

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 1 MARCH 2017

(C/2024/2674)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2017-2018 SESSION

Sittings of 1 and 2 March 2017

BRUSSELS

Contents	Page
1. Resumption of the session	3
2. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes	3
3. Composition of Parliament: see Minutes	3
4. Verification of credentials: see Minutes	3
5. Composition of committees and delegations: see Minutes	3
6. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 69d): see Minutes	3
7. Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes	3
8. Implementing measures (Rule 106): see Minutes	3
9. Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes	3
10. Documents received: see Minutes	3
11. Transfers of appropriations: see Minutes	4
12. Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes	4

Contents	Page
13. Texts of agreements forwarded by the Council: see Minutes	4
14. Action taken on Parliament's resolutions: see Minutes	4
15. Order of business	4
16. Statement by the President of the Commission on the White Paper on the future of the European Union .	5
17. Preparation of the European Council meeting of 9 and 10 March 2017 (debate)	29
18. Tackling the disappearance of migrant children in Europe (debate)	41
19. Gender pay gap (debate)	55
20. Recent partial decriminalisation of domestic violence in Russia (debate)	68
21. Breaches of current freedom of movement rights of EU citizens residing in the UK and the use of six-month expulsions (debate)	75
22. Gender balance among judges at the Court of Justice (debate)	84
23. Information exchange mechanism with regard to intergovernmental agreements and non-binding instruments in the field of energy (debate)	88
24. Options for improving access to medicines (debate)	95
25. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance	107
26. Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes	112
27. Closure of the sitting	112

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 1 MARCH 2017**PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI***Presidente***1. Resumption of the session**

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta il 16 febbraio 2017.

(La seduta è aperta alle 15)

2. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes**3. Composition of Parliament: see Minutes****4. Verification of credentials: see Minutes****5. Composition of committees and delegations: see Minutes****6. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 69d): see Minutes****7. Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes****8. Implementing measures (Rule 106): see Minutes****9. Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes****10. Documents received: see Minutes**

11. Transfers of appropriations: see Minutes

12. Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes

13. Texts of agreements forwarded by the Council: see Minutes

14. Action taken on Parliament's resolutions: see Minutes

15. Order of business

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 16 febbraio 2017, è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

mercoledì:

Comunico di aver ricevuto una richiesta da parte dell'onorevole Terry Reintke.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I would like to bring to your attention the recent case of Deniz Yücel, a German-Turkish journalist, who has been detained in a Turkish prison for more than two weeks now. He, together with 150 Turkish journalists, deserves our solidarity. This House should not only demand a strong and decisive reaction from the Commission and the Member States, especially the German Government, but we should also request a debate on the situation of journalists imprisoned in Turkish prisons, for the upcoming Strasbourg session.

Let us demand the release of journalists detained in Turkey. Journalism is not a crime: it is the basis of democracy.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Onorevole, anch'io sono preoccupato per la libertà di espressione in tutto il mondo – un attimo, sto rispondendo all'onorevole Reintke – se il suo gruppo parlamentare intende chiedere un dibattito su questo argomento, durante la prossima Conferenza dei presidenti ne discuteremo. Attendo la proposta del suo gruppo parlamentare.

Ha chiesto la parola l'onorevole Spinelli.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi appello all'articolo 22 del regolamento – e mi rivolgo a Lei, Presidente – perché sono stupita da quanto ha detto ieri alla stampa sugli accordi di rimpatrio in Libia.

Senza che il Parlamento ne avesse ancora discusso, e conoscendo le obiezioni di tanti deputati, si è dichiarato favorevole a campi di detenzione in Libia, dove migranti e rifugiati potranno essere rinchiusi – cito – anche per anni. Il mio gruppo, ma non solo, è contrario all'accordo, anche l'ONU ritiene la Libia uno Stato non sicuro. Nell'intervista, Lei dice che non dovranno essere campi di concentramento – e ci mancherebbe – non so però come l'Unione possa garantirlo, non essendo la Libia un protettorato.

Sono stupita perché, a suo tempo, Lei promise di essere un Presidente rispettoso delle diversità di quest'Aula, temo sia una promessa non mantenuta.

Presidente. – Grazie onorevole Spinelli, non ho mai parlato di campi di concentramento, questa parola non appartiene al mio linguaggio, e sono contrario a qualsiasi campo di concentramento, sia esso di tipo nazista, sia esso di tipo comunista. Quindi sono contrario anche ai campi di concentramento in qualsiasi parte del mondo.

Ho soltanto detto che i profughi, gli immigrati che devono rimanere in Libia e che rimangono in Libia devono essere accolti in campi dove ci siano medici, medicinali e devono essere trattati nel rispetto totale della dignità della persona. Ho detto soltanto questo, e non ho mai parlato di campi né di detenzione né di concentramento, questo non fa parte della mia cultura politica, onorevole Spinelli.

Tomáš Zdechovský (PPE). – Pane předsedající, dovolu mi upozornit na to, že bychom se měli držet jednacího řádu a pokud někdo chce vznést jakoukoliv námitku, tak by měl na začátku podle čl. 184 písm. a) jednacího řádu uvést, podle kterého článku tuto námitku vznáší. Jinak toto není Parlament, ale je to kabaret, každý si tady může vystupovat a může vás tady napadat, jak chce.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, on behalf of the Group of Friends of European Ukraine, I would like to draw your attention to the third anniversary of the victory of Euromaidan. The Maidan Revolution of Dignity was a game-changing event not only for Ukraine: its significance is huge for today's Europe and the whole free world. The Ukrainian nation chose to be European, free and democratic.

During the struggle, Putin disclosed his true face by occupying Ukraine and launching a war in eastern Ukraine. Despite the huge human and financial losses, Ukraine remains a solid member of our European family and is showing a true example of real change. The EU must respond adequately, inter alia by finalising visa-free travel for Ukraine as soon as possible.

Colleagues, to all of us in Europe the Maidan revolution is a reminder of freedom and of the price paid for it. That should not be underestimated in these turbulent times. Glory to the heroes of Maidan.

Presidente. – Io apprezzo tutti gli interventi, ma vi ricordo che stavamo discutendo dell'approvazione dell'ordine del giorno. È lecito criticare il Presidente, è lecito dire tutto quello che si vuole in quest'Aula, però vi prego di rispettare le regole e rispettare gli altri colleghi, se no veramente diventa una gran confusione.

Dicevamo, mercoledì c'è una dichiarazione del Presidente della Commissione sul Libro bianco sul futuro dell'Unione, sarà aggiunta come primo punto all'ordine del giorno. Secondo, la relazione dell'onorevole Jáuregui Atondo sulla «democrazia nell'Unione europea: potenziale e sfide» è rinviata alla tornata di marzo II. Terzo punto: la seduta proseguirà fino alle ore 24.

Ci sono obiezioni? L'ordine del giorno è così modificato.

Giovedì la commissione giuridica ha approvato la seguente relazione dell'onorevole Ferrara sull'immunità parlamentare, conformemente all'articolo 9, paragrafo 8, del regolamento del Parlamento, detta relazione sarà aggiunta alle votazioni di giovedì. L'ordine del giorno è così modificato.

L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato.

16. Statement by the President of the Commission on the White Paper on the future of the European Union

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulla dichiarazione del Presidente della Commissione sul Libro bianco sul futuro dell'UE [2017/2559(RSP)].

Voglio ringraziare il Presidente della Commissione e l'intera Commissione per aver deciso di presentare in Parlamento, il giorno stesso dell'approvazione del Libro bianco sul futuro dell'Europa, questo testo di dibattito. È importante che questa istituzione, che è l'unica eletta direttamente dagli europei, abbia un ruolo centrale nel dibattito per un'Europa più efficace e più vicina ai nostri cittadini.

Come tutti sapete e come la Commissione sa, nell'ultima plenaria sono state approvate tre relazioni degli onorevoli Verhofstadt, Böge-Berès e Bresso-Brok, che hanno aperto il dibattito in seno al Parlamento. Credo che questo dibattito debba continuare anche nella prossima plenaria e in vista della dichiarazione congiunta per la celebrazione del sessantesimo anniversario della firma dei trattati di Roma il 25 marzo prossimo. Questo anniversario a mio parere non deve esistere solo come un momento celebrativo, ma deve rappresentare l'occasione affinché le istituzioni europee si mettano ancora di più all'ascolto dei cittadini, lavorando insieme per rispondere alle loro preoccupazioni.

Jean-Claude Juncker, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members of this House, ladies and gentlemen, later this month in Rome, 27 of our Member States will stand shoulder to shoulder in peace, solidarity and friendship to mark the 60th anniversary of the Treaties of Rome, and I would like to see the President of Parliament associated with these ceremonies. However, this will not simply be a birthday celebration. It should also be the birth moment of the European Union of 27, and as we turn the page and commence a new chapter in our history, it is time we sought new answers to a question as old as our Union is young: *quo vadis Europa* at 27?

Europe's founding fathers were visionaries. Altiero Spinelli and Ernesto Rossi, imprisoned by a fascist regime, dared to dream of a place where allies and adversaries would unite. Unable to speak freely, they penned the manifesto for a free and united Europe, which had to be circulated secretly in Rome among the Italian resistance movement in 1943. In writing this manifesto, this new chapter, Spinelli and Rossi decided not to cling to the darkness surrounding them in their Ventotene prison cells. They stretched out their arms to the light instead. They dreamed of a better future and paved the way towards it.

Sixty years later, this should be an inspiration for us. With nothing to dim our voices, would we be forgiven for not speaking up? In 60 years' time, what will our grandchildren say of our legacy? I want them to be proud, as Spinelli and Rossi would probably have been today.

Now is our time to be pioneers and to carve out a vision so that we may work hand in hand, united at 27, towards our future.

Sehr verehrter Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren, liebe Kollegen! Jeden Tag ändert sich die Welt um uns herum. Die Änderungen und Veränderungen sind rasant. Globalisierung, Terrorismus, Migration, die Auswirkungen neuer Technologien auf Gesellschaft und Arbeitsplätze verändern den Alltag der Europäer tiefgreifend. Umstände, Verhältnisse, Zusammenhänge wechseln nicht jährlich, monatlich oder wöchentlich, sie wechseln täglich – so sehr und so schnell, dass wir manchmal außer Atem kommen.

Vor uns liegen große Herausforderungen und hohe Hürden. Sie sind groß und hoch, aber mitnichten unüberwindbar. Entweder werden wir von solchen Entwicklungen überholt, niedergewalzt, oder wir lassen uns auf sie ein, gestalten sie und ergreifen die neuen Chancen, die sie mit sich bringen. Europa darf nicht müde werden. Europa muss hellwach sein und Chancen und Möglichkeiten aktiv, manchmal auch proaktiv, nutzen. Wie es mein Freund Frank-Walter Steinmeier gesagt hat: Wenn wir anderen Mut machen wollen, brauchen wir selbst welchen. Die Zukunft Europas darf nicht zur Geisel von Wahlperioden, Parteipolitik oder kurzfristig innenpolitisch aufbereiteten Erfolgsmeldungen werden. Der Brexit, so bedauerlich und schmerzhaft er auch sein mag, wird die Europäische Union auf ihrem Marsch in die Zukunft nicht stoppen können – wir machen weiter, wir müssen weitermachen!

Wohin gehst du, Europa? *Quo vadis, Europa?* Wohin steuert das Europa der 27? Es gibt eigentlich keinen besseren Zeitpunkt und auch keinen anderen Zeitpunkt als jetzt, um diese zugegebenermaßen schwierige Debatte zu führen. Alle Überlegungen und Debatten darüber, welchen Weg wir einschlagen, müssen eine wesentliche Aufgabe im Blick haben, und die Lösung dieser Aufgabe muss unser aller Handeln bestimmen.

Seien wir ehrlich: Viel zu lange war das, was die Menschen von Europa erwarteten, zu weit entfernt von dem, was Europa bieten und leisten konnte. Unsere Aufgabe wird es sein, deutlich zu machen, was Europa kann und was Europa nicht kann. Nehmen wir zum Beispiel die Bekämpfung der Arbeitslosigkeit und im Besonderen der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit. Wir treffen uns Gipfel um Gipfel und versprechen die Arbeitslosenzahlen, im speziellen die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit, abzusenken. Dabei liegt dies weit außerhalb der alleinigen Möglichkeiten Europas. Auf europäischer Ebene können wir keine Wunder vollbringen, wenn die nationalen Maßnahmen zu kurz greifen. Wir können Ausbildungsprogramme finanzieren, Investitionen stimulieren – Letzteres übrigens nicht ohne Erfolg – doch das führt nicht automatisch und per se zu einem systematischen Rückgang der Arbeitslosigkeit. Der EU-Haushalt steuert lediglich 0,3 % zu den europäischen Sozialhaushalten bei – 0,3 %! Die Mitgliedstaaten bringen 99,7 % auf. Zu behaupten, Europa stünde alleine in der Verantwortung, wenn es um die Bekämpfung der Arbeitslosigkeit geht, ist schlicht falsch.

Dann sollen wir auch nicht so tun, als könne alleine Europa das Problem lösen. Wir und die Mitgliedsstaaten sollten dies endlich zugeben. Wir sollten Menschen nicht glauben machen, dass wir die Sonne und den Mond herbeizaubern können, wenn wir höchstens ein Teleskop liefern können. Wir sollten aufhören, Absichten anzukündigen und sollten uns stattdessen stärker auf die Bereiche konzentrieren, in denen wir handfeste Ergebnisse liefern können.

Der Ausgangspunkt für das Weißbuch der Kommission, das ich Ihnen heute vorlege, ist folgender: Es ist an der Zeit – ich wiederhole mich –, dass wir klarstellen, was Europa leisten kann und was nicht. Viel zu oft wird die Debatte über Europas Zukunft auf mehr oder weniger Europa verkürzt. Dieser Ansatz führt aber in die Irre, wie alle übertriebenen Vereinfachungen in die Irre führen. Im Weißbuch stellen wir verschiedene Wege für die Zukunft der EU-27 vor: fünf Szenarien für die Europäische Union der 27, wenngleich es in der Wirklichkeit mehr Möglichkeiten geben kann. Nicht alle Szenarien finden die spontane Zustimmung der Kommission, aber alle fünf Szenarien sind im Gespräch, ergo müssen wir uns mit ihnen beschäftigen. Wir müssen darlegen, zu welchen Folgen jedes einzelne dieser Szenarien führen kann.

Schauen wir uns ein erstes Szenario an, das auf eine Fortsetzung der bisherigen Politik abstellt. Als diese Kommission antrat, habe ich diesem Haus versprochen, die Dinge anders anzugehen, um das Vertrauen der Menschen wiederzuerlangen, und in weiten Teilen gelingt uns das hoffentlich auch. Die Kommission hat bereits große Fortschritte dabei erzielt, den althergebrachten Reflex zu brechen, jeden Aspekt im Alltag der Menschen regulieren zu wollen und uns in alles einzumischen. Die Menschen wollen nicht, dass wir Vorschriften für Toilettenspülungen oder für die Höhe von Kinderschaukeln erlassen. Wir haben Hunderte von Vorschlägen zurückgezogen und schlagen anstatt 130 Initiativen pro Jahr, wie in früheren Jahren üblich, lediglich 23 neue Initiativen pro Jahr vor. Wir konzentrieren uns auf die großen Dinge, die für den Menschen wirklich wichtig sind. Und trotzdem wird die Kommission in allen Hauptstädten, in fast allen nationalen Parlamenten, manchmal auch hier, in fast der gesamten Presse der Überregulierung bezichtigt. Dieses permanente Brüssel-Bashing macht keinen Sinn, weil dieses Brüssel-Bashing seit dem Amtsantritt dieser Kommission keine Grundlage hat. Es täte uns allen im Übrigen gut, wenn wir mit diesem Brüssel-Bashing, diesem European-Union-Bashing aufhörten. Dies ist sehr oft ein Ersatz für nationale Versäumnisse. Wir können so weitermachen, all unsere Energie darauf zu lenken, Ergebnisse in wichtigen Bereichen zu erzielen und unsere positive Agenda, die die Zustimmung dieses Hauses gefunden hat, voranzubringen. Vollendung des Binnenmarktes, des digitalen Binnenmarktes, der Energieunion, der Kapitalmarktunion und der Verteidigungsunion. Das tun wir auch. Und das werden wir tun. Doch die Frage muss erlaubt sein, ob das ausreichend ist.

Wir könnten auch den entgegengesetzten Weg einschlagen und uns als Europäische Union der 27 ausschließlich auf den Binnenmarkt beschränken: Szenario 2. Falls sich die Mitgliedsstaaten in immer mehr Politikbereichen nicht auf eine gemeinsame Haltung verständigen können, falls immer mehr Regierungen die Kommission zu einem simplen Binnenmarktverwalter degradieren möchten, wäre dies womöglich die einzige gangbare Lösung. Unsere Lösung, meine Lösung ist das nicht. Die europäische Union ist mehr als eine mehr oder weniger gehobene Freihandelszone. Europa ist mehr als Markt, Waren und Geld. Der Binnenmarkt und der Euro sind keine Ziele an sich. Sie haben dem Menschen und den Menschen zu dienen. Trotzdem gibt es Regierungen, die die Rolle der Europäischen Union und ergo der Kommission zurückdrängen möchten auf die Binnenmarktverwaltung. Ich bin strikt dagegen!

Dann gibt es eine dritte Option, ein drittes Szenario. Müssen alle Mitgliedsstaaten der Europäischen Union immer im gleichen Tempo voranschreiten? Wenn wir im Kreise der 27 keine Einigung erzielen können, weder was Ziele noch die Wege dahin betrifft, dann sollte es denjenigen, die in verschiedenen Bereichen vorankommen wollen, erlaubt sein, weitere Fortschritte dort zu machen, wo sie ihnen notwendig erscheinen. Gleichzeitig müssen die anderen, die nicht am Start dabei sein können oder nicht am Start dabei sein wollen, die Möglichkeit haben, sich Absichten und Taten der Erststartenden später anzuschließen.

Doch wie würde sich ein solches System auswirken? Für eine kleine Anzahl von Ländern könnte dieser Ansatz große Fortschritte mit sich bringen. Für Länder, die in einem derartigen Rahmen etwa sämtliche Informationen in der Terrorismusbekämpfung austauschen, ein wirkliches europäisches Asylsystem einrichten und Verteidigungskapazitäten zusammenlegen möchten, wäre dies ohne jeden Zweifel ein gangbarer Weg. Es könnte jedoch auch ein kompliziertes System konzentrischer Kreise entstehen, in dem viele Länder außerhalb des Orbits zentraler politischer Strategien kreisen würden. Dadurch wäre Europa noch schwerer verständlich, als es ohnehin schon ist. Wie erklärte man beispielsweise den Menschen, dass Europa für die Harmonisierung von Frequenzen zuständig ist, auf denen autonom fahrende Fahrzeuge bei einem Unfall den Rettungsdienst anrufen können, allerdings nur in den Ländern X, Y und Z, und daher bekämen sie keine Hilfe, wenn sie im Land A unterwegs sind. Die Schwierigkeiten dieses Ansatzes sehen wir bereits

heute, wenn wir versuchen zu erklären, dass Europa teilweise für die Überwachung der Schengen-Außengrenzen zuständig ist, aber eben nur teilweise. Und trotzdem: Die Vorstellung, dass einige Mitgliedstaaten in Teilbereichen voranschreiten und denen die Bahn brechen, die sich erst später anschließen möchten, darf nicht ohne weiteres ad acta gelegt werden. Diese Form der Avantgarde zielt nicht auf Exklusion, sondern auf spätere Inklusion. Ich kann ehrlich gesagt dieser Vorgehensweise einiges abgewinnen. Ziel muss es bleiben, zu 27 voranzumarschieren. Wenn sich dies aber als unmöglich erweise, muss man der Koalition der Integrationswilligen die Erlaubnis zum Weiterfahren geben. Europäische Erfolge waren fast immer das Werk vorausseilender Pioniere. Siehe Schengen, siehe Euro.

(Beifall)

Es gibt aber noch eine vierte Möglichkeit: Die EU-27 könnte gemeinsam beschließen, in einer etwas kleineren Anzahl von Bereichen vereint mehr zu tun. Also in Bereichen, in denen unsere europäischen Maßnahmen einen echten Mehrwert erzielen würden und in denen die Menschen zu Recht mehr von uns erwarten: Szenario Nummer 4. Dies würde letztlich bedeuten, dass wir nach dem Prinzip 'weniger ist mehr' verfahren. Beispiele für Bereiche, in denen die Bürger mehr von uns erwarten, sind die Sicherheitspolitik und das sogenannte Dieselgate. Eine echte Europäische Agentur für Terrorismusbekämpfung, die Informationen über Grenzen hinweg austauscht und Verdächtige systematisch beobachtet, könnte – davon bin ich überzeugt – einen greifbaren Mehrwert für unser aller Sicherheit bieten. Genauso müssen sich europäische Verbraucher, die durch technische Manipulationen von Automobilherstellern in die Irre geführt werden, auf eine EU-Agentur verlassen können, die Sanktionen gegen Täuschungsunternehmen durchsetzen kann und dafür sorgt, dass diese auch Schadensersatz – und zwar überall – leisten müssen. Anstatt die Menschen dadurch zu enttäuschen, dass wir scharf formulierte Schreiben versenden, in denen wir die Mitgliedstaaten zum Handeln auffordern, müssen wir sicherstellen, dass diesen Aufforderungen auch Folge geleistet werden kann.

Schließlich – Szenario 5 – könnten die Mitgliedstaaten auch beschließen, mehr Befugnisse und Ressourcen zu teilen und mehr Entscheidungen gemeinsam zu treffen. Sie könnten so Vollgas geben, das neu geordnete Gemeinsame in die Zukunft hinein gestalten und die Leadership der Europäischen Union sicherstellen. Klimaschutz: Hier muss Europa weiterhin eine Vorreiterrolle spielen, egal was jenseits des Atlantiks ins Haus steht. Nachhaltige Entwicklung: eine europäische Daueraufgabe. Verteidigung: Hier müssen weitere eigenständige Beiträge Europas in Aufstellung gebracht werden.

Toutes ces perspectives, toutes ces esquisses, tous ces projets théoriquement possibles sont des choix qui s'offrent à nous.

Tout en ayant récusé l'idée qu'il faudrait réduire l'Union européenne à l'état de zone de libre-échange, ce qui n'est pas mon concept et qui ne correspond pas aux ambitions de l'Europe, je ne vais pas vous dire ma préférence absolue aujourd'hui parce que, en fin de compte, ce n'est pas à moi seul – et je le regrette – ni à la Commission de faire ces choix *'in splendid isolation'*.

Je n'ai pas voulu présenter les vues définitives de la Commission. Je ne procède pas, alors que c'est devenu la mode, par 'exécution audace'. La parole sera à votre Parlement, aux parlements nationaux, aux gouvernements, à la société civile, bref, aux citoyens. Contrairement à ce qui, jadis, fut la règle, la Commission ne prescrit pas, ne dicte pas, n'instruit pas. Elle veut être à l'écoute avant de se prononcer définitivement. Pas de diktat – cela ne correspond pas à mon tempérament – mais de l'écoute. Je ne suis pas un dictateur, mais j'aime dire les choses comme je les vois. J'aimerais annoncer la couleur, ma conception de l'Union européenne dès aujourd'hui, et je mesure la déception de ceux qui auraient voulu que je le fasse. Mais nous préférons écouter avant de dire. À ceux qui voudraient qu'avant le débat, la Commission dise ce qu'elle voudrait être, je dirai qu'il ne faut pas confondre *leadership* et diktat. Contrairement à ce qui a été fait jusqu'à présent, nous voulons d'abord écouter avant de nous prononcer. Cela peut conduire – je l'ai lu – à des déceptions majeures, mais c'est une méthode qui fait honneur à la démocratie non seulement représentative mais aussi entière.

Parler d'institutions, de révision des traités, de procédures institutionnelles – débat qui agite ceux qui sont installés dans le confort de la bulle bruxelloise, qu'il faudra, à tout prix, que nous quittions tous ensemble – ne m'intéresse pas pour l'instant. D'ailleurs, un tel discours n'intéresserait pas les citoyens. Vous, qui faites des réunions dans tous vos pays, vous a-t-on jamais posé une question sur l'équilibre des pouvoirs entre le Conseil, la Commission et le Parlement? Jamais! Jamais je n'ai eu à répondre à une telle question! C'est donc un débat typiquement bruxellois qui, mis à part ceux qui sont installés dans le confort de la bulle bruxelloise, n'intéresse personne. Il ne faudrait donc pas conduire ce débat.

Viendra, j'en suis certain, le jour où les traités devront être adaptés à une volonté collective, mais à une volonté collective à naître. Car elle n'existe pas aujourd'hui. Pour pouvoir donner corps à cette volonté collective, il nous faut un véritable débat, un débat honnête sur l'Europe et sur ce que les citoyens attendent de l'Union européenne. Cette conversation vertueuse ne doit pas avoir lieu seulement à Rome ou encore à l'occasion de nos nombreux sommets ou de nos nombreux débats ici même. Elle doit avoir lieu dans les villes et les régions, partout en Europe. C'est avec vous, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, et avec les États membres que nous tiendrons une série de débats sur l'avenir de l'Europe. Chaque voix, même minuscule, à peine audible même, doit être entendue. Les citoyens nous diront ce qu'ils attendent de l'Union européenne. Ils exprimeront vraisemblablement leurs doutes, leurs interrogations, mais aussi leurs espoirs. À nous d'y répondre. Le Livre blanc, que je vous invite à lire, y compris son introduction et l'échange des arguments pour et contre, nous aidera à formuler les bonnes réponses.

Au cours des prochains mois, la Commission apportera de nouvelles contributions à ce large débat avec une série de documents de réflexion et de propositions plus précises portant sur les grands enjeux dont demain sera fait. Nous présenterons nos idées sur le renforcement de la dimension sociale, débat à mes yeux essentiel et auquel j'apporte toute mon attention.

Ceux qui applaudissent, lorsqu'on parle d'Europe sociale, ne font pas la majorité dans cette salle. Honte à vous! Parce que l'Europe sociale est un enjeu principal pour les décennies à venir.

Nous présenterons nos vues sur l'approfondissement de l'Union économique et monétaire et, notamment, sur les mécanismes qui amélioreront la très nécessaire coordination des politiques économiques. Nous présenterons nos vues sur la maîtrise de la mondialisation et nos réflexions sur l'avenir de la défense de l'Europe et l'avenir des finances de l'Union européenne.

En matière de défense, il est évident que les États européens devront augmenter leur budget militaire, mais la stabilité planétaire n'est pas seulement fonction de l'ampleur des budgets militaires. La stabilité internationale, mondiale, planétaire est aussi fonction de la dimension des budgets d'aide au développement et du financement de la lutte contre le changement climatique. Réduire les budgets de l'aide au développement, remettre en cause les engagements qui furent les nôtres et ceux des autres en matière de changement climatique – je parle de la COP 21 – nuira gravement à la stabilité intégrale. L'Union européenne doit porter et continuer à porter ces messages. La stabilité, ce n'est pas seulement l'affaire des armées, c'est aussi l'affaire de ceux qui veulent aider ceux qui sont en retard à rejoindre ceux qui sont en avance. La stabilité, ce sont les dépenses militaires, mais pas exclusivement; c'est aussi l'aide au développement et la lutte contre le changement climatique.

Mesdames et Messieurs, vous vous êtes déjà penchés sur toutes ces questions et nous nous réjouissons à l'idée de continuer à travailler avec vous et notamment avec les rapporteurs qui ont vu leurs rapports adoptés récemment.

Je prends rendez-vous avec vous en septembre, lors du discours sur l'état de l'Union, où je développerai davantage ces idées, pas avant, mais après avoir écouté les uns et les autres.

J'aimerais que le Conseil européen donne en décembre ses orientations pour un processus qui atteindra son apogée lors des élections européennes en 2019.

En 2019, nous avons rendez-vous avec le suffrage universel européen. Ce sera d'abord un rendez-vous d'explications. Explications entre les forces politiques, c'est-à-dire entre les familles politiques, qui devront dire comment elles voient l'Europe de 2025 et au-delà. Je voudrais que le processus démocratique engagé en 2014 connaisse son prolongement, c'est-à-dire qu'en 2019, les partis européens présentent au choix de l'électeur des têtes de liste, exigence qu'il faudra que nous respections pour que la démocratie européenne fonctionne et reste crédible. En 2019, nous ne pourrions pas renoncer à l'acquis que nous avons réalisé en 2014, ensemble. Je salue d'ailleurs amicalement les candidats qui n'ont pas eu la chance que j'ai pu avoir.

(Jean-Claude Juncker réplique à M. Verhofstadt qui disait hors micro: 'La prochaine fois'.)

Les citoyens européens doivent pouvoir décider qui sera le prochain président de la Commission européenne. Les citoyens doivent pouvoir faire leur choix, pas les officines gouvernementales. Je ne serai pas candidat à un deuxième mandat, comme je l'ai dit dès le premier jour.

(Applaudissements venant de la droite de l'hémicycle.)

(En réaction à ces applaudissements) J'avais pour intention de ne jamais décevoir l'extrême-droite, j'ai réussi.

Je ne serai pas candidat à un deuxième mandat, mais, croyez-moi, je ne suis ni fatigué ni à court d'idées, au contraire, et vous allez le voir.

Monsieur le Président, l'Europe s'est relevée des cendres de la Seconde guerre mondiale pour réaliser l'impossible: mettre fin à cette éternelle tragédie européenne qui, en fait, nous obligeait – les peuples, leurs dirigeants – à choisir entre la guerre et la paix. Dans le monde d'aujourd'hui, plus de quarante guerres et conflits militaires font rage, mais pas un seul ne se déroule sur le sol européen proprement dit. Vu de plus loin et à partir d'autres continents, l'Europe continue à rester une chose magnifique: avoir réuni tout un continent, avoir mis un terme à ce funeste décret d'après-guerre qui voulait que l'Europe, à tout jamais, soit scindée en deux blocs, y avoir créé un espace de stabilité, de prospérité et d'égalité nous vaut l'admiration du monde entier. Très souvent, j'ai l'impression que les autres nous admirent et que nous-mêmes, il nous arrive de nous détester.

Mais cette Europe, celle que je décris, n'est pas un acquis, ni une évidence. L'Europe a toujours été et reste aujourd'hui et pour toujours un choix délibéré, qu'il faut défendre contre vents et marées, contre l'assaut de ceux qui ne veulent pas comprendre le cours de l'histoire. Les choix que nous faisons maintenant, aujourd'hui, demain, dans deux ans et d'ici 2025 doivent tenir compte de leurs implications, non seulement pour nous, mais surtout pour les générations à venir. Parce que nous serons jugés, non pas sur ce qui nous a été légué, mais sur ce que nous laisserons en héritage. Nos citoyens nous disent souvent que nous devons faire les choses différemment. Oui, nous y sommes prêts, mais il ne faut pas vouloir tout changer. Nous devrions essayer de mieux comprendre les contraintes et les chances d'une application correcte du principe de subsidiarité, qui ne doit pas devenir un ersatz pour la solidarité, laquelle doit, elle, rester le principe directeur de toutes nos actions européennes et nationales. Très souvent, en écoutant ceux qui se font l'avocat du principe de subsidiarité, j'ai l'impression que, comme ils ne veulent pas parler de solidarité, ils préfèrent parler de subsidiarité. Il s'agit de bien comprendre la signification exacte du concept de subsidiarité.

Monsieur le Président, nous n'avons pas le droit d'être – comment dire – patriotes contre les autres. Le patriotisme du XXI^e siècle se décline en deux dimensions: un patriotisme heureux, accepté et acceptable vers l'intérieur, et la solidarité, qui est le prolongement du patriotisme heureux vers l'extérieur. Il y a des valeurs qui doivent continuer de nous unir: la paix, la démocratie, la solidarité, l'état de droit – qui doit être la règle qui sous-tend notre vivre-ensemble très souvent menacé –, la dignité et l'égalité de tous les êtres humains, ainsi que la liberté de la presse. Regardez ce qui se passe en Turquie où l'on emprisonne, sans raison aucune, des journalistes allemands parce qu'ils ont osé dire ce qu'il fallait dire! Les valeurs, oui, ce qui inclut le refus du rejet de l'autre, de celui qui est différent de nous, mais qui n'est pas moins noble que nous-mêmes.

Nous ne pouvons pas accepter que les voix de ceux qui défendent ces valeurs, dont je voudrais qu'elles soient universelles, soient noyées dans le vacarme des slogans nationalistes qui font du patriotisme une arme contre les autres. Le patriotisme n'est plus un patriotisme lorsqu'il se dirige contre les autres. L'Europe, elle, doit rester une force mondiale positive. Nos sociétés européennes sont bâties sur l'ouverture et nous devrions en être plus fiers. D'autres préfèrent se refermer sur eux-mêmes et tourner leur regard vers l'intérieur. Le nombrilisme fait des progrès angoissants à travers la planète. Mais une telle attitude n'est ni dans notre nature, ni d'ailleurs dans notre intérêt. La démocratie – la démocratie entière – est un produit européen et nous la défendrons partout et de toutes nos forces. Alors, ayons le courage, la patience et la détermination qui sont nécessaires aux longs trajets et aux grandes ambitions.

L'Europe continue à être une grande ambition. Une ambition qui a derrière elle et devant elle un long trajet. Nous avons aujourd'hui le choix entre plusieurs chemins, certains plus pernecieux que d'autres, d'autres plus porteurs d'avenir que d'autres.

Monsieur le Président, quel que soit le choix que nous ferons, la destinée de l'Europe à Vingt-sept est entre nos mains. Entre nos mains, oui, mais elle est d'abord et avant tout une affaire de cœur et une affaire de valeurs, de valeurs qui donnent sa véritable dimension à la raison d'État européenne. Je ne suis pas en train de citer un poème européen, je décris une nécessité continentale.

(Applaudissements)

Esteban González Pons, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank President Juncker for having chosen the European Parliament as the first place to present this White Paper. The anniversary of the Treaties of Rome will be something other than a celebration: it will be a farewell to the United Kingdom and it will be the birth of the Union with 27 Member States.

We have done many things wrong before arriving at this point. Brexit is not the cause. Brexit is the last consequence and we must be sure it remains the last consequence. If Brexit is a divorce, the anniversary of the Treaties of Rome should be a time to renew the commitments between us and the Union. We are all facing serious challenges: globalisation, terrorism, migration and the refugee crisis, climate change and so on. The question is simple: how do we want to deal with those challenges?

How do we move forward? But also, do we want to move forward? This is a legitimate question too because I know that I want to move forward, but we cannot simply blame those who do not want to go further than we are now, by calling them anti-European. We are all Europeans. Europe belongs to all Europeans, no matter whether they come from the north, the south, the east or the west. Europe belongs to all of us.

That is why I thank the Commission for having presented five different scenarios, even knowing that none of them will be fully accepted. For my Group, for example, a sixth scenario could also be possible: merging the other five because they are not mutually exclusive. I agree with President Juncker that the time has come to align expectation with reality. It is time to say what you can do, and not promise what you cannot do. It is time to defend Europe because it is the best bastion against nationalism and populism. What Member States must do is to stop blaming Europe for what Europe cannot do because it does not have the tools. This is a wrong and dangerous game and Brexit is one of the consequences.

Whatever road we take, we must take it in unity and with consensus because these two words have given us 60 years of peace. We may have forgotten where we come from. We come from war, death, poverty and hunger. We come from lack of freedom. We may have forgotten why unity is so important. We may have forgotten to explain that there is no alternative to the Union – not in the past, not now, and not in the future. The Union was – and will be – the best instrument for peace. So, when a country as important as the United Kingdom leaves us, we have to ask ourselves the question: are they leaving us because peace is already consolidated or because peace is no longer important? I cannot understand it.

To conclude, this debate is necessary: a debate about the future that we want for ourselves and for our children. This debate starts today, right here, right now, in the European Parliament. This Parliament must be fully involved from now on. Every single Member, every single Committee and every single body of this House must be involved. Europeans must be the owners of their own future, and this Parliament is the way forward for them. This debate means that the Council, the Commission and the Parliament have realised one thing: that the Union is built from its citizens and not from the institutions. As Manfred Weber said today, it is now or never. Well done, Mr Juncker.

(Applause)

Gianni Pittella, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I know you, President Juncker, as a devoted pro-European, a man who all his life has fought to make Europe better and stronger. But the White Paper the Commission is now presenting has disappointed us now that Europe is faced with unprecedented challenges: a protectionist US President, Russia and China on the rise, and the bloody war on our doorstep from which millions of people are running for their lives; now that populists show their ugly face in every corner of Europe; now that hardworking families all over Europe are struggling to make ends meet and are worried about their children's future; now that our common European House, which has sheltered us for decades, has to weather the toughest storm ever. Now you are presenting us with a reflection paper and scenarios instead of a clear plan to fortify our House to weather this storm. You are right, President Juncker, in showing all the political difficulties, because the difficulties are real; but it is necessary, it is essential, to indicate one political priority, one political option, because the European Commission is not a bureaucratic body but a political body, and you know very well that we support you for this reason. I can only see one option, the fifth option, because it is the only viable option: to work together as Europeans and to do much more together, because together we are stronger.

There is so much left to do. Our House needs a strong Social Pillar to protect our citizens. And it needs European fiscal capacity. We must complete the European monetary union and build a sustainable Europe capable of fighting climate change and creating jobs and growth. We must combat tax fraud, and the project of a common European army is now more important than ever. We have to defend our inclusiveness without leaving aside the eastern countries. We can only achieve this if we stay united as Europeans. President Juncker, I call on you and on your Commission to take on your responsibility. You are the guardians of the Treaties, the guardians of the common European good and our common European future at this time. We ask you to show leadership and urge the Council to take on their historic duty.

In a couple of weeks, we will celebrate the anniversary of the Rome Treaties. Only some years after a terrible world war in Europe, political leaders had the courage to commit to European unity and explained to their citizens why we Europeans are stronger together. After decades in which Europe has brought us peace and prosperity, is it really too much to ask of this generation of leaders to commit to Europe and make it stronger for the future? Let us not give up. Let us show political leadership in the fight together for a Europe that is better and stronger, so that our children and their children will have a good future.

(Applause)

Ulrike Trebesius, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Vielen Dank, Herr Vorsitzender! „Quo vadis, Europa?“, fragen Sie, Herr Juncker, und das ist eine gute und richtige Frage zur richtigen Zeit. Die EU und die Eurozone stehen vor Herausforderungen, derer sie nicht Herr werden. Zu nennen sind insbesondere die Folgewirkungen der Gemeinschaftswährung Euro, die Europas Bürgern einen epochalen Schaden zugefügt hat. Die Krise schwillt weiter und die bisherige Politik – nämlich Zeit zu kaufen – funktioniert nicht.

Ja, die EU hat für Frieden gesorgt, aber inzwischen wird im Zusammenhang mit der EU nur noch der Frieden beschworen. Erinnern wir uns: Einst sollte die EU und insbesondere die Euro-Zone auch für Wohlstand und für Wachstum sorgen – diese Hoffnungen sind fehlgeschlagen. Das ist auch kein Betriebsunfall, sondern die Folge von Zentralismus und Größenwahn. Die gescheiterten Konzepte der gesellschaftlichen und wirtschaftlichen Zentralisierung gehören in die Mottenkiste.

Leider finden sich solche Ideen auch noch in Ihrem Papier, Herr Juncker. Beispielsweise in Szenario 5, wo die Politik in das Innovationscluster nach dem Vorbild von Silicon Valley gerückt werden soll. Herr Juncker, Sie sind bereits ein kleines Stück auf dem richtigen Weg gegangen, sich von überholten Ideen zu verabschieden. Sie müssen noch ein Stück weitergehen. Innovation und Wandel funktionieren von selbst, wenn die Politik gute Rahmenbedingungen schafft. Wenn Staaten Industriepolitik wollen, dann sollen sie dies auf eigene Verantwortung und auf eigene Kosten tun.

Ihr Szenario 2, die EU auf den gemeinsamen Markt zu beschränken, ist deshalb nicht unvernünftig! Die Friedenswirkung der wirtschaftlichen Integration bliebe so erhalten. Ich gebe aber zu, dass es für die EU weitere Anliegen gibt, eine funktionale Rolle zu übernehmen – beispielsweise die Terrorabwehr und den Grenzschutz.

Ihr Konzept 4 steht unter der Überschrift „weniger machen und das effizienter“! Grundlegend ist diese Idee, die EU auf einige Bereiche zu beschränken, gut und der richtige Ansatz. An dieser Stelle sollten wir weitergehen. Wir sehen an der schnellen Abfolge und dem Wandel der Krisenszenarien der letzten Jahre, dass wir Politikbereiche kaum auf ewig festzurren können. Flexibilität ist notwendig. Es muss klar sein, dass die in Szenario 4 genannte Kooperation eine freiwillige Beteiligung an einzelnen Programmen bedeutet und die Nationalstaaten die Möglichkeit bekommen, je nach Bedarf aus Programmen auszusteigen oder neue Kooperationen einzufügen. Die Zeiten ändern sich, und die EU braucht institutionelle Regeln, die eine Anpassung an neue Herausforderungen ermöglichen. Niemand kann hier im Hause voraussehen, wo Kooperationen in 10 oder 20 Jahren Sinn machen und wir sollten zukünftigen Generationen – das haben Sie zurecht angesprochen – diese Freiheiten auch lassen.

Herr Juncker, Sie sind hier vielleicht schon einen Schritt weiter als unser Kollege Verhofstadt, der seine Brexit-Lektion noch nicht gelernt hat und den europäischen Bürgern weiter ein zentralisiertes Wohlfühlglück aufzwingen möchte. Bitte kommunizieren Sie das doch! Es wird höchste Zeit, dass sich dieses Parlament von einer Politik des Wunschdenkens verabschiedet. Und zuletzt: Ihre fünf Szenarien legen doch eine gewisse Flexibilität nahe. Wie schade, Herr Juncker, dass Sie diese Flexibilität nicht gegenüber David Cameron so formuliert haben, denn dann wären die Briten sicherlich noch Mitglied dieser Europäischen Union. Vielen Dank.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I find it a crazy idea that it is now Mr Juncker's fault that there is a Brexit. I thought it was more or less an internal catfight within the Conservative Party that was the reason for Brexit.

It is crazy how some people then blame this House here and say that it is the cause. But that said, I welcome the contribution from the Commission and I certainly welcome your introduction, Mr Juncker, because you made mention of the founding fathers: Altiero Spinelli, and I could add Paul-Henri Spaak, I could add Heinrich von Brentano, founding father of the German *Grundgesetz*, and I could add Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman. I could even add Winston Churchill, because from 1946 to 1951 — a part that was forgotten by Mr Boris Johnson in this biography of Winston Churchill — he was the leader of European integration and of the future European Union.

That said, it is important to recognise one thing here, which is that, before we go to Rome for the festivities, what we want today is something different from the Treaty of Rome, because the Treaty of Rome was a customs union. It was maybe the right answer in 1957 but, let us be honest, it is not the answer to the challenges we are facing today.

I think it is very important to talk about the founding fathers because they had more ambition than just the Treaty of Rome. The Treaty of Rome was a fall-back option, a fall-back solution, because they were not able — because of the 'no' vote in the French National Assembly — to make a defence union, to make a political union, and to make an economic union. It is wise to remember what they wanted after the Second World War, which was to create a Union that was capable and decisive.

But what is our problem today? You will find it in your five scenarios. You have given us five scenarios but what I remember from your introduction is that we can forget the first three. Let us talk about scenarios four and five, and I think that is the right decision to make, but, let us be honest: what is lacking in the European Union of today? Why are we not capable of stabilising our neighbourhood? It is because we do not have the capabilities to do so. Why are we not capable of finding a solution to the migration crisis and the refugee crisis? Because we have no capabilities to do so at European level.

Why are we not capable of cleaning up our banks, eight years after Lehman brothers? Eight years after, we are still facing problems with an unrealised banking union, with no recovery fund and so on. Why? Because we have no European capacities and capabilities.

And finally, why do we not have big European internet companies? If we talk about Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, Samsung, they are all American or Asian. And why? Because we do not have a completed digital market in the European Union: No European capacities, for example for a European telecom authority or a digital authority, as you propose in your fourth scenario. That is the lesson.

We are still a loose confederation of nation states based on the unanimity rule, and if there is one country blocking — and you know this better than I do, Mr Juncker, having been a Member for a long time of the European Council — if only one member says 'no', then we apply the unanimity rule and we do not go forward.

Too little, too late — that is the consequence of the absence of the European capacities and European capabilities that we desperately need.

So we do not need to start asking whether it is four, five, or three, because we are already familiar with the different circles in the European Union. We have 50 exceptions in the European budget. There are 50 different circles in the European Union. The question now is how can we overcome that? How, for one, do we convince European leaders at national level to make the jump forward that we desperately need? That is the question, and therefore our proposal from Parliament, in our papers and in the reports that have been discussed and approved two weeks ago, is to start an interinstitutional reflection.

We alone cannot decide this. You alone, Mr Juncker, cannot decide from your side in the Commission. Even the Council cannot do that – and maybe they do not have the inspiration to do it. So our plea, Mr President of the Commission, is that you back our proposal for an interinstitutional reflection from day one, from now on, so that we are not only talking about Brexit here in this House, but we also open an offensive – a positive, optimistic reform of the Union in parallel with Brexit. And it is not only a negative story of one country leaving us, but also a story of 27 who know that their destiny in the future will be in unity, together, in the European Union.

Patrick Le Hyaric, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, prenons acte de votre profession de foi selon laquelle votre Commission, Monsieur le Président, n'impose pas, ne prescrit pas.

Si c'est vrai, alors il vous faudra prendre appui sur ce que vivent et disent les citoyens – les travailleurs, les paysans, les chômeurs, les jeunes – et organiser un grand débat citoyen européen; des sortes d'états généraux pour une refondation de l'Union européenne.

Les défis sont trop importants, trop inquiétants pour ne pas changer de cap. L'enjeu n'est pas de procéder à un simple toilettage de la façade: il faut repenser, il faut se refonder et il faudra bien faire un bilan de l'application des traités.

Tant que l'Union européenne ne sera pas l'affaire des peuples-mêmes, tant qu'elle ne prendra pas en compte leurs aspirations à mieux vivre, tant qu'elle ne sera pas un projet pour la justice, l'égalité, la solidarité, la démocratie, le bien-être humain et environnemental, elle continuera d'être rejetée.

Tant qu'elle ne sera perçue que comme un système d'étranglement de la Grèce ou une sorte de police des dépenses publiques, tant qu'elle sera une forteresse pour les migrants, mais un paradis pour la libre circulation du capital, elle continuera d'être rejetée.

Tant qu'elle roulera en convoiturage avec les milieux d'affaires et les fonds financiers au détriment des travailleurs, elle sera rejetée.

Voilà pourquoi, Monsieur le Président Juncker, on peut imaginer un autre scénario, un scénario qui parte des gens eux-mêmes, des salariés, des créateurs, de la jeunesse.

Lancez un grand débat public populaire européen préparant une conférence européenne de refondation démocratique, sociale, écologique, féministe, en vue de construire un nouveau projet européen. Ne pas le faire condamnera l'idée européenne elle-même.

Commencez d'ailleurs, entre nous, par consulter les peuples sur le projet de libre-échange avec le Canada: ce serait un acte montrant que l'Europe est un atout pour transformer la mondialisation.

Remplacez le concept de concurrence généralisée par celui de coopération, l'austérité par une nouvelle répartition des richesses et une nouvelle manière de les produire, le chômage et la précarité par une sécurité sociale professionnelle, l'actuelle politique agricole commune par une nouvelle politique agricole et alimentaire qui prendrait en compte l'emploi et la santé.

Imaginons une nouvelle politique de l'industrie de demain et du numérique, un grand projet de coopération avec les pays du Sud. On peut agir pour que les milliards de liquidités que fournit la Banque centrale européenne servent des projets pour l'emploi et de nouveaux services publics.

Lançons un grand plan contre l'évasion fiscale et un projet d'harmonisation fiscale et sociale visant la justice.

Le projet européen pourrait se relancer en amendant le fonds que vous avez créé pour en faire un fonds pour le développement social, humain et environnemental qui, en même temps, pourrait refinancer les États surendettés.

Monsieur le Président, nous ne devons pas rater ce moment historique. Écoutez les peuples, associez-les à un nouveau projet.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, c'est peu de dire que l'Union européenne n'est pas au mieux de sa forme, et je vous remercie donc, Monsieur le Président Juncker, de venir avec des propositions.

Vous tentez dans votre document de répondre à la question du «comment». Nous pensons qu'avant de répondre à cette question, il faudrait s'interroger sur le «pourquoi», et en particulier pourquoi un nombre croissant de nos concitoyens sont devenus défiants, voire ouvertement hostiles à l'idée même de construction européenne.

Il est clair qu'à leurs yeux, l'Union européenne a perdu en légitimité. Il y a évidemment la question de la légitimité institutionnelle: l'Union serait trop éloignée, trop opaque; les décisions y seraient prises de manière trop dissimulée par des politiques qui n'assureraient pas suffisamment leurs responsabilités. Si tel était le diagnostic, on s'attendrait à des propositions ambitieuses sur le plan de la transparence et du contrôle démocratique, et tout cela est nécessaire.

Mais je pense que la défiance a des racines plus profondes, car si c'est de légitimité qu'il s'agit, c'est bien de légitimité par le résultat. En effet, à quoi peuvent mener un grand marché et une monnaie uniques, combinés à la concurrence fiscale et sociale? À quoi peuvent mener des traités de libre-échange et des normes de réglementation qui érigent en norme absolue et supérieure le droit au profit, sinon à l'enrichissement des détenteurs du capital au détriment de tous les autres? C'est cela, je pense, qui est à la source des gros bataillons de nos concitoyens qui rejoignent les eurosceptiques, voire les europhobes.

Si l'Union européenne était un véhicule, il s'agirait moins aujourd'hui de discuter de sa forme, du nombre de sièges ou même de la vitesse de ce véhicule que de sa motorisation et, surtout, de sa direction. Monsieur Juncker, si je peux me permettre, vous nous proposez de faire du surplace, de faire marche arrière, de faire marche avant ensemble ou dans des groupes différenciés, mais toujours dans une direction, comme si l'idée d'un changement de cap était tout simplement impensable.

Vous avez eu le courage, Monsieur Juncker, de nous poser le diagnostic correct lorsque nous avons été confrontés au défi de l'asile et de l'immigration. Vous nous avez dit – et vous aviez raison – que, si nous voulons garder cet espace de libre circulation auquel nous tenons tant – et nous y tenons –, nous ne pouvons pas ne pas avoir une politique commune d'asile et d'immigration et une gestion commune de nos frontières. Vous avez eu ce courage.

Curieusement, face à l'explosion des inégalités et à une monnaie unique qui tangué – et c'est peu dire –, vous n'avez pas le courage de dire la vérité historique. Il n'y a aucune – je dis bien aucune – union monétaire dans l'histoire de l'humanité qui ait tenu sans union fiscale, sans union sociale et, dès lors, sans union politique et démocratique. C'est cette contradiction-là que nous devons aujourd'hui résoudre si nous voulons conserver le marché et la monnaie uniques, et nous le voulons.

Si nous voulons reconquérir, Monsieur le Président, le cœur et l'esprit de nos concitoyens, il est urgent, à nos yeux, de reconnecter la construction européenne à ce qui était son ambition initiale, c'est-à-dire assurer la paix sur ce continent – et cela reste d'actualité – par l'extension de la démocratie et par une prospérité partagée. Si nous voulons reconnecter l'Europe à cet objectif, nous devons abandonner cette idée de concurrence fiscale et sociale pour aller vers la convergence, autrement dit remettre la dignité de tous, et pas la prospérité de quelques-uns, au cœur du projet européen.

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the White Paper on the future of the European Union follows the usual format that we are used to. It recognises the problems facing it, but fails to understand that many of these were created by the EU in the first place. The solution is always the same, namely for the EU to have yet more power in order to solve the problems that it created, and that always means yet more integration – political, fiscal and economic.

The Paper acknowledges that the current economic crisis particularly affects the younger generation. It quite rightly wants to ensure that every generation is better off than the previous one. It acknowledges that the effect on the young is particularly felt within the euro area and, in the same paragraph, it goes on to say 'this highlights the need to complete economic and monetary union'. It defies belief that Mr Juncker, or anybody else, can fail to understand that the European single currency is the single biggest reason for the catastrophic levels of youth unemployment in countries like Portugal, Spain and Greece. The austerity measures designed to keep the euro alive just make things worse.

The Paper does not once mention the British referendum. If Mr Juncker tried to understand the reasons why the British voted to leave, it might help him understand what is needed to reform the European Union. Sadly, I do not think he is going to do that but, happily, Britain will not be part of it.

(Applause)

Vicky Maeijer, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – De Europese Unie is in verval en de steun voor uw Europese project brokkelt af. Onder anderen de Nederlanders zeiden al nee tegen de Europese grondwet en tegen het associatieverdrag met Oekraïne. En nu vertrekt de eerste lidstaat, omdat de Britten nee zeiden tegen de EU.

Ik ben blij voor hen. Maar in een tijd dat de bevolking snakt naar vrijheid, is het enige waar u hier mee bezig bent het in stand houden van de Brusselse droom. Want de toekomstplannen van Juncker voor de Europese Unie zijn meer van hetzelfde: meer, meer, meer Europese Unie. De voorzitter van de Europese Raad, Donald Tusk, wil de lidstaten zelfs opnieuw trouw laten zweren aan het Europese project. Wie verzint zoiets? Hoe wereldvreemd bent u eigenlijk? U speelt met de toekomst van miljoenen burgers die u niet vertegenwoordigt en die u helemaal niets hebt gevraagd.

De heer Juncker zegt nu dat hij iedere burger, iedere stem wil horen. Maar mag ik u een paar citaten van dezelfde man in herinnering brengen? Over het Franse referendum in verband met de Europese grondwet zie hij: "If it is a yes, we will say: on we go. If it is a no, we will say: we continue." En over Griekenland: "When it becomes serious, you have to lie".

Voorzitter, dát is democratie in de Europese Unie, dát is waar Brussel hier voor staat. Dit soort voorstellen van ongekozen EU-bazen zal bij de Nederlanders alleen maar het gevoel bevestigen dat we af moeten van de verstikkende EU, op weg naar soevereiniteit, op weg naar vrijheid.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Juncker very much indeed for coming to the Chamber this afternoon and for outlining his White Paper.

Mr Juncker, it was very nice to see you and I will regret losing you in two-and-a-half years' time when you go into retirement. But the legacy you will leave, sir, in terms of the White Paper that you have outlined this afternoon is really quite dangerous and a real delusion in terms of denial of what has happened. Everything that has happened in the European Union in the last few days – and last few years for that matter – has been because of lack of action: the lack of sensible action, or the lack of action full-stop. And so what you see across the European continent is the emergence of all the threats and all the issues that you have highlighted in your White Paper, but there is nothing in the White Paper that gives citizens across Europe the opportunity to voice their discontent – via referenda, for instance – and actually highlight to you what is wrong.

We all wish the European Union project a future. There are 27 Member States that want that to happen. There is one Member State that has made the right decision to walk away. But, sir, can I just implore you to look at that White Paper? You have signalled with your fifth option what your preference is, but I ask you again, for the sake of 440 million citizens, please go back to a blueprint and come up with something new, something that does not just paper over the cracks and look backwards for solutions, rather than looking forward for what is actually required.

Presidente. – Passiamo ora agli altri oratori. Siamo in forte ritardo, sono stato flessibile con i presidenti dei gruppi, ora vi chiedo di rispettare rigorosamente il tempo a voi assegnato, non potrò neanche concedere il «cartellino blu» perché, ripeto, il ritardo è molto forte.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to congratulate President Juncker on the decision to present the White Paper to the Parliament and to present it to the press in the presence of the Parliament. This is a good sign as it shows what you think about the future of Europe, namely that it has to be a democratic construction, a democratic building.

I would also like to congratulate you – and to disagree with the Socialists – because I think it is a good idea to present five scenarios and not only one solution. The problem of the future of Europe is not the Commission and its view, it is not the European Parliament and its view, but is really the responsibility of the Member States and now the Member States, within their national parliaments and their national public opinion, will have to say what they want. They have to be confronted with their own responsibilities. I think that this is a very important step to bring transparency, democracy and legitimacy to this process of reforming the European Union in the near future.

Finally, I would like to say that the EPP Group has approved its own strategy. We are totally committed to the idea of a social market economy, to innovation, development, growth, the creation of jobs and prosperity, and to moving forward in defence and security reforms that lead towards a kind of European defence union.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, I would say that the problem is not that the Commission is coming forward with scenarios, because that is interesting. Nevertheless, the expectation will be of the Commission saying that we can consider these scenarios but that there is a choice, which is the choice the Commission is proposing.

Why is that so? Because we are in such a situation, with these overlapping crises and these so-called existential crises, that the key question in the current situation is not whether we need to have better European solutions or to go backwards. This is not the central question. The central question is about how we can deliver better European solutions, because we have a majority in favour of better European solutions.

I am sure that majority exists here in this House; I am sure, of course, it exists in the Commission; and I am sure that majority exists among European citizens. Why? Because it is evident that, in order to deliver better labour conditions and better large-scale investment, we need better European solutions. The same goes for trade, defence, security and migration. So let us focus the discussion on how to deliver these better European solutions. I hope this will be the central question for the period to come.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. Formand! Hvis vi skal vælge den rigtige fremtid for EU, er det vigtigt, at vi starter med at slå en ting helt fast: Brexit var ikke sygdommen, det var symptomet på sygdommen. Sygdommen er et EU, der i alt for mange år har bevæget sig langt længere i integration og i en føderal retning, end medlemslande og ikke mindst befolkningerne i EU har ønsket.

Derfor er det helt centrale nu, at Kommissionen har spillet ud til medlemsstaterne og sagt: Skal vi gå i en retning, der betyder mindre EU, et mere reformeret EU, tilbage til ideen om det indre marked som omdrejningspunktet og ikke den føderale union? Hvis vi gør det, tror jeg, vi har en fremtid som et europæisk fællesskab, der bygger på fælles værdier. Går man derimod videre i den føderale retning mod en europæisk superstat, er jeg sikker på, at Brexit kun er det første i en række lande, der hellere vil søge deres lykke uden for fællesskabet end indenfor. Det burde være bekymringen, både hos Kommissionen og hos EU-føderalisterne i dette hus.

Jeg håber, vi vælger den fornuftige vej. Jeg håber, vi vælger den vej, der betyder et samarbejde, vi kan være sammen om, og ikke en føderal union, som vi alle ønsker at komme ud af.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, *monsieur* Juncker, hablo en nombre de la Alianza Libre Europea en este Parlamento. Con el *brexit* sabemos que el futuro de Europa será necesariamente diferente en algunos meses. Para prepararlo, debemos tomarnos seriamente nuestro propio eslogan: «Unidad en la diversidad».

Hasta ahora ha sido posible que cada Estado miembro vaya prácticamente por su cuenta, y así no hay Unión. En el futuro, la Unión solo será posible si se cumplen dos condiciones: primera, que la Unión Europea reconozca el valor de naciones de dimensiones medianas y acoja a antiguas naciones, declaradamente, explícitamente proeuropeas, como Escocia y Cataluña; segundo, que todos los Estados, los actuales y los que se agreguen, acepten que el respeto a la diversidad solo se consigue si al mismo tiempo se aceptan lazos y compromisos comunes que les obliguen y que les hagan más fuertes. Es decir, para la Europa del futuro, mayor diversidad, con una más eficaz unidad.

Solo así serán creíbles los valores de la Unión Europea.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Kelias į federalizmą, apie kurį mes šiandien diskutuojame, mano nuomone, bus pats tiesiausias kelias į Europos subyrėjimą. Negi mes pasiruošę tuo keliu eiti? Matyčiau kitą kelią. Ne dviejų greičių, ne Europos federalizacijos, bet Europos kelią į vienybę ir laisvę. Laisvų, lygiateisių tautų Europa – tai vienintelis kelias, kuris gali mus suburti bendram siekiui už Europos išlikimą ir jos ateitį.

Matyčiau kelią į Europą be išgalvotų baimių, į Europą be iškreipto liberalizmo, be aklo kapitalizmo, ne tokia, kurioje apologetai nebemato išnaudojamo žmogaus, kur dauguma politikų nebeturi atsakomybės, o dauguma valdininkų – sąžinės. Negi mes nusiteikę stiprinti būtent tokią Europos Sąjungą? Negi mes nusiteikę didžiųjų valstybių problemas spręsti mažųjų sąskaita? Šiandien aš matau norą į paribį nustumti tas valstybes, kurios iš tiesų yra už valstybių sandraugą, už tikrą Europos Sąjungos reformą, o ne jos pavertimą Jungtinėmis Europos Valstijomis.

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Wenn man den Ausführungen des Herrn Kommissionspräsidenten, aber auch jenen der Chefs der Pro-EU-Fraktionen hier sein Gehör schenkt, hat man ein bisschen den Eindruck, als wäre hier gerade die versammelte Kapitänbrücke der Titanic angetreten und verschließt Auge und Ohr davor, dass in dieses europäische Konzept längst schon Wasser eingedrungen ist.

Ich verstehe nicht, warum man hier nicht Einsicht darin hat, dass gerade die Fehlentwicklungen der Zentralisierung in den vergangenen Jahren hier das Problem sind, und unbeirrt in die falsche Richtung weitermachen möchte. Es gäbe genug Konzeptvorschläge, diese Europäische Union zu verändern, sie zu redimensionieren und damit in eine gute Zukunft zu führen. Beispielsweise liegt der Vorschlag auf dem Tisch, die Europäische Kommission zu halbieren, das Europäische Parlament zu redimensionieren und damit den Mitgliedstaaten wieder mehr an Entscheidungsräumen möglich zu machen.

Aber das alles ist offensichtlich für Sie zu wenig interessant, weil Sie genau diesen Schritt weiter und weiter verfolgen wollen, Europa zu zentralisieren, während Ihnen auf der anderen Seite die Bürger Europas davonlaufen und Sie eigentlich Europa einen sehr, sehr schlechten Dienst erweisen, wenn Sie genau diese verfehlten Konzepte weiterentwickeln, statt den Nationalstaaten wieder mehr an Möglichkeiten zu übertragen.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συζήτηση που ανοίγει, και με τη Λευκή Βίβλο, έχει στόχο να κάνει πιο αποτελεσματική την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στην επίθεσή της ενάντια στους λαούς, σε συνθήκες εντεινόμενης λαϊκής δυσαρέσκειας. Φανερώνει τη διαπάλη με τους ανταγωνιστές της διεθνώς, τους σφοδρούς ανταγωνισμούς στο εσωτερικό της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, στο έδαφος της ανισομετρίας, ανάμεσα σε κράτη μέλη και μερίδες του κεφαλαίου, όπως και την ανάγκη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να κερδίσει χρόνο.

Καμία από τις πέντε εκδοχές που προτείνονται δεν έχει σχέση με τα λαϊκά συμφέροντα. Όποιο σενάριο και αν ακολουθηθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και τις κυβερνήσεις της, οι εργαζόμενοι θα είναι οι πολλαπλά χαμένοι και τα μονοπώλια οι ωφελημένοι και πολλαπλά κερδισμένοι που θα θησαυρίζουν. Οι εργαζόμενοι, από την ίδια τους την πείρα, μπορούν να βγάλουν συμπεράσματα ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι ένωση του κεφαλαίου και ότι οι στόχοι που υπηρετεί όλα αυτά τα χρόνια είναι βαθιά αντιλαϊκοί. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ούτε αλλάζει, ούτε βελτιώνεται. Άμεση ανάγκη και διέξοδος είναι να δυναμώσει η λαϊκή πάλη ενάντια στην Ευρώνηση και το καπιταλιστικό σύστημα, για την εργατική εξουσία, με αποδέσμευση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Herbert Reul (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident! Wir sind uns ja einig: Europa hat große Leistungen vollbracht. Das bestreitet eigentlich keiner. Und deshalb ist es wichtig. Es ist aber auch unbestritten, dass Europa offensichtlich in der Zustimmung der Menschen und sogar eines Staates an Zustimmung verloren hat. Da hilft es auch nicht, das gesundzubeten, oder zu beschwören, wie toll dieses Projekt ist. Es hilft auch nichts, von morgens bis abends das kaputtzureden, was gut ist, und nur über das Schlechte zu reden.

Und deshalb, Herr Kommissionspräsident, bin ich Ihnen außerordentlich dankbar für diese Art des Vorgehens, die Sie jetzt gewählt haben: Endlich einmal nicht nur eine Vorlage der Kommission, die sagt: „So wird's gemacht.“, sondern ein nachdenkliches Papier mit Alternativen. Damit hat man die Chance, die Menschen und auch uns alle wieder mitzunehmen auf ein Zukunftsprojekt hin, die Leute zusammenzuführen, darüber nachzudenken, was ist der Vorteil beim Weg A, beim Weg B, beim Weg C oder D, einfach mal abzuwägen, was man dann am Ende will, was man denn noch hinkriegt, wo der gemeinsame Nenner ist. Darum geht es doch im Moment. Und wenn jetzt nur wieder ein Papier vorgelegt wird und jeder betet seine Sachen runter, die einem wichtig sind, rasen wir doch wieder vor die Wand.

Ich finde es außerordentlich intelligent und super hilfreich, dass dieser Weg gewählt wird. Ich glaube, der ist richtig, denn natürlich muss man da einmal ein paar Fragen beantworten, was Europa kann und was Europa nicht kann – der Frage kann man doch nicht ausweichen. Hier wird ständig von dem Thema Jugendarbeitslosigkeit geredet – mit Recht. Und Präsident Juncker hat präzise beschrieben, dass genau dieses Beispiel dazu geeignet ist, zu erklären, warum wir das Ding vor die Wand fahren: Weil wir uns überfordern, weil wir das gar nicht können, was wir da leisten sollen, weil wir gar nicht zuständig sind. Es ist doch viel klüger zu sagen: Was machen wir? Wir machen das, was alle Staaten als klug empfinden, was Europa gemeinsam machen kann, weil ein Staat es alleine nicht mehr hinkriegt. Und um die anderen Sachen muss sich auch jeder zu Hause ein bisschen kümmern.

In diesem Sinne: Herr Präsident Juncker, ich bin Ihnen wahnsinnig dankbar dafür, dass dieser Versuch gemacht wird. Das macht natürlich nur Sinn, wenn wir uns jetzt alle auf diesen Weg einlassen. Wenn jetzt jeder wieder seine Programme runterbetet, dann fährt das vor die Wand. Und wenn beim nächsten Rat wieder nur jeder erzählt, was er will und was er nicht will, ist es auch vorbei.

Herzlichen Dank, das ist eine Riesenchance!

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D). – Mr President, President Juncker, today in Belgium it is *Complimentendag*. Do you know what that means? It means giving compliments to each other, it is a very special day, so let me start with a compliment. You have written a very comprehensible White Paper, something one can easily understand: I can give it to my mother who is 68 years old, or to my daughter who is nine years of age, and they will understand it. It is a good start to a discussion.

But having said that, our Group is also disappointed because, here in Parliament, all of us are elected to prepare the future of Europe, and that means getting into the concerns of Europe, and you know very well what they are. If you look at the great challenges of Europe, they are migration and security, solidarity – or the lack of solidarity – and growing inequalities. You mentioned the social pillar, and, of course, climate change. If you want to address those things – and we need to do that, it is our mutual responsibility – then you need a Union in which we work much more closely together.

So you do not need all these scenarios. We know which scenario we need to prepare the future of Europe.

Pascal Durand (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Juncker, j'aimerais tellement vous croire lorsque vous dites que vous avez l'Europe sociale au cœur et que vous voulez effectivement qu'elle devienne une priorité. Nous sommes tous d'accord ici – vous aviez dit d'ailleurs en prenant vos fonctions que c'était peut-être la Commission de la dernière chance –, nous sommes tous conscients qu'il y a un problème majeur avec l'Union européenne actuellement.

Sans faire de procès d'intention, comment voulez-vous que nous puissions étudier des scénarios de solutions alors que nous n'avons pas partagé de diagnostic commun sur les raisons pour lesquelles l'Union européenne est en crise et en difficulté?

Je n'entrerai pas dans le détail de votre dernier scénario – qui, manifestement, a votre préférence. C'est simplement le même que le premier, sauf qu'on enlève les chaussons pour mettre des baskets, mais on va toujours au même endroit et toujours sur le même chemin.

Monsieur Juncker, nous devons – comme M. Verhofstadt l'a clairement dit – nous poser la question des blocages dans cette Europe et nous demander, pour pouvoir effectivement avancer, quelles sont les réformes que nous devons mettre en œuvre afin de pouvoir transformer cette Union européenne?

Marco Valli (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente Juncker, Lei ha detto nel Suo discorso che la moneta unica, il mercato unico oggi sono al servizio dei cittadini.

Io Le posso dimostrare esattamente il contrario ed è per questo che i cittadini si stanno disaffezionando al progetto, proprio perché c'è questo conflitto di interessi, su cui si fonda l'Unione europea, e il fatto che presenti Lei queste proposte, dopo essere stato il Presidente di un paradiso fiscale – di fatto, il Lussemburgo – per vent'anni, fa salire ulteriormente questa disaffezione dei cittadini verso l'Unione europea e le proposte che potete portare in questo ambito.

Volete veramente che la gente si affezioni al progetto europeo? Allora, partiamo da tre punti fondamentali: primo, liberiamoci da chi ha palesi conflitti d'interesse come Lei; secondo, discutiamo di alternative alla moneta unica e a questo mercato unico, mettendoli veramente al servizio delle persone – non solo dei grandi portatori d'interesse; terzo, coinvolgiamo i cittadini in questo processo. Vogliamo referendum e democrazia diretta che devono essere i pilastri della nuova Europa altrimenti i cittadini si chiederanno sempre: chi comanda l'Europa, noi o le lobby?

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Najbliższa przyszłość, czyli rok 2017, zadecyduje o dalszych losach Unii Europejskiej, czyli odpowie na pytanie „Quo vadis, Europo?”. Będą to wydarzenia krajowe z Europą w tle, bo oprócz uruchomienia procedury Brexitu za dwa tygodnie idą do wyborów Holendrzy, później odbędą się rundy prezydenckie we Francji, a następnie wybory niemieckie. Te wybory i rozstrzygnięcia krajowe będą miały większy wpływ na przyszłość Europy niż nawet najlepiej opracowana biała księga i najlepiej zorganizowane święto 60-lecia traktatów rzymskich – oby było jak najlepiej zorganizowane, ale już święto 50-lecia było raczej świętem elit niż samych Europejczyków. Chociaż te rozstrzygnięcia będą miały charakter krajowy, to jednak agenda tych wyborów będzie w pełni europejska. Migracja, uchodźcy, terrorizm, przyszłość strefy euro, wspólna obronność – to jest ryzyko i to jest szansa. Ryzyko dlatego, że na tym terenie w natarcu były i są siły populistyczne i ksenofobiczne, ale w tym jest również szansa dlatego, że one żyją z lęków autentycznych i realnych, tylko nie dają żadnej prawdziwej odpowiedzi. Takiej odpowiedzi oczekujemy od Komisji – na razie mamy scenariusze, to jeszcze nie jest plan. Ale w przyszłym tygodniu, nie mając jeszcze tego planu, możemy dokonać aktu pożądanej ciągłości pośród wielu niepewności, to znaczy przedłużyć mandat Donalda Tuska jako szefa Rady Europejskiej. Niech tak się stanie.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Juncker, je vous remercie d'avoir choisi le Parlement européen pour présenter votre Livre blanc – Parlement européen qui, vous le savez, vient d'adopter trois rapports qui pourraient apporter une contribution forte au cycle de débats que vous venez d'ouvrir.

En ce qui concerne ce Livre blanc, je vois bien que vous étiez obligé de mettre sur la table plusieurs scénarios. Il me semble qu'il n'y en a qu'un qui soit vraiment viable. Il a besoin d'être nourri; il doit être la base à partir de laquelle nous convaincrions nos électeurs – les citoyens européens – que c'est la voie à suivre.

L'année 2017 est une année que vous avez définie dans toute son amplitude jusqu'à sa conclusion au Conseil européen de décembre, et c'est ce chemin que nous devons accompagner. Or, sur ce chemin, il y a des rendez-vous électoraux, et je vois votre Livre blanc – que vous nous présentez ici, au Parlement européen, alors que nous-mêmes avons déjà apporté nos contributions pour nourrir cette réflexion – comme une interpellation des capitales.

Il faut que les questions et les scénarios que vous présentez soient perçus comme des alternatives dans chacune des capitales au moment où les États membres se prononceront pour dire ce qu'ils veulent pour eux-mêmes, mais aussi où ils choisissent de dire ce qu'ils veulent pour l'Europe.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente Juncker, Lei oggi ci presenta un Libro bianco sul futuro dell'Unione.

Se aveste il coraggio di scrutare la vostra coscienza, dovrete presentarcene anche un altro: il Libro nero del passato recente, delle diseguaglianze, della povertà e dell'esclusione sociale. Il punto di partenza è ciò che l'Europa può fare? Glielo dico io, cosa deve fare: cambiare politiche e finalità in tutti i vostri scenari. Vuole un esempio? Nella vostra risposta unica alle migrazioni, cancellate la già scarsa flessibilità dell'attuale Dublino, non esiste un meccanismo di redistribuzione preventivo obbligatorio e permanente. La vostra solidarietà esiste solo a parole, perché le regole diranno altro.

La vostra difesa comune non punta alla riduzione dei costi e dei doppioni per reinvestire i risparmi nel sociale, ma si basa invece sull'aumento della spesa per costruire una superpotenza militare che per ora è priva persino di un interesse veramente comune e quando critica la Turchia – Presidente – si ricordi che quell'accordo illegale con Ankara, l'ha voluto Lei e la Sua Commissione, senza neanche un voto di questo Parlamento. Come sempre, chiedete solo più strumenti per imporre meglio le politiche sbagliate e gli errori di questi anni. Alla vostra mancanza di autocritica, ai vostri carri davanti ai buoi, noi diciamo no. Perché senza una vera Europa sociale, non c'è Europa, ma l'Europa sociale qui ancora non c'è.

Franck Proust (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, il y a ceux qui s'affirment et ceux qui se résignent, il y a les réalistes et ceux qui jouent sur les peurs, il y a ceux qui travaillent pour l'avenir avec pragmatisme et ceux qui s'isolent. Croire en l'Europe, ce n'est pas une option, c'est une nécessité. Mais croire ne suffit pas: il faut agir, car l'instabilité géopolitique actuelle nous pousse à réinventer notre projet.

La Commission européenne esquisse aujourd'hui différents scénarios pour l'avenir de l'Europe. Cette réflexion, nous allons la mener à vos côtés, avec pragmatisme et sans dogmatisme. Les vendeurs de rêves doivent le comprendre. Ici, au Parlement, nous travaillons pour construire une Europe qui agit et qui gagne. Le Brexit éveillera les consciences. Oui, les négociations seront difficiles, mais elles doivent l'être, car l'Europe à la carte n'est pas une solution. J'ai confiance en Michel Barnier pour mener à bien ce processus, et les Britanniques et tous les Européens se rendront compte de ce que perd le Royaume-Uni en quittant l'Union européenne.

Soixante ans après la signature du traité de Rome, une seule question doit guider notre action: quelle Europe voulons-nous vraiment? Préparer l'avenir de l'Europe, c'est agir sur des priorités sans naïveté pour le renforcement de la sécurité et de la lutte contre le terrorisme, pour un contrôle accru de nos frontières, pour aller chercher la croissance là où elle se trouve, à l'extérieur, en promouvant une défense commerciale intelligente, et pour une relance de la politique industrielle.

Il faudra du courage pour affronter les mensonges de tous ceux qui rêvent de la fin de l'Europe. Ils proposent l'affaiblissement de notre continent et de nos États, mais nous, nous travaillons au renforcement d'une communauté de destins qui protège et, surtout, qui soit respectée dans le monde.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Juncker, vous avez raison, dans les gouvernements des États membres, il n'y a pas de volonté collective et il faut le montrer du doigt. Vous avez raison aussi lorsque vous dites que l'Union européenne n'est pas une évidence, et vous avez raison de lancer un appel pour reconstruire le consensus européen. Mais vous avez tort de ne pas montrer le chemin, car les ennemis de l'Europe, ceux qui s'attaquent à nos valeurs, ne vont pas s'arrêter, ils ne vont pas attendre la fin de nos délibérations.

Monsieur Juncker, je vous suggère donc d'agir, de montrer le chemin, d'avoir le courage de marquer du sceau européen les solutions que les citoyens attendent de nous.

Il nous faut du courage. Vous savez, Monsieur Juncker, la mélancolie n'a jamais réussi à changer les choses. Je vous ai trouvé un peu triste. Il nous faut du courage, à vous et à nous, parce que dehors, les citoyens attendent une réaction.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). – Herr talman! Åter en gång har jag lyssnat till herr Junckers tal; åter igen har jag slagits av hur tröttsamt och uppreparande det är med samma gamla felaktiga lösningar. Det är precis som om man är oförmögen att lägga örten mot marken och lyssna på vad folket i Europa säger. Hälften av Europas befolkning har ingen tilltro till EU längre. Ni ser det i valdeltagandet: 42 procent av Europas befolkning röstade senast.

Och vad har ni för lösning på det? Jo, lösningen är mer EU, mer av samma politik, mer av samma misslyckande som har tagit er hit där ni är idag, när hälften av Europas befolkning inte har tilltro till EU längre. Det måste vara uppenbart att det inte fungerar längre. Det måste vara uppenbart att det krävs nya tag. Fortsätter man i denna riktning är EU dömt att misslyckas, i den form vi ser idag.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Juncker. You are right, Mr Juncker, that we are standing at a crossroads, not because of Brexit – which I am very sorry about – but because of a lack of agreement between Union members and because of the unwillingness or inability of many politicians to explain the importance of the Union for the future. So we are in a situation where every kind of future is possible. It will depend on our decision and on the decision of every European.

We need to understand the achievements we have made in recent decades. We should also understand the weaknesses that we are now facing and we must be fully aware of the consequences of each decision. By presenting the White Paper, Mr Juncker, you are forcing us to understand what the options at this crossroads are. I believe that this White Paper will help us to decide, correctly and wisely, about our future in developing the joint project of a joint Europe for the good of us all and of our people.

Jeppe Kofod (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to thank President Juncker for this White Paper. We need a strong Europe and we need leadership on the challenges of globalisation that no country can deal with by itself. That is clear. We need to harvest the good side of globalisation but we also need to deal with the negative side.

We need a solidarity pact between the European Member States and the EU as such, to stop the race to the bottom, for example on tax and corporate taxation. We can see that there is a race to the bottom on tax payment, we can see the EUR 1 trillion cost every year of tax evasion and tax avoidance in Europe: EUR 2000 per citizen per year, money that could be spent to protect our welfare state.

We also need to stop the race to the bottom on workers' rights, decent salaries and decent working conditions. So we need a solidarity pact that can protect the worker in the age of globalisation, and we need leadership on the migration crisis, not only patrolling our EU external borders but also fighting the root causes of migration and the refugee crisis, which is the biggest refugee crisis since the Second World War.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, in the times we are living in we need a strong Europe, but we also need to understand that visions are more than institutions. Visions are never about institutions.

Sometimes I feel that we underestimate how much we have achieved in recent decades: reunification, the single market, what could be the most competitive global economy if we take the right decisions, the fact that we can create financial stability and ensure we have the scientific research that can make us leaders, and the fact we have such a strong political identity that other parts of the world and our neighbours lean towards our values. That is what we are capable of.

We have achieved not just unification: we have achieved the opportunities to take decisions. Sometimes I feel that we lack the real political will to take these decisions because we fall into the trap of ever-ongoing discussions about institutions to replace the old institutions. We do, of course, need to discuss the balance of powers, but we can do that only if we put unity before uniformity and accept that Europe's strength is plurality, openness, the safeguarding of our values and the eagerness and willingness to take political decisions to make the visions come true.

That is more important than these discussions about institutions. They are very important, but the vision of a strong Europe is stronger.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, I have really tried to understand President Juncker's approach today, but I have to say that I have difficulties. I am not sure if it is the right one.

You have spoken about five scenarios, Mr Juncker, and you are actually referring the decision to the national capitals. I know that the Commission does not have the power to discuss levels of integration but I think that, more than ever, we need clear leadership, with vision and concrete proposals. I agree with you that we need a sincere, open dialogue with our citizens and collective motivation but, again, I hope that the way you choose today is the right one.

My strong vision is like yours: to have a Europe that is not divided; to have an open and modern Europe, peaceful and with real security and wellbeing for everyone.

One thing I would like to say is that the biggest priority for Socialists and Democrats is the asylum system, with genuine reform of the Dublin arrangements, and I do not see that as an absolute priority of this Commission. Also, when we speak about immigration, we need a system truly based on solidarity. We have to go back to a fully restored Schengen and not have border controls: there are no grounds for having them introduced.

Viviane Reding (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, je crois qu'il faut choisir notre voie, et au plus vite. Je suis d'accord avec ceux qui disent que discuter, discuter, discuter... ne mène à rien. Il faut agir, et puis l'Europe à la carte, cela suffit!

Le sursaut dont l'Europe a besoin ne peut venir que d'un noyau de pays européens prêts à aller de l'avant vers une Europe de la sécurité, mais avec des instruments communs, vers une Europe de la paix, avec des capacités de défense commune et un véritable ministre des affaires étrangères, vers une Europe de la prospérité, avec un budget digne de ce nom pour investir dans la jeunesse, dans le progrès social et dans les infrastructures numériques et énergétiques, vers une Europe de la liberté, avec la conditionnalité des Fonds européens au respect du droit et des valeurs de l'Union, et vers une Europe de la démocratie, avec un président directement élu et un Conseil des ministres statuant à la majorité simple.

Pour relever ces défis, nous devons reformer l'Europe autour de ceux qui ont de l'ambition pour notre Union. Alors, réformons l'Europe avec des actions communes et concrètes. La souveraineté des générations futures, leur capacité à décider de leurs propres règles et à maîtriser leur propre destin en dépend.

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ciascuno dei primi quattro scenari che Lei ha indicato – signor Presidente – contiene elementi di verità.

La dinamica incrementale innescata dal trattato di Lisbona non va sottovalutata, il mercato interno resta la nostra leva più potente, l'integrazione differenziata è uno strumento fondamentale che già esiste, e sussidiarietà e proporzionalità sono principi che si possono e si devono implementare meglio. Tuttavia, è evidente che solo facendo di più e insieme in alcune aree fondamentali, potremo affrontare le sfide che abbiamo dinanzi a noi.

In particolare, è evidente che occorre completare l'Unione economica e monetaria, se vogliamo renderla sostenibile e fattore di crescita. Per chi condivide la stessa moneta, ridurre la disoccupazione non è un optional ma una necessità, altrimenti vincerà chi pensa che occorre recuperare sovranità monetaria e svalutare. Il Parlamento ha mostrato che è possibile farlo sulla base dei trattati esistenti e conservando l'unità del quadro giuridico dell'Unione e ha proposto di realizzare uno scambio tra convergenza rafforzata delle politiche economiche e costruzione di una capacità fiscale per sostenere gli investimenti e assorbire gli shock.

Capiamo che il momento politico ha consigliato di rinviare questa discussione, ma essa non può essere lasciata cadere e il Parlamento europeo farà sentire forte la sua voce.

Victor Boştinaru (S&D). – Domnule preşedinte, vorbesc în numele delegaţilor social-democrate ale statelor deja vechi „noi membre” ale Uniunii Europene.

Evaluarea Comisiei, chiar dacă poate fi tehnic corectă, mă îngrijorează. Responsabilitatea primordială a Comisiei e aceea de a asigura leadership și direcția evoluției Uniunii Europene, nu aceea de a fi un think-tank. Într-unul din cele mai dramatice momente ale Uniunii Europene reafirmarea solidarității între toate statele membre reprezintă un imperativ. Da, solidaritate, inclusiv prin prezervarea unei politici de coeziune solide.

Noi ne opunem ideii unei Europe cu două sau mai multe viteze, care este periculoasă, iar momentul ales pentru prezentarea ei este cel mai nepotrivit cu putință. Această propunere nu poate decât să genereze noi diviziuni, îngrijorare, frustrări și chiar umilință, inclusiv în societăți profund convinse de importanța proiectului european și dispuse să coopereze loial și în toate formele pentru consolidarea Uniunii Europene, așa cum este cea din țara mea.

Așa că, domnule președinte, nu vă asumați această direcție de acțiune. Ea nu poate decât să creeze noi disensiuni și tensiuni între statele membre și va avea cu siguranță un impact negativ asupra alegerilor europene din 2019 care ar putea să devină o amenințare pentru proiectul european.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, rozhodně tato bílá kniha jako analýza možných scénářů je lepší než zpráva o reformě institucí, kterou jsme nedávno přijali. Konečně nabízí scénáře, které jsou realistické. Nenalhávejme občanům, že zajistíme to, co zajistit nemůžeme, protože Evropská unie k některým věcem nemá kompetence.

Evropská unie samotná přece nemůže zajistit pracovní místa pro všechny, nemůže zajistit bydlení pro všechny, dát garanci za péči o bydlení pro všechny děti a mladé lidi. Evropská unie nemůže přijmout všechny uprchlíky, kteří chtějí bezpečný život.

Občané Evropské unie velmi dobře rozumí tomu, že Evropská unie všechno toto zajistit prostě nemůže. Ale očekávají, že Evropská unie prostřednictvím svých institucí a prostřednictvím vlád národních států bude dělat to, co dělat musí a co vyplývá ze závazků, které jednotlivé státy přijaly. To znamená, že Evropská unie musí zajistit fungování volného pohybu osob, služeb, zboží a v situaci ohrožení bude chránit bezpečnost svých občanů a bude reagovat na to, aby byla připravena na ochranu svých vnějších hranic.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie Presidente Juncker per aver voluto presentare qui in Parlamento europeo il Libro Bianco sul futuro dell'Europa.

Penso che questo Libro bianco possa aiutare a far sì che il vertice di Roma non sia solo un'occasione celebrativa dei sessant'anni, ma anche una riunione nella quale si parli veramente del rilancio dell'Europa. Ha detto bene Presidente Juncker, va posto fine alle continue critiche all'Unione europea. È tempo di rilanciare l'Europa unita a 27, fare di più e farlo tutti insieme, perseguendo l'idea di un'Europa a grande velocità e non a due velocità. È questo l'unico scenario possibile per un'Unione possibile, lo scenario migliore per il futuro dell'Europa.

A questo Libro bianco sul futuro dell'Unione dovranno seguire relazioni sulle singole questioni: la zona euro, il pilastro sociale, il bilancio comunitario, la lotta al cambiamento climatico, il patto di stabilità e crescita, la politica estera e di sicurezza, relazioni da adattare al tipo di integrazione che dovrebbe essere poi fatta propria dagli Stati membri. Insomma, spero davvero – Presidente Juncker – che il Libro bianco da Lei presentato sul futuro dell'Unione possa rappresentare il certificato di nascita dell'Europa a 27.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αφού ο παλιός πολιτικός κόσμος της Ευρώπης απέτυχε, αφού γέμισε την Ευρώπη με εκατομμύρια φτωχούς, αφού γέμισε την Ευρώπη με στρατιές ανέργων, αφού τα έκανε θάλασσα, τώρα ρίχνει λευκή πετσέτα, εγκαταλείπει, κι όχι μόνο αυτό, αλλά ρίχνει τα βάρη στους ίδιους τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς.

Τώρα θυμήθηκε τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς ο κύριος Juncker και ζητάει την άποψή τους, τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς που συνεχώς επιμένουν ότι πρέπει να σταματήσει η λιτότητα, πρέπει να υπάρξει δίκαιη κατανομή του πλούτου που παράγεται στην Ευρώπη, τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς που ζητούν τη διαγραφή του χρέους γιατί η Ευρώπη έχει μετατραπεί σε μια Ευρώπη δανειστών, σε μια Ευρώπη όπου ορισμένα κράτη είναι οφειλέτες και ορισμένα άλλα κράτη είναι δίδην δανειστές, τους ευρωπαϊκούς λαούς που ζητούν το σεβασμό της δημοκρατίας, την οποία δεν σέβεται η τρόικα στην Ελλάδα και σε άλλες χώρες. Ζητούν το σεβασμό της εθνικής κυριαρχίας, ζητούν το σεβασμό πολλών πραγμάτων, ζητούν το σεβασμό των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων.

Αυτά, λοιπόν, έχασε ο κύριος Juncker να μας πει. Αυτή, λοιπόν, είναι η απάντησή του; Οι λαοί απαιτούν αλλαγή στην Ευρώπη.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, este Livro Branco sobre o futuro da União Europeia parte de premissas erradas, parte de um diagnóstico errado da atual situação, que ignora as raízes da crise e do progressivo afastamento das populações face a este processo de integração.

Hoje, camadas cada vez mais amplas da população e dos trabalhadores veem na União Europeia um problema e uma ameaça aos seus rendimentos e aos seus direitos. E este pensamento não decorre de nenhuma avaliação subjetiva – decorre da aplicação concreta das políticas da União Europeia, que impuseram aos povos da Europa os cortes salariais, os aumentos de impostos, as privatizações e a degradação das funções sociais do Estado.

Ao mesmo tempo, esta mesma Europa favorece os grandes grupos económicos, com políticas à medida dos seus interesses. Aqui reside a causa do euroceticismo, mas também as razões da estagnação económica e do crescimento das desigualdades sociais. Sem reconhecer esta realidade, não haverá Livro Branco que possa resolver os problemas da Europa.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Köszönöm szépen kedves Tajani elnök úr, nem azért fogok önről szépeket mondani mert szót adott, de azt is köszönöm, de ezt már előre elterveztem, hogy szépet fogok mondani, ugyanis remek volt az önnel készült interjú a német sajtóban a migrációval kapcsolatban. Remélem Juncker úr is olvasta, mert ő ugye él-hal azért, hogy az európai embereknek a gondolatait, szemléletét megismerje, hát most a migrációval kapcsolatban megismerhette, Tajani úr ugyanis pontosan azt közvetítette, amit a humánusan gondolkodó európai emberek a menekültkérdésről és a bevándorlásról gondolnak.

Két pillér, az egyik, hogy gyökerében kell a problémát kezelni, tehát mondjuk Afrikában, meg a nyomorúságos szegény országokban, a gazdaság stabilizálását kell elérni. A másik pedig, hogy akik viszont menekülnek, háborúból vagy egyéb közvetlen veszélyből, őket a lakóhelyükhöz minél közelebb, a saját földrészükhöz kell lehetőség szerint biztonságba helyezni, normális emberi körülmények között, orvosi ellátással, gyógyszerekhez hozzáféréssel, satöbbi.

Rögtön tudtam, hogy ezen ki fognak készülni egyes képviselőtársaim. Kérdezem önöket, miért ilyen hisztérikusan reagálnak, miért beszélnek itt koncentrációs táborról, miért akarják önök mindenáron a sokmilliós bevándorlást rákényszeríteni Európára? Ha tényleg biztonságot akarnak ezeknek a nyomorult embereknek, akkor miért nem hiszik el, hogy ez a jó megoldás, amit Tajani mondott?

(Fine della procedura «catch-the-eye»)

Jean-Claude Juncker, Président de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, je dois dire que les débats se suivent et se ressemblent. Les débats au Parlement européen ont ceci de particulier qu'on n'écoute pas ceux qui ont parlé, mais qu'on lit le texte qu'on avait préparé. C'est cela un débat? C'est le contraire. Je ne vais donc pas me répéter, parce qu'on ne m'écouterait pas une deuxième fois. Vous lirez, c'est peut-être plus facile que d'écouter.

À ceux qui pensent que la Commission a mal choisi son sujet, je répondrai simplement qu'en Europe, il ne faut jamais essayer d'innover. Trop nombreux sont les classiques, les traditionalistes, les réactionnaires et les conservateurs qui n'acceptent pas qu'on change de méthode.

On a critiqué la méthode qui fut, celle qui consistait en des propositions de la Commission parfois réfléchies mais jamais discutées avec le grand public. Maintenant, la Commission propose autre chose: nous soumettons à la méditation de tous, y compris de cette assemblée, différents scénarii, qui ne trouvent pas tous mon approbation – vous avez bien senti que, parmi les options que nous présentons, il y en a une qui me plaît beaucoup plus que les quatre autres.

Mais si nous n'en présentions qu'une, nous tuerions le débat. On crie sur tous les toits d'Europe qu'il faut débattre, qu'il faut que nous retrouvions le chemin vers nos concitoyens, nos électeurs – qui sont des citoyens et pas seulement des électeurs – et lorsqu'on le fait, on le critique. Mais «merde!», dirais-je si on n'était pas au Parlement européen. Que voulez-vous que nous fassions?

Le groupe socialiste – et mon ami Gianni qui n'est plus là, alors que normalement il est présent – critique la Commission pour ne pas avoir dit quelle option aurait sa préférence. Alors, je voudrais tout de même, en toute amitié, que le groupe socialiste, d'ici quinze jours, en identifiant ceux qui sont pour l'option 1, 2, 3, 4 ou 5, me fasse parvenir son opinion sur la question. N'oubliez pas de parler aux Premiers ministres socialistes, ne l'oubliez surtout pas. Vous n'êtes pas Premiers ministres, malheureusement pour vos pays, mais ils le sont et pensent le contraire de ce que vous dites.

Le Président. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

José Blanco López (S&D), *por escrito.* – Es preocupante la falta de impulso al proyecto europeo que percibimos en la Comisión y sobre todo en el Consejo. Llegamos al aniversario del Tratado de Roma con una falta notable de ambición y de perspectiva y, sobre todo, de soluciones a los problemas reales de los ciudadanos europeos. Al frente de la Unión se debe trabajar con ambición, concreción y determinación. Los gobiernos de los Estados miembros no demuestran voluntad colectiva de reconstruir el consenso, principal motor de la Unión. Es especialmente importante consolidar ese consenso político europeísta para mantener viable el proyecto europeo, tras el *brexit* y la tensión con los nacionalistas/populistas. La Comisión debe seguir marcando el camino del proceso. El libro blanco sobre el futuro de la UE es un ejercicio de prospectiva insuficiente para ver claramente qué futuro tiene Europa y si merece la pena seguir confiando en él. Los ciudadanos esperamos soluciones que requieren acción y coraje. El libro blanco no necesariamente las recoge, es un mapa de opciones teóricas. En nuestra opinión, la Comisión debería haber establecido un diagnóstico sobre lo que no funciona en la UE y los Estados miembros mostrar una clara voluntad política para avanzar hacia una Europa más fuerte.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito.* – Nos preocupa la falta de impulso al proyecto europeo que percibimos en la Comisión y sobre todo en el Consejo. Llegamos al aniversario del Tratado de Roma con una falta notable de ambición y de perspectiva, y sobre todo de falta de soluciones a los problemas reales de los ciudadanos europeos. Al frente de la Unión se debe trabajar con ambición, concreción y determinación. Los gobiernos de los Estados miembros no demuestran voluntad colectiva de reconstruir el consenso, principal motor de la Unión. Es especialmente importante consolidar ese consenso político europeísta para mantener viable el proyecto europeo, tras el *brexit* y la tensión con los nacionalistas/populistas. La Comisión debe seguir marcando el camino del proceso. El libro blanco sobre el futuro de la UE es un ejercicio de prospectiva insuficiente para ver claramente qué futuro tiene Europa y si merece la pena seguir confiando en él. Los ciudadanos esperamos soluciones que requieren acción y coraje. El libro blanco no necesariamente las recoge, es un mapa de opciones teóricas. En nuestra opinión la Comisión debería haber establecido un diagnóstico sobre lo que no funciona en la UE, y los Estados miembros mostrar una clara voluntad política para avanzar hacia una Europa más fuerte.

Lorenzo Cesa (PPE), *per iscritto.* – La Commissione europea guardiana dei Trattati, ci pone davanti uno scenario con cinque ipotesi possibili per il futuro dell'Europa. Adesso tocca al Parlamento europeo, come espressione della volontà dei cittadini, aprire una discussione sulla base di queste ipotesi, per trovare una risposta alle sfide che la nostra Unione affronta. Dalle nostre discussioni, dovrà scaturire l'Europa che vogliamo.

La direzione ormai più auspicabile da prendere è quella di una Europa a più velocità, una Europa differenziata che avanzi rapidamente e in maniera efficace coinvolgendo gli Stati che chiedono maggior integrazione. Questa soluzione ha una sua logica a sé stante, le sfide sono tante e l'Europa unita, in quanto prima potenza economica del mondo, ha una responsabilità a livello internazionale che non può ignorare. Dobbiamo evitare però di lasciare indietro qualcuno, ricordando i nostri valori: Europa significa principalmente solidarietà.

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), *schriftlich.* – Ich befürworte das Vorgehen des Kommissionspräsidenten und seinen gewählten Ansatz. Das Weißbuch stellt die richtige Grundlage für eine breite Debatte dar, die wir in den kommenden Monaten führen müssen – und zwar unter Einbeziehung aller Beteiligten: der europäischen Institutionen, der nationalen Parlamente, der Regionen und Kommunen und der gesamte Zivilgesellschaft. Die fünf möglichen Szenarien skizzieren verschiedene Optionen, wo die Union in Zukunft stehen könnte. Für mich ist klar: Europa muss sich bewusst sein, dass es nur als geeintes Europa nicht in der Bedeutungslosigkeit versinkt; was aber nicht heißen kann, dass jeglicher nationaler und kultureller Unterschied nivelliert werden muss. Insofern gilt das Leitmotto von Juncker unverändert: Europa muss stark in den großen Dingen sein und sich in den kleinen Dingen zurücknehmen.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos preocupa la falta de impulso al proyecto europeo que percibimos en la Comisión y sobre todo en el Consejo. Llegamos al aniversario del Tratado de Roma con una falta notable de ambición y de soluciones a los problemas reales de los ciudadanos europeos.

Al frente de la Unión se debe trabajar con ambición, concreción y determinación. Los gobiernos de los Estados miembros no demuestran voluntad colectiva de reconstruir el consenso, principal motor de la Unión. Es especialmente importante consolidar ese consenso político europeísta para mantener viable el proyecto europeo tras el *brexit* y la tensión con los nacionalistas/populistas.

La Comisión debe marcar el camino del proceso. El Libro Blanco sobre el futuro de la UE es un ejercicio de prospectiva insuficiente para ver claramente qué futuro tiene Europa y si merece la pena seguir confiando en él. Los ciudadanos esperamos soluciones que requieren acción y coraje. El Libro Blanco no necesariamente las recoge, es un mapa de opciones teóricas.

En nuestra opinión, la Comisión debería haber establecido un diagnóstico sobre lo que no funciona en la UE y haber ofrecido soluciones concretas.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos preocupa la falta de impulso al proyecto europeo que percibimos en la Comisión y sobre todo en el Consejo. Llegamos al aniversario del Tratado de Roma con una falta notable de ambición y de perspectiva, y sobre todo de falta de soluciones a los problemas reales de los ciudadanos europeos. Al frente de la Unión se debe trabajar con ambición, concreción y determinación. Los gobiernos de los Estados miembros no demuestran voluntad colectiva de reconstruir el consenso, principal motor de la Unión. Es especialmente importante consolidar ese consenso político europeísta para mantener viable el proyecto europeo, tras el *brexit* y la tensión con los nacionalistas/populistas. La Comisión debe seguir marcando el camino del proceso. El libro blanco sobre el futuro de la UE es un ejercicio de prospectiva insuficiente para ver claramente qué futuro tiene Europa y si merece la pena seguir confiando en él. Los ciudadanos esperamos soluciones que requieren acción y coraje. El libro blanco no necesariamente las recoge, es un mapa de opciones teóricas. En nuestra opinión la Comisión debería haber establecido un diagnóstico sobre lo que no funciona en la UE, y los Estados miembros mostrar una clara voluntad política para avanzar hacia una Europa más fuerte.

Barbara Kappel (ENF), *schriftlich*. – Heute wurde von Kommissionspräsident Jean-Claude Juncker ein Weißbuch mit fünf Szenarien für die Zukunft der Europäischen Union präsentiert, in welchem Wege zur Wahrung der Einheit der EU-27 aufgezeigt werden sollen. Drei der beschriebenen Wege bzw. Szenarien würden einem Realitätstest unter den aktuellen politischen Rahmenbedingungen wohl kaum standhalten, während zwei davon einer näheren Betrachtung bedürfen: Das erste Szenario, mit dem Namen „Those who want more do more“, skizziert ein Europa der Willigen, welche in bestimmten Politikbereichen verstärkt zusammenarbeiten, um gemeinsam schneller voranzuschreiten. Eine Vorgehensweise, die auch heute schon durch das im Vertrag von Lissabon vorgesehene Instrument der „Ständigen Strukturierten Zusammenarbeit“ möglich ist. Im zweiten Szenario, mit dem Namen „Doing less more efficiently“, fokussiert die Europäische Union ihre Ressourcen auf eine ausgewählte Anzahl von „großen“, d. h. bedeutenden Themenfeldern und überlässt andere den Mitgliedstaaten. Eines dieser Themenfelder könnte beispielsweise eine gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik darstellen. Abschließend lässt sich festhalten, dass dieses Weißbuch und die Aussprache über die Zukunft der Europäischen Union zwar wichtig und aufgrund der ergebnisoffenen Herangehensweise auch erfreulich ist, jedoch reichlich spät kommt. Taktische Überlegungen in Bezug auf das anstehende Wahljahr 2017 dürften ein wesentlicher Grund für diese Aussprache sein.

Miapetra Kumpula-Natri (S&D), *kirjallinen*. – Nähdäkseni meillä on tasan yksi järkevä vaihtoehto: EU:n ja yhteistyön vahvistaminen. Maailmanpolitiikka on epästabiilissa tilassa, eikä Euroopan todellakaan kannata nyt ryhtyä itse heikentämään itseään.

Eurooppalaiset populistit ovat väläyttelleet mahdollisuutta kaventaa eurooppalaista yhteistyötä niin, että ainoastaan sisämarkkinat jätettäisiin ja poliittinen yhteistyö karsittaisiin pois. Näin ei missään tapauksessa pidä tehdä – ei, vaikka pelkäisi populistien menestyvän kansallisissa vaaleissa. Jos EU:sta riisutaan politiikka, jää käteen vain rahan etu. Silloin esimerkiksi ihmisten ja ympäristön hyvinvointi, kuluttajansuoja, työntekijöiden suoja, veronkiertoa vastaan taistelu ja muut erittäin tärkeät asiat jäisivät pois.

Javi López (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nos preocupa la falta de impulso al proyecto europeo que percibimos en la Comisión y en el Consejo. Llegamos al aniversario del Tratado de Roma con una falta notable de ambición y de perspectiva, y sobre todo de falta de soluciones a los problemas reales de los ciudadanos europeos. Al frente de la Unión se debe trabajar con ambición, concreción y determinación. Los gobiernos de los Estados miembros no demuestran voluntad colectiva de reconstruir el consenso, principal motor de la Unión. Es especialmente importante consolidar ese consenso político europeísta para mantener viable el proyecto europeo, tras el *brexit* y la tensión con los nacionalistas/populistas. La Comisión debe seguir marcando el camino del proceso. El libro blanco sobre el futuro de la UE es un ejercicio de prospectiva insuficiente para ver claramente qué futuro tiene Europa y si merece la pena seguir confiando en él. Los ciudadanos esperamos soluciones que requieran acción y coraje. El libro blanco no necesariamente las recoge, es un mapa de opciones teóricas. En nuestra opinión la Comisión debería haber establecido un diagnóstico sobre lo que no funciona en la UE, y los Estados miembros mostrar una clara voluntad política para avanzar hacia una Europa más fuerte.

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Prin propunerile Comisiei Europene pentru viitorul UE, cuprinse într-un document numit „Carta Albă”, se va decide până la sfârșitul anului asupra viitoarei direcții a Uniunii. Cele cinci scenarii de lucru nu sunt exhaustive și nici nu se exclud unul pe altul și consider că documentul nu propune o Europă cu două viteze, deoarece fiecare stat membru are posibilitatea de a se integra sau nu.

Această viitoare Cartă Albă va încerca să introducă niște reguli noi la care statul membru poate adera sau nu, intrând astfel într-o categorie sau alta. De exemplu, referitor la fondul de securitate constituit după criză, fiecare stat membru a avut posibilitatea de a adera, acesta fiind și cazul României.

Consider că această Carte Albă va propune un mecanism de aderare similar. Și, nu în ultimul rând, Uniunea Europeană funcționează cu o nouă procedură pentru votul cu majoritate calificată, iar aproximativ 80% din întreaga legislație a UE este adoptată prin această procedură. Acest lucru limitează posibilitatea formării unei despărțiri nete, în două categorii, a statelor membre.

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR), *kirjallinen*. – Euroalue on ollut erilaisten talouskriisien kourissa pian puolet siitä ajasta, jona euro on ollut käytössä. Nykyisenlainen kompromissieuro on osoittautunut kestäättömäksi kokeiluksi. Asia tehtiin selväksi jo viiden presidentin kertomuksessa. Siinä suosittelut muutokset olivat suurisuuntaisia ja toistaiseksi voimassa oleviin EU:n perussopimukseen verrattuna radikaaleja. Lähtökohta, että jos euro ei voi mukautua erilaisten euromaiden tarpeisiin, on jäsenmaiden mukauduttava euron edellytyksiin, edustaa sanelupolitiikkaa, jota toteutetaan euromaiden kansalaisten hyvinvoinnin kustannuksella.

Parlamentti on viime aikoina saanut eteensä vain vaihtoehtoja liittovaltioon etenemisen edistämiseksi. Ota tai jätä -valintatilanne johtaa skenaarioon 1. Se ei ole vahvistanut Eurooppaa, kuten on todettu. Valitettavasti integraation syventäminenkään ei ole tehnyt Eurooppaa vahvemmaksi, vaan integraation syventäminen talouden kustannuksella on aika ajoin tuonut mieleen Neuvostoliiton. Eurooppa on vahva vain, jos sen talous on vahva. Mahdollisesti joidenkin jäsenmaiden voi olla tarpeen itse vahvistaa talouttaan euroeron avulla. Markkinoiden häiriöttömän toiminnan, talouskasvun ja työllisyyden varmistamiseksi on tärkeää luoda viralliset väylät eurosta eroamiselle niille, jotka siihen vaihtoehtoon päätyvät. Vain siten voidaan taata markkinoiden nopea rauhoittuminen ja eurooppalaisten hyvinvointi.

Alfred Sant (S&D), *in writing*. – It might make sense to open the discussion about the future of Europe with a discussion about its past, its history. Frequently I get the feeling, in this Parliament and elsewhere, that such discussions too often take exclusively an ideological perspective – that of pilgrims intent on reaching the new Jerusalem. Moreover they get bound to technocratic approaches that are grounded in neo-liberalism. Even the social dimension, when it is included, gets relegated to a policy chapter, calibrated in positivist terms.

Perhaps what we need is a self-critical, historical review of what the European project has been, set in a framework of the realities of European history since the French Revolution. Perhaps what we need is an acknowledgement and examination of the failures as well as the achievements of the European project over the last sixty years – seen not in contingent terms but as strategic responses undertaken in historical time. These need to be reinforced if their outcome was good for the European peoples, and reversed where they have been mistaken. Decisions about the future of Europe must be built on an honest, critical assessment of our recent past. Unfortunately, this terrain has been abandoned to populists and demagogues.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Európska únia stojí po tzv. brexite na križovatke a musíme sa rozhodnúť, akou cestou sa vydáme. Z hľadiska záujmov Slovenska je pre nás nepripustný každý variant, ktorý ráta s dvojrýchlostnou Európou, ale aj taký, ktorý predpokladá federalizáciu Európskej únie. Žiaden z predložených variantov nie je konečný. Európska únia by sa v budúcnosti mala sústrediť na pozitívnu agendu, ktorá prináša občanom a firmám konkrétne výsledky. Príkladom je energetická únia a jednotný digitálny trh. Mala by sa tiež prehlbovať integrácia spoločného trhu a posilniť mechanizmus dodržiavania pravidiel v rámci eurozóny. Európa tiež potrebuje spoločne čeliť súčasným výzvam, ako je masová migrácia, bezpečnostné riziká vyplývajúce z terorizmu a ruskej rozpínavosti a hrozba globálnych obchodných vojen. Na to potrebujeme účinné a efektívne nástroje v podobe úradov, ako je európska pohraničná a pobrežná stráž a, samozrejme, konsenzus v otázkach zahraničnej a obchodnej politiky. Naopak Európska komisia aj Parlament by mali celkom opustiť pole kultúrnych a etických otázok a nič neriešiacich vyhlásení a rezolúcií k rôznym podružným témam. Osobne sa prikláňam ku kombinácii variantov číslo jedna a štyri. Otvára možnosť pre širokú celospoločenskú diskusiu, ktorú akútne potrebujeme. Správne nastavenie priorit a ich dôsledné dodržiavanie môže Európsku úniu naštartovať a znížiť vnútorné trenia medzi jednotlivými členskými štátmi.

Iuliu Winkler (PPE), în scris. – „Quo vadis Europa celor 27?“, este întrebarea lansată astăzi de Președintele Comisiei în plenul reunit la Bruxelles.

Prezentând Carta albă despre viitorul UE, Președintele Juncker a trecut în revistă cinci scenarii posibile propuse dezbaterei publice: de la o Uniune cât mai profund integrată politic la varianta Europei cu două viteze, coșmarul statelor din estul continentului, și până la o Uniune minimală, redusă la statutul de zonă de comerț liber. Dezbaterea preconizată este mai mult decât necesară.

Cred că miza cea mai importantă este mobilizarea cetățenilor, motivarea lor pentru a participa la consolidarea noii UE, care, pentru întâia oară în istoria ei, își va vedea unul dintre membri plecând. Pentru a avea viitor, UE trebuie să recâștige încrederea cetățenilor ei, proiectul european trebuie să redevină generator de adevărate speranțe și chiar iubire.

Dintre cele cinci scenarii, eu cred în materializarea celui de-al șaselea: Uniunea Europeană a cetățenilor ei. Aceasta este o uniune a regiunilor și comunităților. Reconstructivă pe regiunile ei, UE va deveni mai eficientă și va fi capabilă să pună în valoare economiile locale. Prețuind sincer toate comunitățile sale naționale, etnice și lingvistice, Europa comunităților va pune cetățeanul cu adevărat în centrul reconstrucției sale.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

17. Preparation of the European Council meeting of 9 and 10 March 2017 (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the Council and Commission statements on preparation of the European Council meeting of 9 and 10 March 2017 (2016/3019(RSP)).

Chris Agius, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, honourable Members, the 28 Heads of State or Government will be meeting in Brussels next Thursday, 9 March. On Friday, 27 leaders will discuss their own preparations. I know you had intensive discussions last month on the future of Europe, and I am aware of your contributions. Today, however, I will concentrate on what is expected to happen next week.

The discussions will focus on citizens' main concerns, namely growth, external security and migration. Let me take these subjects one by one. The emphasis will be, first and foremost, on economic issues with a number of important subjects featuring under the title Jobs, Growth and Competitiveness. Against the backdrop of the latest forecasts, leaders will have a political discussion on the economic situation in Europe. The outlook overall is positive. The European Council debate will certainly look at how best to use this positive momentum.

The leaders will also touch upon trade. This subject has come to the forefront lately, not least because of recent declarations on the subject by one of our transatlantic partners. It is therefore a good time for Europe to send a clear signal and reaffirm its belief in free and fair trade and the greater good that comes from sharing its benefits. I will take this occasion to thank you for giving your consent to the deal on the EU-Canada Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA). It was an important step forward for all of us, and it is crucial for the credibility of the Union.

The last element under this economic chapter is the single market. The leaders will look at efforts to deepen the single market in all its dimensions. Together, Parliament and Council have made good headway – most recently concerning the digital single market, with breakthrough agreements on roaming and portability. But a lot remains to be done and, if we are to meet the deadline we have set for ourselves of completing the single market by 2018, there is no time to lose.

The second item on the agenda will be external security and defence. This topic was already discussed last December, as leaders are determined that Europe needs to do more for its own security. A new momentum has developed: in March they will want to reinforce that message and ensure that the whole agenda moves forward as quickly as possible.

Another topic that leaders are following closely is migration. It was added to the agenda after discussions at the last informal meeting in Malta. The leaders want to review what has been done to implement the decisions taken in February and to keep the pressure high, so that efforts are pooled to tackle the Central Mediterranean route. With the start of spring around the corner, leaders want to avoid any repetition of the tragedies of last year. Of course, in parallel, work continues on all elements of the EU's comprehensive approach and we will maintain vigilance on other migratory routes.

There was also another outcome of the Malta summit. The leaders decided to have a political discussion in March on the Western Balkans. Signs coming from that region in recent months are increasingly worrying. Leaders want to dedicate time to discussing the situation in detail and to send a strong signal of EU commitment to the region.

Lastly, the European Council is expected to note the absence of consensus on the European Public Prosecutor's Office proposal, paving the way for reinforced cooperation on the issue.

Thank you very much for your attention. I am looking forward to this debate.

Jyrki Katainen, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, if you will allow, we would like to share this introduction from our side. Commissioner Avramopoulos will go deeper into the migration issue.

But first, we had a very interesting discussion just a little while ago about the future of Europe. It was quite a visionary discussion and next week's Council will not, hopefully, be as visionary because the purpose of next week's Council meeting is rather to concentrate on short-term delivery, which is very important from the point of view of our citizens. The first priority for the Commission next week will be to see the meeting of the leaders in the European Council take concrete steps forward to deliver on jobs, growth and competitiveness.

Unemployment is still too high across Europe, but it is now at its lowest level since 2009. We are moving in the right direction, but risk persists and we are not yet where we want to be. To continue our good progress, the Commission would like to see the European Council give its support next week to the swift extension of the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI). This will allow us to keep investing across Europe in projects which stimulate economic growth and create jobs for Europeans. In one and a half years EFSI has already financed projects worth EUR 30 billion, and this is expected to trigger around EUR 170 billion in additional investments throughout Europe.

The European Council will also talk about trade policy, which is another important policy area from the point of view of job creation. We need more rule-based trade. We hope that the European Council will acknowledge the important vote in Parliament on the approval of our progressive trade agreement with Canada and I take this opportunity to praise you for this important decision. Even those in this House who voted against the Agreement with Mr Trudeau's Canada were quite impressed by his presence. So let me remind you of his words on this issue: 'We must choose to lead the international economy, not simply be subject to its whims'.

You know by now that this Commission does not believe naively in trade. This is why we want the European Council to give political impetus next week to our efforts to equip the Union with modernised tools to tackle unfair trade. When others step back from rule-based trade, the European Union must step forward and we have others, such as Japan, Mexico, Mercosur and India, willing to do likewise and make sure that the rules of the game are the rules which best serve and protect our citizens and our societies. Rule-based trade is the way to govern globalisation and that is why Europe must move on with this agenda.

I would now like to ask Commissioner Avramopoulos to continue on the other subject.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the other topic which Heads of State and Government will need to discuss next week, as Mr Katainen said, is migration. Even if we make progress in the management of the migratory flows, the situation is still very fragile. We all need to be committed to implementing the agreed – I repeat, the agreed – measures and finding a way forward to complete the structural reforms. The credibility of our actions inside the Union, at our borders and in our migration management, is central to building mutual trust and to enabling us to act in a collective way.

Our comprehensive European agenda on migration contains elements of solidarity and responsibility. It demands that we take forward each element in parallel with the others. The success of one reinforces the others. In all areas we must both show solidarity and assume responsibility. Now is the moment to prove what we really mean whenever we make reference to this basic principle upon which Europe is built. And the more effectively we work with third-country partners on tackling the root causes of migration, the greater our capacity to ensure a fair and effective system of asylum and migration management here in the European Union.

March 2017 will be a month when many people look to Europe's past, and many people look to Europe's future. In the Commission, we will make sure that we also shape Europe's present.

Françoise Grossetête, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, Monsieur le Vice-président de la Commission, Monsieur le Commissaire, ce débat s'inscrit véritablement dans la continuité du débat que nous avons eu précédemment sur l'avenir de l'Europe. De plus, il s'inscrit à un moment crucial et hautement symbolique puisque, en ce mois de mars, nous allons fêter les soixante ans du traité de Rome et nous devrions ouvrir aussi les négociations du Brexit, symbole des crises que doit affronter l'Union européenne.

Les tensions avec la Russie, le terrorisme, la guerre en Syrie, la crise économique, la crise migratoire, la nouvelle politique des États-Unis... Le monde vit sur un volcan qui, loin d'être éteint, peut à tout moment se réveiller. Face à ces menaces, l'Europe est un dernier îlot de stabilité qu'il est impératif de préserver. Pour cela, il nous faut mettre en œuvre une politique de défense commune, préalable indispensable à la protection de nos frontières et à la défense de nos valeurs dans le monde.

Pourtant, l'Union européenne apparaît à nos concitoyens de moins en moins comme une communauté, mais de plus en plus comme un assemblage d'égoïsmes nationaux. Il est grand temps de mettre les chefs d'État ou de gouvernement face à leurs responsabilités: veut-on poursuivre la construction de l'Europe ou la détricoter? Ce fut le sujet du débat précédent. À ce titre, je félicite la présidence maltaise qui ne ménage pas ses efforts pour pousser un agenda ambitieux. C'est le cas, par exemple, en ce qui concerne les investissements: Monsieur le Vice-président, vous avez parlé des efforts de l'EFSD, l'union des marchés des capitaux, tous ces investissements qui doivent nous permettre de soutenir l'industrie et l'innovation et de créer les emplois que nos citoyens réclament.

Je me réjouis aussi qu'un accord ait pu être trouvé en ce qui concerne le programme de soutien aux réformes structurelles 2017-2020. Ce programme doit maintenant être mis en œuvre le plus rapidement possible car, ne nous y trompons pas, la convergence de nos politiques économique, sociale, fiscale est indispensable au renforcement de la zone euro. À cette fin, il est urgent que des réformes de fond soient conduites dans de nombreux États membres, particulièrement en France. L'euro doit être un instrument de la puissance européenne, mais nous ne pourrions rien construire sans confiance et sans des bases économiques et sociales solides, au risque de voir notre maison commune s'effondrer sur ses fondations.

Alors que repli sur soi et protectionnisme semblent être devenus la règle depuis l'élection de Donald Trump, notamment, l'Europe doit continuer à porter, sans naïveté, un message d'ouverture. Notre continent peut faire du développement des échanges commerciaux un formidable atout économique.

L'Europe doit être au rendez-vous, le monde nous regarde. Le Parlement européen, au nom des citoyens, doit continuer à être la force motrice pour engager un sursaut européen. Ne nous laissons pas impressionner, l'histoire démontrera que nous avons raison.

President. – I know that there are indicators for blue cards, but I am following the advice of President Tajani and I will not accept blue cards because of time constraints.

Maria João Rodrigues, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, this debate shows that there is a connection between preparing for the European Council and the previous debate on scenarios for Europe. I can see that this European Council is trying to put into practice Scenario 5, namely working together to come up with better European solutions.

This is the case with regard to investment and to completing the single market with the digital and the energy union. This is also the case regarding the need to manage migration and to build up a real European asylum system. This is also the case regarding the trade agreement which was completed with Canada and which paves the way for a new generation of trade agreements, if some new concerns are introduced. This is also the case with regard to defence.

So on this European Council agenda you have many critical issues where we need to deliver better European solutions. Nevertheless, let me underline that when it comes to growth, we really want more of it because the current European Semester clearly shows that there is a limit to the growth strategy we are following in Europe. Up to now we been driven by exports. We have nothing against this, but we feel this is the right moment to bet on domestic demand, which means reducing social inequalities. This is the second source of growth in Europe which should be strengthened.

Then, if this is the case, all these outcomes of the European Council should pave the way for a good declaration at the Rome Summit. Let me underline this: we should not just commemorate the 60th anniversary. We need to use the opportunity to pave the way for the future, which means having a declaration that highlights the importance of the European social pillar and of a real reform of the euro area to deliver upward economic and social convergence, as well the need to come up with a European defence strategy and to make Europe a central entity for cooperation at the level of good trade agreements and good strategic partnerships and support for the multilateral system. So these are the expectations for the Rome Declaration.

Geoffrey Van Orden, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, on economic issues businesses need regulatory certainty and economic stability if they are to grow. As the United Kingdom will undoubtedly be leaving the European Union in the next two years or so, and given the intensity and importance of the economic relationship between the UK and its continental neighbours, it is clearly in the interests of both the EU and the UK that the new strategic partnership, based on amicable and sensible arrangements, is agreed as quickly as possible. We start from a position of regulatory equivalence and mutual recognition of standards – maximum continuity and deep mutual market access will therefore be a great economic reassurance on both sides of the Channel.

In terms of internal security, it is clearly in the interests of all our nations that the opportunities for cooperation between our police, security and intelligence agencies is maximised. Many of the problems that have been identified following terrorist attacks in recent years concern the workings of security agencies within States, rather than between them. Bilateral and multilateral cooperation between countries has generally been good, and Europol has often played a useful role in this. The United Kingdom has highly effective and internationally respected security and intelligence capabilities. They have proved their value across Europe and beyond, and it is very much in the interest of the EU in particular, as well as the UK, that arrangements are put in place to ensure that these operational relationships are maintained in the years ahead.

On defence, while some transatlanticists here suggested EU defence ambitions are about reinforcing NATO, the reality is different. The ambition is for an autonomous military capability and just at the time when the democracies need to be standing together in solidarity, when that great transatlantic security bond of NATO should be revitalised, the EU is pursuing a separate agenda. This is dangerous. Some have suggested that the new US administration was anti-NATO and this underlined the need for some separate agenda. Nothing could be further from reality and the new American President has underlined yet again his strong support for NATO.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, in fact the three topics on the European Council's agenda – economy, security and what we call the political model – have to be in balance and I think that these three topics have to be a clear priority.

As far as the question of security is concerned, let us be honest. What has the European Union achieved in diplomatic terms in recent months and years? How strong and heavyweight a player have we been? I must say that it is not too optimistic and it is a matter of fact that you can hardly be a heavyweight diplomatic force without having defence and military capacity. That is the reality. That is also why we are not present in a number of important negotiations on critical conflict issues, which have had an impact on us, but which we have certain limits in influencing. So in this respect I do not agree with the previous speaker. It is a question of our credibility and I believe that a European defence is necessary to assert true security with goals, means and a strategy. It is crucial that together we pool our political will and capabilities.

On the second issue, economics and especially on trade, I agree with Vice-President Katainen that CETA has to be ratified. I also believe that we need necessary and finely-tuned defence mechanisms. But what I believe even more is that we, as a heavyweight in economic terms well beyond our demography, should use that. It is not just a question of negotiating with Japan and other countries at a time when we are at, shall we say, a standstill with the US. Why do we not have our own agenda that we impose on the Americans? Our negotiating position is already influenced by that. There will of course be limits to it and we will have to see.

Finally, on migration, this is not the end of it. The migration problem will still be with us for many years to come. I believe that we need a true migration policy that will provide all the incentives and the tools that we need, but at the same time will take into account our own interests and also the specifics of the individual Member States. So I expect that the European Council will deliver on this. To be honest, what the Presidency has told us today is not convincing. It is not an input into the political debate but has rather more technocratic elements.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, a União Europeia e o seu processo de integração estão numa crise profunda, mas é uma crise que não é conjuntural – decorre antes da sua matriz liberal e profundamente antidemocrática.

Perante esta crise, que é indisfarçável, o próximo Conselho irá naturalmente debruçar-se sobre as habituais soluções destinadas apenas a iludir a opinião pública.

Contudo, os povos da Europa não querem mais do mesmo, não querem mais um aprofundamento dos pilares da União Europeia militarista, liberal e federalista. Não querem mais uma fuga para a frente, que ignore por completo as causas reais da atual crise.

O Livro Branco sobre o futuro da Europa propõe cinco cenários. Para nós, falta um sexto, de rotura com este processo de integração neoliberal, uma rotura que abra as portas à construção de uma outra Europa, ao serviço das populações e dos trabalhadores, uma Europa de cooperação, sem o CETA, onde todos os povos sejam respeitados na sua soberania e no seu direito a decidir do seu próprio modelo de desenvolvimento.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, creo que somos conscientes del año difícilísimo que va atravesar el proyecto de integración, en una crisis ya muy profunda, y tengo que decir que la impresión es de una paralización preocupante de las instituciones. Y lo digo también por el Libro Blanco que se nos ha presentado hoy, por parte de la Comisión Europea, que es más un ejercicio prospectivo más digno de un *think tank* que de una institución como la Comisión Europea, de la que hubiéramos esperado que nos diera unos mensajes y un camino y una apuesta política más clara.

Este Libro Blanco parece confirmar, de alguna manera, lo que ya nos dejó entrever el señor Juncker en el último debate del Estado de la Unión: que la Comisión es cada vez más un secretariado del Consejo y cada vez tiene menos papel político, lo cual es muy preocupante.

Mire, necesitamos una dirección clara y es evidente que, en estos momentos, tenemos un bloqueo en el Consejo muy claro de determinadas direcciones que necesitamos tomar.

Pero sí esperamos de la Comisión que dé algunas direcciones claras: reforma de la eurozona, pilar social, democratización. Y ya que en el próximo Consejo van a hablar mucho de inmigración, reforma en el sistema de asilo y cambio en nuestras políticas en relación con el asilo y a la inmigración que hasta ahora han sido auténtico un desastre.

Steeve Briois, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, pendant que nos agriculteurs crèvent la bouche ouverte, la Commission européenne nous informe qu'elle détourne le Fonds européen agricole pour le développement rural afin de financer l'installation des migrants clandestins.

Vous devriez rougir de honte pour les 30 % d'agriculteurs français qui gagnent moins de 350 euros par mois. Déjà confrontés à la suppression des quotas laitiers ainsi qu'à la concurrence internationale déloyale, ils n'ont pas cette même chance de pouvoir bénéficier de la Commission, de leurs dirigeants, qui préfèrent, eux, négocier dans leur dos des traités de libre-échange comme l'AECG, qui – je vous le rappelle – signera l'arrêt de mort de notre agriculture.

Cette Union européenne-là était censée défendre la sécurité, la prospérité et le pouvoir d'achat. Or, cette Union européenne-là fait totalement l'inverse, car les peuples européens veulent tout simplement quitter cette Union européenne qui impose, à la schlague, les politiques d'austérité dans les États membres.

Espagne, Portugal et maintenant Italie: tous sont menacés de sanctions financières s'ils ne parviennent pas à réduire leur endettement. Au Royaume-Uni, ils ont dit «oui» au Brexit et, contrairement à ce que racontent les prétendus experts, l'économie britannique se porte bien mieux qu'ailleurs en Europe, avec une hausse des exportations ainsi qu'une baisse du chômage.

L'année 2017 portera le coup de grâce à cette Union européenne vacillante. Aux Pays-Bas, en France et en Allemagne, les peuples vous balayeront définitivement pour, enfin, construire une Europe des nations et des libertés.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony, köszönöm szépen, az Európai Tanács jövő héten visszatér a munkahelyek, foglalkoztatás témájára, idézek a dokumentumból: „azért, hogy az Európai Unió polgárai élvezhessék a gazdasági jólétet és a virágzást”. Hát, finoman próbálok fogalmazni, azért nem ajánlanám, hogy az Európai Unió egyetlen illetékese is mondjuk egy kelet-magyarországi faluba elmenjen ezzel a szöveggel, mert hát elég temperamentumos nép vagyunk, vagy legalábbis előtte kössön valami komolyabb biztosítást.

Tehát nincs jólét kérem szépen, nincsen virágzás, hagyjuk abba ezt az álmodozást, és amit végre csinálni kellene tizenhárom éve, mondjuk a hazám esetében az Európai Unióba való belépés után, az az, hogy mutassunk föl számokat. Ezalatt a tizenhárom év alatt, meg előtte a csatlakozási folyamatban mennyi európai uniós pénz lett belepumpálva, – most pártthovatartozásra tekintet nélkül mondom – a közép- és kelet-európai országokba, és nézzük meg, hogy a korupció vagy mi más volt az oka annak, vagy pedig ezek a pénzek visszavándoroltak a kedves nyugati barátainkhoz és a különböző multinacionális cégekhez, vagy különben miért maradt el a polgárosodás, miért él annyi ember nyomorúságban, közmunkából vagy pedig összeszerelő műhelyekben, szalag mellett, teljes bizonytalanságban, minimális, alacsony, Nyugat-Európában elképzelhetetlen bérekért dolgozva?

Ezt kellene végre megnézni, nem a nagy szövegeket ismételtetni évről évre.

PRZEWODNICTWO: RYSZARD CZARNECKI*Wiceprzewodniczący*

Przewodniczący. – Bardzo proszę o nieprzekraczanie limitu czasu, w przeciwnym razie będę musiał odbierać głos.

Wzorem moich poprzedników informuję, że nie będę udzielał głosu w ramach „niebieskiej kartki”, mamy bowiem duże opóźnienie.

György Schöpflin (PPE). – Mr President, it seems to me that major issues have been raised this afternoon and these issues are customarily described as ‘the future of Europe’, but even more significant is the question: what kind of Europe should we be discussing? To my mind, it should be a Europe that is not merely acceptable to the citizens, but responds to their concerns, and in this connection let me ask, as Parliament’s rapporteur: what exactly is happening to the European Citizens’ Initiative? It is after all in the Treaty, in Article 11, and has achieved no success at all. It is a prime instrument for connecting citizens and Europe.

The President of the Commission, Mr Juncker, has rightly urged that we should stop Brussels-bashing; in exactly the same way we should stop Member State-bashing. We should be clear. A Europe based on mutual respect, on parity of esteem, is the Europe that works. It follows that the European political system has three components: Brussels, the citizens, and the Member States. They all have legitimate roles to play; they depend on each other. If these basic principles are not observed then the objectives of the March summit – growth, external security, migration – will be that much more difficult to attain.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – V sklepih vrha sta dva odstavka, namenjena migracijam. Vam, spoštovani komisar, zaupam in podpiram vaša prizadevanja in če se vrnem k dogovoru z Malte – nujno je potrebno izvajati.

Izboljšati moramo predvsem humanitarne razmere v Libiji v tesnem sodelovanju z Mednarodno organizacijo za begunce in komisariatom Združenih narodov za begunce. Libija ne sme postati žep. Če tam izbruhne vojna, bomo priča novi humanitarni katastrofi. In nujno je sodelovanje z južnimi sosedami Libije. Naj v tem kontekstu pred vrhom omenim še zahodni Balkan. Ne smemo pozabiti na države ob zahodnobalkanski migrantski poti.

Nadaljevati je treba izgradnjo zmogljivosti, krepiti regionalno sodelovanje. Unija mora biti ključna igralka pri vzdrževanju krhke politične stabilnosti na zahodnem Balkanu. To je naša neposredna soseščina, s številnimi izzivi, in zato je še toliko bolj pomembna pot vodje evropske diplomacije Federice Mogherini – kmalu – na zahodni Balkan.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Mr President, on energy union and Nord Stream II, I expect that, instead of meeting Gazprom envoys, the Commission will ensure EU jurisdiction over the project, publish analyses requested by the Council, including from DG Energy, and supports Ukraine and other CEE countries politically. By doing this, the Commission will bring credibility and solidarity back to the concept of energy union.

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, el próximo Consejo Europeo ahonda en los pecados originales, a pesar de ver cómo se desinfla este proyecto insolidario, esa Unión Europea de centro y periferia cuyo dogma neoliberal empobrece y desindustrializa, creando una Europa de desigualdad y precariedad.

Dicen que se centrarán en el empleo, en el crecimiento y en la competitividad. Ya lo conocemos. ¿Empleo? Precario, para trabajadores pobres. Y crecimiento y competencia de las grandes empresas y de sus cuentas de resultados. No me acuerdo ya del plan de empleo juvenil o de esos planes de industrialización del principio de la legislatura.

Hablan de defensa europea y mienten, porque es una defensa supeditada a la OTAN, es decir, a los planes geopolíticos estadounidenses. Y hablan como si los refugiados fueran una catástrofe natural, y preparan deportaciones masivas y hasta detenciones de menores. Y luego hablan de Trump. Y, no contentos con subcontratar con la dictadura de Erdogan, pretenden subcontratar a un Estado fallido y destruido por la OTAN, como Libia. Siguen el camino de su fracaso.

Mario Borghesio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, abbiamo sentito poche e generiche frasi da parte del rappresentante della Commissione sulla questione dell'immigrazione.

Io vorrei sapere qualcosa di preciso di quello che stiamo facendo con la Libia, perché è stata fortemente sottolineata l'importanza degli accordi con la Libia, ma poi non se n'è più saputo niente. In realtà, noi abbiamo, da una parte, un governo Sarraj che è nelle mani dei Fratelli Musulmani, cioè dei cartelli islamisti e, dall'altra, la povera Italia che non riesce a concludere niente con un paese di questo genere. Un conto è fare dei patti e reclamizzarli, magari attraverso i media europei molto compiacenti verso la Commissione, un conto, invece, è realizzare poi questi patti, dare concretezza a questa azione che dovrebbe anche tutelare sul piano umanitario.

Non sappiamo dove siano questi richiedenti asilo, non sappiamo come siano trattati, non sappiamo quale sia il ruolo di queste milizie, non sappiamo che cosa avvenga dai porti della Cirenaica che non sono certamente controllati dal regime di Sarraj. Questa è una situazione estremamente confusa, non chiara, sulla quale la Commissione europea rifiuta di dare risposte chiare e di dire la verità, noi vogliamo sapere la verità, cosa succede in Libia sull'immigrazione.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Köszönöm szépen Elnök Úr, igen, *point of order* szeretnék tenni, napirendi kérdést vetnék föl. Én értem azt, hogy idő szűkével Tajani úr megtiltotta a kékkártyás lehetőségnek a használatát, ezt az alelnökök is követik, viszont ezt én megértem, de ez esetben teljesen elfogadhatatlannak tartom, hogy rendre az összes hozzászóló öt, tíz, húsz másodperccel, sőt harminc másodperccel meghaladhatja kereteit.

Én konkrétan azért jöttem ide, hogy ezt a vitát meghallgassam, és egyben kérdést szerettem volna fölteni néppárti képviselőknek, hogy ők hogyan viselik azt, hogy a szóvirágok mellett szótlánul tűrik, hogy Orbán Viktor ezrével és tízezzel ad ki vízumokat ellenőrizetlen embereknek ebben az Európán Unióban.

De hozzáteszem, hogy ez a lehetőségem most nincs meg, viszont szeretném Elnök Urat arra kérni, hogy vagy tartjuk az időket vagy nem.

President. – Mr Szanyi, the second part of your speech was not a point of order.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε πρόεδρε, στις 7 Φεβρουαρίου το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο έλαβε απόφαση να παραταθούν για τρεις ακόμη μήνες οι έλεγχοι στα εσωτερικά σύνορα της Γερμανίας, της Αυστρίας, της Δανίας, της Νορβηγίας και της Σουηδίας για να παρεμποδιστεί η είσοδος παράνομων μεταναστών στις χώρες αυτές. Με αυτή την απόφαση, όχι μόνο καταργείται στην πράξη η Συνθήκη Schengen, αλλά παράλληλα επισημοποιείται, θεσμοθετείται θα έλεγα, η αδικία και η διαφορετική μεταχείριση μεταξύ των κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Κατά ποια λογική οι πέντε προαναφερθείσες χώρες κινδυνεύουν περισσότερο από τους παράνομους μετανάστες από ό,τι κινδυνεύει η Ιταλία και η Ελλάδα, οι οποίες είναι χώρες με εξωτερικά σύνορα, είναι χώρες εισόδου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και σε αυτές συρρέουν εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες, αν όχι εκατομμύρια, παράνομοι μετανάστες και τούτο όχι για να εγκατασταθούν σε αυτές, αλλά διότι έχουν ωθηθεί να φτάσουν εκεί από την εσφαλμένη πολιτική ανοικτών συνόρων που έχουν εφαρμόσει και οι πέντε χώρες που προανέφερα. Άρα, λοιπόν, δεν είναι δυνατόν να δεχτούμε αυτή την πολιτική. Όταν το Συμβούλιο λαμβάνει τέτοιες αποφάσεις γι' αυτά τα θέματα, φανταστείτε με ποιο τρόπο θα λάβει αποφάσεις και για τα άλλα σοβαρά θέματα, όπως είναι η ανάπτυξη, η άμυνα και η ασφάλεια, η αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας και γενικώς το μέλλον της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Rat wird sich auch berichten lassen über Reformen und Reformbemühungen der Staaten des westlichen Balkans, und er wird feststellen: Es hat Fortschritte gegeben, und es ist noch viel zu tun. Aber das alleine reicht nicht mehr aus. Wir müssen uns sehr bemühen, weil der Weg doch lang und steinig ist, auch während dieser Veränderungsphase die Menschen in den Ländern zu erreichen.

Russland investiert im westlichen Balkan, China tut das, die Türkei tut das, Saudi-Arabien tut das, und die Menschen sehen die Moscheen und sehen die Leistungen, die dort gebracht werden. Und wir schaffen es nicht einmal, ein Emaillechild mit der europäischen Fahne an die Projekte zu nageln, die wir geschaffen haben. Stattdessen bieten wir dem einfachen Bäcker in Belgrad an, dass wir nun Kapitel 16 eröffnen. Kein Mensch in Belgrad – außer den Politikern – weiß, was Kapitel 16 ist. Wenn wir uns um die Menschen auf dem Balkan nicht mehr bemühen, werden die aufgrund der langen Zeit, die wir brauchen, irgendwann ein bisschen die Lust verlieren, auf dem Weg mitzulaufen.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Meine Damen und Herren! Wir haben heute eine große und wichtige Rede des Kommissionspräsidenten gehört, der endlich einmal eine Debatte eröffnet hat, statt ein Ziel vorzugeben und es ungeachtet aller Kritik zu verfolgen. Ich glaube, dass es wichtig ist – eine Chance für die Europäische Union –, die Kurskorrekturen vorzunehmen, die die Europäische Union vornehmen muss. Und deshalb liegt der Ball jetzt beim Rat. Der Rat sollte auf seinem nächsten Treffen genau diese Debatte eröffnen, sie in die Gesellschaft hineintragen, der Rat sollte darauf aufmerksam machen, dass Europa die unterschiedlichsten Möglichkeiten hat, sich zu entwickeln.

Es ist schon sehr bemerkenswert, wenn man sich die einzelnen Optionen anschaut, die der Kommissionspräsident vorgetragen hat, dass darunter auch die Option ist, zu sagen: Wir sollen künftig weniger machen, uns auf das Wichtige konzentrieren und das Wichtige sollen wir besser machen als zuvor. Denn das heißt doch aus dem Munde des Kommissionspräsidenten nichts anderes als dass sich die Europäische Union bislang verzettelt hat. Sie hat viel zu viel gemacht, sie hat Unwichtiges gemacht und sie hat das Wichtige nicht gut gemacht. Eine solch kritische Rede des Kommissionspräsidenten über seine eigene Arbeit, über die Arbeit dieser Kommission und die Arbeit dieses Hauses haben wir noch nie gehört. Es ist bemerkenswert, dass er sie gehalten hat, und am Rat ist es, mit derselben Ehrlichkeit zu den Bürgern Europas zu sprechen. Vielen Dank.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident! Unglaublich, was wir heute hier sowohl vom Rat wie von der Kommission hören! Man hat nichts erreicht. Die Umverteilung klappt nicht. Dublin klappt nicht. Schengen klappt nicht. Und stattdessen möchte man jetzt fünf Wege eines neuen Europas vorstellen, wo wir uns vielleicht etwas Neues raussuchen können. Werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, können Sie sich nicht vorstellen, warum die Engländer die EU verlassen haben? Weil man nicht auf das Volk gehört hat. Weil sie Angst vor der Einwanderung, Angst vor der Immigration haben. Vor dem, was auf Europa zukommt. Machen Sie doch endlich mal eine Politik für die Völker Europas! Mangels dessen, dass es ein Volk Europas nicht gibt, sprechen Sie von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern und vergessen die Volkssouveränität. Denn wir als Abgeordnete sind zunächst einmal unserem Volk gegenüber verpflichtet, und dann Europa.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor presidente, señores del Consejo, señores de la Comisión, yo creo que hay una gran coincidencia en esta Cámara y en toda Europa sobre cuatro urgencias importantes: en inmigración; en pilar social; en crecimiento y empleo; y en defensa europea, sobre la que últimamente se habla mucho. Quiero centrarme en esta idea para señalar que, probablemente, estamos ante uno de los momentos más críticos para la defensa y la seguridad de Europa, pero también ante una extraordinaria oportunidad para construir este pilar de la Unión Europea en el que los padres fundadores pensaron ya.

Mi pregunta o mi cuestión es para decirles que... atención con la financiación de un nuevo esfuerzo en materia de seguridad, porque muy probablemente no estamos en condiciones de decir a los ciudadanos que hay que recortar presupuesto o política social para gastar en defensa.

Y creo que es el momento de hacer una defensa común, pero hay que hacerla con unos recursos propios que la propia Unión Europea construya al servicio de esta urgencia y de este objetivo.

Esta es una idea que hay que barajar, porque la defensa es necesaria, pero con fuentes y con recursos propios de la Unión Europea, no con el presupuesto de los Estados miembros.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-président, le Conseil européen se tiendra à un moment où nous ne saurons pas ce qu'auront fait les Britanniques. Alors, dans l'attente du dépôt des instruments de l'article 50, ce Conseil européen de printemps devra, comme vous l'avez dit, se préoccuper de la question de l'investissement.

Au-delà de l'EFSI, je crois que pour l'Union européenne, ce dont nous avons aussi besoin aujourd'hui, c'est d'un investissement qui soit maintenu au service de l'investissement social et de la transition écologique dans laquelle l'Union européenne doit s'engager.

En outre, pour la première fois, ce Conseil européen aura à adopter une recommandation spécifique pour la zone euro. Selon moi, c'est une avancée absolument majeure lorsque l'on cherche à améliorer la coordination des politiques économiques au sein de cette zone. Cela doit devenir un outil régulier pour pouvoir piloter les politiques économiques des États membres de manière agrégée au service de l'investissement et de l'emploi, plutôt que d'un cycle d'austérité qui a trop duré au sein de l'Union européenne.

Lors de ce Conseil, vous parlerez du marché intérieur. S'agissant de l'union des marchés des capitaux, faisons attention à ce que ce projet soit recentré en fonction de la nouvelle donne liée aux débats du Brexit.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedniče, teme na Vijeću sljedećeg tjedna zaista su važne, od izbora predsjednika za drugu polovinu mandata, ekonomskih pitanja, migracija i stanja na zapadnom Balkanu.

Dobro je da eurozona raste četrnaest kvartala za redom, nezaposlenost pada, a GDP jača u svim članicama, ali lijepim vijestima bi trebalo priključiti recimo dogovor o jačanju europskih sigurnosnih mehanizama. Trebamo ozbiljnu integraciju sigurnosne i obrambene politike. Nemogućnost Unije da građanima pruži sigurnost može ih trajno udaljiti od zajedničkih, a usmjeriti isključivo prema nacionalnim rješenjima.

Pozdravljam raspravu Vijeća o jačanju napetosti na zapadnom Balkanu. Stabilnost ove regije ovisi o rezultatu sučeljavanja dva procesa: napretku država na putu pridruživanja Europskoj uniji i procesa koji to ugrožavaju zbog interesa suprotnih vrijednostima euointegracija. Naša podrška prvom procesu je ključna. Međutim, kakvu europsku perspektivu nudimo ovim zemljama? Na primjer, koncept Europe koncentričnih krugova ozbiljno bi ugrozio europsku perspektivu ne samo u zemljama kandidatima, nego i u novijim zemljama članicama.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Go raibh maith agat, a Uachtaráin agus tá áthas orm cúpla focal a rá ar an ábhar so.

Looking at the discussion here this afternoon and the topics on the agenda, it is all very positive. We want to create trade, free and fair, complete the single market by 2018, further jobs and growth in the European Union, improve our competitiveness and extend the European Fund for Strategic Investments, which, as Mr Katainen, who has done so much work for it, pointed out, has spent EUR 30 billion generating EUR 170 billion in investment. That is a significant sum and obviously a very positive development.

But I would ask the question: what credit does the European Union get for all this good work? I would say, very little. So I think from now on we need to have, alongside everything we do, a communication strategy for our citizens, and also, as President Juncker pointed out, it is time to stop Brussels-bashing. I would say it is time to lash back at the Brussels-bashers. Lash back at the Brussels-bashers. That is very important as well.

Go raibh maith agat, a Uachtaráin.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, al prossimo Consiglio sarà necessario dare priorità alle politiche di occupazione, crescita e competitività, continuando sulla strada dei progressi compiuti finora.

È necessario rilanciare gli investimenti e proseguire le riforme strutturali per modernizzare le nostre economie. In questo quadro, solo politiche di bilancio responsabili, ma nettamente orientate alla crescita possono contribuire a porre l'attuale ripresa su una base più sostenibile e a promuovere la crescita e l'occupazione.

Ugualmente urgente è un piano comune in materia di difesa, assieme al rafforzamento dei legami con la NATO. In questo momento storico, con un'America improvvisamente divisa, uno sforzo economico rilevante degli Stati membri, ma non solo, verso una difesa comunitaria sarebbe il segno tangibile che gli ideali alla base dell'Unione sono ancora forti e condivisi.

Mi auguro che si dimostri altrettanta coesione nella discussione sulla rotta nel Mediterraneo, luogo in cui l'Italia impiega quotidianamente energie e risorse per far fronte ad un'emergenza che riguarda tutta l'Europa.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, dear colleagues, the meeting of the EU Council is an important occasion for EU leaders to address, firstly, the economic situation in Europe, trade policy, progress made on files related to the single market strategy, as well as the first phase of the 2017 European semester.

On migration, leaders will have to review what has been done to implement the decisions taken at the informal summit in Malta on 3 February concerning the central Mediterranean route. Priorities include training, equipping and supporting the Libyan National Coastguard and making further efforts to disrupt the business model of smugglers through enhanced operational action by involving Libya and relevant international partners. Moreover, the Council should assess the implementation of its December 2016 conclusions on external security and defence. In this regard it is clear that something new is necessary. In a challenging geopolitical environment, EU cooperation on external security and defence has to be strengthened. We really need a future defence union.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο της 9ης και 10ης Μαρτίου θα πρέπει να ασχοληθεί σοβαρά με το ζήτημα της μετανάστευσης. Αυτή τη στιγμή με βάση τα στοιχεία που έχει δώσει η ίδια η Επιτροπή, από την Ελλάδα έχουν γίνει μόνο 9.566 μετεγκαταστάσεις προσφύγων. Υποτίθεται ότι θα έπρεπε να έχουν γίνει και να ολοκληρωθούν μέχρι τον επόμενο Σεπτέμβριο 66.400 μετεγκαταστάσεις, δηλαδή μέχρι στιγμής έχει γίνει μόνο το 1/6 των μετεγκαταστάσεων. Η Γερμανία όφειλε να πάρει από την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα με μετεγκατάσταση 25.094 άτομα. Έχει πάρει μόνο 2.442, δηλαδή ούτε το 10%. Επομένως, πρέπει να υπάρξει αποφασιστική ρύθμιση στο θέμα αυτό, πρέπει να υπάρξουν μέτρα κατά των κρατών που δεν εκτελούν τις μετεγκαταστάσεις και ταυτόχρονα, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε θα πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα, ούτως ώστε να υπάρξει αποσυμφόρηση των νησιών του Αιγαίου. Υπάρχουν 16.500 πρόσφυγες και παράνομοι μετανάστες που βρίσκονται σε Λέσβο, Χίο, Σάμο. Κάτι πρέπει να γίνει με την αποσυμφόρηση των νησιών του Αιγαίου.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, precisamos absolutamente de investir na segurança e defesa dos nossos cidadãos, mas isso só acontecerá se o fizermos coordenadamente, no quadro da política comum de segurança e defesa e de uma estratégia de segurança interna.

Mas, para isso, precisamos de mais recursos nacionais e de um orçamento europeu adequado. Se o Conselho Europeu se empenhar no combate à selva fiscal e ao branqueamento de capitais e financiamento do terrorismo, travando paraísos fiscais, *onshore* e *offshore*, então, os Estados-Membros poderão recuperar ativos substanciais para investir na nossa segurança e defesa. Um imposto sobre as transações financeiras seria um passo decisivo nesse sentido.

Quanto à tentativa imoral de externalizar as nossas responsabilidades na gestão das migrações e na proteção dos refugiados, através da criação de *hotspots* na Líbia, que ninguém conseguirá gerir num país destruído e sem governação, por falta de Europa, a menos que os governos europeus tenham a coragem de pedir um mandato internacional, invocando a legítima defesa, e tenham a coragem de pôr botas no terreno – muitas botas no terreno –, garantindo a segurança e a defesa de todos na Líbia e de todo o território líbio, e não só na zona marítima e costeira.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, there has been plenty of discussion this afternoon about the future and the past. The Commission must also live in the present. Since the Bratislava summit in September we have been working hard to deliver on a unifying set of priority issues.

Today President Juncker has again shown his commitment, and the commitment of the whole Commission, to delivery by presenting his White Paper in line with the promise made before this House in his State of the Union speech. Life goes on and our work goes on. The European Union is 60 years young. That means that we are old enough and wise enough not to get distracted from the task at hand today. We are also young enough, energetic enough and enthusiastic enough to make sure we deliver what we promise.

Next week's European Council must be about delivery. Delivery is the most important point on this issue. Europe needs to deliver on migration, deliver on jobs and prosperity, deliver on security, and deliver on all of its agreed priorities. The European Commission will continue to deliver.

Chris Agius, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, honourable Members, thank you for a useful exchange, which I will convey to the President of the European Council. Let me use these concluding remarks to underline the importance for the European Union, for all of us, of the two principles: responsibility and delivery.

The European Council, as is its prerogative, draws the way forward and provides strategic guidance. This is reflected in its conclusions in the form of objectives and deadlines. It is then our responsibility – the responsibility of both the Council and the Parliament – to work together to deliver on this guidance. With your help, with your ideas and with your energy, the Presidency has already been able to deliver on important tasks set by the European Council. I hope there will be many, many more. In the end, this is what matters to citizens, not institutional wins, but responsibility and delivery from the lawmakers. Thank you for your help in achieving that ambition.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

David McAllister (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Am 9. und 10. März tagt der Europäische Rat in Brüssel. Die Gipfelteilnehmer werden sich unter anderem mit der Lage auf dem westlichen Balkan befassen. Im Auswärtigen Ausschuss haben wir zuletzt intensiv über die angespannte Situation in der Region diskutiert. Die Hohe Vertreterin Federica Mogherini reist in diesen Tagen in alle sechs Staaten des westlichen Balkans. Das ist ein richtiges Zeichen. Diese Woche haben wir im Auswärtigen Ausschuss die Berichte des Europäischen Parlaments über Serbien, Mazedonien, Montenegro und Kosovo beraten und abgestimmt. So unterschiedlich die Länder auch sind, eine Botschaft ist in allen Berichten identisch: Der westliche Balkan muss auch in Zukunft eine Priorität der auswärtigen Politik der Europäischen Union bleiben. Diese Länder sind uns durch viele kulturelle, wirtschaftliche und politische Verbindungen sehr nah. Durch ihre geopolitische Lage – umschlossen von Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union – sollten wir ein ganz besonderes Interesse an einer positiven Entwicklung der Region haben. Die Menschen vor Ort wollen eine stabile und friedliche Zukunft. Mit der Europäischen Union ist dies möglich.

Csaba Molnár (S&D), *írásban*. – Az Európai Unió idén lesz 60 éves. A Brexit nem azt jelenti, hogy az EU nyugdíjba vonul 60-ik születésnapján. Éppen ellenkezőleg, a Brexit esély arra, hogy Európa megújuljon. Megtartson mindent, ami jó és megváltoztasson mindent, ami rossz. A demokrácia, a piacgazdaság a modern társadalmunk alapjai ma veszélyben vannak. Populisták, nacionalisták, szélsőségesek támadják, akik a múlt megbukott ideológiával próbálnak szavazatokat nyerni rövid távú céljaik eléréséhez. Ezek a vezetők maguk alatt vágják a fát. Ideig-óráig lehetnek nyertesek. De ha szétesik, Európa cudar világ jön, orosz-kínai befolyási övezetté válunk. A szélsőséges nacionalista erővel csak veszíthetünk.

Európa 60. születésnapja nem a nyugdíj kezdete, hanem éppen ellenkezőleg: új anyakönyvi kivonatot kell kiállítanunk Európának. Új fejezetet kell nyitnunk, ahol a problémákra, a bajokra nem az a megoldás, hogy csak később döntünk, vagy újabb bizottságot állítunk fel a bajok megvizsgálására. Európa most kezdődő új fejezetében az emberek jólétére és biztonságára kell koncentrálni kizárólag. Minden politikánkat az kell, hogy vezérelje: az emberek jobban élnek és biztonságban vannak. A britiek „lelépési” pénzét, 60 milliárd eurót fordítunk arra, hogy legyőzzük a globalizáció melléktermékét: a társadalmi egyenlőtlenséget. Használjuk arra, hogy a piacgazdaságot mindenki érdekébe állítjuk, növekedést indítunk be és újra élesztjük a hatvan éve tartó európai álmot. Azt az európai álmot, miszerint a gyermekek jobban élnek, mint a szüleik.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Euroopa peab iseenda kaitsmiseks ja turvalisuse suurendamiseks tegema senisest palju rohkem ning olema proaktiivsem. Ülemkogu arutelu peab selgelt edasi arendama viimase aasta jooksul hästi edasi liikunud kaitsekoostöö teematikat. Euroopa riikide kaitsekoostöö on seni olnud tagasihoidlik ja loodetud on peamiselt NATOle. Euroopa peab ise palju rohkem panustama ning kasutama ära kõik võimalused turvalisuse ja kaitsevõime suurendamiseks ja seda ka Euroopa Liidu kontekstis. ELi riikidel tuleb sarnaselt NATO liikmesriikidele seada oma eesmärgiks 2% SKPst kulutamise kaitsele. Samuti on ELil võimalik toetada NATO infrastruktuuri, nagu kasarmute, teede jne loomist, kaitsetööstuse koostööd ja arendamist ning kaitsevæe-Schengeni loomist. On selge, et praegu on õige hetk hästitoimiva Euroopa kaitsekoostöö ülesehitamiseks.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), na pismie. – Ostatnie dni poprzedzające kolejne posiedzenie Rady Europejskiej stanowią ważny moment refleksji i zastanowienia się nad tym, jakim kwestiom powinno się nadać priorytet, o czym rozmawiać najwięcej. W czasach, kiedy Europa boryka się z licznymi wyzwaniami i problemami wymagającymi podejmowania szybkich i zdecydowanych działań, nie możemy również zapominać o dokładnej analizie źródeł i przyczyn bieżącej sytuacji. Należy wyciągać wnioski z decyzji dobrych, a może nawet bardziej z tych mniej skutecznych, oraz identyfikować nowe źródła zagrożeń i nowe możliwości. Dobrą okazją ku temu będzie zbliżająca się 60. rocznica podpisania traktatów rzymskich.

W kontekście spotkania Rady Europejskiej w marcu ważnym tematem powinna być oczywiście gospodarka, w tym szczególnie jej dalsza cyfryzacja umożliwiająca usprawnienie procesów produkcyjnych oraz handlu. Nieustannie kluczowym tematem pozostaje również dbałość o rozwój i podtrzymanie funkcjonowania jednolitego rynku UE. W sposób szczególnie trzeba dbać o to, aby panowała na nim swoboda przepływu towarów, kapitału, ludzi i usług, nieograniczana nieuczciwymi praktykami handlowymi czy też utrudnieniami o charakterze pozataryfowym. Nie może zabraknąć również zwrócenia uwagi na kolejne kroki mające na celu złagodzenie konsekwencji kryzysu migracyjnego oraz pracę nad usprawnieniem funkcjonowania granic zewnętrznych UE, co jest naturalną konsekwencją zniesienia granic między państwami członkowskimi – granica zewnętrzna UE staje się jej jedyną granicą.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), na pismie. – Kwestie bezpieczeństwa i obronności na stałe zagościły na agendzie szczytów Rady Europejskiej. Biorąc pod uwagę dzisiejszą sytuację międzynarodową, to dobrze. W chwili obecnej kluczowe jest, by decyzje, które zapadły na poprzednim szczycie, szczególnie te dotyczące wdrażania Globalnej Strategii czy European Defence Action Plan, zostały wdrożone przy pełnym zaangażowaniu państw członkowskich. Ważne jest także, by UE i jej państwa członkowskie sprawniej funkcjonowały wewnątrz, ale także współpracowały z NATO.

Podczas ostatniej Konferencji Bezpieczeństwa w Monachium Federica Mogherini powiedziała, że w ciągu ostatnich 7 miesięcy podjęto już 42 wspólne projekty między NATO i UE. To krok w dobrym kierunku. Nowa amerykańska administracja także wymaga od Europy większego zaangażowania w Sojusz Północnoatlantycki, co należy przyjąć ze zrozumieniem i świadomością wyzwań. Należy więc zakasać rękawy. Mam także nadzieję na ponowny wybór Donalda Tuska na Przewodniczącego Rady Europejskiej. Jakikolwiek zmiany na tym stanowisku nie będą służyły stabilizacji sytuacji w Europie. Ponadto Donald Tusk wykazał się przez dwa i pół roku swojego urzędowania przewodnictwem, którego UE w tych trudnych czasach bardzo potrzebuje.

18. Tackling the disappearance of migrant children in Europe (debate)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie zwalczania problemu zaginięć dzieci migrujących w Europie (2017/2566(RSP)).

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, honourable Members, protecting children, especially those in migration, is a top priority of our policies. By securing the future of children, Europe is securing its own future and not only that. Children in migration need to be protected, assisted and offered durable solutions at all stages of migration. We have to ensure that they are not exploited, abused or trafficked.

This challenge is becoming even more pressing given that, in 2016, children represented 26% of the arrivals by sea. This is an almost tenfold increase since 2010. Many of them are unaccompanied minors. Moreover, shortly after their arrival in Europe, an increasing number of minors abscond or disappear. In spite of the efforts taken at European and national level, the situation of minors remains unsatisfactory and protection gaps must still be filled. Ensuring adequate assistance, in terms both of material supply, adequate reception and care and of legal information and psycho-social support, is key to building trust and avoiding absconding.

The Commission is working on concrete and comprehensive actions to ensure the protection of children in migration. The European Agenda on Migration and the Action Plan on Unaccompanied Minors constitute our starting point. The Commission will also follow up on the conclusions of the 10th European Forum on the Rights of the Child, organised in November 2016, and on the outcome of the recent 'Lost in Migration' conference organised by Missing Children Europe in Malta in January.

In Greece, the Commission is actively supporting the appointment of a child protection officer in each hotspot. Here, the availability of sufficient dedicated reception facilities remains a challenge both on the islands and on the mainland. Over 1 000 unaccompanied children are still awaiting a shelter placement. EU funding is available under the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund to support capacity building, provide relevant infrastructure and develop operational actions in frontline Member States. Additional funding is also available under the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme to improve child protection in migration.

In 2017, priorities on combating violence against children and women explicitly include children in migration. Funding under the Emergency Support Instrument has also been made available for child protection activities. The European Asylum Support Office (EASO), the European Border and Coast Guard and Europol are also supporting frontline Member States in identifying unaccompanied minors and providing information on relocation. They offer capacity-building activities and collaborate with public security departments for investigations on smuggling and trafficking. Ensuring legal means of transfer is another key aspect to prevent minors absconding and falling into smugglers' traps.

The Dublin system, including transfers and family reunification, and the relocation schemes must work efficiently and fast. All those involved need to collaborate better to implement these procedures smoothly. For the moment, only 205 unaccompanied minors have been relocated from Greece and Italy and, as we all understand, this is unsatisfactory.

However, the Commission is working closely with Member States in this respect. It has deployed dedicated teams in frontline Member States to address this matter. Moreover, last year's proposals to reform the Common European Asylum System aim at strengthening the guarantees available for vulnerable persons, including children. The proposals include provisions on safe accommodation in suitable reception facilities, and prompt and effective guardianship for unaccompanied minors who apply for asylum.

In the absence of travel documents, fingerprinting is one of the very few options for identifying a person. For this reason, last year's reform proposals also aim to lower the minimum age for fingerprinting from 14 to six years old, with a view to reducing the risk of minors going missing.

Swift progress on all asylum proposals is now needed in the European Parliament and the Council. If children go missing, they have to be found, and they have to be found fast. Existing instruments to report and record child disappearances must be fully used. The Schengen Information System (SIS) constitutes the only Europe-wide information exchange on missing persons in general. For this system to be useful, missing children must be reported to the police and other relevant responsible authorities. They, in turn, should immediately record the disappearance in the Schengen Information System, attaching photographs and fingerprints and indicating that the child is unaccompanied. Currently the information system stores information on about 100 000 missing persons in 29 European countries, out of which about 65 000 are children.

In 2016, 5 687 persons were found on the basis of SIS. In addition, the Commission has recently proposed to improve the information system. For instance, we suggest having a new type of preventive alert for missing unaccompanied children, to be issued in cases when a child is particularly at risk. Better use must also be made of the existing 'Missing Children' hotline (116 000). For instance, all reception centre managers should report all cases of children going missing via this hotline.

As you can see, many actions are ongoing to protect children better in migration, and the European Union will step up its efforts. The migration crisis has been exploited by ruthless criminal networks, involved in trafficking in human beings, to target the most vulnerable, in particular women and children. It is our duty to protect children. We need to focus on prevention, the quality of care and protection. We must reinforce our fight against the criminals, mobilise and inform public opinion and put pressure on Member States to use all tools available to protect children in migration. Let us live up to the challenge and address it by using all resources in a united and coordinated manner.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for his commitment. A real tragedy is unfolding in Europe, which needs urgent and concrete action. More than a year ago, Europol sounded the alarm when tens of thousands of migrant children went missing. They had been trafficked, abused, exploited and exposed. It is happening today in Europe. We are far away from a zero tolerance policy against traffickers and smugglers.

With the Intergroup on Children's Rights in this Parliament, together with Missing Children Europe, we have been at the forefront in putting this emergency at the top of the EU agenda. We call on the police to prioritise missing children, without double standards between European and migrant children. We need effective rules for cross-border cooperation and increased cooperation with Europol, filling the existing gaps. We need to allocate more resources to hotlines, to help report disappearances and build trust with migrant children to prevent them from running away, to make sure children remain in the protection system and to provide them with a safe environment and decent living standards.

Children must be registered when entering the European Union and I support the Commissioner's reform proposal for EURODAC, moving to take fingerprints from the age of six, to be able to protect them and to trace them. Member States need also to increase their interoperability between the Schengen and the Visa Information System and, as we revise the asylum package, we cannot sacrifice children. Europe should mean safety for them. What if it was our child missing?

Tanja Fajon, *v imenu skupine S&D*. – Za desetine tisočev izgubljenih migrantskih otrok, o katerih danes govorimo, so krive kriminalne združbe in ne delujoča azilna politika Evropske unije.

Imamo striktna in zavezujoča pravila za članice, ko obravnavajo iskalce azila, posebej otroke brez spremstva. Ampak to velja v teoriji. V praksi sistem ne deluje. Imamo zelo slabo izmenjavo informacij, neenotna mnenja, kako posodobiti azilni sistem. Način obravnave otrok brez spremstva je po državah neenoten.

Nekatere države sploh nimajo institucije, ki bi bila odgovorna za te otroke. Na vseh teh področjih velja prava zmešnjava. Z izvajanjem dublinske uredbe pošiljamo nemočne otroke po Evropi sem ter tja kot pakete.

Ukrepi, ki bi mladoletnike morali ščititi, jim nuditi varnost, zaradi česar so prišli na naša tla, jih dejansko poženejo v beg. Jih prisilijo, da poniknejo, izginejo. Odprite časopis ali internet. Zanjih dve leti se o tej problematiki pišejo ene in iste zgodbe. Na ravni Unije pa še vedno ni koraka naprej.

Zakaj ni akcijskega načrta? Zakaj mladoletniki niso prioriteta?

In ustno vprašanje mojih kolegov je dovolj natančno. Zato tudi jaz pričakujem bolj natančne odgovore. Predvsem pa zahtevam načrt za reševanje teh otrok in njegovo dosledno izvajanje.

Monica Macovei, *în numele grupului ECR*. – Mulțumesc. Peste 10 000 de copii au dispărut din centrele de recepție după ce au intrat în Europa odată cu fluxul de migranți, așa cum arată datele Europol.

În 2016 numai în Italia au ajuns peste 13 000 de minori neînsoțiți. Mulți au parcurs un drum foarte periculos pe ruta Africa de Nord-Europa.

Cum procedăm pentru a proteja acești copii? Cum facem ca acești copii să nu devină victime sigure ale traficului, inclusiv de organe, ale exploatării sexuale, ale abuzurilor? Putem face asta în mai multe feluri: prin numere de urgență, prin măsuri care să reunifice familiile, personal calificat în centrele de recepție și, de asemenea, colectarea datelor biometrice de la o vârstă cât mai mică, începând cu șase ani, așa cum se propune și de comisar în regulamentul Europol. Este foarte importantă găsirea acestor copii pentru că numai așa îi putem readuce în siguranță.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Mijnheer de commissaris, ik ben blij met alle woorden die u hier sprak. Maar ik zou graag daden zien. Een jaar geleden kwam Europol al met het cijfer van 10 000 vermisten in Europa. Vandaag maakt Child Focus België bekend dat er in België 116 nieuwe dossiers zijn geopend. Vorige week was ik op bezoek in Duinkerken, op twee uur rijden van Brussel. Ik nodig u graag uit om eens mee te gaan kijken naar het Franse opvangkamp aldaar. Honderd niet-begeleide minderjarige asielzoekers zitten er in houten barakjes, zonder zorg, zonder onderwijs en zonder iemand te zien om een asielaanvraag in te dienen. Dat is het Europa van 2017! Dat mogen we niet tolereren.

Ik vraag u officieel om een echt actieplan met goede opvang en korte procedures. Daarbij moet echt worden ingezet op de strijd tegen mensensmokkelaars en worden gezorgd voor de uitwisseling van *good practices*. Waar kinderen zitten, moeten instanties foto's nemen opdat men niet pas na 8 of 9 dagen per e-mail een melding doet als er een kind wordt vermist. Weet u, mijnheer de commissaris, als mijn hond vanavond niet thuiskomt, dan ga ik harder zoeken naar mijn hond dan Europa zoekt naar de 10 000 vermiste kinderen.

Kom met dat actieplan. Ik breng u graag de aanbevelingen van de conferentie in Malta. Ik was daar zelf en ik wil ze u persoonlijk overhandigen. Daar staan heel concrete dingen in!

Marina Albiol Guzmán, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, perdonen, pero es que a mí me parece increíble todo lo que estoy oyendo aquí en estos momentos. Parece que ahora están ustedes preocupadísimos por los menores migrantes, pero no piensan en los menores cuando se construyen vallas, cuando cierran fronteras, cuando niegan visados, cuando abren centros de detención o cuando firman acuerdos con Turquía, Afganistán o Libia y alimentan a las mafias. Y todo lo que sucede con los menores es fruto de esas políticas que ustedes no cuestionan.

Un buen ejemplo de las consecuencias que tienen estas políticas para los menores es la situación en Melilla. Allí hay centenares de menores atrapados —algunos, en centros; otros, muchos, en la calle, sin escolarizar— y al Gobierno de España no se le ocurre otra cosa para solucionar esta situación que ponerse a negociar un acuerdo con el Reino de Marruecos para deportarlos, para deportar a los menores.

Esto no soluciona nada, esto lo que hace es enviar el problema lejos para que no nos moleste.

Jean Lambert, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I think we are all agreed that we need a joined-up system that is going to protect children and ensure that their best interests are at the heart of what we do. We know that we need to develop a system that youngsters trust and will engage with, and that protects them, informs them properly, has effective legal guardians and will cooperate across borders where necessary. We know that we need governments to step up, and indeed to step in, to help those countries under particular pressure.

As the Commissioner said, the offers are pretty poor at the moment and even those offers made are not always taken up. So I think we need to think seriously about how we improve that. But we do need, as others have said, a system that works in reality. It is no surprise that kids will believe smugglers' promises to reunite them with family when we see the reality of what many of those minors currently face and the lack of information they get.

We only have to look at the scandal of Calais in terms of child protection: children identified there by civil society organisations, not the authorities, a Supreme Court judgment to remind the British Government of their obligations, a totally inadequate system of cooperation and transfer between France and the UK, and still poor delivery even now. The French are closing the centres that they took unaccompanied minors to and the British Government thinks it has done its job, although there are still at least 1 000 who have, potentially, the legal right to be there under Dublin.

So we really do need to make our system start working. I look forward to the infringement proceedings that I hope the Commission will bring against Member States.

(Applause)

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the United Nations Refugee Agency estimates that 35% of migrants entering the European Union since January 2016 were children. In 2015, 85 482 unaccompanied minors applied for asylum in the EU, which was three times the 2014 figure. Now it seems that thousands of these children have gone missing, their fate unknown.

Are we to believe these children were sent abroad unaccompanied? Are we to believe that in a single year 85 000 minors made their own decision to make their way to Europe entirely on their own? Of course not. They were trafficked by criminal gangs, but someone had to pay the gang first and, presumably, that was their parents or families. The EU Schengen Area and open borders policy has helped to create an immigration and asylum racket: get the children in first and then the families can follow. The innocent victims of this racket are the children themselves.

Mara Bizzotto, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa dovrebbe aiutare i bambini che scappano dalla guerra, ma non lo fa e mi chiedo: non lo fa per incapacità o per complicità; è incapace o complice dei delinquenti, dei trafficanti di essere umani che organizzano viaggi della morte?

Perché l'Unione europea lascia morire ogni anno centinaia di bambini nel Mar Mediterraneo? Perché non si creano corridoi umanitari per accogliere in Europa, in modo legale e sicuro, i veri profughi, evitando così l'arrivo di tanti clandestini che vengono sfruttati dalla malavita per il commercio di droga, per la prostituzione minorile e per il traffico di organi?

Ogni giorno in Italia scompaiono 28 minori non accompagnati. L'associazione Penelope è venuta qui al Parlamento a chiederci di affrontare a livello europeo il fenomeno delle migliaia di minori non accompagnati scomparsi. Questa associazione, che in Italia fa un lavoro straordinario e aiuta le famiglie e le persone scomparse, è venuta anche a chiedere aiuto, il nostro aiuto, per i 1 600 minori, cittadini italiani scomparsi. Non dimentichiamoci di questi bambini – 1 600 – che sono cittadini europei e che sono spariti nel nulla.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, la situación es alarmante. Unicef ha señalado que, en el año 2015, 96 000 menores no acompañados solicitaron asilo —un 20 % del total de los niños— y Europol estima que el 27 % del millón de migrantes que llegó a Europa en 2015 eran menores. Tenemos que hacer frente a este drama entre todos: la Unión y cada uno de los Estados miembros.

En primer lugar, debemos buscar a los menores desaparecidos, ya que muchos están siendo expuestos a todo tipo de malos tratos por parte de bandas criminales y están siendo víctimas de explotación sexual. Además, debemos asumir responsabilidad, ya que muchos de ellos han desaparecido estando en centros de acogida europeos. Los niños, al sentirse desprotegidos e inseguros, deciden huir, y es entonces cuando fácilmente pueden caer en manos del crimen organizado.

Para evitar estos hechos, es necesaria la reforma de la Directiva de las condiciones de acogida: es fundamental.

En reubicación, es urgente que los menores sean atendidos y sean reubicados y reasentados, y rápido, sobre todo los de Grecia e Italia.

Y quiero pedir especial protección para los niños con bebés, niñas y niños que vienen siendo padres, y para esos pido especial protección. Y además es urgente la asignación del tutor: una asignación no diferida, una asignación inmediata.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio il Commissario Avramopoulos per le sue dichiarazioni.

I dati citati dal Commissario, come i dati pubblicati proprio ieri dall'UNICEF sui minori scomparsi, dimostrano la gravità della situazione ed evidenziano la necessità di porre in atto una strategia complessiva a livello europeo, fondata sul principio del superiore interesse del minore. Le istituzioni europee devono quindi sforzarsi di garantire coerenza fra tutte le proposte che costituiscono la riforma del sistema di asilo, e mi riferisco in particolare alla proposta di revisione del regolamento di Dublino che mantiene, anche per i minori, il criterio della responsabilità del paese di primo approdo, con il rischio di spingere indirettamente i minori ad intraprendere movimenti secondari per trasferirsi clandestinamente nel paese membro in cui desiderano presentare domanda di asilo.

Come è stato detto in occasione della conferenza «*Lost in migration*» tenutasi a Malta, per tutelare i minori sul territorio europeo, dobbiamo fare in modo che essi possano presentare la domanda di asilo nello Stato in cui si trova, eventualmente, una persona con dei legami familiari. E se, per tutelare i minori, è apprezzabile la proposta inserita nel sistema Eurodac di introdurre i dati biometrici per i minori, addirittura già a partire dai sei anni, è necessario però che questo avvenga in presenza di adeguate garanzie, con personale specializzato e con tutte le cautele necessarie ad evitare traumi per i bambini.

Ed è fondamentale trasmettere fiducia ai bambini migranti, assicurare loro dignitose condizioni di accoglienza, assegnare a ciascun minore un tutore adeguatamente formato che valuti quale sia per lui il migliore interesse e promuovere iniziative che nel lungo periodo ne favoriscano l'integrazione.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI*Wiceprzewodniczący*

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Det er desværre lige så forudsigeligt, som det er frygteligt, at det er de svageste, nemlig børnene, som det går hårdest ud over, når man ser det asylkaos, som er skabt i disse år i Europa. Løsningen er lige så logisk, som den har været svær for EU-landene at komme frem til, nemlig at det handler om at tage fat om problemets rod, altså handler om, at vi får afhjulpet de mekanismer, der gør, at menneskesmuglere kan lave en guldrandet forretning ved at misbruge folks håb om at komme til Europa, herunder at misbruge børn – noget af det frygteligste, man overhovedet kan forestille sig.

Så det er ikke et spørgsmål om, at alle her i salen synes, der er frygteligt, når børn bliver misbrugt, også i denne sammenhæng. Spørgsmålet er, hvordan vi får afhjulpet dette problem mest effektivt, og her handler det altså om at afhjælpe de faktorer, der gør, at menneskesmuglere kan lave denne forretningsmodel.

Endelig skal vi også huske at screene de ældste af børnene, for vi ser i hvert fald i Danmark masser af sager, hvor voksne påstår at være børn og blandt andet kommer ind på asylfaciliteterne for børn og der misbruger de mindre, uledsagede flygtningebørn. Det er også en problemstilling, der skal tages op i denne sammenhæng.

Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, on tourne en rond. Il y a un an exactement, Europol nous annonçait la disparition de 10 000 enfants migrants, et tout le monde se scandalisait de ces disparitions, alors que nous dénoncions cela depuis des années. Soit. Aujourd'hui, un an après, on est toujours là à débattre et à redébattre.

Pourtant, les solutions existent pour protéger ces enfants. On les connaît et, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous les avez rappelées: identification immédiate, enregistrement, désignation immédiate d'un tuteur, mise à l'abri et numéro de téléphone gratuit. Ce sont des mesures plutôt simples et rappelons qu'on parle, grosso modo, de 90 000 enfants face à une Europe d'un demi-milliard de citoyens.

Mais ces mesures, il faut les vouloir et vouloir les mettre en place. Monsieur le Commissaire, aujourd'hui, je ne vais pas du tout dénoncer l'inaction de la Commission, bien au contraire. Mais au fond, ce n'est pas ici, dans cette enceinte, qu'il faudrait débattre, mais plutôt au cœur des parlements nationaux, car ce sont les États qui pêchent et qui, comme dans beaucoup d'autres domaines, manquent cruellement de volonté politique et manient l'hypocrisie en ne respectant ni les engagements ni les législations européennes.

Arrêtons d'accuser l'Europe pour ce qu'elle ne peut pas faire. Soyez, Monsieur le Commissaire, notre porte-parole pour mettre les États membres au pied du mur. C'est un scandale pour ces enfants et une honte pour les citoyens européens.

Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, es nuestro deber, ha dicho, pero he de decir que están fallando estrepitosamente. Y los responsables tienen nombre y apellidos: son los Estados miembros y sus políticas que, como casi siempre, están ausentes de este debate. Menores no acompañados están sufriendo violencia física y sexual y amenazas. Y esto favorece a las mafias y sus redes de tráfico, por ejemplo, en Hungría, Bulgaria o Croacia, según informa Save the Children.

Pero también sufren violencia a manos de policías y militares, y también hay que decirlo. En Europa hay cárceles temporales para estos niños, que siguen siendo objeto de devoluciones en caliente. Y si muchos prefieren la calle a los campamentos, es por miedo a la violencia o a ser deportados. No olvidemos que sus familias han vendido todo lo que tienen para que ellos puedan viajar y tener una oportunidad, con la presión psicológica que ello conlleva.

Señorías, los menores son los más vulnerables, y muchos están siendo tratados con violencia en Europa. Lo hecho y no hecho hasta ahora es vergonzoso, y ni tan siquiera tienen aún procedimientos comunes de identificación y seguimiento de estos menores.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD). – Herr talman! Diskussionen kring barn och särskilt ensamkommande barn har varit felaktig från första början. Jag kan förstå att många av er har fått fel bild. Ofta när man pratar om migration och barn hittar media en bild på ett litet barn, ofta en flicka, en bild som indirekt säger att barnet har kommit bort från sina föräldrar under flykten till Europa. Naturligtvis är bilden en annan.

Om det är något land som känner till fenomenet ensamkommande barn är det vi i Sverige. Vi tog emot 35 000 under år 2015. Anledningen till att ensamkommande valde Sverige är ju naturligtvis tvådelad: välfärd och ålderstester. Sverige har fortfarande inte fått igång några tvingande ålderstester för asylsökande. Tänk om det är en stor grupp som avviker medvetet för att ta sig till det land som de ville till från början istället? Tänk om det är en grupp där de flesta påstår sig vara sjutton år och sedan magiskt har fru och barn när de får sin asylansökan beviljad?

Мария Габриел (PPE). – Г-н Председател, по последни данni на Върховния комисариат на ООН едно от всеки четири лица, търсещи убежище, е дете. Всички цитираме стряскащата цифра от над десет хиляди деца мигранти, които са изчезнали в Европа. Точният брой обаче на изчезналите деца остава неизвестен. Голяма част от случаите са недокладвани поради липса и на централен регистър. Това води до създаване на погрешни данни. Необходимо е наистина информацията да се споделя на европейско ниво, така че тя да бъде достъпна за всички държави членки.

Второ, превенцията – ключова дума. Превенцията на случаите на изчезнали деца мигранти трябва да бъде в центъра на миграционната политика на Европейския съюз. Продължителните административни процедури, липсата на информация и доверие в местните власти, неподходящи приемни условия, както и практиката на задържане са само някои от факторите, които допринасят за случаите на изчезване. Необходими са конкретни усилия в тази насока, за да не позволим тези деца да станат жертва на криминални мрежи и трафиканти, да предотвратим случаите на повторни изчезвания.

Поздравления за усилията Ви, господин Комисар! Въпросите като условията на прием, ролята на Фронтекс, Евродак, всичко това е значителна стъпка напред. Трябва всички да подходим с отговорност към тези досиета, за да може да гарантираме предоставянето на сигурна среда за децата мигранти, както и подобрена система за проследяване с цел осигуряване на ефективна закрила.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Vor fast einem Jahr haben wir hier sehr emotional über diesen Sachverhalt diskutiert, und es gibt sie immer noch, die verschwundenen Kinder. Das müsste Sie, Herr Kommissar Avramopoulos, eigentlich nervös machen – im Interesse der Kinder und Jugendlichen, aber auch im Interesse der Sicherheit in Europa. An Ihrer Stelle würde ich mir auch Gedanken machen, ob es auch vielleicht damit zusammenhängt, dass der Umsiedlungsprozess aus Griechenland immer noch nicht in Gang gekommen ist und dass so immer noch tausende Kinder fest sitzen, die nichts zu verlieren haben, und nicht wenige davon werden Opfer krimineller Banden.

Ich würde mir nicht nur Gedanken machen, wie der Umsiedlungsprozess beschleunigt werden kann, sondern vor allem, wie man zwischenzeitlich die Bedingungen für die Kinder verbessern kann. Ich habe die Zustände in griechischen Flüchtlingslagern gesehen und ich kriege diese Bilder nicht aus dem Kopf. Wir sollten alles tun, um die Kinder nicht alleine zu lassen. Wir brauchen diesen vielzitierten Aktionsplan, sonst werden wir hier im nächsten Jahr wieder genau das gleiche diskutieren, und das sollten wir eigentlich nicht.

Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Cieszę się, że mogę przemawiać. Poprzednie moje wystąpienie niestety musiało być anulowane, ponieważ siedziałem na Pańskim miejscu.

Mówimy o dramatach, ludzkich dramatach, bo zaginięcie dziecka dla każdego rodzica jest tragedią. Sam mam trójkę dzieci i myślę, że większość z nas doskonale zdaje sobie sprawę z tego dramatu i rozmiaru tego dramatu. Wydaje mi się, że tym bardziej powinniśmy starać się inwestować środki finansowe poszczególnych państw członkowskich, a również Unii Europejskiej, w krajach, w których ci ludzie wyjeżdżają, uciekają. Myślę, że im większe inwestycje i poprawianie poziomu życia ludności poza Europą, tym mniej tego typu tragedii na starym kontynencie, naszym kontynencie. Myślę, że warto, by w tej dyskusji to wybrzmiało.

Monika Hohlmeier (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst einmal muss man feststellen, dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Kernaufgabe haben, sich um vermisste Kinder zu kümmern, die in ihren Gebieten sind. Das ist erst einmal ihre Hauptaufgabe, ihre Kompetenz. Offiziell hat die Europäische Kommission nicht einmal eine Kompetenz dafür, weil das der Vertrag von Lissabon nicht vorsieht. Wenn es in Belgien in Unterkünten Probleme gibt, hat der Staat Belgien und seine Regierung die Verpflichtung, genauso wie in Deutschland oder wie in Frankreich.

Aber ich habe konkrete Bitten in den Feldern, in denen wir – glaube ich – etwas tun können, und zwar im Besonderen im Bereich der Hotspots, wo die meisten unbegleiteten Minderjährigen ankommen. Wäre es eine Möglichkeit, Herr Kommissar, dass wir im Bereich von Frontex und EASO gesonderte Einheiten schaffen, die sich um unbegleitete Minderjährige bei der Ankunft kümmern, und dafür vielleicht auch ein eigenes Personalkontingent vorsehen, um die jeweiligen Behörden vor Ort auch dazu zu bringen, unbegleitete Minderjährige von Anfang an, wenn es geht, getrennt unterzubringen, ihnen gesonderte Unterstützung zukommen zu lassen, und das vielleicht auch zum Teil mit Unterstützung europäischer Mittel?

Eine zweite Bitte: Im Bereich von Europol gibt es zwar Einheiten zum Kampf gegen Menschenhandel, Einheiten zum Kampf gegen Zwangsprostitution, Versklavung und ähnliches, aber es gibt kein spezifisches beziehungsweise kein ausreichendes Personal, das sich um die Frage der verschwundenen Kinder oder der bedrohten Kinder kümmern kann. Wäre es möglich, hier in diesen Bereichen ganz gezielt eine Aufstockung bei Europol vorzunehmen, um gezielte und rasche konkrete Schritte von unserer Seite aus ergreifen zu können?

Péter Niedermüller (S&D). – Elnök Úr, miközben az Európai Menekültügyi Rendszer különös figyelmet fordít a kísérő nélküli gyermekekre, fiatakorúakra, a magyar kormány tovább szigorítaná a menekültekkel kapcsolatos törvényeket. Ennek keretében olyan jogszabály készül, amely a 14-18 év közötti, kísérő nélküli gyermekeket, fiatalokat kivéve a gyermekvédelmi törvény hatálya alól. Ez azt jelenti, hogy ezek a gyerekek nem kerülnek gyermekotthonokba, nem kapnak kirendelt gyámot, speciális védelmet. A javaslat azt is tartalmazza, hogy a kiskorúak is automatikusan őrizetbe kerüljenek, és a tranzitónában létesítendő konténertáborokban kell megvárniuk a menedékkérelmi eljárás végét.

Ez a tervezet semmiben sem felel meg az ENSZ gyermekek jogairól szóló egyezményének, sérti a magyar állam alkotmányos kötelezettségét, valamint az emberségből fakadó védelem elvét. Itt és most hívom föl az Európai Parlament és a Bizottság figyelmét, a magyar kormány újabb embertelen intézkedésére. Meggyőződésem, hogy morális kötelezettségünk mindent megtenni annak érdekében, hogy ebből a javaslatból soha ne lehessen tényleges törvény.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα παιδιά είναι τα μεγάλα θύματα της προσφυγικής κρίσης. Περισσότερα από 89.000 ασυνόδευτα παιδιά ήρθαν στην Ευρώπη το 2015 και 10.000 παιδιά πρόσφυγες έχουν εξαφανιστεί, σύμφωνα με στοιχεία της Europol. Στην Τουρκία είναι πάρα πολλές οι περιπτώσεις ασυνόδευτων παιδιών που πέφτουν θύματα εμπορίας, κακοποίησης και εκμετάλλευσης.

Υπολογίζεται ότι, στην Ελλάδα, το 40% περίπου των προσφύγων που βρίσκονται στη χώρα είναι παιδιά. Θέλω να επανέλθω, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, στο θέμα της αποσυμφόρησης των νησιών του Αιγαίου, διότι, σύμφωνα με στοιχεία, στους 16.500 ανθρώπους που βρίσκονται στα νησιά, το 40% τουλάχιστον είναι παιδιά. Υπενθυμίζω την απάντηση που μου δώσατε προ ημερών για το θέμα αυτό, όταν είπατε ότι μπορούν πλέον οι ευπαθείς ομάδες να πάνε στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα, και σας παρακαλώ να το δείτε άμεσα το θέμα αυτό διότι είναι πολύ σημαντικό. Είναι ανάγκη να μπορέσουν αυτοί οι άνθρωποι, αυτά τα ασυνόδευτα παιδιά, να πάνε στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και να μην συνωστίζονται στα νησιά του Αιγαίου. Μπορεί να δοθεί άμεση λύση στην αποσυμφόρηση των νησιών του Αιγαίου κατά 40%.

Alessandra Mussolini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei fare un esempio concreto, perché ho ascoltato bene le parole del Commissario.

Quando le persone più vulnerabili, che sono i bambini, arrivano in uno Stato membro in Europa, che cosa sono? Sono un numero, quel numero sparisce, quel numero non lo trovi più. Negli hotspot quando vengono registrati, prima delle registrazioni, noi dobbiamo dar loro protezione immediata. Perché non eliminare questo numero che, a mio modo di vedere, è una vergogna e non dar loro immediatamente una carta di protezione? Perché sono detentori di diritti.

Poi: eliminazione dei trasferimenti, perché da un trasferimento all'altro negli Stati membri noi li dobbiamo ridurre al minimo, proprio solo nel superiore interesse del minore, perché tra un trasferimento e l'altro si possono perdere, sono bambini che quando arrivano nello Stato membro già sono stati abusati, violentati, ne abbiamo visti veramente in condizioni tremende. L'ultimo, e lo dico, no ai trasferimenti e un impegno economico importante, perché per la tutela occorre un impegno economico, se non ci sono soldi, non ci sono neanche tutele.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, le 12 septembre 2013 déjà, nous votions une résolution qui condamnait les lacunes en matière de protection des mineurs non accompagnés au sein de l'Union et dénonçait les conditions d'accueil, souvent déplorables, de ces mineurs ainsi que les nombreuses violations de leurs droits fondamentaux dans certains États membres.

Quatre ans plus tard, 10 000 mineurs ont disparu selon Europol. C'est un détestable bilan et une faillite collective. Les mineurs non accompagnés constituent l'une des populations les plus vulnérables et, pourtant, leurs droits sont bafoués dès leur arrivée en Europe, avec la rétention, la lenteur des procédures et les regroupements familiaux qui ne se font pas, autant de raisons qui les poussent à fuir au risque de tomber aux mains des trafiquants.

Nous pouvons empêcher cela, notamment en arrêtant les transferts de mineurs au titre du règlement de Dublin, en interdisant la rétention des mineurs ou en relocalisant ceux qui sont arrivés. Pour cela, il faut remettre au centre du processus l'intérêt supérieur de l'enfant, et j'ai le regret de dire que reprendre les transferts vers la Grèce n'est pas une bonne voie à suivre, car ce principe aura un impact direct sur les mineurs, dont les conditions d'accueil restent inacceptables, notamment dans les pays de première entrée.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, Canadá es un ejemplo y una referencia en el mundo en el tratamiento a los menores refugiados y, particularmente, a los menores acompañados. ¿Por qué no lo es la Unión Europea?

Ayer mismo sostuvimos en la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior una audiencia muy intensa en la que pudimos escuchar testimonios desgarradores, pero también propuestas de respuesta a la problemática de los menores no acompañados en la Unión Europea.

¿Qué espera la Comisión para exigirles esas respuestas a los Estados miembros? Este asunto lo debatimos aquí en abril del año pasado, lo votamos y escuchamos de la Comisión el compromiso de traer aquí un plan específico de medidas ante el drama, la tragedia de los menores no acompañados. Todavía lo estamos esperando.

Estamos reformando el sistema europeo de asilo; ahí es donde tenemos que encuadrar la reforma de la Directiva de acogida y de los procedimientos de acogida y de los procedimientos de protección a los menores no acompañados para que, de una vez, la Unión Europea esté a la altura de lo que promete y dé una respuesta que sea una medida de su altura, de su estatura moral ante esa tragedia de diez mil niños desaparecidos en la Unión Europea —según Interpol— pero, sobre todo, de un 20 % de menores no acompañados, del conjunto de los menores que demandan refugio, siendo como son el eslabón más vulnerable de la cadena del refugio, pero también de la explotación de personas.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, všichni se shodujeme, že děti jsou těmi nejzranitelnějšími, těmi nejvíce nevinými oběťmi v té vlně migrantů, kteří přišli do Evropy. A Evropa by měla dokázat, že si je vědoma své odpovědnosti a dokáže hájit nejlepší zájem dítěte.

Jaké je tedy řešení? Už jste tady o tom mnozí z vás hovořili. Děti musí být identifikovány, musí získat ochranu a péči, kterou potřebují. Myslím, že nikdo z nás nebude litovat prostředků na naplnění těchto opatření. Je potřeba vyčlenit řádné finanční prostředky a také personální kapacity. Nemáme v tom žádné omezení. Chci vás, pane komisaři, vyzvat, abyste si byl vědom toho, že máte naši plnou podporu pro všechna legislativní opatření i finanční opatření ke snímání otisků prstů, k identifikaci dětí a k finančním zajištěním pro zařízení, kde bude o děti adekvátně pečováno.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i minori non accompagnati che arrivano in Europa lungo la rotta del Mediterraneo centrale sono vittime di violenze di ogni genere, sono la categoria più a rischio.

Secondo il rapporto UNICEF «Un viaggio mortale per i bambini», pubblicato recentemente, dei 181 000 migranti e profughi arrivati in Italia, circa il 30 % sono minori e nove su dieci di essi sono arrivati sulle coste italiane non accompagnati. Inoltre, dei 4 579 migranti che nel 2016 si stima siano morti durante la traversata del Mediterraneo, si ritiene che 700 fossero minori. Europol ha fatto sapere che almeno 10 000 bambini migranti e rifugiati sono scomparsi in Europa nel 2016; molti di questi minori vengono arruolati nel mondo della microcriminalità dove subiscono vari tipi di sfruttamento. Questi sono i numeri di un'Odissea.

È necessario e urgente mettere in campo una strategia globale volta a proteggere tutti i minori migranti, così come annunciato nell'agenda europea della migrazione; i minori non accompagnati devono essere tutelati e protetti contro ogni minaccia. Questa deve essere una priorità assoluta dell'Europa, l'Europa la facciamo anche così.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, nestanak djece migranata u Europi u 21. stoljeću skandalozna je pojava pred kojom se doista trebamo sramiti. Jamčiti sigurnost onih koje odlučimo primiti, naša je dužnost i ova je užasna pojava još jedan pokazatelj da smo zagrizli više nego što možemo proživakati.

Toleriranje ilegalne migracije ogromnih razmjera dovelo je do ovog sramotnog problema, i bez ozbiljne revizije naše useljeničke politike i politike azila, on neće biti riješen. Ilegalne migrante na naš teritorij dovode kriminalci, krijumčari ljudi. Što smo mi otvoreniji za takvu vrstu migracije, to više ljudi želi doći na takav način, a krijumčarima posao cvijeta.

Ono što se često ne uzima u obzir jest da kriminalci imaju svoje partnere u Europi pa im dio migranata, koji su nezaštićeni i predstavljaju laki plijen, samo prosljeđuju za druge kriminalne aktivnosti. Stanimo na kraj ilegalnoj migraciji i riješimo ovaj problem jednom zauvijek.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, comisario, esta declaración era imprescindible si tenemos en cuenta que Europol puso cifras para medir el problema: 10 000 menores no acompañados desaparecieron en 2015. Significa que en algún momento hubo constancia de dónde estaban y quiénes eran, pero lo peor es lo poco que sabemos de lo que ocurre con ellos y lo mucho, triste y grave, que podemos imaginar. Si las personas en busca de asilo son ya vulnerables, los menores, las mujeres y otros colectivos con necesidades especiales nos recuerdan la intensidad de un drama que necesita ya medidas urgentes.

La trata de seres humanos, que «caza» entre personas desesperadas y que se ayuda de nuevas tecnologías para encontrar a sus víctimas, se combate mejor con la cooperación policial y judicial, la definición de un delito específico, una atención especial en los puntos de entrada, con una rápida asignación de tutorías e inserción en programas de integración. Pero necesitamos, señor comisario, saber dónde están estos niños y necesitamos exigir a los Estados miembros su colaboración en estas políticas.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ευχαριστώ τον κύριο Επίτροπο για τη συμβολή του στη συζήτηση. Εμένα, καταρχήν, με στενοχωρεί το ότι επαναλαμβάνουμε μια συζήτηση που έγινε προ έτους, πράγμα που δείχνει ότι, δυστυχώς, πολύ λίγα πράγματα καταφέραμε. Θα αποφύγω να πω ότι πρέπει να σταματήσουμε τις αιτίες που δημιουργούν το πρόβλημα, δηλαδή τους πολέμους, γιατί θα ακουστεί πρωθύστερο. Ήδη βρισκόμαστε μπροστά στο πρόβλημα και αυτό είναι που πρέπει να αντιμετωπίσουμε.

Υποστηρίζω όλες τις προτάσεις που ακούστηκαν γιατί κινούνται προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση. Θέλω να υπογραμμίσω ιδιαίτερα την πρόταση να συζητηθεί το ζήτημα και στα εθνικά κοινοβούλια. Τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να αναλάβουν τις ευθύνες τους. Τέλος, θέλω να πω κάτι που δεν έχει λεχθεί μέχρι στιγμής: πρέπει τα μέσα ενημέρωσης να ανοίξουν τα μάτια των πολιτών. Πρέπει να έχουν αυτό το θέμα στην ατζέντα τους, έτσι ώστε κάθε χρήσιμη πληροφορία να δίδεται εκεί που πρέπει.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the number of what we call unaccompanied minors has reached a record of more than 95 000 last year. Those children are at serious risk of abuse, trafficking and exploitation, and they experience dramatic situations on a daily basis. It is not a question of money. It is a question of political will. We are dealing with human beings, and the most vulnerable of human beings, children. We should not be lecturing other countries about human rights whilst we let this happen on our own continent.

Beyond the issues of relocation and procedure we must have put in place mechanisms to support and heal children who very often experience immense suffering and trauma, often resulting in serious mental health issues. This must be done by taking into account the special needs of children with disabilities, and young women and girls, and we must also give these children access to education. It is a human right.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, escutámos as suas preocupações e prioridades espúrias e as intenções securitárias para resolver esta atroz realidade.

Registamos como sacodem a responsabilidade da violação dos direitos das crianças, uma violação que se soma às muitas violações de direitos humanos que hoje ocorrem em solo europeu e que resultam das vossas criminosas políticas migratórias.

Discutamos as causas deste flagelo. Discutamos como o Regulamento de Dublin e os objetivos da vossa revisão em curso do sistema de asilo desrespeita e impede o direito à reunificação e à vida familiar.

Falemos de como as vossas políticas de muros, de externalização de fronteiras, de retorno e de repulsão alimentam as redes de tráfico de seres humanos e a exploração sexual de mulheres e crianças.

Rejeitamos a vossa histeria securitária, que privilegia a identificação, a recolha de dados dactilográficos desde os seis anos e até a detenção, imagine-se, ao invés de garantir o cumprimento dos direitos fundamentais da criança à proteção e à integração. Tenham vergonha, Senhor Avramopoulos.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, in January 2016 Europol revealed that at least 10 000 migrant and refugee children were missing in Europe. This is a terrible drama, a terrible strategy, and very difficult to explain. It is clear that Europe has to act to tackle the disappearance of migrant children with every possible means and as soon as possible.

I believe the Commission should inform us when it is going to present a comprehensive strategy to protect all children in migration, as announced last May in the European agenda on migration, and how it will address the clear conclusions and recommendations made during the 10th European Forum on the Rights of the Child and the 'Lost in Migration' Conference in Malta. Moreover, I would like to know what the Commission is doing to support Member States in relocating more children from Greece and Italy.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αύξηση της εξαφάνισης παιδιών-μεταναστών εντός της Ένωσης δείχνει τον βαθμό σήψης του δυτικοευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού. Συγχρόνως αποκαλύπτει την κουλτούρα και τη νοοτροπία του μεγαλύτερου μέρους της εξτρεμιστικής μουσουλμανικής κοσμικής θεώρησης, όπου η γυναίκα και το παιδί αποτελούν εκμεταλλεύσιμα προϊόντα. Εκατοντάδες οι αποδείξεις και τα στοιχεία που μαρτυρούν ότι τα εξαφανισμένα παιδιά πέφτουν θύματα παιδικής δουλείας και εμπορίας οργάνων.

Η ανθρώπινη ζωή παράγει χρήμα και η ανθρώπινη αξιοπρέπεια εξαγοράζεται. Διακινητές δουλέμποροι, αριθμός εργαζομένων σε ΜΚΟ, συμμετέχουν σε ένα διεθνές κύκλωμα που γιγαντώνεται λόγω της ανυπαρξίας, ανοχής και ανικανότητας της πολιτισμένης Ευρώπης. Μόνη λύση είναι ο πλήρης εθνικός έλεγχος των εξωτερικών συνόρων, όπου τα παιδιά θα τυγχάνουν της αρμόζουσας προστασίας και όπου οι διάφοροι επιτήδριοι και οι μουσουλμάνοι γονείς που εγκαταλείπουν τα παιδιά τους θα τιμωρούνται παραδειγματικά.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, desde que a Europa o revelou, em janeiro de 2016, que, então, já 10 000 crianças migrantes e refugiadas haviam desaparecido em solo europeu, que fizeram a Comissão e o Conselho para proteger estas crianças e muitas mais não acompanhadas que chegam à Europa e impedir que caiam nas mãos de traficantes de seres humanos, predadores de todo o tipo e redes criminosas, incluindo terroristas?

Na Suécia, há uns meses, polícias disseram-nos, contristados, que, se uma criança sueca desaparecesse, revolviam o país – mas, se fosse migrante ou refugiada, não havia meios.

Que Europa é esta em que, para tudo, os nossos governantes invocam razões de segurança, mas nela falham clamorosamente, falhando na recolocação e no reagrupamento familiar de refugiados, incluindo requerentes de asilo, incluindo menores, arrastando processos de nomeação de tutores, acesso ao ensino, aconselhamento legal, especializado e apoio psicológico, devolvendo crianças afegãs à procedência, a pretexto de que vêm de um «safe country»?

De facto, assim, alimenta-se o negócio sinistro dos traficantes e põe-se em causa a nossa segurança coletiva.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte, domnule comisar, copiii trebuie protejați indiferent în ce țară trăiesc, așadar și copiii refugiați. Dacă cifra este adevărată, 35% dintre migranții intrați sunt copii neînsoțiți, numărul este enorm. Cum ajung acești copii neînsoțiți? Aici cred că trebuie să căutăm cauza și apoi soluțiile. Totdeauna trebuie să mergem la cauză. Este greu de crezut că minorii au decis să plece fără părinți. Mult mai sigur pare a fi de fapt traficul copiilor, traficul copiilor fără părinți.

Domnule comisar, eu cred că trebuie să acționăm pe două planuri. Primul plan este ca statele membre și Comisia să găsească soluții de protecție a copiilor care ajung în Europa, dar cealaltă soluție este să facem ceva să oprim conflictele.

Și vă întreb direct, domnule comisar, există în momentul de față o colaborare între instituțiile internaționale ONU, UNICEF, Comisia Europeană, Crucea Roșie Internațională, statele membre, organizații locale, pentru că altfel cauza nu va fi rezolvată și rămânem în continuare cu un flux de copii care vin în nesiguranță și sunt traficați. Mulțumesc.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, let me start by expressing my thanks for your contribution to this debate and for your interventions that call for actions to protect children. A few of you, I believe, did not hear my introductory remarks, but most of you were here, and I believe that the common conclusion is that we share the same concerns and objectives. I can assure you that the Commission is working on concrete and comprehensive actions to protect children in migration and offer them a future.

Tomorrow the Commission will adopt a package of reports that show that all actions are interlinked. Relocation – and this was underlined by some of you earlier – is the key solidarity measures also for migrant children, and I agree with you that that this situation is unsatisfactory. All migrants eligible in Greece and in Italy should be relocated before September. It is a deadline for all Member States, and I believe that all of them will take up their responsibilities and will move swiftly to the implementation of this relocation scheme. Relocation of unaccompanied minors should increase as a matter of absolute priority for us and for all of us. I said at the beginning that detention is a tool of last resort that should not be excluded per se, but only used in cases where it is in the best interest of the child.

Let me stress that the European legislation requires Member States to place minor migrants only in specialised detention centres that are adapted for migrants so that they have access to leisure activities. Sometimes, as I said before, this is for their own protection because let us be clear: the reality out there on the ground is not ideal. We have to prevent minors falling into the hands of unscrupulous smugglers and traffickers that wait outside open detention centres, so closed centres can be appropriate in some cases.

Some of you, like me, have been visiting these places. Children are the easiest victims of smugglers and traffickers. Colleagues, our primary, common goal is to protect children and I would like also to call on NGOs with expertise to support the authorities of Member States under pressure even more. The protection of children of course needs to be regulated, but it is the responsibility of our societies, of all of us as a whole, and the Commission has taken the lead on that but, as was said very correctly before, Member States should take their share and I fully agree with the proposal to sensitise and mobilise your colleagues in the national parliaments. We have to address this issue together, united, and I do not think there is one person among you, or among the Members of the Commission or among your colleagues in the national parliaments, that does not share our determination, our commitment, to safeguard and support this vulnerable group of the migrants that have decided to cross rough seas, fire, dictatorships, difficulties and dangers in order to come to Europe. It is our duty and it remains, as I said before, our top priority to address this very, very sensitive issue.

Przewodniczący. – Dziękuję za tę ostateczną deklarację, którą pan złożył. Proszę zauważyć, że mówiliśmy o dzieciach. Nigdy nie mówiliśmy o uśmiechu dziecka, radości dziecka, wręcz o czymś zupełnie innym. Oczekujemy zatem na konkretne kroki.

Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD), *in writing*. – The scale of disappearance of migrant children is absolutely shocking. Research by Missing Children Europe estimates that up to 50% of unaccompanied children in certain reception centres in the EU go missing. We are told by Europol that there is a ‘tremendous amount of crossover’ between smugglers smuggling refugees across borders and gangs ensnaring people for forced sexual and labour exploitation. Yet the issue is not confined to the country of origin. If a child is abducted in Spain, they could easily travel as far as Sweden or any of a dozen countries without them or their kidnappers ever being subject to a passport check. The opportunity to catch the perpetrators is lost, and the problem is incredibly difficult to tackle when we do not even know which country a criminal or victim is in. If the European Union truly cares about security, it will rethink the Schengen Agreement, which leads to the unrestricted freedom of movement of traffickers and their victims.

Miriam Dalli (S&D), *in writing*. – When historians look back at the migration crisis, there will be many things that they will say Europe should have done differently. Fifty per cent of all children who arrive at reception centres in Europe go missing, the majority of them lost within the first 48 hours of arrival.

These minors, who have very often been separated intentionally from their family members by traffickers, are often subjected to kidnapping, sexual exploitation, slavery, the tracking of organs, prostitution and even forced drug smuggling. This is not the life for a child. This has resulted in one of the largest atrocities of this migration crisis and it cannot continue to go ignored. But with only four Member States having legal or procedural regulations on missing migrant children, we still have a long way to go. I can think of no greater need for children, than the need for protection. And these children, like all children, deserve it too.

Rosa D’Amato (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – I dati di Europol parlano chiaro e in Europa sarebbero scomparsi oltre 10 mila minori rifugiati.

Questi bambini, il più delle volte privi di documenti e spesso senza adulti che li accompagnano, rischiano di finire preda di organizzazioni criminali internazionali che hanno l’obiettivo di ridurli in schiavitù o di sfruttarli sessualmente, quando non addirittura per la compravendita di organi. Il panorama giuridico europeo è frammentato e farraginoso, privo di una strategia unitaria che possa permettere una lotta efficace alla sparizione dei minori migranti. Sarebbe invece opportuno intervenire tempestivamente per fare in modo che si adotti un protocollo unico, che consenta la loro identificazione al momento dello sbarco o comunque dell’arrivo, della loro registrazione in un database condiviso a livello UE e l’immediato affidamento a servizi di tutela dei minori.

In caso di sparizione sarebbe opportuno intervenire con la massima urgenza, diramando segnalazioni e avvisi a ogni autorità competente in ciascuno Stato membro. Serve inoltre una politica di contrasto duro ed efficace a ogni forma di sfruttamento e sottrazione dei minori immigrati e la Commissione dovrebbe agire in via prioritaria su questo argomento e non limitarsi a spendere parole, tanto belle quanto vacue.

Kinga Gál (PPE), *írásban*. – A migránsok közül is az Európába igyekvő gyermekek vannak leginkább kitéve a zaklatás és a kizsákmányolás veszélyeinek, valamint ők esnek a leghamarabb az emberkereskedők áldozatául, ezért saját védelmük érdekében fontos, hogy regisztrálva legyenek, ezzel megakadályozva elkallódásukat. A migráns gyerekek eltűnését úgy lehet a leghatékonyabban megakadályozni, ha a hazájukhoz közeli táborok életkörülményeinek javítása révén el tudjuk érni, hogy életüket kockáztatva és számtalan veszélynek kitéve magukat ne kelljenek útra Európa felé.

Ennek egyik legfontosabb eleme a megfelelő oktatáshoz való hozzáférés biztosítása, ugyanis ez elengedhetetlen a gyermekek egészséges fejlődéséhez, de saját közösségük jövője szempontjából is – nem eshetnek ki egész generációk az oktatásból. De ugyanúgy fontos a megfelelő egészségügyi ellátás biztosítása is számukra. Magyarország is ezért támogatja a libanoni, jordániai, iraki menekülttáborokban az oktatás biztosítását, szorgalmazza kórház építését.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D), *per iscritto*. – Il rapporto pubblicato dall'Unicef dall'emblematico titolo «Un viaggio mortale per i bambini» fotografa una situazione drammatica che per dovere morale, senso di giustizia, onestà politica e istituzione non possiamo non vedere.

Dei 181 436 migranti e profughi arrivati in Italia nel 2016, 28 223 sono minori. Nove su 10 sono minori accompagnati. Ogni giorno ne scompaiono 28. Dopo le violenze, le torture, i traumi di un viaggio attraverso l'inferno, in Europa non trovano una accoglienza adeguata, così molti scappano, fanno perdere le proprie tracce, continuano ad essere vittime perfette, perché indifese, di una criminalità senza scrupoli. Non ci sono minori migranti e minori europei, minori profughi e minori cittadini, ci sono bambini e ragazzi che l'Europa ha il dovere di distinguere dagli adulti. I minori hanno bisogno di cure diverse, di attenzioni diverse, di spazi dedicati e di un percorso, un progetto, che li possa portare, se non a dimenticare, a superare tanto dolore.

Oggi la Commissione europea approva la sue raccomandazioni per la politica di migrazione, che non possono non contenere un capitolo dedicato ai minori che scappano dalla guerra e arrivano in Europa. Regole che devono riguardare tutti gli Stati membri. Che nessuno si senta assolto, perché siamo tutti coinvolti.

Jaromír Kohlíček (GUE/NGL), *pisemně*. – V řadě zemí EU se v posledních dvou letech objevily tisíce nominálně nezletilých migrantů. Zdá se, že těžší z informací o zvláštních podmínkách dětí, které jako migranti přijdou do EU. Vzhledem k tomu, že nemají žádné osobní doklady a věk se na pohled opravdu spolehlivě určit nedá, je řada těchto migrantů řazena mezi nezletilé na základě vlastního prohlášení. V proslulé „džungli“ u města Calais byli nominálně dospělí a nominálně nezletilí. Dospělí byli přemístěni do různých utečeneckých zařízení po celé Francii, zatímco „nedospělí“ se nakonec do Anglie dostali. Nejsm si jist, zda podobná politika je správná, ale chápu, že u mladších migrantů je větší šance ovlivnit jejich postoje výchovou. Přesto se nemohu ubránit přesvědčení o tom, že se o své občany má starat především země jejich původu, a nikoliv jimi zvolená a „zřejmě i někým doporučená“ země. V zásadě je jedno, zda se jedná o oficiálně pohřešované nedospělé migranty nebo o ty, jejichž pobyt je známý. V řadě zemí EU tyto postoje oficiálních míst výrazně zesilují xenofobní nálady a zvyšují preference extrémní pravice. Tím i narůstá riziko sebedestrukce projektu Evropské unie.

Kati Piri (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – Duizenden alleenreizende kinderen zijn de afgelopen jaren zoek geraakt in Europa. Zij lopen het gevaar slachtoffer te worden van uitbuiting, gedwongen prostitutie, en zelfs illegale orgaanhandel. De EU en de nationale regeringen zouden er goed aan doen dit probleem hoog op de agenda te zetten, zowel voor de veiligheid van deze kinderen als voor onze eigen veiligheid. Zij zijn immers een makkelijke prooi voor georganiseerde misdaad en extremistische ronselaars.

Het is bizar dat Europa niet eens voor deze meest kwetsbare migranten kan zorgen. Onze regeringen moeten simpelweg zorgen voor fatsoenlijke opvang, betere monitoring en het nakomen van eerder gemaakte afspraken over de herplaatsing van vluchtelingen uit Griekenland en Italië. Zo zijn er in Griekenland 500 alleenstaande kinderen die al maanden aan alle voorwaarden voor herplaatsing voldoen, maar desondanks nog altijd niet door andere Europese landen zijn overgenomen. Het is een schande!

Soraya Post (S&D), *skriftlig*. – 10 000 migrerande barn är försvunna i Europa. Dessa siffror hör vi om och om igen. Men de försvunna barnen är inte försvunna, de lever och finns mitt ibland oss. De försvinner av rädsla för att skickas tillbaka. När barnen inte har någon trygg plats tar de tillflykt till det ställe som tar emot dem. De hamnar hos organiserade gäng, de säljer droger för att överleva, de blir sexuellt utnyttjade, utan tillgång till skola, sjukvård eller någon av alla de rättigheter barn har. Det är vuxna som har tagit deras rätt till en trygg plats. Det är vuxna som tagit bort deras hopp. Vissa barn är så utlämnade att de väljer att ta sitt liv. Vi behöver ge dessa barn deras rätt till en självklar plats i världen: vi måste ge barnen uppehållstillstånd och göra det omedelbart genom en generell amnesti. Barnen behöver veta att de är önskade. Som Olof Palme sa: det finns inte dina ungar eller mina ungar, det finns bara våra barn. Och detta behöver barnen veta. I dag, i denna minut.

Емил Радев (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – Информацията за изчезналите 10 000 деца мигранти е притеснителна по две причини. От една страна, това са деца, за които ние имаме задължението да се грижим с особено внимание, имайки предвид, че някои от тях са загубили родителите си. От друга страна, ако толкова много деца успяват да избягат от зоркото око на службите, представете си още колко и какви хора използват мигрантските маршрути, за да достигнат до Европа и после да изчезнат.

Необходими са повече действия на европейско ниво за защита на децата мигранти, като например борба срещу трафика на хора, предоставяне на специални грижи за непридружените деца, засилване на сътрудничеството и обмена на информация между службите за сигурност по отношение на изчезналите деца, дори и чрез създаване на специализиран отдел в Европол.

Необходимо е и чрез предстоящите промени на европейското законодателство да гарантираме, че непридружените деца мигранти получават квалифицирани и обучени настойници. Децата мигранти не са престъпници, но могат да се превърнат в такива, ако попаднат в ръцете на трафиканти на хора, организирани престъпни групи и дори терористични мрежи. Затова справянето с проблема на изчезналите деца мигранти е в интерес както на тяхната сигурност и благосъстояние, така и на европейската сигурност.

Monika Smolková (S&D), písomne. – Lisabonská zmluva zakotvuje ochranu práv detí ako jednu z úloh Európskej únie, a to jednak vnútorne (v rámci EÚ), ako aj vo vzťahu k tretím krajinám. V posledných obdobiach do Európy, žiaľ, ročne prúdia tisíce detí pochádzajúcich z tretích krajín a migrujúcich bez sprievodu svojich rodičov alebo zákonných zástupcov. Dôvodom, prečo je tomu, tak je mnoho, no niektorí sú utečencami a utekajú pred vojnou, ozbrojeným konfliktom, prenasledovaním či diskrimináciou v krajine pôvodu. Je však mnoho detí, ktoré utekajú pred chudobou a v Európe hľadajú lepší život a prácu. Čo osobne považujem za najsmutnejšie, je to, že mnohé z týchto detí sú častými objektmi obchodovania s ľuďmi, nútenej práce či vykorisťovania. Ak by sme aj opomenuli motív cesty týchto migrujúcich detí, s ľútosťou musím konštatovať, že tieto deti sú extrémne zraniteľné a náchylné stať sa obeťou prostitúcie, zneužívania na pornografiu, otrokom detskej práce, obchodu s drogami a ďalších foriem zločinnosti. Za mimoriadne alarmujúci problém považujem miznutie migrujúcich detí, ktoré sú spomedzi migrantov najzraniteľnejšími, pretože v živote, kde sa ocitli, sú akoby neviditeľné a bez vlastného hlasu.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη (PPE), γραπτώς. – Ένα χρόνο μετά την κατάθεση σχετικής κοινοβουλευτικής ερώτησης για την εξαφάνιση, κατ' εκτίμηση, 10.000 ανήλικων προσφυγόπουλων στην Ευρώπη, η κατάσταση όχι μόνο δεν έχει αλλάξει αλλά φαίνεται να είναι χειρότερη απ' ό τι γνωρίζουμε. Τα στοιχεία πλέον μιλούν ακόμη και για 30.000 αγνοούμενα παιδιά, τα οποία μέχρι στιγμής αδυνατούμε να εντοπίσουμε και να βοηθήσουμε να επανενωθούν με τις οικογένειες τους. Πολλά από αυτά πιθανολογείται ότι έχουν πέσει θύματα εκμετάλλευσης, ιδίως σεξουαλικής, από δίκτυα οργανωμένου εγκλήματος διακίνησης ανθρώπων και εμπορίας οργάνων (trafficking). Είναι γεγονός ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Αστυνομική Υπηρεσία δεν διαθέτει ειδική μονάδα που να ασχολείται με τα αγνοούμενα παιδιά, ενώ ο συντονισμός των κρατών μελών στον τομέα αυτό είναι απογοητευτικός. Η καταγραφή των ανήλικων με τη λήψη δακτυλικών αποτυπωμάτων, λαμβανομένης υπόψη της ηλικίας τους και σε κάθε περίπτωση, όχι σε ανήλικους κάτω των έξι ετών, είναι ένα σημαντικό μέτρο για να αποφύγουμε νέα φαινόμενα εξαφάνισης παιδιών. Επιπλέον, είναι κεφαλαιώδους σημασίας να υπάρξουν πιο αποτελεσματικοί ευρωπαϊκοί κανόνες, που να αναγκάζουν τα κράτη μέλη να συνεργάζονται μεταξύ τους αλλά και με τη EUROPOL, για να γεφυρωθεί το υπάρχον κενό στη διασυνοριακή συνεργασία. Τα παιδιά είναι η πιο ευάλωτη ομάδα των μετακινούμενων πληθυσμών και αποτελεί χρέος της πολιτισμένης Ευρώπης να προστατεύσει το μέλλον τους.

19. Gender pay gap (debate)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia są oświadczenia Rady i Komisji w sprawie zróżnicowania wynagrodzenia ze względu na płeć (2017/2567(RSP)).

Chris Agius, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, Commissioner Jourová, first of all let me thank you for the opportunity to intervene here today on the topic of the gender pay gap. Equality between men and women is a fundamental principle of the European Union. It is enshrined both in our Treaties and in Article 23 of the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights.

In 1975, the Treaty of Rome was successfully invoked to defend the rights of an air hostess who worked for the Belgian national airline, Sabena. She felt it was unfair that she was paid less just because she was a woman. She demanded equal treatment and won her case in the European Court of Justice. That groundbreaking European Court ruling more than 40 years ago opened the way for the first European directives on gender equality. Mainstreaming this principle in all our activities represents an important mission for the Union. Promoting equal economic independence for women and men, including by closing the income gap, is a crucial element necessary to ensure de facto gender equality. However, as we all know, equality on paper does not always translate into factual equality. The principle of equal pay for work of equal value has long been enshrined in European law. Nonetheless, women in Europe continue to earn, on average, around 16% less than men. In some Member States, the gender pay gap is over 20% and when it comes to pensions the situation is even bleaker, with a gap of 38.5% on average across the European Union.

The causes of the gender pay gap are many. However, an important underlying problem is that society seems to value women's work, paid or unpaid, less than the work of men. Firstly, the sectors employing a majority of women are also those sectors where pay tends to be the lowest. These include care work, cleaning services, casual work and so on. Secondly, women tend to be employed in more junior positions compared to men, a phenomenon we call the glass ceiling. Thirdly, women often have less continuity in their careers, as compared to men. This is because they so often give up their jobs or reduce their working hours in order to work at home. Finally, there is the crucial issue of lack of transparency in pay. It is hard to fight unfairness when unfairness is hidden. These challenges are common in all Member States, however their extent, dimension and context all differ from one Member State to another. This is why the actions that need to be taken in order to address this complex issue of the gender pay gap vary accordingly. Gender equality policies are essential instruments in economic terms. They also lead to greater prosperity, competitiveness and employment. They increase inclusiveness and social cohesion.

Honourable Members, what measures should be taken to close the gender pay gap? Greater pay transparency can help the underpaid fight for their rights. Jobs should be classified mutually and fairly. Also, we must focus on the quality of jobs: while flexibility is important, it should not be forcibly imposed on workers, for example, in the form of precariousness or involve involuntary part-time work. Moreover, more women are needed in company boardrooms and in other decision-making groups. Finally, we must ensure that both sexes can benefit from the opportunities offered by the digital economy, the green revolution, robotics and by the many other transformative developments in the labour market. To achieve this, we should start with education, as gender stereotyping starts very early in our lives. We should encourage more girls to study science, engineering, technology and maths. The IT sector, of course, is another area where women are under-represented and where their talents are needed.

We also need to take a closer look at the concept of a correct work-life balance. This can be addressed through a variety of measures, which include better access to childcare and child services for dependents, as well as flexible work arrangements or leave provisions. This is true also for men. In this context, the Council looks forward to the forthcoming initiative from the Commission on improving the work-life balance.

I would like to thank the European Parliament for its continuous commitment to maintaining the issue of the gender pay gap on the European agenda. I believe this is an issue on which our two institutions have much common ground. The Council has, in particular in the last two years, worked on the gender pay and pensions and on women in poverty. On Friday, the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council will discuss measures to enhance the skills of women and men in the labour market. In this context, ministers will also consider further measures aimed at addressing the gender pay gap. Moreover, in the context of the European semester, the Council will adapt recommendations to improve women's labour market outcomes and to reduce the gender pay gap. To summarise, we must continue to work together. Only by turning words into actions will we succeed. Thank you very much for your attention.

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, equality between women and men is a fundamental value of the European Union, enshrined in the Treaty from the very beginning. The Treaty of Rome, whose 60th anniversary we will remember in a few days, already included a provision on equal pay, opening the way for a broader gender equality policy in Europe later on.

Over the last 60 years, women have reaped the benefits of education and massively entered into the labour market. Sixty per cent of new graduates today are women. Yet, after undeniable encouraging developments, the gender pay gap seems to have stabilised at 17% in the EU. Compared to men, women are also less likely to be in paid employment, to sign permanent and stable work contracts, and they tend to work fewer hours. The glass ceiling still exists: although women have made inroads into economic decision-making positions, less than 5% of company leaders in the EU are women.

So it is clear that to finally erase the gender pay gap, we have to do much more. We know the gender pay gap has various root causes and my aim is to have a set of different measures to effectively tackle these roots. In other words, each of those sources of pay gap requires different solutions.

In 2014 we adopted a Recommendation on strengthening the principle of equal pay between men and women through transparency. We proposed a package of measures which could be adopted by Member States to effectively fight the direct discrimination in pay for work of equal value, and we work with the Member States to assess how these measures were implemented and how it works in practice. Ladies and gentlemen, I can only share with you that our assessment is that transparency is very important but it does not do magic.

Discrimination, which means different pay for the same work, is already prohibited by EU law, so we are pushing for better enforcement of the legislation in force. But discrimination is unfortunately not the only cause of the gender pay gap. We witness the horizontal segregation of the labour market. Women tend to be grouped in sectoral jobs which are under-paid and valued less, such as the social care sector, for instance. It is our intention to support both women and men to go for the less and non-traditional jobs. A good example is the digital sector, already mentioned here by the Presidency, where there are only 30% of women, and we know it is the sector of the future. We pay for projects to get more girls and women into this sector. And, yes, education is the way to solve this problem as well.

There is also an issue of part-time jobs. It is clear that during some period of time people might need to use the working arrangement to better reconcile work and private duties. However, it should not be a rule that only women are going for part-time jobs, and there needs to be a guarantee for employees who choose the temporary arrangement to resume full-time work. It is one of the provisions we intend to promote in the package of measures to improve conditions for working parents and carers, the so called 'work-life balance package', which is a joint initiative with Commissioner Thyssen. The Commission should adopt this package of legislative and non-legislative measures on 21 April.

One of the big challenges is the unequal sharing of care responsibilities between women and men. Among the working population, women spend on average 21 hours a week on caring and household activities compared to nine hours spent by men. It has a lifelong effect on women's careers, earnings and unfortunately also pensions, where we now have a harmful 40% gap as a reward to women for their lifelong care for their families.

All this shrinks their economic independence. This is not acceptable: all talents must be properly valued and recognised; and a better work-life balance should be sought for both men and women. When providing parents with choice and opportunities, we also aim to eradicate the negative lifelong effect of 'no-choice available' on women's careers, earnings and pensions. I already said in one of the plenary sessions when we discussed the pay gap and work-life balance initiative that it is our duty to remove the barriers for working parents to combine better work and family duties and it will be the free choice of people to use these opportunities. This is the philosophy which you will see in the package on work-life balance which we are preparing.

This is, as you know, one of our initiatives for 2017, and this is also an initiative related directly to the European Pillar of Social Rights. The Commission is also undertaking a number of policy and awareness-raising actions to address the gender pay gap. As you know, we initiated the European Equal Pay Day; we encourage the exchange of best practices among Member States and we co-finance Member State initiatives through the Structural Funds and actions by civil society. Talking of Structural Funds, there will be a very rich chapter in the new package on work-life balance to encourage the Member States to use better and more intensively the EU Structural Funds for creating more and better and affordable social care facilities, whether it be crèches, kindergartens or facilities for caring for seniors, because this money should serve people. I cannot imagine many more and better opportunities to use this money for a really good purpose. Ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to the debate with you now.

Przewodniczący. – Bardzo dziękuję, pani komisarz. Wysłuchaliśmy dwóch oświadczeń, obraz wydaje się dość klarowny. Oba oświadczenia są w podobnym duchu, nie ma istotnych rozbieżności, natomiast wydaje się, że deklaracje, które padły, oznaczają, że zarówno Rada, jak i Komisja mają zamiar spełniać swoje funkcje.

Zanim państwa pożegnám, dziękując za 60 minut spędzonych razem, chciałbym zapowiedzieć, że nie przewidujemy procedury „niebieskiej kartki” w tej debacie.

Elisabeth Köstinger, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Gleicher Lohn für gleiche Arbeit muss im 21. Jahrhundert eine Selbstverständlichkeit sein. Leider – und gerade Sie, Frau Kommissarin, haben es ja bereits vorgetragen – gibt es diese Einkommensunterschiede noch immer, und wir alle sind wirklich sehr stark gefordert, um vor allem die Ursachen innerhalb Europas zu bekämpfen und somit eben zum Schließen dieser Einkommensschere wirklich beitragen zu können. Ich bin der Meinung, dass vor allem eben auch dieses Fehlen von Frauen in zum Teil technischen Berufen maßgeblich dazu beiträgt, und wir schon auch – und es wurde bereits angesprochen – vor allem im Bildungsbereich hier sehr stark ansetzen müssen, um Frauen zu ermutigen, gerade eben jene Berufe wahrzunehmen, die in ganz Europa eigentlich sehr stark nachgefragt sind.

Frauen nehmen sich aber sehr oft im Berufsleben zurück, weil sie einer Mehrfachbelastung mit Familie und Kinder und sehr oft auch dem Pflegebereich ausgesetzt sind. Auch hier glaube ich, ist es sehr wichtig, im Sozialbereich für unterschiedliche Möglichkeiten zu sorgen und die Frauen hier stärker zu entlasten. Beziehungsweise möchte ich auch zu bedenken geben, dass sehr viele Frauen für sich dieses Lebenskonzept aussuchen und beispielsweise als Hausfrauen zu Hause bleiben. Ich glaube, dass sollte auch ein Bereich sein, den wir noch viel stärker wertschätzen sollten. Frauen nehmen sich aber auch in Gehaltsverhandlungen zum Teil sehr stark zurück. Auch hier muss man sehr früh bei Mädchen ansetzen, ihnen dieses nötige Selbstbewusstsein mitgeben, und eben auch diese Karriereperspektive bieten. Sehr wichtig wird es für uns auch sein, den *pensiongap*, den wir aufgrund dieser sehr starken Unterschiede im Einkommen wahrnehmen, entsprechend schließen zu können, denn vor allem Altersarmut betrifft auch sehr stark die Frauen.

VORSITZ: EVELYNE GEBHARDT

Vizepräsidentin

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, nadie puede presumir de vivir en una sociedad moderna cuando datos como los que hoy se han planteado aquí nos reflejan que las mujeres cobran una media europea de un 16 % menos que los hombres por un mismo trabajo. Y hablamos de media europea... porque hay países, como el mío, como España, donde según informes como los que han lanzado estas últimas semanas los sindicatos, estamos en una brecha del 23 %.

Por lo tanto, estos datos nos tienen que hacer ver la necesidad de impulsar políticas reales y plantearnos objetivos para reducir esta brecha salarial. Porque si seguimos a este ritmo, los datos nos dicen que nuestras nietas habrán conseguido el objetivo de la igualdad salarial, que tardaremos más de 70 años en conseguir la igualdad salarial.

Por lo tanto, seamos conscientes de la necesidad de poner objetivos claros. Planteemos la reducción del 2 % en cada país, cada año, de brecha salarial. Planteemos una auditoría —la transparencia es fundamental para poner un espejo a aquellos que no están cumpliendo con la legalidad— y seamos capaces de dar también a los interlocutores sociales el papel que deben tener para prevenir esta situación.

Una sociedad no se puede denominar como justa cuando las mujeres están en una situación de desigualdad como la que tenemos en estos momentos en la Unión Europea.

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

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI), *blue-card question*. – Do you know which was the place in the Polish theoretical physics Olympiad, the first place of women, of girls? I can tell you: 800th. Do you know how many women are in the first 100 chess players? I can tell you: not one. Of course women must earn less than men because they are weaker, they are smaller, they are less intelligent, and they must earn less. That is all.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Mire, señor diputado, según usted, según sus teorías, yo no tendría derecho a estar aquí como diputada, y sé que le duele. Sé que le duele y le preocupa que hoy las mujeres podamos estar representando a los ciudadanos en igualdad de condiciones con usted. Yo aquí vengo a defender a las mujeres europeas de hombres como usted.

Jana Žitňanská, *za skupinu ECR*. – Vážená pani komisárka, pomerne často sa na Slovensku stretávam s ľuďmi, ktorých by možno dnešná debata o rodovom znevýhodnení nezaujala, no napriek tomu sa ich bytostne, prakticky dotýka. Ide o ľudí v povolaniach, ktoré sú podľa mňa jedny z najnáročnejších. Ide o zdravotné sestry, učiteľky, profesionálne i neprofesionálne opatrovatelky. Nemyslím si, že je našou úlohou hodnotiť, ako a prečo sa pre svoje povolanie rozhodli, no ak môžem na tomto krátkom priestore niečo spomenúť, dovoľte mi osobnú skúsenosť.

Poznám veľa príbehov, kedy až vlastná skúsenosť ukázala otcom rodín, mužom, že usilovať o lepšie finančné podmienky, dostupnú a kvalitnú starostlivosť o deti, seniorov a zdravotne znevýhodnených je tou najlepšou investíciou do spokojnej spoločnosti v budúcnosti. Budem rada, ak téma rodovej nerovnosti pri platoch nezostane len „ženskou témou“. Potrebujeme otcov, manželov, partnerov, poslancov a mužov politikov, ktorí zabojujú tiež za lepšie podmienky spolu s nami.

Angelika Mlinar, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Wir müssen endlich aufhören damit, an den Mythos der Gleichberechtigung zu glauben; er ist schlicht und ergreifend noch nicht Realität. „Gleiche Bezahlung für gleiche Arbeit“ ist eines der Grundprinzipien der Europäischen Union, welches seit 1957 in den Verträgen eingebettet ist. Und dennoch gibt es ein *gender pay gap*, unterschiedliche Bezahlung für Männer und Frauen in jedem einzelnen Mitgliedstaat.

Viele Länder feiern den sogenannten *equal pay day* – jenen Tag des Jahres, an welchem Frauen eigentlich beginnen, für ihre Arbeit genauso viel Geld zu bekommen wie ihre männlichen Kollegen. Der *equal pay day* in Österreich ist der 4. März, in der EU allgemein der 2. März. Bis dahin arbeiten die Frauen in Österreich 63 Tage lang, in der EU 61 Tage lang im Verhältnis zu ihren männlichen Kollegen eigentlich umsonst. Mädchen bekommen oft weniger Taschengeld als Buben oder ihre Brüder, und die Pensionen für Frauen betragen, wie von der Frau Kommissarin schon erwähnt, 40 % weniger als jene für Männer – innerhalb der gesamten EU.

Sie sehen: Für Frauen beginnt es mit der Einkommensungleichheit in der Wiege und endet sozusagen an der Bahre.

João Pimenta Lopes, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhora Presidente, a uma semana de uma data histórica ligada à luta emancipadora das mulheres, destacamos o agravamento da precariedade laboral e dos baixos salários que atingem as trabalhadoras, assumindo expressões particularmente chocantes e inaceitáveis nas novas gerações e em setores como a indústria têxtil, do comércio, do alojamento e da restauração ou dos serviços.

As discriminações salariais, diretas e indiretas, entre homens e mulheres têm causas, não surgem por geração espontânea. O capital e o patronato usam-nas para aumentar a exploração.

Discriminações alavancadas nas políticas de direita dos Estados-Membros e da União Europeia, indissociáveis do ataque à contratação coletiva e aos salários e da ofensiva contra os direitos laborais dos trabalhadores e das mulheres, em particular.

A superação destas desigualdades só será possível rompendo com as vossas políticas de classe, pondo fim à precariedade, limitando o recurso ao trabalho temporário, regulando horários de trabalho, sem que excedam as 8 horas diárias, garantindo o princípio de salário igual por trabalho igual e a valorização salarial, assegurando a devida proteção na e da maternidade.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, yo creo que la comisaria ha descrito muy bien el fenómeno. En toda la Unión Europea, con una brecha salarial de 17 %, si contamos el conjunto de ingresos nos vamos al 40. Y yo lo que tengo que decir es que las cosas no evolucionan. Estamos estancados, como se ha señalado.

Mucho tiene que ver también con el tipo de medidas, de reformas del mercado laboral, que hemos impulsado en los últimos años, porque, evidentemente, tenemos una problemática con el trabajo parcial, que, además, después tiene un efecto muy importante en la tasa de cobertura del desempleo y en las pensiones. El hecho de que cobren menos también tiene un efecto en las pensiones, porque tenemos una brecha en pensiones del 40 %.

Por lo tanto, yo creo que el fenómeno es compartido y que aquí hay que ser valiente. La cuestión de la transparencia por parte las empresas que se ha señalado es importante, pero, sobre todo, hay que recuperar una agenda de igualdad de género muy fuerte.

Tengo que decir al representante del Consejo que nos ha hecho un poco de notario de la realidad, ya que nos ha dicho que, si hubiera más mujeres en puestos de mando, esta situación mejoraría. Pues bien, tienen ustedes una Directiva, la de mujeres en los puestos de dirección de las grandes empresas, bloqueada. Sería una buena idea que la desbloquearan porque así eso permitiría también avanzar en este ámbito.

Barbara Kappel, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Minister, Frau Kommissarin! Die Erwerbsquote von Frauen steigt in den EU-Mitgliedstaaten zwar seit Jahrzehnten an, dennoch tragen Frauen in der Regel weniger als die Hälfte zum durchschnittlichen Haushaltseinkommen bei. Mein Heimatland Österreich ist eines jener Länder, in denen Frauen prozentuell am wenigsten beisteuern. Der Unterschied im Bruttostundenlohn liegt in Österreich bei 22,2 Prozent – das ist um ein Drittel mehr als in der EU. Das heißt, Frauen verdienen in Österreich pro Stunde im Durchschnitt um mehr als ein Fünftel weniger als Männer. Soweit zum Thema „gleicher Lohn für gleiche Arbeit.“

Noch gravierender ist der Einkommensunterschied hochgerechnet auf das Jahreseinkommen. Österreichische Frauen haben ein durchschnittliches Jahreseinkommen, welches um 44,5 Prozent oder mehr als zwei Fünftel niedriger ist als jenes von Männern. Die Gründe dafür sind vielfältig. Wir haben einiges heute schon gehört: Es sind weniger Frauen in Management und Führungsaufgaben, Frauen erfüllen in einem viel stärkeren Ausmaß als Männer wichtige unbezahlte Tätigkeiten wie Haushaltsführung, Kindererziehung und Altenpflege, und müssen deshalb oft Teilzeitjobs annehmen. Frauen haben häufiger Karriereunterbrechungen und auch die Segregation am Arbeitsmarkt und in der Erziehung trägt dazu bei. Der Befund kann uns nicht beruhigen, deshalb müssen wir auf allen politischen Ebenen ansetzen, um diese Einkommensunterschiede auszugleichen.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Nikto v tomto Parlamente ani vo verejnom priestore neobhahuje rozdiely v platoch mužov a žien vykonávajúcich rovnakú prácu alebo prácu rovnakej hodnoty. Je to určite dobrá správa a zaslúži si, aby sme o nej hovorili, hoci aj opakovane. Horšia správa je, že hoci tento Parlament prijíma stále ďalšie uznesenia, ktorými sa snaží znížiť neopodstatnené platové rozdiely medzi mužmi a ženami, už 11 rokov sa nenašla politická vôľa potrebná na novelizáciu smernice z roku 2006 o vykonávaní zásady rovnosti príležitostí a rovnakého zaobchádzania s mužmi a ženami vo veciach zamestnanosti a povolania.

To je frustrujúce nielen pre mňa ako poslankyňu, ktorá sa tejto téme venuje, ale najmä pre ženy a matky, ktoré platová diskriminácia postihuje a nemajú účinné nástroje na to, aby sa pred ňou bránili. To sa nezmení dovtedy, kým nevyriešime otázku ďalšej budúcnosti EÚ, o ktorej sme diskutovali na začiatku tejto schôdze. Pretože to, aké opatrenia prijíma na boj proti neopodstatneným platovým rozdielom medzi mužmi a ženami a či ich vôbec prijíma, závisí od toho, pre ktorý z Junckerových scenárov sa rozhodneme.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D). – Gerbiama Komisare, teigiamai vertinu Komisijos ryžtą kovoti su moterų ir vyrų darbo užmokesčio skirtumu, tačiau, nepaisant visų pastangų, vis dėlto situacija nesikeičia. Nevienodi atlyginimai yra daugialypė problema, todėl be darbo užmokesčio skaidrumo, pirmiausia raginu valstybes nares nacionaliniuose įstatymuose įtvirtinti aiškią vienodo darbo užmokesčio apibrėžtį. Be to, taip pat labai svarbu apibrėžti, kas yra tas lygiavertis darbas, nes ES lygmeniu nėra nustatyta lygiavertčio darbo apibrėžtis ar aiškūs vertinimo kriterijai, kuriais remiantis būtų galima palyginti skirtingus darbus.

Vienas iš būdų nustatyti lygiavertį darbą – pasinaudoti lyčių požiūriu neutraliomis pareigybių vertinimo ir klasifikavimo sistemomis. Darbo užmokesčio skirtumas gali atspindėti ir darbo rinkos nelygybę, kurią iš esmės dažniau patiria moterys, ypač kalbant apie sunkumus derinant profesinę veiklą ir šeiminių gyvenimą. Ir dėl to moterys iš tikrųjų dažniau dirba ne visą darbo dieną, dažniau pertraukia savo profesinę karjerą, tai riboja jų galimybes mokytis visą gyvenimą, taip pat riboja ir jų profesinį tobulėjimą. Gerbiama Komisare, iš visos širdies prašau kaip galima greičiau pateikti teisėkūros ir neteisėkūros priemonių paketą dėl darbo ir šeimos suderinimo.

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W kontekście dzisiejszej sytuacji chciałabym zwrócić państwa uwagę na moją ojczyznę. Od wielu miesięcy w instytucjach unijnych trwa nagonka na Polskę. Jej podstawowym elementem jest powielanie kłamstw o sytuacji kobiet w Polsce, jak i o rzekomo łamanej demokracji. Są to oczywiste insynuacje, czego dowodem może być ostatnio opublikowany raport PwC „Women in Work Index 2017”, z którego wynika, że Polska znajduje się w czołówce państw z najniższą luką płacową – tylko 7%. Raport PricewaterhouseCoopers wskazuje również, że jeśli utrzymamy obecny trend zmian, to różnicę w wynagrodzeniach w Polsce uda się zniwelować już w roku 2021, czyli najszybciej spośród wszystkich badanych krajów OECD.

Szanowni państwo, tak się realnie mierzy równouprawnienie – nie w oparciu o kłamstwa, ale o fakty. Polska na tym polu odniosła wielki sukces. Bierzcie z nas przykład.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Madam President, the gender pay gap is the difference between what women and men earn on average per hour before tax. In general, women are not paid less than men for the same work, because that is illegal under EU law. Nonetheless, the gender pay gap is real, even when you factor in the difference in hours worked between men and women. That gap is especially wide in low paid jobs.

A recent study in Ireland showed that in 2015 we had a 14.8% difference in median pay between women and men. Crucially, that gap has widened by 80% since 2012, when it stood at 8.3%. This impacts throughout women's lives with knock-on negative effects on their pensions. The causes of the gender pay gap are complex. We have identified them and now we need to address them. An overarching way of doing this is to strengthen the gender mainstreaming approach throughout the entire lifecycle and to ensure work-life balance.

Dominique Martin (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, débattre aujourd'hui sur les écarts de rémunération entre hommes et femmes est à la fois primordial et futile. Primordial, car il est intolérable que, pour le même emploi, l'écart de salaires entre hommes et femmes soit environ de 9 %. Futile, car ce chiffre de 9 % ne reflète qu'une partie de la triste réalité. En effet, l'écart salarial annuel net est de 25 % si l'on prend en compte le temps partiel et la ségrégation professionnelle.

En mars 2015, je dénonçais déjà le scandale de ces femmes obligées de prendre un travail à temps partiel pour gagner 700 euros par mois, soit moins que le seuil de pauvreté. Aujourd'hui, c'est une femme sur trois qui travaille à temps partiel. La ségrégation professionnelle – le fait que les femmes et les hommes ne travaillent pas dans les mêmes secteurs, n'accèdent pas aux mêmes postes, aux mêmes responsabilités – influence aussi grandement cet écart de rémunération.

Dénonçons également l'exploitation de toutes ces femmes dans la grande distribution, dans les sociétés de nettoyage ou autre émanation de la mondialisation qui, pour un salaire de misère, ne maîtrisent même pas leur emploi du temps.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz (PPE). – Szanowni Państwo! Dzisiaj rozmawiamy o luce płacowej. To jest ten wskaźnik, którego używamy do monitorowania i którego używamy do oceniania i Komisji Europejskiej, i państw członkowskich, jeżeli chodzi o sytuację kobiet.

Chciałabym zauważyć, że luka płacowa ilustruje i diagnozuje tylko fragment różnic płacowych i ekonomicznych pomiędzy kobietami i mężczyznami. Luka, której używamy w naszych statystykach, luka płacowa, odzwierciedla tylko różnice w stawkach godzinowych podstawy wynagrodzenia w danym sektorze gospodarki. To oznacza, że ten wskaźnik nie uwzględnia dodatków za staż, za funkcje, za pełnione stanowisko, za nadgodziny, za dodatkowe projekty. Nie uwzględnia środków takich jak nagrody, nie uwzględnia pozapłacowych dodatków, jak służbowe samochody, komórki, laptopy itd., które zazwyczaj kojarzone są z wysokimi stanowiskami, które bardzo rzadko przypadają kobietom.

Więc gdybyśmy chcieli naprawdę porównać zarobki kobiet i mężczyzn w obrębie branży, powinniśmy tak naprawdę zestawiać ich roczne PIT-y składane do urzędów skarbowych. Taka całościowa luka płacowa byłaby lepszym miernikiem różnic pomiędzy kobietami i mężczyznami na rynku pracy. Wiemy, że taka całościowa luka, bo ona jest zmierzona, wynosi w Unii Europejskiej około 38 %, a więc podobnie jak luka emerytalna, która również jakby obejmuje więcej elementów wynagrodzenia niż luka płacowa.

Pani Komisarz! Ja apeluję o zmianę metodologii wyliczania różnic w zarobkach i o zastosowanie luki całościowej lub luki emerytalnej jako wskaźnika różnic pomiędzy kobietami i mężczyznami.

Pina Picierno (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi è il 1° marzo, ed è in realtà, se ci pensiamo, il primo giorno di lavoro retribuito del 2017 per molte donne, ma non perché siano state in ferie da Capodanno ad oggi, non è questa la ragione, ma perché – se si tiene conto, naturalmente, della parità di mansioni rispetto ai colleghi uomini – hanno lavorato gratis per i primi due mesi. Questo ci dicono tutti gli studi che ricostruiscono la situazione rispetto al divario retributivo.

Perché, sì, nella nostra prospera, ricca Europa esistono ancora queste differenze enormi e sono differenze – colleghe – assolutamente inaccettabili, come avete detto. È inaccettabile anche che questa differenza diminuisca con questa velocità irrilevante, perché di questo passo arriveremo ad una parità di retribuzioni tra ottant'anni; probabilmente potranno raggiungere questo obiettivo le nostre nipoti e, concludo Presidente, quindi ci aspettiamo che la Commissione e gli Stati membri mettano ...

(la Presidente ritira la parola all'oratrice).

Julie Girling (ECR). – Madam President, equal pay for equal work is one of the European Union's founding principles and every Member State is bound to ensure that the principle of equal pay for male and female workers for equal work, or work of equal value, is applied. As Marian Harkin said, however, actually making sure this happens is only half of the problem.

The reasons behind the gender pay gap are complex. They overlap and there is no one solution to this issue, but there is absolutely no doubt at all in my mind that the gender pay gap is caused by direct discrimination: segregation in the labour market, traditional gender stereotypes and work-life balance issues. When combined, all these serve to reinforce gender inequality on a much broader scale. The impact of the pay gap extends even beyond retirement, as we have heard. The at-risk-of-poverty rate is around 22% for women over 65 – reflecting the inequality of pay.

What can we do? It is time that we took real action. We must extend the right to flexible work to all jobs. We must create a more effective policy on shared parental leave, with fathers getting at least three months' paid leave, and we must provide a mandatory scheme that includes funded training for women over the age of 40 who have done their duty in society, as they see it, to get back to work. Society must take responsibility for that.

Anna Hedh (S&D). – Fru talman! Alla här i kammaren vet, eller borde veta, att lönegapet mellan män och kvinnor i EU är enormt, inte minst med tanke på att det nu är år 2017 och att principen om lika lön skrevs in i Romfördraget för 60 år sedan.

Det borde vara en självklarhet att kvinnor och män får lika lön för lika arbete, men att hitta en lösning tar tydligen tid. Kvinnor utgör fortfarande en oproportionell andel av dem som jobbar deltid. De är också överrepresenterade i osäkra, otrygga anställningsformer. Enligt den senaste tillgängliga statistiken från Eurofond är trenden att deltidsarbete är något som ökar. Samma statistik från Eurofond visar också att kvinnor i familjer med barn under sju år tillbringar 32 timmar i veckan i betalt arbete och 39 timmar i obetalt arbete. För män är siffrorna 49 timmar betalt arbete respektive 15 timmar obetalt arbete.

I mitt hemland Sverige, som oftast används som ett föredöme i diskussionen om jämställdhet, når vi lika lön-principen om först 33 år med dagens tempo. I Sverige är löneklyftan 12,5 procent; i EU är den ännu högre och därför krävs det att vi vidtar faktiska åtgärder nu.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Madam President, last but not least, allow a male colleague to speak about the gender pay gap. Although women have as good, or better, qualifications than men in many cases, their skills are often not valued the same as men's and their career progression is slower. This results in an average gender pay gap of 16% in the European Union. Over the years it also results, among other factors, in a gender pension gap of around 39%. This situation is not acceptable and has to be addressed as soon as possible.

Equality between men and women is one of the fundamental values of the European Union but today we are reminded that it is not one of its fundamental realities. We must cut the gender pay gap by 2% each year over the next five years. The 2006 (recast) EU Gender Equality Directive provides guidance for Member States but I believe it is fundamental to have a revision of the recast Directive to introduce mandatory transparency of pay reports and gender action plans in companies in order to reduce the gap.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Madam President, to achieve equal pay for equal work is a top priority for women's empowerment and the lack of progress is frankly frustrating. The gender pay gap is a challenge throughout Europe in all kinds of jobs. Even in Sweden, my country, a champion of gender equality, women earn in a lifetime on average EUR 300 000 less than men. So what are we to do? There is no one-size-fits-all solution. It is a structural problem that needs to be dealt with from different angles and nationally.

Member States have to ensure that women have equal career opportunities in all fields, and this includes care facilities for children and a culture of shared family responsibility between men and women, to facilitate and encourage women entrepreneurship and to fight discrimination. The private sector, where the gender pay gap is more common, should take its share of the responsibility. It is important that we join forces at all levels to raise awareness, putting pressure on Member States to take concrete actions and share best practices.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questi anni molti sforzi sono stati fatti per ridurre la disparità di salario fra uomini e donne in Europa.

I dati in tal senso sono incoraggianti, ma di certo non sono soddisfacenti. Oggi le donne tra i 30 e i 35 anni risulta abbiano in media un più elevato livello di istruzione e siano quindi più qualificate rispetto agli uomini di pari età, ma soltanto il 63 % di queste ultime svolge un'attività professionale, a fronte del 75 % degli uomini. Tale situazione di disuguaglianza, lo abbiamo detto, si manifesta anche in termini di divario salariale tra uomo e donna, divario che tende ad ampliarsi nelle pensioni.

Sono necessarie quindi politiche volte a modificare questa tendenza, a supportare le donne nell'esigenza di conciliare lavoro e famiglia, ma è necessario soprattutto investire nell'educazione, al fine di abbattere pregiudizi e discriminazione che ancora troppo spesso determinano un divario salariale tra uomini e donne.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođa predsjednice, žena je kao majka i supruga stup svake obitelji, ali njezina ključna uloga u obiteljskom domu ni na koji način ne isključuje njezino profesionalno ostvarenje. Žalosno je da mnoge žene danas na tržištu rada nailaze na razne oblike diskriminacije, kojima nema mjesta u civiliziranom svijetu.

Postoje sve izraženije tendencije u europskoj politici da se ženu i muškarca u potpunosti izjednači i svede na isto, što smatram neprirodnim i kontraproductivnim. Različiti smo i te razlike trebamo uvažavati. No tamo gdje nema razlika, gdje obavljamo isti posao, trebamo imati jednake uvjete rada. A naravno, podrazumijeva se – i jednaku plaću.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, comisaria, tenemos perfecta medida de la dimensión del problema, y para la celebración del Día de la Mujer Trabajadora quiero insistir en un cambio de perspectiva sobre la brecha salarial y el trabajo femenino.

La expresión en euros de la brecha salarial es solo parte de la factura que pagamos por no aprovechar al máximo el talento y las capacidades que despreciamos por culpa de la desigualdad. La diferencia de salarios entre hombres y mujeres es la traducción, en el mercado del trabajo, de la desigualdad, y eliminarla pasa por propiciar la conciliación y la corresponsabilidad —en casa, en el hogar— y por asignar responsabilidades sobre la base del mérito y la capacidad sin que el género penalice.

Mientras no solucionemos estos problemas, que empiezan por las actitudes personales de todos nosotros, las mujeres trabajaremos menos horas y en peores empleos, nos pagarán menos por cada hora trabajada y tendremos menos tasas de empleo y retiros más bajos.

Y un ejemplo de ese cambio de actitud es el debate de hoy: solo han participado cuatro hombres, y uno de ellos para insultarnos. Hay que cambiar también la actitud. Es un problema de todos. Es un problema social de hombres y de mujeres.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I think we all agreed that equal pay is, first of all, a matter of elementary fairness, and the fact that we still have this average pay gap of 16-17% also shows, among other things, the lack of respect for women, which is so deeply rooted in traditions and stereotypes. So we need to be smart in introducing a combination of legislative and non-legislative measures in order gradually to change the situation and the conditions.

Yes, we heard here from several men – and the one who offended all of us reminded me of a discussion I had last year in New York with an African minister who had very similar opinions, and I realised how happy I am to live in Europe, even though we have all the problems we have discussed here. This is a good address for women, because the vast majority of us agree that there must be full respect for women, and that there is no reason for keeping the pay gap.

This is a matter of fairness, but keeping the pay gap and keeping the barriers for women who want to combine better family duties and work is also a matter of alarming economic short-sightedness, because we have very telling figures showing that not enabling women to go to work if they want to combine work with their family duties – with better help from men, of course – is a great waste of talent.

I am in frequent contact with IT companies and they desperately need talent, they need innovation, they need fresh thinking, and they are seeking women in this sector. They are also seeking women because women are more in tune with consumer thinking. Women comprise up to 70% of consumers, as measured by the volume of money invested, so there is a demand to have more women better educated for this sector.

Speaking also about those economic factors – and we need to speak about them because when we speak about this only as a gender problem it will not fly because the argument of unfairness, and I do not know why, is still not strong enough – in economic terms, society needs children. We heard the figures today in our new White Paper: the demographic trend in Europe is really alarming, and we need to think about it. Our societies, our economies, need to harvest what has been invested in the education of women. It is so short sighted not to help women to use their education in better jobs.

I could continue this economic argument but I will give you just two figures. We can see that keeping the barriers for women going to work if they so wish costs, in some Member States, up to 5% of GDP. This is a telling figure. There is another figure which I do not use very often but which is relevant, understanding that women's economic dependence on men leads to violence against women: that figure shows how much this horrible phenomenon in the EU costs. We have calculated that it is EUR 260 million a year in Europe. This is the cost of violence against women.

I could continue. I know we do not have much time, so I will conclude by saying that I take this gender pay gap very seriously, I understand all the complexity, and I can only repeat that we need to address all the sources of the pay gap and to come up with smart, well-targeted measures to get rid of it as soon as possible. Maybe we could discuss further whether there is a need for bigger sanctions, whether there is a need to encourage victims of discrimination to complain more often, and so on. There are very concrete measures which we want to introduce.

Chris Agius, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, Commissioner, honourable Members, thank you once again for this timely and useful debate. It has shown once again the complex, but pressing nature of this problem. A cross-cutting life-course approach is needed. Each measure we take in each policy area is a part of the puzzle. The Presidency had decided to focus in particular on the issue of skills. On Friday, the Council will adopt a set of conclusions on enhancing the skills of women and men on the European Union's labour market.

Improving the skills of women will improve their situation on the job market and, later on, in retirement. It is a necessary step on the road towards equal economic independence. In its conclusions in the context of the European Semester on the Annual Growth Survey and the Joint Employment Report, the Council will note that more visibility should be given to the gender pay gap and the gender gap in coverage of pensions and that more efforts should be made to reduce them. Thank you once again for your attention.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – I dati relativi al divario salariale fra uomini e donne nell'Unione europea delineano un quadro complesso, e molto diversificato a seconda dell'area geografica. In particolare, è preoccupante vedere come in alcune regioni d'Europa gli squilibri salariali crescano invece che diminuire. Le disuguaglianze crescono o persistono nonostante le donne abbiano mediamente un titolo di studio più elevato degli uomini: le donne rappresentano il 60% dei laureati totali, e in media l'83% delle donne ha ottenuto almeno un diploma di istruzione secondaria superiore nell'UE, contro il 77,6% degli uomini.

Alla luce di questi dati sul livello di istruzione, è facile capire come la promozione dell'uguaglianza salariale fra uomini e donne sia indispensabile per tutte quelle imprese che vogliono investire nel talento e nella professionalità. Le donne nutrono aspettative sempre maggiori nei confronti della vita professionale, ed è dovere delle istituzioni europee incoraggiare questo percorso di uguaglianza in modo armonico per tutti gli Stati membri.

Eider Gardiazabal Rubial (S&D), por escrito. – Nadie puede presumir de vivir en una sociedad moderna cuando la realidad es que las mujeres cobran el 16,7 % menos que los hombres por un mismo trabajo. Y hablamos de media europea... porque hay países como España, donde según informes publicados recientemente por los sindicatos, la brecha puede alcanzar el 23 %. Estos datos nos tienen que hacer ver la necesidad de impulsar políticas reales y plantearnos objetivos para reducir esta brecha salarial. Porque si seguimos a este ritmo, hasta 2086 las mujeres no cobrarán lo mismo que los hombres, serán nuestras nietas las que consigan el objetivo de la igualdad salarial. Los socialistas pedimos la reducción del 2 % anual la de brecha salarial en cada país, la transparencia obligatoria de los informes sobre las remuneraciones, un plan de acción de género en las empresas, auditorías para reducir las diferencias salariales y apoyar a los interlocutores sociales para prevenir esta situación. Una sociedad no se puede denominar como justa cuando las mujeres están en una situación de desigualdad como la que tenemos en estos momentos en la UE. Las mujeres no somos ni más débiles ni menos inteligentes, somos iguales que los hombres y tenemos los mismo derechos.

Maria Grapini (S&D), în scris. – Doamnă Comisar, egalitatea de gen este un drept prevăzut în Tratatul de la Roma, dar, așa cum a spus reprezentantul Consiliului, în practică este o diferență între drepturile reglementate și cele reale.

Eu aș dori însă să privesc mai optimist acest subiect astăzi când sărbătorim venirea primăverii în țara mea, simbolul fiind „Mărțișorul” pe care femeile îl primesc de la bărbați. Cred, doamnă Comisar, că responsabilitatea realizării în fapt a egalității de gen revine mai degrabă statelor membre. Eu trebuie să spun că în țara mea s-au făcut mari progrese și în ceea ce privește implicarea femeilor în funcții de conducere și salarizarea.

V-aș propune, doamnă Comisar, să vă propuneți să aveți măsuri prin care să fie împărtășite exemple pozitive din unele țări, să continuați cu acțiuni de promovare a femeilor așa cum a fost cea a rețelei ambasoadorelor femeilor antreprenor.

Dreptul femeilor de a primi o remunerație egală cu a bărbaților pentru același loc de muncă și aceeași responsabilitate trebuie respectat, iar rolul este atât al instituțiilor, cât și al societății civile și al ONG-urilor.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D), por escrito. – Nadie puede presumir de vivir en una sociedad moderna cuando la realidad es que las mujeres cobran el 16,7 % menos que los hombres por un mismo trabajo. Y hablamos de media europea... porque hay países como España, donde según informes publicados recientemente por los sindicatos, la brecha puede alcanzar el 23 %. Estos datos nos tienen que hacer ver la necesidad de impulsar políticas reales y plantearnos objetivos para reducir esta brecha salarial. Porque si seguimos a este ritmo, hasta 2086 las mujeres no cobrarán lo mismo que los hombres, serán nuestras nietas las que consigan el objetivo de la igualdad salarial. Los socialistas pedimos la reducción del 2 % anual la de brecha salarial en cada país, la transparencia obligatoria de los informes sobre las remuneraciones, un plan de acción de género en las empresas, auditorías para reducir las diferencias salariales y apoyar a los interlocutores sociales para prevenir esta situación. Una sociedad no se puede denominar como justa cuando las

mujeres están en una situación de desigualdad como la que tenemos en estos momentos en la UE. Las mujeres no somos ni más débiles ni menos inteligentes, somos iguales que los hombres y tenemos los mismo derechos.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Με αφορμή την ευρωπαϊκή ημέρα ισότητας των αμοιβών, στις 3 Νοεμβρίου, ο κ. Timmermans δήλωσε ότι η Επιτροπή εργάζεται σκληρά για να εξαλείψει το μισθολογικό χάσμα που υπάρχει μέχρι σήμερα στις αμοιβές μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών στα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Ωστόσο, μέχρι στιγμής η στάση της Ένωσης απέναντι σε ορισμένα κράτη μέλη της, όπως είναι η Ελλάδα, κάθε άλλο παρά βοηθά στην εξάλειψη του μισθολογικού χάσματος ανάμεσα στα δύο φύλα. Έτσι, στην πατρίδα μου η μερκελική λιτότητα και η βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή έχουν οδηγήσει την ανεργία των γυναικών στα ύψη, με τη διαφορά των συνολικών αποδοχών μεταξύ των δύο φύλων να ανέρχεται σε 45,2%. Η διάλυση του δημόσιου τομέα και η επιβολή ευέλικτων μορφών απασχόλησης έφερε πολλές γυναίκες στην οικονομική απόγνωση. Οι ανισότητες μεταξύ ανδρών και γυναικών έχουν αρνητικές συνέπειες για τις ίδιες τις κοινωνίες και λόγω αυτών των ανισοτήτων αδυνατούν να δημιουργήσουν βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και κοινωνική συνοχή.

Marijana Petir (PPE), napisan. – Od potpisivanja Rimskoga Sporazuma 1957. godine, kojim se zabranjuje diskriminacija na temelju spola u svezi s plaćama, žene se i dalje bore za jednakost i ravnopravnost na radnim mjestima. Nažalost, realnost je drugačija te pokazuje da žene u prosjeku zarađuju 17 % manje od muškaraca što kasnije utječe na nižu mirovinu i za 40 %.

Moram napomenuti da na razlike u plaćama veliki utjecaj imaju stereotipi i predrasude koji se baziraju na spolnoj diskriminaciji. Na primjer, žene se često grupira u sektore koji u prosjeku imaju niže plaće, manji društveni ugled i smatraju se tradicionalno ženskim zanimanjima, kao što su poslovi vezani uz skrb. Također, žene tjedno prosječno utroše 21 sat na neplaćene poslove, poput brige oko kućanstva i djece, dok muškarci samo 9 sati što ostavlja dugoročne učinke na ženske karijere, zarade i mirovine.

Problem na koji se želim fokusirati je slabiji kontinuitet radnoga staža kod žena. Žene imaju manju vjerojatnosti stalnog zapošljavanja i potpisivanja dugotrajnih ugovora radi odgovornosti koje imaju oko obitelji i djece. Povećanjem socijalne potpore i usvajanjem paketa mjera kojima bi se umanjile prepreke zaposlenim roditeljima omogućilo bi se ženama da budu majke bez straha za svoja radna mjesta i za egzistenciju sebe i svojih obitelji.

Pavel Poc (S&D), písemně. – Průměrný rozdíl mezi platem či lépe hodinovou odměnou Evropana a Evropanky vykonávající stejnou práci tvoří neuvěřitelných 16 procent. V případě některých států je však rozdíl ještě vyšší. Kupříkladu v České republice tato nerovnost dosahuje rekordních 21 procent. Případně mi naprosto nereálné, aby v 21. století ještě docházelo k tomu, aby při vykonávání stejného zaměstnání ženy musely pracovat až o 10 let déle, jen aby na konci své kariéry dosáhly stejné odměny jako i zástupci mužského pohlaví. Tato nesmyslná sociální nespravedlnost musí být co nejdříve odstraněna. Umělé vytváření rozdílů v ohodnocení jen na základě pohlaví nepředstavuje jen obyčejnou známku netolerovatelné diskriminace, ale vyúsťuje přímo do stavu, kdy je rizikem chudoby ohroženo daleko větší procento žen než mužů, a to ačkoliv ženy statisticky dosahují vyššího vzdělání. Věřím v to, že transparentnost představuje nutný nástroj, kterým proti diskriminaci na základě pohlaví můžeme úspěšně bojovat. Podporuji proto transparentnější systémy odměňování a auditů, kterými budeme schopni odstranit finanční rozdíl dvou měsíců, který má prakticky ročně k dobru mužské pohlaví. Stojím pevně za požadavkem politické skupiny Socialistů a demokratů volajícím v průběhu dalších pěti let po snížení platového rozdílu mezi muži a ženami o dvě procenta. Odkládání vyřešení problému platového znevýhodnění milionů Evropanek je neospravedlivé.

Jutta Steinruck (S&D), schriftlich. – Die Gleichbehandlung von Frauen und Männern ist ein Grundrecht in der Europäischen Union. Dass einige meiner Vorredner die ungleiche Bezahlung von Frauen selbst bei gleicher Qualifikation und Leistung für gerechtfertigt halten, ist erschreckend. Die Gender Pay Gap beträgt unbereinigt sage und schreibe 41% im EU-Durchschnitt! Das führt über die Jahre unweigerlich zu einem weiteren Problem: Der Abstand zwischen den Renten von Männern und Frauen beträgt 39%. Frauen sind somit häufiger von Altersarmut betroffen. Es gilt in Europa dringender denn je, diese Lücken zu schließen. Wenn wir so weitermachen wie bisher, dauert es noch bis zum Jahr 2069, bis Männer und Frauen endlich gleich bezahlt werden. Wir brauchen jetzt Transparenz über Entlohnung und Sanktionen für Unternehmen, die gegen die Gleichstellung bei der Bezahlung verstoßen. Wir brauchen bezahlbare und gute Betreuungsangebote, um Frauen bei der Kinderbetreuung und der Angehörigenpflege zu entlasten. Und wir brauchen einen Wandel in unseren Köpfen, welchen finanziellen Wert wir typischen Frauenberufen zumessen. Mit diesen Ansätzen müssen wir die Gender Pay Gap in den nächsten Jahren um 2% jährlich senken – das sind wir der Hälfte der Bevölkerung unserer Mitgliedsstaaten schuldig!

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *írásban*. – Fontosnak tartom a férfiak és nők közötti bérszakadékról szóló vitát, hisz ma EU-s szinten mintegy 20 %-ra tehető a férfiak és a nők közötti bérkülönbség. Egy nőnek legalább 10 plusz munkaévet jelent, ha ugyanazt a fizetési szintet szeretné elérni, mint egy férfi. Az évtizedek óta problémát okozó béregyenlőtlenség mértéke tagállamonként eltér, de még mindig jelentős. Motiváló célzattal évek óta vannak figyelemfelhívó kampányok, mint például a tizenharmadik alkalommal megrendezett „Equal Pay Day” kampány. Sokszor azonban a férfiak és nők közötti egyenlőtlenség az egész munka-életcikluson végig kísérhető, az álláskeresőktől kezdve a nyugdíjba vonulásig.

Az, hogy a nők vagy a férfiak vannak-e túlsúlyban, szektoronként változik, de sajnos általános, hogy a nők kevesebb százaléka jut vezetői pozícióba, szektorra való tekintet nélkül. A szegényteljes helyzet megszüntetéséért eddig sajnos nem sokat tett a magyar kormány, habár ahhoz neki is hozzá kellene járulnia. Olyan azonnali lépéseket kellene kezdeményeznie, mint, hogy megfelelő szabályozással rászorítja a munkáltatókat a fizetési diszkrimináció megszüntetésére, vagy például garantálnia kellene a gondozói intézmények és az otthoni munka elismerését. Alá kell húznom azt is, hogy a bérezési diszkriminációhoz hasonló gondot jelent az EU-n belül a tagállami minimálbérek különbsége, valamint az európai minimálbér hiánya is, mely utóbbit közös európai szándék mentén kell minél előbb megvalósítanunk.

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Alors que nous sommes en 2017 et que l'on ne cesse d'affirmer tous les efforts accomplis dans de nombreux domaines, il reste trop aisé de donner des exemples montrant que les femmes ne sont toujours pas mises sur un pied d'égalité avec les hommes. L'écart salarial fait partie de ces exemples et reste trop important, avec une moyenne de 16,7% en 2014. En effet, à travail égal, une femme est payée 83,6 centimes pour chaque euro payé à un homme. À ce rythme, l'égalité de rémunération ne serait une réalité qu'en 2084. Force est de constater que de nombreux efforts doivent encore être réalisés dans ce domaine. L'écart salarial est donc toujours une réalité, et les changements sont trop lents. Notre objectif devrait être, plus que jamais, de s'intéresser aux causes et conséquences de ces écarts afin de parvenir à diminuer ces différences persistantes entre hommes et femmes. Un autre objectif est de changer les mentalités, notamment au niveau de certains hommes, qui ne sont pas assez prêts à travailler sur ce problème. Comme je l'ai déjà dit, les hommes et les femmes ne sont pas et ne seront jamais les mêmes, mais ils devraient au moins avoir les mêmes droits.

Romana Tomc (PPE), *pisno*. – Spoštovani predsedujoči, najlepša hvala za besedo. Žalosti me dejstvo, da ženske, ki so enako usposobljene in opravljajo enako delo kot moški, še vedno prejemajo nižji dohodek. Kljub vsem prizadevanjem EU je povprečna razlika v plačilu še vedno 16,1 %, pri čemer so precejšnje razlike med državami članicami. Tu smo ženske iz Slovenije sicer v prednosti pred drugimi Evropejkami, saj je razlika v plačah v naši državi najnižja. Vendar pa vseeno posledic neenakosti med spoloma, ki se ustvarjajo na področju zaposlovanja, ne podcenjujemo. Če bi dejansko obstajala enakost na trgu dela, bi tudi kot družba lahko izkoristili številne potencialne obeh spolov – to pa bi v končni posledici privedlo tudi do višje rasti BDP vseh posameznih držav članic pa tudi EU kot celote. Prav zato se moramo še naprej zavzemati za koncept enakopravnosti pri zaposlovanju ter za transparentnost plač. Kajti le tako bo EU lahko uresničevala načela, h katerim se je zavezala tudi v Pogodbi.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), *por escrito*. – Nadie puede presumir de vivir en una sociedad moderna cuando la realidad es que las mujeres cobran el 16,7 % menos que los hombres por un mismo trabajo. Y hablamos de media europea... porque hay países como España, donde según informes publicados recientemente por los sindicatos, la brecha puede alcanzar el 23 %. Estos datos nos tienen que hacer ver la necesidad de impulsar políticas reales y plantearnos objetivos para reducir esta brecha salarial. Porque si seguimos a este ritmo, hasta 2086 las mujeres no cobrarán lo mismo que los hombres, serán nuestras nietas las que consigan el objetivo de la igualdad salarial. Los socialistas pedimos la reducción del 2 % anual de la brecha salarial en cada país, la transparencia obligatoria de los informes sobre las remuneraciones, un plan de acción de género en las empresas, auditorías para reducir las diferencias salariales y apoyar a los interlocutores sociales para prevenir esta situación. Una sociedad no se puede denominar como justa cuando las mujeres están en una situación de desigualdad como la que tenemos en estos momentos en la UE. Las mujeres no somos ni más débiles ni menos inteligentes, somos iguales que los hombres y tenemos los mismo derechos.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Como sabrán, la brecha salarial entre mujeres y hombres está, según datos de EUROSTAT, en torno al 17 %. En el día a día, millones de mujeres en toda la Unión Europea sufren una discriminación que podemos denominar como silenciosa, porque, bajo la apariencia de salarios similares, la precarización de los contratos, la temporalidad y el reconocimiento de plusones por categorías hacen que las mujeres perciban menor salario, lo que condiciona inequívocamente sus posibilidades de vida digna ahora y en el futuro, cuando reciban su jubilación. Como saben, el pasado año el Parlamento Europeo se pronunció periódicamente contra la brecha salarial y denunció la precarización. Como ejemplo, está la Resolución, aprobada el pasado 26 de mayo de 2016, sobre pobreza y perspectiva de

género. ¿Qué medidas ha llevado a cabo la Comisión Europea para atender las demandas que este Parlamento expresó en dicha Resolución, sobre todo en su apartado 17? ¿Qué han hecho los Estados miembros en el marco de sus reuniones en el Consejo? Me temo que si seguimos así, con esta parálisis institucional sin estrategia real de género, profundizaremos aún más en la desconfianza hacia las instituciones europeas que tiene la ciudadanía actualmente.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – O agravamento da precariedade laboral e baixos salários, que atingem as trabalhadoras, assumindo expressões particularmente chocantes e inaceitáveis nas novas gerações e em sectores como as indústrias têxtil, do comércio, do alojamento e restauração, ou dos serviços representam um escândalo que importa denunciar em vésperas de mais um 8 de março. As discriminações salariais, diretas e indiretas entre homens e mulheres têm causas concretas. Não surgem por geração espontânea. As causas residem na exploração e nas políticas de direita dos Estados Membro e da UE que promovem esta exploração, com destaque para os ataques à contratação coletiva e aos salários, a ofensiva contra os direitos laborais dos trabalhadores que afetam sempre mais as mulheres como o demonstram todas as estatísticas sociais. A superação destas desigualdades só será possível rompendo com as políticas de classe, pondo fim à precariedade, limitando o recurso ao trabalho temporário, regulando horários de trabalho sem que excedam as 8 horas diárias, garantindo o princípio de «salário igual para trabalho igual» e a valorização salarial, assegurando a devida proteção na e da maternidade.

20. Recent partial decriminalisation of domestic violence in Russia (debate)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Vizepräsidentin der Kommission und Hohen Vertreterin der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zu der vor Kurzem erfolgten teilweisen Entkriminalisierung von häuslicher Gewalt in Russland (2017/2570(RSP)).

Frau Mogherini ist verhindert. Frau Jourová, Sie sprechen in ihrem Namen. Bitte schön!

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, I welcome this opportunity to discuss here, on behalf of Federica Mogherini, the recently adopted Russian law decriminalising some forms of domestic violence, in the context of other discussions we are having on issues related to gender and children. While no country is immune from domestic violence, unfortunately not even in the EU, the Russian Federation has always lacked comprehensive measures to prevent violence against women and children. Currently, according to statistics from the Russian Interior Ministry, about 40% of grave crimes in Russia are committed within the family.

In 2006, the United Nations Committee on Elimination of Discrimination against Women recommended that Russia adopted specific legislation on domestic violence, stepped up its efforts to protect victims of violence and promoted gender equality. In 2010 and 2013, the Committee under the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women found that Russia failed to implement these recommendations, and urged it to give priority to this issue. Russia is one of only three members of the Council of Europe that have not signed the Istanbul Convention, that is, the Council of Europe's Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence.

Most countries in Europe are taking measures to stop domestic violence and raise awareness of this serious violation of human rights. On the contrary, Russia's recent actions send the wrong message about the country's commitment to tackling violence against women and children. They also go against its responsibilities as a member of international organisations.

The recent law – adopted by the parliament and signed by President Putin – reduces ‘battery within the family’ from a criminal to an administrative offence for first-time offenders, and it weakens the sanctions. This is a clearly regressive step. It reverses some amendments to the criminal code adopted by the Russian Parliament itself in 2016, which treated violence against relatives as a criminal offence. The law was passed just weeks after the decision by the Russian Ministry of Justice to list the ANNA Centre as a ‘foreign agent’. The ANNA Centre is a Russian NGO renowned for its work on combatting domestic violence, including its reporting for the United Nations and the Council of Europe.

The European Union expressed its concern about this bill right after it was voted by the parliament, and before it was signed into law by President Putin. We addressed this issue in the Council of Europe on 1 February and in the OSCE on 2 February. After the law was signed, on 7 February, we confirmed our criticism through a statement. We now repeat our call on Russia’s institutions to reverse this law and to respect international human rights standards, implementing in full the recommendations of the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. The ratification of the Istanbul Convention would also be a very positive step.

There can be no excuse for domestic violence. Social norms can be no excuse; family culture can be no excuse. Social norms can change, but we need to work hard for this to happen. We need to work on education and on good laws, so that violence can be eradicated from family life. Reducing sanctions is clearly a step in the wrong direction. It can only leave those who need protection more vulnerable and weaker than before. Honourable Members, thank you for your attention and I look forward to our discussion.

Michael Gahler, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Warum reden wir hier in diesem Hause über diese Rechtsänderung in Russland? Weil wir leider feststellen müssen, dass es in der russischen Duma auch in diesem Fall keine Stimme, keine Lobby für die Schwachen in der Gesellschaft gibt. Und NGOs, die sich darum kümmern – wir haben es gerade gehört –, werden auf die Liste der ausländischen Agenten gesetzt. Stattdessen werden natürlich dann konsequent die Brutalen geschützt, ob sie jetzt Familienväter sind oder andere. Es ist auch ein Hinweis darauf, wie sich die Gesellschaft weiterentwickelt. Warum gibt es denn in der nächsten Lebensphase dann ein Komitee für Soldatenmütter in Russland? Weil die sich um ihre Söhne Sorgen machen müssen, weil sie dort in vielen Fällen genauso brutal, bis hin zum Tode, behandelt werden.

Das ist ein Ausdruck für eine Verrohung der Gesellschaft insgesamt und auch der Sprache in diesem Land. Und ich glaube und fürchte, es soll allgemein die Sensibilität für Gewalt geschwächt werden, die Sensibilität dafür, dass man die Gesellschaft ja eigentlich in vielen Bereichen – in den Lehrplänen, in den Übungen an Schulen – militarisiert. Das alles ist aus meiner Sicht ein ganz böses Vorzeichen dafür, dass in dieser russischen Gesellschaft die gesamte Richtung nicht stimmt, und es beginnt mit den Kleinsten und Schwächsten in der Familie. Das ist zu verurteilen.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, efectivamente, Rusia ha emprendido una regulación del castigo a la violencia contra las mujeres, la violencia doméstica, que nos resulta inaceptable, y me parece muy importante que escuche que este Parlamento y que la Unión Europea lo condenan, y que piden que revise esa legislación. Tenemos un grave problema con la violencia doméstica y, desgraciadamente, no solamente en Rusia.

La comisaria ha pedido que Rusia ratifique el Convenio de Estambul. Estoy completamente de acuerdo, pero tenemos que reconocer que catorce Estados miembros de la Unión Europea no han ratificado el Convenio: Bulgaria, Croacia, Chipre, Chequia, Estonia, Alemania, Grecia, Hungría, Irlanda, Letonia, Lituania, Luxemburgo, Eslovaquia y el Reino Unido. Si queremos exigir a las autoridades rusas un cambio en esa legislación, si queremos de verdad proteger a las mujeres de todo el mundo, tenemos que dar ejemplo en la Unión Europea.

Y tengo, desgraciadamente, que hablar de mi país también, de España: desde que ha empezado el año, han sido asesinadas una media de dos mujeres por semana en nuestro país. Así que exijamos, pero demos ejemplo nosotros también.

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

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE), otázka položená zvednutím modré karty. – Vážená paní poslankyně, jenom jsem se Vás chtěla zeptat, zda víte o tom, že Česká republika má již deset let platný zákon na ochranu proti domácímu násilí a že tento zákon je funkční.

Elena Valenciano (S&D), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Sí, hay muchos países que cuentan con una legislación sobre violencia doméstica, pero, perdonen, señorías, no hay más que ver la cifra de mujeres asesinadas y víctimas de violencia para que reconozcamos todos que es claramente insuficiente lo que estamos haciendo. He puesto mi propio país como ejemplo: se trata de proteger a las mujeres, más que una defensa de nuestra identidad nacional. Cualquier tipo de legislación que retroceda con respecto a la protección de las mujeres será criticada por esta diputada.

Monica Macovei, în numele grupului ECR. – Mulțumesc. Potrivit Amnesty International, o nouă lege din Rusia semnată de Putin pe șapte februarie anul acesta dezincriminează unele forme de violență domestică.

Amnesty International a atras atenția că aceasta este o încercare dezgustătoare de a bagateliza și mai mult violența în familie, o chestiune pe care conducerea Rusiei o minimalizează de multă vreme. Prin această lege se ucide curajul și spiritul liber încă din familie inclusiv la minori. Copiii sunt crescuți să nu aibă curaj, să suporte violența, să suporte insulta și să aibă pumnul în gură. Nu putem avea curajul public dacă în familie suntem reduși la tăcere prin abuz și prin violență.

Iată ce ne așteaptă în Rusia sau cu Rusia sau sub Rusia – drepturile omului ca în Evul Mediu.

Renate Weber, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Madam President, an archaic justification for domestic violence in Russia says: if he beats you, it means he loves you. Recently the Russian Orthodox Church stated that corporal punishment, if reasonable and carried out with love, is an essential right given to parents by God. Unless paired with proof of broken bones, shattered jaws or damaged organs, the voices of the victims of domestic violence are silenced by this horrible law.

All the progress made by Russian NGOs that fought over the last two decades to offer more protection to women and children will have been in vain. The perversity of domestic violence lies in its intimacy and its loneliness: the shame that surrounds it, the fear of sharing the house with the abuser, and the undeniable hope that maybe, just maybe, tomorrow it will not happen again, put the victims in the most vulnerable position. A bruise is not a sign of love or respect or happiness. Fourteen thousand women die every year in Russia at the hands of their husbands. They all started with just a bruise.

What can we do now? Would political dialogue be able to reverse this legislation? Can we support the work of women's NGOs in Russia? Probably with difficulty, but I strongly believe that we cannot fail them.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Senhora Presidente, a descriminalização parcial da violência machista na Rússia é uma péssima notícia para todas as mulheres. É uma vitória do patriarcado que o Parlamento rebaixe as leis contra a violência machista e abra assim caminho para avançar com a impunidade destes delitos qua atentam contra as mulheres e violam os direitos humanos.

As agressões machistas no âmbito doméstico, mesmo quando não provocam lesões importantes, também são delitos. Produzem sofrimento e atacam a nossa autoestima, a nossa saúde e os nossos direitos.

Descriminalizá-los é um retrocesso que reforça o pensamento machista de que as mulheres são apenas propriedade dos homens, que poderão dispor mesmo das nossas vidas. Isto incentiva um machismo que assassina mulheres todos os dias. Só na semana passada, no Estado espanhol, foram assassinadas 5 mulheres.

Basta já! Tolerância zero. Nenhuma agressão sem castigo. É necessário passar das palavras aos atos. Por isso, pedimos, Sra. Comissária, intervenções com todos os meios ao seu alcance, incluindo uma diretiva europeia para terminar com a violência machista.

Terry Reintke, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, colleagues, Commissioner, domestic violence is not a tradition. Beating up a spouse or child is not simply an administrative offence. Domestic violence is a criminal act, even if the recent law adopted in the Russian Parliament tells us otherwise. This law is not simply a legal change; it is a message. It is a message to all victims of domestic violence, to all Russian women, and to all women all over the world: we do not care about your concerns and we do not care about you.

That is why the European answer to this message should be: we do care; we care about any form of gender-based violence. Not only will we adopt the best legislation against domestic violence, starting with the ratification of the Istanbul Convention by the European Union, as well as all Member States, but we will also provide support and funding for women's shelters, support for victims and women's empowerment, starting with the 'She Decides' Fund. What a powerful message of strength and determination – I mean real strength and real determination, not the strengths that people such as Trump or Putin believe in – this would be to all European women, to all Russian women and to all women all over the world.

Mylène Troszczynski, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, les violences domestiques partout dans le monde doivent être combattues, et les victimes protégées et soutenues, nous sommes tous d'accord.

Quand j'ai vu ce débat à l'ordre du jour de nos travaux de ce soir, je me suis demandé de quel crime le gouvernement russe avait encore pu se rendre coupable. Mais contrairement à ce que vous prétendez, nulle part le texte adopté par la Douma à la quasi-unanimité ne légitime une quelconque violence ni conjugale ni familiale.

L'humanité est ainsi faite, la famille est sacrée pour tous – enfin presque tous, car on peut en douter à la vue des textes adoptés et des discours tenus dans cet hémicycle qui mettent gravement en danger l'équilibre familial traditionnel en s'attaquant à l'institution du mariage, en faisant la promotion de la théorie du genre ou en adoptant des mesures permettant la marchandisation du corps de la femme.

Alors, plutôt que de penser aux enfants russes recevant une éducation et, parfois, certes, des fessées de leurs parents, il serait peut-être plus avisé de votre part d'essayer de comprendre les raisons des monumentales fessées électorales que l'Union européenne va recevoir d'ici quelques mois.

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

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE), *pregunta de tarjeta azul*. – Querida colega, ¿no considera que lo que está sucediendo en Rusia es una vuelta a la Edad Media patrocinada por el Estado?

Las mujeres y los niños no son sacos a los que golpear. El abuso físico, golpearlos físicamente, es algo inaceptable. Punto.

Tras firmar esta ley, el presidente de Rusia no debería llamarse Vladimir Putin, debería llamarse «Vladimir el terrible» o, quizá mejor, «Vladimir el apaleador».

(La oradora no recibe respuesta a la pregunta.)

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Paní předsedající, vážená paní komisařko, myslím, že to byl Solženicyn, kdo řekl: „Neznám žádného tvora pod sluncem, který by tolik vytrpěl jako ruská žena.“ Dost možná, že měl Alexandr Isajevič před očima stejně jako Někrasov statečné ženy děkabristů, ale zcela jistě měl na mysli tisíce ruských žen živořících v gulagu, na stavbě železničních tratí, na polích sovchozů. Měl na mysli hrůzy války, kdy ženy ztrácely své muže a syny. Měl na mysli statečné ruské ženy, které ve válce umíraly.

Alexandr Isajevič se dožil i čečenské války v devadesátých letech. Určitě věděl o ruských matkách, které chodily po kavkazských vesnicích a držely v rukou fotografie svých ztracených synů, těch synů, které ruská generalita nahнала na čečenská válečná jatka.

Solženicyn dobře znal tíhu ruské každodennosti. Věděl o tom, jak ruští muži utápějí svoji duši ve vodce, a soucítí s jejich ženami. Solženicyn se netajil úctou k ruským ženám. Škoda, že se nedožil nového zákona přijatého ruskou dumou, podle něhož se již domácí násilí na ženách nepovažuje za zločin, ale za pouhý přestupek. Byl by první, kdo by vysvětlil, odkud pochází násilí v ruské duši.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME*Vice-présidente*

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hemos hablado en muchas ocasiones en este hemiciclo sobre la violencia de género diciendo que es la mayor lacra social que vive en estos momentos el mundo. Y también que no entiende de fronteras, que no entiende de territorios, que las mujeres están siendo asesinadas en el mundo por el mero hecho de ser mujer. Y nos encontramos ahora con esta situación, donde el Gobierno ruso aprueba una ley que dice que pegar una vez a la mujer no es delito; con datos tan escalofriantes como el que cerca de 14 000 mujeres al año son asesinadas en ese país.

Creo que es importante —ya lo hemos trasladado en otras ocasiones— la necesidad de que la política exterior de la Unión Europea tenga una dimensión de género, y, por lo tanto, traslade, en las relaciones con otros países y en la política de cooperación, esa dimensión de género para prevenir estas situaciones y para que las mujeres, dentro y fuera de la Unión Europea, sepan que cuentan con un altavoz en este Parlamento.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Madam President, thank you, Madam Commissioner, for your commitment on violence against women. Today, I wish to reach out to the women and children of Russia that have lost legal protection from domestic violence, to show them solidarity. The new Russian law trivialising domestic violence is a serious setback in combating violence against women. It sounds chilling that beating up your wife, your partner or child becomes simply an administrative offence, like wrongly parking your car, unless permanent damage is caused. It is even absurd to think that this kind of abuse by a loved one would not cause permanent damage to the victim. Domestic violence is violence. It is not a private issue, it is a crime, and it has to be treated as such. Traditional sexist maxims never justify this violence. Women's rights are human rights. These are universal values under the United Nations Charter.

It is not the West versus Russia. Or is it about ideology, patriotism, nationalism, a way to disempower women? We are not interfering in domestic affairs, but standing up for humanity. Russia is a member of the United Nations and the Council of Europe, and should behave as such, first of all by signing and ratifying the Istanbul Convention on Violence against Women. I call on the EU and on the Council of Europe to raise this issue in particular at the upcoming UN Conference on the Status of Women and to urge Russia to modify the law.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir erleben gegenwärtig eine Renaissance autoritärer Verhaltensweisen: Der starke Mann hat Konjunktur – nicht nur in der Politik. Durchgreifen, Fakten setzen, ohne mit anderen zu reden, drüberfahren – das sind Verhaltensweisen, die sich immer größerer Popularität erfreuen. Dazu gehört auch die Gewalt in der Familie gegenüber der Partnerin und gegenüber den Kindern – nicht nur in Russland, aber vor allem in Russland.

Der Beschluss der Duma vom 1. Februar, körperliche Züchtigung innerhalb der Familie nur mehr bei schweren körperlichen Folgen strafrechtlich zu verfolgen, ist ein Schlag ins Gesicht der zivilisierten Welt. Wer seine Familie liebt, der schlägt nicht zu. Zuschlagen ist kein Zeichen von Stärke, ganz im Gegenteil: Schwach ist, wer zuschlägt. Und ein Gesetz, das die Rücksichtslosen schützt, ist ein schwaches Gesetz.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caros Colegas, teoricamente, em 1718, a Rússia aboliu a segregação de género. 300 anos depois, no índice das desigualdades de género, a Rússia encontra-se nos últimos lugares da lista. Mantém-se um abismo no que diz respeito às oportunidades entre homens e mulheres.

Num país bastante populoso, com mais mulheres do que homens, elas ganham menos 32% do que eles. Numa Rússia moderna, que recusa a Convenção de Istambul, 90% dos casos de violência de género não são denunciados e usa-se isso, não para educar para a igualdade, mas para desculpar aquilo que deveria ser um crime público.

Quando a religião, a política e a justiça se confundem é muito perigoso. Quando a isso se junta a violência como cultura, a explosão é iminente. Esta não é uma questão cultural, é um problema político.

Vladimir Putin afirmou que a descarada ingerência da justiça na família é intolerável. Mas, Sr. Presidente, é mais intolerável a demissão descarada da política no cumprimento da democracia.

Interventions à la demande

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Vážená paní předsedající, před dvaceti šesti lety to bylo v Moskvě, kde se členské státy OBSE shodly, že budou usilovat o vymýcení všech forem násilí na ženách. Je ironií, že po dvaceti šesti letech se všechny formy násilí na ženách opět vrací a ruší se ten tvrdší postih. Každá třetí žena v Rusku čelí domácímu násilí. Není to tedy proto, že by v Rusku nehrozilo násilí, ale naopak.

Předkladatelé argumentují tím, že se jedná o vnitřní záležitost tradiční ruské rodiny, a návrh dekriminlizuje domácí násilí vůči dětem i vůči manželově manželce. Jako trestný čin bude posuzováno vážnější násilí od zlomeniny výše. Za předchozího stavu bylo pro ženy velmi náročné domoci se pomoci. Nyní to tedy bude ještě složitější.

Nevím, jestli má smysl vyzývat prezidenta Putina, aby navrhl změnu zákona, když tento zákon před měsícem podepsal. Ale jsem přesvědčena o tom, že se musíme ozvat a podpořit ty, kteří mají tolik odvahy, že se proti násilí postaví. Očekávám, že to bude hlas církvi a dalších organizací i jednotlivců, kteří boj za lidské a důstojné podmínky života v Rusku ještě nevzdali.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, ha destato notevole preoccupazione la legge per depenalizzare parzialmente i maltrattamenti in famiglia approvata di recente in Russia, nonostante le aspre critiche manifestate dalle associazioni per la difesa dei diritti umani.

La violenza domestica è, infatti, in qualunque paese del mondo, una violazione dei diritti delle donne, di particolare gravità, che provoca traumi indelebili anche nei bambini ed è purtroppo un problema che, spesso, piuttosto che essere denunciato rimane nascosto, protetto dalle mura domestiche e dalla complicità di un tessuto sociale chiuso ad ogni intervento dello Stato in quelle che vengono considerate solo questioni familiari.

A fronte dell'immediata denuncia dell'Alto rappresentante dell'Unione e di tutti gli Stati membri, che ha stigmatizzato l'operato della Russia, l'Unione europea deve impegnarsi con la massima determinazione per promuovere, attraverso la propria politica estera, l'eliminazione della violenza domestica anche fuori dai propri confini.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, comisaria, la decisión rusa que despenaliza la violencia doméstica va en dirección contraria al esfuerzo que se está realizando en todo el planeta por combatir la violencia de género. Es, además, una muestra más de la regresión que, desde el año 2014, observamos en materia de respeto a los derechos fundamentales en ese país.

El Servicio de Acción Exterior de la Unión Europea, el Consejo de Europa o las Naciones Unidas son algunas de las organizaciones internacionales que consideran que la despenalización de la violencia machista dentro del hogar desprotege a las mujeres, pero perjudica también a los niños y no es compatible con la Carta Social Europea que compromete a Rusia.

Nos sorprende, por ello, que esta Federación sea uno de los cuatro países, entre los cuarenta y siete del Consejo de Europa, que no han firmado el Convenio de Estambul, junto con los catorce miembros de la Unión Europea que han sido ya mencionados.

Toda nuestra solidaridad, pues, con las mujeres rusas y nuestro apoyo al Servicio de Acción Exterior de la Unión Europea en todas las acciones que emprenda para ayudar a revertir esta situación.

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Dekriminalizacija družinskega nasilja je velik korak nazaj. Ženske pa na takšen način postajajo še bolj ranljive. To je tudi velik odmik od zastavljenih ciljev Evropske unije o enakopravnosti med spoloma.

V dokumentu Evropske komisije Strateško sodelovanje za enakost spolov 2016-2019 je navedenih pet ključnih področij ukrepanja, tudi spodbujanje enakosti spolov zunaj meja Evropske unije in boj proti nasilju, zato smo dolžni ostro obsoditi vsakršno nasilje, in to kjer koli na svetu.

Presentljivo pa je, da je predlog spornega amandmaja delo ženske. Ta primer je jasni pokazatelj, da je družinsko nasilje tesno prepleteno z nazori družbe in tradicijo. Zato si moramo še naprej prizadevati za večje ozaveščanje žrtev in preventivne ukrepe, o ničelni toleranci do nasilja pa seznaniti že deklace, saj je odnos do ženske v največji meri odvisen odvisen prav od vzgoje v družini.

V kolikor sklonimo glave pred rusko namero, ki je v navzkrižju z mednarodnimi zavezami človekovih pravic, potem kršimo lastne zaveze, saj je skrb za pravice žensk in njihovo dostojanstvo tudi temeljni pogoj za mir in varnost po svetu.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I wanted to raise one additional concern. I am aware, from Georgia and Armenia, of the Russian influence in this regard. Exactly the same kinds of laws against domestic violence are being called into question by forces who consider that preventing and combating domestic violence represents something imposed by Europe and America and at odds with morality.

We have to be aware that this type of attempt to stop the fight against domestic violence is a very essential part of pro-Russian propaganda, which emphasises the so-called traditional values. We know what that means: 'traditional values' means that women are not allowed to decide on their lives and that they are subordinated to men. We have to be aware of this risk: it is spreading.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, this has been a very useful exchange and I thank the honourable Members for their contributions. From this debate I conclude that we all share a common interest in using EU diplomatic power to its full potential in support of Russian citizens and of respect for human rights, international standards and human dignity in Russia.

No country is immune from domestic violence. In that regard, and in view of 2017 being the Year of European Action on Ending all Forms of Violence against Women, we will continue our efforts to promote the eradication of domestic violence and to support its victims within the EU as well as beyond our borders. May I close by signalling once again my appreciation of the European Parliament's role in keeping this important issue on the international agenda.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Declarations écrites (article 162)

Mireille D'Ornano (ENF), par écrit. – Ce débat relatif à la dépenalisation des violences conjugales et familiales en Russie est symptomatique de la désinformation permanente portant sur cet État dans les médias occidentaux. Aux termes de l'article 116 révisé du Code pénal russe, les violences conjugales ou familiales sans conséquences sur la santé seront désormais passibles de quinze jours d'arrêt administratif, de 30 000 roubles d'amende ou de 180 heures de travaux d'intérêt général. Cette réforme remédie à une incohérence juridique. En effet, les auteurs de violences sans conséquences sur la santé (comme les fessées, s'agissant des enfants) se voyaient auparavant soumis au droit pénal au prétexte de leur qualité de «proches» du plaignant. Des violences de gravité similaire, dont se serait rendu coupable tout autre individu, tombaient, quant à elles, sous le coup du droit civil. Les violences conjugales infligeant un dommage à la santé, si bénin soit-il, restent du ressort pénal et entraînent une peine allant jusqu'à deux ans d'emprisonnement. La réforme introduit également les ordonnances restrictives, inconnues, jusqu'alors, en droit russe. La société russe réproouve autant que les sociétés d'Europe occidentale les violences conjugales. Cette réforme vise simplement à prévenir toute immixtion de l'État dans la sphère familiale.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), kirjalikult. – Eesti riigipea, president Kersti Kaljulaid lausus äsja oma vabariigi aastapäeva kõnes järgnevat: „Vägivaldsed mustrid korduvad põlvest põlve, neid murda ei saa teisiti kui avaliku tähelepanuga, mis toob kaasa olulise nihke hoiakutes. Ei piisa, kui delegeerime selle probleemi politseile ja sotsiaaltöötajatele.” On äärmiselt positiivne, et president Kaljulaid liigub koduvägivalda käsitledes õiges suunas, kuid samas peame kurbusega tõdema, et meie suur idanaaber liigub täiesti vastupidises suunas. Selline suhtumine tõestab veel kord seda, et Venemaa ei ole hea partner Euroopa Liidule, seda nii energia valdkonnas kui ka teistes asjades. Olen seda Parlamendis korduvalt öelnud, aga võib-olla tõestab selline lähenemine mõnele kolleegile, et Venemaa mõttemaailm ja väärtused ei kattu meie omadega.

21. Breaches of current freedom of movement rights of EU citizens residing in the UK and the use of six-month expulsions (debate)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur la question orale à la Commission sur les violations de l'actuelle liberté de circulation des citoyens de l'Union européenne séjournant au Royaume-Uni et le recours aux expulsions au bout de six mois, de Sophia in 't Veld, Catherine Bearder, Gérard Deprez, Cecilia Wikström, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Angelika Mlinar, Louis Michel, Nathalie Griesbeck, Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, María Teresa Giménez Barbat, Yana Toom, Renate Weber, Javier Nart, Carolina Punset, Ivo Vajgl, Marian Harkin, Enrique Calvet Chambon et Marietje Schaake, au nom du groupe ALDE, Claude Moraes et Seb Dance, au nom du groupe S&D, Jean Lambert, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE, et Marie-Christine Vergiat, Cornelia Ernst, Barbara Spinelli, Marina Albiol Guzmán, Kostas Chrysogonos, Josu Juaristi Abaunz, Stelios Kouloglou, Merja Kyllönen et Paloma López Bermejo, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL (O-000008/2017 — B8-0204/2017) (2017/2572(RSP)).

Catherine Bearder, author. – Madam President, firstly my thanks go to Sophia in 't Veld, a D66 MEP who has helped enormously with this issue. This union of sovereign states has been clear over the years that the rights of their citizens are important and are to be protected, with the mutual recognition of qualifications, agreements on health and pension rights, and so on. Like many other MEPs I receive heartfelt emails from citizens living in the UK and across Europe. There are tens of thousands of EU citizens in the UK. They have paid their taxes, they have paid into our pension pots, and they are paying down our debts. They contribute to our society and our economy. The threats from Mrs May's government must be stopped now. No ifs, no buts. They are doctors, nurses, shopkeepers, students, teachers and others – they are not political bargaining chips.

There are many examples. There's the Romanian electrician forced to resign after threats and bullying. There's the Italian beautician who has been resident for 20 years, married to a Brit, but now threatened with deportation as she has no private health insurance. And the lists go on and on. They are real people, with real lives, who are worried and fearful. Is that how we should be treating people we promised we would welcome? My government needs to guarantee the rights of these people immediately and stop uncertainty. We need to protect the UK that I know: open, tolerant and united.

But it is for this House and its MEPs to speak for all European citizens. We are the ones who must fight for the rights that need to be protected. Brexit negotiations will be tough, and we all know it is easier to chop away rights than to protect them. So this House demands the Commission enforces EU rules and the British Government must respect those rules, respect the citizens, and respect the benefit that migrants bring.

Claude Moraes, author. – Madam President, before I say anything else I must put a clear question to Commissioner Jourová, on behalf of EU citizens. Now, and once Article 50 is triggered, will you, as the guardian of the Treaties, take action to ensure that the Free Movement Directive is properly applied in relation to both EU citizens in the UK and UK citizens in other EU countries?

Why must we ask this today? Because there is compelling and growing evidence, since the Brexit vote, from our constituency casework, responsible journalism and the voices of EU citizens themselves, that some EU citizens in the UK are experiencing great uncertainty about their position. There is suspicion that, far from protecting their rights in the sensitive transition period, the UK has already begun to use them as bargaining chips. We can detect this from the approximately 28% of EU citizen applicants for UK citizenship since the referendum who have had their applications rejected or declared invalid. It is well known that the procedure for some who have been living in the UK, sometimes for decades, involves having to fill in the notorious 85-page forms, which can often trigger delays and panic.

I do not have time here to recount the stories of heartbreak and stifling bureaucracy but we must ask if this amounts to a UK policy or to negligence in respect of individuals and families whom we are legally obliged to protect. The European Parliament will hold hearings to gather our own evidence and do our job, but the Commission can act right away.

The UK Government has a moral, political and legal duty to protect the rights of all EU citizens, not least because they contribute to our communities and our economy. They are vital. As Article 50 is triggered, hundreds of thousands of UK citizens in other EU countries will want the same equality and dignity that is afforded to EU citizens in the UK: not a negotiation, but a guarantee. The UK Government must do what is right. The Commission must engage and we, your MEPs, will represent you.

Barbara Spinelli, Auteur. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se ci rivolgiamo alla Commissione con questa interrogazione è perché vogliamo dare voce agli oltre 3 milioni di cittadini europei che vivono in Inghilterra e al milione e più di cittadini britannici che vivono nell'Unione.

L'ansia degli uni e degli altri è grandissima e i loro diritti di circolazione, di soggiorno e di lavoro dovranno essere garantiti fin da ora e nella maniera più dettagliata nel futuro accordo di recesso. Contrariamente a quanto affermato dai fautori del Brexit, infatti, sarà estremamente difficile far valere i loro diritti acquisiti. Molte menzogne sono state raccontate in occasione del referendum, troppo silenziosi e reticenti sono stati su questo punto i fautori del «remain» ed è cruciale che la Commissione parli chiaro.

La House of Lords lo ha già detto in modo inequivocabile: in assenza di un accordo negoziato, le conseguenze della perdita dei diritti di cittadinanza europea saranno severe, per questo è importante sapere come la Commissione intende procedere per far fronte alle infrazioni di cui il Regno Unito si è reso responsabile negli ultimi anni con leggi molto restrittive sulla residenza dei cittadini europei in Inghilterra. Fino al giorno in cui si raggiungerà un accordo di separazione, il Regno Unito è soggetto al diritto europeo, alla direttiva sulla libera circolazione, e deve dunque rispondere delle eventuali violazioni unilaterali, allo stesso modo in cui sono obbligati a farlo tutti gli Stati membri. Fino ad allora l'Inghilterra non potrà limitarsi a dire che farà entrare dall'Unione solo «the brightest and the best», oltre naturalmente ai più benestanti come si ripromette di fare dopo l'uscita.

Jean Lambert, author. – Madam President, I think we are all aware that the UK is not the only Member State with issues regarding long-term residence and citizenship. We will discuss the others when the Petitions Committee brings forward their resolution. However, many EU 27 nationals do live in the UK and over a third of them live in my region of London. Some of them are my neighbours. And the lack of certainty over their future is causing huge concern, just as it is for UK nationals living in other Member States. You only have to read the testimonies on the 'Brexpats' website.

Much of this uncertainty could certainly be removed by the British Government. I think many of us will welcome tonight's vote in the House of Lords on the Article 50 bill, asking the government to introduce proposals within three months of the triggering of that Article, to ensure that EU citizens in the UK have the same residence rights after Brexit. In the meantime, as people have said, there are people in the UK from EU countries who have lived, worked, studied and retired there. Some have caring responsibilities and there I think we have an issue with the long-term residents directive. They do not want to be used as bargaining chips; they feel it is insulting and demeaning, and it is. Our government could at least be clear that these people are valued and it should strongly condemn the rising racism and xenophobia we are seeing in the UK.

A lot of the stress and the fear that we are seeing is also being caused by the attitude of the authorities. Certainly in terms of sickness insurance we know there has been a shift in position by the British Government over the last few years on the role of the NHS. We really hope that the Commission will get on, please, and introduce the infringement proceedings that have been hanging for so long. I think many of us would say from the case work that we are seeing, and indeed from the excellent LIBE petitions survey, that when you look at this, we either have a government that is dealing with wilful incompetence or targeted administrative efforts to actually delay, restrict, diminish – all of these words crop up time after time, and we would like some certainty, please, for our citizens and yours.

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, freedom of movement is one of the basic rights of EU citizens and the European Commission will continue to defend it as a top priority. The correct application of EU rules on free movement by all Member States is of fundamental importance – correct application by all Member States. And for as long as the UK remains a Member State, all rights and obligations continue to apply.

I am fully aware that EU citizens living in the United Kingdom are concerned about their future rights; EU citizens residing in the United Kingdom deserve to know what their rights will be in the UK after the UK leaves the European Union and, vice versa, the same applies to UK citizens residing in the other 27 Member States. The authors of the oral question are absolutely right: people need certainty and stability and they deserve respect and fairness. That is why I hope that this issue can be addressed as soon as possible. However, it is first for the UK to give effect to the outcome of the referendum vote. There can be no negotiation before notification, as you know. It is therefore not possible to be more precise at this stage.

Let me now refer to the individual questions. On the first question, concerning the statistics on the number of residence applications, residence refusals and expulsions from the UK, the Commission does not have up-to-date statistics on this matter. EU law on free movement of EU citizens does not oblige Member States to collect such data and share them with the Commission. Some data on numbers of issued residence documents are in the public domain, but there is little data on refused applications, and there is almost no publicly available data on expulsions and appeal rates.

Ever since the entry into force of the Free Movement Directive in 2006, the Commission has been working closely together with Member States to improve their ability to collect statistical data and share it. Unfortunately, progress is limited due to a lack of commitment on the part of Member States.

With regard to the infringement procedures, I would like to underline that the Commission takes appropriate action to address failures of any Member State to comply with their obligations under EU law. There are currently infringement procedures in this area against eight Member States. The two pending infringement procedures against the United Kingdom relate to access residence rights of economically non-active citizens, and rights of UK nationals returning to the United Kingdom after residing in another Member State. I would like to inform you that the Commission is assessing these cases carefully.

As regards the residence rights of economically non-active citizens, the Commission will take into account in its assessment the recent case law of the Court of Justice concerning the conditions to which Member States can subject the access to welfare benefits by economically non-active EU citizens in order to protect public finances. Please allow me to underline that the Commission is also carefully assessing the compliance with the provisions of the Free Movement Directive of the latest amendments to the UK legislation that came into force in February 2017.

With regard to your last question, the Commission attaches great importance to providing guidance to Member States in order to prevent breaches of EU law. Therefore, since the Free Movement Directive entered into force, the Commission adopted five official guidance documents: in 2008, the report on the application of the Directive; in 2009, guidelines for better transposition and application of the Directive; in 2010, the Handbook for the processing of visa applications; in 2013, the report on free movement and in 2014, the Handbook on marriages of convenience.

In addition to official guidance, the Commission has met experts from Member States twenty-four times in an expert group dedicated to the application of the Free Movement Directive. These meetings are a useful tool to communicate the Commission's interpretation on issues of practical application of EU law.

Last but not least, I would like to inform you that a few weeks ago, the Commission has made available an e-tool on free movement for national administration, together with its citizenship report issued by the Commission in January 2017. The Citizenship report sets out a number of actions to raise citizens' awareness of their rights and how to seek help if their rights are not respected.

Roberta Metsola, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, free movement is one of the cornerstones of our European project and we need to be vigilant in order to ensure that there are no unnecessary limitations to it by any Member State. The 'sufficient resources' argument is one that requires constant monitoring and, while it is fair that EU migration does not become a burden on the host state, this principle should not be abused by Member States, nor should it be used, as my colleagues have said, as a bargaining chip.

The UK remains a Member State of the EU and the Commission must insist that, until the moment it is not, any and all existing EU *acquis* needs to be respected, implemented and properly applied. In this respect, it is crucial that the Commission provides Member States, including the United Kingdom, with proper guidance to ensure the correct application of the Free Movement Directive and protect the rights of EU citizens.

This is an issue that is so personal for so many people. I have met countless Maltese citizens who live and work in the United Kingdom, and many UK nationals who live in my constituency of Malta and Gozo. They are worried. They are concerned that the life they have spent decades building is suddenly uncertain, they are anxious that after years of abiding by the law, working and paying taxes, they read reports that make them apprehensive. They should not be made to feel targeted. Their rights must be clarified sooner rather than later.

Richard Corbett, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, on behalf of the Socialist Group and especially the Labour members of the Socialist Group, let me say that the way the British Government appears to be intending to use European citizens living in the UK as pawns in the negotiation is a disgrace.

The good news is that an hour ago, in the House of Lords, the UK Government, the Conservative government, was defeated when the House of Lords adopted an amendment that obliges the government, if it is confirmed by the House of Commons, to settle this question as quickly as possible and in the shortest period ahead. If that is sustained, that is good news. But I fear that the Conservatives will use their majority in the House of Commons to overturn this amendment and go back to the status quo. It is a disgrace and we shall fight it all the way.

But we must do one more thing in this Parliament: we must be vigilant throughout the negotiations and look very closely at the deal that comes back, the so-called divorce deal, because if it does not respect citizens' rights we should refer it to the Court of Justice to verify its compatibility with the Treaties.

Anthea McIntyre, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, Britain has a long and celebrated history of immigration, a proud record of welcoming people from inside the EU and from across the world, and this will continue long after Brexit. Immigration has made our country stronger, richer and more tolerant. The Prime Minister was very clear about the value she places on the contribution of EU citizens to Britain, to its economy, its society and its culture. That is why securing the status of EU nationals residing in the UK, and of UK nationals residing in the EU, is a top priority for the Prime Minister. Any delay in reaching guarantees on this issue is a consequence of timing and procedure, not of political will.

Why are we not now debating how we can make freedom of movement work better? Why are we not debating how we can rebuild people's confidence in the principle? Why are we not debating how we can address the concerns regarding its implementation across the whole of Europe? For example, we could be addressing the concerns in Germany about access to public services and benefits. We could be addressing the demographic challenges that many EU countries face.

Our debates do nothing to convince people that we have solutions to the challenges we face – and then we wonder why voters are turning to the fringes of our political system for answers. Debates like this just fuel the scaremongers and spread fear amongst our citizens, who are already unsettled by the changing political landscape. We are missing an opportunity to strengthen our goal of a better Europe, and I am afraid that political point scoring ahead of the triggering of Article 50 will only weaken this House and its credibility.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL), *question "carton bleu"*. – Tá tú ag caint ar an luach atá Theresa May á chur ar mhuintir na hEorpa. Cén luach atá curtha aici orthusan atá ina gcónaí i dTuaisceart na hÉireann; daoine a vótáil chun fanúint laistigh don Aontas Eorpach, go bhfuil faillí uafásach déanta orthu agus ní hamháin sin, ach go bhfuil baol anois ann go bhfuil comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta curtha i mbaol dá bharr seo? Ní fheicimse agus níl aon iontaoibh agam go bhfuil Theresa May ag tabhairt aon aird nó aon aire dár muintir thuas sa Tuaisceart a bhí ag iarraidh fanúint san Aontas Eorpach.

Anthea McIntyre (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – The Conservative Party has always been the Conservative and Unionist Party. The Conservatives believe completely in Northern Ireland and in supporting the Northern Irish citizens of Great Britain. We are committed to ensuring that all parts of the country, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England, remain as a Union and together solve the problems that are inevitable in this Brexit process.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8))

Seb Dance (S&D), *blue-card question*. – You say that this debate sends a signal – an unhelpful one, according to you. Surely the Government sends a much stronger signal than we ever could in this House? Is the fact that the Government is refusing now to acknowledge, and to protect, the rights of the three million citizens who live in our country not damaging our economy and damaging our public services – because we are sending a signal to these people that we do not want them? That is not British.

Anthea McIntyre (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – Were it true, it would not be British, and I would agree with you, but it is not true and you are doing our Prime Minister a great disservice if you think that she does not want to confirm the status of EU nationals residing in the UK. She has made that very clear, but she has also made clear that we want to protect the rights of UK nationals in the other European countries, and those two things go hand-in-hand.

If it were down to our Prime Minister alone, it would already have been sold. It is not Britain that is holding this up. It is other Member States that will not discuss this and will not agree it at this point.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, sí, mientras el Reino Unido siga siendo un Estado miembro de la Unión Europea, su Gobierno está obligado a respetar los Tratados que firmó, y la Comisión debe garantizar que se cumplen y actuar contra quienes lo vulneren.

Ante la colosal incertidumbre que el *brexit* ha generado, es nuestra obligación dar certezas a todos los ciudadanos europeos que durante años han vivido y contribuido legalmente al Reino Unido y a los países de la Unión. Gracias a la iniciativa de mi colega liberal Sophia in 't Veld, hemos constituido un grupo de trabajo en este Parlamento con un único y claro objetivo común: defender los derechos de los ciudadanos europeos residentes en el Reino Unido y los británicos residentes en la Unión.

Incluso antes del *brexit* la discriminación de mis compatriotas en el Reino Unido ya era una realidad. Lo conozco bien porque sigo de cerca el grupo de Facebook «Españoles en Reino Unido», que ahora se subtítulo «Surviving Brexit». Pero, señora May, lo siento, los derechos no son negociables.

And the european citizens are not a bargaining chip.

Matt Carthy, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, I absolutely share the concerns of Members here tonight when they outline their frustration and anger at the failure of the British Government to outline its commitment to protect EU citizens living in Britain. But why should we be surprised that the British Government will not commit to protecting the rights of EU citizens in Britain when it will not protect citizens that it claims jurisdiction over? The people of the North of Ireland voted to remain part of the EU.

I am an Irish Republican. I have listened all my life to institutions like these, institutions like those in Westminster, telling me that the constitutional status of the North of Ireland could not change unless the majority of the people acceded to it. We all collectively came together in 1998 and accepted the Good Friday Agreement, which underpinned that principle. Well, we are saying tonight 'right back at you.' The people in the North of Ireland wanted, and want, to remain part of the EU. That decision must be respected, and we are depending on the EU to stand up for citizens in the North of Ireland because it is absolutely apparent that we cannot depend on the British Government to do so.

Raymond Finch, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, at a time when the people of Europe are calling for reductions in immigration and for stricter border controls, here you are going on and on, again. While you elitists may not want to accept it, the Brexit vote made a decision: the British people decide who comes to our country and who stays there. As for residence rights, the EU is scaremongering, as are all of you, and treating British expats and EU citizens as bargaining chips. It is an absolute disgrace and it is one more reason why we are glad to be out and why we are confident that we have made the correct decision. May you all suffer for what you are doing to those people.

(The speaker did not agree to take a blue-card question under Rule 162(8) by Anneliese Dodd)

Janice Atkinson, *on behalf of the ENF Group*. – Madam President, I am certainly not in favour of the EU, or the UK, using British citizens as a bargaining chip; it is quite disgraceful. Mrs Merkel and others could actually state very clearly now that they are not using people as bargaining chips, but they are choosing not to do so. What you do not recognise in this place is that the majority of British people said by vote that they are taking back control of their borders.

As Lord Tebbit, my hero, said in the House of Lords this evening: we will be putting British citizens first. He is back. Yes, the Lords did make a decision this evening, but guess what? Our Home Secretary has at least grown a pair of balls recently and is going to rescind it. They are going to overturn it because the British voted for Brexit. Yes, Ms Spinelli, we are going to have the brightest and best from around the world, from China, from India, and we are going to choose who come to our borders. Not you, Labour, you are out for another 20 years, out for a generation, and thank God for that. Roll on, Mrs May.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Madam President, over eight months have passed since 52% of British voters decided that the UK should leave the European Union. In those eight months the British Government has not triggered Article 50 and they have not opened up the opportunity to actually negotiate how best to arrange our divorce. So what have they done? They have confronted those Europeans who have applied for residence permits with a level of bureaucracy that I can only describe as ironic for a government that has spent so much time complaining about bureaucracy in the European Union. They have published new regulations on immigration and updated policy on the removal and revocation of European citizens, which has only created more fear, more chaos and more uncertainty for those Europeans living in the UK. They have sent letters to European citizens living in the UK for decades, often married to UK husbands or wives, to make sure they prepare for their departure. If this is Prime Minister May's idea of creating the grounds for a friendly negotiation, if this is the idea of a global Britain, then I would ask her to think again because this is not global Britain; it is certainly not noble Britain: it is Little Britain at its very smallest.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Madam President, many of us have received e-mails from concerned EU citizens in the UK. One group of people have not sent these letters, but they do have a lot to worry about. There are up to 300 000 Roma migrants in the UK. Recently, a report from the Institute for Public Policy Research warned that Roma EU migrants in Britain face a triple whammy of challenges, legal limbo in terms of residency, and an increase in racist attacks of 57% since the referendum. For them, having to leave Britain would mean not knowing if they would have to send their kids to bed hungry.

You will probably not receive any e-mails about this, but I would like to ask you, colleagues, to put some thought and action into the situation of the most vulnerable casualties of Brexit.

Емил Радев (PPE). – Г-жо Председател, свободното движение на хора в рамките на Съюза е едно от най-големите преимущества от членството, на което пряко се радват ежедневно милиони граждани на държавите членки. Премахването или ограничаването му би повлияло негативно върху живота на хората. Освен че е една от основните свободи, това е и ключово за развитието на европейската икономика, конкурентоспособност и бизнес.

В този контекст, бих искал директно да заявя, че опитите на британското правителство да ограничи правата на европейските граждани, живеещи или искащи да се установят на острова, са недопустими. Великобритания е и до момента на своето окончателно излизане от Съюза ще продължава да бъде държава член, и трябва да спазва изцяло съществуващото законодателство, включително принципите на свобода на движение и недопускане на дискриминация.

Осъждам опитите чрез лъжливи твърдения да се насява страх в британското общество, че половин България и Румъния ще се преселят във Великобритания. Трудностите при предстоящите преговори не са оправдание подобни безсъдържателни твърдения, касаещи една или друга държава членка, да служат като предлог за нарушаване на договорите и потъпкване правата на европейските граждани. Затова призовавам Европейската комисия да защити всички европейски граждани и да гарантира спазването на техните права за свободно движение и установяване навсякъде в Съюза, в това число и във Великобритания, дори и ако се наложи да се стартира наказателна процедура срещу последната. Необходима ни е повече информация за съществуващи случаи на нарушения и какви действия ще бъдат предприети за тяхното преустановяване.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Madam President, there are worrying signs of possible violations of the right to freedom of movement of European citizens in the UK. I made a list of examples in a petition signed by over 30 000 people that I submitted to this Parliament.

If we have this problem now, I am wondering what will happen after Brexit. We have to react from now on, to prevent any abuse, because this affects not only Europeans but also British people. Too often, populists talk in Britain about Eastern Europeans who come to take their jobs. Anyone who believes that we wanted to see 200 000 Romanian professionals – students, doctors and engineers trained in Romania – leaving for the UK is really crazy. At the same time, it is these so-called bad Europeans who buy British products and work with UK companies and will fight to protect the British people after Brexit.

I trust the EU and the British people will not let freedom of movement in the UK disappear, because together we are stronger. We have to give more freedoms and rights to Europeans in order to win against populism.

We do not need five scenarios: we need one good one to make Europe a better place for Europeans and British people, and freedom of movement is at the core of this project for the future.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, naváží na své kolegy ze skupiny Evropské lidové strany. Jsem rád, že dnes projednáváme tento bod, protože ve chvíli, kdy Velká Británie je součástí Evropské unie, je třeba, aby Komise učinila vše pro to, aby Britové dodržovali evropskou legislativu. To si myslím, že je základní postulát, který platí, a další debaty, které zde probíhaly mezi jednotlivými britskými poslanci, s tím základním problémem až tak nesouvisí.

Zkrátka a dobře, je zde jasná směrnice o volném pohybu a jasně se ukazuje, že Velká Británie tuto směrnicí plně nedodržuje, že její obsah částečně vyprazdňuje. Je trochu škoda, paní komisařko, že nemáme bližší informace, že nemáme více statistik o tom, kolik občanů Evropské unie bylo v posledních letech z Velké Británie vyhoštěno, protože by to jasně potvrdilo to, že současná britská legislativa zužuje svobodu pohybu tak, jak ji upravuje evropská směrnice.

Vyzývám tedy stejně jako kolegové ze skupiny Evropské lidové strany Komisi, abyste tomuto problému věnovali mimořádnou pozornost, protože marná sláva, Evropská unie stojí na čtyřech základních svobodách, svobodě pohybu, svobodě kapitálu, svobodě služeb a svobodě zboží. Pokud bychom byli tolerantní k tomu, že jedna z těchto svobod bude omezoována, poškozujeme tím principy Evropské unie nehledě na to, jak dopadne samotný brexit a jaká práva po brexitu budou mít občané Evropské unie na britských ostrovech.

Proto, prosím, věnujte tomuto pozornost, chráníme tím principy Evropské unie.

Interventions à la demande

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I wanted to draw attention to the case of homeless European migrants who found themselves destitute and sleeping rough. In my constituency in north-west Manchester the Booth Centre is committed to helping rough sleepers to move off the streets and into stable homes. It is working in close partnership with many organisations, including local authorities, and they are very concerned about the recent increase in British Home Office activity around European migrants who are sleeping rough and at risk of mental health problems. This attack on rough sleeping has coincided with the Brexit campaign where European migrants have been stigmatised and hate crime has increased in my country.

The Booth Centre is actually fully committed to the voluntary assisted reconnection of destitute European migrants and in the last 12 months has organised the return of 141 people. They work with the individual to ensure that they have got a place to stay on their return and are linked to family, medical and social services. But the Home Office is at the moment riding roughshod over this and not working properly with the voluntary organisations that put these people's well-being at the core of their work.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το θέμα που συζητούμε είναι ιδιαίτερα σοβαρό, από την άποψη ότι παρατηρούνται πλέον προβλήματα στην ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία των πολιτών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, με αφορμή την απόφαση για Brexit και αυτό είναι βεβαίως πάρα πολύ σοβαρό διότι έχουμε πολλούς πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που εργάζονται στη Βρετανία και έχουμε και πάρα πολλούς Έλληνες οι οποίοι εργάζονται στη χώρα και ανησυχούν για τις προοπτικές που έχουν και τις προϋποθέσεις υπό τις οποίες θα μπορούσαν να συνεχίσουν να απασχολούνται στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο.

Υπολογίζουμε βεβαίως ότι η διαδικασία για την ολοκλήρωση της εξόδου της Μεγάλης Βρετανίας από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα διαρκέσει δύο έτη. Είναι βέβαιο ότι σε αυτή την διετία θα πρέπει να εξακολουθήσουν οι πολίτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και βεβαίως και οι Έλληνες να ασκούν πλήρως τα δικαιώματά τους. Από κει και πέρα, θα πρέπει να υπάρξει πρόβλεψη για το τι θα συμβεί στο μέλλον.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, apprendiamo dal ministro degli Interni britannico che il principio di libera circolazione – come lo conosciamo – è destinato a cambiare in modo repentino, dopo il Brexit.

Resta comunque il fatto che uno dei pilastri fondamentali dell'Unione è il diritto alla libera circolazione e che su questo pilastro si uniforma tutta la normativa primaria, sia comunitaria sia nazionale. Certo, questo equilibrio è appunto messo in discussione dall'avvio della procedura ex articolo 50, ma va sottolineato che il diritto alla libera circolazione è sancito anche dall'articolo 45 della Carta dei diritti fondamentali. La circostanza eleva il livello di tutela del principio ad un rango superiore, in particolare se si considerano i diritti acquisiti e le aspettative di vita di coloro che hanno stabilito di vivere e non solo di risiedere nel Regno Unito.

Mi auguro che queste preoccupazioni non diventino strumento di pressione diplomatica e di trattativa, lasciando spazio alla adeguatezza sostanziale della tutela dei cittadini dell'Unione.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – *(rečníka nepočúť, lebo nemá zapnutý mikrofón)*... ekonomické slobody sú tou hlavnou výhodou, pretože občania veria projektu európskej spolupráce. Európanmi sa ale budú cítiť len vtedy, ak budú v skutočnosti a naozaj rovnocennými občanmi. Dnes sme ale svedkami vzniku dvoch kategórií občanov. Hovoríme možno o konci Schengenu, hovoríme o rozdielnych pracovných podmienkach, hovoríme o rozdielnej kvalite potravín. Potom sa treba opýtať, či ešte hovoríme o Európskej únii.

V Spojenom kráľovstve takto dnes žije v neistote viac ako 100 tisíc Slovákov. Pracovníci z východnej Európy vždy boli pozitívnym prínosom pre krajiny starej Európy a do verejného rozpočtu Veľkej Británie prispievali viac ako piatimi miliardami eur/libier ročne. Aj Rakúsko chce obmedziť prídavky na deti slovenským pracujúcim, zvlášť opatrovatelkám, ktorých je tam 20 tisíc. Poctivo pracujú a odvádzajú dane v Rakúsku.

Nízke mzdy na Slovensku prinútili slovenských otcov a matky hľadať prácu za hranicami, aby ich deti mali lepšiu perspektívu. Voľný pohyb osôb členskými krajinami neškodil, ale pomohol. Chcem vyzvať Európsku komisiu, aby hájila záujem všetkých občanov EÚ, a lídrov členských štátov, aby hľadali rozumnú dohodu a kompromis.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Věra Jourová, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to reassure you that the Commission is taking all necessary action to make sure that EU law is fully respected. Until the Treaties cease to apply to a Member State that has notified the European Council of its intention to withdraw from the Union, in accordance with Article 50, such a Member State remains a member of the EU, with all rights and obligations. EU law continues to apply in full to the United Kingdom and in the United Kingdom until it is no longer a member of the European Union.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE), *in writing*. – Free movement – which includes the rights of people to work and reside in other EU Member States is enshrined in the EU Treaties, including Article 21 of the TFEU and Article 45 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which reads that every EU citizen has a right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States. I believe this is a fundamental principle and that the UK, as a full member of the EU, must duly comply with this clause. I call on the Commission to provide us with any necessary statistics of any cases of unjustified expulsion or refusal and to ensure that the UK upholds the rights of EU citizens in the UK.

Carlos Coelho (PPE), *por escrito*. – A liberdade de circulação e residência é um pilar fundamental da União. É a expressão maior da cidadania europeia. É o maior sucesso de e para os Europeus. É a maior conquista da Europa dos Cidadãos.

Para um país como Portugal, que sempre se voltou para o exterior, esta conquista reveste particular importância. A números de 2015, são mais de duzentos mil os portugueses que vivem no Reino Unido e que, enquanto cidadãos europeus, puderam beneficiar – sem serem discriminados pela sua nacionalidade – de todos os direitos acessíveis aos ingleses.

Assim, os relatos de que as autoridades britânicas estão a dificultar, por via administrativa, a residência de europeus, não podem passar impunes. Por enquanto, o Reino Unido permanece um Estado-Membro de pleno direito e, por isso, tem de respeitar as regras comunitárias. Em nome dos europeus, mas em particular dos milhares de portugueses que lá residem, este Parlamento tem de velar pelo estrito respeito dos direitos dos cidadãos europeus.

Ana Gomes (S&D), *in writing*. – Let me be clear: for the time being and at least for the next two years, the UK is a member of the EU, and therefore must apply EU freedom of movement laws. In case of breaches, the Commission must launch infringement proceedings and take the necessary measures to guarantee the full and unreserved implementation of EU law and, in this particular case, the respect for one of the Union's core principles.

Whenever the UK Conservative Government finds the courage to act on the result of the referendum that it called for and triggers Article 50 – nine months and counting! – the result of the exit negotiations will determine which rules will be applicable to EU citizens residing in the UK. Again, let me be clear: their protection is our absolute priority, as is protection of the values that should guide every decision taken by the Union. Please note: the promotion of fear, hate and xenophobia is not acceptable in this Union.

Ева Майдел (PPE), *в писмена форма*. – През 2016 г. ЕС беляза прогрес по ключовите си проекти, свързани със защитата на външните граждани, борбата с тероризма, единния цифров пазар, енергийния съюз, Фонда за стратегически инвестиции. През 2017 г. продължаваме да работим за сигурността и благосъстоянието на гражданите на Съюза, борим се за нови свободи, като например свободното движение на данни.

През 2016 г. гражданите на Великобритания избраха да не бъдат част от всички тези проекти и процеси след излизането си от ЕС. Преди „Брекзит“ да бъде факт обаче, Великобритания остава пълноправен член на ЕС. Едно от произлизащите от членството задължения е ангажиментът гражданите на ЕС да се възползват от свободното движение в Съюза. Важно е правата на трите милиона европейски граждани, живеещи във Великобритания, да бъдат гарантирани както сега, така и след „Брекзит“.

Заставам зад решението на Камарата на лордовете и разчитам, че то ще бъде финално. Един от фундаментите, на които е базиран ЕС, е принципът на правовата държава – той трябва да бъде спазван и отстояван без изключения. Недопустимо е граждани на ЕС да бъдат лишавани от правото си легално да работят и пребивават във Великобритания. Спазването на тази свобода следва да бъде зорко следено от Европейската комисия, а нарушаването ѝ – строго наказвано.

22. Gender balance among judges at the Court of Justice (debate)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur la question orale au Conseil sur l'équilibre hommes-femmes parmi les juges de la Cour de justice, de Mady Delvaux, au nom de la commission des affaires juridiques (O-000149/2016 — B8-0203/2017) (2016/3025(RSP)).

Mady Delvaux, auteure. – Madame la Présidente, la Cour de justice est l'une des institutions importantes de l'Union européenne. En quelque sorte, elle symbolise l'état de droit, l'espace européen de justice, qui est un des piliers de notre démocratie. Le Parlement européen est très attaché au bon fonctionnement de la Cour de justice. Il l'a démontré par le passé en veillant à lui attribuer les ressources nécessaires. J'en veux pour preuve la bonne disposition de la grande majorité des membres du Parlement lorsqu'il s'est agi de réformer le tribunal. Sans enthousiasme, mais dans le but de permettre un bon fonctionnement du tribunal nous avons accepté, en octobre 2015, la proposition du Conseil, qui consistait à doubler le nombre de juges du tribunal, alors que le Conseil n'avait pas réussi à se mettre d'accord sur une augmentation moins importante du nombre de juges ou un système de rotation.

Le Parlement n'a donc jamais manqué d'apporter son soutien à la Cour quand on le lui demandait, parce que nous estimons que dans une démocratie, il faut garantir aux citoyens l'accès à la justice, des procès équitables dans des délais raisonnables et une justice efficace. Mais notre démocratie se distingue aussi par le respect des droits de l'homme, de nos valeurs, parmi lesquelles, évidemment, le principe de l'égalité.

Je voudrais rappeler ici que, lors de la réforme de la Cour de justice de l'Union, le Parlement avait insisté sur le respect de l'égalité entre hommes et femmes. Lors des trilogues, le Conseil avait promis et s'était engagé à proposer davantage de femmes aux postes de juges aussi bien à la Cour qu'au tribunal. Nous avons même introduit par amendement un calendrier sophistiqué qui permet aux États membres de nommer à chaque fois deux juges, ce qui aurait dû faciliter le respect de la parité. Nous savons évidemment que la nomination des juges n'est pas de la compétence du Parlement européen, mais je m'attendais à ce que les États membres respectent leur engagement. Or, que constatons-nous aujourd'hui? Sur les 28 juges de la Cour de justice, seulement 5 sont des femmes. Parmi les 44 juges du tribunal, on ne compte que 10 femmes. Soit 15 femmes sur un total de 72 juges. À peine 20 %.

Les représentants du Conseil me répondront que c'est l'héritage du passé. Soit. Mais comment expliquer alors que sur les 15 juges nouvellement nommés, trois seulement sont des femmes. C'est scandaleux et inacceptable. Je ne peux pas croire que dans nos États membres, il n'y a pas moyen de trouver des femmes juges capables de siéger à la Cour de justice ou au tribunal. De plus, je ne peux pas croire que les États membres ne s'engagent pas pour l'égalité entre hommes et femmes. Cela me semble élémentaire. Je rappelle que nous vivons au XXI^e siècle. Nos grands-mères ont été ridiculisées, mais elles se battaient pour avoir le droit d'étudier, d'accéder à des postes de responsabilité. Nous n'y sommes toujours pas. Nous avons une justice européenne rendue principalement par des hommes et un système judiciaire où manque le regard croisé des femmes.

En conséquence, ma question s'adresse aux représentants des États membres: qu'entendez-vous entreprendre pour respecter les engagements que vous avez pris de promouvoir la parité hommes-femmes lors de la nomination des juges à la Cour de justice européenne? Ne pensez-vous pas qu'une représentation équilibrée hommes-femmes est un atout pour la Cour de justice et pour une justice de qualité?

Enfin, je voudrais féliciter les États membres qui ont proposé des femmes et qui ont veillé ainsi à un meilleur équilibre hommes-femmes au sein de la Cour et du tribunal, et dans le même temps, je veux dire ma déception, voire mon mépris, pour les pays qui ne l'ont pas fait.

Chris Agius, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, equality between women and men is a fundamental principle of the European Union, as we said earlier today in our debate on the gender pay gap. The equal participation of women and men in decision-making is a matter of justice, respect for human rights and good governance.

This was underlined by the Council in its conclusions of December 2015. On that occasion the Council also noted that there is still a need to achieve de facto gender equality in the European Union, which requires a multifaceted approach, including legislation, awareness-raising and positive action programmes.

The Council thus called inter alia on Member States' governments to promote a balanced representation of women and men in the political sphere, including nominations to high-level positions in the EU institutions. Against this background, it is not surprising that the importance of ensuring gender balance in high judicial functions was also reaffirmed in the context of the reform of the General Court, which was adopted in December 2015 and is currently being implemented.

As you know, this reform foresees an increase in the number of judges at the General Court in three stages. The first stage, the appointment of 12 additional judges, is currently being completed and the second stage is also in the process of being implemented with a view to reaching the number of 47 judges. Two appointments are still outstanding.

The final stage, in which the Court will comprise two judges per Member State, will be completed by 2019 and only then will it be possible to assess whether we have come closer to the objective of gender balance in the composition of the General Court. At present, out of a total of 44 judges at the General Court, ten are women and, among the 22 judges who were newly appointed in 2016, six are women. This is of course not yet satisfactory, even if there is a slight upward trend, which hopefully we will further consolidate.

What can we do in order to reinforce an equal gender representation among judges at the Court? Of course under the Treaty the appointment of judges and, by implication, the nomination of candidates, is the exclusive prerogative of the governments of the Member States. Neither the Council nor Parliament have any role in this respect. What the legislator can do – and has done in the context of the reform – is to create a legal framework which facilitates the nomination of one woman and one man by the Member States. The phasing in of new judges has been conceived in a way which ensures that over time the regular terms of office of the two judges of each Member State end at the same time. The idea is that this should make it easier for Member States to propose one woman and one man.

Regarding the selection procedure, the decisive criterion for the appointment of judges is not gender but merit. The Treaty provides that judges are to be chosen from persons whose independence is beyond doubt and who possess the ability required for appointment to high judicial office. Candidates are screened and interviewed by an independent panel of eminent persons, which has set very high standards in terms of qualification and independence and whose opinions on the candidates' suitability have so far always been followed by Member States' governments.

This has led many Member States to introduce internal procedures with an open call for candidates and an objective selection to identify the best candidate. This is a welcome development to ensure the highest quality of judges, but of course there is no guarantee that there will be a sufficient number of women among the candidates nor that the best candidate for a given position will be a woman.

This brings me back to my initial point, the Council conclusions of December 2015 on equality between women and men in the field of decision-making. In order to achieve de facto a more balanced representation of women and men in the General Court, we now need to concentrate on different aspects, such as awareness-raising and regular monitoring of progress made. These are no doubt the very legitimate objectives behind Ms Delvaux's question and I am confident that the views expressed in today's debate will be carefully examined and taken into account as much as possible in the capitals of the Member States.

Tadeusz Zwiefka, w imieniu grupy PPE. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Nie po raz pierwszy rozmawiamy o równouprawnieniu płci w różnych obszarach życia. Dzisiaj mówimy o tym bardzo specyficznym obszarze – o wymiarze sprawiedliwości, i to w wydaniu europejskim – w Europejskim Trybunale Sprawiedliwości. Rzeczywiście w grudniu 2015 roku zawarliśmy taką dżentelmeńską umowę z przedstawicielami Rady po to, by ukończyć legislacyjne podstawy kolejnej reformy Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości – reformy, którą uznaliśmy za niezbędną. Mamy pełną świadomość, że to nie jest zapis, który kogokolwiek do czegokolwiek obliuguje, ale jest to jednak dżentelmeńska umowa, umowa, której dotrzymania będziemy się domagać. I tutaj dziękuję bardzo Mady Delvaux za przygotowanie tego pytania.

Moja konkluzja jest taka: otóż obserwując zatrudnienie w obszarze wymiaru sprawiedliwości w państwach członkowskich, możemy dostrzec, że większość sędziów to są kobiety. Trudno jest mi sobie dzisiaj wyobrazić, że w tej wielkiej liczbie sędziów-kobiet nie znajdziemy takich pań, które spełniają najwyższe standardy wymagane przy obejmowaniu funkcji sędziego Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości. Zatem apelujemy do państw członkowskich, aby zechciały brać to nasze porozumienie pod rozwagę, a mówię to ze spokojnym sumieniem, ponieważ mój kraj desygnowało do Europejskiego Trybunału Sprawiedliwości dwie panie.

Jytte Guteland, för S&D-gruppen. – Fru talman! När Europaparlamentet och ministerrådet antog den nya förordningen för EU-domstolen var det en framgång för jämställdheten att vi fick igenom vårt krav om en jämn könsfördelning mellan män och kvinnor vid utbyggnaden av tribunalen. Därför är det mycket olyckligt att vi nu, vid tillsättningen, ser att endast fem av femton nya tillsatta domare är kvinnor. Det innebär att medlemsstaterna inte respekterar den här överenskommelsen med parlamentet.

Om vi menar allvar med att uppnå jämställdhet mellan kvinnor och män, vilket också förordas i vårt EU-samarbete enligt artikel 3 i fördraget, förutsätter det att EU-domstolen är jämställd. Det är också angeläget att vi speglar befolkningarna i EU. De 500 miljoner människor som bor och lever och verkar i EU har rätt till rättssäkerhet, och därmed till att vara speglade av domarkåren. Jag skulle vilja veta hur rådet tänker för att nu uppfylla sitt åtagande för att främja EU:s jämställdhetsmål och en balanserad könsfördelning i EU-domstolen?

António Marinho e Pinto, em nome do Grupo ALDE. – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Senhor Ministro, o Supremo Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia tem 28 juizes, 11 advogados-gerais e um secretário. Num total de 40 membros, apenas 7 são mulheres, 5 das quais juizas e 2 advogadas-gerais.

São números que me envergonham enquanto europeu e que me fazem sentir que não está tão longe assim o tempo em que as mulheres estavam legalmente impedidas de aceder à magistratura.

Com estes dados, a União Europeia perde legitimidade para implementar políticas que imponham aos Estados-Membros e às empresas privadas o respeito pelo princípio da igualdade de género.

Esta desigualdade no Tribunal de Justiça da União Europeia não é responsabilidade apenas de homens, mas também de algumas mulheres. Quando, há cerca de ano e meio, em outubro de 2015, apresentei um relatório sobre a reforma do Tribunal Geral, propus uma alteração do respetivo regulamento que garantisse um efetivo número igual de juizes e de juizas.

Infelizmente não foram só homens que estiveram contra: algumas mulheres opuseram-se a essa proposta, pois estavam mais interessadas numa apressada e desnecessária duplicação do número de juizes desse tribunal do que na concretização histórica deste direito fundamental das mulheres europeias.

Jiří Maštálka, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, dnešní diskusi o potřebě vyrovnaného zastoupení mezi ženami a muži v profesi soudců u Evropského soudního dvora chápu jako upozornění na stále přetrvávající nerovnost mezi ženami a muži, proti čemuž chceme bojovat.

Myslím si ale, že bychom se měli soustředit především na problematiku uplatnění žen na trhu práce a jejich platové ohodnocení. Rozdíl v hodinové mzdě zaměstnaných mužů a žen je v Česku například dvacet dva procent. Nižší mzdy se samozřejmě promítají i do výše důchodů. Ženy se například po rozvodu s partnerem ocitají na samé hranici chudoby.

Dalším obrovským problémem je nedostatek dostupných služeb pro matky s dětmi, což vede k omezení uplatnění žen na trhu práce. Tento fakt zvyšuje sociální náklady státu. Genderová problematika je velice široká a já doufám, že se neomezíme pouze na případ Soudního dvora Evropské unie. Musíme udělat maximum, abychom ženám umožnili sladit rodinný život s nezbytným profesním růstem.

Heidi Hautala, Verts/ALE-ryhmän puolesta. – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa herra neuvoston puheenjohtaja, kun neuvosto ei kyennyt ratkaisemaan parhaalla mahdollisella tavalla tätä yleisen tuomioistuimen uudistusta, niin Euroopan parlamentti tuli avuksi. Me todellakin sitten hieman vastahakoisesti, mutta kuitenkin hyväksyimme sen, että tuomarien määrä kaksinkertaistetaan, ja me teimme poliittisen sopimuksen. Herra Zwiefka sanoi, että se oli herrasmiessopimus, mutta se oli poliittinen sopimus, jolla me päätimme, että vastaisuudessa pyrimme mahdollisimman tehokkaasti siihen tilanteeseen, että tuomioistuimessa on yhtä paljon nais- kuin miestuomareita.

Te käytätte valitettavasti hyvin perinteisiä argumentteja, kuten että sukupuoli ei suinkaan ratkaise, vaan ansiot, ja ettei ole mitään takeita siitä, että ehdokkaissa on naisia, ja totta kai paras valitaan. On kuitenkin kummallista, että tässä yhteiskunnassa ja Euroopan unionissa edelleen näitä ehtoja täyttävät sitten lähinnä vain miehet. Toivon, että neuvosto todella muistaa sen sopimuksen, jonka komissio, neuvosto ja Euroopan parlamentti tekivät.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, l'égalité hommes-femmes est un principe juridique fondamental en France et en Europe. C'est aussi un principe fondateur de la civilisation européenne contemporaine.

Sur ce sujet comme sur tant d'autres, l'Union européenne est, hélas, incapable de montrer l'exemple. Seuls trois des quinze juges dernièrement nommés à la Cour de justice de l'Union européenne sont des femmes, ce qui manifeste un certain mépris à l'égard d'autres femmes qui avaient la compétence requise pour être choisies.

Il est urgent de réagir. Il faut réaffirmer avec force l'égalité de l'homme et de la femme à l'heure où Daesh et certains communautarismes prônent l'asservissement de la femme à l'homme. Si l'Union ne le fait pas, les peuples européens en tireront les conséquences.

Mais pour elle, il est sans doute déjà trop tard. En France, c'est bientôt une femme qui se chargera de faire respecter l'égalité hommes-femmes à la place de l'Union.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! 50 % der Bevölkerung sind Männer, 50 % sind Frauen. Da ist es insofern absolut logisch, dass diese Gleichstellung auch vor Gerichten und natürlich auch vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof zu respektieren ist. Das Europäische Parlament hat es sich nicht einfach gemacht, sich eine Entscheidung abzurufen, als es darum ging, die Anzahl der Richter und Richterinnen zu erhöhen. Eine Bedingung war eindeutig, dass dementsprechend auch auf die Anzahl der Frauen Bezug genommen und die Anzahl der Richterinnen erhöht werden soll. Insofern kann man nur sagen: Der Rat hat dieses Prinzip nicht berücksichtigt. Und wir im Europäischen Parlament müssen uns in Zukunft sehr gut überlegen, inwiefern wir uns da auf den Rat auch verlassen, der uns entsprechend etwas zusichert und sich nicht daran hält.

Interventions à la demande

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych pouze poukázal na to, že ten podíl mezi muži a ženami je opravdu skoro vyrovnaný, padesát jedna ku čtyřiceti devíti procentům v evropské populaci, a že opravdu nevnímám žádný rozumný důvod pro to, aby podobný poměr nebyl i v zastoupení na Evropském soudním dvoře.

Na druhou stranu si myslím, že by to nemělo být absolutní dogma. Já jsem příznivcem toho, aby nebyla ani diskriminace na základě pohlaví, prostě ti nejlepší právníci by měli zasedat v této tak vážené instituci, jakou je Evropský soudní dvůr. Já podporuji samozřejmě zastoupení žen, tu přechodnou kvótu, to znamená, aby bylo určité přechodné ustanovení, které umožní větší zastoupení žen na Evropském soudním dvoře. Ale skutečně nestigmatizujeme lidi podle toho, jaké mají pohlaví. Jsem přesvědčen, že jsme schopni dosáhnout rozumné dohody.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, da donna, già magistrato in Italia – un paese nel quale, oggi, il 50,6 % dei magistrati sono donne – mi rammarica notare come, in seno alla Corte di giustizia e al Tribunale, ancora persista una marcata disparità di genere.

Nonostante i provvedimenti adottati da questo Parlamento nel 2015 al momento della riforma della Corte di Giustizia e l'entrata in vigore di un regolamento che invita gli Stati a presentare alla Corte di Giustizia 2 giudici di sesso diverso, la tendenza non sembra essersi invertita. Dal 2016 in poi, l'unico nuovo giudice della Corte di giustizia è stato un uomo, mentre per quanto concerne il Tribunale, sono stati nominati ben 15 giudici uomini e solo 3 donne. È evidente, quindi – e mi rivolgo al Consiglio – che occorre continuare a sollecitare gli Stati affinché propongano una maggiore presenza delle donne nella Corte di giustizia, dove certamente sono in grado di portare capacità, competenza e impegno. Questo per dare concretezza al principio dell'equilibrio di genere negli Stati, ma anche nell'Unione.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το Δικαστήριο των Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων, το 1976, εξέδωσε την σημαντικότερη απόφαση Defrenne, μια απόφαση με την οποία καθιέρωσε την ισότητα των δύο φύλων ως προς τις αμοιβές σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκών Κοινοτήτων. Σήμερα όμως, στους κόλπους του Δικαστηρίου της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, το ποσοστό των γυναικών είναι μικρότερο του 20%.

Το γεγονός βέβαια ότι σε πολλά ανώτατα δικαστήρια των κρατών μελών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης υπάρχουν λίγες γυναίκες δεν μπορεί να είναι δικαιολογία για τα κράτη μέλη για να μην διορίζουν δικαστές γυναίκες, διότι έχουν το δικαίωμα να διορίζουν καθηγητές Πανεπιστημίου και άρα καθηγήτριες Πανεπιστημίου ή ακόμη και δικηγόρους. Επομένως, τα πράγματα είναι απλά: οφείλουν τα κράτη μέλη κατά τη διαδικασία διορισμών να λάβουν σαφέστατα υπόψη την αρχή της ισότητας των δύο φύλων και να διορίζουν και γυναίκες δικαστές στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, outside the famous British Old Bailey courtroom stands the statue of Lady Justice, a stark reminder that justice is for all. That principle goes back at least to Roman times, to the Roman goddess Justitia. Since the 16th century, Lady Justice has often been depicted wearing a blindfold, that shows that justice, true justice, is blind to wealth, power or other status, and in today's society we might well add gender, amongst other characteristics.

I do not think it is in any way a stretch to suggest that the same principles should apply to the appointment of judges. Equality of opportunity should exist for all. I do not care whether a judge is a woman or a man, black or white, rich or poor, straight or gay, religious or atheist. I only care for the job that they do. Appointments of judges must depend solely on their ability to apply the law diligently, without fear or favour. Equality of outcome is not, for these reasons, a valid target.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Chris Agius, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, as I stated initially, the promotion of gender equality in high-level positions in the EU institutions, including in the Union courts, is an important political objective shared by our institutions. While in the most recent appointments at the General Court we have seen a slightly higher percentage of women than before, there is clearly still scope for improvement.

We could ask what else could be done to promote gender equality in the composition of the General Court. It is difficult to understand that, while in many Member States women are well represented in national judicial functions, this is still not the case in the European Union's Court. Perhaps it is due to the fact that, for judges at the General Court, relevant experience of at least 12 to 15 years is requested, and that women are less represented in this category of experienced lawyers and judges. Some paths towards improving the situation have been outlined, as I have already mentioned, in the Council conclusions of 7 December 2015 on equality between women and men in the field of decision-making, in which the Council called on governments and the social partners to establish far-reaching equal opportunities policies and to set targets and timelines to further develop and implement effective measures aimed at ensuring the balanced representation of women and men in decision-making and leadership, including training, mentoring and sponsoring schemes.

This could be food for thought, inter alia, as regards the preparation of suitable female candidates for judges' posts at the General Court, and might contribute, over time, to improving the overall gender balance among judges.

Finally, I think that we could again take stock of the situation once the last stage of the reform has been completed, which should be sometime in 2020. In the meantime, I am confident that discussions like this one contribute to the public debate on the issue and to awareness raising in the capitals. Thank you very much for this debate and for your attention.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

23. Information exchange mechanism with regard to intergovernmental agreements and non-binding instruments in the field of energy (debate)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Zdzisław Krasnodębski, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie, sur l'établissement d'un mécanisme d'échange d'informations en ce qui concerne les accords intergouvernementaux et les instruments non contraignants dans le domaine de l'énergie (COM(2016)0053 — C8-0034/2016 — 2016/0031(COD)) (A8-0305/2016).

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, sprawozdawca. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Szanowni Państwo! Nadrzędnym celem unii energetycznej jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa energetycznego jej członkom, które w dużej mierze zależy od dywersyfikacji dostaw. Zgodność umów międzyrządowych w dziedzinie energii z unijnym prawem jest jednym z warunków prawidłowego funkcjonowania wewnętrznego rynku energii, podniesienia bezpieczeństwa dostaw i dywersyfikacji. Jednak jak wszyscy wiemy, dotąd Komisja nie dysponowała skutecznym narzędziem przeciwdziałania zawieraniu umów niezgodnych z prawem unijnym, niezgodnych z celami Unii energetycznej.

Ponad rok temu, w grudniu 2015 roku, w parlamentarnej rezolucji dotyczącej unii energetycznej zwracaliśmy uwagę na małą przejrzystość umów międzyrządowych, na dostawę i tranzyt surowców energetycznych z państw trzecich lub budowę i wykorzystanie niezbędnej infrastruktury oraz zwracaliśmy uwagę na brak skuteczności dotychczasowych mechanizmów kontroli.

W lutym ubiegłego roku Komisja przedstawiła projekt modyfikacji decyzji w tej sprawie. Od tego czasu w ramach Komisji Przemysłu, Energii i Badań Naukowych prowadziliśmy intensywne prace, by ustanowić mechanizmy weryfikacji w stosunku do wspomnianych umów. Muszę tu podkreślić, że bez bardzo dobrej współpracy z kontrsprawozdawcami poszczególnych grup politycznych, z ich doradcami tak szybka ścieżka legislacyjna nie byłaby możliwa. Chciałem wszystkim bardzo serdecznie podziękować.

Ten okres bardzo wytężonych negocjacji przypadł na końcowy okres prezydencji słowackiej. Również z prezydentką słowacką pracowaliśmy bardzo dobrze nad tym dokumentem. Chciałbym też podziękować przewodniczącemu ITRE, panu profesorowi Buzkowi, za zaangażowanie, współpracę, nie zawsze oczywistą wśród polityków o różnych orientacjach politycznych, ale myślę, że rzeczywiście była to bardzo dobra współpraca.

Jestem przekonany, że projekt decyzji, który mamy jutro uchwalić, może zapewnić obywatelom i państwom większe bezpieczeństwo energetyczne. To będzie zarazem pierwszy akt legislacyjny wdrażający założenia wspólnej strategii energetycznej 28 państw członkowskich. Oczywiście ten projekt jest rezultatem kompromisu osiągniętego w negocjacjach między grupami politycznymi w komisji oraz w negocjacjach z Radą, i jak każdy kompromis oznacza konieczność pewnych ustępstw. Najważniejsze postanowienia tego dokumentu to to, że projekty umów, które dotyczą dostaw lub przesyłu gazu ziemnego i ropy naftowej, będą weryfikowane przez Komisję Europejską, zanim zostaną ratyfikowane, czyli *ex ante*. Do tej pory mieliśmy do czynienia jedynie z weryfikacją *ex ante* i tylko pod kątem istniejących przepisów unijnych; teraz dodatkowym kryterium weryfikacji staje się również szeroko zdefiniowane bezpieczeństwo energetyczne.

Natomiast nie udało się w obecnym kształcie tej decyzji zamieścić weryfikacji *ex ante* umów dotyczących energii elektrycznej. Warto jednak podkreślić, że zgodnie z zapisem klauzuli rewizyjnej mogłyby one zostać włączone w zakres weryfikacji przy kolejnej aktualizacji przepisów. Klauzula weryfikacji *ex ante* nie obejmuje także tak zwanych instrumentów niewiążących oraz umów hybrydowych. Jeżeli chodzi o instrumenty niewiążące, to kryteria notyfikacji są w tym przypadku znacznie mniej restrykcyjne, jednak ważne jest to, że zostały one zdefiniowane w tej decyzji, co otwiera możliwość wprowadzenia bardziej szczegółowej weryfikacji tych instrumentów w przyszłości.

Projekt pomija też umowy hybrydowe, ale w ramach trójstronnych negocjacji Komisja zobowiązała się wydać oświadczenie, zgodnie z którym klauzula rewizyjna zawarta w artykule 10 decyzji umożliwi Komisji wystąpienie w przyszłości z wnioskiem o włączenie tego rodzaju umów w zakres weryfikacji. To są umowy, które zawierają państwa, rządy z podmiotami formalnie pozarządowymi, ale w których państwa trzecie sprawują dominującą rolę.

Dziękuję bardzo, jeszcze się wypowiem oczywiście na koniec naszej debaty.

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I welcome the excellent agreement reached at the last trilogue in December on the intergovernmental agreements (IGA) decision review between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission. With this, we have reached a major political success that we have built together over the last months. I want to congratulate the rapporteur, Professor Krasnodębski, and the Members of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy for their excellent work. I also want to congratulate the Dutch and the Slovak Presidencies for their support.

The review of the IGA decision takes place in the context of the Energy Union Strategy, the objective of which is to give European Union consumers – households and business – secure, sustainable, competitive and affordable energy supplies. In the current geopolitical climate, the Energy Union is essential to stimulate the production of renewables, improve energy efficiency and deliver a more integrated energy sector, which can ensure the security of supply and a successful energy transition, while promoting investment, growth and jobs.

With the agreement on the IGA decision, the first act to be agreed from the security of supply package we presented one year ago, we are giving a very powerful signal. We are showing that jointly, Parliament, the Commission and the Council attach great importance to bringing more coherence to our external energy policy, and that this external energy policy should be guided by respect for our internal rules and principles.

The current rules on intergovernmental agreements were agreed in 2012, and they require Member States to notify the Commission of their energy agreements with non-European Union countries only after they have been concluded (ex-post). The Commission has been notified of some 124 intergovernmental agreements under the 2012 rules. One third of the agreements related to energy infrastructure or energy supply contained provisions that were not compliant with European Union law. Moreover, it has proven very difficult to renegotiate or terminate intergovernmental agreements once they have been signed by the parties. In fact, no intergovernmental agreement has been successfully renegotiated as yet.

The review therefore has two main objectives: to ensure full compliance of IGAs with European Union law, thereby ensuring the proper functioning of the internal energy market, enhancing competition, and ensuring energy security. And to increase the transparency of IGAs in order to increase the cost-effectiveness of European Union energy supply and increase solidarity between Member States.

The deal is very relevant: for the first time, the principle of a mandatory ex-ante assessment by the Commission of gas and oil IGAs has been accepted, while electricity IGAs are still subject to a mandatory ex-post check. For the first time the role of non-legally binding instruments has been recognised, in full respect of the principle of subsidiarity and proportionality.

This will allow for more transparent and fully compliant IGAs in the future. This will increase our energy security and the functioning of our internal market. Of course, there should be no complacency, and the Commission will continue monitoring the development of the information exchange in the future. By 1 January 2020 we will issue a report on its implementation, to monitor the situation, notably regarding agreements between Member States and undertakings but also regarding electricity IGAs.

At the last trilogue in December, the Commission made a statement in that sense that will be attached to the Minutes of today's debate. On this basis, I am confident that the vote in plenary tomorrow will give a strong backing to the important agreement that we have achieved together.

WRITTEN STATEMENT BY THE COMMISSION

1. The review clause of this Decision (Article 10) covers the possibility for the Commission to assess whether it is appropriate to address agreements between Member States and undertakings from third countries, in the future, and to assess whether all instruments in this Decision are sufficiently addressed.

2. The Commission commits itself to make this assessment no later than 1 January 2020.

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER GRAF LAMBSDORFF

Vizepräsident

Bendt Bendtsen, *ordfører for udtalelse fra Udvalget om International Handel*. – Hr. formand! En mekanisme for udveksling af oplysninger er første spæde skridt på vejen til EU's energiunion. Det er godt for det videre arbejde med energiunionen, at vi nu får mulighed for at få et tidligt tjek af de olie- og gaskontrakter, som indgås med lande uden for EU. Vi øger nu gennemsigtigheden og har mulighed for at gribe ind, inden kontrakterne indgås. Man skulle ikke tro, at det tidlige tjek var en nødvendighed, men det er det desværre. Det viser sig, at op mod en tredjedel af tidligere indgåede kontrakter ikke var på linje med de beslutninger, vi ønsker i forbindelse med energiunionen og EU's indre marked. Jeg håber og tror, at det vil ændre sig til gavn for alle europæere.

Vladimir Urutchev, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, as the Commissioner stated, a number of existing intergovernmental agreements were not compliant with EU law. The high-profile example was the South Stream project. Moreover, it has proved very difficult, even impossible, to renegotiate or terminate such agreements. According to the new rules, Member States should inform the Commission in advance about their future gas and oil contracts with third countries through a formally established exchange mechanism. This mechanism will allow Member States to be aware early enough about non-conformity with EU law and to have the Commission's expertise on their side.

I would highlight the fact that this is the first dossier from the Energy Union strategy on which an agreement with the Council has been reached, and securing this agreement in a record time is a significant political achievement towards establishing the Energy Union.

The key objectives of the decision are to increase transparency of the energy market, to guarantee that intergovernmental agreements in the field of gas and oil are in line with EU law, and to strengthen the EU's resilience to gas and oil supply disruptions. It will equally increase Member States' negotiating power with third countries, as they benefit from the political and economic weight of the European Union. Subsequently, a high degree of transparency will also contribute to closer cooperation between Member States in the field of external energy relations and the achievement of long-term objectives relating to the functioning of the internal energy market.

More transparency and coordinated purchasing will eliminate market fragmentation in the EU. That is why I think this decision deserves our approval.

Miroslav Poche, *za skupinu S&D*. – Pane předsedající, Evropská unie dlouhodobě dováží víc jak polovinu spotřebované energie ze zahraničí. Velmi často ze zemí, které energetické suroviny považují za nástroj své zahraniční politiky, což je naprosto nepřijatelné. Evropa na to musí reagovat jednoznačnou a silnou pozicí při jednáních o energetických dodávkách. Proto je větší míra transparentnosti při vyjednávání mezinárodních dohod, zejména o dodávkách ropy a zemního plynu, více než potřeba.

Intenzivnější výměna informací a možnost, aby se Komise účastnila těchto jednání jako pozorovatel, je tou cestou, která musí vést ke zlepšení naší pozice. Komise musí prostřednictvím notifikace těchto smluv zajistit rovněž to, aby plně odpovídaly pravidlům vnitřního energetického trhu Evropské unie. Za pozitivní změnu považuji, že se tak nebude dít až poté, co jsou dohody uzavřeny, ale v průběhu jejich vyjednávání. Zatím dodavatelé stále aplikují pro jednotlivé země dvojí standardy, a to je zásadní problém. Vidím za tím jejich snahu oslabit silnou evropskou pozici, taktiku „rozděl a panuj“, dá se říci. Právě tomuto rozhodování musíme zabránit.

Uzavírané smlouvy musí zmírnit nepříznivý dopad na ostatní státy. Nové nastavení mechanismu výměny informací tak ve výsledku povede k posílení spolupráce, vzájemné důvěry, transparentnosti a prohloubení solidarity v rámci celé energetické unie, což považuji za základní předpoklad zajištění naší energetické bezpečnosti.

Angelika Mlinar, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Zuallererst möchte ich mich bei Ihnen, Herr Krasnodębski, als Berichterstatter bedanken. Sie haben wirklich ausgezeichnete Arbeit geliefert, und das erzielte Resultat spricht für sich.

Der ausgehandelte Beschluss setzt sich zum Ziel, die Schwächen des derzeitigen Mechanismus zu überwinden. Zum heutigen Stand müssen Abkommen der Kommission erst zur Untersuchung vorgelegt werden, nachdem sie ratifiziert wurden. Allerdings stellte sich heraus, dass Abkommen, die nicht mit dem Unionsrecht vereinbar sind, nur sehr schwer im Nachhinein neu ausgehandelt werden konnten. Mit dem morgen zur Abstimmung stehenden Beschluss wird sich dies ändern. Nun wird die Kommission vor der Unterzeichnung der Abkommen im Bereich Öl und Gas prüfen, ob diese mit dem Unionsrecht im Einklang stehen. Sollten die Mitgliedstaaten zudem von den Gutachten der Kommission abweichen, müssen sie ihre Beweggründe dafür schriftlich erläutern. Des Weiteren wird eine klarere Definition des Begriffs „zwischenstaatliches Abkommen“ eingeführt, in der auch internationale Organisationen enthalten sind.

Ich bin davon überzeugt, dass mit diesem Beschluss die Transparenz und die Kohärenz der EU-Außenbeziehungen im Bereich Energie wesentlich verbessert werden und die Verhandlungsposition der EU gegenüber Drittländern vor allem im Gasbereich gestärkt wird. Meine Fraktion, die Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten, wird das unterstützen.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, η τελική πρόταση, όπως έχει διαμορφωθεί μετά τους τριμερείς διαλόγους, όντως βελτιώθηκε σε επιμέρους σημεία. Χαιρετίζουμε, για παράδειγμα, τη διαγραφή της πρότασης για υποχρεωτική συμμετοχή της Επιτροπής στις διαπραγματεύσεις. Δυστυχώς όμως, ο βασικός στόχος για αύξηση των εξουσιών της Επιτροπής εις βάρος των κυριαρχικών δικαιωμάτων των κρατών μελών παραμένει. Οι διάφορες προτάσεις που παραμένουν, για μεγαλύτερη εμπλοκή της Επιτροπής στη διαδικασία, ακόμα και πριν από τη σύναψη των διακυβερνητικών συμφωνιών, με την υποχρεωτική εκ των προτέρων αξιολόγηση, είναι προβληματικές και περικλείουν κινδύνους. Δεν γίνεται τα κράτη μέλη να μην μπορούν να υπογράψουν, να κυρώνουν ή να συνομολογούν σχέδια των διακυβερνητικών συμφωνιών χωρίς την έγκριση της Επιτροπής, όπως ζητείται στην πρόταση που έχει κατατεθεί. Ιδίως από τη στιγμή που η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεν κατόρθωσε ακόμη να αντιμετωπίσει τα σοβαρά προβλήματα που υπάρχουν στην ενεργειακή τροφοδοσία, καθώς πολλά κράτη μέλη (και περιοχές) της Ένωσης είναι απομονωμένα από τα μεγάλα ενεργειακά δίκτυα. Είναι πολύ επικίνδυνο να προωθούνται πολιτικές που περιορίζουν τη δυνατότητα των κρατών να διαμορφώνουν πολυδιάστατες ενεργειακές συμφωνίες βάσει των συμφερόντων του λαού. Αντ' αυτού, πρέπει να διασφαλίσουμε πως θα υπάρχει ενισχυμένος κρατικός έλεγχος και εθνική ευελιξία για τη διασφάλιση της ενεργειακής ασφάλειας στο λαό. Η προσπάθεια χειραγώγησης των κρατών από την Κομισιόν απαράδεκτη. Γι' αυτό και η GUE/NGL θα καταψηφίσει αυτή την πρόταση.

Indrek Tarand, fraktsiooni Verts/ALE nimel. – *If you allow me, I will speak in Estonian.* Austatud istungi juhataja! Mul on väga kahju, et fraktsioon GUE hääletab selle resolutsiooni vastu, sest see on väga hea resolutsioon. Just fraktsioon GUE võiks selle pooldada, sest hr Krasnodębski on teinud väga põhjaliku töö, mis viib meid sammukese lähemale Euroopa tegeliku energialiidu poole, ja EU energialiiduna võib ühel päeval olla palju tähtsam kui EU Euroopa Liiduna.

Mul oli väga suur au töötada koos hr Krasnodębskiga ja see kogemus ütleb mulle, et teadlase taust Euroopa Parlamendis energiaküsimustes on väga oluline. Mitte igast poliitikust ei saa teadlast, aga heast teadlasest saab hea raportöör ja selle lausega ma ka oma sõnavõtu lõpetan.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Tarand, Sie dürfen selbstverständlich Estnisch sprechen. Wir haben hier die besten Dolmetscher der Welt, und sie sind auch spätabends noch fit und dolmetschen alles exzellent.

Roger Helmer, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Mr President, the explanatory statement for this proposal says its objectives are secure, affordable and sustainable energy. Yet for many years the EU has followed policies which have exactly the opposite effect. Germany, with the largest renewables investment, now uses increasing volumes of lignite. In the UK we are planning to use diesel generation as back-up.

The highly respected Economist magazine currently runs a front-page story entitled 'Clean energy's dirty secret'. I recommend it to colleagues. It says we have created regulatory and subsidy structures that militate against energy infrastructure investment and threaten security of supply. I quote: 'Green energy is eating its own tail'. Yet this proposal today amounts to little more than bureaucratic paper pushing. The explanatory statement concludes by saying the EU is torn apart by migratory and eurozone crises and desperately needs a success. Indeed it does, but this report will not deliver that success.

Jerzy Buzek (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja nie zgodzę się z moim przedmówcą, jeśli chodzi o ocenę tego porozumienia, ale pozwolicie państwo, że zacznę od tego, od czego zaczęła większość przemawiających na tej sali, a mianowicie od gratulacji dla pana sprawozdawcy. To było pierwsze sprawozdanie pana profesora Krasnodębskiego w Parlamencie Europejskim i skoro słyszy się takie słowa pochwały, to znaczy, że rzeczywiście było ono dobre. Ja to mówię, wiedząc oczywiście o ciepłych słowach, które on skierował pod moim adresem. Jestem przekonany, że mówimy bardzo szczerze. Widać z tego, że można w Parlamencie Europejskim skutecznie pracować ponad podziałami politycznymi w najważniejszych dla Unii Europejskiej i dla naszych obywateli sprawach. Zatem jeszcze raz gratuluję, również Komisji Europejskiej, co jest bardzo ważne, i dwóm zeszłorocznym prezydentom. Ten wynik nas naprawdę satysfakcjonuje.

To jest początek prawnych regulacji dotyczących unii energetycznej, pierwsza prawna regulacja, ale proszę pamiętać: największe trudności są zwykle z wdrażaniem tego, co wcześniej uchwaliliśmy. I to wszystko jest jeszcze przed nami. Liczą się nie tylko dalsze rozwiązania w ramach unii energetycznej, które już leżą na stole i nad którymi pracujemy i będziemy ciężko pracować w komisji ITRE, ale być może jeszcze ważniejsze jest to, by już dzisiaj mówić o tym, w jaki sposób my to wdrożymy i jak będziemy egzekwować. Ostatnie doświadczenia z napięciami wokół inwestycji Nord Stream 2 wskazują właśnie na to, że wdrażanie i egzekwowanie w Unii Europejskiej i w ramach unii energetycznej będzie najważniejsze.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych chtěl ve svém projevu nejprve omluvit pana kolegu poslance Kukana, který z nenadálých osobních důvodů nemůže vystoupit v jednacím sále. Nicméně já bych chtěl hovořit o energetické unii z pohledu bezpečnosti. Já jsem příznivcem toho, aby energetická bezpečnost a vnitřní trh byly velmi provázané. To, co řekl pan komisař Cañete ve svém úvodním vystoupení, je velmi důležité. Evropa je ohromný trh a my nedostatečně využíváme tohoto prostoru.

Jsem přesvědčen, že je důležité, v jaké době se stane energetická unie skutečnou prioritou Evropské unie a jejích institucí. Musíme sledovat transparentnost, to je nepochybné. Ve vyjednávání různých dohod Evropa představuje ohromný vnitřní trh a měli bychom na této skutečnosti vlastně plánovat naši budoucnost. Naše pozice velkého vnitřního trhu umožňuje vyjednat nejlepší podmínky. Já bych byl rád, kdybychom si toho byli vědomi.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, un mercato interno dell'energia non correttamente funzionante pone l'Unione in una posizione vulnerabile e svantaggiosa circa la sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento energetico e compromette i potenziali benefici per i consumatori e l'industria.

Obiettivo strategico dell'Unione dell'energia, infatti, è di consentire l'accesso a un'energia sicura, sostenibile e a prezzi concorrenziali. Sono dell'opinione che la costruzione di un meccanismo per lo scambio di informazioni, relativo ad accordi intergovernativi tra Stati membri e paesi terzi nel settore dell'energia, pur andando nella giusta direzione, limitando gli individualismi degli Stati membri, non soddisfa pienamente l'esigenza di informazione preventiva. Al pari degli accordi intergovernativi, le dichiarazioni congiunte tra Stati membri dell'Unione europea e paesi terzi devono essere esaminate prima della loro sottoscrizione, al fine di creare la necessaria certezza giuridica per gli investimenti. Solo un sistema di controllo equivalente dei contratti intergovernativi e degli strumenti non vincolanti può impedire che le parti possano trovare sotterfugi.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ανταλλαγή πληροφοριών σε σχέση με τις διακυβερνητικές συμφωνίες στον τομέα της ενέργειας είναι σημαντική. Δεν πρέπει όμως να ξεχνούμε ότι πρόκειται για τομέα στον οποίο τα κράτη μέλη διατηρούν την εθνική τους κυριαρχία. Αυτό που προσπαθείτε να κάνετε τώρα, με την ex ante έγκριση, είναι να περιορίζετε ουσιαστικά τις κυριαρχικές εξουσίες των κρατών μελών. Τα κράτη μέλη οφείλουν να τηρούν το κοινοτικό δίκαιο. Έχουν δικαίωμα να υπογράφουν διεθνείς συμφωνίες. Μόνο αν παραβιάζουν το κοινοτικό δίκαιο, έχετε εσείς δικαίωμα, ως Επιτροπή, να προσφεύγετε στο Δικαστήριο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για να επιβάλει αυτό κυρώσεις. Διαφορετικά, δεν θα υπήρχε η έννοια της παραπομπής ενός κράτους μέλους για παραβίαση του κοινοτικού δικαίου. Θα είχατε εσείς τον ex ante έλεγχο στα πάντα και έτσι δεν θα υπήρχε αυτή η διαδικασία. Άρα, τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να διατηρήσουν τις κυριαρχικές τους εξουσίες και αν παραβιάζουν το κοινοτικό δίκαιο, τότε να τα παραπέμπετε. Δεν μπορείτε όμως, διά της πλαγίας οδού, να παίρνετε αρμοδιότητες, ως Επιτροπή, τις οποίες δεν έχετε.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, podržavam ova nova pravila koja daju jaču snagu Komisiji, kako bi mogla zapravo i pomoći državama članicama u pregovorima s trećim zemljama oko uvoza energije.

Ono što osobno smatram jest da bi ex ante uvjete trebalo proširiti i na uvoz, odnosno ugovore vezane uz uvoz električne energije, pogotovo ako gledamo okruženje Europske unije, susjedne države koje, iako su članice energetske zajednice, ulažu u nove kapacitete termoelektrana na ugljen. Budući da one nisu obveznice emisije trgovanja ugljičnim dioksidom, također ne služe prekograničnom poboljšanju zagađenja država članica.

Smatram da bi Komisija trebala i u takvim slučajevima s državama članicama sudjelovati u pregovorima, jer se na taj način ugrožava konkurentnost na unutarnjem tržištu električne energije u Europskoj uniji.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Miguel Arias Cañete, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, Members, thank you for your contributions to this debate. The Energy Union is one of the ten priorities of the Juncker Commission. Let me stress in this respect that reaching an agreement on one of the proposals of the Security of Gas Supply package adopted in February last year is an important step towards the realisation of the Energy Union. It is also important to show that we can do this in just 12 months. Many of you have stressed this issue, too. It shows that when there is the political commitment and we share the same clear objectives, we are able to offer concrete responses to the needs of business and of European citizens. Let us keep this positive spirit for the forthcoming negotiations on the Clean Energy for All Europeans package that is now on the table of the European Parliament and the Council.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski, *sprawozdawca*. – Dziękuję za pozytywną ocenę mojej pracy. To rzeczywiście jest moje pierwsze sprawozdanie legislacyjne w komisji ITRE; przedtem byłem autorem dwóch sprawozdań z inicjatywy własnej, które oczywiście nie mają takiego znaczenia prawnego jak to sprawozdanie, które jest rzeczywiście ważnym krokiem w kierunku realizacji unii energetycznej.

Ja się zgadzam z panem premierem Buzkiem, że najważniejsze jest wdrażanie, to, co zrobimy z tą legislacją. Tutaj bym zaapelował też do Komisji, żeby była odważna i konsekwentna, ponieważ pewne decyzje, które są podejmowane, takie jak decyzja w sprawie gazociągu OPAL czy brak decyzji w sprawie Nord Stream 2, powodują rzeczywiście, że w wielu krajach, których obywatele byli bardzo przekonani co do Unii Europejskiej i jej zalet, narasta sceptycyzm. Odwaga i konsekwencja jest niezwykle pożądana. I apeluję do Panów o to.

Natomiast chciałem się jeszcze odnieść do tej kwestii krytyki, która pojawiła się nie przypadkiem z lewej i z prawej strony. To często się zdarza na tej sali, że koledzy z lewej strony zgadzają się z tymi z prawej strony sali, prawica z lewicą. Więc obie te strony wyrażały zaniepokojenie, czy nie wkraczamy za bardzo tą legislacją w uprawnienia państw członkowskich, w ich suwerenność. Ja muszę powiedzieć, że pochodzę z ugrupowania politycznego i sam osobiście podtrzymuję pogląd, że tutaj niezwykle ważna jest dla nas suwerenność państw członkowskich w ramach Unii, uprawnienia państw członkowskich. Ale tę suwerenność państw członkowskich, państw narodowych w Unii powinniśmy budować wspólnie. Nie powinno być tak, panie profesorze Marias, kolega z grupy zgłaszał też uwagi krytyczne, nie może być tak, że suwerenność jednego państwa odbywa się kosztem naruszania bezpieczeństwa państw, członków tej samej Unii, w której wszyscy jesteśmy i której suwerenność wspólnie budujemy. To jest wartość, którą powinniśmy zachować.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 2. März 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Existujúci mechanizmus výmeny informácií oľhľadom medzivládnych dohôd s tretími krajinami v oblasti energetiky sa zatiaľ ukazuje ako neúčinný. Jeho cieľom je kontrola súladu takýchto dohôd s právnymi predpismi a energetickými prioritami Európskej únie. Výsledkom má byť posilnenie vnútorného trhu a energetickej bezpečnosti EÚ a jej členských štátov. Na papieri to vyzerá dobre, prakticky v súlade so stratégiou energetickej únie. Reálny efekt je však momentálne zanedbateľný. Problémom je, že kontrola sa vykonáva ex post, čiže až po uzavretí akýchkoľvek dohôd. Napríklad krajiny primárne závislé od jedného dodávateľa fosílnych palív môžu byť tlačené do rôznych nevýhodných ústupkov.

Po uzavretí dohody je však na nápravu už príliš neskoro. Ako problematických bolo označených až 17 uskutočnených medzivládnych dohôd. Vstupovať do nich po podpise však bolo zbytočné. Navyše sa v mnohých prípadoch začali realizovať aj konkrétne s nimi súvisiace investičné projekty. Vzhľadom na vysokú závislosť EÚ od dovozu fosílnych palív z tretích krajín by namiesto byrokraticky náročného komplexného posudzovania stačilo povedať do akej miery tie medzivládne dohody prispievajú k diverzifikácii zdrojov a prepravných ciest. Z praktického hľadiska by sa to malo diať pred uzatvorením takýchto dohôd. To však nezávisí od EÚ, ale iba od vôle predstaviteľov jednotlivých členských štátov.

András Gyürk (PPE), írásban. – A 2006-os és 2009-es tél alapjaiban ingatta meg az addig stabilnak tartott európai földgázrendszer. Korábban elképzelhetetlennek tűnt, hogy az Unió külső politikai csatározások ilyen komolyan tudják befolyásolni hétköznapijainkat. Ugyan a földgázszállítás kimaradása felkészületlenül érte a tagállamokat, hála a közös erőfeszítéseknek és a szolidaritásnak, sikerült átvészelnünk ezt a veszélyes időszakot. Ezek a krízisek azonban nemcsak mint fenyegetések vonultak be az európai történelembe, hanem mint egy új korszak kezdete.

Az addig elszigetelt tagállami energiapolitikák elkezdtek közeledni egymáshoz és felértékelődött az ellátásbiztonság valamint a szolidaritás kérdésköre. Megkezdődött az igazi energiauniós integráció, elindult a szomszédos tagállamok hálózatainak összekötése és jelentős lépéseket tettünk a piacfejlesztés érdekében. Természetes, hogy egy ilyen integrációs folyamatból nem maradhatnak ki a sokszor legnagyobb volumenű, államközi szerződések sem.

Bizonyos mértékű informáltság és normakontrol képes lehet javítani a tagállamok alkupozióján, ezáltal hozzájárulva az adott ország jólétéhez és versenyképességéhez. Nem szabad azonban, teljesen felrúgnunk a piacgazdaság egyik legalapvetőbb törvényét, az üzleti titokhoz való jogot. Az Uniónak ebben az esetben is meg kell találnia a megfelelő egyensúlyt: több Európa helyett a jobb Európára kell koncentrálni.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), na piśmie. – Ustanowienie mechanizmu wymiany informacji w odniesieniu do umów międzyrządowych i instrumentów niewiązujących w dziedzinie energii jest niezwykle istotnym krokiem naprzód w kierunku silniejszej i bardziej zjednoczonej Unii Europejskiej na polu energii. Cieszę się, że umowy międzyrządowe będą podlegały analizie Komisji Europejskiej przed ich podpisaniem, gdyż dzięki temu nie tylko będziemy mogli mieć pewność, iż będą one zgodne z prawem europejskim, ale również pomoże to w dopilnowaniu, by nie były one efektem wykorzystywania pozycji siły nad państwem członkowskim przez państwa trzecie. Uważam jednak, że analiza ex-ante powinna dotyczyć nie tylko umów międzyrządowych, ale również instrumentów niewiązujących, które pomimo swojego niewiążącego charakteru są też wykorzystywane w tak istotnych celach jak ustanawianie ram dla infrastruktury energetycznej czy dostaw energii, wpływając tym samym na rynek energii w sposób podobny do umów międzyrządowych.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Las reformas introducidas por el Parlamento Europeo no hacen sino reforzar los poderes de la Comisión frente a los Estados Miembros en la negociación de acuerdos intergubernamentales, con el fin de ajustarlos a la normativa europea. A pesar de que en el debate se han esgrimido argumentos tales como la necesidad de asegurar que las políticas de los Estados Miembros sean compatibles con los objetivos generales de las políticas energéticas de la UE (como son la eficiencia y seguridad energética), la propia Comisión reconoce que desea que los acuerdos intergubernamentales se revisen —esencialmente— para profundizar en la liberalización del mercado eléctrico y gasístico, tal y como marcan las directrices del tercer paquete energético y de la política de competencia. En este sentido, se trata de dotar a la Comisión de nuevos poderes formales e informales para desregular los mercados energéticos internacionales: poderes que, por cierto, no reclama en el ámbito de los acuerdos internacionales entre multinacionales privadas del sector energético. Creo que deberíamos ser más cautelosos, sobre todo en un momento en que la política energética exterior de la Comisión es más agresiva que nunca, como vemos con los ataques a Rusia y las peligrosas alianzas con países como Qatar.

24. Options for improving access to medicines (debate)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Soledad Cabezón Ruiz im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über die Optionen der EU, den Zugang zu Arzneimitteln zu verbessern (2016/2057(INI) (A8-0040/2017).

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, *ponente*. – Señor presidente, queridos colegas, los sistemas sanitarios forman parte de la Europa social en la que los ciudadanos y las ciudadanas europeos se reconocen y que valoran especialmente; son cruciales para garantizar la cohesión social y también la productividad, que generan una sociedad sana. Pero se enfrentan a retos, como la sostenibilidad, debido al envejecimiento de la población, al incremento de las enfermedades crónicas, a la irrupción de nuevas tecnologías.

Pero, hoy, nos trae aquí, fundamentalmente, el incremento del gasto farmacéutico: un 17 % de todo el gasto en salud — un 1,4 % del PIB de la Unión Europea—.

Y es que los altos precios de los medicamentos nos han puesto, a los países desarrollados, en un escenario que no considerábamos que nos pudiese alcanzar algún día: la hepatitis C —una enfermedad con graves consecuencias, pero a día de hoy con tratamiento curativo— no ha podido aún aspirar a su erradicación, sino que estamos priorizando, a base de guía, su tratamiento, lo que se hace difícil de justificar desde el punto de vista ético. Pero el cáncer también amenaza con 24 millones de casos nuevos para 2030, con un incremento del 68 % respecto a 2012.

Pero esto no es cuestión de ética, también es cuestión de derechos. El artículo 35 de la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales protege el derecho a la salud. El medicamento, como tal, no puede ser considerado un bien de consumo más, sino que tiene que ser especialmente regulado para que el paciente se encuentre en el centro del acceso al mismo.

Pero, además de los precios y la sostenibilidad, tenemos los problemas del desabastecimiento, la falta de adecuación a las necesidades por falta de interés comercial —en aspectos como la resistencia antimicrobiana— o la necesidad de poner incentivos —como es el caso de los medicamentos huérfanos—, problemas en la competencia para que entren los genéricos o falta de innovación con pequeñas modificaciones en muchos casos.

El precio de los medicamentos lo establece la industria sobre la base del valor, faltando otros equilibrios que garanticen el acceso a la ciudadanía. Los medicamentos huérfanos aumentan en un número que hace pensar que los criterios se están aplicando de forma incorrecta, debido a que generan un negocio rápido, un retorno rápido de la inversión.

Preocupan, como digo, los litigios en la competencia que dificultan la entrada de los genéricos. Todo ello parece que puede acabar desembocando o está desembocando en un modelo de negocio que dificulta el acceso a los medicamentos por parte la ciudadanía europea.

Los Estados miembros, con acuerdos confidenciales, con copago, en definitiva, con diferentes medidas, tratan de dar solución, pero, finalmente, lo que tenemos es un mercado más fragmentado y más desigual. La Comisión pone en marcha incentivos públicos, pero que tampoco garantizan ese retorno a la sociedad a través de un precio o un acceso justo.

Se nos hace crucial ese equilibrio de poderes y, para ello, el valor terapéutico añadido es crucial y tiene que ser establecido por la Comisión y los Estados miembros de forma coordinada.

Necesitamos, señor comisario, un marco legislativo en este sentido; también analizar otros criterios, por supuesto, económicos y sociales para que lo garanticen.

Necesitamos evaluar el verdadero impacto de la propiedad intelectual en la promoción de la innovación y en la calidad de la misma y, en definitiva, en el acceso a los medicamentos, el fin social que realmente justifica también este derecho fundamental.

Tenemos que evaluar los incentivos públicos puestos en marcha y también garantizar el retorno de la inversión justa con un precio adecuado y un acceso garantizado. Necesitamos un mejor marco que garantice la competencia y la entrada de los genéricos y un uso racional del medicamento.

Pero, muy especialmente, hoy quiero reivindicar —y no se puede demorar más— un plan que erradique la hepatitis C. Es inmoral, es insostenible que, a día de hoy, cuando tenemos medicamentos que salvan la vida de las personas, no seamos capaces de coordinarnos de forma suficiente para erradicar esta enfermedad.

En definitiva, en este informe se proponen medidas y acciones —estas y otras más—, y le pido al señor comisario que tome esta iniciativa y, antes de final de año, nos muestre una propuesta legislativa.

El Parlamento se suma al Consejo, a la ONU y a la OCDE. Es un clamor popular que tenemos que dar respuesta a esta justa demanda.

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the House, and in particular the rapporteur, Ms Cabezón Ruiz, and the shadow rapporteurs, for your enormous efforts in preparing the report on access to medicines in Europe. I fully share your concern about the need to improve patients' access to medicines and to help ensure that all patients have timely access to innovative and affordable medicines everywhere in the EU. There should be affordable and innovative medicines for each and every European citizen.

The key question here is, of course, how do we balance the objectives of innovation, quality and affordability? On the one hand, we need to ensure that the industry develops truly innovative products that respect the strict rules of safety, quality and efficacy while, on the other hand, we need to make sure that this innovation remains affordable, and thus accessible, to patients throughout Europe. I support Member States' initiatives to help reduce the price of medicines and increase transparency, and the Commission has published a study on enhanced coordination across countries in this area. Together we can all do more for European patients.

Your report addresses the entire life cycle of an innovative pharmaceutical's initial research, regulatory approvals, market launch and, ultimately, entry into the market of generic competitors. Let me concentrate on two aspects which figure prominently in the report: first, health technology assessment and, second, the incentive schemes aimed at encouraging pharmaceutical companies to develop innovative products for unmet medical needs.

I would like to start with health technology assessments. As you rightly state, health technology assessments help Member States to ensure the sustainability of their health care systems, encouraging pharmaceutical companies to develop products with clear therapeutic value-added benefits for patients. In 2016 the Commission announced its intention to propose an initiative on strengthening European Union cooperation for health technology assessment in 2017. We are working intensively on this initiative, analysing the results of the public consultation and preparing the impact assessment.

In that context, I welcome the input provided by Parliament on health technology assessment. Concretely, your report recommends the harmonisation of health technology assessment tools and methodologies and that consideration be given to compulsory relative-effectiveness assessments at EU level, with a focus on medical and therapeutic aspects. I cannot, of course, yet indicate what the Commission will propose, as we need to finalise our analysis first. Your input will contribute to shaping the initiative. My aim is to come up with a proposal that has clear benefits for all – for patients firstly, for all European citizens and for Member States.

Secondly, let me turn to the incentive system for pharmaceutical companies. A key component of this system is patents. The aim of patents is to allow companies to recover long-term investment in the research and development of new products through exclusive rights. In the pharmaceutical sector these patent rights can be extended by so-called supplementary protection certificates. This extension can be used when research and development has taken a very long time. In addition to patent rights and the supplementary protection certificates, companies can also benefit from regulatory data protection and sometimes market exclusivity periods, for example to develop orphan drugs.

You will also remember that we announced our intention to improve the patent system in Europe in the Single Market Strategy. Let me reassure you that this work includes a reference to supplementary patent certificates for pharmaceuticals. It is currently ongoing. Let me add that we will soon launch a comprehensive study to look into the complex incentive system for pharmaceuticals, in line with the recent Council conclusions. This study will investigate the impact of the current regime on innovation, availability and accessibility. We expect to have the final results of the study at the end of this year. In the meantime we published, earlier this month, an inception impact assessment announcing an evolution of the supplementary protection certificates legislation. This assessment also identifies legislative and non-legislative options for the way forward, and we intend to launch a public consultation before the summer.

Let me stress that your own-initiative report will provide a very important contribution to this work. I would like to emphasise that, when it comes to incentive schemes, we already have, as you know, dedicated European rules which apply for specific types of products such as advanced therapies, paediatric medicines and orphan medicines.

First, in the field of paediatric medicines, as I explained last December in Strasbourg, we are currently preparing a second implementation report showing how the sector functions. We are currently analysing the results from the consultation so I am not yet in a position to draw conclusions at this stage.

Second, in the area of advanced therapies and orphan medicines, our current focus is on the effective implementation of the legislation. In particular, for orphan medicines, let me recall that the legal framework has, for the past 17 years, enabled a strong increase in research and development activities for rare disorders. Investment in this field was previously too scarce due to the very small numbers of patients concerned.

I recognise that, besides health technology assessments and the incentive schemes, there are many other very important aspects covered by your report. For example, you touch upon research pricing competition and international matters. You also comment on the new forms of regional cooperation between smaller groups of Member States, such as the one involving Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Austria. Your report additionally calls on the Commission to submit a number of reports and to organise follow-up actions such as the creation of a new pharmaceutical forum. Be assured that we will carefully analyse these suggestions.

I believe we need to capitalise on the work already carried out in other forums. This is the case, for example, on the collection of pharmaceutical prices in the European database or on the guidance documents produced by international organisations. Very often this work is conducted in close cooperation with the Commission and Member States.

Let me conclude by expressing once again my sincere appreciation and gratitude for the strenuous efforts put into this important report. Let me remind you that the Commission is also working with Member States, in the Expert Group on Safe and Timely Access to Medicines for Patients, to optimise the use of the existing regulatory tools. I am encouraged by the fact that we all share a common vision, namely maintaining a favourable environment for real innovation in the EU, while ensuring that all European patients have timely access to truly innovative and affordable medicines of good quality and safety. In the light of that, I look forward to hearing your views.

Piernicola Pedicini, *relatore per parere della commissione per lo sviluppo*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la relatrice Cabezón per il lavoro che ha qui svolto, anche a nome dell'onorevole Corrao, della commissione sviluppo, visto che è stato ben recepito il lavoro che hanno fatto in quella commissione e nella commissione ambiente, soprattutto per i temi che sono stati individuati e sottolineati riguardo ai paesi in via di sviluppo.

Tuttavia voglio riportare il tema su quello che succede qui in Europa e soprattutto riguardo alla prevaricazione dei diritti fondamentali, come quello della salute. Cito Sofosbuvir, prima l'ha citato la relatrice, che può portare alla guarigione completa dall'epatite C e che viene venduto nell'Unione europea a 277 volte il prezzo di produzione; il vaccino per la pertosse si produce a un prezzo che è meno di un dollaro, ma nell'Unione europea viene venduto a 120 dollari; Erlotinib, per il tumore al pancreas, costa 15 000 euro a trattamento e produce un aumento medio di sopravvivenza di soli 15 giorni; Cetuximab, per i tumori del polmone, costa 80 000 euro a paziente e produce un aumento medio di sopravvivenza di un mese e mezzo soltanto.

Noi crediamo – dal nostro punto di vista – che nella relazione di iniziativa dell'onorevole Cabezón non si affrontano questi temi con la dovuta incisività. Ma il peggio viene da quegli emendamenti vergognosi del PPE e di ALDE che vogliono addirittura promuovere l'«innovazione incrementale». Siamo all'assurdo.

Qualunque medico sa molto bene che l'industria utilizza la strategia del «brevetto sempreverde», per conservare il più possibile il monopolio di un prodotto, apportando soltanto piccole modifiche come, ad esempio, l'aggiunta di un eccipiente. Su questo emendamento abbiamo chiesto il voto nominale perché tutti devono sapere chi sono quei gruppi politici che stanno dalla parte dell'industria che vuole fare profitto a tutti i costi sulla pelle dei pazienti, rendendoli di fatto malati cronici che non devono essere mai guariti, perché così, davvero, possono spremere fino all'osso.

Eleonora Evi, *relatrice per parere della commissione per le petizioni*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i danni provocati dalle misure di austerità, con i tagli orizzontali ai bilanci in materia di sanità pubblica e l'indisponibilità di medicinali o il mancato accesso agli stessi a causa della loro onerosità rendono oggi impossibile il diritto alla cura ad un numero esponenziale di cittadini europei, soprattutto i più poveri.

Le disuguaglianze si stanno duramente accentuando ma, a livello europeo, continua a permanere una volontà politica finalizzata a mantenere lo status quo, aggravato da quel rapporto oscuro tra case farmaceutiche e pezzi delle istituzioni sul quale è evidente non si voglia assicurare piena trasparenza. Non si spiegherebbe altrimenti la decisione della Commissione Juncker di ritirare la proposta di modifica della direttiva 89/105/CEE sulla trasparenza delle misure che regolano la fissazione dei prezzi dei farmaci – direttiva che risale a ben 28 anni fa – e nonostante la Commissione stessa avesse ammesso che il quadro normativo oggi vigente non riflette più le modalità con le quali vengono definiti i prezzi dei medicinali. È uno stato di cose inaccettabile che mina ancora una volta la credibilità dell'esecutivo comunitario.

Françoise Grossetête, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Union européenne est chargée par les traités de garantir l'égal accès de tous à la santé et, bien sûr, une santé de qualité et sûre. Mais c'est une mission oh combien complexe, si l'on tient compte de la fragmentation des systèmes de soins nationaux, des différences structurelles entre les États membres et de l'évolution de la science qui rend possible des innovations dont le coût ne fera, sans aucun doute, qu'augmenter.

Une mission dont nous avons pu cependant nous acquitter au mieux jusqu'à présent grâce à la mise en place d'un cadre réglementaire solide, avec la législation sur les médicaments humains, la directive sur les soins de santé transfrontaliers, le règlement sur les médicaments orphelins et beaucoup d'autres textes.

Ce cadre réglementaire a permis d'encourager la recherche et l'innovation, grâce à des incitations soigneusement ciblées, tout en améliorant l'accès aux traitements. Preuve en est, en France, par exemple, où les traitements innovants sont souvent rapidement disponibles et les frais de médicaments ont été stabilisés entre 2009 et 2014.

Les formidables innovations de rupture, qui arrivent enfin sur le marché, vont faire entrer la médecine dans une ère nouvelle et auront un fort impact sur les prix. Bien sûr, cela ne pose pas avec acuité la question de la pérennité de nos systèmes de soin, mais ce n'est pas pour cela que l'on doit baisser les bras. Or j'ai l'impression que c'est ce que certains ici ont voulu faire avec ce rapport, dont la version finale est heureusement bien plus mesurée.

Je mets sérieusement en garde cependant: ne ralentissons pas l'innovation de demain avec des calculs à court terme. La recherche médicale s'inscrit dans la durée et a besoin de visibilité et de stabilité.

Le défi de l'accès aux traitements passera par de nouveaux modèles commerciaux pour les laboratoires, une coopération renforcée entre les États membres, une harmonisation de l'évaluation des technologies médicales au niveau européen, l'évolution de la e-santé et du numérique et le développement de la prévention. Des solutions plus complexes, certes, mais plus durables. Pensons-y! Le coût de l'innovation est aussi le prix du progrès.

Carlos Zorrinho, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhor Presidente, no momento em que se debate a visão para o futuro do projeto europeu, precisamos cada vez mais de ação para que os cidadãos europeus sintam este projeto como seu.

Saúdo a relatora pelo excelente relatório que elaborou, mas agora é preciso passar à prática, e já! Os Estados-Membros têm de colaborar para combater a fragmentação do mercado. A Agência Europeia do Medicamento deve ser chamada, através do alargamento de competências, a apoiar este processo colaborativo. É necessária uma nova diretiva que garanta maior transparência dos procedimentos de fixação de preços e das garantias de reembolso.

Deve ser reforçado o esforço público de apoio e incentivo à investigação, em domínios como as doenças raras, que afetam nichos específicos, sendo depois esse esforço refletido na formação dos preços ou na perda de propriedade intelectual.

Para assegurar preços justos e acessíveis para os utentes e para os serviços de saúde, temos de estimular o uso dos medicamentos genéricos para aumentar a acessibilidade e apoiar a investigação em medicamentos inovadores para as doenças pediátricas.

A União Europeia e o projeto europeu tem de significar mais e melhor saúde para os seus cidadãos. Isso é possível e é absolutamente necessário.

Bolesław G. Piecha, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziękuję za to sprawozdanie. Zapewnienie stabilności systemów opieki zdrowotnej w dobie zwiększonych wydatków i starzenia się społeczeństwa wymaga prowadzenia wielu działań, również działań dotyczących dostępu do leków, ich ceny i dostępności. Głównie jest to kwestia wykorzystania Oceny Technologii Medycznych (HTA). To wykorzystanie powinno dotyczyć głównie leków generycznych i biopodobnych, ponieważ w dzisiejszych czasach te ceny bywają nieadekwatne do kosztów produkcji. Głównie trzeba wykorzystać konkurencję w sektorze leków niechronionych patentem (off-patent), bo to one generują konkretne oszczędności. W zakresie technologii lekowej popieram usprawnienie wymiany informacji. Istnieją przecież raporty krajowe HTA, a wymiana informacji powinna być dokładnie sprecyzowana, głównie jeżeli chodzi o zasady badań klinicznych, standardy, procesy. Natomiast bardzo bym był ostrożny przy ocenie ekonomicznej, ponieważ krajowe systemy różnią się, i pozwoliłbym, by ta część oceny była domeną państw członkowskich.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie „niebieskiej kartki” (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Ja mam takie pytanie: czy nie uważa pan, że najlepszym sposobem na zwiększenie dostępności leków byłoby, gdyby Unia skasowała wszelką legislację w tym gatunku, a także zakazała państwom wtrącania się do produkcji leków?

Bolesław G. Piecha (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Nie bardzo mogę się zgodzić z takim oto stawianiem problemu. Lek to nie jest zwykła substancja, to nie jest kawałek odzieży, marynarka, spodnie czy kromka chleba. Tutaj wymagane są bardzo szczegółowe badania, głównie bezpieczeństwa, efektywności, a co za tym idzie – głównie skuteczności. Nie można wracać do czasów sprzed stu lat, gdzie każdy komiwojazer mógł reklamować coś, co miało być lekiem, a lekiem nie było. To są zbyt duże pieniądze, zbyt duże zaangażowanie systemów finansowych państw członkowskich, żeby zostawić to biegowi wolnej konkurencji, wolnego rynku.

Gesine Meissner, im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Das ist ein wichtiges Thema, über das wir heute sprechen. Ich bedanke mich bei der Berichterstatterin für die umfangreiche Arbeit. Wir haben sehr lange und sehr intensiv diskutiert. Es geht darum, den Patienten in den Mittelpunkt zu stellen und dann bei einer älter werdenden Bevölkerung, bei teilweise mehr chronischen Erkrankungen, die wir leider haben, für möglichst alle Menschen den gleichen Zugang zu den Medikamenten zu schaffen und eben auch in der Forschung innovativ zu sein und letztlich zu bezahlbaren Medikamenten zu kommen.

Ich möchte eines jetzt hier sagen, weil das so ein bisschen im Raume stand: Ich halte es für falsch, den Forschern jegliche Ethik abzusprechen. Das klingt so ein bisschen durch. Es gibt viele Forscher im Bereich der Pharmazie, die den Menschen durchaus helfen wollen. Das ist eine wichtige Sache. Natürlich geht es dann darum, auch Absprachen zu treffen, länderübergreifend zu sehen, wie man sich gegenseitig unterstützen kann, zum Beispiel, wenn es irgendwo einen Engpass an medizinischer Versorgung gibt, wenn vielleicht eine besondere Seuche oder etwas anderes ausgebrochen ist, wo man tatsächlich sehen kann, welcher andere Mitgliedstaat vielleicht etwas vorrätig hat, wo man sich aushelfen kann. Es geht auch darum, sich bei der Forschung abzusprechen und auch zu sehen, dass die Preise nicht ins Uferlose gehen.

Aber ich möchte eines ansprechen, was ich auch für ganz wichtig halte: Die OECD hat festgestellt, dass mindestens 20 % der Gesundheitskosten nicht nötig wären, weil unnötige Behandlungen und unnötige Medikamentenvergabe durchaus zu berücksichtigen sind. Digitalisierung kann eine Menge bringen, das wurde auch schon angesprochen. In Griechenland hat man gemerkt, dass durch elektronische Verschreibung die Medikamentenkosten um 40 % gesenkt werden konnten. All das müssen wir in Betracht ziehen, um tatsächlich dafür zu sorgen, dass wir für die Menschen, die die Medikamente brauchen, das nötige Geld haben.

Kateřina Konečná, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Pane předsedající, v první řadě mi dovoluji poděkovat paní zpravodajce za její práci. Domnívám se, že dokument obsahuje zmínku o všech zásadních problémech, které dnes ztěžují přístup k léčivům občanům v Evropské unii.

Tím nejzásadnějším z mého pohledu je problém tzv. paralelního reexportu, který sužuje zejména státy, jako je ten můj. Je třeba, aby orgány Evropské unie i členské státy vynaložily maximální úsilí za účelem zabránění paralelnímu obchodu s farmaceutickými produkty na nejvýnosnějších trzích, neboť to vede k nedostatku řady léků, z čehož vznikají mimořádně velká rizika ohrožující zdraví občanů, kteří jsou často dokonce nuceni léčbu přerušit. Věřím, že tuto věc zpráva jasně říká.

Taktéž se domnívám, že se nám podařilo vyzvat k řešení zcela kontroly vymknutého práva duševního vlastnictví, které dnes umožňuje nové patentování produktu, který byl jen nepatrně upraven, s cílem prodloužit dobu ochrany léku na úkor hledání nových. Proto mě šokuje podání pozměňovacích návrhů pravice, která se snaží tyto odporné praktiky farmaceutického průmyslu dále chránit. Doufám, že kolegové vezmou rozum do hrsti a na něčem takovém se nebudou podílet.

Co by mělo být znovu akcentováno i v souvislosti se včerejším Dnem vzácných onemocnění je to, že vývoj nových inovativních léčiv se nemůže řídit pouze pravidly trhu a mantrou nákladů na zisk, jak už tady dnes řekl i pan komisař. Doufám, že se tímto dokumentem podařilo rozvázat ruce Komisi i členskými státy a ještě v tomto legislativním období se dočkáme nějakého řešení.

Mireille D'Ornano, au nom du groupe ENF. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, combien de patients en Europe connaissent des difficultés croissantes d'accès à des médicaments, pourtant vitaux? Qu'il s'agisse de traitements anticancéreux contre l'hépatite C ou contre des maladies rares, certaines tarifications astronomiques relèvent d'un véritable scandale. Faut-il pour autant pénaliser l'industrie pharmaceutique créatrice tout de même de 800 000 emplois? Par ailleurs, je reste mesurée sur le recours à des outils juridiques comme les licences obligatoires favorisant la recherche et la conception de médicaments génériques mais en Europe.

Autre point, l'Union européenne ne saurait outrepasser ses compétences. Le remboursement est en particulier une décision souveraine des États et l'Union ne saurait imposer sa définition d'accès universel aux soins.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr, köszönöm a szót. A most tárgyalt jelentésből világossá válik, hogy az uniós gyógyszerpiac beteg, súlyos egyensúlyhiányban szenved. Megbomlott az egyensúly a köz- és magánérdek között. A kormányok kötelesek lennének a lakosság egészségvédelme érdekében biztosítani a gyógyszerekhez való hozzáférést, nyilván megfizethető áron.

A magánérdek, ezzel szemben a gyógyszergyártók profitja. Természetesen szükséges biztosítani a jövedelmezőséget az innováció, a kutatás szempontjából. Ugyanakkor a jövedelmezőség ennél jóval nagyobb. A gyógyszeripar a világ egyik legjövedelmezőbb üzletágává vált, és sajnos nem kis részben a szellemi tulajdon oltalmának indokolatlan, mesterséges kiterjesztésével. Az európai lakosság egészségének védelmében kötelességünk helyreállítani az egyensúlyt ezen a területen.

Pál Csáky (PPE). – Elnök Úr, néhány konkrétummal szeretnék hozzájárulni a vitához. Úgy vélem, hogy az Európai Bizottságnak folytatnia kell a gyógyszerészeti rendszer működésének értékelését. A begyűjtött adatok hozzásegíthetnek a fenntartható egészségügyi rendszerek biztosításához és innovatív gyógyszerek kifejlesztéséhez. Azt gondolom, hogy például az árak kérdésében, vagy a hamis gyógyszerek elleni küzdelemben, továbbá az információcsere terén az európai együttműködés intenzívebbé tétele kifejezetten szükséges.

Nem értek egyet azzal, hogy a gazdasági válságra, vagy megszorító politikák negatív hatásaira hivatkozzunk az egészségügyi rendszerek helyzetével kapcsolatban. Ez egyoldalú megközelítés. Közép-Európa tagállamaiban a gazdasági válságtól függetlenül, máig rosszabb az egészségügy helyzete, mint Nyugaton. A felzárkózás időt vesz igénybe, viszont minden eszközt meg kell ragadnunk arra, hogy elkerüljük azt, hogy a betegek gyógyulása és az egészség attól függjön, hogy melyik országban élünk.

Ezen a helyen említtem meg a gyógyszerek párhuzamos kereskedelmét, ez a mi országainkban is élő probléma, és gyógyszerhiányhoz vezet. Ennek megakadályozása érdekében az uniós intézményeknek és a tagállamoknak is lépniük kell, mert a minőségi és elérhető áru gyógyszer nem luxus. Nagyon fontos továbbá, hogy a tagállamok megosszák az információt, a szakértelmet és a bevált gyakorlatokat egymás között, hogy megelőzzék a gyógyszerek túlárazását, és biztosítsák a generikus termékek piacra jutását.

(A felszólaló hozzájárul egy, az eljárási szabályzat 162. cikkének (8) bekezdése értelmében feltett kék kártyás kérdés megválaszolásához).

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty*. – Pane kolego, Vy jste řekl, že situace ve zdravotnictví ve střední Evropě je horší než v jiných členských státech Evropské unie. Já se Vás zcela konkrétně ptám: O jakých státech střední Evropy mluvíte? Protože já se domnívám, že zrovna v České republice, byť má své problémy, je zdravotní péče poskytovaná pacientům na velmi vysoké úrovni a nechci, aby o této zemi bylo mluveno tak, že je tam situace horší nebo že tam pacienti nemají přístup k léčbě.

Pál Csáky (PPE), *odpoveď na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty*. – *(rečníka na začiatku dobre nepočul, lebo nemá zapnutý mikrofón)*...Budem odpovedať ... v slovenskom jazyku, aby ste to lepšie počuli. Do určitej miery súhlasím s vami. Ale myslím si, že máme „spoždení“ vo východnej Európe, to nemôžeme riešiť jedine nejakými vyhláseniami. Myslím si, že je potrebná spolupráca členských krajín a európskych inštitúcií a som presvedčený o tom, že aj v tejto oblasti rola alebo úloha Európskej komisie je nezastupiteľná.

Damiano Zoffoli (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, è arrivato il momento di aggiornare la legislazione europea sui farmaci, un mercato che genera oltre 200 miliardi di euro di fatturato e che dà lavoro a oltre un milione di persone.

Un settore in crescita che però ha bisogno di regole avanzate, non solo per garantire la sicurezza dei medicinali, ma anche la qualità dell'innovazione e la sostenibilità dei sistemi sanitari per una popolazione che invecchia. I farmaci sono diversi dagli altri beni di consumo, le regole sulla proprietà intellettuale rischiano di confliggere con la tutela della salute, che chiede ai governi di garantire l'accesso di tutti ai medicinali.

Voterò quindi a favore di questa relazione, che chiede inoltre un maggiore investimento pubblico nella ricerca e vuole superare la frammentazione del mercato europeo e la disparità di accesso ai medicinali fra i cittadini europei. Vorrei inoltre sottolineare che c'è un tema legato anche allo spreco dei farmaci, che pure dovremmo affrontare, sul quale proprio oggi ho presentato un'interrogazione scritta alla Commissione, chiedendo agli Stati membri di attivarsi per promuovere il recupero dei medicinali validi e scaduti. Parliamo di tonnellate di farmaci che ogni anno finiscono nei rifiuti, procurando un importante danno ambientale, oltre che economico, per i sistemi...

(la Presidente ritira la parola all'oratore).

President. – Colleagues, if you get one minute from your Group please try to stick to one minute. We are way over time already. I will not have a catch-the-eye in this debate, I am afraid we cannot do it because we are way over time already. Please stick to your time slots.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Mimo że projekt sprawozdania o unijnych możliwościach zwiększenia dostępu do leków wydaje się korzystny, jednak operuje dwuznacznościami, które mogą powodować zawyżanie przez koncerny kosztów badań i ceny leków wprowadzonych na rynek podobnie do opisywanej zasady określającej uczciwą cenę leku, która może zostawiać swobodę manipulowania w celu maksymalizacji zysków. Nowa dyrektywa Komisji ma regulować procedury ustalania cen leków i systemy refundacji, a jedyne kryterium, jakie zostało uznane za istotne, to kryterium wyzwań rynkowych. Systemy ustalania cen i systemy refundacji należą do kompetencji państw członkowskich, podczas gdy instytucje europejskie są kompetentne w zakresie ochrony konkurencji i wsparcia badań naukowych, co oznacza, że przez ten dokument organy Unii próbują wpływać na państwa członkowskie, by wprowadzały regulacje zgodne z ich oczekiwaniami, choć same organy Unii nie zostały traktatowo upoważnione do zajmowania się tego rodzaju problematyką.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, someone having to walk hundreds of kilometres to access medicine: you would probably think of sub-Saharan Africa and some unfortunate mother looking to help her child. In the Republic of Ireland, at the moment, we have such a situation: we have a mother called Vera Twomey who is trying to help her daughter Ava Twomey get access to medicine, and to do this she is walking hundreds of kilometres from her home to our parliament in Dublin.

The purpose of it is so she can get access to medicine based on tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). She currently can, in Ireland, get access to CBD, which is also a cannabidiol-based treatment, for her daughter. Her daughter suffers from a severe form of epilepsy called Dravet's syndrome. She suffers multiple seizures. If she could access THC, which she could in Germany, Poland, Great Britain and other countries, her seizures would stop.

What I suggest here is that the European Union concentrate on harmonising this, rather than concentrating on jumping through hoops about harmonising what we eat for our breakfast.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, много пациенти в Европа нямат или имат само ограничен достъп до жизненоважна диагностика и лечение. Неравенствата в достъпа до качествено здравеопазване в целия Европейски съюз са широко разпространени и за съжаление иновациите не достигат с еднаква скорост до всички страни членки. Макар правомощията в областта на лекарствената политика да са на национално ниво, според мен има и европейски решения за подобряване на сегашната ситуация. Лекарствените продукти са един от основните стълбове на здравната система, а не просто търговска стока. Съображенията, свързани с общественото здраве и интереса на пациентите, трябва да имат превес над икономическите съображения. Затова Европейската комисия трябва да следи внимателно ситуацията със паралелната търговия, за да не се допуска тя да води до недостиг на лекарства в някои държави, както например в България.

Смятам, че е контрапродуктивно да говорим за хармонизиране на цените на лекарствата в Европейския съюз. Икономическата ситуация е различна във всяка държава и цените следва адекватно да отразяват това. Това, което обаче можем да направим, е да хармонизираме оценката на терапевтичната добавена стойност на всеки лекарствен продукт, за да се ускори процесът по пускането им на пазара и да се избегне публикуване. В момента оценката се прави от двадесет и осем различни национални агенции, но някои държави изпитват сериозни затруднения поради липса на административен капацитет. В крайна сметка от това страдат пациентите, които са в неизгодно положение, защото нямат навременен достъп до необходимото лечение.

И най-накрая, бих искал да обърна внимание на един важен въпрос, който се отнася до сътрудничеството на регионално ниво.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Der vorliegende Bericht macht deutlich, dass es eine wichtige Aufgabe für die Europäische Union ist, Patientinnen und Patienten in allen Mitgliedstaaten den Zugang zu Medikamenten in gleicher Weise zu gewährleisten. Artikel 17 der Grundrechtecharta verweist auf den Schutz des geistigen Eigentums. Wenn Firmen in Innovation und Forschung investieren, wird hierdurch eine Rendite auf die Investition sichergestellt. Eine Besonderheit stellt dabei aber der Arzneimittelmarkt dar, weil Arzneimittel nicht wie andere Güter betrachtet werden können. Artikel 35 der Charta verpflichtet die Staaten, den Zugang zu Arzneimitteln zu gewährleisten. Somit gibt es einen Zielkonflikt zwischen zwei Grundrechten, der zugunsten der Gesundheit der Europäerinnen und Europäer gelöst werden muss. Die EU muss sich dafür einsetzen, dass das Wohl der Patientinnen und Patienten und nicht der Profit im Vordergrund steht. Die Markteinführung von Generika ist dabei ein wichtiges Mittel, um den Wettbewerb anzukurbeln, Preise zu senken und für ein nachhaltiges und leistungsstarkes Gesundheitssystem zu sorgen.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Zabezpečenie účinných, bezpečných a ekonomicky dostupných liekov je hlavne zodpovednosťou a úlohou členských štátov. Na úrovni EÚ je však potrebné podporovať legislatívne vedecko-výskumné informačné, ekonomické i finančné mechanizmy, ktoré napomôžu dosiahnutie tohto cieľa.

Predovšetkým treba zabezpečiť tvorbu a implementáciu účinných politík a podporu vývoja výskumu a výroby nových liekov v krajinách EÚ. Treba zväziť politiky zamedzujúce a sťažujúce škodlivý outsourcing týchto kapacít z mimo územia EÚ so všetkými jeho negatívnymi dôsledkami. Trh musí viac odpovedať skutočným a definovaným zdravotným potrebám obyvateľov a neriadiť sa napríklad podľa medicínsky pochybných, módných či dokonca škodlivých life-stylových požiadaviek.

Pozornosť treba venovať aj liekom pre zriedkavé ochorenia a liekom na ochorenie ... liekom na ochorenia, ktoré možno v EÚ považovať za zanedbané. Úlohou ostáva aj zaistenie ochrany obyvateľstva pred nekvalitnými či podvodnými liekmi prenikajúcimi na územie EÚ. Rovnako dôležitá je ochrana obyvateľstva pred medicínsky nezdôvodniteľnými či priamo iracionálnymi liečiteľskými postupmi a prípravkami z okruhu tzv. alternatívnej medicíny. Je dôležité primerané zapojenie samotného pacienta, ktorý sa musí stať subjektom a spoluvorcom potrebných zmien.

Vytienis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened to Members' comments and opinions with great interest and I am grateful for this rich exchange of views. This debate shows we share the aim of helping patients gain access to truly innovative medicines at affordable prices across the European Union. I would like to pick up a couple of points raised in your report and in the debate.

I support Member States' initiatives to help reduce medicine prices and increase transparency in the setting of such prices. Small countries have lower negotiating power and face particular difficulties. I welcome the ongoing cooperation amongst European Union countries in this regard. In addition, our European Union Joint Procurement Agreement enables Member States to buy medicines together under the same conditions. In fact, most Member States will buy pandemic vaccines together this year. Thinking about vaccines, vaccine shortages are indeed a major challenge. This is why we are setting up a joint action on vaccines with the Member States to help them forecast and manage vaccine needs.

Last and most important, the report provides a contribution to our ongoing work on health technology assessment. Once again, my aim is to come up with a proposal that has clear benefits for all, including, above all, European patients. Finally, I fully agree with the need for a strategic breakthrough on disease prevention to reduce the need for medicines, as expressed in your report.

Let me conclude by expressing again my gratitude to Ms Cabezón Ruiz and the shadow rapporteurs. Our discussions today demonstrate very well the value of effective and continuous dialogue, which I trust will continue as matters progress. I look forward to our future cooperation.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Ponente. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, no puedo más que comenzar, para terminar, celebrando los anuncios que nos hace. Recogido el guante, muestra de su compromiso, anuncia que va a poner en marcha o van a hacer una propuesta sobre la evaluación de las tecnologías, en concreto de los medicamentos. Creo que eso vendrá a dar respuesta, que será muy importante para eso que aquí ha reivindicado algún grupo: la necesidad de tener un criterio objetivo para que podamos poner un precio justo y evitar el exceso de algunos casos, como aquí se ha puesto de manifiesto.

Celebro que vaya a revisar los incentivos para que cumplan el objetivo eficaz para el que están mandatados o que revise el impacto de la propiedad intelectual. Efectivamente, el informe también hace un llamamiento a la revisión de la Directiva; pide una estrategia, necesaria, para combatir la resistencia antimicrobiana; una estrategia contra el cáncer; también para medicamentos pediátricos; por supuesto, abordar el desabastecimiento de los países, sobre todo los países del Este; una mayor coordinación y transparencia entre los Estados miembros. En definitiva, es un panorama complejo, pero que creo que en el informe, con ayuda de todos, hemos sabido recoger, y hemos sabido apuntar para que se explore, para alcanzar lo que todos aquí —se ha visto— compartimos.

Compartimos, y creo que hay un consenso generalizado, la necesidad de garantizar la sostenibilidad de los sistemas sanitarios y de garantizar el acceso a los medicamentos por parte de la ciudadanía europea. No puedo más que terminar agradeciendo enormemente el trabajo de todos los ponentes alternativos —también de los ponentes de las opiniones de DEVE, de JURI y de PETI, con su contribución inestimable, y, por supuesto, su capacidad de diálogo—, para que consiguiéramos este informe, que contó con un amplio consenso en la comisión y que espero que mañana cuente con el mismo apoyo, para que podamos apoyar así las iniciativas que el comisario va a poner en marcha y, en definitiva, mejorar la calidad de vida de los ciudadanos europeos.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet morgen, Donnerstag, 2. März 2017, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), per iscritto. – La crisi finanziaria e le politiche di austerità stanno costringendo molti Stati ad effettuare ingenti tagli ai servizi essenziali come la sanità. Sono milioni i malati che non possono accedere a cure e medicinali a causa del prezzo. Sono presenti sul mercato medicinali che permettono il trattamento di numerose malattie ma con prezzi immotivatamente proibitivi.

Ad esempio, il Sofosbuvir è un farmaco usato per il trattamento dell'epatite C, che viene venduto all'interno dell'Ue a un prezzo che è 277 volte quello di produzione. I meccanismi della proprietà intellettuale, anziché venire incontro alle esigenze dei pazienti, vengono utilizzati dalle aziende farmaceutiche per massimizzare i profitti. Tutto ciò è in evidente contrasto con il diritto fondamentale alla salute.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE), in writing. – Health expenditure remains constant even if the prices per patient of some new medicines are higher than in the past. It is true that during the debates on this report, the discussion on affordability of medicines was automatically related to 'fair price'. But what does fair pricing mean? From my point of view it means one that can reasonably be covered by patients and health budgets and that simultaneously continues to sustain research and development.

Currently, the high prices of many new medicines are challenging public healthcare systems or patients who have to pay for them out of their own pocket (as is the situation in most low- and middle-income countries). Therefore, we have to find solutions to overcome this situation by taking into account the economic circumstances and needs of the health system of each country, not by creating idealistic references for high-income countries in price setting, and highlighting the advantages of incremental innovation.

We also need to address the additional barriers which hamper patients' access to medicines, and which are not related to budgets: red tape and bureaucracy, lack of vision for the medium and long term, instability of legislation in many Member States, unpredictability, and a lack of dialogue and partnership.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – Negli ultimi decenni i prezzi dei nuovi medicinali nell'UE sono aumentati al punto da diventare inaccessibili per molti cittadini. Per garantire quindi un migliore equilibrio tra gli interessi della salute pubblica dei paesi dell'UE e quelli dell'industria farmaceutica, ben venga questa proposta di iniziativa legislativa in cui si richiedono misure per migliorare la tracciabilità dei costi di ricerca e di sviluppo, i finanziamenti pubblici e le spese di marketing.

Mi rattrista però constatare che, mentre 11 milioni di italiani sono costretti a rinunciare alle cure mediche, alcuni politici lavorano per moltiplicare gli affari delle case farmaceutiche. Sappiamo bene che l'industria farmaceutica utilizza la strategia del «brevetto sempreverde» al fine di conservare il più possibile il monopolio di un prodotto, apportando soltanto piccole modifiche come, ad esempio, l'aggiunta di un eccipiente.

Sull'emendamento in questione abbiamo chiesto il voto nominale perché tutti devono sapere chi sono quei gruppi politici che lo supportano. È bene ribadire che noi del Movimento 5 Stelle ci opponiamo, oggi come sempre, a quei gruppi politici che stanno dalla parte dell'industria e delle multinazionali farmaceutiche il cui unico interesse è fare profitto al costo più alto di tutti: quello della pelle e della salute dei pazienti.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Στηρίζουμε την έκθεση, γιατί πραγματικά στηρίζει ουσιαστικά τους πολίτες στα θέματα που αφορούν την προσβασιμότητα στα φάρμακα και τη διεύρυνση των δυνατοτήτων επιλογών. Ο Χάρτης Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ αναγνωρίζει το θεμελιώδες δικαίωμα των πολιτών στην υγεία και την ιατρική περίθαλψη. Τα δημόσια συστήματα υγείας οφείλουν να διασφαλίζουν καθολική πρόσβαση στην υγειονομική περίθαλψη για όλους τους ευρωπαίους πολίτες. Θεωρούμε ότι τα φαρμακευτικά προϊόντα αποτελούν τον βασικό παράγοντα της ιατροφαρμακευτικής περίθαλψης, όπου όλοι οι πολίτες δικαιούνται πρόσβαση. Οι ψηλές τιμές των καινοτόμων φαρμάκων δεν παρέχουν προσβασιμότητα σε όλους τους πολίτες. Ο ανταγωνισμός αποτελεί ένα σημαντικό παράγοντα για να οδηγήσει σε μείωση των τιμών των φαρμάκων και έτσι να βελτιώσει τη πρόσβαση σε φάρμακα. Σημειώνουμε ότι οι δαπάνες για τον φαρμακευτικό κλάδο της ΕΕ ανήλθαν στο 17,1% των συνολικών δαπανών για την υγεία και στο 1,41% του Ακαθάριστου Εγχώριου Προϊόντος.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Dostęp do leków to jeden z ważniejszych tematów, jakimi zajmuje się rząd każdego państwa członkowskiego Unii Europejskiej. Z jednej strony, w obliczu rosnącej odporności na środki antybakteryjne musimy wspierać innowacyjność, która oczywiście kosztuje. Kosztuje zarówno firmy farmaceutyczne, jak i obywateli. Z drugiej strony, musimy mieć na uwadze fakt, że budżety służb zdrowia są z reguły bardzo napięte, a różnice w zamożności społeczeństw europejskich – ogromne. Dlatego cieszą zapisy sprawozdania, które zwracają uwagę na te problemy, wzywając m.in. do dostosowania ceny leków do stopnia zamożności populacji, promowania leków generycznych czy przyjrzenia się problemowi tzw. handlu równoległego, przez który bogatsze państwa członkowskie wykupują leki od swoich biedniejszych sąsiadów. Jednocześnie pragnę zauważyć, że zapisy dotyczące oceny jakości leków i proponujące wspólne kryteria mogą osłabiać autonomię państw członkowskich w decydowaniu o cenach i poziomie zwrotów za leki. Mam nadzieję, że Komisja nie zinterpretuje tych nieprecyzyjnych zapisów w ten sposób i nie zdecyduje się wkroczyć na obszar, w którym nie ma uprawnień traktatowych do działania.

Laurențiu Rebegea (ENF), *în scris*. – Este regretabil faptul că numeroși cetățeni din statele membre nu au acces la asistență medicală sau la medicamente și, mai mult, este extrem de îngrijorător că se înregistrează mii de victime din cauza lipsei de tratamente eficiente împotriva bolilor rare, precum și din cauza lipsei de acces la anumite tratamente sau a costului astronomic al acestora.

Statele membre trebuie să sprijine cercetarea și dezvoltarea bazate pe nevoile medicale ale cetățenilor, în scopul creării de medicamente inovatoare și producerii de medicamente generice la prețuri accesibile pentru toți pacienții. De asemenea, este necesară o mai mare transparență în ceea ce privește costurile investițiilor în cercetarea, dezvoltarea și inovarea farmaceutică, astfel încât consumatorul să nu ajungă să plătească, în final, de două ori pentru același produs.

Consider că statele membre trebuie să coopereze din proprie inițiativă, în special în ceea ce privește prețurile, rambursările și schimbul de informații. Îndemn factorii publici de decizie să ia măsuri proactive pentru ca medicamentele generice și biosimilare să devină disponibile în timp util pentru a reduce în mod real costurile și cheltuielile totale pentru medicamente, ținând seama întotdeauna de nevoia de a asigura aceleași efecte benefice și continuitatea îngrijirii pacienților.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – Mesdames, Messieurs, chers collègues, je vous invite à voter en faveur de ce rapport. Depuis quelques années, les firmes pharmaceutiques demandent des prix exorbitants pour leurs nouveaux produits. Dans mon pays, en Belgique, on parle de plus de 43.000 euros pour le traitement de l'hépatite C, mais aussi de plus de 100.000 euros pour un an de traitement du cancer du sein. A terme, ces prix mettent en jeu le budget de la sécurité sociale. Par ailleurs, la réputation innovatrice des médicaments les plus chers est souvent surfaite. S'agit-il d'ailleurs bien d'innovations réelles ? Pour justifier les prix élevés, les firmes pharmaceutiques mettent en avant les coûts élevés de recherche et développement des médicaments. Mais combien coûte réellement le développement d'un nouveau médicament ? L'information n'est pas publique. Par ailleurs, une part importante de la recherche a lieu dans des universités financées par des fonds publics. Il est donc heureux que nous nous saisissons aujourd'hui du dossier. Je vous remercie pour votre attention.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), *în scris*. – Cunoscut este faptul că accesul la asistență medicală reprezintă un drept fundamental al tuturor cetățenilor. Ca atare, unul din obiectivele de bază ale UE și ale OMS, respectiv obiectivul 3 de dezvoltare durabilă, vizează tocmai asigurarea accesului indivizilor (pacienților) la medicamente. Evident, accesul la medicamente este dependent de existența la timp a medicamentelor și de gradul lor de accesibilitate pentru toți cetățenii, fără discriminare.

Însă există încă discrepanțe majore între sistemele publice de sănătate, ca și între sistemele farmaceutice din statele membre, la care se adaugă provocările generate de îmbătrânirea populației UE. Mai mult decât atât, accesul la medicamente este îngrădit fie datorită strategiilor de afaceri din domeniul farmaceutic (strategii de maximizare a profitului), fie din motive politice, legate de procesul de producție sau de distribuție sau chiar din cauza comerțului paralel, fie datorită veniturilor mai reduse ale unor state membre.

Însă, îmbunătățirea accesului la medicamente poate fi obținută și prin reducerea procedurilor administrative și a restricțiilor bugetare, prin dezvoltarea de medicamente biosimilare și inovatoare. De asemenea, implicarea tuturor celor interesați în domeniul medical (producători, cercetători, organizații de pacienți, instituții etc.), în vederea îmbunătățirii accesului la medicamente al cetățenilor Europei este esențială.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *na piśmie*. – W związku z dynamicznie rozwijającym się przemysłem farmaceutycznym Światowa Organizacja Handlu (WTO) zasugerowała włączenie leków w system patentowy i wprowadzenie ochrony praw własności intelektualnej dla przedsiębiorstw, związanych z opracowywaniem nowych leków. Prawo do ochrony praw własności intelektualnej jest prawem podstawowym zapisanym w art. 17 Karty praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej. Ma ono na celu zapewnienie inwestorom/badaczom zwrot z inwestycji, gwarantując, propagując i pobudzając w ten sposób innowacje i badania z korzyścią dla społeczeństwa. Takie rozwiązanie mogłoby przynieść wiele korzyści, a rynek farmakologiczny mógłby się stać jednym z najbardziej atrakcyjnych i dochodowych rynków. Kolejnym ważnym aspektem przedstawionym w raporcie jest ujednolicenie dostępności oraz cen leków dla obywateli państw członkowskich. Ważne jest, aby zapewnić każdemu obywatelowi UE pełen dostęp do leków innowacyjnych, bezpiecznych pod względem jakości i sprzedawanych na rynku po przystępnych cenach. Dlatego uważam, że należy poprzeć propozycje, aby chronić prawa naszych obywateli zarówno w kwestii równego dostępu do leków, jak również prawa własności intelektualnej badaczy.

25. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 163 GO).

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente, el Parlamento tiene que saber que la planta de la factoría Nissan, ubicada en Ávila, es una empresa fundamental para el desarrollo de nuestra tierra: cientos de familias dependen de ella directa o indirectamente.

La decisión de cancelar inmediatamente la fabricación del vehículo NT500, así como de reducir la fabricación del modelo NT400, a partir del próximo mes de abril, supondría la pérdida de 500 empleos directos y 300 indirectos y, sobre todo, contraviene el plan industrial vigente hasta 2023, cofinanciado con fondos comunitarios y dirigido, precisamente, a sostener la fabricación de estos vehículos.

Quiero hacer un reconocimiento expreso a la importancia de Nissan en Ávila y a todo lo que ha aportado durante años, pero lo importante en tiempos de incertidumbre es garantizar los empleos vinculados a mantener la producción.

Nadie puede perder su empleo. Cualquier solución debe pasar por el mantenimiento de la estabilidad del trabajo; cualquier solución debe pasar por el acuerdo aceptado por los trabajadores y no debe suponer una pérdida de salario retributivo, laboral o geográfico.

La Comisión tiene que comprometerse. Desde el Parlamento Europeo lucharemos por ello y estaremos vigilantes.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, we can see that the epidemic of military spending is spreading across western countries. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the world's military spending may reach USD 1.7 trillion. More than half of this money is in NATO countries' military budgets: USD 980 billion.

But for some politicians this is not enough. US President Donald Trump made an announcement about increasing the military budget by USD 54 billion. Chancellor Merkel said recently that Germany will raise defence spending to 2% of GDP; some other European countries are going to do the same.

I would ask my colleagues whether they really believe that spending 20 times more than a potential adversary is not enough for defence. I doubt it. This is a neat trick whereby some lobbyists want to redistribute budget money from social and development objectives to the military.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Caros Colegas, assistimos a uma perigosa farsa sobre o suposto acordo amigável entre Portugal e Espanha sobre a construção de um armazém temporário de resíduos nucleares na central de Almaraz, que se comprometeram a iniciar um diálogo construtivo.

Qualificar o ATI de temporário é uma verdadeira farsa. O ATI é a própria chave da sobrevivência da energia nuclear em Espanha, que, desde 2010, deveria ter sido construído ao lado de Madrid, mas que a oposição do Governo de Castilla-La Mancha embargou.

A resposta para o drama das 5 centrais nucleares espanholas estarem já a 90% da sua capacidade foi Almaraz – a central obsoleta ao lado de Portugal, cujos solos o Conselho de Segurança Nacional Espanhol classificou de risco. Em 2008 e 2015, Portugal e Espanha assinaram protocolos para consulta em projetos transfronteiriços, pelo que este suposto acordo nada vem acrescentar de novo.

Irónico é que a Ministra do Ambiente de Espanha prometa agora toda a transparência aos vizinhos e amigos portugueses, numa retórica que a ninguém convence, alegando que o ATI é uma piscina que não tem impacto ambiental de maior e que até melhora a situação atual. Mais irónico e perigoso é o Governo de Portugal ter abdicado dos interesses nacionais, retirando a queixa contra Espanha.

Os portugueses não cedem a manipulações e só aceitam o encerramento da central de Almaraz.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Kiedy świat cieszył się zakończeniem II wojny światowej, w Polsce trwało antysowieckie powstanie zbrojne, które objęło ponad 200 tys. obywateli, przyniosło tysiące ofiar zamordowanych strzałem katyńskim w tył głowy. Dla uczczenia ich pamięci od 7 lat obchodzimy Narodowy Dzień Pamięci Żołnierzy Wyklętych. W tym dniu sercem i myślami jestem w Polsce i z Polakami. Cześć i chwala bohaterom!

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, mulțumesc. Ne punem astăzi întrebarea încotro se îndreaptă Europa? Cred că înainte de a răspunde la această întrebare trebuie să răspundem de unde a pornit Uniunea Europeană?

Cu toții știm că lipsa de libertate, moartea, foametea, sărăcia și războiul în mod paradoxal au generat acest măreț proiect. Iar astăzi putem constata că Uniunea ne-a asigurat timp de 60 de ani pacea și prosperitatea, ceea ce ne demonstrează că nu a existat, nu există și nici nu va exista o alternativă la Uniunea Europeană.

O Europă cu cercuri concentrice sau cu două viteze nu va fi un loc în care adversarii și aliații să se unească așa cum doreau părinții fondatori ai Uniunii Europene, dimpotrivă, această reconfigurare ar duce în mod cert la dezintegrarea proiectului european și de aceea România se pronunță pentru o Europă puternică, consolidată și unitară.

Indiferent de soluțiile pe care le vom urma ele trebuie să fie un rezultat al consensului, iar o Europă puternică este o asigurare de viață pentru toate statele membre.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, este viernes se cumple un año del asesinato de Berta Cáceres, defensora de derechos humanos, feminista y lideresa de la Copinh. A pesar de la condena unánime de este Parlamento y otras organizaciones internacionales, su asesinato a día de hoy sigue impune. Según Amnistía Internacional, hay lagunas judiciales y una vergonzosa ausencia de investigación efectiva. Esta situación es intolerable y envía un mensaje de impunidad, no solo ante este caso, sino también hacia los 123 activistas asesinados en Honduras desde el golpe de Estado de 2009.

Basta ya, señorías, de buenas palabras. Si queremos parar los asesinatos, hay que mandar un mensaje contundente. Se debe paralizar ya el acuerdo de asociación Unión Europea-Centroamérica, así como cortar la ayuda bilateral al Estado hondureño, en especial en el programa Eurojusticia. Hechos y no palabras: es lo que asegura que las violaciones de derechos humanos por Estados y por empresas no se mantengan impunes.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Vážení pane komisaři, já bych chtěla v tuto chvíli poděkovat všem, kteří pomohli Petrovi Jaškovi k tomu, že je na svobodě. Český humanitární pracovník byl vězněn čtrnáct měsíců v soudánských věznicích a nakonec nespravedlivě odsouzen ke dvaceti čtyřem letům vězení. Jeho jméno bylo součástí rezoluce, kterou přijal tento Parlament v říjnu loňského roku. Díky tlaku české, ale i evropské diplomacie mu v neděli 26. února soudánský prezident Umar Bašír udělil milost a nařídil jeho okamžité propuštění. Všichni jsme mohli vidět jeho velkou radost, když stál s českým ministrem zahraničí Zaorálkem a velvyslankyní v Egyptě Šmigolovou před odletem do vlasti.

Myslím, že spolu s diplomatickým tlakem Evropské unie to bylo právě velké diplomatické nasazení ministra Zaorálka a české velvyslankyně, které vedlo k propuštění Petra Jaška. Díky nim a díky Bohu je Petr Jašek živ a zdravý na svobodě. Je to povzbuzení pro nás pro všechny, láska a pravda zase jednou zvítězila.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, en estos últimos días se están acelerando en España los juicios contra dirigentes independentistas catalanes por parte de los máximos tribunales de justicia.

Hace semanas pregunté a la Comisión qué pensaba sobre la independencia judicial en España, tal como está prevista en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales. La Comisión respondió haciendo un elogio vago, genérico de la independencia judicial e indicando que la Comisión se forma opinión a base de encuestas y del diálogo bilateral con las autoridades nacionales, que son precisamente las denunciadas.

Ya veo que no puedo esperar mucho de la Comisión Europea en este aspecto. Por ello, renuevo aquí mi denuncia.

En España es cada día más difícil encontrar jueces y fiscales de las más altas magistraturas que no dependen de la voluntad del Gobierno y del primer partido de la oposición: son elegidos por ellos y siguen las órdenes del fiscal general del Estado, nombrado también por el Gobierno.

En España, la separación de poderes es un deseo democrático aún no realizado.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Unione europea importa grano canadese che per le leggi nordamericane andrebbe smaltito come rifiuto, invece qui da noi in Europa diventa pasta, pane, pizze, farine e dolci.

Assistiamo ad una sorta di dumping al contrario, che danneggia l'agricoltura del Mezzogiorno e attenta alla salute dei consumatori. La prassi di miscelare grani contaminati con grani privi di contaminazione al fine di ottenere partite mediamente contaminate, sia pure entro i limiti di legge, è vietata, ma alcune industrie di trasformazione giustificano questa prassi come ineludibile per il loro know-how.

La Commissione deve assolutamente armonizzare a livello internazionale le soglie europee di micotossine, prima tra tutte il DON. A questa misura andrebbero affiancati il divieto d'uso di glifosato ai grani di importazione, il riconoscimento del ruolo sussidiario delle associazioni nelle analisi tossicologiche sui prodotti a base di cereali e il sostegno alle campagne di informazione sui consumatori. Alla fiducia di chi consuma e a strutture di chi lavora dobbiamo rispetto.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, decía el presidente de este Parlamento, al iniciar la sesión, que estaba muy preocupado por la libertad de expresión en el mundo. Yo quisiera invitar al señor Tajani a que viniera a España, donde esta semana se celebran siete juicios por comentarios en redes sociales.

Y es que en España hay represión, persecución y criminalización: por cuestionar la Casa Real, como el rapero Valtonyc; por un tuit, como Cassandra, Strawberry o Zapata; por un *sketch* de sátira política, como Facu Díaz; o, simplemente, por una obra de teatro irónica, como sucedió a los titiriteros hace ahora un año.

Estos son solo algunos casos, pero hay más. Y es que parece que en España por un tuit o por una canción puedes acabar entre rejas.

László Tókécs (PPE). – (A felszólalás első része technikai probléma miatt nem került rögzítésre.) Elnök Úr, mint a román államhatalom a marosvásárhelyi Római Katolikus Gimnáziumot meg akarja szüntetni. Erre a célra az országos korrupcióellenes ügyészséget használja fel, mely korrupció gyanúja ürügyén nem csupán az iskola igazgatóját függesztette fel, hanem jelenleg törvényellenes módon, a tanulók szüleit is százával zaklatja, és kihallgatásra rendeli be.

Ezzel együtt a megyei tanfelügyelőség jogsértő módon tiltotta a gyermekek elemi iskolába való beiratkozását. Veszélybe került a tanintézet mintegy négyszáz tanulójának az őszi beiskolázása, és magának az iskolának a léte forog kockán. Tiltakozom a magyar egyházi iskolánkat sújtó, kisebbséggel szembeni diszkrimináció és hatalmi visszaélés, valamint a szülők megfélemlítése ellen. Antonio Tajani elnök úr közbelépését kérem az iskola, a szülők és a gyermekek védelmében.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, από τον Μάιο του 2010, εφαρμόζεται στην Ελλάδα το καταστροφικό μνημόνιο που έχει μετατρέψει τη χώρα σε ένα απέραντο κοινωνικό νεκροταφείο, με εκατομμύρια φτωχούς και με στρατιές ανέργων. Σαν να μην έφταναν αυτά, η Τρόικα συνεχίζει το «business as usual». Ήδη από εχθές, επέδραμαν στην Αθήνα οι εκπρόσωποι της Τρόικας και ζητούν μειώσεις συντάξεων που φτάνουν μέχρι το 35% αλλά και μειώσεις των εισοδημάτων μέσω της μείωσης του αφορολόγητου ορίου. Αντί, λοιπόν, να ανακεφαλαιοποιηθούν τα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία, τα οποία κατέστρεψε η Τρόικα με το PSI, τελικά στέλνει τους ήδη φτωχοποιημένους συνταξιούχους στον μνημονιακό Καιάδα. Αντί να δημιουργηθεί ένα δημόσιο ταμείο για τα κόκκινα δάνεια, η Τρόικα βγάζει στο σφυρί τα σπίτια των Ελλήνων. Αντί να γίνουν επενδύσεις, η Τρόικα δρομολογεί το ξεπούλημα της δημόσιας περιουσίας αντί πινακίου φακής. Ο ελληνικός λαός δεν ανέχεται πλέον τα μνημόνια και σύντομα θα πετάξει την Τρόικα έξω από την πατρίδα μας.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já chci informovat Parlament a Komisi, že v České republice byl odvolán ministr průmyslu a obchodu Jan Mládek, a to z toho důvodu, že nedostatečně hájil zájmy spotřebitelů a preferoval zájmy mobilních operátorů. Například dostatečně netlačil na odbourání cen roamingu a prosadil zákon o elektronických komunikacích, který poškozoval spotřebitele, místo aby dostatečně právě spotřebitele chránil proti poskytovatelům mobilních služeb.

Ministr je pryč, nicméně původní zákon, který je podle mého názoru v rozporu s evropským právem, s evropskou směrnicí, dále platí. Já jsem několikrát vyzýval Komisi písemně, aby se tímto zabývala a řešila situaci v České republice a tlačila na Parlament České republiky, na českou vládu, aby se změnila právní úprava, která bude chránit zájmy českých spotřebitelů stejně jako spotřebitelů v celé Evropě.

Takže vyzývám zástupce Komise, aby se tímto problémem dále zabývali a řešili nesoulad českého práva.

Davor Škrlec (Verts/ALE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, razumijem zabrinutost javnosti u Republici Hrvatskoj zbog cijena prirodnog plina, pogotovo nakon liberalizacije koja je došla s novim promjenama zakona o tržištu plina. Međutim, posljednja odluka Vlade Republike Hrvatske o reguliranju veleprodajne cijene plina, zapravo nije u dugoročnom interesu Republike Hrvatske, odnosno u dugoročnom javnom interesu.

Razlog je što se na taj način odgađaju investicije u obnovljive izvore energije i to one koje trebaju iskoristiti lokalne potencijale, odlažu se investicije u energetske učinkovitost i u oba se slučaja zapravo ne otvaraju lokalna radna mjesta koja su toliko nužna za povećanje zaposlenosti građana u Republici Hrvatskoj. Također, ovakvom politikom dugoročno je ugrožena i sigurnost opskrbe Republike Hrvatske, zbog toga što će nesigurnost na kraju platiti ili građani ili HEP.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la politique agricole commune est un terrible échec. En France 700 agriculteurs se sont suicidés l'an dernier et un agriculteur sur trois vit avec moins de 350 euros par mois.

Le commissaire à l'agriculture, Phil Hogan, a d'abord nié la gravité de la situation. Il s'avoue aujourd'hui complètement dépassé. Dans un entretien qu'il a accordé au journal *Libération* le 28 février, il estime qu'il faudrait accorder plus d'aides aux petites exploitations et moins aux grandes. Mais rien n'est fait.

Le problème est de toute façon plus profond. La PAC est responsable du désastre agricole parce qu'elle a imprudemment supprimé les droits de douane et favorisé délibérément la concentration des exploitations. La ferme des 1 000 vaches et son modèle de production: un modèle adapté à l'ultralibéralisme.

Si nous voulons préserver l'agriculture familiale, il faut donc complètement changer de modèle. En tant que Français, je préconise de remplacer la PAC par une PAF, une politique agricole française.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie i Panowie! Towarzysze i towarzyszki! Dzisiaj w Polsce obchodziliśmy Dzień Pamięci Żołnierzy Wyklętych, żołnierzy, którzy po drugiej wojnie światowej walczyli pod ziemią z komunistycznym okupantem Polski; walczyli po amnestii, walczyli do śmierci Stalina, a ostatni z nich poległ dopiero w 1963 roku.

Dzisiaj młode pokolenie Polaków przywraca pamięć o bohaterach walczących z komunizmem. Ci młodzi ludzie prosili mnie, żebym powiedział Państwu o żołnierzach niezłomnych i uczcił tym wystąpieniem ich pamięć. Mówimy im: „Cześć i chwała”. Mówimy: „Cześć i chwała bohaterom”, ale ilekroć wchodzę do tego budynku przez bramę z napisem Altiero Spinelli, powtarzam sobie ich zawołanie: „Precz z komunizmem. Śmierć komunistom”. Dziękuję za uwagę.

Pál Csáky (PPE). – Pán predseda, chcem vysloviť poďakovanie Európskej komisii, menovite podpredsedovi Timmermansovi a komisárke Jourovej za iniciatívnu spoluprácu. Na základe nášho dialógu Európska komisia vyhlásila v novembri minulého roku pilotný projekt Justice Programme: Europe of Diversities pre multijazyčné a multikulturálne spoločnosti v EÚ.

Tento týždeň som dostal správu, že táto výzva inšpirovala aj občianske organizácie v mojej krajine, Slovenskej republike, a predložili projekt pod názvom Better United in Europe. Je to pekný príklad pozitívnej odozvy myšlienky expertov Európskej komisie v spoločnosti členskej krajiny. Dúfam, že budú predložené ďalšie dobré projekty aj z iných krajín, a taktiež dúfam, že po úspešnom vyhodnotení pilotného projektu budeme pokračovať v spolupráci na základe tých istých princípov.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, el Gobierno español ha aprobado un decreto legislativo para abolir gradualmente el actual sistema de estiba portuaria y liberalizar este sector.

Este decreto se ha aprobado sin diálogo social. Va mucho más allá de lo que pedía el propio Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión; pone en riesgo la continuidad de los puestos de trabajo de los estibadores y precariza sus condiciones laborales. No tiene en cuenta las negociaciones que, durante dos años, han mantenido el sindicato y la patronal ni el hecho de que ambas partes habían cerrado ya acuerdos que eran perfectamente compatibles con la sentencia del Tribunal.

Apoyamos un modelo de estiba abierto y sin monopolios, pero que preserve, al mismo tiempo, los derechos de los empleados y garantice la dignidad en las condiciones laborales, la seguridad y la formación.

No queremos más trabajo precario ni despidos baratos; queremos empleo de calidad y unas políticas que lo fomenten y lo protejan. Mucho nos tememos que, en este caso, el Gobierno español también va en la dirección contraria.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, is é inniu an chéad lá de cheiliúradh Sheachtain na Gaeilge 2017. Is fiú a rá gur ceiliúradh idirnáisiúnta é seo, agus dá bhrí sin, táim thar a bheith sásta fáilte mhór a chur roimh thosaicreachtaí daltaí ó ghaelscoileanna éagsúla, Gaelscoil na Bruiséile ina measc, agus beidh siad ag teacht anseo an tseachtain seo chugainn chun na Parlaiminte. Glacfaidh na daltaí páirt i gcluichí rólghlactha trí mheán na Gaeilge.

Is díospóireacht bheo leanúnach í cearta teanga. In Éirinn, mar shampla, tá ár rialtas féin ag déanamh faillí ar ár bpobal Gaeilge le heaspa seirbhísí agus easpa aitheantais. Tá dearcadh rialtas na Breataine scannalach i dtaobh ár dteanga dhúchasach agus níl sé toilteanach Comhaontú Chill Rìmhinn a chomhlíonadh maidir le hAcht na Gaeilge. Tá sé chomh tábhachtach dár bhféiniúlacht, dár gcultúr agus do chearta daonna go seasfaidh an tigh seo lenár gcearta teanga. Is páirt dár bhféinmhuinín, dár n-éiceolaíocht agus dár gcultúr í an Ghaeilge. Bímis bródúil agus mórtasach aisti agus tugaimis teachtaireacht láidir do na glúine atá amach romhainn gur sheasamar an fód agus, gan dabht, tá an focal deireanach ag an mbean ón nGaeltacht sa tigh seo anocht, mar sin bainigí taithneamh as an gcuid eile den oíche.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! W jednej z holenderskich tak zwanych Levenseindekliniek, czyli klinik końca życia, zabito wbrew jej woli chorą na depresję, ale świadomą tego, co się z nią dzieje, i broniącą się kobietę. O jej losie zdecydowano na podstawie procedur eutanazyjnych. Tego makabrycznego aktu nie usprawiedliwi żadna ustawa, żadne poparcie społeczne, żadne partie polityczne, żadna władza. Wzywam do niezwłocznego zajęcia stanowiska wobec tej sprawy wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej pana Fransa Timmermansa, w którego kraju zresztą doszło do tej tragedii. Wszyscy musimy być świadomi, że przyzwalające milczenie urzędowych rzeczników praw człowieka będzie zaproszeniem do eskalacji podobnych nieludzkich praktyk. Oczekuję na reakcję władz Unii Europejskiej.

Der Präsident. – Damit ist dieser Tagesordnungspunkt geschlossen.

26. Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes

27. Closure of the sitting

Der Präsident. – Im Namen aller Kolleginnen und Kollegen danke ich der Kommission für ihre Anwesenheit. Ich danke den Dolmetscherinnen und Dolmetschern für ihre exzellente Arbeit bis spät in die Nacht und wünsche Ihnen allen eine gute Nacht.

(Die Sitzung wird um 23.40 Uhr geschlossen.)

—

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
Verts/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