kommissionen også tage et opgør med de store lande, i stedet for kun at gå efter de små fisk på de små områder.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χρόνια πολλά. Κύριε Επίτροπε, για τη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, η εφαρμογή του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης το 2015 είναι συνώνυμη με την κατάλυση της δημοκρατίας και της λαϊκής κυριαρχίας. Το 2015, ο ελληνικός λαός με δημοκρατικό τρόπο αποφάσισε την αλλαγή των νεοφιλελεύθερων οικονομικών πολιτικών που εφήρμοζαν οι ελληνικές κυβερνήσεις και η τρόικα τα προηγούμενα χρόνια. Ο ελληνικός λαός, με 62% στο δημοψήφισμα, καταψήφισε τη συνέχιση των μνημονίων που επέβαλε η τρόικα. Σε αυτή την κυρίαρχη απόφαση, οι θεσμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης απάντησαν με ένα οικονομικό πραξικόπημα. Με όπλο το κλείσιμο των τραπεζών, εκβίασαν την Ελλάδα να υπογράψει για τρίτη φορά το ξεπούλημα της χώρας, τις περικοπές εισοδημάτων και συντάξεων, και την απορρύθμιση της αγοράς εργασίας. Δηλαδή επέβαλαν και πάλι μνημόνια που, εκτός των άλλων, παραβιάζουν τον Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων κατά κοινή ομολογία και έχουν οδηγήσει στη φτώχεια και στην ανεργία. Τώρα οι θεματοφύλακες των Συνθηκών και οι κυβερνήσεις που εφαρμόζουν τα μνημόνια αλληλοκαταγγέλλονται στην παρανομία αλλά και ταυτόχρονα συνεργάζονται για την επιβολή της πολιτικής της λιτότητας. Κύριε Επίτροπε, ο ελληνικός λαός τις έχει καταδικάσει αυτές τις πολιτικές, θεωρεί συνυπεύθυνους και τους ευρωπαϊκούς θεσμούς και τις κυβερνήσεις για τις καταστροφές που έχουν επιφέρει και θα τους δώσει την κατάλληλη απάντηση.

Πρόεδρος. – Σας ευχαριστώ για τις ευχές σας για την ονομαστική μου εορτή.

Francis Zammit Dimech (PPE). – Sur President, jien ninghaqad ma' kull min ferah lir-rapporteur ghar-rapport tieghu li jidentifika numru ta' aspetti importanti marbuta ma' suggett li hu fil-qalba tal-hajja demokratika Ewropea ghaliex l-implimentazzjoni tal-ligi Ewropea hi precizament dik li taghti l-garanzija li-cittadini Ewropej biex jibbenefikaw mis-shubija tal-pajjizi taghna fl-istess Unjoni Ewropea.

Naghmel xi referenzi anke li huma rilevanti ghall-Malta, pereżempju fil-paragrafu 16 huwa identifikat nuqqasijiet meta jkollok dewmien, anke fl-applikazzjoni ta' ligijiet li jolqtu l-frodi jew il-hasil tal-flus. Wiehed ma jistax ma jorbotx dak li jissemma hemmhekk fir-rapport, anke ma' sitwazzjonijiet li huma serji hafna, serji anke fid-dawl ta' dak li kien żvelat fil-Panama Papers u ghalhekk, meta f'pajjiżna ma jkunx qiegħed jimplimenta jew, fi żmien li suppost jew anke korretta-ment, il-miżuri marbuta ma' hasil ta' flus, dak ikun ta' detriment għall-hajja mbagħad ta-cittadini għewwa pajjiżna.

Wiehed ukoll ma jistax ma jirreferix ghar-rapporti li kellna fil-midja, anke rigward indhil fl-operat tal-FIAU, li hija l-aġenzija marbuta biex thares kontra l-hasil tal-flus jew anke rapporti iktar riċenti dwar il-Bank Pilatus li huwa implikat anke rigward attività illeċita fejn qieghed jaġixxi ta' bully mal-midja lokali biex jassigura li jnehhu anke mill-arkivji tagħhom xi materjal li hu jqis offensiv lejha.

L-Unjoni Ewropea hija mibnija fuq is-saltna tad-dritt. Preċiżament dan il-Parlament, fil-ġranet li ghaddew, kellna l-opportunità li nsellmu lejn il-memorja tal-ġurnalista investigattiva Daphne Caruana Galizia, li ghamlet il-hidma kollha tagħha biex tassigura dik is-saltna tad-dritt u biex tkun hi minn ta' quddiem nett, anke f'investigazzjonijiet importanti hafna.

Naghlaq b'kumment għal paragrafu iehor fejn jissemmev il-whistleblowers. Ir-rapport jghid li dawn iridu jinghataw inkoraġġiment u mhux ikunu mfixkla. Ukoll dan huwa importanti għaliex f'xi pajjiżi, sfortunatament inkluż f'Malta, ikollok sitwazzjonijiet fejn, il-whistleblower ikun moghti inkoraġġiment jew ikun imfixkel, skont dak li jghid, jekk jaqbilx jew le lil min ikun qieghed fil-poter.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Komisja Europejska jako strażniczka traktatów powinna być gwarantem stosowania prawa wspólnotowego, aby tak było w praktyce, niezbędne jest dalsze usprawnianie transpozycji prawa w państwach członkowskich, jak i zagwarantowanie jego należytego poszanowania. W 2015 roku Komisja otrzymała 3450 skarg dotyczących domniemyanych naruszeń prawa unijnego. Państwa członkowskie, których dotyczyła większość skarg, to Włochy, Hiszpania i Niemcy. Duża liczba toczących się postępowań w sprawie uchybienia zobowiązaniom państwa członkowskiego pokazuje, że prawidłowe stosowanie prawa unijnego wciąż pozostaje poważnym wyzwaniem. Z końcem 2015 roku otwartych było 1368 spraw dotyczących niewypełnienia obowiązków państw członkowskich, co stanowi nieznaczny wzrost w stosunku do poprzedniego roku, niemniej jednak jest to nadal mniejsza liczba postępowań niż w 2011 roku, co jest swego rodzaju optymistycznym sygnałem.

Prawidłowa transpozycja i wdrożenie przepisów prawa unijnego do ustawodawstwa krajowego w odpowiednim czasie oraz przejrzyste krajowe ramy legislacyjne zapewniające pełne poszanowanie dla podstawowych wartości i praw zapisanych w traktatach i Karcie Praw Podstawowych Unii Europejskiej powinny być dla państw członkowskich priorytetem, aby unikać przypadków naruszania prawa wspólnotowego, gdyż w efekcie narusza ono należytą ochronę obywateli.

Na koniec pragnę pogratulować sprawozdawcy dobrze przygotowanego dokumentu.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Rządy prawa polegają przede wszystkim na kontroli władzy, a rządy prawa w Unii Europejskiej polegają na kontroli władz Unii Europejskiej. Jeżeli jakkolwiek władza dojdzie do wniosku, że zarzuty, że nie przestrzega ona zasad, na które się powołuje, mają charakter absurda, są niedopuszczalne, to może skończyć tak jak ta władza, która swoich oponentów umieszczała w szpitalach psychiatrycznych.

Oczywiście na razie krytyków władz Unii Europejskiej traktuje się u nas tylko jako przeciwników Europy, ale i tak jest to oburzające. Mam nadzieję, że pewnego dnia zawrócimy z tej drogi. Niestety bardzo często widzimy, że konkretne naruszenia prawa w państwach członkowskich, wobec których oczekiwaliśmy tylko werbalnego zajęcia stanowiska, przez władze Unii Europejskiej są ignorowane – na przykład cenzura zawarta w nowym prawie francuskim o tzw. zakazie utrudniania aborcji albo zatajanie przestępstw popełnianych przez nielegalnych imigrantów w poszczególnych państwach członkowskich. Władze Unii Europejskiej muszą szanować głosy wzywające do przestrzegania prawa, niezależnie od tego skąd i od kogo pochodzą.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, ефективното прилагане на законодателството на Европейския съюз е от съществено значение, за да могат гражданите и предприятията да извлекат ползи от политиките, които изготвяме. Правилното прилагане на правото гарантира, че физическите лица и дружествата могат да се възползват от правата си и да получат бърза и ефективна правна защита, ако тези права са нарушени. Ако законодателството не се изпълнява или прилага правилно, това ще отслаби доверието на гражданите в Европейския съюз.

През 2015 г. мобилността и транспорта, енергетиката и околната среда са били трите области на политиката, в които бяха установени най-голям брой потенциални нарушения. А резултатите в докладите показват, че ненавременното и неправилно транспониране на европейските директиви продължава да бъде основен проблем при прилагането на правото на Европейския съюз. Не може да не отбележим и ролята, която гражданите и европейските институции имат, за да гарантират, че държавите членки спазват правото на Европейския съюз.

Големият брой производства за установяване на неизпълнение на задължения през 2015 г. показва, че гарантирането на навременното и правилно прилагане на законодателството на Европейския съюз в държавите членки остава сериозно предизвикателство. За да улесним прилагането на правото на Европейския съюз от държавите членки, законодателството на Съюза трябва да бъде ясно, разбираемо, последователно и прецизно, като същевременно се взема предвид практиката на Съда на Европейския съюз, в която се набляга на необходимостта от предвидимост и предсказуемост на разпоредбите на ЕС. Поздравявам докладчика г-н Хрисогонос за отличния доклад.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Rechtsetzung ist die eine Seite der Medaille. Die andere Seite der Medaille, die aber genauso wichtig ist, ist dann natürlich die Anwendung und die Kontrolle. Die Europäische Kommission ist die Hüterin der Verträge und dementsprechend auch zuständig für beide Seiten dieser Medaille. Die Kontrolle der Kommission über die Anwendung des EU-Rechts wird also von Jahr zu Jahr bedeutender. Es ist wichtig, dass wir darauf achten, unseren gemeinsamen *acquis* zu erhalten und für die einheitliche Anwendung und Umsetzung zu sorgen.

Neben den wichtigen Themen der Anwendung im Bereich Asyl und Migration möchte ich hier insbesondere auf die wirtschaftspolitische Komponente eingehen. Es gibt nun Mitgliedstaaten, die in einigen Bereichen die Anwendung des EU-Rechts verweigern oder zumindest verwässern, und zwar tun sie das systematisch.

Einerseits dort, wo es um die Umsetzung ins nationale Recht geht. Hier möchte ich als ein *bad example* Österreich bezüglich der Umwelthaftung hervorheben, die wir in der nächsten Debatte thematisieren werden.

Andererseits aber auch in der Durchsetzung und im Vollzug von EU-Recht – genau dort, wo das Funktionieren des Binnenmarkts von der grenzüberschreitenden Behördenzusammenarbeit abhängt, dort, wo die Staaten oftmals kein eigenes Interesse haben, lassen einige Mitgliedstaaten systematisch Ignoranz walten.

Ich möchte hier ein konkretes Beispiel ansprechen, nämlich Ungarn. Der österreichische Verwaltungsgerichtshof hat vor Kurzem bei der Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern feststellen müssen, dass trotz EU-Vorschriften, die die effektive Strafverfolgung und den Strafvollzug zwischen den Mitgliedstaaten sicherstellen, im Falle Ungarns, die Rechtshilfe systematisch verweigert wird. Es ist also ein Streitfall im Zusammenhang mit der Entsendung von Arbeitnehmern. Das ist natürlich ein Fall, der besonders heikel ist, und daher suche ich gerade auch bei diesen heiklen Fällen, darauf zu achten, dass beide Staaten auch wirklich EU-Recht entsprechend anwenden.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Andriukaitis, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή υποτίθεται ότι είναι ο φύλακας των Συνθηκών. Το ερώτημα όμως που πλανάται στον ελληνικό λαό είναι ποιος τελικά θα μας φυλάξει από τους φύλακες, κι αυτό γιατί τα έργα και οι ημέρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής ως μέλους της τρόικας είναι από τα πιο μελανά σημεία της λειτουργίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Αντί η Επιτροπή να είναι θεματοφύλακας των Συνθηκών, εδώ και επτά χρόνια δρα ως θεματοφύλακας των συμφερόντων των δανειστών. Ως μέλος της τρόικας, μαζί με την Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα, επέβαλε μνημόνια, πετσόκοψε μισθούς και συντάξεις, μείωσε τις δημόσιες δαπάνες, διέλυσε το σύστημα υγείας και το ασφαλιστικό σύστημα, γέμισε την Ελλάδα με στρατιές ανέργων και εκατομμύρια φτωχούς, μετέτρεψε την Ελλάδα σε ένα απέραντο κοινωνικό νεκροταφείο. Έτσι, παραβίασε το δίκαιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα της Χάρτας των Ανθρώπινων Δικαιωμάτων και κούρελισε κάθε έννοια δημοκρατίας στην Ελλάδα, καθώς, όχι μόνο δεν σεβάστηκε το αποτέλεσμα του δημοψηφίσματος του Ιουλίου του 2015 κατά των μνημονίων, αλλά αντίθετα εκβίασε την ανατροπή του. Επομένως για ποια εφαρμογή δικαίου μιλάμε;

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, aby mohla Evropská unie dosahovat všech svých cílů, je nutné, aby dobře fungovala. Evropská unie přináší podnikům a občanům mnoho výhod, které však nepřichází automaticky. Aby lidé mohli využívat benefity členství v Evropské unii a aby jim svědčila ochrana, kterou jim evropské právo zajišťuje, musí státy implementovat a transponovat evropské právo a musí ho střežit a chtít jeho dodržování.

Nicméně se setkáváme s transpozičním deficitem, což opětovně prokazuje právě tato zpráva o kontrole uplatňování práva v Evropské unii. Je zde řada negativních jevů. Třeba rozdílné právní úpravy, bariéry, nedostatečná ochrana a nejistota firem a občanů Evropské unie. Je nutné o tomto deficitu také více diskutovat a je potřeba více se zamyslet, jak efektivním způsobem bojovat proti porušování práva a řízením před Evropskou komisí a před Soudním dvorem.

Je třeba také zajistit včasné a správné uplatňování právních předpisů Evropské unie, ale vidíme, že zavedený způsob není dostatečně aktivní. Já nevyzývám k tomu, aby Soudní dvůr daleko více někoho penalizoval a abychom se přikláněli k řešení, která budou mít finanční následky. Já vyzývám k tomu, abychom se více zamysleli nad tím, jak třeba efektivně vysvětlovat transpoziční dluh v daných členských státech. Především předlužené státy, bylo tady zmíněno Řecko nebo Itálie, stejně nejsou schopny tyto sankce potom dodržovat. Proto chci, aby se Evropská komise zamyslela nad tím, jak uplatňovat svou moc a jakým způsobem bude s členskými státy i nadále více komunikovat.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, transparența și claritatea sunt indispensabile în elaborarea și aplicarea dreptului de către instituțiile Uniunii Europene și statele membre. S-a vorbit aici de numărul mai mic de petiții, de plângeri, 3 450. Pentru mine este o surpriză că jumătate, aproape 50 %, din aceste plângeri sunt venite din trei țări, care pot fi exemplu sau se vor a fi exemplu pentru statele membre mai noi, vorbesc aici de Germania, Italia și Spania. Din păcate, nu trebuie să ne amăgim. Numărul de încălcări ale drepturilor omului este mult mai mare, însă cetățenii, mulți dintre ei, nu își știu drepturile sau sunt demobilizați de birocrăția care există în depunerea unei petiții. Petițiile reprezintă o sursă importantă de informații directe, nu numai cu privire la încălcările și deficiențele aplicării dreptului în Uniunea Europeană și în statele membre, ci și la posibilele lacune ale legislației Uniunii. De aceea, trebuie să ținem cont de ele.

Personal, primesc foarte multe petiții, nu numai din țara mea ci și din alte țări. Cred, domnule comisar, că nu trebuie să fiți supărat – așa am înțeles eu și poate îmi răspundeți. Parlamentul are un rol esențial și trebuie să exercite un control politic asupra acțiunilor de asigurare a respectării legislației, privind modul în care Comisia rezolvă această problemă și cum raportează, în mod transparent, anual, Parlamentului despre acest subiect.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, like many others before it, this report again points out that the EU has been set up as a Union based on the rule of law and respect for human rights, a community of values in which the rights of minorities are respected and in which cultural and linguistic diversity is protected and enhanced.

The report is right to point out that, besides monitoring violations and deficiencies in the application by Member States of existing EU legislation, the Commission is also bound to act in previously omitted legislative areas in order to give effect to Treaty provisions. This is especially true for cases where definite failures can be observed in the compliance with the founding values of our Union. For example, there is still no secondary EU legal framework to protect and guarantee the rights of national minorities living in the European Union, even though this is an area where the EU is very active in relation to third countries. As one academic pointed out, in the EU, minority protection is still an area destined for export and not for domestic consumption.

Such loopholes in EU legislation are very clearly visible, not only when Member States act against the spirit of the Treaties but also when citizens expressly point out issues in petitions or citizens' initiatives. In this sense, it was definitely regrettable that the Commission only agreed to register the Minority SafePack European citizens' initiative when forced by a judgment of the EU tribunal.

To recall, the promoters asked the EU to adopt a set of legal acts aimed at improving the protection of persons belonging to national and linguistic minorities, and [noted] that strengthening cultural and linguistic diversity in the Union is something that is a founding value of our Union. The implementation of EU law is a priority, but so is acting on such long-standing omissions with clear negative consequences on the lives of millions of EU citizens.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, řádné uplatňování práva Evropské unie je důležité zejména z dvou momentů. Umožňuje řádné fungování Evropské unie a poskytuje právní jistotu občanům a institucím a samozřejmě i podnikům, že se mohou spolehnout na platné právo, že mohou jednat v důvěře v platné právo.

Kontrola dodržování práva Evropské unie je svěřena Komisi a také občanům. Pokud jde o tu občanskou kontrolu, myslím si, že o ni bychom měli velmi stát a měli bychom napomáhat právě této občanské iniciativě. Jako jeden z těch momentů, po kterém opakovaně voláme, se objevuje požadavek na zřízení jednoho ústředního portálu pro podávání stížností, ale i pro informace o zahájených řízeních o porušování nebo nesplnění povinnosti. Pro mě je velmi podstatné, že dochází k jakémusi poklesu počtu zahajovaných řízení, což je dáno nepochybně i nižší legislativní aktivitou v tomto volebním období, což kvituji.

Na druhou stranu to porušování práva je stále nesmírně závažné. Za ty závažné příklady já považuji zejména porušování práv daných na úseku ochrany životního prostředí a nejsou to pouze nové členské státy. Je to například i Rakousko. Nechci vést dělicí čáru mezi starými a novými členskými státy, ale je důležité, aby zejména na úseku životního prostředí opravdu platilo pravidlo Evropské unie, padni komu padni.

Pokud jde o *gold-plating*, zde bych si ještě dovolil říci jednu zásadní poznámku. Myslím si, že bychom měli opravdu zdůrazňovat i úlohu vnitrostátních parlamentů. Na závěr bych chtěl poděkovat zpravodaji za předložení velmi dobré zprávy.

Παρεμβάσεις με τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye»

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συγχαρητήρια για την ονομαστική σας εορτή. Συγχαίρω τον εισηγητή της έκθεσης, κύριο Χρυσόγονο, για αυτή την έκθεσή του που αναπόφευκτα περιλαμβάνει συμβιβασμούς, αλλά χαιρετίζω ιδιαίτερα το γεγονός της αναφοράς στα δικαιώματα των ευρωπαίων πολιτών, τα οποία παραβιάζονται από την οικονομική κρίση. Το κράτος δικαίου είναι το υπέρτατο συμφέρον των ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Η εφαρμογή του κράτους δικαίου είναι πρωτίστως αρμοδιότητα και της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής κι αυτό δεν είναι θεωρητικό ζήτημα, είναι πρακτικό ζήτημα. Αποφάσεις δικαστηρίων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, που αφορούν θεμελιακά δικαιώματα παραβιάζονται και δεν εφαρμόζονται στην Κύπρο. Ευρωπαϊκές οδηγίες για τις παράνομες πρακτικές και τις ρήτρες των τραπεζών δεν εφαρμόζονται με τον ίδιο συνεκτικό τρόπο σε όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Και καταλήγω, κύριε Πρόεδρε: η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, με βάση τη Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας, πρέπει να είναι χώρος ελευθερίας, ασφάλειας και δικαιοσύνης. Αυτό είναι το όραμα, αυτό μας ενώνει.

António Marinho e Pinto (ALDE). – Senhor Presidente, felicito o colega Chrysogonos pelo sentido deste relatório, pelo excelente trabalho realizado e, sobretudo, pela coragem de nele incluir alguns aspetos da realidade que as conveniências políticas de circunstância poderiam aconselhar a omitir.

Refiro-me à influência negativa que as medidas de austeridade aplicadas em alguns Estados-Membros tiveram na administração da justiça. Eu próprio testemunhei isso em Portugal, pois, enquanto presidente da Ordem dos Advogados Portugueses, escrevi por duas vezes ao Fundo Monetário Internacional, à Comissão Europeia e ao Banco Central Europeu, alertando para os efeitos catastróficos que uma tresloucada política de justiça assente na austeridade estavam a causar no funcionamento do sistema judicial.

Senhor Comissário, é urgente e imperioso tomar medidas para aprofundar a integração europeia na área da justiça. As instituições da União funcionarão muito melhor e, sobretudo, modernizar-se-ão alguns sistemas judiciais de Estados-Membros que estão mais próximos dos modelos do Santo Ofício do que dos modelos de justiça de Estados democráticos.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χρόνια πολλά. Θέλω και εγώ να συγχαρώ τον κύριο Χρυσόγονο για τον εμπειριστατικό τρόπο με τον οποίο αντιμετώπισε ορισμένα κρίσιμα και ευαίσθητα θέματα στην έκθεσή του. Μία παράμετρος που πρέπει να μας απασχολήσει για την εφαρμογή του δικαίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως είναι η καθυστέρηση με την οποία εφαρμόζεται αυτό από ορισμένα κράτη, καθώς επίσης και η μη εφαρμογή του από άλλα, παρά το γεγονός ότι αυτά ξέρουν πως θα υποστούν συνέπειες. Αιτία αυτής της εξελίξεως είναι το γεγονός ότι το δίκαιο, σε πολλές περιπτώσεις, δεν ανταποκρίνεται στις απαιτήσεις της σύγχρονης κοινωνίας και δεν καλύπτει τις ανάγκες αυτής. Επιπλέον, υπάρχει πολύ μικρή συνεργασία με τα εθνικά κοινοβούλια και πολλές φορές η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιβάλλει να θεσμοθετηθούν αποφάσεις οι οποίες στρέφονται κατά των συμφερόντων ορισμένων κρατών. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα είναι η Ελλάδα στην οποία, με τρόπο απαράδεκτο και κατά παράβαση της αρχής της αλληλεγγύης έχει επιβάλει τα μνημόνια και έχει μετατρέψει τη χώρα σε ένα απέραντο στρατόπεδο συγκεντρώσεως δυστυχισμένων ανθρώπων.

(Τέλος παρεμβάσεων με τη διαδικασία «catch-the-eye»)

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, colleagues, thank you very much indeed for your comments, questions and suggestions. If I may, let me start with Ms Hautala's question on administrative procedures because this is a very fundamental one.

The Commission is committed to guaranteeing that citizens, businesses and stakeholders can interact with an administration that is open, independent and efficient. For that purpose, the Commission, as well as other institutions and bodies, has a well-established set of horizontal rules which govern its administrative behaviour.

This includes, among others, a strong commitment made by laying down general provisions in the Code of Good Administrative Behaviour, which must guide administrative conduct in relations with citizens, as well as a range of provisions in legislation on staff and financial regulations, on data protection and access to documents, to name but a few. In addition, the Annex 'Administrative procedures for the handling of relations with the complainant regarding the application of European Union law' to the communication 'EU law: Better results through better application', on relations with a complainant in respect of infringements of Union law, specifically protects the complainant's position in the informal phase of the infringement procedure.

These measures include: first, a 12-month time limit from the filing of the complaint, within which the Commission should, as a general rule, decide whether to initiate an infringement procedure or not; second, the possibility for the complainant to meet the representatives of the Commission in order to present his/her argument; and, third, the requirement to give prior notice should the Commission intend to close the case, thus allowing the complainant to raise new arguments within four weeks.

The Commission is, therefore, at this stage not convinced that the benefits of using a legislative instrument that would codify administrative law would outweigh the costs. New legislation would require the revision of a considerable volume of existing European Union legislation. Even when done with care and a sense of proportion, codification is likely to lead to problems of delimitation between the general and specific laws, not making legislation any clearer or litigation any easier for citizens and businesses affected. It would also remove the flexibility required to adapt to particular needs.

The second question concerning the role of Parliament in monitoring the implementation of EU law was raised by Ms Grapini. Without prejudice to the democratic control by Parliament, under Article 17 of the TEU it is the Commission which oversees the application of European Union law, under the control of the Court of Justice of the European Union.

The infringement procedure, under Articles 258 and 260 TEU, form part of a specific *sui generis* competence conferred directly on the Commission under the Treaties. Therefore, the infringement procedure has a specific bilateral nature. It is conducted solely between the Commission and the Member State concerned.

Some Members of Parliament raised questions about Greece and Cyprus, especially Mr Marias, Mr Mavrides, and others. I would just say that the Greek and Cypriot Memorandums of Understanding were not part of European Union law because they led to intergovernmental financial support. The Greek and Cypriot Memorandums of Understanding were only formally agreed between the lenders and the beneficiary Member State.

The Court of Justice confirmed that, when adopting and implementing measures under such an intergovernmental adjustment programme, the national authorities of the concerned Member State do not implement European Union law.

Referring to some political statements about double standards and so on, as you know very well, the rule of law, the European Union Treaties, procedures and competences, are enshrined in a crystal-clear legal framework. Here it doesn't matter whether it is a small country or a big country, we have the same possibility to start these procedures if the situation allows us to do it. The procedure to address infringements is the same for all countries, and the Commission takes all cases very seriously, whether it concerns cases in Hungary, Germany, or any other country.

Mr President, honourable Members, the Commission very much shares your interest in the correct application of EU law, which is necessary for the benefit of European Union citizens, businesses and public administration. The Commission looks forward to continuing its work with Parliament on this very important topic.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, Εισηγητής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, να ευχηθώ και εγώ με τη σειρά μου για την ονομαστική σας εορτή. Θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω όλους τους συναδέλφους, τόσο της μεγάλης πλειοψηφίας των ομιλητών που εξέφρασαν πολύ θετικά σχόλια για την έκθεσή μου, όσο και για εκείνους που εξέφρασαν επικριτικές απόψεις, διότι στο πλαίσιο ενός δημοκρατικού διαλόγου οι επικρίσεις, όταν αφορούν την ουσία των ζητημάτων, μπορούν μερικές φορές να μας δώσουν την ευκαιρία για γόνιμο προβληματισμό. Η ουσία του πράγματος είναι ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση βρίσκεται σήμερα σε μια κατάσταση αμφιβολίας για το μέλλον της. Πριν από λίγο καιρό, ένα κράτος μέλος για πρώτη φορά αποφάσισε να αποχωρήσει με την ψήφο των πολιτών του. Αλλά η αμφισβήτηση δεν περιορίζεται σ' αυτό το κράτος μέλος. Είναι φανερό ότι μεγάλη μερίδα ευρωπαίων πολιτών αισθάνεται πως οι πολιτικές της Ένωσης δεν εξυπηρετούν επαρκώς τον στόχο της κοινής ευημερίας των λαών της, των οποίων εξαγγέλλει η ιδρυτική της Συνθήκη. Τις ανησυχίες αυτές των πολιτών πρέπει η Ένωση να τις αντιμετωπίσει σοβαρά και κατά την άποψή μου ο δρόμος για να τις αντιμετωπίσει είναι να υπάρξει μεγαλύτερη προσήλωση στο πρωτογενές ευρωπαϊκό δίκαιο, στις Συνθήκες, και ιδίως στο Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων, με έμφαση, θα σας έλεγα, στα κοινωνικά δικαιώματα. Στο δικαίωμα για υγεία, στο δικαίωμα για παιδεία, στο δικαίωμα για εργασία, στο δικαίωμα για κοινωνική ασφάλιση, γενικότερα στα δικαιώματα αξιοπρεπούς διαβίωσης των ανθρώπων. Προκειμένου να συμβεί αυτό, χρειάζεται περισσότερη αλληλεγγύη, τόσο μεταξύ των κρατών μελών όσο και στο εσωτερικό των κοινωνιών, με αναδιανομή από τους έχοντες προς τους μη έχοντες και όχι το αντίστροφο, όπως σε μεγάλο βαθμό συμβαίνει σήμερα.

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε. Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί σήμερα.

7. Durchführung der Umwelthaftungsrichtlinie (Aussprache)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση σχετικά με την έκθεση της κ. Laura Ferrara, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Νομικών Θεμάτων, σχετικά με την εφαρμογή της οδηγίας για την περιβαλλοντική ευθύνη (2016/2251(INI)) (A8-0297/2017)

Laura Ferrara, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, come cittadina portavoce del Movimento 5 Stelle al Parlamento europeo, sono particolarmente fiera di poter presentare questa ambiziosa ma realistica relazione sull'applicazione della direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale.

C'è infatti un legame molto stretto e molto sentito tra il frutto di questo lavoro e le ragioni per le quali io, insieme a milioni di altri cittadini italiani, ci stiamo impegnando politicamente per cambiare le cose che secondo noi non vanno bene, sia in Italia che in Europa.

Una di queste ragioni, simbolicamente rappresentata da una delle 5 stelle del Movimento, è proprio la tutela e il rispetto dell'ambiente in ogni sua forma, come bene unico e fondamentale per la vita e anche per le generazioni future. Mi fa molto piacere quindi che questo impegno sia stato condiviso dai colleghi degli altri gruppi politici, che ringrazio per aver contribuito a rendere la proposta che rivolgiamo alla Commissione europea ancor più ambiziosa e avanzata.

La prima considerazione che occorre fare in materia di responsabilità ambientale è che l'implementazione della direttiva, avvenuta in maniera disomogenea e superficiale, non ha raggiunto i risultati sperati. Sono necessari maggiori sforzi per rendere possibile una standardizzazione delle regole sulla responsabilità ambientale nell'Unione europea e, in tal senso, occorre fornire un'interpretazione univoca del concetto di soglia di rilevanza significativa del danno ambientale e introdurre delle procedure amministrative standard di notifica delle minacce di danno ambientale.

Soprattutto chiediamo che la direttiva venga aggiornata il prima possibile, ampliando la nozione di danno ambientale e la sua portata applicativa, in particolare con riferimento ai criteri di determinazione degli effetti negativi sulle specie e gli habitat protetti, ai rischi di danno alle acque e al terreno ma anche alla salute umana e all'aria. Tale nozione andrebbe aggiornata al fine di renderla sufficientemente efficace e coerente e per tenere il passo con la rapida evoluzione degli agenti inquinanti prodotti dalle attività industriali.

Siamo convinti che i costi di riparazione del danno ambientale a carico degli operatori possano essere ridotti attraverso l'utilizzo di strumenti finanziari obbligatori come assicurazioni o come garanzie analoghe, di cui chiediamo l'introduzione.

Sarebbe altresì opportuno istituire un fondo europeo per la protezione dell'ambiente dai danni causati dall'attività industriale, disciplinato dalla direttiva, per far fronte ai rischi di insolvenza e solo nei casi in cui i mercati delle garanzie finanziarie dovessero fallire. Questo fondo servirebbe anche nei casi di catastrofi ambientali causate da fattori industriali quando non è possibile individuare l'operatore responsabile del danno.

Per altro verso è necessario agire sul fronte della prevenzione con azioni di informazione, di sensibilizzazione e di responsabilizzazione basate sul principio «chi inquina paga». In quest'ottica si chiede di valutare l'introduzione di un regime di responsabilità civile per i danni causati alla salute umana e all'ambiente.

Nella stessa direzione va la proposta di istituire un registro per gli operatori che svolgono attività pericolose e un sistema di monitoraggio finanziario per assicurare che gli operatori siano solvibili. Particolarmente efficace, poi, sarebbe la previsione di sgravi fiscali o di altre forme di premialità per le aziende che si impegnano con successo nella prevenzione dei danni ambientali.

Riteniamo altresì che i cittadini debbano svolgere un ruolo non secondario nel sistema della responsabilità ambientale. Pertanto occorre fornire loro adeguati strumenti di denuncia, sia per sollecitare l'intervento delle autorità competenti, sia introducendo meccanismi di risarcimento collettivo per violazioni del diritto ambientale dell'Unione. E ancora chiediamo l'adozione di un regime di responsabilità secondaria obbligatoria che estenda la responsabilità a chi acquista un'azienda che causa il danno. Tutto questo, come ad esempio la proposta di istituire delle apposite autorità indipendenti con poteri di gestione, riteniamo che possa giovare alla tutela dell'ambiente e della salute dei cittadini.

Vytėnė Povilaitė, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission thanks Parliament for tabling this important initiative and appreciates the efforts undertaken to look into the implementation of the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD). The Environmental Liability Directive sets the EU framework for prevention and remediation of damage to biodiversity, to water and to land. It is based on the 'polluter pays' principle. Many findings and suggestions in the draft report and motion for a resolution are consistent with the Commission's own report and evaluation of the Environmental Liability Directive in 2016.

In the wake of that report, we are now working together with Member States and stakeholders to improve their implementation of the directive, including developing the knowledge base, the expertise and administrative capacity for applying the directive. The shortcomings of the Environmental Liability Directive need to be addressed: first, the unsatisfactory non-level playing field; second, the under-developed capacity; and third, the insufficient financial security level in many Member States. The Commission will work on these issues with the Member States and stakeholders in the context of the Multiannual Work Programme 2017-2020.

The Commission's view is that the directive's potential still needs to be fully exploited by making more use of it and by applying it more consistently. Only after this should we consider legislative amendments.

The systematic collection and analysis of data and information on environmental liability should lead to an ELD information system shared with all interested Member States. This would facilitate the future implementation of the directive. We will need to see how this initiative improves the implementation on the ground before considering extending the scope of the directive and before considering whether damage to air, or to health, should be covered.

We have made a clear commitment to perform a new REFIT evaluation of the directive in four to six years' time. That will provide the needed evidence base for future action. I thank Parliament for supporting all efforts to improve the implementation of the Environmental Liability Directive, especially in the framework of the Multiannual Work Programme. Thank you for your excellent report.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Емил Радев, *от името на групата PPE*. – Г-н Председател, бих искал да поздравя г-жа Ферара за доклада, и да ѝ благодаря за чудесното сътрудничество по време на преговорите. Директивата за екологичната отговорност влезе в сила през 2004 г., а транспонирането ѝ в държавите членки приключи през 2010 г. Оттогава тя вече беше изменяна три пъти. В доклада се призовава отново за промяна, свързана с разширяване на обхвата и налагане на отговорност за вреди, нанесени върху човешкото здраве и околната среда, включително вредите за въздуха.

Трите предишни изменения на Директивата не доведоха до необходимите резултати. За това е особено важно, при евентуално бъдещо разширяване на приложното поле да се направят необходимите проучвания и оценки на въздействието. По този начин ще се създаде ефективна обща рамка за предотвратяване и отстраняване на екологичните щети на разумна цена за обществото.

Важното е да се използват инструменти за финансова гаранция и държавите членки да предприемат мерки за ускоряване на развитието на тези инструменти и пазари, включително финансови механизми в случай на несъстоятелност. По този начин ще се гарантира покриване на щетите, дори и в случай на неплатежоспособност на икономическите оператори. Не считам, обаче, че създаването на Европейски фонд за опазване на околната среда от щетите, причинени от промишлена дейност, ще спомогне за по-доброто функциониране на принципа „замърсителят плаща“ заложен в Директивата.

За да постигнем по-добро прилагане на Директивата, Европейската комисия трябва да приеме насоки, които да помогнат за правилното ѝ транспониране в националните законодателства. Засилването на обучението на специалисти и юристи в областта на екологичната отговорност също ще допринесе за по-добра защита на правата на лицата, засегнати от екологични щети.

Само така ще можем да осигурим на нашите граждани безопасна и стабилна система за управление на катастрофи, основана на споделяне на риска, засилена отговорност и на принципа „замърсителят плаща“.

Benedek Jávor, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety*. – Mr President, sorry for being late; I was at the trilogue.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) participated, in accordance with Rule 54, in the discussion on the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD). The ELD is a key piece of legislation aiming to establish a framework of environmental liability based on the ‘polluter pays’ principle and to prevent and remedy environmental damage.

As both the Commission's report and the Committee on Legal Affairs highlighted, despite some improvements, the directive has shown incompleteness and thus limited effectiveness. Implementation still varies significantly from one Member State to another. We have a patchwork of liability systems, due also to the interplay with already-existing national laws, which in my opinion can undermine the common standards and expose some Member States or regions to a greater risk of environmental disaster and the financial consequences thereof. As is clear from the ENVI opinion, better implementation of the directive, including improving the information base and providing more training and assistance to the Member States – a key pillar of the Commission's action plan and multiannual work programme – is needed, but is far from being sufficient.

We should address the remaining challenges in a systematic manner and revise the directive in the near future, in the light of the Commission's recent Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT) exercise. A revision would allow us to extend the scope and applicability of the directive by making operators of all activities strictly liable for all environmental damage they cause, which means removing the limitation in Annex 3. In this context, the INI report rightly calls on the Commission to impose liability for damage to human health and the environment in the future and also calls for the removal of certain exemptions.

I also welcome very much the call for rethinking the financial security system, which is at the heart of the matter. This would entail high-level mandatory environmental liability insurance for operators, differentiated ceilings for activities with different risk factors and the creation of an EU-wide fund to bear the cost of relevant measures beyond the mandatory security in the event of large-scale disasters.

I also stress that proper involvement of inspection bodies is key. In this context, the Commission should further develop inspection support capacity at EU level and help the Member States strengthen their national bodies.

Let me highlight one more message: we urgently need EU legislation on the minimum standards for implementing the Aarhus Convention 'Access to Justice' pillar.

Jytte Guteland, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Jag vill börja med att säga tack till föredragande Laura Ferrara för hennes arbete med att ta fram detta betänkande och för ett gott samarbete. Ekosystemen är grunden för liv, hälsa, välbefinnande och samhällsutveckling. Vi är beroende av vår miljö och av våra mänskliga handlingar, så vi måste värna miljön mycket mer. Miljöansvarsdirektivet uppstod ur behovet av just gemensamma regler på EU-nivå för att värna miljön. Det antogs redan 2004 och medlemsstaterna fick tre år på sig att införliva det i nationell rätt, men trots det dröjde det ända till 2010 innan det blev verklighet. Detta är obegripligt.

Kommissionens rapport ger dessutom en oroande bild av direktivets faktiska tillämpning. Direktivet har genomförts på ett inkonsekvent sätt, som också lett till att miljöskador registrerats oenhetligt och ofullständigt. Därför föreslår vi i betänkandet tydligare vägledningsdokument för operatörer, berörda myndigheter, miljöorganisationer och försäkringsbolag. Vi måste värna miljön. Den är grunden för liv och hälsa och ger glädje både för oss i vår tid och för kommande generationer.

Det är viktigt att vi avhjälper betydligt fler miljöskador än de som omfattas idag. Människor med olika erfarenheter och bakgrund delar samma luft. Vi vet att tusentals människor runt om i Europa dör på grund av dålig luftkvalitet. Därför måste vi ha gemensamma regler på EU-nivå även för miljöskador som omfattar luften. Jag utgår från att kommissionen tar sig an detta i förberedelserna för en kommande revidering.

Många studier visar även att det på nationell nivå inte har funnits någon vägledning eller praxis för när en skada bör betraktas som en allvarlig miljöskada. Därför föreslår vi kommissionen att ta fram offentliga databaser för att möjliggöra för verksamheter och medborgare att bli medvetna om miljöansvarsdirektivet och dess tillämpning. Detta skulle leda till att bättre avhjälpa och förebygga miljöskador.

För vår grupp har det också varit en prioritet, och jag är glad att det är med, att kommissionen utvecklar möjligheterna till kollektiva prövningar för överträdelse av EU:s miljölagstiftning. Det ger fler möjlighet till upprättelse.

Om vi menar allvar med att uppnå EU:s mål för en hållbar utveckling då måste vi göra betydligt mer. Därför är det hög tid att EU-kommissionen reviderar detta direktiv så att fler skador för hälsa och miljö omfattas av direktivet. Det måste ske snart, det måste vara tillämpligt med principen om att förorenaren betalar och denna princip måste alltid vara vägledande i tillämpningen av direktivet. Mot bakgrund av det undrar jag vad kommissionen gör idag och vad planen är inför kommande revidering?

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Г-н Председател, най-напред искам да благодаря на колегата Ферара за усилията и работата по това досие. Защитата на околната среда е инвестиция в бъдещето и това се разбира вероятно от всеки, и е висша проява на родолюбие. Категорично, принципът „замърсителят плаща“ трябва бъде насърчаван, защото той е единственият справедлив принцип, въз основа на който може да се осъществява защитата на околната среда.

Целта на прегледа на прилагането на Директивата за екологична отговорност е амбициозна и я приветствам. Въпреки това, има конкретни текстове, които призовават за разширяване на обхвата, промяна на определенията, хармонизиране на значителния праг за целия Европейски съюз и т.н., които не съвпадат с нашите политически виждания на групата на Европейските консерватори и реформисти.

Въпреки че подкрепяме инициативата за укрепване на правната рамка с цел по-добра защита на природната среда, бих искал да подчертая, че това не трябва да бъде с цел да бъдат засилени, затегнати съществуващите правила или разпоредби, а е въпрос на по-добро прилагане. Създаването на прекомерна административна тежест обикновено води до негативни ефекти, като например подкопава равновесието и естествения начин на действие на единния пазар.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, *ALDE-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, ympäristövastuudirektiivin ajatus on yksinkertainen: saastuttaja maksaa.

Ympäristövahingon aiheuttajan on kustannettava vahingot, jotka syntyvät vahingon korjaamisesta ja ympäristön saattamisesta takaisin ennalleen. Valitettavasti ympäristövastuun toimeenpano vaihtelee kovin paljon jäsenmaiden välillä. Saastuttaja ei aina maksakaan.

Toimeenpanon puutteet heikentävät ympäristön vahingoille alistuneiden alueiden hyvinvointia ja myös ihmisten hyvinvointia. Ei ole tavatonta, että juuri syrjäseuduilla ja taloudellisesti heikoimmilla alueilla myös ympäristövahinkojen hoitaminen voi olla heikkoa. Pahimmillaan vahinkojen korjaustyöt voivat venyä pitkiksi ajoiksi ja huonoimmassa tapauksessa vahingot ja korjaukset unohdetaan kokonaan.

Jos aiheuttajaa ei saada vastuuseen tai jos valtiolla sen omasta lainsäädännöstä riippuen ei ole velvollisuutta rahoittaa korjaustoimia omasta kukkarostaan, suurimman hinnan maksavat ihmiset, maaperä, vesistöt, eläinlajit ja koko pilaantuneen alueen ympäristö.

Mietinnöstä, josta äänestämme tänään, vaaditaan, että tulkinanvaraa ympäristövastuun määrittämiselle pitää selkeyttää. Direktiivin erityinen heikkous on sen löysä määritelmä merkittävälle ympäristövahingolle. Komission täytyy puuttua tähän pikimmiten. Vaadimme myös, että komissio uudelleenarvioi direktiiviä ja asettaa siten vaatimuksia ympäristövahinkovakuutuksesta ja rahavakuudesta riskialttiin toiminnan harjoittajalle.

Lopuksi komission on vakavasti harkittava, tulisiko myös tuottamukselliset ilmanlaatuja heikentävät toimet, kuten taanainen hiukkaspäästöskandaali, tuoda tämän direktiivin soveltamisalaan. Se on suurimmassa määrin ympäristöön ja ihmisten terveyteen vaikuttava asia. Tässä asiassa on aika toimia, ja komissiokaan ei kyllä ole saanut mitään kovin puhtaita papereita.

Κώστας Χρυσόγονος, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση σχετικά με την οδηγία για την ευθύνη πρόληψης και αποκατάστασης περιβαλλοντικής ζημίας μας αφορά όλους. Σκοπός της παρούσας οδηγίας ήταν η θέσπιση κοινού πλαισίου για περιπτώσεις ζημίας με βάση την αρχή ότι «ο ρυπαίνων πληρώνει». Μέχρι σήμερα όμως τα αποτελέσματα δεν ήταν τα επιθυμητά, καθώς παρατηρείται ασυνεννοησία μεταξύ των κρατών, ενώ το πλαίσιο κατανομής ευθυνών είναι περιορισμένο. Οφείλουμε λοιπόν να διατυπώσουμε έναν σύγχρονο και λειτουργικό ορισμό της περιβαλλοντικής ζημίας, με βάση την ταχεία εξέλιξη των ρυπογόνων παραγόντων που οφείλονται στις βιομηχανικές δραστηριότητες, εντάσσοντας σε αυτό ειδικές περιπτώσεις, όπως είναι, μεταξύ άλλων, οι υπεράκτιες δραστηριότητες. Θα πρέπει εξάλλου το πλαίσιο για την περιβαλλοντική ευθύνη να επεκταθεί για να συμπεριλάβει και την επαναφορά των οικοσυστημάτων στην αρχική τους κατάσταση μετά τον τερματισμό των επιβλαβών επαγγελματικών δραστηριοτήτων. Οφείλουμε να αντιληφθούμε πως η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και της υγείας των πολιτών είναι η πρωταρχική μας ευθύνη.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the Environmental Liability Directive is a ground-breaking one and it is a vitally important tool to defend European nature and its citizens and future generations. However, it is a missed opportunity. The directive is under-used because it is toothless and its scope is too narrow and it contains loopholes.

Also, the directive is too limited in its strict liability regime as it can only be applied to a set type of environmental damage as listed in its annex. That annex (Annex 3) covers water, land and biodiversity damages only. In particular, it covers them only in the context of certain activities that are included on a restricted list.

Furthermore, it is simply irrational that the directive does not cover rapidly-evolving pollutants, damage to air, fauna and flora and landscape, human health and air quality.

It is my inescapable conclusion that for this directive to become genuinely operational and effective, we need to revise and enlarge its scope.

We should consider the option of requiring subsidiary state liability to be made mandatory. I have heard no justifications that would convince me that establishing clear parameters for accountability in this regard would not and could not be warranted. Responsibility and liability cannot be outsourced, especially because damage to the environment and human health affects citizens and society at large, and not just the individuals concerned.

In this vein, I strongly support the proposal by the rapporteur to consider introducing legislation to assist operators and insurance companies to make use of insurance schemes in cases of environmental damage – also by way of examining the option of making financial security mandatory for operators affected by this directive. I am sympathetic to the hesitation in imposing such an obligation on operators, but not having a requirement of mandatory security in this regard is simply too dangerous.

Jane Collins, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, any operator that is responsible for damage to the environment must be held accountable for their actions. However, the determination of the accountability should be down to the Member State.

I am pleased to see that the ELD does not prevent Member States from adopting stricter rules – but who are you to grant that permission? You mention the establishment of a secondary liability regime based upon the systems already adopted by several Member States; one of those being the UK. But why a secondary regime? This is typical of the EU implementing more and more unnecessary legislation.

The report calls for the consideration of a European fund for the remedying of environmental damage. May I remind you the EU does not have its own money? The money that you waste comes from the Member States. So if you propose this fund who is going to pay for it? Because remember, one of your largest contributors will soon be leaving.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, la protection de l'environnement est un enjeu majeur du XXI^e siècle. De notre aptitude à l'assurer dépend, dans une large mesure, le salut de l'humanité.

La directive européenne du 21 avril 2004 a donc entrepris d'apporter une contribution à cette noble ambition, en mettant en œuvre une responsabilité environnementale sur la base du principe du «pollueur-payeur». Plusieurs études ont toutefois montré l'échec de cette directive. Il faut donc remercier M^{me} Ferrara d'avoir pris l'initiative de proposer d'améliorer le droit européen dans un domaine où les États ne peuvent pas se contenter d'agir séparément.

Certaines de ces propositions sont intéressantes, par exemple celle d'étendre le champ d'application de la directive aux dommages causés à l'air. On sait, en effet, à quel point la pollution de l'air est devenue préoccupante. Mais d'autres propositions vont trop loin, comme celle de créer un fonds européen d'indemnisation ou encore celle d'accorder des avantages fiscaux aux entreprises qui s'engagent dans la prévention des dommages environnementaux.

Je pense qu'il serait préférable d'encourager chaque État à créer un fonds national d'indemnisation pour indemniser les dommages environnementaux en cas d'insolvabilité des pollueurs. Quant à la politique fiscale, j'estime qu'elle doit relever des États. Il aurait fallu respecter davantage la souveraineté des États pour espérer convaincre le Conseil de modifier la directive de 2004.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ο μεγαλύτερος κίνδυνος για το περιβάλλον δεν προέρχεται συνήθως από τις δραστηριότητες των απλών πολιτών αλλά από τις μεγάλες εταιρείες. Αυτές κατασκευάζουν τα μεγάλα εργοστάσια, αυτές πραγματοποιούν γεωτρήσεις και εξορύξεις, αυτές μεταφέρουν χιλιάδες τόνους πετρελαίου. Όπως πρόσφατα ατυχήματα έχουν αποδείξει, ένα μόνο τέτοιο συμβάν είναι ικανό να προκαλέσει ανυπολόγιστη καταστροφή που ο αντίκτυπός της μπορεί να επηρεάσει ακόμα και τις μελλοντικές γενιές. Ποιος δεν θυμάται το πυρηνικό ατύχημα στο Τσέρνομπιλ, τη Φουκουσίμα ή την πετρελαιοκηλίδα στον Κόλπο του Μεξικού; Πρέπει να θέσουμε λοιπόν τις εταιρείες, αλλά και τις κυβερνήσεις, προ των ευθυνών τους. Οι εταιρείες θα πρέπει να έχουν τόσο την αστική ευθύνη αλλά και την ποινική, σε περίπτωση οικολογικής καταστροφής. Οι κυβερνήσεις που αδειοδοτούν τις εταιρείες, σε περίπτωση που δεν είχαν θεσπίσει αυστηρούς κανόνες, θα πρέπει επίσης να έχουν ευθύνες. Με τον όρο «ευθύνες» εννοώ και ποινικές, πέρα από τις ασυλίες και άλλες μεθόδους με τις οποίες επίορκοι πολιτικοί και κρατικοί αξιωματούχοι αποφεύγουν τις διώξεις. Το περιβάλλον δεν τον κληρονομήσαμε από τους προγόνους μας. Δεν μας ανήκει. Το δανειστήκαμε και έχουμε ευθύνη να το παραδώσουμε στα παιδιά μας καλύτερο από ό,τι το παραλάβαμε.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Pan předsedající, dovolu mi především, abych poděkoval všem kolegům z Výboru pro právní záležitosti, kteří se podíleli na zpracování výsledného textu zprávy. Budu hlasovat pro přijetí této zprávy, nejenom proto, že Česká republika je zde zmíněna v pozitivním kontextu, ale proto, že jde o celkově vyvážený text.

Občané očekávají od Evropské unie taková pravidla, která zajistí vysoký standard kvality životního prostředí. Toho lze však dosáhnout i bez zbytečné byrokracie a vytváření nových institucí. Proto nejsem příznivcem vzniku evropského fondu tak, jak je ve zprávě navrhováno. Vnímám ale, že původní text směrnice z roku 2004 je třeba modernizovat a využít tak nabytých zkušeností z dosavadního provádění.

Evropská komise by se v dalším postupu měla zaměřit pouze na takové změny, které vycházejí z nezpochybnitelných faktů a jejichž dopad na kvalitu životního prostředí bude zcela zřejmý. Jen taková regulace bude mít smysl.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ziel der Umwelthaftungsrichtlinie war es auf der Grundlage des Verursacherprinzips eine verschuldensunabhängige Haftung zur Vermeidung und Sanierung von Umweltschäden einzuführen. Wir müssen feststellen: Bisher klappt das nicht. Die Richtlinie ist erst viel zu spät und dann nur uneinheitlich und bruchstückhaft umgesetzt worden; oft wird sie überhaupt nicht angewendet. Schon der Meldepflicht von Umweltschäden wird nicht nachgekommen. Es kann doch nicht sein, dass 86 % aller Schäden aus nur zwei von 28 Mitgliedstaaten stammen sollen.

Daher brauchen wir eine Pflicht zur Einrichtung einer zentralen öffentlichen Datenbank, auf die alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger Zugriff haben und sich über Umweltschäden informieren können. Wir müssen unsere Bürger damit in die Lage versetzen, ihre Rechte auch durchzusetzen, und insoweit ist die Eröffnung zur kollektiven Rechtsdurchsetzung dringend geboten.

Weiterhin muss dringend Luftverschmutzung in den Anwendungsbereich aufgenommen werden. Wir haben jährlich 467 000 Tote in der Europäischen Union alleine durch schlechte Luft. Das sind 467 000 Tote in der Europäischen Union zu viel. Daneben müssen wir Definitionen, wie zum Beispiel die Erheblichkeit der Umweltschäden, klarer fassen. Teilweise sind die Definitionen zu restriktiv und bedürfen deswegen der Aktualisierung, damit die Haftungspflicht nicht ins Leere läuft.

Und schließlich, die Beseitigung von Umweltschäden kostet Geld. Um diese Beseitigung in jedem Fall bezahlen zu können, brauchen wir eine verbindliche Umwelthaftungspflichtversicherung für Betreiber und müssen auch die Frage der Sekundärhaftung klären. Im Notfall brauchen wir einen EU-Fonds, der einspringt, wenn Unternehmen insolvent sind. Es darf nicht sein, dass Umweltschäden mangels Liquidität der Verursacher nicht behoben werden können, denn dann hilft auch das beste Gesetz nichts.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Mr President, I think we need to remind ourselves that this is an implementation report and that the principles behind it are not at question. This is not an opportunity for Members to out-green each other here in the Chamber; it is actually a consideration of how well this is working.

I understand the temptation to try to extend the scope to air, water and many other areas; these are issues that we all work on day in and day out, but this would not be necessary if these core legislative acts – those for example on the ambient air quality directive – contained clear access to justice provisions based on the Aarhus Convention that Member States currently pay only the slightest lip service to.

You cannot identify shortcomings with implementation and then make it more wide-ranging, less specific, more complex and harder to implement. It simply does not make sense. I would simply like to remind Members that the impact study attached to this report says: 'Stakeholders' comments during this study indicate that they are not likely to accept the creation of a fund or scheme for a wide range of reasons.....', and so it goes on.

So why deliberately put that in there when, actually, there are other routes we could take that would be much more effective. Giving citizens access to justice to me is the simplest and easiest way of doing that.

Frédérique Ries (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, le 17 décembre 2003, le Parlement européen faisait un grand pas en avant dans la protection de l'environnement en adoptant cette directive sur la responsabilité environnementale.

Protéger la nature et la biodiversité tout en misant sur l'innovation, sur les techniques d'avenir, c'est clairement dans l'ADN de notre Parlement, c'est clairement dans l'ADN des libéraux européens. C'est d'ailleurs mon ami et ancien collègue libéral hollandais, Toine Manders, qui était le rapporteur à l'époque et à la manœuvre pour le Parlement, pour porter sur les fonts baptismaux ce système communautaire pour la prévention et la réparation des dommages environnementaux.

Qu'il s'agisse des OGM et du risque de contamination involontaire des cultures conventionnelles ou bio, ou du marché du carbone, créé en 2005 pour réduire les gaz à effet de serre, à chaque fois, le principe s'applique: le pollueur paie. Dans son rapport de mise en œuvre de 2016, la Commission européenne reconnaît d'ailleurs que, si la directive de 2004 est efficace pour réparer les dommages environnementaux et encourager la prévention, elle n'a pas encore – pour le dire diplomatiquement – réalisé tout son potentiel.

Comme l'a d'ailleurs rappelé M^{me} Girling, il s'agit ici de la question de l'observation de l'application de la directive, et comme l'a dit notre rapporteure, il y a parfois un décalage entre la théorie et la pratique. M^{me} Ferrara, qui a fait un excellent travail – je tiens à la remercier –, a parlé tout à l'heure d'application non homogène et superficielle. J'ai noté ses mots.

C'est vrai pour les dégâts causés aux espèces et aux habitats naturels protégés. On sait à quel point les directives «Habitat» et «Oiseaux» peuvent être contournées par certains États membres. C'est tout aussi vrai pour les dommages qui entament les ressources en eau. Autre catégorie encore couverte par la directive: la pollution des sols, qui peut avoir des conséquences graves sur la santé humaine.

Là encore, il y a des progrès à faire. Progrès qui – c'est important de le dire – peuvent aussi passer par la prévention. Un exemple tout récent: nous votons ici, il y a deux jours, le non-renouvellement du glyphosate en l'occurrence. Je ne rouvre pas ce débat et je ne reviens pas sur le caractère cancérigène de la substance, mais sur son impact sur les sols. S'en passer tout simplement serait donc l'attitude la plus responsable, à savoir la prévention sur le plan de l'environnement.

En conclusion, je dirais – comme d'autres l'ont dit ici – que nous pouvons évidemment renforcer le droit de l'environnement mais, pour moi, l'urgence est plutôt d'appliquer concrètement et complètement ce principe du pollueur-payeur dans les politiques européennes et aussi – c'est notre paragraphe 29, il est important, et c'est ce que propose M^{me} Ferrara –, de mettre en place ce fonds européen pour la réparation des dommages environnementaux, car les victimes comptent sur nous.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κύριε Επίτροπε, στην εφαρμογή και στην πράξη της οδηγίας για την οποία συζητάμε υπάρχουν σοβαρές παραλείψεις και πρόθεση εξυπηρέτησης συμφερόντων, τόσο στον τομέα της πρόληψης, όσο και σε αυτόν της αποκατάστασης. Στην Ελλάδα είχαμε πρόσφατα τη βύθιση ενός τάνκερ 45 ετών, που μετέφερε 2,5 χιλιάδες τόνους μαζούτ στον Σαρωνικό Κόλπο, λίγο έξω από την Αθήνα, και προκάλεσε τεράστια οικολογική καταστροφή, αλλά και μεγάλη ζημιά στους επαγγελματίες και στους αλιείς της περιοχής. Κατά τα άλλα, υπάρχουν τρεις επισημάνσεις στην έκθεση που νομίζω ότι πρέπει να ληφθούν υπόψη. Πρώτον, όσον αφορά τη σύσταση του ευρωπαϊκού ταμείου αποκατάστασης και κάλυψης των ζημιών, θα πρέπει να επεκταθεί για όλες γενικά τις ζημιές. Πρέπει να βρεθεί τρόπος ακόμα και με άτοκη μορφή δανεισμού και, μέχρι να βρεθεί ο ένοχος, να προλάβουμε τη ζημιά από την αρχή. Δεύτερον, να καλυφθεί πιθανή ζημιά στη φάση της αδειοδότησης. Παραδείγματος χάριν, ο πλοιοκτήτης σε αυτό το περιστατικό που σας ανέφερα πριν

από την Ελλάδα δήλωσε οικονομική να αποκαταστήσει τις ζημιές και να καταβάλει αποζημιώσεις. Επομένως, πρέπει να βρεθεί ένας τρόπος, είτε με ασφαλιστικές καλύψεις, είτε με ασφαλιστικές επιλογές. Τρίτον, στον έλεγχο και καταγραφή όλων αυτών πρέπει να μετέχουν, εκτός από τη διοίκηση, και το κοινό και οι πολίτες. Δηλαδή χρειάζονται μέτρα εφαρμογής της αρχής του Aarhus για να μετέχουν οι πολίτες σε όλες τις διαδικασίες που αφορούν το περιβάλλον, δηλαδή τη ζωή τους.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD). – Monsieur le Président, je remercie notre collègue Laura Ferrara pour son travail sur ce rapport, dont l'enjeu principal, à savoir la réparation des dommages causés à l'environnement par l'activité humaine, me tient particulièrement à cœur.

On ne peut nier le fait que les mécanismes traditionnels de responsabilité prévus dans les droits civils nationaux répondent de plus en plus difficilement à cette question. Cela tient à la fois à la nature et à l'ampleur des enjeux. Ainsi, il paraît naturel qu'une action internationale concertée mobilisant l'ensemble des États soit à privilégier pour des raisons d'efficacité.

Je soutiens pleinement l'objectif de ce rapport d'étendre la définition du dommage environnemental à l'air, aux écosystèmes et au paysage. En effet, la définition actuelle de la directive du 21 avril 2004 est trop restreinte, et de nombreux champs d'activité dangereux pour l'environnement ne sont pas inclus dans son champ d'application.

L'environnement est notre patrimoine commun à tous, et notre seul droit sur lui est de le préserver, de le protéger et de le transmettre à nos enfants.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor presidente, valoramos aquí la aplicación de la Directiva de responsabilidad medioambiental que se aprobó el año 2004 y que luego fue transpuesta unos años después. El objetivo era, sin duda, poder prevenir y reparar cualquier daño medioambiental bajo el principio de que «quien contamina paga».

Es clave, lógicamente, todo lo que es prevención y reparación para poder tener un crecimiento sostenible y para poder hacer que las economías funcionen y las sociedades sean sanas. En este sentido, la Directiva pretendía trabajar en tres campos: detención de la pérdida de biodiversidad, tanto en relación con las especies como con los hábitats protegidos; la calidad y la cantidad de agua —poder de alguna manera parar el deterioro—; y también la protección del suelo.

La ponente, Laura Ferrara, contempla qué déficits tiene la aplicación de esta Directiva, y uno que se ha constatado a lo largo de toda la sesión es la diferente aplicación por parte de los Estados miembros. De hecho, hay muchas diferencias en cuanto al número de incidentes por daños medioambientales que activan la aplicación de esta Directiva entre unos Estados miembros y otros.

Por lo tanto, una conclusión rápida es que necesitamos una armonización en la aplicación de esta Directiva. Lo ha dicho la Comisión. Habrá que cotejar y estudiar con datos comparativos todos los Estados miembros para ver qué está pasando realmente y a partir de aquí ver cómo podemos mejorar el texto legal.

Se proponen varias cosas: ampliar el ámbito de aplicación de la Directiva, tanto por lo que respecta —después de las investigaciones tecnológicas y médicas— a los daños medioambientales que pueden lesionar la salud humana —y, por lo tanto, abordar también este tema—, como también a todo lo relativo a la contaminación aérea.

En definitiva, se trata de cumplir con la Estrategia 2020 de tener un crecimiento integrado, pero también sostenible, y, por lo tanto, de apoyar a la Comisión en ese estudio, en ese cotejar datos, en este ver los intercambios para ver de qué manera podemos mejorar la aplicación de esta Directiva, que hará, sin ninguna duda, que nuestra economía funcione y que tengamos una sociedad sana.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Die Realität zeigt uns: Es gibt noch gewaltig etwas zu tun, wenn es um die ordentliche Umsetzung dieser Richtlinie geht. Es gilt allerdings auch, bei der Umwelthaftung die Ausdehnung des Anwendungsbereichs anzustrengen. Wieso ist Luftverschmutzung nicht im Anwendungsbereich enthalten? Hier geht es doch wirklich um ein Thema, das alle Menschen, Kinder, die Zukunft betrifft, und daher sollte auch Luftverschmutzung im Anwendungsbereich widerspiegelt sein.

Ich möchte einige Fälle, die durch unsere Medien geistern, erwähnen – schlimme Fälle, die daheim eben die Zeitungen füllen: brennbarer Abfall, der in einem Wohngebiet in Budapest lagert, die Meeresverschmutzung vor Harku in Estland, die Pestizidverschmutzung des Grundwassers in Korneuburg in Österreich und das Fischsterben in der Mürz in der Steiermark nach der Inbetriebnahme eines Kraftwerks. Das sind alles Fälle, die bei einer ordentlichen Umsetzung der Umwelthaftung zu vermeiden wären.

Es geht um die Vermeidung, Sanierung und schließlich auch immer um die Frage: Wer zahlt für Schäden am Lebensraum von uns allen? Die traurige Wirklichkeit sieht so aus, dass viele Mitgliedstaaten mangelhaft und lasch umsetzen, und es ist dann die Allgemeinheit, die den Schaden erleiden muss, die dann für diesen Schaden auch aufkommen muss, und es sind nicht die Verursacher, die zur Verantwortung gezogen werden. Es geht also darum, Gerechtigkeit herzustellen in der Frage, wer für den Schaden zur Kasse gebeten wird.

Es geht aber auch darum, die großen industriellen Verschmutzer, die unsere Umwelt schädigen, in die Verantwortung zu nehmen. Das Prinzip „Der Verschmutzer zahlt“ ist das einzig logisch Gerechte, was mir dazu in den Sinn kommt. Insofern fordere ich Sie auf, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, dass Sie weiterhin dort eingreifen, wo die Mitgliedstaaten nicht oder nur mangelhaft umsetzen, und natürlich auch, dass Sie aufgrund dieses ausgezeichneten Berichts unserer Berichtsteratterin anvisieren, dass Sie die Regeln allenfalls dort überarbeiten, wo sie ambitionierter sein sollten.

Jiří Maštálka (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, při schvalování směrnice o odpovědnosti za životní prostředí jsme v roce 2004 vycházeli z alarmujících čísel. Podle dat Evropské komise bylo v tomto roce na tři sta tisíc lokalit v Evropě potenciálně nebo skutečně znečištěno škodlivými látkami a náklady na sanaci takových škod by dosahovaly odhadem stovky miliard EUR.

Nedomnívám se, že bychom v dnešní době měli k dispozici data výrazně pozitivnější. Přitom úplného provádění směrnice o odpovědnosti za životní prostředí bylo dosaženo, po značných peripetiích, až v roce 2010. Sedm členských států se i v dnešní době potýká s problémem dodržování povinností. Jménem frakce konfederace Evropské sjednocené levice a Severské zelené levice bych tímto rád poděkoval zpravodajce za korektní zprávu. Ztotožňujeme se s jejími závěry ve smyslu, že je nyní potřeba tuto směrnici revidovat. Apelujeme proto na Komisi. Je nutné definice pozměnit, rozšířit objektivní zodpovědnost za škodu na životním prostředí a důsledněji aplikovat zásadu „znečišťovatel platí“.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio anch'io la relatrice per l'ottimo lavoro fatto. La direttiva della quale stiamo parlando è stata un passo importante della nostra Europa, delle istituzioni, fatto però con i limiti che sono stati più volte richiamati nella discussione. Il recepimento è stato lento, spesso incoerente, difforme rispetto ai contenuti e agli obiettivi della direttiva, e i ritardi nel recepimento hanno consentito poi la verifica della sua attuazione, anch'essa penalizzata da un ritardo molto consistente e del tutto controproducente.

Per questo motivo è molto importante rivedere quella direttiva alla luce anche dei limiti che sono stati messi in evidenza. La revisione dunque ci compete, è da fare con rapidità e deve, io credo, partire da un elemento, che è quello che è stato ricordato da molti miei colleghi: comprendere i danni causati alla salute umana e all'ambiente, inclusi quelli relativi all'aria, che sono invece esclusi dalla direttiva iniziale.

Credo che a questo si debba aggiungere, perché è importante, anche l'istituzione di un regime di responsabilità civile per i danni causati sia alle persone che all'ambiente nel suo insieme. Per poterlo fare efficacemente è indispensabile avere anche ispezioni periodiche a livello ambientale fatte dall'Unione europea con le sue istituzioni.

Bisogna poi dare la possibilità alle persone che sono state colpite da un danno ambientale di avere accesso al ricorso giudiziario, che serve in tempi brevi. La tempestività nel compensare il danno qualche volta vale moltissimo per la qualità e la certezza della vita delle persone che sono state coinvolte, come abbiamo visto in questi anni.

Infine servono una campagna di informazione, massima trasparenza nell'applicazione della direttiva e massima informazione nel conoscere ciò che può capitare ai cittadini europei.

Ivica Tolić (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, čestitke izjaviteljici na sveobuhvatnom izvješću i prijedlozima za poboljšanje direktive. Direktiva je zaista uopćena, a nekoliko nerazjašnjenih termina u njoj dodatno otežava primjenu. Jedan od tih termina je npr. prag značajnosti štete u okolišu za kojega ne postoje kriteriji ocjenjivanja. Direktiva je nadalje primjeniva samo na određene vrste šteta u okolišu i to je čini dodatno ograničenom.

Ograničenje je i činjenica da nisu odgovarajuće definirane štete koje se odnose na incidente velikih razmjera, posebno kada nije moguće utvrditi odgovornost onečišćivača. Nije na odgovarajući način definirana ni šteta od onečišćivača iz industrijskih djelatnosti.

Osobno pozdravljam ideju osnivanja Europskog fonda za otklanjanje šteta u okolišu. Isto tako, dobar je prijedlog da se postojeću definiciju šteta proširi na zrak, floru, faunu, krajolik i, što je posebno važno, ljudsko zdravlje. Podržavam reviziju direktive i prijedloge gospođe Ferrara.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da tempo si avverte l'esigenza di un'implementazione della direttiva sulla responsabilità ambientale. Provengo da una terra meravigliosa, per secoli chiamata «terra di lavoro», che oggi è tristemente nota come «terra dei fuochi», una terra avvelenata dall'interramento di rifiuti tossici di imprese di tutta Europa, e soprattutto del Nord Italia, che da decenni si servono dei servizi di smaltimento illegale offerti dalla criminalità organizzata per eliminare, a basso costo, le scorie delle proprie attività produttive.

Occorre innanzitutto una riformulazione della definizione di danno ambientale per estenderne l'ambito anche alla fauna, alla flora, all'aria e al paesaggio e ampliare le responsabilità oggettive ad altre attività pericolose attualmente non previste.

Vanno introdotte norme che agevolino gli operatori e le compagnie assicurative, al fine di aumentare la diffusione di un regime assicurativo per i casi di danno ambientale.

Infine ulteriori elementi in grado di migliorare il quadro delle garanzie per il danno ambientale potrebbero essere la previsione di un più adeguato sistema di controllo finanziario e l'istituzione di un registro nazionale ed europeo per gli operatori che svolgono attività pericolose.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, από τη συζήτηση προκύπτει ότι το νομοθετικό πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης δεν καλύπτει τις ζημιές οι οποίες προκαλούνται στο περιβάλλον, για αυτό βεβαίως πρέπει να ρυθμίσουμε τα θέματα έτσι ούτως ώστε να υπάρχει απόλυτη ευθύνη των εταιρειών που προβαίνουν σε ρύπανση και να υπάρχει δυνατότητα αποζημίωσης όσων έχουν ζημιωθεί. Φέρνω για παράδειγμα την πρόσφατη ζημιά που έγινε, τη μόλυνση στον Σαρωνικό, όπου παρότι θέσαμε ζητήματα για αποκατάσταση των ζημιωθέντων, των επιχειρηματιών, των αλιέων και όσων εμπλέκονται στην περιοχή και έχουν υποστεί ζημιά, από την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση αποδείχθηκε ότι δεν έχει γίνει τίποτε. Υπάρχει βεβαίως το Διεθνές Ταμείο Αποζημιώσεων και κάτι τέτοιο πρέπει να θεσπίσουμε και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Τέλος, κύριε Andriukaitis, όσον αφορά την προηγούμενη συζήτηση, λίγο ως πολύ ως Επιτροπή «νίπατε τας χείρας σας» και παριστάνετε τον Πόντιο Πιλάτο, ότι δεν ξέρετε τίποτε για το έγκλημα, δεν ξέρετε τίποτε για το τι έγινε στην Ελλάδα με το μνημόνιο. Όμως η Επιτροπή ήταν αυτή η οποία επέβλεπε την εφαρμογή του μνημονίου, κύριε Andriukaitis. Εσείς επιβάλλατε τις εντολές των δανειστών στην Ελλάδα, επομένως έχετε απόλυτη ευθύνη ως Επιτροπή και όσα είπατε προηγουμένως στη συζήτηση νομίζω ότι δεν έχουν καμία σχέση. Εγώ, κύριε Andriukaitis, σας απαντώ γιατί δεν είχα δικαίωμα απάντησης πριν. Δεν μπορείτε να «νίπτετε τας χείρας σας» ως Επιτροπή και να λέτε «δεν ξέρω τι έγινε στην Ελλάδα». Ποιος επέβλεπε την εφαρμογή του μνημονίου; Εσείς ως Επιτροπή την επιβλέπατε. Έχετε τεράστια ευθύνη λοιπόν.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η οδηγία περιβαλλοντικής ευθύνης ως κοινό πλαίσιο για την πρόληψη και την αποκατάσταση περιβαλλοντικής ζημίας, πρέπει να περιλαμβάνει όλους τους ρυπογόνους παράγοντες και στοιχεία που οφείλονται στις ανθρώπινες δραστηριότητες και παρεμβάσεις. Κατ' αυτήν την έννοια, πλέον των ήδη υπαρχόντων στην προηγούμενη οδηγία ορισμών περιβαλλοντικής ζημίας, θα πρέπει να επεκτείνουμε το πεδίο εφαρμογής προκειμένου να συμπεριλάβουμε τη ζημιά στον αέρα, την πανίδα, τη χλωρίδα, τη βιοποικιλότητα και τα οικοσυστήματα. Επιπρόσθετα, η συνεργασία με διεθνείς οργανισμούς, και ειδικότερα τον Παγκόσμιο Οργανισμό Υγείας, θα μεγιστοποιήσει τις πιθανότητες επίτευξης των περιβαλλοντικών στόχων. Βάσει της αρχής «ο ρυπαίνων πληρώνει», οι παραβάτες πλέον των αυστηρών κυρώσεων και προστίμων να αναλαμβάνουν τις δράσεις αποκατάστασης του περιβάλλοντος και επαναφοράς των οικοσυστημάτων στην αρχική τους κατάσταση. Η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος δεν αποτελεί πεδίο πολιτικής αντιπαλότητας και είναι υπόθεση όλων μας, αν αναλογιστούμε ότι το περιβάλλον συνδέεται άμεσα με τη βιωσιμότητα, την αειφόρο ανάπτυξη και την ποιότητα ζωής.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem samozřejmě stejného názoru, že biodiverzita, ochrana rozmanitosti půdy i ochrana vod před škodami, to je velmi zásadní hodnota, kterou bychom měli chránit i pro budoucí generace.

Princip „znečišťovatel platí“ je nepochybně správný, ale vyvstávají zásadní otázky, kdo je znečišťovatel. V tomto smyslu bych přivítal i rozšíření působnosti směrnice. Myslím si, že tato otázka zde byla nastolena a bylo by vhodné, aby na ni Komise následně reagovala.

Myslím si, že Fond nápravy škod, instrument pro prevenci a zároveň úhrady škod, které budou vznikat na životním prostředí, je rovněž velmi dobrý nápad. Obecně je nutno říci, že pro řádné fungování Evropské unie právě na úseku ochrany životního prostředí je nezbytné zajistit dodržování této směrnice a rozšíření působnosti tak, aby se na ni občané mohli spolehnout a jednat v důvěře v ní.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, vreau de la bun început să o felicit pe raportoare, pentru că, pe de o parte, a identificat foarte bine ce trebuie modificat în directivă, este un o propunere echilibrată, da, toți, de la cetățean până la instituțiile naționale și europene, trebuie să fim preocupați de protecția mediului înconjurător. Sigur, aș dori un mai mare accent pe prevenție, pentru că poluatorul plătește, dar pe noi ne interesează protecția mediului, nu banii aceia care se strâng de la poluator.

Însă, atrag atenția că, de foarte multe ori, există o lipsă de infrastructură. Companiile nu au cum și unde să depoziteze, de exemplu, deșeurile și nu există soluții tehnice și tehnologice în statele membre. De aceea, cred că este nevoie să existe o legiferare atentă, astfel încât să nu creăm o discrepanță statele membre și o concurență, până la urmă, inegală pe piața internă. Este important să clarificăm și să armonizăm modul de aplicare a directivei și specific aici că nu este o procedură administrativă standard pentru a notifica autoritățile competente cu privire la producerea unei daune asupra mediului înconjurător. Deci, sunt de acord cu modificarea directivei.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! A környezeti felelősségről szóló irányelv mögött húzózó alapelv úgy szól, hogy a szennyező fizet. A gyakorlatban viszont mégis egy másik alapelvet vélünk látni sokan: ez pedig az, hogy a hatalmas profitokat privatizálni, a környezetszennyezéssel okozott kárt pedig a társadalomra, a lakosságra hárítani. Ezt láttuk például az egyik legnagyobb környezeti katasztrófa során, ami Európa újkori történelmében megesett, Magyarországon a vörösiszap-katasztrófa volt ez.

Gratulálok a jelentéshez, illetve a véleményhez magyar képviselőtársamnak, Jávor Benedeknek, aki közismerten elkötelezett a környezetvédelem ügye mellett, és jó szakember is. Ezért is merem megkérdezni tőle, hogy ismerte a konkrét vörösiszap-katasztrófa ügyét, mennyiben találta úgy, hogy a környezeti felelősségről szóló EU-s irányelv alkalmazható volt, illetve mennyiben befolyásolta ezt a jelentést a vörösiszap-katasztrófa tanulsága? Erős a gyanúm, hogy például a 30-as és 31-es pontot igenis befolyásolta, motiválta mindaz a hiányosság, amit tapasztaltunk az EU-joggal összefüggésben a vörösiszap-katasztrófához kapcsolódó felelősségi kérdésekben.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, effectivement, le principe pollueur-payeur doit devenir la règle dans l'Union européenne et ceci dans tous les domaines. De ce point de vue, en tant que coprésident de l'intergroupe parlementaire «Biens communs et services publics», je ne peux que me féliciter de l'extension du projet de directive à la question de l'air, aux écosystèmes et au paysage.

Comme l'a dit Saint-Exupéry, reprenant une idée des Indiens d'Amérique, nous n'héritons pas la terre de nos parents, nous l'empruntons à nos enfants. Chacun doit garder cela en mémoire lors de ses comportements personnels.

On a beaucoup parlé du glyphosate aujourd'hui en agriculture, et je voudrais saluer le courage du Parlement européen sur ce sujet. Mais je voudrais aborder une autre question, celle des mines et des dépôts, qui posent aujourd'hui de graves problèmes. Dans ma région, le Limousin, les mines d'uranium ont pollué considérablement le paysage et les sols et rien n'a été fait pour les réparer. Je crois qu'il faut trouver un moyen pour faire en sorte que, d'entrée de jeu, lorsqu'on ouvre une mine, on paye pour sa restructuration.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Vytėnė Povilė Andriukaitė, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, may I address some very important topics which were raised, especially speaking about the call to consider the possibility to extend the scope of the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD) and to impose liability for damage to human health, including damage to the air. Within the REFIT evaluation of the ELD carried out between 2013 and 2016, the scope of damage was also extensively considered. It was, in particular, subject to one of the studies in the preparation of the REFIT evaluation and Commission report. The evaluation concluded that damage to air is a rather uncommon category for a strict liability system as it by its nature mostly diffused damage – *inter alia*, damage which cannot be clearly attributed to individually-specified liable persons.

Similarly, damage to human health would also require a fundamentally different approach to that of a restoration in kind which governs the ELD. For human health damage, traditionally civil liability systems for personal or bodily injury and loss of life exist in all Member States. This is normal traditional or conventional damage dealt with through civil liability and enforced by courts, in contrast to environmental damage, which is dealt with by public authorities.

However, I agree that the Commission should look into this issue within the next REFIT evaluation of the ELD. Given the problems with air pollution, particulate matter and nitrogen dioxide, dieselgate. Also, the question needs to be considered of whether the ELD is the most appropriate basis to deal with such issues.

I understand, of course, that several Member States take different views, speaking about possibilities to introduce mandatory financial security and a European fund for environmental damage caused by industrial activities. The question as to whether mandatory financial security should be established at EU level was the subject of the first and second Commission ELD report in 2010 and 2016 and the REFIT evaluation. Also, the Commission investigated in 2012 and 2013 the feasibility of a European industry risk-sharing facility or fund. There are several obstacles, including the 'polluter pays' principle and, of course, the different views of different stakeholders.

The Commission has therefore made financial security a topic and working area in the Multiannual Work Programme 2017-2020. The Commission will launch a comprehensive investigation of the situation and challenges in the EU by looking also in the individual Member States, paying particular regard to the mentioned big issues of ELD concerning financial security and with a view to coming up with as many concrete interpretations and recommendations as soon as possible.

Honourable Members, while there may be some differences in views on the immediate way to further implement and develop the Environmental Liability Directive to make it more effective and efficient, we agree in principle with most of the views and ideas in the report. But, at this point in time, rather than launching new or amended legislation, we should work on better implementation, notably through the joint ELD Multiannual Work Programme 2017-2020.

The Commission is already implementing this Work Programme, and recently brought together stakeholders and government experts at a workshop which led to a common understanding document with practical measures to help competent authorities, operators and other stakeholders to implement the ELD. All the results are available on the Commission's Environmental Liability webpage.

Laura Ferrara, *relatrice*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio tutti i colleghi che sono intervenuti, ringrazio il collega Javor per l'ottima collaborazione e ringrazio tutti i relatori ombra che, con le loro proposte e la loro collaborazione, hanno arricchito il testo finale che oggi andremo a votare.

Io mi auguro di trovare in questa seduta plenaria lo stesso consenso che abbiamo ricevuto già in sede di votazione nella commissione giuridica ma, dalla discussione di oggi, mi sembra che si converga su dei punti principali, ovvero il fatto che questa direttiva, a nostro avviso, debba essere assolutamente migliorata nell'implementazione nei singoli Stati membri perché, ad oggi, i due obiettivi che si prefiggeva di raggiungere, ovvero la prevenzione e la riparazione del danno, sono rimasti purtroppo disattesi nella stragrande maggioranza dei paesi membri.

Per far ciò è necessario che ogni singolo paese dell'Unione europea si doti di nuovi strumenti, quali quelli proposti in questa relazione. Faccio riferimento, in particolare, a un registro obbligatorio, in modo da poter garantire un monitoraggio costante. Solo in questo modo si possono prevenire i danni ambientali.

Quando si parla di danni ambientali, e quando si parla della tutela della salute dei cittadini che, indirettamente, viene a essere lesa quando viene commesso un danno all'ambiente, è importante prevenire, perché poi il risarcimento successivo, anche in termini economici, purtroppo non sarà mai in grado di ristorare appieno la salute lesa o di ripristinare la situazione ambientale ormai violata.

E perché è importante anche un fondo europeo? Perché nell'ambito dell'Unione europea è chiaro come vi siano situazioni di società di trasporti dei rifiuti che appartengono a un paese membro e operano in un altro. È per questo che è importante che il fondo sia europeo, e non soltanto nazionale, perché in questo caso si può creare una tutela collettiva su tutto il territorio dell'Unione.

Ad oggi, purtroppo, tutto questo manca. Mancano anche strumenti finanziari obbligatori di cui devono dotarsi le imprese che pongono in essere attività potenzialmente pericolose, perché si verifica il caso in cui le società, le imprese in questione, falliscono e quindi il principio «chi inquina paga» viene a essere lesa, perché diventa impossibile risalire al diretto responsabile e avere, da parte sua, una ristoro della situazione lesa.

Mi auguro che la Commissione europea tenga conto di questa relazione e che quindi possa esserci un reale miglioramento sia per l'ambiente sia per la salute dei cittadini.

Przewodniczący. – Debata została zamknięta.

Głosowanie: 26 października 2017.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 11.40)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

8. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.05)

9. Sacharow-Preis 2017 (Bekanntgabe der Preisträger)

Presidente. – Ho l'onore di annunciare che la Conferenza dei presidenti dei gruppi politici ha appena deciso di attribuire il premio Sacharow 2017 per la libertà di pensiero all'opposizione democratica in Venezuela, all'Assemblea nazionale rappresentata dal suo presidente Julio Borges e a tutti i prigionieri politici, così come elencati dal Foro penale venezuelano e rappresentati da Leopoldo López, Antonio Ledezma, Daniel Ceballos, Yon Goicoechea, Lorent Saleh, Alfredo Ramos e Andrea González.

(applausi)

Ho l'onore di annunciare questo risultato nel giorno in cui, anche grazie alle pressioni del Parlamento europeo, tre attivisti per i diritti umani sono stati liberati in Turchia.

Dalla sua istituzione nel 1988 questo premio viene assegnato a chi ha contribuito in modo eccezionale alla lotta per i diritti umani. Non ha un colore politico, rappresenta invece uno dei momenti più simbolici...

(risate in Aula)

Vi prego di rispettare la volontà della maggioranza del Parlamento, non c'è nulla da ridere quando si parla di milioni di persone e di bambini che muoiono di fame! Si può non essere d'accordo con la maggioranza, ma bisogna rispettare, in democrazia, la volontà della maggioranza di questo Parlamento. Non c'è nulla da ridere quando si parla di difesa dei diritti umani!

(applausi)

Il premio Sacharov rappresenta uno dei momenti più simbolici della funzione del nostro Parlamento: essere sempre in prima linea per difendere e promuovere la libertà, la democrazia e gli altri diritti umani, dentro e fuori i nostri confini. Oggi abbiamo il dovere di denunciare, ancora una volta dopo cinque risoluzioni votate dal Parlamento europeo negli ultimi anni, la grave situazione in Venezuela.

In questo paese dell'America latina, dove vivono molti cittadini europei e molti cittadini venezuelani sono di origine europea, molti sono privati dei loro diritti fondamentali, creando una spirale di crisi istituzionale, economica e sociale. Le condizioni di vita del popolo venezuelano si sono gravemente deteriorate. Siamo di fronte a una vera e propria emergenza umanitaria: mancano medicine, assistenza medica, cibo, acqua potabile ed elettricità. Centinaia di migliaia di persone sono costrette all'esodo dal paese. Non possiamo non levare la nostra voce in difesa della libertà, della democrazia, dei diritti umani.

Per questo abbiamo deciso di conferire il premio Sacharov per la libertà di pensiero all'opposizione democratica, ricordando il nostro totale sostegno all'Assemblea nazionale del Venezuela, parlamento eletto democraticamente, l'unico parlamento eletto democraticamente.

(applausi)

Vogliamo anche lanciare un appello per una transizione pacifica verso la democrazia e per la creazione di un corridoio umanitario che allevi le sofferenze del popolo. Oggi non premiamo soltanto l'opposizione democratica: vogliamo manifestare la nostra volontà di essere vicini e di rendere omaggio a tutto il popolo venezuelano, a coloro che sono stati imprigionati ingiustamente solo per aver espresso la propria opinione e a chi, quotidianamente, lotta per sopravvivere a un regime totalitario, alle famiglie in lutto per la perdita dei propri cari durante mesi di ininterrotta e pacifica protesta per la libertà. Oggi sosteniamo la lotta di un popolo per la sua libertà.

Ma tutte le battaglie per i diritti sono ugualmente importanti. Chi viene oppresso, subisce ingiustizie e viene privato della libertà e dei diritti, ovunque nel mondo, potrà sempre contare su questo Parlamento. Per questo motivo la Conferenza dei presidenti ha deciso di invitare alla cerimonia di premiazione, che si terrà il 3 dicembre a Strasburgo, anche gli altri due candidati al premio, Aura Lolita Chávez Ixcaquic e Dawit Isaak, che sarà purtroppo rappresentato da un suo familiare, visto che è ancora detenuto in Eritrea.

10. Abstimmungsstunde

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati delle votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

10.1. Wahl eines Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments (Abstimmung)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca l'elezione di un Vicepresidente del Parlamento europeo in sostituzione dell'on. Lunacek. Ricordo che, ai sensi dell'articolo 20 del regolamento, il nuovo Vicepresidente prende il posto del Vicepresidente uscente nell'ordine di precedenza.

Ho ricevuto la candidatura dell'on. Heidi Hautala. La candidata mi ha comunicato di accettare la candidatura e, poiché il numero delle candidature non supera il numero dei seggi da assegnare, la candidata è eletta per acclamazione a meno che un numero di deputati o uno o più gruppi politici pari almeno...

(Il Parlamento elegge l'on. Hautala per acclamazione)

Mi pare che la volontà dell'Aula sia molto chiara, quindi mi congratulo con l'on. Hautala per la sua elezione per acclamazione.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich wollte Sie nur fragen, ob wir irgendwann damit rechnen können, dass auch die anderen vakanten Stellen der Vizepräsidenten besetzt werden. Oder liegt es daran, dass die schon längst ausgeschiedenen Kollegen keine Lücke hinterlassen haben?

Presidente. – Quando arriveranno le candidature, voteremo. Mi auguro che arrivino il prima possibile.

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA

místopředseda

10.2. Durchführung der Umwelthaftungsrichtlinie (A8-0297/2017 - Laura Ferrara) (Abstimmung)

10.3. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung (A8-0387/2016 - Paul Tang) (Abstimmung)

10.4. Aufsichtsanforderungen an Kreditinstitute und Wertpapierfirmen (A8-0388/2016 - Othmar Karas) (Abstimmung)

10.5. Achtung des Privatlebens und Schutz personenbezogener Daten in der elektronischen Kommunikation und Aufhebung der Richtlinie 2002/58/EG (Verordnung über Privatsphäre und elektronische Kommunikation) (A8-0324/2017 - Marju Lauristin) (Abstimmung)

— *Before the vote:*

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Mr President, briefly, because a lot of myths – or you could also say a lot of lies – have been spread around by some industrial lobbyists. I would like to add some very short points on what we are deciding today.

The ePrivacy Regulation aims to put users back in control of their communication data and to make sure that confidentiality of communication in a digital environment becomes a reality for everyone. At the same time, the ePrivacy Regulation does not ban all forms of advertising. It only addresses the issues of surveillance-driven advertising and wants consumers given a choice about whether they want to be tracked or not for commercial purposes. Also – and I really cannot understand how this argument came into the debate – the mandate of the ePrivacy Regulation does not at all affect the powers of Member States to fight against illegal content online. Members today have a very clear choice: you can either disappoint the vast majority of citizens who want their confidentiality to be protected, or you can give in to the demands and lies of some industry lobbyists. Any further delay in this decision will only affect the strength of our position when it comes to negotiations with Council and Commission. Therefore, I urge everybody here to vote in favour of the mandate today.

(Applause)

— *After the vote:*

Marju Lauristin (S&D), rapporteur. – Mr President, I want to thank all those who voted for the decision and, above all, I want to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their work. It was very hard work. We met with a lot of people from different sides. We felt how strongly citizens were expecting that this mandate would be given, and we did our best.

Also, this is my last day in Parliament. I thank all of you for this very enriching experience and it is my wish that the European Parliament will stand firm in defending democracy, liberal values and a future for Europe. Thank you.

(Loud applause)

President. – For those who were not being patient, Ms Lauristin is leaving the House, so I think it was a question of courtesy to give her the opportunity to speak.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Mr President, I am sure that there is a rule in the Rules of Procedure that says that the plenary cannot be used for further political discussion that was already dealt with extensively in committee, and this is a clear case of that.

(Applause)

10.6. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (RC-B8-0576/2017, B8-0576/2017, B8-0577/2017, B8-0578/2017, B8-0579/2017, B8-0580/2017, B8-0581/2017, B8-0582/2017) (Abstimmung)

10.7. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (A8-0310/2017 - Gunnar Hökmark) (Abstimmung)

10.8. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien (A8-0311/2017 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung)

10.9. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (A8-0312/2017 - Daniel Caspary) (Abstimmung)

10.10. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (A8-0265/2017 - Kostas Chrysogonos) (Abstimmung)

President. – That concludes the vote.

11. Stimmerklärungen

11.1. Rahmen für eine einfache, transparente und standardisierte Verbriefung (A8-0387/2016 - Paul Tang)

Oral explanations of vote

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I fully agree that financial stability should be guaranteed and that capital should be used to fund the real economy, rather than for speculative activity. What are financial bubbles and what are the consequences? As we saw in 2008, our life is not a computer game where someone can start a risky game, fail and afterwards, without consequences, start a new one. That is why we need guarantees. That is why securitisations are an important part of well-functioning financial markets.

11.2. Bekämpfung von sexueller Belästigung und Missbrauch in der EU (RC-B8-0576/2017, B8-0576/2017, B8-0577/2017, B8-0578/2017, B8-0579/2017, B8-0580/2017, B8-0581/2017, B8-0582/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Oczywiście głosowałam za rezolucją przeciwko molestowaniu seksualnemu nie tylko w miejscu pracy, szczególnie takim jak Parlament Europejski, w którego skład wchodzić przecież reprezentanci narodów Europy korzystający z prestiżu społecznego i władzy, chociaż nie zgadzamy się z pewnymi aspektami konwencji stambulskiej. Chciałabym jednak zauważyć, że nawet kilka rezolucji czy monitorowanie tego rodzaju przypadków łącznie z ich penalizacją może nie zredukować tego typu zachowań naruszających osobistą godność, gdy nie przestrzega się zasad społecznych i moralnych, gdzie tworzone jest prawo przeciwko rodzinie czy w skutkach prowadzące do walki między mężczyznami a kobietami, propagujące wolność od wartości chrześcijańskich, skutkujące stworzeniem perspektywy wyzwolenia człowieka od biologicznych uwarunkowań, podważaniem wartości rodziny tworzonej wspólnie przez ojca i matkę jako rodziców i tworzeniem nowego modelu seksualności. Propagowanie niektórych aspektów równouprawnienia w praktyce oznacza brak delikatności, a nawet wulgarne traktowanie kobiet, skoncentrowanie uwagi na wartościach seksualnych.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážení pán predsedajúci. Rovnako ako moje kolegyne a kolegovia považujem sexuálne obťažovanie za neprípustné. A rovnako ako asi každý poslanec tohto parlamentu sa domnievam, že aj na pôde tejto inštitúcie musíme urobiť viac preto, aby sme účinne predchádzali nielen tejto forme obťažovania. V mojom vystúpení v rozprave k tejto téme som navrhla aj konkrétne opatrenia.

Žiaľ, niektoré kolegyne a kolegovia neodolali pokušeniu využiť aj túto tému na zvýšenie politického tlaku na členské štáty, aby ratifikovali takzvaný Istanbulský dohovor. Chcem im odkázať, že formulácia, že členské štáty majú povinnosť ratifikovať tento dohovor, je nepravdivá. Prekračuje kompetencie tohto parlamentu a bráni nám, ktorí rešpektujeme európske zmluvy, aby sme podporili toto uznesenie.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Podobnie jak Anna Záborská uważam, że skandalem jest wykorzystywanie dramatu atakowanych czy wykorzystywanych seksualnie kobiet do propagowania genderowej konwencji stambulskiej. Przecież na bieżąco słyszymy, co się dzieje: jest afera Weinsteina pokazująca wykorzystywanie w świecie filmowym. Wiemy o wykorzystywaniu kobiet w strukturach władzy i o sposobie, w jaki struktury te mogą służyć do wykorzystywania kobiet. Do tej pory nie wiemy, kto w naszym Parlamencie jest podejrzany o takie praktyki, i tym samym domagam się, żeby publicznie ujawnione zostały osoby, które w tak poniżający sposób zachowały się wobec kobiet w naszym Parlamencie.

Wiemy o tym, że policja często ukrywa korelację między nielegalną imigracją a atakami na kobiety, tak jak było w Kolonii. Niestety przykładem tego jest odrzucona przez chwilą poprawka, a skandalem na tle tego wszystkiego jest wykorzystywanie dramatów kobiet do propagowania genderowej konwencji stambulskiej i do wywierania presji na państwa.

11.3. Wirtschaftspolitik des Euro-Währungsgebiets (A8-0310/2017 - Gunnar Hökmark)

Oral explanations of vote

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to underline the importance of cohesion policy. Cohesion policy is a most powerful instrument for reducing regional development disparities. In my country, Latvia, it gives more than 70% of investments in our economy. That is why we are very concerned about the future of cohesion policy after 2020. I think that the amount of money for cohesion policy should be increased, not reduced, after 2020.

Latvia has lost one third of its population in the last 25 years and demographic trends for the future are very unfavourable. People leave the country because of the low salaries and lack of prospects there. We are in a very dangerous trap and if Cohesion Fund investment is reduced, there will be no way out of this trap. I voted in favour, of course.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Уважаеми г-н Председател, гласувах против доклада, тъй като в него има точки, с които не мога да се съглася. Икономическият растеж е неравномерно разпределен в Европа, именно заради това, че не може да се прилага еднакъв подход към страните членки. Абсолютно не мога да се съглася с призива за допълнителни съвместни усилия за подобряване интеграцията на мигранти и хора с мигрантски произход на пазара на труда.

Смятам, че преди всичко трябва да се разрешат проблемите на собствените ни държави. На първо място – огромното неравенство, неравнопоставеността между държавите от западната и източната част на Съюза. В тази връзка това, което трябва да прави Комисията, е да наказва държавите, които прилагат протекционистична политика, като например Германия, Франция, Белгия и Италия, защото в източните държави има голяма безработица, а младите хора са бъдещето на Европа.

Друга тема е, че голяма част от мигрантите не бягат от война, а са икономически мигранти, дошли в Европа с тази цел – достъп до пазара на труда.

11.4. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Australien (A8-0311/2017 - Daniel Caspary)

Oral explanations of vote

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, Australia and Sweden have a long tradition of trade. They have a similar business culture, resulting in 450 subsidiaries and almost 1 000 Swedish companies doing business in Australia, which generate 11 billion Swedish krona in exports from Sweden. That is why I am very satisfied that we have approved the negotiating mandate. I would very much like to urge the Commission and our Australian partners to make a transparent, safe and ambitious deal so we do not have to wait until free trade comes to go.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, free trade is the cornerstone of the EU. In light of Brexit and the lack of clarity on the United Kingdom-EU market, the EU, and Ireland in particular, must seek to strengthen trading with other markets. In 2015, the EU was Australia's third-largest trading partner after China and Japan. The trade in goods in 2015 amounted to EUR 62.5 billion and exports from Australia to the EU amounted to EUR 10.6 billion. There is a long-standing, friendly relationship between Australia and Ireland, with one in three Australians claiming Irish heritage. An EU-Australia trade agreement will strengthen our relationship even further and be mutually beneficial in opening access to markets and fostering competition.

However, there have been real concerns expressed over the potential negative implications of such a trade agreement on agri-food exports such as beef and dairy. I take such concerns extremely seriously, as an Irishman, as the farming industry and agri-food sectors play a central role in the Irish economy. So it is important that due consideration is given to these sectors and, if there are quotas given to Australia, that there will be a review clause after a number of years, so that could be re-addressed ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, подкрепих доклада на колегата Каспари относно предложения мандат за провеждане на търговски преговори с Австралия, защото напускането на Великобритания на Европейския съюз със сигурност ще бъде загуба за свободната търговия, а както е известно, свободният пазар и свободната търговия са крайъгълните камъни, на които е основан Европейският съюз.

Преговорите трябва да започнат колкото е възможно по-скоро и трябва да се придържахме към компетенциите, които Съюзът има в тази сфера.

11.5. Verhandlungsmandat für die Handelsverhandlungen mit Neuseeland (A8-0312/2017 - Daniel Caspary)

Oral explanations of vote

Jasenko Selimovic (ALDE). – Mr President, when measuring market share, New Zealand is the eighth most important export market for Swedish companies. This relationship could be deeper and more developed and I believe that the deal on free trade will make it so. I expect both partners very swiftly to deliver a modern, ambitious, balanced, fair and comprehensive free trade agreement that will benefit us all.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-н Председател, подкрепих този доклад на колегата Каспари и гласувах за него по същите причини, поради които подкрепих и предишния – именно докладът относно предложението за провеждане на търговски преговори с Нова Зеландия. Мотивите ми са подобни, а Европейският съюз се нуждае от нови пазари, свободната търговия е основният крайгълен камък на Европейския съюз. Преговорите трябва да започнат колкото е възможно по-бързо, трябва да се придържаме към компетенциите, които Съюзът има в тази сфера, защото както Нова Зеландия, така и Австралия могат, и ще бъдат важни икономически партньори, и по този начин показваме своята подкрепа.

11.6. Kontrolle der Anwendung des EU-Rechts im Jahr 2015 (A8-0265/2017 - Kostas Chrysogonos)

Oral explanations of vote

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the number of infringements remains high. At the end of 2015, there were 1368 infringement cases. They especially concern violations of EU law, in particular in the fields of employment and social affairs, the environment, justice, fundamental rights, the internal market, transport, health, education and culture. Every delay is dangerous. It undermines the trust of the people in the European Union and has real material consequences. To avoid this in the future, we should work closely with the Commission, national governments and national parliaments. But first of all we should understand the real nature of the infringements and only after that will we be able to tackle this problem effectively. I voted in favour.

12. Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

(The sitting was suspended at 12.55)

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

13. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr wieder aufgenommen.)

14. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

15. Standpunkt des Rates in erster Lesung: siehe Protokoll

16. Große Anfragen (Aussprache)

16.1. Koordinierte Bemühungen auf EU-Ebene zur Erhöhung der Durchimpfungsrate

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Große Anfrage gemäß Artikel 130b der Geschäftsordnung von Piernicola Pedicini, Laura Agea, Rosa D'Amato, Tiziana Beghin, Marco Valli, Marco Zullo, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Ignazio Corrao, Laura Ferrara, Eleonora Evi, Isabella Adinolfi, Joëlle Bergeron im Namen der EFDD-Fraktion an die Kommission betreffend koordinierte Bemühungen auf EU-Ebene zur Erhöhung der Durchimpfungsrate (O-000074/2017 – 2017/2867(RSP)) (B8-0603/2017).

Piernicola Pedicini, autore. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi abbiamo voluto avviare un dibattito sul tema dell'obbligatorietà dei vaccini perché recentemente, in Italia, è stata introdotta una misura per la somministrazione obbligatoria di sei nuovi vaccini, che si aggiungono ai quattro vaccini già obbligatori, per un totale attualmente di dieci vaccinazioni obbligatorie.

I dati disponibili sul portale *Global Vaccine Action Plan* dimostrano che questo è avvenuto pur non trovandosi di fronte a una reale emergenza epidemica che avrebbe potuto giustificare una misura così coercitiva. Il ministero della Salute italiano ha giustificato questo provvedimento basandosi sui dati di incidenza del morbillo dei primi mesi dell'anno in Italia; questi dati erano realmente preoccupanti, tenuto conto anche del fatto che il morbillo in Italia rimane tuttora endemico.

Tuttavia molti genitori sono preoccupati per questa decisione drastica del ministero della Salute italiano perché non hanno capito come mai, se c'era un'emergenza per il morbillo, non si è adottata una misura specifica per contrastare il solo morbillo. Non hanno capito per quale motivo l'obbligatorietà è stata estesa a dieci vaccinazioni obbligatorie e, purtroppo, ad aggravare le paure dei genitori è stata la circostanza che un tema così delicato, che riguarda la salute dei nostri bambini, è stato portato al centro del dibattito politico e trattato come da due opposte tifoserie, con evidenti strumentalizzazioni che noi troviamo molto pericolose.

Per questo abbiamo voluto parlarne qui al Parlamento europeo, fuori dal contesto nazionale e fuori dal momento di maggiore attenzione mediatica, in modo da poterne discutere serenamente proprio nell'interesse di quei genitori preoccupati. La maggioranza dei cittadini, e noi con loro, riconoscono l'importanza che hanno avuto i vaccini per ridurre, e in alcuni casi eliminare (si pensi al vaiolo), l'incidenza di gravi malattie infettive. Tuttavia quegli stessi cittadini, e noi con loro, vogliono prima di ogni altra cosa che i farmaci, specialmente se somministrati a persone sane e per di più bambini, siano efficaci e sicuri. I cittadini vogliono sapere quali rischi reali corrono i loro figli quando accettano di vaccinarli e il ruolo delle istituzioni dovrebbe essere quello di fornire queste informazioni in modo chiaro e trasparente.

Per questo noi crediamo che la politica dovrebbe occuparsi di rendere indipendenti e liberi dalle pressioni dell'industria farmaceutica (che mira al profitto) tutti gli organismi di controllo, come l'Agenzia europea per i farmaci e come le agenzie nazionali di controllo dei farmaci, che devono poter esprimere il loro parere esclusivamente su base scientifica. Sappiamo che questo non è sempre vero e ciò non aiuta quel rapporto di fiducia verso le istituzioni che è la base per il raggiungimento degli obiettivi dei piani di vaccinazione nazionale.

Perché, per quei vaccini di cui sono state testate l'efficacia e la sicurezza, si pone poi il problema di quale strategia adottare per raggiungere maggiori coperture vaccinali e, se ci guardiamo intorno, notiamo che la maggior parte degli Stati membri, tra l'altro quelli con maggiore sviluppo sia economico sia sociale, hanno adottato un approccio basato sul convincimento e sull'accompagnamento delle famiglie alla vaccinazione, e non un approccio basato sull'obbligatorietà.

Per questo chiediamo alla Commissione: dalle informazioni in vostro possesso si può affermare che un approccio coercitivo, basato sull'obbligatorietà vaccinale, sia più efficace di un approccio basato sulla raccomandazione attiva e sull'accompagnamento consapevole delle famiglie alla vaccinazione?

Seconda domanda: il fatto che l'obbligo di effettuare un totale di dieci vaccini a bambini da zero a tre anni non abbia precedenti può essere considerato una ragione valida per invocare il principio di precauzione?

E per finire: nell'ambito della priorità del rafforzamento industriale, contenuta nella lettera di intenti del Presidente Juncker, Juncker stesso ha indicato un piano d'azione congiunto sulle politiche nazionali di vaccinazione. Ci chiediamo in che modo le politiche di vaccinazione siano un mezzo per rafforzare il mercato interno e l'industria, perché invece noi crediamo che la salute dovrebbe essere completamente al di fuori delle logiche di mercato.

Vytėnė Povilaitis Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, vaccination is one of the most effective public health measures. Vaccination saves lives. Vaccination protects our societies, reduces illness and helps achieve long life expectancy rates. Vaccination not only leads to better public health outcomes, but it is also beneficial from a socio-economic point of view.

Before vaccines existed, many children would die young or be crippled for life. Our generation has no memory of this. Thanks to vaccination, such diseases have almost – I stress almost – been eradicated. As President Juncker mentioned in the State of the Union speech, today in the EU children are still dying from diseases such as measles that can easily be prevented with vaccines. This is unacceptable.

So I want to thank Members for raising this major interpellation on a subject of great importance to all of us. Vaccination programmes have become increasingly fragile in the face of the low uptake of vaccines, vaccine hesitancy and vaccine shortages. Many people in Europe live and work in different Member States throughout their lives and have trouble in comparing vaccination calendars and vaccinating their children on time. Each country in Europe has its own vaccination schedule. They are the result of long traditions and therefore vary widely across the Union. Some countries opt for mandatory vaccination and it is their legal right to do so.

Honourable Members, I would like to address each of your questions. The first question is whether the obligation to carry out the 10 vaccinations for young children should be considered a reason to invoke the precautionary principle. First, 12 Member States currently have at least one mandatory vaccination in their national vaccination programmes and some have many more. Italy is one of seven Member States that prescribe between 10 and 14 mandatory vaccinations in their vaccination programmes. As such, the new Italian law does not constitute a so-called precedent in Europe.

The precautionary principle can be invoked when there is a suspected danger to human health and scientific knowledge does not permit an evaluation of the situation and of the risk. In the case of vaccination, we have scientific evidence-based knowledge on the benefits of vaccination. In this context, when considering vaccination programmes, it would not be appropriate only to take into account the small risk of potential adverse reactions to vaccines while ignoring the solid evidence-based benefits of vaccination. It would be misleading, in fact, at a time when people in Europe are dying from measles – a disease that should have been eliminated long ago because the European Union had obligations to eradicate measles by 2014, but we are not there. We need to strengthen our approach to vaccination. We need to encourage everyone to be vaccinated and protect the most vulnerable in society, leaving no one behind.

Moving to your second question: can the Commission gather evidence on the effectiveness gap between mandatory and non-mandatory vaccination policies with regard to immunisation rates? The Commission can play a key role in facilitating the collection, analysis and dissemination of evidence-based research on the best ways to increase vaccine coverage. To this end, we will work closely with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control and the Member States. Some studies show that, in the case of healthcare professionals, mandatory vaccination has indeed increased vaccination uptake. Our studies point to mandatory vaccinations not being decisive in determining childhood immunisation rates. As such, more data is needed to understand if, and how, changes in vaccination policies have influenced immunisation trends. Further research would help us to better appreciate the relationship between voluntary and mandatory vaccination programmes and vaccine coverage.

I do not want to enter into a discussion on the benefits of voluntary versus mandatory programmes. They are all working towards the same goal of improving health. To do so, we need to analyse the implementation of the national programmes. Do we have appropriate surveillance in place? Is data available and used to inform future vaccination policies? How are targets met and what are the attitudes of health workers? That is very important. These are some of the issues we need to look at.

Finally, your third question: how can the EU coordinate action to improve the effectiveness of vaccination policies and increase immunisation rates? As you will know from President Juncker's letter of intent to the Parliament, the Commission intends to present an initiative to support Member States in strengthening cooperation on vaccination. Our aim is to help counter vaccine hesitancy and increase vaccination coverage, address shortages and prepare for emergencies, ensuring cooperation between Member States, involving stakeholders and ensuring a comprehensive research agenda on vaccination. We will work closely with a broad range of stakeholders from the health workforce, industry, academia, NGOs and patients' organisations.

In addition, next year I intend to launch a new joint action with Member States. This action builds on the results of the discussions with stakeholders that I held earlier this year. I hope it will pave the way towards a shared vision to improve vaccination coverage in the EU. This action, which will be co-financed by the health programme, will focus on the convergence of national policies on vaccination schedules and the evaluation of the effectiveness of vaccination policies. The aim is to increase intersectoral cooperation, promote cross-border interoperability and increase the consistency of communication on vaccination.

Together we are working, first, to increase trust and confidence in vaccines, which is very important, through vaccination programmes and health systems, and to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of vaccination programmes and improve electronic vaccine registries. These efforts must be underpinned by effective communication and enhanced public engagement. We need to foster an understanding of the importance of vaccination as a key tool for preventing diseases.

This issue is one that affects us all, irrespective of borders or nationality. It is one we must address collectively and strategically. I count on Members to support these efforts and help increase vaccination coverage in Europe.

Seán Kelly, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Madam President, the coordinated efforts to increase vaccination cover in Europe are of course welcome. However, I cannot accept some of the approaches which I have heard advocated. To suggest that legal requirements are not necessary for ensuring the highest possible immunisation rates is to disregard how crucial these immunisations are. We cannot take chances when it comes to the health and safety of our citizens and in particular, our children. We must take heed of the often life-saving health benefits of vaccinations for our children, as the Commissioner has just pointed out.

Accurate and widespread information is essential to ensure citizens know how important vaccines are for their children. Safety is, of course, always a primary concern; now decisions directly affect minors. Unfortunately, it seems that public attention is often focused on vaccine safety and not on vaccine effectiveness. Modern medicine has allowed an extremely high safety record in vaccinations. Misplaced fears regarding the safety of vaccines have in the past caused a decrease in vaccination coverage. This of course caused outbreaks of diseases such as measles. For example, vaccination is not mandatory in Great Britain, and around 24 000 children a year in England are not immunised against measles, mumps and rubella. Part of the hesitation of parents to allow their children to receive the combined vaccination for these three infectious diseases was caused by a discredited study which claimed to show a link between vaccination and autism. This study has since been disproved.

Vaccines are not only important to prevent disease in individuals; they are hugely important for communities at large and are proven to be effective in reducing child mortality. There is an obligation on governments to ensure that every citizen is given the opportunity to live a healthy life and therefore, vaccination should be mandatory across Europe.

Dá bhrí sin tá súil agam gur féidir linn cabhrú lenár saoránaigh, go háirithe ár leanaí, saol sláintiúil a bheith acu trí instealladh a fháil i gcoinne na ngalar seo.

Andrea Cozzolino, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, siamo o non siamo tutti d'accordo che i vaccini rappresentano uno strumento efficace di prevenzione delle epidemie e rappresentano il mezzo per debellare malattie pericolose? Siamo o non siamo d'accordo che veicolare messaggi artefatti, palesemente fasulli e privi di validità scientifica sia un modo per creare confusione e allarmismi che abbassano i tassi di immunizzazione? Siamo o non siamo tutti d'accordo che è nostro dovere politico e morale impegnarci per garantire anzitutto che i più deboli, i bambini, non vengano penalizzati da comportamenti irrazionali?

È un bene, è davvero un bene, che l'interpellanza, piuttosto che insistere sulla presunta dannosità dei vaccini, si concentri in maniera positiva sui meccanismi migliori per diffondere il solo strumento di immunizzazione a nostra disposizione contro malattie e rischi di epidemie.

L'introduzione dell'obbligo, nel caso italiano, è la testimonianza che si è giocato troppo con le incertezze e con le paure umane, fomentando allarmismi e diffondendo teorie pseudo-scientifiche. L'interpellanza di oggi è un chiaro segno di un cambio di passo, molto positivo, che ci consente di riportare finalmente la discussione in una sede più ampia, uscendo dai confini nazionali e coinvolgendo l'Europa intera.

Questa è la strada da seguire: aprirci a discussioni a tutti i livelli scientifici. Solo in questo modo possiamo evitare in futuro nuove accuse, come quelle mosse di recente dal *New York Times*, che ha tracciato un pericoloso parallelo, in Italia, per chi ha fatto attivamente campagna sulla piattaforma antivaccini, ripetendo i falsi legami tra vaccinazione e autismo. Oppure dal Presidente Juncker che, nel suo discorso sullo stato dell'Unione, ha ricordato che non è pensabile che nell'UE muoiano ancora bambini di malattie evitabili: in Romania e in Italia, dovrebbero avere accesso alle vaccinazioni senza se e senza ma. Appoggiamo le misure nazionali di vaccinazione.

Andiamo ai fatti, osserviamo i dati. In Italia nel 2017, per esempio, nel caso del morbillo appena la copertura è scesa al di sotto della soglia critica del 95 % il numero dei casi si è moltiplicato (4 689, sono i dati del 15 ottobre), con 4 decessi. La possibilità di veder crescere in maniera esponenziale i fattori di rischio per le fasce più deboli o di provocare l'estensione dell'area dell'epidemia anche al resto dell'Europa è un rischio reale.

Qual era la soluzione di fronte a questa sfida? Il principio era proprio quello di adottare il principio di precauzione, pure invocato. Ha spinto le autorità sulla strada migliore, per fare aumentare in maniera rapida i tassi di immunizzazione. D'altronde, nel mondo, le cose non sono proprio così diverse. Esiste per esempio negli Stati Uniti, in Canada e in Giappone il divieto di accesso alle scuole a chi non è vaccinato. L'Australia toglie gli assegni familiari a chi non vaccina i propri figli. La Germania, che non aveva obblighi vaccinali, dopo 400 casi di morbillo e la morte di una donna di 37 anni ha deciso di multare con 2 500 euro i genitori che portano al nido figli non immunizzati.

Non possiamo contare solo sulla razionalità dell'essere umano che, soprattutto in momenti di crisi e di debolezza, il più delle volte frutto di un dolore, di un destino ritenuto ingiusto, si aggrappa a tutte le speranze, o peggio rimane preda di illusioni. Per questo dico: torniamo tutti a essere un po' più umani, riscopriamo il rispetto per anni di studi e di esperienze, mettiamo tutti insieme al bando congetture e teorie prive di alcun fondamento.

Guardiamo in faccia i dati in Italia. Ogni anno si spendono 29 miliardi in farmaci, di cui 318 milioni in vaccini. A titolo esemplificativo, spendiamo 1 miliardo per gli antibiotici, 300 milioni per gli antitumorali. Davvero pensiamo che la speculazione delle case farmaceutiche si voglia o si possa concentrare sulla parte più piccola dell'intera spesa?

Piuttosto andrebbe indagato su quanto annualmente famiglie e persone spendono – riflettiamo su questo – nel sottobosco di esami e consulti alternativi e su quanta speculazione ci possa essere dietro tutto questo, soprattutto il dolore di tante famiglie e di tanti genitori.

Signor Commissario, andiamo avanti. Credo che si debba andare avanti spediti su una strada europea, magari con la centrale unica degli acquisti dei vaccini, come annunciato, ma anche armonizzando i sistemi di una banca dati centralizzata per dare più trasparenza alle nostre informazioni, come parte integrante di quel piano che Lei ha descritto per dare più fiducia ai cittadini, per fornire risposte ai bisogni e per restituire loro speranza.

Urszula Krupa, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Jak większość lekarzy docenia profilaktyczne znaczenie i rolę szczepień, jednak tak jak część badaczy mam wątpliwości co do bezpieczeństwa szczepienia noworodków. Autorzy interpelacji pytają także o zastosowanie zasady ostrożności w kontekście dodatkowych (już dziesięciu) obowiązkowych szczepień we Włoszech, tym bardziej, że według badań obowiązkowość szczepień nie wpływa na wyszczepialność, co jest ważne także, zanim poznamy rzeczywistą odpowiedź na intensywną stymulację niedojrzałego układu immunologicznego i kształtującego się układu nerwowego.

W Polsce niemowlę, łącznie z przeprowadzanym w pierwszej dobie szczepieniem przeciw gruźlicy i WZW B, otrzymuje 26 dawek obcogatkowego antygeny. Warto wiedzieć, czy dziecko jest w ogóle w stanie prawidłowo zareagować na tak wiele zróżnicowanych bodźców oraz czy szczepienie nie stanowi zagrożenia dla rozwoju mózgu, chociażby ze względu na niewykształconą barierę krew-mózg, jaka powstaje dopiero w szóstym tygodniu życia dziecka. Czy warto przesunąć pierwsze szczepienia przynajmniej powyżej 2 miesięcy życia? We wczesnych miesiącach życia dziecko jest przecież chronione przez przeciwciała matczyne, dlatego szczepienia przeciw niektórym mikroorganizmom wykonywane tuż po urodzeniu nie prowadzą do trwałej odporności. Niemowlęta nie mają wykształconego układu odpornościowego i jego dojrzałość osiągają dopiero około trzeciego roku życia. Odporność humoralna jest związana z immunoglobulinami przechodzącymi przez łożysko, głównie w ostatnich 2 miesiącach ciąży, a dziecko osiąga bardzo powoli, dopiero po 12 miesiącach, 50% poziomu odporności ludzi dorosłych.

Wskazane byłoby, moim zdaniem, badanie autentycznej odpowiedzi ze strony organizmu noworodków, niemowląt, a także dzieci, które przecież choć są szczepione, to oddawane do żłobka i przedszkola bardzo często chorują na różne infekcje.

Ivan Jakovčić, u ime kluba ALDE. – Gospođa predsjednice, mada je ova rasprava došla na dnevni red prvenstveno potaknuta raspravama koje se dešavaju u Italiji i svime onime što se u Italiji dešava pa i dosta, nažalost, smrtnih slučajeva, za koje smo čuli i koji su se nažalost dogodili, mislim da je pozitivno da je ova rasprava došla u naš Parlament. Uvijek će biti onih koji su *pro* i *contra* za jednu ili za drugu stranu, ali mislim da trebamo ovu raspravu iskoristiti za nešto drugo. Ne samo za sukobljavanje, nego za jedan konstruktivan doprinos razmjeni iskustava na nivou Europske unije, razmjeni iskustava među državama.

U mnogočemu su mnogi standardi slični, ali ne u svemu. Pa recimo i u ovom konkretnom slučaju gdje imamo vrlo različite, čak bih rekao tradicije cijepljenja novorođenčadi ili djece. Tako i Hrvatska ima neke svoje tradicije, neke svoje situacije.

Mislim da je uloga Komisije, i tu želim potaknuti Komisiju i povjerenika da zaista izrade jednu vrlo, vrlo fundiranu studiju i predlože, na neki način, ono što bi mogla biti neka smjernica u budućnosti jer i kvaliteta života i kvaliteta življenja novorođenčadi i svih mladih ljudi povećava se iz dana u dan. I ta iskustva koja postoje u Eurpskoj uniji mislim da je vrlo pametno i potrebno razmijeniti.

Joëlle Mélin, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, s'il est un domaine où l'Europe, selon nous, pourrait avoir son efficacité, ce serait bien évidemment celui de la santé publique, puisque les frontières n'ont rien à voir avec l'expansion des microbes ou des virus et que, là, effectivement, une position commune pourrait permettre de faciliter les choses sur le plan de la santé publique pour chaque État.

Rappelons déjà une chose: chaque État membre est libre de sa politique de santé publique et, voir, aujourd'hui, apparaît un grand débat en Italie, mais aussi en France — puisque ces jours-ci nous voyons apparaître dans la loi française une obligation de procéder à onze vaccins obligatoires à partir du 1^{er} janvier — signifie que, précisément, des changements brutaux s'opèrent dans la façon d'aborder la vaccination.

De nombreuses questions scientifiques voient le jour, mais aussi des questions de la part des parents qui s'interrogent, alors que la France, au moins, connaît une pénurie de médicaments depuis dix ans. Là encore, pour des raisons de marché et de brevets de certains laboratoires monopolistiques, ces pénuries ont fait que la couverture vaccinale n'a pas été aussi bonne.

On peut se poser la question de savoir pourquoi, alors que quinze pays ne pratiquent pas la vaccination obligatoire et que douze autres n'imposent qu'un ou plusieurs vaccins, on n'a pas eu plus d'épidémies que cela. Pourquoi serait-il d'un coup obligatoire d'avoir autant de vaccins?

Je pense que mon collègue Piernicola Pedicini doit penser exactement la même chose. Pourquoi tout cela? Pourquoi aussi brutalement et quels sont les intérêts éventuels des laboratoires? D'autant plus qu'en France, nous avons quand même vécu deux fausses épidémies – je dis bien «fausses épidémies» –, qui ont donné lieu à une réticence allant au-delà même de l'incrimination de certains vaccins dans le cadre de pathologies dégénératives graves.

Alors, je crois que notre institution et la Commission doivent se pencher et permettre des études a priori et non a posteriori, ne rien imposer par avance qui n'ait pas un caractère scientifique, un caractère indépendant, sauf si nous devons penser – pardonnez-moi d'inquiéter tout le monde – que quelqu'un dans un pays quelque part dispose d'une information relative à du terrorisme bactériologique.

Dans l'état actuel des choses, un moratoire des études vaccinales, afin de pouvoir déterminer dans quelle mesure et à quel taux la vaccination doit être pratiquée, au fond, dans nos différents pays européens serait, à mon avis, beaucoup plus sage que d'imposer en disant: «Les vaccinations, c'est bon quoi qu'il arrive.» Je pense que plus de recul serait nécessaire.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedníčka. Prekvapuje ma, že na pôde Európskeho parlamentu sa zaoberáme rozhodnutím talianskej vlády zvýšiť počet povinných očkovaní. O to viac, že aj iniciátori tejto rozpravy priznávajú, že o očkovanom kalendári pre občanov môžu rozhodovať len členské štáty.

Navyše zásada predbežnej opatrnosti, na ktorú sa odvolávajú, sa týka politik Únie. V otázkach spadajúcich do ich výlučnej kompetencie je na členských štátoch, či a akú zásadu budú uplatňovať.

Žijeme v dobe, kedy veľká skupina ľudí spochybňuje buď samotné očkovanie ako účinnú metódu boja proti závažným ochoreniam alebo efektívnosť zákonnej povinnosti očkovania. Autori otázky pre Komisiu, o ktorej tu diskutujeme, patria k tej druhej skupine.

Možno si neuvedomujú, že tým otvárajú priestor pre šarlatánov, ktorí dokážu v dobe internetu presvedčiť za krátky čas veľké množstvo rodičov bez medicínskeho vzdelania o svojich nevedeckých teóriách. To, že sú úspešní, potvrdzuje klesajúci počet zaočkovaných detí, a nielen novorodencov.

Navyše materiál, na ktorý sa autori odvolávajú, nie je vedeckou štúdiou, ale iba komunikačným materiálom, ktorý kombinuje štatistiky o vakcinácii s informáciou o platnej legislatíve. Nie je to štúdia, ako tvrdia, a nespĺňa kritériá seriózneho vedeckého výskumu.

Pán komisár, kolegyně a kolegovia, hovorme radšej o cezhraničnom rozmere rizík súvisiacich s nedostatočnou vakcináciou a o potrebe celoeurópskych garancií nešírenia ochorení v súvislosti s voľným pohybom a migráciou.

(Rečníčka súhlasila s tým, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty (článok 162 ods. 8 rokovacieho poriadku).)

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD), domanda «cartellino blu». – Vorrei chiedere alla collega se è al corrente del fatto che la vaccinazione risiede in un campo che riguarda la salute e non la sanità.

La salute si occupa delle persone, di mantenere lo stato di salute delle persone che sono già sane. Non stiamo parlando di persone malate, quindi questa è una competenza che non è degli Stati membri ma è una competenza anche del Parlamento europeo e delle istituzioni europee.

Anna Záborská (PPE), odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty. – Ďakujem veľmi pekne za otázku. Mohli by sme o tom polemizovať, ale očkovanie sa priamo dotýka predchádzaniu ochorení, a tým pádom aj prevencie, ktorá je súčasťou zdravotnej starostlivosti členských štátov. Čiže, súhlasím s tým, že sa môžu tieto témy prelínať, ale myslím si, že v kontexte, o ktorom hovoríme, je to kompetencia členského štátu. Ďakujem.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕКР). – г-жо Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, за мен няма никакво съмнение, че ваксините предпазват населението, особено в днешно време, в което няма граници вътре в Европейския съюз. Но все пак държавите членки трябва да запазят суверенитет над своите ваксинационни календари и над здравето на своите граждани.

Поводът за този разговор е Италия, където наскоро се въведе задължителна ваксинация на новородени деца, в случая 6 ваксини в допълнение към четирите, които бяха задължителни, стават общо 10 задължителни ваксини. Легитимната цел за постигане на най-високи равнища на ваксинация е обяснима, но може да бъде постигната по два начина, или чрез по-строги политики, или през това, което се нарича комбинация от политики на задължения на препоръка.

Проучване през 2016 година показва, че държавите, в които е задължително ваксинарането, не са постигнали много по-добър обхват от сравними страни, в които не е в сила законово задължение. Затова има два въпроса: може ли Комисията да събере доказателства относно разликата в ефективността между задължителни и незадължителни ваксинационни политики по отношение на равнищата и как може Съюзът да координира действия за подобряване ефективността от политиката за ваксинация и повишаване равнищата на имунизация?

Jozo Radoš (ALDE). – Gospođa predsjednice, još i prije ovog zastupničkog pitanja postojala je tema rasprava o tome da li postoji prekomjerno odnosno štetno cijepljenje. U biti se radi o širem pitanju, da li generalno postoji pretjerana tj. prekomjerna upotreba lijekova u interesu farmaceutske industrije, i to je jednako tako vrlo, vrlo prisutno u javnosti.

Uvjeran sam da je cijepljenje korisno i podržavam navode gospodina povjerenika, ali svejedno smatram da je, zbog pitanja koja postoje u javnosti, dobro da su kolege postavili ovo pitanje, pogotovo pitanje da Komisija ponudi dokaze i informacije o tome da li postoji razlika između cijepljenja i obaveznog i neobaveznog cijepljenja i da li postoji mogućnost da se bespotrebno cijepimo odnosno, posredno, da li tu postoji neki interes farmaceutske industrije, koji nije u interesu zdravlja građana.

Jednako tako podržavam poziv Komisiji da radi na tome da standardizira, uvede jednaka pravila ili slična pravila ili koordinira napore za cijepljenje u Europskoj uniji. I drago mi je na kraju da je gospodin povjerenik svoje izlaganje završio stavom da Europska komisija ulaže napore da bi povećala procijepljenost u Europskoj uniji.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you very much indeed. Honourable Members, I am very happy to have listened to you, but if I may I will just say a few words in my mother tongue, Lithuanian, because as a medical doctor I would like to focus the attention of my colleagues, Members of the European Parliament, who have just mentioned some very important issues.

Ponia Krupa iškėlė klausimus dėl naujagimių vakcinavimo ir vakcinų skaičiaus. Aš neabejoju, kad Italija turi didžiules mokslines pajėgas, pediatrių, imunologų, klinikistų, laboratorijos pajėgas, puikią mokslinę bazę, ir suprantama, kad jų žingsniai spręsti šias problemas yra pagrįsti. Ir labai teisingai Jūs keliate klausimus, kuriuos reikėtų diskutuoti tarp specialistų. Man kaip kardiochirurgui yra puikiai suprantama privalomos vakcinacijos nauda. Aš privalėjau save vakcinuoti nuo hepatitų, kitų virusinių susirgimų. Kodėl? Nes intervencijos metu aš galiu pažeisti savo rankas ir tuo pačiu užkrėsti ligonį, yra daug profesijų, kuriose yra privalomas vakcinavimas. Tai ar čia yra kokie nors kiti kriterijai apie studijas autizmo dar ko nors, kai mes žinome moksliškai pagrįstus argumentus, kuriais patys ir vadovaujamės. Aš save vakcinuoju nuo gripo kiekvienais metais viešai ir kviečiu Jus visus tą daryti. Ar gi čia yra diskusijos dėl farmacijos industrijos, ar tai yra diskusijas dėl mūsų pačių, profesionalų ypatingai, gebėjimo parodyti, kaip yra svarbu užkirsti kelią toms infekcinėms ligoms, kurios yra valdomos.

Ponia Mélin iškėlė klausimus dėl ryšio tarp ypatingai pavojingų infekcijų, bakterijų, bakterinio ginklo naudojimo terorizme. Ir čia ypač svarbu pabrėžti, kad prevencijos prasme nauji tyrimai, naujos paieškos yra neišpasakytai reikalingos. Ir tai yra pasaulinis susitarimas turėti pasaulines reguliavimo taisykles, kurios leistų mums sukaupti išteklis preventyviai reaguoti, jeigu naujos infekcijos būtų kurtos arba būtų panaudotas bakterinis ginklas. Juk čia yra sveikatos saugumo klausimas taip pat.

Aš labai dėkoju, kad iškėlėte klausimą dėl studijų. Taip, reikalingos tos studijos ir mes tą darysime. Ir ponas Jakovčić paminėjo Kroatijos atvejį. Taip, iš tiesų Jūs žinote, kad yra dvylika šalių, kuriose vakcinacija yra privaloma, yra profesijų, kuriose vakcinacija būtina, nes kitaip, kaip minėjau, tos profesijos gali sukelti daug bėdų platinant infekcinius susirgimus. Aš truputį pajuokausiu. Mes visi žinome, kad, kai mes vairuojame automobilį, tai automobilio techninė apžiūra kas porą metų yra privaloma, o tuo tarpu, kai mes turime savo sudėtingą biologinę sistemą, tai mes galime neprivalomai rūpintis. Keista, pamėginkim diskutuoti. Atšaukim automobilių privalomą techninę priežiūrą. Kai mes kalbame apie dalykus be galo rimtus, mes staiga imame naudoti keistą argumentą, multinacionalinės kompanijos, bet tie argumentai iš pasenusių arsenalo, reikėtų turbūt giliau įsigilinti į skaičius, problemas, juk teisingai pasakė ponas Cozzolino, kad mes negalime žaisti žaidimų, kai kalbame apie žmonių gyvybes, bet juo labiau, kai kalbame apie vaikų gyvybes. Aš negaliu patikėti, kad mes nesugebame suvaldyti, apsaugoti vaikučių ir suvaldyti tymų protrūkio. Dovanokit, bet tai yra visiškai nepriim-

tina, kad mes galime užsimerkti ir sakyti, žinot kažkas tai atsitiko, nu mirtis, nu ką padarysi, mėginkim toliau, kaip sakyti, nesiimkim priemonių.

I would like to stress once more that right now in Europe children are still dying from vaccine-preventable diseases that should long ago have been eradicated in Europe. We are all responsible. We all need to do more to stop this.

I want to thank you for this inspiring discussion. I believe the time has come to engage with Member States with a view to increasing the acceptance and uptake of vaccines across the EU. In this context, I sense that there is common ground to counter vaccine hesitancy – I see that we are all like-minded – to strengthen evidence, transparency and sustainability of national vaccination programmes and to increase the effectiveness of EU vaccine research and development. Today's discussions show that there is broad agreement about the added value of EU-level cooperation on vaccines. Together we must maximise our limited resources and work towards more convergent national vaccination policies. We need convergence in this situation.

To this end, as I said earlier, the Commission is shaping a new initiative to support Member States by leveraging intersectoral cooperation, promoting cross-border interoperability and increasing consistency of communication. I am confident that this worldview will, in the long run, lead to better vaccination coverage across Europe and stop the tragic deaths of unvaccinated people in this context, especially children.

I wish to thank you again, honourable Members, for your support. You play an important role in these discussions and I welcome your engagement. Let me assure you that the Commission and myself personally are fully committed to improving vaccination in Europe.

Die Präsidentin. – Danke schön, Herr Kommissar! Wir haben einen Kommissar erlebt, der mit vollem Herzen bei dem ist, was er sagt; das ist auch mal schön, das zu spüren. Danke schön!

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

17. Beschlüsse über bestimmte Dokumente: siehe Protokoll

18. Übermittlung der in dieser Sitzung angenommenen Texte: siehe Protokoll

19. Zeitpunkt der nächsten Sitzungen: siehe Protokoll

20. Schluss der Sitzung

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.44 Uhr geschlossen.)

21. Unterbrechung der Sitzungsperiode

Die Präsidentin. – Ich erkläre die Sitzungsperiode des Europäischen Parlaments für unterbrochen.

Legende der verwendeten Zeichen

*	Konsultationsverfahren
***	Zustimmungsverfahren
***I	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, erste Lesung
***II	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, zweite Lesung
***III	Ordentliches Gesetzgebungsverfahren, dritte Lesung

(Das angegebene Verfahren entspricht der von der Kommission vorgeschlagenen Rechtsgrundlage.)

Abkürzungen der Ausschüsse

AFET	Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
DEVE	Entwicklungsausschuss
INTA	Ausschuss für internationalen Handel
BUDG	Haushaltsausschuss
CONT	Haushaltskontrollausschuss
ECON	Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung
EMPL	Ausschuss für Beschäftigung und soziale Angelegenheiten
ENVI	Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit
ITRE	Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie
IMCO	Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz
TRAN	Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr
REGI	Ausschuss für regionale Entwicklung
AGRI	Ausschuss für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung
PECH	Fischereiausschuss
CULT	Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung
JURI	Rechtsausschuss
LIBE	Ausschuss für bürgerliche Freiheiten, Justiz und Inneres
AFCO	Ausschuss für konstitutionelle Fragen
FEMM	Ausschuss für die Rechte der Frau und die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter
PETI	Petitionsausschuss
DROI	Unterausschuss Menschenrechte
SEDE	Unterausschuss Sicherheit und Verteidigung

Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ECR	Fraktion der Europäischen Konservativen und Reformer
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
Vers/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen/Freie Europäische Allianz
EFDD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der direkten Demokratie
ENF	Fraktion Europa der Nationen und der Freiheit
NI	Fraktionslos



C/2024/3037

3.5.2024

**Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die
Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union**

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.109663

(C/2024/3037)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	26.3.2024	
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.109663	
Mitgliedstaat	Italien	
Region		
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	Misure agevolative per la realizzazione dei Programmi dei contratti di filiera nel settore della pesca e acquacoltura	
Rechtsgrundlage	Base giuridica nazionale: Bozza di Decreto Direttoriale Contratti di Filiera Pesca	
Art der Beihilfe	Regelung	
Ziel	Fischerei und Aquakultur	
Form der Beihilfe	Zuschuss, Zuschuss/Zinszuschuss	
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 600 000 000 EUR Jährliche Mittel: 100 000 000 EUR	
Beihilfehöchstintensität		
Laufzeit	bis zum 31.12.2029	
Wirtschaftssektoren	Fischerei und Aquakultur	
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Dott. Francesco Saverio Abate_ Direzione Generale della Pesca Marittima e dell'Acquacoltura- Ministero dell'Agricoltura e Sovranità Alimentar via XX Settembre 00187 Roma	
Sonstige Angaben		

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind,
finden Sie unter:

<https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA>



C/2024/3090

3.5.2024

**Genehmigung staatlicher Beihilfen nach den Artikeln 107 und 108 des Vertrags über die
Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union**

Vorhaben, gegen die von der Kommission keine Einwände erhoben werden

SA.113441

(C/2024/3090)

Datum der Annahme der Entscheidung	16.4.2024	
Nummer der Beihilfe	SA.113441	
Mitgliedstaat	Bulgarien	
Region		
Titel (und/oder Name des Begünstigten)	ТСТФ: Помощ в подкрепа на разходи за вода за напояване при отглеждане на земеделски култури	
Rechtsgrundlage	Закон за подпомагане на земеделските производители	
Art der Beihilfe	Regelung	
Ziel	Behebung einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben eines Mitgliedstaats	
Form der Beihilfe	Zuschuss	
Haushaltsmittel	Haushaltsmittel insgesamt: 16 000 000 BGN	
Beihilfehöchstintensität		
Laufzeit	bis zum 30.6.2024	
Wirtschaftssektoren	Landwirtschaft, Jagd und damit verbundene Tätigkeiten	
Name und Anschrift der Bewilligungsbehörde	Държавен фонд „Земеделие“ гр. София 1618, „Цар Борис III“ 136	
Sonstige Angaben		

Die rechtsverbindliche(n) Sprachfassung(en) der Entscheidung, aus der/denen alle vertraulichen Angaben gestrichen sind,
finden Sie unter:

<https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search?caseInstrument=SA>



C/2024/3091

3.5.2024

**Vorherige Anmeldung eines Zusammenschlusses
(Sache M.11537 – Enbridge / MPLX / ISQ / WPC)
Für das vereinfachte Verfahren infrage kommender Fall**

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3091)

1. Am 23. April 2024 ist die Anmeldung eines geplanten Zusammenschlusses nach Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ⁽¹⁾ bei der Kommission eingegangen.

Diese Anmeldung betrifft folgende Unternehmen:

- Enbridge Inc. („Enbridge“, Kanada),
- MPLX Delaware Basin LLC („MPLX“, Vereinigte Staaten), kontrolliert von Marathon Petroleum Corporation (Vereinigte Staaten),
- I Squared Capital Advisors (US), LLC („ISQ“, USA),
- WPC Parent, LLC („WPC“, Vereinigte Staaten).

Enbridge, MPLX und ISQ werden im Sinne des Artikels 3 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b und Absatz 4 der Fusionskontrollverordnung die gemeinsame Kontrolle über WPC übernehmen.

Der Zusammenschluss erfolgt durch Erwerb von Anteilen an einem neu gegründeten Gemeinschaftsunternehmen.

2. Die beteiligten Unternehmen sind in folgenden Geschäftsbereichen tätig:

- Enbridge ist ein Infrastrukturunternehmen im Bereich Energie, das in erster Linie in den Sektoren Transport, Speicherung und Vertrieb von Rohöl und Erdgas in Nordamerika sowie im Bereich der erneuerbaren Energien in Nordamerika und Europa tätig ist.
- MPLX ist Eigentümer und Betreiber von Energieinfrastrukturen und Logistik-Vermögenswerten im Midstream-Bereich und erbringt Dienstleistungen im Kraftstoffvertrieb.
- ISQ ist eine Private-Equity-Gesellschaft mit Schwerpunkt auf Energie, Versorgungsunternehmen, Telekommunikation, Gesundheitsversorgung und Verkehr in Nordamerika, Europa sowie in anderen Volkswirtschaften der Welt.

3. WPC wird Eigentümer bestimmter Erdgasfernleitungen und anderer Vermögenswerte in Texas, Vereinigte Staaten, und wird auf den Märkten für die Fernleitung und Speicherung von Erdgas in Texas, Vereinigte Staaten, tätig sein.

4. Die Kommission hat nach vorläufiger Prüfung festgestellt, dass das angemeldete Rechtsgeschäft unter die Fusionskontrollverordnung fallen könnte. Die endgültige Entscheidung zu diesem Punkt behält sie sich vor.

Dieser Fall kommt für das vereinfachte Verfahren im Sinne der Bekanntmachung der Kommission über die vereinfachte Behandlung bestimmter Zusammenschlüsse gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates über die Kontrolle von Unternehmenszusammenschlüssen ⁽²⁾ infrage.

5. Alle betroffenen Dritten können bei der Kommission zu diesem Vorhaben Stellung nehmen.

Die Stellungnahmen müssen bei der Kommission spätestens 10 Tage nach dieser Veröffentlichung eingehen. Dabei ist stets folgendes Aktenzeichen anzugeben:

M.11537 – Enbridge / MPLX / ISQ / WPC

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1 („Fusionskontrollverordnung“).

⁽²⁾ ABl. C 160 vom 5.5.2023, S. 1.

Die Stellungnahmen können der Kommission per E-Mail oder Post übermittelt werden, wobei folgende Kontaktangaben zu verwenden sind:

E-Mail: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Postanschrift:

Europäische Kommission
Generaldirektion Wettbewerb
Registratur Fusionskontrolle
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË



C/2024/3092

3.5.2024

Vorherige Anmeldung eines Zusammenschlusses
(Sache M.11213 – BP / EQUINOR / NET ZERO NORTH SEA STORAGE JV)
Für das vereinfachte Verfahren infrage kommender Fall

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3092)

1. Am 16. April 2024 ist die Anmeldung eines geplanten Zusammenschlusses nach Artikel 4 der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ⁽¹⁾ bei der Kommission eingegangen.

Diese Anmeldung betrifft folgende Unternehmen:

- BP CCUS UK NEP Limited („BP CCUS“, Vereinigtes Königreich), kontrolliert von BP p.l.c. („bp“, Vereinigtes Königreich), und
- Equinor Low Carbon UK Limited („Equinor Low Carbon“, Vereinigtes Königreich), kontrolliert von Equinor ASA („Equinor“, Norwegen).

BP CCUS und Equinor Low Carbon werden im Sinne des Artikels 3 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b und Absatz 4 der Fusionskontrollverordnung die gemeinsame Kontrolle über Net Zero North Sea Storage Limited („NZNSS“, Vereinigtes Königreich) übernehmen, das derzeit vollständig im Eigentum von BP CCUS steht.

Der Zusammenschluss erfolgt durch Erwerb von Anteilen an Net Zero North Sea Storage Holdings Limited („Holdco“), einem für den Zweck des Erwerbs aller Kapitalanteile an NZNSS neu gegründeten Unternehmen.

2. Die beteiligten Unternehmen sind in folgenden Geschäftsbereichen tätig:

- BP CCUS ist eine Tochtergesellschaft von bp, einem weltweiten Konzern, der in der Versorgung mit Erdöl, Erdgas, Erdöl und petrochemischen Erzeugnissen sowie alternativen Energieträgern tätig ist.
- Equinor Low Carbon ist eine Tochtergesellschaft von Equinor, einem internationalen Unternehmen, das in der gesamten Kohlenwasserstoff-Wertschöpfungskette sowie im Bereich anderer Energieformen, einschließlich erneuerbarer Energien und CO₂-armer Lösungen, tätig ist.

3. Die Geschäftstätigkeit von NZNSS wird in der Entwicklung, dem Bau, der Finanzierung und dem Betrieb eines Transport- und Speichersystems für die Beförderung und dauerhafte Speicherung von CO₂ bestehen, das von CO₂-Emittenten in den Industrieregionen Teesside und Humber im Nordosten des Vereinigten Königreichs erzeugt wird.

4. Die Kommission hat nach vorläufiger Prüfung festgestellt, dass das angemeldete Rechtsgeschäft unter die Fusionskontrollverordnung fallen könnte. Die endgültige Entscheidung zu diesem Punkt behält sie sich vor.

Dieser Fall kommt für das vereinfachte Verfahren im Sinne der Bekanntmachung der Kommission über die vereinfachte Behandlung bestimmter Zusammenschlüsse gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates über die Kontrolle von Unternehmenszusammenschlüssen ⁽²⁾ infrage.

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1 („Fusionskontrollverordnung“).

⁽²⁾ ABl. C 160 vom 5.5.2023, S. 1.

5. Alle betroffenen Dritten können bei der Kommission zu diesem Vorhaben Stellung nehmen.

Die Stellungnahmen müssen bei der Kommission spätestens 10 Tage nach dieser Veröffentlichung eingehen. Dabei ist stets folgendes Aktenzeichen anzugeben:

M.11213 – BP / EQUINOR / NET ZERO NORTH SEA STORAGE JV

Die Stellungnahmen können der Kommission per E-Mail oder Post übermittelt werden, wobei folgende Kontaktangaben zu verwenden sind:

E-Mail: COMP-MERGER-REGISTRY@ec.europa.eu

Postanschrift:

Europäische Kommission
Generaldirektion Wettbewerb
Registratur Fusionskontrolle
1049 Bruxelles/Brussel
BELGIQUE/BELGIË



C/2024/3096

3.5.2024

Keine Einwände gegen einen angemeldeten Zusammenschluss

(Sache M.11326 — MSC / GIP III / ITALO)

(Text von Bedeutung für den EWR)

(C/2024/3096)

Am 27. Februar 2024 hat die Kommission nach Artikel 6 Absatz 1 Buchstabe b der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 139/2004 des Rates ⁽¹⁾ entschieden, keine Einwände gegen den oben genannten angemeldeten Zusammenschluss zu erheben und ihn für mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar zu erklären. Der vollständige Wortlaut der Entscheidung ist nur auf Englisch verfügbar und wird in einer um etwaige Geschäftsgeheimnisse bereinigten Fassung auf den folgenden EU-Websites veröffentlicht:

- der Website der GD Wettbewerb zur Fusionskontrolle (<https://competition-cases.ec.europa.eu/search>). Auf dieser Website können Fusionsentscheidungen anhand verschiedener Angaben wie Unternehmensname, Nummer der Sache, Datum der Entscheidung oder Wirtschaftszweig abgerufen werden,
- der Website EUR-Lex (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html?locale=de>). Hier kann diese Entscheidung anhand der Celex-Nummer 32024M11326 abgerufen werden. EUR-Lex ist das Internetportal zum Gemeinschaftsrecht.

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 24 vom 29.1.2004, S. 1.



C/2024/3107

3.5.2024

Mitteilung der Kommission über die Anwendung des Regionalen Übereinkommens über Pan-Europa-Mittelmeer-Präferenzursprungsregeln bzw. der Ursprungsprotokolle zur diagonalen Kumulierung zwischen den Vertragsparteien dieses Übereinkommens

(C/2024/3107)

Zur Anwendung der diagonalen Ursprungskumulierung zwischen den Vertragsparteien des Regionalen Übereinkommens über Pan-Europa-Mittelmeer-Präferenzursprungsregeln⁽¹⁾ (im Folgenden „Übereinkommen“) teilen die betreffenden Parteien einander über die Europäische Kommission die mit den anderen Parteien vereinbarten Ursprungsregeln mit.

Es sei daran erinnert, dass die diagonale Kumulierung nur zulässig ist, wenn die Partei der Endfertigung und die Partei der Endbestimmung mit allen am Erwerb der Ursprungsseigenschaft beteiligten Parteien, d. h. mit den Parteien, in denen die verwendeten Vormaterialien ihren Ursprung haben, Freihandelsabkommen mit denselben Ursprungsregeln geschlossen haben. Vormaterialien mit Ursprung in einer Partei, die kein Abkommen mit der Partei der Endfertigung und/oder der Partei der Endbestimmung geschlossen hat, sind als Vormaterialien ohne Ursprungsseigenschaft zu behandeln. Konkrete Beispiele hierfür werden in den Erläuterungen zu den Ursprungsprotokollen Pan-Europa-Mittelmeer gegeben⁽²⁾.

Auf der Grundlage der von den Parteien gemachten Mitteilungen an die Europäische Kommission enthalten die beigefügten Tabellen folgende Angaben:

Tabelle 1 – Vereinfachte Übersicht über die Kumulierungsmöglichkeiten

Tabellen 2 und 3 – Datum der Anwendung der diagonalen Kumulierung.

In Tabelle 1 markiert ein „X“ ein zwischen zwei Parteien bestehendes Freihandelsabkommen mit Ursprungsregeln, die eine Kumulierung nach dem Muster der Pan-Europa-Mittelmeer-Ursprungsregeln vorsehen. Um eine diagonale Kumulierung mit einem dritten Partner anwenden zu können, müssen alle Felder der Tabelle zwischen den drei Partnern mit einem „X“ markiert sein. Bei der diagonalen Kumulierung gibt es jedoch einige Ausnahmen. In diesen Fällen verweist eine (1), eine (2) oder ein (*) neben dem „X“ auf die jeweilige Ausnahme.

Die in Tabelle 2 aufgeführten Daten beziehen sich auf:

- den Beginn der Anwendung der diagonalen Kumulierung auf der Grundlage der Anlage I Artikel 3 zum Übereinkommen, wenn sich das betreffende Freihandelsabkommen auf das Übereinkommen bezieht. In diesem Fall steht vor dem Datum ein „(C)“;
- den Beginn der Anwendung der Ursprungsprotokolle zur diagonalen Kumulierung, die dem betreffenden Freihandelsabkommen beigefügt sind (in den übrigen Fällen);
- den Beginn der Anwendung der diagonalen Kumulierung auf der Grundlage der Anlage I Artikel 7 zum Übereinkommen in der durch den Beschluss Nr. 1/2023 des Gemischten Ausschusses des Übereinkommens vom 7. Dezember 2023⁽³⁾ geänderten Fassung. In diesem Fall steht vor dem Datum ein „(R)“.

Die Datumsangaben in Tabelle 3 beziehen sich auf das Datum der Anwendung der den Freihandelsabkommen zwischen der EU, der Türkei und den Teilnehmern des Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozesses der EU beigefügten Protokolle zu den Ursprungsregeln, die eine diagonale Kumulierung vorsehen. Sobald in ein Freihandelsabkommen zwischen in dieser Tabelle aufgeführten Parteien ein Verweis auf das Übereinkommen aufgenommen wird, ist in Tabelle 2 eine Datumsangabe eingesetzt worden, der ein „(C)“ beziehungsweise ein „(R)“ vorangestellt ist.

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L 54 vom 26.2.2013, S. 4.

⁽²⁾ ABl. C 83 vom 17.4.2007, S. 1.

⁽³⁾ ABl. L, 2024/390, 19.2.2024, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec/2024/390/oj>

Unter die Zollunion zwischen der EU und der Türkei fallende Vormaterialien mit Ursprung in der Türkei können als Vormaterialien mit Ursprungseigenschaft zum Zweck der diagonalen Kumulierung zwischen der Europäischen Union und den an dem Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozess beteiligten Ländern, mit denen Ursprungsprotokolle gelten, behandelt werden.

Für die in der Tabelle genannten Vertragsparteien gelten folgende Codes:

— Europäische Union	EU
— EFTA-Länder:	
— Island	IS
— Schweiz (einschließlich Liechtenstein) ⁽⁴⁾	CH (+ LI)
— Norwegen	NO
— Färöer	FO
— Die Teilnehmer am Barcelona-Prozess:	
— Algerien	DZ
— Ägypten	EG
— Israel	IL
— Jordanien	JO
— Libanon	LB
— Marokko	MA
— Palästina *	PS
— Syrien	SY
— Tunesien	TN
— Türkei	TR
— Die am Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozess der EU teilnehmenden Staaten:	
— Albanien	AL
— Bosnien und Herzegowina	BA
— Nordmazedonien	MK
— Montenegro	ME
— Serbien	RS
— Kosovo **	KO
— die Republik Moldau	MD
— Georgien	GE
— Ukraine	UA

Diese Mitteilung tritt an die Stelle der im Amtsblatt ABl. C, 2024/1623 vom 22.2.2024 veröffentlichten Mitteilung.

⁽⁴⁾ Die Schweiz und das Fürstentum Liechtenstein bilden eine Zollunion.

* Diese Bezeichnung ist nicht als Anerkennung eines Staates Palästina auszulegen und lässt die Standpunkte der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten zu dieser Frage unberührt.

** Diese Bezeichnung berührt nicht die Standpunkte zum Status und steht im Einklang mit der Resolution 1244/99 des VN-Sicherheitsrates und dem Gutachten des Internationalen Gerichtshofs zur Unabhängigkeitserklärung des Kosovo.

Tabelle 1

Vereinfachte Übersicht über die Möglichkeiten der diagonalen Kumulierung in der Pan-Europa-Mittelmeer-Zone

		EFTA-Länder				Teilnehmer am Barcelona-Prozess											Teilnehmer am Stabilisierungs- und Assoziierungsprozess der EU								
	EU	CH (+ LI)	IS	NO	FO	DZ	EG	IL	JO	LB	MA	PS	SY	TN	TR	AL	BA	KO	ME	MK	RS	MD	GE	UA	
EU		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X (¹)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
CH (+LI)	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
IS	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
NO	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
FO	X	X	X	X											X										
DZ	X																								
EG	X	X	X	X					X		X			X	X										
IL	X	X	X	X					X						X										
JO	X	X	X	X			X	X			X			X											
LB		X	X	X																					
MA	X	X	X	X			X		X					X	X										
PS	X	X	X	X											X										
SY															X										
TN	X	X	X	X			X		X		X				X										
TR	X (¹)	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X		X (*)	X (*)	(*)	X (*)	X (*)	X (*)	X	X (²)		
AL	X	X	X	X											X (*)		X	X	X	X	X	X			
BA	X	X	X	X											X (*)	X		X	X	X	X	X			
KO	X														(*)	X	X		X	X	X	X			
ME	X	X	X	X											X (*)	X	X	X		X	X	X			
MK	X	X	X	X											X (*)	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	
RS	X	X	X	X											X (*)	X	X	X	X	X		X			
MD	X														X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	
GE	X	X	X	X											X (²)									X	
UA	X	X	X	X																X		X	X		

- (¹) Für Waren, die unter die Zollunion EU-Türkei fallen, ist das Anfangsdatum der 27. Juli 2006.
Für landwirtschaftliche Erzeugnisse ist das Anfangsdatum der 1. Januar 2007 (keine Kumulierung mit MD und GE).
Für Kohle und Stahlerzeugnisse ist das Anfangsdatum der 1. März 2009 (keine Kumulierung mit MD und GE).
- (²) Für die Erzeugnisse
- gemäß den Kapiteln 1 bis 24 des Harmonisierten Systems zur Bezeichnung und Codierung der Waren und
 - für die unter Anhang 1 des Freihandelsabkommens zwischen der Republik Türkei und Georgien fallenden Erzeugnisse kann die Ursprungskumulierung nur bei Ursprung in der Republik Türkei und Georgien angewandt werden.

Beginn der Anwendung der Ursprungsregeln zur diagonalen Kumulierung in der Paneuropa-Mittelmeer-Zone

	NO	IS	CH (+LI)	EU			EFTA-Länder		
	1.1.2006 (C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.1.2006 (C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.1.2006 (C) 1.2. 2016 (R) 1.1.2025		EU				
	1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025	1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025		1.1.2006 (C) 1.2.2016 (R) 1.1.2025			CH(+LI)		
	1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025		1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025	1.1.2006 (C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025			IS		
		1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025	1.8.2005 (C) 1.7.2013 (R) 1.1.2025	1.1.2006 (C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025			NO		
	1.1.2.2005	1.1.2005	1.1.2006	1.1.2.2005 (C) 12.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025			FO		
						DZ			
	1.8.2007	1.8.2007	1.8.2007	1.3.2006 (C) 1.2.2016		EG			
	1.7.2005	1.7.2005	1.7.2005	1.1.2006		IL			
	17.7.2007	17.7.2007	17.7.2007	1.7.2006 (C) 1.9.2021 (R) 1.1.2025		JO			
	1.1.2007	1.1.2007	1.1.2007			LB			
	1.3.2005	1.3.2005	1.3.2005	1.1.2.2005		MA			
	1.5.2016	1.5.2016	1.5.2016	1.7.2009 (C) 1.3.2016 (R) 1.1.2025		PS			
						SY			
	1.8.2005	1.3.2006	1.6.2005	1.8.2006		TN			
	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019	(ⁱ)		TR			
	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025		AL			
	(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 9.12.2016 (R) 1.1.2025		BA			
				(C) 1.4.2016 (R) 1.1.2025		KO			
	(C) 1.11.2012 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.10.2012 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.9.2012 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025		ME			
	1.5.2015 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	1.5.2015 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	1.2.2016 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025		MK			
	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025		RS			
				(C) 1.12.2016 (R) 1.1.2025		MD			
	(C) 1.9.2017 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.9.2017 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2018 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.6.2018 (R) 1.1.2025		GE			
	1.6.2012	1.6.2012	1.6.2012	(C) 1.1.2019 (R) 1.1.2025		UA			

[illegible]

MD	RS	MK	ME	KO	BA	AL	TR
(C) 1.12.2016 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2016 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 9.12.2016 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(I)
	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.2.2016 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.9.2012 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019
	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.5.2015 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.10.2012 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019
	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.5.2015 (C) 1.4.2022 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.11.2012 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.1.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.5.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	1.9.2007 (C) 1.12.2019
							(C) 1.10.2017
							1.3.2007
							1.3.2006
							1.1.2006
							(C) 26.3.2021
							1.1.2007
							1.7.2005
(C) 1.10.2017	(C) 1.6.2019	(C) 1.8.2018	(C) 1.6.2021	1.9.2019	(C) 1.8.2021	(C) 3.5.2021	
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 3.5.2021
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.8.2021
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	1.9.2019
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.6.2021
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.8.2018
(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.2.2015 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.6.2019
	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.4.2014 (R) 1.1.2025	(C) 1.10.2017
							(C) 29.4.2021
(C) 24.5.2023 (R) 1.1.2025		(C) 6.7.2023 (R) 1.1.2025					

(¹) Für Waren, die unter die Zollunion EU-Türkei fallen, ist das Anfangsdatum der 27. Juli 2006.
Für landwirtschaftliche Erzeugnisse ist das Anfangsdatum der 1. Januar 2007.
Für Kohle und Stahlerzeugnisse ist das Anfangsdatum der 1. März 2009.

Beginn der Anwendung der Protokolle zu den Ursprungsregeln, die eine diagonale Kumulierung zwischen der Europäischen Union, Albanien, Bosnien und Herzegowina, dem Kosovo, Montenegro, Nordmazedonien, Serbien und der Türkei vorsehen

⁽¹⁾ Für Waren, die unter die Zollunion EU-Türkei fallen, ist das Anfangsdatum der 27. Juli 2006. Gilt nicht für landwirtschaftliche Erzeugnisse und für Kohle und Stahlerzeugnisse.

ANHANG

Bekanntmachung betreffend elektronische ausgestellte Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen EUR.1 und EUR-MED gemäß Absatz 1 Buchstabe d der Empfehlung Nr. 1/2023 des Gemischten Ausschusses des Übereinkommens ⁽¹⁾**Norwegen**

System: Altinn – Regierungsportal für den digitalen Dialog zwischen Unternehmen, Bürgern und Behörden

Beginn: 2.4.2020

Link zur Überprüfung der Echtheit der Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen: <https://eur1.toll.no>

Türkei

System: MEDOS – Automatisiertes System für Ursprungszeugnisse und Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen

Beginn: 24.4.2018

Einheitlicher Link für alle Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen, beginnt mit <https://mdc.gtb.gov.tr> oder <https://uygula.ma.gtb.gov.tr> (Zugang durch Scannen des QR-Codes oder Eingabe des Pfads auf der Bescheinigung)

Marokko

Beginn: 12.1.2021

Link zur Überprüfung der Echtheit der Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen: <http://www2.douane.gov.ma/certificate/>

Israel

System: Global Gate

Beginn: 1.4.2024

Link zur Überprüfung der Echtheit der Warenverkehrsbescheinigungen:

<https://shaarolami-query.customs.mof.gov.il/CustomsPilotWeb/CertificateOfOrigin>

⁽¹⁾ ABl. L, 2024/243, 15.1.2024, ELI: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reco/2024/243/oj>



C/2024/3113

2.5.2024

MITTEILUNG DER KOMMISSION

Zweite Änderung des Befristeten Rahmens für staatliche Beihilfen zur Stützung der Wirtschaft infolge des Angriffs Russlands auf die Ukraine – Krisenbewältigung und Gestaltung des Wandels

(C/2024/3113)

1. Einführung

1. Am 9. März 2023 nahm die Kommission ihre Mitteilung über den Befristeten Rahmen für staatliche Beihilfen zur Stützung der Wirtschaft infolge des Angriffs Russlands auf die Ukraine – Krisenbewältigung und Gestaltung des Wandels (im Folgenden „Befristeter Rahmen zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels“) ⁽¹⁾ an.
2. Im Befristeten Rahmen zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels legte die Kommission ihre Auffassung dar, dass der Angriff Russlands auf die Ukraine und seine unmittelbaren und mittelbaren Auswirkungen einschließlich der daraufhin verhängten Sanktionen sowie der beispielsweise durch Russland ergriffenen Gegenmaßnahmen (im Folgenden die „derzeitige Krise“) zu erheblichen wirtschaftlichen Unsicherheiten, zur Störung von Handelsströmen und Lieferketten und zu außergewöhnlich großen und unerwarteten Preisanstiegen geführt hatten, insbesondere bei Erdgas und Strom, aber auch bei zahlreichen anderen Inputs, Rohstoffen und Primärgütern. Diese Auswirkungen hatten zusammengekommen zu einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben aller Mitgliedstaaten geführt, von der eine Vielzahl von Wirtschaftszweigen betroffen waren. Vor diesem Hintergrund hielt die Kommission es für angemessen, Kriterien für die Würdigung staatlicher Beihilfemaßnahmen festzulegen, die die Mitgliedstaaten auflegen können, um diese beträchtliche Störung durch im Befristeten Rahmen zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels beschriebene außerordentliche Maßnahmen zu beheben.
3. Am 20. November 2023 beschloss die Kommission, dass es nunmehr grundsätzlich möglich wäre, die auf Artikel 107 Absatz 3 Buchstabe b AEUV basierenden außerordentlichen Maßnahmen zur Behebung einer beträchtlichen Störung, die im Befristeten Rahmen zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels festgelegt sind, auslaufen zu lassen, zumal mit diesen außerordentlichen Maßnahmen eine Gefahr von Verzerrungen einherging. ⁽²⁾ Konkret beschloss die Kommission insbesondere, i) die Abschnitte 2.2, 2.3 und 2.7 des Befristeten Rahmens zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels wie geplant zum 31. Dezember 2023 auslaufen zu lassen, ii) das Auslaufen der Abschnitte 2.1 und 2.4 des Befristeten Rahmens zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels jedoch auf den 30. Juni 2024 zu verschieben. Die Kommission erkannte jedoch an, dass die derzeitige Krise für bestimmte Märkte weiterhin zu Risiken und Unsicherheiten führt. Mit der Verschiebung des Auslaufens der genannten Abschnitte gab die Kommission den Mitgliedstaaten die Möglichkeit, Unterstützungsmaßnahmen als Schutzvorkehrungen aufrechtzuerhalten, und räumte ihnen mehr Zeit für die verwaltungstechnische Umsetzung der erforderlichen Maßnahmen ein.
4. Bei der Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom 21. und 22. März 2024 hoben die Mitgliedstaaten die anhaltenden Auswirkungen der derzeitigen Krise und die Herausforderungen, mit denen der Agrarsektor konfrontiert ist, hervor. Die Kommission führte weitere Konsultationen mit den Mitgliedstaaten durch, insbesondere in Form einer am 27. März 2024 eingeleiteten Umfrage und einer Sitzung am 15. April 2024. Die Mitgliedstaaten wurden ferner um schriftliche Stellungnahme ersucht. Die Kommission hat alle eingegangenen Antworten bei ihren Überlegungen berücksichtigt.

⁽¹⁾ Mitteilung der Kommission – Befristeter Rahmen für staatliche Beihilfen zur Stützung der Wirtschaft infolge des Angriffs Russlands auf die Ukraine – Krisenbewältigung und Gestaltung des Wandels (ABl. C 101 vom 17.3.2023, S. 3).

⁽²⁾ Mitteilung der Kommission – Änderung des Befristeten Rahmens für staatliche Beihilfen zur Stützung der Wirtschaft infolge des Angriffs Russlands auf die Ukraine – Krisenbewältigung und Gestaltung des Wandels (ABl. C, 2023/1188, 21. November 2023).

5. Wenngleich die wirtschaftliche Störung in allen Mitgliedstaaten eine weitreichende Beeinträchtigung des Wirtschaftslebens bewirkt, geht die Kommission davon aus, dass die Durchführung bestimmter Maßnahmen zur wirksamen Behebung der Beeinträchtigungen insbesondere in der Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse sowie im Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor mehr Zeit erfordern könnte. In diesen spezifischen Sektoren, die durch einen besonders hohen Anteil kleiner Unternehmen gekennzeichnet sind, werden die erforderlichen Anpassungen zur wirksamen Überwindung der derzeitigen Krise mehr Zeit in Anspruch nehmen. Darüber hinaus sind insbesondere in Bezug auf die Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse und in gewissem Maße auch in Bezug auf die Aquakultur bestimmte sektorspezifische Merkmale zu berücksichtigen, so die Abhängigkeit von den jährlichen Wachstumsperioden und Erntezyklen sowie die Notwendigkeit, Inputs wie Düngemittel in einer Zeit besonders hoher Preise zu erwerben, während die damit produzierten Erzeugnisse zu den unter Druck geratenen derzeitigen Preisen verkauft werden müssen. Dies rechtfertigt eine Ausnahme in Form eines längeren Durchführungszeitraums für diese Sektoren.
6. Auf dieser Grundlage ist die Kommission der Auffassung, dass die bestehenden Unterstützungsmaßnahmen es den Mitgliedstaaten zwar im Allgemeinen ermöglichen, den verbleibenden Unsicherheiten zu begegnen, dass aber im Agrar-, Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor nach wie vor Anfälligkeiten bestehen und diese Sektoren ganz besonders darauf angewiesen sind, dass mehr Zeit für die Durchführung wirksamer Unterstützungsmaßnahmen eingeräumt wird.
7. Vor diesem Hintergrund hat die Kommission beschlossen, das Auslaufen des Abschnitts 2.1 des Befristeten Rahmens zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels in Bezug auf Beihilfen für Unternehmen, die in der Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse oder im Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor tätig sind, auf den 31. Dezember 2024 zu verschieben. Angesichts der besonderen Herausforderungen, mit denen diese Unternehmen konfrontiert sind, ist die Kommission der Ansicht, dass sie als von der derzeitigen Krise betroffene Unternehmen im Sinne von Randnummer 61 Buchstabe d des Befristeten Rahmens zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels angesehen werden können, ohne dass die Mitgliedstaaten dies eigens nachweisen müssen.
8. Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass die Abschnitte des Befristeten Rahmens zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels, mit denen der Übergang zu einer klimaneutralen Wirtschaft unterstützt werden soll (d. h. die Abschnitte 2.5, 2.6 und 2.8), die sich auf Artikel 107 Absatz 3 Buchstabe c AEUV stützen, nicht überprüft werden müssen, da sie bis zum 31. Dezember 2025 gelten. Diese Abschnitte werden daher von dieser Änderung nicht berührt.

2. Änderungen am Befristeten Rahmen zur Krisenbewältigung und zur Gestaltung des Wandels

9. Randnummer 55 erhält folgende Fassung:

„(55) Die Kommission ist der Auffassung, dass der Angriff Russlands auf die Ukraine und seine unmittelbaren und mittelbaren Auswirkungen, einschließlich der daraufhin verhängten Sanktionen sowie der beispielsweise durch Russland ergriffenen Gegenmaßnahmen, zu erheblichen wirtschaftlichen Unsicherheiten, zur Störung von Handelsströmen und Lieferketten und zu außergewöhnlich großen und unerwarteten Preisanstiegen geführt haben, insbesondere bei Erdgas und Strom, aber auch bei zahlreichen anderen Inputs, Rohstoffen und Primärgütern. Diese Auswirkungen haben zusammengekommen zu einer beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben aller Mitgliedstaaten geführt. Störungen der Lieferketten und erhöhte Unsicherheit haben direkte und indirekte Auswirkungen auf viele Bereiche. Darüber hinaus wirkt sich der Anstieg der Energiepreise auf praktisch alle Wirtschaftstätigkeiten in allen Mitgliedstaaten aus. Die Kommission ist daher der Auffassung, dass ein breites Spektrum von Wirtschaftszweigen in allen Mitgliedstaaten von einer beträchtlichen wirtschaftlichen Störung betroffen ist. Vor diesem Hintergrund hält die Kommission es für angemessen, die Kriterien für die Würdigung staatlicher Beihilfemaßnahmen festzulegen, die die Mitgliedstaaten auflegen können, um diese beträchtliche Störung zu beheben.“

10. Randnummer 56 erhält folgende Fassung:

„(56) Staatliche Beihilfen sind insbesondere dann gerechtfertigt und können auf der Grundlage des Artikels 107 Absatz 3 Buchstabe b AEUV befristet für mit dem Binnenmarkt vereinbar erklärt werden, wenn sie dazu dienen, die Liquiditätsengpässe von Unternehmen zu beheben, die direkt oder indirekt von der beträchtlichen Störung im Wirtschaftsleben betroffen sind, die infolge des militärischen Angriffs Russlands auf die Ukraine und seiner unmittelbaren und mittelbaren Auswirkungen, einschließlich der verhängten Sanktionen oder der beispielsweise von Russland getroffenen wirtschaftlichen Gegenmaßnahmen eingetreten ist. Wenngleich die wirtschaftliche Störung in allen Mitgliedstaaten eine weitreichende Beeinträchtigung des Wirtschaftslebens bewirkt, stellt die Kommission in diesem Zusammenhang fest, dass die Durchführung bestimmter Maßnahmen zur wirksamen Behebung dieser Beeinträchtigungen insbesondere in der Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse sowie im Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor mehr Zeit erfordern könnte. In diesen spezifischen Sektoren, die durch einen besonders hohen Anteil kleiner Unternehmen gekennzeichnet sind, werden die erforderlichen Anpassungen zur wirksamen Überwindung der derzeitigen Krise mehr Zeit in Anspruch nehmen. Darüber hinaus sind insbesondere in Bezug auf die Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse und in gewissen Maße auch in Bezug auf die Aquakultur bestimmte sektorspezifische Merkmale zu berücksichtigen, so die Abhängigkeit von den jährlichen Wachstumsperioden und Erntezyklen sowie die Notwendigkeit, Inputs in einer Zeit besonders hoher Preise zu erwerben, während die damit produzierten Erzeugnisse zu den unter Druck geratenen derzeitigen Preisen verkauft werden müssen. Dies rechtfertigt eine Ausnahme in Form eines längeren Durchführungszeitraums für diese Sektoren.“

11. Randnummer 61 Buchstabe c erhält folgende Fassung:

„c) Die Beihilfe wird spätestens am 30. Juni 2024 gewährt (*); dies gilt mit Ausnahme von Beihilfen für in der Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse oder im Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor tätige Unternehmen, die bis zum 31. Dezember 2024 gewährt werden können;

(*) Wird die Beihilfe in Form eines Steuervorteils gewährt, so muss die Steuerschuld, in Bezug auf die der Vorteil gewährt wird, spätestens am 30. Juni 2024 entstanden sein (bzw. am 31. Dezember 2024 bei Beihilfen für Unternehmen, die in der Primärproduktion landwirtschaftlicher Erzeugnisse oder im Fischerei- und Aquakultursektor tätig sind).“