



VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 11 APRIL 2016

(C/2024/1268)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2016-2017 SESSION

Sittings of 11 to 14 April 2016

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Resumption of the session	3
2. Statements by the President	3
3. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes	4
4. Request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity: see Minutes	4
5. Verification of credentials: see Minutes	4
6. Composition of political groups: see Minutes	4
7. Composition of committees: see Minutes	4
8. Council positions at first reading: see Minutes	4
9. Corrigenda (Rule 231): see Minutes	4
10. Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes	4
11. Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes	4
12. Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes	4

Contents	Page
13. Documents received: see Minutes	4
14. Order of business	4
15. International Roma Day (debate)	6
16. Annual reports 2012-2013 on subsidiarity and proportionality (debate)	12
17. Objection pursuant to Rule 106: renewal of the approval of the active substance glyphosate (debate)	26
18. Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (short presentation)	36
19. Towards improved single market regulation (short presentation)	39
20. Learning EU at school (short presentation)	42
21. Erasmus+ and other tools to foster mobility in vocational education and training (short presentation)	48
22. The EU role in the framework of international financial, monetary and regulatory institutions and bodies (short presentation)	54
23. Small-scale coastal fishing in regions dependent on fishing (short presentation)	57
24. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea: fisheries aspects (short presentation)	63
25. External dimension of the CFP, including fisheries agreements (short presentation)	66
26. One-minute speeches (Rule 163)	70
27. Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes	77
28. Closure of the sitting	77

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 11 APRIL 2016

VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ

Präsident

(Die Sitzung wird um 17.05 Uhr eröffnet.)

1. Resumption of the session

Der Präsident. – Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 10. März 2016, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.

2. Statements by the President

Der Präsident. – Meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der 22. März war ein schwarzer Tag für Belgien, ein schwarzer Tag für Europa. Heimtückische Mörder verübten eine entsetzliche Terrorserie in Brüssel. 32 unschuldige Menschen tot, 340 unschuldige Menschen verletzt, zum Teil sehr schwer – das ist die Bilanz dieser Grausamkeit, eine Bilanz der Unmenschlichkeit.

Die Verbrecher des IS zielten mit ihren Attentaten auf das Herz Europas, auf Brüssel, das den europäischen Institutionen und vielen anderen Organen eine Heimat bietet, auf Brüssel, diese vielsprachige, kosmopolitische und tolerante Stadt, die unsere offene europäische Gesellschaft verkörpert. Vor allem aber zielte die Mörderbande auf die unschuldigen Menschen von Brüssel. Angriffe auf öffentliche Orte wie Flughäfen oder U-Bahnen richten sich gezielt gegen unschuldige Menschen – gegen Männer, gegen Frauen, auch gegen Kinder. Das zynische Kalkül solcher Attentäter ist es, ganz Brüssel, ganz Belgien, ganz Europa in Furcht zu versetzen, damit die Angst und der Hass unsere Herzen erobern.

Deshalb müssen wir besonnen bleiben, nicht jeden Muslim unter Generalverdacht stellen, nicht den Islam mit dem primitiven Islamismus der Mörder gleichsetzen. Deshalb müssen wir im Gedenken an die Opfer als Europäerinnen und Europäer solidarisch gegen diese Angst zusammenstehen, uns nicht anstecken lassen vom Hass der Attentäter, nicht dem Hass mit Hass begegnen, nicht auf Gewalt mit Gewalt antworten, sondern ein wachsendes Misstrauen, eine wachsende Furcht bekämpfen, bekämpfen auch durch Mut und durch Zusammenhalt mit dem Ziel, die Freiheit aller und unsere Demokratie zu verteidigen und die Würde aller Menschen vom Grundsatz zu achten und zu beschützen.

Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, dass Menschen auf der ganzen Welt fast täglich zu Opfern dieser Dschihadisten werden: in Afghanistan, in Pakistan, im Irak, in der Elfenbeinküste, in der Türkei, in Tunesien, in Ägypten, in Syrien, in Somalia, in Nigeria. In all diesen Ländern wurden in den vergangenen Monaten unschuldige Menschen oft zu Hunderten Opfer dieser Terroristen, und es wurde ihnen das Leben genommen. Dabei ist diese Liste nicht einmal vollständig.

Wir dürfen uns nichts vormachen: Dieser Terror ist global. Und übrigens sind die meisten der Opfer dieses Terrors Muslime. Dieser Terror ist eine globale Herausforderung, und wir werden sie nicht durch einzelne nationale Maßnahmen beantworten können. Der Kampf gegen den Terrorismus bedingt, dass wir zusammenstehen – alle – in Europa gemeinsam und in der Welt.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments wünsche ich den Verletzten eine rasche Genesung und drücke unsere volle Solidarität mit den Familien und den Angehörigen der unschuldig ermordeten Menschen aus. Den Opfern und ihren Angehörigen gilt unser tief empfundenes Mitgefühl. Wir werden die Opfer dieses Terrors in Brüssel und andernorts in der Welt nicht vergessen, wir dürfen sie nicht vergessen.

Ich bitte Sie, sich zum Gedenken an die Opfer für eine Schweigeminute zu erheben.

(Das Parlament erhebt sich zu einer Schweigeminute.)

Vielen Dank.

- 3. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes**
- 4. Request for the waiver of parliamentary immunity: see Minutes**
- 5. Verification of credentials: see Minutes**
- 6. Composition of political groups: see Minutes**
- 7. Composition of committees: see Minutes**
- 8. Council positions at first reading: see Minutes**
- 9. Corrigenda (Rule 231): see Minutes**
- 10. Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes**
- 11. Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes**
- 12. Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes**
- 13. Documents received: see Minutes**
- 14. Order of business**

Der Präsident. – Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung dieser Tagung, wie er in der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 7. April 2016 gemäß Artikel 149 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist verteilt worden. Zu diesem Entwurf wurde folgende Änderung beantragt:

Montag:

Die EVP-Fraktion hat beantragt, eine Aussprache über den Einwand gemäß Artikel 106 der Geschäftsordnung zur Verlängerung der Genehmigung des Wirkstoffs Glyphosat nach dem Bericht Karim auf die Tagesordnung zu setzen.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, au nom du groupe du Parti populaire européen, je souhaite demander qu'un débat soit ajouté à l'ordre du jour de ce soir concernant l'objection relative à la substance glyphosate. En effet, ce débat peut se dérouler après celui de notre collègue Karim. Il est important que nous puissions en parler en plénière car c'est un dossier qui préoccupe beaucoup nos concitoyens.

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, en effet, c'est un sujet qui préoccupe beaucoup nos concitoyens, et je pense donc que nous avons tout à gagner à un débat public là-dessus.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Málokdo podporuje debatu o glyfosátu tak jako já. Pořádal jsem k tomu v Parlamentu konferenci, ale ta věc byla dostatečně zevrubně projednána ve výborech, na webstreamu a jiných zasedáních. Nic nového se od sebe už nedovíme, ani veřejnost od nás.

Lhůta pro podání pozměňovacích návrhů končí za hodinu a 40 minut. Noční debata, kde nic nového nezazní, je naprosto nefunkční.

Der Präsident. – Da Sie es wünschen, führen wir eine elektronische Abstimmung durch.

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag an.)

Dienstag: Keine Änderungen.

Mittwoch:

Der Rat hat mir mitgeteilt, dass Malta seinen Kandidaten für den Rechnungshof zurückgezogen hat. Der entsprechende Bericht von Herrn Šoltes wird daher von der Tagesordnung abgesetzt.

Donnerstag: Keine Änderungen.

(Der Arbeitsplan ist somit angenommen.)

Gianni Pittella (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non è un richiamo al regolamento, volevo esprimere un sentimento: il gruppo socialista è scandalizzato per il trattamento riservato in queste ore ai rifugiati che si trovano a Idomeni. È inaccettabile e criminale sparare su persone in cerca di protezione internazionale. Voglio ricordare che FYROM è un paese candidato all'adesione all'Unione europea.

Le chiedo, Presidente, di rivolgere un fermo e deciso appello alle autorità di FYROM perché la smettano con questi atteggiamenti e mi rivolgo anche a Frontex perché assicuri la sicurezza dei rifugiati. Mi dicono, in questi secondi, che l'Austria ha iniziato la costruzione di una barriera a scopo preventivo, sul Brennero, mi ricorda tanto una guerra preventiva di Bush, un disastro.

Manfred Weber (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wenn der Kollege Pittella das Wort ergreift, um ein Statement abzugeben, möchte ich nur darauf hinweisen dürfen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen: Wir alle wollen, dass die Behörden in Europa menschenwürdig mit allen Betroffenen umgehen.

Aber mein Kenntnisstand sagt, dass die griechischen Behörden den Betroffenen Idomeni Plätze angeboten haben, wo sie in Griechenland menschenwürdig untergebracht werden. Und die Flüchtlinge haben diese Plätze nicht akzeptiert.

Deswegen muss auf der gleichen Seite genauso darum gebeten werden, dass auch die Flüchtlinge sich korrekt verhalten und sich an Recht und Gesetz halten.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le président, mon groupe avait demandé une résolution d'urgence sur la situation au Sénégal et la situation de M. Bibo Bourgi.

Je souhaiterais, puisque cela n'a pas été possible, que vous adressiez un message personnel au président Macky Sall, car M. Bibo Bourgi a été reconnu comme étant inapte à subir une incarcération.

Or, au lendemain d'une audience du tribunal d'arbitrage sous l'autorité de la commission des Nations unies pour le commerce international, M. Bibo Bourgi a été incarcéré par les autorités du Sénégal; je souhaiterais donc que vous puissiez adresser un message à ce propos au président Macky Sall.

Der Präsident. – Frau Berès! Ich bin schon von verschiedenen Seiten auf diesen Fall angesprochen worden, ich bin auch schon in Kontakt mit der Botschaft Senegals. Ich werde aber auch mit dem Präsidenten Kontakt aufnehmen.

15. International Roma Day (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zum Internationalen Tag der Roma

(2016/2645(RSP)).

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you on behalf of the Commission for this opportunity to speak today on the occasion of International Roma Day, which we celebrated last Friday. Discrimination against Roma is still widespread across the EU. Anti-Gypsyism, a specific form of racism closely related to deep-rooted negative stereotyping and stigmatisation of Roma, is on the rise. It is linked to the rise of radicalism and extremism in general in the EU.

This trend raises serious concerns. It is crucial to take a strong stand and to do our best to stop these negative phenomena, which are incompatible with the values cherished by the European Union. The Commission has put in place a solid framework of policy, legal and financial instruments which, if implemented properly, should produce results on the ground.

The Commission has stepped up its efforts to ensure the correct implementation of legislation to combat discrimination against Roma. The Commission has also urged Member States to demonstrate greater political will and a long-term vision to combat discrimination and promote the inclusion of Roma people. The inclusion of minorities in education, the labour market and political life is one of the main ingredients of a healthy society.

This year the Commission launched a targeted campaign to effectively tackle stereotypes and prejudices against the Roma, called 'For Roma, with Roma'. It includes training for the media and close collaboration with municipalities in selected Member States. The fight against discrimination against Roma and anti-Gypsyism – including hate speech and hate crime targeting the Roma community – is included in the Commission's annual reporting on the progress made in advancing Roma integration, as well as in the Council recommendations on effective Roma integration measures, the first ever EU legal instruments specifically referring to Roma.

The Commission has welcomed and strongly supported the initiative of the European Parliament to designate 2 August as European Roma Holocaust Memorial Day. The Commission has also encouraged Member States to do the same. It is our duty to acknowledge and remember all those who suffered under the Nazi regime, including Roma. The suffering of Roma in concentration camps is a horrific chapter of human history that is less widely known. The Commission will support the European Parliament in its action to bring the European Parliament resolution to the Council for further discussion.

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Președinte. – În această dezbatere nu se fac intervenții la cerere și nu se acceptă cartonașul albastru.

So no blue cards and no catch the eye in this debate.

György Hölvényi, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, it is my honour and a real privilege to share my hopes regarding the International Roma Day on behalf of my Group, the European People's Party.

Roma affairs have social, human and economic aspects all at once. These affairs are not less important than they have been up to now. Not less important than they were in 2011, when – during the Hungarian Presidency – a project called Roma Strategy was launched. Hungary is proud of having called the attention of the community to those European Roma competitors who should be considered as human resources but often have no chance to prove it.

Youngsters from the Roma population have to face extra difficulties if they want to break out of their cultural or material circumstances, which are ruled by the strict tradition and tight bonds of their community. Even if they manage to overcome these factors, they have to face the discriminating prejudices of society.

The Roma population needs special aid in this effort to be able to overcome these disadvantages and other complexes. Our task is to form the attitude in society to be more respectful and adapting. The European Union's main duty is to create the professional framework through special programmes focusing on this issue. That is why the Roma strategy has called on the Member States to refuse all kinds of segregation, discrimination and racism.

These Roma programmes and invested resources can be refunded only if we take action together with them on the basis of common decisions.

We have to bring together not only Roma but also non-Roma if we want to create sustainable projects. It is of great importance that the culture and history of Roma should be integrated in the education of the youth and that the new generation does not grow up without any knowledge or with false information concerning the 10 million Roma citizens in Europe.

Europe has decided to face what it has missed so far and will pay attention to creating equal opportunities and providing early childhood aid, which is the most important action, even if the results are apparent only much later. This is how targeted school and pre-school programmes started in the Member States, and this was the way to give more and more Roma children the chance to get help from early childhood.

As we open the doors for schools wider and wider, likewise we have to open the gates of the churches as well, so that a receptive and solidarity-based spirit can pervade Roma communities. Let us be proud of Roma intelligence; let us give Roma youngsters the opportunity to obtain degrees, and let us create the circumstances for them to work among us.

In Europe, the unique Hungarian Roma college network serves as a good example to help hundreds of Roma students to get a degree. Among them are doctors, researchers, teachers and artists. We started this work together; let us continue together.

Soraya Post, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Förra året vid den här tiden debatterade vi en resolution om kampen mot och erkännandet av antiziganism samt EU:s erkännande av förintelse av romer under andra världskriget. Parlamentet antog resolutionen med en väldigt bred majoritet. Med den resolutionen har parlamentet tydligt visat vägen hur vi ska arbeta för att romer ska kunna få åtnjuta lika rättigheter inom EU – kort sagt för att romer ska behandlas som människor.

Antiziganismen är en skam för Europa. I debatten med rådet och kommissionen var alla överens om att antiziganismen ska bekämpas med alla medel. I dag är det dags att börja diskutera hur det ska gå till. Det räcker inte med sociala åtgärder. Vi måste föra kampen mot denna särskilda form av rasism. Alltså behöver vi arbeta mot *mainstream*-samhället.

Parlamentet har ställt två muntliga frågor som ligger till grund för denna debatt. De handlar om vad kommissionen och rådet ska göra för att medlemsländerna ska vidta konkreta och effektiva åtgärder för att motverka denna särskilda form av rasism, antiziganism. Rådet och medlemsstaterna måste sätta upp ambitiösa och konkreta mål för sitt arbete som kommissionen kan utvärdera. Annars kommer ingenting att hända. Kommissionen måste inrätta en hög representant mot rasism som ser till att arbetet mot all sorts rasism är prioriterat i medlemsländerna, särskilt eftersom vi i dag ser hur rasismen och rasister kommer in i våra parlament.

Slutligen har jag en konkret fråga till rådet. När kommer ni att bekräfta inrättandet av den 2 augusti som den europeiska minnesdagen för romernas förintelse? Jag tänker att parlamentet har gjort sitt, och nu måste även ni göra ert.

Förra veckan firade vi internationella romska dagen hela veckan, romaveckan, med bred majoritet, brett deltagande av de olika politiska grupperna. Vi hade partiledardebatt, vi hade utställningar, vi hade olika seminarier för att bara konstatera att trots nationella strategier så fungerar inte inkluderingen av romerna. Vi måste vända på pannkakan lite, vi måste också arbeta emot majoritetssamhället. Det finns nämligen en förändring av attityder. Politiker och folk på bussen uttrycker sig utan skam negativt gentemot romerna runtom i Europa.

Jag var i Berlin den 8 april. Jag hade flera olika möten med olika deltagare. Jag såg på filmer. I minst ett tusental läger runtom i Europa bosätter sig romer utan tillgång till el, utan tillgång till vatten, utan tillgång till skolor för barnen, utan någon som helst tillgång till sjukvård. Situationen är katastrofal. Om inte vi agerar nu så kommer Europa att få stå med väldigt lång näsa och ta emot mycket skam från övriga världen. Det är inte acceptabelt att vi i ett modernt demokratiskt samhälle ska fortsätta att ha 10–12 miljoner människor som lever under fattigdomsgränsen. Det är en stor skam. Vi måste agera nu, vi kan inte vänta. De högerextrema krafterna utnyttjar denna grupp till max och vinner faktiskt väljare på grund av att vi etablerade politiska partier inte tar tag i frågan så som vi bör.

Vi från den socialdemokratiska gruppen har satt upp ett program. Vi har positionerat oss. Vi kommer inte att acceptera detta. Jag vill också passa på nu att tacka de politiska gruppledarna som deltog i debatten. Alla var där förutom från ALDE-gruppen som hade någon form av förhinder. Övriga partier visade dock tydligt och klart att de står upp för att se till så att den romska frågan finns på den politiska agendan, trots alla andra svåra utmaningar som vi står inför. Så nu skulle jag vilja att kommissionen tar tag i denna fråga på allvar. Det är inte acceptabelt 2016 att vi går in i nästa år utan att ha gjort någonting. Nu måste det göras någonting. Detta är inte acceptabelt.

Jana Žitňanská, *za skupinu ECR*. – Slovensko patrí medzi európske krajiny s početnou rómskou menšinou. Odhaduje sa, že dnes tvorí asi 9 % populácie.

Veľká časť Rómov je následkom nízkeho vzdelania a nezamestnanosti závislá od sociálneho systému a tiež v živote čelí zložitým situáciám z dôvodu chudoby, diskriminácie a zaužívaných stereotypov. Rómske deti sú častejšie ako nerómske zaškolované v špeciálnych školách a zamestnanosť Rómov predstavuje asi len 10 % oproti 60 % u nerómov. Mnohí Rómovia už rezignovali na hľadanie si pracovného miesta, deti strácajú motiváciu sa učiť. Napriek dostupným finančným prostriedkom zo štátneho rozpočtu, ale aj eurofondom sa ukazuje, že štát dlhodobo nie je schopný začleniť vylúčených Rómov. Som presvedčená, že zásadnú úlohu v tomto procese zohrajú a už aj zohrávajú občianske združenia, cirkevi a najmä miestni lídri, ktorí si zaslúžia naše uznanie a môžu inšpirovať mnohých ďalších vo svojich komunitách. Preto je dôležité im vytvárať podmienky pre prácu, finančne ich podporovať, ale aj zviditeľňovať. Preto som rada, že minulý týždeň v Európskom parlamente slávnostne odhalili slovenskému Rómovi a jeho kolegom putovnú sochu. Ján Cibula má neuveriteľný životný príbeh. Z osady sa vypracoval až k vlastnej lekárskej praxi vo Švajčiarsku a bol jedným z deviatich iniciátorov prvého rómskeho svetového kongresu. Pri tejto príležitosti si teda už 45. rok pripomíname svetový deň Rómov. Pán Cibula bol presvedčený, že iba združovanie rómskych elít pomôže zbúrať bariéry medzi Rómami a nerómami, ktoré žiaľ existujú v spoločnosti dodnes. Nikto z nás si nevybral, či sa narodí zdravý alebo so zdravotným postihnutím, či príde do bohatej rodiny alebo do rodiny žijúcej v chudobe v niektorej z osád. Bez pomoci zvonka sa však z bludného kruhu chudoby a vyčlenenia nedostane. Čím skôr sa nám podarí preseknúť tento kruh, tým viac z toho budú profitovať nielen samotní Rómovia, ale celá naša spoločnosť. Oddiaľovanie riešenia môže mať naopak devastujúce následky nielen pre konkrétnych ľudí, ktorých sa to týka, ale hrozí ešte väčší nárast radikálnych postojov.

Angelika Mlinar, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, the ALDE Group very much welcomes this debate on the occasion of International Roma Day. Celebrating Roma culture also highlights the persecution and discrimination that Roma people face in all areas of life, and we would like to use this opportunity to remind everyone here that non-discrimination is a fundamental value of the European Union. Much more needs to be done not only to fight discrimination and stereotypes against Roma people, but also to support their socio-economic integration. This is the key to delivering on equality for all.

The European Union and the Member States have committed to this, but if you look at the reality on the ground, we are far from living up to our standards. Forced evictions, segregation and discrimination in access to jobs, education, housing and health care cannot be tolerated any more in our Union. We cannot be satisfied with national strategies for Roma integration on paper only. The European Parliament should be further involved and should take a proactive stance in monitoring the extent to which such strategies are implemented – both from a cost-effectiveness standpoint and from a concrete-outcome point of view. We have a common responsibility to act and to ensure that fundamental rights are respected for all.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Der Internationale Roma-Tag eignet sich wirklich schlecht für Folklore-Nachmittage und auch nicht für halbleere Säle, wie wir es jetzt hier erleben. Vielmehr ist er doch ein Anlass zu begreifen – wirklich zu verstehen –, dass Roma seit Jahrhunderten in Europa leben – mehr als 600 Jahre. Und ich finde, 600 Jahre sind doch genug, um als einheimisch zu gelten, als Nachbar, als Arbeitskollege und – das darf ich zumindest für die europäische Linke sagen – als Freunde.

Letzteres fällt uns gar nicht schwer, denn Roma sind echte Weltbürger, nicht nur, weil sie noch nie und zu keiner Zeit auch nur irgendeinen Krieg angezettelt haben, sondern weil Roma in sehr vielen Ländern der Welt die Gesellschaft bereichert haben und bereichern und das bis heute tun, sie prägen, wie der kanadische Schriftsteller Ronald Lee, der österreichische Jazz-Gitarrist Harri Stojka, der Weltbürger und Bürgerrechtler Romani Rose, die Sängerin Marianne Rosenberg, der Boxer Johann Wilhelm Trollmann, der wie 500 Millionen Roma und Sinti im Zweiten Weltkrieg von den Hitler Faschisten im KZ umgebracht wurde.

Ich habe in den letzten Jahren wirklich viel mit Roma gesprochen, und wieder und wieder haben sie mir eines gesagt: „Was wir wollen, ist eigentlich ganz einfach. Wir wollen weder einen eigenen Staat noch beharren wir auf irgendeiner bestimmten Religion. Wir wollen dort, wo wir leben, leben können. Wir wollen leben wie alle anderen, wir wollen arbeiten, Familien gründen, alt werden, ja auch sterben in dieser Familienrunde. Wir wollen keine Privilegien, keine Extrabehandlung. Würde, das wollen wir. Wir möchten gleichbehandelt werden“, sagen sie immer wieder, „gleiche Chancen haben und, bitte schön, keine Angst haben müssen zu sagen, was wir sind: Roma.“

Dass heutzutage Roma immer noch erklären müssen, dass sie wirklich Menschen sind, dass sie wie wir in Frieden leben wollen, sich nicht nur als Musiker verstehen und ganz bestimmt auch keine weißen Kinder stehlen, aber sehr wohl ein Problem damit haben, wenn man sie nach 17 Jahren aus Deutschland in das Kosovo abschiebt, in ein Land, wo sie keine Existenzgrundlagen haben, das mitnichten ein sicheres Land für sie ist – all das ist eine der wirklich großen Zumutungen unserer Zeit – einer Zeit, in der Rassismus und völkische Arroganz wieder Hochkonjunktur haben.

Unter solchen Bedingungen für eine vorurteilsfreie und eine menschenwürdige Welt zu kämpfen, ist für die vielen größeren, aber vor allem auch für die ganz vielen kleinen Roma-Organisationen und -Initiativen gar nicht so leicht, sondern richtig schwer. Auch deshalb nutze ich die heutige Gelegenheit, genau ihnen Dank zu sagen, nicht das Gejammer und Getue von der Integration zu wiederholen, ihnen Dank zu sagen, all jenen, die diesen unermüdlichen Kampf jeden Tag führen, wie Amaro Drom in Berlin, dem Roma-Center in Göttingen, den Verteidigern – das ist mir sehr am Herzen liegend – des Roma-Parlamentes in Budapest, den Gitanos in Spanien, den vielen, vielen Roma-Initiativen in Serbien, im Kosovo, in Rumänien, in Bulgarien. Wenn immer geredet wird vom Integrieren neu hinzukommender Roma: Diese Initiativen reden nicht davon, die machen das ganz einfach. Sie zeigen, worum es wirklich geht: Um die Unteilbarkeit der Menschenrechte, für die es keine Vorbedingung gibt außer eines: ein Mensch zu sein.

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, dear colleagues, and especially dear Roma all over Europe, International Roma Day is a day to commemorate the atrocities and the persecution that Roma have been facing for hundreds of years on this continent. But it is also a day to think about the injustices that Roma still face every day in Europe.

The past – but also our present – makes it very clear that we hold responsibility. We hold responsibility to create a fully-inclusive European Union and to fight against anti-Gypsyism and for equal rights for all. We can make a difference today. We can shape the politics of anti-discrimination. We can create a society that gives equal chances with regard to housing, employment, education and health.

As dry as it very often seems, the EU structural funds are one of the instruments at our disposal in order to do this. But we even need to go further, because the fight against discrimination does not end with merely shaping policies. It needs to go very deep in our mainstream society. To give just one example, there are 11 million Roma living in the European Union. There is a great diversity amongst this community. Yet still, when I open the newspaper, I see stereotypical images of Roma every single day. This does not represent their great diversity and this will not be a step in order to fight against anti-Gypsyism in the European Union.

Lastly, in my struggle, together with Roma activists, I have again and again been thanked for what I am doing, and I hear them thank the Commission for fighting for equal rights. I want to take this opportunity to say that I do not want to be thanked any more, because actually we are the ones who should be grateful. We are the ones who should be grateful for the richness that Roma culture represents within Europe and for the power of Roma activists within the political debates. I am thankful for all the Roma who have opened their homes to me, who have shared food with me, who have shared their experiences and who have let me be part of their struggle. So thank you – Erika, Nino, Andrea, Daniella, David, Ivana – for letting me fight side by side together with you against anti-Gypsyism and for a European Union of equal rights and inclusion. I am deeply honoured.

James Carver, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, of all the paternal advice that I was offered, I well remember a conversation with my father: ‘son’, he said, ‘never forget who you are and where you come from. If you cannot do this then you will never be true to yourself’. Dad was a Romani gypsy. His own mother was born in a caravan or, as we say in Romani, a vardo. He was typical of many of his kith and kin. Never held back by his own illiteracy, he was streetwise, shrewd and incredibly tough. As I am believed to be the only British parliamentarian of Romani descent, I am proud to champion the real concerns facing a community living on the margins of UK society.

On Roma Nation Day I met with representatives of the International Romani Union, the Gypsy Council and Traveller Movement groups outside 10 Downing Street in London. I then hand-delivered a letter outlining my concerns over recent changes in UK planning legislation redefining a legal personality of a Traveller, thus placing increased difficulties on my community, who already face a massive shortage of site provision. I also asked for the appointment of Romanies to the UK Holocaust Commission, as the current absence from membership, despite the Nazi genocide that cost some half a million lives, is felt as another instance of exclusion.

In 21st-century Britain there has never been a more pressing time to tackle the problems facing Britain’s travelling communities. Both the UK Government and the Westminster Parliament must rise to that challenge instead of continually sweeping the issue under the carpet. I will not hold my breath.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much for this inspiring discussion. I endorse every word you have said. I have to think about many of the things which you have raised here.

Soraya Post said that we need to do a lot and we need to do it now. I think the situation is worse, because we are doing a lot – we have done a lot, we have invested a lot – and it obviously is not working because the situation is not improving. On the contrary, the situation is worsening. Now, with the worsening of the whole atmosphere in Europe and with increasing intolerance, the Roma people are among the first to be attacked, mocked and abused. That is why we have to do better. I am thinking deeply about where the barriers are and why we are not able to achieve better results in terms of including Roma citizens.

I can see three main problems. One problem is resortism. We need to tackle all four areas with one series of well-targeted actions: health protection, labour, social protection and education, giving a helping hand to children and families with children. We see in Member States that these sectors are dealt with by different ministries, and they themselves say that they understand and they need common action. This is already being reflected in the national strategies. I hope that a solution can be found soon.

The second problem is that I have a feeling that we are implementing this policy for the Roma but without their participation. We need to involve them more because action cannot be taken without them. Here it is necessary to give more support to the NGOs – some Members also said this – and local communities which are in everyday contact with Roma people. I have always criticised the fact that NGOs are only given financing for one year at a time, because NGOs are not the only ones working for the inclusion of Roma. We have to tackle the permanent problem of finance. They keep looking for money to maintain their activities, and so we should also look at the financing of NGOs, because financing for at least three years would help their projects become more sustainable.

The last problem which I see is that EU funding should be better used. Again we are speaking about short-term projects, but longer-term action is necessary to change the situation, because the task ahead of us is not a trivial one. We want to change the stereotypes and prejudices in society, and this cannot be done in the short term and with badly-chosen instruments.

So let us all work together on this, and let us be brave enough to admit that what we are doing is not working. Let us do better.

Președinte. – Dezbateră a fost închisă.

Declarații scrise (articolul 162)

Damian Drăghici (S&D), in writing. – 45 years ago, on 8 April, the Roma representatives took a first common stand for the emancipation of our communities. We celebrate this and Europe joining our struggle every year on International Roma Day. I consider it is also a moment to emphasise our European society should equally accommodate all its citizens and value diversity as its undoubted chance to permanent enrichment. It is our common duty to ensure solidarity, freedom, equality and fairness will become the real pillars of the future EU. Fighting the social exclusion of marginalised communities such as the Roma should be accelerated. Ensuring equal access to development resources is the only way to break the poverty cycle threatening to entrap the Roma for many generations ahead. Our success stories should inspire non-Roma and Roma as well. Because, as the majority populations need to learn more about us, we shall explore more our values and increasing potential to make a difference in Europe. Not least, we shall not forget it is our shared responsibility to educate our children not to be judgmental on others' skin colour or cultural background. The way we educate them will reflect on the future they are building.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), por escrito. – La comunidad romaní, con una población estimada entre 10 y 12 millones de personas en la UE, es la minoría más extensa que existe en Europa. La lucha contra el antigitanismo en los ámbitos político, social y jurídico es impostergable como consecuencia del auge que este despreciable fenómeno está cobrando en la UE a través del infamante discurso del odio, dirigido contra los gitanos, y los significativos actos de violencia racista que se han producido en los últimos tiempos. El antigitanismo es un tipo especial de racismo dirigido contra los gitanos y una forma de deshumanización que hunde sus raíces en la historia de Europa. El antigitanismo puede cometerse por parte de actores estatales o no estatales, en cuyo caso se proyecta en políticas públicas que directa o indirectamente discriminan a los gitanos y les privan del pleno disfrute de sus derechos fundamentales. Es importante exigir a los EEMM que prioricen estrategias nacionales de lucha contra la discriminación de los gitanos y que consagren un día especial de conmemoración del Holocausto Gitano que ha sido reconocido por el Parlamento Europeo en su resolución de 15 de abril de 2015.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), por escrito. – La comunidad roma, con una población estimada de 10 o 12 millones de personas en la UE, es la minoría más extensa que existe en Europa. La lucha contra el antigitanismo en todos los frentes políticos, sociales y jurídicos es impostergable dado el auge que este despreciable fenómeno está cobrando en la UE a través del infamante discurso del odio, dirigido contra las romas, y los significativos actos de violencia racista que se han producido en los últimos tiempos. El antigitanismo es un tipo especial de racismo supremacista dirigido contra los roma y una forma de deshumanización que hunde sus raíces en la historia de Europa. El antigitanismo puede cometerse por parte actores estatales o no estatales en cuyo caso se proyecta en políticas públicas que directa o indirectamente discriminan a los romas y los privan del pleno disfrute de sus derechos fundamentales. Es importante exigir a los EEMM que prioricen estrategias nacionales de lucha contra la discriminación de los roma y que consagren un día especial de conmemoración del Holocausto Gitano que ha sido reconocido por el Parlamento Europeo en su resolución de 15 de abril de 2015.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D), írásban. – Minden évben április 8-án ünnepeljük Nemzetközi Roma Napot, arra emlékezve, hogy 1971-ben ezen a napon ült össze az első Roma Világkongresszus. Most 45 évvel később, továbbra is megkülönböztetés, előítéletek és társadalmi hátrányok sújtják az európai romákat. Nagy részük reménytelen szegénységben él, sokkal kisebb esélye van munkát találni, jó oktatást, egészségügyi ellátást kapni, és sok-sok évvel rövidebb életre számíthat, mint nem roma honfitársai.

Szegyenletes, hogy számos tagállamban jogellenesen kilakoltatják a romákat. Botrányos, hogy sok tagállamban nem a szegregáció felszámolásáért lépnek fel, hanem védelmükbe veszik a megkülönböztetést, számos roma gyereket minősítenek önkényesen sajátos nevelési igényűnek és kényszerítenek rosszabb minőségű iskolákba. A romáknak szánt források jelentős része ma sem jut el az érintett közösségekhez. Az elmúlt napokban hat különböző képviselőcsoporthoz tartozó 22 képviselőtársammal és 10 a romákat képviselő civil szervezettel rendeztünk Roma Hetet az Európai Parlamentben, ahol szakmai és kulturális rendezvényekkel hívtuk fel a figyelmet az európai romák helyzetére és befogadásuk fontosságára. Meggyőződésünk, hogy az európai intézményeknek és a tagállamoknak kötelessége, hogy az eddigieknél többet tegyenek a romák befogadása, az egyenlő esélyek biztosítása érdekében.

Csaba Sógor (PPE), írásban. – Bizonyára sokan értesültek arról az elítélendő és sajnálatos esetről, hogy a nemzetközi roma nap alkalmából Bukarestben felállított rendezvénysátorra ismeretlen sértő és durva romaellenes feliratokat festettek. A rendőrség elkezdte a nyomozást, a román kormány és a román államfő felháborodásának adott hangot, több nagykövetség is megszólalt, sőt, még a Világbank is közleményben ítélte el a történeteket.

Magam is csak csatlakozhatok a felháborodott reakciókhoz és le szeretném szögezni: a hasonló megnyilvánulások nem méltóak egy EU-tagállamhoz, amelyben a roma közösség súlyos társadalmi leszakadással küszködik. Ugyanakkor mindenképpen fel szeretném hívni rá a figyelmet, hogy Romániában nem csak a roma közösséggel szemben létezik nyílt diszkrimináció, a mostanihoz hasonló erőszakos üzenetek gyakran megjelennek a magyar kisebbséggel szemben is, sporteseményeken, falfirkákon, de egyes médiaorgánumok részéről is tetten érhető az uszítás és a gyűlöletkeltés.

Szeretném, ha az állam intézményei és a politikusok hasonló vehemenciával ítélnék el ezeket a jelenségeket is, hiszen nem engedhetjük, hogy társadalmilag elfogadottá váljon ez a magatartásforma.

16. Annual reports 2012-2013 on subsidiarity and proportionality (debate)

Președinte. – Următorul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbateră privind raportul lui Sajjad Karim, în numele Comisiei pentru afaceri juridice, referitor la Rapoarte anuale 2012-2013 privind subsidiaritatea și proporționalitatea (2014/2252(INI)) (A8-0301/2015).

Sajjad Karim, rapporteur. – Mr President, a colleague with a very good sense of humour said to me earlier today: 'I so much look forward to your annual proposals for reform for subsidiarity, proportionality and better law-making', and I did smile at him. It really has been a tremendous honour for me, over many years now, to be able to play my part in helping to develop the way in which we carry out our legislation-making processes. Of course, I cannot do it alone, and I must acknowledge and thank all of my shadow rapporteurs who have helped me for many years now: Tadeusz Zwiefka, Mady Delvaux, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, António Marinho e Pinto and, of course, colleagues like Angelika Niebler, who is currently leaving the Chamber as I am addressing you all.

Colleagues, this is really a pivotal point for the European Union and, indeed, for my country – the United Kingdom – as well. I firmly believe that Britain and the European Union are stronger together, and I hope that, through our proposals, we can cement the relationship between this Parliament and our national parliaments. Britain's input in the European Union, I believe, benefits the entirety of Europe. But this may be one of the last occasions that I, as an MEP, am actually able to put forward proposals of this sort, because we are about to undergo a referendum in the UK that, at this stage, remains far too close to call.

What concerns do our constituents, our citizens, actually have on this particular topic? Well, they may not recognise the details that we attach and the names we attach, but they quite frequently say to all of us that the European Union is too distant, that it is doing far too much, and that what it does applies to far too many people unnecessarily. And we, as a Parliament, must address these pivotal issues. It is important for our own democratic accountability. In particular, if these reforms are rejected, we play into the hands of those who ultimately want to break the European Union and weaken all of our citizens. We must not allow that to happen. It is in that spirit that our national leaders came to an agreement and have put that forward for us to consider, in accordance with how we wish to proceed.

Is the European Union's law-making too distant? Well the role of national parliaments, and coupled with that, their responsibility and rights: we must bring national parliaments much closer to our EU decision-making processes. It is only by doing that that we strengthen them and we strengthen ourselves. Indeed, I have to confess that my own House of Commons EU Scrutiny Committee is not the best example of how EU legislation should be scrutinised, and I certainly do not recommend that as a way forward. Is the European Union doing too much? Well, we must have Europe only where necessary. Subsidiarity – reasoned opinions from national parliaments – has increased, but not all of our parliaments are fully engaged. The Impact Assessment Board itself has said that subsidiarity is not adequately addressed in our impact assessments.

In my report, I also encourage more participation of national parliaments in the preparation of EU legislation, such as green papers or white papers. This could also include annual debates for each national parliament with the European Commission. The yellow card procedure in the Treaties should be easily implementable for national parliaments, since there are several circumstances in which difficulties have been reported. An extension to the eight-week time period for consultation with national parliaments under the subsidiarity check should be furthered.

I have a number of other proposals which I will go into, but I will save those for when I come back at the end of the debate. But my final plea to colleagues is this: we have nothing to be frightened of when we say we want to empower ourselves and national parliaments to work much more closely to ensure that we, ultimately, are delivering legislation which is seen as relevant and proper by our citizens.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Karim for his excellent report on the Commission's report for 2012-2013 on subsidiarity and proportionality.

For the Commission, subsidiarity and proportionality must be at the heart of the European democratic process: the very key to our objective of being big on the big things and small on the small things. We have committed to give real effect to the principle of subsidiarity and to work closely with national parliaments and other EU institutions to enhance our common understanding of subsidiarity and ensure that every proposal complies with that principle.

National parliaments play a key role when it comes to monitoring respect for the principle of subsidiarity. In that regard, the report calls on the Commission to deepen its relations with the national parliaments and to engage in a yearly debate with each national parliament. The Juncker Commission pledged to forge a new partnership with national parliaments, in particular by increasing the frequency of Commissioners' visits to national parliaments. Since taking office in November 2014, Commissioners have made more than 270 visits to national parliaments. The Commission intends to continue the frequency of these visits, explaining what we do and why we do it and listening to the concerns of national parliaments. The report also suggests revising the guidelines for impact assessments. In May 2015 the Commission adopted the Better Regulation Package. This new framework includes a range of measures to make Commission policy-making more transparent and evidence-based. It comprises improved guidelines, both for *ex-ante* impact assessments and the retrospective evaluation of already-existing legislation.

The revised guidelines also include strengthened guidance both on subsidiarity and proportionality analysis, as well as a dedicated tool for the legal basis of a given proposal and its subsidiarity and proportionality aspects. Furthermore, the package sets up a new regulatory scrutiny board responsible for reviewing the quality of impact assessments and of major evaluations. The board is also responsible for recommending improvements in case particular aspects, including subsidiarity or proportionality, have not been duly taken into account.

This brings me to the comments in the report calling on all institutions to ensure that subsidiarity checks are also undertaken at the conclusion of the legislative negotiation before the adoption of the final text. The Commission is very pleased that the three institutions have recently agreed on a new inter-institutional agreement on better law-making. The agreement puts renewed focus on ensuring that the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality are given full respect when developing Union legislation and assessing its impacts. The agreement not only obliges the Commission to explain in its explanatory memoranda how the measures proposed are justified in the light of the principle of subsidiarity, but now provides that the European Parliament and the Council will, when they consider it appropriate and necessary, carry out impact assessments in relation to any substantial amendments they make to the Commission's initial proposal.

The Commission is pleased that all the institutions have jointly committed to ensuring that subsidiarity is a key element throughout the legislative process. Let me conclude by reassuring all Members that the Commission will make sure that the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality remain at the heart of the European democratic process. We look forward to working with the other EU institutions under the new inter-institutional framework to ensure that every piece of legislation respects the principle of subsidiarity.

Kazimierz Michał Ujazdowski, *autor projektu opinii Komisji Spraw Konstytucyjnych*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Również bardzo serdecznie chcę podziękować panu posłowi Karimowi za to sprawozdanie, i za część analityczną, i za tą część reformatorską, bo to jest rzeczywiście bardzo brytyjskie, w najlepszym tego słowa znaczeniu, sprawozdanie, które powiada: trzeba być konsekwentnym. Tak, jeśli mówimy a, trzeba powiedzieć także i b, więc w żadnym razie nie możemy zadowalać się obecnym stanem rzeczy i tym, że instytucje europejskie deklarują przestrzeganie zasady pomocniczości i proporcjonalności. Trzeba w tym wypadku większej konsekwencji, bo rzecz nie ma charakteru abstrakcyjnego. Realizacja zasady pomocniczości to jest oszczędne dobre prawo, a oszczędne dobre prawo bez centralizmu, bez arbitralności, bez nadmiernej biurokracji to jest więcej energii i konkurencyjności w Europie i w państwach członkowskich.

Dlatego też uważam, że powinniśmy wyciągnąć z tego wnioski i rzeczywiście zastanowić się nad wydłużeniem okresu, w którym parlamenty narodowe mogą stosować zasadę pomocniczości, nad ich wzmocnieniem. Ja bardzo cieszyłbym się też z tego, żeby Wielka Brytania została w Unii Europejskiej i byśmy mogli stosować mechanizm czerwonej kartki, który pozwoli parlamentom narodowym na blokowanie złego ustawodawstwa. Wreszcie potrzebne są jednolite kryteria. Jednolite kryteria to zaś wymaga kooperacji parlamentów narodowych rozmaitych, wszystkich państw Unii Europejskiej i większej odwagi i otwartości ze strony Parlamentu Europejskiego, który nie powinien traktować parlamentów narodowych jako konkurentów.

Na koniec chcę powiedzieć panu posłowi sprawozdawcy: wierzę, mam nadzieję, że Wielka Brytania zostanie w Unii Europejskiej a jej wkład będzie z pożytkiem dla oszczędnej, dobrej legislacji. Dziękuję bardzo.

Helga Stevens, *Rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie werkgelegenheid en sociale zaken*. — Als rapporteur voor advies van de Commissie EMPL ben ik zeer tevreden over het feit dat veel elementen van ons advies zijn overgenomen in het verslag van mijn ECR-collega van de Commissie juridische zaken.

In ons advies deden wij enkele aanbevelingen:

Ten eerste moeten de Commissie en de lidstaten de discussie versterken over de toepassing van het subsidiariteits- en evenredigheidsbeginsel op het gebied van werkgelegenheid en sociale zaken. Ten tweede vereist het subsidiariteitsbeginsel dat wij er als beleidsmakers op toezien nieuwe Europese wetgeving een tastbare toegevoegde waarde te bieden. Ten derde moet de rol van de nationale parlementen verder worden versterkt.

Ik sluit af met twee persoonlijke bedenkingen. Ik pleit er krachtig voor dat er werk wordt gemaakt van een onafhankelijke entiteit voor de effectbeoordeling. Tenslotte wil ik benadrukken dat gedurende het wetgevingsproces substantiële wijzigingen kunnen worden aangebracht in het voorstel van de Commissie. Het is dan ook belangrijk dat wordt nagegaan of deze amendementen in overeenstemming zijn met het subsidiariteitsbeginsel.

Patricija Šulin, *Pripravljalica mnenja Odbora za proračunski nadzor*. – Hvala poročevalcu, gospodu Karimu, za pripravljeno poročilo. Veseli me, da so v njem tudi priporočila, ki smo jih sprejeli v mnenju Odbora za proračunski nadzor.

S pravilno uporabo načel subsidiarnosti in sorazmernosti bomo lahko dejansko prišli do zakonodaje, ki bo koristila državljanom, podjetjem in delavcem, ter se izognili nepotrebnim upravnim bremenom.

Odbor za proračunski nadzor se je še posebej zavzel, da Komisija, v skladu z obema načeloma, poenostavi postopke pridobitve sredstev Evropske unije.

Prijavni postopki morajo biti učinkoviti in usmerjeni k rezultatom. Hkrati pa bi morala Komisija bolje dokazati in pokazati dodano vrednost programov iz večletnega finančnega okvira v upravičenih državah članicah.

Presoja načel subsidiarnosti in sorazmernosti mora biti bistveni element Unije in priprave ter ocenjevanja njenih politik in zaupanja državljanov v Evropsko unijo.

Tiziana Beghin, *relatrice per parere della commissione per il commercio internazionale* – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, intervengo a nome di David Borrelli, relatore per parere della commissione INTA.

Il tema della sussidiarietà e della proporzionalità è centrale per un armonico e positivo sviluppo delle competenze dell'Unione, perché riguarda i rapporti con i cittadini e gli Stati membri. Questo argomento però non è comunque privo di impatti anche sulla politica commerciale. Per questo vorrei riassumere la discussione che abbiamo affrontato in INTA.

Prima di tutto il tema degli SDS, nota questione che ha alimentato e continua ad alimentare una serie di potenziali conflitti fra i poteri dell'Unione e la sovranità giurisdizionale degli Stati membri.

In secondo luogo, la questione dell'assistenza macrofinanziaria. Maggiori controlli *ex ante* ed *ex post* sono necessari, in particolare per valutare la proporzione dell'assistenza che offriamo ai nostri partner e nel contempo rafforzare il controllo del Parlamento.

In terzo luogo, vi sono i temi della trasparenza e delle valutazioni di impatto dei trattati internazionali, facendo sì che queste ultime siano sincere, affidabili e coerenti. Il coinvolgimento delle imprese in questa fase e soprattutto delle piccole e medie imprese, come richiesto nel parere INTA, resta cruciale. Infine, concludo ricordando come sussidiarietà e proporzionalità siano un elemento centrale per le tematiche commerciali. Anzi, la vera sfida è come calibrare meglio le nostre azioni, portando quanto più vicino possibile al cittadino il processo decisionale; ritengo che la politica commerciale non possa essere esclusa da questo ambito.

Tadeusz Zwiefka, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Od wielu lat mam wielką przyjemność współpracować z panem posłem Karimem przy dorocznych sprawozdaniach dotyczących pomocniczości i proporcjonalności w procesie tworzenia prawa unijnego i za każdym razem pojawiają się nowe propozycje czy pogłębione analizy tego, co powinniśmy zrobić. Warto by doprowadzić do skutecznego ich wdrożenia, ponieważ bez wątpienia będzie miało to bardzo dobry wpływ na jakość tworzonego przez nas prawa.

Zasada pomocniczości i proporcjonalności jest absolutnie podstawową zasadą w procesie legislacji unijnej, powiedziabym, że jest to punkt wyjścia w tworzeniu prawa wspólnotowego. Szczególnie teraz, w okresie, kiedy w wielu naszych krajach członkowskich pojawiają się coraz silniejsze akcenty antyunijne, pojawiają się pytania: po co jest potrzebna Unia Europejska, skoro tworzy prawo skomplikowane, skoro następuje przeregulowanie. Dlaczego to w ogóle ma miejsce?

Stosowanie zasady pomocniczości i proporcjonalności – tak jak zaleca pan poseł Karim, razem z bardzo dobrze przeprowadzonym procesem oceny wpływu – to jest coś co powinniśmy eksponować w naszym działaniu, co powinno włączać w rozumienie istoty tworzenia prawa europejskiego nie tylko obywateli, ale także przedsiębiorców europejskich, by rozumieli, dlaczego prawo wspólnotowe jest wartością dodaną, a nie czymś, co tworzymy sami dla siebie. Stąd ważna rola polegająca na tym, by wciągnąć parlamenty narodowe do większego udziału w tworzeniu tego prawa i spowodować, aby zechciały one już na etapie wypowiedzania swoich opinii o nowych propozycjach być bardziej aktywne. Dotyczy to zarówno propozycji składanej przez Komisję Europejską, jak i samego prawie końcowego efektu, który wynika z negocjacji pomiędzy Parlamentem Europejskim i Radą.

Uważam, że termin na składanie takich wniosków w uzasadnionych sytuacjach rzeczywiście powinien być wydłużony, powinniśmy wzmocnić rolę parlamentów narodowych. Dlatego nowatorska propozycja zgłoszona przez kolegę Karima, aby wprowadzić tak zwaną zieloną kartę, która pozwoliłaby parlamentom narodowym na składanie bardzo uzasadnionych i bardzo sensownych propozycji już do Komisji Europejskiej, wydaje mi się niezwykle zasadna.

Mady Delvaux, au nom du groupe S&D. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je pense que nous sommes tous d'accord pour rappeler à quel point les principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité sont importants pour que nous formions une Union proche des citoyens.

Ces principes sont nécessaires et utiles à la bonne marche de l'Union européenne, et je dis bien, la bonne marche. En effet, ces principes ne visent en aucun cas à empêcher l'Union d'agir avec efficacité. Les principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité doivent être finement calibrés par rapport au besoin d'efficacité du travail de nos institutions, de façon à atteindre un juste équilibre. Or je pense que le rapport tel qu'il nous est présenté menace cet équilibre fragile et pourtant essentiel au bon fonctionnement de l'Union. Et je ne peux me résoudre à ce que les principes fondateurs servent les desseins des eurosceptiques.

Au nom du respect des principes de subsidiarité et de proportionnalité, ce rapport invite à créer des étapes supplémentaires dans notre processus législatif. Ces étapes alourdisent la charge bureaucratique qui pèse déjà sur nos institutions et l'application de telles procédures a pour effet de freiner, voire de bloquer le processus législatif européen.

Or, nous devons à nos citoyens une Union efficace, qui tienne compte de leurs préoccupations, une Union performante au service de leurs intérêts, une Union flexible capable de répondre prestement aux défis qui s'imposent à elle, une Union sans cesse plus étroite entre les peuples, capable de réagir de manière commune aux circonstances dans le respect réciproque.

C'est pourquoi, au nom de ceux qui croient en cette Union européenne, j'invite les collègues à soutenir les amendements du groupe S&D qui protègent un équilibre précieux pour l'Europe. Je dis «oui» à la subsidiarité et à la proportionnalité, mais pas au détriment d'une Union efficace pour les citoyens.

I suppose you guessed, Mr President, that I do not share the rapporteur's view on the principle and the application of subsidiarity and proportionality, but I want to thank him for his fairness and for the good collaboration.

Hans-Olaf Henkel, im Namen der ECR-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich pflichte Herrn Karim voll bei. Leider gibt es in meiner Sprache, dem Deutschen, kein anderes Wort für Subsidiarität. Was bedeutet das? Wenn meine Heimatstadt Hamburg ein Problem hat, dann sollen die Hamburger versuchen, es zu lösen. Und erst, wenn die es nicht können, soll dieses Problem nach Berlin. Und erst, wenn Berlin es nicht lösen kann, soll es nach Brüssel. Leider wird in diesem Haus immer wieder dagegen verstoßen.

Einer der Hauptgründe für den Verstoß gegen das Prinzip der Subsidiarität ist der Einheits-Euro, meine Damen und Herren, denn der führt automatisch zum genauen Gegenteil, nämlich zur Zentralisierung, und diese Zentralisierung entfremdet die Europäer immer mehr von Brüssel. Er führt immer mehr zu einer mangelnden Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Eurozone und vor allen Dingen auch zu Rechtsradikalismus. Deshalb hier wieder mein Ceterum censeo: Ich bin der Meinung, dass der Einheits-Euro nicht nur zu Zwist und Zwietracht, sondern auch immer mehr zu Zentralismus führt und schon deshalb abgeschafft werden muss.

António Marinho e Pinto, *em nome do Grupo ALDE*. – Obrigado senhor Presidente. Começo por saudar o relator de elogiar o trabalho que ele fez neste relatório. Senhor Presidente, caros colegas. Um dos mais graves problemas da União Europeia na atualidade, é o afastamento dos cidadãos e até de alguns Estados-Membros, das próprias instituições da União. Eu penso que o relatório do Senhor Karin parte desse problema, e procura com o rigor e com seriedade, levar a uma boa aplicação dos princípios da subsidiariedade e da proporcionalidade. Nessa medida, contribuirá decisivamente para prestigiar as instituições da União e para as aproximar dos cidadãos. Aproximar a União Europeia dos cidadãos e não afastá-la.

É importante que as leis sejam compreensíveis e o seu processo seja simples e acessível à generalidade dos cidadãos, em nome de quem aqui atuamos e intervimos. Os resultados das eleições europeias demonstram que os cidadãos estão cada vez mais afastados da própria União, das próprias instituições comunitárias. Nesse sentido, gostaria de, mais uma vez, de saudar o trabalho do Senhor Karin e elogiar o esforço que faz para combater esse problema, essa questão, na União Europeia. Eu apoio o relatório, votarei a favor e tenho aqui só uma pequena questão que, aliás, está praticamente ultrapassada, que era a possibilidade de ampliar o prazo para que os parlamentos nacionais se pronunciem, ampliar esse prazo de oito para doze semanas. Eu concordo ampliação do prazo permitirá os relatórios e uma análise mais aprofundada e fundamentada por parte dos parlamentos nacionais e isso prestigiará a própria União Europeia. Quero, no entanto dizer que, o tratado não prevê essa possibilidade, mas o Conselho, os Estados-Membros aprovaram por unanimidade esse alargamento desse prazo e, portanto, penso que a questão está ultrapassada, num futuro próximo, isso deverá ser introduzido no próprio Tratado.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, como ustedes saben, pero un gran número de europeos desconoce, el Parlamento Europeo es la única institución elegida democráticamente pero no escribe las leyes europeas. Y la razón no es casual. En los propios Tratados se quiso evitar que la mayoría trabajadora pudiera trasladar directamente sus demandas sociales en materia de legislación, cediendo esta competencia a la Comisión.

Más aún, incluso después de oír la voz del Parlamento, son los Gobiernos de los Estados los que de nuevo deben aprobarla evidenciando su corresponsabilidad en la agenda neoliberal y desreguladora que domina actualmente Europa.

La complejidad y la falta de legitimidad en este modo de legislar y gobernar están en el centro del debate hoy: supuestamente los principios de subsidiariedad y proporcionalidad deben aportar algo de claridad al proceso legislativo europeo, pero se trata en la práctica de principios vagos, como ustedes mismos admiten, que se interpretan al gusto del legislador.

Me permito afirmar que el principio rector de la política europea es otro: el neoliberalismo. Puedo ilustrarlo con ejemplos de su propio informe: usted habla de subsidiariedad, de que los Parlamentos nacionales puedan decidir soberanamente sobre sus políticas, pero en cuanto se ponen a hablar de los países intervenidos por la troika tales precauciones se olvidan.

En cuanto a la proporcionalidad, la aplican ustedes como la propia Comisión, de un modo abiertamente politizado para frenar nuevas propuestas legislativas que frenen la erosión de los derechos sociales de los trabajadores.

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

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL), *blue-card question*. – I want to thank you for that contribution and ask: would you agree that people have become disillusioned with the European project not just because of the Troika and all that it has done to the citizens, particularly the Irish people, but also because the power of initiative resides with the Commission? It should reside with us MEPs, who have been sent here to represent people, not with an unelected Commission.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – La verdad es que comparto con usted, señora Anderson, el planteamiento que hace. Efectivamente, los ciudadanos europeos están verdaderamente decepcionados por las políticas que se están adoptando en este Parlamento en contra de los trabajadores y de las trabajadoras.

Max Andersson, för Verts/ALE-gruppen. – Herr talman! Detta betänkande om årsrapporterna om subsidiaritet och proportionalitet 2012-2013 innehåller flera bra förslag om att få EU att gå i rätt riktning för att få subsidiaritetskontrollen att fungera, något som är väldigt viktigt för att stärka demokratin inom EU. Det innehåller också ett antal ganska dåliga förslag om ett övermått av konsekvensbedömningar.

Jag börjar med att prata om det som är problematiskt med detta betänkande. Konsekvensbedömningar är inte så enkla att göra som man kan tro. Det är lätt att ta fram siffror – inte nödvändigtvis korrekta siffror men siffror – för hur mycket det kommer att kosta ett företag att genomföra till exempel en ny bra miljölagstiftning. Det är dock svårare att få fram siffror på hur stora de samhällsekonomiska vinsterna är av ett förslag. Konsekvensbedömningar riskerar att bli skeva i riktning mot att inte göra något. Att som det föreslås i detta betänkande ha konsekvensbedömningar innan, under och efter det att man har arbetat med ett förslag är alldeles för mycket av konsekvensbedömningar, och det skulle ställa till problem för EU:s handlingsförmåga.

De bra sakerna i betänkandet handlar om att få EU:s subsidiaritetskontroll att fungera, få det gula kort som i dag inte används alls i den utsträckning som det borde. 15 av parlamenten i EU:s 28 medlemsländer använder det knappast överhuvudtaget. Det finns sådant som vi kan göra här för att få subsidiaritets- och proportionalitetskontrollen att fungera. Vi skulle kunna ta och förlänga den tid som parlamenten har på sig för att göra det. Vi skulle kunna ta och införa ett grönt kort, så att parlamenten får möjlighet att lägga fram egna förslag för kommissionen som kommissionen kan titta på. Det finns mycket att göra, och jag hoppas att nästa rapport kommer att vara ännu bättre.

Gerard Batten, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, this report on subsidiarity and proportionality quotes Article 5 of the Treaty, which says: 'notionally invites consideration of whether exercise of an EU competence is necessary or could properly and effectively be done at the Member State level'.

How very decent of you to actually concede that some laws should be made by democratic nation states and not the EU. Say something about subsidiarity. I might be wrong but I seem to remember about 24 or 25 years ago, when the Treaty on European Union was progressing, somebody suggested that there should be a cash prize for anybody that could actually define subsidiarity and describe how it would work in practice. As far as I know nobody ever won.

Proportionality is a bit late when the EU now controls most areas of domestic policy, and most of our laws now come from the EU, down to the wattage in electric kettles, toasters and vacuum cleaners. We recently saw the British Prime Minister on his hands and knees begging the EU to allow him to reduce VAT on tampons, which is something that he is powerless to do.

David Cameron's so-called reforms include something on the yellow card, which says that Member States – not individual Member States, of course: 15 together – can stop some legislation. I would like to ridicule this but I do not have to, because it was already ridiculed by William Hague when he was Foreign Minister in parliament, when he absolutely tore this idea to pieces when it was proposed before. If you do not believe me you can see it on YouTube, and you can see David Cameron laughing away next to him. Now he has adopted exactly the same policy as one of his most mooted reforms.

You are all going to get a lesson in subsidiarity and proportionality when the British people have their referendum on 23 June and when they vote to leave. They are increasingly coming to understand that the essential question is: do you want to live in a democratic state or an undemocratic state where you do not elect and cannot sack your government in Brussels?

Gilles Lebreton, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, la procédure du carton jaune est l'arme principale des parlements nationaux pour contraindre la Commission de Bruxelles à respecter le principe de subsidiarité. Elle oblige la Commission à réexaminer une proposition législative lorsque celle-ci a fait l'objet d'avis motivés, c'est-à-dire de protestations de la part du tiers des parlements nationaux des États membres.

Le rapport relève que ce carton jaune a réussi une seule fois à persuader la Commission d'abandonner une proposition. C'était en 2012, à propos de la scandaleuse proposition Monti II, qui remettait en cause le droit de grève. C'est un bilan bien maigre car, le reste du temps, la Commission a rejeté avec une certaine arrogance les autres cartons jaunes. La subsidiarité est donc un leurre. La Commission ne la respecte pas et la viole, soit directement soit indirectement, par le biais d'actes délégués, c'est-à-dire de décrets-lois auxquels elle recourt massivement, comme le rapport le déplore.

Le rapport a le mérite de dénoncer cette situation, mais il déçoit en se bornant à appeler la Commission à engager un dialogue avec les parlements nationaux et à améliorer ses études d'impact. Il propose, certes, de créer un carton vert, qui permettrait aux parlements nationaux d'adresser des suggestions à la Commission, mais cela ne ferait que ressusciter les placets d'Ancien Régime que les quémandeurs présentaient au bon plaisir du roi.

C'est une solution beaucoup plus radicale et beaucoup plus démocratique qu'il faudrait mettre en place. Elle consisterait à créer une vraie procédure de carton rouge qui permettrait à chaque État membre de s'opposer à une proposition législative de la Commission, dès lors qu'il estime que cette proposition porte atteinte à son intérêt vital. Ce carton rouge serait un droit de veto qui permettrait à chaque État de faire respecter sa souveraineté. Il constituerait ainsi un premier pas vers le remplacement de l'Union européenne par l'Europe des nations, que j'appelle de mes vœux.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η δυσπιστία και ο ευρωσκεπτικισμός των πολιτών είναι αποτέλεσμα της μη συμμόρφωσης προς τις αρχές της αναλογικότητας και επικουρικότητας στη χάραξη ενωσιακών πολιτικών. Προφανώς, δεν φταίνε οι λαοί της Ευρώπης, όση προπαγάνδα κι αν χρησιμοποιείται.

Παράδειγμα η Ελλάδα: ο Ελληνικός λαός δεν είναι τεμπέλης, διεφθαρμένος και άτιμος. Μόνο ευκολόπιστος και παραπλανημένος από πολιτικούς σαλτιμπάγκους και κατευθυνόμενα ΜΜΕ, εγχώρια και ξένα. Έξι χρόνια τον παραπλανούν ότι τα μνημόνια και οι εφαρμοστικοί νόμοι επιβάλλονται προς όφελός του και με γνώμονα τη βιωσιμότητα της πατρίδας του, ενώ οι ίδιοι τηρούν υπέρογκους τραπεζικούς λογαριασμούς και εξωχώριες εταιρείες. Σκάνδαλα που καλύπτονται, λίστες με φορολογικές ατασθαλίες που ποτέ δεν διερευνώνται, επίορκοι πολιτικοί που κρύβονται πίσω από κοινοβουλευτικές ασυλίες. Αλήθεια πόσο αναλογικό και επικουρικό είναι αυτό προς τους πολίτες που δεν έχουν να φάνε ή να πληρώσουν τα φάρμακά τους;

Καμία πολιτική μνημονίου και κανένας εφαρμοστικός νόμος δεν τήρησε τις αρχές της επικουρικότητας και αναλογικότητας για τους Έλληνες. Μόνο τις αρχές της τιμωρίας, της τραπεζικής μακροοικονομίας και του πλιάτσικου στην ιδιωτική, ακίνητη και κινητή περιουσία. Τα ψέματα τελείωσαν και μαζί τελειώνουν και οι αποτυχημένες δεξιές και αριστερές κυβερνήσεις. Εμείς σαν εθνικιστές λέμε ναι στην Ευρώπη των λαών και των εθνών, με δικαιοσύνη όμως στην αναλογικότητα και επικουρικότητα.

Pavel Svoboda (PPE). – Rád bych poděkoval kolegům z výboru JURI, že se podíleli na vzniku této zprávy a chtěl bych poděkovat panu Karimovi za přijatelný kompromis.

Pro mě osobně otázka subsidiarity a proporcionality je jednou ze základních otázek legislativního procesu v EU. Jde o kvalifikovaný způsob zapojení vnitrostátních parlamentů do tohoto procesu, jde o nástroj užitečný v dnešní době, kdy vztah členských států a Unie je velmi citlivý. Zároveň aplikace tohoto principu ale také není jediným způsobem, jímž vnitrostátní parlamenty legislativní proces Unie ovlivňují. Připomeňme, že v Radě ministrů zasedají ministři, kteří jsou rovněž odpovědní svým vnitrostátním parlamentům.

Nicméně tento princip je srozumitelný našim občanům a občané žádají, abychom jej naplňovali. My musíme konstatovat, že tento princip je nejenom určitým skrutiniem, ale také předpokladem úspěšné realizace společných evropských iniciativ, za něž jsme odpovědní, a nikoli jen nástrojem k jejich blokování.

Jak jsem již řekl, domnívám se, že tato zpráva představuje dobrý kompromis použitelný pro naši budoucí práci při projednávání konkrétních návrhů.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, come Lei sa, i principi di sussidiarietà e di proporzionalità sono molto importanti e anche molto delicati, non solo da realizzare, ma soprattutto da mettere in equilibrio tra di loro, non a caso, molti colleghi lo hanno sottolineato.

Qual è però il risultato che deriva dalla relazione che stiamo discutendo? Che tutte le forme ulteriori di controllo introdotte finiscono paradossalmente con il togliere trasparenza ai processi che verranno affrontati e, dall'altra parte, rovesciano quello che per noi è invece il percorso positivo, cioè quello di dare maggiore autonomia e potere all'Unione europea. Si ritorna invece a consegnare responsabilità non necessarie agli Stati membri.

Dunque nei fatti è questo un provvedimento che ci allontana dall'obiettivo per il quale siamo qui a rappresentare i cittadini europei. Vorrei farle notare, tra l'altro, non per responsabilità di chi ha lavorato intorno a questo tema, che siamo davanti ad un'ipotetica soluzione in contrasto con altri provvedimenti che sono in discussione proprio in questi giorni o addirittura in queste ore, quelli che affronteremo, voteremo già nella giornata di domani, non sono coerenti con l'accordo interistituzionale sulla *better regulation* e hanno elementi di forte contrasto, ad esempio con i compromessi che voteremo sul *REFIT*.

Dunque, la direzione imboccata è una direzione che secondo me va assolutamente e rapidamente modificata.

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

Vizepräsident

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Ich danke zunächst einmal dem Berichterstatter für einen hervorragenden Bericht. Subsidiarität und Verhältnismäßigkeit sind zwei Leitprinzipien der Europäischen Union. Aber es ist auch erforderlich, dass diese Leitprinzipien angewandt werden und dass ihnen in der praktischen gesetzgeberischen Arbeit nicht widersprochen wird, wie es immer wieder zu beobachten ist.

Was wir jetzt im Europäischen Parlament vorliegen haben, ist der Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission zur europaweiten Einlagensicherung als dritter Säule der Bankenunion. Diese europaweite Einlagensicherung nimmt eben nicht auf die spezifischen gewachsenen Strukturen der europäischen Bankenlandschaft Rücksicht, nimmt nicht Rücksicht auf Sparkassen und auf Raiffeisenkassen, auf deren Einlagensicherung und auf die Institutssicherung, die damit verbunden ist. Schlimmer noch: Sie nimmt auch nicht Rücksicht darauf, dass die Wirtschaftspolitik in den einzelnen unterschiedlichen Staaten der Europäischen Union unterschiedlich ist und sein muss. Wenn Staaten imstande sind, unterschiedliche Risiken für ihre Unternehmen zu erzeugen durch unterschiedliche wirtschaftspolitische Maßnahmen, dann ist eine gemeinschaftliche Einlagensicherung gerade das Falsche, etwas, was dem Subsidiaritätsprinzip widerspricht, denn sie ist ein Anreiz dafür, dass man Risiken dann in den Bankbilanzen ablädt, weil die Einlagensicherung dafür ja gerade stehen wird.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, subsidiariedad y proporcionalidad son principios básicos para una construcción armónica de la Unión Europea. Los mecanismos puestos en marcha para respetarlos son hoy insuficientes y formalistas y ofrecen unos plazos a las partes interesadas, especialmente a las regiones europeas con competencias legislativas, claramente insuficientes. Además, en algunos Estados, por ejemplo el mío, el procedimiento para poder conformar la opinión del Estado al respecto no garantiza que la voz de las regiones, si no coincide con el punto de vista del Estado, figure en los informes de alerta temprana.

Si en materia de subsidiariedad tenemos esta laguna, imagínense qué no ocurrirá con el fondo de las cuestiones sobre las que se legisla. Todo lo que se pierde por el camino, aleja a las instituciones europeas de los ciudadanos y perjudica la transparencia y la participación.

La experiencia de estos años ha demostrado que hay que corregir el procedimiento y creo que, como señala el informe, no basta con un control *ex ante*, sino que parece conveniente hacer al menos un informe de evaluación del funcionamiento a posteriori de la normativa de la Unión desde la perspectiva de la proporcionalidad y la subsidiariedad. En definitiva, hay que tomarse esto en serio, si de verdad creemos en una Europa federal y en el concepto de unión y en lo que ello significa: una suma voluntaria de sus miembros. Y nada mejor para fomentarla que tratar a todas las instituciones afectadas por las políticas europeas como mayores de edad.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, applicare il principio di sussidiarietà, quando correttamente interpretato, significa fare in modo che le decisioni siano prese a livello il più possibile vicino ai cittadini, cosa che è estremamente importante e fondamentale per il Movimento 5 Stelle.

Comprendiamo benissimo che non si tratta di uno strumento di democrazia diretta, ma non vi è dubbio che si tratti di un principio che mira ad avvicinare l'Unione europea ai suoi cittadini, garantendo il rispetto della sovranità dei singoli Stati membri e l'adozione di un'azione a livello locale ogniqualvolta ciò sia necessario. Esprimiamo quindi apprezzamento per una relazione che, con coraggio, mette in risalto sia la centralità di questo principio sia i limiti che si incontrano nella sua corretta interpretazione.

Esprimiamo in particolare apprezzamento per il paragrafo 29 della relazione, nel momento in cui, in conformità ai principi di sussidiarietà e proporzionalità, sarebbe opportuno che la Commissione semplificasse la procedura di richiesta dei fondi dell'Unione europea, in modo da renderla più efficiente e meritocratica e in modo da evitare che si verifichino casi di corruzione, che molto spesso si annidano nelle procedure burocraticamente complesse, e chiediamo poi che si faccia chiarezza sulla conformità al principio di sussidiarietà dei vari aspetti dei trattati commerciali internazionali, che l'Unione europea sta negoziando senza la necessaria trasparenza, tra cui ad esempio il TTIP.

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Enkele dagen na het Nederlandse referendum met de welbekende uitslag - twee derde van de bevolking sprak zich uit tegen een maatregel van de Europese Unie - lijkt het me nuttig om toch nog eens in verband met de subsidiariteit het principe te herhalen. Idealiter zou subsidiariteit moeten verhinderen dat de Europese Unie zich steeds verder uitbreidt, dat zij om zich heen grijpt en dat zij zich bevoegdheden toeëigent die haar niet toebehoren of die beter niet op Europees niveau zouden moeten worden behandeld.

Wat krijgen we nu van de Commissie JURI hier op ons bord? Een tekst waarin staat - en ik citeer - "dat de Unie op de gebieden die niet onder haar exclusieve bevoegdheid vallen, slechts mag optreden" - en ik citeer opnieuw - "indien en voor zover de doelstellingen van het overwogen optreden niet voldoende door de lidstaten op centraal, regionaal of lokaal niveau kunnen worden verwezenlijkt, maar vanwege de omvang of de gevolgen van het overwogen optreden beter door de Unie kunnen worden bereikt".

Met zo'n zinnetje, collega's, kan men natuurlijk alle kanten uit. Met zo'n zinnetje in handen van de adepten van de Europese Unie gaan wij naar een uitbreiding en verdere centralisering van die Europese Unie. Met zo'n zinnetje, gecombineerd met de exclusiviteit van de bevoegdheden in handen van de Europese Unie, is natuurlijk het principe van de subsidiariteit, namelijk dat de bevoegdheden op een zo laag mogelijk niveau moeten worden uitgeoefend, een principe dat dode letter wordt.

De Europese Unie krijgt hier, zelfs in dit Europees Parlement, op dit zo belangrijke principe een blanco cheque om haar plannen voor een federaal Europa verder door te zetten. De *ever closer Union* gaat hier ook vandaag weer verder door en we kunnen dat eigenlijk nauwelijks nog tegenhouden, tenzij met referenda naar het Nederlandse voorbeeld, waardoor u allemaal hier als adepten van het federale Europa, even worden wakker geschud.

Het doel, namelijk een federaal Europa met een zinnetje als dit, heiligt alle middelen én het feit dat subsidiariteit uiteindelijk toch maar een vodge papier blijkt te zijn.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – V prvom rade blahoželám kolegovi Karimovi k predloženému textu. Odôvodnené stanoviská národných parlamentov majú rovnaký cieľ ako európska iniciatíva občanov: priblížiť európsku politiku občanom a posilniť demokratickú zodpovednosť európskych inštitúcií. Je tu však aj ďalšia podobnosť. Odpovede Komisie na tzv. žlté karty národných parlamentov pripomínajú odpoveď na návrh európskej občianskej iniciatívy Jeden z nás. Vanie z nich duch nadradenosti. Predložené uznesenie na viacerých miestach upozorňuje na sklon Komisie za každú cenu presadzovať vlastný pohľad a zároveň s ľahkosťou ignorovať námietky zo strany národných parlamentov a občianskych iniciatív. Samostatnou kapitolou sú iniciatívne správy tohto Parlamentu. Mnohé sú písané tak, akoby ich autori o subsidiarite a proporcionality nikdy ani nepočuli. Vyzývam preto vedenie Parlamentu na zavedenie prísnejších pravidiel pre kontrolu dodržiavania princípov subsidiarity ešte pred hlasovaním o nich v pléne.

Ak Komisia a tento Parlament nezačnú brať vážne odôvodnené námietky a návrhy zdola, natrvalo svojím formalizmom otrávia celý európsky projekt. A potom, žiaľ, už ich názor nebude nikoho zaujímať.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che il dibattito sulla sussidiarietà e sulla proporzionalità sia viziato dai tanti euroscettici che ci raccontano che l'Europa non rispetta questo principio.

La realtà è che quando si va a vedere il numero ridottissimo di cartellini gialli e arancioni che non solo arrivano alla fine, ma il numero ridottissimo di quelli che iniziano una procedura – perché per iniziare una procedura di violazione della sussidiarietà bisogna che se ne possa dimostrare l'effettiva violazione – questo ci dimostra come avvenga molto raramente che la violazione sia messa in atto dalla Commissione e che quindi sia difficile dimostrarne l'esistenza.

Credo che l'impianto della relazione sia un po' viziato da questa preoccupazione, con il rischio, inserendo troppe cautele, troppe procedure aggiuntive, di danneggiare l'altro principio fondamentale che è quello della semplificazione e del legiferare meglio, oppure di allungare all'infinito il processo decisionale. Credo quindi che alcuni emendamenti siano da votare, in quanto necessari.

Due parole sulla questione della *green card*. Credo sia un tema interessante ma che va inserito in un trattato e non utilizzato, messo in pratica adesso, perché deve essere collegato al potere di iniziativa legislativa del Parlamento europeo, altrimenti questo indebolirebbe il nostro ruolo legislativo.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριοι συνάδελφοι, σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 4 της Συνθήκης για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, κάθε αρμοδιότητα η οποία δεν απονέμεται στην Ένωση με τις Συνθήκες ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη. Με τη ρύθμιση αυτή καθορίζεται πανηγυρικά ότι το τεκμήριο αρμοδιότητας ανήκει στα κράτη μέλη, τα οποία διατηρούν τα αποκλειστικά κυριαρχικά τους δικαιώματα σε όλα τα πεδία, πλην εκείνων στα οποία η Συνθήκη, με βάση την αρχή της δοτής αρμοδιότητας, απονέμει εξουσία δράσης στα όργανα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, τα οποία μάλιστα, όταν δρουν στο πεδίο των συντρεχουσών αρμοδιοτήτων, οφείλουν να σέβονται τις αρχές της επικουρικότητας και της αναλογικότητας.

Στην Ελλάδα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και η τρόικα και η ΕΚΤ παραβιάζουν, συνεχώς, βάνανυσα την αρχή της δοτής αρμοδιότητας, καθώς δρώντας σε πεδία που δεν ανήκουν καν στις αρμοδιότητες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, επιβάλουν μειώσεις σε μισθούς και συντάξεις, αυξάνουν τους φόρους εισοδήματος και περιουσίας, διαλύουν το ασφαλιστικό και τις εργασιακές σχέσεις και απαιτούν ξεπούλημα της δημόσιας περιουσίας.

Κύριοι της Επιτροπής, σταματήστε επιτέλους να παρανομείτε και να παραβιάζετε τις Συνθήκες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης!

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE). – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar quiero transmitir mi felicitación por este acuerdo. Efectivamente, el principio de subsidiariedad y el principio de proporcionalidad son fundamentales para el correcto funcionamiento de la Unión Europea y son el punto de partida de las políticas europeas. Qué duda cabe de que el principio de subsidiariedad acerca la política europea al ciudadano y determina cuándo la Unión Europea es competente para legislar. Lo mismo sucede con el principio de proporcionalidad, que hace que cualquier acción de la Unión Europea tenga sentido y se adapte a la finalidad que se persigue.

Es importante el informe, porque lo que intenta es garantizar la eficacia y también la legitimidad democrática en la toma de decisiones y, de alguna manera, refuerza el proyecto europeo. Es verdad que después del Tratado de Lisboa se han creado toda una serie de tarjetas a disposición de los Parlamentos nacionales para establecer mecanismos que permitan supervisar correctamente la aplicación de estos principios de subsidiariedad y proporcionalidad. Cabe destacar que esto se ha llevado con normalidad, pero que es verdad que todos estos mecanismos tienen que ser ágiles, tienen que ser realmente sencillos y tienen que ser eficaces. Lo más importante en estos casos es la cooperación entre todas las administraciones nacionales y europeas y garantizar y reforzar esos dos principios.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Subsidiarität soll heißen mehr Bürgernähe, mehr Demokratie. Subsidiarität soll aber nicht heißen: Handlungsunfähigkeit in der europäischen Gesetzgebung. Wir haben es immer wieder mit Menschen zu tun, die sich durchaus auch zu Recht die Frage stellen: Wie funktioniert die europäische Demokratie? Die Verfahren sind so wahnsinnig kompliziert. Und wenn ich mir nun diesen Bericht jetzt anschau, wird es noch einmal komplizierter. Viele Punkte im Bericht führen ein immenses – fast – Verunmöglichen des europäischen Gesetzgebungsprozesses herbei. Anstelle klarer, transparenter Kompetenzteilung wird im Bericht unter dem Vorwand der Subsidiaritätskontrolle nationalen Parlamenten das Recht zugesprochen, die europäischen Prozesse in jedem Fortschritt zu behindern. Unterstützen ist eine Sache, aber zu behindern ist natürlich ein Problem.

Natürlich sollen nationale Kompetenzen nicht durch Europa-Agenten unterminiert werden. Allerdings ist das hier vorgeschlagene Ausmaß an nationaler Kontrollfunktion schlichtweg ineffizient. Besonders im Zusammenhang mit der Einführung eines Grün-/Rot-Kartensystems für nationale Parlamente warne ich vor deren bewusstem Einsatz als Blockadeinstrument, als Sabotageinstrument für gute Vorhaben.

Und Achtung auch auf den sozialen Dialog. Die Umsetzung der vorgeschlagenen Kompetenzanpassungen könnte nämlich auch als Vorwand dienen, den sozialen Dialog und die Sozialpartner letztlich zu schwächen. Insofern verweise ich – und mache gern Werbung dafür – auf den Bericht Kaufmann über REFIT. Hier sind letztlich viel bessere Maßnahmen vorgeschlagen, die auch dazu führen, dass das Prinzip der Subsidiarität auf eine demokratische Art und Weise wesentlich besser respektiert wird und Sozialpartner auch einbezogen werden.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Państwo! Przede wszystkim gratuluję sprawozdawcy bardzo dobrego sprawozdania, które podkreśla potrzebę przywiązywania większej wagi do zasady pomocniczości podczas tworzenia prawa europejskiego. Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawcą, że potrzebujemy większego zaangażowania, rzeczywistej partycypacji parlamentów narodowych w tworzeniu prawa europejskiego, że to jest kwintesencją demokracji, że potrzebujemy rozszerzenia i wzmocnienia narzędzi dostępnych dla krajów członkowskich, przez które mogą one wpływać na kształt tworzonego prawa. I tutaj mówimy i o żółtej kartce, która już istnieje (w sprawozdaniu jest proponowana zielona kartka, czerwona kartka). To są narzędzia, które pozwalają skutecznie hamować albo wносить wkład własny w tworzone prawo.

Potrzebujemy też lepszego rozumienia, czym jest zasada pomocniczości, jak interpretować prawo i gdzie są granice kompetencji Unii Europejskiej i państw członkowskich. To sprawozdanie przypomina, czym jest zasada pomocniczości, że to jest uniwersalna zasada, która leży u podstaw Unii Europejskiej, że wszystko co można zrobić na poziomie krajów członkowskich powinniśmy tam robić a dopiero to, co jest ponad to – na poziomie Unii Europejskiej, tak żeby to co robimy na poziomie Unii Europejskiej, faktycznie było bonusem i przynosiło wszystkim korzyści, a nie było gorsetem, który nas krępuje.

To jest bardzo ważne, żeby o tej zasadzie pomocniczości pamiętać, bo naruszenie tej zasady podważa zaufanie do Unii Europejskiej i sprawia, że Unia Europejska bywa postrzegana jako zagrożenie niezależności, co jest oczywiście kompletną bzdurą. Dziękuję bardzo!

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Meiner Meinung nach haben die letzten sechs Jahre gezeigt, dass sich das Lissabon-System zur Subsidiarität insgesamt bewährt hat. Der Mechanismus funktioniert. Die europäischen Institutionen haben der Wahrung des Subsidiaritätsprinzips erhöhte Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet, und die einzelstaatlichen Parlamente haben eine sehr hohe Bereitschaft zur Wahrnehmung der ihnen zustehenden Befugnisse unter Beweis gestellt. Dies spiegeln auch die sehr interessanten Berichte der COSAC wieder.

Es ist ein gutes Zeichen für die inzwischen entwickelte Subsidiaritätskultur, dass es in der ganzen Zeit nur zwei gelbe Karten nationaler Parlamente in Richtung Kommission gab. Es ist zweifellos erforderlich und richtig, den politischen Dialog mit den einzelstaatlichen Parlamenten zu intensivieren, daran bin ich interessiert, daran sollten wir alle interessiert sein. Zugleich jedoch möchte ich betonen: Die Europäische Union ist ein politisches Mehrebenensystem. Seine Funktionsweise ist kompliziert. Es wird für Bürgerinnen und Bürger aber nur dann nachvollziehbar und verständlich, wenn klar ist, wer wofür zuständig und verantwortlich ist. Daher ist es wichtig, die unterschiedlichen Kompetenzen der einzelnen Handlungsebenen nicht zu vermischen.

Gerade in der heutigen Zeit, da Populisten aller Couleur wie jüngst in den Niederlanden zum Angriff auf die europäischen Institutionen blasen, sollten wir den durchschaubaren Trick entzaubern, wenn die unterschiedlichen Ebenen gezielt gegeneinander ausgespielt werden, so ganz nach dem Motto: hier – in Anführungsstrichen – „die gute Region“ und da „das böse Europa“.

Wir sollten nicht zulassen, dass der Verweis auf das Subsidiaritätsprinzip missbraucht wird, um unter diesem Deckmantel unsere europäische Gemeinschaft zu schwächen oder sie gar in Frage zu stellen. Heute ist es mehr denn je vonnöten den europäischen Gedanken und die europäischen Institutionen zu stärken, und zwar gemeinsam mit den nationalen und den regionalen Parlamenten.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, doamnă comisar, doamnelor și domnilor colegi, în primul rând aș dori să-l felicit pe raportor pentru munca depusă. De-a lungul timpului, instituțiile europene și parlamentele naționale au fost preocupate de identificarea unor mecanisme eficiente necesare adoptării unei legislații care să corespundă atât unor exigențe naționale, cât și interesului general al Uniunii Europene. Respectarea principiilor subsidiarității și proporționalității în cadrul procedurilor de legiferare la nivelul Uniunii Europene constituie „cheia de boltă” a unei reglementări care să respecte cât mai mult nevoile cetățeanului european.

Introducerea și consolidarea unor proceduri prin care se evaluează respectarea celor două principii în diferite faze ale procesului decizional, consultările publice prin care părțile interesate prezintă observații, dar și posibilele soluții la problemele identificate sunt de natură să ofere valoare adăugată procesului legislativ. Plecând de la premisa că cele două principii constituie punctul de plecare pentru formularea politicilor la nivel european, Comisia este așteptată ca mai departe să analizeze în mod amănunțit în ce măsură acestea sunt respectate.

Cu toate acestea, câteva observații se impun. În toată procedura legislativă, trebuie avut în vedere faptul că studiile de impact au ca obiect doar stadiile inițiale ale procesului legislativ, în condițiile în care propunerile legislative pot suferi modificări substanțiale în procesul de adoptare. Având în vedere aceste aspecte și pentru a respecta întocmai interesele cetățenilor europeni, se impune astfel efectuarea unei verificări...

(Președintele a întrerupt discursul vorbitorului.)

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Já moc děkuji za tuto zprávu, protože z doby, kdy jsem v České republice byl odpovědný za implementaci evropské legislativy do vládních návrhů, tak musím říci, že celá řada návrhů, která přicházela, nebo tedy již schválených směrnic, která přicházela do národních států, tedy i do ČR, postrádala faktické odůvodnění principu subsidiarity a proporcionality.

To odůvodnění bylo často velmi formální, což ostatně ukazují i studie a analýza, o které tady dnes debatujeme, kdy Výbor pro posouzení dopadů jasně uvedl, že až u jedné třetiny návrhů předložených Komisí je ono odůvodnění subsidiarity pouze formální.

Kdyby dnešní jednání a schválení dokumentu vedlo k tomu, vážená paní komisařko, že Komise bude tyto dva principy, tato dvě kritéria evropské legislativy fakticky věcně, velmi intenzivně posuzovat, tak já osobně budu šťastný. Je to podle mého názoru nutností i vzhledem k politické situaci, ve které se Evropská unie nachází, a myslím si, že je v zájmu nás všech, těch, co věří v zachování myšlenky evropské integrace, aby zkrátka a dobře zvláště stanoviska národních parlamentů byla více brána v potaz. A dostane-li nějaký materiál tzv. žlutou kartu, pak se domnívám, že by Komise takovýto materiál měla opustit.

To ostatně platí i pro princip evropského prokurátora, vážená paní komisařko, který vy tady zastupujete, a který v roce 2013, právě takovou žlutou kartu dostal.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, principiile solidarității, subsidiarității și proporționalității sunt importante. Ele au fost create pentru a asigura un echilibru al puterilor, dar și mijloace pentru reprezentarea intereselor locale. Dar nu sunt de acord cu cele spuse de domnul raportor.

Europa nu trebuie să existe doar unde este necesar. Uniunea Europeană a fost creată pentru că era necesară pentru menținerea păcii, pentru o mai bună coordonare între statele membre, pentru bunăstarea cetățenilor europeni, pentru reguli comune, mobilitate, creșterea potențialului Europei. Domnul raportor spunea să nu ne fie teamă. Mie nu îmi este teamă de Europa. Din păcate, am senzația că dumneavoastră vă este. Mie îmi plac Europa și Parlamentul European, pentru că aici vocile amândurora sunt auzite și vocile țărilor noastre sunt egale.

De aceea, eu susțin ideea de creștere a participării și a exprimării punctelor de vedere naționale și locale și trebuie un dialog mai bun cu parlamentele naționale. Dar acest lucru trebuie în primul rând să se realizeze prin mecanismele existente și cu un echilibru în această abordare, nu cu mesaje populiste.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, sve politike su lokalne, svaka politika je lokalna, jer svaka politika, pa i ova koju mi ovdje vodimo i ono što donosimo kao propise, ima refleksiju i posljedice na lokalnu razinu, odnosno na naše građane koji žive u nekoj općini, u nekom gradu, u nekoj regiji.

Zato su sve politike lokalne i zato je princip supsidijarnosti za mene iznimno bitan princip kako bi upravo Europska unija bila lakše prepoznatljiva među našim građanima jer ne možemo pobjeći od te činjenice da imamo problema s identitetom europskih politika. Naravno, ne mogu se sve politike voditi isključivo na lokalnom nivou, to je potpuno jasno.

Mnogo toga trebamo imati na europskom nivou, ali mi tu europsku politiku moramo uspjeti prevesti na jednostavan način u lokalnu politiku. Onda ćemo imati uspjeha. Inače će uspjeh definitivno izostati.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, thank you very much for this interesting debate, and I thank Members for their comments and questions on this important topic.

I would like to use the opportunity to react on what Mr Pospíšil said. The proposal on the European Prosecutor's Office is quite a good example of how the current Commission works. The proposal received – I think – 11 yellow cards from the national parliaments and, as I said before, this Commission has already visited national parliaments 270 times. At least 10 of these were mine, because I did not see the Commission sending a letter to the parliament as the end of the matter. I felt it necessary to come back to these national parliaments and to explain how we modified the proposal by replacing the centralised structure with a decentralised one. The national parliaments could see that it is in my strong interest to explain and to convince them that the issue of subsidiarity has disappeared. This is merely how this works in one example: the case of the European Prosecutor's Office.

I feel it is necessary to create such a model, which will not replace national prosecution but will strengthen it. So this is another example of how we are trying to improve communication with the national parliaments and to ensure that we keep solid, mutual communication.

I would like you to know that all the Commissioners remain at your service to discuss the subsidiarity and proportionality aspects of proposals tabled by the Commission, and once again I wish to thank the rapporteur and all the Members involved for an excellent report.

Sajjad Karim, rapporteur. – Mr President, may I start by thanking the Commission for its input today and indeed by putting on record the tremendous support that I have received for my ideas from Frans Timmermans. The Commission work programme also reflects that.

May I thank all colleagues from all sides of the House who took part in the debate today for putting forward, on the whole, their constructive observations. I know that, in most cases, even where we have disagreement, their proposals are based upon foundations where they are putting forward a critical but positive analysis of how they feel we can best move forward. So I thank all of my colleagues for their input.

I wish briefly to touch upon one or two issues. First of all, in relation to the red card: this is not a veto. It was never proposed as a veto, and it was never envisaged to be anything of the sort. But the point is that, if we have the other measures that bring national parliaments much closer to our decision-making, we will never have a need for any of our national parliaments ever to have to exercise a red card, let alone for it to be described anywhere near a veto.

On subsidiarity – once again this has been raised by colleagues – we must evaluate subsidiarity mid-term and at the end, but those evaluations are not binding. They provide a measure to ensure that we have not moved so far away from the subsidiarity principle that we are carrying out work at our level that we should not be doing.

My Liberal colleagues raised an issue in relation to the extension of the eight-week time period. I agree with them that any extension of the current deadline for submitting opinions on subsidiarity should indeed be incorporated into the Treaties when they are next updated.

Finally, various comments were made by the extreme right of this House which were quite interesting for me, particularly from the UKIP representatives, who are not present here. They made various points, but when it came to the technical issues, there were only two, and on both they were completely wrong. They were wrong in describing the red card as a yellow card, and I am pretty sure that the British people will show them the red card very soon indeed. The majority of laws that are made in the UK do not emanate from the EU. It is 13%. That is not a majority. So I look forward to showing them the red card on 23 June.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE), în scris. – Propun ca raportorii Parlamentului European să consulte comisiile de specialitate din parlamentele naționale, în special în cazul rapoartelor legislative. În acest fel, dialogul politic cu parlamentele naționale asupra respectării principiilor subsidiarității și proporționalității poate fi deschis mult mai devreme. Pe această bază, raportorii Parlamentului European își pot fundamenta mai bine pozițiile față de inițiativele legislative ale Comisiei Europene sau față de propriile teme în rapoartele din proprie inițiativă.

17. Objection pursuant to Rule 106: renewal of the approval of the active substance glyphosate (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Entschließungsantrag, eingereicht von Pavel Poc, Kateřina Konečná, Bas Eickhout, Piernicola Pedicini, Mark Demesmaecker, Sirpa Pietikäinen und Frédérique Ries im Namen des ENVI-Ausschusses, zu dem Entwurf einer Durchführungsverordnung der Kommission zur Erneuerung der Genehmigung des Wirkstoffs Glyphosat gemäß der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1107/2009 des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über das Inverkehrbringen von Pflanzenschutzmitteln und zur Änderung des Anhangs der Durchführungsverordnung (EU) Nr. 540/2011 (D044281-01 - 2016/2624(RSP)) (B8-0439/2016).

Giovanni La Via, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, il dibattito di oggi non era previsto all'ordine del giorno originario, ma ritengo che fosse giusto confrontarsi, in quest'Aula, su una tematica così importante che riguarda da vicino la salute umana e animale e l'ambiente e sono quindi contento che questo dibattito possa avere luogo qui di fronte a tutti.

Negli ultimi mesi abbiamo assistito a intense discussioni in merito alla decisione della Commissione europea di rinnovare l'autorizzazione all'utilizzo del glifosate all'interno del quadro normativo delineato dal regolamento relativo all'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti fitosanitari; l'autorizzazione vigente scade infatti a giugno del 2016. Come tutti voi sapete, il glifosate è un principio attivo di un erbicida selettivo ed è attualmente il diserbante che registra il più elevato volume di produzione a livello globale; è usato negli ultimi quarant'anni su scala mondiale e viene impiegato nel 76 % dei casi nel settore agricolo.

La commissione ENVI di questo Parlamento, a nome di cui presento oggi questa posizione, ha sollevato e approvato l'obiezione che ci troviamo adesso a discutere, chiedendo alla Commissione europea di ritirare il progetto di regolamento di esecuzione, di non rinnovare l'approvazione del glifosate, di elaborare un calendario chiaro per la redazione di un elenco di coformulanti che non possono essere inclusi nei prodotti commerciali. La relazione invita inoltre la Commissione a provvedere in breve tempo ad una revisione indipendente della classificazione del glifosate, alla luce delle prove scientifiche disponibili relative al potenziale cancerogeno della sostanza stessa, nonché all'eventuale proprietà di interferenze sulla base dei criteri scientifici orizzontali per i disregulatori endocrini.

Ma farei un breve passo indietro, per meglio comprendere quanto successo dopo il rinnovo dell'autorizzazione da parte della Commissione. Nel marzo 2015, infatti, l'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC) ha classificato il glifosate come probabilmente cancerogeno per l'uomo, in base a prove limitate di effetti cancerogeni sull'uomo e di prove sufficienti di tumori negli animali da laboratorio.

A novembre 2015 l'EFSA, l'Agenzia europea per la sicurezza alimentare, in contrasto con il parere dell'IARC, ha completato una valutazione paritetica del glifosate ed è giunta alla conclusione che è improbabile che tale prodotto rappresenti una minaccia di cancro per l'uomo e che gli elementi di prova disponibili non ne giustificano la classificazione relativamente al suo potenziale cancerogeno, in conformità al regolamento relativo all'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti fitosanitari.

La commissione ENVI, dinanzi a tale situazione, ha deciso a grande maggioranza di ritenere che in questo caso si debba procedere all'applicazione del principio di precauzione, al fine di garantire che le sostanze attive o i prodotti immessi sul mercato non abbiano effetti nocivi per la salute umana o animale o per l'ambiente. Il regolamento relativo all'immissione sul mercato dei prodotti fitosanitari afferma che, in particolare, non si impedisce agli Stati membri di applicare il principio di precauzione, quando sul piano scientifico vi siano incertezze quanto ai rischi che i prodotti fitosanitari che devono essere autorizzati nel loro territorio comportano per la salute umana, animale o l'ambiente.

La commissione ENVI ritiene pertanto che il progetto di regolamento di esecuzione della Commissione non garantisca un elevato livello di protezione della salute, non applichi il principio di precauzione ed ecceda le competenze di esecuzione stabilite dalla normativa. Chiede quindi alla Commissione di ritirare il progetto di regolamento, invita la Commissione a non rinnovare l'approvazione, invita l'EFSA a divulgare tutte le prove scientifiche. Signor Commissario, colleghi, quella illustrata è la posizione della commissione che presiedo, sulla quale ovviamente vi dovete esprimere.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, allow me to recall that the right of scrutiny of the European Parliament concerns the question of whether the draft implementing act exceeds the implementing powers provided for in the basic act. In this respect I would like to point out that the draft implementing regulation for renewal of the approval of glyphosate has been processed in line with the procedures set out in Regulation No 1107/2009 and Regulation No 182/2011 on comitology. The Commission considers, therefore, that it has not exceeded its implementing powers.

The Commission services have presented a draft implementing act to the standing committee in compliance with the legal framework. The Commission services are now discussing with Member States the best way forward on the renewal of the approval for glyphosate and will endeavour to find a solution which commands the widest possible support among the Member States. The current draft implementing act is therefore likely to be amended and should not be considered as a decision from the Commission.

Before Members express their position on this draft resolution, I would like to recall a few important points that were raised when this was discussed in Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. The draft regulation includes a firm commitment to review the approval if the European Chemicals Agency process leads to a classification relevant for the approval.

Second, the Commission has started working on co-formulants. The current draft, if adopted, would not allow the placing on the market of glyphosate-containing products containing the co-formulant tallowamine.

Third, the Commission has called on the industry to publish the regulatory studies submitted by companies. I refer here to the letter that Commissioner Andriukaitis recently sent to the glyphosate taskforce. The Commission services have received the response of the applicants and are now clarifying the details with them.

Angélique Delahaye, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, tout d'abord, sur la forme, je souhaite rappeler que c'est une objection sur un acte d'exécution et, donc, que cela n'aura aucune conséquence juridique. Ce sujet fait pourtant partie des préoccupations des citoyens et, dans le même temps, le monde agricole traverse une crise sans précédent. En Europe, de nombreux agriculteurs ont recours au glyphosate dans la plupart des productions végétales. Le glyphosate est fondamental pour les stratégies de désherbage. Or, à ce jour, il n'y a pas d'alternative économiquement viable à proposer aux agriculteurs garantissant l'absence de conséquences sur la santé humaine.

Pour toutes ces raisons, nous devons être force de proposition pour que le blocage actuel entre les États membres et la Commission trouve une issue. Je souhaitais également rappeler que nous avons une procédure en matière d'homologation des substances que nous, colégislateurs, avons décidée et votée. En la matière, la procédure a été respectée. De plus, en cas de nouvelles informations, la Commission peut toujours revenir sur son autorisation, et nous attendons d'ailleurs l'analyse de l'écart pour fin 2017.

Au regard de ces éléments, j'ai proposé des amendements, au nom du groupe PPE, limitant l'autorisation dans le temps, demandant à la Commission et aux États membres d'accélérer leur travail sur la liste des coformulants à interdire, comme la tallow amine, et proposant à la Commission des mesures d'encadrement pour les États membres. Je souhaite également un renforcement de la recherche et de l'innovation afin de trouver des alternatives à l'utilisation du glyphosate.

Je compte sur l'ensemble de mes collègues pour approuver ces propositions.

(L'oratrice accepte de répondre à une question «carton bleu» (article 162, paragraphe 8, du règlement))

Susanne Melior (S&D), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Präsident! Frau Kollegin, Sie haben eben einige Punkte angesprochen, die im Zusammenhang mit Glyphosat und dem Einsatz wichtig sind. Sie sind nicht darauf eingegangen, dass wir natürlich auch Futtermittel aus Drittstaaten importieren. Das ist auch ein Punkt, der in diesem Zusammenhang diskutiert werden muss. Ich will Ihnen die Frage stellen, ob Sie nicht wegen des Vorsorgeprinzips in der Europäischen Union genau aus diesem Grunde gegen den weiteren Einsatz von Glyphosat sowohl in Lebensmitteln als auch in Futtermitteln stimmen müssten.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE), *réponse «carton bleu»*. – Chers collègues, j'espère avoir compris votre question, d'après la transcription.

Je pense qu'il faudrait mener un débat plus avancé sur cette question avant d'adopter une position ferme et définitive.

Pavel Poc, *za skupinu S&D*. – Nejsmutnější na této věci je, že tento Parlament vůbec musí podávat námitky proti prováděcím opatřením Evropské komise. To je prostě hrůza.

Možná, že bychom měli zrevidovat vůbec celý proces tzv. komitologie, nesrozumitelného rozhodovacího procesu, který odcizuje Evropskou unii jejím občanům.

Výrobci glyfosátu kdysi tvrdili, že po jeho použití nezůstávají rezidua. Byla to lež. Těch reziduí je plné naše životní prostředí, naše potraviny i my sami. Ve Spojených státech začne letos Úřad pro kontrolu potravin a léčiv testovat obsah glyfosátu v potravinách. Naše rezoluce vyzývá Evropskou komisi k následování v zájmu bezpečnosti evropských občanů.

Jsme podobně přesvědčováni, že glyfosát není nebezpečný pro lidské zdraví. Evropský úřad pro bezpečnost potravin svoje doporučení zakládá na několika tzv. klíčových, ale utajovaných studiích, financovaných kým? Průmyslem. Ovšem Mezinárodní agentura pro výzkum rakoviny a desítky a desítky nezávislých vědců přinášejí více a více důkazů, že glyfosát může být příčinou celé řady zdravotních poruch a je patrně i endokrinním disruptorem.

Evropská unie chce bojovat s antibiotickou rezistencí, glyfosát byl patentován jako antibiotikum. Zajímá to pouze tento Parlament. Jsme si vědomi té smutné skutečnosti, že evropské zemědělství se ze závislosti na glyfosátu nedokáže uzdravit.

Julie Girling, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, my Group will robustly rebut this resolution: we will not be voting for it. I could give you a long speech on the use of glyphosate and how important it is to agriculture. I do not have time for that, so let me just concentrate on what I see as the failures in the resolution.

The resolution states, as part of its justification, that residues of glyphosate have been found in soil and water; well, yes, they have. But, as the German Federal Risk Institute tells us, they have been found in quantities at less than 1% of the daily acceptable rate. It also states that residues have been found in food. Again, this is not about hazard, this is about risk, and they are at levels way below those which are acceptable to human health. So why does this form such an upfront part of this resolution when it is frankly irrelevant?

It also says, in Recital J, that the current proposal has no restrictions on use. That is not the case. The draft implementing regulation clearly states that regulatory measures to identify co-formulants must be developed. It is already there in the draft regulation. So before we even think about the use of glyphosate and its value to us, we really ought to get our facts right. And where we talk about the precautionary principle, once again: the precautionary principle as enshrined in EU law is to take care of cases where there is not any scientific advice. There is a plethora of scientific advice here. That is one of the problems: that we have to choose between our own European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) advice and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), and I see no reason to move away from EFSA.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – Mr President, I am lucky that I checked when the public debate would be in plenary, because I just found out that it is now! But my own process was as difficult as the whole process of the authorisation by the Commission, because let us be clear: what kind of process is it when a Commissioner, after tabling the authorisation, sends letters to the biggest industrial giant in this area asking for more transparency? So there have been huge difficulties and yes, we have EFSA, we have a strong role in our decision-making process in Europe, and we count on EFSA, and EFSA is relatively clear in its statement.

So my Group believes that we should look very closely at what EFSA is saying. But EFSA is not saying anything about the amount of time – the number of years – that we should go for. Therefore we have just tabled an amendment, as the Liberal Group, in which we call on the Commission to renew the approval of glyphosate with a maximum of five years, and to take into account any new evidence up to that time which proves that it is more dangerous than we previously thought, in which case the authorisation should be withdrawn. That is what we just tabled 20 minutes ago, and I hope that you can follow that line during the plenary vote.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), „kékkártyás” kérdés, melyet Julie Girling képviselőhöz intéz. – Igen, Girling asszonynak szerettem volna föltenni azt a kérdést, de gondolom, hogy a vitához is hozzátartozik, hogy ha akkora ellenállás van a glifozát használatát ellen – megjegyzem egyébként, hogy körülbelül feleannyi glifozátot használ föl a világ mezőgazdasága, mint amennyi a kakaó összetermés, szóval nagyon nagy mennyiségről van szó – nincsenek alternatívák? Csak ez az egy megoldás lenne: a glifozát? Szerintem vannak alternatívák, és ezen kéne dolgoznunk.

Julie Girling (ECR), blue-card answer. – If I understood that correctly, this was a question about the use of glyphosate and – did you say cocoa? I am sorry but it did not come across very well in the translation. Yes, there are many aspects of agriculture – some of them much closer to home than cocoa – in the European Union that rely very heavily on the use of glyphosate. In some cases there is resistance, and that is why we have a Sustainable Use Directive which lays out very clearly for farmers exactly how products such as glyphosate should be used and, if resistance is detected, what steps they should take. So I am perfectly confident that resistance can be dealt with, so no, I do not have a problem with that. We really do need glyphosate.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, kansainvälisen syöväntutkimuskeskuksen IARC:n mukaan glyfosaatti luokiteltiin maaliskuussa 2015 todennäköisesti ihmiselle syöpävaaralliseksi aineeksi. Lisäksi on selkeää näyttöä siitä, että glyfosaatti toimii hormonihäiritsijänä.

Mainosten mukaan glyfosaatti hajoo luonnossa parissa viikossa. Viimeaikaiset tutkimukset ovat kuitenkin osoittaneet, että glyfosaatti ja sen hajoamistuotteet, erityisesti AMPA, voivat sitoutua maaperään ja kulkeutua edelleen muualle ympäristöön. Riskit ovat erityisen suuria kylmässä ilmastossa, jossa maaperän prosessit ovat hitaita. Näyttö glyfosaatin nopeasta hajoamisesta perustuukin lämpimiin olosuhteisiin ja niillä tehtyihin kokeisiin. Tarvitsemme tutkimusta siitä, miten glyfosaatti hajoo, säilyy ja vaikuttaa myös kylmemmissä ekosysteemeissä, ennen kuin sokeasti annamme luvan jatkaa nykykäytäntöjä.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Ja, es ist gut, dass wir heute über Glyphosat reden, denn der Stoff gehört in den Mittelpunkt der Diskussion, auch weil es um ein Prinzip geht, das uns als Europäern fast heilig ist: das Vorsorgeprinzip. Es gibt einen nach wie vor nicht ausgeräumten Krebsverdacht, und den hat nicht irgendwer geäußert, sondern den hat die Weltgesundheitsorganisation geäußert, der steht im Raum und der ist nicht ausgeräumt.

Es gibt einen massiven Verlust an Biodiversität bei dem Einsatz dieses Mittels, das immerhin noch auf 40 Prozent der Flächen ausgebracht wird und in den letzten 10 Jahren eine Steigerung um 70 Prozent erreicht hat, und Glyphosat ist mittlerweile überall nachweisbar, im Bier, im Getreide und auch in uns. Und mir ist es egal Frau Girling, wir brauchen nicht über Grenzwerte zu streiten, der Stoff gehört da einfach schlicht und ergreifend nicht hin. Deshalb müssen wir uns wirklich ernsthaft überlegen, ob wir nicht erstens Alternativen prüfen und ob wir es zweitens akzeptieren, dass eine Kommission nach einem langen Diskussionsprozess eine Vorlage macht, die sagt: Es darf um 15 Jahre verlängert werden – bei keinen Einschränkungen. Keine Einschränkungen heißt: Es darf vor der Ernte angewendet werden, es darf jeder Laie anwenden, und es darf angewendet werden aus rein ökonomischen Gründen: Der Bauer spart 100 Euro. Da stellt sich doch die Grundsatzfrage: Dürfen ökonomische Gründe denn höher gewertet werden als ökologische oder auch Gesundheitsgründe? Deshalb darf dieser Stoff nicht in der Zulassung verlängert werden.

Und ein Satz noch zur Transparenz-Initiative des Kommissars: Also sorry, das nachher zu machen und dann die Firmen zu bitten, das ist doch ein Armutszeugnis. Es gehört eine generelle Transparenz in die Verfahren.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Peter Liese (PPE), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Herr Kollege Häusling, Sie haben gesagt, dass die Kommission keine Einschränkungen vorgeschlagen hat. Jetzt liegen aber Änderungsanträge vor – zum Beispiel von der EVP –, wo wir genau die Einschränkungen, die Sie gerade aufgezählt haben, fordern. Und würden Sie diesem Antrag näher treten, auch unter dem Aspekt, dass, wenn die EntschlieÙung so durchkommt und Glyphosat sofort verboten wird, möglicherweise noch giftigere Stoffe eingesetzt werden? Das kann ja auch nicht im Sinne der Grünen sein.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Lieber Kollege Liese! Ich finde, die EVP-Fraktion hat schon einen großen Schritt nach vorne gemacht. Nach den Debatten im Agrarausschuss ist das ein wichtiger Schritt. Aber ich glaube, man muss doch in den Vordergrund stellen: Es gibt nicht nur chemische Alternativen zu Glyphosat. Die Anwendung von Glyphosat lässt sich in den allermeisten Fällen – ich behaupte, zu 90 Prozent – als Alternative ersetzen durch mechanische Maßnahmen, durch Pflügen oder auch durch Unkrautbekämpfung mit der Hacke. Deshalb ist doch die Frage, ob wir dann so ein Mittel wirklich weiterhin uneingeschränkt anwenden lassen. Das ist eine Grundsatzfrage. Bei dieser Grundsatzfrage, habe ich gesagt, geht es ums Vorsorgeprinzip.

(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine weitere Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Pilar Ayuso (PPE), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – ¿Me puede decir cuánto cuestan las medidas de labranza y cuánto suponen en emisiones de efecto invernadero?

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Liebe Frau Kollegin! Ich bewirtschafte einen Hof biologisch, und ich lade Sie gerne ein, sich die Maßnahmen, die alternativ zu Glyphosat möglich sind auf einem Hof, der seit 30 Jahren kein Glyphosat einsetzt, mal wirklich anzuschauen. Es ist machbar, und es ist eine Alternative.

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi inserisco anch'io in questo dibattito, perché è importante oggi poterne parlare in vista del voto di mercoledì.

Il rinnovo all'autorizzazione del glifosato va fermato e va fermato perché, in modo particolare, non si può pensare di rinnovare l'autorizzazione nel momento in cui le due più grandi agenzie scientifiche non concordano su questo punto. È necessario un tavolo congiunto per addivenire a una posizione comune, senza la quale queste istituzioni europee non possono pensare di rinnovare l'autorizzazione del glifosato.

Inoltre, abbiamo anche detto già in quest'Aula il pericolo relativo agli interferenti endocrini e il fatto che l'ECHA – qui manca un'altra agenzia che deve ancora esprimersi – che dovrà nei prossimi mesi fornire la sua posizione. Prima di questa posizione non è pensabile prendere una decisione in merito a un qualunque rinnovo del glifosato.

E infine l'impatto ambientale, l'impatto ambientale sull'ambiente, soprattutto sugli organismi acquatici è da studiare, da monitorare, oltre che quello sulla salute umana.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank my colleagues for this very important debate. The correspondence I received on this has been quite interesting. There has been quite a large lobby to ban glyphosate, and we respect those who emailed us in that regard. But in recent days I have been getting emails from individual farmers – and I welcome those emails – not from the farm organisations, but from individual farmers – talking to me about how vital glyphosate is for them when they are practising conservation agriculture and trying to reduce their carbon footprint in a sustainable way that is positive for the environment. I think it is very easy to call for a ban on the chemical, because chemicals raise concerns among our citizens. We need to reflect on exactly what is before us here.

There are two, apparently different, scientific assessments. But in fact one – the EFSA position – looks at the risks, while the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) looks at the hazards. We need to differentiate between both of those. The position of our group – the EPP – is, in my view, very measured. We very much want to make sure the products are safe, but we do not want an outright ban. We support re-registration of this product, but not for 15 years. We want actions taken if there is, in the future, evidence where there are concerns about it. Let us not ignore the voices that talk to us, but let us listen to all of the voices that lobby on this important issue.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Wir sprechen von Glyphosat und haben es heute als Pflanzenschutzmittel bezeichnet. Es ist kein Pflanzenschutzmittel, es ist ein Totalherbizid, es tötet Pflanzen. Es ist daher auch kein Unkrautvernichtungsmittel, denn es macht in Wirklichkeit keinen Unterschied zwischen Unkraut und Kulturpflanze. Diesen Unterschied macht es nur dann, wenn diese Kulturpflanze RR-tauglich ist, sprich, wenn es Monsanto oder sonst jemandem gelungen ist, ein Enzym in die Pflanze einzupflanzen, das sie widerstandsfähig gegen diesen Giftregen macht.

Das heißt, wir haben uns heute, glaube ich, schon relativ klar darauf verständigt, dass Glyphosat tauglich ist, den menschlichen Körper zu schädigen, sei es nun krebserregend, sei es hormonverändernd. Und natürlich ist das eine Frage des Risikos. Das heißt, wie oft sind wir denn dieser Schädigungsgefahr, diesem Schädigungspotenzial ausgesetzt?

Wenn wir hier einfach negieren, dass es eine Vielfachkonfrontation mit Glyphosat gibt, dann können wir einer Zulassung zustimmen. Wenn wir der Meinung sind, dass es sowohl ein Risiko als auch ein großes Schädigungspotenzial gibt, dann müssen wir verhindern, dass hier die Zulassung verlängert wird.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 162 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Franc Bogovič (PPE), Vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka. – Spoštovana kolegica, sam sem sadjar vse od leta 1986 in približno 25 let že uporabljam tudi glifosat kot enega od herbicidov v sadjarstvu, vinogradništvu, kjer je najbolj pogosto uporabljan.

Verjemite, da je tistim, ki uporabljamo te pripravke, najbolj v interesu, da pridemo do konca, do dna z resnico. Predvsem pa mislim, da pri tem pripravku gre za to, da je pri tem 40 let uporabe, in pri 40 letih uporabe ni več potrebe ugotavljati samo preventivne in previdne ukrepe...

(Predsedujoči je govorca prekinil.)

Der Präsident. – Herr Bogovič! Der Sinn des Verfahrens „blaue Karte“ ist, dass Sie der Kollegin eine Frage stellen, nicht dass Sie die Rede halten, die sie im *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren gerne gehalten hätten.

Frau Kadenbach, ich fürchte, da ist nichts zu beantworten. Deswegen fahren wir jetzt in der Rednerliste fort.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Sagen er jo den, at WHO's cancerexpertpanel har klassificeret glyphosat som værende sandsynligvis kræftfremkaldende, og at EFSA konkluderer, at glyphosat næppe indebærer en risiko for mennesker. Det er to meget forskellige vurderinger af stoffet glyphosat, og netop det er vel kernen i denne sag - at vi har to meget forskellige vurderinger. Set i det lys synes jeg, at det er bekymrende, hvis vi tillader en forlængelse af licensen for round-up for yderligere 15 år, når der foreligger to så vidt forskellige vurderinger af stoffet. Jeg opfordrer derfor indtrængende EU-Kommissionen til at sætte menneskers sundhed før penge. Vi bliver nødt til at få stoffet glyphosat undersøgt til bunds, før vi giver en forlængelse af licensen på yderligere 15 år. Vi kan ikke være andet bekendt. Det kan godt være, at det så kan være vanskeligt at finde alternativer, men vi bliver nødt til at få undersøgt dette. Vi kan ikke sidde WHO's bekymring overhørig.

Der Präsident. – Für das nun folgende *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren muss ich Ihnen mitteilen, dass ich mehr Meldungen habe, als ich jetzt in der Kürze der Zeit durchzählen kann. Ich kann also nicht alle drannehmen und bitte dafür um Nachsicht wegen der nachfolgenden Debatten und der Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die in diesen Debatten sprechen.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Já jsem hlasovala pro to, aby se o tomto bodu mohla vést rozprava, protože jsem přesvědčena, že občané by měli vědět, o čem zde hlasujeme.

Posuzování, povolování chemických látek používaných v zemědělství, které mají vliv na lidské zdraví, je zásadní prioritou a věřím, že je také zásadní prioritou pro Evropskou komisi, která o tom prioritně rozhoduje, a je také zásadní prioritou pro členské státy. Proto jsem si vyžádala stanovisko Ministerstva zemědělství a životního prostředí ČR, které byly konzultovány, které se zúčastnily rozhodovacího procesu, a které doporučily, abychom jako poslanci podpořili stanovisko Evropské komise.

Já budu hlasovat také pro pozměňovací návrhy Evropské lidové strany, které samozřejmě mají hledisko bezpečnosti jako svoji prioritu, a navrhuje se v nich např. zkrácení té povolené doby na 7 let.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor Presidente, me parece muy oportuno que haya este debate, porque hay incertidumbre y, por lo tanto, conviene aclarar algunos aspectos.

Me parece grave que algún colega diga que hay distintas agencias con distintas opiniones. No. La Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria, la EFSA, que, nos guste o no, es nuestra autoridad europea en materia de seguridad alimentaria, ha dicho que no hay ningún riesgo en cuanto a la sustancia activa. También lo ha dicho el Instituto Federal de Evaluación de Riesgos alemán, y luego tenemos la Agencia Internacional para la Investigación del Cáncer, que ha dicho que prevé riesgos por lo que respecta al producto final, el herbicida final.

Por lo tanto, hay incertidumbre. Evidentemente, es un producto muy utilizado por los agricultores, pero ese no es el argumento. El argumento es si creemos a nuestra autoridad de seguridad alimentaria o no la creemos. Yo prefiero creer a nuestro sistema de seguridad y no a otros. Por lo tanto, si hay dudas, resolvámoslas. Pero, desde luego, la objeción no es oportuna.

Richard Ashworth (ECR). – Mr President, this House has a duty to ensure that public food is safe and that the environment is responsibly managed, and we must take those responsibilities very seriously indeed. But on the other hand, we must also ensure that decisions we make are strictly proportionate to risk, not to hazard, and we must be aware of the consequences of those decisions.

In the case of glyphosate – a product which is endorsed by the Food Standards Agency as safe and for which there is no immediate substitute – for the industry to achieve the same effects, it would have to revert to more traditional mechanical operations. I could not disagree more with some of the comments which were made earlier about mechanical operations. We would have to revert to greater use of other agrochemicals and, in consequence, we would add considerably to the costs of an industry that is already under great difficulty. This House must be guided by the facts and common sense, not emotion. I urge the Commission to renew approval.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, međunarodna agencija za istraživanje raka uvrstila je glifosat u kategoriju tvari koje su vjerojatno kancerogene. Meta-analiza epidemioloških studija radnika koji su u svom radu koristili herbicid pokazala je povećan rizik kod njih od B-staničnog limfoma.

Multinacionalne kompanije, s druge strane, umanjuju opasnost glifosata za zdravlje jer i dalje žele prodavati GMO koji je jedino konkurentan s aplikacijom tog herbicida. Smatram da odluku o produženju odobrenja uporabe glifosata moramo donositi poštujući načelo predostrožnosti. Narušavanje tog načela narušava pravo građana, a u ovom slučaju poljoprivrednika, na zdrav život u zdravom okolišu kao i na njihovu sigurnost u radu.

Nakon konzultacija koje sam obavila sa stručnjacima da se detaljnija analiza učinaka glifosata na ljudsko zdravlje može napraviti u roku od godine dana, te svjesna činjenice o razmjerima uporabe glifosata kao aktivne tvari u poljoprivredi, predlažem da se odbije ovaj prijedlog Europske komisije.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Ačiū, pirmininke. Europos Komisija nėra pasiryžusį imtis pokyčių glifosato klausimu, todėl Parlamento vaidmuo čia ypač svarbus. Komisijos veiksmai rodo, kad, jos nuomone, problemos su glifosatu neegzistuoja, užsimerkiama net prieš tokius skandalus, kurie kilo Europoje dėl vokiško alaus, jau nekalbant apie mokslininkų atliktus tyrimus dėl galimos glifosato žalos žmogaus organizmui. Kita vertus, žinoma, visiškai glifosato uždrausti kol kas būtų per anksti. Šiandien žemės ūkis ir taip išgyvena krizę, grūdų kainos pasiekusios istorines žemumas. Uždraudę naudoti glifosatą įstumsime ūkininkus į nepavydėtiną padėtį, todėl racionaliausia šiandien būtų pratęsti porai metų naudojimą ir griežtinti glifosato naudojimo taisykles, įvertinant, kad glifosatu purkšti laukus ne visada yra saugu, pavyzdžiui, prieš derliaus nuėmimą. Todėl racionalu investuoti laiką ir lėšas į analogiškos kokybės alternatyvų paiešką ir atitinkamą žemdirbių švietimą. Ačiū.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me repeat that the point at issue in this debate is whether the draft implementing act exceeds the implementing powers provided for in the basic act. As I said before, the draft implementing regulation for renewal of the approval of glyphosate is consistent with the relevant regulations. The Commission considers, therefore, that this falls within its implementing powers. The Commission services will continue to discuss with Member States the best way forward on the renewal of glyphosate, seeking a solution which commands the widest possible support among Member States. The draft implementing act is therefore likely to be amended.

Giovanni La Via, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in primo luogo, debbo sottolineare l'utilità di questo dibattito che ci ha consentito, in questa sede, alla presenza di tutti i colleghi, di poter esprimere ognuno le proprie posizioni.

Abbiamo visto che esistono posizioni fortemente differenziate all'interno del Parlamento, così come già evidenziate anche in commissione ambiente, ma oggi è il momento di cercare anche possibili soluzioni. Abbiamo sentito, in quest'Aula, la proposta di alcuni emendamenti da parte dei gruppi politici, che potrebbero temperare, da un lato, l'esigenza di avere un rinnovo dell'autorizzazione, ma, dall'altro, evidentemente poter dare garanzie in tempi più brevi sulla effettiva e non presunta, eventualmente, cancerogenicità del prodotto.

Una cosa però è certa, e ne dobbiamo essere tutti consapevoli, ed è l'importanza che questo prodotto largamente utilizzato in agricoltura oggi ha come erbicida e che, evidentemente così come hanno detto alcuni colleghi, potrebbe essere sostituito solamente con degli interventi meccanici cioè delle scerbature manuali o meccaniche che, obiettivamente, se, da un lato, sono tecnicamente possibili, dall'altro lato, sicuramente minerebbero la competitività del nostro sistema produttivo. Ecco quindi che domani e nei prossimi giorni ci ritroveremo a votare su questo tema e invito tutti alla più ampia riflessione.

Dall'altro lato, un altro elemento emerso e che sottolineo brevemente è il ruolo dell'Agenzia per la sicurezza alimentare: è lo strumento tecnico di cui dispone l'Unione europea. E, così come detto dall'onorevole Aguilera, è sicuramente lo strumento che abbiamo a disposizione e del quale ci dovremmo fidare anche per le nostre valutazioni, altrimenti non saprei a cosa debbano servire le agenzie che gravano sul bilancio dell'Europa.

Der Präsident. – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurde vom Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit ein Entschließungsantrag eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – Il glifosato è una sostanza attiva ampiamente utilizzata tra i diserbanti. Nel 2000, allo scadere del brevetto, è stato commercializzato da molteplici aziende e diverse centinaia di prodotti fitosanitari contenenti glifosato sono attualmente registrati in Europa per l'utilizzo nel settore agricolo.

Nel marzo 2015 l'Agenzia internazionale per la ricerca sul cancro (IARC) ha classificato il glifosato come «probabilmente cancerogeno per l'uomo» in base a «prove limitate» di effetti cancerogeni sull'uomo, «prove sufficienti» di tumori negli animali da laboratorio, nonché «prove solide» di dati meccanicistici riguardanti la cancerogenicità del glifosato «puro» e dei formulati contenenti glifosato. Ciononostante, nel novembre 2015 l'Autorità europea per la sicurezza alimentare (EFSA) ha completato una valutazione del glifosato e ha concluso che è improbabile che il glifosato rappresenti una minaccia di cancro per l'uomo e che gli elementi di prova disponibili non ne giustificano la classificazione relativamente al suo potenziale cancerogeno in conformità al regolamento (CE) n. 1272/2008.

Il MoVimento 5 Stelle non intende rinnovare l'autorizzazione del glifosato fintantoché non ci sarà un pronunciamento unico sull'assenza di rischio cancerogeno e non si sarà pronunciato anche l'ECHA rispetto alle probabili proprietà di interferente endocrino del principio attivo, valutazione attesa entro il 2017.

Michel Dantin (PPE), par écrit. – Monsieur le Président, Interdire le glyphosate, sans mesure d'accompagnement ni vision de moyen et long terme, aurait un impact à la fois dommageable pour le secteur de l'agriculture déjà en crise, et contre-productif en termes de sécurité sanitaire et environnementale.

Avec mes collègues du groupe PPE, nous proposons une série d'amendements au projet de résolution, afin préserver la compétitivité du secteur agricole et garantir un haut niveau de sécurité sanitaire. Nos propositions visent à réduire la durée d'autorisation de 15 à 7 ans, afin de prendre en compte l'absence de consensus parmi les scientifiques, mais aussi le temps nécessaire pour les professionnels agricoles pour s'adapter à d'éventuels changements réglementaires. Le glyphosate est aujourd'hui un produit indispensable pour divers types de culture, nous ne pouvons pas l'interdire sans proposer aux agriculteurs des alternatives techniquement et économiquement viables.

Conscient des inquiétudes et des incertitudes actuelles, je suis toutefois favorable à un encadrement plus strict de l'utilisation du glyphosate, en le limitant aux professionnels, en renforçant la formation des agriculteurs et en interdisant son usage avant les récoltes. Nous devons enfin pouvoir à tout moment réviser l'autorisation si de nouvelles preuves scientifiques justifient l'interdiction du produit. Je vous remercie.

Esther Herranz García (PPE), *por escrito*. – Considero que es importante que el Parlamento Europeo no desautorice la opinión de un órgano de la Unión como es la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria. La eventual prohibición del uso del glifosato no solo pone en un enorme aprieto a muchos agricultores ante la inexistencia de una solución alternativa, sino que también favorece las importaciones procedentes de terceros países que utilizan pesticidas cuyo uso se encuentra prohibido en el territorio de la Unión.

Tenemos que velar por preservar la salud del consumidor pero, antes de adoptar una medida tan drástica como la retirada de la autorización de esta sustancia, tendríamos que asegurarnos de que existen razones científicas fundadas y de que no hay soluciones intermedias que podrían ponerse en marcha para reducir los potenciales riesgos que plantea el glifosato.

Está claro que la Agencia Internacional de Investigación sobre el Cáncer ha realizado una evaluación de laboratorio muy distinta al enfoque realizado por la Autoridad de Seguridad Alimentaria, basado más en el impacto real que tiene el glifosato sobre el terreno. A este paso, acabaremos con todo tipo de tratamiento fitosanitario, dejando el suministro de alimentos en Europa a merced de las importaciones de terceros países. Desde mi punto de vista, no solo perderá el agricultor europeo, sino también el consumidor.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – La proposition de la Commission européenne de renouveler pour 15 ans l'approbation d'utilisation du glyphosate (substance contenue notamment dans le Round up), n'est pas acceptable en raison de craintes liées à son emploi dans la composition de produits agricoles et ménagers.

La commission du Parlement européen chargée de l'environnement s'en est saisie et une partie de la communauté scientifique a mis en lumière des risques probables pour la santé lors de l'utilisation de produits — très répandus — contenant du glyphosate. Aujourd'hui, en session plénière du Parlement, cette objection n'a malheureusement pas été retenue et je le regrette. Une majorité des députés a soutenu un accord de renouvellement pour 7 ans. Je m'y suis opposé. En accordant ce «demi-blanc seing» à la Commission, le Parlement européen envoie un mauvais signal. Il revient à présent à la Commission, puis aux Etats de tenir compte des réticences exprimées.

Je plaide aujourd'hui pour une reformulation de la proposition tenant compte de la dangerosité potentielle de cette substance, tout en permettant une transition soutenable pour les exploitants agricoles et des produits alternatifs économiquement et écologiquement responsables. Je vous remercie pour votre attention.

Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Cada vez son más las evidencias y los estudios independientes sobre los riesgos del glifosato para el medioambiente, la biodiversidad y la salud humana: toxicidad, efectos cancerígenos y reproductivos, acción mutagénica y residuos en los alimentos. La OMS lo califica como «probablemente cancerígeno». Conviene recordar también que Monsanto ha puesto en el mercado soja genéticamente modificada resistente al glifosato (principio activo del herbicida que ella misma comercializa). Y alguien debería explicar también por qué antes de estos transgénicos el límite máximo residual de glifosato en soja en Europa y en los Estados Unidos era de 0,1 mg/kg y a partir de 1996 lo elevaron a 20 mg/kg. ¿Fueron los estudios y las evidencias de las empresas, tal vez, los que determinaron elevar este límite? Yo me pregunto: ¿qué más tiene que suceder para que la Comisión Europea reaccione y aplique el principio de precaución y no renueve la autorización del glifosato? ¿Se olvidaron ya del escándalo de las vacas locas? Las agricultoras y los agricultores somos las primeras interesadas en que se garantice la seguridad alimentaria. Dejen de utilizarnos como excusa para proteger intereses contrarios a los nuestros. Pónganse a trabajar en las alternativas, que -como muy bien saben- existen.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Seul le retrait pur et simple de ce produit dangereux pour le citoyen sera une réelle satisfaction. On peut se demander pourquoi certains gouvernements, dont le gouvernement belge, se positionnent en faveur de l'autorisation du glyphosate. De lourds soupçons pèsent sur ce produit, probable perturbateur endocrinien responsable de cancers et de problèmes hormonaux et dangereux pour le développement. Il a fait l'objet de nombreuses études soulignant la toxicité de ses effets secondaires ainsi que le lien entre l'exposition au glyphosate et le développement de l'autisme chez les enfants. L'OMS a classé l'herbicide dans les substances dites cancérigènes probables. On peut comprendre que Monsanto fasse le maximum pour que le glyphosate soit autorisé, tant son retrait ferait baisser les bénéfices de la multinationale. Mais quand un danger pèse sur nos citoyens, il est de notre devoir, chers collègues, de faire valoir le principe de précaution! Je ne peux accepter que reste sur le marché un produit qui fait courir de graves risques potentiels à la santé des Européens. Il reste un mois aux États restés aveugles à cette évidence pour enfin nous rejoindre dans ce combat pour la sécurité des citoyens européens.

18. Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (short presentation)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann über das Programm zur Gewährleistung der Effizienz und Leistungsfähigkeit der Rechtsetzung (REFIT): Bestandsaufnahme und Ausblick (2014/2150(INI)) (A8-0208/2015).

Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Berichterstatterin. – Herr Präsident! Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Anlass für den vorliegenden Initiativbericht ist die Mitteilung der Kommission von 2014 zum Programm zur Gewährleistung der Effizienz und Leistungsfähigkeit der Rechtsetzung, abgekürzt REFIT. Nun ist seitdem leider doch schon etwas Zeit ins Land gegangen. REFIT gibt es seit 2012. Im Mai letzten Jahres hat die Kommission ihr umfassendes Reformpaket zur besseren Rechtsetzung vorgestellt, und inzwischen haben wir ein neues interinstitutionelles Abkommen zwischen Kommission, Parlament und Rat. Das REFIT-Programm spielt eine zentrale Rolle für die Arbeit der Kommission, und es wird sie auch beim Zusammenwirken der Institutionen im Gesetzgebungsprozess spielen. Von daher ist es höchste Zeit, dass sich unser Haus endlich zu diesem Programm positioniert.

Lassen Sie mich einige Aspekte des Berichts, der im Rechtsausschuss mit großer Mehrheit angenommen worden ist, hervorheben. Gut ist, dass der Vizepräsident der Kommission Frans Timmermans mit dem Geschäftsbereich bessere Rechtsetzung betraut wurde. Dies war und ist ein starkes politisches Signal an die Unionsbürgerinnen und Unionsbürger, die unsere Europäische Union als zu bürokratisch wahrnehmen. Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger erwarten zu Recht, dass sich etwas ändert. Der Bericht unterstreicht richtigerweise, dass es bei besserer Rechtsetzung im Kern nicht um die bloße Anzahl von EU-Gesetzen geht, nicht um die Frage, mehr oder weniger Gesetze. Entscheidend ist vielmehr ihre Qualität, und ich darf daran erinnern, dass eine europäische Norm in der Regel 28 Normen ersetzt, was de facto zu weniger Bürokratie führt und zugleich den gemeinsamen Rechtsraum und den gemeinsamen Markt stärkt.

Der Dialog mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern, mit den Sozialpartnern, mit Interessenvertretern aus allen Bereichen der Zivilgesellschaft trägt dazu bei sicherzustellen, dass die EU-Rechtsetzung transparent, zielführend und kohärent ist. Im Bericht legen wir daher Wert darauf, dass die Kommission bei Konsultationen die Ansichten aller Interessenträger ausreichend berücksichtigt. Ausgewogenheit und Transparenz sind ebenso erforderlich, wenn es um die verschiedenen Kommentare geht, die über die Internetseite der Kommission unter der neuen Rubrik: „Lastenabbau – Sagen Sie Ihre Meinung“ eingehen und die durch die neu geschaffene REFIT-Plattform geprüft werden. Noch ist es zu früh für eine Bewertung der REFIT-Plattform, aber die Kommission kann gewiss sein, dass das Parlament diesen Prozess intensiv verfolgen wird.

Mein Bericht betont ferner, dass Folgenabschätzungen einen wichtigen Platz in der Gesetzgebung einnehmen. Wie sie wann von wem vorzunehmen sind, dazu gab es in unserem Haus sehr engagierte Diskussionen. Hierzu stellt der Bericht klar, dass der neue Ausschuss für Regulierungskontrolle der Kommission keine verbindlichen Stellungnahmen abgeben darf. Das muss auch in Zukunft so bleiben, denn die Kommission als Exekutive steht in der politischen Verantwortung. Sie hat zu entscheiden, und sie muss ihre Verantwortung wahrnehmen. Folgenabschätzungen sind eben genau kein Ersatz für politische Entscheidungen, und was abgeschlossene Vereinbarungen der Sozialpartner angeht, so gilt selbstverständlich die Autonomie der Sozialpartner.

Großes Augenmerk widmet der Bericht zu Recht dem Abbau von Verwaltungslasten, gerade für die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen, die das Rückgrat der Wirtschaft darstellen. Auch hier gilt bei vielem wie bei anderen Dingen: Die EU ist kein Unternehmen, und gute EU-Gesetzgebung lässt sich eben nicht auf betriebliche Kosten-Nutzen-Rechnung reduzieren. Deshalb hebt der Bericht hervor, dass der Abbau von Verwaltungslasten für KMU nicht dazu führen darf, die Rechte von Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern in Frage zu stellen oder Ausnahmen für die KMU vielleicht sogar zu einer Fragmentierung des Binnenmarktes führen.

Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, last but not least, das Parlament wird dem Thema REFIT weiterhin große Aufmerksamkeit beimessen. Ich möchte mich bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen für die gute Mitarbeit und Zusammenarbeit im Ausschuss bedanken, insbesondere natürlich bei den Schattenberichterstatterinnen und —berichterstattern.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen, liebe Frau Berichterstatterin! Ich möchte nur ganz kurz sagen, dass das REFIT-Programm wirklich ein gutes Programm ist, dass man es zu begrüßen hat, dass die Kommission konkrete Vorschläge auch zurückzieht. Das ist ein Novum der Juncker-Kommission, und das kann man nur unterstützen.

Ich habe einen Punkt, den ich gerne noch ansprechen möchte, das ist das Thema Gesetzesfolgenabschätzung. Wir haben im Parlament über viele Jahre, auch im Zuge von besserer Rechtsetzung, viel Mühe darauf verwendet, dass die Vorschläge, auch Änderungen, die aus dem Parlament kamen, eben einer ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsfolgenabschätzung unterliegen. Da muss man die Kommission noch mal ermuntern und auffordern, einfach noch ambitionierter zu werden. Es gibt diesen Ausschuss für Regulierungskontrolle. Wir hatten uns mal als Fraktion vorgenommen, dass wir einen unabhängigen Normenkontrollrat ins Leben rufen wollen, so wie viele Mitgliedstaaten diesen haben, bei uns in Deutschland ist es der Fall, in den Niederlanden, in Großbritannien, da funktioniert das.

Das, was die Kommission jetzt mit dem Ausschuss für Regulierungskontrolle macht, ist ein Rückschritt, und ich bitte einfach, in Sachen Unabhängigkeit dieser Gesetzesfolgeninstitution weiter dran zu bleiben. Wir werden das vom Parlament aus machen.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Mulțumesc domnule președinte. Și eu vreau să încep prin a felicita raportarea pentru acest document.

Reglementarea adecvată și funcțională prin programul REFIT este esențială în sensul creșterii transparenței și îmbunătățirii procesului decizional. Încredințarea unui portofoliu privind buna reglementare primului vicepreședinte al Comisiei constituie, în acest sens, un răspuns solicitărilor făcute de Parlamentul European.

În fața creșterii birocrăției și scăderii încrederii în Uniunea Europeană, consider că este important să întărim mai ales dialogul civic și dialogul social. În acest sens, întărirea rolului instituțiilor precum Comitetul Regiunilor sau Comitetul Economic și Social European constituie o prioritate menționată și în acest raport.

Astfel, salut extinderea, de asemenea, a perioadei de consultare publică la 12 săptămâni înainte, pe parcursul și după elaborarea legislației. Într-o mai mare coerență legislativă, avem nevoie să ne asigurăm în primul rând, însă, că statele membre implementează legislația, dar, mai ales, că cetățenii o înțeleg, o aprobă și sunt foarte bine informați.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σαν καθηγητής θεσμού της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο Πανεπιστήμιο της Κρήτης, έδινα πάντα, και συνεχίζω να δίνω, μεγάλη σημασία στο ρόλο της Επιτροπής, διότι η Επιτροπή είναι ο θεματοφύλακας της εφαρμογής του κοινοτικού δικαίου. Η Επιτροπή διαθέτει τα εργαλεία εκείνα που της επιτρέπουν να κρίνει την αποδοτικότητα και καταλληλότητα του νομοθετικού έργου που παράγουν οι θεσμοί. Τα εργαλεία αυτά πρέπει, βεβαίως, να βελτιωθούν.

Όμως, η Επιτροπή δεν πράττει το ίδιο, κυρία Jurovā, ως μέλος της τρόικας στην Ελλάδα. Διότι εκεί αναδεικνύεται η σύγκρουση συμφερόντων. Εκεί, η Επιτροπή ενεργεί καθαρά ως εκπρόσωπος των δανειστών και θα σας φέρω ένα παράδειγμα. Αυτό το διάστημα, πιέζει η τρόικα στην Ελλάδα να ληφθούν μέτρα για το συνταξιοδοτικό, για το ύψος των συντάξεων, για τη μείωση των επικουρικών συντάξεων κι εγώ ερωτώ: με ποια αρμοδιότητα παρεμβαίνει η Επιτροπή; Τα θέματα των συντάξεων ανήκουν στην αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών. Το ίδιο κάνετε και με τη φορομνηχτική πολιτική που επιβάλλετε στην Ελλάδα. Επομένως, εκεί, ως μέλος της τρόικας, εκφεύγετε των αρμοδιοτήτων σας.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, svi smo potpuno svjesni toga da je Europska unija preburokratizirana. Sam potpredsjednik Europske komisije, gospodin Timmermans, govorio je o tome ovdje u Parlamentu, i to ne samo jedanput.

Međutim, što mi zaista činimo da bismo pojednostavnili procedure i da bismo uistinu bili jasniji s našim zakonodavstvom građanima, a pogotovo onima koji su na neki način komitenti Europske unije, prije svega tu mislim na brojna mala i srednja poduzeća. Želim posebno naglasiti, između ostaloga, problem kompliciranosti korištenja raznih izvora financiranja iz Europske unije.

Postoji zaista šuma propisa koja nam je na neki način potrebna, jer moramo imati pravila. Međutim ta šuma propisa je čisto neprohodna za mnoge one koji zaista trebaju financijsku pomoć Europske unije. U tom kontekstu i ja pozivam na pojednostavljenje propisa.

Andrey Novakov (PPE). – Mr President, REFIT was designed to be a firewall and watchdog since 2012. The programme implemented over 200 actions and contributed to savings for businesses and individuals, which is great. However, this motion for a resolution does not cover very obvious items.

The idea is to go simple, right? But there are 65 key documents on REFIT, so it is not that simple or user-friendly. The Commission work programme for 2016 includes 40 REFIT initiatives, but not that many of them concern the reduction of the administrative burden for beneficiaries of EU funding.

At the same time, original investments through the EU budget for the period 2014-2020 total over EUR 250 billion. Billions of those euros are absorbed by bureaucracy in the process of application, management and control of EU-funded projects. In November 2015, 92% of the MEPs in this Chamber voted in favour of a resolution for cutting red tape, but few of those priorities are implemented in the resolution. I support the Commission in that initiative, but when things are not going as planned more concrete action is required.

(The President cut off the speaker)

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to thank Ms Kaufmann for the report on REFIT. The conclusions of the report are a strong encouragement for the Commission's work in this area and also for me personally. Making EU law more effective and efficient, reducing the costs of its application and working with Member States to ensure that it is implemented well: this is a task for all European institutions. Our success in this area will make a positive contribution to growth and jobs and, therefore, help to fight the 'EU fatigue' we are too often confronted with.

This common endeavour is reflected in the interinstitutional agreement for better law-making which you approved on 8 March 2015. The report we are discussing today dates from before that agreement, so many of the issues it raises have in fact already been resolved between us. The Commission adopted the better regulation package on 19 May 2015 with a view to ensuring an effective and efficient regulatory environment for businesses as well as for other stakeholders.

The package included several measures, one of which, the new Regulatory Scrutiny Board, is already in place. Half of its members are external to the Commission, and its prerogatives have also been extended to cover the review of ex-post evaluations. This includes new comprehensive guidelines and tools to cover the application of better regulation throughout the entire policy cycle. It means planning, impact assessments, legal drafting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation as well as stakeholder consultation. This is the first time that such integrated guidance has been prepared in the Commission.

A new REFIT platform has been established. A first meeting took place in January, and I hope that first results can be presented by the summer. Our new interinstitutional agreement on better law-making includes a number of important achievements. On implementing acts and delegated acts, the proposed approach should facilitate future discussions between the co-legislators and reassure them. The Commission will also provide greater transparency by allowing stakeholders to see the text of delegated acts and implementing acts before they are adopted.

On annual and multiannual programming, the interinstitutional agreement provides for intensive cooperation between the institutions in setting priorities through annual and multiannual programming and on identifying the priority files for the legislative procedure.

On regulatory fitness, each new act will set out how the legislation will be monitored and evaluated in the future so that we can check whether it is working as planned. The Commission's regulatory fitness programme will also play a central role in simplifying the body of existing legislation and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens but without weakening any of our important social or environmental goals.

On transparency, in some cases working jointly across the institutions to build common IT platforms for delegated acts – and later perhaps for the codecision procedure – will help open up decision-making to public scrutiny. After formal adoption, the Commission will immediately start working with Parliament and the Council to ensure the timely and effective implementation of this agreement so that together we can start delivering even better legislation for citizens.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Es para plantear una queja sobre la discriminación de mi Grupo. Hemos pedido ya dos «*catch the eye*» esta tarde y no se nos han concedido. Es incomprensible que en un debate donde solamente hay una representante de mi Grupo, en este debate, no se nos haya permitido intervenir.

Der Präsident. – Frau Kollegin! Ich kann bei neun, zehn, manchmal 15 oder 18 Nachfragen beim *Catch-the-eye*-Verfahren nicht jeder Fraktion in jeder Debatte das Wort erteilen. Ich muss das gerecht verteilen. Die größeren Fraktionen kriegen manchmal zwei *Catch-the-eyes*, die kleineren, auch meine eigene, manchmal niemanden. Es ist einfach so. Hier wird nicht diskriminiert, sondern es wird gerecht über die Debatten verteilt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), na piśmie. – Program REFIT, odnoszący się do lepszego stanowienia prawa i sprawności regulacyjnej UE, jest ważnym krokiem w kierunku uproszczenia przepisów oraz znacznego ograniczenia obciążeń regulacyjnych dla MŚP, które odpowiadają za 80 % miejsc pracy tworzonych w Europie. Należy jednak pamiętać, że jakiegokolwiek zmiany w prawodawstwie powinny być gruntownie przemyślane, również w perspektywie długoterminowej.

Zbyt pochopne uproszczenie obowiązków administracyjnych w zakresie ochrony danych, bezpieczeństwa produktów konsumenckich i zamówień publicznych może mieć negatywny wpływ na wolności obywatelskie i prawa pracownicze. Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawcą, że konieczne jest, aby pracownicy mieli prawo do ochrony bezpieczeństwa i zdrowia w pracy oraz minimalnych warunków zatrudnienia, niezależnie od tego, w jakim przedsiębiorstwie są zatrudnieni.

Ponadto ważnym aspektem programu REFIT jest analiza oceny skutków Komisji, która powinna obejmować ocenę społecznych i środowiskowych konsekwencji braku prawodawstwa oraz jego wpływ na prawa podstawowe obywateli. Konieczna jest ponadto poprawa kontroli *ex post* w całym procesie ustawodawczym oraz zapewnienie przejrzystości, przewidywalności i pewności prawa na szczeblu unijnym.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Hemos oído muchas veces que la Comisión no desea atacar el nivel de protección social, ambiental, o al consumidor. Que lo que desea es legislar mejor, de manera más clara, más simple, más transparente y más informada. Y en estas declaraciones que no son más que propaganda cae abundantemente este informe. Seamos claros. El debate sobre la reducción de la burocracia y mejora de la legislación cumple un doble objetivo: primero, crear un clima desfavorable hacia la intervención pública; segundo, favorecer a las instituciones tecnocráticas y a los intereses patronales en la elaboración de la legislación. No es casual que sean las iniciativas de mayor protección de los derechos sociales las que se retiran, como ocurre con la Directiva de maternidad o con la falta de legislación sobre salud laboral. No es casual que se normalice que grupos de expertos ocupen el lugar de los representantes electos a la hora de decidir si una normativa es obsoleta o necesaria. Debemos huir de debates instrumentales y afirmar que el problema de la legislación europea no es su complejidad, sino su ataque sistemático a los derechos de los trabajadores europeos.

19. Towards improved single market regulation (short presentation)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Anneleen Van Bossuyt über das Thema „Auf dem Weg zu einer besseren Rechtsetzung für den Binnenmarkt“ (2015/2089(INI)) (A8-0278/2015).

Anneleen Van Bossuyt, Rapporteur. – Ik ben blij dat ik vandaag eindelijk het verslag over betere regelgeving in de interne markt kan presenteren. Het is een proces van lange adem geweest.

Het minste dat we vandaag kunnen zeggen, is dat de Europese Unie zich in woelig water bevindt. Wij hebben de eurocrisis, de vluchtelingen crisis, de veiligheids crisis, Brexit, Grexit en vorige week nog het referendum in Nederland. Ik zou dan ook graag willen zeggen dat de tijd om met oogkleppen rond te lopen in Europa en “Meer Europa” als oplossing voor dit alles te zien, voorbij is! Als mensen mij vragen “Wat kan Europa doen om weer aansluiting bij zijn burgers te vinden?” dan antwoord ik stevast dat Europa de verantwoordelijkheid heeft om zijn relevantie aan te tonen. Het is pas als Europa kan aantonen dat het ertoe doet, dat mensen de meerwaarde ervan zullen inzien.

Het is dan ook een gedeelde verantwoordelijkheid van de Europese instellingen om zich door dit principe, vertaald in het subsidiariteitsbeginsel, te laten leiden wanneer er wordt beslist of er al dan niet moet worden opgetreden, om te beslissen hoe het beste kan worden opgetreden als er regelgeving nodig is, en uiteindelijk om ervoor te zorgen dat de regelgeving die aangenomen wordt eenvoudig en gemakkelijk toepasbaar is. Dit is dan ook het uitgangspunt van het verslag over betere regelgeving in de interne markt. De interne markt die één van de hoekstenen is van de Europese samenwerking.

Het is dan ook belangrijk dat de wetgeving die wordt aangenomen, ook wordt uitgevoerd en omgezet door de lidstaten. Om de verwezenlijkingen van de interne markt in de hand te kunnen werken en ook de uitdagingen van de eenge-maakte digitale interne markt te kunnen benutten, moeten de instellingen blijf geven van vastberadenheid. Zo niet, dan kunnen de inspanningen om tot betere regelgeving te komen, worden gedwarsboomd door regeldrift. Op eenvoudige en effectieve wijze wetgeving ten uitvoer leggen en ook de wetgeving voortdurend evalueren om ervoor te zorgen dat de doelstellingen worden bereikt, dat is de boodschap.

Het verbeteren van de regelgeving inzake de interne markt betekent niet dat regelgeving wordt afgeschaft, maar wel dat er een competitief regelgevingsklimaat wordt geschapen dat banen en bedrijven in Europa houdt. Een interne markt die productie, innovatie en handel niet frustreert, maar stimuleert. Vragen durven stellen, kritisch durven zijn, zonder taboes. Op die manier gaan voor een sterke en dynamische interne markt die bijdraagt tot groei op lange termijn in Europa en dus ook tot de welvaart van de Europese burgers. Dat is wat ik met dit verslag voor ogen had. Ik hoop dan ook morgen bij de stemming op jullie stem te mogen rekenen.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur very much for an excellent report. Better regulation is a roadmap to a better-functioning single market. Better single market rules are not about diminishing workers' or consumer rights; they are about diminishing bureaucracy and red tape.

The single market rules must be simple, proportionate and applicable in the real economy. We need to move from inadequate to quality impact assessments and to make problem-solving tools, such as SOLVIT and Your Europe, available to all citizens. Dialogue with stakeholders is essential, and so is avoiding gold-plating, where Member States impose an extra burden when implementing single market rules.

It is therefore bizarre that the left are resisting the better regulation agenda at a time when we need a transparent, effective single market that is closer to our citizens. We need enforcement, not ideological confrontation between business and consumers. As Commissioner Timmermans rightly says, we need to be big on big things and small on small things.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Úr, az egységes belső piac egyik fontos eleme a fogyasztóvédelmi szabályok betartása, ami persze sokszor azért nem történik meg, mert a fogyasztók sajnos nincsenek tisztában, vagy nincsenek kellően tisztában azzal, hogy milyen eszközök állnak rendelkezésükre a jogaik érvényesítésére. Ezért nélkülözhetetlen a folyamatos tájékoztatás Európa-szerte csakis úgy, mint az érdekképviselletekkel való egyeztetés. A közös uniós keretrendszernek továbbá azt is biztosítania kell, hogy az egységes piaci szabályozás – amennyire csak lehetséges – naprakész legyen. Folyamatosan követni kell a digitális újításokat, ezáltal a felhasználói igényeket, így segítve elő az európai egységes digitális piac kiteljesedését. Megjegyzem, létezik olyan magyar fejlesztés, melynek az a lényege, hogy egy mobiltelefonnal rámegeyünk a vonalkódra, az adott áru vonalkódjára fényképezőgéppel, és máris adja ki annak a terméknek az adatait. Ilyeneket kéne a Bizottságnak felkarolni.

Vicky Ford (ECR). – Mr President, the single market is meant to make it easier for businesses and consumers to trade across 28 countries with 500 million consumers. It is not meant to add more costs; it is meant to remove costs and thus help our economies to grow, create jobs and growth. This report by my Belgian colleague and supported by others from many countries tonight will say that we should only introduce new rules where it helps our economies to grow, that new rules should be simple and easy to apply, that small businesses in particular should have a lighter burden and that national parliaments should have a stronger voice and be able to use a red card to block unwanted laws. Britain is not alone in asking for reform and it has been very good to hear colleagues from all across Europe support this report tonight. I hope we will all vote for it in the plenary tomorrow.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il particolare tema del mercato unico, strumento essenziale per rilanciare crescita economica ed occupazione, pone sfide di efficacia ed efficienza della legislazione che non sono rinviabili, posto che, per mezzo del giusto *corpus* normativo, si restituisce fecondità ad un contesto non più competitivo per le nostre imprese e per migliorare la normativa sul mercato unico, che rafforza la fiducia dei consumatori.

In questa ottimizzazione del processo legislativo viene in evidenza il valore aggiunto europeo, sia nella scelta condivisa della *governance* del mercato unico, sia nell'adozione, da parte degli Stati membri, della normativa di attuazione. Non va trascurato, inoltre, il problema della mancanza di indicatori sufficienti per misurare l'efficacia dell'attuazione della legislazione nei differenti ambiti del mercato unico.

In ogni caso, sopra ogni processo legislativo ed esecutivo – non mi stancherò mai di rimarcarlo – viene il principio ispiratore del rispetto dei diritti fondamentali, attraverso i quali devono essere conseguiti obiettivi di semplicità, trasparenza e coerenza.

Der Präsident. — Lieber Herr Caputo! Ich habe hier eine kleine rote Lampe, die immer dann angeht, wenn der Redner so schnell spricht, dass die Dolmetscher mit dem Dolmetschen nicht hinterherkommen. Die war eben die ganze Zeit an. Mein Ratschlag an Sie wäre – damit alle Kollegen Sie verstehen können –, ein bisschen langsamer zu sprechen und sich vielleicht ein bisschen weniger vorzunehmen.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, I can only agree with the view of the report on what a well-regulated single market should look like: one that avoids unnecessary legislation and bureaucracy, but also one that does not lack ambition and does not compromise on environmental protection, health and safety, consumer protection and social standards; one that recognises the importance of better implementation and enforcement of existing rules instead of creating new legislation before the old has even been tested; one that provides for an environment where competition can thrive and can lead to more growth and more jobs; one that does not lag behind in new emerging economic areas but provides for a strong development platform for the companies of the digital economy; and ultimately one that is able to secure the long-term growth of the European Union for the benefit of its citizens.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, jedinstveno tržište predstavlja najveću korist od europskih integracija za sve države članice. Danas je sasvim normalno da svi sa svima trgujemo i prepoznavamo prekogranične poslovne prilike te u njih ulažemo. Dok je tako, nema straha za Europu.

Da bismo i u budućnosti nastavili prosperirati od jedinstvenog tržišta, moramo ga proširiti na sve vrste usluga i zaštititi od loših praksi i prekomjerne regulacije. Manjkavi i bespotrebni zakoni i propisi, s jedne, te spora i loša provedba kvalitetne regulacije, s druge strane, najviše štete malim i srednjim poduzećima koja zapošljavaju više od 80 % radnika u privatnom sektoru.

Ne želimo li u budućnosti ozbiljno ugroziti socioekonomsku sliku Europe, bolja regulacija jedinstvenog tržišta, koja će smanjiti administrativni teret i pružiti više prilika malim i srednjim poduzećima, mora nam biti apsolutni prioritet.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection and, in particular, the rapporteur Ms Van Bossuyt for this report.

We agree that the single market is a cornerstone of European integration. In recent decades it has delivered more jobs and contributed to higher growth. We need to address the whole policy cycle, so last year the Commission presented two main initiatives designed to do that: the Better Regulation Package and the Single Market Strategy.

Last May we proposed a Better Regulation Package, covering the entire policy cycle from consultations and impact assessments to the adoption, implementation and evaluation of EU legislation. The package will help us make sure that EU laws tackle the real problems of citizens and businesses. From now on, EU laws should be adopted according to better evidence and a more careful assessment of their impact on the real world. This will help us regain the trust of EU citizens.

More recently a new interinstitutional agreement on better law-making was negotiated by Parliament, the Council and the Commission. We now have a strong political framework and a renewed commitment from the institutions in support of better regulation. After formal adoption it will be up to Parliament and the Council to work with the Commission to ensure its timely and effective implementation. We need to ensure that we deliver the benefits for citizens and businesses in practice rather than just in theory.

Let us take the Regulatory Fitness Programme as an example – the one which we discussed a while ago. The Commission's Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme will also play a central role in simplifying the body of existing legislation and reducing unnecessary regulatory burdens, especially for microenterprises and small and medium enterprises, and we will do so without weakening any of our important social and environmental goals.

The second major initiative that we took last year is the Single Market Strategy adopted in October. It has three key aims: creating new opportunities for people and businesses, encouraging and enabling the modernisation and innovation that Europe needs and, above all, ensuring practical delivery. In some areas we need to launch new initiatives, such as introducing a service passport for key sectors of the economy, adopting a legislative proposal to prevent discrimination against consumers based on nationality or residence, or revising the Mutual Recognition Regulation.

However, it is not enough just to come forward with new initiatives. We need to ensure the effective and efficient application of the existing legislation. We need to design legislation better and to evaluate and fix things which do not work as they should. We also need to make sure that existing rules are applied correctly by the Member States and backed by a smart approach to enforcement and the development of a compliance culture. For example, we will promote an enhanced partnership with Member States through implementation plans for new legislation and yearly compliance dialogues with each Member State.

We all have the same aims. We have the same broad vision of what we want to achieve: we all want improved single market legislation and better delivery. Let us work together – the Commission, Parliament and the Council – to do this.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

20. Learning EU at school (short presentation)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Damian Drăghici über den Erwerb von Kenntnissen über die EU an Schulen (2015/2138(INI)) (A8-0021/2016).

Damian Drăghici, rapporteur. – Mr President, currently, European citizens have limited knowledge about the EU and how its institutions work. According to a 2014 Eurobarometer opinion poll, 71% of European Union citizens feel that they are not very well informed about the EU and 44% feel that they have a limited understanding of how the EU works. Even more worryingly, 52% of Europeans believe that their voice does not count in the EU.

Under these circumstances it is little wonder that citizens feel distant to or even increasingly estranged from the European project, become even more Eurosceptic, and perceive democratic deficits in the decision-making processes of the Union.

Therefore, enhancing dialogue about the EU in our schools and other educational institutions is crucial in order to bridge the long-standing gap between the European Union and its citizens and to restore their faith in the merits and necessity of the European integration process. This is even more important in the current context of the ongoing refugee crisis and of serious threats to fundamental human rights and democracy due to the recent terrorist attacks.

The Report 'Learning EU at school' highlights that the main role of education is to train fully aware and active citizens in an increasingly complex, multicultural and integrated Europe and should therefore equip all learners with solid knowledge about the EU and in-depth understanding of its functioning and concrete added-value.

An EU dimension in education should also encourage learners to critically reflect on European matters and how these influence their country and their own activities. This will empower them to form well-informed and balanced opinions, exercise their democratic rights and responsibilities, value diversity, intercultural and interreligious dialogue and be active and responsible citizens.

With this in mind, the report stresses that the EU should become more visible in teaching materials and extracurricular activities at all levels and in all forms of education, including non-formal and lifelong learning. Teaching about the EU should reflect both the role of Member States in the development of the EU and the influence of the EU on national developments. In this context I would like to stress the importance of a European approach to the teaching of history in developing a reflective awareness of the past and a critical 'culture of remembering' based on European values.

Another important aspect the report focuses on is the strengthening of citizenship education with the aim of enabling learners to acquire the competences they need to live and actively engage in pluralistic democratic societies and make their concerns heard. Core elements to be taught include tolerance, awareness and understanding for other cultures as well as democratic values and human rights.

Until now, a majority of Member States has progressively integrated an EU dimension into their curricula and into teacher training, but gaps and disparities between and within Member States continue to exist. Much more could be done, for example, with regard to curricula, teacher training, textbooks and teaching methods.

Therefore the report strongly encourages Member States to review and update their education systems and all forms of EU-related curricula content, to support all possibilities of conveying more information about the EU to learners as well as to teachers and other educators through formal, non-formal and informal learning, and to fully exploit and complement EU financial instruments, programmes and initiatives in this regard.

At the European level, existing possibilities offered by the EU programmes in the field of education and culture should be fully used to promote active citizenship, cultural awareness, intercultural understanding and other valuable key and transversal competences. In this regard, the report calls for adequate financial support for these programmes, a greater focus on their qualitative outcomes and wider access to mobility, paying special attention to teachers and other educators, young people with different socio-economic backgrounds and vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

In addition, platforms such as EU Twinning, the School Education Gateway and EPALE for adult learning can be used for the development and exchange of teaching materials and projects related to the EU and its institutions, as well as citizenship education.

The report calls on the Commission to continue to support Member States in their efforts to develop and promote an EU dimension in education while respecting their competence in the field, also by providing a common framework and guidelines for learning about the EU and by actively conveying information to key stakeholders and citizens.

I want to thank, first of all, the Committee and all the people that helped on this, and the shadow rapporteurs.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Therese Comodini Cachia (PPE). – Waqt li nicċelebraw id-diversità Ewropea, nirrikonoxxu l-valuri u l-ghanijiet komuni bejnietna u nahdmu biex nifhmuhom. Fost it-theddida ta' radikalizzazzjoni diretta lejn dawn il-valuri, isir aktar mehtieġ li niffaċilitaw l-gharfien ta' dawn il-valuri u ghanijiet Ewropej.

Iż-żgħażaġh haqqhom l-aħjar opportunità biex ikunu parti mill-proġett Ewropew, jipparteċipaw u jikkontribwixxu fih. L-istudenti jridu opportunità biex jaghmlu l-Ewropa tagħhom.

Stati Membri diġà joffru edukazzjoni fuq “European affairs” iżda l-valuri u l-kultura Ewropea jmorru oltre l-istudju tal-istrutturi.

Biex nagħtu lill-istudenti l-aħjar opportunità, irridu narmaw lill-ġhalliema bl-ġhodka tajba. Għalhekk l-EU għandha tik-kontribwixxi aktar lejn opportunitajiet ta' “continuous training” għall-ġhalliema, linji gwida dwar standards edukattivi, tappoġġja networking u tifrix ta' “good practices” u tipprovdi lill-ġhalliema b’“e-learning platforms” u materjal diġitali.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Domnule președinte, educația este baza societății și felicit raportorul pentru abordarea sa privind includerea conceptului de dimensiune europeană în programele școlare și schimbul de bune practici între instituțiile de învățământ în statele membre.

În calitate de membru al Comisiei pentru agricultură, aș dori să întăresc o idee exprimată în acest raport, și anume faptul că Uniunea trebuie să țină pasul permanent cu noile provocări de ordin societal și tehnologic, iar statele membre trebuie să asigure armonizarea continuă a programelor de învățământ profesional și tehnic, pentru a face față provocărilor. Mediul rural reprezintă pionul principal al dezvoltării economice și, de aceea, educația în domeniul agricol trebuie să reprezinte o componentă importantă în cadrul programelor învățământului profesional și tehnic la nivel european.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE). – Mr President, many citizens still do not have sufficient knowledge about the values on which European integration is based, nor how the European Union and its institutions function and directly influence their countries and their own activities. To help citizens understand that the European Union benefits our everyday life we need to bring the European Union closer to its citizens, explaining in practical terms what the EU does for each of us. Enhancing dialogue about European Union in our schools, associations and public spaces is essential, especially in the current situation of an increasingly globalised world which faces unprecedented challenges.

Teaching about the EU should reflect the complex relationship between the European Union and its Member States. It should be clear for all citizens that the EU has been shaped by its Member States with their unique histories and diverse cultures. I believe that an intercultural approach to education policy is highly needed.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr, az uniós ismeretek oktatása akár hasznos is lehetne, ha a fiatalok nem egyoldalú propagandát, hanem valós képet kapnának az Unióról, a jövő lehetőségeiről. Ez a jelentés nem éppen a felfogásban készült. Idézem: „az Unióval kapcsolatos ismeretek hiányossága [...] demokratikus deficit érzését keltheti és az euro-szkepticizmus [...] elterjedéséhez vezethet”. A demokrácia hiánya nem csupán érzés, hanem tény, az EU-szkepticizmus pedig nem pestis járvány, hanem összefoglaló elnevezése azoknak az irányzatoknak, amelyek nem az Európai Egyesült Államokban látják a szép jövőt. „Az oktatás egyik célja, hogy az egyéneket felkészítse a multikulturális társadalomban való létre.” Nem, az oktatás a nemzeti és a közös európai identitást kellene, hogy erősítse, a multikulturális társadalom bukott ideálját pedig végleg vessük el!

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per sentirsi davvero europei, credo che i cittadini debbano conoscere l'Unione europea. Ciò significa prima di tutto che i cittadini devono avere a disposizione tutti gli strumenti, materiali e intellettuali necessari a questo fine. Significa favorire una riflessione critica sulla storia dell'integrazione e sull'attuale assetto europeo; significa insegnare e promuovere, soprattutto con esempi concreti e positivi, i valori e i diritti fondamentali condivisi; significa ancora spiegare l'assetto istituzionale, i processi decisionali dell'Unione europea, che certo semplici non sono, e il relativo impatto delle decisioni europee sulla vita quotidiana di tutti quanti i cittadini.

Solo così possiamo formare cittadini europei che siano veramente consapevoli e cercare di ridurre il deficit democratico, deficit democratico, la cui esistenza viene riconosciuta in maniera forte e netta dalla relazione stessa. Addirittura si sottolinea esplicitamente come il crescente divario tra i cittadini e le istituzioni europee vada affrontato e risolto.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzy! Popieram wprowadzenie do programów szkolnych nauczania o Unii Europejskiej. Wiedza dotycząca przyczyn i historii integracji europejskiej, funkcjonowania instytucji europejskich czy wpływu Unii na życie codzienne jej obywateli mogą i powinny być częścią kursów historii czy wiedzy o społeczeństwie, tak jak w przypadku mojego kraju, Polski.

Z pewnością takie informacje stanowią wartość dodaną edukacji szkolnej i wyposażą uczniów w wiedzę niezbędną do zrozumienia współczesnego świata. Szczególnie ważna jest inicjatywa edukacji obywatelskiej: rolą szkoły jest nie tylko kształcenie, ale również wychowywanie. Uczniowie powinni czerpać wzorce aktywnego życia obywatelskiego i być zachęceni do uczestnictwa w nim.

Biorąc dzisiaj pod uwagę napływ uchodźców i procentowy wzrost udziału osób pozaeuropejskiego pochodzenia w społeczeństwach państw członkowskich, istotne są szanse edukacyjne, a szczególnie zwrócenie uwagi na wychowanie obywatelskie, jeżeli chodzi o ich integrację w naszym społeczeństwie. Sprawozdanie pana Drăghici popiera te inicjatywy, uwzględniając wsparcie finansowe Komisji Europejskiej.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission welcomes the report on learning EU at school. Let me first of all congratulate Mr Drăghici on his excellent work. Recent developments have once more demonstrated the risks of a 'disconnect' between disaffected young people and society. Our answer has to be multifaceted and has to promote our values and foster inclusion through education. Every young person in Europe needs to understand and share our fundamental values. And we need to build a Europe where every young person is able to find their place in society and achieve their potential, regardless of their background or abilities.

What does learning EU at school mean concretely? I fully agree with the broad approach taken by Mr Drăghici in his report. To me it comprises two core aspects: the teaching of European history, cultures and languages on the one hand, and citizenship education on the other. Indeed, these aspects are linked. Without knowing Europe it is impossible to understand the founding values of the EU. In turn, knowing the cultures and languages of our neighbours supports active European citizenship.

All those elements together form the concept of a European dimension in education, as expressed in Mr Drăghici's report. It is, of course, up to the Member States to integrate this concept into their national school curricula. The Commission is ready to support this through its policy cooperation with Member States and especially the Erasmus+ programme.

Some years ago, the Council and Parliament agreed on the key competences every European needs. They include social and civic competences and cultural awareness and expression. Fostering these competences and encouraging intercultural and interreligious dialogue to help our children become responsible and active citizens has always been an important element of our initiatives at EU level. In the current context, it is more necessary than ever to better understand but, first and foremost, to better transmit our common values.

One year ago, in March 2015, the EU education ministers adopted the Paris declaration in response to the Charlie Hebdo attacks, in order to better promote citizenship and the common values of freedom, tolerance and non-discrimination through education. It is also one of the priorities of Education and Training 2020, our policy cooperation framework with Member States. A working group is currently tackling the topic of preventing violent radicalisation with a focus on enhancing critical thinking and media literacy.

The Commission also welcomes the importance the report attaches to EU programmes such as Erasmus+, Europe for Citizens and Creative Europe when it comes to promoting active citizenship, language skills and cultural awareness. I can confirm that in 2016 the Commission remains fully committed to funding concrete projects under these programmes, which aim at fostering active and democratic citizenship.

I am determined to continue developing our virtual education platforms under Erasmus+, such as e-training, a network of 300 000 teachers, the electronic platform for adult learning in Europe and a school education gateway. These are valid instruments for our teachers and educators, who are key players in the school context. These platforms give them access to relevant high-quality teaching materials, encourage them to network and help them to exchange best practices.

The Commission will closely monitor the impact of all of these measures on actually developing more active and democratic participation among our citizens. I appreciate the commitment of the European Parliament to this essential agenda and I look forward to further cooperation with you on this important topic.

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK

Vizepräsidentin

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Dominique Bilde (ENF), par écrit. – Ce rapport d'initiative de mon collègue socialiste soulève quelques interrogations quant au respect du pluralisme des idées et de la liberté d'expression. En effet, sous prétexte d'apprendre l'Union européenne à l'école, il sera désormais interdit d'émettre des opinions eurosceptiques, critiquer l'édifice européen étant décrit dans ce rapport comme un dangereux virus à éradiquer grâce au vaccin miracle que serait la propagande pro UE.

Ce médicament, qui s'assimile en fait à une vaste campagne de marketing promotionnel auprès de nos enfants, vous souhaitez l'inoculer au détriment de la souveraineté des États qui gardent pourtant officiellement la compétence exclusive en matière d'éducation. Mais les nations européennes, pourtant d'ores et déjà poussées à bout par vos politiques suicidaires, seront sommées d'harmoniser leurs programmes scolaires et de financer des mesures vantant le multiculturalisme, objectif qui, pour vous, semble prioritaire par rapport à l'apprentissage des savoirs fondamentaux comme la lecture, l'écriture, ou les mathématiques.

Chers collègues, si vous souhaitez réellement «reconnecter» les citoyens des États Membres avec l'UE, cessez de nier leur liberté d'expression, arrêtez de leur mentir sur les soi-disant bienfaits de la construction européenne et mettez un terme à votre aveuglement et à votre volonté d'imposer aux peuples européens un modèle de société dont ils ne veulent pas.

Andrea Bocskor (PPE), írásban. – Először is szeretném megköszönni Damian Draghici képviselő úrnak a színvonalas és átfogó jelentést, nagyra értékelem munkáját. Az Európai Uniónak napjainkban új kihívásokkal kell szembenézni, így sokkal fontosabb, mint valaha, hogy az iskolákban és a közéletben egyaránt párbeszéd alakuljon ki az Európai Unióról, értékeiről, hogy a polgárok ismerjék az európai integrációs folyamat előnyeit és rendszerét. Az uniós polgárok jelenleg hiányos ismeretekkel rendelkeznek az Európai Unióról és intézményeinek működéséről, amit az Eurobarométer 2014 tavaszi felmérése is mutat: az uniós polgárok 44%-a nem érti az Unió működését. Nem csoda tehát, hogy a polgárok nem érzik magukhoz közel az Uniót, és egyre inkább elfordulnak az uniós politikától és projektektől. Ezen úgy tudunk javítani, ha már iskolás korban megfelelőbb tájékoztatásban részesítjük a polgárokat. Ennek egyik módja az iskolai oktatás uniós dimenziójának növelése, amely felkészítheti a polgárokat arra, hogy egy egyre összetettebb és globalizált világban éljenek. Meggyőződésem, hogy a jelenkori Európában még inkább szükség van az Európai Unió alappilléreinek, értékeinek megismerésére, továbbá az Unió és tagállamai történelmének és értékeinek ismerete és megértése kulcsfontosságú a további békés együttéléshez, a kölcsönös megértéshez, a toleranciához és a szolidaritáshoz. Köszönöm szépen a figyelmet.

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – Az európai uniós ismeretek iskolai elsajátításáról szóló jelentés egy rendkívül fontos és aktuális témakört jár körbe. A számok magukért beszélnek: a legutóbbi európai parlamenti választásokon az állampolgárok csupán 42,61%-a (a 18–24 éves korosztály 27,8%-a) szavazott. Az Eurobarometer 2014-es közvélemény kutatása során a válaszadók 44%-a nem értett egyet azzal az állítással, hogy „Értem, hogyan működik az Unió”. Ilyen körülmények között érthető, hogy az állampolgárok távolinak érzik az Európai Uniót, és demokratikus deficitet éreznek annak döntéshozatalában. Ugyan több tagállam oktatási rendszerében már helyet kapnak az uniós ismeretek, jelentős különbségek tapasztalhatóak ilyen tekintetben az egyes tagállamok között és a tagállamokon belül is.

Általánosságban elmondható, hogy az uniós ismeretek csupán kis részét képezik a tananyagoknak. Az uniós ismeretek oktatása nem csupán konkrét tárgyi ismeretek átadását jelenti. Legalább ilyen fontosak a személyes élmények, mint például az ifjúsági és önkéntes munka, az Erasmus programban való részvétel, az uniós intézmények meglátogatása, uniós hivatalnokokkal való kapcsolat, gyakornoki lehetőségek. Az idegen nyelvek oktatása is kulcsszereppel bír, hiszen segíti az interkulturális tudatosság kialakulását, és támogatja a tagállamok közötti mobilitást. Bár az oktatás önmagában nem számolja fel az állampolgárok Unióval szemben érzett esetleges fenntartásait, erősítheti az Unióhoz tartozás érzését, a közösségi szellemet, és az uniós intézmények működésének jobb ismeretét.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE), por escrito. – Este informe evidencia que introducir una dimensión europea en la enseñanza de los países no es un lujo, sino una necesidad, si aspiramos a construir una ciudadanía europea compartida. Provengo de un país, España, que valora muy positivamente la dimensión europea de la educación, como ponen de manifiesto los datos de la Comisión, según los cuales somos el país que más estudiantes recibe y más estudiantes envía dentro del programa Erasmus. Se pone de manifiesto también que aprender una ciudadanía europea común no implica olvidar las distintas identidades y tradiciones culturales. Deseo subrayar que este «enfoque intercultural» debe estar fuertemente articulado alrededor de valores y principios comunes, pues no es posible una integración escolar positiva allí donde los derechos personales son subordinados por razón de religión, ideología o cultura. El sentimiento de pertenencia europeo es una travesía difícil, pues la historia de Europa lo es también de egoísmos nacionales. En esta pluralidad de gentes, culturas y sensibilidades habita a la vez el peligro y la salvación. Debemos emprender este viaje con tacto, cuando se trata de respetar las identidades legítimas de los europeos, pero también con audacia, cuando se trata de orientarnos hacia el horizonte común que nos ilusiona.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Смятам, че въвеждането на европейско гражданско образование в училище е изключително важно, защото ще позволи на децата от ранна възраст да са запознати с правата и задълженията си като европейски граждани и да участват пълноценно в политическия живот на Европа и на собствената си страна.

Спадът на избирателна активност сред младежите е особено притеснителна тенденция, която, според мен, ясно показва необходимостта от преподаване на гражданско образование, което да запознава младите хора с европейските демократични институции, принципи и практики, както и възможностите, които европейската интеграция им дава. Неразбирането на начина на функциониране на ЕС и на неговите основни ценности и принципи превръща младите европейски поколения в лесна мишена за дезинформационни кампании, които целят да подкопаят устоите на демократична Европа и да отслабят нейните институции, засилвайки популистките и националистически нагласи. Това е предизвикателство, заслужаващо европейски отговор, който уважава националните компетенции и образователни традиции.

Европейското измерение в образованието ще спомогне за възстановяването на отслабената връзка между Европейският съюз и неговите граждани чрез създаването за чувство на принадлежност към една общност, основаваща се на ценности и върховенство на закона. В този контекст е важно да се гарантира, че учителите са мотивирани да преподават на младите това знание и разполагат с всички необходими ресурси.

Victor Negrescu (S&D), în scris. – Educația despre Uniunea Europeană este foarte importantă în construcția proiectului european. Cetățenii europeni și mai ales tinerii trebuie să înțeleagă care sunt avantajele oferite de UE, să cunoască mecanismele de funcționare ale instituțiilor europene, dar și să deprindă tehnicile prin care pot participa la procesul decizional european. Din păcate, în prezent, nu știm suficient unii despre alții, iar sistemul nostru educațional nu prezintă tinerilor drepturile lor în calitate de cetățeni europeni. Cu un plus de cunoaștere a istoriei întregii Uniuni Europene și cu mai multă informație despre actualitatea europeană, tinerii vor recăpăta încrederea în instituțiile europene construite cu atât de multă dificultate pentru a asigura pacea și dezvoltarea continentului nostru.

De aceea, în calitate de cadru universitar, dar și de inițiator al mai multor dezbateri despre nevoia de a avea o programă comună la nivel european despre UE, susțin cu toată tăria acest raport care sper să genereze din partea Comisiei Europene și a statelor membre soluții clare pentru uniformizarea, dar și popularizarea educației despre UE.

Ева Паунова (РРЕ), в писмена форма. – Европейският съюз се изправя пред все повече предизвикателства - локални, национални, глобални, икономически, политически. За да можем да се изправим срещу тях и да продължим още по-силни, е важно да се чувстваме европейци, да знаем как работи Съюзът, какво може той да направи за нас и какво можем ние да направим за него.

Ето защо вярвам, че познанията и принадлежността към ЕС трябва да бъдат изградени от най-ранна възраст, като училищата във всички страни членки трябва да насърчат европейското измерение в образованието. Докладът на Европейския парламент за обучението за ЕС в училище предоставя отлични насоки за това как могат да бъдат придадени познания за целите и механизмите на Съюза, както и да бъде насърчено критичното разсъждаване върху приоритетите и ценностите на Европа. Само така младото поколение ще бъде подготвено да работи и живее като активни граждани в един все по-интегриран Съюз и в един глобализиран свят.

Опознаването на ЕС в училище изисква също прилагането на нов подход, редом с подготовка на преподавателите, както е споменато в доклада. Вярвам, че е ключово в класната стая да бъдат използвани интерактивни методи и примери за това как ЕС е от значение за живота на всеки един от нас.

21. Erasmus+ and other tools to foster mobility in vocational education and training (short presentation)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Ernest Maragall über das Thema „Erasmus+ und andere Instrumente zur Förderung der Mobilität in der beruflichen Aus- und Weiterbildung – ein Ansatz des lebenslangen Lernens“ (2015/2257(INI)) (A8-0049/2016).

Ernest Maragall, ponente. – Señora Presidenta, este informe es un informe de iniciativa de la Comisión de Cultura y Educación y cuenta, como no podía ser de otro modo, con la visión complementaria de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales, y me parece que el resultado es muestra de esa positiva complementariedad. Y el informe lo que pretende es aportar elementos de solución positivos para una ecuación que hoy está sin resolver: la ecuación entre educación, aprendizaje e incorporación al trabajo de tantos jóvenes europeos.

En este ámbito, Comisario, estamos muy lejos del camino recto para alcanzar los objetivos a los que nos comprometimos, a los que la Unión Europea se comprometió en su momento con la Estrategia 2020. Más bien parece que en algunos casos estamos casi divergiendo. A esa evidencia trata también de responder la propuesta de reforma y mejora del programa Erasmus+ que este informe contiene, dirigido muy especialmente al sector, a la realidad, de nuestra formación profesional y del aprendizaje.

De eso trata este informe: identifica los obstáculos y circunstancias que explican la actual insuficiencia e inadecuación de Erasmus+ para este objetivo concreto y formula las líneas principales de reforma y de adaptación que han de permitirnos extender el éxito global de Erasmus+, que sí existe y es indiscutible, a este nuevo ámbito de formación profesional y aprendizaje.

Digámoslo claramente: movilidad es igual a empleabilidad. Si lo tenemos claro y respetamos este criterio seguramente avanzaremos y ganaremos algunas batallas. Y es por eso que este Parlamento se dirige a la Comisión Europea y también a los Estados miembros con una cierta exigencia y con una no menor urgencia, y lo hacemos concretando diagnóstico, dificultades, instrumentos, etc.

Algunos puntos para concretar esa propuesta, esta reflexión y esa urgencia: ampliar y mejorar las opciones de movilidad, empezando por la creación de un marco de referencia realmente europeo que ofrezca clara y sencillamente las posibilidades al alcance; la adopción de medidas complementarias de ese programa Erasmus con los programas sociales, el Fondo Social Europeo, la European Youth Initiative); el incremento adecuado de los recursos económicos para atender las necesidades y complejidades de las circunstancias específicas de este colectivo protagonista de la formación profesional y del aprendizaje. Por lo tanto, programas adecuados para eliminar los obstáculos a la creación de entornos de éxito para esta cuestión, empezando por las barreras lingüísticas y siguiendo por la simplificación de procedimientos y el debido acompañamiento y tutoría de nuestros estudiantes, etc.

La definición, también, de los agentes intermedios, que deberán protagonizar nuevos modelos de gestión, nuevos modelos de éxito, para dar la máxima potencia al programa Erasmus+ en este campo. Y por eso habrá que pensar en la definición de agencias o consorcios de ámbito regional y de composición mixta. Sistema educativo y sistema empresarial deben trabajar juntos, deben ponerse de acuerdo para dar la respuesta operativa adecuada.

También hemos de completar el proceso de reconocimiento de estudios y de las capacidades adquiridas, y la experiencia profesional, no siempre reconocida en términos de título profesional, pero que es esencial hacerlo ahora, y para ello hay que completar Europass, hay que completar ECVET y hay que pensar ya en un estatuto del aprendiz europeo, como también se defiende en el informe.

Por último, hay que dedicar el esfuerzo debido a la preparación y a la movilidad de los propios docentes, que son instrumentos clave para el éxito de esta operación. Esta posición clara del Parlamento Europeo lo que quiere es otorgar a la formación profesional el rol que le corresponde dentro del programa Erasmus. El rol que ha perdido en buena parte precisamente por la integración en un solo programa de Erasmus+.

Die Präsidentin. – Für das nun folgende *Catch-the-eye-Verfahren* habe ich zahlreiche Wortmeldungen. Ich werde jedoch von EVP und S&D je zwei Personen aufrufen und von den anderen Fraktionen je eine. Ich bitte um Ihr Verständnis dafür.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Andrea Bocskor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony, először is szeretném megköszönni a jelentéstevőnek a színvonalas jelentést, nagyra értékelem a munkáját. A tanulási és képzési mobilitás nagyon fontos egyrészt a személyes fejlődés, a fiatalok társadalmi beilleszkedése, a munkaerő-piaci versenyképesség, az interkulturális környezetben végzett munkához való képességek fejlesztése szempontjából. Mindez része a minőségi oktatásnak és a foglalkoztathatóság elősegítésének. A nem formális és az informális tanulásnak, valamint a szakképzésnek fontos szerepe van az élethosszig tartó tanulás folyamatában, illetve azon kihívások kezelésében, mint a korai iskolaelhagyás, a NEET fiatalok nagy száma, a munkanélküliség.

Az Erasmus+ program sikeresnek bizonyult, viszont az eddigi eredmények azt mutatják, hogy teljes mértékben nem használták ki az összes lehetőséget, így továbbra is ösztönözni kell ezt a mobilitást a szakképzés területén. A nagyobb mobilitás esélyesebb foglalkoztathatóságot vonz maga után, a munkaerő-piaci eltérések azt jelentik, hogy minél előbb cselekednünk kell. Nagyobb szinergiára van szükség az oktatásügyi rendszerek és a munka világa között.

Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, educația este și trebuie să rămână un drept fundamental al tuturor cetățenilor europeni, indiferent de mediul din care provin, și nu trebuie să existe nicio constrângere care să împiedice participarea la programe și inițiative care permit ulterior accesul persoanelor de orice vârstă pe piața muncii.

Programul Erasmus a reprezentat un succes din punct de vedere al mobilității și este nevoie ca statele membre, împreună Comisia, să garanteze accesul în condiții de egalitate la acțiunile de mobilitate în cadrul Erasmus + pentru toate categoriile de persoane, să fie respectată egalitatea de gen pentru acces nepreferențial la toate programele educaționale, inclusiv cele tehnice. Consider că statele membre și Comisia trebuie să își coreleze eforturile pentru a reduce barierele lingvistice și culturale, pentru o mai bună funcționare a programelor de mobilitate pentru tineri și cadre didactice, pentru un transfer optim de cunoștințe și experiență.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ήδη από τον Ιανουάριο του 2014, το πρόγραμμα Erasmus + αποτελεί το νέο πρόγραμμα εκπαίδευσης και επαγγελματικής κατάρτισης, το οποίο με προϋπολογισμό 15 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ θα προσφέρει μέχρι το 2020, σε τέσσερα εκατομμύρια φοιτητές, τη δυνατότητα σπουδών ή εργασίας σε άλλο κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης. Παράλληλα, στόχος του προγράμματος είναι να βελτιώσει τις προοπτικές σταδιοδρομίας και να παρέχει στους φοιτητές κοινωνικές διασυνδέσεις.

Ωστόσο, η κοινωνική και οικονομική πραγματικότητα καταδεικνύει την ανάγκη αυτό το πρόγραμμα να προσαρμοστεί στις οικονομικές ανάγκες κάθε χώρας. Συγκεκριμένα, στις χώρες της Ένωσης, παρατηρούνται ακραίες ανισορροπίες στα ποσοστά ανεργίας. Η Ελλάδα εμφανίζει ποσοστό ανεργίας 24% και ποσοστό ανεργίας των νέων 48,9%, ως αποτέλεσμα της βίαιης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής και των πολιτικών λιτότητας και μνημονίων που επιβλήθηκαν στην Ελλάδα. Είναι, επομένως, αναγκαίο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να διαθέσει περισσότερα κονδύλια στις χώρες που πλήττονται από υψηλά ποσοστά ανεργίας.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat (ALDE). – Distinguido Presidente, Señorías, en la Comisión de Cultura y Educación hemos acogido favorablemente el informe del señor Maragall. Por ello, nos sorprende que él mismo proponga una enmienda insistiendo en un asunto ya rechazado en la Comisión. En esta enmienda se pide que los documentos del programa Erasmus + se traduzcan en las lenguas vehiculares oficiales de los sistemas escolares, pero la traducción de documentos no representa un problema para los ciudadanos que son beneficiarios del programa Erasmus+. Me parece contradictorio que el ponente desee invertir recursos económicos europeos en un procedimiento burocrático de traducción francamente inútil. Además, es incoherente, porque Erasmus nació para permitir a los estudiantes tratar con otras culturas y para aprender los idiomas de los demás, no para encerrarse en los espacios cómodos y en sus propias lenguas oficiales o cooficiales.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione ha alcuni aspetti positivi che tuttavia si scontrano con la timidezza con cui viene giudicato il fallimento degli strumenti impiegati dall'Europa per contrastare la piaga della disoccupazione giovanile che in alcuni paesi, per esempio nel sud dell'Europa, continua a rimanere a livelli inaccettabili.

Debole anche la presa di posizione sull'accrescimento dei divari delle tutele socioeconomiche e dei diritti in materia di lavoro giovanile nonché sull'abbandono scolastico precoce. Credo che l'istruzione vada tutelata nella sua dimensione di diritto umano fondamentale e debba considerarsi un bene comune da rendere accessibile a tutti, compresi i disabili, su un piano di parità. Inoltre, è fondamentale eliminare tutti gli ostacoli sociali ed economici che limitano l'eguaglianza di opportunità, compresi quelli relativi all'istruzione e alla formazione professionale.

Non si possono ottenere questi risultati con le logiche dell'austerità che finora hanno guidato le scelte europee martoriando soprattutto i cittadini dell'Europa meridionale. Alcuni strumenti come Garanzia giovani hanno mancato gli obiettivi per i quali erano stati pensati. L'Unione europea può e deve fare di più per l'istruzione giovanile.

Dominique Bilde (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, ce rapport sur Erasmus+ est plutôt satisfaisant, et je me félicite que mes collègues aient intégré des propositions réalistes que j'avais tenté de porter en commission, notamment la nécessité de s'appuyer sur les chambres de métiers et de l'artisanat pour valoriser la formation professionnelle.

J'émettrai quelques réserves. Je ne suis pas sûre que le seul fait d'accroître la mobilité permettra de résoudre le problème du chômage, notamment chez les jeunes. Il me semble qu'il faudra au préalable prendre plusieurs mesures de bon sens: s'assurer de l'adéquation des études avec les besoins du marché de l'emploi par un recentrage des conseils en orientation, et mettre l'accent sur l'acquisition des savoirs fondamentaux. Je vous rappelle que, selon le dernier rapport commun du Conseil et de la Commission sur le suivi du cadre stratégique «Éducation et formation 2020», au sein de l'Union, 22 % des personnes âgées de moins de 15 ans présentent des lacunes en mathématiques, et 18 %, en lecture.

Enfin, si je me réjouis du succès des programmes comme Erasmus+, qui s'inscrivent dans le cadre de coopération intergouvernementale intelligente et efficiente, je tiens à rappeler que l'éducation est, et doit rester, une compétence des États membres.

Malgré ces quelques lacunes, je soutiendrai...

(La Présidente retire la parole à l'oratrice)

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Myslím, že všichni se shodujeme na tom, že program Erasmus plus je základním nástrojem pro prosazování našich společných cílů, tzn. snížení nezaměstnanosti, snížení chudoby, zlepšení šancí pro všechny děti na to, aby měly kvalitní vzdělání. Proto tato zpráva, která je vlastně na začátku čerpání tohoto funkčního období, je konstruktivně kritická, tzn. upozorňuje na to, že musíme sledovat efektivitu navržených programů a priorit.

Pan komisař, kterého si velmi vážím, jistě ví, že klíčem ke kvalitnímu vzdělání je učitel a motivace žáka. Proto je třeba, aby tyto programy zaměřené na odborné vzdělání sledovaly spojení s praxí, podnikatelské dovednosti, jazykové dovednosti a aby byla zjednodušena administrativa. Děkuji mu za to, že se o to zasadí.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I am very pleased to see this report, because much of my work prior to coming into politics was working with young people to foster exactly this kind of exchange, working with young people who did not have those kinds of opportunities through the more formal university higher education Erasmus+ programmes. I just wanted to tell a little story which I think is important. In the summer of 2014 I went to be with some young people from the UK, Russia, Ukraine and Romania who were all in the same space for two weeks, engaging with each other through the Erasmus programme. This was at a time when Ukraine and Russia were at war with each other, but these young people in the same space learning from each other were not at war and could learn to live in peace together. We need more projects and programmes like this that can demonstrate how we can progress better living together.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, Erasmus+ je važan program jer građanima koji su u potrazi za novim znanjima i vještinama te poslovnim prilikama omogućuje da steknu vrijedna iskustva u drugim sredinama. Upoznavanje drukčijih obrazovnih modela i poslovnih navika te kulturnih posebnosti uz neizostavno učenje stranih jezika značajno doprinosi konkurentnosti na jedinstvenom tržištu i razvoju novih kreativnih ideja koje nisu ograničene na usko lokalno ili regionalno tržište.

Slažem se da ovaj program treba učiniti dostupnijim te pojednostavniti postupke prijave, kao i poboljšati kompatibilnost između različitih sustava strukovnog obrazovanja i osposobljavanja. S druge strane, smatram potpuno nepotrebnim da ovaj program, koji je jednako važan svim Europljanima željnima znanja, opterećujemo ideološkim preporukama kako to čini izvjestitelj u onim dijelovima u kojima propagira pozitivnu diskriminaciju raznih manjinskih zajednica i promiče umjetno stvoren europski identitet.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, htio bih istaknuti kako je Erasmus+ jedan od onih odličnih programa koje ima Europska unija, neovisno o tome što smo čuli da ima niz poteškoća u nekim dijelovima realizacije ovoga programa. Koliko je to pripomoglo mladim ljudima, koliko je to pripomoglo onim osobama koje su stekle nova znanja i nove vještine, ne treba posebno isticati.

Ono što želim istaknuti je svakako da trebamo više kompatibilnosti među našim programima, trebamo više mobilnosti onih koji daju znanje mladima, prije svega znači profesora, nastavnika, i taj detalj treba ugraditi. Ali s druge strane, za razliku od moje kolegice koja je upravo sada razgovarala, ja upravo mislim da je ovaj dio programa koji govori o manjinama u Europi itekako važan za izgradnju onoga što znači europski identitet, za jačanje europskog identiteta, jer europski identitet postoji htjeli vi ili ne.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the Commission welcomes the report on Erasmus+ and other tools to foster mobility in VET – a lifelong learning approach. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Maragall, for his work. I fully share the view expressed in the report that the learning and training grants offered by the Erasmus+ programme are contributing to high-quality education, improved employability and better civic competences.

For many trainees, especially from lower socio-economic backgrounds, their Erasmus+ experience is often their first occasion to leave their home countries and step into another reality. Mr Maragall's report contains a rich analysis of both the advantages and the challenges of mobility. The advantages are many: when trainees and apprentices go abroad, they acquire new professional competences which contribute to their training at home. Moreover, they improve their motivation and self-confidence, their versatility and adaptability and their language, communication and intercultural skills. All of these competences and skills acquired abroad give them an advantage on the labour market.

Challenges range from reduced access to mobility programmes, the lack of financial resources, linguistic and cultural barriers, poor compatibility with training programmes at home and cumbersome recognition of skills acquired abroad to legal obstacles. The Commission is aware of these challenges. I will try to respond to some of them in the little time I have here and now.

The Commission has already created a logistical and organisational framework which strives to make VET mobility a success for everybody involved. The Erasmus+ VET Mobility Charter, for example, improves the strategic impact of VET mobility on VET organisations. Through the charter, the Commission rewards high-quality mobility initiatives and internationalisation strategies. It is through the networking of schools that possess the VET Mobility Charter and their links to their respective local labour markets that better placements can be found and suitable companies located. We also have a good body of intermediaries – such as chambers of commerce, associations or local authorities – which help improve the logistics and the quality of VET mobility.

Regarding people with special needs, the Commission has always considered it a priority to make their participation in the programme possible. Additional funds are made available to persons with special needs, which cover their additional expenses during their stay abroad. As for simplified access to the programme, the Erasmus+ IT tools are constantly being adapted to meet the applicants' requests, and efforts are being made to simplify application procedures. We have been working with the national agencies managing Erasmus+ at the national level to tailor IT tools and e-forms to the applicants' needs and to simplify them.

The Commission also works closely with the national agencies to ensure maximum visibility of the programme's VET actions. Various promotion events and social media campaigns at national and European level have been organised, such as the 'We Mean Business' campaign that aimed to boost the number of companies getting involved in transnational traineeships.

Finally, linguistic preparation. Knowing the language of your host country is a crucial success factor for training periods abroad, especially for young trainees, whose knowledge of a foreign language can be limited. The programme helps them get over the linguistic hurdle by offering language assessment tools, online language courses and other linguistic and intercultural preparation courses.

The European Parliament also contributes to improving the quality and quantity of VET mobility. In concrete terms, the pilot projects of both Mr Maragall and Mr Arthuis will provide vital funds to overcome obstacles and improve transnational placements for the future. This is in line with our policy priorities to improve work-based learning and help the younger generation to have better chances on the job market.

Let me conclude by saying that I greatly appreciate the commitment of the European Parliament to boosting the quality and quantity of mobility in vocational education and training. The Commission is working in the same direction, and I am looking forward to our cooperation on these issues.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Therese Comodini Cachia (PPE), in writing. – The underlying negative perception of VET as being an educational pathway of less worth needs to be addressed through a concerted and common approach. We can start by establishing common high standards in European VET to provide learners with training of a good standard and facilitate mobility and recognition of competences amongst diverse national systems. This means that we also need to address the use of VET by national systems as a way to show a decrease in the number of early school leavers by lowering the educational and training component of VET or else pushing learners towards VET from a very young age without ensuring that they gain basic skills. VET is not the stop plug to early school leavers. It is just one of the measures that may entice early school leavers to return to training, but other measures taking place earlier on in a learner's life are needed. VET represents an important tool for re-skilling, widening and upgrading skills within a lifelong learning programme that can facilitate employment.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), napisan. – Erasmus+ je novi program za obrazovanje i usavršavanje, a cilj je smanjenje ranog napuštanja obrazovnog sustava i povećanje broja visoko obrazovanih osoba. Kroz program mobilnosti pojedincima se nudi mogućnost obrazovanja i usavršavanja u inozemstvu. Mobilnost je u današnje vrijeme jako popularna kod mladih. Podržavaju je sve institucije EU-a jer je prepoznat njezin pozitivan utjecaj na razvoj mladih koji se uče toleranciji, drugim kulturama i običajima.

Mobilnost povećava socijalnu uključenost mladih u društvo i promiče aktivno građanstvo. Između ostalog, jedan od ciljeva mobilnosti je smanjivanje broja nezaposlenih mladih osoba. Praksom u inozemstvu mladi stvaraju kontakte s poslodavcima te je dokazano da se lakše zapošljavaju. Međutim, mobilnost ne prevladava u strukovnom obrazovanju i osposobljavanju, ponajprije zbog neusklađenosti visoko obrazovnih ustanova u kojima se provode programi mobilnosti. Na razini EU-a ključno je omogućiti bolju koordinaciju i organizaciju programa mobilnosti.

Nadalje, neophodno je prepoznati i potvrditi rezultate programa mobilnosti koje mladi ostvaruju kroz formalno i neformalno učenje. To su jezične i druge vještine koje mladi stječu u inozemstvu. Smatram da se treba nastaviti s financiranjem i povećati iznose potpore programa mobilnosti. Time bi se omogućilo sudjelovanje većem broju osoba u programima mobilnosti. Državne, regionalne i lokalne razine svakako bi trebale bolje promovirati i podupirati mobilnost.

Claudia Tapardel (S&D), în scris. – În calitate de europarlamentar tânăr nu pot să nu apreciez faptul că programul Erasmus+ încurajează mobilitatea și pregătirea tinerilor europeni pentru inserția pe piața muncii. De ce? Pentru că șomajul în rândul tinerilor rămâne periculos de ridicat la 22,1%. Pentru că cerințele angajatorilor de pe piața muncii nu sunt întru totul corelate cu un sistem unitar de dobândire a aptitudinilor. În același timp, după repetate încercări de a convinge Comisia Europeană să suplimenteze fondurile alocate programelor de reducere a șomajului în rândul tinerilor, am ajuns la concluzia că avem o dificultate de înțelegere a seriozității problemelor cu care se confruntă tinerii europeni. Susțin adoptarea acestui raport inclusiv prin prisma faptului că cere exact ceea ce am solicitat și eu Comisiei - un set de statistici la zi care să prezinte eficiența programului Erasmus+ și a altor programe care încurajează mobilitatea forței de muncă în UE. Nu în ultimul rând, vreau să fac un apel către toate grupurile politice să nu ignore multilingvismul, astfel încât programul Erasmus+ să devină accesibil în toate limbile oficiale ale UE, așa cum este firesc.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE), na piśmie. – Zgodnie ze statystykami przedstawionymi przez Eurostat w lutym 2016 roku bezrobocie wśród ludzi młodych w UE było na poziomie odpowiednio 21,5 % w strefie euro i 19,5 % dla całej Unii Europejskiej. Pomimo pewnych pozytywnych zmian w ostatnich latach dane te są niepokojące.

Wykorzystanie programu Erasmus + i innych narzędzi wspomagania mobilności w kształceniu i szkoleniu zawodowym jest jedną z inicjatyw o kluczowym znaczeniu dla trwałej poprawy sytuacji. Wzrost mobilności pomaga zwiększać elastyczność zawodową młodych ludzi, jak i promować podnoszenie własnych kompetencji oraz aktywnego poszukiwania zatrudnienia. Obecnie jedynie 1 % młodych osób korzystających ze szkolenia zawodowego połączonego z pracą bierze udział w programach z zakresu mobilności.

W pełni popieram podjęcie wszelkich działań w celu udoskonalenia programów mobilności w kształceniu i szkoleniu zawodowym. Szczególnie ważne jest ułatwienie wzajemnego uznawania i akredytacji wszelkich tego typu inicjatyw.

Milan Zver (PPE), pisno. – Spoštovani, jutri bomo glasovali o uporabi programa Erasmus+ in drugih instrumentov za spodbujanje mobilnosti v poklicnem izobraževanju in usposabljanju.

Vesel sem, da je Parlament pripravil resolucijo, ki se osredotoča na poklicno izobraževanje. Kot stalni poročevalec EP za program Erasmus + spremljam tudi aktivnosti povezane s starim programom Leonardo, ki so sedaj sestavni del Erasmusu.

Erasmus + je izjemnega pomena za spodbujanje mobilnosti. Žal pa zaradi različnih socialno-ekonomskih dejavnikov le 1 % udeležencev poklicnega izobraževanja sodeluje v programih mobilnosti. Za mnoge med njimi mobilnost ni tako samoumevna kot za univerzitetne študente.

Zato poslanci pozivamo Evropsko komisijo, da v sodelovanju s centrom CEDEFOP pripravi konkretne ukrepe, ki bodo zagotovili, da se ta delež poveča. Potrebno je olajšati sočasno financiranje iz sorodnih programov in mehanizmov, kot so Erasmus+, Evropski socialni sklad, Jamstvo za mlade in Pobuda za zaposlovanje mladih.

Komisijo in države članice pozivamo, da bolje uveljavijo in uskladijo delovanje obstoječih mehanizmov, kot so Europass, ECVET in evropski referenčni okvir za zagotavljanje kakovosti poklicnega izobraževanja ter nadaljujejo s prizadevanji za medsebojno priznavanje študijskih programov, kvalifikacij, neformalnega in priložnostnega učenja.

Večja mobilnost na področju poklicnega izobraževanja bo pripomogla k odpravljanju neskladij med ponudbo in povpraševanjem po spretnostih ter k povečanju zaposlenosti mladih v EU.

22. The EU role in the framework of international financial, monetary and regulatory institutions and bodies (short presentation)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Sylvie Goulard über die Aufgaben der EU im Rahmen der internationalen Finanz-, Währungs- und Regulierungsinstitutionen und – gremien (2015/2060(INI)) (A8-0027/2016).

Sylvie Goulard, rapporteure. – Madame la Présidente, je m'exprimerai en français.

Je suis très heureuse que nous arrivions au vote de ce rapport, qui est un modeste rapport d'initiative sur un sujet qui nous dépasse très largement.

Il y a dans ce rapport deux mots-clés si on veut en saisir le sens. Le premier mot-clé, c'est «contrôle démocratique». Nous avons effectivement – et je crois que l'Europe, qui est une société ouverte, y est particulièrement attachée – la volonté de participer à la stabilisation du système financier international. Cette stabilisation suppose de conclure des accords au niveau global, avec des partenaires qui peuvent se trouver en Amérique, en Asie et demain, peut-être, dans le monde entier. Or, la nécessité de fixer des règles au niveau global se heurte assez rapidement aux exigences de la démocratie et, dans le fond, nous ne sommes plus toujours capables de donner une réponse très simple à une question tout aussi simple, à savoir: qui décide?

Par conséquent, le point de départ de ce rapport était de constater que, dans de plus en plus de domaines, nous ne pouvons pas répondre à nos électeurs, aux citoyens, concernant la question simple: qui décide? Et il est assez important, même si des comités d'experts interviennent, que les entités démocratiquement élues puissent exercer leur fonction.

Deuxièmement, le second aspect important est celui de l'influence de l'Europe dans cette négociation globale. Le rapport essaie d'être assez pragmatique et de partir, notamment, des domaines dans lesquels nous avons des pouvoirs législatifs, c'est-à-dire dans lesquels nous légiférons avec le Conseil. A priori, tous les États membres sont liés par cette législation. Or, il apparaît parfois que, dans des comités, dans des organisations internationales, certains États ne jouent pas le jeu collectif, par exemple dans le domaine bancaire où, pourtant, il existe une législation commune.

Sur la méthode, nous avons observé ce qui se fait dans un certain nombre d'institutions internationales qui sont parfois des organisations internationales à part entière, comme l'OCDE ou le FMI, des organismes plus souples, qui ont été créés au fil de la crise ou qui se sont renforcés pendant la crise, comme le G20 ou le Financial Stability Board, et puis un certain nombre d'autres organismes comme le Comité de Bâle pour les banques, l'IOSCO, l'IEIS, l'IOPS, ou encore l'IASB – je suis désolée pour les interprètes, cela fait beaucoup de sigles –, au sein desquels l'industrie est parfois présente, ce qui peut aussi poser des problèmes de conflits d'intérêts, et parfois de représentation très parcellaire des pays du monde.

Je tiens d'ailleurs à remercier les services du Parlement, qui nous ont permis d'obtenir un certain nombre de rapports sur ces différentes institutions, ainsi que mes rapporteurs fictifs. Je vois que Mady Delvaux est là, et Sirpa Pietikäinen également. Je ne sais pas s'il y en a d'autres que j'oublie mais, en tout cas, nous avons, je crois, vraiment bien travaillé tous ensemble. J'espère que nous pourrions avoir une large majorité, parce qu'encore une fois, ce sont des sujets sur lesquels nous essayons d'anticiper, et nous nous efforçons de lever le voile sur des pratiques qui ont été nécessaires en raison de la crise, mais que nous ne sommes plus tout à fait capables, au final, d'expliquer aux électeurs.

Ce que j'espère, c'est que la Commission pourra mettre en place ce que nous avons appelé un dialogue financier, c'est-à-dire un rapport plus étroit entre ceux qui représentent l'Europe et cette assemblée, de manière à ce que nous puissions, en amont, discuter des mandats et, en aval, regarder ce qui a été obtenu. C'est un peu la base du dialogue monétaire avec la BCE qui a, lui aussi, été créé en marge des traités.

Ce n'est pas plus, ce n'est pas moins, c'est un début et, encore une fois, je vous remercie tous d'être là si nombreux ce soir pour l'adoption de ce rapport. Merci, Monsieur le Commissaire, d'être avec nous également.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Madam President, history has taught us that when we act together we are strong, and when we are divided, we are weak and unable to face challenges, whether these be the refugee crisis, the financial crisis or taxation issues. Actually, when it comes to global financial markets, the EU is belittling itself and reducing its powers by being so ineffective, so opaque and having so many intrigues between the Member States and competences – not only between the Member States but also between the different divisions in the Commission and between the Commission and the Member States – not to mention the opaqueness, which Sylvie Goulard has already mentioned, about openness to civil society and Parliament about what is actually going on in international fora. The latest big signal has been not only taxation but, after the financial crisis, the need to change the system. What we need is democratic scrutiny and the possibility for Parliament to give pre-guidance and afterwards scrutiny on these issues.

Mady Delvaux (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, le premier mérite de ce rapport, c'est de dresser un inventaire des différents organes auxquels l'Europe participe, illustrant leur diversité en termes de modes de fonctionnement, de statut et de composition.

Je voudrais remercier Sylvie Goulard d'avoir pris l'initiative de ce rapport et je salue le sens du compromis dont elle a fait preuve, qui permettra, du moins je l'espère, de dégager une large majorité lors du vote. En effet, il s'agit d'envoyer un message fort à la Commission, mais surtout au Conseil et aux États membres.

Il faut améliorer la coordination et assurer la cohésion de l'Union pour défendre nos intérêts légitimes, sans oublier les pays moins bien lotis. Il faut un maximum de transparence, de façon à pouvoir retracer les influences qui sont à l'origine des décisions. Il faut, en outre, un contrôle démocratique, un débat au sein des parlements nationaux, mais aussi avec la société civile, qui doit être dotée des ressources et des compétences nécessaires pour mener les discussions. Il faut, enfin, que les représentants de l'Union rendent des comptes et qu'ils veillent au respect des engagements pris.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η πολυμελής συνεργασία ανάμεσα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και στους διάφορους διεθνείς οικονομικούς οργανισμούς, καθώς και ο διαχωρισμός των καθηκόντων τους, κάθε φορά, πρέπει να υλοποιηθεί και αυτό αποτελεί πραγματική αναγκαιότητα, προκειμένου να υπάρξει χρηματοπιστωτική σταθερότητα και ανάπτυξη. Για να γίνει όμως αυτό, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα πρέπει να βάλει τάξη στα του οίκου της. Συγκεκριμένα, είναι αναγκαίο να υπάρξει επαναπροσδιορισμός στα εποπτικά καθήκοντα της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας και της συμμετοχής της στα προγράμματα της τρόικας. Στην Ελλάδα, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα λειτουργεί ως δανειστής της χώρας και όχι ως ανεξάρτητη νομισματική αρχή, με αποτέλεσμα να υπάρχει σύγκρουση συμφερόντων.

Αυτό, βέβαια, θα σταματήσει όταν η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα φύγει από την τρόικα. Επιπλέον, θα πρέπει η ΕΚΤ να εγκαταλείψει τη στρατηγική της «μερκελικής» λιτότητας και να συμβάλει πραγματικά στην παροχή ρευστότητας, προκειμένου να υπάρξουν χαμηλά επιτόκια και τόνωση της ανάπτυξης. Τέλος, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα πρέπει να συμβάλει σε μια συνεργασία ισορροπημένη στα οικονομικά και χρηματοπιστωτικά θέματα, απαλλάσσοντας τις χώρες του Νότου απ' την πιστωτική ασφυξία.

Sylvie Goulard, rapporteure. – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais intervenir pour un rappel au règlement. Ce serait bien que les collègues parlent du sujet du rapport. Cela serait plus intéressant que de venir faire inlassablement le même numéro qu'on entend sur d'autres sujets.

Le sujet de ce rapport, c'est la place de l'Union européenne dans les enceintes internationales globales.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αναφέρομαι στον Κανονισμό, διότι σύμφωνα με τον Κανονισμό, η εισηγήτρια δεν έχει δικαίωμα να κάνει υποδείξεις στους ομιλητές στο τι θα πούνε. Δεύτερον, αυτά που ελπίζω έχουν άμεση σχέση με την έκθεση και η εισηγήτρια όφειλε να πει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα παραβιάζει αυτή τη στιγμή τις Συνθήκες με το να συμμετέχει στην τρόικα. Αυτό το έχει πει και το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο, επομένως, να την επαναφέρετε στην τάξη.

Die Präsidentin. – Herr Marias! Das war jetzt nicht wirklich zur Geschäftsordnung. Es haben sowohl Sie das Recht zu sagen, was Sie meinen, was richtig ist, als auch die Berichterstatterin, zu hoffen und dafür zu plädieren, dass sich die Rednerinnen und Redner auf ihren Text beziehen.

Marco Zanni (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sfide globali richiedono un coordinamento su ampia scala e su questo sono perfettamente d'accordo; quello su cui invece sono in disaccordo è la risposta che si vuole dare perché non ritengo credibile la soluzione «più Europa».

La risposta non può essere di costringere tutti ad allinearsi ad un modello unico, l'eliminazione di ogni forma di dissenso o la continua cessione di sovranità a un'Unione europea che oggi non è in grado di dare soluzioni ai problemi dei cittadini. Non vogliamo che l'Europa parli con una sola voce. Quello che chiediamo è una maggiore cooperazione e rispetto e per raggiungere questo non abbiamo bisogno di una sovrastruttura tecnocratica come l'UE. L'utopia federalista degli Stati Uniti d'Europa, che esalta il ruolo delle crisi come mali necessari per convincere i cittadini a cedere più sovranità a strutture lontane e al di fuori dal controllo democratico è pura follia irrealizzabile. Se l'Europa, quella vera, vuole sopravvivere, deve abbandonare questo progetto fallimentare e virare su un modello di integrazione funzionale per singoli obiettivi che tuteli e rispetti le differenze degli Stati.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych se věnoval části, o které hovořila paní zpravodajka. Máme předjímat, máme být jaksi předvídaví a zároveň uplatňovat postupy, které před občany obhájíme.

Já s tímto souhlasím, co říkala paní kolegyně, nicméně volám také po tom, abychom více komunikovali i s členskými státy. Je nepochybné, že globální finanční trh a role Evropské unie v mezinárodních finančních institucích je velice závažné téma. Ale neméně závažnou otázkou je, jakým způsobem Evropská unie a její instituce svou politiku komunikují s členskými státy a jejich občany. Tady si myslím, že máme skutečně významné rezervy.

Česká republika má finanční trhy a nastavená pravidla na těchto finančních trzích na velmi dobré úrovni. My jsme za to zaplatili velmi vysokou cenu právě v podobě nutnosti sanovat banky v 90. letech. Byl bych velmi rád, kdyby i Evropská unie se z toho následného postupu a komunikace s občany poučila, třeba i od nás.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Valóban, amikor ezekről a kérdésekről beszélünk, mi azért gondolhatunk nemcsak a különböző pénzügyi szervezetekben végzett tevékenységünkre, mármint az Európai Unió részéről, hanem arra is, hogy vajon ezek mennyire szolgálnak a külpolitikai céljainkat. Nekem meggyőződésem, hogy Európának kifejezetten érdeke, hogy a világban azok a békefolyamatok előre mozduljanak, amelyek egyébként később csúnya konfliktusokba tudnak torkollani.

Éppen ezért én azt gondolom, azt javaslom, hogy a következőkben sokkal nagyobb hangsúlyt fektessünk a külpolitikai érdekképviselőre, azaz nem csupán úgy általában legyen Európa támogató, hanem a konkrét érdekei mentén.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like first of all to congratulate Ms Sylvie Goulard for taking the initiative to present this report. Last October the Commission released a communication aiming at a more unified external representation of our economic and monetary union in international financial institutions. We can no longer accept that the euro area, which has the second largest currency in the world and which represents one of the world's key market actors and economic powerhouses, does not speak with one voice on economic and financial matters in international financial institutions.

This especially holds for the International Monetary Fund. The International Monetary Fund is a key pillar of the international monetary system in charge of global crisis prevention and crisis response. It is of strong relevance for the euro area. A more unified representation will allow the euro area to effectively shape its future role in the global financial architecture and more effectively promote euro area interests at a global level.

Our proposal consists of two elements: streamlining euro area representation in the short term and moving to a unified representation by the year 2025. We are aware that the road ahead is not easy. We are currently discussing the proposals with the Member States. The decision-making process will take some time; agreement is not imminent, but we believe that an agreement can be reached. We welcome an early discussion with Parliament on this important subject and we take note of your recommendations.

We appreciate that the report stresses the need for a stronger European voice. As regards international standard-setting bodies for financial regulation, the situation is very diverse from the Financial Stability Board to the Basel Committee and others. Each body has its own particular governance arrangements, and the extent to which the EU is represented varies – often with only certain Member States represented. We agree with Parliament that the European position should be better coordinated, as we all understand that when we are united we are stronger on the international scene, and we set out in our October communication what the Commission will do to get there.

The Commission also takes note of the proposals in the report to involve European supervisory authorities more in international fora. A core interest of the European Parliament is to be more involved in discussions leading up to the development of new international rules concerning the financial sector. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the Commission has been steadily building up strong relations with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON). This work is not finished, and we stand ready to provide timely updates on salient developments in international financial regulation.

To conclude, a point on the G20: we should bear in mind that the G20 is an informal forum where leaders make commitments to address global challenges, putting their personal credibility at stake. It does not adopt binding decisions or replace regular decision-making processes.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

23. Small-scale coastal fishing in regions dependent on fishing (short presentation)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Ruža Tomašić über Innovation und Diversifizierung der kleinen Küstenfischerei in von der Fischerei abhängigen Gebieten (2015/2090(INI)) (A8-0044/2016).

Ruža Tomašić, izvijestiteljica. – Gospodo predsjedavajuća, gospodine povjereniče Vella, cijenjene kolegice i kolege zastupnici, slogan ove naše zajednice je „Ujedinjeni u raznolikosti”. No, pravila su dosad manje-više bila univerzalna i nisu priznavala tu toliko isticanu raznolikost, a pojedine odredbe zajedničke ribarstvene politike i Mediteranske uredbe koje se konkretno tiču malog obalnog ribolova najbolji su primjer toga.

Sredozemlje i sjeverna mora zakonodavcu i birokratskom aparatu bila su jedno te isto, a posljedica takvog pristupa je zakonodavni okvir koji guši razvoj ribarskih zajednica i na jugu i na sjeveru kontinenta. Prvi korak u izgradnji novog okvira je donošenje definicije obalnog, malog obalnog i tradicijskog ribolova na razini Europske unije, uvažavajući pritom posebnosti različitih ribarskih regija.

Pozivamo Komisiju da u ovom procesu u obzir uzme više različitih kriterija poput veličine plovila, upotrijebljenog ribolovnog alata, selektivnosti ribolovnih tehnika, trajanja izlazaka u ribolov, ali i socioekonomske pokazatelje, kao što je utjecaj tradicijskog ribarstva na blagostanje lokalnih zajednica. Smatramo da je potrebno preispitati mogućnost malog obalnog ribolova u otočnim zajednicama koje zbog egzistencije tradicionalno ovise o ribarstvu i sudjeluju u ribolovnim aktivnostima tijekom cijele godine.

Takva bi odluka bila u potpunosti u skladu s novom inicijativom za otoke kojom želimo razviti sveobuhvatna rješenja za probleme ekonomskog i demografskog odumiranja otoka te očuvanje otočnih zajednica. Uzimajući u obzir negativne učinke administrativnog opterećenja koje u budućnosti treba značajno smanjiti, od Komisije i država članica tražimo da se kroz nadležna tijela pobrinu da mali obalni ribolov dobiva odgovarajuća sredstva iz Europskog fonda za pomorstvo i ribarstvo. Tradicijski ribolov važan je segment kulturno-povijesne baštine priobalnih zajednica te bi kao takav trebao biti temelj razvoja ribolovnog turizma. Pozivamo zato Komisiju da podupre ulaganja u promicanje ribarskog nasljeđa i diversifikaciju ribarstva u području kulture i umjetnosti.

No, kako ne bi sve ostalo samo na tradiciji te kako bismo osigurali održivost otočnih zajednica u budućnosti, Parlament ovim izvješćem snažno podupire diversifikaciju sektora ribarstva razvojem komplementarnih djelatnosti te ulaganjem u plovila, sigurnosnu opremu, osposobljavanje i inovacije, pri čemu ključni cilj mora biti financiranje aktivnosti koje su društveno, ekološki i gospodarski održive.

Ove ciljeve moguće je postići samo uz sudjelovanje svih lokalnih dionika, poduzetničkih udruga, istraživačkih instituta, sveučilišta, tehnoloških centara te lokalnih i regionalnih institucija, pa pozivamo Komisiju da im pruži dostatnu potporu kako bi zadovoljili uvjete navedene u Europskom fondu za ribarstvo te da poduzme odlučnije korake kako bi se poboljšale njihove mogućnosti financiranja.

Na kraju bih željela zahvaliti svima koji su doprinijeli izradi ovoga izvješća. U prvom redu zahvaljujem kolegama izvjestiteljima u sjeni i svim članovima Odbora za ribarstvo koji su svojim prijedlozima i raspravama stvorili vrlo konstruktivnu i pozitivnu atmosferu oko ovoga izvješća.

No, kao izvjestiteljica posebno bih se željela zahvaliti stručnjacima i ribarima iz Hrvatske koji su prepoznali trenutak te svojim znanjem i iskustvom odlučili utjecati na procese u politici. Ovako otvorena i iskrena suradnja između politike i zainteresirane javnosti vraća vjeru u demokratske procese i budi nadu da zajedno s građanima možemo popraviti sve ono što danas ne valja u Europskoj uniji.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, me congratulo por el informe Tomašić. La pesca costera artesanal es muy importante: en España representa el 66 % de la flota y en Galicia, de donde procedo, representa el 85 % de los buques, es decir, más de 3 800 embarcaciones, incluyendo la actividad del marisqueo desde embarcación.

Recientemente una delegación de la Comisión de Pesca visitó precisamente esta tierra y pudo comprobar la importancia de la pesca artesanal. Se trata, en su mayoría, de embarcaciones pequeñas, de empresas de carácter familiar. Emplean artes selectivas, tienen escaso impacto ambiental y consumen menos combustible.

Tenemos que ayudar a esta flota, muy importante en las comunidades locales de las que procede. El Fondo Europeo Marítimo y de Pesca afirma que es necesario establecer un plan de acción, de desarrollo, de competitividad y de sostenibilidad de la flota pesquera artesanal. En Galicia se está ultimando este plan, que contempla, entre otras cosas, prioridad para la flota artesanal en todas las medidas que prevé el Fondo, plan de empleo para asegurar el relevo generacional y medidas para asegurar la comercialización de sus productos y también para mejorar la eficiencia energética de las embarcaciones.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, parece-me importante reconhecer que há neste relatório uma defesa muito interessante das pescas nas zonas mais remotas, ou seja, nas zonas ultraperiféricas da Europa. De facto, nos Açores, de onde sou oriundo, há particularidades que têm que ser defendidas, garantindo a proteção de frotas de menor dimensão e a implementação de verdadeiros projetos alternativos da economia azul. Esta abordagem tem de estar alicerçada em pesquisa científica e regulada por consistência de oportunidades económicas e identificação das condicionantes ambientais. O resultado deverá confluir em temas como a diversificação da utilização do mar, a dignificação e incremento da formação dos profissionais da pesca e a valorização de recursos biológicos. É também por isto tudo que quero destacar a possibilidade apontada no relatório de iniciativa de ampliar a ação do Fundo Europeu para os Assuntos do Mar e das Pescas para abarcar sistemas similares ao saudoso POSEI Pescas.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η παράκτια αλιεία αποτελεί μια κοινωνικά βιώσιμη μορφή αλιείας η οποία, σύμφωνα με την Κοινή Αλιευτική Πολιτική, μπορεί να αυξήσει την ανταγωνιστικότητα και την επιχειρηματικότητα στον αλιευτικό τομέα. Ωστόσο, σε πολλά κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης, οι παράκτιες και νησιωτικές περιοχές αντιμετωπίζουν σημαντική οικονομική ύφεση που έχει ως αποτέλεσμα τη μείωση του πληθυσμού και την φυγή των κατοίκων.

Επιπλέον, σε χώρες όπως η Ελλάδα που πλήττεται από τα μέτρα της λιτότητας και του μνημονίου, οι αλιείς βιώνουν τις συνέπειες του αγροτικού μνημονίου της τρόικας, με αποτέλεσμα την οικονομική ύφεση η οποία είναι πολύ πιο έντονη.

Είναι, επομένως, αναγκαίο η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να λάβει άμεσα μέτρα, ώστε να ανασυγκροτηθεί ο πρωτογενής τομέας, να δοθεί έμφαση στη γαλάζια οικονομία, να ενισχυθεί η απασχόληση στις παράκτιες και νησιωτικές περιοχές και να αυξηθεί η χρηματοδότηση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στον αλιευτικό τομέα. Ενώ, σε σχέση με την Ελλάδα, θα πρέπει επιτέλους να μπει φραγμός στην φορομπηχτική λεηλασία και στο αντιασφαλιστικό ρεσάλτο στα πενιχρά εισοδήματα των αλιέων.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora Presidenta, Comisario, la política pesquera común necesita una definición racional de pesca costera y tradicional y fórmulas más flexibles para apoyar un sector crítico, para el mantenimiento de la actividad, la población, la cultura y los modos de vida tradicionales en las costas europeas. La definición sobre la base del tamaño y potencia de los barcos no sirve; proponemos criterios vinculados a la diversidad de este sector pesquero y a la relación de la pesca a pequeña escala con el mantenimiento de la actividad y las poblaciones tradicionales en las sociedades costeras.

Queremos una regulación más rigurosa de la pesca recreativa y más imaginación y valor en las medidas de diversificación de la renta en este sector. De ello depende que sigamos conservando en Europa modos de vida que forman parte del patrimonio europeo y que van a ofrecer también experiencias únicas a los futuros clientes de la marca europea de turismo de calidad. Escuchen más, por favor, el clamor de las sociedades del salitre.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a reforma da política comum das pescas não contribuiu para resolver, como se impunha, os graves problemas que enfrenta a pequena pesca costeira, a pesca artesanal e as regiões das mais dependentes. Pelo contrário, muitos problemas agravaram-se.

Queremos nesta ocasião insistir em propostas de há muito, cuja necessidade é confirmada pela evolução da realidade. A elaboração de um programa comunitário específico de apoio à pequena pesca, a defesa de um tratamento diferenciado com regimes e modelos de gestão adaptados às características e problemas específicos deste segmento, o apoio à renovação e modernização da frota, a melhoria dos rendimentos do setor, se necessário intervindo na sua cadeia de valor de forma a valorizar os preços pagos à produção, a consagração e alargamento das áreas de reserva de acesso exclusivo de forma a melhor proteger as frotas e comunidades locais, dando-lhes prioridade no acesso a recursos. Não bastam altissonantes proclamações em defesa da pequena pesca. É necessário que estas proclamações se traduzam num compromisso concreto e em medidas concretas, muito para lá daquilo que tem vindo a ser feito.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitam kolegici Tomašić na izvrsnom izvješću koje će svakako doprinijeti kvaliteti života malih ribara.

Reforma zajedničke ribarske politike započeta u siječnju 2014. godine ima za cilj uvesti inovacije, stvoriti nova tržišta i poboljšati kvalitetu života u obalnim područjima. Poboljšanje kvalitete života u obalnim područjima nije moguće dok je na snazi tzv. Mediteranska uredba iz 2006. godine zbog neselektivnog pristupa zabrane korištenja tradicionalnih alata i tehnika na području Mediterana. Zabrane tog tipa dovode do napuštanja tradicionalnih načina izlova i raseljavanja stanovništva, posebno s otoka, zbog nemogućnosti ostvarivanja osnovnih egzistencijalnih potreba.

Stoga se slažem kako je potrebno definirati obalni, mali obalni i tradicijski ribolov u skladu s socioekonomskim karakteristikama, zaštitom bioraznolikosti i posebnostima različitih regija, a ne samo u skladu s dimenzijama i snagom ribarskih plovila, s obzirom na činjenicu kako postojeći propisi Europske unije nisu zadovoljavajući.

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, querido Comisario, todos estaremos de acuerdo en que es preciso hacer un esfuerzo desde la Unión Europea por proteger la pesca artesanal. Estamos hablando de un modo de vida que debemos conservar pero también de una actividad económica y social que puede seguir siendo viable y rentable si tomamos las decisiones adecuadas. Normas específicas para pesca específica. Eso es lo que necesitamos.

Y siendo esto importante lo es fundamentalmente para algunas regiones —lo ha dicho el señor Serrão—, como las regiones ultraperiféricas, que necesitan de una protección especial para garantizar la supervivencia de los pescadores que utilizan técnicas tradicionales y que, además, se caracterizan por ser muy respetuosas con el medio ambiente. La pesca costera en estos territorios es consustancial al desarrollo económico de los mismos debido a sus características geográficas y a su gran alejamiento del continente.

Por eso, es importante que adoptemos medidas para proteger su actividad, que volvamos a un POSEI para pesca y que trabajemos para reforzar el desarrollo y la innovación que permitan garantizar que estos barcos van a poder seguir faenando.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la Commissione deve sforzarsi di sostenere progetti innovativi e disposizioni giuridiche che agevolino lo sviluppo delle regioni dipendenti dalla pesca.

Occorre, in particolare, dare priorità ai progetti incentrati sulla creazione e il mantenimento dei posti di lavoro e sulla promozione del pescaturismo e della gastronomia legata ai prodotti della pesca artigianale. La Commissione deve sostenere attivamente gli investimenti a favore della diversificazione della pesca sia nella commercializzazione e lavorazione dei prodotti ittici locali, sia per stimolare lo sviluppo di canali di distribuzione locali e per la promozione di prodotti attraverso la creazione di segni distintivi e marchi locali.

È fondamentale, inoltre, che sia la Commissione sia gli Stati membri aumentino progressivamente le quote attribuite ai pescatori artigianali al fine di favorire questo tipo di pesca socialmente ed ecologicamente sostenibile, così come è importante riservare priorità alla pesca costiera artigianale nell'assegnazione dei finanziamenti del Fondo europeo per gli affari marittimi e per la pesca.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, zajednička ribarska politika kao da je izraz nekog birokrata iz neke kancelarije na 12. katu, ne znam točno u kojoj ulici u Bruxellesu. Tako otprilike izgleda nesenzibilnost onoga što upravo imamo u ovom izvještaju, kao nešto što je zaista odličan rezultat napornog rada, dogovaranja i zato želim izraziti svoju snažnu podršku ambiciji da se tradicijsko malo ribarstvo napokon stavi na ono mjesto koje zaslužuje unutar europskih politika.

Naravno da je to iznimno važno za opstojnost mnogih otočkih zajednica, naravno da je to bitno za promociju turizma i naravno da je to bitno za enogastronomiju otoka, ali i inače primorskih regija. Zato želim izraziti snažnu podršku i promovirat ću ovaj izvještaj u Hrvatskoj i u drugim otočnim, odnosno primorskim, regijama Europe.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, podržavam ovo izvješće i čestitam kolegici Tomašić na prijedlogu da se izmjeni Mediteranska uredba i postojeća regulativa o selekciji alata i tehnika.

Mali obalni ribolov izuzetno je značajan sa socioekonomskog i tradicijsko-kulturološkog gledišta za otočko i priobalno stanovništvo Republike Hrvatske. Stoga sam i pokrenula inicijativu o proglašenju malog ribolova nematerijalnom kulturnom baštinom Republike Hrvatske. Naime, ukidanje malog ribolova u Hrvatskoj dodatno je pogoršalo život stanovnika u priobalnim i otočkim područjima, koja su ionako suočena s izrazitom depopulacijom stanovništva. Mali obalni ribolov s tradicionalnim tehnikama i alatima predstavlja stoljetnu tradiciju u Hrvatskoj i bitnu sastavnicu identiteta hrvatskog primorskog prostora.

Stoga smatram da je potrebno primijeniti regionalni pristup gospodarenja morskim resursima po svim geografskim, biološkim, sociološkim i gospodarskim specifičnostima kako bi zaustavili postojeće negativne trendove koje je stara zajednička ribarska politika donijela.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, quisiera en primer lugar felicitar a la señora Tomašić porque ha hecho un gran trabajo, ha sido muy receptiva a todas las propuestas, y yo creo que en general ha quedado un informe más que adecuado.

Quiero destacar, señor Comisario, que prácticamente todos los diputados se han referido a que es necesaria una definición nueva de pesca costera artesanal. Es algo sobre lo que existe una gran coincidencia en este informe. No pueden ser los doce metros de eslora lo que identifique qué es pesca costera artesanal. Hay que hacer una nueva definición. Pero no basta con esa nueva definición; es necesario un apoyo explícito. Hasta ahora no se ha dado. Los programas operativos nacionales no han tenido esa discriminación positiva.

También hay que aprovechar —y así se recoge en este informe— para crear un segmento turístico pesquero en el que participe este sector sin verse excluido. Por tanto, termino como empecé: felicitando a la señora Tomašić y apoyando claramente este informe.

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrter Herr Kommissar Vella! Ich denke, es ist ganz wichtig, dass wir in die Grundverordnung die kleine und küstennahe und handwerkliche Fischerei komplett mit aufgenommen haben und sie auch entsprechend in dem dazugehörigen Finanzinstrument – dem EMFF, dem Europäischen Meeres- und Fischereifonds – mit Unterstützung bedacht haben.

Das war ein sehr wichtiges Signal. 70 % aller Fischereibetriebe in Europa gehören sozusagen der kleinen handwerklichen und küstennahen Fischerei an, und deshalb spielt dabei auch die Regionalisierung eine ganz entscheidende Rolle. Ich finde das gut, dass Herr Kommissar Vella da auch den Mitgliedstaaten eine gewisse Freiheit gibt und also nicht sagt, *one size fits all*, sondern: Wir werden Mehrjahres-, Mehrarten-Managementpläne entwickeln, die dann auch genau auf diese Fanggebiete und auf die Fischereibetriebe ausgerichtet sind.

Glücklicherweise haben wir jetzt für meine Heimatregion – die Ostsee – den Ostseepan so weit fertig, der auch viele Vorteile für die Fischerei bringt: Dass sie die Ein-Netz-Regel abgeschafft haben, dass nicht unnötig mehr Seetage notiert werden müssen, dass auch Sozialleistungen in besonderen Stilllegungsphasen gezahlt werden können, das sind alles wichtige Signale an die kleinen Fischereibetriebe, die uns authentisch machen zusammen mit dem Tourismus, und da können wir auch mit hinein investieren im Juncker-Plan, und dann wird das auch in eine positive Richtung gehen.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I welcome the European Parliament's own-initiative report on innovation and diversification of small-scale coastal fishing in fisheries-dependent regions, and I would like to thank rapporteur Tomašić for the report.

The European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF), which as you know is the structural support tool for the common fisheries policy for the period 2014-2020, was the fruit of intense negotiations between the European Parliament and the Council. Thanks to the fund, Member States can and probably will implement most of what is requested or proposed in the report.

The fund permits a higher intensity of aid – 80% – for all operations related to small-scale coastal fishing. Some examples are: young fishermen starting out in the sector; health and safety; diversification; partnerships between scientists and fishermen for the purposes of training; lifelong learning; marketing and processing; and innovation. However, it is the responsibility of Member States to decide, under the respective operational programmes approved in late 2015, how to translate their strategic preferences into concrete support to their small-scale coastal fishing fleet.

The figures for small-scale coastal fishing fleets are telling. They account for only 8% of gross tonnage yet they represent nearly three quarters – almost 75% – of active fishing vessels. They account for only 12% of the value of landings and 16% of the gross value added, yet they represent 48% of the total number of jobs and 36% of the full-time equivalents, which means that a significant proportion of the jobs are part-time.

This last element implies that fishing is not the only, or even the main, source of income for many small-scale coastal fishing fishermen and families. In any event, it is a fact that small-scale coastal fishing vessels are fundamental for the viability and resilience of coastal communities dependent on them, and I fully agree with that view.

However, it is also a fact that industrial or large-scale fishing fleets are also based in coastal areas and that they represent most of the value of landings, gross value added and full-time equivalent jobs within the EU. Thus, these are at least as fundamental for the viability and the resilience of coastal communities as small-scale coastal fishing fleets. Furthermore, the simple fact that some 36 stocks in the Atlantic are now operating at maximum sustainable yield shows that large-scale fleets can also fish in a sustainable way whilst producing a lot of added value and social benefits. In view of the above, we need to support all fishing fleets and avoid instituting an asymmetric fishing policy, even though we do recognise the equal importance of this small-scale coastal fishing.

Regarding control requirements, let me recall that small-scale coastal fishing can already benefit from preferential conditions of support from the EMFF for the installation of control equipment on board. As to the proposal to relax control requirements for the fund during the review of the Control Regulation, we have to be particularly careful in ensuring that this does not jeopardise fishing resources in the coastal band. The coastal band is a strip about 12 nautical miles wide where most small-scale coastal fishing occurs and where most Member States grant preferential access rights to vessels.

In particular, there is a serious risk that further relaxing regulatory requirements on small-scale coastal fishing could encourage fishing by additional vessels and worsen crowding in the coastal band, especially in areas where there is already a lot of pressure on regulated and unregulated stocks. I am convinced that such a further relaxation would backfire both in terms of economic viability and environmental protection.

Regarding the definition of small-scale coastal fleets, according to the EMFF Regulation, Article 3(14) covers fishing vessels of an overall length of less than 12 metres and not using towed fishing gear. It was subject to intense discussions during the trilogues on the EMFF regulations. Many alternatives, including the criteria proposed on point one of the report, were proposed, analysed and discussed, but in the end it was not possible to come to an agreement on any new definition, and the existing one was proposed. A regionalised approach to the definition could have some merit but would also risk creating an uneven playing field.

In conclusion, all fleets, including the small-scale coastal fishing fleet, are fundamental for the continued viability of coastal areas. A successful CFP is the best possible way to ensure the environmental, economic and social sustainability of EU fisheries and coastal areas. There is a lot of public support for that.

Finally, be aware that relaxing further control requirements and allowing over-capacity to develop or increase in the 12-nautical-mile zone would clearly threaten the resilience of these communities. I have no doubt that the co-legislators will get back to us on these issues as part of the planned revision of the control regulation. Thank you for your valuable comments.

Die Präsidentin. – Damit ist dieser Punkt abgeschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 12. April, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Jørn Dohrmann (ECR), *skriftlig.* – Kystfiskeri er afgørende for yderområdenes beskæftigelse, turisme, tiltrækningskraft og fastholdelse af bosætning. Samtidig udgør kystfiskeriet en stor del af det samlede fiskeri i mange af de europæiske lande. Den direkte beskæftigelse inden for kystfiskeriet er en hjørnesten i mange lokalsamfunds økonomi, og samtidig er den afledte beskæftigelse i fiskeindustrien, detailhandelen og en række andre erhverv af stor betydning for især yderområderne i de lande, der har kystfiskeri. Turismen nyder godt af kystfiskeriet som kulturbærende faktor og er ofte årsag til turisternes fascination af et givent område. Fisk tilberedt og behandlet lokalt og på en for et område særegen måde er også med til at styrke turismen. Derfor er kystfiskeriet en afgørende faktor for bosætning og fastholdelse af bosætning i de kystnære områder, hvorfor det er vigtigt, at kystfiskeriet har de bedst tænkelige forhold i de europæiske lande.

Tonino Picula (S&D), *napisan.* – Postojeće odredbe o malom ribolovu ne samo da ukidaju stoljetne prakse i tradiciju, već mogu dodatno potaknuti uznapredovao problem depopulacije otoka ugrožavajući identitet i egzistenciju otočana. Prilagodba zakonodavstva je potrebna kako bismo sačuvali jedinstvenu kulturnu baštinu malih ribara.

Zbog toga mi je izuzetno drago da je usvojen najvažniji amandman kojim sam Komisiju pozvao da omogući mali priobalni ribolov u otočnim zajednicama koje tradicionalno ovise o ribarstvu, u svrhu vlastite egzistencije. Osim njega, ušao je i amandman kojim tražim da se napravi odgovarajuća definicija obalnog i malog obalnog ili tradicionalnog ribolova u nekomercijalne svrhe, koja će se temeljiti više na društveno-gospodarskim i kulturnim karakteristikama određenog područja, a ne na dimenzijama i snazi ribarskih brodova.

Posebno mi je drago da je usvojen amandman koji ukazuje na zabrinutost zbog gubitka tradicionalnih ribolovnih vještina i znanja zbog nepovoljnih uredbi za obalne zajednice. Kao zastupnik koji je rođen na otoku i odrastao uz more, svjestan važnosti i težine života na otocima, pozivam na prilagodbu europskog zakonodavstva kako bi sačuvali jedinstvenu kulturnu baštinu malih ribara. Time bi Europu zaista potvrdili u ujedinjenju u njenim različitostima.

24. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea: fisheries aspects (short presentation)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die kurze Darstellung des Berichts von Norica Nicolai über fischereiliche Aspekte im Rahmen des internationalen Übereinkommens über die Artenvielfalt des Meeres in Gebieten außerhalb des nationalen Hoheitsbereichs (Seerechtsübereinkommen der Vereinten Nationen) (2015/2109(INI)) (A8-0042/2016).

Norica Nicolai, raportoare – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, vreau să mulțumesc în primul rând colegilor din comisie și în special raportorilor din umbră pentru modul în care am colaborat la întocmirea acestui raport, raport pe care îl consider ca fiind un mesaj clar de susținere pentru Comisia Europeană, subliniind totodată care sunt prioritățile comisiei noastre în raport cu negocierile privind noul acord internațional. După cum știți, aproape 64% din apele planetei rămân în afara sferei de reglementare a Convenției privind dreptul mării, ca atare protejarea mediului, a biodiversității marine și a exploatării sustenabile a resurselor nu sunt acoperite de această convenție, care are peste treizeci și cinci de ani de existență, care aplică principiul libertății mărilor într-o lume în care lucrurile s-au schimbat, în care economia e diversificată, nevoia de hrană și de resurse a populației este cu totul alta.

Ca atare, această convenție urmează să fie supusă, sperăm noi, într-un viitor apropiat, unor modificări care să o aducă la o realitate prezentă. În ceea ce privește acordurile ulterioare, cel mai important acord pe care dorim să-l semnalăm este cel care vizează stocurile de pește, acord încheiat în 1995. Acest acord se adresează specific stocurilor de pește cu migrație mare și celor aflate în afara jurisdicției naționale. Acordul este în vigoare, este un acord bun, sigur mai sunt chestiuni care se pot discuta în legătură cu efectele acestui acord, dar comisia noastră recomandă susținerea și menținerea fermă, nemodificată, a prevederilor acestui acord în viitorul instrument juridic.

În 2004, Adunarea Generală a ONU a decis să se înceapă primele forme de negociere a acestei convenții. Ulterior, în 6 iunie 2015, Adunarea Generală a ONU decide deschiderea unor dezbateri și negocieri în cadrul unor comisii preliminare. Comisiile vor începe activitatea în 2016 și sperăm ca un prim raport să-l avem în 2017. Scopul acestor comisii va fi acela de pregătire a negocierilor de fond cu privire la dezvoltarea unui instrument internațional legal, subordonat Convenției privind dreptul mării, care să acopere lacunele și să completeze acordurile aflate în vigoare în prezent. Doresc să subliniez în mod deosebit rolul important pe care Comisia Europeană l-a avut, fiind una dintre vocile care au luat această inițiativă în ceea ce privește grupul de lucru, dar în acest context doresc să știți că există state care doresc excluderea din acest acord a anumitor tipuri de activități ce se desfășoară în afara jurisdicției naționale și cu precădere pescuitul, fapt care ne pune în dificultate, Comisia Europeană și Parlamentul nefiind de acord cu această excludere. Pe scurt, includerea pescuitului în acest nou instrument internațional, legal, este o prioritate pentru noi din motivele exprimate mai devreme, dar, cu un amendament foarte ferm, că acest lucru nu va duce la renegocierea acordului din 1995 privind stocurile de pește, ci va asigura includerea acestuia într-un nou cadru internațional.

De asemenea am recomandat folosirea, extinderea și sporirea importanței organizațiilor regionale pentru gestionarea pescuitului. Ele sunt parte a acordului din 1995, unele dintre ele au funcționat mai puțin bine, dar în general activitatea acestor organizații regionale este meritorie. Sugerăm Națiunilor Unite să găsească o modalitate de motivare a statelor mai puțin implicate în acest acord. În ceea ce privește zonele maritime protejate, acestea nu pot avea succesul scontat dacă nu există o coordonare și o colaborare între toate domeniile de activitate și dacă acestea nu sunt stabilite într-o logică de ansamblu privind protejarea biodiversității. Sperăm ca noul instrument internațional să includă o structură instituțională de luare a acestor decizii.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, señor Comisario, en primer lugar quiero felicitar a la ponente por este informe, y yo lo que quería decirle es que hoy venimos a debatir sobre un nuevo instrumento internacional para regular nuestros mares, pero lo primero que hay que decir es que no es necesaria más regulación: el marco que tenemos es suficiente y lo que es importante es que todas las partes lo cumplan porque no por añadir más leyes internacionales estaremos preservando mejor nuestros mares y océanos.

Hasta ahora, es evidente que no lo hemos hecho muy bien y estamos haciendo un uso ineficiente del marco de gobernanza del que disponemos. Las organizaciones regionales de pesca son competentes y deben gestionar los recursos pesqueros, y tienen que seguir haciéndolo como lo están haciendo, así que centrémonos en fortalecer y mejorar la coordinación entre las organizaciones internacionales y las regionales y pongámoslas a trabajar todas juntas para regular de forma adecuada la pesca mundial.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, saúdo também a relatora. Os recursos pesqueiros são uma componente da biodiversidade marinha e as pescarias a atividade humana com maior impacto nessa biodiversidade. Considero, pois, incontornável, a necessidade de uma abordagem jurídica e científica integrada.

Quero por isso destacar neste relatório a menção aos ecossistemas marinhos vulneráveis e às áreas ecológica e biologicamente significantes. O primeiro reflete o reconhecimento da sensibilidade ambiental feita pela FAO, mais próxima da manutenção de recursos, e o segundo reflete o reconhecimento da Convenção para a Diversidade Biológica, usualmente mais próxima das preocupações relativas à biodiversidade e ao funcionamento dos ecossistemas.

Parece-me que a integração de ambas as abordagens neste relatório poderá contribuir para dar consistência política em apoio da implementação de uma rede mundial de áreas marinhas protegidas nas áreas para além da jurisdição nacional, na minha opinião fundamental para a conservação dos oceanos e dos seus recursos.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια, την κυρία Nikolai για την εισήγησή της, γιατί πραγματικά καλύπτει τα θέματα τα οποία μας απασχολούν. Στο πλαίσιο της Σύμβασης των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για το Δίκαιο της Θάλασσας, η Γενική Συνέλευση των Ηνωμένων Εθνών αποφάσισε να θεσπίσει ένα διεθνές νομικά δεσμευτικό μέσο, για τη διατήρηση και τη βιώσιμη χρήση της θαλάσσιας βιοποικιλότητας.

Συγκεκριμένα, τονίστηκε ότι πρέπει να επιτευχθεί ο παραπάνω στόχος και έτσι θα πρέπει η αλιευτική βιομηχανία και η αγορά της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να είναι προσανατολισμένες προς την βιωσιμότητα. Η Σύμβαση αυτή του ΟΗΕ πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί, βεβαίως, απ' όλες τις χώρες, όχι μόνο τις χώρες Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά και τις χώρες οι οποίες είναι υποψήφιες προς ένταξη στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τις υπόλοιπες.

Ταυτόχρονα, εκτός απ' την προστασία των πόρων, νομίζω ότι θα πρέπει για άλλη μια φορά, να επισημάνω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει επιτέλους να ασχοληθεί σοβαρά με τη στήριξη των αλιέων όλων των κρατών μελών και ιδίως της πατρίδας μου, της Ελλάδος.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, a conservação da biodiversidade marinha, particularmente nas águas internacionais, requer indiscutivelmente um esforço de cooperação e de concertação ao nível internacional. As Nações Unidas constituem o fórum adequado para estabelecer e aprofundar, conforme necessário e a evolução da realidade o exija, esses laços de cooperação e de concertação, tendo em vista a boa conservação dos recursos marinhos e a sua exploração sustentável, segundo critérios de justiça e de equidade.

A Convenção sobre o Direito do Mar constitui, entre outros, um instrumento adequado para prosseguir estes fins. As medidas a implementar devem apoiar-se num sólido conhecimento científico e numa aturada avaliação de impacto das diversas atividades desenvolvidas em meio marinho. A União Europeia tem aqui um papel que nem sempre tem sido assumido com a coerência e os meios que se justificavam. Bem pelo contrário. O exemplo das pescas de profundidade é elucidativo. Por que razão o que é prejudicial fazer-se nas águas da União Europeia passa a ser aceitável nas águas internacionais?

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já chci podpořit samozřejmě veškeré iniciativy, které povedou k tomu, co je předmětem dnešního jednání v této zprávě, tzn. dosažení udržitelného rozvoje úrovně rybářství a samozřejmě i biologické diversity v rámci moří a mořského prostředí.

Na druhou stranu ovšem musíme si přiznat, že i v Evropské unii se potýkáme s vlivy, které se odrážejí právě v úbytku biodiverzity. Vybral jsem, dovolil jsem si, několik, které skutečně souvisí s tím naším evropským prostorem. To je nárůst lidské populace a urbanizace právě v pobřežních oblastech; nadměrný přívod dusíku a fosforu, který může právě způsobit eutrofizaci; samozřejmě i intenzita rybolovu, která ohrožuje samotnou existenci výskytu ryb a dalších živých organismů, a nepochybně i znečišťování z lodí vyplachováním palivových a olejových nádrží.

Zde pořád máme řadu nedostatků i na vlastním poli a vítám tuto aktivitu, která na tyto otázky upozorňuje.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ritengo giusto e quanto mai opportuno, forse solo un po' in ritardo, l'intervento delle Nazioni Unite finalizzato alla conservazione e all'uso sostenibile della diversità biologica marina nelle zone non sottoposte a giurisdizione nazionale.

Il moltiplicarsi delle attività marittime e l'aumento della pressione sulla sostenibilità marina rendono non più procrastinabile un'azione di tutela. Lo sviluppo di uno strumento internazionale giuridicamente vincolante che voglia essere davvero efficace e ben coordinato in materia di biologia marina deve necessariamente contemplare anche l'attività di pesca, così come è necessario inserire nel nuovo accordo internazionale il principio di responsabilità attraverso il riconoscimento del danno ecologico in mare e l'accertamento della catena della responsabilità per tale danno.

Nel nuovo accordo internazionale va previsto lo sviluppo di un meccanismo istituzionale per realizzare una valutazione preliminare di impatto ambientale per le attività che possono avere un impatto significativo sull'ambiente marino, con una base scientifica solida e accompagnando tale attività con monitoraggi ambientali e socioeconomici.

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich liebe einfach diese parlamentarische Debatte, wo man unterschiedliche Auffassungen und Meinungen hört und dabei vielleicht dann auch das eine oder andere Argument liefern kann. Die Durchsetzung dieser internationalen Abkommen – das ist das A und O dabei. Wir haben genügend Gesetze – Gabriel Mato hat es vorhin gesagt –, aber wir müssen uns als Europäische Union stark machen von unserer Marktposition aus. 70 % des in Europa verbrauchten Fisches und der Fischprodukte sind Importe, nur 30 % können wir aus eigenem Aufkommen, aus eigenen Fanggebieten als Frischfisch oder aus Aquakultur bringen. Zu uns importieren die Südostasien, die Chinesen, die Russen bringen ihren Fisch auf den Markt, und überall soll im Prinzip kontrolliert werden, dass auch die Qualität und Nachhaltigkeit in der Fischerei durchgesetzt wird. Deshalb auch unsere gemeinsame Forderung: Wir brauchen ein europäisches Öko-Label. Und nach diesem Öko-Label müssen dann auch alle Importe beurteilt werden. Sie können nicht einfach auf unseren Markt kommen, sondern sie müssen sich auch an die Bedingungen halten. Das wäre auch fair für unsere eigene Fischerei.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all allow me to welcome this own-initiative report on fisheries issues within the international agreement on the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity in areas beyond national jurisdiction, better known as BBNJ. I am happy to say that the report rightly focuses on this important development, which should bring international maritime law up to date with developments in the last 30 years.

We have been promoting this new agreement since the first meeting of the BBNJ Working Group in 2006. This report by Mrs Nicolai, whom I would like to thank very much, is very timely, as the first preparatory committee, which opens the negotiations on this international instrument, has just taken place in the last two weeks, between 28 March and 8 April.

It will be followed by a second meeting at the end of August, between 26 August and 12 September. The report rightly points out that the new legal instrument will address a package of elements. These will include marine genetic resources, including questions on the sharing of benefits, area-based management tools including marine protected areas, environmental impact assessments, capacity-building and the transfer of marine technology. One of the main aims of this new agreement will be to establish a mechanism which will enable the creation and management of marine protected areas. This will help the global community meet the commitment it made at the third Rio Conference on Sustainable Development to protect 10% of oceans in this manner by 2020.

The European Union would also like this agreement to make the UNCLOS provisions on environmental impact assessments operational. This is necessary to prevent or to mitigate activities which have a negative impact on marine biodiversity. All activities in the high seas that could have an impact on marine biodiversity, including fisheries, should be covered by the new agreement without, however, undermining existing international fisheries law and bodies. This agreement should also help achieve the biodiversity protection provisions in the UN fish stocks agreement (FSA).

We agree with the report that the UN FSA continues to function well and should not be renegotiated, only implemented better. Similarly, we continue to support the work of regional fisheries management organisations. I am committed to ensuring that these organisations become more effective in delivering their aims of managing highly migratory and straddling stocks. I want to reassure you that the Commission and the European Union will continue to play a leading role in the UN negotiations and to defend the need for better protection of marine biodiversity, in line with our international commitments.

We will also continue to support the work of the regional fisheries management organisations in managing fisheries. The right balance will have to be struck between conservation and sustainable use, similarly to what we have done with the latest reform of the common fisheries policy. In addition, we will not allow these negotiations to upset the balance of rights and obligations established by the UNCLOS. We consider this to be the legal framework under which all human activities in the oceans should be undertaken.

I would like to conclude by thanking you for the support in our fight against illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. This remains one of our priorities, and we will continue to work with our international partners to tackle this serious environmental, social and economic problem.

PUHETTA JOHTI ANNELI JÄÄTTEENMÄKI

varapuhemies

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna.

25. External dimension of the CFP, including fisheries agreements (short presentation)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Linnéa Engströmin kalatalousvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö yhteisistä säännöistä YKP:n ulkoisen ulottuvuuden soveltamiseksi, kalastussopimukset mukaan lukien (2015/2091(INI)) (A8-0052/2016).

Linnéa Engström, rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent cooperation in this report. A special thanks also to the Long-Distance Advisory Council, which was very timely in organising a conference in Las Palmas on the issue so that we could take their input into account in the drafting of the report.

I am very happy that we all share the ambition of promoting sustainable fishing, keeping fish stocks above levels that can produce maximum sustainable yield, not only inside the EU waters but also outside the EU. Historically there have been very good reasons to be critical of fisheries agreements – they used to be very unsustainable. The great achievement of the new common fisheries policy is the inclusion of rules on fishing activities outside of the EU.

The EU is now bound to respect human rights and only fish from surplus stocks. The transparency provisions in the new protocol on Mauritania that will soon be voted on at Parliament should work as a guideline, and I want to thank the Commission here. I know that the negotiations with Mauritania were very hard, and the Commission should be praised for doing a great job. Now we need to make sure that the conditions are met, and we will follow proceedings very closely to make sure that Mauritania lives up to its commitments and publishes all its agreements with other states and private companies.

There are many good ambitions that we share in this report – the establishment of regulatory framework for joint ventures, for instance. Since the CFP is to be a vehicle to provide technical, scientific and financial assistance to third countries, the EU must promote the harmonisation of conditions of access to African waters for all foreign fleets. The regional management of fisheries should be encouraged, including control programmes, and the network of fisheries agreements is to be used to ensure that other distant fishing fleets also respect the same standards of sustainability. The EU should encourage third countries to develop a regulatory framework for joint ventures from the EU and other interests as the best way of ensuring that such joint ventures are sustainable and transparent.

Over party lines, I am happy that the European Parliament shares the objective of using the influence of the EU on the international stage in order to improve fisheries management and transparency standards. The EU should encourage a race to the top, instead of a race to the bottom, in international fisheries. I hope that we can cooperate in the same great spirit on the Commission's new proposal on the Fishing Authorisation Regulation, for which I am rapporteur. We will start at the next Strasbourg part-session, as I understand.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Gabriel Mato (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, lo primero que quisiera hacer es felicitar a la ponente, que ha sido capaz de compatibilizar el nacimiento de su bebé con la elaboración de este buen informe.

La dimensión exterior de la política pesquera común es un ámbito de importancia fundamental para Europa, dada la insuficiencia de recursos pesqueros en las aguas comunitarias. Los acuerdos que cerramos con terceros países suponen, y esa es una parte que ahora queremos reforzar especialmente, un beneficio no solo económico sino también social para los habitantes de esas zonas y para el desarrollo de su propia industria pesquera.

Además, su papel es fundamental a la hora de crear empleo, tanto en la Unión Europea como en los países en cuyos caladeros actuamos. La Unión Europea ha logrado en los últimos años mejorar de forma muy significativa la calidad de los acuerdos pesqueros, y podemos presumir de que las flotas pesqueras europeas son las que cumplen unos estándares sociales y ambientales más altos a nivel mundial.

Debemos, en todo caso, avanzar en la línea de cerrar convenios pesqueros más transparentes y sostenibles y tenemos que asegurarnos de que cumplen unas condiciones mínimas tanto para esos países en los que va a trabajar nuestra flota como para nuestros pescadores.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, antes de mais eu quero felicitar a relatora, a deputada Linnéa Engström. A formação de um documento de trabalho preliminar e a permanente abertura a sugestões dos diferentes relatores-sombra pareceu-me uma forma particularmente adequada de elaborar relatórios de iniciativa do Parlamento. Este é um documento importante, como já referiu e subscrevo o que disse o colega Gabriel Mato, mas, no entanto, acho que peca apenas pela falta de reconhecimento de que a biodiversidade marinha está sob pressão, estando as pescas entre as ameaças mais imediatas. Tenho pena que isto não tivesse ficado no articulado. Pela positiva haveria muitos aspetos a destacar, e são esses que me levarão a votar positivamente este documento do qual fui relator-sombra pelos Socialistas e Democratas. Entre eles parece-me particularmente importante a menção a um registo único para as embarcações que circulem nas águas internacionais. É preciso terminar com as permanentes alterações de bandeira, esse expediente tão utilizado pelos armadores prevaricadores.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι συγκρούσεις που προκαλούνται στον τομέα της αλιείας δεν έχουν πλέον εθνικά χαρακτηριστικά, καθώς αυτοί που συγκρούονται είναι οι φτωχοποιημένοι, από την οικονομική κρίση και τις φορομνηχτικές πολιτικές της λιτότητας, αλιείς της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή η οποία προχωρά στη λήψη μέτρων για την προστασία των θαλάσσιων πόρων. Σ' αυτή την κρίση προστίθεται βεβαίως και η διαρκώς αυξανόμενη πίεση που ασκούν οι αναδυόμενες αλιευτικές δυνάμεις από την Ασία, καθώς επίσης και η έλλειψη σεβασμού των θεμελιωδών αρχών που η κοινή αλιευτική πολιτική έχει θεσπίσει.

Μια εύλογη εξωτερική διάσταση της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής οφείλει να διασφαλίζει τα συμφέροντα των Ευρωπαίων αλιέων, ιδιαίτερα των μικρότερων, και να επιτάσσει τη βιωσιμότητα, τη διατροφική ασφάλεια και την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης αλιείας εκτός Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, διότι οι επιπτώσεις στα θαλάσσια οικοσυστήματα δεν γνωρίζουν όρια. Αυτό, όμως, θα είναι ανώφελο, αν η κοινή αλιευτική πολιτική δεν απαντήσει, ταυτόχρονα, στο δίκαιο αίτημα ανασυγκρότησης του πρωτογενούς τομέα της Ευρώπης, ιδιαίτερα σε εκείνες τις χώρες που έχουν πληγεί απ' τα μνημόνια, όπως η Ελλάδα.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora Presidenta, gracias a la ponente por el trabajo realizado. Quiero decir que la flota europea, los profesionales europeos de la pesca son, de acuerdo con las estimaciones de todos los organismos internacionales, los más respetuosos del mundo en la explotación de los recursos pesqueros, los que mejor colaboran a través de sus acuerdos con el desarrollo del sector de los terceros países y los que encabezan la lucha contra la pesca no declarada y no reglamentada.

Podemos mejorar, y estamos en ello, extremando el control y la transparencia y fomentando el papel de las organizaciones regionales de regulación pesquera, pero debemos conservar como objetivo mantener una política de acuerdos que ha dado buenos resultados hasta ahora.

Abandonar negociaciones sin agotar al máximo las posibilidades de acuerdo solo beneficia a flotas de otras áreas del mundo que ocupan de inmediato nuestro lugar con unos estándares mucho peores para nuestros antiguos socios y para proteger el medio. Por eso pido aquí confianza, respeto y apoyo para un sector, en su inmensa mayoría, ejemplar; ese es el objetivo que guía las enmiendas que he presentado a este informe.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a dimensão externa da política comum das pescas enferma de muitos dos problemas, deficiências, limitações e contradições da própria PCP nas suas diversas dimensões internas. Temos sido muito críticos desta política e dos seus resultados práticos. Ao abrigo dos acordos de pesca, ditos de parceria, mas que de parceria efetiva têm muito pouco, tudo ou quase tudo se resume a transferências financeiras, sempre parcas, para países em desenvolvimento, a troco do direito de explorar os seus recursos haliéuticos. Em muitos casos isto é assim desde há décadas. Estes países são continuamente privados das mais-valias que obteriam se fossem eles próprios a explorar os seus recursos, assim comprometendo a possibilidade de criarem riqueza e emprego, o seu desenvolvimento, soberania e independência. Há que reconhecer o falhanço da política de cooperação da União Europeia neste domínio e levar a cabo mudanças profundas, envolvendo os países interessados e articulando mais eficazmente a dimensão externa da PCP com a política de cooperação para o desenvolvimento, que se quer mais genuína e efetiva.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Já bych na okraj svého vystoupení chtěl pouze ocenit, že Česká republika může v tomto programovacím období čerpat prostředky i z rybářského fondu, je to poprvé.

Nicméně k tématu bych chtěl sdělit, že i minulý Parlament se zabýval tímto zásadně důležitým tématem, tedy rybolovem a dohodami o rybolovu, a v roce 2012 přijal svoji zprávu, ve které v bodě 11 uvedl, že připomíná, že hlavním cílem vnější rybářské politiky musí být zachování platných dohod o rybolovu a hledání nových příležitostí pro rybolov ve třetích zemích. Parlament přitom uznává, že pokud loďstvo EU ukončí svou činnost v lovištích některé ze třetích zemí, příslušná rybolovná práva se zpravidla rozdělují jiným loďstvům, která uplatňují mnohem nižší normy v oblasti zachování řízení a udržitelnosti, než jaké stanoví a chrání EU.

Myslím si, že to je otázka, na kterou bychom skutečně měli dodat odpověď. Do jaké míry taková loviště při vyklizení našich pozic obsazují jiní?

Werner Kuhn (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, dass die partnerschaftlichen Abkommen der Europäischen Union mit Drittstaaten, die meistens auch Entwicklungsländer sind, von großer Wichtigkeit auch für die Staaten selber sind. Sie haben meistens eine relativ unterentwickelte – kleine handwerkliche – Fischerei, und aus den finanziellen Beiträgen, die wir als Europäische Union aus den Fangerträgen dort als Aufbauleistung einbringen, können sie ihre Flotten verbessern, können dort auch versuchen, eine Verarbeitung aufzubauen – ob wir uns Mauretanien oder Marokko anschauen, das sind berechte Beispiele dafür –, und es wird nach den Regeln der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik der Europäischen Union gefischt. Dort können auch wissenschaftliche Erhebungen über die Bestände gemacht werden – ob das im Indischen Ozean ist über *bluefin tuna*, ob das bis hinein in den Pazifik oder vor Afrika und auch im Atlantik ist.

Es ist ganz wichtig, dass wir dort auch die illegale Fischerei bekämpfen, darauf aufmerksam machen, welche Länder sich eben nicht an die Regeln der Vereinten Nationen halten. Das kriegt man ja nur vor Ort mit, wenn dort unsere Flotten unterwegs sind. Und deshalb ist hier ein guter Anfang gemacht, der sehr gut kombiniert werden kann auch mit Entwicklungspolitik, und dass hier dann auch Qualität eingebracht werden kann, ist für meine Begriffe von höchster Wichtigkeit.

Fisch ist Allgemeingut. Es darf nur das Meer abgefischt werden, das das jeweilige Land uns auch zubilligt. Darüber gibt es ganz klare Verträge, das kann überwacht werden, auch über unser eigenes Navigations- und Satellitensystem Galileo. Die Schiffe haben alle ihre automatischen Identifikationssysteme.

Insofern sehe ich nicht die großen Bedenken, die einige Kollegen haben. Kollegin Engström, ich muss Ihnen ein großes Kompliment machen. Das ist ein guter Bericht, den Sie abgeliefert haben.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first all we greatly appreciate this timely report on the external dimension of the fisheries policy prepared by the rapporteur, Ms Engström, and I would also like to thank the rapporteur.

The report's recommendations are very much in the same direction as the Commission's policy. It recognises that sustainable fishing partnership agreements contribute to sustainable fishing and to the development of the fisheries sector in partner countries. I fully agree that these agreements play a key role in the global governance of the oceans. As you know, my ambition is to set a benchmark at international level through these agreements. Sustainable fisheries partnership agreements (SFPAs) contribute to the achievement of development goals, in particular food security. We need to help developing countries to manage their resources in a sustainable way, and this is key for the supply of healthy food and for the livelihood of coastal populations.

I welcome the report's finding that SFPAs are a very successful tool that integrate the partnership component and commercial aspects of the SFPAs, and that they promote transparency, sustainability and accountability. I also share your objective that we should ensure even better consistency between fisheries, environmental and trade policy, as well as development cooperation.

I agree that, as pointed out in the Court of Auditors' report, there is room for further improvement. This is the case, for example, for our sectoral support policy. This is already a highly effective tool, supporting our third-country partners in developing their fisheries sector in a sustainable way and in fighting illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. We will continue to work to rally the sector's support and ensure better coherence with our policies and our regional cooperation.

Some of the report's recommendations have already been included in my recent proposal on the sustainable management of the external fleet. I want to improve the current legal framework and extend its scope to tackle any situation where a Union vessel is fishing outside EU waters, including under the so-called private licences. I also want to prevent abusive reflagging, which is not addressed in the current rules. These measures should definitely improve transparency and represent an additional step in reinforcing the governance of oceans where the EU is playing a key role. I am therefore looking forward to Parliament's support on this proposal.

Finally, a few words on regional fisheries management organisations. We have a key interest in creating such bodies where stocks are shared, and in ensuring that they work well when they already exist. We have been working hard to increase the performance of these bodies in recent years, including through financial contributions.

We will also continue to improve scientific compliance and to ensure science-based decision-making. Geographical gaps, such as in the central Arctic Ocean, should be closed by setting up an adequate management framework. Existing advisory bodies, such as the Fishery Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic, should be made into fully-fledged decision-making bodies. But we cannot achieve this alone. Therefore, since the beginning of my mandate, I have reached out to a number of key players to move better fisheries governance forward.

Regarding the rapporteur's support for our stronger and clearer provisions on joint ventures, the Commission has proposed this through specific conditions in its new proposal for the regulation of the external fleet – FAR – which is now under negotiation. This will increase transparency and reduce opportunities for abuse.

I would like to take the opportunity to assure you that the Commission is fully committed to improving global fisheries governance as an essential component of ocean governance. We will continue to act globally at the level of the UN and FAO to have the legal framework we need, regionally to have efficient fisheries management bodies in place, and bilaterally in the framework of sustainable fisheries partnership agreements and dialogues with key partners to make sure fish stocks are managed in the best possible way and in a transparent manner.

I would like to thank this House for its support and I am looking forward to continuing our work in a good spirit of cooperation.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna.

26. One-minute speeches (Rule 163)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana minuutin puheenvuorot poliittisesti tärkeistä asioista työjärjestyksen 163 artiklan mukaisesti.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, in my speech I would like to focus on the marine environment and the significant potential it has to benefit and support rural communities. It should be promoted to benefit those communities. In tonight's debate we have focused on fishing and also the benefits for those communities, but I wish to emphasise these, and I know the Commissioner will agree with me because I met him last year at a very significant conference in Cork on the potential of the blue economy and the strong growth figures that we have seen in Ireland in the blue economy. It has continued to outperform the national economy, with rates of about 8% up to the year 2014, which exceeds growth in the national economy, and for every EUR 100 turnover created from the ocean economy there is EUR 75 to 80 interlinking in the surrounding economy. So it is of enormous potential both in terms of tourism, energy creation, fishing and fish processing, and research and innovation, and I would urge the Commissioner, who I know is committed to this, to promote the blue economy and its very valuable potential for supporting the rural regions in our communities.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președinte, dosarele Panama au arătat faptul că nu există la nivel mondial mecanisme de control capabile să asigure un tratament egal pentru toți cetățenii și toate companiile. Piața nu asigură șanse egale pentru toți, ci doar pentru cei care sunt puternici. Dincolo de comportamentul profund imoral al celor care și-au ascuns banii în paradisurile fiscale, departe de plata impozitelor în țările unde obțin profituri, mai grav este că lumea a pierdut ceea ce se putea face cu aceste fonduri.

Potrivit informațiilor din presa românească, sumele ascunse sunt echivalente cu bugetul sănătății din România și superioare bugetului alocat tinerilor. Sunt sigur că situații similare există în multe țări europene. Restructurarea paradisurilor fiscale, plata impozitului în locul obținerii profitului și mecanismele de sprijin pentru mediul economic pot fi mecanisme prin care putem rezolva această situație. Reamintesc faptul că taxa pentru tranzacții financiare a fost susținută de peste jumătate de milion de cetățeni și că aceasta poate bloca acest tip de întâmplări să se reproducă pe viitor. Comisia Europeană trebuie să reacționeze și așteptăm propuneri ferme.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, prvostupanjsko vijeće Haškog suda izreklo je oslobađajuću presudu Vojislavu Šešelju, srpskom ratnom huškaču i glavnom organizatoru i zapovjedniku zločinačke paravojske za vrijeme rata u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini. Ovakva je presuda sama po sebi skandalozna, ali neki su njezini dijelovi posebno šokantni.

Vijeće je, primjerice, Veliku Srbiju okarakteriziralo kao „politički, a ne zločinački projekt” što je u koliziji s nekim ranijim presudama istog suda. Svakome iole upućenom u politička i ratna zbivanja na području bivše Jugoslavije devedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća jasno je da Velika Srbija nije mogla nastati ni na koji drugi način nego zločinom tako da je ovakva karakterizacija potpuno apsurdna.

ICTY je ovom presudom narušio ne samo proces pomirenja na području bivše Jugoslavije, nego i povjerenje u međunarodno pravo. Nakon ovoga mnoge će države u budućnosti zazirati od suradnje s međunarodnim sudovima što će negativno utjecati na svjetski mir i stabilnost.

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Madam President, on 26 April there will be the thirtieth anniversary of the disaster at the Chernobyl nuclear power station in Ukraine. Among others, some 5 000 people were forcibly sent from Estonia to Chernobyl for the elimination of the effects of the nuclear disaster. Recorded diseases to workers in the Chernobyl recovery operations were significant. Rates of cancers and other health problems were much higher among recovery workers than in the rest of the population. After Estonia regained independence, former recovery workers were entitled to various social benefits, but the regulations changed in 2003. Nowadays they are entitled to some benefits only if they are recognised as unlawfully repressed persons. In Estonia an oppressed person must have been an Estonian citizen at the time of repression. Most representatives of ethnic minorities do not meet this criterion. Therefore, they cannot obtain benefits. This limitation concerns almost exclusively people of ethnic minority origin, and it leads to indirect ethnic discrimination. Indirect discrimination of people suffering from the Chernobyl disaster on the grounds of ethnicity or origin should be abolished without delay.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor Presidenta, la familia Domecq, a la cual pertenece la esposa del Comisario Miguel Arias Cañete, ha recibido desde 2008 36,6 millones de euros en subvenciones de la PAC, de la política agraria común. Es la segunda familia española que más dinero ha recibido de Europa. Solo esto ya sería motivo suficiente para que el señor Cañete compareciera en este Parlamento, porque su familia se forraba con dinero de los europeos y europeos mientras fue ministro de Agricultura y ha continuado haciéndolo ahora que es Comisario de la Unión Europea. Pero a esto hay que sumar que la señora Micaela Domecq es una de las presuntas evasoras fiscales que aparece en los papeles de Panamá. ¡Señor Cañete, venga aquí a dar la cara o, mejor aún, deje el cargo y váyase a su casa!

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, on 10 December 1991, the vast majority of the population of Nagorno-Karabakh voted for independence in a referendum. The response to this democratic process was a military offensive by Azerbaijan, with more than 30 000 dead. Subsequently a ceasefire between Azerbaijan, Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia was signed. The creation of the Minsk Group in 1992 was a breakthrough, but Azerbaijan has refused to implement a true international mechanism for monitoring violations of the ceasefire.

Nagorno-Karabakh has fully democratic institutions, an exemplary judicial system and low levels of corruption. For this reason we request the inclusion of representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh in the negotiations of the Minsk Group, precisely because they decide the future of the country's inhabitants. Once the military conflict is resolved it will be necessary to agree a procedure to properly recognise the new independent state at international level.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono qui per dire che, grazie alla Magistratura italiana, è venuto alla luce un nuovo scandalo riguardante lo smaltimento illecito di rifiuti connessi alle attività estrattive di petrolio in Basilicata, nel Sud Italia. Sono stati coinvolti sindaci, consiglieri regionali, presidenti di regione, sottosegretari, ministri e anche il primo ministro italiano Matteo Renzi.

Eppure, il 13 novembre 2014, ho chiesto alla Commissione, che è qui rappresentata, se gli impianti di Tempa Rossa, Tecnoparco e Centro Olio di Viggiano, fossero conformi alle direttive europee; il 7 gennaio 2015 ho segnalato gli effetti nocivi per la salute delle attività estrattive nella Val d'Agri; il 5 marzo 2015 ho chiesto informazioni sulla compatibilità ambientale di un pozzo ENI, incidentato per la quinta volta; il 12 marzo 2015 ho segnalato la pratica di smaltimento illecito di fanghi industriali a Tempa Rossa; il 21 giugno 2015 ho segnalato la contaminazione da metalli pesanti e idrocarburi della falda acquifera a ridosso del centro Oli di Viggiano; aggiungo: una dichiarazione scritta, dieci interventi in plenaria, più di venti interventi in commissione ambiente.

Allora, io voglio sapere cosa ci stanno a fare le Istituzioni europee se, a fronte di tutte queste segnalazioni, non è stato preso nessun provvedimento per difendere la salute dei cittadini.

Mario Borghesio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, denuncio alla Presidenza una gravissima violazione dei diritti e delle prerogative del Parlamento e del parlamentare, in questo caso il sottoscritto, sottoposto a un procedimento davanti al tribunale di Milano per opinioni espresse.

Ebbene, pur essendo stato notiziato il Tribunale del fatto che la questione era *sub judice* alla commissione JURI, il tribunale si è rifiutato di sospendere il procedimento, non solo, ma ha deciso inopinatamente il rinvio a giudizio. Ora, credo che siamo di fronte a una non consueta gravissima violazione della prerogativa e anche violazione di quello che è il portato della giurisprudenza costante delle Corti di giustizia. Perciò domani consegnerò al Presidente Schulz un ricorso nel quale chiedo che il Presidente del Parlamento difenda la prerogativa di cui sopra davanti alla Corte di giustizia. Non possiamo tollerare che un principio di libertà, perché questa prerogativa difende anche, è una prerogativa del Parlamento oltre che del parlamentare, venga violato in maniera inopinata contro la giurisprudenza costante delle Corti di giustizia.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Doamnă președintă, Corina Crețu, membră a Comisiei Juncker, a fost acuzată de colaboratori și de jurnaliștii de Politico că nu își îndeplinește mandatul. Nu merge pur și simplu la birou. Ea își petrece timpul în țara de origine sau transformă vizite oficiale în sejururi private. Colegii din CONT au cerut socoteală domnului Italianer, dar răspunsurile n-au fost convingătoare. Aparent, Comisia dorește să ascundă sub preș aceste grave încălcări ale eticii profesionale. Crețu a reacționat într-un stil foarte personal.

Tot jurnaliști de Politico au scris despre broșura tipărită de ea cu bani ai Comisiei Europene. Nu e o apărare, ci un cult al personalității pentru care Ceaușescu ar fi fost invidios. Publicată în română, broșura explică faptul că Europa există doar întrucât Crețu lucrează. Am cerut azi explicații Comisiei printr-o întrebare scrisă și aștept să aflu dacă domnul Juncker e de acord cu cheltuirea banilor europeni pentru interesul strict privat al unui comisar.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, mis primeras palabras son hoy de recuerdo a Eloy Palacio, un bombero que falleció este último fin de semana luchando contra un duro incendio en mi ciudad, en Oviedo; por lo tanto, un abrazo para la familia y para el conjunto del cuerpo de bomberos de Oviedo.

Pero hoy quería hablar de una situación insufrible que está viviendo el sector lácteo en Asturias: más de dos mil familias viven con preocupación el posible fin de su manera de vivir ante la ausencia de medidas claras por parte de la Comisión Europea y de los Estados miembros para garantizar unos precios razonables.

Necesitamos medidas de mercado que permitan al consumidor diferenciar entre los distintos productos lácteos y su procedencia, y necesitamos también acabar con el *dumping* que está conduciendo al sector hacia un fin sin salida. Por eso, la leche asturiana necesita un futuro en interés de los ganaderos y del conjunto de los consumidores.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Szanowna Pani Przewodnicząca! Politycy mojego regionu od lat ostrzegają przed neoimperialną polityką Rosji. Gruzja i Ukraina powinny stanowić światła ostrzegawcze. Czy teraz, kiedy zdajemy sobie sprawę z rosyjskiej wojny propagandowej wobec Zachodu, analizujemy, w jaki sposób mogła ona wpłynąć na wynik holenderskiego referendum. Czy społeczeństwa, politycy państw Unii Europejskiej wspierali społeczeństwo prezydencji w wypełnianiu wspólnej polityki bezpieczeństwa i obrony wobec naszych partnerów i wobec takich zagrożeń, jakie dochodzą ze strony Rosji. Czy zdajemy sobie sprawę, że ta sama propaganda może być stosowana we wszystkich bez wyjątku państwach członkowskich Unii Europejskiej.

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Fru talman! Den bosnienserbiske ledaren Radovan Karadžić har dömts i Haagtribunalen för bland annat folkmord. Domen kommer, trots dess brister, att vara viktig för etablerandet av sanningen om kriget samt försoningsprocessen i Bosnien, ett av EU:s kandidatländer som fortfarande präglas av problem.

Några dagar senare har dock extremisten Vojislav Šešelj friats helt, huvudsakligen för att tribunalen inte har kunnat styrka sambandet mellan Šešeljs hatiska retorik och de krigsbrott som har begåtts. De må hända att det är juridiskt svårt att bevisa samband mellan att säga såsom Šešelj att man vill "gröpa ur ögonen på varje kroat" och de brott som har begåtts. Moraliskt är det dock inte det minsta svårt. Om domstolen inte kan fördöma dessa uttalanden måste vi politiker göra det. Friandet av Šešelj kommer att ha stora konsekvenser för försoning och EU:s utvidgning. EU-politiker måste därför stödja både försoning och utvidgningsprocessen genom att tydligare fördöma de begångna illdåden och därmed skapa den moraliska rättvisa som domstolen inte lyckats skapa.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, la semana pasada recibimos en el Parlamento Europeo la visita de los vecinos y vecinas de Muskiz, Abanto y Alumbres, que viven día a día junto a —pegados a— dos plantas químicas de tratamiento de combustibles no convencionales como el coque. Estas dos plantas de Petronor y Repsol incumplen la legalidad abiertamente. Una está construida sobre territorio marítimo. La otra amenaza con expandirse sobre terrenos protegidos por la Red Natura 2000.

En común ambas zonas registran datos irregulares de afecciones pulmonares, cáncer y muerte prematura, y sus emisiones no se monitorizan convenientemente. En común, también, la permisividad que directamente reciben por parte de los representantes públicos que giran en las puertas giratorias bien engrasadas por las multinacionales.

Quien debería defender a la ciudadanía está comprado. Ayuntamientos como el de Zierbena han preferido gastar dinero público en defender a las multinacionales que en defender la salud de sus habitantes.

Por ello, vamos a solicitar lo que creemos más que justificable: que la Unión Europea se movilice para estudiar y justificar los peligros de estas instalaciones para la salud de los habitantes, para que esta situación no se repita ni en el Estado español ni en cualquier otro país de la Unión Europea.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospodo predsjednice, u mnogim državama članicama, a ovdje posebno ističem Hrvatsku iz koje dolazim, nedostaju mjere za energetske obnovu višestambenih zgrada, a posebno one mjere koje se fokusiraju na ranjive i socijalno ugrožene skupine potrošača. Nažalost, potpuno su izostale mjere borbe protiv energetske siromaštva i mjere poboljšanja standarda stanovanja kojima bi se omogućio veći udio korištenja obnovljivih izvora energije, domaćih izvora energije i smanjila nezaposlenost.

Pod izlikom ostvarivanja ušteda u potrošnji toplinske energije Vlada Republike Hrvatske je neodgovornim uvođenjem zakonske obveze građanima za ugradnju razdjelnika topline i prijetnjom financijskim sankcijama, a bez prethodno provedene obnove zgrada, narušila jedan od osnovnih ciljeva Direktive o energetske učinkovitosti, osnaživanje prava potrošača na točnu informaciju o iznosu i vremenu potrošnje energije te naplatu iznosa stvarno potrošene energije.

Pozivam Vladu Republike Hrvatske na izmjenu nepravdnog zakona i pravilnika te upozoravam Komisiju na buduće pravovremeno djelovanje i reagiranje u zaštiti potrošača i prava građana Europske unije.

Petr Mach (EFDD). – Dovolte, abych vás seznámil s tím, co si o dohodě Evropské unie s Tureckem myslí Česká republika.

Český parlament přijal následující usnesení: 1) Poslanecká sněmovna důrazně odmítá zavedení povinného přerozdělovacího mechanismu běženců; 2) Poslanecká sněmovna odmítá dohodu předsedů vlád členských zemí EU, která se týká zrušení víz pro turecké občany.

Zajímá ale v Bruselu vůbec někoho, co si myslí jeden demokraticky zvolený parlament? Já se obávám, že nikoliv. Evropská rada a Komise záměrně upekly s Tureckem dohodu, která nemá náležitosti smlouvy, aby o ní nemohl jednat tento ani žádný jiný parlament v členském státě.

Hanba Evropské radě, že obešla demokratické instituce a uzavřela s Tureckem dohodu, o které žádný parlament ani nejednal. Toto je demokratický deficit v praxi, to je důvod proč evropské instituce ztrácejí důvěru občanů.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, le 6 avril, les Néerlandais ont décidé par référendum de rejeter l'accord européen d'association avec l'Ukraine. L'Ukraine n'était qu'un prétexte. Le véritable objectif des 480 000 citoyens qui ont déclenché ce référendum était de désavouer l'Union européenne et ses dirigeants, l'Union européenne et sa faillite face à la crise migratoire – ses dirigeants, qui accumulent les scandales: LuxLeaks pour Jean-Claude Juncker et Panama papers pour le commissaire à l'énergie, Miguel Arias Cañete.

Mais l'Union ne veut pourtant pas comprendre le message adressé par 64 % des votants. Au lieu de s'amender, elle resserre toujours davantage les liens technocratiques qui étranglent les États membres. Dernier exemple en date: la création en cours d'une agence super-Frontex pour sauver Schengen.

L'Union aura la monnaie de sa pièce, avec le Brexit le 23 juin, en attendant la percée de Marine Le Pen en France en 2017.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, not for the first time I want to talk about trade here in the Chamber and, in particular, the issue of a trade agreement with Mercosur. I know that voices were raised in the Agriculture Council today in Luxembourg. 23 Member States are really concerned about the tactics of the Commission – about their potential opening offer to Mercosur, particularly regarding sensitive products, including beef, but also applying to poultry and, indeed, pig meat. There are real concerns at this time, when agriculture across Europe is in a very difficult position, that the Commission would be so willing to open the gates to importation of beef and cause real problems for rural parts of the European Union, and farmers in particular. As voices were raised around the Agriculture Council meeting this morning, I wanted to add my voice. I know other colleagues on the Agriculture Committee would share concerns here and once again warn the Commission not to sacrifice agriculture for other sectors of the economy.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Madam President, it is a long-debated issue whether Member States should sell citizenship and residence permits or not. States have of course full sovereignty to decide to whom, and how, to grant their respective nationality, but of course it is EU nationality. However, recent global developments put this question into another perspective. The serious risk represented by terrorists, the worrying scale of tax evasion, and the refugee crisis, force us to revise the issue. Economic citizenship programmes run by Member States are just like harmful tax competition. Conditions vary greatly. However, they all lack transparency and therefore represent a breeding ground for fraud, corruption and even terrorism. Some countries are openly offering rich individuals and companies the opportunity for tax planning, thus assisting tax evasion, or even potential money laundering by terrorist organisations on EU territory.

The fact that these schemes make it so easy for the rich to gain rights within the EU while others literally risk their lives to get here also sends a wrong message. Therefore, the question arises: do we want to support tax evasion, make things easy for terrorists and maintain unequal treatment of migrants based on their financial background, or finally create a common system with strict rules and monitoring to prevent all this?

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jeżeli ten fragment wstępu do Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej, który mówi o inspiracji religijnym dziedzictwem Europy ma mieć realne znaczenie, a nie być tylko dyplomatycznym ozdobnikiem, powinniśmy wspólnie pamiętać o rocznicach takich jak 1050-lecie chrztu Polski. Szkoda, że dzisiaj przewodniczący naszego Parlamentu nie skierował do naszego społeczeństwa żadnego przesłania z tej okazji. Tym bardziej że 50 lat temu obchody tysiąclecia chrztu Polski stanowiły kamień milowy na drodze ku wolności naszego narodu, a więc również na drodze, która przyniosła wolność innym narodom Europy i bezpieczeństwo wszystkim. Tamte wydarzenia pokazują, że cywilizacja chrześcijańska jest nie tylko naszym dziedzictwem, ale w czasach współczesnych była również oparciem dla naszej wolności. Jest ciągle naszą nadzieją.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señora Presidenta, la crisis de los refugiados está haciendo saltar las costuras de esta Unión Europea que no es capaz de dar seguridad ni de reasentar a estas miles y miles de personas que están especialmente protegidas. Es más, se desmontan los dispositivos de rescate y se da una solución militar por medio del grupo de la OTAN, de seguridad con Frontex o una solución meramente represiva. La hemos visto: los palos y los gases que ofenden.

Estamos repitiendo los mismos errores. En la guerra contra el terror lo que hicimos fue subcontratar la tortura, y ahora subcontratamos la deportación masiva. Es decir, dinamitamos el Derecho internacional, la Convención de Ginebra o nuestras propias leyes.

Es una aberración decir que Turquía es un país seguro, porque allí no están seguros ni su oposición ni los periodistas ni los intelectuales. Turquía, además, es tolerante con los extremistas sirios, que han desestabilizado, que han producido esta situación, y utiliza a los refugiados como arma para chantajearnos. Y nosotros aceptamos su chantaje y subcontratamos a los matarifes para que nos hagan el trabajo sucio.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Téměř přesně před rokem, 17. března se sešli ministři školství v Paříži a přijali prohlášení o prosazování občanství a společných hodnot svobody, tolerance a nediskriminace v procesu vzdělávání jako reakci na útoky na Charlie Hebdo.

Po roce se můžeme ohlédnout a musíme konstatovat, že situace se nezlepšila a teroristické útoky hrozí dále. Samozřejmě, že neočekáváme, že do roka přinesou všechna opatření konkrétní a rychlé výsledky, ale musíme říci, že způsob integrace tak, jak byl v některých zemích pojatý, nemá dostatečné výsledky.

Proto souhlasím s tím, že je potřeba především podpořit učitele. Podpořit je v jejich přípravě na to, jakým způsobem učit žáky a vést je k toleranci, ale také k zodpovědnosti, k solidaritě, ale především k vnímání lidských a také evropských hodnot.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Domnule președinte, stimați colegi, virusul Zika reprezintă un pericol la nivel internațional.

Un ultim studiu arată că acest virus poate determina o gamă mai largă de tulburări ale creierului decât se credea până acum. Ne confruntăm deja cu un număr crescut de cazuri de microcefalie, de sindrom Guillain-Barré și de alte tulburări neurologice potențial asociate cu acest virus. Există prea multe întrebări cu privire la aceste conexiuni și, în acest sens, este necesară consolidarea supravegherii virusului Zika și, totodată, îmbunătățirea metodelor de cercetare. Timpul este prețios pentru a avea un diagnostic rapid, un tratament adecvat, dar și pentru găsirea unor vaccinuri pentru femeile însărcinate.

Organizația Mondială a Sănătății, a cărei aniversare tocmai a avut loc săptămâna trecută, a luat deja o serie de măsuri pentru a sprijini țările afectate. Cazuri importante de infectare cu virusul Zika au fost raportate în mai multe țări europene și trebuie să ținem seama de faptul că ne confruntăm cu riscul apariției unui focar și în Europa. Trebuie să fim pregătiți să facem față unei astfel de situații. Este foarte important ca personalul medical să fie vigilent, dar și ca populația să fie conștientă de riscurile existente.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, бих искал да Ви обърна внимание върху пълзящата ислямизация в циганските махали в България, като тази в Пазарджик например, която представлява сериозна опасност за националната ни сигурност и за националната сигурност на останалите държави –членки на Европейския съюз.

Резултатът от тези процеси видяхме наскоро в Париж и Брюксел. Тази радикализация и ислямизация се организира и провежда от властта в Република Турция, която продължава своята агресия и инвазия на територията на Република България посредством формирането и на нова протурска ислямистка политическа организация и партия, проводник на агресивната политика на Ердоган. Това се случи вчера.

Крайно време е лидерите на европейските държави да осъзнаят истинската заплаха, която представлява днешната нова турска неоосманистка политика, да се определят и да заемат своята страна в тази истинска война, която се води на територията на европейския континент. Няма повече време за политически коректно говорене и няма повече време за заравяне на главите в пясъка.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Terorismus nezná hranic a ohrožuje naši svobodu, ohrožuje důvěru lidí ve veřejnou moc, v to, že jim zajistí skutečné bezpečí.

Myslím si, že bychom se měli domoci právních nástrojů rezolutního vypořádání se s osobami pachatelů z hlediska osobní újmy, která by jim měla být učiněna v důsledku spáchání teroristického činu. Proto si myslím, že je důležité do našeho právního řádu postavit najisto, že soudy budou moci zbavovat občanství nebo omezovat občanská práva u těch osob, občanů EU, kteří spáchali nebo se podíleli na teroristickém aktu, pokud je samozřejmě z toho usvědčil nezávislý a nestranný soud pravomocným způsobem.

Podle mého názoru není dále přípustné, aby občané EU, kteří páchají teroristické akty, čerpali výhody z tohoto občanství, ale musí být učiněno zadost tomuto jejich státoobčanskému vztahu k jinému členskému státu Evropské unie.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, more and more allegations of sexual abuse perpetrated by UN peacekeepers have continued to surface over the past weeks. The UN Security Council last month passed a resolution but, given that some countries attempted to water down the text, it is unlikely to be implemented vigorously. It is an outrage that the most vulnerable in this world – women and children who have lost everything – are preyed upon by those supposed to offer them protection. I am shocked to the core about allegations that girls in the Central African Republic were forced by a military commander to take part in acts of bestiality, or that soldiers were asking starving children for sex in exchange for food. These are members of the military from all over the world, including from Europe. Acting collectively, Europe has the muscle to help end this sickening abuse. I call on High Representative Mogherini to make this a priority for coordinated EU action at the UN, to ensure that all perpetrators are tried under criminal proceedings and to provide effective training that raises awareness that such abuse cannot be tolerated.

Afzal Khan (S&D). – Madam President, steelworkers and their families in Port Talbot and across the country are desperately worried about the uncertainty currently facing the UK steel industry. It is welcome news that Tata has found a buyer for their Scunthorpe steelworks. However, uncertainty remains about the future of steel-making in Britain, putting thousands of jobs at risk and threatening an industry which is vital to the UK's defence and security.

Faced with this crisis, the UK Government's response has been totally inadequate both in the EU and back at home. Labour has put forward a clear four-point plan for the steel industry, including stabilising the industry and providing security for steelworkers, initiating a review into lowering costs like business and energy rates, fast-tracking infrastructure projects requiring large amounts of steel and engaging with the sector to lay out a long-term strategy for the future of the UK steel industry. I urge the UK Government to act now to set out a long-term plan for the steel industry in Britain and to back EU action against the importation of cheap Chinese steel.

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome the news today that Greybull Capital has bought Tata Steel's Long Products Division, in a difficult deal brokered by local management and the unions in Scunthorpe.

It is good news for an industry in an existential crisis due to the massive dumping of cheap steel. Contrary to the Europhobes' lies, the EU is not the cause of this crisis, but it is a crucial means for fixing it through strong trade defence measures. MEPs, the Commission and governments representing 72% of Europe's population are in favour of action, but it is our government – the British Government – which is blocking that crucial EU action.

Stronger trade defence tools could be finalised in a matter of weeks, on 13 May at the EU Trade Council, and it is up to the UK Government and David Cameron to decide if they are really willing to save our steel communities and our vital industry.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, every state has the right to defend its inhabitants, independence, territorial integrity and interests by whatever means deemed necessary, without, however, breaking the law or violating the inherent rights of its own people. Of these rights, freedom of speech and self-expression rank among the most important.

Two years ago, the Latvian Maxim Koptelov published a survey on the possibility of Latvia joining the Russian Federation. He himself described the whole idea as a joke. Nonetheless, in February of this year he was sentenced to six months in prison. Interestingly, the authorities had ignored similar surveys on the subject of Latvia joining the United States of America. What is more, a month ago the Latvian Parliament introduced an amendment to its criminal law, according to which essentially any statement, even a joke, deemed to have improper content could now lead to actual imprisonment. My home country has disgraced itself in a shameful manner.

Puhemies. – Kohdan käsittely on päättynyt.

27. Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes

28. Closure of the sitting

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.00.)

Key to symbols used

*	Consultation procedure
***	Consent procedure
***I	Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading
***II	Ordinary legislative procedure: second reading
***III	Ordinary legislative procedure: third reading

(The type of procedure is determined by the legal basis proposed in the draft act.)

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

AFET	Committee on Foreign Affairs
DEVE	Committee on Development
INTA	Committee on International Trade
BUDG	Committee on Budgets
CONT	Committee on Budgetary Control
ECON	Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs
EMPL	Committee on Employment and Social Affairs
ENVI	Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety
ITRE	Committee on Industry, Research and Energy
IMCO	Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection
TRAN	Committee on Transport and Tourism
REGI	Committee on Regional Development
AGRI	Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development
PECH	Committee on Fisheries
CULT	Committee on Culture and Education
JURI	Committee on Legal Affairs
LIBE	Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
AFCO	Committee on Constitutional Affairs
FEMM	Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality
PETI	Committee on Petitions
DROI	Subcommittee on Human Rights
SEDE	Subcommittee on Security and Defence

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

PPE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)
S&D	Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group
ALDE	Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
GUE/NGL	Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left
Vers/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
EFDD	Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group
ENF	Europe of Nations and Freedom
NI	Non-attached Members