



VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 15 NOVEMBER 2017

(C/2024/3099)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2017-2018 SESSION

Sittings of 13 to 16 November 2017

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Opening of the sitting	4
2. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (consent) (Rule 69c): see Minutes	4
3. Debates on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (announcement of motions for resolutions tabled): see Minutes	4
4. Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes	4
5. Documents received: see Minutes	4
6. Transfers of appropriations: see Minutes	4
7. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (debate)	4
8. Winter plan for asylum seekers (debate)	25
9. Formal sitting – Slovakia	41
10. Welcome	46
11. Composition of Parliament : see Minutes	46
12. Composition of committees	46

Contents	Page
13. Voting time	47
13.1. Election of a Vice-President of the European Parliament (to replace Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz) (vote)	47
13.2. Election of a Vice-President of the European Parliament (to replace Alexander Graf Lambsdorff) (vote)	47
13.3. Period for adopting delegated acts (A8-0332/2017 - Gesine Meissner) (vote)	47
13.4. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Karel Pinxten (A8-0336/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	47
13.5. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Pietro Russo (A8-0337/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	47
13.6. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Hannu Takkula (A8-0338/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	48
13.7. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Baudilio Tomé Muguruza (A8-0342/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	48
13.8. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Bettina Jakobsen (A8-0341/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	48
13.9. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – João Alexandre Tavares Gonçalves de Figueiredo (A8-0343/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	48
13.10. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Iliana Ivanova (A8-0344/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)	48
13.11. Protection against dumped and subsidised imports from countries not members of the EU (A8-0236/2017 - Salvatore Cicu) (vote)	48
13.12. Rule of law in Malta (B8-0596/2017, B8-0597/2017) (vote)	48
13.13. Multilateral negotiations in view of the 11th WTO Ministerial Conference (B8-0593/2017) (vote)	49
13.14. Eastern Partnership: November 2017 Summit (A8-0308/2017 - Laima Liucija Andrikiienė, Knut Fleckenstein) (vote)	49
13.15. Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (B8-0589/2017) (vote)	49
13.16. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (B8-0594/2017, B8-0595/2017) (vote)	49
14. Explanations of vote	49
14.1. Protection against dumped and subsidised imports from countries not members of the EU (A8-0236/2017 - Salvatore Cicu)	49
14.2. Rule of law in Malta (B8-0596/2017, B8-0597/2017)	51
14.3. Multilateral negotiations in view of the 11th WTO Ministerial Conference (B8-0593/2017)	52

Contents	Page
14.4. Eastern Partnership: November 2017 Summit (A8-0308/2017 - Laima Liucija Andrikiienė, Knut Fleckenstein)	53
14.5. Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (B8-0589/2017)	54
14.6. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (B8-0594/2017, B8-0595/2017) ...	55
15. Corrections to votes and voting intentions	56
16. Resumption of the sitting	56
17. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting : see Minutes	57
18. Legacy of the 1917 totalitarian Bolshevik revolution (topical debate)	57
19. Decision adopted on the second Mobility Package (debate)	80
20. Activities of the European Ombudsman in 2016 (debate)	97
21. Composition of committees : see Minutes	111
22. Composition of Parliament : see Minutes	111
23. Environmental Implementation Review (EIR) (debate)	111
24. Combating inequalities as a lever to boost job creation and growth (debate)	119
25. Russian ban – EU fruit and vegetable sector (debate)	137
26. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes	149
27. Closure of the sitting	149

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 15 NOVEMBER 2017

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

1. Opening of the sitting

(Ședința a fost deschisă la ora 9.00)

2. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (consent) (Rule 69c): see Minutes

3. Debates on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (announcement of motions for resolutions tabled): see Minutes

4. Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes

5. Documents received: see Minutes

6. Transfers of appropriations: see Minutes

7. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (debate)

Președintele – Primul punct pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterile referitoare la Declarațiile Consiliului și Comisiei privind situația statului de drept și a democrației în Polonia (2017/2931(RSP)).

Vreau să fac de la început un apel pentru toți colegii: să stea în timpul pe care îl au alocat întrucât, după cum știți, la ora 12.00 avem o ședință solemnă cu Președintele Slovaciei și ar trebui să terminăm până atunci.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, common values such as human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and human rights are the cornerstone of the European Union. Each Member State must therefore respect, protect and promote them.

After the debates in January and September 2016, this is the third time that the Council has been asked to intervene in this House on the situation in Poland. The continued debate on these issues shows again that the protection and promotion of the rule of law and human rights are a constant challenge. This challenge requires unwavering attention and efforts across different policy areas. The Presidency – and, indeed, all of us – agree that the protection of the rule of law, democracy and fundamental rights in our Union cannot be taken for granted. We also agree that there is never a time to be complacent about the state of fundamental rights protection in Europe. Our core values are put to the test every day as we are facing multiple interrelated crises, be they in the area of migration or internal security. Ensuring the rule of law is an absolute priority and has to be our joint commitment, of the Member States and EU institutions together. Equally, fundamental rights need to be upheld and defended as our best guarantee for sustaining stable, open

and free societies.

Only one month ago, on 12 October, the Justice and Home Affairs Council had an exchange of views with the Director of the Fundamental Rights Agency, Michael O'Flaherty, on the priorities in the protection of fundamental rights. After this debate, the Council adopted conclusions on the application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights in 2016. These conclusions reaffirmed that democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights lay down the foundation of the European Union and our societies.

A few days later, on 17 October, the Council held its annual Rule of Law Dialogue. This year, the specific focus was on media pluralism and the rule of law in the digital age. Let me assure you that the rule of law, including the independence of the judiciary and the balance of powers, are at the heart of our concerns, and the EU is not alone. Our strongest partner is the Council of Europe, which is fully engaged in the promotion, protection and development of human rights and the rule of law.

According to our information, the Polish authorities are in contact with both the Venice Commission and the European Commission, following the opinions and recommendations issued. The Council has already been informed twice about the situation in Poland by First Vice-President Timmermans, and I am looking forward to the update he will now present to us on the latest developments.

From the Council side, it is worth mentioning that on 11 July this year, the Ecofin Council adopted country-specific recommendations in the context of the 2017 European Semester, of which one specific recommendation concerning Poland addressed the issue of the rule of law. The issues raised go to the heart of our commitment to the Union. We therefore trust that all sides will act responsibly and constructively to reach a swift solution that leaves no doubt about our core values.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I want to start by thanking this Parliament for its strong engagement on this issue, and especially the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, which I had the honour to update on the issue on 6 November. It is not my intention to repeat everything I said then, it would take too much time, but let me start by saying that an issue pertaining to the rule of law never affects only the country concerned: it affects the whole construction of the European Union. That is the basis upon which I believe this Parliament's engagement is so important.

I want to recall that on 26 July the Commission adopted a third Rule of Law Recommendation addressed to the Polish authorities. This was necessary after four laws adopted by the Sejm would have had a very significant negative impact on the independence of the Polish judiciary and would have increased the systemic threat to the rule of law. Two of the four laws were sent back to parliament by the President of the Republic.

The recommendation also recalled the situation of a systemic threat to the rule of law, resulting from the changes to the Constitutional Tribunal, which have led to a serious undermining of its independence and legitimacy as the result of its complete recomposition, contrary to the normal constitutional process for the appointment of judges. Moreover, the Polish executive persists in its refusal to publish a number of the Tribunal's rulings.

Unfortunately, the Polish reply regarding the third recommendation did not announce any concrete measures to address the issues raised by the Commission. We have now sent four letters to the Polish authorities since July, inviting them to meet. Sadly, these invitations were not accepted. I have not had the opportunity to talk to Polish Ministers about the issue. So our exchanges have essentially been in writing. That said, my invitation still stands, and I hope I can have a dialogue with the Ministers of Justice or Foreign Affairs as soon as possible.

In parallel to the Rule of Law Recommendation, the Commission has also initiated infringement proceedings in relation to the Polish Law on the Common Courts Organisation, which discriminates against individuals on the basis of gender. This is contrary to Article 157 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union and to the 2006 Directive on Gender Equality in Employment. In our reasoned opinion, the Commission also raised the issue that giving the Minister of Justice discretionary power to prolong the term of office of judges who have reached retirement age, as well as discretionary power to dismiss and appoint court presidents, would undermine the independence of Polish courts.

To be very clear: the Minister of Justice in Poland is also Chief Prosecutor and the Chief Prosecutor now has full discretionary powers to appoint and dismiss presidents of courts. Just let this sink in for a moment. The Commission understands that, on the basis of this law, a considerable number of court presidents have already been dismissed. The Commission is currently finalising its assessment of the Polish authorities' reply, with a view to deciding on the next step.

President Duda also presented two new draft laws on the Supreme Court and on the National Council for the Judiciary. The Commission is now analysing these new draft laws very carefully and will follow closely the related developments. At this preliminary stage of our assessment, the Commission already notes that certain issues in connection with the new draft laws could raise serious concerns. The Commission will continue to assess these issues thoroughly and objectively, including in the light of the Venice Commission opinions which will be forthcoming in December.

The Commission is not alone in its assessment of the gravity of the situation. Other critical opinions have been issued on the draft laws, not only in Poland by the Supreme Court, the Council for the Judiciary and the ombudsman, but also at European and international level. I would refer to the recent opinions of the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary and the Consultative Council of European Judges.

I would refer, too, to the preliminary observations by the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers, who also takes the view that the independence of the judiciary is under serious threat in Poland today, and has expressed serious concerns about the two draft laws on the Supreme Court and the National Council for the Judiciary.

Every Member State carrying out judicial reforms must respect the rule of law as one of the fundamental values to which all Member States signed up when joining the EU. It is up to the Member States to organise their justice systems, including whether to establish a council for the judiciary, or not. However, where such a council has been established to safeguard judicial independence, as in the Polish constitution, the independence of that council must be guaranteed, in line with European standards.

So let me recall for the record what it is that the Commission expects from the Polish authorities to avoid further escalation. First, the Polish authorities should restore the independence and legitimacy of the Constitutional Tribunal as guarantor of the Polish Constitution. Second, the Polish authorities should bring the Law on the Common Courts Organisation into line with Union law by abolishing gender discrimination and by abolishing the Minister of Justice's influence on judges through the retirement regime and the dismissal or appointment of court presidents. Third, the Polish authorities should bring the law on the National School of Judiciary into line with European standards on the independence of the judiciary by eliminating external influence on assistant judges, notably, again, by the Minister of Justice. And finally, the Polish authorities should bring the two new draft laws on the Supreme Court and on the National Council for the Judiciary, proposed by President Duda, fully into line with EU law and with European standards on the independence of the judiciary and the status of councils for the judiciary.

The legislative process on these two draft laws, which is about to commence, will provide a key test for the Polish authorities, to show to the outside world whether or not there is willingness to respect the rule of law and take full account of the Commission's concerns and the forthcoming opinions of the Venice Commission.

The Commission is looking for real, constructive dialogue in order to redress the situation in Poland with regard to the rule of law. This Parliament's support for our efforts is essential if we want to succeed.

Janusz Lewandowski, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Już po raz piąty Parlament Europejski reaguje na nadużycia władzy w Polsce, bo o tym jest ta debata. To, co czuję dzisiaj, wyrażę słowami mojego rodaka, który dokonał desperackiego aktu samospalenia niedawno w centrum Warszawy: „Wstydzę się, że znajomym z Zachodu muszę tłumaczyć, że Polska to nie to samo, co polski rząd”. Źródło tej debaty tkwi w polskim rządzie, w nadużyciach mandatu, który był zdobyty w demokratycznych wyborach, ale pewnie byłby on słabszy, gdyby ludzie wiedzieli, że głosują nie tylko na szerokie rozdawnictwo pieniędzy – co pomaga ubogim, ale zadłuża kraj – ale że głosują również na deptanie ładu konstytucyjnego, niezawisłego sądownictwa, a nawet wycinanie ostatniej istniejącej puszki na terenie Europy, ale także ściganie uczestników pokojowych manifestacji, jak również tolerowanie przejawów ksenofobii, rasizmu i neofaszyzmu na naszych ulicach.

To wszystko jest bardzo dobrze widoczne. Tego się nie da ukryć. Nie spuści się jakiejś nowej żelaznej zasłony. Polska demokracja ma się dobrze tylko w zmyślonym świecie kreowanym przez media, także zawłaszczone, które stały się tubą rządowej propagandy. Ale ten zmyślonny świat kończy się tam, gdzie kończy się codzienne pranie mózgów. W rzeczywistości nie zdarzyło się, by jakiś rząd tak szybko rujnował pozycję międzynarodową własnego kraju, tak szybko i tak boleśnie kompromitował swój kraj na arenie międzynarodowej. A chodzi o Polskę, z której moglibyśmy być bardzo dumni jako z dzieła zbiorowego Polaków, sięgającego po najwyższe stanowiska w Unii Europejskiej, największe fundusze, wpływy, przekuwającego swoje idee na programy Unii Europejskiej, jak Partnerstwo Wschodnie, unia energetyczna.

Powstaje pytanie o przyszłość Polek i Polaków i nie chodzi tylko o szacunek, wizerunek, pieniądze i wpływy, lecz o bezpieczeństwo. Dzisiejsze osamotnienie Polski, samowykluczenie Polski jest całkowicie sprzeczne z polską racją stanu, z lekcją, jakiej udzieliła nam historia. Bo to jakby ktoś prosił się, by wróciło przekleństwo polskiego losu, przekleństwo polskiej geopolityki.

Wolna i demokratyczna Polska ma przyjaciół w wolnej i demokratycznej wspólnocie europejskiej, a nie w Turcji czy na Białorusi. Wolny świat, demokratyczny świat upomina się o Polskę jako członka własnej rodziny, upomina się w imię zasad, w których kryje się mądrość zgromadzona w drodze prób i błędów. Mądrość, jak zorganizować wolne społeczeństwo, by chronić swobody obywatelskie przed dyktaturą, jak zorganizować dobrą gospodarkę, w której myśli się o następnych pokoleniach. To są zasady wpisane w naszą konstytucję i w unijne traktaty. Kto je łamie, ten na początku zabiera ludziom wolność, ale na końcu może zabrać ludziom także przyszłość.

Obecny obóz rządzący ma pewną niewygodę, gdy przypominamy, jak się zachowywał, gdy był opozycją, jak chętnie tu właśnie, w Parlamencie Europejskim inicjował rozmaite wysłuchania, przesłuchania, niemające zresztą żadnego znaczenia, bo były niewiarygodne i polegały na nieprawdzie. Ale wtedy obecna posłanka PiS – rządzącej partii – radośnie tweetowała (to był grudzień 2014 roku): „To dobrze, że opozycja zorganizowała wysłuchanie publiczne w Parlamencie Europejskim na temat zagrożenia demokracji (czyli oni inicjowali). Jesteśmy w Unii, to jest także nasz Parlament.” Tak, to jest nasza Unia Europejska, to jest nasz Parlament, ale my nie cieszymy się na te debaty, bo nie chcemy wstydić się za rządzących Polską. Chcemy, żeby wróciła duma z naszego kraju.

Gianni Pittella, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io vorrei rivolgermi direttamente ai cittadini polacchi, agli amici cittadini polacchi. So bene che il vostro governo proverà a far passare questo dibattito come l'ennesimo tentativo di accanirsi nei confronti della Polonia. È falso. Noi amiamo il vostro popolo e amiamo la vostra nazione. Abbiamo fatto tutto il possibile, come ha ricordato puntualmente il Vicepresidente Frans Timmermans, per tenere aperto il dialogo con le autorità polacche, e continuiamo a farlo anche oggi, come ha detto Timmermans, pronti al dialogo. Ma il dialogo si fa in due, e se c'è sordità da una parte è difficile fare un dialogo.

Siamo sempre disponibili al confronto, a patto che non si metta in discussione il principio su cui si fonda il nostro vivere insieme. Primo principio: libertà, democrazia e Stato di diritto. L'Unione europea non è un ristorante, nel quale si entra e ci si serve *à la carte*, ma è una democrazia che vive, è una comunità di valori a cui tutti i suoi membri sono vincolati.

Io questa mattina avrei voluto discutere di come difendere i diritti dei cittadini polacchi di fronte alle conseguenze della Brexit, di come evitare che tanti giovani polacchi debbano lasciare il loro paese per andare all'estero, e invece siamo tutti ostaggi del governo polacco, che non viene a Bruxelles per occuparsi dei problemi dei suoi cittadini e che continua a provocarci con un atteggiamento di chiusura.

Chiedo alle autorità polacche: voi dite di rappresentare la maggioranza della Polonia – avete avuto i voti, sì certamente – ma i vostri concittadini non vi hanno mai dato alcun mandato per attaccare l'indipendenza del Tribunale costituzionale, per ridurre l'autonomia della magistratura, e allora perché fate questo? La verità vera è che i vostri tentativi di minare l'indipendenza della magistratura sono un'arma di distrazione di massa dalle difficoltà che avete al governo. Avete mentito ai vostri elettori e non volete confrontarvi sui problemi concreti. Ma dietro ai vostri progetti c'è anche un'altra cosa, un'altra cosa più profonda. C'è il disprezzo per la democrazia liberale, l'ostilità verso i diritti umani e verso le regole costituzionali, il culto della legge del più forte, e vedere sabato scorso le strade di Varsavia presidiate dalle squadracce dell'estrema destra mi ha ricordato le pagine più cupe della storia europea.

A tutti i polacchi, a chi oggi si oppone a questo governo, ma anche a chi lo ha votato, a tutti i polacchi io dico che noi non vi lasceremo soli. Il gruppo Socialista e Democratico con la sua delegazione polacca è vicino al popolo polacco. Noi non siamo contro la Polonia, noi siamo contro la deviazione dal percorso lineare di uno Stato di diritto. Vogliamo che questo percorso si corregga. Vogliamo che la Polonia viva pienamente il suo essere membro centrale dell'Unione europea.

(L'oratore accetta di rispondere a una domanda «cartellino blu» (articolo 162, paragrafo 8, del regolamento))

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (NI), *blue-card question*. – My question to Mr Pittella is: *caro Presidente*, would it not be better for you to tackle the real problems of your political family, the Socialists, and of your *caro amico* the Prime Minister of Malta, Mr Muscat, rather than the fictitious problems of Poland?

Gianni Pittella (S&D), *risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu»*. – È davvero ridicolo paragonare la situazione di Malta alla situazione della Polonia, e paragonare la situazione del Primo ministro maltese, che ha sempre dato la sua disponibilità, concretamente, a dialogare con le istituzioni europee, a essere presente nel Parlamento europeo e a correggere i difetti e i problemi che ci sono a Malta, con la situazione della Polonia. Quindi non facciamo paragoni! Anche questa è un'arma di distrazione dai problemi veri. Mettere sullo stesso piano Malta e Polonia è un falso storico.

Ryszard Antoni Legutko, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Jako człowiek trochę doświadczony w polityce, jednak sądziłem, że jest jakaś granica bezwstydu, ale po tym, co usłyszałem od kolegi Lewandowskiego, to zmieniam zdanie: nie ma granicy bezwstydu. No jeszcze niżej można upaść, niż Pan dzisiaj upadł, opowiadając te niebywałe rzeczy. Po prostu do tej pory nie mogę dojść do siebie, że naprawdę nie ma jakiegokolwiek wewnętrznej moralnej kontroli, że można tak gadać takie obrzydliwe, nieprawdziwe rzeczy. Oburzające!

Proszę Państwa! Jeśli chodzi o merytoryczną odpowiedź w sprawie reformy sądownictwa i kontaktów między rządem polskim a Komisją Europejską, ja Państwu ją przesłałem na skrzynki. Macie Państwo bardzo szczegółową, dokładną informację na ten temat. Jeżeli ktoś z Państwa chce ze mną wdać się w dysputę na ten temat, jestem oczywiście otwarty. Natomiast tutaj, na tej sali, tak jak w czasie tych poprzednich odsłon, przecież naprawdę nie chodzi o żaden dialog. To nie jest żadna debata. No, nie oszukujmy się – to jest kolejny orwellowski seans. To jest pokaz siły w stosunku do Polaków i do polskiego rządu. Tu nie chodzi o praworządność. Nie chodzi o wartości, tylko chodzi o władzę, prawdę, kto ma władzę. To jest kolejna odsłona tego samego. Przecież, kilka czy kilkanaście godzin po ogłoszeniu projektów ustaw w sprawie sądownictwa kolega Weber z innymi posłami już wszczęli ogólnoeuropejską, antypolską kampanię. Przecież pan Weber nie zna języka polskiego. Nie znał treści tych ustaw. Nie znał żadnych ekspertów. W ogóle nie zainteresował się, ale już wiedział. Już parę godzin i trzeba puścić tę falę, tę kolejną krucjatę przeciw polskiemu rządowi. Zresztą to samo robili socjaliści, to samo – liberałowie. Czy to jest zaproszenie do debaty? To nie jest żadne zaproszenie do debaty. Nie oszukujmy się. Państwo macie jakąś obsesję, jakieś uporczywe natręctwo, jeżeli chodzi o polski rząd, prawda? To było widać, że ciągle do tego wracacie. *(Oklaski)* No ludzie, zmiłujcie się. To jest też przykład niebywałej arogancji, która jest rozpowszechniona wśród elity politycznej w Europie Zachodniej, już nie mówiąc o mediach. No, niemieckie media. Nie wiem, jak mam to nazwać, co tam się wypisuje na temat Polski. To jest jakaś antypolska orgia, a mówiąc po prostu dyrdymały. To są kompletne dyrdymały. To jest taka Niagara kłamstwa, że zamiast sześć i pół minuty ja bym musiał mieć sześć i pół miesiąca, żeby to wszystko prostować. No, nie jestem w stanie tego robić. Albo barbarzyńskie zachowanie pani minister obrony Niemiec. Tak jak, nie przymierzając, kiedyś sowieccy dyplomaci też, prawda, deklarowali się z pomocą swoim przyjaciółom w krajach satelickich. Albo wypowiedzi prezydenta Macrona o Polsce i o innych krajach wschodnioeuropejskich. To są jakieś takie... Ja w tym widzę takie stare kolonialne nawyki, które tutaj się pojawiają. I ta Wschodnia Europa nagle śmie coś robić, prawda, decydować o sobie, no niebywałe, bez naszej wiedzy. Proszę przyjąć do wiadomości, że proces upodmiotowienia we Wschodniej Europie się dokonuje i żebyście Państwo, nie wiem, co tutaj w obliczu tego robili lub czego nie robili, to będzie trwało.

Jeśli chodzi natomiast o Komisję, Panie Przewodniczący Timmermans, ja właściwie już wszystko powiedziałem w czasie poprzednich debat. Proszę mi tutaj nie mówić, że Pan reprezentuje prawo, że Pan reprezentuje wartości. Wszystkie te działania Komisji przeciw Polsce są działaniami bezprawnymi, które łamią traktaty europejskie. I to, że te działania są tutaj przyklepywane w Parlamencie, to nie czyni je mniej bezprawnymi. Państwo macie tu większość. Możecie wszystko przegłosować, co chcecie, nawet że dwa plus dwa jest pięć. Ale prawda jest taka, że to są działania bezprawne. To są też – ja już mówiłem o tym wielokrotnie – to są te podwójne standardy, które są nieodłącznie w Polsce związane z Pana nazwiskiem. Pan jest stroną w wewnętrznym konflikcie w Polsce i Pan tego nie kryje, prawda? Jak się działy w Polsce różne niedobre rzeczy, to Pan milczał. Jak się działy w Hiszpanii niedobre rzeczy, to Pan tutaj się wypowiadał tak, że właściwie nie wiadomo było, o czym Pan mówi. Jakby jakaś jedna dziesiąta z rzeczy, które działy się w Hiszpanii, działa się w Polsce teraz, toby się Pan tutaj zmienił w świętego Jerzego, który walczy ze smokiem. *(Oklaski)* Komisja, niestety, ma ten niedobry zwyczaj, że po prostu ignoruje wszystkie odpowiedzi polskiego rządu i cały czas powtarza to samo. Komisja nazywa to dialogiem albo zaproszeniem do rozmowy. Panie Przewodniczący, to nie jest dialog. To nie jest zaproszenie do rozmowy. Jest takie pojęcie, które temu odpowiada. To jest ultimatum. Mówicie państwo: to ma być zrobione, a jak nie – to będziecie ukarani. To mniej więcej jest dialog, prawda, w stylu Komisji. To jest to, co Szekspir nazwał *the insolence of office*, prawda? To jest taka beczelność urzędów czy beczelność władzy. Wszystko możecie zrobić. Uważacie, że wszystko możecie powiedzieć i wszystko nakazać. *(Oklaski)*

Proszę Państwa! To tak naprawdę nie zaszkodzi Polsce. Dawaliśmy sobie radę z większymi problemami. To szkodzi Unii. To znaczy, że gdyby zebrać wszystkie antyunijne diatriby, które tutaj padały w tej Izbie, to one by mniejszą szkodę wizerunkowi Unii zrobiły niż Pana wystąpienia. To znaczy dla zniszczenia wizerunku Unii Europejskiej Pan zrobił więcej niż Nigel Farage i Marine Le Pen razem wzięci. *(Oklaski)*

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Barbara Kudrycka (PPE), pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Chciałam powiedzieć, że sposobem na to, aby nie było debat tego typu, jest nieniszczenie Trybunału Konstytucyjnego, niedewastowanie niezawisłości sędziowskiej, sądów powszechnych i niewykonywanie zarządzeń Trybunału Sprawiedliwości. Dlatego moje pytanie do pana Legutki jest: czy traktujecie Unię Europejską jak dojną krowę, z której można wyciskać jedynie pieniądze, czy raczej jako wspólnotę prawa, w której obowiązują nas te same cywilizacyjne, zachodnie wartości?

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Nie, nie traktujemy Unii Europejskiej jako dojnej krowy. Nie wiem, co jeszcze mogę powiedzieć. Jeśli chodzi o trybunał, no to ja przypominam, że pani i pani partia chciała przejąć całkowicie trybunał i umieścić wszystkich swoich nominatów, czternastu na piętnastu członków, ale wtedy pan Timmermans tego nie zauważył jakoś. Prawda? Jeżeli Pana przyjaciele polityczni robią skandaliczne rzeczy, to Pan tego nie widzi. Nie dostrzegł Pan. Nie słyszałem. Powiedział Pan jakieś słowo na ten temat? Nie powiedział Pan. Może się Pan uśmiechać, prawda, drwiąco i pobłaźliwie, ale nie powiedział Pan.

Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, I would like to ask Mr Legutko why he doesn't stay for the debate.

(Mr Legutko left the Chamber)

Why are you leaving, Mr Legutko? Because I have something to say to you. I have to say something to you. Your attack on Mr Lewandowski I find outrageous.

(Interjections from the floor)

If there is one sensible, reasonable, colleague of ours, sometimes even a little bit boring, then it is Mr Lewandowski. And to say that he has lost his senses, well, I think it is the Polish Government that has lost its senses and not Mr Lewandowski.

(Applause)

Mr President, on Saturday 60 000 fascists marched in the streets of Warsaw – neo-Nazis, white supremacists – and I'm not talking about Charlottesville in America, I'm talking about Warsaw, Poland, 300 km more or less from Auschwitz and Birkenau. Well, I have to tell you, I thought that it should never happen in Europe, and that it should never happen also in Poland; certainly not in Poland, because we do not have to give lessons to Poland. That's not the point. It's the place where, before Magna Carta, before *Habeas corpus*, there were free cities, a beacon of creativity and of freedom. It is the country that liberated itself from two authoritarianisms, from fascism and communism, and they did it alone.

And at the same time it is also, since their entrance into the European Union, a country that was really at the heart of Central and Eastern European democracy, and moreover also of economic growth, before Germany. So there is nothing to say about Poland – we are not attacking Poland. What we are attacking and what is being said is that over the last two years there has been a government, and behind that government there is a personality, Mr Kaczyński, who thinks that he can copy someone – and I apologise to the PPE Group – namely Mr Orbán, who also thinks that he has to establish illiberal states everywhere in the European Union. To copy Mr Orbán is, I think, not in the interests of Poland and Polish society and Polish citizens. And that is the point of our intervention today.

And unfortunately, in this case, we will ask you, Mr President, to activate Article 7 – and not, I have to tell you very clearly, to punish any Polish citizens. That is not the point. My proposal is even that, when we have sanctions, the European money should go directly to Polish cities, to Polish civil societies and to Polish citizens, because we can never allow Polish citizens to be the victims of this reactionary agenda of the Polish Government and of Mr Kaczyński.

(Applause)

(The speaker declined to answer a blue-card question from Ms Gosiewska)

Marek Jurek (ECR). – ...słowami z niedopuszczalną aluzją do obozu w Auschwitz, która po raz kolejny padła z ust pana Verhofstadta, proszę Prezydium naszego Parlamentu o zajęcie się jego wypowiedziami. Ten język nienawiści musi się wreszcie skończyć. Dziękuję bardzo!

Președintele – Am luat notă.

Barbara Spinelli, a nome del gruppo GUE/NGL. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei rivolgermi ai colleghi polacchi e in particolare ai rappresentanti del partito al governo. Vorrei che capissero che non stiamo punendo un paese membro, che rispettiamo le sovranità multiple di cui l'Unione dovrà sempre più essere composta. Il motivo per cui adotteremo una terza risoluzione sulla Polonia è per ricordare insieme le ragioni che ci tengono uniti, i fondamenti normativi che tutti i paesi membri hanno sottoscritto. Intendo la *rule of law* nel senso più profondo del termine. Vi invito a leggere il considerando E della risoluzione. La *rule of law* è distinta dalla *rule by law*.

Rule by law significa governo per mezzo della legge, dove la legge è l'atto di cui si serve chi esercita il potere sulla base di una maggioranza parlamentare. *Rule of law* è una nozione in cui entra un concetto sostanziale di diritto, come insieme di diritti fondamentali, indipendenza dei giudici, separazione dei poteri, libera espressione, diritti dei rifugiati e delle donne.

Chi vince le elezioni ubbidisce a questo insieme di diritti, non li concede. Una volta eletti in questo Parlamento, tutti abbiamo il compito di rappresentare la totalità dei cittadini dell'Unione, senza distinzione di nazionalità o circoscrizione elettorale, e allo stesso tempo il dovere primario di assicurare che i fondamenti della cittadinanza, diritti e libertà fondamentali, siano pienamente garantiti.

Domandando di attivare l'articolo 7, paragrafo 1, non chiediamo altro che di tener fede a tale impegno e di assumerci la responsabilità di proseguire il dialogo aperto con il governo di uno Stato membro. D'altro canto, si tratta del solo strumento che come Parlamento il trattato ci ha fornito.

Judith Sargentini, namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie. – Debatten over grondrechten en de rechtsstaat lopen in dit Parlement vaak erg hoog op. Ergens in het debat komt er iemand die zegt dat er met twee maten gemeten wordt. Dat het een politiek spel is. Dat het ene land wel en het andere niet wordt aangepakt. Dat de regeringspartij toch een meerderheid heeft in het Parlement en dat daarmee alle besluiten democratisch zijn. Ook zal er iemand zeggen dat aanpassingen van de grondwet, de samenstelling van het Hooggerechtshof of de financiering van kranten in een andere lidstaat precies zo geregeld zijn. En dan wordt er iemand echt laaiend, want het volk en het land worden niet goed behandeld.

Voorzitter, dat zijn jij-bakken en jij-bakken slaan het debat dood. Je zorgen ventileren over wetten die een regering aanneemt, is niet hetzelfde als een bevolking attaqueren. Het is zaak dat we het volk, het land, de regering en de partij niet op één hoop gooien. Want de meerderheid bestaat bij de gratie van de minderheid. En dat zijn ook leden van de bevolking, ook mensen met rechten en behoeften. Dé manier om jij-bakken te ontcrachten is te laten zien dat we ze omarmen, dat we zelf kritisch zijn, dat we bereid zijn om de tekorten in ons eigen systeem te benoemen en dat we niet weggijken van misstanden, in geen enkel Europees land.

We debatteren vandaag dus over het handelen van de Poolse regering en niet over het land of de bevolking. De Groenen zien een trend van krimpde burgerlijke vrijheden. Wetgeving die de rechtszekerheid van de burgers inperkt, gaat met een noodgang door het Poolse Parlement. De onafhankelijkheid van het Grondwettelijk Hof wordt ondermijnd. Het kapverbod in het woud van Białowieża wordt genegeerd. Het zelfbeschikkingsrecht van vrouwen staat op de tocht. Vluchtelingen aan de grens worden teruggeduwd naar Wit-Rusland en journalisten hebben het zwaar, erg zwaar. Er is dus reden genoeg voor dit Parlement om te onderzoeken of de rechtsstaat systematisch afkalft. De Groenen vinden het daarom heel verstandig dat dit Parlement bereid is om aan dat onderzoek te beginnen.

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz, w imieniu grupy EFDD. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Ustalmy kilka faktów. Po pierwsze, ten parlament nie ma absolutnie żadnego prawa do osądzania działania suwerennego państwa polskiego. Dlaczego? Bo z jednej strony mamy tutaj europarlament, który jest wydmuszką. Jest jakimś europejskim żartem. A z drugiej strony mamy ponad tysiącletnie państwo polskie. Polska będzie trwała jeszcze długo po tym, jak cała historia Unii Europejskiej zamieni się w jeden malutki akapit w ogromnym podręczniku do historii głupich doktryn politycznych. Po drugie, cała ta debata została zwołana z inspiracji niektórych polskojęzycznych polityków, żeby przykryć ich problemy polityczne w Polsce, żeby przykryć ich afery reprivatyzacyjne, pamięć o ich nieudolnych rządach i obecnym braku jakiegokolwiek pomysłu dla Polski. Ci polskojęzyczni politycy za bardzo zapatrzyli się w stronnictwo zdrady, na Rzewuskich, Szczęsnych Potockich, i zamarzyło im się, że będą rządzić Polską z łaski brukselskich czy berlińskich panów. Po trzecie, ten parlament dzisiejszą debatą wspina się na szczyty hipokryzji i obłudy. Zatem wszystko jest w porządku w Hiszpanii, gdzie trwają zamieszki, gdzie jest ponad siedmiuset rannych, gdzie są więźniowie polityczni. Zatem wszystko w porządku jest w Niemczech, gdzie szaleje cenzura polityczna. Zatem wszystko jest w porządku w Belgii, gdzie wojsko musi patrolować ulice w obawie przed islamskimi terrorystami. Ale nie jest w porządku w Polsce, gdzie legalnie wybrany rząd realizuje swoje obietnice wyborcze. Obłuda hipokryzja i fałsz – oto czym jest ta debata.

Szanowni Państwo! Kilka dni temu, 11 listopada obchodziliśmy rocznicę odzyskania niepodległości przez Polskę. Wolność odzyskaliśmy dzięki tytanicznej pracy mądrych, polskich polityków i wysokiej świadomości narodowej i naszego społeczeństwa. Dla odmiany w czasie II wojny światowej Polska utraciła swą niepodległość przez politykę Anglii i Francji. Jestem posłem wolności i jak każdy Polak wiem, że nie potrzebujemy unijnych rad, pouczeń i krytyk. Zajmijcie się własnymi państwami i przestańcie się tutaj kompromitować.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D), sinisen kortin kysymys. – Te sanoitte, että Puolassa on laillisesti valittu hallitus. Se on totta, ja minun kysymykseni on, onko teidän mielestänne laillisesti valitulla hallituksella oikeus tehdä mitä tahansa. Eikö se velvoita Puolaa mihinkään, että me olemme Euroopan unionin jäsenvaltioina sitoutuneet yhteisiin arvoihin: ihmisoikeuksiin ja oikeusvaltion periaatteisiin? Se, että laillisesti valittu hallitus voi tehdä mitä tahansa, on kyllä vallon väärinkäyttöä.

Robert Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz (EFDD), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Szanowna Pani! Nie jestem zwolennikiem tego rządu. Niestety pytanie nietrafione. Jestem w opozycji do tego rządu, natomiast jestem w opozycji przede wszystkim do wartości Unii Europejskiej, które są całkowicie różne od wartości europejskich. Nie zgadzam się z podejściem biurokratycznym urzędników Unii Europejskiej, którzy próbują ingerować w działalność suwerennego polskiego państwa.

Michał Marusik, w imieniu grupy ENF. – Panie Przewodniczący! Proszę Państwa! My, Polacy, dokładnie pamiętamy czas, kiedy to decyzje o tym, co nam Polakom wolno, a czego nam nie wolno, zapadały w Moskwie. W Moskwie ustalano granice naszej politycznej wolności i suwerenności. Zmieniło się teraz bardzo wiele, ale widać, że dla nas Polaków zmieniło się to, że obecnie granice naszej politycznej wolności wyznaczać chce i wyznacza Bruksela i Strasburg. Wiemy, że gwałt zadawany narodom i państwom zakończył się śmiercią Związku Socjalistycznych Republik Radzieckich. I ten sam proceder ingerencji w wolność polityczną narodów i państw zakończy się śmiercią związku socjalistycznych republik europejskich. I nie będzie czego żałować... Wolni i bezpieczni obywatele w wolnych i bez-

piecznych krajach – taki powinien być nasz cel. Kilkaset lat temu na europejskich dworach był chłopiec do bicia, taki urząd. Dziś z Polski zrobiliście sobie chłopca do bicia. Powiem to, co mówi polska ulica: ręce precz od Polski! (Oklaski)

President. – I would like to remind everybody that in reality we were not forced to join the European Union.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Ten apel do Unii zacząć chcę od wyjaśnienia, że nie mam zamiaru rządzić rządów PiS. Jako prawicowiec jestem ich zawziętym wrogiem. Polacy tylko dlatego popierają PiS, że poprzednie rządy były jeszcze gorsze. I problem w tym, że Unia odbierana jest jako poplecznik poprzednich rządów właśnie. Dlatego ataki pana Timmermansa i innych zwiększają popularność PiS-u. Tym bardziej, że Polacy nie lubią, jak ktoś wtrąca się w ich sprawy.

Wiele argumentów używanych przez Unię jest słusznych, ale wiele jest absurdalnych. Wynika to stąd, że nie znacie sytuacji w Polsce, a informacje otrzymujecie od ludzi, którzy widzą rzeczy nie takimi, jakimi są, a takimi, jakimi chcieliby, żeby były. A więc wprowadzają was w błąd. W dodatku wasze żądania są sprzeczne z uczuciami większości Polaków. Żądacie praw dla homoseksualistów – poparcie dla PiS-u rośnie. Żądacie jakichś głupich praw kobiet, gadacie o jakimś gender – poparcie dla PiS-u rośnie. Oskarżacie PiS o nacjonalizm (to jest nieprawda: PiS to sanacja, narodowcy są wrogami PiS-u) – poparcie dla PiS-u rośnie. Innymi słowy, przeszkadzacie nam w walce z tym obrzydliwym rządem, a więc proszę odczepcie się. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

President. – Mr Korwin-Mikke, you have a request...

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 162 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

(Interjection from the floor: 'No!')

No? Listen, colleagues. The only person who has the right to accept or not to accept is Mr Korwin-Mikke. We said it would be one blue card per speaker, and Mr Korwin-Mikke accepts the request from Ms Becerra Basterrechea.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – Señor Korwin-Mikke, cada vez que abre usted la boca, creo que Polonia se avergüenza. Sinceramente. Creo que Polonia está en el corazón de todos y todos amamos Polonia. Amamos su libertad, adoramos su valentía, adoramos la innovación y lo que ha conseguido hacer.

¿Y usted nos viene a decir que si estamos de acuerdo en que el partido que gobierna ahora, que está destruyendo el Estado de Derecho en Polonia, está mejorando en popularidad porque tiene una postura contra los homosexuales como la suya respecto a las mujeres?

¿Usted también piensa que hay que eliminar, quitarnos la voz a las mujeres? ¿Quiere usted que deje de preguntarle? ¿Quiere usted que deje de decirle?

Europa ama Polonia porque Polonia es Europa. Y yo represento a los polacos igual que usted. Y creo que mejor.

¿Me puede usted contestar?

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI), odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki. – Mówiłem o absurdalnych prawach kobiet. Macie pretensje o to, że kobiety w Polsce mają przywilej, że mogą – nie muszą – przejść wcześniej na emeryturę. I wy uważacie, że to jest naruszenie praw kobiet, bo równość się narusza. Ale przecież wy gadacie o kobietach pięćdziesiąt razy częściej niż o mężczyznach, czyli też równość kobiet jest tutaj naruszona. Tak czy nie? Więc nie rozumiem, o co tutaj chodzi. Żadne prawa kobiet nie są w Polsce naruszane. Przeciwnie. Na przykład więcej kobiet pracuje – jeśli Panią to interesuje – na własne firmy niż na Zachodzie. Ja wcale nie jestem tego zwolennikiem, ale tak jest. O co wam chodzi?

Roberta Metsola (PPE). – Mr President, I am glad to be able to take the floor after that contribution. The first words I ever heard a Polish person say were 'Be not afraid'. Growing up in Malta, Saint John Paul was our inspiration, and he still is. To me, Poland will always be the nation of my Pope of Solidarity, who stood up to be counted when it was easier to sit down – a land that inspires hope and has symbolised courage in the face of so much adversity.

Poland joining the European Union was the crowning moment for the children of that revolution and it proved just how far the nation had come. We cannot allow it to take any further steps backwards. But Poland has been let down by those leading it, who are weakening the democratic institutions and safeguards in the country, and who think that having an electoral majority means they can now do what they like.

That is not how it works in our European Union. The rule of law is important because it is our fail-safe to protect democracy. It is the basis of everything. In a time of free and social media, it is absolutely impossible to hide the truth and the true picture of the deplorable developments in Poland. We have eyes and ears. Nobody has to inform Brussels what is going on – we already know.

Human rights and the rule of law are in increased danger – and no one is here to attack Poland. Poland is a country that must be at the very heart of our Union, but, to that end, it must respect the rule of law. Its leaders must engage with the Commission in a constructive dialogue, and must respect the people who are courageous enough to stand up to them. Yes, we still have serious concerns about the proposed law on the National Council for the Judiciary and about the proposed law on the Supreme Court. These must be addressed. We must send a message that we will not stand idly by while the very bases of democracy and the rule of law in Poland are being undermined. We must insist that the Polish authorities respect their moral and legal obligations as an EU Member State.

In conclusion, I look to my Polish colleagues – colleagues like Mr Lewandowski – and I look to Poles demonstrating that the Polish nation and the Polish Government are not one and the same. I know that Polish courage is something which still inspires. These are Polish patriots, standing up for Poland, and I salute them. Be not afraid.

(Applause)

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Debatujemy na temat Polski jako państwa prawa. Robimy to wśród przyjaciół, w rodzinie, w naszej europejskiej rodzinie, a nie wśród wrogów. „O nas z nami”, a bywało, że było „o nas bez nas” w przeszłości.

Istotą debaty jest przestrzeganie prawa w Polsce, ważnym państwie ze swoją tożsamością, kulturą, historycznymi zasługami. Polacy zawsze chcieli być w Europie i nadal chcą być tu, w Europie. Unia daje nam, Polakom, poczucie bezpieczeństwa politycznego, społecznego i gospodarczego. Europejskie wartości i prawo są naszymi wartościami i my także chcemy ich strzec.

Dlatego nas, ludzi lewicy, niepokoją, po pierwsze, przejmowanie wymiaru sprawiedliwości przez jedną partię, po drugie, próby ograniczania godności i praw kobiet, po trzecie, stosowanie odpowiedzialności zbiorowej, czego skrajnym przykładem jest odbieranie emerytur funkcjonariuszom i żołnierzom, po czwarte, negowanie historycznych zasług wielu organizacji i żołnierzy walczących z faszyzmem i w Polsce, i w Europie.

Pomiędzy Komisją a rządem narasta napięcie. Apelujemy do Komisji: zróbcie krok wstecz! Apelujemy do rządu: zróbcie dwa kroki wstecz! Za ten spór nie mogą płacić Polska i jej obywatele.

Sophia in 't Veld (ALDE). – Mr President, I note that Mr Legutko is afraid to answer any questions – he just made his statement and left, and that is symptomatic. In a democracy, you have debate: you have dialogue, questions and answers and an exchange of positions, and he just gives a monologue and leaves. That is called cowardice. What I did not hear in his totally irrational seven-minute rant was one single word of condemnation of the fascist march and the fascist slogans of last weekend. It was just a rant, and I have not heard where he stands. I would also like to hear about the rest of the ECR Group, because by not speaking out they are tacitly agreeing with the position of the PiS Government. Think about it: do you want to distance yourself from this, or do you want to side with a government that does not condemn fascists and that is restricting the freedom of other NGOs? Think very carefully about where you stand.

The government speakers represent – or claim to represent – the Polish people, as if there is only one opinion and one truth. Do you know what that is called? Absolutism. This is an authoritarian government that does not respect pluralism and does not respect the opinions of others. We know better, because we have seen the thousands who took to the streets to protest against the government – thousands of very courageous people, many courageous women – who spoke out against the government and for pluralism, for democracy, and for civil society.

So, Mr Legutko – who is not here – if you are asking for respect, then why do you not respect others? You have no respect for women's rights, no respect for LGBTI people, no respect for people who do not share your religion, and no respect for people who do not share your opinion.

What I find very striking is how much the agenda of the PiS Government looks like the agenda of Mr Putin. They are always saying 'we don't like the Russians', but their agenda is identical to that of Mr Putin.

(Applause)

Finally, I would like to say that this debate is not about Poland; it is about the rule of law. I welcome the words of the Council, but now we need some action. We need a real, broad mechanism that applies to all the Member States and that does not leave it to the Member States to judge themselves. We need a broad, independent mechanism, as has been proposed by the European Parliament.

(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from Mr Złotowski under Rule 162(8))

Malin Björk (GUE/NGL). – Herr talman! Situationen i Polen och i Ungern är oerhört allvarlig, och kommissionen pratar om ett *systemic threat to the rule of law*. Vi i vänstern delar den bedömningen, precis som många av kollegerna här, men vi ser också ett *systemic threat against women's rights*, vilket lyftes av några kollegor. Detta samband mellan attacken på demokratin, attacken på kvinnors rättigheter och det alltmer fascistiska auktoritära styret är så uppenbart. Det är dock faktiskt inte alla kollegor här inne som ser det. Däremot såg de många polacker som gick ut på gatorna och demonstrerade i *black protest* detta samband, och det är till dem jag skulle vilja skicka vårt stöd.

Vi feminister här i Europaparlamentet vill skicka en tydlig signal av stöd till och solidaritet med er som kämpar både för demokrati, för rättsstaten, för kvinnors rättigheter, mot rasismen och mot fascismen i Polen. Ni har vårt stöd, och jag hoppas att ni får stöd av alla kolleger här och att de alla kommer att inse sambandet mellan kvinnors rättigheter, demokratin och rättsstaten.

(Talaren avböjde att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") från David Coburn i enlighet med artikel 162.8 i arbetsordningen.)

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, it really is a pity that Mr Legutko is not here anymore, because – I hate to break it to him – he is not Poland. He is representing one voice in the Polish debate. I actually asked my Polish friends what they would like to hear mentioned in this debate and, in no time, dozens of people answered by messages, emails and comments. Many points were brought up: amongst others, the government's reaction – or non-reaction – to the fascist march last Saturday; LGBTI rights; minority rights; the question of free elections and free media; independent courts; the cutbacks to NGO funding; teachers' rights; the question of Białowieża Forest; and also – over and over again – women's rights and sexual and reproductive rights were mentioned by Polish citizens, and I wanted to bring this up in the debate.

But the story that took my breath away, I must say, was the story of Piotr – a middle-aged man from a small city in Poland who burnt himself in the middle of Warsaw in protest at this government. He wrote a manifesto, bringing up demands that he would like to see considered by the PiS government in Poland. One thing that he said really struck me. Despite the fact that he wants people to stand up against this government, he said, 'remember, however, that the PiS electorate are our mothers, brothers, neighbours, colleagues and friends'. This is not about fighting a war; it is about creating a dialogue, and I think it is now on us and Mr Timmermans to create this dialogue and to stand up for the rule of law and for Polish citizens.

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

David Coburn (EFDD), blue-card question. – Surely Polish values are those of its democratically elected parliament and government, not those of other European nations. I speak as a homosexual: I do not agree with many of the things that the Polish Government are doing. I am also very pro-feminist, so I do not agree with a lot of the other things that the Polish Government are doing. But surely it is the right of the Polish people to make their own decisions. Britain will never forget what Polish pilots did for us in World War II, and if Poland is being dictated to by the EU, perhaps you should consider joining Britain in Brexit – would you agree with me, Madam?

(Applause in some quarters)

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE), blue-card answer. – Mr Coburn, I do not know how many times this has to be repeated in this Parliament. It is not specific policies that we are discussing today, it is the breaching of the Polish Constitution, and that is the basis for how we are doing democracy all together. If the rule of law is not respected in countries then there cannot be a democratic debate. This is the problem, this is why we are standing up. We are not discussing policies here, we are discussing what the fundament is of how we discuss. If that is breached then there cannot be democracy and there cannot be a democratic debate, and that is the problem regarding the situation in Poland right now.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). – Herr talman! Så fort man inte delar åsikt med EU-ivrarna i detta hus ska man stämplas som extrem. Man har helt enkelt inte samma värde som ni andra här inne. Tyvärr är det ni som sitter nere på första raden som skulle behöva en intensivkurs i demokrati, och som tyvärr saknar lite uppfostran hemifrån. Ni sitter där och hånlar och skrattar i er uppblåsta grandiosa självbild av er själva.

Polen har blivit ett av era favoritmobbingoffer. Att respektera utfallet av ett demokratiskt val i ett demokratiskt land – det finns inte i era uppblåsta egon. Då ska ni istället uppfostra folket till att följa er syn på saker och ting.

Tillsättningen av domare i författningsdomstolen ser ni som något förfärligt. Jag vill då säga att vi har samma system i Sverige. Domarna i HD kallas justitieråd, är sexton till antalet och utses av regeringen. När inleder ni kritiken mot Sverige? När kommer ni att hota Sverige med sanktioner? Ni borde alla anmäla er till en grundkurs i demokrati.

(Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 162.8 i arbetsordningen.)

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE), fråga ("blått kort"). – Jag skulle bara vilja ställa en fråga till Lundgren. Ser du inga problem med utvecklingen i Polen, där regeringen hyllar en rasistisk och nationalistisk demonstration? Ser du inga problem med en regering som politiserar tillsättningen av domstolsväsendet? Det är nämligen det som skiljer sig, inte procedurerna i sig, de finns i olika länder. Ser du inga problem i utvecklingen av demokrati och rättsstat i Polen?

Peter Lundgren (EFDD), svar ("blått kort"). – Givetvis är det så att det finns problem – det finns det i alla länder. Vi har samma problem i Sverige, där vi utser högsta domarna och kallar dem för justitieråd. Vi har problem i Sverige – liksom Polen har problem i sitt land. Jag vägrar dock att acceptera att Bryssel och Strasbourg ska bli en övergripande myndighet som ska läxa upp länderna för att de inte delar den bild som ni har här inne. Det måste ändå finnas ett nationellt självstyre. Jag kommer aldrig att backa på den punkten. Jag kommer aldrig att sälja ut mitt land till EU-eliten!

President. – Colleagues, we are 15 minutes behind schedule so I want to remind you of this. If you agree, we could stop the blue cards, because some of them are not answered, others are rhetorical, so I think it would help if we stopped the blue cards. If you are in agreement with me in this respect, we will go that way.

Auke Zijlstra (ENF). – Polen heeft op democratische wijze een aantal wetwijzigingen geïntroduceerd en mijnheer - Timmermans, vicevoorzitter van de Europese Commissie, veroordeelt die wetwijzigingen en veroordeelt daarmee indirect dus ook de Poolse democratie. Ondertussen gooit Spanje een gekozen deelregering in de gevangenis. Mijnheer Timmermans steunt Spanje en steunt daarmee dus de Spaanse versie van een democratie. Mijnheer Timmermans zegt net dat het Europees Netwerk van Raden voor de rechtspraak de onafhankelijkheid van rechters het allerbelangrijkste vindt. Maar wat mijnheer Timmermans verzwijgt, is dat diezelfde organisatie ook zegt dat rechters in Spanje veel minder onafhankelijk zijn dan rechters in Polen. In Spanje worden rechters met regelmaat specifiek uitgezocht en onder druk gezet zodat de gewenste uitspraak volgt. Waarom vindt mijnheer Timmermans dat dan geen schending van Europese waarden?

Voorzitter, Polen is een functionerende democratie. Als de kiezers het toch weer anders willen, dan kunnen ze de volgende keer anders kiezen. Dat lijkt me toch een stuk beter dan dat mijnheer Timmermans hier iedereen de wet voorschrijft.

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wobec realnych problemów korupcji i naruszeń rządów prawa na Malcie Pan, Panie Komisarzu Timmermans, milczy i nie uruchamia procedury. Czy dlatego, że to rząd pańskiej rodziny politycznej socjalistów? Nie miał Pan takich zahamowań, żeby wytoczyć działa kłamliwych oskarżeń wobec Polski, przepisując słowo w słowo, *copy paste*, fałszywe zarzuty polskiej totalnej opozycji broniącej patologii minionych rządów i pozostałości po komunizmie. Nazywam to paradoksem Timmermansa: po pierwsze, milczeć w sprawie korupcji w łonie własnej socjalistycznej rodziny, po drugie, atakować tych, którzy mając demokratyczny mandat, naprawdę korupcję zwalczają, reformując chory, obciążony patologiami sądowy system w Polsce, niezreformowany od czasów komunizmu, niezlustrowany, obciążany powiązaniami z ośmiornicą warszawską, po trzecie, stawać po stronie tych, którzy chcą chronić i konserwować patologię polskiego systemu sądowego. To zaiste odwrócona hierarchia wartości. To głębokie niezrozumienie, że w Polsce dokonuje się sanacja chorego państwa i wymiaru sprawiedliwości. To dokończenie nieskończonej rewolucji Solidarności spóźnione o dwadzieścia pięć lat, a nie naruszenie zasad demokracji i rządów prawa. *(Oklaski)*

Frank Engel (PPE). – Mr President, I will hand the floor to Mr Elmar Brok if he prefers, but otherwise I will relay it – I find it exceptionally funny, Mr Saryusz-Wolski, that somebody should use the language that you have just used after having spent virtually your the whole political life serving the very system that you now condemn. It is a little strange, but oh well.

What I wanted to say is that Mr Timmermans really encapsulated it all when he started, when he said: 'I hope I can have a dialogue with the Polish authorities'. But we are not having a dialogue with the Polish authorities; we are not having a dialogue with the Polish Government either. It is again a bit like yesterday – poor Mr Matti Maasikas who has to stand up for something which I am sure he would rather not have to stand up for. The Polish Government is just as absent as their loudspeaker in this House, who gave out a seven-minute statement about essentially not much and then left with most of his colleagues and spent the rest of the morning with the Polish press – his friends, I suppose – outside of the plenary hall. This is the way in which this Polish authority, this Polish Government, this Polish majority, acts. Sophia in 't Veld was totally right when she explained that. It is apodictic; it is absolute; we are all wrong; we have no idea what is happening there; we get it all wrong and they are all right.

The problem in Poland is that they are trying to change the state and to model it so that generations to come will have no chance to change it back for the better. That is the thing that we have to be concerned about, because there are millions and millions of Poles – probably half of them, more than half of them – that would still make up a pretty big Member State who want a future in Europe; who want a democratic future; who want a future in a free society; who want a future in a society where they are allowed to think, to speak, to demonstrate and to be what you are – not what God supposedly wants you to be.

Those Poles we are standing up for, because they have chosen to be part of the European society, and that is why we care. They are not only sovereign Poles; they are also sovereign Europeans, and they want back their sovereignty over thought, over speech and over behaviour.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Schade, dass Herr Legutko nicht mehr hier ist. Ich hätte ihm gesagt, dass Europa kein Supermarkt ist, wo man sich die Waren einfach aussuchen kann.

Europa ist ein gemeinsames Haus, in das wir freiwillig eingezogen sind und wo für alle dieselben Regeln gelten. Das sind die Kopenhagen-Kriterien, ganz vorne Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Demokratie und dazu gehört auch die Unabhängigkeit der Gerichte, insbesondere des Verfassungsgerichts. Seit zwei Jahren gibt es diesbezüglich Probleme in unterschiedlichen Ausprägungen mit wechselseitigen Schuldzuweisungen.

Aber so kann es nicht weitergehen. Es geht darum, dass diese permanente Verfassungskrise gelöst wird. Alle unabhängigen Beobachter sind sich darin einig, wie etwa die Venedig-Kommission. Der europäischen Institutionen haben das Recht und die Verpflichtung, die polnische Regierung darauf hinzuweisen. Aus innenpolitischen Gründen versteift sich diese Regierung darauf, tun und lassen zu können, was sie will. Das steht im Widerspruch zu den Verträgen, und es ist positiv, dass die Kommission ihre Rolle als Hüterin der Verträge so ernst nimmt.

Wiederholte Aufforderungen zum Dialog wurden in den Wind geschlagen. Wir haben als gewählte Vertreterinnen und Vertreter der europäischen Bevölkerung die Verpflichtung, die Kommission dabei zu unterstützen und, wenn erforderlich, auch unmissverständliche Maßnahmen zu verlangen wie jetzt im konkreten Fall die Einleitung des Artikel-7-Verfahrens nach vorheriger Überprüfung der Sachlage im zuständigen Ausschuss. Wir tun das, weil wir Polen lieben.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Teisės viršenybės ir pagarbos demokratijai terminai įdomiai šiandien čia, Parlamente, skamba po Ispanijos siekių uždrausti referendumą Katalonijoje. Išraiškingai skamba ir Europos Sąjungos institucijų tyla dėl teisinio Barselonos politikų persekiojimo. Dar išraiškingiau šiandien skamba kaltinimai Lenkijos Respublikai, neva už demokratijos pažeidimus, už savo teismų sistemos pertvarką, už savo aiškią ir kategorišką poziciją pabėgėlių klausimų, už kitus savarankiškumą įtvirtinančius sprendimus. Principuose, kuriais remiasi Europos Komisija, pasakyta, kad visais atvejais paisoma vienodo požiūrio į valstybes nares. Jeigu Europos Sąjungos vadovai nuolat kartoja, kad Katalonijos klausimas yra Ispanijos vidaus reikalas, tai kodėl dabar nirstama dėl Lenkijos vyriausybės ar Parlamento sprendimų? Sakykite, kad tai jų vidaus reikalas ir nesikiškime. Pastangos pažaboti nacionalinę teisę, pažaboti nacionalinius Bendrijos valstybinių institucijų sprendimus yra ne kas kita, kaip valstybių savarankiškumo naikinimas.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, de quels crimes est accusée la Pologne dans son légitime gouvernement? Du crime de vérité: la Pologne refuse de se soumettre aux médias et à leur propagande mensongère organisée par l'oligarchie mondialiste et européiste. Du crime de justice: la Pologne refuse l'immigration massive imposée par l'Allemagne pour sa croissance économique, alors que les Polonais, eux, doivent s'expatrier pour trouver du travail. Du crime de souveraineté: la Pologne se refuse de laisser à des juges le pouvoir souverain du peuple, car la justice est faite au nom du peuple.

En somme, vous reprochez à la Pologne d'être la Pologne, de résister comme elle sait le faire à l'oppression du nouvel ordre européen, désordre pour nos peuples et nos nations. Vous lui reprochez de préserver son identité en s'opposant à votre religion mondialiste, destructrice du droit, de la justice, individualiste, relativiste, nihiliste, religion opposée au droit de Dieu et donc aux droits de l'homme.

La Pologne restera la Pologne. Elle a su résister à la barbarie nazie et au communisme, elle résistera au totalitarisme européen. Vive la Pologne!

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση στηρίζεται σε ευκαιριακές, αποσπασματικές, ανήθικες και εκτός πλαισίου αιτιάσεις. Επιχειρείται, από την πλευρά της Ένωσης, η παρέμβαση στα εσωτερικά μιας χώρας, με πρόσχημα τις κυβερνητικές απειλές εναντίον του κράτους δικαίου. Οι αρμοδιότητες που επιδιώκει η Επιτροπή να ασκήσει ανήκουν πρωτίστως στο Συμβούλιο και στα κράτη μέλη.

Αντί να επιβάλει μέσω επιλεκτικής ανάγνωσης των Συνθηκών την τιμωρία της Πολωνίας, την καλώ να στηρίξει τις κυβερνητικές αρχές να αποβάλουν τα όποια κομμουνιστικά βαρίδια του παρελθόντος και να τις αφήσει ανεπηρέαστες στην άσκηση των κυριαρχικών τους δικαιωμάτων. Η Ένωση διακήρυττε την εμπιστοσύνη και την ελπίδα μεταξύ ίσων, αλλά έχει καταλήξει να αυθαιρετεί με γνώμονα το συμφέρον συγκεκριμένων χωρών εις βάρος των υπόλοιπων.

Αυτό αποδεικνύεται και από την εγκαθίδρυση ενός μόνιμου πλέον μηχανισμού απόλυτου οικονομικού ελέγχου και επικυριαρχίας στη χώρα μου, την Ελλάδα, με τις ευλογίες της αριστερής κυβέρνησης. Η κυβέρνηση ενός ανεξάρτητου και κυρίαρχου έθνους πρέπει να είναι υπόλογη μόνο στους πολίτες της και, όσο τους υπηρετεί, οφείλει να μην αποδέχεται οποιαδήποτε εξωτερική παρέμβαση.

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, today I express all my support for, and friendship towards, the people of Poland – this great nation and strategic neighbour to us across the Baltic.

Poland was a respected partner in the EU but now its political clout is being tarnished. The new Government is busy justifying its unjustifiable breaching of the rule of law. The strength of our European family is the rule of law. It is about shared values and democracy, an independent judiciary, freedom of assembly and freedom to demonstrate, and women's rights. Poland, like all of us, embraced those values, and the family cannot be fully functioning if one of the Member States breaches the trust between us.

With our resolution, we are reaching out to Poland. We call on the Government to listen to the voice of its own people and to the independent European institutions, to engage in constructive dialogue, to reconsider its action, and to address the legitimate concerns raised by the European Commission and the Venice Commission. These concerns are based on hard legal facts, not politics. It is not Europe against Poland – it is Europe with Poland. We want to cooperate with the Government, and it is in their hands to avoid further action by the Commission. Turning their backs on this opportunity is leading Poland, together with populists and Eurosceptics, nowhere other than marginalisation, and it is creating tension.

We want Poland back as a key player in our European family, with the prominent role that the people of Poland deserve, a credible and active partner when it comes to resolving the challenges facing Europe. We need Poland in order to shape a better future for our children together.

(Applause)

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Es gibt die Redewendung „Aller guten Dinge sind drei“, und tatsächlich gibt es jetzt eine dritte Entschließung zu Polen. Ist also alles gut? Ganz im Gegenteil! Denn bis heute verweigert die polnische Regierung jeden direkten Dialog mit der Kommission, und insbesondere mit der Justizreform beschneidet sie die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz, einen Grundpfeiler für Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Hinzu kommen Beschränkungen der Zivilgesellschaft, des Versammlungsrechts, der Frauenrechte.

In aller Deutlichkeit: Die Polen sind immer wieder für demokratische Werte eingetreten – Solidarność, „my body, my rights“ und viele weitere Proteste –, und wir werden nicht hinnehmen, dass den Menschen in Polen Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit jetzt von der eigenen Regierung genommen werden. Deshalb legen wir weiter den Finger in die Wunde. Wir stehen an der Seite der polnischen Bürger!

Gerolf Annemans (ENF). – Hoge omes van de Europese Unie, bent u niet beschaamd dat u het Poolse volk hier op het matje roept? Dat trotse Europese volk heeft ons de weg naar de uitgang van het communisme getoond op een ogenblik dat u, mijnheer Timmermans, als goede socialist waarschijnlijk nog vond dat het imperium van de Sovjet-Unie en haar satellieten gerespecteerd moest worden. Dat trotse Poolse volk leert ons ook nu weer hoe je niet aan het handje van de Europese Unie moet lopen. Op hetzelfde ogenblik gaat het Spaanse koninkrijk op een brutale en middeleeuwse manier om met het Catalaanse volk, met methodes die doen denken aan de manier waarop de Spaanse Inquisitie in de 16e eeuw de Nederlanden, inclusief mijn Vlaanderenland, tegen hun wil onder Spaanse heerschappij wou houden. Bent u niet beschaamd, dames en heren? Ik ben een aanhanger van Willem van Oranje. In vredesnaam, hou op met die hypocrisie, schaam u en donder op.

President. – Two things: the Spanish Government is respecting its Constitution...

(Interjection from Mr Annemans: 'You are not in the debate, Mr President.')

... and secondly, I would ask you to use normal terms. Do not offend the speakers before you. That is what I wanted to say to you.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Mr President, this is a very heated debate, and it is sad and very disappointing to hear that some of our colleagues simply do not want to notice all the systematic problems that are destroying democracy in Poland. Mr Legutko left the debate – so much for dialogue. That is exactly what we are criticising: the lack of an open dialogue.

We are interested in the situation in Poland, we are worried – that is why we are holding a debate today. I have many friends in Poland and I stand here today for them. We are calling on the Polish Government to respect democracy and constitutional rights, to ensure the freedom of the media and to defend the independent judiciary. We will call for Article 7 of the EU Treaty to be triggered.

We will continue on our course for an open dialogue with the Polish Government. The EU is not à la carte, the government cannot just pick and choose. We are debating the rule of law and not rule by law. I sincerely hope that today we can send a strong message to our Polish friends and citizens: we want you in the EU, Poland has always been part of Europe and always will be.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałabym zaapelować z tego miejsca, z Parlamentu Europejskiego, do rządu Prawa i Sprawiedliwości: jesteście rządem, który w nadmiarze wypełnia obietnice wyborcze. W kampanii używaliście haseł „Polska w ruinie”. Polacy w 2015 roku, w okresie wyborów, dumni ze wspaniałego rozwoju kraju, nie rozumieli tych haseł. Dzisiaj wszystko jest jasne.

Droga, którą idzie rząd – zawłaszczanie prawa przez polityków, odbieranie wolności Polakom, odbieranie praw kobietom polskim, odbieranie powszechnych sądów obywatelom, niszczenie szkół, lekceważenie młodych lekarzy, wpuszczanie w najważniejszym dla Polaków dniu – Święcie Niepodległości – skrajnych nacjonalistów z różnych krajów z radykalnymi hasłami, nazywanie tej skrajnie nacjonalistycznej manifestacji przez członków rządu „pięknym widokiem, radosnym świętem” – to droga spełniająca obietnice doprowadzenia Polski do ruiny.

Nawet te niecałe 19 % uprawnionych w Polsce wyborców, głosując na PiS, nie głosowało za taką Polską. Nie gotujcie nam tej drogi dzisiaj! Nie lękajcie się zrezygnować z tej drogi. Mamy mądre społeczeństwo, w którym można odpowiedzialnie prowadzić mądrą politykę. Najwyższy czas to zrobić.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente; comisario Timmermans, cada vez que en este Parlamento Europeo discutimos sobre el Estado de Derecho en Polonia, se pone de manifiesto que este Parlamento Europeo no tiene ningún problema ni con Polonia, país muy querido, ni con los polacos.

Tiene un problema cuando la extrema derecha, fascista, supremacista blanca y cargada de discursos de odio y de discriminación, se manifiesta en Varsovia —lo haga en Varsovia o lo haga en cualquier parte de Europa—. Y tiene un problema cuando se atenta contra la independencia del poder judicial. Porque, si en España, quien rompe la ley, quien quiebra el Estado de Derecho responde penalmente es porque hay un poder judicial independiente, y lo que está sucediendo en Polonia es exactamente lo contrario, que se está atentando contra la independencia del poder judicial.

Y atenta contra los valores europeos y la integración europea quien no comprende que este Parlamento Europeo, cuando habla de Polonia, representa a los polacos. Cada uno de los parlamentarios europeos representamos a 500 millones de europeos. Y este Parlamento Europeo no es extraterrestre en Polonia: representa a esos millones de polacos que tienen derecho a confiar en sus instituciones, en el Estado de Derecho y en la prevalencia de la ley y de la Constitución, también protegiendo a los polacos en nombre del Derecho europeo.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, od pobjede predsjednika Duda i stranke Pravo i pravda na izborima u Poljskoj u europskim se institucijama pokušava stvoriti dojam da je ta država otišla u krivom smjeru, krši temeljna ljudska prava svojih stanovnika i samo što ne postane diktatura.

Realnost je naravno drugačija. Sva istraživanja pokazuju kako su Poljaci praktički jednako entuzijastični prema članstvu u Europskoj uniji kao i svih ovih godina, a stranka Pravo i pravda uživa podršku 45 – 50 % birača.

Iz toga proizlazi da je problem nešto sasvim drugo od onoga što nam se servira. Proeuropski poljski narod ima drukčiju viziju Unije od europskog *establishmenta*, a aktualna vlada uživa veliku podršku Poljaka jer tu viziju nastoji provesti u djelo.

Nastavimo li Poljacima docirati iz Bruxellesa, neka se nitko sutra ne čudi ako Poljska postane nova Ujedinjena Kraljevina. Volju građana možete zanemarivati, a njihove ideje ili strahove odbacivati, samo toliko dugo dok vam oni to dozvole.

Diane James (NI). – Mr President, a key component of European Union membership is supposedly shared sovereignty. At no point, to my knowledge, have Member State citizens been told that the European Union is now supreme, that Member State governments are subservient and that European Union dictatorship is now in place.

This morning a veiled and bullying threat to invoke Article 7, to punish Poland, was made. I would welcome this as full and final proof that European Union membership renders democratic national general elections and associated pledges, promises and outcomes by the winning party, absolutely meaningless. I will voice one warning: be careful what you wish for when you invoke Article 7.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Frans Timmermans, Vice-voorzitter van de Commissie. – Sta mij toe eerst een woordje in mijn moedertaal te zeggen, en wel rechtstreeks tegen mijnheer Annemans. Dat hij mij persoonlijk aanvalt, vind ik geen enkel probleem. Dat ben ik gewend, dat raakt mij niet. Maar dat hij de beweging waaruit ik voortkom aanvalt en de sociaaldemocratie beschuldigt van collaboratie met totalitaire regimes, kan ik niet laten voorbijgaan. Sociaaldemocraten waren de eerste slachtoffers van de bolsjewieken. Sociaaldemocraten waren de eerste slachtoffers van de fascistten. Sociaaldemocraten waren de eerste slachtoffers van de nazi's. Ze hebben zich altijd verzet tegen totalitaire regimes. Ik laat dat dus niet passeren. Zeker niet uit de mond van iemand die misschien eens in de geschiedenis van zijn eigen beweging kan duiken voordat hij de geschiedenis van andere politieke bewegingen durft aan te kaarten.

Mr President, we are talking today about the rule of law in Poland. If you want to play football you abide by the rules of the game and you accept the fact that there is a referee that makes sure that those playing the game abide by the rules. If you join the European Union, you do this as a sovereign decision. You sign and ratify a treaty. Once you have signed and ratified a treaty, the rules of that treaty apply to you. Then if you simply say “I am a sovereign nation, I don't care about the rules”, it is like saying: “I want to play football but I will determine for myself which rules I will apply and which rules I will not apply”. Then you cannot play football!

The European Union cannot function if Member States start saying “We pick and choose which rules we have adhered to, are applicable to us, yes or no”. I think this should be the starting point of our debate. Concretely, in Article 2 of the Treaty, all Member States have said very clearly that they will respect the rule of law. One of the fundamental elements of the rule of law is that you accept and maintain a separation of powers. An independent judiciary is essential in the rule of law. You cannot pick and choose and use the argument that you have the majority to simply ignore the law. You can use that majority to change the law. You can use a majority to change the Constitution if you have one, but you cannot simply say “I ignore it because I have a majority”. You cannot use democracy against the rule of law and this is the argument that is often used in this debate.

Just imagine, I would say to those of the European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR) who still remained in the room, just imagine the shoe were on the other foot, and in this Parliament a majority would say, “Hey, we have the majority, we don't care about the Rules of Procedure of Parliament, we have the majority, we dictate what happens!” In what position would you then be? The rights you now claim for yourself as a majority might not be granted to you once you no longer are a majority. This is a fundamental problem for Europe because, as some of you have said, once you have destroyed the independence of the judiciary, even if you lose an election, the new powers that be will have no other option but to try and revert it and then it becomes a perpetual machine of not respecting the rule of law. This will never stay limited to one Member State. If it happens in one Member State it affects the Union as a whole, and this should never be disregarded.

Had Mr Legutko still been here I would have said to him: you took seven minutes to say nothing, not one word, about the points I made about the independence of the judiciary. And I would also have said to him, after his vile attack on Mr Lewandowski, I would suggest to Mr Lewandowski to wear this as a badge of honour. Why? Because in the last two years, I have learned that if you have no arguments, if you have nothing to say, if you don't know how to react, you start with personal attacks. This is also my experience in the last two years. So every personal attack on me is proof that they have no arguments, that they don't know what to say and that they don't have a point at all.

Finally, you know the old joke about the “ghost rider” [driving the wrong way on the motorway]. Somebody is sitting in his car listening to the radio, and on the radio the announcer says “Be careful, on the A2 there is a ghost rider driving the other way” and the person sitting in the car says: “One? I see hundreds!”

This is how I would react to Mr Legutko. It is not the European Commission only. It is not the European Parliament only. It is organisations of European judges, it is the Venice Commission, it is the United Nations. Are all these people wrong? Are all these people wrong? Is the only one who is right the PiS government in this? They will say yes! But if you want a real dialogue, at least have the courtesy to go into the points that are made.

And a final remark about what Guy Verhofstadt and others said about last Sunday. There is a very thin line between proud patriotism and terrible nationalism. It is a very thin line. I admire proud patriotism but I also believe that all those who believe in proud patriotism have a responsibility not to let that slide into terrible nationalism, because if we fall into the trap of nationalism we bring back to life the most terrible parts of European history, and some of this was seen on the streets of Warsaw last Sunday. I do applaud the fact that President Duda clearly said that he distances himself from the expressions of extremism, of anti-Semitism, and other expressions.

(Applause)

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me assure you once again that the Estonian Presidency, and the Council as a whole, attach great importance to upholding the rule of law and fundamental values within the EU. This debate of today has once again reminded us that the EU is better at solving problems between its Members than within the Members. That is what the EU was created for.

It is also worth recalling that the effectiveness of the EU rests on the delicate balance between respecting the sovereignty of its nation states and pooling the sovereignty to make those states stronger together. Nevertheless, it is clear that all Members have to comply with fundamental freedoms, democratic standards and the rule of law. I am not in a position to state more at this stage. I speak as the Presidency of the Council and therefore in the name of all its Members. The Council will, however, continue to follow this issue very closely.

Now a more personal remark: I have heard some comparisons between Moscow and Brussels during this debate. Having lived myself – having had to live myself – in the Soviet Union, I find these comparisons utterly inappropriate.

(Applause)

Those who make these comparisons do not know either Brussels or Moscow, or do not want to know, or do not want to remember.

(Applause)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Presidente. – Comunico di aver ricevuto due proposte di risoluzione, conformemente all'articolo 123, paragrafo 2, del regolamento.

La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà mercoledì 15 novembre 2017.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR), na piśmie. – Nie było mnie na sali obrad podczas kolejnej debaty o moim kraju. Nie chciałam uczestniczyć w pozbawionym merytorycznych podstaw spektaklu nienawiści. Wypowiedź G.Verhofstadta tylko potwierdziła słuszność tej decyzji. W tym czasie postanowiłam złożyć kwiaty w KL Natzweiler, niemieckim obozie koncentracyjnym założonym w pobliżu Strasburga na terenie okupowanej Francji. Przez obóz oraz rozrzucone w okolicy podobozы przeszło ponad 50 tys. więźniów, ponad 22 tys. zginęło. Wśród więźniów wywodzących się z 30 narodów największą grupę stanowili Polacy, w tym pochodzenia żydowskiego (13 606 więźniów). Muzeum już po wojnie zostało spalone przez neonazistów. Chociaż podczas II wojny światowej we Francji funkcjonował kolaboracyjny rząd w Vichy, nikt nie próbuje Francuzom przypisywać udziału w Holokauście, jak to z łatwością czyni się wobec Polski. Takie „przypadkowe” pomyłki we współczesnym świecie po prostu się nie zdarzają. Składam hołd ofiarom obozu koncentracyjnego KL Natzweiler, który stanowił jedno z tysięcy ogniw w zaplanowanym i konsekwentnie realizowanym przez hitlerowskie Niemcy przemyśle zagłady. Informacje o przeprowadzanych tutaj eksperymentach medycznych muszą wstrząsnąć każdym wrażliwym człowiekiem. Polacy byli ofiarami hitlerowskich Niemiec, walczyli z niemiecką i sowiecką okupacją. Nigdy nie utworzyli kolaboracyjnego rządu. Polskie państwo podziemne skazywało na śmierć każdego, kto wydawał Żyda Niemcom. Aluzyjne wiązanie zagłady w Auschwitz z Polską w wypowiedzi Verhovstadta uważam za nikczemne.

Adam Gierek (S&D), na piśmie. – Funkcjonowanie praworządności w Polsce nie sprowadza się wyłącznie do kwestii mechanizmów funkcjonowania prawa w ostatnich 2 latach, do czego odnosi się KE; jest to wewnętrzna problematyka instytucji prawnych i dopiero praktyka może wykazać, czy nastąpiło łamanie praw konwencyjnych i co należy w tych mechanizmach naprawić. Zachodzi istotne pytanie: czy w poprzednich rozwiązaniach prawnych nie miało miejsca łamanie europejskiej konwencji praw człowieka? Odpowiadam: tak – miało. A oto przykłady: 1) polskie prawo nie gwarantuje minimalnego standardu ochrony jednostkom eksmitowanym z zajmowanych przez nie nieruchomości. Sprzedawanie lokali wraz z lokatorami w Polsce prowadzi do realnego łamania podstawowych praw człowieka; 2) polskie prawo toleruje pozbawianie obywateli RP praw nabytych dotyczących uprawnień emerytalnych, co ostatnio dotyczy funkcjonariuszy służb mundurowych, głównie tych, którzy zakończyli służbę w PRL. Dotyczy to również tych ludzi na rentach inwalidzkich. Stosuje się wobec nich zasadę odpowiedzialności zbiorowej za tzw. „komunę”, a więc za to, że żyli w tych czasach i uczciwie służyli ówczesnemu państwu; 3) od lat polski kodeks karny wykonawczy w sprawie więźniów nie gwarantuje im humanitarnych powierzchni odbywania kary nie mniejszej niż 4 m², gdyż często wynosi ona 2 m². Poprę rezolucję, pod warunkiem, że zawarta w niej groźba nałożenia na Polskę sankcji ekonomicznych zostanie przez PE odrzucona.

Ana Gomes (S&D), in writing. – It is because we love and admire Poland and the Polish people that we must react to the ongoing attack by the Kaczyński/Szydło Government of Poland against the independence of the judiciary, including the Supreme Court. Because not respecting the independence of the judiciary amounts to abuse of power and violation of the rule of the law, and we are already seeing many other grave implications: in the muzzling of the media, in the intimidation of political opponents, in the obscurantist gender discrimination against Polish women, etc. To the point that Piotr, a Polish Jan Palach, recently felt he had to replicate in Warsaw the desperate self-immolation of Prague, 1969, under totalitarian occupation. Ominously, alarmingly, 60 000 Nazis marched in Warsaw last weekend and the Minister of the Interior of the Kaczyński/Szydło Government lauded them and echoed their racist, white supremacist slogans. I urge Vice-President Timmermans and the Commission: Do not delay triggering action under Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union against this Polish Government. Before these Nazi fascists further disgrace Poland! And the European Union!

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – Parlament Europejski chce zastosować wobec Polski dyscyplinujący artykuł 7 - Traktatu o Unii Europejskiej. Wytykanie przez Fransa Timmermansa łamania praworządności w Polsce spotyka się z moim ostrym sprzeciwem. To antypolska, europejska kampania mająca na celu zdestabilizowanie i nękanie rządu Prawa i Sprawiedliwości, który nie wpisuje się w nurt lewicowo-liberalny. Z tego właśnie powodu jesteśmy prześladowani. Jest to pewna forma dyktatury europejskiej. Sytuacja, w której Komisja Europejska gotowa jest oczekiwać od rządu suwerennego państwa lekceważenia woli wyborców i podporządkowania się jej oczekiwaniom, prowadzi do wypaczania zasad demokracji. Tu nie chodzi tak naprawdę o Polskę i stan polskiej demokracji, a jedynie o wsparcie polskiej opozycji, która w skandaliczny sposób szkaluje wizerunek Polski i Polaków. Nie mogę się z tym zgodzić i definitywnie będę głosować przeciwko tej rezolucji.

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), in writing. – In his opening remarks in this debate on the situation in Poland, Commission Vice-President Timmermans said that ‘an issue pertaining to the rule of law never affects only the country concerned: it affects the whole construction of the European Union.’ The debate has also referred to the requirement that independence of justice systems and courts must be maintained. Frequently, in our debates, we demand that the fundamental rights of people be respected by governments. Why is it that the Commission and the Council have not expressed similar concerns over the situation in Catalonia? It is outrageous that the government of a Member State can inflict violence upon peaceful citizens on their way to cast a vote. It is unacceptable that the Spanish Government can sack the legitimately elected government of Catalonia, and utterly incredible that elected Catalan ministers are sent to prison for exercising the democratic mandate given to them by voters in Catalonia. Surely this is a situation which demands a response from the leadership of the EU, at the very least offering to facilitate dialogue and a return to democratic order, and seeking guarantees that voters in Catalonia will be allowed to democratically determine their own constitutional future.

Benedek Jávor (Verts/ALE), írásban. – Egyre növekszik azon országok száma, amelyek kapcsán vitát kell folytatunk a jogállamiságról. Nagyjából hasonlóak azok a tünetek, amelyek felmerülnek: a kormányzatok folyamatosan megsértik a hatalmi ágak szétválasztásának elvét, módszeresen bontják le a hatalom korlátait, a fékeket és ellensúlyokat. Az információs társadalomban hatalom egyik legfontosabb és megkerülhetetlen ellensúlyát a sajtószabadságot és a média-pluralizmust veszélyeztetik. A sajtó szabadsága egyre több EU tagországban is veszélyeztetett: Máltán megölik az ország legelismertebb oknyomozó újságíróját, mert túl közel került olyan kínos ügyekhez, mint például az azeri megvesztegetési botrány.

Magyarországon és Lengyelországban kormányzatilag monopolizálják a médiapiacot, szimpla propaganda-eszközzé degradálva a sajtó meghatározó részét. Az orosz propaganda és hamis hírek szélteben-hosszában terjednek Európában, választásokat, népszavazásokat befolyásolva. Az Európai Bizottság eközben széttárja a kezét, hogy bocsánat, ez tagállami hatáskör. De szabad sajtó nélkül nem lesznek demokratikus tagállamok, azok nélkül pedig nem lesz sem demokratikus, sem másmilyen Európai Unió. Nem lehet megúszni, hogy az EU aktívan kivegye a részét a független média és a tényfeltárás megóvásából és támogatásából.

A Bizottságnak igenis feladatává kell tenni részben az újságírók jogainak megvédését, meg kell védenie a médiapluralizmust: jogi eszközökkel, pénzügyi forrásokkal egyaránt. A 2020-as hosszútávú költségvetésben meg kell találni a módját a médiapluralizmus hosszútávú és széleskörű támogatásának, de addig is a rendelkezésre álló keretek között sürgős intézkedésekre van szükség.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Η Συνθήκη της ΕΕ δεν θα πρέπει να χρησιμοποιείται από την Επιτροπή και από διάφορες πολιτικές δυνάμεις του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου ως μέσο για την παρέμβαση στα εσωτερικά ενός κράτους μέλους, ιδίως μάλιστα όταν οι λαοί, στη βάση της αρχής της λαϊκής κυριαρχίας, έχουν κάνει τις δικές τους επιλογές αναδεικνύοντας κυβερνητικές πλειοψηφίες οι οποίες πρέπει να εφαρμόζουν το πρόγραμμά τους. Ταυτόχρονα, η ΕΕ οφείλει να σέβεται τη συνταγματική δομή και τις παραδόσεις των κρατών μελών. Επιπλέον όμως, πρέπει να σημειωθεί ότι και οι κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών οφείλουν να σέβονται τη δημοκρατία, το κράτος δικαίου, τον Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της ΕΕ, καθώς επίσης και το κοινοτικό κεκτημένο.

Péter Niedermüller (S&D), írásban. – A jogállamiság az Európai Unió legfontosabb alapelve. Ha veszélybe kerül a jogállamiság, akkor veszélybe kerül a demokrácia, veszélybe kerülnek az emberi jogok is. A jogállamiság biztosítja az igazságszolgáltatás függetlenségét, a média, a véleménynyilvánítás szabadságát. Ma mindez veszélyben van Lengyelországban, és Magyarországon is.

Nem kerülhetjük meg a kérdést, hogy ebben a helyzetben mit kell tennie az Európai Parlamentnek, az Európai Uniónak. Mindenekelőtt tárgyalni kell, s meg kell próbálni rábírnai az illetékes kormányokat, hogy térjenek vissza Európába. Ha azonban ez nem vezet eredményre, akkor nem riadhatunk vissza határozottabb, keményebb intézkedésektől sem. Hogy mi vár Európára, ha nem leszünk következetesek, azt jól mutatják a múlt heti, varsói események. Ahol 60.000 újnáci vonult fel üvöltözve, „fehér Európát”, „tisztá vért” követelve. Az európai történelem legsötétebb hagyományai éledtek fel, s keltettek félelmet sok millió európai polgárban. Szégyellem magam, hogy ezen az eseményen magyar politikusok is részt vettek. És ezt a gyalázatos eseményt a lengyel kormány „hazafias aktusnak” nevezte. De pontosan ezen az úton válik elfogadottá a bezárkózó, kirekesztő újnáci politika. Nekünk, az Európai Parlamentben alapvető politikai és morális kötelességünk, hogy a leghatározottabban elítéljük az ilyen eseményeket, és a leghatározottabban szembe szálljunk azokkal a kormányokkal, amelyek az ilyen történéseket is felhasználva fordulnak szembe Európával.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D), par écrit. – Depuis son arrivée au pouvoir, le parti conservateur s'attelle à démanteler tous les contre-pouvoirs nécessaires à la démocratie. Les pouvoirs du gouvernement ont été considérablement élargis avec la réforme du système judiciaire qui octroie à l'exécutif un pouvoir discrétionnaire sur les juges et le tribunal constitutionnel. Le gouvernement s'attaque aussi aux libertés individuelles, à la liberté des médias et à la société civile trop critique. Le ministère de la justice a notamment refusé des fonds à des organisations pour le droit des femmes, tout en finançant des mouvements religieux. Je suis très préoccupée par les atteintes aux droits sexuels et reproductifs des femmes alors que le gouvernement tente de durcir voire d'interdire totalement l'avortement.

Il y a plus d'un an, nous avons tous salué la décision de la Commission d'engager, pour la première fois depuis sa création, le cadre européen pour l'État de droit. Mais cela n'a eu aucun effet notoire et l'Union ne fait que constater la gravité de la situation.

Le Parlement prend aujourd'hui ses responsabilités avec cette résolution. Nous appelons la commission des libertés civiles à préparer un rapport pour l'activation de l'article 7.1, menant à des sanctions. Ce régime illibéral, au cœur de l'Union, est intolérable.

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE), in writing. – In his opening remarks in this debate on the situation in Poland, Commission Vice-President Timmermans said that 'an issue pertaining to the rule of law never affects only the country concerned: it affects the whole construction of the European Union.' The debate has also referred to the requirement that independence of justice systems and courts must be maintained. Frequently, in our debates, we demand that the fundamental rights of people be respected by governments. Why is it that the Commission and the Council have not expressed similar concerns over the situation in Catalonia? It is outrageous that the government of a Member State can inflict violence upon peaceful citizens on their way to cast a vote. It is unacceptable that the Spanish Government can sack the legitimately elected government of Catalonia, and utterly incredible that elected Catalan ministers are sent to prison for exercising the democratic mandate given to them by voters in Catalonia. Surely this is a situation which demands a response from the leadership of the EU, at the very least offering to facilitate dialogue and a return to democratic order, and seeking guarantees that voters in Catalonia will be allowed to democratically determine their own constitutional future.

Ivan Štefanec (PPE), písomne. – Každá vláda členského štátu Európskej únie musí rešpektovať a chrániť rozdelenie moci, ktoré je charakteristické pre demokratické krajiny. Každý zásah do nezávislosti súdnej moci ohrozuje právny štát a istotu občanov a firiem v spravodlivý proces. Rovnako aj sloboda médií a vylúčenie ich politického ovplyvňovania je základným kameňom demokratického zriadenia. So znepokojením sledujem, ako sa tieto piliere v Poľsku postupne rúcajú. Na druhej strane však existujú oblasti, do ktorých nesmú európske inštitúcie zasahovať. Medzi ne patrí aj oblasť kultúrnej a rodinnej politiky. Keďže predložený text obsahoval pre mňa neprijateľné zásahy do týchto oblastí, nemohol som ho podporiť.

Kristina Winberg (EFDD), skriftlig. – Situationen i Polen är väldigt komplex och EU har tagit en för tydlig ställning för en tolkning av situationen. Naturligtvis kan hot och brott mot de mänskliga rättigheterna inte accepteras, dock har EU i detta glömt Polens historia med ett totalitärt förtryck från kommunismen. En del av de åtgärder som Polen genomfört är ett sätt att bearbeta denna mörka del av Polens historia och säkerställa ett demokratiskt styrelseskick. Det är mycket möjligt att allt som gjorts i Polen inte står i linje med de värderingar som EU tagit fram och nu nyttjar för att motivera en rad åtgärder mot Polen. Dock rättfärdigar detta inte EU att kritisera och bestraffa Polen för beslut som fattats i enlighet med det demokratiska system som Polen har; detta är för tidigt och utgör ett alldeles för grovt övertramp av Polens självbestämmande som nation. Om något ska ske i form av en intervention på den internationella arenan angående Polen så är det enskilda stater genom organisationer som OSSE och FN som kan och ska driva dessa frågor.

och frågor av liknande karaktär, inte EU. Jag tror inte på överstatlighet, och detta är tyvärr kanske det bästa exemplet på ett EU som gått för långt.

8. Winter plan for asylum seekers (debate)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sul piano invernale per i richiedenti asilo.

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, last winter we all saw the press reports about the difficult conditions and the vulnerable situation of thousands of refugees and migrants facing severe weather conditions in European reception centres. We cannot allow this situation to happen again. We have to make full use of all resources and instruments that are at our disposal.

According to the data supplied by the Greek authorities more than 15 000 migrants are present on the Greek islands as we speak. The hotspots are overcrowded, and living conditions could become very difficult due to winter conditions. Furthermore, there are still thousands of refugees and migrants stranded in the Western Balkan countries that may face a difficult situation if the weather conditions worsen.

No single country is able to handle this kind of situation alone. Efforts should be made not only by the most affected countries, but also by all other countries in order to support them. The Commission is the EU institution best placed to coordinate and help in such situations. The Commissioner will brief you on the current plans to mitigate the situation, as well as on other forms of support that can be provided to the most affected countries or planned ahead as contingency measures.

Funding and concrete plans alone are, however, not sufficient to help us tackle this difficult situation. Lasting stabilisation of the situation on the eastern Mediterranean route will be key to improving the situation of these refugees and migrants. We need to further implement the EU-Turkey statement. Continued support for countries along the Western Balkans route is also key. In addition, we will pursue all legislative proposals on the reform of the common European asylum system, building on the work carried out so far. We need to gradually put in place a proper and sustainable asylum and migration policy.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the situation of refugees and migrants facing potentially harsh winter conditions has always been a key concern for our Commission. Our clear priority is to provide all Member States and our neighbours with support in their task and efforts to protect the refugees and migrants during the winter season.

We all know that this is not a new issue, and the Commission has been proactive in assisting and supporting the authorities on the front line throughout all previous winters. But our collective preparedness has to be structured because – yes – winter comes every year and nobody knows or can predict how heavy it may become. We all know this is a demanding exercise for national authorities, notably in those countries which host a large number of migrants.

Looking first at the situation in Greece, it is indispensable to recall the enormously positive and stabilising effect brought about by the activation of the EU-Turkey Statement in March 2016. Since the very beginning of the crisis, the European Union has made available around EUR 1.3 billion in support to Greece for tackling its migration and refugee challenges, making Greece the largest beneficiary of EU home affairs funds, as well as the exclusive beneficiary of the new EU emergency support instrument.

This EU funding enabled the upgrading of the hotspots and ensured the operation of the open accommodation site of Kara Tepe on the island of Lesbos. Necessary services such as washing, cleaning, catering and food provision, housing, transportation, legal aid, medical services and educational activities are not a luxury. They are a must. They are essential for the dignified treatment all migrants must enjoy.

Without EU financial support directly to the Greek authorities or via implementing partners such as the UNHCR and the IOM, many refugees and migrants would have been deprived of their fundamental human rights. Last year, the Commission also funded the purchase and installation of prefabricated houses and heating devices. This has also significantly contributed to the overall improvement of the reception conditions on the islands.

But today we are again facing a situation of severe overcrowding on most of the islands. Yes, the situation has become very difficult. This is due to a combination of factors: the recent increase in arrivals on the Greek islands since the early summer of 2017 — even though limited — together with the still insufficient and not always adequate reception capacity and the still limited returns to Turkey.

We cannot have a repetition of last year. The shocking images from last year must not return. Effective solutions must immediately be found. I have personally just come back from Greece, where I had constructive discussions with the Greek authorities. My colleague in charge of humanitarian aid, Commissioner Stylianides, has also been in close and regular contact with the Greek side. Solutions have been identified and we will continue to assist Greece in addressing the situation, notably on the islands of Lesbos, Chios and Samos.

This is why, in order to tackle the situation on the islands effectively, the Commission has also taken concrete steps to expand the scope of the rental scheme funded by the Emergency Support Instrument. By the end of the year, the rental scheme will reach up to 2000 places, adding thereby up to an additional 900 places to the 1 122 places already available on the islands.

To do this, the full engagement and cooperation of the local authorities is essential. EU funding was mobilised during the summer under the Greek AMIF National Programme specifically to support winterisation works in the hotspots on the islands, but there are winter-related works which still need to be completed.

More precisely, electricity grids in hotspots should be upgraded, all housing units should be connected to electricity and further heating appliances should be provided for those housing units that are not equipped for winter conditions. Additional prefabricated units should be transferred from the mainland where possible. The Commission has also been calling for the creation of appropriate reception facilities, including closed facilities, on the islands.

Let me add at this point that the cooperation of all actors, at all levels and in particular with local authorities, is key. They are the ones who are most closely confronted with the dire situation on the ground. They all have to work together and support each other in the efforts to exit the crisis mode and move towards sustainable migration management. Only if everyone does their part and all parts of a comprehensive strategy are fulfilled will the situation improve.

The continuous, full implementation of the EU-Turkey Statement is key for the situation on the islands to improve. Again, let me repeat that continuous support and timely delivery from all partners — the national authorities, the Commission, EU agencies, the UNHCR, the IOM and other implementing partners on the ground — is essential. It is equally key that the Greek authorities continue to invest in swift asylum and return procedures, which contribute to further improving the situation on the islands.

The emergency support instrument is providing accommodation in rental apartments all over Greece, not just on the islands, and we are ready to finance up to 30 000 places. As of 7 November, 15 458 refugees are already living in rental apartments, whilst the Greek Government is in the process of organising more transfers from the reception centres.

Furthermore, all 21 long-term Commission-funded reception centres in mainland Greece are winterised, with the Greek Government having undertaken to close substandard temporary reception centres before the end of the year. I would like to emphasise that our clear objective is to ensure that most people on the mainland are living in rental accommodation. The Commission is also ready to fund additional places should such needs be confirmed.

But our joint efforts on this matter are not just about Greece. We, as Europe, as a continent, have to remain prepared. We are closely following the situation in all Member States, in particular the front-line Member States, including Italy and Bulgaria, where there seem to be no imminent challenges concerning refugees and migrants for the winter.

The preparation of the authorities and funds we have provided since last year have yielded clear results. For example, in Bulgaria, the International Organisation for Migration has implemented an action for the purchase and distribution of winter clothing kits and shoes to migrants in all reception centres in Bulgaria. According to information from Bulgaria, these kits have already been available since October.

Regarding Italy, no specific winterisation needs have been identified, but progress is being made in swiftly mobilising EUR 35 million of emergency assistance to support Italy in further catering for the needs of those arriving in the country and improving the efficiency of procedures. Work is also under way on the possible mobilisation of up to a further EUR 100 million to assist in meeting needs on the ground. Any emerging winterisation needs could then be supported in this framework.

Let me now turn to Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The European Union has been using all possible tools to help cope with the refugee crisis in both countries and is providing significant financial and technical support. Last winter, the Western Balkans faced considerable difficulties due to cold weather and heavy snowfall, especially in Serbia. We all recall the images from last year.

Expanding reception capacities and ensuring that existing centres are adequate for the upcoming winter has been one of our priorities, and we are working closely with the Serbian authorities to this end. A special measure adopted in March 2017 with a budget of EUR 23.5 million aims, amongst other things, to cover accommodation costs; both running costs and refurbishment.

Under the EU Trust Fund, an action of EUR 21 million was approved in June in response to the Syrian crisis. It includes a EUR 16 million direct grant for Serbia also covering costs related to the running of centres, including staff and utilities, education and health care. Signing off on this by the end of this year is a priority.

Until then, humanitarian aid has allowed us to support the provision of food and non-food items, as well as protection to refugees and migrants in formal education and transport to schools. The more than EUR 83 million allocated to Serbia overall, both through humanitarian aid and pre-accession assistance, makes European Union is the largest donor to Serbia. In total, more than EUR 118 million has been allocated to Serbia in past and planned EU financial and technical support in the field of border migration and asylum management.

For instance, IPA funding for the current deployment of 50 guest officers from EU Member States has been extended until the European Border and Coast Guard Agency can deploy teams with executive powers. Negotiations to allow for such deployment are ongoing both with Serbia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Since the crisis broke out in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Commission has allocated EUR 19 million specifically to help that country cope with the refugee crisis. This is part of over EUR 50 million allocated in past and planned EU financial and technical support for the country in the field of borders, migration and asylum management. We will consider additional funds as needs arise. More generally, the European Union is looking into providing additional support based on the needs agreed with our partner countries.

We are all sensitive to this issue. It is, above all, a matter of our humanitarian duty. I look forward to hearing your views.

Ελισάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυονίδη, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PPE. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, επί τέσσερις μήνες παρουσιάζονται αυξημένες ροές προσφύγων και μεταναστών από τα παράλια της Τουρκίας στα νησιά του Βορειοανατολικού Αιγαίου. Τον Σεπτέμβριο είχαμε 6.000 νέες αφίξεις και περίπου ίδιο αριθμό τον Οκτώβριο, δηλαδή μέσα σε δύο μήνες περισσότεροι από 10.000 ξένοι ήρθαν στην Ελλάδα. Το πρώτο δεκαήμερο του Νοεμβρίου είχαμε ήδη 1.603 νέες αφίξεις. Αντιλαμβάνεστε ότι καθημερινά εκατοντάδες άνθρωποι προστίθενται στους ήδη υπάρχοντες, ενώ η χώρα αδυνατεί πλέον να τους παρέχει περιθαλψη και συνθήκες αξιοπρεπούς διαβίωσης.

Στη Λέσβο, που αριθμεί 32.000 κατοίκους, βρίσκονται 8.000 αλλοδαποί, ενώ οι υποδομές επαρκούν μόνο για 2.000. Παράλληλα, 1.500 άνθρωποι μένουν σε σκηνές, με κίνδυνο για τη ζωή τους όταν οι καιρικές συνθήκες αλλάξουν. Ανάλογη κατάσταση παρατηρείται στη Χίο και τη Σάμο.

Γνωρίζετε ότι τα προγράμματα μετεγκατάστασης έληξαν στις 26 Σεπτεμβρίου, με συνέπεια να είναι αδύνατη η μετακίνηση νέων προσφύγων από τη χώρα προς άλλα κράτη μέλη. Παράλληλα, η επαναδιαπραγμάτευση του κανονισμού του Δουβλίνου, που προσβλέπει σε μόνιμο μηχανισμό μετεγκατάστασης, προσκρούει στις χώρες που αρνούνται την αναλογική κατανομή προσφύγων σύμφωνα με την αρχή της αλληλεγγύης. Ως εκ τούτου, είναι άγνωστος ο χρόνος υιοθέτησης του νέου κανονισμού.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, μην ξεχνάτε ότι η χώρα μου, η Ελλάδα, βρίσκεται σε πρόγραμμα και έχει τεράστια οικονομικά προβλήματα με αύξηση της φτώχειας, αλλά παράλληλα, παρά ταύτα, έχει καταβάλει υπεράνθρωπες προσπάθειες να διαχειριστεί το μεταναστευτικό πρόβλημα ικανοποιητικά μέχρι τώρα. Σας περιγράφω όμως μια κατάσταση που είναι σήμερα στα όρια της ανθρωπιστικής κρίσης. Κάνω έκκληση στην Επιτροπή να εκπονήσει άμεσα, εδώ και τώρα, έκτακτο σχέδιο αποσυμφόρησης των νησιών, διαφορετικά κινδυνεύουμε να βρεθούμε προ έκρυθμων καταστάσεων που θα είναι δύσκολο να αντιμετωπίσουμε.

Tanja Fajon, v imenu skupine S&D. – Zima je pred vrati. Na grških otokih so razmere z begunci in migranti nevzdržne. Dobro milijardo evrov smo namenili Grčiji, zakaj begunci, migranti še vedno nimajo dostojnih pogojev za bivanje? Na otokih ni sprejemnih centrov, primernih, postopki registracije so počasni. Ljudje so tam dejansko ujeti. Naslednji meseci so lahko zato za številke usodni, še posebej za najbolj ranljive, ženske in otroke.

Grčijo, Komisijo in evropske vlade zato pozivam, naj ukrepajo skupaj s številnimi humanitarnimi in človekoljubnimi organizacijami, ki dobesedno rešujejo življenja na otokih. Države članice morajo prenehati z vračanjem migrantov na grške otoke. Ljudi z otokov je treba nemudoma preseliti na celino. Ta dogovor s Turčijo v resnici ne deluje v korist nikogar. Ob zaprtju zahodno-balkanske poti je narasla organizirana trgovina z ljudmi, kriminalci služijo denar na račun človeških usod. Še več, pet držav, vključno Avstrija in Nemčija, je vnovič zahtevalo podaljšanje nadzora na notranjih mejah brez argumentov in to ni vračanje k Schengenu, kot ste napovedali, spoštovani komisar, ampak še večji odmik od svobode gibanja na evropskih tleh.

Prenova azilnega sistema je na mrtvi točki. In dokler bomo samo tu razumeli razsežnosti migracijskih in begunskih tokov, doma pa bodo voditelji delali drugače, lahko pozabimo na učinkovito upravljanje z migracijami v Evropi.

Νότης Μαριάς, Εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ελλάδα δέχεται το τελευταίο τρίμηνο αυξημένες μεταναστευτικές ροές. Τα νησιά του Αιγαίου δεν αντέχουν άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες, εφόσον εκεί έχουν πλέον εγκλωβιστεί πάνω από 15.000 άτομα. Και όλα αυτά συμβαίνουν ενώ από τέλη Σεπτεμβρίου έχει ολοκληρωθεί το περιφημο σχέδιο μετεγκατάστασης, το οποίο εφαρμόστηκε από Γερμανία και Γαλλία μόνο κατά το ένα τρίτο. Ταυτόχρονα, στην Ελλάδα, οι ΜΚΟ κάνουν πάρτι με τα ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια που έχουν διατεθεί για τους πρόσφυγες, αντί να διαθέσουν τα κονδύλια αυτά για την εκτέλεση ενός χειμερινού σχεδίου για τους αιτούντες άσυλο.

Κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, ενόψει αυτής της κατάστασης πρέπει να αρχίσει η διαδικασία άμεσης αποσυμφόρησης των νησιών του Αιγαίου που δεν διαθέτουν πλέον τις αναγκαίες υποδομές υποδοχής, να επαναπροωθηθούν όσοι δεν δικαιούνται διεθνούς προστασίας, να διατεθούν τα κονδύλια της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αποκλειστικά στην τοπική αυτοδιοίκηση και στο κράτος, να συνεχιστεί το πρόγραμμα μετεγκατάστασης και να τροποποιηθεί το Δουβλίνο III προκειμένου να πάψει η Ελλάδα να μετατρέπεται σε αποθήκη ψυχών, να χτυπηθούν τα δουλεμπορικά κυκλώματα που μεταφέρουν χιλιάδες παράνομους μετανάστες και, τέλος, να σταλεί αποφασιστικό μήνυμα στον Ερντογάν για να πάψει να παίζει με το μεταναστευτικό.

Sophia in 't Veld, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, I should like to thank the Commissioner for his words. Commissioner, I much agree with you and I am grateful to the Commission for the work it has been doing in this area. I would also like to extend my gratitude and my respect to the people on the Greek islands who have shown immense responsibility and humanity in meeting the refugee crisis, and I think others should take an example from that.

Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos said we cannot have a repetition of last year, and yet we seem to be having that repetition. The point is here: we do not have a technical, practical problem; it is not that people are stuck on the islands because there no boats and planes. It is the direct result of political decisions taken by the national governments. I cannot hold the Estonian Presidency responsible for all the Member States, but it is an absolute disgrace that on the richest continent in the world, we are worried about whether people are going to make it through winter. I cannot remember the exact figures, you mentioned all sorts of figures, but we are talking about tens of thousands of people. Are we seriously saying that there is a practical problem for 500 million citizens in the European Union to somehow

provide decent shelter to a few thousand people? Honestly? It is an absolute disgrace! All the talks about deals with unsavoury regimes – that is just escapism, distracting from what should really be done.

There has been a very decent proposal by the Commission sitting on the desk of the Council for a year and a half. Parliament has done its homework. Yes, we represent different political views in this House too, it is difficult. But you know what? In the treaties, there is no longer the unanimity rule. If the Council is pretending that it can only decide when there is unanimity, it is actually violating the treaties. I suggest that the Council gets on with it and that we get this asylum and migration policy up and running as soon as possible, and make sure that the most civilised and prosperous continent in the world is actually going to give civilised and dignified shelter to people in need.

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich gebe meiner Kollegin recht. Es geht nicht nur darum, dass Griechenland, Italien und die westlichen Balkanländer für die entstandene Situation verantwortlich sind, sondern wir selbst stehen insgesamt als Europäische Union – einschließlich der Mitgliedsstaaten einschließlich der Kommission, einschließlich uns, die wir politische Verantwortung hier im Europäischen Parlament haben – in der Pflicht, zu verhindern, dass sich Ereignisse wie im vergangenen Jahr wiederholen.

Das, denke ich, sollte uns alle miteinander verbinden und sollte nicht dazu führen, dass wir irgendwie die Schuld auf irgendjemanden schieben, sondern dass wir ganz klar sagen, was jetzt zu tun ist. Da muss als Erstes gesagt werden: Wir haben ein Problem damit, dass es bei der Umsetzung dessen, was als Deals, als Abkommen zwischen der EU und anderen Ländern geschlossen worden ist, hapert, dass wir inzwischen eine Situation haben, dass zum Beispiel die griechischen Inseln durchaus auch seitens der EU – sicher nicht mit blanker Absicht, aber dennoch wird es zugelassen – so behandelt werden wie beispielsweise Australien, Papua-Neuguinea, als Insel betrachtet, um dort letztendlich das Flüchtlingsproblem abzuladen.

Das können wir nicht mehr weiter zulassen. Es ist viel über die Kommission finanziert worden. Wir wissen aber auch, dass beispielsweise ein Großteil der Gelder gar nicht direkt an den griechischen Staat gehen kann, sondern an Flüchtlingsinitiativen oder an das UNHCR. Wir wissen auch, dass ein Teil dessen, wozu man sich verpflichtet hat, letztendlich gar nicht umgesetzt werden konnte. Auf den griechischen Inseln sollten 2 000 Wohnungen geschaffen werden. Die sind nicht geschaffen worden, es sind nur 1 100!

Bei den Verpflichtungen, die auf dem Festland eingegangen worden sind, hapert es ebenfalls. 28 000 Plätze in Wohnungen sollten vom UNHCR geschaffen werden. Es fehlen noch 9 000. Dafür sind die Gelder schon vorhanden, sie sind bereitgestellt worden! Die griechische Regierung war verpflichtet, permanente Einrichtungen mit 12 000 Plätzen zu schaffen. Sie hat das Ziel so gut wie erreicht: da fehlen, glaube ich, noch 200 Plätze. Wir sollten wirklich daran gehen, dass wir sagen: Wir brauchen konkrete praktische Lösungen. Es gibt einen Vorschlag, beispielsweise Hotelzimmer anzumieten. Jetzt sagen aber die Regeln – sowohl seitens des UNHCR, aber auch für die Kommission: Das geht nicht. Wir können keine Hotelzimmer finanzieren. Doch! Wir müssen eine Lösung finden! Denn die Wohnungen werden nicht so schnell kommen. Mir kann keiner erzählen, dass man beispielsweise einen Hotspot wie in Moria, der permanent überbelegt ist – statt 2 500 sind 5 000 bis 6 000 Flüchtlinge dort – winterfest machen kann. Das geht nicht!

Wenn ich auf den Inseln aber auch die Wohnungen nicht schaffen kann, dann muss ich wirklich gucken, wie ich nutze, dass es dort ein Potenzial an freien Zimmern gibt, die angemietet werden können, und dann muss ich die Regeln verändern! Dazu muss es doch einen Weg geben, das ist doch eine praktische Lösung! Also: Neben dem, was schon gemacht worden ist, muss mehr gemacht werden.

Zweitens möchte ich darauf hinweisen: Das Problem verstärkt sich ja auch gerade dadurch, dass die vielen Mitgliedstaaten ihre Regeln nicht einhalten. Ich habe gestern im deutschen Fernsehen einen kurzen Bericht gesehen. Gezeigt wurden da mehrere Flüchtlinge im Hungerstreik wegen der Bedingungen im Lager. Inzwischen habe ich festgestellt: Die waren im Hungerstreik – Gott sei Dank haben sie ihn jetzt beendet –, weil sie nach Deutschland sollen und von Deutschland nicht aufgenommen werden. Das deutsche Fernsehen sagt das aber nicht. Es erweckt den Eindruck: Das sind wieder die Griechen, die sind zu allem zu blöd, die kriegen es nicht hin. Aber wir als Bundesrepublik Deutschland erfüllen unsere Pflichten nicht. Und so betrifft das auch viele andere Länder. Das ist der Punkt, da bitte ich auch den Rat anzusetzen und zu sagen: Lassen Sie uns nicht über allgemeine Dinge reden, sondern lassen Sie uns konkret werden. Es geht um Menschenleben. Hier stehen wir alle gemeinsam in der Verantwortung.

Judith Sargentini, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de collega's hebben gelijk. Dit gaat niet over de vraag of er genoeg bedden of dekens zijn. Dit gaat over iets anders. De Griekse regering laat vluchtelingen op die eilanden omdat ze bang is voor een aanzuigende werking. Er zijn genoeg opvangplekken op het vasteland. De Turkse regering zegt: in het kader van de Turkije-deal nemen wij alleen maar mensen terug die op de Griekse eilanden zijn, niet die op het vasteland. De andere lidstaten denken: dat is eigenlijk wel handig zo want dan hoeven wij niet zoveel mensen te hervestigen. Het feit dat er 12 000 vluchtelingen en migranten vastzitten op de Griekse eilanden terwijl er maar voor 5 000 mensen opvang is, hoeft helemaal niet zo te blijven. Haal die mensen naar het vasteland en breng ze dan onder bij andere lidstaten. Maar dat gebeurt niet. En wat is het eigenlijke Europese beleid? Het eigenlijke Europese beleid voor deze winter is hopen op een warme kerst.

Mevrouw Zimmer en mevrouw In 't Veld hebben gelijk, maar de politieke vraag erachter moet worden gesteld. We kunnen de Turkije-deal niet zo houden als hij nu is. We kunnen inderdaad niet met andere landen dit soort deals blijven sluiten. We kunnen de schuld niet alleen maar bij de Grieken leggen. We moeten onze eigen verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Maar de Griekse eilanden op deze manier in de steek laten, dat kan zeker niet.

Kristina Winberg, *för EFDD-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Tempereraturen är just nu i Damaskus 25 grader, i Lagos 30 grader och i Bangladesh 30 grader.

Ingen människa ska behöva sova i tält som migranterna i Sverige gjorde vintern 2015. Det finns dock en enkel lösning: Vi säger nej från början.

Europa, och särskilt Sverige, har tagit sitt ansvar – ett ansvar som vi aldrig haft, eftersom Sverige inte startat ett krig på över 200 år och inte haft några kolonier på 300 år. När upphör ansvaret? frågar jag.

Det finns en enkel lösning på detta: Lägg resurserna på resor hem för de ekonomiska migranter som det handlar om. Säg nej innan de åker över så behöver vi inte bli utpressade av Turkiet.

Jag lägger nu fram lösningarna, så får vi se vad ni gör med dem. Kanske behöver ni fundera lite mer och skriva betänkanden. Vi vet dock alla att det kommer att sluta med Australiens migrationssystem. Därför åker jag snart dit och lär mig mer om detta. Sedan kan ni fråga mig istället för dessa liberaler som just nu styr i EU.

Fri asylrätt och öppna gränser för hela världen fungerar inte. Det är dags att inse det nu.

Mara Bizzotto, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi cinque anni sono sbarcati in Italia 700 000 immigrati presunti profughi. Più di mezzo milione, cioè l'80 %, sono clandestini che non scappano da nessuna guerra. Questi falsi profughi approfittano del sistema europeo di asilo e l'inetto governo italiano, con la complicità di Bruxelles, offre anni a questi immigrati vitto, alloggio e servizi gratis.

Tutto questo è costato agli italiani 14 miliardi di euro: una follia senza senso, una scandalosa ingiustizia. Gli italiani sono giustamente incattiviti con l'Europa e con i governi Letta, Renzi e Gentiloni, che hanno aperto le porte del nostro paese all'invasione di clandestini. La situazione è insostenibile e la riforma del regolamento di Dublino va nella direzione sbagliata. Servono regole chiare e risolutive, come avviene negli Stati Uniti e in Australia: stop all'immigrazione legale, rimpatri forzati di tutti clandestini, chiusura immediata delle frontiere, carcere a vita per i trafficanti di esseri umani. Solo i pochi che scappano veramente dalla guerra vanno accolti. Tutti gli altri sono immigrati illegali e vanno espulsi subito, senza se e senza ma.

Presidente. – Anche se parole, diciamo un po' pesanti, forse sarebbe meglio non usarle in quest'Aula.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Voorzitter, het is denk ik een understatement dat er in dit Parlement verschillende opvattingen bestaan over de afspraken tussen de EU en Turkije. Tegelijkertijd ben ik ervan overtuigd dat we het er met z'n allen over eens zijn dat de uitvoering cruciaal is, aan welke kant je ook staat in dit debat. Ik kan hier vandaag niet anders concluderen dan dat de uitvoering nog veel te wensen overlaat, zeker waar het gaat om de situatie op de Griekse eilanden. Er komen dagelijks meer mensen aan dan er vertrekken en er komen dus veel meer mensen aan op de hot-spots dan ooit de bedoeling was. Dat heeft allerlei gevolgen voor de hygiëne en de huisvesting en leidt tot onderlinge spanningen.

We hebben allemaal nog die beelden van vorige winter op ons netvlies, met erbarmelijke omstandigheden voor heel kwetsbare mensen. Burgers in heel Europa hebben die beelden gezien en waren geschokt. Hoe kunnen wij hen uitleggen dat er geld en middelen beschikbaar zijn, dat er hotelkamers gehuurd kunnen worden, dat er prefabwoningen klaarstaan, dat er voldoende voorraden dekens, kacheltjes enzovoort zijn, maar dat we er op de een of andere manier niet in slagen om met al die middelen die 15 000 mensen een warme plek in de winter te bezorgen? Waar gaat het precies mis en wat gaan we eraan doen om dat te voorkomen? Ik ben blij met de toezeggingen van de Raad en de Commissie dat alle middelen en instrumenten zullen worden ingezet om een herhaling van vorig jaar te voorkomen. Maar het Parlement zal hen aan die toezeggingen houden.

(De spreker gaat in op een “blauwe kaart”-vraag (artikel 162, lid 8, van het Reglement))

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), blue-card question. – Mr Lenaers, you mentioned the terrible situations and conditions that the migrants were facing. It seems that each and every time when winter approaches, we come up with this winter plan for asylum seekers. Don't you think that, besides general conditions like stepping up the relocation of asylum seekers and supporting family reunification and integration, the Commission and the Council should have to come up with a blueprint, a plan for long-term solutions for asylum seekers? So that we do not just have this kind of situation where we try to address these terrible situations that we are facing, don't you think?

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE), blue-card answer. – Mr President, of course we need a long-term solution, and if I remember correctly there wasn't even much of a plan last year, but what I wonder most of all is how it can be that we have still such a massive backlog, for instance, in the appeal procedures in Greece. If we want to have these kinds of policies working, we need to do something about that. How can it be that, as the Commissioner explained here, we have given EUR 1.3 billion in aid in order to fix the solutions for these people, but not much has happened yet.

I think these are the crucial questions that need to be answered in order to come to that long-term solution. These are the basic conditions that we need to fulfil in order to have a proper solution and, yes, relocation. All these things are important, but it begins with having the power to do the things that we have agreed so far.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Der Winterplan für Flüchtlinge. Ich finde es unerträglich, dass wir offenbar jedes Jahr wieder sagen müssen: Der Winter naht! Doch etwa auf den griechischen Inseln sehen wir nach wie vor Überbelegungen, sind Flüchtlinge in Zelten untergebracht und so kalten Temperaturen ausgeliefert. Eine weitere humanitäre Katastrophe bahnt sich mitten in Europa an. Der Winter naht, doch die Bilder vom letzten Winter dürfen sich nicht wiederholen.

Es gibt Lösungen: Kommission und griechische Regierung müssen mehr Schutzsuchende in feste Unterkünfte auf dem Festland bringen. Dublin-Rückführungen müssen ausgesetzt werden, und die faire Verteilung von Flüchtlingen auf alle Mitgliedstaaten muss endlich umgesetzt werden. Der Winter naht! Gemeinsam können wir eine Katastrophe verhindern – wir sollten es anpacken.

Erlauben Sie mir, Herr Präsident, eine persönliche Anmerkung. Das Europäische Asylrecht richtet sich nicht nur an Kriegsflüchtlinge. Es gilt für alle, die vor politischer Verfolgung und vor Folter fliehen. Es ist ein Anspruch, den wir umsetzen müssen. Auch wenn wir in den letzten Jahren keinen Krieg begonnen haben, sind wir nicht nur wegen unserer Kolonialgeschichte, sondern auch wegen unserer aktuellen Politik mindestens mitverantwortlich für Armut und andere Entwicklungen in afrikanischen Herkunftsstaaten.

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

Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Danke Frau Sippel. Ich selbst war am Samstag in Moria in dem Hotspot. Ich will der Beschreibung, wie elend und schmutzig und überfüllt es da ist, nichts hinzufügen. Aber ich habe auch gehört, dass das EASO-Behörde dort sehr langsam arbeitet und nicht gut arbeitet, sodass jetzt die Europäische Bürgerbeauftragte im Juni entschieden hat, eine Beschwerde wegen administrativen Fehlverhaltens anzunehmen.

Sind Sie nicht auch der Meinung, dass man die Arbeit des EASO zum einen unterstützen muss, aber auch genauer nachhalten muss, dass es gut arbeitet, dass es eben auch individuellen Schutz gibt?

Birgit Sippel (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ich glaube, wir haben genau mit dem Ziel, die Arbeit vor Ort zu unterstützen, zu beraten und sicherzustellen, dass die Asylbedingungen eingehalten werden, das Europäische Unterstützungsbüro für Asylfragen gestärkt, und natürlich ist es Aufgabe der Kommission, auch sicherzustellen, dass die Erwartungen, die wir an diese Stärkung geknüpft haben, umgesetzt werden. Insofern bin ich sehr dafür, dass wir das überprüfen und eventuell noch notwendige Unterstützung für das Europäische Unterstützungsbüro für Asylfragen organisieren.

Jean Lambert (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, we can welcome much of what the Commissioner has said this morning in terms of preparedness for many of the countries that have been spoken of. There is a question about whether the Commission considers that the absorption capacity of those funds is adequate and the difference will really be made.

I also want to add my voice to others that have talked about the importance of relocation, especially from the Greek islands to the mainland, and that we have to get rid of this agreement with Turkey that keeps people stuck on the islands, puts additional pressure on the local population there and prevents real solutions happening for those people. We also need our Member States to step up and implement more in terms of relocation.

The speeding up of family reunification is still absolutely necessary; it is lamentable what is happening. What other Member States could also be doing is not trying to return people, whether it is to Bulgaria or Greece, countries under pressure, they do not have to do this under Dublin, they can take responsibility for those cases.

Carlos Coelho (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Comissário, Caras e Caros Colegas, para benefício de uns e desgraça de outros, o verão tem-se prolongado por essa Europa fora, em particular no sul, mas sejamos claros, o inverno vai chegar e, novamente, tememos o pior.

No início deste ano, ecoaram neste Parlamento os terríveis apelos de quem estava no terreno: na Grécia, nos Balcãs, havia refugiados a morrer e – literalmente – do frio. Então, como agora, estávamos perante esse complexo puzzle da chamada crise dos refugiados: falta de solidariedade europeia, falta de recursos humanos e meios financeiros, um sistema europeu comum de asilo periclitante e uma tragédia a acontecer perante os nossos olhos no Mediterrâneo.

Mas, em janeiro de 2017, também como agora, os fundos para fazer face ao problema tinham já sido disponibilizados. Perante este hemisfério, a Comissão Europeia afirmou que havia falhas no terreno que não permitiam utilizar o dinheiro da melhor maneira. Ao fim de quase um ano, não é admissível nem a mesma resposta, nem que tudo se mantenha igual.

Por isso, Senhor Comissário Avramopoulos, para encontrarmos soluções, não podemos ter medo de identificar nem responsabilidades nem as causas dos problemas. A pergunta é, por isso, clara: quem é responsável por estarmos ainda perante o mesmo problema? O Governo grego está a falhar? A União Europeia não está a disponibilizar os meios suficientes? São estas as perguntas a que temos de responder.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente. Se han dado cuenta del frío que hace en Estrasburgo, ¿no? ¿Se imaginan haber pasado la noche con sus familias en una tienda de campaña preparada para el verano, no para el invierno, y que esto vaya a ser su realidad durante todo este invierno, durante un año y durante dos años?

Pues esa es la dura pena que, por acción de unos u omisión de otros, Europa está infligiendo a seres humanos cuyo único pecado es tratar de sobrevivir.

Así que exigimos al Gobierno griego que no siga reteniendo a estas personas en las islas. Que su traslado al continente sea urgente, para poder atenderlas. Y exigimos a los compañeros presidentes del Consejo que, de una vez por todas, se desarrolle la solidaridad y la responsabilidad que Europa tiene para con estas personas. Al Consejo. Me gustaría mucho que lo escucharan.

En realidad, el pecado original de todo esto radica probablemente en nuestro acuerdo con Turquía, pero los culpables no son los ciudadanos que están retenidos en las islas griegas. Ya está bien.

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

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL), ερώτηση «γαλάζια κάρτα». – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Valenciano συμφωνώ μαζί σας πως πρέπει να κάνουμε ό,τι μπορούμε για να βελτιωθούν οι συνθήκες για τους πρόσφυγες, αλλά, απ' ό,τι ξέρω, τη μετεγκατάσταση προσφύγων από τα νησιά στην ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα την εμποδίζει μια ερμηνεία της Επιτροπής για τη συμφωνία Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας.

Αν είναι έτσι, δεν είναι άδικο να ζητάτε κάτι από την ελληνική κυβέρνηση, αντί να το ζητάτε από το Συμβούλιο και την Επιτροπή;

Elena Valenciano (S&D), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – No, no me parece injusto. Aquí cada uno tiene su responsabilidad. Yo no quiero hacer responsable al Gobierno griego: le pido al Gobierno griego que, por lo menos, esas personas sean trasladadas al continente para poder ser atendidas. Es evidente que la responsabilidad no es solo del Gobierno griego. La responsabilidad está en todos nosotros, en todos los Gobiernos de la Unión Europea y en la propia Unión Europea. Y en nosotros, que somos incapaces, con las instituciones que tenemos, de atender con dignidad a personas que no han cometido ningún delito. Compartamos la responsabilidad y busquemos la solución.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señor presidente; pues sí, efectivamente, se trata de evitar que la historia, la trágica historia se repita este invierno. Mire, yo estuve en Moira y en Kara Tepe y, desgraciadamente, puedo confirmar que los contenedores habitación son congeladores en invierno y hornos en verano. Vean lo que me dijo un peticionario de asilo: «Vivir en Moira nos hace enfermar; en invierno es helado, todo está empapado; el último invierno quemamos papeles y plásticos para calentarnos. Es como si no fuéramos seres humanos». Fin de la cita.

Somos conscientes, señor comisario, de sus esfuerzos y de su compromiso solidario, pero debemos dar respuesta eficaz basada en el principio de solidaridad, tal y como exige el artículo 88 del Tratado de Funcionamiento de la Unión Europea. Debemos trabajar conjuntamente las instituciones y los Estados miembros para conseguir unas condiciones de vida digna para los peticionarios de asilo. Sobre todo, debemos gestionar y pedir explicaciones sobre la incorrecta gestión de los fondos que se aplican para este fin.

Debemos hacer un llamamiento a los Estados miembros para que avance con eficacia el proceso de reubicación. La realidad es que Grecia sola no puede. Hay cincuenta mil personas dentro de Grecia y deben recibir la ayuda comunitaria.

Y por último, señor presidente, una atención especial para los grupos más vulnerables: los niños, las mujeres y los ancianos.

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

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE), pregunta de tarjeta azul. – Señor presidente, a mi colega Díaz de Mera me gustaría preguntarle qué balance hace de la aplicación de la reubicación y de la cuota que tenía asumida España. Porque, evidentemente, todos hablamos hoy —usted también lo ha hecho— de la insolidaridad de los Estados miembros, pero uno de los países más insolidarios que ha habido en esta cuestión ha sido España. Me gustaría saber qué evaluación hace de la ejecución del programa de reubicación en relación con España.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Muchas gracias por la pregunta. Pues, en realidad, afirmo que el compromiso de España es inequívocamente firme.

Recientemente, en una comparecencia del ministro competente en el Congreso de los Diputados, este dijo que están dispuestos a cumplir todos sus compromisos y que el problema está en los *hotspots*, que no son capaces de reaccionar a tiempo. Por eso he hablado de gestión; la gestión que significa identificar, distribuir y trasladar. Cuando eso se resuelva, naturalmente, España tiene que estar dispuesta a cumplir su compromiso.

Claude Moraes (S&D). – Mr President, it's not just the containers and the freezing conditions mentioned by Mr Díaz de Mera García Consuegra: over 12 000 people are now stranded in the hotspots on the Greek islands. I visited them recently in these hotspots, and the capacity is for half those numbers: there are around 5000 places. So we have a problem.

Many have mentioned what that problem is, but it boils down to two things. One, of course, is the wider political question to the Council, which is: what are the responsibilities that Member States will take on relocation and ensuring that we quickly manage the system's Dublin III – the asylum system – to ensure that Member States meet their responsibilities. We all know that is critical. But coming back to what the Commissioner has said in detail, he admitted to the severe overcrowding and that the situation has been difficult, but he was very detailed in his response, and this is the clear focus: that funding from the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF) is now coming instead of the European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) funding by the Commission. But what is the absorption of this? Can the Commissioner say more about how effective this can be in the freezing conditions that we are about to meet, because that is very important? Can he say more about this?

Alessandra Mussolini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'ultimo intervento mi dà la possibilità di dire che noi dobbiamo eliminare il discorso dell'emergenza dell'inverno, dell'autunno, del caldo estremo in estate, ma operare un cambiamento strutturale, soprattutto con due questioni. Occorre omologare i vari sistemi su tutto il territorio degli Stati membri ed elevare anche la qualità degli standard.

Molti colleghi hanno parlato dell'accoglienza, delle qualifiche, cioè delle possibilità che noi abbiamo di distinguere se ci sono rifugiati, se ci sono climatici, se ci sono economici. Lo stiamo facendo, lo sta facendo la Commissione e lo sta facendo il Parlamento, perché noi stiamo rivoluzionando, ad esempio, Dublino, e questo si deve sapere.

Quindi l'appello è non vanificare il lavoro che stiamo compiendo, che sta facendo il Parlamento, che ha fatto la Commissione, e dire soprattutto al Consiglio di fare presto e veramente non vanificare questa rivoluzione e il cambiamento che noi stiamo operando, superare l'emergenza, perché la crisi umanitaria non è emergenza ma è un fatto con il quale noi dobbiamo convivere, e aumentare da ultimo anche gli accordi bilaterali.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, più di 12 000 persone sono bloccate nelle isole greche, in condizioni del tutto inumane che abbiamo verificato di persona nel maggio scorso, in campi sovraffollati e inadeguati dove ci riportano frequenti soprusi e casi di violenze. La situazione, con l'arrivo del freddo, è destinata a essere ancora più catastrofica. Lo scorso inverno, nel campo di Moria a Lesbos sono morte sei persone per via delle rigide temperature, dormivano in tende coperte di neve e non arrivava abbastanza cibo. Queste morti pesano sulle coscienze di chi ha voluto l'accordo cinico con la Turchia.

L'Unione europea deve assicurare condizioni di accoglienza degne e per questo i governi europei non possono lasciare la Grecia da sola, devono immediatamente ampliare e velocizzare i ricollocamenti e i ricongiungimenti familiari, e soprattutto smettere di rimandare in Grecia le persone ai sensi dell'ipocrita criterio del primo paese d'accesso del regolamento di Dublino.

È il momento, anzi, che il Consiglio inizi a discutere seriamente della riforma del regolamento di Dublino, magari prendendo esempio dalla forte e ambiziosa posizione che ha espresso la commissione LIBE di questo Parlamento.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, ich möchte Sie gar nicht persönlich angreifen, aber ich kann nicht anders.

Wenn Sie Ihre Rede im September hier gehalten hätten, hätte ich gesagt: schwache Rede, Herr Kommissar. Aber uns im November zu erzählen, wir müssen sofort etwas tun – mir fehlen die Worte, Ihnen zu antworten.

Es geht doch nicht darum, dass Sie uns hier heute aufzählen, wieviel Geld Sie ausgegeben haben. Dafür hätten Sie Ihren Buchhalter schicken können. Es geht darum, was Sie tun, damit dieses Geld die Menschen auch wirkungsvoll erreicht, wo Sie einschreiten, wenn es eine nationale Regierung vielleicht alleine nicht schafft. Das wollen wir wissen – nicht, wieviel Geld die Kommission ausgegeben hat. Das weiß ich wohl, dass das eine Menge ist. Nur wenn es an entscheidenden Stellen nicht hilft, nützt es uns nichts.

Deshalb, Herr Kommissar, möchte ich Ihnen heute schon sagen: Im nächsten Jahr wird wahrscheinlich im Dezember Winter sein. Vielleicht reden wir im August, September darüber, welche Schularbeiten Sie bis dahin endlich gemacht an haben.

Μιλτιάδης Κύρκος (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε επίτροπε, σήμερα το Κοινοβούλιο και η Επιτροπή εκφράζουν την ανησυχία μας για την ανεπαρκή προετοιμασία των ελληνικών αρχών για τον χειμώνα που έρχεται. Την ίδια στιγμή, στην Ελλάδα, το κυβερνών κόμμα σπαράσσεται από διαφωνίες με τον υπουργό μεταναστευτικής πολιτικής, κ. Μουζάλα, για το αν υπάρχουν θαλάσσια σύνορα, αν είναι αναγκαία η καταγραφή των εισερχομένων και αν είναι χρήσιμη η κοινή δήλωση με την Τουρκία. Δήλωση που, ακριβώς επειδή δεν υλοποιείται από τη μεριά μας, για γραφειοκρατικούς, διοικητικούς ή άλλους λόγους, έχει ως αποτέλεσμα οι πρόσφυγες και οι οικονομικοί μετανάστες να συσσωρεύονται στα νησιά μας και να δημιουργούνται μη ανθρωπιστικές συνθήκες διαβίωσης. Και, μόλις προχθές, ο αρμόδιος για τα κονδύλια αναπληρωτής υπουργός Οικονομικών, κ. Χαρίσης, μας διαβεβαίωσε -και διαβάζω τα δικά του λόγια- ότι «η υλοποίηση των έργων για τα hotspots προχωράει κανονικά».

Να δεχτώ πως η ανησυχία μας είναι υπερβολική και πρέπει να δείξουμε εμπιστοσύνη στην ελληνική κυβέρνηση με μία όμως επιφύλαξη. Αν ζήσουμε μια επανάληψη της περσινής τραγικής κατάστασης, να απαιτήσουμε εκ μέρους των ευρωπαίων πολιτών την άμεση παραίτηση του υπεύθυνου υπουργού Οικονομικών και την ανάληψη από την Ελλάδα των συγκεκριμένων ευθυνών της για τις διοικητικές της αδυναμίες. Με 1,3 δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ που έχουν διατεθεί στην Ελλάδα, δεν μπορεί να μη διασφαλίζουμε ανθρώπινες συνθήκες σε ελάχιστες χιλιάδες ανθρώπους.

Procedura «catch-the-eye»

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážení pán predsed a postavenie stanových táborov pre prichádzajúcich utečencov na gréckych ostrovoch malo byť dočasným riešením. Rovnako dočasné malo byť aj rozhodnutie o prerozdeľovaní žiadateľov o azyl medzi členské štáty.

Žiaľ, dnes sme svedkami toho, ako sa tieto tábory menia na trvalé a ako ich zúfalí obyvatelia strácajú nádej na normálny život. A zajtra budeme hlasovať o mandáte Parlamentu na rokovanie s Radou, ktorého súčasťou má byť požiadavka urobiť z pôvodne dočasného automatického prerozdeľovania utečencov trvalú súčasť európskeho azylového systému.

Nedovoľme, aby Európa rezignovala a zmierila sa so stavom trvalého provizória. Pretože za takéto provizorium sa platí stratou ľudskej dôstojnosti a solidarity.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ogni anno viene l'inverno – mi sembra un dato incontestabile – così come ogni anno viene l'estate. Ecco, non possiamo ritrovarci a ogni inizio di stagione a discutere su come affrontare l'emergenza climatica dei rifugiati.

È vero, signor Commissario, che l'assistenza tecnica e finanziaria fornita dalla Commissione in Grecia e in Italia è stata importante per molti aspetti previdenziali, ma una volta per tutte andiamo oltre l'emergenza, altrimenti tra pochi mesi ci ritroveremo a dibattere sul piano estivo.

Discutiamo piuttosto sul perché, ad oggi, oltre 15 000 persone vivono in condizioni estreme, perché non sono stati ricollocati. Interroghiamo la Presidenza di turno su come intende gestire i negoziati sul regolamento di Dublino. Basta con i piani di emergenza, lavoriamo piuttosto su riforme legislative ambiziose.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, teške zime u državama članicama s hladnijom kontinentalnom klimom svake godine uzmu svoj danak u ljudskim životima. Svako se društvo ima obvezu pobrinuti za svoje najranjivije, a ljudi bez krova nad glavom u teškim vremenskim uvjetima to svakako jesu.

Mislim da nije dobro praviti razliku između tražitelja azila i domicilnih stanovnika u ovom pitanju. Velika hladnoća jednako ugrožava sve ljude koji nemaju smještaj i grijanje, neovisno o njihovom podrijetlu ili pravnom statusu.

No, kad već raspravljamo o planu za zimu za tražitelje azila, moramo se priupitati i zašto primamo tolike ljude koje ne možemo adekvatno zbrinuti. Kako smo došli u situaciju da tim ljudima nudimo slobodu, a na kraju im dajemo oboljenje ili smrt na hladnoći? To je pitanje koje traži hitan odgovor jer zima je pred vratima.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Διεθνής Αμνηστία προειδοποιεί πως το 2017 θα είναι η πιο θανατηφόρα χρονιά για τους μετανάστες στη Μεσόγειο. Οι απάνθρωπες συνθήκες που βιώνουν οι πρόσφυγες στα hotspots των νησιών του Αιγαίου επιβεβαιώνουν την αποτυχία της Ένωσης. Τα κράτη μέλη πρέπει να πάνε να αρνούνται τους πρόσφυγες και να παραβιάζουν έτσι τις θεμελιώδεις αρχές της Ένωσης και να ενισχύουν ταυτόχρονα τις δυνάμεις της ξενοφοβίας και του ρατσισμού.

Για να σταματήσει το έγκλημα σε βάρος των προσφύγων, πρέπει να αντιταχούμε στον απάνθρωπο χαρακτήρα της Ευρώπης-φρουρίου. Απαιτούμε, λοιπόν, να καταργηθεί το Δουβλίνο II, να αρθεί άμεσα η συμφωνία ανταλλαγής προσφύγων με την Τουρκία, να δημιουργηθεί ένα κοινό δίκαιο σύστημα ασύλου στηριγμένο στην έμπρακτη αλληλεγγύη, να δημιουργηθούν νόμιμοι και ασφαλείς οδοί, καθώς και ένα μόνιμο, δεσμευτικό και δίκαιο σύστημα μετεγκατάστασης των προσφύγων και να επιβληθούν επιτέλους κυρώσεις στα κράτη μέλη που επιμένουν να μην αναλαμβάνουν τις ευθύνες τους. Ειδική μέριμνα πρέπει να υπάρξει για τα παιδιά, καθώς και για την προστασία του δικαιώματος επανένωσης των οικογενειών των προσφύγων.

Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte die Frage von Frau Zimmer von heute früh noch mal aufnehmen, wie es darum steht, dass Deutschland Menschen, die schon qualifiziert sind, eine Familienzusammenführung zu haben, zusammenbringt.

Das sind 4 500 Personen, deren Fälle aber einvernehmlich mit der griechischen Regierung und mit der Zustimmung auch der deutschen Regierung verlangsamt bearbeitet werden. Ich denke, das muss aufhören.

An Herrn Avramopoulos gerichtet: Sie haben rasche Rückführungsmaßnahmen durch die griechische Regierung in die Türkei gefordert. Eine Frage an Sie: Wie können Sie annehmen, dass die Türkei ein sicherer Drittstaat ist, wo nach dem Referendum durch Erdoğan doch die Menschenrechtslage extrem schlechter ist und wo doch die türkischen Flüchtlinge aus der Türkei am EU-Grenzfluss Evros zunehmen?

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, η συζήτηση που κάνουμε αυτή τη στιγμή είναι η επιτομή της υποκρισίας. Όλες και όλοι παριστάνουν τους ανθρωπιστές και χύνουν κροκοδείλια δάκρυα για την τραγική κατάσταση στην οποία θα βρίσκονται οι παράνομοι μετανάστες και οι πρόσφυγες τον χειμώνα, και η συζήτηση αυτή γίνεται τώρα, που έχει ήδη αρχίσει το κρύο.

Μέχρι τώρα τι κάναμε; Παρακολουθούσαμε απλά να έρχονται οι παράνομοι μετανάστες από την Τουρκία στην Ελλάδα και χαιρόμασταν διότι αυτοί ήταν μόνο μερικές χιλιάδες και όχι εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες, όπως συνέβαινε μέχρι τώρα. Πίεσε η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση την Τουρκία να σταματήσει αυτή την απαράδεκτη κατάσταση; Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει την τάση να αναμειγνύεται στα εσωτερικά των κρατών, όπως κάνει τώρα με την Πολωνία. Πίεσε τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών που δεν δέχονται να πάρουν το ποσοστό των μεταναστών που τους αναλογεί, ούτως ώστε να τηρήσουν τις υποχρεώσεις τους;

Επιπλέον, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θέλει να μετατρέψει την Ελλάδα σε τόπο εγκατάστασης αυτών των δυστυχών ανθρώπων. Δίνει χρήματα και θέλει να παραμείνουν στην Ελλάδα και όχι να φύγουν εκτός Ελλάδας και, δυστυχώς, η δουλόφρων ελληνική κυβέρνηση και η αξιωματική αντιπολίτευση το αποδέχονται αυτό.

Και ένα τελευταίο: ο πόλεμος στη Συρία έχει τελειώσει, γιατί δεν στέλνουμε πάλι...

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, this is a very important discussion. At the outset, I must say that the European Union deserves credit for what it has been trying to do in relation to refugees and asylum seekers. If you look at non-EU countries, they do not do half as much as the European Union, and while we have deficiencies, that is the starting point.

Definitely, countries like Italy – and especially Greece – deserve great credit because, despite the economic travails that they have had over the last number of years, they are still taking in the refugees and trying to deal with them. We should be giving them every support possible to help the situation.

If migrants are illegal, they should be sent back. If they are legal, they need to be given the best possible care – especially with the onset of winter. It would be tragic that anybody who comes here looking for freedom and is legal would die because of the lack of warmth, clothing and comfort that they deserve. I am with the Commission: cooperate with Greece.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, grazie per la sua sensibilità e per il suo impegno. Tuttavia, ancora una volta ci ritroviamo a parlare della potenziale tragedia che rischia di colpire decine di migliaia di persone con l'arrivo del gelo invernale. L'estrema serietà della situazione e le attuali criticità delle politiche dell'asilo rendono indispensabile intervenire adottando misure concrete ed efficaci per garantire l'accesso immediato ad un riparo a tutti i richiedenti asilo, e penso in particolare alle donne e ai bambini, i più vulnerabili.

Gli insoddisfacenti dati sui ricollocamenti e sui ricongiungimenti familiari, ancora oggi, dimostrano quanto sia necessario fornire sostegno, e non soltanto economico, agli Stati membri di primo arrivo, e penso per esempio alla Grecia.

Si impongono allora un rinnovato impegno e un piano d'azione efficace per affrontare in modo adeguato la grave crisi umanitaria in atto, per garantire un ricovero dignitoso ai profughi e migranti, e in secondo luogo, finalmente mi auguro, un criterio di responsabilità condivisa fra gli Stati.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σήμερα, Νοέμβρη του 2017 και για τρίτη συνεχή χρονιά, θυμόμαστε -τόρα που αρχίζουν τα κρύα- τους χιλιάδες εγκλωβισμένους πρόσφυγες οι οποίοι ζουν σε άθλιες συνθήκες. Σε καταλύματα στα ελληνικά νησιά που φιλοξενούν πάνω από 15.000 ανθρώπους όταν οι υποδομές επαρκούν μόλις για 5.000, με τη θάλασσα να ξεβράζει και πάλι πτώματα και τις ευρωπαϊκές ηγεσίες να κρύβονται πίσω από την κοινή δήλωση με την Τουρκία.

Αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, κύριε Επίτροπε, η αντιμετώπιση του προσφυγικού προβλήματος δεν είναι μετεωρολογικό φαινόμενο, είναι δείγμα του μόνιμου ευρωπαϊκού χειμώνα που διανύουμε, ιδιαίτερα τα τελευταία χρόνια, όπου ανθρωπισμός, πολιτισμός και πρόσφυγας έχουν θαφτεί στο χιόνι και στις λάσπες. Τα δικαιώματα των προσφύγων, σύμφωνα το διεθνές δίκαιο, παραβιάζονται και έχει προκαλέσει οργή η παράνομη συμφωνία Ελλάδας-Γερμανίας για αριθμητικό πλαφόν στη διαδικασία της οικογενειακής επανένωσης.

Επομένως, κύριε Επίτροπε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, θα μπορέσουν να επιταχυνθούν οι διαδικασίες αναγνώρισης καθεστώτος πρόσφυγα; Θα εγκατασταθεί επιτέλους ένας μόνιμος ευρωπαϊκός μηχανισμός μετεγκατάστασης; Θα εφαρμοστεί η οικογενειακή επανένωση χωρίς ποσοτώσεις ντροπής; Αυτά είναι τα κύρια ερωτήματα που πρέπει να απαντηθούν και όχι να βρούμε έκτακτες λύσεις αντιμετώπισης των καιρικών φαινομένων.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente. *Winter plan for asylum seekers*: invierno para los refugiados. Este Parlamento Europeo no puede detener las estaciones, ni puede conseguir que en el invierno no haga frío, pero sí puede y debe cambiar la política europea y el modo en que esta se ejecuta. Y las medidas de incremento de personal — médicos, abogados, intérpretes—, particularmente para personas vulnerables, son paliativas.

Lo que realmente hay que cambiar es la política que ha impedido que se ejecute el plan de realojamiento. Y debe ordenar que se produzca el traslado al continente y, por tanto, a lugar seguro y estable y duradero, a todas aquellas personas que sufren espantosamente el hacinamiento en esos *hotspots* ubicados en islas, y particularmente de las personas más vulnerables: mujeres y niños.

Eso es lo que debe ser cambiado, y no puede ser sometido ni a condiciones de imposible cumplimiento, como las que ha impuesto el último plan de realojamiento, ni tampoco a la resignación, a la ausencia de voluntad política de los Estados miembros y de su gobiernos de cumplir con el Derecho europeo.

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

Dimitris Avramopoulos, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me take the opportunity to repeat that our commitment is to help all affected countries to be ready to respond in situations like this. With winter already on our doorstep, curbing efforts is not an option. Funding at EU level is not an issue, and I know that we can count on your support for this. Through our various funding instruments, we are already responding, and we will continue to do so for any additional needs.

We cannot keep having these discussions over and over again. We need a structurally ingrained response system. This is why we need to speed up the reform of our Common European Asylum System, which includes better and more adequate reception conditions across the European Union. The current system is not sustainable in the long run. We cannot continue to leave the responsibility for the vast majority of applicants, whether in law or practice, to only a few Member States. We need to be ready for the future and to design a system that is effective but fair to all. This includes the Dublin IV Regulation, which Ms in 't Veld mentioned, and I could not agree more with her remarks. It is important that the European Parliament sends a strong message on the need to revise the Dublin Regulation, and it is time for the Council to advance it.

Many of you mentioned relocation. Ninety per cent of the relocation requests submitted by Italy and Greece become effective relocations. This is a success. Thanks to the cooperation of Member States, EU agencies and international partners, we have relocated more than 30 000 people, reaching an average of 2 200 relocations a month. This is a success. Through the implementation of the scheme, we have managed to build trust among Member States, and I can tell you that this was not one of the easiest tasks I've had.

For the future, our first priority is to relocate all those eligible under the two Council decisions. The potential for solidarity with Italy and Greece has not been exhausted, and the European Union should continue relocating. We continue to provide financial support to those Member States sustaining their relocation efforts beyond the current schemes.

I hope we will not have to repeat this discussion again in the future. We are all working to achieve the same goal: decent living conditions for all migrants immediately and better, sustainable migration management in the long term.

Now allow me to say some words in Greek.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως είπα και προηγουμένως, όλοι εργαζόμαστε και πρέπει να συνεργαζόμαστε για τον ίδιο σκοπό· για να ξεφύγουμε από την αντιμετώπιση μιας διαρκούς κρίσης και να αντιμετωπίσουμε το μεταναστευτικό με μεγαλύτερη επιτυχία σε ολόκληρη τη χώρα, ιδίως δε στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, αλλά και σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη, γιατί αυτό το φαινόμενο δεν θα σταματήσει -μην έχετε καμία αμφιβολία. Επομένως, πρέπει να το αντιμετωπίσουμε με σύνεση, στρατηγική, συνεργασία και συντονισμό.

Πρώτα απ' όλα, πρέπει να συνεχίσουμε να διεξάγουμε τον πόλεμο κατά των κυκλωμάτων των διακινητών, καταστρέφοντας το επιχειρηματικό τους μοντέλο και τιμωρώντας αυστηρά τους εγκληματίες αυτούς. Όσο για τη δήλωση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας, θα ήθελα να σημειώσω ότι έχει συμβάλει ουσιαστικά και αποτελεσματικά σε αυτό. Η δε πλήρης και συνεχιζόμενη εφαρμογή της θα συμβάλει ακόμα περισσότερο, όπως ακριβώς έχει συμφωνηθεί. Πρέπει όλοι να συμβάλουμε ώστε οι ελληνικές αρχές να μπορέσουν να εντατικοποιήσουν την εφαρμογή της δήλωσης, επιταχύνοντας όλες τις προβλεπόμενες διαδικασίες.

Βέβαια, και συμφωνώ με αυτό που ελέγχι πρωτότερα, οφείλουμε να στείλουμε ένα ξεκάθαρο μήνυμα ότι κανείς δεν πρέπει να διακινδυνεύει τη ζωή του στη θάλασσα για να φτάνει παράτυπα στην Ευρώπη, διότι πολύ απλά θα επιστρέφεται στη χώρα του. Αυτό, κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, δεν σημαίνει ότι κλείνουμε τα μάτια στην ανθρωπινή τραγωδία που συντελείται στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Κεντρικής και της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου. Αντίθετα, ενθαρρύνουμε, στηρίζουμε πολιτικά, αναλαμβάνουμε πρωτοβουλίες και χρηματοδοτούμε την επανεγκατάσταση των προσφύγων.

Ήδη, αξίζει να σημειώσετε ότι, από τις 50.000 καινούργιες θέσεις που ανακοινώσαμε, τα κράτη μέλη δήλωσαν ότι είναι έτοιμα να καλύψουν σχεδόν 35.000 από αυτές, και αναμένουμε ακόμα περισσότερες δεσμεύσεις. Στο άμεσο μέλλον οφείλουμε να συνεργαστούμε, ώστε κανείς από τους ανθρώπους που προσωρινά φιλοξενούμε να μη βρεθεί ξανά απροστάτευτος σε καιρικές συνθήκες σαν κι αυτές που ζήσαμε πέρυσι.

Θα ήθελα να σημειώσω και κάτι άλλο· δεν υπάρχει ούτε περιθώριο αλλά ούτε είναι και ώρα για αλληλοκατηγορίες. Είναι αλήθεια ότι η γεωγραφική θέση της Ελλάδας την εξέθεσε σε μεγάλες προσφυγικές και μεταναστευτικές πιέσεις. Αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα και, όπως έχω πει κατ' επανάληψη, στο ξεκίνημα αυτής της άνευ προηγουμένου κρίσης τόσο η Ελλάδα όσο και ολόκληρη η Ευρώπη βρέθηκαν απροετοίμαστες, θα έλεγα δε ότι βρέθηκαν και απροστάτευτες.

Η Ευρώπη, όμως, δεν άφησε μόνη της την Ελλάδα, όπως δεν άφησε μόνη της ούτε την Ιταλία, από την πρώτη κιόλας στιγμή. Η βοήθεια ήταν, είναι και θα συνεχίσει να είναι και στο μέλλον, ουσιαστική και συνεχής, σε μέσα, δυνατότητες και χρήματα. Οι πιέσεις όμως δεν έχουν σταματήσει και δεν ξέρουμε και πότε θα σταματήσουν. Οι δε απρόβλεπτες καιρικές μεταβολές και ο βαρύς χειμώνας που ενέσκηψε πέρυσι, ανέδειξαν μία δραματική πτυχή αυτού του θέματος. Συνθήκες απαράδεκτες για την πολιτισμένη Ευρώπη και εικόνες ντροπής που δεν πρέπει να επαναληφθούν. Γι' αυτό, σε συνεργασία με τις ελληνικές αρχές, λαμβάνονται πλέον όλα τα απαραίτητα μέτρα που προανέφερα, για να ολοκληρωθούν χωρίς περαιτέρω καθυστερήσεις οι προετοιμασίες. Οφείλουμε να συνεχίσουμε την προετοιμασία για τον χειμώνα και προλαβαίνουμε να το κάνουμε. Πρέπει δε να εντείνουμε τη συνεργασία σε όλα τα επίπεδα.

Ειδική, ωστόσο, αναφορά πρέπει να γίνει για την τοπική κοινωνία και τους πολίτες των νησιών που, με τη στάση τους, έστειλαν ένα μήνυμα ανθρωπιάς, ευαισθησίας και πολιτισμού σε ολόκληρο τον κόσμο.

Κυρίες και κύριοι, η Ευρώπη της ευημερίας, του πολιτισμού και του ανθρωπισμού δεν είναι δυνατό να μην είναι σε θέση να προσφέρει προστασία σε 10.000 ανθρώπους. Την ευθύνη γι' αυτό τη μοιραζόμαστε όλοι: ευρωπαϊκοί θεσμοί, κράτη μέλη, κοινωνία των πολιτών. Συλλογική λοιπόν η ευθύνη, συλλογική και η δουλειά που πρέπει να κάνουμε για να ανταποκριθούμε σε αυτό το ανθρωπιστικό μας καθήκον.

Matti Maasilas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, honourable Members, the Presidency, like all of us, is aware of the difficult situation that the refugees and migrants are currently facing and may face in some regions of Europe. We are committed to do everything possible to improve the situation and to help frontline countries, both in the short and in the long term. As you heard from Commissioner Avramopoulos, the Commission is indeed working with the Member States concerned, and with other international actors, to be prepared in case the winter conditions worsen.

There were references, some quite emotional, to the reform of the Common European Asylum System. First, I warn against reducing this issue – the whole reform – to just one piece of legislation, the Dublin Regulation, and within the Regulation to just this one issue of relocation, when making these statements here. This reform consists of seven pieces of legislation, of which three are already in the trilogues with Parliament. The work is ongoing, the Presidency is well aware of the urgency and of the importance of this reform, in particular the Dublin Regulation.

As for relocation from Greece and helping Greece, work has been done and the work is ongoing. The Commissioner referred to some particularities there, such as the eligibility issue and the issue of returns, and these need to be taken into account as well. But again, in broader terms of helping Greece at this moment, I want to refer once again to the thorough report by the Commission on the ongoing work.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti in attesa della seduta solenne)

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D), por escrito. – El invierno ya está aquí y seguimos con las mismas o mayores carencias que hace un año en la cobertura de las necesidades básicas de miles de personas migrantes y demandantes de asilo —entre ellas muchas mujeres y niños— atrapadas en las islas griegas. En Samos y Lesbos, preparadas para acoger a 3 000 personas, se amontonan más de 8 000, sin acceso adecuado a agua, alimentos, atención médica o incluso un techo. Los socialistas hemos conseguido introducir este debate en el pleno pero, lamentablemente, una mayoría formada por grupos políticos tanto a nuestra derecha como a nuestra izquierda, han impedido que se pudiera aprobar una resolución en la que el Parlamento reclamara medidas concretas tanto a la Comisión como al Consejo. Pedimos al Gobierno griego el fin de la política de contención y traslados urgentes al continente que permitan un tratamiento digno y evitar una nueva tragedia este invierno, y exigimos al resto de gobiernos europeos, de una vez por todas, un mínimo de solidaridad que alivie la presión sobre Grecia y que dé una salida digna a estos miles de seres humanos que

no han cometido ningún delito y que requieren de nuestra protección.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D), *por escrito*. – El invierno ya está aquí y seguimos con las mismas o mayores carencias que hace un año en la cobertura de las necesidades básicas de miles de personas migrantes y demandantes de asilo — entre ellas muchas mujeres y niños— atrapadas en las islas griegas. En Samos y Lesbos, preparadas para acoger a 3 000 personas, se amontonan más de 8 000, sin acceso adecuado a agua, alimentos, atención médica o incluso un techo. Los socialistas hemos conseguido introducir este debate en el pleno pero, lamentablemente, una mayoría formada por grupos políticos tanto a nuestra derecha como a nuestra izquierda, han impedido que se pudiera aprobar una resolución en la que el Parlamento reclamara medidas concretas tanto a la Comisión como al Consejo. Pedimos al Gobierno griego el fin de la política de contención y traslados urgentes al continente que permitan un tratamiento digno y evitar una nueva tragedia este invierno, y exigimos al resto de gobiernos europeos, de una vez por todas, un mínimo de solidaridad que alivie la presión sobre Grecia y que dé una salida digna a estos miles de seres humanos que no han cometido ningún delito y que requieren de nuestra protección.

Nicola Caputo (S&D), *per iscritto*. – In questi giorni sto ricevendo mail da parte di moltissimi gruppi e associazioni solidali, che chiedono azioni urgenti, per impedire la morte di altri rifugiati a causa del freddo, dato che l'inverno sta di nuovo sopraggiungendo. Lo scorso inverno per il freddo a Moria, sono morte sei persone che cercavano rifugio e protezione in Europa. E tuttavia le condizioni nei campi di Chios, Samos, Kos e Lesbo sono ancora oltre il limite della sopportazione. Nei giorni scorsi anche l'Alto commissariato Onu per i rifugiati ha chiesto al governo greco di adeguare rapidamente i campi per i rifugiati che si trovano sulle isole, in vista dell'inverno, ma le autorità greche non sembrano avere alcun piano per gestire la nuova emergenza. Di fronte a questa situazione finora l'Europa ha assistito senza intervenire e l'inverno è arrivato nuovamente. Probabilmente sarò retorico, ma cosa c'è di imprevedibile in questa situazione? L'unica cosa imprevedibile, dopo decine di migliaia di morti è che l'Europa e i suoi Stati membri aspettino le tragedie per dolersene e non so cosa, per dimostrare un minimo di buon senso e amore per il prossimo.

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Ich unterstütze die Forderung nach einem Winterhilfsplan für Asylbewerber. Wir brauchen einen Plan, mit dessen Hilfe wir langfristig unserer Verantwortung gerecht werden. Der Winter steht vor der Tür, und auf den griechischen Inseln harren mehr als 15 200 Flüchtlinge und Migranten aus, und dies bei einer Kapazität für 8 000 Menschen. Eine weitere humanitäre Katastrophe bahnt sich an. Ich hoffe, dass auf alle Reden und Worte bald Taten folgen, wie zum Beispiel die Umsetzung der fairen Verteilung der Flüchtlinge auf die Mitgliedstaaten.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), *por escrito*. – El invierno ya está aquí y seguimos con las mismas o mayores carencias que hace un año en la cobertura de las necesidades básicas de miles de personas migrantes y demandantes de asilo — entre ellas muchas mujeres y niños— atrapadas en las islas griegas. En Samos y Lesbos, preparadas para acoger a 3 000 personas, se amontonan más de 8 000, sin acceso adecuado a agua, alimentos, atención médica o incluso un techo. Los socialistas hemos conseguido introducir este debate en el pleno pero, lamentablemente, una mayoría formada por grupos políticos tanto a nuestra derecha como a nuestra izquierda, han impedido que se pudiera aprobar una resolución en la que el Parlamento reclamara medidas concretas tanto a la Comisión como al Consejo. Pedimos al Gobierno griego el fin de la política de contención y traslados urgentes al continente que permitan un tratamiento digno y evitar una nueva tragedia este invierno, y exigimos al resto de gobiernos europeos, de una vez por todas, un mínimo de solidaridad que alivie la presión sobre Grecia y que dé una salida digna a estos miles de seres humanos que no han cometido ningún delito y que requieren de nuestra protección.

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D), *por escrito*. – El invierno ya está aquí y seguimos con las mismas o mayores carencias que hace un año en la cobertura de las necesidades básicas de miles de personas migrantes y demandantes de asilo — entre ellas muchas mujeres y niños— atrapadas en las islas griegas. En Samos y Lesbos, preparadas para acoger a 3 000 personas, se amontonan más de 8 000, sin acceso adecuado a agua, alimentos, atención médica o incluso un techo. Los socialistas hemos conseguido introducir este debate en el pleno pero, lamentablemente, una mayoría formada por grupos políticos tanto a nuestra derecha como a nuestra izquierda, han impedido que se pudiera aprobar una resolución en la que el Parlamento reclamara medidas concretas tanto a la Comisión como al Consejo. Pedimos al Gobierno griego el fin de la política de contención y traslados urgentes al continente que permitan un tratamiento digno y evitar una nueva tragedia este invierno, y exigimos al resto de gobiernos europeos, de una vez por todas, un mínimo de solidaridad que alivie la presión sobre Grecia y que dé una salida digna a estos miles de seres humanos que no han cometido ningún delito y que requieren de nuestra protección.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), *por escrito*. – El invierno ya está aquí y seguimos con las mismas o mayores carencias que hace un año en la cobertura de las necesidades básicas de miles de personas migrantes y demandantes de asilo —entre ellas muchas mujeres y niños— atrapadas en las islas griegas. En Samos y Lesbos, preparadas para acoger a 3 000 personas, se amontonan más de 8 000, sin acceso adecuado a agua, alimentos, atención médica o incluso un techo. Los socialistas hemos conseguido introducir este debate en el pleno pero, lamentablemente, una mayoría formada por grupos políticos tanto a nuestra derecha como a nuestra izquierda, han impedido que se pudiera aprobar una resolución en la que el Parlamento reclamara medidas concretas tanto a la Comisión como al Consejo. Pedimos al Gobierno griego el fin de la política de contención y traslados urgentes al continente que permitan un tratamiento digno y evitar una nueva tragedia este invierno, y exigimos al resto de gobiernos europeos, de una vez por todas, un mínimo de solidaridad que alivie la presión sobre Grecia y que dé una salida digna a estos miles de seres humanos que no han cometido ningún delito y que requieren de nuestra protección.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI), *γραφτώς*. – Οι διαβεβαιώσεις ότι η συμφωνία Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – Τουρκίας και η παρουσία του NATO και της Ευρωσυνριοφυλακής στο Αιγαίο αντιμετωπίζουν το προσφυγικό κατέρρευσαν. Οι εναλλασσόμενες φάσεις εξέλιξης του προσφυγικού ακολουθούν τις φάσεις των ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων και της κόντρας Τουρκίας – Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, με τους πρόσφυγες να γίνονται εργαλείο εκβιασμών. Οι προσφυγικές ροές εκτοξεύτηκαν και πάλι. Οι πρόσφυγες στοιβάζονται σε απάνθρωπες συνθήκες –παρά τα εκατομμύρια που δόθηκαν στις ΜΚΟ- σε στρατόπεδα εγκλωβισμού στα νησιά, με δυναμικότητα φιλοξενίας πολύ κάτω από τον αριθμό των προσφύγων. Ο κίνδυνος θανάτων σε συνθήκες χειμώνα, όπως πέρυσι, είναι άμεσος. Η κατάσταση είναι δραματική για τους πρόσφυγες, τους εργαζόμενους στις δομές και τους κατοίκους των νησιών-φυλακών. Το διαπίστωσαν πρόσφατα οι ευρωβουλευτές του ΚΚΕ με επιτόπου επισκέψεις τους. Η παρωδία του προγράμματος μετεγκατάστασης και η πολιτική του Δουβλίνου με σύνθημα «μακριά οι πρόσφυγες», που ακολουθούν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και η ελληνική κυβέρνηση για να αποθαρρύνουν την έλευση προσφύγων, πέρα από τον εγκλωβισμό, μπλοκάρει και τις οικογενειακές επανενώσεις, γεγονός που οδήγησε σε απεργία πείνας προσφύγων στην Αθήνα. Πρέπει να σταματήσει αυτή η βαρβαρότητα· άμεση κατάργηση των στρατοπέδων προσφύγων και μεταναστών και βελτίωση των συνθηκών φιλοξενίας. Να ανοίξουν οι δρόμοι μετάβασης προσφύγων για όπου αυτοί επιθυμούν.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

9. Formal sitting – Slovakia

President. – President Kiska, it is a pleasure to have you here in the European Parliament today. The European Parliament is the heart of our democracy. Your speech is important for us, to have your ideas, your proposals. We are in the middle of the debate on the future of the European Union. To have the leaders in this Parliament is important because we want to have very good debates, very good meetings with European leaders. I want to thank you once again for your visit here, and I now give you the floor.

(Applause)

Andrej Kiska, *President of the Slovak Republic*. – Mr President, it was a great honour to accept the invitation to speak to this distinguished European auditorium. There is not a more representative place where any European politician could express his views on the future of our European project.

Even the timing of my address here could hardly be better. In two days, Slovakia will celebrate the day when we made our first steps to democracy. It all began with young people, with students whose courage to stand up against the regime had opened the door to the Velvet Revolution. Twenty-eight years ago we went into the streets and we called for freedom, human rights and democratic institutions. We forced the Communist regime to dissolve, after four decades.

When I try to comprehend what we have achieved since 17 November 1989, I almost cannot believe how far we have managed to get. I stand here as the president of a proud, free and democratic country – a member of the European Union – whose citizens can travel freely across the continent and use the same currency as countries from the opposite side of the inglorious Iron Curtain.

None of it would be possible without the attractive power of peace and prosperity of the European project. We have succeeded because we had a vital vision to become a part of the West, and because we were granted the opportunity to fulfil this dream through the European Union. Indeed, the success story of Slovakia is a success story of European integration.

(Applause)

The timing of my speech here might be a lucky chance, but it is no coincidence that I have decided to begin my remarks with the success story of European integration in the part of Europe I am coming from. Because in the middle of the overwhelming pessimism of the past few years, it seems almost out of place to talk about success. And yet, I am convinced that these doubts about the ability of the EU to cope with common challenges, to overcome present difficulties, are greatly exaggerated. Make no mistake, this does not make them less dangerous. They are in our heads, they influence sentiment in our societies, they tamper with our electoral decisions. In the end, they even drive our political and policy actions.

So I am not here to downplay the dangers of populism, nationalism and extremism fuelled by dissatisfaction in our societies and amplified by professionally-orchestrated propaganda. I am not here to underestimate the consequences of Brexit, or the real challenges we need to address in the monetary union, border protection or elsewhere. But I am here to forcefully reject the idea that there are some fundamental flaws in the architecture of the EU that will lead us to a bleak future. That something is rotten in the European project and it has been somehow responsible for the recent rise of extremism and nationalism. I am here to refuse the popular game of 'blame it on Brussels' whenever it serves to cover some pressing domestic political issue.

(Applause)

Let me point out where I do see a weakness in upholding the EU project. There is no doubt we defend the right cause – the project of peace, prosperity and human dignity. Facts speak volumes about the success of European integration. Of course, anti-European populists and extremists cannot beat us in providing solutions to improve the lives of our citizens. But too often it looks like they beat us with their limitless confidence and passion for their case. We need real, stronger leadership, more confidence and devotion when acting and speaking up on behalf of the EU.

We are aware of this problem in Slovakia. A month ago we adopted a joint declaration of the President, the Speaker of the Parliament and the Prime Minister, which strongly and decisively reinforces our membership in the EU as a strategic interest without any alternative for the future of our country. We have agreed that we will communicate with our public responsibly. That we will not use double language abroad and at home about EU decisions.

(Applause)

I consider this point especially important. We can see how often the EU is misused in political campaigns, and how well it serves populists to present all victories as national, and all defeats as European. We cannot get trapped by images of doom portrayed by those who would like to see us in another crisis. The EU is not a sinking ship and we do not have to radically reform the way we operate. The most pressing issues can be solved by finishing what we have begun years ago. This is valid for the euro zone, Schengen or the single market.

Not all of our past decisions were picture perfect and it will take some fine-tuning to overcome the challenges we face. But we do not need revolution. We just have to focus on what the EU Members have mastered during 60 years of integration – solving the issues together, helping each other and learning from each other.

Solidarity and mutual trust are crucial to our success and our strength to overcome whatever comes next. But the recent migration crisis unfortunately left wounds on our mutual trust. And it will take time and effort to eventually heal these wounds. So let me today just say something that I used to repeat again and again during our heated domestic discussions. It is our moral duty to help children, women and men who flee their homes to save their lives, and Slovakia should never hesitate to show solidarity to our friends and partners in the EU.

(Applause)

Slovakia openly pursues its strategic interest to be at the core of European integration, but I think we should focus on substance, on achieving convincing results, and not lose too much energy in debates on a core or so-called multi-speed Europe. This discussion is not new. Only players and contexts differ.

There has always been and there always will be EU countries willing to do more than others at some point in time. To explore more areas of cooperation is certainly not against the unity of the EU when agreed rules are respected, but it is crucial that new initiatives are open to anyone interested. And I know for sure that Slovakia will not look for back seats when new projects are on the table.

While we invest our effort in the consolidation of our internal affairs, we shall not forget the role of the EU beyond its borders. Because there are many threats out there with a significant impact on our common future, security and well-being.

The EU today is an economic superpower, but its voice in the security challenges around us is quite limited, whether it is dealing with Russia over the illegal annexation of Crimea and its support of separatists in Donbas, or the situation in Syria and Libya. But the EU was built to be the project of peaceful economic integration, not a common military powerhouse. It always feels a bit cheap to criticise perceived lack of geopolitical prestige or a lack of operational capability during sudden crises, if one is not willing to equip the EU with proper abilities and powers. Or if one is not ready to respect common actions when they matter the most.

We in Slovakia are in favour of a more ambitious foreign and security policy of the EU. I do not think it is sustainable to limit the EU to the role of a money-raising benefactor after the dust settles, a benefactor trying to rebuild what has been left or destroyed by interventions of unscrupulous players on the international scene. Looking at the world today, it must be clear that the EU needs to transform itself into a more powerful global player.

But I suggest we address this task rather honestly. No common policy can be efficient if it is pushed aside any time someone deems it convenient. I am content that we have abandoned the idea of some European army as a starting point, because we need first to agree on what it really means to strengthen our cooperation in this field.

Also, let me be clear: in Slovakia, we have never seen this initiative as an attempt to compete with the defence guarantees provided by NATO and a strategic partnership with the United States. But we see lot of room where enhanced European cooperation can fill in and play a crucial role. Without merging our resources together, we would never be able to stand up to our ambitions. That is why Slovakia welcomes the idea of 'permanent structured cooperation'.

While speaking about security, let me add one remark. I am following an ongoing investigation in the United States about the scope of Russian interference in their presidential elections. Then I look back home where I can hardly see any action at all. And I always tell myself how lucky we are to live in Europe where, apparently, No Russian influence is felt, as none is being intensively investigated ...

But, on a more serious note, while we start talking about the European defence projects, we should act together against the imminent and dangerous threat we all face – the Russian propaganda and information war. It would be ridiculous to work on our defence hardware but leave this vulnerability open to attacks. Honestly, it would be shame to let the European project fail because of our inability to halt the dissemination of hoaxes and fake news ...

(Applause)

... because propaganda has real consequences in our everyday lives. It shaped the moods in the EU and influences attitudes of our citizens. It seeks to spread chaos, to weaken our stability, to undermine the trust of people in our institutions, and to make us afraid of every upcoming election.

One of the biggest threats comes from inside. We need to look into organised financial and personal schemes linked to media, non-governmental organisations, business entities or political parties. It is no secret that people in our countries get hired and used to destabilise our societies. In many cases, we simply ignore it or feel it inappropriate to take action. But Russia becomes more bold in its efforts to destabilise Europe and it is ready to use any situation to this end.

I really appreciate that this Parliament approved a resolution on Russian propaganda last year. It was a bold and much needed first step. It is clear the problem should be dealt with the utmost political and expert attention at the European level and it should lead to active defence. We shall not tolerate disinformation interfering with our strategic interests. We must defend ourselves, in words and in deeds.

I have mentioned the post-Communist journey of my own country as proof of the success of European integration, and I will go even further and say that enlargement itself has been the most successful EU policy since the fall of the Berlin Wall.

(Applause)

It has been the most important contribution of European politicians of the past three decades to keep the continent peaceful, free and prosperous.

I have no doubt that our common future will be determined greatly by our capability to accept new members, by our ability to secure the stability and prosperity of our neighbourhood. No matter how serious our internal challenges seem to be right now, we must not give up on enlargement.

The fate of the Western Balkan countries must remain one of our priorities. Yes, there are reasons to be disappointed by the lack of progress in reforms, in overcoming old divisions, but rather than relax our attention, the EU should engage more. We have horrific experience of what could happen if the Western Balkans stay at the margin of our attention. The security and stability of the region is closely intertwined with the security and stability of the EU, so we cannot afford to give up on them. That means we cannot kill the vision of successful integration for them.

A failure to offer hope is empowering adversaries of a prosperous, peaceful and integrated Europe. We simply cannot lose our friends in our neighbourhood, especially in the Eastern Neighbourhood. In this situation it is ridiculous to spend months in discussions on how to avoid any reference to a membership vision, instead of focusing on what we can offer them.

Let me be more specific. Moldova is one of the poorest parts of Europe. People there desperately long for better lives that can be achieved through reforms and a realistic vision of a better future, something that the EU can offer the best. Without our help, they will be left vulnerable to the Kremlin's interference.

Georgia, a country that has been doing its best for well over a decade; our true ally in the region. But also a country that suffers from a recent war with Russia. A big part of its territory is still illegally occupied and people are left suffering. I touched the barbed-wire fence that can divide your garden overnight and leave you with no access to your family. And yet, Georgia has not lost its strategic direction towards the West. So let's not put this bond at risk by our ignorance and indifference that could lead to irreparable damage.

And finally, Ukraine, our biggest neighbour, is fighting its war for a territorial integrity while carrying out reforms at the same time. I often hear they do not do enough. But they will not do better if we lose our interest, cut off our support and leave them on their own. Moreover, if we get back to business as usual with Putin's regime, if we lift the sanctions without forcing the Kremlin to respect international law and principles, then we are willing to trade our own long-term security and stability for dubious individual short-term profits and interests.

European integration embodies everything that is dear to us – life in peace, life in dignity where every human being is respected. It is our common heritage; our precious and verified plan to survive, our only meaningful path to the future. I am sure the European Union has many great years ahead.

(The House accorded the speaker a standing ovation)

President. – President Kiska, thank you very much for your speech. The debate on the future of the European Union is open. Thank you for your contribution.

Onorevole Batten, prego.

Gerard Batten (EFDD). – Mr President, on a point of order under Rule 22, and in particular Rules 5(4) and 38 regarding the rights and freedoms of MEPs and our rights to information, on Wednesday, 8 November I was one of a small group of UK MEPs asked to meet the UK House of Commons EU Exiting Committee. We were going to have a short meeting, but that was cut even shorter when Mr Guy Verhofstadt refused to enter the room until the other UK MEPs had left. Mr Hilary Benn, the Chair of the committee, reluctantly had to ask us to leave.

The behaviour of Mr Verhofstadt contravened the rules I quoted, and was deliberately obstructing an exchange of views between MEPs and UK MPs. I am going to write to you separately, but I would like to ask you to take steps to have Mr Verhofstadt removed as the Parliament representative in the Brexit negotiations and replaced by somebody impartial.

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. – *(responding to an interruption from the floor)* We have Mr Corbett first and then you. OK? Silence, please.

(Applause)

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Mr President, with respect, what we have just heard is totally inaccurate. The House of Commons Committee on Brexit was indeed in the European Parliament and conducted a series of meetings with British Members from the different parties, with Mr Verhofstadt and the Brexit team, and with others. They did not, indeed, allow participants in one meeting to stay on to listen to what happened in the next of their meetings. That is perfectly reasonable and normal. To complain that he, Mr Batten, could not stay on for the next one of their meetings is distorting what was actually at stake. What happened was perfectly normal, proper practice and decided by the House of Commons – which they pretend to respect the sovereignty of – and yet they clearly have no respect whatsoever for the workings of the House of Commons.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, Governor Jerry Brown came here and gave us an interesting talk. We all made our contributions, I made mine, and I was looking forward to seeing it on the Parliament's TV thing. Sadly, I was excluded, as was Mr Peter Lundgren, and Mr Steven Woolfe was also excluded.

It gave rather the impression that the entire Parliament favoured the CO₂ method of global warming. That really is not the case, and it makes it look as if Parliament is being managed. I know you sir, and one of the reasons I voted for you – and I think you are a good man – is that you promised to protect minority views, and I know that you do. Perhaps you have not seen this, but it is bad if they put out propaganda that does not look as if it represents all the views. I would like to bring that to your attention.

(Applause)

Jacqueline Foster (ECR). – Mr President, just a point of clarification, if I may: I was present at the meeting when the House of Commons committee came to talk to us. Our colleague across the Chamber is not correct, because the chairman of that committee – Hilary Benn – was quite relaxed about the MEPs who were present, who we had had a brief discussion before with, about them remaining in the meeting with Mr Verhofstadt. That is just a point of clarification. The House of Commons committee, led by Hilary Benn, were quite happy for the MEPs, including the British ones, to be present at the next meeting. It was Mr Verhofstadt – it is obviously his choice – who had decided or determined that the MEPs should not remain. I will leave you with that thought.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Possiamo alle votazioni. Non dobbiamo fare un dibattito su quello che è accaduto. Ho capito qual è il problema.

Onorevole Collins, è per un altro problema?

Jane Collins (EFDD). – Mr President, this is a point of order under Rule 38. I have learned that Mr Barnier met with the GUE/NGL Group yesterday to discuss Brexit. He has made no effort at all to speak with the EFDD as a group. You know that Verhofstadt has excluded all eurosceptic groups from the Brexit Steering Committee. Please instruct them to include all MEPs in their discussions. If we do not have the information, we cannot express an opinion, and then that is a restriction of our rights.

(Applause)

Presidente. – Ho capito benissimo, onorevole Collins. Non apriamo un dibattito sulla questione. L'on. Verhofstadt ha la mia piena fiducia e la fiducia della stragrande maggioranza del Parlamento. Si può essere d'accordo o meno su quello che dice, ma ha la fiducia della stragrande maggioranza del Parlamento.

Onorevoli colleghi, sia molto chiaro. Io ho sempre rispettato tutte le opinioni che si esprimono in questo Parlamento, però non tollero che questa Aula si trasformi in un circo. Quindi non tollero né boati né atteggiamenti aggressivi, è chiaro?

Jo Leinen (S&D). – Mr President, from Brexit to more pleasant developments, we have on the tribune a delegation from the National People's Congress from China, and, after a break of one and a half years, we are pleased to have again an interparliamentary meeting. A lot of changes in China and Europe that we will discuss this afternoon and tomorrow morning, and I think we should give the colleagues a very warm welcome.

(Applause)

10. Welcome

Presidente. – Mi associo anch'io al saluto ai rappresentanti del Congresso nazionale del popolo cinese in occasione della quarantesima riunione interparlamentare Unione europea-Cina.

11. Composition of Parliament : see Minutes

12. Composition of committees

Presidente. – Ho ricevuto dal gruppo ALDE una richiesta di nomina di una commissione. Tale nomina figurerà nel processo verbale della seduta odierna. Se entro l'adozione del processo verbale non sarà presentata alcuna osservazione, tale nomina sarà considerata approvata.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, je sais que vous êtes très soucieux du respect et des bons débats. Ce matin, nous avons eu un débat sur la Pologne et...

(Le Président interrompt l'orateur)

Presidente. – Onorevole, o mi dice qual è il punto all'ordine del giorno, se no non le posso dare la parola. Qual è il punto all'ordine del giorno? Se dobbiamo fare un altro dibattito sulla Polonia, visto che già c'è stato, è inutile continuare. Se c'è un punto all'ordine del giorno, lei mi dice qual è e intervenga. Se no stiamo perdendo tempo e non credo che sia giusto farlo.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur Verhofstadt a comparé les manifestations en Pologne avec Auschwitz. Ceci n'est pas possible, la Pologne a suffisamment souffert pour que l'on ne fasse pas d'amalgame de ce genre.

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

13. Voting time

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca il turno di votazioni.

(Per i risultati della votazioni e altri dettagli che le riguardano: vedasi processo verbale)

13.1. Election of a Vice-President of the European Parliament (to replace Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz) (vote)

13.2. Election of a Vice-President of the European Parliament (to replace Alexander Graf Lambsdorff) (vote)

13.3. Period for adopting delegated acts (A8-0332/2017 - Gesine Meissner) (vote)

13.4. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Karel Pinxten (A8-0336/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Indrek Tarand, rapporteur. – Mr President, I should like to thank all colleagues for the exciting votes for the Vice-Presidencies. It was a great feeling to be part of the Olympic Games again. While I do know how much we hate rapporteurs' two-minute speeches before a valuable voting time, in this case it would be wrong if I were silent about one issue, which is the Belgian candidate. In the Committee, we had the vote which did not support him because he was accused of some violations of rules on misbehaviour or something like that. But we are not the court here, and unless the person has not been proven guilty, he is innocent and we should keep that in mind.

On the other hand, we have the report adopted in 2014 by this Parliament, written by Ms Inés Ayala Sender, which basically says that we do not recommend than two more periods in office at the Court of Auditors in Luxembourg. On this occasion, this candidate is applying for a third. If you want to vote in favour, use my first excuse, if you want to vote, against use my second.

The other concern which there has been in the Court of Auditors is a gender balance. It is regrettable, but very big and old Member States have never considered promoting a woman candidate. It is not only for Finland, Estonia, Bulgaria and other small states to promote gender balance. It is also for Italy, Spain, Hungary, etc. (I did not mention Poland today, they got their share earlier in the morning).

Finally, the thing is that we should also consider if we want our former colleagues, politicians, to become members of the Court of Auditors. If we do, we have to be consistent. If we prefer to have professional auditors and accountants there to inspect our everyday dealings with financial matters, we should be also consistent. What we have is a mix. Sometimes bigger political groups take one deal, sometimes the other, depending on a candidate's political background.

We should come up with a decision – what do we really want? Otherwise, as a rapporteur, I would encourage you to vote according to your conscience and make the best possible decision for Europe.

13.5. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Pietro Russo (A8-0337/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)

- 13.6. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Hannu Takkula (A8-0338/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)**
- 13.7. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Baudilio Tomé Muguruza (A8-0342/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)**
- 13.8. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Bettina Jakobsen (A8-0341/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)**
- 13.9. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – João Alexandre Tavares Gonçalves de Figueiredo (A8-0343/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)**
- 13.10. Nomination of a member of the Court of Auditors – Iliana Ivanova (A8-0344/2017 - Indrek Tarand) (vote)**
- 13.11. Protection against dumped and subsidised imports from countries not members of the EU (A8-0236/2017 - Salvatore Cicu) (vote)**

— *Prima della votazione:*

Salvatore Cicu, relatore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, solo per sottolineare l'importanza di questo voto, un'importanza strategica per il Parlamento e per la sua politica commerciale. Con questo dossier andiamo a realizzare una nuova metodologia che, attraverso la sua applicazione, tutelerà la nostra europea e realizzerà la condizione soprattutto di non disperdere migliaia di posti di lavoro.

Consentitemi un ringraziamento particolare a tutti i colleghi e a tutti i relatori ombra che hanno con me contribuito a realizzare questo lavoro, di tutti i gruppi politici, e un ringraziamento particolare al Presidente del Parlamento Tajani, che ha accompagnato, in nome del Parlamento e in maniera imparziale, il dossier. Grazie a tutti.

13.12. Rule of law in Malta (B8-0596/2017, B8-0597/2017) (vote)

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

— *Before the vote on recital B:*

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Gestern wurde in vielen Redebeiträgen zu Malta eine direkte Parallele gezogen von Polen/Ungarn zu Malta. Deshalb will ich nochmal sehr deutlich sagen: Mit Blick auf die Panama-Papiere ist unsere Fraktion vehement dafür eingetreten, alle vorgebrachten Verwicklungen Malτας klar zu benennen und Aufklärung einzufordern. Manche Anträge konnten wir gegen den Widerstand anderer Fraktionen durchsetzen. An dieser Position hat sich nichts geändert und wird sich nichts ändern. Aber bezogen auf eine systematische Gefährdung von Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit sehen wir klare Unterschiede zwischen Polen/Ungarn und Malta. Aus diesem Grunde beantragt unsere Fraktion, die Worte „und Artikel 7“ in Erwägung B zu streichen.

(The oral amendment was accepted)

13.13. Multilateral negotiations in view of the 11th WTO Ministerial Conference (B8-0593/2017) (vote)

13.14. Eastern Partnership: November 2017 Summit (A8-0308/2017 - Laima Liucija Andrikienė, Knut Fleckenstein) (vote)

13.15. Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (B8-0589/2017) (vote)

13.16. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (B8-0594/2017, B8-0595/2017) (vote)

President. – That concludes the vote.

14. Explanations of vote

14.1. Protection against dumped and subsidised imports from countries not members of the EU (A8-0236/2017 - Salvatore Cicu)

Oral explanations of vote

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Változatlanul nagyon nagyon nehéz így beszélni, hogy hatalmas hangzavar van még a teremben, hiszen a szavazáson ugye kivételesen itt vannak a képviselők, és ilyenkor mennek ki, én még kérném egy kis türelmét Elnök Asszonynak, hogy esetleg még várjunk egy pár percet, nagyon nehéz így beszélni, és a választóinkat is megsértjük azzal, hogy ilyen körülmények között beszélünk fontos dolgokról.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, ‘very, very good proposal’, although he might not be so happy with the implications of the new anti-dumping measures Parliament voted for today. As Europeans, we pride ourselves on our high environmental and social standards, but if the Commission were serious, they would give legal status to Process and Production Methods, a World Trade Organisation initiative to ensure that consumers can have information about the environmental and social impacts of the products they are buying.

During the climate talks in Bonn, Trump’s administration is unapologetically carrying the beacon for dirty coal. To be consistent with the Paris Agreement, we within the EU must use trade restrictions in response. Over the weekend, thousands of ‘Ende Gelände’ activists stormed a coal mine in Germany calling for an end to fossil fuels. Their action needs legislative back-up from us as their democratic representatives. We cannot be pro-climate and pro-trade simultaneously if we are not willing to introduce restrictions on products relying on dirty coal.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěla vysvětlit, proč jsem podpořila změny dvou nařízení o ochraně před dumpingovým dovozem a ochraně před dovozem subvencovaných výrobků ze zemí, které nejsou členy Evropské unie.

Evropská unie musí chránit své podniky před dumpingovými dovozy zejména z Číny. Navržené změny jsou navíc kompatibilní s pravidly Světové obchodní organizace. Revize nařízení zavádí neutrální metodologii ve vztahu ke třetím státům, která Komisi umožní přistoupit ke kalkulaci nákladů na vstupy do výroby dle mezinárodního srovnání nebo srovnávacího základu ve vhodné reprezentativní zemi. Komise bude mít také možnost postihnout vyrovnávacími opatřeními nedovolené subvence způsobující prokazatelnou újmu průmyslu. Proto jsem tyto návrhy obou nařízení podpořila.

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, nos alegra que se reaccione por fin a los problemas del dumping en sectores industriales clave en nuestra economía, como es el del acero, aunque con menos determinación de la necesaria, por desgracia. No obstante, este informe incluye referencias al dumping social y medioambiental, lo cual es un avance. Pero lamentablemente son solo eso, referencias. En la parte legal del texto, el dumping de salarios o de estándares medioambientales desaparece.

Pero no nos vamos a tragar el cuento de los *lobbies*. El dumping es solo uno de los problemas de nuestra industria. La Unión Europea lleva más de una década abriendo mercados sin control, desregulando y separando industria del control público. A su vez, daban poder sin contrapartida a los *lobbies* de la industria: millones de euros en beneficios caídos del cielo con la implementación del fallido mercado del carbono.

Lo que necesitamos es una política industrial progresista que dé futuro a los sectores productivos estratégicos, los haga sostenibles medioambientalmente, sea social y solidaria y garantice el arraigo local de los territorios con la industria.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, today I backed vital EU action to prevent the dumping of cheap imports onto our market. These rules have long been called for by the steel industry, given that goods sold below the cost of production are putting thousands of jobs at risk across the continent. That is why I am baffled as to why the UK Government has announced that it is not planning to match these protections after Brexit, making the UK steel sector a sitting duck for cheap Chinese products.

In my region, in the West Midlands, it means bread and butter for no less than 260 000 people. That is the number of jobs that depend on the steel industry in the West Midlands that are being put at risk by the Tories. I call on the UK Government to reconsider its reckless approach to Brexit that is devastating the economy, and at least ensure our businesses can fight with equal weapons following the UK's departure from the EU.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να αμυνθεί απέναντι στις αθέμιτες εμπορικές πρακτικές, τις οποίες εφαρμόζουν πολύ συγκεκριμένα κράτη. Αναφέρομαι ειδικότερα στην Κίνα, η οποία κάνει ντάμπινγκ συνεχές, με αποτέλεσμα να έχει διαλυθεί ουσιαστικά η βιομηχανία χάλυβα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Πρέπει λοιπόν να αντιμετωπίσουμε τις πολιτικές ντάμπινγκ, οι οποίες δεν εκφράζονται μόνο με την ενίσχυση υπό μορφή εξαγωγικών επιδοτήσεων, αλλά κυρίως με τη μη εφαρμογή ουσιαστικά, σε μια σειρά κρατών, των διεθνών προτύπων που καθορίζει η Διεθνής Οργάνωση Εργασίας σε σχέση με την απασχόληση. Έτσι, στο τέλος έχουμε μια μείωση του κόστους, ακριβώς λόγω της μείωσης του μισθολογικού κόστους επειδή δεν τηρούνται οι διεθνείς όροι σε σχέση με την εργατική νομοθεσία. Ταυτόχρονα, τα κράτη αυτά δεν τηρούν και τους περιβαλλοντικούς όρους και όλα αυτά έχουν ως συνέπεια τη μείωση του κόστους παραγωγής και, φυσικά, τη διαμόρφωση ενός κλίματος ντάμπινγκ. Όλα αυτά πρέπει να τα αντιμετωπίσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tyto novely nařízení Evropského parlamentu. Jsem přesvědčen, že je třeba mít jasná pravidla pro boj s dumpingem. Sám jsem příznivcem maximální možné šíře volného obchodu mezi jednotlivými státy. Na druhou stranu není možné respektovat nebo tolerovat dumpingové praktiky. Je dobře, že tato nařízení dneska prošla, protože mi taky reagujeme na určité problémy dosavadní právní úpravy a střetu dosavadní právní úpravy s platnými pravidly Světové obchodní organizace.

Důležité poselství z toho dneška je, že Evropský parlament nechce v žádném případě dopustit, aby do Evropy bylo dováženo zboží, které je uměle subvencováno a aby tak byly ohroženy některé složky našeho evropského průmyslu. Pro Českou republiku je třeba říci, že zvláště ocelářský průmysl v České republice byl ohrožen dumpingovým zbožím.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Madam President, the whole premise of this debate is wrong – the whole tenor of the arguments we have just been hearing from my friends in the Socialist Group about cheap imports, as though they are a bad thing. Think of what lower prices mean for people on low incomes! The countries that have done best are the ones who did not worry about cheap imports, about dumping if you want to call it that.

They took the view that, if foreign taxpayers wanted to subsidise their own consumers, that was more foolish of the foreign taxpayers and very nice for their consumers, and the Hong Kongs, the Singapores, more recently the Australias and New Zealands, all benefited by opening their markets without insisting on reciprocity.

Behind all of this talk about protectionism and anti-dumping lies the reality that protectionism is a way of transferring wealth from entrepreneurs to politically connected old companies, from start-ups to companies with unionised labour, from the many to the few, and frankly from the poor to the rich.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Paní předsedající, určitě je dobře, že Evropská unie chrání své trhy a svou ekonomiku před nekalou konkurencí přicházející především ze států vlastněných nebo spoluvlastněných podniků, ale řekněme si jasně, že přesto, že stojí zato podpořit toto nařízení, nemáme vyhráno. My nevíme, jestli je kompatibilní s pravidly Světové obchodní organizace, a Čína, kvůli které se to vlastně všechno dělá, tak celkem logicky bude tato opatření u Světové obchodní organizace napadat. Napadla to, že jsme jí nepřiznali statut tržní ekonomiky loňského prosince. Teď po roce, když se to pokoušíme řešit tímto opatřením, zcela logicky napadne i toto opatření. Já bych rád věděl, jestli máme, jestli Evropská komise i Evropský parlament mají nějaký plán B pro případ, že u Světové obchodní organizace neuspějeme a že Čína naopak uspěje, protože to by nás postavilo do velmi nevýhodné situace. Nicméně toto nařízení já jsem v tuto chvíli podpořil.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem rovněž podpořil předložené návrhy. Podle mého názoru máme povinnost chránit náš vnitřní trh a to především smysluplnými a jasnými pravidly. Chceme to u ochrany hranic a myslím si, že bychom to měli samozřejmě vyžadovat i u ochrany vnitřního trhu. Kvalita, splnění vlastně všech norem důležitých pro ochranu zdraví, pro ochranu spotřebitelů, to jsou všechno nároky, které musíme klást na dovozce, kteří právě vstupují na náš vnitřní trh.

Myslím si, že nekalým postupům bychom měli zabránit. Projevují se nejen v ocelářství, ale i v zemědělství. Projevují se velmi negativně na úseku životního prostředí. Myslím, že toto všechno bychom měli zvážit, a tudíž já jsem přivítal tento návrh, který zvyšuje pravomoci Komise, protože se taky do jisté míry srovnávají pravidla. Pokud chceme po našich zemědělci, po našich výrobcích, firmách, aby plnili veškeré normy, tak toto musíme chtít bezesporu od těch, kteří na náš trh vstupují z vnějšku.

14.2. Rule of law in Malta (B8-0596/2017, B8-0597/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Gyakran fogadunk el állásfoglalást az újságírók életének és személyes biztonságának védelmében, amikor EU-n kívüli, általában fejlődő országokról van szó. Közben nem fektetünk elég hangsúlyt rá, hogy egy EU-tagállamban is leszámolás áldozatai lehetnek azok a sajtómunkások, akik a politikai vagy gazdasági elit számára kényelmetlen ügyeket tárnak fel. Sokszor bíraltuk itt Törökországot vagy Oroszországot az újságírókkal szembeni erőszakos cselekedetek miatt, ezért a máltai eset azt jelzi, az EU-ban is van tennivalónk ezen a téren.

Azt hiszem, nemcsak Máltán fordulhat elő, hogy egy újságíró leszámolás áldozata lesz, a mai nyitott világban mindenhol veszélyt hordoz magában a tényfeltárás és az oknyomozás. Itt az ideje, hogy tettekkkel mutassunk példát az újságírók védelmére: a hatóságok vizsgálják ki az esetet és találják meg a felelősöket! Különböző joggal mutogatnak ránk azok, akiket a sajtószabadság lábbal tiprásával vádolunk, hogy előbb a saját problémáinkat oldjuk meg.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo di non esagerare definendo Daphne Caruana Galizia una martire della libertà. Lei, giornalista tenace e coraggiosa, era stata più volte minacciata per il suo lavoro di indagine a Malta sui Panama Papers e continuava il suo lavoro per difendere la libertà di espressione sancita dalla Carta dei diritti fondamentali, come del resto la stessa indipendenza della magistratura.

Ora, dopo il suo assassinio con un'autobomba, sappiamo che lo stesso popolo maltese è sceso in piazza per chiedere verità e giustizia. È quello che dobbiamo continuare a fare noi dopo che l'Osservatorio per il pluralismo dei media ha definito alto il rischio a Malta ed una delegazione del Parlamento europeo ha ritenuto che gli organi di controllo e giudiziari siano politicizzati.

Questa relazione, che appoggio, esprime gravi preoccupazioni per lo Stato di diritto a Malta e per questo, come cittadina, come giornalista e come eurodeputato, chiedo un'indagine internazionale e chiedo che si faccia verità e giustizia su questo assassinio.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil návrh tohoto usnesení a jsem rád, že prošel. Já jsem vždycky opatrný, když projednáváme vnitropolitickou situaci v některém členském státě a přijímáme k tomu usnesení. Ale v tomto případě se jedná o věc, kterou musí evropské instituce jasně monitorovat a jasně odsoudit. Je to zcela bezprecedentní, že na území Evropské unie byl zavražděn novinář, paní Galiziová. Je to opravdu tak závažný fakt, že k tomu Evropská unie nesmí mlčet, a je dobře, že zde jasně hájíme principy právního státu a jasně chceme po orgánech Maltý, aby tuto situaci vyšetřily.

Stejně tak je dobře, že tam řešíme další problémy spojené s fungováním právního státu na Maltě, jako je třeba otázka praní špinavých peněz. Principy právního státu patří mezi základní principy, základní hodnoty Evropské unie. Jsou to základní evropské hodnoty a my je takto musíme hájit.

14.3. Multilateral negotiations in view of the 11th WTO Ministerial Conference (B8-0593/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señora presidenta, he votado a favor de esta Resolución. Especialmente quería destacar algunos aspectos; por eso la explicación de mi voto. Prefiero un comercio multilateral que esté regulado. Ante esta globalización es la única forma de garantizar que tengamos unas normas y que los débiles puedan subsistir ante esta globalización. Pero hay tres propuestas en la Resolución que quería destacar.

La número 8, en la que destaca la importancia de conseguir los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible para 2030 y los compromisos del Acuerdo de París. El cambio climático es un problema mundial que debemos abordar todos los países.

También en la Resolución, el punto número 9 reitera el vínculo que existe entre la igualdad de género y el desarrollo inclusivo, recalando que el empoderamiento de la mujer es indispensable para erradicar la pobreza.

Y el punto 6, que habla sobre la agricultura, y que destaca que los posibles resultados no deben anteponerse a los debates del futuro de la paz.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Organizația Mondială a Comerțului are ca scop liberalizarea serviciilor și vrea să încurajeze un flux de servicii și accesul pe piață. De la momentul lansării Runde de la Doha în 2001, lumea s-a schimbat. Noile provocări, precum comerțul electronic, comerțul digital sau transparența investițiilor trebuie puse în acord cu realitatea. Ce vrem? Vrem un flux de servicii fără piedici, vrem un mediu de afaceri în care se pot dezvolta și au acces pe piață. Aceasta se face prin acces mai ușor, mai ieftin, prin reducerea costurilor, prin reducerea poverilor administrative, prin reducerea procedurilor vamale, inclusiv pentru oamenii de afaceri și IMM-urile din România. În plus, toate acestea se pot clădi numai atunci când avem stabilitate legală și stabilitate fiscală.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Madam President, I supported the resolution, as our group – the ECR – is committed to the multilateral trade agenda and to a positive outcome in Buenos Aires. The central role of the WTO as the multilateral forum for trade discussions needs strengthening and, where progress is not possible, the WTO should not stay stuck on these topics, but instead advance in areas where it can advance and make a difference. This could be e-commerce, investment facilitation or SMEs. So, again, the work of the WTO can strongly contribute to the opening of markets and enhancing global trade. This is work which should be supported, and I was happy to do that.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Konferencja Buenos Aires może być przełomowa. Może, ale oczywiście nie musi. Kluczowe jest stanowisko Stanów Zjednoczonych w sprawie negocjowanych umów, a jak wiemy dziś nie jest to stanowisko dla nas interesujące.

Zwracam uwagę przy tej okazji na dwa elementy. Długa perspektywa, jaką się posługujemy, to dobra zapowiedź do odpowiedzialności dobrze rozłożonej w czasie, ale niestety przy bardzo szybko zmieniających się warunkach prowadzenia handlu, przy uruchomieniu także możliwości sprzedaży drogą cyfrową, przez internet, trzeba pamiętać o konieczności zachowania daleko idących elementów elastyczności, tak aby sztywność porozumień nie blokowała, zwłaszcza rozwoju handlu, rozwoju wymiany w ramach nowych technologii.

14.4. Eastern Partnership: November 2017 Summit (A8-0308/2017 - Laima Liucija Andrikiienė, Knut Fleckenstein)

Oral explanations of vote

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W dniu wczorajszym byłem dość krytyczny. Zwracałem uwagę w debacie, że mamy za dużą rozpiętość pomiędzy słowami a czynami, zwłaszcza jeżeli chodzi o tę bezpośrednią aktywność eurodeputowanych w tych porozumieniach, w tych rozmowach czy w tych negocjacjach, w których dochodzi do głosowań i to głosowań dla nas – podkreślam – kluczowych. Tak było w Kijowie podczas posiedzenia Euronestu. Dziś z satysfakcją chciałbym odnotować jeden bardzo ważny fakt. Dość zgodnie odrzucono dwie niezbyt fortunne poprawki i bardzo dużą większością, ponad pięciuset eurodeputowanych, przyjęliśmy te wytyczne, które są kluczowe na szczyt Partnerstwa Wschodniego, który za moment się rozpoczyna. Jeszcze raz chcę na to zwrócić uwagę. Z mojego punktu widzenia to jest bardzo, bardzo istotne.

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem hlasovala pro doporučení Evropského parlamentu Radě a Komisi k Východnímu partnerství. Považuji tuto otázku, otázku bezpečnosti, která je dlouhodobou prioritou také pro zahraniční politiku České republiky, za zcela zásadní pro naši budoucnost. Ostatně právě projekt Východního partnerství byl zahájen v Praze v době českého předsednictví v roce 2009. V některých ze šesti zemí, kterých se týká, dochází postupně ke zhoršení bezpečnostní situace, situace v oblasti lidských práv nebo demokratizačních trendů.

To neznamená, že bychom měli něco na tomto projektu měnit, ale musíme poskytnout těmto zemím další podporu a povzbuzení. Proto zpráva obsahuje řadu doporučení pro Radu, která by měla zvážit například jednání o celní unii, o Schengenu. Víím, že to v dohledné době není realistické, ale měli bychom o tom do budoucna uvažovat.

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, the Eastern Partnership launched eight years ago is one of the most successful foreign policy initiatives taken by the EU. It gave practical and measurable results. Four thousand students have gained a scholarship in the EU, 10 000 people have been exchanged in exchange programmes, and most importantly citizens of Moldova, Georgia and Ukraine now travel visa-free to the EU.

However, this partnership needs new dynamism and the countries of the region still need help. Ukraine needs help to resist the Russian occupation. The Minsk agreement has to be respected, and these other countries need help to resist the Russian influence. Only then may these countries be able to make a move towards the EU and to improve and have a clear stance towards the Union, to get closer to it.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamna președintă, statele membre ale Uniunii trebuie să acționeze și să vorbească cu o singură voce și fără înțelegeri oculte cu Federația Rusă, pentru a fi un partener unic și clar și transparent pentru țările din Parteneriatul Estic care încă se luptă să iasă din comunism. Să nu uităm, Crimeea este sub ruși, în estul Ucrainei încă mor oameni, iar cei care luptă pentru ruși în Ucraina sunt antrenați în Transnistria. Propaganda rusă iarăși trebuie contracarată, secundă de secundă. De exemplu, prezintă Uniunea Europeană ca pe o dictatură, în timp ce dictatura este în Federația Rusă. După semnarea acordurilor de asociere, Uniunea a devenit principalul partener pentru Georgia, Moldova, Ucraina. În Ucraina, de exemplu, comerțul dintre Ucraina și Uniune a crescut cu peste 27% numai în perioada ianuarie - august 2017, iar exportul moldovenilor a crescut cu peste 15%.

Un singur lucru aş mai vrea să spun: parteneriatul este o politică pe termen lung şi evoluţia lui depinde de reformele reale pe care le fac şi pe care oamenii trebuie să le simtă în buzunare, la doctor, în administraţie, pe străzi, în maşini, în viaţa lor de zi cu zi.

Rupert Matthews (ECR). – Madam President, those countries that have escaped the fatal grip of Communist Soviet Union – namely Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine – all deserve our support as they move towards democracy, the rule of law and human rights, as well as support for a market economy, sustainable development and good governance. That is why I am pleased to be voting in favour of this motion, and we should all be committed to a stronger, more democratic and more successful Eastern neighbourhood to the European Union. But at the same time, we should not try to force them all into a straitjacket of one single answer to their problems. The brotherhood of nations belongs in the hearts of men, not in supranational institutions.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, καταψήφισα την έκθεση για την Ανατολική Εταιρική Σχέση διότι θεωρώ ότι δεν είναι αμοιβαία επωφελής, ιδίως όταν αυτή τη στιγμή υπάρχει και λειτουργεί η συμφωνία Ελεύθερων Συναλλαγών Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ουκρανίας. Μια συμφωνία που θα διαλύσει την αγροτική οικονομία σε όλη την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Έχω επισημάνει και παλαιότερα ότι η συμφωνία αυτή θα οδηγήσει σε αθρόα εισαγωγή αγροτικών προϊόντων -και κυρίως κτηνοτροφικών προϊόντων- από την Ουκρανία στην Ελλάδα, τα οποία θα είναι αμφιβόλου ποιότητας και πάμφθηνα και θα έχουν, βεβαίως, ως αποτέλεσμα τη διάλυση της κτηνοτροφίας στην Ελλάδα.

Θεωρώ, λοιπόν, επικίνδυνη αυτή τη λειτουργία και θεωρώ επίσης ότι η ελληνική κυβέρνηση έπρεπε να μη συμφωνήσει στη διαδικασία κύρωσης της συμφωνίας Ελεύθερων Συναλλαγών Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ουκρανίας. Μόνο με αυτόν τον τρόπο θα μπορούσε να προστατεύσει την ελληνική κτηνοτροφία.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, protože osobně jako poslanec za Českou republiku považuji za velmi důležité, že rozvíjíme Východní partnerství. Do budoucna bych byl ještě ambicióznější ve společné spolupráci se zeměmi, které se přidružily k Evropské unii.

Považuji za velmi důležité podporovat Gruzii, Ukrajinu a Moldavsko v jejich úsilí v přibližování se k Evropské unii. Ve chvíli, kdy toto úsilí z naší strany nebude opravdové, tak bude pokračovat posilování vlivu Ruska v tomto regionu a my zkrátka musíme chtít, aby tyto země nastoupily cestu demokracie, svobody, právního státu a tržní ekonomiky, nikoliv, aby tam byly posilovány různé autoritativní režimy, které pak jsou podporovány ze strany Ruska. Takže já to vítám a jsem také rád, že se tam jasně odsuzují některé aktivity Ruska v tomto regionu, na prvním místě okupace Krymu.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! To bardzo dobrze, że gdy myślimy o Europie, nasz wzrok sięga do Gruzji, do Armenii, do krajów, gdzie często rodziła się nasza cywilizacja. To dobrze, że myśląc o Europie, pamiętamy o narodach Europy Wschodniej.

Tylko pytanie, czy mamy do czynienia rzeczywiście z solidarnością? Gdy spojrzymy na tekst naszej dzisiejszej rezolucji, co my tam widzimy? Jest wprawdzie mowa o niedyskryminacji, o mniejszościach, ale gdy spojrzymy głębiej, w tekście – mimo że deklaratywnie tam jest na przykład mowa o mniejszościach – nie ma ani słowa o tożsamości narodowej, ani słowa o prawach językowych, prawach szkolnych. Mimo że temat dzisiaj jest bardzo aktualny i wielu kolegów o tym mówiło. Tam nie ma ani słowa o komunizmie i konieczności wydobywania się z totalitaryzmu. Tak naprawdę, jeżeli szanujemy te narody, to zainteresujemy się ich wartościami, bo na razie eksportujemy do nich niestety naszą dekadencję.

14.5. Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (B8-0589/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Megrendítő ez a jelentés az európai környezeti állapotokról, környezetszennyezésről, természetpusztításról, de hát észre kell, hogy vegyük, hogy ez egyenesen következik az Európai Unió gazdaságából és jellegéből. Hiszen nyilvánvalóan az Európai Unió nem a helyi gazdaságokat támogatja, hanem ugye azt látjuk, hogy az úgymond egységes piacon tengernyi kamion és repülőgép szennyezi a levegőt, mert teljesen fölöslegesen hurcolja ugye az árukat – különösen így van ez a mezőgazdasági áruk esetében, vagy termények esetében –, az egyik végéből Európának a másikba.

Holott azt az adott tagállamokban is nagyon jól elő lehetne állítani, meg lehetne termelni, és ha már a mezőgazdaságnál tartunk, ír a jelentés arról, hogy ki van zsákmányolva a termőföld, vagy hogy milyen jól tenne a környezetnek, hogy ha lenne legeltetési állattenyésztés. De kérem szépen, ezek mind ellentmondanak magának az Európai Uniónak, amelyiknek például a mezőgazdasági támogatási rendszere is az iparosított, a környezetet is kizsákmányoló mezőgazdaságot támogatja.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Doamna președintă, Planul de acțiune pentru natură, oameni și economie trebuie pus în aplicare pentru conservarea mediului, esențială pentru fiecare om în parte, pentru viața noastră. Vrem cer și apă curată, vrem mâncare sănătoasă și nu plină de chimicale, vrem construcții care să nu ne otrăvească și așa mai departe. Resursele Pământului sunt tot mai limitate și informarea corectă a oamenilor este vitală, pentru că oamenii trebuie să ceară guvernelor să aplice corect legile europene care astăzi nu sunt corect și nici complet aplicate. De asemenea, trebuie să ceară guvernelor să oblige industriile de alimente, de energie, de produse chimice, de automobile, de materiale de construcții sau de mediu să nu influențeze politicile unor state membre și să finanțeze rețehnologizarea așa încât să ne protejeze viața și nu să ne omoare.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ψήφισα υπέρ της έκθεσης για το σχέδιο δράσης για τη φύση, τον άνθρωπο και την οικονομία. Θεωρώ ότι είναι σημαντικό σχέδιο, διότι προστατεύει τη βιοποικιλότητα και τις περιοχές Natura 2000. Όμως, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να αποδείξει στην πράξη ότι σέβεται τις περιοχές Natura 2000 και αναφέρομαι στην αναγκαιότητα να προχωρήσει στη λήψη μέτρων για τις παραβιάσεις που συμβαίνουν αυτή τη στιγμή στο όρος Όχι στη Νότια Καρυστία, μια περιοχή που έχει χαρακτηριστεί ως περιοχή Natura 2000.

Και όμως, εγκαθίστανται εκεί πάρα πολλά πάρκα που έχουν σχέση με την παραγωγή αιολικής ενέργειας. Σταθμοί, λοιπόν, αιολικής ενέργειας, οι οποίοι υπερβαίνουν αυτή τη στιγμή το 50% της δύναμης που θα εγκατασταθεί συνολικά σε όλη την Ελλάδα. Αυτό έχει ως αποτέλεσμα να καταστρέφεται το περιβάλλον, η βιοποικιλότητα, η πανίδα και η χλωρίδα και απαιτούνται μέτρα από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

14.6. The situation of the rule of law and democracy in Poland (B8-0594/2017, B8-0595/2017)

Oral explanations of vote

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Természetesen nemmel szavaztam a Lengyelországot elítélő gyalázatos jelentésre, tudják, kedves képviselőtársaim, mi magyarok és lengyelek nem szeretjük, hogy ha olyanok oktatnak bennünket demokráciából, akik a saját tagállamaikban, a saját lakosságuk elemi érdekeit figyelmen kívül hagyják, illetve a saját lakosságuk akaratát figyelmen kívül hagyják.

Mit tudnak ezek az emberek a demokráciáról? Ugye a vak is látja, hogy e gyalázatos terv nyomán telepítik be a világ különböző távoli tájairól a migránsokat Európába, ez ellen egyre elkeseredettebben tiltakozik a helyi lakosság. Mi magyarok és lengyelek együttérzéssel látjuk azt, ahogy mennek tönkre Nyugat-Európában a települések, az emberek élete, az emberek biztonságérzete. Magyarország és Lengyelország ellenáll, teljesen nyilvánvaló, hogy ezért büntetnek bennünket folyamatosan. De nyugodtan büntethetnek, mi ennél ellenállóbbakká válunk ezáltal.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Głosowałam przeciwko rezolucji, podobnie myśląc jak większość Polaków popierających działalność rządu wybranego w demokratycznych wyborach. To dzięki ludziom kochającym ojczyznę, których nie udało się zmusić do emigracji, wybrano rząd, który próbuje zreformować praktycznie wszystkie dziedziny życia, także sądownictwo tworzone jeszcze za czasów reżimu komunistycznego w PRL, co nie podoba się opozycji, która nigdy nie miała takiego poparcia, i Komisji Europejskiej – powołującej się na poszanowanie ludzkiej godności, demokrację, równość, praworządność, prawa człowieka, tolerancję i sprawiedliwość. Poparcie dla tego nieustannie nękanego i krytykowanego, a nawet zastraszonego odebraniem funduszy rządu rośnie, dlatego Polacy zadają sobie pytanie, czy nie chodzi tutaj raczej o prześladowanie i niechęć do katolickiej tożsamości polskiego narodu, nieustannie poddawanego sąsiednim totalitaryzmom, który miał nadzieję, że wchodzi do Unii jako Europy ojczyzn.

Jiří Payne (EFDD). – Paní předsedající, jakékoliv vyjádření k problematice právního státu a k rovnováze ústavní moci v Polsku bude znít nepoctivě, protože v Polsku existuje politická opozice.

Zatímco Evropská unie je od počátku založena na úmyslném demokratickém deficitu. Ten se v praxi projevuje tak, že nesmí existovat alternativa k oficiální politice, že volby nemohou ovlivnit podobu a směřování Evropské unie, že neexistuje opozice, která by zítra mohla převzít odpovědnost a dělat jinou politiku. A uvedu malý příklad z nedávné doby politické perzekuce v Evropské unii. Před několika týdny Jean-Claude Juncker na tomto místě řekl: „Komise dnes navrhuje nová pravidla financování politických stran a nadací. Neměli bychom plnit pokladny protievropských extrémistů.“ A pokračoval tím, že peníze budou dostávat pouze ty strany, které souhlasí s Komisí.

Takhle vypadá férová konkurence politických stran v Evropské unii? Ne, to je projev politické perzekuce.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Stanowisko, jakie przyjął Parlament Europejski, nie jest przeciwko rządowi w Polsce, ono jest przeciwko Polsce i społeczeństwu polskiemu, przeciwko konkretnym inicjatywom społeczeństwa obywatelskiego. Jeżeli ponad czterystoma głosami ten Parlament głośnie przeciwko inicjatywie „Zatrzymać aborcję” w obronie prawa do urodzenia się dzieci niepełnosprawnych, jeżeli dziesiątki tysięcy uczestników Marszu Niepodległości pod pretekstem paru wypowiedzi potępionych przez prezydenta, przez liderów partii politycznych, a nawet przez młodzież organizującą ten marsz, jeżeli pod tym pretekstem oskarża się dziesiątki tysięcy uczestników tego marszu i polskie społeczeństwo o faszyzm, to mamy naprawdę do czynienia ze skandalem.

Niestety ta rezolucja wpisuje się znakomicie w to ponure stulecie rewolucji bolszewickiej. Tylko na szczęście my mamy trochę tolerancji i nie oskarżamy kierownictwa Parlamentu Europejskiego o odpowiedzialność za to, że paru komunistów zrobiło sobie wystawę „Wielki Październik — socjalizm był i socjalizm będzie” w siedzibie tegoż Parlamentu w Brukseli.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, nepodporila som návrh uznesenia o Poľsku, pretože nesúhlasím s tým, aby Európsky parlament prijímal politické uznesenia kritizujúce členské štáty Únie. Ak niektorý členský štát poruší svoje zmluvné záväzky, je povinnosťou Komisie ako strážcu zmlúv, aby konala. Od upozornenia až po žaloby na - Európskom súdnom dvore. A ak súd potvrdí názor Komisie, potom sa aj tento Parlament môže zaoberať otázkou, aké opatrenia je treba prijať na európskej úrovni, aby sa obnovil rešpekt voči európskym zmluvám a právu. Nezabúdajme, že hlas demokratického parlamentu nie je názorom nestranného pozorovateľa. Je to politický názor momentálnej väčšiny a my poslanci sme zástupcami našich voličov, nie sudcami.

15. Corrections to votes and voting intentions

(The sitting was suspended at 14.03)

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA

místopředseda

16. Resumption of the sitting

(The sitting resumed at 15.00)

17. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting : see Minutes

18. Legacy of the 1917 totalitarian Bolshevik revolution (topical debate)

President. – The next item is the topical debate (Rule 153a) on the legacy of the 1917 totalitarian Bolshevik revolution (2017/2933(RSP)).

I would like to add that there will be no catch the eye and no blue cards in this debate, so please take that into account and I will repeat this if necessary.

Sandra Kalniete, author. – Mr President, one hundred years ago, Lenin's coup in Russia paved the way for the most inhuman political system of the last century: totalitarianism. Today we remember and commemorate more than 100 million victims of totalitarian regimes, all those who vanished in Stalin's gulags, Hitler's death camps and Mao's great famine, and those who were killed by other dictators and tyrants inspired by Communists and Nazis.

The consequences of these totalitarian regimes are felt to this day. Like many of those who were left behind the Iron Curtain under Communist rule, I have experienced totalitarianism myself. My grandparents perished in the gulag, my mother spent 17 years there, my father eight years, and I was born there. From day one of my life, my parents had to check me in with the KGB every month. I had no rights at all. I was born with the label 'enemy of the people'.

For those crimes not to be repeated, we need remembrance and education to build immunity for our societies against every temptation of totalitarian solutions. And let me quote the great Hannah Arendt: 'Totalitarian solutions may well survive the fall of totalitarian regimes in the form of strong temptations, which will come up whenever it seems impossible to alleviate political, social or economic misery in a manner worthy of man.'

Moreover we need to recognise and confront totalitarian trends wherever they manifest themselves, whether it is North Korea which poses a global threat, whether it is Russia where Stalin is once again admired, or whether it is totalitarian jihadist Islamism which is at war with our values and with true Islam. We should not close our eyes to the fact that China is emerging as a superpower under Leninist autocracy, or to the case of Venezuela, where populist rule has evolved into a dictatorial regime.

The clear link between populism, extremism, autocracy and dictatorship around the world is one to bear in mind as we face the challenges in our own societies. Our own Euro-Atlantic family of nations with shared values has not been immune to very obvious populist and authoritarian trends. Populism is a form of authoritarianism that distorts democracy without destroying it, but under populist rule, democracies become illiberal, with populists defining themselves as the entire people, and all those who disagree as enemies of the people. Therefore we need to clearly recognise and resist populists and radicals on both the left and the right and not let them hijack and denigrate our democratic values.

As we are facing the rise of autocratic global powers, we in Europe should find ways to revitalise our core values within our own family of nations. Whatever the temptations of totalitarian thinking, I strongly believe that liberal democracy must have and will have the last word.

President. – Ms Kalniete, thank you very much for these strong words warmly welcomed by colleagues in the plenary.

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, huge thanks to the European Parliament for arranging this discussion, a very topical one. Thanks for the invitation to the Presidency to take part in this discussion. Let me start by recalling the resolution of the European Parliament from 2 April 2009 on European conscience and totalitarianism, which calls for the proclamation of 23 August as a Europe-wide day of remembrance for all the victims of all the totalitarian regimes.

There is this famous sentence by the philosopher George Santayana: 'Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it'. The topic of today's discussion incites reflection on how we can learn from history. The 1917 Bolshevik revolution was a turning point in the history of a great nation, Russia, and it changed the history of the whole continent. Historians are still discussing the scale of the impact of the 1917 revolution, and rightly so. We cannot close our eyes, either, to the worrying tendencies still there, one century later, in Russia and beyond its borders.

The Bolshevik programme of peace, land and bread won the party considerable support among hungry urban workers and soldiers. It was effective propaganda. But it brought about destruction, famine and war. As the historian Anne Applebaum recently put it: 'it created not a beautiful new civilisation but an angry, unhappy and embittered society, one that squandered its resources, built ugly, inhuman cities, and broke new ground in atrocity and mass murder'. The totalitarian regime and machinery that was built on this ideology also led us to the enforced division of Europe for half a century. This we have overcome, fortunately, through the positive, transformative force of European integration. But are we entirely out of the woods? Are we safe from foreign interference, from attempts to undermine our achievements?

Let me also remind you – just as Sandra Kalniete did just before me – my generation of Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Romanians and many other nations spent the first half of their lives under the totalitarian regime that the Bolsheviks created and spread throughout the eastern part of the European continent. I was 25 when Estonia freed itself from the Soviet occupation. For me, the Russian revolution is not something from history books, it is something very real. When I look around in today's Europe, I find the real consequences, the real legacy of Bolsheviks, more than I like to.

In 1967, the year I was born into the Orwellian society of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic, illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, the great George F. Kennan, in an analysis of the Bolshevik revolution half a century on, wrote: 'the Bolshevik leaders brought ... a complex of attitudes toward the Western governments... Among these attitudes were a fundamental challenge to the legitimacy of the Western governments, a pervasive cynicism about the parliamentary and democratic sources of their power, a denial that their peoples owed them loyalty.'

You would have thought that was in the past. However, last week, the Russian ambassador to the EU, Vladimir Chizhov, gave an interview to the *Baltic Rim Economics Review* where he states: 'In the Russian view, the subsequent policies of NATO and EU enlargement, export of democracy and erosion of continent-wide arms regimes have put to rest any hopes for a truly inclusive governance of Europe.' The EU's 'export of democracy' – a cold breeze dating back a century – reminds us of anxieties we thought had long ago disappeared.

Let me now turn to the worrying phenomenon of populism. I am addressing this issue here because in today's Europe, the populists target this Union of ours. They try to undermine the achievements of over 60 years of European integration. I am also addressing this issue because populism is at the very roots of Bolshevism, from the first works of Karl Marx, who started this cruel madness. Catchy and attractive-sounding, populist propaganda promises oversimplified solutions for complex issues. Populists divide our societies into good and bad, us and them. This undermines the democratic and open political debate, while radicalisation and extremism gain ground.

Europe has already paid a heavy price for creating such dividing lines in the past. The experience of the two World Wars taught us not to focus on differences but to create a common space to live, study and work. Our nations agreed on common fundamental principles such as democracy, the rule of law and the protection of human rights. Our societies are facing different challenges, related for instance to security, defence, migration and so on. Populist rhetoric has created deep divisions in our societies on those issues instead of allowing us to work together on common solutions in the EU. Populists use information technology to communicate the message even more widely. This has brought along new challenges, such as misinformation on a massive scale, fake news and attempts to influence democratic elections. It is not easy for citizens to discern fake news or to find and access reliable information.

These challenges need to be countered on many different levels. I welcome the Commission's plans – as recently announced by First Vice-President Timmermans at the General Affairs Council – to carry out preparatory work on the topic of fake news. This is a fundamental issue of partly foreign interference threatening to seriously undermine our democracies. We must not forget the important role of education and youth work either. The first Leaders' meeting under President Tusk's Leaders' Agenda on Friday in Gothenburg focuses precisely on education and culture.

We need to develop democratic resilience, media literacy, tolerance, critical thinking and conflict resolution skills. In particular, media literacy has become key to fighting off populist propaganda and manipulation through fake news. In October, the Estonian Presidency organised the third annual Rule of Law Dialogue in the General Affairs Council on the topic of media pluralism and the rule of law in the digital age. It was underlined that increased levels of disinformation are another core challenge, including for democracy and the rule of law. This challenge can be counterbalanced by increased levels of media literacy.

We need to put more energy and means into strategic communication and make the best use of the methods and tools which have proved efficient both in the EU and within our neighbourhood. For instance, the valuable work and output by the East Strategic Communication Task Force in the European External Action Service shows us how we can improve and magnify our narrative in the eastern neighbourhood.

I would like to conclude by stressing how important it is to prevent our citizens from being misled by populists. History shows the impact that propaganda and manipulation can have on our societies. Thus it is our common responsibility to preserve the vital values of tolerance, protection, human rights and the rule of law. I hope that today's discussion on this sad anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution will further contribute to keeping and respecting these common values in the future, too.

President. – Minister, thank you, and I must say that when you referred to the quote by Ambassador Vladimir Chizhov, having been for years his Czech counterpart both in Prague and in Brussels, I could supplement that with some other freezing quotes.

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I could never speak as eloquently about this issue as Sandra Kalniete and Matti Maasikas have just done, for the simple reason that I had the good fortune to be born on the right side of the Iron Curtain, and therefore never had the personal experience of what it means to live in a dictatorship or in a totalitarian state. This does not mean that I do not feel a collective historic responsibility, for all Europeans, to make sure that this memory is never lost, that it is part of our educational system in a way, and that our children don't forget, so that they do not repeat the mistakes of the past.

I am certainly not claiming this as a Commission responsibility or a European responsibility, but I do call on national authorities to make sure that the totalitarian past, which is an integral part of all our histories, is never forgotten so that the experience should never be repeated.

The 1917 revolutions in Russia were a turning point of twentieth century history and politics. It was the beginning of a wave of totalitarian regimes, in which the ideology dictated that the individual was not relevant; that the only thing that mattered was the ideology and the goals that the state dictated through people who thought that individual rights and democracy had no part in their society. As this regime, the Bolshevik regime, took over in the October Revolution, it sought legitimisation through the hunting down of enemies. There were incredible numbers of individual victims of the political terror, especially in the elite of the country, whose experience looms large in our history writing. But terror, to be effective, needs to be indiscriminate. Terror only works if innocent people are victims of it, because it makes everybody scared, and in absolute numbers it was the ordinary people who suffered most.

I think because it was not mentioned before today, I want to mention that we should maintain a special place in our collective memory for the many millions who perished in the Holodomor in Ukraine. The people of the Soviet Union made sacrifices on a scale which numbs the mind in helping to defeat the Nazi regime, but the end of the Second World War did not alter the baleful nature of the Stalinist dictatorship. Furthermore, the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States and the puppet regimes put in place in Central Europe left our continent divided, leaving people to the East with effectively closed borders yearning for political and personal freedoms and missing out on the prosperity that took off in our part of Europe.

The events of 1989 — to which I am proud to say I have been witness to throughout my career — were for most people a matter of joy, as country after country was able to throw off the totalitarian regimes imposed upon them, and then, in the EU enlargements in 2004 and since, to mend the terrible fracture in our continent. There is no more important event in 70 years of European integration than that wonderful event in 2004 when Europe became whole again. 'Now grows together what belongs together' should be a leading motto in our European Union.

While the wounds are deep and countries are still coming to terms with their history, the transformational power of the people to turn their countries into social market democracies where freedom reigns is a miracle. Those of us who witnessed the states of Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s and who go back now see a miracle; with all the shortcomings we still have, it is a miracle.

That is why I agree so wholeheartedly with President Juncker when he said, in the State of the Union address, that Europe must breathe with both its lungs, East and West. That is why I never hesitate to repeat the wonderful words expressed by Václav Havel at a conference I attended in Prague, when he said: 'Our goal is to make sure that East and West regain just geographical meaning, not moral meaning, not economic meaning, only geographical meaning'. That should always be our goal, especially to honour the memory of people like Václav Havel.

Our Union is based on the tripod of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Through European history, we know that if we abandon one of the legs of the tripod, the whole tripod will topple and we will not be able to maintain these rights.

It is also important that Europe marks the 23 August, the anniversary of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union signing the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, to remember all the victims of the totalitarian authoritarian regimes that have scarred Europe during the 20th century. Yes, they went at each other at some point, but Stalin would have preferred to maintain a strategic alliance with this other mass murderer called Adolf Hitler.

The Europe-wide Day of Remembrance for the victims of all totalitarian and authoritarian regimes keeps alive the memory of the victims and pays tribute to them. Commemoration also helps us to recall lessons learnt from this dark chapter in European history. The Spanish writer Jorge Semprún said that European integration was born in Buchenwald. The EU is based on the idea that you link your destiny to your neighbours' destiny. That is a clean break with a totalitarian vision of exactly 100 years ago in the Bolshevik revolution.

The concept fostered in the Bolshevik revolution, in the Fascist regime in Italy, in the Nazi regime in Germany, and in the subsequent Fascist regimes in other European countries, was always that the individual does not count – it is only our goals that count, and if individuals die because of that, tough luck. This is something we as Europeans of today can never, ever accept.

We should never take our freedoms for granted. Nothing is irreversible, as the volatile politics of our continent show. Democracy and freedom need maintenance. Ideology that allows you to murder your neighbour is still rampant in Europe. Look at the fundamentalist jihadists who have exactly the same vision of being allowed to kill other human beings because they do not share your ideology: exactly what the Stalinists and the Nazis did.

It is perhaps not surprising, but it is dispiriting, that the current government of Russia, which incidentally seems very ambivalent in its own attitude to the Bolshevik revolution, is devoting so much effort and so many resources into misinformation aimed at our societies and other democracies. It is a matter of great concern that apparently it is seeking to divide us and rule us by teaming up with the present forces of illiberalism, nationalism and xenophobia, and inflaming hatred and instilling doubt about our hard-fought democratic values.

I would say, let us not fall for the temptation of the strong man. I do not understand why this is again so tempting to many of our co-citizens. Let us never give in to these dark forces. Let us not fall for the demons of extreme nationalism which, like alcoholism, offer short-term exaltation, but long-lasting headaches, deep disruption, poverty and despair. Europe is ultimately an idea and a promise that it is possible to overcome age-old antagonisms and live together, trade together and work together in freedom and peace. Markets and currency are important instruments, but not our end goals.

On this, the 100th anniversary of the October Revolution, it is good to recall the lessons of the past. Domination of one another is not the answer. Europe grows out of a free and democratic choice to join a union and pool one sovereignty so that the whole is greater than the sum of all its parts. Looking back on our history, we can only conclude that we are lucky to be alive today, and so we must cherish the open, prosperous, diverse and peaceful societies we have built where individual freedoms are not sacrificed on the altar of so-called collective interests based on a totalitarian ideologies. But we must never take this for granted, nor the fundamental values that our European house is based on. We then must consequently show the same energy, passion and determination to defend what Europe is, to defend who we really are and to understand that collective prosperity is impossible without individual liberty.

President. – Ladies and gentlemen, we will now proceed with the debate. I need to underline that we have a very extensive list of speakers and I will be very strict in terms of respecting the speaking time. So on the second signal I will just have to take the floor from any who exceed their speaking time.

Андрей Ковачев, от името на групата PPE. – Г-н Председател, г-н Министър, г-н Комисар, преди 100 години започна един ужасяващ политически и социален експеримент, отговорен за масовото депортиране, убийствата и заробването на милиони човешки същества. Комунистическата диктатура рухна през 89-а година, но комунизмът не беше осъден за престъпленията му, така както стана след Втората световна война с националсоциализма и фашизма, а тогавашният Запад в името на мирния преход преглътна сътрудничеството с бившите комунисти.

Днес младите поколения не само не знаят истината за репресиите, променили милиони човешки съдби, но и се опитват да им насаждат носталгия към тях. Дали има разлика между лагерите на Хитлер и Сталин? Такава няма, освен че сталинските бяха по-дълго и погубиха повече хора. Всички тоталитарни диктатури трябва да бъдат приравнени като еднакво човеконенавистни, както и техните символи. Непознаването на собствената ни история ни обрича да повтаряме грешките на миналото, като позволяваме да се възпроизведат старите авторитарни практики. Никога повече не трябва да допускаме такива експерименти и най-добрият инструмент за това е образованието!

Our duty, ladies and gentlemen, is to keep the memory of what has happened and never repeat it again. In my country Bulgaria alone, tens of thousands were killed after the Soviet occupation. Let us pay tribute to all victims of totalitarian regimes and never repeat it again.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy, au nom du groupe S&D. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Mesdames et Messieurs, les révolutions russes de 1917 sont un événement majeur qui a changé le cours de l'histoire et qui a ébranlé le monde. Nourries par la colère d'une population opprimée contre un système autocratique et profondément inégalitaire, elles ont mis fin au régime tsariste. Cette révolte portait en elle l'espoir d'une société nouvelle, plus juste et solidaire.

Ces aspirations et ces idées, dévoyées par le coup d'État, puis par la dictature stalinienne, font partie de notre héritage, comme 1789 et 1848. Elles nous permettent de mieux comprendre comment changer la société pour assurer l'avenir. Sans démocratie, pas d'égalité. Aucun changement si radical n'a de sens s'il n'est pas juste.

L'exploitation n'a pas disparu, les injustices non plus. De nombreux Européens se sentent abandonnés, mis au ban de la société. Le chômage, la pauvreté et les inégalités grimpantes font rage. La résignation et la colère sont là.

Sans réponse aux souhaits de nos peuples que nos institutions soient attentives, réactives et effectives, c'est notre démocratie qui sera mise en danger. En effet, ce sont cette exaspération et cette peur qui constituent le terreau des extrémismes dont la cible est la démocratie.

Afin de permettre aux Européens de retrouver la confiance, de leur redonner de l'espoir, nous appelons à la concrétisation d'une Europe refondée reposant sur quatre piliers, à savoir d'une Europe sociale, écologique, respectueuse des droits fondamentaux et profondément européenne.

Ne nous voilons pas la face, le libéralisme est une impasse et le national-populisme une menace. Nous appelons à un changement d'Europe.

President. – I am sorry, colleague, but I announced at the very beginning that this debate is without blue cards and without catch-the-eye. My apologies, but this is the case.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Składam hołd ofiarom komunizmu, ponad stu milionom osób na całym świecie. Chylę czoła przed bohaterstwem moich rodaków, którzy tuż po uzyskaniu niepodległości podjęli walkę z nawałą bolszewicką, ratując całą Europę. Chylę czoła przed bohaterami Katynia, Ostaszkowa, Miednoje, pomordowanymi polskimi oficerami, przed polskim państwem podziemnym, żołnierzami wyklętymi, bohaterami polskimi chłopami, ostoją patriotyzmu i tradycji, przed ofiarami grudnia 1970 i stanu wojennego. Ich ofiarę pamiętamy. Cześć ich pamięci.

Petras Auštrevičius, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, the communist coup d'état in Russia, still called a revolution by some even in this House, opened the most brutal period of the 20th century. A hundred years ago, all hell broke loose, taking more than 100 million human lives among the Russian people and other innocent nations across the globe. The Bolsheviks' sick desire to conquer the whole world with their communist ideals caused the equally shameful rise of National Socialists and similar human rubbish.

The communist system cost millions of lives, but it was doomed from the very outset. Getting rid of communism's ghosts in Central and Eastern Europe was consolidating a peaceful process of human dignity and joy. Against the backdrop of such events, it makes us understand better than ever the real significance of the European Union, the most successful European project.

Mr President, taking no more time, may I ask you to pay a tribute with a minute's silence for the more than 100 million people killed by the shameful Bolshevik coup d'état.

President. – Colleagues, this is a serious issue, and I think the debate so far confirms the deep pain that many nations in Europe have suffered. I would ask you for one minute's silence in memory of the victims.

(The House rose and observed a minute's silence)

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, οι σημερινές συζητήσεις αποφασίστηκε να διοργανώνονται για να συζητούμε επίκαιρα ζητήματα που απασχολούν τους λαούς της Ευρώπης. Το ΕΛΚ, κατά την άποψή μας, προβοκατόρικα προκαλεί μια ιδεολογική συζήτηση για να αποπροσανατολίσει από τα πραγματικά προβλήματα που ταλανίζουν τους λαούς. Σήμερα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οι λαοί φτωχοποιούνται, διαλύεται το κοινωνικό κράτος, οδηγούμαστε σε κοινωνικό και οικονομικό ντάμπινγκ και τα δημοκρατικά και εργασιακά δικαιώματα καταργούνται, οδηγώντας στη μαζική ανεργία, τη φτώχεια, την έλλειψη πραγματικής δημοκρατίας.

Η διαχείριση του προσφυγικού, οι νεοφιλελεύθερες πολιτικές λιτότητας και η στρατιωτικοποίηση δείχνουν όσο ποτέ άλλοτε το милитарιστικό, ξενοφοβικό, ρατσιστικό και αντεργατικό πρόσωπο της Ένωσης. Την ίδια ώρα, η άνοδος της ακροδεξιάς, των νεοφασιστών και των νοσταλγών του Χίτλερ στοιχειώνει την Ευρώπη και δείχνει ξεκάθαρα πως το τέρας του φασισμού αναγεννιέται.

Η Οκτωβριανή Επανάσταση είναι ένα κοσμοϊστορικό γεγονός που άλλαξε τον ρου της ιστορίας στον 20ό αιώνα. Ανέτρεψε το σάπιο καπιταλιστικό σύστημα και απελευθέρωσε τεράστιες αναπτυξιακές παραγωγικές δυνάμεις. Άνοιξε τον δρόμο στους αντι-αποικιακούς αγώνες των λαών και έπαιξε πρωταγωνιστικό ρόλο στο τσάκισμα του χιτλεροφασισμού. Πάνω απ' όλα, έδειξε πως είναι δυνατή μια κοινωνία που μπορεί να αποτελεί ασφάλεια για το μέλλον των εργαζομένων, διασφαλίζοντάς τους στέγαση, εκπαίδευση και υγεία. Πως μπορεί να δημιουργήσει έναν νέο τύπο διεθνών σχέσεων βασισμένων στην ειρήνη και την αλληλεγγύη και όχι στους πολέμους και τις ιμπεριαλιστικές επεμβάσεις. Ως αριστερά εμπνεόμαστε από....

(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)

President. – Mr Sylikiotis, please respect the time slot you have received and also show respect to your colleagues. I let you speak even though your speech is considered by the Chair as unfortunate and... in line with history. You had the opportunity to speak. Mr Sylikiotis, respect the chair. You had your time to speak.

(Interjection from Mr Sylikiotis)

Mr Sylikiotis, do not push me into taking measures.

(Interjection from the floor)

Colleague, you are not here to debate with other colleagues. You asked for a point of order. Under which rule do you wish to speak?

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, parece-me evidente que não tem, o Presidente que está a conduzir os trabalhos, a imparcialidade que se exige a quem conduz os trabalhos. O Senhor decidiu, não sei com base em que disposição do Regimento, mas gostava que aqui nos informasse, fazer um minuto de silêncio a pedido. Não sei se é habitual, não sei se lhe pedir agora também um minuto de silêncio.... Mas aquilo que se exige é a imparcialidade na condução dos trabalhos e não é dar mais tempo a uns e cortar do tempo de outros, como acabou de fazer. Isso não é imparcialidade! Está bem demonstrado o seu conceito de liberdade de expressão e de liberdade de opinião! Está bem demonstrado onde é que está o totalitarismo aqui nesta casa.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Būkime sąžiningi. Įvykius Sankt Peterburge 1917 m. spalį net ir patys bolševikai ilgą laiką vadino „spalio perversmu“. „Didžiąja revoliucija“ šis perversmas tapo tik po gero dešimtmečio, kaip dalis komunistinės mitologijos. Negaliu sugalvoti nei vienos priežasties, kodėl mes turėtume toliau plėtoti sovietinę mitologiją. Todėl vadinkime daiktus savais vardais, o spalio įvykius Rusijoje – bolševikų perversmu.

Praėjusią savaitę keli kolegos Parlamente mėgino švęsti šimtąsias bolševikų perversmo metines. Turėtume užduoti sau klausimą – ar galime Europos demokratijos šventovėje leisti švęsti pradžią režimo, kuris ne tik nieko bendro neturėjo su demokratija, bet ir yra atsakingas daugiau kaip už šimtą milijonų mirčių visuose pasaulio žemynuose?

Mano šalis, keturis su puse dešimtmečio išbuvusi komunistinėje okupacijoje, yra priėmusi, manau, labai teisingą sprendimą. Abu didžiausi totalitariniai dvidešimtojo amžiaus režimai – tiek komunizmas, tiek nacizmas, yra teisiškai sulyginti ir pripažinti vienodai nusikalstamais. Esu įsitikinęs, kad geriausias 1917 m. bolševikų perversmo įvertinimas būtų jo įvardinimas nusikalstamu.

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, the legacy of the 1917 Bolshevik coup d'état is the oppression and murder of hundreds of millions of people. That legacy continues in places like China, Cuba and North Korea. The ideology that inspired the Bolsheviks caused this human tragedy. Marxism is supposed to be scientific. It cannot be wrong. Therefore, it believes it is justifiable to sweep away anyone who opposes it by any means. The essential evil at the heart of Marxism is the idea that the end justifies the means. That idea unites Communism and Nazism. They are two sides of the same totalitarian coin.

Marxism is nonsense. Marxist parties that seize power become dictatorships with only one goal – their own self-preservation. Look at the Chinese Communist Party today for evidence of that. The Nazis pulled the gold teeth out of murdered Jews. The Chinese Communist Party today oversees a totalitarian system where they not only imprison and kill dissidents of any kind, but harvest and sell their organs for a multi-billion dollar organ transplant industry.

Under Marxism, any depravity becomes justifiable, but Marxists tell us it is not real Marxism and we need to try again. The Bolshevik coup proves just how fragile civilisation is and how the ideas behind it must be resisted by all of those who love freedom, liberty and decency.

Marcel de Graaff, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – De bolsjewistische staatsgreep bracht een afschuwelijk socialistisch regime aan de macht dat critici vervolgde. Burgers bespioneerden elkaar, kinderen verraden hun ouders en echtgenoten elkaar. Het richtte werkkampen en martelcentra in. Het kostte volgens minimale schattingen 22 miljoen mensen het leven. Communisme, marxisme, socialisme, dat zijn allemaal loten aan dezelfde stam en de nieuwste loot heet globalisme.

Ook het globalisme breekt gemeenschappen af tot angstige individuen, vernietigt de saamhorigheid van gezin en volk, vernietigt identiteit en eigenheid. Het haat christendom, boeddhisme en andere wereldbeschouwingen die de sociale band tussen mensen versterken. Het haat andere meningen. Het controleert de media en het onderwijs, maakt journalistiek en school tot propagandamachine. Deze Europese Unie is volledig in de greep van globalisten, van neo-marxisten.

Kijk naar de vrienden van deze EU: Turkije, China, Saoedi-Arabië, Iran, landen met totalitaire regimes. Het globalisme omarmt de totalitaire islam en laat zijn aanhangers met miljoenen de EU binnen. En kijk dan naar de vijanden van de EU: de regering-Trump, Rusland, Hongarije en Polen, waar regeringen de christelijke identiteit van hun land proberen te verdedigen, of het Verenigd Koninkrijk, dat zich expliciet tegen de totalitaire macht van de EU keert. Maar de grootste vijand van deze EU zijn niet de terroristen die monsterlijke aanslagen plegen in onze steden. Nee, het zijn de critici van de EU, die worden verketterd als populisten, als extreem-rechts, als fascist en xenofoben.

Ja, de erfenis van de bolsjewieken is springlevend. Hier in deze EU wordt een totalitair regime voltooid. Gelukkig is er hoop. Steeds meer burgers — Britten, Polen, Hongaren, Sicilianen — staan op tegen deze EU. Dus burgers van de EU: sta op en loop weg van deze onderdrukkende elite, loop weg van deze marionettenpartijen.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, enfin une évocation du totalitarisme communiste issu de la révolution bolchévique, elle-même héritière de la Révolution française.

Chez tous les révolutionnaires, on observe en effet la même haine de l'ordre naturel, la même prétention à faire table rase du passé, la même négation de toute transcendance, la même violence contre les récalcitrants, une violence qui va jusqu'à l'assassinat, au meurtre de masse, au génocide, comme au Cambodge ou en Ukraine.

Cependant je ne puis qu'être navré de l'assimilation abusive formulée, lors de leurs témoignages émouvants, par M^{me} Kalniete et M. Maasikas quant à ce qu'ils appellent aujourd'hui les populismes.

En quoi la défense des identités qui est la nôtre, s'exprimant seulement pacifiquement par la voie des élections, injustement discriminée jusque dans cette enceinte, a-t-elle quoi que ce soit à voir avec le communisme?

M. Timmermans a cité Vaclav Havel, celui-ci n'était-il pas très critique au sujet de nos institutions?

Prenons garde à l'avertissement du dissident Boukovsky qui craignait que ne se constitue une nouvelle Union soviétique européenne.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, aș începe adresându-mă mai întâi domnului din grupul comunist care era nemulțumit pentru că am păstrat un minut de reculegere în memoria victimelor. Aș vrea să îi reamintesc că jumătate din Europa a păstrat cincizeci de ani liniștea în privința a ceea ce se întâmpla dincolo de Cortina de Fier și ar trebui să își aducă aminte de acest lucru, cu atât mai mult cu cât, deocamdată, comunismul nu a existat decât în formă totalitară. Așa că, atunci când dumneavoastră considerați că trebuie să vă revendicați de la comunism, vă revendicați direct de la crimele comise în numele ideologiei pe care o reprezentați.

Mai este ceva care ar trebui discutat foarte deschis și tocmai în această incintă: o parte din partidele comuniste din centrul și estul Europei s-au transformat la începutul anilor '90 în partide social – democrate, au luat chiar numele celor pe care îi detestau cel mai mult în timpul istoriei comunismului, sunt unii dintre ei aici, cu noi, în acest hemiciclu și de altfel nu au de multe ori nicio problemă în a se asocia cu comuniștii și a vota împreună în numele unui viitor luminos.

Despre aceasta ar trebui să discutăm, despre incapacitatea de a accepta critică, despre refuzul de a accepta separarea puterilor, despre dorința de a acapara justiția în multe dintre țările foste comuniste. Acestea sunt chestiunile pe care ni le-au lăsat cei care au creat *homo sovieticus* pentru că, așa cum spunea Svetlana Alexievich, singurul proiect comunist care a reușit este crearea lui *homo sovieticus* și plătim costurile acestei creații fiecare dintre noi, în Europa.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, the best way to avoid the consequences of revolutions and wars is to prevent them by tackling the reasons that cause them.

In 1913, Vladimir Lenin wrote that the revolution he was preparing would not take place in his lifetime. However, it happened four years later. In 1917, it was not the Bolsheviks who seized power, but other groups that gave it to them, and nobody – except the Bolsheviks – was ready to take the power that was lying at their feet. The revolution happened because problems accumulating in society had been ignored for a long time.

What lessons should the European Union draw from the Russian revolution today? Firstly, it should recognise the problem and not deny it. We still try to deny problems and punish those who warn us about them. Secondly, institutions will not help if there is an ideological emptiness inside them. An absence of common values eventually leads to the collapse of structures. Thirdly, do not solve your problems of today at the expense of a weak group of the population. For example, the problem of social inequality should not be given to capitalists or national linguistic minorities' problems to nationalists. Fourthly, do not solve internal problems by demonising your neighbours in order to consolidate your own society. Such consolidation works only for a short period, but the problems will return like a boomerang.

We need a clear vision. If we are unable to formulate our vision and our aims in a short form which is understandable for every single person, this means that we do not have this vision at all. It is a path straight to stagnation, then to collapse and anarchy followed by totalitarianism. Let us think about it.

Bernd Lucke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Frau Kalnete! Der Bolschewismus, der Totalitarismus, der Maoismus, der Nationalsozialismus haben unendliches Leiden hervorgerufen und unzählige Opfer zu verantworten, und Sie haben dem in würdevollen Worten gedacht. Aber es war unwürdig, die Opfer des Totalitarismus zu instrumentalisieren, um jetzt gegen populistische Bewegungen auszuholen.

Herr Ratspräsident, Karl Marx war kein Populist, Nigel Farage ist kein Nazi, die Fünf-Sterne-Bewegung besteht nicht aus Bolschewisten. Es ist falsch, die Unterschiede zu verwischen. Und wenn Sie das tun und wenn Sie die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus und des Bolschewismus und des Maoismus so instrumentalisieren, dann geben Sie zu erkennen, dass Sie einen Anspruch auf Meinungsführerschaft haben, der sich gegen jede Form von Protest richtet einen Anspruch auf Meinungsführerschaft, der seinerseits dann etwas Totalitäres hat.

Dita Charanzová (ALDE). – Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, byla bych ráda, aby tato debata vyzněla jako memento – memento událostí, které nezvratně negativně poznamenaly dějiny Evropy včetně mé země, České republiky.

To, co se před sto lety v Rusku stalo, mnozí ještě dnes vnímají jako sociální revoluci. Faktem je, že bolševický puč vedl k brutální totalitě, která jen v Sovětském svazu připravila o život desítky milionů lidí. Jejich památku a odvahu těch, kteří s komunistickým režimem vedli svůj osobní boj, bychom dnes měli ocenit především.

Bohužel, stále jsou ve světě ale u moci režimy, které pod rouškou ideologie perzekuují, vězní a popravují své odpůrce. Věnujme proto tuto debatu i těm, kteří stejně jako my před lety usilují o svou svobodu a uznání svých práv. Nechť je jim pád železné opony v tomto boji inspirací.

Merja Kyllönen (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, viisas kansakunta ottaa oppia historiasta. Vallankumous oli seurausta siitä, että teollisen vallankumouksen myötä suurella osalla väestöstä, aikuisilla ja lapsilla oli arvoa enää osana tuotantokoneistoa. Omistavaa osaa ei kiinnostanut, kuinka ihmiset elivät tai jaksivat, heidän arvonsa ja oikeutensa olivat haitta ja koulutus tarkoitti hankalasti hallittavia. Vain mahdollisimman suuri tuotto mahdollisimman pienillä kustannuksilla oli tärkeää.

Ihmisten eriarvoistaminen ei ole tässä maailmassa johtanut koskaan mihinkään hyvään. Tänä päivänä me näemme korruption, ihmisten riiston ja järjestelmän ahneuden vaikutukset. Me ihmettelemme silti radikalismien nousua ja äärioikeiston houkutusta. Miksi? Mietitään vaikka Aasian vaateteollisuutta, mistä eurooppalaiset yritykset ostavat vaatteita ja kankaita, tai sitten omaa Eurooppaamme, missä suurteollisuuden äänitorvet vaativat, että ihmiset tekevät useaa eri työtä minimipalkalla ansaitakseen toimeentulonsa samaan aikaan kun omistava prosentti viihtyy veroparatiiseissaan.

Tekemällä kaikesta koulutuksesta maksullista me heikennämme sivistyksen ja koulutuksen tasoa ja kansasta tulee jälleen pelkkä osa tuotantokoneistoa. Onko siis ihme, että jatkuvan ihmisten eriarvoistamisen kautta kansalaiset nousevat vastarintaan? Toivottavasti olemme edes jotain historiasta oppineet ja ymmärrämme, että eriarvoistumisen tie ei ole fiksu tie Euroopalle eikä millekään muullekaan alueelle.

Tim Aker (EFDD). – Mr President, Winston Churchill famously said that the inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings and the inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of misery. And that misery was famine, suffering, repression, and political suppression. It is interesting that the communists in this place delight in freedom of speech by extolling a regime and political idea that took that away from millions of people over 70 years. They should be thoroughly ashamed of themselves.

Freedom is only ever one generation away from extinction. Those who are wary of anyone concentrating power in one place should always be on their guard. Look at those with power. How did they get it? Ask those with power what they are going to do with it, and if necessary, ask them how we can take it away from them. The price of freedom is always eternal vigilance.

Michał Marusiak (ENF). – Panie Przewodniczący! Proszę Państwa! Nasza ocena bolszewickiej rewolucji w Rosji obciążona jest pewnym takim błędem poznawczym, i to błędem pod wpływem propagandy lewicowej. Lewicowa propaganda mianowicie stara się nam wmówić, że cele tych bolszewików były słuszne, tylko metody były brutalne i niehumanitarne. Tymczasem musimy się właśnie zastanowić nad tymi celami. Propaganda chce wmówić nam, że władza, która zabija i okrada jest władzą złą, a taka władza, która tylko okrada, a nie zabija, jest władzą dobrą. A to jest nieprawda. To też jest przecież zła władza. Musimy się zastanowić nad tym, jakie były prawdziwe cele komunistów. Wprowadzenie komunizmu, czyli wprowadzenie własności kolektywnej, było ich celem i celem komunistów pozostało na zawsze. Odebrano ludziom własność owoców ich pracy, nazywając to jakąś własnością kolektywną, jakąś własnością wspólną,

własnością wszystkich. Robiono to oczywiście przy użyciu barbarzyńskich metod, ale zastanawiamy się również nad tym celem. Popatrzmy bowiem na Europę, jaka ona się staje dzisiaj. Tu nie ma obozów koncentracyjnych. Tu nie ma jakichś masowych zbrodni. Nie ma masowego terroru, ale poziom inwigilacji obywateli, poziom kontroli władzy nad obywatelem, poziom ucisku fiskalnego wyraźnie pokazuje, jak bardzo jesteśmy zmuszani do pracy na naszych nadzorców. Dorobek narodów europejskich w zdecydowanej większości znajduje się w rękach biurokratycznych nadzorców. Komunizm więc – ta idea komunistyczna – tutaj święci swoje wielkie triumfy i trzeba o tym krzyczeć. Trzeba o tym mówić i nie przemilczać, tylko odważnie powiedzieć, że nam potrzeba wolności własności i sprawiedliwości. Jeżeli Europa ma nie zginąć pod ciosami własności wspólnej, to musimy się jej wyrzec. Musimy być takim kontynentem, w którym wolni i bogaci obywatele żyć będą w wolnych i bezpiecznych krajach. O to wołam!

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υπερασπιζόμαστε τον σοσιαλισμό, που -σε λίγα μόλις χρόνια- έλυσε μεγάλα προβλήματα που παραμένουν άλυτα στον καπιταλισμό. Κατάργησε την ανεργία και την εκμετάλλευση, γνώρισε στους λαούς τι σημαίνει μόνιμη και σταθερή δουλειά με δικαιώματα, δωρεάν υγεία, παιδεία για όλους, πάμφθηνη κατοικία και σιγουριά για το μέλλον.

Το εκμεταλλευτικό σύστημα που υπερασπίζεστε σημαίνει εργασιακή γαλέρα, ουρές ανέργων, μόνιμη ανασφάλεια, πλειστηριασμοί, άνθρωποι να ψάχνουν στα σκουπίδια. Στον σοσιαλισμό οι λαοί έζησαν μονιασμένα και ειρηνικά για δεκαετίες. Το σύστημά σας στάζει αίμα από τα εγκλήματα των ιμπεριαλιστικών πολέμων, με Χιροσίμες, διαμελισμένα κράτη και προσφυγιά. Ο σοσιαλισμός νίκησε το τέρας του φασισμού στον Δεύτερο Παγκόσμιο Πόλεμο και ο φασισμός είναι παιδί του καπιταλισμού. Η δημοκρατία που προβάλλετε είναι η δικτατορία των μονοπωλίων. Η λάσπη, ο αντικομμουνισμός και οι απαγορεύσεις που επιστρατεύουν οι υποστηρικτές και απολογητές του καπιταλισμού δείχνουν τον φόβο τους. Οι λαοί, διδαγμένοι, θα ξαναβρούν τον δρόμο τους. Το σάπιο σύστημα είναι το παλιό. Το μέλλον του κόσμου είναι ο σοσιαλισμός-κομμουνισμός.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, each tree should be assessed by its fruits. One hundred years of communism in practice equals roughly 100 million victims. It was, and still is, a system which is based on two pillars – violence and lies. From Karl Marx to Lenin, all ruling Communist leaders have advocated and practiced only one way of action: total liquidation of their real or supposed adversaries by systematic violence.

After 1917, the Bolsheviks could keep their power only through a reign of terror. Here, our Socialist colleague was absolutely mistaken, claiming that the start of the coup was glorious. In the first two years of Bolshevik power, 300 000 political executions were carried out. In two years, 100 concentration camps were in place. It was from them, 13 years later, that the Nazis took over the best practices.

Soviet communist rulers were in a permanent state of war, mainly against their own nation, but also against the rest of the world. All this equals large-scale and systematic crimes against humanity. The problem today is the inequality of victims. Those who have suffered under communist terror have not yet seen an internationally binding commitment to 'never again'.

I think today it is high time to unite ourselves in equal respect and solidarity with victims of all terrorist regimes.

(The President cut off the speaker)

Francisco Assis (S&D). – No célebre congresso de Tours, em dezembro de 1920, o grande socialista francês Léon Blum afirmou, referindo-se aos leninistas soviéticos, que então enfrentavam: «Pela primeira vez em toda a história do socialismo, vós concebeis o terrorismo não apenas como um recurso de última hora, não apenas como uma medida extrema de salvação pública perante a resistência burguesa, nem sequer como uma necessidade vital para a revolução, mas sim como um meio de governação».

Isto é, logo na génese do processo soviético, houve uma esquerda europeia que se opôs à revolução soviética. Blum perdeu aquele congresso, mas ele tinha toda a razão. A verdade é que o que se verificava na União Soviética era a de confiscação de todo o poder por parte de uma vanguarda partidária que anulou qualquer perspectiva de debate pluralista, impediu a afirmação de qualquer modelo de constitucionalismo democrático, proibiu a prossecução de uma razão crítica e, dado o carácter classista que exaltou, anulou a sua própria pretensão universalista. Cem anos depois, o balanço que podemos fazer da revolução soviética não pode ser senão um balanço trágico.

John Flack (ECR). – Mr President, the legacy: hundreds of millions of people dead and democracy crushed across half of Europe for generations. If it had not been for Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, who ended the Cold War in the 1980s, the death toll would have grown higher and democracy would have continued to be denied to hundreds of millions of people.

So what is relevant today as the world faces threats from other unelected totalitarian regimes? The democratic West must resolutely stand up for freedom, for self-determination and for democracy, and not allow the artificial imposition of borders imposed by any small, unelected ruling elite. As President Reagan famously said in words that were unattributed a few minutes ago: 'Freedom is never more the one generation away from extinction'. He went on to say: 'We didn't pass it to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same'. That is the lesson all in this Parliament should accept.

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Mr President, I would like to remind my colleagues that we have representatives of eight communist parties elected to this Chamber and we have pretty good relations with some communist regimes such as, for instance, China.

The October Revolution is a very complex phenomenon, and this year even the Kremlin decided not to commemorate officially the anniversary of the October Revolution. In spite of that, some of my colleagues used the events of 1917 as a pretext to demonise contemporary Russia. We really have a lot of problems with this state, but please could we maybe limit ourselves to more urgent issues like Ukraine, Crimea and the Eastern Partnership, for instance.

We are all politicians, and as politicians we have to understand that each word has its price. And if we are not preparing for a war with Russia the day after tomorrow, we have to save at least some opportunities for future dialogue. I strongly believe that today's debate does not serve that purpose.

Jiří Maštálka (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, bolševická revoluce v Petrohradě v říjnu 1917 byla bezesporu historickým milníkem v dějinách moderního Ruska a možná i celého světa. Je to historická událost, o které je třeba mluvit. Názory na ni jsou i v samotném Rusku rozpolcené stejně jako společnost. Jisté je, že revoluce dosáhla úspěchů, vymýtila negramotnost, pozvedla životní úroveň části obyvatel.

(Předsedající přerušil řečníka z důvodu problému s tlumočením.)

V mimořádně krátké době proběhla rekordní vlna industrializace, během pouhých 10 let, i když uznávám, za cenu velkých lidských obětí.

Nelze opominout ani hrdinství vojáků Rudé armády v boji proti Hitlerovi. Každá politická ideologie nese stejný bolestný kříž v podobě lidských obětí. Snad se všichni shodneme na tom, že vynášet rozsudky nad historickými událostmi mají historikové, nikoliv poslanci EP.

Nathan Gill (EFDD). – Mr President, President Gorbachev famously proclaimed that the EU was the old Soviet Union dressed in western clothing. The erosion of democracy and sovereignty has been incremental. Nothing has been done by force, but allegedly in the public's best interests, with power grabs from crisis or through mass migration. Even the modern day *Pravda* journal observed striking similarities between the Lisbon Treaty and its communist predecessors.

Former Soviet dissident, Vladimir Bukovsky, warned of disturbing similarities between the USSR and blueprints for the EU superstate. He said the European Commission was the Politburo in view of the secretive way in which power is exercised. The European Parliament, he added, is a mere rubber-stamp institution like the Supreme Soviet of the old USSR. Thankfully, the biggest difference between the EU and the USSR is a constitutional pathway out of the Union. I am proud that the...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Marie-Christine Arnautu (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, la célébration du centenaire de la révolution bolchévique les 8 et 9 novembre au Parlement, à Bruxelles, et l'intitulé du débat d'aujourd'hui «Legs de la révolution totalitaire bolchévique de 1917» sont une insulte à toutes les victimes du communisme et à leur famille, dont la mienne.

Comment peut-on oser parler de «legs» ? De quel héritage s'agit-il?

L'excellente exposition organisée par notre collègue, Marek Jurek, nous l'a pourtant rappelé: les crimes perpétrés au nom du communisme à hauteur de plus de cent millions de morts n'ont jamais été officiellement et définitivement condamnés, comme ce fut le cas, à juste titre, pour les crimes nazis.

Je siège dans cet hémicycle depuis plus de trois ans et j'y ai entendu des centaines de fois les mots «tolérance» et «démocratie» avec un empressement non dissimulé, d'ailleurs, pour s'ingérer dans le gouvernement de nations pourtant souveraines, sous couvert qu'elles bafoueraient les valeurs européennes ou qu'elles seraient, comme on l'a entendu, populistes, c'est-à-dire qu'elles défendraient leurs peuples, d'abord, à savoir exactement le contraire du communisme. Je pense bien sûr, par exemple, à la Hongrie, à la Pologne et à la Russie. Le hasard veut que ce soit justement des pays qui ont payé un très lourd tribut au régime de l'Union soviétique.

Aujourd'hui, ces pays se battent plus que d'autres pour préserver l'identité de leurs peuples. Ils veulent réhabiliter leurs racines chrétiennes, ils n'en ont pas honte et ils veulent défendre la famille et le concept salvateur de nation, en clair, tout ce que le communisme s'est acharné à détruire pendant 70 ans. Et pourtant, certains continuent de distiller son idéologie mortifère.

Aucune complaisance n'est acceptable. Nous devrions tous, ici, nous engager solennellement à ce que nos peuples ne revivent jamais cela.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök Úr! Kedves Képviselőtársaim, kedves Timmermans úr, aki egy nagyon érdekes, huncut ember, ahogy látom. Miért mondom ezt? Ugye elképzelem, hogy egészséges, normális gondolkodású, különösen a posztkommunista országokban élő emberek, ha látják, hogy mi történt itt ma, teljesen meghatódnak. Ugyanis egy perces néma vigyázz volt az Európai Parlamentben, a kommunizmus százmillió áldozatának tiszteletére és emlékére.

Milyen csodálatos dolog! De ők nem ismerik az Európai Uniónak a velejéig romlott és végtelenül hazug természetét! Timmermans Úr, kedves, maguk megváltoztatták ennek az egész vitának a címét! Amikor én bejelentkeztem múlt héten, még ez volt: Radikalizmus és populizmus Európában száz évvel az oroszországi bolsevik forradalom után. Összedugták a fejüket, rájöttek, ez egy kicsit túl átlátszó, ezzel együtt láttuk a vitán, hogy erről szólt a dolog, hogy az Önök által populistának nevezett, a nemzeti szuverenitásért kiálló erőket akarják gondolatilag (...) (Az elnök megvonta szót.)

Adam Szejnfeld (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sto lat od bolszewickiej rewolucji to sto milionów ofiar śmiertelnych i dziesiątki milionów więźniów politycznych na całym świecie. Komunizm zawsze i wszędzie, na każdym kontynencie był wprowadzany siłą, ale pod szczytnymi sztandarami równości, sprawiedliwości, powszechności czy likwidacji klas. Ale praktycznie jednak oznaczał zawsze jedno: nieograniczony terror, bo komunizm to dyktatura jednostki, to polityczny monopol partii komunistycznej, to likwidacja społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, to podporządkowanie władzy wszystkich środowisk, grup społecznych czy organizacji pozarządowych, to zakaz nie tylko działania, ale nawet myślenia innego niż to nakazane przez władze. Dlatego uważam, że komunizm, jako ideologia szkodliwa dla jednostki, także dla tkanki społecznej, powinien być zakazany.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi ricorrono i cent'anni dalla nascita di un modello di Stato che l'Europa ha lasciato confinato al secolo scorso, un modello che da ideologia si fa imposizione e sopraffazione. Sì, sto parlando del totalitarismo. Da quella Rivoluzione d'ottobre è nata una dittatura che aveva preso un pezzo di mondo per buona parte del Novecento. Il popolo in quella dittatura, come in tanti altri nati in quegli anni, è sempre stato parte della retorica totalitaria. La dittatura del popolo, l'orgoglio del popolo, l'onore del popolo. Eppure, popolo e oligarchi e dittature non hanno mai avuto nulla in comune, se non lo sfruttamento dei primi a vantaggio dei secondi. Dalla storia un monito, signor Presidente, per tutti noi, in un tempo, il nostro, in cui troppo spesso il popolo torna ad essere sventolato come bandiera in grado di giustificare ogni sopruso. Poco importa il nome di chi lo usa a proprio vantaggio, il rischio è sempre lo stesso: scivolare nella violenza del totalitarismo.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sto milionów ofiar. Niewyobrażalny terror. Słusznie złożyliśmy dzisiaj hołd ofiarom komunizmu. Ale ja chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na inny aspekt komunizmu. Otóż konstytutywnym elementem komunizmu było kłamstwo, kłamstwo posunięte do niewyobrażalnych rozmiarów. Już sama nazwa bolszewicy jest kłamliwa. Ale oni kłamali we wszystkim: w historii, w ekonomii, w biologii (Miczurin), w naukach ścisłych – wszędzie, wszędzie, zawsze kłamali. Odwracali znaczenie słów, odwracali znaczenie pojęć, które są utrwalone kulturowo w naszej europejskiej kulturze. I czyż dzisiaj nie dzieje się to samo? Popatrzmy na siebie, Szanowni Państwo, popatrzmy na debaty, które tutaj odbywamy, na debatę, która dzisiaj toczyła się o Polsce.

A gdzież były fakty? Otóż faktów nie było. Chodzi o odwrócenie znaczenia słów, a to odwraca kierunek rozwoju ludzkości. I ten wniosek wyciągnijmy dla siebie, Szanowni Państwo, z tej paskudnej...

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, u prošlom su stoljeću Europu zadesila dva totalitarizma, nacistički i komunistički. Moj je otac bio žrtva oba. Deportiran je u nacistički logor Dachau, a poslije je zatočen u komunističkom logoru Goli otok.

Međutim, želim biti jasan. Dok je Lenjinova Oktobarska revolucija imala za cilj slobodu i solidarnost, Hitlerov je nacizam u temeljima imao rasizam i ksenofobiju. Oktobarska revolucija imala je osim sovjetskog komunizma, gdje su stradali milijuni, mnoge varijante u Europi, ali i u Aziji, Africi i Latinskoj Americi. Neki su još i danas živi.

I jugoslavenski, Titov komunizam je na početku proveo mnoge tragedije, proizveo mnoge tragedije da bi kasnije njegova socijalistička verzija ipak otvorila prostore privatnom vlasništvu, samoupravnom socijalizmu i slobodi kretanja, tada u cijeloj podijeljenoj Europi. Dakle, za razliku od većine u ovom Parlamentu nisam živio ni iza željezne zavjese, ali ni u liberalnoj demokraciji.

Potpuno sam siguran, najbolji odgovor za oba totalitarizma je Europska unija.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, nenhum acontecimento histórico terá sido alvo de tanta hostilidade e de tantas campanhas de mentiras e calúnias como a Revolução de Outubro. Não é de estranhar que assim seja. Cada realização, cada conquista da Revolução de Outubro é uma boa razão para fazer dela inspiração para todos os que lutam por um mundo melhor, sem lugar para a exploração e para a opressão, mas, simultaneamente, cada uma dessas conquistas justifica o ódio que contra ela destilam os que querem perpetuar a exploração e a opressão.

Amplios direitos sociais, direito ao trabalho, proibição do trabalho infantil, jornada máxima de oito horas de trabalho, direito a férias pagas, pleno emprego, direito à habitação e à saúde e educação gratuitas, proteção na maternidade, igualdade entre homens e mulheres, o contributo decisivo para a derrota do nazi fascismo, para a paz e para a libertação dos povos oprimidos pelo colonialismo: nenhuma tentativa de reescrever a história é capaz de apagar este legado. O capitalismo não é o fim da História.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, comrades, socialism has been the most catastrophic political experiment in history, responsible for the deaths of millions. Socialism is completely unnatural to mankind. All forms of socialism lead inexorably to dictatorship of the bureaucrat and not the proletariat. Socialism can only achieve equality through authoritarian bureaucratic police states.

Capitalism and its concomitant economic and political liberty provides the greatest material wealth for the greatest number of people. Furthermore, capitalism fits well with the rule of law and democracy. The European Union follows its socialist predecessors, trying to achieve bureaucratic authoritarianism by sleight of hand and by salami-slicing legislation, rather than Soviet tanks and guns. However, all socialism leads to the same thing – in this case a pan-European police state where elected Catalanian politicians are deported on a European arrest warrant. Socialism is a complete infringement of human rights.

Georg Mayer (ENF). – Herr Präsident! Wenn sich ein solches Ereignis wie diese vermeintliche Revolution, deren Ausmaß ja auch historisch und auch menschlich so schwer greifbar ist, zum hundertsten Mal jährt, dann sollte man sich diesem Thema mit einer gewissen Distanz nähern. Man sollte auch – das gilt vor allem für unser Haus – gewisse Schlüsse daraus ziehen, Schlüsse, die uns dazu bringen und weiterbringen, friedlich und frei vor allem miteinander zu leben und auch miteinander umzugehen. Das ist etwas, was uns jedenfalls diese Geschichte lehren kann.

Deswegen finde ich es auch bedenklich, wenn etwa heute Herr Maasikas vom Rat einen Schluss zieht, den ich so nicht stehen lassen kann. Denn wenn er den Populismus mit den Kommunisten und mit der Revolution von damals vergleicht, dann ist das eine völlig unzulässige Annäherung an dieses Thema. Das ist politisch einfältig, und es ist nahezu schon gefährlich verharmlosend, was hier vom Rat als Position gegeben wurde. Denn ich bin – und ich denke, er hat auch mich damit gemeint – gerne Populist, ich höre gerne auf die *vox populi*. Diesen Vergleich, Herr Präsident, sollte man hier in diesem Haus nicht zulassen.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Mr President, freedom, liberty, democracy: those words roll off the tongue so easily, don't they? Yet we forget how hard they were to win. This debate reminds us how the ideology of extreme socialism leads to poverty, violence and, indeed, to the loss of that freedom. This debate also reminds us how dangerous a political ideology is when, as Mr Timmermans says, the only things that matter are the goals dictated by the state. And yet, this debate is being turned into an anti-populist debate rather than concerning itself with the evil of communism.

We hear today that populists are the dangers – the dangerous people – yet we are not the ones who are trying to forge a new EU extreme ideology of a flag, a Council, a Parliament and its own anthem on people who do not want it.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, vidite kako su emotivne ove rasprave. Vidite kako gospodin Timmermans, koji je imao sreću živjeti s druge strane, shvaća i prihvaća nasljeđe koje se dogodilo u Europi, a vidite koliko smo sretni mi koji možemo danas živjeti u ujedinjenoj Europi bez totalitarizama. Ali smatramo da su razotkrivanje istine, osuda kršenja temeljnih ljudskih prava, zadovoljština žrtvama i njihovim obiteljima preduvjeti odgovornog suočavanja s prošlošću.

Naša europska pučka obitelj prihvatila je opće civilizacijsko nasljeđe i vrijednosti Europske unije. Smatramo se odgovornima podsjećati i danas na to kako europsko društvo svoju budućnost gradi u skladu s europskom osudom svih fašističkih, komunističkih i totalitarnih sustava koji su u cijeloj Europi kroz proteklo stoljeće prouzročili tragična stradanja, progone, likvidacije političkih neistomišljenika.

I moja domovina Hrvatska, kao članica Europske unije, neupitan je dio europskog civilizacijskog kruga i nema alternative procesu suočavanja s prošlošću koju su prošle i druge države članice, svojedobno pripadnice istočnoeuropskog komunističkog bloka. To je nužan proces u razotkrivanju istine. Naš zajednički dug čitavom europskom naraštaju, a osobito mladima, jest da na temelju međusobnog uvažavanja i poštivanja univerzalnih humanističkih vrijednosti otvorimo put budućnosti bez društvenih podjela. Ne smijemo dopustiti da se pojavom radikalizma i populizma u Europi dovedemo u stanje gdje sustav postaje dovoljno slab, kada ekstremisti vrlo naglo mogu ući u središte i tamo gdje ih nitko ne očekuje.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente; cien años después de 1917, un fantasma recorre Europa, pero no es el fantasma del comunismo del *Manifiesto* de Marx que inspiró a los bolcheviques. Es el fantasma del populismo, a menudo teñido de nacionalismo reaccionario, lo que nos recuerda algunas lecciones importantes.

La primera es que nunca ningún derecho ni ninguna libertad está conquistado para siempre, tampoco en la Unión Europea. La segunda, que es una triste paradoja mantener la resistencia a un régimen fenecido resucitando sus fantasmas. Y eso le puede pasar a quien mantenga una retórica antisoviética o antirrusa imitando al régimen de Putin, o al que mantenga una retórica antifascista o antifranquista cuarenta y dos años después de muerto Franco mientras practica desde alguna instancia de poder político una restricción del pluralismo, de las libertades, o una negación de las diferencias y del derecho a convivir bajo la ley y el Derecho, rompiendo el Estado de Derecho.

De modo que lo más importante, si hay una lección, es que nada hay tan antieuropeo como la negación del Derecho como técnica de resolución pacífica de conflictos y como conquista democrática de la civilización.

Monica Macovei (ECR). – Domnule președinte, holocaustul roșu a făcut o sută de milioane de victime. În „Cartea neagră a comunismului”, Martin Malia spunea că numărul victimelor regimurilor comuniste este între 85 și 100 de milioane de oameni. Prin rezoluția din 2006, Consiliul Europei a condamnat regimurile comuniste totalitare din Europa Centrală și de Est din ultimul secol, marcate fără excepție de violarea masivă a drepturilor omului și a menționat asasinatelor și execuțiile, lagărele de concentrare, tortura, moartea prin înfometare, deportările, închisoarea pe nedrept, închisoarea celor care se opuneau regimului politic, adică comunismului, munca forțată, persecuțiile pe motive etnice sau religioase și, bineînțeles, încălcarea libertății de conștiință, de exprimare și a celorlalte.

Trebuia atunci, în 2006, poate și mai devreme, mers până la capăt și interzis comunismul. De ce nu am interzis atunci comunismul? Trebuie interzis așa cum a fost interzis și fascismul.

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz (ALDE). – Señor presidente. En primer lugar, perdón, por haberles abandonado durante décadas tras el telón de acero. Segundo, un hecho: tres años después de la toma del Palacio de Invierno los mismos marineros que ayudaron a los bolcheviques a tomar el poder se rebelaron en Kronstadt y fueron aplastados por el Ejército Rojo. Pedían elecciones con voto secreto, libertad de expresión y de prensa, libertad de reunión, libertad de trabajo y producción.

No hubo lo que prometía la propaganda comunista. Hubo una dictadura de una casta dirigente con poder absoluto sobre la vida y la muerte durante décadas. A los bolcheviques les siguieron otros populistas, propaganda y tensiones antidemocráticas de signos opuestos. Aprendimos dolorosamente que el fin no justifica los medios.

Hoy otros populismos, mentiras, propaganda y tensiones antidemocráticas juegan contra la Unión Europea y sus libertades. En Cataluña, por ejemplo, agentes externos han liderado mentiras, propaganda, *fakes* para debilitar España, buscando debilitar el futuro de la democracia en toda Europa.

El reto es desenmascarar, ahora también, a los aprendices de tirano, emboscados algunos en la Rusia de Putin o en la Venezuela de Maduro.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Alexandra Kollontaj è stata la prima ministra donna al mondo. Rivoluzionaria, portò nella costituzione del '18 il diritto all'aborto e il diritto al divorzio, i diritti di autodeterminazione delle donne. In «Largo all'eros alato» Kollontaj parla dell'amore come di un sentimento profondamente sociale nella sua essenza. Ecco, la rivoluzione, cento anni fa, fu un atto d'amore, che io rivendico come femminista e come comunista, contro la vostra vergognosa equiparazione di comunismo e nazismo sotto l'etichetta di totalitarismo. State paragonando un disegno razziale di sterminio a un'idea di uguaglianza e di libertà che non è sepolta sotto le tragedie e sotto il crollo del socialismo reale.

Nel 1917 non fece soltanto irruzione il gruppo bolscevico nel Palazzo d'inverno, fecero irruzione operai e contadini nella storia. Forse preferireste a parlare con gli zar, come oggi preferite parlare con il re anziché col popolo catalano. Sì, quel giorno è stata data una spinta alla storia verso una futura umanità. Un fantasma si aggira per l'Europa.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, due argomenti tabù di cui si parla poco, soprattutto del primo: le origini misteriose e i finanziamenti oscuri della rivoluzione bolscevica. Non se ne parla mai, chissà come mai, e invece meriterebbero un approfondimento anche in sede politica oltre che storica. E poi l'altro, sollevato giustamente, creando un'enormità di polemiche, dal grandissimo Ernest Nolte anche qui al Parlamento europeo: la comparabilità e la consequenzialità fra comunismo sovietico e nazionalsocialismo alla luce di genocidi nel Novecento, cioè i massacri comunisti e l'Arcipelago Gulag come antecedente storico di Auschwitz.

Questi sono argomenti seri, su cui dovremmo riflettere. Ci dite che non dovremmo parlare noi populist, molti lo dicono. Ma, quando c'era l'Unione Sovietica, chi se non i nostri movimenti patriottici e nazionalisti parlava di queste cose, rivelava, proclamava chi erano i veri autori responsabili delle forze di Katy, che ancora a Norimberga sono stati attribuiti erroneamente non ai veri autori sovietici. E allora onore a Putin, che rifiuta di celebrare la Rivoluzione d'ottobre....

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! W 1917 r. do władzy doszli bolszewicy, obiecując walkę z wyzyskiem, równość płci, walkę z nacjonalizmem, walkę z rasizmem, wolne związki zamiast małżeństw, obalenie monarchii, wprowadzenie demokracji, czyli dokładnie to samo, co obiecuje Unia Europejska. W 1920 r. Polacy powstrzymali tych szaleńców, którzy chcieli zająć Europę. I co jest dzisiaj? Dzisiaj muszę oglądać bolszewika Altiero Spinelli w Brukseli. Muszę widzieć, że na znaczkach poczty belgijskiej Lenin jest najwybitniejszą osobistością XX wieku. Na sali widzę pana Timmermansa, a 95% tutaj ludzi na sali to są albo socjaliści, albo komuniści, albo chrześcijańscy socjaliści, albo narodowi socjaliści i inni faszyści, i inni czerwoni. Tak? Nie tylko u nas. W USA Bernie Sanders, przecież to Trocki, o mało co nie został prezydentem Stanów Zjednoczonych. Tymczasem w Rosji stalińscy wyróżnili bolszewików, a potem coraz wolniej, powoli odchodzili od bolszewizmu. I dzisiaj pan Putin by usunął w ogóle bolszewizm, gdyby nie to, że przegrałby z Ziuganowem, bo tam jest demokracja, i dlatego go nienawidzicie.

(Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos)

President. – Mr Korwin-Mikke, you have run out of time. May I ask you, for now and for any time in the future, not to offend your colleagues.

Boris Zala (S&D). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, kolegovia, niet pochyb, že musíme jednoznačne odsúdiť akékoľvek revolučné násilie. Rovnako tak je odsúdeniahodné bolševicko-stranícke uchopenie moci, ktoré vždy vedie k tomu, čo voláme totalitný štát. Ale rád by som zdôraznil, nepripomínajme si len tragické dôsledky, ale aj rovnako tragické príčiny revolučných nálad a násilia. Ak sa pozriem na poučenie z bolševického puču z hľadiska príčin, tak EÚ nesmie nikdy cynicky ponechať osud celých sociálnych skupín napospas neľudským trhovým silám. EÚ musí posilniť svoj sociálno-trhový charakter, definitívne prekonať neoliberálnu ortodoxiu. Práve tá plodí odpor, vzburu tých, ktorí boli a sú v tejto ortodoxii obetovaní. Dnešné vzmáhanie sa nacionalizmu, populizmu, neofašizmu, ale aj ľavicového radikalizmu je dôsledkom, negatívnym dôsledkom nesociálneho konštruktú politiky. Ak sa chceme vyhnúť malým a veľkým bolševickým prevratom, myslíme na to.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – „Podstęp, kłamstwo, przelana krew, dyktatura są usprawiedliwione, jeżeli umożliwiają władzę proletariatu. Polityka marksistowska jest w swojej formie dyktatorska i totalitarna.” Tych słów nie napisał reakcyjny wróg marksizmu i komunizmu, lecz jego postępowy obrońca Maurice Merleau-Ponty, wybitny, subtelny francuski filozof, bo także po tej stronie żelaznej kurtyny, po której szczęście miał żyć przewodniczący Timmermans, byli komuniści, byli zwolennicy komunizmu, były silne partie komunistyczne. I trochę uważam za niestosowne, że akurat przy tej okazji Pan się powołuje na Semprúna, który również był wieloletnim działaczem hiszpańskiej partii komunistycznej.

Przemoc, terror, masowe egzekucje były wpisane w sam rdzeń marksistowskiej doktryny. I wszędzie, gdzie próbowano je wcielić życie, znajdują się masowe groby. Myślę więc, że ta rocznica powinna być dla wielu członków tego Parlamentu, którzy byli członkami partii komunistycznych, okazją do rachunku sumienia i ekspiacji.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente; señor Timmermans, ha dicho que siente la responsabilidad colectiva de toda Europa y que va a contribuir a que no repitamos errores impulsando la memoria democrática. En consecuencia, está obligado a recibir y a escuchar a las asociaciones de víctimas y familiares de las más de 150 000 personas asesinadas por la dictadura franquista. Y comprobar, como dicen la ONU o el Consejo de Europa, que hoy siguen sufriendo porque viven buscando a más de 150 000 asesinados. Porque viven pendientes de verdad, de justicia y de reparación.

Ayer mismo, en una de estas fosas comunes, en Aragón, las víctimas sufrieron una nueva humillación: la retirada de ayudas públicas impidió exhumar y enterrar dignamente a quince vecinos de Pomer, ciudadanos europeos asesinados por defender la democracia.

La transición española fue posibilista. Nos cambió a mejor. Pero debemos afrontar de una vez sus pecados originales. La amnesia es uno de ellos. Traten a las víctimas del franquismo igual que a las del comunismo o el nazismo. Y pido que incluya a las autoridades españolas entre las que deben recibir un llamamiento para mejorar, y mucho, en la recuperación de la memoria democrática. Si lo hace, se lo agradeceremos.

Marina Albiol Guzmán (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, ocho personas poseen la misma riqueza que la mitad más pobre de la humanidad. Millones de mujeres son explotadas en fábricas textiles que producen, por ejemplo, para Inditex. Sesenta y cinco millones de personas en el mundo desplazadas por conflictos o violaciones de derechos humanos. Y un planeta que se nos muere por deforestación, contaminación de los mares y calentamiento global. Este es el resultado del capitalismo: horror, barbarie y explotación.

Así que la pregunta no es cómo podemos seguir siendo comunistas. La pregunta es si aún queda alguien tan irresponsable como para defender el capitalismo. Cien años después de la revolución que triunfó con la consigna de «paz, pan y tierra» en el país del pueblo que venció a los nazis, el reparto de la riqueza en el mundo, el feminismo, el socialismo, es decir, que nadie sufra para que otros vivan mejor, no solo es la opción más justa sino que, además, es la única viable.

Y a ustedes lo que les aterra es saber que una vez sucedió, que una vez el pueblo explotado se levantó, y que volverá a suceder.

Nicolas Bay (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, le titre de ce débat, «Les legs de la révolution totalitaire bolchévique» peut évidemment nous inviter à nous souvenir des 100 millions de morts du communisme quelques jours seulement après l'anniversaire de la chute du mur de Berlin.

Cette idéologie effroyable qui a ensanglanté non seulement l'Europe, mais beaucoup d'autres pays du monde et qui continue d'ailleurs de prospérer dans un certain nombre de pays et d'opprimer un certain nombre de peuple.

Mais bien sûr il y avait des arrière-pensées derrière la volonté d'imposer ce débat aujourd'hui, dans notre Parlement, en essayant de fustiger la Russie d'aujourd'hui, qui évidemment n'a rien à voir avec le communisme d'hier.

La Russie d'aujourd'hui est une grande puissance qui est un allié naturel de nos nations européennes et nous n'avons que des inconvénients à ne pas tenir compte de cette réalité.

En revanche on peut s'interroger aussi sur les orientations de l'Union européenne. L'Union européenne méprise de plus en plus les peuples, elle fustige la Hongrie ou la Pologne, parce que les choix démocratiques des peuples sont contraires aux orientations de la Commission européenne, c'est un des aspects du totalitarisme.

Et puis, on voit bien que l'on veut aller toujours plus loin, à marche forcée, vers une Union européenne fédéraliste, comme l'URSS fonctionnait autrefois.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, minulý týden, dne 7. listopadu, uplynulo 100 let od bolševického puče v Rusku, eufemisticky nazývaného Velkou říjnovou socialistickou revolucí. V tyto dny jsme si komunistický převrat připomínali i v Bruselu. V Domě evropských dějin se uskutečnila kvalifikovaná konference. Panelisté zmínili zločiny komunismu ve světě. Padla zde i cifra označující počet mrtvých, které mají komunisté na svědomí: více než 90 milionů obětí.

Nyní mi dovolu, dámy a pánové, abych oslovil komunisty, kteří dnes v tomto sále mezi námi sedí. Především se to týká portugalských komunistů. Milí naši evropští bolševici, minulý týden jste uspořádali na půdě Evropského parlamentu výstavu oslavující sté výročí komunistického převratu. Panely vaší výstavy byly čistou adorací komunistických symbolů a komunistického násilí. A já se vás ptám: To vám není hanba oslavovat smrt devadesáti milionů lidí?

Nyní se obracím znovu k vám, vážení demokratičtí poslanci. Komunisté se v řadě zemí bývalého sovětského bloku znovu derou k moci. Zneužívají demokracie, do vysokých pozic protlačují příslušníky bývalých nomenklatur a stávají se významným bezpečnostním rizikem pro EU. Čas celoevropského zákazu komunistických symbolů už nastal. Demokracii je třeba bránit.

PRZEWODNICTWO: BOGUSŁAW LIBERADZKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Przewodniczący. – Jeszcze raz przypominam. Nie stosujemy „niebieskiej kartki” ze względu na charakter tej dyskusji. Jednocześnie, również serdeczna prośba: nie używajmy zwrotu „europejscy bolszewicy”, bo to nie pogłębi jakości naszej dyskusji.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, a cent'anni dalla Rivoluzione di ottobre, i motivi da cui essa è scaturita sono ancora tutti qua: le disuguaglianze sociali, lo sfruttamento dell'uomo sull'uomo e la voglia di emancipazione dei popoli.

Come socialista europeo ho sposato un'ideologia politica che pensa di poter coniugare libertà civili e politiche con maggiore uguaglianza contro il modello del socialismo reale, ma da italiano so quanto la storia del Partito comunista italiano in Italia sia stata una storia di battaglia e di progresso, e voglio ricordare che fu proprio quel Partito comunista italiano a eleggere qui da indipendente Altiero Spinelli.

Oggi l'Unione Sovietica non c'è più e il modello dello Stato sociale europeo occidentale non sta più in piedi, in contrapposizione al modello sovietico. Oggi diventa fondamentale, quindi, come proveremo a fare giovedì a Göteborg, al Summit per il pilastro sociale, dimostrare la nostra capacità come europei di tenere insieme aspirazioni all'uguaglianza sostanziale, sempre vive nelle persone, con il desiderio di difendere la libertà dal totalitarismo di qualunque colore politico.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, glavno nasljeđe boljševičke revolucije je 100 milijuna mrtvih. Neki su skončali od gladi, neki u neljudskim uvjetima u logorima od raznih bolesti i tjelesne iscrpljenosti, neki od posljedica mučenja od strane represivnog aparata, a neki su jednostavno likvidirani kao neprijatelji raznih komunističkih režima od 1917. do danas.

Svi oni koji imaju potrebu romantizirati boljševičku revoluciju i pričati bajke o radnicima, jednakosti i pravdi neka prvo zastanu i sjetu se ovih 100 milijuna žrtava. I među njima je bilo puno običnih ljudi, radnika i obespravljenih, a od komunista su u zamjenu za svoj težak život dobili tešku smrt.

Nažalost, čini se da nismo naučili lekciju pa danas pojedinci koji spavaju s komunističkim priručnicima pod jastukom imaju veliku političku moć u nekim zapadnim državama, a u nekima čak prijete doći na vlast.

Imamo veliku odgovornost educirati nove generacije kako bi znale prepoznati komunističko zlo i oduprijeti mu se. I jedna nova smrt u ime sulude ideologije koja je iza sebe dosad ostavila 100 milijuna leševa bila bi previše.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señor presidente, para mí es un misterio insondable que hoy, en 2017, aún haya alguien que considere a Lenin un genio, alguien cuya obra quedó ensombrecida por Stalin, porque eso es falso. Lenin fue un populista y un dictador que usó el terror de forma sistemática. Lenin enseñó a Stalin el camino del genocidio y ese es su verdadero legado.

Sí, en España, en mi país, hay populistas como Pablo Iglesias que llaman «genio» al dictador Lenin y que van a celebrar los cien años de la revolución bolchevique precisamente a Bolivia, justo cuando Evo Morales declara su intención de conducir a su país en la dirección de Cuba o Venezuela. También hay líderes como el de Izquierda Unida, Alberto Garzón, que rinde tributo a Lenin en las redes sociales. O también hay partidos independentistas antisistema, como la CUP, que usan carteles de inspiración leninista para su propaganda.

Sí, todavía hay algunos que aspiran a ser Lenin, pero no en la Rusia zarista de 1917 sino en la Europa democrática de 2017. Cuidémonos del legado de Lenin. Cuidémonos del legado leninista, porque solo sirve hoy, en 2017, para dos cosas: para privar de libertades y derechos y para hundir países prósperos en la pobreza.

Steeve Briois (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, nous célébrons aujourd'hui le triste anniversaire de la révolution bolchévique, qui a donné naissance à l'URSS, responsable de la mort de quinze millions de personnes. N'oublions jamais les ravages du communisme et du nazisme.

Ce devoir de mémoire est essentiel pour combattre les deux totalitarismes idéologiques qui menacent aujourd'hui notre vieux continent.

Le premier, c'est celui porté par les mondialistes qui veulent une jungle mondiale sans protection économique, sans barrières douanières, dont les effets sont ravageurs pour l'emploi. Ce mondialisme encourage la spéculation financière, le dumping social et l'évasion fiscale. Avec ce mondialisme, ce sont des conditions de vie indignes et précaires pour des millions d'Européens dont vous n'entendez pas la souffrance.

L'autre danger, c'est celui des immigrationnistes qui imposent à nos nations européennes des millions de migrants, alors que nous subissons déjà une submersion migratoire.

Ces deux dictatures, personne n'a le droit de les contester. Malheur à ceux qui oseront critiquer la pensée unique, car ils seront taxés de populistes, de xénophobes, de racistes ou d'extrême droite.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, some of the Members of this House have today compared the Soviet Union with the European Union, mixing up open borders democracy, human rights, a market economy and democratic elections with the Iron Curtain and borders, torture, deportations and executions.

I must tell those Members in question that they have not learned anything, and have not understood anything about democracy. It is a shame, and an insult to all those who suffered and lost their lives. It is also a shame that we still see people celebrating the so-called Glorious Revolution of October 1917. They do not understand that totalitarian ideas will always lead to totalitarian dictatorship, totalitarian executions and deportations – because, when might goes before right, freedom is lost and individuals suffer.

The core responsibility of the European Union is to be the firm and strong defender of human rights, democracy, open borders and a free society. That is why we need to understand the differences, because, if we do not, we lose some part of our freedom.

(Applause)

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, this year marks the centenary of the Russian totalitarian revolution. It is indeed 100 years since that Bolshevik coup in Russia. What, at the time, looked like a small group of ideological extremists was soon established as a totalitarian communist regime.

In order to strengthen ... I am sorry, can I speak please? It seems that some discussions are going on in the Chamber. In order to strengthen the resilience of European democracies, it is important to reflect on the lessons of the past century and on the current challenges to democracy in Europe and worldwide. It is constructive to review the consequences of that revolution, which was a time when people attempted to assert their rights, but in the end their voices were ultimately pushed away.

Drawing on conclusions about the present, we forecast and build a future, relying on things of which we are 'certain' only in relation to the past. Taking into account the current challenges the European continent faces, the EU has to provide long-term solutions by building bridges and defending and promoting democratic values: free elections, the market economy and human rights.

There are millions of witnesses from Central and Eastern Europe who could give testimony on what happened in that part of Europe between the end of World War II and 1989.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Pierwszy Wiceprzewodniczący Komisji! Koleżanki i Koledzy! Bardzo bym chciał, żeby ta dzisiejsza debata stała się przełomem i żeby nigdy już nie doszło do takich sytuacji, jak na przykład odrzucenie przez ten parlament wniosku o debatę, która miała upamiętnić siedemdziesięciolecie zdrady jałtańskiej i skazania połowy narodów Europy na życie pod dominacją sowiecką. Wtedy tych naszych 40% izby, która za tym głosowała, żeby o tym rozmawiać, nie uratowały żadne prawa mniejszości.

Wysoka Izbo! Komunizm zrodził się z nienawiści do Boga, do ludzkiego strumienia, do rodziny, do tradycji narodowych. Komunizm oczywiście zrodził się również z pogardy dla zwykłego życia ludzi. Dlatego chłopci już w Tambowie musieli się przeciwko niemu buntować. Dlatego nasi dziadkowie uratowali świat w 1920 roku. Dlatego zagłodzono miliony Ukraińców. I dzisiaj nacjonalistyczny populistą jest tym lenińskim kułakiem, krwio pijcą, którym się straszy ludzi. Naprawdę opamiętajcie się, dlatego że słyszeliście, ilu jeszcze ludzi usprawiedliwia zło komunizmu. I niestety, Panie Pierwszy Wiceprzewodniczący, Pan nie do nich kierował swoją dłoń i swoje orędzie.

António Marinho e Pinto (ALDE). – Senhor Presidente, tentar fazer uma revolução socialista num país feudal só poderia levar à socialização da miséria e da servidão, que era o que verdadeiramente havia para socializar na Rússia de 1917. Prometeu-se paz, pão, terra e liberdade, mas o que se distribuiu foi a guerra civil, a fome generalizada, a coletivização da terra e um Estado policial que suprimiu todas as liberdades individuais e coletivas.

A voracidade assassina desse Estado policial não poupou mesmo os dirigentes do próprio partido bolchevique que desencadeara a revolução, como ficou evidenciado nos Processos de Moscovo e no assassinio de Leon Trotsky, consumado a milhares de quilómetros da Rússia por um sicário de José Estaline.

Albert Camus disse um dia que a revolução bolchevique acabou por conduzir à realização de uma das mais emblemáticas utopias do marxismo, ou seja, a passagem do Estado governo de pessoas a Estado administrador das coisas. Mas, sinistra ironia, misturando e confundindo as pessoas e as coisas.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Conselho, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, naturalmente que celebrar os cem anos da revolução russa é celebrar, antes de mais, a morte de dezenas de milhões de pessoas e só isso é suficiente para condenar o comunismo como ideologia e o comunismo como regime, assim como condenamos o nacional-socialismo, assim como condenamos o maoísmo. E aqui, hoje à tarde, já foram dados muitos exemplos daquilo que aconteceu em toda a Europa de Leste.

Mas eu gostava de dizer que até no Ocidente e em África, no caso português em 75, durante um ano, nós fomos objeto da repressão comunista, das perseguições comunistas e ainda hoje o país paga o preço das nacionalizações que nessa altura foram feitas e que congelaram a economia portuguesa durante imenso tempo.

Mas, pior que isso, quando foi feita a mais que justa, necessária e muito atrasada descolonização, deixámos a União Soviética em Angola, em Moçambique, em Cabo Verde, na Guiné Bissau, em São Tomé e Príncipe e também em Timor e deixámos os povos africanos entregues a Cuba e à União Soviética, à maior das repressões e ao regime mais inigualitário e mais vil que podia ter sido instalado. Esses povos também merecem uma homenagem neste dia em que celebramos um acontecimento tão nefasto.

László Tókécs (PPE). – Elnök Úr! November 8-án, az Európai Parlamentben centenáriumi ünnepség keretében emlékeztek meg az 1917. októberi bolsevik forradalomról. Az alkalmi plakáton a sarló és kalapács kommunista jelképe díszelgett. Október folyamán a francia államtanács viszont arra utasította a bretagne-i Ploermel városát, hogy II. János Pál pápa emlékművéről távolítsa el a kereszt krisztusi szimbólumát. Itt és így állunk most Európában.

A valamikori keresztény Európát pusztá létében fenyegető totalitárius bolsevik kommunizmus egyenes örökségeként az Unió szívében és a szabad Nyugaton, demokratikus támogatással folyik tovább az európai értékeket meghazudtoló ateista propaganda. Miközben a holokauszttagadást méltán bünteti a törvény, ezzel szemben Európa nagy részében a tömegvilkos kommunizmus büntetési és önkényuralmi jelképei nem esnek ugyanazon megítélés alá.

Végérvényesen szakítanunk kell a képmutató kettős mérce használatával! Jelenkori globális fenyegetettségünkben, európai és keresztény identitásunk és értékeink védelmében egyszer s mindenkorra szabadulnunk kell a kommunizmus romboló örökségétől.

Μανώλης Κεφαλογιάννης (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όσοι δεν διαβάζουν την Ιστορία σωστά είναι καταδικασμένοι να τη ζήσουν στη χειρότερη της μορφή. Δεν καταδικάζουμε τις σκέψεις και τις ιδέες, καταδικάζουμε τις πράξεις συγκεκριμένων καθεστώτων. Γιατί στο όνομα των υψηλότερων ιδανικών έγιναν τα πιο απαίσια εγκλήματα στην ιστορία.

Βεβαίως, αν δει κανείς τις ιδεολογίες, είναι σαν να σκαρφωνούμε στην κορυφή ενός βουνού που έχει στην κορυφή του κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη και ελευθερία. Εμείς προσπαθούμε να κατακτήσουμε την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη μέσα από την ελευθερία και κάποιοι έλεγαν ότι θα κατακτήσουν την ελευθερία μέσα από την κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη. Η περίοδος της αδιότητας όμως έχει περάσει εδώ και 100 χρόνια από το πραξικόπημα -επανάσταση όπως το λένε οι ίδιοι- των μπολσεβίκων με 100 εκατομμύρια νεκρούς.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ανακήρυξε την 23η Αυγούστου ως ημέρα μνήμης των θυμάτων του σταλινισμού και του ναζισμού, και είναι συγκεκριμένη η πράξη αυτών των ακραίων καθεστώτων, και το Συμβούλιο της Ευρώπης καταδίκασε τα εγκλήματα των ολοκληρωτικών κομμουνιστικών καθεστώτων.

Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, ο σύγχρονος ολοκληρωτισμός είναι ο λαϊκισμός και πρέπει να ηττηθεί, πρώτα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και σε κάθε κράτος ξεχωριστά. Προστατεύουμε τον ευρωπαϊκό τρόπο ζωής, ο οποίος μας χάρισε 70 χρόνια ειρήνης και 70 χρόνια καλής δημοκρατίας. Καταδικάζουμε τον ολοκληρωτισμό σε κάθε του μορφή, απ' όπου κι αν προέρχεται. Καταδικάζουμε τα άκρα και τις ακρότητες.

Асим Ахмедов Адемов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, болшевишката революция преди 100 години роди чудовишна диктатура в бившия Съветски Съюз и страните от Източна Европа. Тази революция е може би най-голямата морална катастрофа в историята на човечеството. Последствията от това събитие деморализират нашите общества и до днес. Една от първите стъпки на държавите, заразени от този болшевишки вирус, беше да унищожат местната интелигенция.

Всички, които сме живели в общество, създадено от този трагичен социален експеримент, знаем и помним каква беше неговата същина – беше ни отнета свободата, правото да изговаряме на глас мислите си. Моята родна страна – България, беше една от държавите, които пострадаха много от това зло. Българските комунисти извършиха едни от най-зловещите атентати в историята на човечеството: взривиха църквата „Св. Неделя“ в София.

Ако искаме да сме свободни, мислещи, ние не трябва да забравяме генезиса на това зло. Ние трябва да лекуваме пораженията в съзнанието на хората с образование, с интелект, защото Европейският съюз е инструмент за решаване на проблемите без насилие. Това е начинът да дадем отпор на територията на злото, което иска да се възроди.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident! Herr Ratspräsident! 1917 begann die große totalitäre Phase Europas.

Erst mit dem Kommunismus in Russland, in der Sowjetunion, und dann ab 1933 in Deutschland. Totalitarismus heißt die völlige Übernahme der Kontrolle über den Einzelnen. Er bedeutet die Vernichtung der Würde des Einzelnen. Wenn hier einige Leute sagen, die Europäische Union sei damit vergleichbar – wir alle, auch Sie, wären bei Stalin und Hitler schon im Gefängnis, weil wir eine unterschiedliche Meinung haben! Wenn es uns gut ginge, wären wir im Gefängnis, sonst wären wir völlig vernichtet worden. Solche Vergleiche anzustellen ist unerträglich.

Ich möchte auch zum Ausdruck bringen, dass es die Kooperation des Nationalsozialismus und des Stalinismus gibt. Der Überfall auf die baltischen Staaten, die Übernahme Polens, die Übergabe der Westukraine an die Sowjetunion und vieles mehr war eine Aufteilung von Gebiet mit Wirkung bis heute durch die beiden totalitären Systeme und mit all den Wirkungen, die wir bis 1989 gehabt haben. Dies sollte man nicht vergessen, das war das Ungeheuerlichste der Geschichte unseres Kontinentes. Mein eigenes Land war daran beteiligt. Deswegen sollten wir alles daransetzen, dass diese Vernichtung der Würde des einzelnen Menschen nie wieder vorkommen kann und auch die Unterjochung von Völkern in Europa nicht wiederkommen kann.

Deswegen ist Europa die Antwort der Freiheit gegen den Krieg und gegen Diktatur! Das ist die Begründung für mich, warum ich Europäer bin.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, sté výročí si připomínáme právě proto, abychom nezapomněli, co to byl komunistický teror. A je vidět, že je to třeba, protože někteří zapomněli, že zde je 94 milionů mrtvých po tomto teroru. Extrémní pravice dokonce si dovoluje srovnat Evropskou unii se Sovětským svazem. Asi proto, že tito poslanci nikdy v komunistické společnosti nežili. Extrémní levice zase naopak volá znovu po komunistické revoluci a po blahu komunismu. Protože tito poslanci nikdy nežili v socialismu a v komunistické diktatuře.

Dámy a pánové, je to tak možné proto, že, bohužel, tyto zločiny nebyly potrestány. Komunismus totiž nebyl jako nacismus poražen ve válce a nebyl tady žádný „norimberský tribunál“. V této souvislosti je skandální, že se zde, v Evropském parlamentu, mohla konat oslava říjnové revoluce jako výstava.

Dámy a pánové, dnes, když jsme hovořili o situaci v Polsku, bylo mi smutno. Vážení demokraté, nedejme se rozdělit. Nenaskočme na tu vlnu populismu a rozdělování demokratických sil v Evropské unii. Bylo by to velmi smutné.

Cristian-Silviu Buşoi (PPE). – Domnule preşedinte, stimaţi colegi, evenimentul despre care vorbim astăzi este un eveniment nefast al istoriei care a dus la dictatură, suferinţă, crime teribile care au schimbat soarta oamenilor nu doar din Rusia şi din fostul spaţiu sovietic, ci şi din ţări din centrul şi estul Europei sau de pe alte continente.

România, țara mea, a avut de suferit din pricina comunismului, elitele sociale și politice au fost distruse, cei care se opuneau colectivizării au fost încarcerați sau omorâți, reminiscențele, din păcate, nu au dispărut nici astăzi în mentalitatea unor politicieni care mai au rol de conducere.

În final, din fericire, voința popoarelor nu a putut fi înfrântă de o ideologie și de o formă de guvernământ. Fără să facem neapărat o paralelă și păstrând, desigur, proporțiile nu putem totuși să nu ne gândim, în contextul dezbaterii de astăzi, la radicalismul, extremismul, populismul care bântuie astăzi Europa. Vedem astăzi partide populiste și naționaliste care vin cu soluții care mai mult înrăutățesc realitatea socială decât să creeze bunăstare. Societățile în care trăim sunt puse la încercare de campanii populiste și emoționale care încearcă să exacerbeze temerile și nemulțumirile justificate ale oamenilor, care prin dezinformări și reflectări falsificate ale realității încearcă, de fapt, să profite pentru un interes politic.

Soluția este să continuăm să promovăm democrația, libertatea individuală, statul de drept, să promovăm solidaritatea și nu ura, toleranța și nu totalitarismul.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, we are not a gathering of historians. We look at history because we are politicians and we want to learn from history. It is quite a miracle that we are now in a hemicycle with the directly elected representatives of 500 million Europeans who were never this close to each other at any time in our history. It is a miracle. This place is a miracle. If we revisit our history, we do it for our own benefit, but especially for the benefit of our children so that we do not make the mistakes of the past again.

So I would say just in conclusion: how did we get, in the 20th century, into this totalitarian quagmire that cost hundreds of millions of Europeans their lives through repression and through war? How did we get there? Totalitarian regimes do not just fall from the sky. The ground is prepared for them. That is what we see.

What are the lessons I draw today? Just a few thoughts, and I will end on that. If politicians claim that they, and only they, represent the will of the people, if they brand anyone who disagrees with them as enemies of the people, if politicians try to limit, or even abolish, the freedom of the media, if they believe they have the right to instruct and control judges, if they constantly look for internal and external enemies who they then turn into scapegoats when they themselves fail miserably in delivering the illusions they peddled to the people – always Jews at the receiving end of this, always Roma at the receiving end of this, always minorities at the receiving end of this – if you see all of this happening, please be vigilant. If you see that happen, please do not look away. We are duty bound to speak up and to act so that the victims of totalitarian regimes have not died in vain.

(Applause)

Matti Maasilta, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, thank you all for this enlightening debate today. To paraphrase former Estonian President Lennart Meri: 'they say that Bolshevism is dead but has anybody seen its dead body?' This discussion today shows again that the search for it still continues. We conduct this search best by education, by developing democratic resilience, media literacy, tolerance and of course, by staying vigilant.

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Ramona Nicole Mănescu (PPE), *in writing*. – Let me share with you, in 60 seconds, what the legacy of the Bolshevik revolution meant for my country – Romania! Executions, physical suppression of political opponents, terror campaigns, expropriations and possessions' confiscation, famine, labor camps. 300.000 killed, starting with 1945. Still, the loss of human lives is just one of the many ways Communism destroyed countries and destinies. Hundreds of thousands more were deported, arrested, imprisoned, sent to force labor, tortured. For some of these victims there are no records. The Second World War ended in 1945. For Romania, it continued until august 1958. The Red Army came in 1944 to liberate Romania and it kept on doing so for 14 years! Romania was forced to abolish a world-recognised and flourishing monarchy and change it with an isolated and decaying communist dictatorship. The terror did not end in 1958. The dictatorship and repression carried on until December 1989. Let me conclude by adding that one of the most despicable crimes of these 45 years of communism in Romania was the physical elimination of the elites. Elites that formed over 200 years of history!

Csaba Sógor (PPE), *írásban*. – A bolsevik forradalom hatása a világra és benne Európára óriási, a volt Szovjetunió mellett azonban azokra az országokra a legnagyobb, amelyben a kommunista diktatúrák emberek millióinak okoztak szenvedést. Az Európai Unió 28 tagállamából 11-ben ilyen ilyen totalitárius rendszerben és állampárti diktatúrában, a tervutasításos gazdaság körülményei között éltek több mint 40 évig. Ez az örökség ma is rányomja a bélyegét az EU újabb tagállamaira: a gazdasági különbségek nem szűntek meg, ezek a társadalmak és gazdasági rendszerek a kommunista örökség miatt óriási hátrányból indulnak, akár a közös piac versenyszabályait, akár az Unión belüli munkaerő-vándorlás jelenségét nézzük.

A mi társadalomfejlődésünkől hiányzik ez a 40 év, ami alatt Nyugat-Európában kiépült az infrastruktúra, megerősödtek a társadalmak és kialakult a szociális jóléti állam európai modellje. Európa újraegyesítése ezért nem egy pillanat, hanem egy folyamatos tevékenység, és éppen a bolsevik forradalom következményei által okozott károk felszámolását jelenti.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), *kirjalikult*. – Suure Sotsialistliku Oktoobrirevolutsiooni aastapäeva on põhjult muidugi meenutada. Eelkõige sellepärast, et meie Euroopas ei suuda ära mõistatada, mis toimub president Vladimir Putini peas. Ühest küljest oleks ta nagu tšekist, kes sündis Feliks Dzeržinski pintsli tõmmete abil oktoobri tuleleekides. Teisalt paistab, nagu tahaks ta olla Nikolai II mantlipärija, tsaar ja imperaator. Kuigi just oktoobrileegid kustutasid nii tsaari kui tema perekonna eluküünla. Nii et peame leppima naabriga, kes on skisofreenik.

Lisaksin siia ka Euroopa Liidu tänaste liikmete vastutuse. On hästi teada, et Lenini viis läbi rindejoone Saksa kindralstaap. Eesmärgiga nõrgestada Venemaad. Aga ka Läti kannab vastutust bolševike vägitükkide eest, sest just bolševiseeritud Läti kütid kaitsesid Leninit isiklikult ja olid selleks relvajõuks, mis bolševike surmava režiimi kehtestas. Ning lõpetuseks – kui meie siin peame sada aastat hiljem arutlema, et oktoobrirevolutsioon oli nii- või naasugune, siis kahtlemata oli sellel sündmusel negatiivseid tagajärgi, mida inimkond siiamani seedima peab. Ning pangem tähele – ka hitlerism ja Mussolini koos kindral Francoga said võimalikuks ikka ja ainult seepärast, et bolševikud Venemaal võimule tulid.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Cada realização, cada conquista da Revolução de Outubro constitui uma boa razão para fazer dela uma fonte de inspiração para todos os que lutam por um mundo melhor, onde não haja lugar à exploração e à opressão, mas, simultaneamente, cada uma dessas conquistas justifica o ódio que contra ela destilam os que querem perpetuar a exploração e a opressão.

Neste sentido, nenhum acontecimento histórico terá sido alvo de tanta hostilidade e de tantas campanhas de mentiras e calúnias como a Revolução de Outubro. Amplos direitos sociais, entre outros, o direito ao trabalho, a proibição do trabalho infantil, a jornada máxima de oito horas de trabalho, o direito a férias pagas, o pleno emprego, o direito à habitação, à saúde e à educação gratuitas, a proteção na maternidade, a igualdade de direitos entre homens e mulheres na família, na vida e no trabalho. O contributo decisivo para a derrota do nazi-fascismo, para a Paz e para a luta de libertação dos povos oprimidos pelo colonialismo. Nenhuma tentativa de reescrever a História apagará este legado.

19. Decision adopted on the second Mobility Package (debate)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest oświadczenie Komisji w sprawie decyzji w sprawie drugiego pakietu dotyczącego mobilności.

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, coming back from the COP23 summit in Bonn, I can testify to the fact that the global community is reassured by the EU's leadership and welcomes our reformed emissions-trading scheme and this mobility package proposal. The Clean Mobility Package is about Europe's political leadership in climate action and industrial leadership in clean and smart mobility.

As I have often said in the past, the leading economy of the 21st century will be the one that leads the transition to clean energy. Right now, when it comes to clean mobility, we have to admit we are lagging behind. Only 1% of the new cars sold within the European Union are electric. For comparison, China expects to reach 20% by 2020, and this is the equivalent of 4.5 million electric cars per year.

The car was invented in Europe, so it should be reinvented here as well, and our ambition should be simple: that the best and the cleanest cars are manufactured here, and that they are driven on the most advanced infrastructure. Today's proposal is an opportunity for Europe's industry to achieve just that. How? First, we set new emissions standards for cars and vans that are 30% lower in 2030 than in 2021, with an intermediary target in 2025, so that no time is wasted.

These targets are highly ambitious, but not disruptive. There is sufficient time for the industry to invest in cleaner technologies and for the employees to transition their skills. We will also ensure implementation through rigorous testing and controls.

Second, we increased our support for the roll-out of alternative fuel infrastructure with a EUR 800 million action plan, and the bulk of the money comes from Europe's carbon market, whose reform has now been adopted. This roll-out must be inclusive across the continent: no region, no consumer should be left behind. And third, we set public procurement rules for new vehicles. Together with these key measures, the Commission proposes improving the organisation of transport systems and to support the roll-out of both alternative fuel infrastructure and clean vehicles. Violeta Bulc will elaborate on this in a moment.

Finally, we gave a strong push for the development of advanced battery technologies here in Europe. The demand for batteries is about to spike all around the world and create a gigantic market worth EUR 250 billion in Europe alone by 2025. So this is our chance to capture this market in a sustainable way. We want to be leaders in green batteries. This means clean production, sustainable and responsible mining of raw materials, recycling and reusing.

Last month I launched the EU Battery Alliance with industry and interested Member States in order to develop strong manufacturing capacity here in Europe and regain competitiveness throughout the value chain. The European Parliament and its Members have an important role to play, so I would like to invite interested MEPs to support this strategic initiative, perhaps by forming the Friends of Battery Group with us.

With this package, we are sending a clear signal to the industry and investors, to public authorities and to consumers. It is also sending a message to our global partners about our ambition and continued commitment to lead in the fight against climate change.

Let me conclude by saying that this is a package that has only winners. Drivers will save thousands of euros in fuel and maintenance costs. We will see 70 000 new jobs of the future created in Europe. Investors will benefit from lucrative new opportunities, and EU car companies will be able to retain their global market share and regain consumers' trust. We will benefit from lower dependency on external energy providers, and we will all start breathing clean air once again, saving thousands of lives which are currently lost to pollution-related diseases.

The proposals are now on your table, and we hope that, together with the Member States, you can adopt this swiftly so that we can continue to demonstrate this global leadership.

Mr President, if you allow me, I will now give the floor to my colleague Commissioner Bulc.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, transport is crucial for our economy and for our citizens. It employs more than 11 million Europeans and generates five percent of Europe's GDP. But, as Vice-President Šefčovič has just underlined, transport also has negative impacts on climate and air quality, which require robust reforms. Today transport accounts for a quarter of all European greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, transport contributes to air pollution, which causes the premature death of 400 000 Europeans every year.

That is why we are taking unprecedented actions in response to this ever-growing challenge. We are reconciling the mobility needs of Europeans with the protection of our planet. Today we are addressing all dimensions of the challenge in a comprehensive, coherent and synchronised way. After the first wave of our mobility package, presented in May, we put forward a second set of measures to accelerate the transition to low emission mobility. We are delivering on all three pillars in our low emission mobility strategy: first, improving the organisation of our transport systems; second, promoting cleaner vehicles; and, third, making alternative energy more accessible for transport.

Let me address these three areas in a little more detail. First, a more efficient transport system. We strongly believe that we can significantly decrease transport emissions by further integrating the different modes of transport. For freight, we propose to revise the existing European rules on combined transport to provide further incentives to shift long-distance freight from road to rail, but also to inland waterways and short sea shipping. For passengers, our goal is to support the development of long-distance bus and coach connections throughout Europe. Citizens should have access to more public transport, with more affordable and better quality services. Decarbonising transport implies offering passengers alternative solutions to the use of private cars.

The second area is cleaner vehicles. A key element of the package is the proposal for new CO₂ standards for cars and vans post-2020. Vice-President Šefčovič has already presented this but I would like to underline now that, besides the supply/manufacturer side of this problem, in this package we are also addressing the demand side. Public authorities can – and are ready to – make a strong contribution to the market uptake of low and zero-emission vehicles. So we want to make it easier for cities and local authorities to purchase, rent and lease those vehicles for their provision of public transport services or for other public use. To provide more certainty in their visibility to the market, we propose to set minimum public procurement targets at national level, which will also generate predictable demand for European industry.

That brings me to the third area, alternative energy. Consumers must have confidence that they will be able to use alternatively powered vehicles throughout Europe. For most, after a home, their car remains the second biggest item of expenditure so it must work in all conditions and everywhere. Charging an electric car along European motorways has to be as easy as filling up at the petrol station. We are therefore proposing an action plan to speed up deployment of charging points. Investment in clean transport is crucial for this to work. As part of this plan, we are now investing another EUR 800 million from the EU budget to roll out additional alternative fuels infrastructure. In addition, we propose new standards for plug interoperability, the same standard throughout Europe.

There is no single magic solution. This is why in today's package we are combining different legislative and financial tools to maximise the impact of our measures and deploy cleaner transport sooner rather than later. The range of measures announced today means that transport will continue to play its part in tackling climate change.

Wim van de Camp, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Allereerst wil ik beide commissarissen feliciteren met het feit dat het tweede mobiliteitspakket is gepresenteerd. U weet dat ik dat te laat vindt. We hadden het eerder moeten hebben. Maar het was een zware bevaling en ik ben blij dat het er is. We zullen kijken wat we voor de verkiezingen nog kunnen doen.

Met name het emissiedeel van dit pakket heeft in de Europese pers veel aandacht gekregen en zou niet ambitieus genoeg zijn. De kritiek van de ngo's is veelvuldig. Het valt mij op dat de auto-industrie en de lidstaten redelijk rustig zijn. De vraag is dus of de Commissie het juiste evenwicht heeft bereikt. De Europese Volkspartij, waartoe ik behoor, staat in ieder geval een juist evenwicht voor. Emissiereductie en elektrificatie zijn heel belangrijk, maar we willen ook graag vasthouden aan een technologie-neutrale aanpak. Ik durf hier gerust te zeggen dat de belangen van de industrie, de werknemers en de consumenten een grote rol mogen spelen. Dat evenwicht zullen wij de komende maanden respectievelijk het komende jaar moeten zien in te vullen met als doel emissiereductie.

Voorts is de richtlijn over de bus- en touringcarmarkt van groot belang. Die heeft nog weinig aandacht gekregen in de pers, maar dit is een sector met heel veel passagiers en heel veel veiligheidsvraagstukken. Tot slot wil ik wijzen op het belang van gecombineerd transport, een oude wens van de Europese Commissie en het Europees Parlement. Dit biedt veel toekomst, veel werkgelegenheid en kan heel schoon zijn. Ook voor die twee dossiers vraag ik dus de nodige politieke aandacht.

Ismail Ertug, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Auch im Namen der Sozialdemokratischen Fraktion gratuliere ich zur Vorlage des Mobilitätspakets.

Es ist kein Widerspruch, zum einen im Verkehrssektor ökologisch zu werden und zum anderen auch die industrielle Basis mit Millionen von Arbeitsplätzen innerhalb der Europäischen Union nicht nur zu erhalten, sondern sie auch auszubauen. Es ist auch unbestritten, dass der Verkehrssektor insgesamt sauberer werden muss. Dafür brauchen wir auf jeden Fall effizientere Fahrzeuge. Wir müssen auch dazu beitragen, dass die alternativen Antriebstechnologien wie die Elektromobilität, wie die Brennstoffzelle und andere ausgeweitet werden. Und wir dürfen auch nicht vergessen, dass die Potenziale der Digitalisierung ausgeschöpft und ausgenutzt werden. Eben durch die Vernetzung wird es möglich sein, unnötigen Verkehr auch einzusparen. Wir müssen auch versuchen, den öffentlichen Personennahverkehr noch attraktiver zu gestalten und – nicht zu vergessen – auch das autonome und das vernetzte Fahren zu unterstützen.

Jetzt ist diese Debatte um den Verbrennungsmotor ja nicht nur in Deutschland, sondern europaweit entflammt. Ich glaube, dass die Debatte um den Verbrenner genauso wenig zielführend ist, wie letztendlich künstlich dessen Lebenszeit auch zu verlängern. Insofern bin ich nach wie vor der Meinung, dass wir mutig in die Zukunft investieren sollten.

Und wenn wir uns die Europäische Union anschauen und auch weltweit, dann sehen wir, dass wir sehr stark vom Export abhängig sind. Wir dürfen auch nicht vergessen, dass andere Kraftzentren dieser Welt wie zum Beispiel China, wie zum Beispiel auch Kalifornien – da waren wir vor Kurzem – mit großen Schritten vorangehen, wenn es eben um diese Verbote bzw. um Verbrennungsmotoren geht. Deshalb sage ich: Wir müssen tatsächlich schauen, dass wir hier nicht das Kind mit dem Bade ausschütten, uns aber gleichwohl auch ambitionierte Ziele für die Zukunft stecken, um in Zukunft noch besser zu werden und den Verkehr emissionsärmer zu gestalten.

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

Tiemo Wölken (S&D), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Ertug, Sie haben gerade gesagt, dass die Debatte um den Verbrennungsmotor und dessen Ende eine künstliche Debatte sei. Habe ich Sie da gerade falsch verstanden? Ich bin mir da nicht so sicher, ehrlich gesagt.

Ismail Ertug (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Vielen Dank für die Frage. Die Debatte ist keine künstliche Debatte, sondern sie wird vielleicht in die falsche Richtung diskutiert.

Mir geht es vielmehr darum: Wenn wir über solche Thematiken sprechen, dann müssen wir uns auch darüber im Klaren sein, dass wir uns die gesamte Wertschöpfungskette auch mal vor Augen führen.

Was heißt das denn, wenn der Verbrennungsmotor letztendlich frühzeitig verboten wird? Millionen von Arbeitsplätzen hängen da dran. Deshalb rate ich dazu, sich nicht verrückt machen zu lassen, auch nicht künstlich zu verlängern, in die neuen Technologien zu investieren, all die Hebel zu nutzen, die wir heute schon haben, um letztendlich dann dadurch den Verkehr emissionsärmer zu gestalten. Da gibt es viele Komponenten, die wir diskutieren können. Das ist nur eine davon.

Przewodniczący. – Zanim przekażę głos następnemu mówcy, chciałbym zwrócić Państwa uwagę na to, że galerię mamy w dużym stopniu zapełnioną. To oznacza, że temat jest ważny i że po prostu nasi goście chcą z galerii przysłuchiwać się debacie.

Kosma Złotowski, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Transport drogowy cieszy się w tej kadencji szczególną uwagą Komisji Europejskiej. Jeszcze na dobre nie ruszyły prace nad pierwszą częścią pakietu mobilności, a już mamy jego drugą odsłonę.

Zmiana nawyków konsumentów czy przekonanie producentów do postawienia na samochody elektryczne wymaga czasu. Potrzebny jest system zachęt dla producentów niskoemisyjnych samochodów i inwestycje w infrastrukturę do ładowania tych pojazdów. Tylko wtedy nie będą one ciekawostką, ale świadomym wyborem. Mam wrażenie, że w tej propozycji cele zdefiniowano bardzo dobrze, ale już sam kalendarz ich realizacji nakreślony przez Komisję jest niezwykle ambitny i będzie stanowił problem w osiągnięciu realnych postępów w zakresie mobilności ekologicznej w najbliższym czasie.

Jednoznacznie pozytywnie należy ocenić natomiast zapowiedź przeglądu dyrektywy w sprawie transportu kombinowanego, a także dyrektywy w sprawie pasażerskich usług autokarowych. Zastanawiam się jednak, czy w kontekście naszych doświadczeń z socjalną częścią pakietu mobilności obiektywne spojrzenie na te przepisy będzie możliwe. Liczę na to, że tym razem za obietnicami otwierania rynku i ułatwień dla firm transportowych operujących transgranicznie nie kryje się protekcyjizm i chęć dalszego dzielenia Europy na Wschód i Zachód.

Pavel Telička, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I am glad that the Commission is delivering a second package which fits very well with the first package. I am also glad that the Commissioner is presenting it under the Energy Union umbrella and that there is an integrated approach as concerns both sectors.

But let me go a little bit further. What we really need in the European Union is a change of mind-set. If we manage to change the mind-set, we will be in a better position to tackle what I see as a weakness in the European Union, and that is the complete ecosystem: it is transport, it is energy, it is industry, it is consumption but it is also research, it is a question of where we really focus and we put the utmost effort in the financial means that we can deliver.

Already California has been mentioned today, China has been mentioned, and the fact is that we are not necessarily well placed today to be the leaders. We are still well placed to be highly competitive in the future if we get the ecosystem right. We need to do it on the European level, we need to do it on the national level. I would hardly find a single policy on the European or national level which would not be affected if we are to meet the objectives that we are setting in this package. I very much encourage you to pursue that direction.

Having said that, the package is one that we have to appreciate, it is well balanced. There are a number of issues that will require clarification, fine tuning, maybe higher ambition, but I would like to say that if we look at the package purely through the optic of emission targets, then we will be failing. It has to be a very complex policy approach, getting the right balance but also getting the right ambition. And that is my final remark: why are the Americans, at least in Silicon Valley, and the Chinese, successful? Because they do not update or upgrade by 10% or 20%, they want a real change, they want a revolution. This is not about the limits – this is about the complex approach that I have mentioned.

Merja Kyllönen, *GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, komissio, hyvät kollegat, pidän esityksissä asetettuja tavoitteita täysin saavutettavissa olevina. Mahdottomaksi niitä ei voi kukaan väittää, sillä on osoitettu, että teknologiaa olisi voitu kehittää jo vuosia, mutta siihen ei ole ollut todellisia lainsäädännöllisiä ohjureita.

Euroopan suurimpana ventialana autoteollisuus on aina ollut huolissaan kunnianhimoisista päästövähennystavoitteista. Realiteetti on kuitenkin se, että ilmastotyössä ei tapahdu liikenteen osalta mitään, elleivät tavoitteet ole riittävän vahvoja ja kohdillaan. Valitettavasti päästökandaali osoitti meille liikenteen alueelta sen, kuinka häikäilemättömästi lainsäädännön porsaanreikiä on vuosikymmenet käytetty hyväksi.

Olen positiivisesti yllätynyt siitä, että nyt komissio rohkeasti uskaltaa tarttua härkää sarvista.

Pidän fiksuna ratkaisuna sitä, että komissio ei asettanut autonvalmistajille kiintiöitä sähköautojen valmistamiseksi, vaan pysyi teknologianeutraalissa lähestymistavassa. Joukkoliikenteen osalta toimeen tартtuminen on äärimmäisen tärkeää, niin että me pystymme yhdistämään liikennemuotoja ja niiden monikäyttöisyyttä, sillä ilmastomuutos ei todellakaan odota, vaan meidän pitää tehdä toimia yhdessä.

EU voi olla ilmastonmuutoksen vastaisessa taistelussa *"trendsetter"*, mutta siihen tarvitaan ohjaavia lainsäädäntötoimia. Kiitos komissiolle siitä, että nyt on päästy vauhtiin. Ei muuta kuin uskallusta – mennään yhdessä rohkeasti eteenpäin!

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les Commissaires, chers collègues, les émissions mondiales de gaz à effet de serre sont reparties à la hausse.

La COP 23 pour le climat se tient en ce moment à quelques kilomètres d'ici, en Allemagne, et qu'est-ce qu'on y entend? Qu'il faut agir. Tout le monde sait qu'il faut agir. Mais que faisons-nous concrètement pour respecter les objectifs de la COP 21 et limiter le réchauffement à deux degrés d'ici la fin du siècle?

Tout le monde sait que, pour cela, il faut notamment que le secteur des transports réduise enfin ses émissions de CO₂ qui ont augmenté de 30 % depuis 1990.

Alors tout le monde le sait. Eh ben non, car il y a un petit groupe qui résiste, ce sont les constructeurs automobiles, eux seuls refusent de voir la réalité en face. Hélas, avec votre proposition, peu ambitieuse, ils peuvent dormir tranquilles.

Pourquoi vous contenter de fixer un objectif de 30 % de réduction des émissions de CO₂ alors que plusieurs pays européens vous réclament cette réduction de 40 % d'ici 2030?

Pourquoi juste inciter les constructeurs à produire 15 % de ces véhicules propres en 2025, alors qu'il faudrait un quota obligatoire, comme la Chine, qui en produira 10 % dès 2019?

Pourquoi leur offrir en récompense le droit de polluer plus, s'ils produisent ces quotas de véhicules propres, et ne fixer aucune sanction, dans le cas inverse, s'ils n'en produisent pas?

Votre proposition n'est pas à la hauteur des enjeux. Des enjeux qui concernent les citoyens, puisqu'on ne règle pas la question de la pollution, les salariés, puisqu'on ne pose pas les bases d'une reconversion durable de la filière en Europe, et les consommateurs européens, qui ne peuvent toujours pas bénéficier d'une vraie mobilité propre.

Alors, je ne vous parle pas des générations futures, je vous parle des générations présentes, mes chers collègues, de ces enfants qui sont dans vos cours d'école et qui respirent la pollution, de ces gens qui ont découvert il y a deux ans qu'ils étaient victimes d'une gigantesque arnaque au diesel et à qui vous demandez aujourd'hui de faire confiance aux constructeurs automobiles.

L'urgence climatique, elle est là. Nous savons tous que nous dansons sur un volcan. Si Trump a décidé de ne rien faire, eh bien l'Europe, elle, doit être capable d'être le leader dans l'action, alors on vous accompagnera dans votre action, parce que nous ne pouvons plus parler du réchauffement climatique, mais de péril climatique.

Jill Seymour, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, I have listened to the Commissioner's speech with interest, and you may be surprised to know I have been calling for railways to be electrified. Unfortunately, many of these projects have been dropped in the UK. I see all the benefits of electric vehicles; however, I do have some concerns. Currently in the UK, we do not have enough rapid chargers to support the growth of electric vehicles. We need industry leaders to speed up the rollout of chargers. Our local planning authorities should streamline this process.

The best way to encourage the public to adopt electric vehicles is to allow nation states to cut taxes and import tariffs. Let's remove red tape and allow the market to take its course.

Marie-Christine Arnautu, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, la politique de l'Union consiste à développer toujours plus les échanges entre États membres. Les voitures produites en Roumanie ou en République tchèque partent en France ou en Espagne, qui envoie ses tomates au Danemark ou en Allemagne, qui vend ses porcs en Italie ou en Grèce.

Cette politique voulue et financée par l'Union a un coût environnemental et social écrasant. C'est bien de vouloir favoriser le transport combiné fluvial ou ferroviaire alors que le dumping social a multiplié sur la route le transport de marchandises. Les normes d'émissions réduites des véhicules légers n'y changeront rien. Il faut changer de paradigme. C'est produire et consommer local qui permettrait de réduire considérablement les émissions polluantes.

Alors, la Commission pourra sérieusement proposer ses plans quinquennaux pour créer à coups de milliards des points de fourniture en énergies alternatives, énergies qui polluent autant que les carburants classiques, à commencer par l'électricité, largement – et pour de longues années encore – produite par des centrales à charbon, à fioul ou même nucléaires, avec leurs déchets à la durée de vie millénaire.

Andor Deli (PPE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr, Alelnök Úr, Biztos Asszony! Szeretném üdvözölni a Bizottság által prezentált második mobilitási csomagot, amely az elsőhöz hasonlóan előrelátó, jövőbe mutató célokat vetít elénk. Mindannyian egyetértünk abban, hogy csökkentenünk kell a károsanyag-kibocsátást a közlekedés terén, ugyanakkor két dolgot hadd emeljek ki. Először is nagyon fontos, hogy a kitűzött célok ambiciózusak legyenek, ugyanakkor meg kell maradnunk a realitások talaján.

Nem érdemes olyan célkitűzéseket megfogalmazni, amelyekről már elejétől fogva sejtethetjük, hogy nem biztos, hogy meg tudjuk őket valósítani. Mindeközben nagy zűrzavart okozunk az autópárhban. Sok megkezdett és mindeddig támogatott fejlesztés hiábavalóvá válhat, ami pedig több ezer európai munkahelyet veszélyeztethet.

Senki sem vitatja, hogy a klímacélok eléréséhez a jelenlegi erőfeszítések nem elegendők, de ha törést okozunk az európai autópárh versenyképességében és gazdasági teljesítményében, megeshet, hogy a veszteségek és károk elvonják az eszközöket épp attól, ami a cél, ez pedig a károsanyag-kibocsátás hatékony csökkentése. Másodszor, nagyon fontos, hogy a kitűzött célok az Európai Unió minden tagállamában megvalósíthatóak legyenek.

Hatalmas a különbség a közlekedés környezetre gyakorolt hatásai terén az Unió egyes régiói között, a járműparkok kora, valamint az infrastruktúra fejlettségi szintje miatt. Ezért nagyon fontos a jelenlegi helyzet feltérképezése és egyes régiók fölzárkóztatása.

David-Maria Sassoli (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, saluto la Commissaria Bulc e il Commissario Šefčovič. Finalmente iniziamo a lavorare sul pacchetto mobilità. Il momento è quello giusto, il trasporto su strada risulta, come è stato detto, essere il più praticato in Europa ed è necessario intervenire per bloccare situazioni che portano alla distorsione della concorrenza, ma anche per intervenire sulle questioni ambientali e sulla sicurezza stradale.

Sappiamo benissimo che il trasporto stradale è afflitto da seri problemi, come il lavoro nero e il dumping sociale ed è nostro compito apportare le giuste soluzioni. In Europa il costo del lavoro cambia da paese a paese. Molte compagnie ne approfittano per entrare nei mercati nazionali a scapito dei lavoratori, della loro sicurezza e con gravissime ripercussioni nel mercato del lavoro nazionale.

In Italia, per fare un esempio che conosco, alle attuali condizioni, molte aziende di trasporto devono chiudere perché non riescono ad essere competitive nel costo del lavoro, con molte società di altri paesi che approfittano di lacune normative per offrire lo stesso lavoro a costi più vantaggiosi. Abusi e distorsioni devono essere corretti. Chiedo a tutti, inoltre, di fare molta attenzione alla definizione del cabotaggio, perché è lì che si gioca il futuro di tante piccole e medie aziende di trasporto.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Voorzitter, dat de Commissie de transportsector wil vergroenen, heeft absoluut mijn steun. Dat is belangrijk. Het is ook belangrijk om in te zetten op alternatieve brandstoffen. We moeten ernaar streven om bijvoorbeeld elektrisch te kunnen rijden van Amsterdam via Straatsburg naar Napels. Volgens mij bestaan er ook instrumenten, zoals het TEN-T-programma, om dat vanuit de EU te ondersteunen.

Ik denk alleen dat de ambities wel wat steviger mogen als het gaat over uitstootvermindering. Nieuwe auto's en bestelbussen moeten in 2030 minstens 30 % schoner zijn dan in 2021. Maar die ambitie zou voor mij sterker mogen. Het nieuwe Nederlandse kabinet, waar mijn partij ook deel van uitmaakt, heeft gezegd dat in 2030 alle nieuwe auto's emissievrij moeten zijn. Die ambitie wil ik ook graag laten doorklinken in Europa. Dus zet die wat steviger neer en maak van die 30 % minstens 50 %.

Gesine Meissner (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank für die Vorlage dieses Pakets. Wir müssen etwas tun im Verkehrssektor, um die Mobilität sauberer zu machen – das wissen wir alle. Es ist viel Richtiges gesagt worden, was ich gut finde. Deswegen freue ich mich auf die Diskussion von verschiedenen Fraktionen. Merja Kyllönen hat gesagt: Wir brauchen Technologieneutralität. Das sehe ich genauso. Quoten, um etwas zu verbieten, sind falsch. Ismail Ertrug hat darauf hingewiesen, dass es auch nicht richtig ist, einfach den Verbrennungsmotor sofort zu verbieten. Pavel Telička hat gesagt, die Chinesen und die Amerikaner setzen sich keine Quoten, die machen einfach.

Das ist natürlich leichter gesagt als getan. In diesem Vorschlag haben wir feste Quoten innerhalb eines bestimmten Zeitraums, und natürlich ist es immer gut, wenn man so etwas hat, weil es dann messbar ist. Aber es ist vollkommen richtig: Wir müssen an ganz, ganz vielen Stellschrauben drehen. Allein den Dieselmotor zu verbieten, den wir eingeführt haben, um CO₂-Emissionen zu vermindern, ist nicht der richtige Weg, obwohl er natürlich nicht besonders sauber ist – vollkommen klar. Bei E-Mobilität allein ist die Frage, woher die Energie kommt. Wir müssen an Platooning denken, wir brauchen andere Materialien, Algensprit kann in Zukunft vielleicht Flugzeuge fliegen. Wir sind ja dabei, an ganz vielen Stellschrauben, auch in der Forschung, etwas zu machen. Ich glaube, das müssen wir verfolgen, nicht nur im Verkehrsausschuss und im Umweltausschuss, sondern in allen Ausschüssen. Dann können wir gut vorankommen.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, esta segunda parte del paquete de medidas para la movilidad por carretera es una gran oportunidad para definir el tipo de transporte que queremos en Europa, y desde mi grupo trabajaremos para que se recojan algunos aspectos que consideramos fundamentales para transformar la movilidad de nuestros conciudadanos en una movilidad más eficiente, más inteligente, más sostenible y más segura.

Primero, mejorar la eficiencia del sistema de transportes en su conjunto. La carretera debe servir para la distribución en corta y media distancia, como complemento de una red ferroviaria regional, nacional y transfronteriza de calidad. Pese a los ataques y a la falta de inversión de muchas instituciones, nuestro compromiso con un tren público y social es irrevocable.

Segundo, apostar por un transporte colectivo seguro y de calidad, especialmente en entornos urbanos e interurbanos. Tercero, mejorar las condiciones de los trabajadores en un sector tan castigado. Y cuarto, potenciar la investigación e innovación en energías cien por cien renovables.

Y hablamos no solamente de economía, empleo o contaminación; también hablamos de la seguridad, de 25 000 vidas que perdemos cada año en Europa y que podríamos estar salvando.

Jakop Dalunde (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Vi diskuterar just nu hur framtidens transportpolitik i EU ska se ut. Under året har en rad förslag lagts fram under rubriken *Europa på väg – En agenda för en socialt rättvis övergång till ren, konkurrenskraftig och uppkopplad rörlighet för alla*.

Om vi ska klara klimatmålen måste transportsektorn ställas om. Nu börjar det verkliga arbetet för att se till att det faktiskt genomförs. Idén om att alla människor ska äga sin egen bil och att vägarna ska fyllas av godstransporter tillhör historien. Framtidens mobilitet bygger på tåg, sjöfart, cykel, e-mobilitet och nya lösningar inom delningsekonomin.

Ska vi lämna över en hållbar och beboelig planet till våra barn och barnbarn? Ska vi kunna andas frisk luft i våra städer? Det är jag övertygad om att vi alla vill, men då vilar ansvaret tungt på oss politiker, på företag och på civilsamhället. Vi ska visa ledarskap.

Vi gröna kräver att transportsektorn ska ha ambitiösa, konkreta och mätbara mål som lever upp till det vi lovade varandra i Paris. Det är en politik för barnvänliga städer med ren luft och säkra gator. Det är emellertid också en politik för en livskraftig landsbygd med effektiva och tillgängliga transporter.

I städerna ska cykel-, gång- och kollektivtrafik ta plats från bilarna, så att de på landsbygden i framtiden fortfarande kan köra bil. De fossila bränslen som vi har måste räcka till dem som faktiskt behöver bilen.

Vi gröna kommer att arbeta för en höjd ambitionsnivå, skärpta krav och obligatoriska krav för medlemsstaterna. Enligt oss är de förslag som nu ligger på bordet långt ifrån vad som faktiskt krävs för att vi ska ta oss hela vägen till Paris. Vi gröna kommer att kämpa för att vi ska nå dit.

Daniela Aiuto (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, do il benvenuto ai Commissari. Come più volte già ricordato, siamo più che favorevoli allo svecchiamento del sistema di trasporto tradizionale, che si basa ancora oggi su una tecnologia vecchia di oltre un secolo.

Tuttavia, per quanto possiamo sforzarci a livello di ricerca e di applicazioni tecnologiche, non riusciremo a rendere accettabili le emissioni di CO₂, utilizzando un motore a combustione e andando oltre l'Euro 6. Dobbiamo essere realistici. Quindi, dobbiamo necessariamente procedere a una decarbonizzazione del settore, abbandonando il fossile, ma lo dobbiamo fare in modo intelligente e ponderato, in quanto le decisioni che prendiamo oggi avranno un impatto sull'industria per i prossimi decenni, con importanti ricadute sociali ed economiche.

Non possiamo permetterci ripensamenti radicali, come è avvenuto, per esempio, per il caso di biocarburanti, e dobbiamo evitare che qualche azienda priva di scrupoli possa taroccare i propri prodotti per renderli falsamente conformi alle direttive esistenti, come nel caso della Volkswagen, che purtroppo conosciamo. La transizione a sistemi di propulsione alternativa per i veicoli non può essere unidirezionale, ma deve prendere in considerazione tutte le nuove tecnologie e svilupparle in maniera equivalente.

Ciò significa che va bene spingere per l'elettrico, ma non dimentichiamoci anche dell'idrogeno e di altre tipologie già ampiamente sperimentate, perché fino a quando la fonte di produzione di energia elettrica non sarà totalmente sostenibile, non si potrà parlare di vera decarbonizzazione. Fino a quando il costo ambientale della produzione del ciclo di vita di un veicolo elettrico non saranno sempre realmente inferiori a quelli di un veicolo tradizionale, non potremo essere soddisfatti e parlare di reale transizione energetica.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for being here today and for the package we are discussing because Europe, as we have said, really is lagging behind when it comes to clean energy and its associated relationship with cars and with vehicles. I very much welcome the package because it sets targets and also provides encouragement and support, as well as financial grants in some areas, to ensure that we reduce our carbon emissions and improve air quality for all citizens.

I particularly welcome the focus on public procurement. I think it is very important in encouraging public authorities to use and to purchase clean vehicles. I am thinking of buses. All our major cities have buses, in fact most cities in Europe depend on buses for public transport rather than any other form of transport. It is very positive and whether it is for electric vehicles or for whatever type of renewable energy that may be used, I can see the real value in that and I can see it being very effective.

Also, the EUR 800 000 for an action plan to ensure that we have charging points along our infrastructure is very positive and will encourage that. I also think that the battery initiative is good, because there is so much potential in that area where Europe are not the leaders, but Europe can lead in that area. I look forward to signing up for that package and to encouraging it, because these are the very practical measures that we need to ensure that we move in this area, because all around us we see the impact of climate change, and now is the time to act.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les Commissaires, la COP 23 s'est ouverte la semaine dernière à Bonn, juste avant la publication, par la Commission, de la suite de son paquet «mobilité».

Les astres semblent s'aligner pour produire une législation efficace de lutte contre les émissions de gaz à effet de serre. L'urgence est d'autant plus criante que l'on vient d'apprendre que les émissions repartaient cette année à la hausse, menaçant de plus en plus notre capacité à rester sous la barre des deux degrés de réchauffement moyen.

Mais voilà, si le paquet de la Commission comporte plusieurs éléments intéressants, il n'en reste pas moins que l'ambition globale est très en deçà de ce qu'exige la crise climatique. La mise en place de normes d'émission pour les poids lourds était indispensable, tout comme la définition des véhicules à faibles émissions. Mais on ne peut que regretter les souplesses prévues dans les objectifs chiffrés de production de véhicules propres.

La commission d'enquête sur les fraudes aux émissions a fini ses travaux en avril de cette année et, déjà, on pave la voie vers de nouveaux dépassements des plafonds d'émission. La Commission n'a d'ailleurs toujours pas indiqué que la mesure des émissions de CO₂ se ferait en conditions réelles de conduite, comme ce sera le cas pour les émissions d'oxyde d'azote. C'est fort regrettable.

L'Union européenne est leader en matière de lutte contre la pollution et contre les émissions de gaz à effet de serre, mais si nous nous reposons sur nos lauriers, si nous laissons les contingences économiques immédiates nous dicter les priorités politiques à long terme, alors qui sera le moteur de la sortie des énergies fossiles si nuisibles pour la santé et le climat?

PRESIDE: RAMÓN LUIS VALCÁRCEL SISO

Vicepresidente

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Commissaris, ik heb de voorstelling van het tweede mobiliteitspakket met gemengde gevoelens gevolgd. Jazeker, er zitten interessante voorstellen in. Maar ik ben niet overtuigd dat het pakket voldoende houvast biedt om onze klimaatverplichtingen na te komen. Tegen 2030 moeten onze lidstaten de uitstoot van de transportsector drastisch verlagen. Zonder de nodige technologie gaat dat niet lukken. De Commissie had daarom strengere CO₂-normen moeten voorstellen voor 2025 en 2030. Ik betreur dus dat u het enige instrument dat u in handen hebt om investeringen en innovatie aan te moedigen, niet optimaal hebt benut. Die investeringen zijn broodnodig als we in de EU een innovatieve economie willen die de concurrentie aankan met andere economische grootmachten.

Maar ik zei het al: er zijn ook een aantal interessante voorstellen terug te vinden, bijvoorbeeld inzake het concurrentievermogen van gecombineerd transport en een degelijke infrastructuur voor alternatieve brandstoffen. Alleen door een modal shift en een overstap naar groene wagens zal onze mobiliteit schoner worden. De bal ligt nu in het kamp van het Europees Parlement. Het glas is wat mij betreft halfvol, en ik wil spoedig aan de slag met dit pakket want ik zie ruimte voor verbetering.

Matthijs van Miltenburg (ALDE). – De toekomst van onze aarde staat op het spel, want het klimaat verandert. Emissies in het transport moeten we terugdringen, terwijl de vraag naar transport en mobiliteit alleen maar toeneemt. De uitdaging is dan ook heel erg groot om onze mobiliteit duurzaam te maken. Maar dat biedt ook nieuwe economische kansen. Transport wordt echter niet duurzaam door louter de publicatie van nieuwe voorstellen op papier. Transport wordt duurzaam door een snelle besluitvorming over die voorstellen en een goede uitvoering in de praktijk. Klimaatverandering wacht niet tot wij in dit Parlement, wellicht pas na maanden, overeenstemming bereiken over welke parlementaire commissie zich waarover mag ontfemen. De buitenwereld verwacht van ons dat wij snel en ambitieus ons werk doen. Laten we dus geen tijd verliezen met onderling gesteggel, want onze volksgezondheid, ons klimaat, ons mobiliteitsvraagstuk en ook onze industrie vragen nu om actie.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Pane předsedající, jsem přesvědčena, že oba dva balíčky o mobilitě představují pro EU velkou výzvu. Máme nyní možnost a dle mého soudu i povinnost zajistit pracujícím co nejsilnější práva a všem občanům udržitelnou dopravu a co nejlepší bezpečnost na silničních komunikacích.

Můžeme samozřejmě vnímat tato témata ideologicky, ale jsem primárně toho názoru, že implementace těchto bodů je zcela v souladu s náplní práce jediné přímo volené instituce Evropské unie, tedy Evropského parlamentu.

Je tedy velmi žádoucí, aby pozice Evropské parlamentu byla co nejprogresivnější a mířila do budoucnosti, ve které nejsou zájmy občanů a planety dány na druhou kolej. Zabýváme se tu komplexními problémy, které však, pokud nebudou řešeny, mohou vést ke katastrofálním důsledkům. Můžeme hodně přispět k lepší kvalitě života a doufám, že si tuto možnost nenecháme vzít. To, co předvedla Komise, je začátek. My to musíme udělat lepší.

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, komission *mobility package* on todellakin odotettu ja tervetullut kokonaisuus. Tiedämme, että liikenne on itse asiassa ainoa sektori, jossa päästöt ovat vain kasvaneet. Liikenteen määrä lisääntyy jatkuvasti, joten nyt tarvitaan todella tehokkaita toimia, jotta päästöjen kasvu saadaan pysäytettyä. Meidän on pyrittävä yhtäältä siihen että meillä on entistä tehokkaampia vähäpäästöisempiä ajoneuvoja, meidän on löydettävä entistä ympäristöystävällisempiä polttoaineita ja toisaalta suunniteltava koko liikennejärjestelmä entistä tehokkaammin, ja tässä digitaatio antaa paljon mahdollisuuksia.

On hyvä, että komissio on omassa ehdotuksessaan ottanut teknologianeutraalin lähestymistavan. Autonvalmistajille asetetaan nähdäkseni aika kunnianhimoiset tavoitteet mutta kuitenkin siinä aikataulussa, että ne on mahdollista saavuttaa. Ja autonvalmistajat itse voivat hakea sen parhaan teknologian, jolla tuo päästöjen vähennys voidaan toteuttaa. Tämä on oikea lähtökohta.

On myös hyvä, että komissio haluaa tukea tutkimusta ja tuotekehitystä vaihtoehtoisten polttoaineiden kehittämiseksi, muun muassa akkuteknologialle, sekä edistää edelleenkin näiden latauspisteiden ja tankkauspisteiden rakentamista eri puolille Eurooppaa.

Kuitenkin on tärkeää samaan aikaan muistaa, että menee aikaa ennen kuin autokanta uudistuu, ja näin ollen kaikkein nopein tapa saada nyt nopeasti vähennettyä päästöjä on lisätä kehittyneiden uusiutuvien biopolttoaineiden käyttöä, koska niitä voidaan käyttää jo olemassa olevassa autokannassa. Olenkin aika pettynyt siihen, että komissio omassa uusiutuvan energian direktiivissään otti todella matalan tavoitetasen uusiutuviin biopolttoaineisiin, näihin liikenteen polttoaineisiin, ja parlamentissa käydään nyt kyllä keskustelua juuri siitä, että tuota tavoitetasoa pitäisi voida nostaa. Se on mahdollista tehdä kestäväällä tavalla ja se on kaikkein nopein tapa vähentää nyt päästöjä. Menee aikansa ennen kuin liikenne tulee sähköistymään, mutta on järkevää, että sitä myös edistetään.

Isabella De Monte (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signori Commissari, le nuove proposte della Commissione europea per rafforzare la leadership europea nel campo dei veicoli puliti e sostenibili sono di vitale importanza per tutti i cittadini dell'Unione. Infatti, con queste proposte si stabiliscono nuovi obiettivi per le emissioni medie di CO₂ delle auto e dei furgoni di nuova produzione, in Europa.

Le proposte sono ambiziose ma nello stesso tempo realistiche e accelerano la transizione verso veicoli a emissioni zero. Esse stimoleranno sia l'innovazione nelle nuove tecnologie e i *business model*, oltre a un efficiente uso di tutti i tipi di trasporto di beni e di persone.

Sono d'accordo con il pensiero della Commissione, ovvero che in Europa ci debba essere un netto cambio di passo e di mentalità e che la riduzione del 40 % di CO₂ al 2030 avvenga anche soprattutto grazie ai trasporti. Nuovi tipi di carburanti di origine non fossile e l'utilizzo dell'elettricità prodotta in maniera pulita possono fare la differenza. Il futuro non è solo diminuire le emissioni delle auto ma anche incentivare l'utilizzo di mezzi meno inquinanti, sviluppare l'intermodalità nel trasporto e spingere affinché la digitalizzazione diventi uno strumento che ci permetta di viaggiare, senza soluzione di continuità, con un solo biglietto.

Ciò che è ovvio è che le proposte presentate debbano essere promosse anche da strumenti finanziari mirati. Non dimentichiamoci che tutto ciò andrà a vantaggio non solo di una migliore mobilità, ma anche della salute di tutti i cittadini europei.

Evžen Tošenovský (ECR). – Pane předsedající, neustále rostoucí doprava v Evropě je skutečností a dá se očekávat, že tento trend bude ještě zesilovat. Růst ekonomiky bude nepostradatelnost dopravních kapacit jen zvyšovat, jak v sektoru přepravy zboží, tak v osobní dopravě. Samozřejmě je důležité minimalizovat negativní dopady na životní prostředí. Velkou výzvou je obrovský růst digitálních technologií využitelných právě v dopravě. Automatizované systémy nabízejí úžasné postupy v optimalizaci řízení jednotlivých dopravních prostředků.

Z pohledu podpory dopravy bychom však neměli příliš preferovat jeden směr tak, jak se to děje při preferenci elektrických automobilů. Již v současné době se ukazují komplikace dostatečné kapacity elektrické energie v jedné oblasti při masovějším nárůstu elektromobilů, ale i dalších aspektů. Ať již se jedná o současné technologické bariéry stávajících bateriových systémů, jejich recyklaci, nekonkurenční ceny a podobně.

Určitě je velmi důležité podpořit výzkum v této oblasti a v celém spektru dopravy. Zachování určité míry technologické neutrality je nezbytně nutné, protože o vítězi v budoucím souboji, zda to budou elektrické dopravní prostředky či vodíkové pohony nebo zcela jiné, dnes neznámé pohonné jednotky bude zásadně rozhodovat tvrdá ekonomika a konkurenční prostředí.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor presidente, comisarios, necesitamos las normas sobre nuevos estándares de emisiones de CO₂, la revisión de la Directiva sobre vehículos limpios, la de transporte combinado, la de pasajeros de autobús y la iniciativa sobre baterías. Pero solo funcionarán si aterrizan sobre personas, conocimiento y tejido industrial capaces de convertir una movilidad más limpia y eficiente en una fértil cantera de empleo de calidad en suelo europeo.

Por eso espero ver acompañado este trabajo legislativo por tres esfuerzos que tienen que ser perceptibles en todos los programas europeos. El primero, orientar la política industrial para que la Unión sea líder mundial en las tecnologías y procesos de fabricación de estos vehículos limpios, sus baterías y la inteligencia que los conecte entre sí y con las infraestructuras.

En segundo lugar, estimular la aparición de nuevos negocios y desarrollos que evolucionen el concepto de modos de transporte hacia el de movilidad integrada. Y, finalmente, conectar las demandas de nuevas pericias y negocios ligados a estos cambios con la formación que se ofrece en universidades y en escuelas profesionales.

Cláudia Monteiro de Aguiar (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhores Comissários, de facto, estamos perante um pacote de mobilidade, um segundo pacote de mobilidade, que, a par do primeiro, traça também objetivos ambiciosos para os transportes a nível da União.

Sendo responsável por um dos relatórios do primeiro pacote de mobilidade, obviamente empenhar-me-ei em alcançar posições que sejam comuns e equilibradas, que, por um lado, permitam salvaguardar a liberdade de circulação de serviços e de mercadorias, mas também, por outro, permitam tornar o setor dos transportes mais competitivo.

Precisamos claramente de reduzir encargos desnecessários – é um facto –, mas não devemos abdicar daquela que é a garantia da defesa do pilar social.

O objetivo da descarbonização real dos transportes na União deve, por isso, ser encarado como uma oportunidade. Uma oportunidade, pois abre portas à inovação e à investigação.

Relativamente à proposta sobre a implementação transeuropeia de infraestruturas de combustíveis alternativos, sabemos que cada país assume as suas prioridades e a sua estratégia. Apesar da obrigatoriedade da diretiva em vigor, estamos também cientes de que não há uma política coerente na União, não há coordenação de políticas e há, até mesmo, certas divergências em matéria de ligações transfronteiriças.

Deixava, portanto, duas questões aos senhores comissários. Perante estas divergências de prioridades dos Estados-Membros, como é que a Comissão pretende efetivamente criar este espaço europeu de combustíveis alternativos? Por fim, sendo proveniente de uma região ultraperiférica, como poderá a Comissão garantir que estas regiões não ficarão para trás, quando está em causa a captação de investimento para os combustíveis alternativos, nomeadamente nas infraestruturas portuárias e quando os Estados-Membros não têm, em alguns casos, esta temática como prioridade?

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señor presidente. En primer lugar, damos la bienvenida a este paquete tan esperado y lleno de expectativas, señor vicepresidente, señora comisaria. El compromiso de reducir el 40 % de emisiones de CO₂ para 2030 es un objetivo que se construye sobre la realidad, que a veces es tozuda.

Acabamos de visitar Tesla, en California. Una planta extraordinaria, pero que construye 25 000 coches eléctricos y todavía muy caros -entre 70 000 y 30 000 dólares- frente a la capacidad, por ejemplo, de la planta de Opel España, en mi ciudad, cercana al medio millón de coches pequeños y baratos.

De modo que hay que pensar que mientras nos preparamos y preparamos infraestructuras y vehículos alternativos eléctricos, de hidrógeno, etc. habrá un periodo clave de transición en el que ir reemplazando no solo los coches que contaminan por otros que no contaminan, sino también la adaptación de miles de trabajadores y sus empleos. Y teniendo siempre en cuenta la huella ecológica de la vida total del vehículo, sea de emisiones bajas o de cero emisiones.

En cuanto a los servicios nacionales de autobuses, señora comisaria, ¿qué piensa usted de dar un servicio competitivo y con competencia de alta calidad pero a precio muy asequible y que asegure a un tiempo garantizar la cohesión territorial de países extensos o con orografía difícil como la mía y sin coste alguno para las administraciones públicas, puesto que el sistema se equilibra y es suficientemente atractivo y rentable para las empresas privadas que asumen el servicio? ¿No es un sueño?

Pues ese sueño, ese sistema, existe en España. Señora comisaria, procuremos no estropearlo, por favor.

Ангел Джамбазки (ЕСР). – Г-н Председател, уважаема г-жо Комисар, уважаеми колеги, за никого не е тайна лобизмът и натискът, оказван от конкретни фирми в държави членки, за да бъде предложението на Европейския съюз толкова едностранично и понякога видимо да ощетява интересите на страните и на превозвачите и предприемачите от Централна и Източна Европа. Последните години се приеха редица лобистки, редица протекционистки законодателства във Франция, в Германия, в Италия, които покровителстват местните фирми и пречат на общия пазар. А това не е редно и противоречи на договорите.

В опит да помогне на тези фирми Комисията предлага неща, които могат да застрашат живота на шофьорите и на всички участници в движението. Например седмичната почивка да бъде в хотел, при условие че няма паркинги в държавите членки, и тези шофьори трябва да избират дали да нарушат директивата или да си пазят товара от нападения на мигранти или организирани престъпни групи. Поставяме тези шофьори в абсурдна ситуация и тогава аргументът да защитим социалните им права много силно бледнее на фона на реалната заплаха за останалите участници на пътя.

Призовавам Комисията да се вслушва в позициите на държавите членки. Тя е длъжна да пази договорите и да работи за това да могат всички предприемачи от всички държави членки да работят така, че да имат еднакви доходи, а да няма такава голяма разлика в доходите между източната и западната и централната част на Европа.

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Patrząc na zanieczyszczenie powietrza, zwłaszcza w dużych europejskich miastach, i koszty, jakie się z tym wiążą, zwłaszcza w obszarze zdrowia, myślę, że nikt nie ma wątpliwości, że niezbędne jest wprowadzenie inteligentnej mobilności czystej energii. I zgadzam się z tymi, którzy mówią, że powinniśmy się skupić nie tylko na napędach elektrycznych, ale także szukać innych alternatywnych napędów i innowacyjnych rozwiązań, tak aby umożliwić odejście od napędów spalinowych. Jak wszyscy wiemy, transport to z jednej strony zanieczyszczenia, emisja CO₂, ale z drugiej strony to są setki tysięcy miejsc pracy. Dlatego też myślę, że Pani Komisarz bierze pod uwagę, że ważne jest tempo wprowadzania zmian, tak aby umożliwić firmom w Europie przekwalifikowanie i dostosowanie się do nowych wyzwań. Musimy także pamiętać, że niezbędne są inwestycje w infrastrukturę doładowania samochodów, której dzisiaj bardzo brakuje, a także inwestycje w sieci energetyczne, tak aby podołały zwiększonemu obciążeniu. I musimy też, Pani Komisarz, pamiętać, że jeżeli chcemy osiągnąć zamierzony cel, samochody na przykład z napędem elektrycznym muszą być na miarę możliwości finansowych konsumentów, jeżeli nie chcemy, aby europejski rynek zalały tanie elektryczne chińskie samochody. I ważne jest w tym wszystkim to, aby cały ten proces dekarbonizacji stał się szansą, a nie walką o przetrwanie dla europejskich firm motoryzacyjnych. To też musimy wszyscy wziąć pod uwagę.

Claudia Țăpădel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnilor comisari, dragi colegi, cel de al doilea pachet privind mobilitatea este, într-adevăr, unul ambițios care se subscrive strategiei mai ample de reinnoire a politicii industriale a Uniunii Europene, precum și obiectivelor de realizare a unui transport european modern. Obiectivul nostru este de a permite industriilor noastre să devină lider mondial în domeniul inovării, al digitalizării și al decarbonizării. Aș dori însă să mă refer astăzi doar la două aspecte:

inițiativa privind bateriile este de o importanță strategică și salut decizia Comisiei. Pe termen lung, trebuie să reducem dependența de alte state, iar acest lucru nu se poate întâmpla decât dacă vehiculele și componentele acestora sunt concepute și produse în Europa;

standardele privind reducerea emisiilor de dioxid de carbon: va trebui să reflectăm cu atenție asupra nivelului optim. Susțin ideea de a trasa o direcție clară care să vină în sprijinul investițiilor, dar care să țină cont și de posibilitățile fiecărui stat membru. În ceea ce privește pachetul de mobilitate în ansamblul său lucrurile rămân sensibile și fac din nou un apel către Comisie și către colegi să cântărim cu atenție impactul noilor măsuri asupra pieței unice, dar și asupra companiilor din estul Europei. Mobilitatea curată este esențială pentru viitorul nostru, dar la fel de important este să nu închidem companiile care asigură această mobilitate.

Lara Comi (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie all'entrata in vigore dell'accordo di Parigi, la comunità internazionale si è impegnata a raggiungere una riduzione delle emissioni di carbonio, procedendo verso una transizione mondiale energetica. Questa transizione va ben oltre l'ambito dei trasporti, dell'agricoltura, dell'edilizia, della gestione dei rifiuti e delle emissioni, poiché dovrebbe essere considerata come un ulteriore elemento del nostro impegno per modernizzare l'economia e per renderla sempre una cosiddetta *green economy*.

Le proposte contenute in questo secondo pacchetto «mobilità» hanno tre obiettivi principali: privilegiare l'efficienza energetica e conquistare la leadership a livello mondiale. Questo è un punto chiave, perché dobbiamo fare molta attenzione allo sviluppo cinese su questo tema, che già nel 2020 vogliono essere pronti e i primi sul mercato da un punto di vista di energie rinnovabili e anche di una mobilità elettrica a tutti gli effetti. Dobbiamo però riuscire a conciliare anche le esigenze dei cittadini.

Non tutte le infrastrutture nazionali sono pronte per avere una mobilità effettivamente verde, una mobilità elettrica e anche con l'utilizzo di energie rinnovabili. Proprio per questo sono convinta che gli obiettivi che vi siete posti del 2025 e del 2030 possono e devono essere un'ottima *deadline* per coinvolgere tutti gli Stati membri. Quindi assolutamente un in bocca al lupo perché è il nostro futuro che deve essere più ecologicamente sostenibile.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhores Comissários, saúdo o acordo interinstitucional conseguido para concretizar uma nova etapa no mercado das emissões. Foi mais um passo para aproximar a União Europeia do cumprimento dos objetivos de Paris e reforçar o nosso potencial para liderar a transição energética.

Em breve, seremos chamados a novos passos: a revisão da diretiva das renováveis, da eficiência energética e o regulamento da «governance». São passos críticos em que a mobilidade desempenha um papel-chave e não podemos correr o risco de falhar.

A eletrificação limpa dos transportes, associada à gestão inteligente tornada possível pelas novas tecnologias digitais, torna a mobilidade um dos maiores desafios de inovação económica e social para a próxima década. Por isso, a Comissão Europeia devia ser ainda mais ambiciosa no pacote para a mobilidade agora apresentado: mais ambiciosa nas prioridades, nas políticas e nas metas. Não podemos hesitar na escolha. Quem perder esta batalha ficará irremediavelmente para trás na plataforma de conhecimento, criação de riqueza, emprego e qualidade de vida que a mobilidade inteligente significa.

Tenhamos, senhores comissários, a lucidez de ousar. Sem ambição, ficaremos agarrados à estrada a lamentar o nosso fracasso coletivo.

Karoline Graswander-Hainz (S&D). – Herr Präsident, werte Kommission, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nach drei Jahren der Stagnation wird der weltweite CO₂-Ausstoß im Jahr 2017 wieder steigen. Das ist traurige Gewissheit. Die Hoffnung, dass die Trendwende nun endlich geschafft ist, weicht der Ernüchterung. Der Verkehrssektor ist nämlich immer noch Hauptverursacher gesundheitsschädlicher Abgase in unseren Städten und ist für ein Viertel der Treibhausgase in der EU verantwortlich.

Die Kommission erkennt, was getan werden muss. Es braucht unbedingt strenge Emissionsgrenzen für Lkw und Pkw, Infrastruktur für saubere Antriebe und Förderung von Forschung und Fertigung in Europa. Und wir müssen mit der Verlagerung auf Schiene und Schiff vorankommen.

Werte Kommission, ich kann Ihnen versichern: Mit den Sozialdemokratinnen und Sozialdemokraten haben Sie Verbündete für mehr und schnelleres Handeln. Ich weiß: Die Mobilitätswende kommt – mit Europas Autoindustrie an der Spitze oder ohne sie.

Петър Курумбашев (S&D). – Г-н Председател, разочаровашо е, че Европейската комисия пропусна в този пакет да предложи конкретни цели за превозните средства с нулеви емисии. Ние сме свидетели как подобна политика с конкретни цели и в областта на енергийната ефективност, и в европейската търговия с емисии, и във възобновяемите енергийни източници дава конкретни резултати. Добре е в бъдеще да има такива квоти, за да може да имаме цели както на общностно ниво, така и на ниво държави членки.

Също така е добре да има стимули при обществените поръчки за електрически превозни средства. Например представете си, че фирмите, които чистят градовете, имат повече електрически коли или камиони. В интерес на истината, има вече доста държави, които активно инвестират в публичния си градски транспорт, например като Китай. А можем да дадем един добър пример от Европейския съюз каквато е Холандия, където инвестират между другото не само в електрическата мобилност, но и в превозните средства, които се задвижват от водород.

Добре е да се поощрят и данъчните облекчения за електрическите мобилни средства, като се намаляват данъците за такива електрически мобилни средства, като се дават бонуси за купувачите, които купуват такива средства, а също така и например като се осигуряват безплатни места за паркиране в градовете.

Tiemo Wölken (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Auf der Klimakonferenz in Bonn werden derzeit zwei wichtige Themen diskutiert. Erstens geht es darum, wie die Staaten ihre Emissionen vergleichbar und transparent senken können. Zweitens wird deutlich, dass wir sehr schnell ehrgeizige Reduktionsziele brauchen, um den weltweiten Temperaturanstieg begrenzen zu können. Beides ist auch wichtig für die Regulierung oder Begrenzung des Treibhausgasausstoßes im Transportbereich, der bald der größte Bereich in der EU sein könnte. Ich werde mich daher dafür einsetzen, dass die Grenzwerte der CO₂-Emissionen an absoluten Werten anhand von Tests auf der Straße festgelegt werden und dass die Reduktionsziele ambitioniert und vergleichbar sind.

Unsere europäischen Autohersteller sind sehr innovativ, und sie können mehr, als wir derzeit verlangen. Verbraucher sind zu Recht verunsichert, weil Autohersteller das in sie gesetzte Vertrauen massiv verletzt haben. Autofahrer zahlen Kilometer für Kilometer drauf, weil die Herstellerangaben zum Verbrauch teils gravierend abweichen. Sie als Hersteller sollten das größte Interesse daran haben, endlich Vertrauen zurückzugewinnen. Daher fordere ich sie auf: Setzen Sie sich für ambitionierte Ziele ein! Lassen Sie sich mit transparenten Verfahren auch überprüfen und erarbeiten Sie sich so das Vertrauen zurück!

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I would like to welcome Ms Bulc and Mr Šefčovič. I know that you are personally very much involved in bringing forward the modern logistics sector and the modern transport sector. Mr Šefčovič is fighting for batteries.

Our problem is that the Commission as a whole, and especially Mr Juncker and his Head of Cabinet, have produced a very weak paper, a very weak proposal. What is the discussion in Bonn? If we want to be at zero in 2050, we also need to do something in the transport sector. When you look at the emissions in the transport sector, you will see that while in the housing sector and the power sector we have been able to go down, in the transport sector there is nothing! Why? Because the Commission and Member States have established impunity for the car industry not only as regards diesel, but also as regards CO₂, for 20 years now. In 1996, Ms Merkel – then Minister for the Environment under Helmut Kohl – prevented Europe from having binding legislation on CO₂ and cars. Then we had ten lost years. The last decade they have tricked us, as my colleague before has said, by giving golden cars in the laps and much fewer golden cars on the road.

Now let's look at the proposal from last week. The Commission's own documents show that if transport is to be on track, cars need to reduce by 60%. That is according to the Commission's own papers. On the table, only 30%! If we want to be at zero in 2050, given that the car has a 15-20 year lifetime, the Dutch government is right when they say the last moment to allow a fossil car on the road will be in 2030. What has the Commission proposed? The Netherlands has a 100% electro mobility quota for 2030. The Commission has a 30% quota, just to show you the level of ambition. In 2025, it will be 15%.

VW is saying that we will have 22% of our sales in 2025. The Commission is less ambitious than VW. Then comes the big trick. Given that the Commission has only made a 15% quota, if 22% of the cars that VW sells in 2025 are electric cars then Volkswagen can take the 7% as a credit to bring more of its gigantic polluting diesel cars onto the road. Understand, we have been fooled by the German car industry and, in part, by the Commission.

Therefore, colleagues, it will be our task to negotiate this upwards. I am quite optimistic. We have an alliance with a lot of governments who will not accept this unacceptable and weak document as proposed by the Commission.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Wiceprzewodniczący Ševčovič! Pani Komisarz Bulc! Chcę powiedzieć, że wyrażam satysfakcję, że przedłożyliście ten dokument. Może trochę źle się składa, że pierwszy i drugi pakiet idą prawie równolegle i czasami w debacie nam się nakładają. Na czym buduję to swoje zadowolenie? Po pierwsze, zwłaszcza Pani Komisarz realistycznie podeszła do sprawy: tak, transport będzie potrzebny, będziemy musieli coraz więcej wozić i będziemy chcieli coraz więcej być wożeni. To jest nieuniknione. I tak, jest to również ważne społecznie, jako element jakości życia, ale i z punktu widzenia miejsc pracy – zmieniając technologię, wcale nie musimy stracić miejsc pracy.

Po drugie, Państwo odnieśli się do swego rodzaju nowej sytuacji – ery postbenzynowej i post ropa naftowa. I to uważam i ten dzisiejszy dzień, i dzisiejsza debata, że być może to się okaże taki historyczny punkt startowy.

Kolejna uwaga: jeżeli w tym dokumencie są jakiekolwiek procenty, daty, liczby, to ja od razu przychodzę z przekonaniem, że to nie będzie prawda, ale kierunek, który dajecie, to jest właśnie to, o co nam chodzi. Ta inspiracja, żeby pójść w kierunku badań, rozwoju, akumulatorów, silników, inteligentnych systemów transportowych, zaopatrzenia w energię, czyli swego rodzaju systemu tankowania, wreszcie zasad ruchu, inteligentnego systemu – to jest to, co może tworzyć tę jakość, początek, impuls. I za to jest uznanie.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Pozdravljam pobudo, še posebej predloge za zmanjšanje emisij, spodbude za spremembe v avtomobilski industriji in med uporabniki, ter večjo uporabo železnice v tovornem prometu.

V Evropi je z avtomobilsko industrijo povezanih kar 12,6 milijona delovnih mest, v Sloveniji je v njej zaposlenih 24.000 ljudi. Ne more nam biti vseeno, kakšna bo njena prihodnost. Novi standardi in cilji dajejo industriji jasen signal in spodbudo za prilagoditev novim razmeram, da bo ostala konkurenčna in ohranila delovna mesta. Premik tovarnega prometa s cest ni le potreben le zaradi emisij, ampak tudi zaradi gneče in uničenih cest ter prometnih nesreč. To je še posebej pomembno za tranzitne države, kot je Slovenija.

Možnost finančnih spodbud je dobra, a številne članice, tudi Slovenija, bodo morale narediti svoj del domače naloge za vzpostavitev ustrezne železniške infrastrukture.

Končno, javni sektor mora biti nosilec pozitivnih sprememb. Večjega razmaha čistih vozil pa ne bo, dokler je potovanje z njimi nefleksibilno in mora biti prilagojeno lokaciji polnilnih postaj.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnilor comisari, stimați colegi, sigur, unii dintre dumneavoastră ați spus aici că este prea puțin ambițioasă propunerea Comisiei, alții că este prea ambițioasă. Eu voi spune că trebuie să fie realistă și vreau să și aduc niște argumente. Eu mă bucur că aveți această preocupare, mă bucur că este moderată propunerea dumneavoastră pentru că trebuie să ne gândim cu o viziune mai largă cum putem să facem aceste schimbări fără a perturba nu numai industria constructoare de mașini – aici vorbim de o întreagă industrie: furnizorii, întreprinderi mici și mijlocii care fac semifabricate, care fac accesorii, care fac piese de schimb.

Deci, sunt de acord că transportul trebuie să își scadă procentul de 4% care, în prezent, contribuie la poluare, dar trebuie să ne gândim că avem nevoie de investiții, de tehnologii, trebuie să vorbim aici de o infrastructură care lipsește și poate, domnilor comisari, vă gândiți nu cum să trecem la autoturisme, ci cum să trecem pe căi ferate electrificate, cum să trecem transportul de pe rutier pe cale ferată și, sigur, cum ne gândim la bugetele naționale și locale ca acele mijloace de transport care fac deservire pentru transport public să fie acelea primele care să schimbe combustibilul, să fie electrice sau cu combustibil alternativ.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διασύνδεση της κινητικότητας και των μεταφορών με τα θέματα περιβάλλοντος και ενέργειας είναι ενδιαφέροντα. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, κεντρική θέση έχουν τα δικαιώματα των επιβατών, όχι μόνο των λεωφορείων, αλλά και των αεροπλάνων.

Κυρία Bulc, θα ήθελα να σας ενημερώσω ότι, σύμφωνα με σημερινό δημοσίευμα της εφημερίδας «Πρώτο Θέμα» και της ιστοσελίδας, με απόφαση της γερμανικής κυβέρνησης τίθενται σε καραντίνα οι επιβάτες από την Ελλάδα, μέχρι τον Μάιο του 2018. Έτσι, θα απαγορεύεται η χρήση γέφυρας αποβίβασης (φυσούνας). Όσοι επιβάτες έρχονται από Ελλάδα θα πηγαίνουν με λεωφορεία σε ειδικό χώρο ελέγχου, όπου η ομοσπονδιακή αστυνομία και οι υπηρεσίες ασφαλείας θα τους κάνουν εξονυχιστικό έλεγχο και μετά θα μπορούν να πάνε να παραλάβουν τις αποσκευές τους.

Υπάρχει ένα σοβαρό θέμα δικαιωμάτων των πολιτών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αλλά και των επιβατών, και θέλω αυτό το θέμα να το δείτε. Το καταγγέλλουμε διότι είναι απόφαση της γερμανικής κυβέρνησης με ισχύ από τις 12 Νοεμβρίου του 2017 μέχρι τις 11 Μαΐου του 2018, στο πλαίσιο αποφάσεων λειτουργίας εξαιρέσεων της Σένγκεν. Δείτε το σας παρακαλώ, γιατί είναι σοβαρό θέμα παραβίασης δικαιωμάτων των επιβατών.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Gre za izjemno pomembno temo, gre pravzaprav za našo prihodnost tudi na mnogih področjih in misim, da to, kar je bilo predstavljeno posega na mnogotera področja. Seveda na področje okolja, na področje seveda tudi energetike, infrastrukture, prometa, vplivalo bo pa seveda tudi na področje sociale in še na mnoga druga področja. Zato seveda me predvsem zanima, kako bo Komisiji uspelo uskladiti vse te segmente, ves ta sektor v povezano celoto, ki lahko potem pripelje k izpolnjevanju ciljev, ki smo si jih zadali, ki pa v enem delu bi seveda lahko bili tudi bolj ambiciozni.

Predvsem bi pa opozoril še na en vidik, ki je izjemno pomemben, to je tudi področje varnosti. Mislim, da vsi ti napor, ki se vlagajo, morajo na koncu poleg seveda tudi emisij tudi ostalih elementov bistveno vplivati tudi na varnost. Zato si seveda iskreno želim, da bi tudi ta tovarni promet čim prej spravili na železnice in s tem zmanjšali tudi tveganja, ki se pojavljajo in vse nesreče, ki temu botrujejo.

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, já oceňuji ambicióznost Vašeho návrhu. Samozřejmě víme, že automobilový sektor zaměstnává 12 milionů Evropanů a představuje tedy tu hlavní sílu zplodin, emisí skleníkových plynů v Evropské unii. Zároveň tedy je tím potenciálem, kde je možné snižovat emise.

Již nyní automobilový průmysl vlastně jde tímto trendem. Jednak snižuje emise a jednak také postupně opouští spalovací motory. Týká se to samozřejmě nejen Evropské unie, jejich orgánů, ale tedy i samotných výrobců automobilů. Přesto si myslím, že návrh těch závazných limitů je možná až příliš ambiciózní. Za 9 let snížit CO₂ emise o 30 %, to opravdu nebude jednoduché. Nicméně oceňuji jistou flexibilitu, kterou jste ponechal pro řešení jak výrobcům, tak členským státům. Děkuji a přeji hodně úspěchů.

Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE). – *(Der Redner spricht ohne Mikrofon.)*... Ihren Bericht, ich freue mich darüber. Ich bin seit 25 Jahren bei der CO₂-Politik dabei, und ich muss Ihnen ehrlich gestehen: Ich hatte Schlimmeres erwartet. Ich glaube, der Bericht geht in eine gute Richtung. Aber ich möchte Sie daran erinnern, dass wir in den letzten 25 Jahren einen permanenten Kuhhandel mit der Automobilindustrie gehabt haben. Sie müssen da hart bleiben.

Gut ist, dass Sie eine Technologieneutralität bevorzugen. Das werden einige Kollegen anders sehen. Ich halte das für gut. Eine Frage: Warum haben Sie bei Ihrem Bonussystem kein Malussystem eingeführt? Da sind doch diejenigen, die sich da wegdrücken wollen, positiv motiviert. Das wären meine kurzen Bemerkungen auf die Schnelle.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I would also like to thank the honourable Members for a very rich debate. I would like to express my appreciation for the fact that in most speeches we felt very strong support for our proposals. Together with Ms Bulc and our energy union team, we are very much looking forward to working with you at such a pace that we will not only make this proposal and have a debate on it, but we will definitely adopt the whole package and make it law before the end of our mandate.

The word which was probably used most frequently in this debate was 'more' and we very much appreciate your support for more ambition, more investment in the infrastructure and more focus on future technologies. I think that if we look at the long-term vision, we would of course like to have mobility with zero emissions, where we would have zero accidents and there would be zero congestion. I think that all this is possible if we kick-start our car and transport industry right now. This is what we are trying to do.

Therefore we propose the most realistic path, namely the curve of a 30% reduction in emissions with a benchmarking system and with very harsh penalties if this 30% reduction is not met by 2030. But we also wanted to offer the industry incentives to give them the flexibility to be technologically neutral because we can see how quickly the science and research is evolving. I do not think we can really say today what the winning technology will be. We just know that it will be emission-free technology in the end.

I would also like to highlight the fact that we are really working here on this cross-cutting basis because by 2030 we want to have more than 70% of our electricity carbon-free. I want to use this clean energy to power our clean cars and to give them the ability to store that energy in green batteries. That is the paradigm change that we are pushing for and we would very much like to achieve.

When it comes to experience from the past, I believe that we can learn from this and therefore we are proposing very rigorous systems of controls, market surveillance, real-driving emission tests and in-service conformity checks, which would really tell us if we are on the right track or if we are deviating from it again. I can assure you that we in the Commission – and I am sure this House as well – will be very vigilant in order to make sure that we achieve the target we have set for ourselves.

If you will allow me, I will now pass the floor to Ms Bulc, but I would like to thank you all very much for your supportive spirit and for all the dynamism which I believe we will need to make sure that this package is adopted before the next European Parliament elections.

Violeta Bulc, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you, in my name too, for a very rich and engaging debate. I am particularly happy to hear that there is a broad consensus on the need to take a comprehensive approach to reach the necessary level of ambition.

Let me really quickly summarise the package and I hope you will recognise this in our proposal as well. First, we do address vehicles, infrastructure and necessary changes in the use of fuel or 'energies', as we are probably going to call them in the future. We do address demand and also the supply side at the same time. We do address passengers and freight at the same time. We do address CO₂ emissions but also noise and other emissions. We do address road transport but also other modes. Why? Because all modes of transport have a role to play in achieving low emission mobility.

Public transport must be a real alternative on the European transport market. This is essential for the environment but also for territorial and social cohesion for our entire Union. Decarbonisation, I believe, is good for all of us; it is good for citizens, it is good for businesses and it is good for all Member States. So I am really looking forward to constructive discussions but let us also move as far as possible under your mandate.

El presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 162 del Reglamento)

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Druga część pakietu mobilności przedstawiona dzisiaj przez Komisję to ambitny zestaw szeregu propozycji legislacyjnych. Co do zasady, przedstawione propozycje stanowią krok we właściwym kierunku i mogą ułatwić przejście na pojazdy niskoemisyjne i bezemisyjne, co może mieć pozytywnie skutki nie tylko dla środowiska, ale także dla europejskiego przemysłu, który utrzyma swoją konkurencyjną pozycję na globalnym rynku. Należy mieć jednak na uwadze, że wprowadzenie proponowanych zmian będzie stanowiło obciążenie nie tylko dla władz państw członkowskich, ale także, zwłaszcza w przypadku rewizji dyrektywy o transporcie zbiorowym, dla władz lokalnych i regionalnych. Z tego względu w toku prac nad pakietem należy szukać takich rozwiązań, które pozwolą uniknąć obciążania samorządów nadmiernymi kosztami i procedurami administracyjnymi oraz będą zachowywały pewną elastyczność w doborze środków.

20. Activities of the European Ombudsman in 2016 (debate)

El presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate sobre el informe de Marlene Mizzi, en nombre de la Comisión de Peticiones, sobre el Informe anual relativo a las actividades del Defensor del Pueblo Europeo en 2016 (2017/2126(INI)).

Aprovecho para dar la bienvenida a la señora Emily O'Reilly, defensora del pueblo europea.

Marlene Mizzi, rapporteur. – Mr President, the importance of the role of the European Ombudsman in protecting citizens' rights and strengthening citizens' confidence and public trust in the European institutions cannot be emphasised enough. This is the only mechanism that holds the EU administration to account and investigates cases on behalf of our citizens. The European Ombudsman is the guardian of good administration, ensuring that the EU institutions function properly and do not encroach upon citizens' rights.

In this regard, I would like to congratulate the Ombudsman, Emily O'Reilly, for her excellent work in improving the quality and accessibility of the Ombudsman's services and for increasing the visibility and impact of the work of the European Ombudsman. Ms O'Reilly, has accomplished a lot since her election by this House as European Ombudsman, back in 2013. The quality of the Ombudsman's Annual Report has been improved. Now the report is clearer and easy to read. Public administrations need to become more citizen-friendly, and I think that you have achieved this milestone with your Annual Report.

You have also improved the role of the Ombudsman's strategic inquiries and initiatives by pursuing, on your own initiative, important topics in the public interest of the European citizens, such as the transparency of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations. New working methods were introduced and case handling procedures were streamlined. This enables greater flexibility and efficiency of the Ombudsman services, aimed at deepening the dialogue between people and institutions. You have also maintained excellent cooperation and a positive engagement with the European Parliament and in particular with the Committee on Petitions.

And last, but certainly not least, you have made the Ombudsman services more visible. According to the Flash Eurobarometer survey of March 2016, 9 out of 10 EU citizens are familiar with their status as European citizens and their right to complain to the Ombudsman. I would also like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their valuable input during all stages of preparing this report: our cooperation was very fruitful and I did my best to accommodate most of their contributions.

I think we all share the view that in such turbulent times, when the European Union is facing unprecedented challenges – such as the unemployment crisis, the migration crisis, Brexit – the role of the Ombudsman in bridging the gap between people and the EU institutions is crucial. Unfortunately, transparency, openness, access to information and documents, respect for the rights of citizens, and high ethical standards are still the top citizens' concerns in the cases investigated by the European Ombudsman. The level of quality of our institutions needs to be reflected in the level of support from European citizens. Trust between citizens and the institutions is of paramount importance. We need to work on that if we are to get a mandate from our citizens to do what needs to be done to protect European citizens and Europe.

Achieving the highest possible level of transparency and access to documents must be the rule. Whenever there are any exceptions to this rule, they should always be weighed against the principles of democracy. I would just like to point out that 100% transparency will probably never be possible in the light of certain legal considerations. However, my report strives to have the highest possible level of transparency and access to documents, in particular when it comes to the EU's economic and financial decision-making process, trade or trilogue negotiations, and even on the ongoing negotiations between the EU and the UK.

The report also notes maladministration with regard to the Code of Conduct of Commissioners. When it comes to 'revolving door' phenomenon of conflicts of interest, it is clear that the highest moral and ethical standards need to apply to all EU institutions. We need to secure respect, and this can only be done through absolute integrity and full independence from the private sector. We want to see a revision of the Code of Conduct of Commissioners. In view of this, it is also time to comply with the Ombudsman's suggestions for improving the EU Transparency Register by making it a mandatory central transparency hub for all EU institutions and agencies.

In view of the emphasis on good governance, I also want to support the Award for Good Administration, which acknowledges best practices in the EU administration and which brings them to the attention of our citizens. Finally, I would like to say that I am very satisfied with the report of the Ombudsman and I wish her the best in her future work.

Emily O'Reilly, Ombudsman. – Mr President, I would like to thank Ms Mizzi and all the shadow rapporteurs for their work on this report and to thank them once again for their strong support, which I greatly value.

This is my fourth time of addressing the honourable Members in plenary. We draw inspiration, honourable Members, from your work as you reflect the concerns of the citizens that you represent and it is my role also to try to deal with similar concerns of citizens. I also very much welcome the presence again of First Vice-President Timmermans to this debate and I thank him for his support for my work.

As you know, a majority of the complaints that we receive are directed at the Commission, given its role and its high level of interaction with citizens. The Commission continues to engage positively with my office and, while no relationship is ever perfect, we both do our best to deal with challenging issues.

This report, however, shows that increasing attention is being paid by my office to the Council. Rising public awareness of its role and greater demands for transparency have prompted this additional scrutiny and perhaps in future years Parliament might consider inviting a Council representative also to attend this very valuable annual hearing.

Today's draft report expresses support for my strategic inquiry into the transparency of the Council's working parties and Coreper committees and a positive outcome would help, I hope, to dispel the perception that EU institutions are not transparent and therefore not sufficiently accountable.

Citizens are not always aware that the Council is not just a so-called 'Brussels institution'. As the French President Macron said recently, 'Brussels is us' and greater Council transparency will, I believe, lessen the temptation to blame Brussels for decisions taken by Member State Ministers and Governments as citizens will see precisely where responsibility lies.

I fully appreciate how hard it can be to get consensus or a majority vote on some matters, but when Parliament and the Commission are clear on where they stand, it can be frustrating to citizens when the failure of the Council to reach a common approach, or even take a vote, means that some proposals remain stalled, sometimes indefinitely.

It is, for example, now over a year since the Commission made its proposal for an improved Transparency Register and Parliament agreed its negotiation mandate earlier this year. However, the Council is now delayed in agreeing its mandate to enter talks. I very much welcome the efforts of the Estonian Presidency to unblock the impasse and I very much hope that agreement can be reached before the elections in 2019.

Transparency in itself, of course, cannot deal with every Union problem, but it can throw light not just on the respective responsibilities of the EU institutions, but also dispel some of the false facts and fake news that increasingly impact on the way in which the EU is mediated, and I note and welcome First Vice-President Timmermans' announcement this week of a public consultation on this matter.

Fake news is ultimately about influencing, with a view to undermining, the democratic process. Lobbying transparency can help to reassure citizens that when it comes to the influencing of the EU institutions, measures are in place to help to mitigate its more negative impacts.

Other transparency work by my office in 2016 included an exchange with Eurogroup President Dijsselbloem, encouraging moves to open up the work of that very important group. Obviously, as the Eurogroup is not officially an EU institution, my mandate is limited, but I did welcome the President's initiative in attempting to further the transparency of its decision-making.

Many citizens were concerned about what they perceived as the lack of accountability of the troika and similar concerns are at times expressed about the Eurogroup and indeed about the Council. Greater accountability through transparency is an obvious way to help to rectify this citizen alienation.

I continue to raise awareness among my colleagues in the European Network of Ombudsmen about important EU issues. Last June, I hosted our annual Network Conference in Brussels at which we discussed open government, populism in Europe and, of course, Brexit. I wish to thank First Vice-President Timmermans for his keynote speech. It meant a lot to colleagues from all of your Member States to be able to have that direct engagement and I have rarely heard such lively post-seminar conversation. I would also like to thank Ms Cecilia Wikström and other MEPs for their support for these events and their much appreciated contributions to them.

This report today also recognises the work of my office in several other areas. These include the transparency of the Brexit talks, continued work with the ECB and the EIB, an ongoing inquiry vis-à-vis the Commissioners' Code of Conduct, improvements to which the Commission has already proposed, a new Ombudsman's guide for EU officials on dealing with lobbyists, our work on the EU whistle-blowing rules to protect EU staff, an inquiry into the Commission EU pilot programme for infringement, the ongoing work with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the European Citizens' Initiative, which the Commission is now revising.

Let me also briefly mention some routine cases dealt with in 2016. There was a complaint from the Polish Research Institute, which undertook three EU co-financed projects. The Institute turned to us after the Commission decided to recover some costs related to the subcontracting of the work. However, following our inquiry and a document inspection, the Commission agreed to waive the recovery of around EUR 86 000.

A Spanish citizen complained about the lack of translation of Commission public consultations. The Commission agreed that public consultations relating to their work programme priorities will in future be in all EU languages. Another case in 2015 was when the European Chemicals Agency agreed to our proposal to require those seeking to register chemicals to show that they have tried to avoid animal testing. These are just three of the over 1 800 complaints we dealt with in 2016.

We have also been revising our internal working procedures and working methods. I wish to thank both the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control for recognition of this work. We will soon be launching a fast-track procedure for dealing with access to document complaints so that we can get answers for citizens within weeks instead of months or even, in some cases unfortunately, years.

Next year we plan to request a moderate budget increase to hire extra multilingual staff. This is due to the fact that we are experiencing a sizable increase in complaints this year. We believe we have implemented large efficiency reforms internally and now need that extra capacity to really improve again our service to citizens.

Finally, I wish to note again the high standards of the EU civil service. Indeed to recognise that work and to share best practice across the institutions, we launched in 2016 the Ombudsman Award for Good Administration, receiving over 90 nominations. The award ceremony was particularly memorable and I was struck by the great pride of the officials in their work and their joy in having it recognised at a time when so much of what they do is either unseen or criticised.

Thank you again to the rapporteur Ms Mizzi, the shadow rapporteurs, their staff and the secretariats for all the work on this year's report, which I and my staff greatly appreciate. Thank you to the Members of Parliament who, through their active engagement with the office, helped make our positive work more effective.

Frans Timmermans, *First Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to thank Marlene Mizzi for a really excellent report which helps us improve the service we provide to our citizens. It also gives me the opportunity to join Marlene Mizzi in expressing my admiration for the work done by Ms O'Reilly as our ombudsman and the progress she has made with her office in 2016. She has helped us to prevent, identify and solve instances of maladministration by the EU institutions, and every citizen has a right to good administration. It is indeed a fact that the Commission is one of the main addressees of the Ombudsman's inquiries and that we comply with her recommendations or suggestions whenever possible. Sometimes we disagree and explain why, but such cases remain limited. The overall compliance rate is very high at 82%.

Both the ombudsman and the report call for greater transparency. I am in full agreement on this. The EU institutions must meet the high transparency standards that citizens rightly expect. We live in a different society. We are no longer in a 'trust me' society. We are in a 'show me' society, and our citizens ask us to explain what we do in full transparency on a daily basis.

As you know, this Commission decided to apply the highest transparency standards upon itself. A key principle is that lobbyists can only meet Commissioners, their staff and Directors-General if they are in the Transparency Register. No registration means no meeting. But we need to go further. The register must become mandatory for lobbyists. This can only happen if that same principle is applied across the board in all three institutions – the Commission, Parliament and the Council. For example, a lobbyist who is not in the register should not be able to meet a Member of the European Parliament. Only then would registration become truly a *sine qua non* for lobbying the institutions. So I call on both the Council and this Parliament to commit to the same standards in the forthcoming interinstitutional agreement following the Commission's proposal of September 2016.

As Ms O'Reilly has explained, we are still waiting for the Council to adopt its mandate, and it really is high time for us to be able to start negotiating about this. It would really be a shame if we did not finish this before the next European elections.

The report also touches upon access to documents and publication of information. Each year we proactively make public tens of thousands of new documents on our web pages, but we plan to go further, for example, by publishing an overview of each Commissioner's mission expenses every two months.

I also fully agree that transparency in trade negotiations is essential to ensure public trust in the EU's trade policy. This Commission took major steps right from the very beginning of its mandate. President Juncker announced, in the 2017 State of the Union speech, that the Commission would publish all its recommendations for negotiating directives for trade agreements. He added that the European Parliament, as well as national and regional parliaments, would be kept fully informed from day one of the negotiations.

Finally, let me stress that the Commission is making sure it abides by the highest standards of ethics and integrity, including by updating them when necessary. The draft new code of conduct increases transparency and sets higher standards for Commissioners, including on post-mandate activities. It incorporates several suggestions made by the European Parliament and the European Ombudsman. Without her, we would not have been able to reach where we are now.

Let me conclude by saying very clearly that this work is never finished. We will always have to improve our standards, improve the way we perform and apply the most forward-looking standards in the quality of administration we deliver for our citizens, and an integral part of that is a maximum level of transparency and accountability. I really want to thank Ms O'Reilly for helping us to reach that level.

Jarosław Wałęsa, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Ms O'Reilly for her efforts and for the fact that she and her staff are constantly good to cooperate with, but also for the excellent quality of her work. I would also like to thank the rapporteur for her work: she managed to prepare a very balanced, well-structured report that tackles all the areas of the important work carried out by the European Ombudsman.

I have been closely monitoring the activities of the European Ombudsman from the very beginning, and I greatly appreciated Ms O'Reilly's work last year. I say to her: you managed to make the post more visible, and your communication strategies, your ideas have contributed to making this office more citizen-friendly, and I really thank you for that. You have proved to be a very efficient Ombudsman, which I also appreciate. You undertake many important initiatives which tackle the current policies of the European Union.

This annual report on the activities of the European Ombudsman serves not only as a summary and approval of the work of the European Ombudsman in a given year, but it is also a reminder to us and to all the European institutions to be more service-minded, to be more open-minded regarding our citizens. It is very important to encourage the European Commission in its efforts to facilitate access to documents and information, especially with regard to EU pilot procedures.

It is very important to provide as much transparency and communication to our citizens as possible, especially because many myths have been created, particularly regarding trade negotiations. However, we have to keep in mind that this transparency should never undermine the negotiating position of the European Union – there is a balance there. Ms O'Reilly, once again, thank you very much for your work, and good luck.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonaşului albastru”*. – Stimate coleg, sunt total de acord cu ce aţi spus dumneavoastră, însă aş vrea să vă întreb legat de ultima parte a discursului dumneavoastră: credeţi că prea multe reguli – şi mă refer acum la propunerea făcută de domnul comisar – legate de posibilitatea întâlnirii eurodeputaţilor cu cetăţenii, cu asociaţiile profesionale nu creează un obstacol în comunicare? În fond, ne întâlnim să discutăm şi să ne informăm. Eu văd aceasta ca o îngrădire a comunicării între noi, cei aleşi – nu e vorba de comisarii numiţi, vorbesc de eurodeputaţi şi de cetăţeni şi asociaţii profesionale.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), *blue-card answer*. – You tackled a very important point, but I think Mr Timmermans said it best: this work will never end. We will try something at one point, if it works then will try to improve it further. But if it does not work, then we will have to change to something else.

In our committee, the Committee on Petitions of this House, we are the closest to the people of European Union. As such, we are the best advocate to see how best to improve communication between us, the institutions of European Union and European citizens. So, yes, this is an ongoing process, and I believe that only together we can make it better.

Jeppe Kofod, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I too would like to thank the Ombudsman Ms O'Reilly for her excellent work, and also our rapporteur in Parliament and First Vice-President Timmermans for his very important remarks on transparency. Let me just stick to that topic – because I think we live at a time when many citizens feel very alienated with regard to institutions, to politics, to governance. I think one of the most important issues here for regaining trust, including in our institutions and our democracy, is actually access to information – transparency, accountability – and therefore the work that the European Ombudsman is doing in this field is so important.

I am looking at the Council side now and I have to say that the Council and many of its working groups are keeping us in the dark. Many of us have had concrete experiences of this, for example the Code of Conduct Group for business taxation. They are supposed to phase out cross-border harmful corporate tax regimes in Europe. They work in secrecy. They work in unanimity; we do not know which countries are blocking or deluding this very important work to ensure fair corporate taxes in Europe. Things like that are alienating citizens and also cause the European Union to be blamed for not acting on very important societal issues.

Therefore I just want to say to the Ombudsman: full support for your work on transparency and we need to stand together to push the Council to open up and become democratically accountable to its citizens. We need to be much more blunt and they need to change their attitude, because if they do not do this, then mistrust of the European Union will continue.

Νότης Μαριάς, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, επιτρέψτε μου καταρχάς να συγχαρώ την Ευρωπαϊά Διαμεσολαβήτρια, κ. O'Reilly, για το εξαιρετικό της έργο. Ο ρόλος του Ευρωπαϊού Διαμεσολαβητή είναι καθοριστικός για τη διαφάνεια και τον έλεγχο της κακοδιοίκησης στο πλαίσιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Στην παρούσα φάση, είναι καθοριστικό να επεκταθεί ο έλεγχος αυτός και σε άλλα όργανα, όπως το Eurogroup, η Τρόικα και ο ESM.

Καταθέσαμε σχετικές τροπολογίες, οι οποίες όμως δυστυχώς απορρίφθηκαν από τις άλλες πολιτικές ομάδες. Σε σχέση με την Τρόικα, θα πρέπει να επισημανθεί ότι η Ευρωπαϊά Διαμεσολαβήτρια πρέπει να ερευνήσει τη σύγκρουση συμφερόντων στην Επιτροπή, ανάμεσα στον ρόλο της στην Τρόικα και στην ευθύνη της Επιτροπής ως θεματοφύλακα των Συνθηκών του ευρωπαϊκού κεκτημένου.

Το ίδιο ισχύει και για τη σύγκρουση συμφερόντων μεταξύ του τρέχοντος ρόλου της ΕΚΤ στην Τρόικα και της εντολής που έχει αναλάβει να ενεργεί ως ανεξάρτητη νομισματική αρχή. Επιπλέον, πρέπει να αναληφθεί έρευνα όσον αφορά την τήρηση, από την πλευρά της Τρόικας, του Χάρτη Θεμελιωδών Δικαιωμάτων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Επίσης, πρέπει να ενδυναμωθεί η λογοδοσία και η διαφάνεια σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, σε σχέση με το Eurogroup και τον ESM, που αναλαμβάνουν επώδυνες αποφάσεις και επιβάλλουν λιτότητα και βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή, όπως έχει συμβεί με την Ελλάδα την τελευταία επταετία.

Τέλος, θα πρέπει να υπάρξει περαιτέρω έρευνα ουσίας σχετικά με το φαινόμενο της μεταπήδησης από τον δημόσιο στον ιδιωτικό τομέα, όπως στην περίπτωση του πρώην προέδρου της Επιτροπής, Manuel Barroso, ο οποίος ανέλαβε εκτελεστικός πρόεδρος της Goldman Sachs International. Εύχομαι καλή επιτυχία στο έργο της κυρίας O'Reilly και γνωρίζει ότι συμπαραστεκόμαστε στον αγώνα της.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, es de ley felicitar a la señora O'Reilly por el magnífico trabajo que está haciendo como defensora del pueblo. No es cortesía, es reconocimiento sincero.

Hay algo que, en cualquier caso, me preocupa, que es el bajo número de personas que se dirigen a la defensora del pueblo para poder presentar sus quejas, comparativamente con lo que sucede en los Estados miembros, donde el número de quejas no se corresponde con que las instituciones en los Estados miembros sean peores que las de la Unión Europea sino, quizás, con una mayor y más fácil práctica. Yo creo que esto es un tema que deberíamos examinar.

Hay algo que es importante, yo creo que es fundamental: que exista una colaboración entre la defensora del pueblo de la Unión Europea y los de los diferentes Estados miembros. En el informe hay cuestiones que me parecen extraordinariamente relevantes, por ejemplo el tema de la transparencia. La transparencia debe ser la norma, no la excepción, y así se plantea. Pero la transparencia no debe estar unida con lo que yo llamaría la «candidez». No podemos ser tan cándidos que, en cuestiones como, por ejemplo, la negociación sobre el *brexit*, seamos de una transparencia de tal nivel que le estemos dando todos los argumentos a nuestra contraparte en la correspondiente negociación. Transparencia es una cosa, candidez es algo totalmente distinto. Seamos, por lo tanto, responsables de nuestros propios límites en la transparencia, que yo ciertamente reclamo.

Hay algo también importante, que es la clara y definida posición que existe respecto a los *lobbies* de todo tipo, desde el *lobby* del tabaco a los *lobbies* de la medicina. Todos sabemos que los *lobbies* están para tratar de influenciar a los diputados, pero tiene que haber unos límites, que es el código de conducta, que tiene que ser rigurosamente implementado.

Lo mismo vale para el código de conducta del presidente de la Comisión Europea cuando deja de serlo, o los propios comisarios o los asesores. La historia de las puertas giratorias tiene que acabar, y tiene que acabar de forma definitiva. Y si tiene que reformarse el código de conducta, refórmese, porque es un clamor ante ciertos escándalos por legales que sean, por legales que sean.

En cualquier caso, este es un informe que ha realizado usted, que no es complaciente. Es un informe sincero y es un informe que tiene audacia, y yo quiero, en ese sentido, reconocerle su trabajo y su función.

Σοφία Σακοράφα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να συγχαρώ την κ. Διαμεσολαβήτρια για τη σαφή, αναλυτική και φιλική προς τον χρήστη έκθεσή της για το 2016, επισημαίνοντας παράλληλα την εποικοδομητική συνεργασία της με την Επιτροπή Αναφορών του Κοινοβουλίου.

Αναμφισβήτητα, όλα τα όργανα και οι οργανισμοί της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης πρέπει να συνεχίσουν να ανταποκρίνονται εντός των προθεσμιών και να βελτιώσουν τον βαθμό συμμόρφωσής τους με τις συστάσεις και τις αποφάσεις του Διαμεσολαβητή. Ειδικότερα, παροτρύνω τη Διαμεσολαβητρια να εντείνει τις προσπάθειές της για πλήρη διαφάνεια και πρόσβαση σε πληροφορίες και έγγραφα που αφορούν συνολικά στις διαδικασίες EU Pilot, στους τριμερείς διαλόγους, στις εμπορικές συμφωνίες και το BREXIT και στις διαδικασίες λήψης αποφάσεων οικονομικού χαρακτήρα. Παράλληλα, την καλώ να εμμένει στην πίεσή της για ένα υποχρεωτικό Μητρώο Διαφάνειας και για την αποτελεσματική προστασία των μαρτύρων δημοσίου συμφέροντος.

Τέλος, με αφορμή την επεισοδιακή αναγνώριση της ευρωπαϊκής πρωτοβουλίας «STOP TTIP», την καλώ να θωρακίσει με άμεση αναθεώρηση τον θεσμό της Ευρωπαϊκής Πρωτοβουλίας Πολιτών.

Igor Šoltes, *v imenu skupine Verts/ALE*. – Žal mi je, da je danes dvorana bolj prazna kot polna, ker gre za izjemno pomembno temo. Mislim, da so ta poročila, ki jih dobivamo v Parlamentu izjemno, izjemno pomembna in da je vloga varuha v tem svetu, v katerem živimo danes, še toliko bolj pomembna glede na vse izzive, na vse diskriminacije, ki se dogajajo in na vsa tveganja. Predvsem pa tudi predstavljajo na nek način to poročilo ogledalo delovanja evropskih institucij. Mnoge evropske institucije kot tudi v nekaterih primerih države si lahko ogledajo, kje tudi državljani Evropske unije vidijo obstaja največji deficit in s tem razkol med pričakovanji Evropejcev in po drugi strani seveda tudi evropskimi institucijami.

Opozoril bi na nekaj stvari, kar se mi zdi izjemno pomembno. Eno od stvari je transparentnost in pa tako imenovani demokratični deficit. Gre preprosto za to, ker demokracije ne moremo imeti in živeti, če nimamo ustrezne transparentnosti, če nimamo ustrezne preglednosti in tu je vloga varuha še toliko bolj pomembna. Zato seveda si zelo želim, da bi bila večja transparentnost upravljanja tudi pri dialogih, da bi bili javno dostopni dokumenti in stališča posameznih držav, ko se glasuje o posameznih perečih vprašanjih tudi na Svetu, ki bi jih pomagalo državljanom tudi razumeti izvor in zgodovino nekaterih odločitev in tako tudi razmisliti, kako pravzaprav so posamezne države reagirale pri pomembnih stvareh.

Pozivam seveda tudi varuhinjo človekovih pravic, naj nadaljuje s preiskavo o delovanju agencij Evropskih unij, s poudarkom na Agenciji za varnost hrane in Evropski agenciji za kemikalije glede Monsanto in možnih posledic v zvezi s trajnostjo in navzkrižjem interesa. Predvsem pa se mi zdi tudi pomembno glede lobiranja, tukaj registri morajo biti znani, tudi glede žvižgačev, tudi glede invalidov in mislim, da gre za mnoga vprašanja, s katerimi želimo seveda narediti tudi delovanje Evropske Komisije in evropskega ustroja bolj jasno.

Bi pa opozoril še na nekaj, in sicer na nek način na pomen evropske državljanske pobude kot neke bistvene oblike demokracije, ki jo imajo državljani na voljo. Zato mislim, da bi bilo potrebno razmisliti, kako seveda to pobudo narediti čim bolj operativno tudi zato seveda, da ne bi Komisija sama odločala o tem, katere pobude prizna katere ne in mislim, da na tem področju je še veliko prostora za izboljšave, če želimo Evropsko unijo in pa seveda evropske institucije res narediti demokratične in jih približati državljanom.

Eleonora Evi, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, per l'Italia oggi è un giorno importante. È stata approvata la legge proposta dal Movimento 5 Stelle sul *whistleblowing*. Da oggi verrà data nuova linfa alla lotta contro la corruzione e verranno tutelati gli informatori e i testimoni di illeciti nel settore pubblico e privato.

A livello europeo è anche grazie al lavoro instancabile del Mediatore europeo, Emily O'Reilly, che voglio ringraziare, che questa lotta va avanti. E ringrazio anche la relatrice Mizzi. La sua relazione contiene una chiara raccomandazione sulla tutela degli informatori che svolgono un ruolo cruciale nel svelare i casi di cattiva amministrazione e si fa la precisa richiesta di introdurre una normativa sul *whistleblowing* a livello europeo.

Abbiamo di fronte un'ottima relazione. Tuttavia, voglio ribadire due concetti che ho voluto esprimere per mezzo di emendamenti che voteremo domani. Quando parliamo di accesso ai documenti e trasparenza, dobbiamo ricordarci che si tratta di principi basilari su cui costruire la casa delle istituzioni, una casa di vetro. Oggi però non è così, come dimostrano le denunce dei cittadini e le indagini del Mediatore, oggi la regola è l'opacità e la trasparenza è l'eccezione.

Dobbiamo ribaltare questa situazione e far diventare la piena e integrale trasparenza la regola del funzionamento delle istituzioni, dei processi decisionali nei triloghi, delle informazioni relative ai procedimenti di infrazione, dei negoziati commerciali e così via, e solo i dati sensibili e coperti da privacy devono essere oggetto di restrizione e tutela.

Infine, per quanto riguarda il registro per la trasparenza per monitorare le lobby, bene l'impegno a migliorarlo, richiesto dalla relazione, per renderlo obbligatorio e trasparente per le istituzioni e gli organismi dell'UE, ma non basta. Serve un atto legislativo, quindi un regolamento, affinché il registro sia legalmente vincolante non solo per le istituzioni, ma anche per i portatori di interesse. Questo, tra l'altro è esattamente la raccomandazione del Mediatore europeo. Domani votando a favore dei nostri emendamenti, possiamo farla riflettere pienamente nel testo della relazione.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Durch die gute Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Berichterstatterin und den anderen Fraktionen und unserem EVP-Berichterstatter Jarosław Wałęsa ist ein guter Bericht entstanden. An dieser Stelle auch noch mal ein Dankeschön an die Berichterstatterin und an die Schattenberichterstatter. Ich möchte mich auch in diesem Jahr bei unserer Bürgerbeauftragten, Frau O'Reilly, für die gute und vertrauensvolle Zusammenarbeit bedanken und sie zu ihrer guten Arbeit beglückwünschen.

Ich möchte aus Zeitgründen auf zwei Dinge eingehen, die mir wichtig sind. Das Erste: Sie haben das selber gesagt, Frau O'Reilly: Sie erarbeiten eine *fast procedure*. Wenn Sie da eine gute Lösung haben, sind wir auch selber daran interessiert. Mir als Mitglied des Petitionsausschusses dauert es manchmal auch zu lange, bis unsere Petenten eine Antwort bekommen. Wenn Sie hier den Stein der Weisen gefunden haben, bitte informieren Sie uns, dann können wir auch dort zusammenarbeiten.

Das nächste Problemfeld ist schon mehrfach genannt worden: Transparenz. Da wende ich mich noch einmal an meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen vom Petitionsausschuss: Hier müssen wir alle gemeinsam noch mal nacharbeiten, wie man so schön sagt: Alle hinsetzen ohne Schaum vorm Mund, ohne ideologische Vorurteile! Vielleicht würde es uns hier viel, viel einfacher fallen, wenn wir zunächst einmal die Grenzen formulieren, und dann könnten wir das große Feld der Transparenz gemeinsam beackern.

Wir werden morgen – das ist ein kleiner Mangel – auch im Abstimmungsverhalten auf dem Feld der Transparenz dann die Unterschiede feststellen. Aber noch mal mein Appell an alle: Bei der Transparenz haben wir alle noch mal Hausaufgaben zu erledigen. Aber ich habe auch in den Zwischentönen erkannt, auch von meiner Kollegin Evi, dass sie womöglich in die gleiche Richtung denkt. Transparenz ist wichtig und gut, aber es gibt auch Grenzen.

In dem Sinne freue ich mich auf die weitere gute Zusammenarbeit.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Mediatore è una di quelle figure che, così come la nostra commissione, avvicinano davvero i cittadini alle istituzioni, facendo di queste non lontane e grigie realtà burocratiche, ma comunità di persone che lavorano per il benessere e per la protezione di ogni cittadino europeo.

Il Mediatore ci richiama al rispetto delle regole, è uno degli strumenti che consentano alle istituzioni dell'Unione di migliorare la qualità dei propri servizi. Uno degli elementi chiave della democrazia è proprio il principio della buona amministrazione sancito dalla Carta dei diritti dell'Unione europea.

Nel 2016 — mi piace ricordare questi dati riportati proprio dalla nostra commissione – oltre 15 700 cittadini sono stati assistiti dal Mediatore europeo, 12 000 persone hanno ottenuto consigli attraverso la guida interattiva presente sul sito web, oltre 1 200 i casi degli uffici del Mediatore che hanno provveduto ad inoltrare informazioni e segnalazioni che sono state trattate come denunce.

Numeri significativi come i temi trattati nelle iniziative strategiche che il Mediatore ha pubblicato. Facciamo qualche esempio: l'esigenza di una maggiore trasparenza in negoziati controversi, come ad esempio il TTIP, l'attuazione della Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti delle persone con disabilità, la trasparenza del Fondo asilo, migrazione e integrazione.

Allora, io mi congratulo per questa relazione che dà atto di tutto questo al Mediatore e che ne riconosce il ruolo e l'alto valore, un ruolo che dobbiamo custodire.

Arne Gericke (ECR). – Herr Präsident, liebe Frau O'Reilly! „Ich möchte die EU-Institutionen dabei unterstützen, effektiver, transparenter und verantwortlicher zu werden, indem ich das Profil des Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten strategisch verstärke.“ So haben Sie Ihr Ziel im Juni 2014 selbst formuliert.

Sie haben Ihre Arbeit sehr gut gemacht. Europa braucht Lautsprecher wie Sie, um die Stimme der Bürger zu verstärken. Sie werden aktiv bei unfairer Behandlung durch EU-Behörden, bei Problemen mit EU-Ausschreibungen und verspäteten Zahlungen, bei verweigertem Zugang zu EU-Dokumenten und ausbleibenden Antworten sowie bei angemessenen oder nicht veröffentlichten Lobbyaktivitäten.

Ich selbst habe hier im Haus schon mal den legislativen Fußabdruck für alle Europaabgeordneten gefordert und danke Ihnen auch deshalb für ihren Leitfaden im Umgang mit Lobbyisten. Er sollte auch bei jedem von uns auf dem Schreibtisch liegen.

Last but not least: Geben Sie mit Ihrem Sitz hier im Haus auch der europäischen Bürgerhauptstadt Straßburg ein Gesicht – ein Gesicht, das ich mir beim Europäischen Parlament am *single seat* Straßburg genauso wünschen würde.

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, tugann oifig an Ombudsman Eorpaigh guth do ghnáthdhaoine agus molaím go hard í. Ach má táimid dáiríre mar gheall ar Eoraip Shóisialta a chur i gcrích, ba chóir dúinn an tOmbudsman Eorpach a fheiceáil mar dhroichead i dtreo na físe sin. Léiríonn na riachtanais ró-iomarcacha riaracháin a theastaíonn ó na gníomhaireachtaí Eorpacha an easpa cumarsáide, ceangail agus tuisceana atá ann idir maorlathas na hEorpa agus na Ballstáit, agus gnáthmhuintir na hEorpa.

Tá pobail agus comhlachtaí in Éirinn fós ag fulaingt de bharr easpa airgid agus de dheasca an riaracháin iomarcaigh seo – Leader mar shampla. In 2011, thug saoránach Éireannach a cás chuig an Ombudsman maidir le rochtain ar channabas míochaine dá hiníon. Agus cé go bhfuil sé lasmuigh d'imscrúdú an Ombudsmain, is ceist an-mhór rochtain ar chúram sláinte do shaoránaigh na hEorpa, go háirithe nuair atá cearta difriúla ag saoránaigh, ag brath ar an mBallstát ina bhfuil siad.

Tá cailín óg Éireannach, Ava Twomey, scartha óna clann faoi láthair agus ina cónaí san Ísiltír, áit ina bhfuil rochtain ar an gcannabas míochaine seo atá ag teastáil uathí. Tá éagóir ollmhór á déanamh ar an gcailín seo agus ar a clann. Agus arís is gnáthshaoránaigh phobail agus comhlachtaí atá ag fulaingt.

Úsáidimis an tOmbudsman chun cabhrú réiteach na bhfadhbanna seo a aimsiú.

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. formand! Tak til ombudsmanden for et fremragende arbejde. Det er rigtigt godt at høre den store støtte, der er til, at vi skal have det, som jeg tror er nøglen for EU til at få bekæmpet det såkaldte demokratiske underskud, nemlig åbenhed i Rådet. Sådan som det er nu, kan Rådet operere helt i lukkethed, og de nationale parlamenter aner ikke, hvad deres regeringer laver. Heller ikke den nationale presse kan følge med. Derfor bliver det fortsat oplevet som en fjern og utilgængelig institution, og det rammer os alle sammen. Derfor var det meget løfterigt at høre både fra dig, Emily O'Reilly, og fra Frans Timmermans, at dette nu skal være i centrum, og jeg håber, at vi kan holde tyskerne lidt på afstand. De er ret bange for åbenhed, har jeg lagt mærke til. Det er helt afgørende!

Forestil jer, at vi havde haft åbenhed omkring Paradise Papers, så man kunne høre, hvilke lande det er, der faktisk holder hånden over skatteunddragelse. Så havde vi kunnet skabe troværdighed om dette her. Det ville være en enorm gevinst for os alle sammen. Jeg synes, vi skal være meget konkrete, så man kan se, hvilken gevinst det vil være også i de nationale debatter. Hvis lukketheden i Rådet meget hurtigt bliver fortid – og jeg er meget optimistisk efter at have hørt jer i dag – så vil det give en alletiders chance for reel demokratisk deltagelse i den fælles beslutningsproces. Lad mig til slut blot nævne to ting meget kort: Vi skal have statutten ændret, så ombudsmanden har adgang til selv at undersøge opfyldelsen af 1049, og så skal vi have hele konceptet med god forvaltning rigtigt ind i lovgivningen og ikke bare som bløde formuleringer. Vi skal have åbenhed fastsat ved lov, også med hensyn til interessekonflikter.

Edouard Martin (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Médiatrice, avant de vous interpellier sur un sujet grave, je veux, moi aussi, vous féliciter pour l'excellence de votre travail et vous en remercier.

Lors de la dernière session, ici, nous avons voté une résolution extrêmement importante sur les moyens que se donnera le Parlement européen pour mieux lutter contre le harcèlement sexuel. J'imagine que vous avez assisté comme nous, atterrée, à ce scandale qui secoue l'ensemble de la société concernant les faits de harcèlement et d'agression sexuelle.

Malheureusement, je le dis et je vais répéter, je ne dis pas que ce Parlement est bourré de harceleurs et bourré de harcelés, mais néanmoins ce phénomène existe et, malgré le vote de cette résolution de qualité, je sens déjà les freins et les résistances en interne, y compris de la part de l'administration. Nous avons précisément besoin, ici, de cette excellence et de cette objectivité qui est la vôtre.

Par conséquent, pourriez-vous nous aider à faire ce travail d'étude, d'enquête, d'analyse et de prospective, non pas pour juger le Parlement européen, mais surtout pour nous aider à nous améliorer, pour nous aider à être meilleurs? Nous avons déjà, il est vrai, le mérite d'avoir un comité anti-harcèlement, mais je trouve qu'il n'est pas approprié au harcèlement sexuel.

Par conséquent, nous avons besoin de votre regard et – je vous interpelle – j'aimerais que vous puissiez aussi nous aider à faire ce travail.

Dans les prochains jours, je me permettrai de vous envoyer un courriel pour vous donner quelques éléments d'analyse et je me tiendrai évidemment à votre disposition si vous le jugez utile. Mais, de grâce, faites-nous aussi part de cette excellence et de ce travail remarquable que vous faites pour que nous soyons, demain, encore meilleurs.

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, let me add my thanks to the Ombudsman and her officials for their work in this past year. I want to raise the 'B' word at this point in the debate, and I hope colleagues will forgive me, because that process – whatever views we take on it, and I deeply regret the course that history appears to be taking – must carry public confidence and legitimacy. Fundamental to securing that public confidence and legitimacy will be transparency and the ability of citizens in the UK and other Member States to have access to the right information to shape their views as this process unfolds. That will, of course, happen through democratic institutions like this Parliament and, indeed, in the House of Commons in the UK.

Democratic legitimacy in the Brexit process did not end on 23 June last year. In many ways, that has to be the start of democratic legitimacy and scrutiny of what is happening. So, without further delay, the UK Government should publish the sector impact statements on Brexit. I also ask the Ombudsman in this coming year to give particular focus to ensuring that the highest levels of transparency are secured throughout the Brexit process in order to give citizens in all our Member States the right to make their own judgments about what is happening.

I specifically ask the Ombudsman to consider releasing specific resources in her good offices to support that and to make sure that the highest levels – I stress the highest levels – of transparency and democratic legitimacy are heard and realised all the way through what will be a difficult and challenging process for all of us.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to focus on a very important aspect of the European Ombudsman's work, which many of my colleagues have already mentioned, namely the so-called revolving door phenomenon. This refers to a situation in which an industry sends its people to a government position in order to gain political support for their private firms and, in the other direction, in which industry hires people from an EU institution in order to gain access to officials and federal legislation, as well as to get inside information on what is going on in EU institutions.

The Transparency International report 'Access All Areas' finds that 15 out of 27 Commissioners who completed their mandates in 2014 entered employment with organisations on the EU lobby register at the end of their 18-month cooling-off period. The bright example is, of course, José Manuel Barroso, who was President of the Commission until 2014 and who became Chairman of Goldman Sachs International for the bank's UK and European operations.

I think the Ombudsman should pay more attention to the revolving door phenomenon in the European Union. The Ombudsman should insist on the creation of an independent ethics body which would decide which professional activities are subject to a conflict of interests and continue her work to ensure publication of the names of all EU officials involved in revolving door cases.

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Rzecznik! Panie Przewodniczący Timmermans! Niech mi będzie wolno najpierw pogratulować pani sprawozdawczyni, pani Marlene Mizzi jej sprawozdania, choć muszę przyznać, że pracy nie miała aż tak bardzo skomplikowanej, dlatego że materia sama się broniła. Sposób funkcjonowania i to, co pani rzecznik mogła złożyć, to jest przedmiot dobrego sprawozdania. Chciałbym tutaj przyznać, iż jestem być może nielicznym na tej sali, który odnotowuje wieloletnią współpracę z panią rzecznik. Spotykaliśmy się wcześniej jeszcze z kolegium kwestorów Parlamentu Europejskiego i wtedy rozstrzygaliśmy nawet sprawy, o których przed chwilą tu pan poseł Martin mówił, czyli chociażby kwestię molestowania (powstał specjalny komitet rozpatrujący skargi dotyczące molestowania w Parlamencie Europejskim). Natomiast pani rzecznik zawsze prezentowała po pierwsze takie podejście: mamy służyć obywatelom, czyli odpowiadać na potrzeby ludzi, żeby się tu znalazło, to czego ludzie potrzebują. Pamiętajmy, że pojęcie przezroczystości czy transparentności ewoluje. Inaczej pięć lat temu to rozumieliśmy, trochę inaczej teraz, więc tutaj doceniam to, że pani rzecznik zawsze była zorientowana na bieżące potrzeby. Trzy obszary, o których pani powiedziała, tj. niedostatki współpracy, czyli Rada Europejska, trojka i *fake news*. To są obszary, na których – myślę – powinniśmy skoncentrować naszą współpracę i tu będziemy wdzięczni za kontakt, aby razem zrealizować skuteczne przedsięwzięcie.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, the European institutions are complex, intertwined organisations that can – to many citizens – seem impenetrable and faceless. As a result, we are often misunderstood by those we aim to serve. Now with the chaotic Brexit negotiations, the rights of so many UK and EU citizens are in the balance. The continued drive of the European Ombudsman towards better transparency, communication and working practice in response to citizens' concerns about the institutions and bodies of the European Union is particularly crucial during difficult times such as these.

Our European organisations must be continually shaped by the feedback of our citizens, and there must be more opportunities for young people and children to participate meaningfully in our institutional workings and to offer up opinions about the decisions that will affect them. In that respect, I would like to recommend the work of the children's ombudsman in Poland, whom I recently met and who is certainly following best practice in his department and across the country.

I am particularly pleased that you, the Ombudsman here in Europe, have been making inquiries into complaints by persons with disabilities. It is gratifying to hear the work that they have been carrying out as an independent mechanism to protect and implement the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities so that everybody may access, engage and question the institutions in order to make our practices align better with our principles.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Vicepresidente Timmermans, io desidero ringraziare innanzitutto l'onorevole Mizzi per l'ottima relazione che affronta i punti fondamentali dell'attività svolta del Mediatore europeo, signora O'Reilly, che pure ringrazio per la presentazione del rapporto annuale 2016.

Nel rapporto viene posto l'accento sui diversi aspetti dell'attività della pubblica amministrazione, sottolineando come l'operato delle istituzioni pubbliche debba essere sempre improntato ad alti standard di correttezza e trasparenza nei processi decisionali e questo nell'interesse dei cittadini.

La collaborazione del Mediatore con il Parlamento è stata ed è di fondamentale importanza per accrescere anche la trasparenza del nostro stesso lavoro. I progressi realizzati, attraverso le raccomandazioni del Mediatore, da parte delle istituzioni europee hanno una particolare valenza anche perché costituiscono un segnale importante in termini di prevenzione e rispetto a situazioni di cattiva amministrazione.

Occorre quindi proseguire secondo la linea tracciata dal Mediatore, il cui lavoro è indispensabile non solo per rendere giustizia ai cittadini che lamentano casi di cattiva amministrazione, ma anche e soprattutto per restituire a tutti i cittadini la giusta fiducia nelle istituzioni europee.

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση ζητεί διαφάνεια. Η έλλειψή της χαρακτηρίζει πολλούς θεσμούς της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Ακόμη και το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο είναι στην τέταρτη θέση των θεσμικών οργάνων που ερευνώνται και, ναι, σε μερικές περιπτώσεις η έλλειψη διαφάνειας είναι σκόπιμη.

Ακόμα κι εμείς οι ευρωβουλευτές και οι συνεργάτες μας πέφτουμε θύματα της γραφειοκρατίας. Ρωτάμε καμιά φορά τις υπηρεσίες στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο: είναι νόμιμα αυτά που μας ζητάτε; Ποιος κανονισμός το λέει; Μπορούμε να τον διαβάσουμε και εμείς; Τον ερμηνεύετε σωστά; Και η απάντηση είναι: το λέμε εμείς και αυτό αρκεί. Και έτσι, η γραφειοκρατία της υπηρεσίας του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου αποκτά εξουσία μεγαλύτερη από αυτήν που έχει το μόνο εκλεγμένο όργανο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η κ. Ο' Reilly, εκ της θέσεως του Ευρωπαίου Διαμεσολαβητή, ακολουθεί με τις παρεμβάσεις της τις αρχές του μέτρου και της αναλογικότητας πλήρως και αποκλειστικά κατ' εφαρμογή των αρμοδιοτήτων που της έχουν αποδοθεί. Όμως, η εφαρμογή αρκετών συστάσεων εκκρεμεί, η υιοθέτηση του κώδικα ορθής διοικητικής συμπεριφοράς είναι ελλιπής, το Μητρώο Διαφάνειας δεν είναι πρακτικά δεσμευτικό, οι συναντήσεις δημόσιου ενδιαφέροντος του προέδρου της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας δεν δημοσιοποιούνται και χαρακτηριστικά αδιαφάνειας εντοπίζονται στις διαπραγματεύσεις και τη διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων της Ένωσης στο σύνολό της.

Προφανώς, η αδιαφάνεια, η έλλειψη δεοντολογίας και η μη ικανοποιητική διαχείριση των συγκρούσεων συμφερόντων είναι εγγενής και συστημική στα θεσμικά όργανα της Ένωσης. Δυστυχώς, η αποφασιστικότητα, η εγρήγορση και η εμπειρία της δεν επαρκούν ως μόνα εχέγγυα για την πλήρη διερεύνηση των υποθέσεων και την προστασία των ευρωπαίων πολιτών από τις περιπτώσεις κακοδιοίκησης.

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, let me repeat what I said earlier, I have to say the Spanish translation of ombudsman is the one that appeals most to me 'defensor del pueblo', which is a very nice expression of this function.

I want to conclude by expressing once again my gratitude to Ms O'Reilly for her constructive approach and the consistently good cooperation between the Commission, the Ombudsman and her office.

The Commission has also greatly appreciated the launch in 2016 by the Ombudsman of an award for good administration. This 'name-and-congratulate' exercise is very rewarding for all those EU officials who are doing their utmost to serve citizens and the general EU interest.

I reiterate my call for delivering real change on lobbying transparency in all three institutions. Citizens have the right to know who is trying to influence the legislative process. So we need a mandatory transparency register, not just a voluntary one. We should not miss the opportunity to deliver this before the next European elections.

Let me be very clear about some apparent misunderstandings. The onus will not be on MEPs. The onus will be on the lobbyists to register, not on the MEPs they see. This will in no way limit the possibilities of MEPs to see their voters. We are talking about people who represent specific interests in lobbying when we are making legislation.

This could perhaps take away some of the worries that I have registered, because transparency and trust are essential in public institutions, certainly at the European level where the distance with our citizens is too big. But also, more generally, society needs more transparency and trust in public institutions.

Strengthening the protection of whistle-blowers is an essential aspect of this.

Following the public consultation, the Commission continues to assess the scope for further EU action and we will finalise this work in the first part of 2018.

Once again, a big thank-you to Ms O'Reilly.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA*varapuhemies*

Emily O'Reilly, *Ombudsman*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for all of their comments and observations, but most of all for their support for the work that I do. We are a very small office with just 80 people, but we have a big mandate and I rely on Parliament, as a big institution, to support me. It is wonderfully gratifying to get the support from right across the Chamber and I deeply appreciate it. I thank Ms Mizzi again for the report that she has done, which has also received such support among colleagues.

A number of very interesting issues have been raised which we will follow up in the days and weeks ahead. Just briefly, as we have gone round Parliament today and over this week, a lot of us have seen some of the big billboards in relation to harassment, reminding people about appropriate workplace behaviour and this is something that I have been discussing with my colleagues. We have obviously taken complaints in the past and can continue to take complaints in relation to this, but we have had very few over the years. I think it needs a deeper conversation in relation to that and I am very happy to be part of that.

On Brexit, in relation to transparency, we started working on this particular issue as soon as the referendum was over. Obviously it is not for me or any of us to tell Member States what to do in relation to the release of important documents vis-à-vis citizens, and perhaps particularly those in the UK, but what I have done is to have discussions with the Member State Ombudsmen and Information Commissioners, including the UK Information Commissioner, to remind them that if they cannot get records from their own Member State, there is always the possibility of seeking to get them from an EU institution that may also hold them.

There has obviously been a lot of talk about revolving doors. We have been very busy with that over the last number of years. In relation to the Commission and the Code of Conduct, we have conducted an investigation into that and we are expecting a response from the Commission in relation to that, though I do acknowledge the proposals that have already been made by the Commission in relation to that.

A number of people mentioned limits to transparency. Yes, of course, when I talk about transparency, I am not talking about transparency at any cost. We are always talking about the appropriate release of documents in the public interest and that has to be the guiding value.

Somebody said that my office, the office of the European Ombudsman, is a mirror for the functioning of the EU and I think that is a wonderful way of describing it. In fact it describes Parliament as well because what we all do is show back to the institutions the actual impact of the laws and the regulations that are passed here.

So thank you very much indeed for your support and your comments, which I will follow up on and thank you, again, Ms Mizzi.

(Applause)

Marlene Mizzi, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I would like to thank everyone for their contributions to this debate, and in particular the shadows and to the European Commission as well as my assistant Desislava Dimitrova and the secretariat of the Committee on Petitions (PETI). It is safe to say that we have a very positive attitude for this year's Report on the Activities of the European Ombudsman and that we all appreciate the important work done by Ms O'Reilly and her team.

The PETI Committee supports you and your work, Ms O'Reilly, and I am sure that the European Parliament and the Ombudsman will continue to work very closely towards the successful implementation of the Ombudsman's recommendations emanating from this year's annual report.

We are on the right path, and that should be the conclusion of this journey. But let's not fool ourselves. The EU has still to strive to achieve the highest level of accountability and transparency.

Maintaining citizens' trust in the EU institutions, especially at a time of a great scepticism regarding the Union project, must be our ultimate goal. We can start building this trust by guaranteeing citizens the right to the highest standards of public administration.

We all have an obligation to represent European citizens in everything we do. We need to commit to improving the way in which the EU administration works, placing citizens at its heart, making sure that we work more transparently, that we are more accountable and that we react immediately when the highest standards are not met.

Regulation (EC) No 1049/200 needs to be revised so that we can facilitate the Ombudsman's work in scrutinising the granting of access to documents by Parliament, the Council and the Commission. We also need to ensure that the European administration follows up on, and implements, the recommendations of the European Ombudsman within a reasonable time frame.

I say to Ms O'Reilly that I look forward to working closely with you, and I am sure that you will maintain your strong dedication to improving the quality of the European administration in answering enquiries and complaints from European citizens. It is in all our interests to make sure that your work is a success story.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Pál Csáky (PPE), írásban. – A témát felkaroló szakbizottság, a Petíciós Bizottság (PETI) alelnökeként üdvözlöm az európai ombudsman tavalyi tevékenységéről szóló jelentését. Fontosnak tartom, hogy az ombudsman munkájának összefoglalása egyszerűen elérhető, érthető nyelven fogalmazódott meg, és az ombudsman hivatala minden hivatalos uniós nyelven közzétette.

Elmondható, hogy eredményes évet zárt tavaly az ombudsman, és ennek az uniós polgárok, de mi, parlamenti képviselők is részesei lehetünk. A hatékonyságot tükrözi, hogy az ombudsmani vizsgálatokat követően kiadott határozatok és ajánlások végrehajtási aránya magas szintet ért el. A PETI bizottságban nyomon követjük az ombudsman munkáját és eszmecserét folytatunk a közös témákat illetően, ezzel járulunk hozzá az aktuálisan felmerülő intézményi működési kérdések megoldásához.

A parlamenti jelentés ismételten megállapítja, hogy az előrelépések ellenére marad javítani való az ombudsman hatáskörébe tartozó témák terén. Itt emelném ki az Európai Bizottság és a Petíciós Bizottság közötti együttműködés továbbfejlesztésének szükségességét, beleértve azon EU Pilot és kötelezettségsegzési eljárásokról szóló tájékoztatást, amelyek petíciókból indultak ki. Számomra különösen fontos az európai polgári kezdeményezés felülvizsgálata, egyetérték a parlamenti előadóval, hogy ez egy olyan kulcsfontosságú eljárás, amelynek eredményessége és ezen uniós polgári jog teljes érvényesülése csak úgy biztosítható, ha a Bizottság figyelembe veszi az érintettek, és ezen belül a Parlament javaslatát is.

Rosa Estaràs Ferragut (PPE), por escrito. – Me sumo al compromiso que desde el inicio de la legislatura lleva mostrando la defensora del Pueblo en su defensa de los derechos de las personas con discapacidad. En este sentido cabe destacar el refuerzo de este compromiso durante 2016 con la puesta en marcha de una iniciativa estratégica para la aplicación de la Convención de las Naciones Unidas sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad. Animo a que siga trabajando activamente tanto en la aplicación de la Convención como de la Estrategia Europea sobre Discapacidad. Felicito a la defensora por la puesta en marcha de la iniciativa en el marco de la Convención, sobre la accesibilidad de los sitios web y herramientas en línea gestionada por la Comisión para una mejora del acceso de las personas con discapacidad a la administración pública de la UE. Es importante que la defensora no cese en su empeño de seguir investigando las denuncias presentadas por personas con discapacidad. La defensora del Pueblo Europeo debe proteger los derechos de las personas con discapacidad y garantizar que la administración de la Unión sea consciente de sus responsabilidades con respecto a estos derechos.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), na piśmie. – W 2016 r. urząd Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich pomógł ponad 15 797 obywatelom, z czego 12 646 spraw rozstrzygnięto poprzez udzielenie porady za pośrednictwem interaktywnego przewodnika, który znajduje się na stronie Rzecznika, a pozostałe 1880 wniosków jako skargi i 1271 jako wnioski o informacje, na które odpowiedzi udzieliły służby Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich. Zostało wszczętych 245 dochodzeń, w tym 235 na podstawie skarg, a 10 z inicjatywy własnej, zamkniętych zostało 291 dochodzeń (278 na podstawie skarg, a 13 z inicjatywy własnej). Cieszy mnie znaczny spadek liczby dochodzeń dotyczących instytucji europejskich, które były prowadzone przez Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich w 2016 r. (245 w 2016 r. w porównaniu z 261 w 2015 r.). Życząc kolejnych sukcesów Pani Rzecznik

Emily O'Reilly, mam nadzieję, że instytucja Europejskiego Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich nie ustanie w usprawnianiu swych działań na rzecz gwarancji pełnego korzystania przez obywateli UE z przysługujących im praw oraz że instytucje i agencje unijne będą dalej pracować na rzecz udoskonalenia szybkiego reagowania na krytyczne uwagi Rzecznika oraz poprawią swoje wskaźniki zgodności z jego zaleceniami.

21. Composition of committees : see Minutes

22. Composition of Parliament : see Minutes

23. Environmental Implementation Review (EIR) (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana keskustelu

— Sirpa Pietikäisen, Simona Bonafè, Mark Demesmaekerin, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandyn, Luke Ming Flanaganin ja Benedek Jávorin ympäristön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunnan puolesta neuvostolle laatimasta suullisesti vastattavasta kysymyksestä ympäristölainsäädännön täytäntöönpanon arvioinnista (O-000065/2017 - B8-0606/2017 ja

— Sirpa Pietikäisen, Simona Bonafè, Mark Demesmaekerin, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandyn, Luke Ming Flanaganin ja Benedek Jávorin ympäristön, kansanterveyden ja elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden valiokunnan puolesta komissiolle laatimasta suullisesti vastattavasta kysymyksestä ympäristölainsäädännön täytäntöönpanon arvioinnista (O-000066/2017 - B8-0607/2017.

Benedek Jávor, author. – Madam President, in February this year the Commission published its first edition of the Environmental Implementation Review (EIR) to give an overview of the implementation of EU environmental law in each Member State. The 28 country reports are accompanied by a summary document listing the common challenges, such as waste management, nature and biodiversity protection, air quality, noise pollution, water quality and management, to identify the root causes of problems, and providing policy proposals and recommendations for improvement.

I would like to stress that the EIR is a soft tool to shed light on implementation gaps, challenges and problems. In this sense it is a key to providing an early warning for the national and sub-national level policymakers which can take corrective actions and address the gaps in time. The EIR also aims to demonstrate success stories that can serve as an example for other Member States. The recently launched peer-to-peer tool facilitates this kind of exchange of knowledge or best practices. The exercise is to be repeated every two years, offering the possibility for iterative changes and improvements.

We, Members of the European Parliament, welcome the EIR and believe that this new review mechanism as a whole has the potential to improve compliance and policy implementation and thus also contribute to greater transparency and the credibility of the EU.

Yet, in order to fully realise this potential, we believe that the process could be further improved, including by broadening the scope of the review, as also expressed in the motion for a resolution adopted in October in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. There is also a need for targeted assistance to the Member States to overcome the barriers of proper, effective implementation, such as ineffective governance, inappropriate institutional framework, lack of capacity and an unclear responsibility of the authorities. My co-sponsors of the motion for a resolution and oral question – Ms Pietikäinen, Ms Bonafè, Mr Demesmaeker, Mr Gerbrandy, Mr Flanagan –and I tabled on behalf of the Environment Committee the following questions, first to the Council, regarding the EIR.

Parliament wishes to highlight the need to address the root causes, in particular lack of policy coherence and insufficient financing. The same goes for covering additional issues in the coming review cycles such as climate change, chemicals regulations, industrial emissions and other systemic challenges linked, for example, to energy, transport and regional policies.

In order to demonstrate clear, strong political commitment, the Council could hold regular meetings dedicated to the implementation of EU environmental law which could facilitate monitoring the performance and progress of a Member State and ensure structured implementation dialogues as proposed by the Commission. For the latter, Member States should pay due attention to ensuring transparency and broad stakeholder participation.

In addition, we would see added value in joint Council meetings to address the implementation of cross-cutting issues and also the environmental challenges of a cross-border nature. We would also like to ask the Commission this oral question and we raise some concerns about the exact means of following up on the policy proposals and recommendations for better implementation put forward by the Commission.

There are issues to be solved linked to data availability and comparability, especially in the context of the next review cycles that would hopefully run with a wider scope. We would like to hear the Commission's views on how the EIR framework could be used as a means of assessing the implementation of the relevant Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the 2030 Agenda and, in general, of shifting from the current sectoral approaches to a coherent, consistent and holistic solution.

We put on the table tools, including a publicly available scoreboard to monitor the performance and progress of each Member State and to improve transparency and raise public awareness and ensure proper public participation in each Member State.

Last but not least, we would like to better understand the linkage between the EIR process and the infringements and, in general, the exact actions taken by the Commission in the event of non-compliance.

Matti Maasikas, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank Parliament for the interest it is taking, through this question and its resolution, in the new environmental implementation review initiative. I can confirm that this interest is fully shared by the Council.

In terms of addressing implementation gaps in EU environmental legislation and policy, this initiative has a high potential. In addition to contributing to the environment ministers' input into the European Semester, the environmental implementation review process is meant to become a distinct and consistent process. It would involve several important elements: the preparation of environmental implementation review country reports and bilateral discussions with the Member States, as well as the identification of common issues and their discussion in the Environmental Council.

On 28 February 2017, the Environment Council held its latest exchange of views on greening the European Semester. The economic system depends largely on the availability and sustainable use of limited natural resources. Keeping this in mind, greening the economy and advancing the transition towards a resource efficient circular economy becomes essential to secure future competitiveness and long-term sustainable and inclusive growth.

In this context, Ministers also discussed the Commission's communication on the EU environmental implementation review. They welcomed this initiative as a useful tool to help improve implementation of EU environmental policy and legislation at national level and contribute to the greening of the European Semester.

In doing this, they underlined the need for national findings to be based on sound scientific data. Ministers also welcomed the opportunity for Member States to engage in dialogue and cooperation with the Commission and among themselves, peer to peer, with the aim of reflecting on their respective priorities, addressing common challenges and sharing best practices.

As regards the specific questions that you have raised at this early stage of the environmental implementation review process, I would like to limit myself to the following comments. We agree with the identified root causes of the implementation gaps and we are willing to address them further.

It is to be expected that the different strands of the implementation process of the environmental implementation review, and in particular the dialogue with the Member States on the basis of the country reports, will allow us to carry out a structured dialogue in Council.

Member States are generally responding positively to the environmental implementation review process. Bilateral dialogues have already taken place in five countries since March this year. These countries are Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Luxembourg and Slovakia.

I also encourage other countries to organise action-oriented country dialogues and to hold forward-looking debates on environmental challenges. I trust that these dialogues will be inclusive and that the relevant stakeholders get an opportunity to contribute as appropriate.

The current environmental implementation review cycle is already very ambitious and covers a large number of complex and very significant areas. In terms of broadening the scope of the environmental implementation review to other policy areas in the future, we find it essential that environmental challenges are tackled in a comprehensive manner and that all relevant policies are taken into account.

The real added value of the environmental implementation review will come from in-depth impartial analysis. However, if broadening the scope is considered, due attention should be given to avoiding a disproportionate administrative burden.

As regards the involvement of the Council – although I cannot speak on behalf of future presidencies – currently, the idea is to bring the structural problems and common challenges identified in the course of the two-year period to the attention of the Council. The Council would then discuss environmental implementation review-related issues at regular intervals in line with the cycle, also ensuring complementarity with the discussion on the greening of the European Semester and the relevant post-2020 strategies.

Lastly, in many areas environmental policy is interlinked with other domains. In addressing the cross-cutting issues, we should avoid working in silos and ensure that all relevant parties are involved in discussions. The respective dialogues should not be held at Council level only, but start from expert groups and other working formations. Hence the effort of engaging colleagues from other policy areas is welcome at all levels in order to achieve a coordinated and informed outcome.

I thank Parliament once again for these questions.

Phil Hogan, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I want to say how glad I am to take this point on behalf of Commissioner Vella. Commissioner Vella wishes to thank the author and all of the people involved in the interest in the environmental implementation review (EIR) and for your support for this important initiative.

The EIR puts implementation in a broader context with a view to finding practical solutions by looking at integration with other sectors and by identifying possible root causes for implementation challenges. This helps to improve the knowledge and sharing of good practice.

The main goal of the EIR was to draw attention to the need for improved implementation in order to attain the European Union's environmental objectives. The environmental targets and deadlines which need to be achieved by the Member States are included in the legal obligations set out in the environmental acquis and are being monitored per directive and regulation.

The EIR encourages cooperation, dialogue and the search for solutions involving a wide range of stakeholders at national level. It is not feasible, but neither is it the Commission's intention, to rely on a name-and-shame exercise. This could, at any rate, jeopardise the achievement of goals. The Commission has included in the country reports both good practices and good examples, as well as implementation challenges. The data used in the country reports are comparable.

The Commission's ongoing initiative in streamlining reporting requirements in EU environmental law is expected to improve the quality and completeness of the data significantly.

The EIR takes a holistic approach, reflecting the spirit of the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Commission is taking steps to ensure that the second review cycle will be even more comprehensive by including chemicals, industrial emissions and the implementation of climate change policies. The nexus with climate change and other policies will also be developed as much as possible.

The Commission encourages Member States to organise national dialogues under the EIR in a cross-sectoral approach. The first five countries' dialogues succeeded in doing so, and further dialogues are being planned.

The Commission has also asked Member States to involve all relevant stakeholders during their country dialogues. We firmly believe that discussions will result in tailored solutions and mount some pressure to fill in the implementation gaps that are identified in the EIR reports.

The EIR inspires learning from good practice. On 7 September 2017, the Commission launched a peer-to-peer tool with the Committee of the Regions. It is intended to support concretely the Member States at all administrative levels to share experience and expertise. This will lead to a database of good practices.

The EIR has not changed the Commission's policy as regards infringements, and there is no formal relationship between the voluntary approach and the legal procedures. In most cases, the infringement procedures will run in parallel where necessary. However, if the EIR succeeds over time in improving implementation, as is expected, fewer infringement procedures will be needed and, therefore, fewer resources will have to be spent on legal proceedings, and we should have enhanced environmental protection due to upstream and systematic solutions.

I wish to conclude by thanking the author and all of the people that have been involved in drawing up this report.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Commissaris Hogan, de Europese Unie heeft een sterke milieuwetgeving, uitgaand van het voorzorgsbeginsel. Onze ondernemers, boeren, wildbeheerders, overheden en burgers worden gehouden aan de sterkste eisen. Deze evaluatie toont aan dat de uitvoering door de EU-lidstaten, provincies, regio's en lokale overheden sterk uiteenloopt. Helaas neemt de ene lidstaat een loopje met de milieuwetgeving en is de andere lidstaat onnodig streng in bepaalde dossiers, terwijl diezelfde lidstaat andere milieuwetgeving weer aan zijn laars lapt.

Ik betreur het dat de waterkwaliteit en medicijnresten in het water te weinig aandacht krijgen in deze rapportage. Ook de inzet van grondeigenaren en provincies voor de verbeterde uitvoering van Natura 2000 mis ik. Boeren moeten opkrassen vanwege stikstofneerslag op natuurgebieden, eeuwenoude familiebedrijven moeten in Twente worden verplaatst. Maar hoe gaan we om met andere sectoren? Hoe anders gaan lidstaten als Nederland om met belangen van het grote geld, met olie- en gaswinning? Daar wil ik het over hebben. In de regio Twente in Overijssel wordt vervuild afvalwater van de oliewinning geloosd onder drinkwater- en Natura 2000-gebieden. Dit is toch de wereld op zijn kop. Uw reactie op mijn schriftelijke vragen was vorig jaar helder. Op grond van artikel 12 van de afvalstoffenrichtlijn moeten de lidstaten ervoor zorgen dat dergelijke lozingen (afvalverwijderingshandelingen) geen gevaar opleveren voor de volksgezondheid en zonder risico voor bodem en water zijn. De Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij en de rijksoverheid weigeren echter al jaren om afvalwater te laten zuiveren voorafgaand aan lozingen in de ondergrond van kwetsbare waterwin- en natuurgebieden. Dit terwijl hiervoor goede zuiveringstechnieken bestaan. Het is daarom de hoogste tijd dat de Europese Commissie in Nederland proactief ingrijpt, met alle juridische middelen waarover zij beschikt, in het belang van onze inwoners, onze omgeving en zeker ook de boeren die daar volop goed aan de slag zijn. Dank u wel.

Simona Bonafè, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se c'è un settore nel quale l'Unione europea è all'avanguardia nel mondo questo è proprio la tutela ambientale, e quindi le normative che ci siamo dati per la qualità dell'aria, la salubrità delle acque, la gestione ottimale dei rifiuti, e potrei andare avanti.

Però non dobbiamo solo vantarci di avere normative ambiziose, dobbiamo poi essere anche in grado di farle rispettare queste norme, cosa che, ahimè, purtroppo non sempre succede. Questo è fondamentale non solo per la credibilità dell'Unione, ma anche per la salvaguardia dell'ambiente e per la salute dei nostri cittadini e anche per le ricadute economiche. Lo vediamo molto bene, per esempio, con l'*impact assessment* sull'economia circolare quali vantaggi in termini di occupazione e di crescita economica può portare una gestione efficace ed efficiente dei rifiuti.

Bene, allora, ha fatto la Commissione a predisporre uno strumento per valutare le performance degli Stati membri nell'attuazione delle normative ambientali. Avere una mappatura ci permette di capire quanto la realtà ci separa dagli obiettivi fissati per legge, i settori nei quali siamo ancora indietro, il perché siamo ancora indietro, e quindi individuare le cause, e quali strumenti mettere concretamente in campo per raggiungere gli obiettivi.

Capite bene che, prima di tutto, è necessario che i dati siano maggiormente comparabili per favorire lo scambio di *best practice*, come chiediamo nella risoluzione. Dobbiamo inoltre avere un quadro più preciso possibile, inserendo nella valutazione anche altri elementi. Pensiamo nella risoluzione all'efficienza energetica, al settore dei trasporti, al cambiamento climatico. Mi fa piacere sentire che c'è già un'apertura, come ha detto il Commissario, anche perché non è pensabile oggi non considerare l'impatto del cambiamento climatico.

Ed ora mi rivolgo al Consiglio. Tutto questo non può essere solo un esercizio di stile, ma gli Stati membri si devono poi impegnare concretamente a raggiungere gli obiettivi, e chiediamo al Consiglio un impegno concreto ad aderire quindi pienamente al riesame e a prendere questo strumento molto sul serio.

Mark Demesmaeker, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Commissaris, onze sterke Europese milieuwetgeving staat vaak in schril contrast met de zwakke uitvoering ervan. Dat heb ik in mijn werk op het vlak van biodiversiteitsbeleid, de afvalwetgeving en uitstootnormen in de praktijk ervaren. We moeten dus verhoogd inzetten op een betere implementatie, want anders blijken onze strikte normen in de realiteit alleen maar papieren tijgers. Het nieuwe EIR-instrument dat de Commissie lanceerde, kan daarbij een belangrijke rol spelen en verdient alle steun.

Alles kan natuurlijk altijd beter. Vanuit de milieucommissie doen we daarvoor enkele aanbevelingen. Ten eerste mag de EIR geen louter technisch instrument zijn. Ze moet ook de politieke discussie voeden. Een vast agendapunt op de Raad over de uitvoering van de milieuwetgeving zou bijvoorbeeld een stap vooruit zijn. Ten tweede is het essentieel dat regionale en lokale overheden voluit worden betrokken. Als Vlaams Europarlementslid kan ik dat niet genoeg benadrukken. Ten slotte breek ik nogmaals een lans voor de uitwisseling van beste praktijken. We moeten het warm water niet altijd opnieuw uitvinden, maar de bestaande expertise en innovatieve oplossingen voluit benutten.

Luke Ming Flanagan, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, one of the biggest problems we have with implementing directives when it comes to the environment is the fact that governments do not actually take ownership of these directives, even though they themselves transpose them into law.

On many occasions, the statement is made at home that 'the EU made us do it', a similar sort of excuse that Bart Simpson comes up with when he has obviously done something wrong: 'someone else made them do it'. What chance is there of real committed implementation if the state itself is not really committed? The result in implementation tends to be shabby and imposed on people, rather than carried out through consultation and dialogue.

A perfect example of this is the Birds and Habitats Directive. As Commissioner Hogan knows himself, I would not be here if it were not for the mess that was made of that. The directive itself is excellent. However, how it was implemented when it came to turf cutters and farmers has left a bitter taste which will not be removed for a long time.

No real consultation took place, and also implementation costs ordinary people money, whether that be septic-tank inspections or training in pesticide spraying. These costs should be borne by the state and not by the individual, because it's really important that we do this. If it's that important then let those who can afford it pay for it.

Julia Reid, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, the Environmental Implementation Review (EIR) is an EU instrument designed to monitor the implementation of EU environmental law and policy. The EIR affords the Commission a more proactive role, enabling it to monitor the implementation of EU environmental law in Member States. This scheme would diminish the discretionary margin of Member States when implementing the directives and would transfer additional powers to EU institutions.

In my opinion, it would be far better to provide a mechanism which would engage with EU citizens directly and which would promote awareness, increase involvement and educate the general public about the environment. I do not think that a new EU legislative instrument monitoring the application of unilaterally imposed legislation is the answer to the improvement of environmental policies in the EU. I believe that Member States should have the freedom to set their own targets rather than being forced to comply with those set by the unelected Commission.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D). – Încep prin a le a mulțumi colegilor pentru că au ridicat aceste întrebări importante în discuția cu Consiliul și Comisia. Aș vrea să subliniez două aspecte în această discuție.

Primul e legat de finanțare. Ca raportor pentru al șaptelea program general al Uniunii de acțiune pentru mediu, cunosc mai multe cazuri în care fondurile cheltuite pentru obiective de mediu nu au adus și rezultatele dorite.

În unele state membre lipsesc banii, dar la nivelul Uniunii Europene nu absența fondurilor este problema, ci proasta administrare a acestora. S-au făcut investiții utile pentru unele proiecte, cum ar fi îmbunătățirea calității apei potabile, dar în multe alte cazuri banii au fost pur și simplu irosiți. Acest lucru rezultă foarte clar din rapoartele Curții de Conturi. Comisia trebuie să acționeze pentru a asigura o folosire mai responsabilă a fondurilor pe care le distribuie pentru proiectele de mediu.

Al doilea aspect este legat de societatea civilă. Multe ONG-uri cu care m-am consultat pentru realizarea raportului mi-au transmis că evaluarea punerii în aplicare a politicilor de mediu este limitată fiindcă implică doar statele membre și Comisia.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi appoggeremo questa risoluzione del Parlamento perché crediamo che il riesame dell'attuazione sia uno strumento essenziale per trarre il massimo beneficio dalle politiche ambientali in Unione europea, ma anche per definire e tracciare quel percorso, quelle tappe che ci servono a raggiungere il futuro sostenibile in Europa.

Tuttavia, crediamo che tutto questo possa avvenire soltanto se si affronta davvero quel paradosso che vede, da una parte, una legislazione europea solidissima in materia ambientale ma, dall'altra, una sua attuazione completamente inefficace. Allora per noi bisogna fare tre cose.

Prima cosa: introdurre delle sanzioni che siano davvero efficaci per quegli Stati membri che però non riescono a far valere, ad imporre il principio «chi inquina paga».

Seconda cosa: il meccanismo delle procedure di infrazione non funziona. Non possono essere i cittadini che pagano due volte: una prima volta in termini di salute perché non viene tutelato l'ambiente in cui vivono e la seconda volta in termini economici perché ricevono una procedura di infrazione. Debbono pagare i responsabili, che sono molto spesso i ministeri dell'Ambiente dei singoli Stati membri, che invece restano lì nelle loro poltrone pur essendo responsabili.

Terza cosa: bisogna interrompere quel triangolo infernale che vede l'industria che inquina che finanzia anche i rappresentanti nelle istituzioni europee e nelle istituzioni locali e regionali che poi nominano però i direttori degli istituti di controllo. Se non si fanno queste tre cose, l'Europa non avrà mai un futuro sostenibile.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já navážu na své kolegy, všichni v sále asi cítíme, že environmentální evropské právo, aquis, je mimořádně důležitou součástí evropského práva a není důležité právo pouze přijmout, ale následně kontrolovat, na kolik to právo je implementováno v národních právních režimech a na kolik tedy je fakticky realizováno. A je dobře, že dneska tady kolegové vznesli tuto otázku, protože sám z vlastní zkušenosti vím, že často přijímáme právní předpisy, které potom na té národní úrovni ne vždycky jsou dobře implementovány a ne vždycky jsou dobře užívány. A v oblasti životního prostředí já toto téma považuji za zvláště důležité. Vítám tady informaci ze strany Komise, že budou připravovány a jsou připravovány hodnotící zprávy o stavu environmentálního aquis.

Chci zdůraznit a doporučuji, aby vedle kritizování nedostatků u jednotlivých členských států byly vyzdvihovány i pozitivní příklady, aby s jednotlivými členskými státy byl více veden dialog, než jenom aby bylo kritizováno, pokud se objeví nějaké nedostatky, protože pak nám v jednotlivých členských státech bude vznikat přirozený odpor vůči environmentálnímu akví a to asi nikdo nechceme.

Jsem také rád, že tady zástupci Komise hovořili o tom, že na Radě pro životní prostředí bude právě otázka implementace těchto předpisů do budoucna více debatována. Já to považuji za správné, protože je mnohem lepší, když jednotlivé státy mezi sebou si vyměňují zkušenosti o tom, jaké mají konkrétní poznatky s implementací těchto právních předpisů, a když si jaksi sdělují vlastní zkušenosti. Je to možná ještě vhodnější, než když Komise stojí v roli toho, kdo kárá jednotlivé členské státy. To si myslím, že není až tak efektivní. Takže to je důležité a jsem rád, že tento bod zde projednáváme.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD). – Madame la Présidente, l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la politique environnementale décline 28 rapports analysant les performances des États membres dans la mise en œuvre de cette législation.

Or des spécificités et des différences profondes existent entre chacun des pays en matière juridique, environnementale ou en ce qui concerne l'action publique.

Il est donc illusoire de vouloir améliorer la comparabilité des données entre des pays qui ne sont pas comparables.

La question orale au Conseil demande aux États de soutenir l'extension du champ d'application de l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la politique environnementale au règlement sur les substances chimiques, aux émissions industrielles et au changement climatique, tout en pointant un manque de financement.

Pourtant, d'après le site de la Commission, 180 milliards d'euros sont déjà consacrés à l'action pour le climat, soit 20 % du budget 2014-2020 de l'Union.

Je m'oppose donc à ce que l'examen de la mise en œuvre de la politique environnementale devienne un gouffre pour les pays contributeurs nets, qui devront probablement financer ces milliards supplémentaires.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, there is no doubt that EU environmental legislation has yielded results. We have better environments than if Europe had not acted collectively. There are issues on implementation by Member States, and that is why this review is very important, but there are also conflicts in our policy.

I was struck last week, watching a television programme called *Ear to the Ground*, by a major report on Japanese knotweed, an invasive alien species that we have tried to get rid of because it is causing havoc to buildings and roads and is spreading like wildfire. The product being used was glyphosate – Roundup – to kill this invasive alien species. Yet, in this House, there are many who would clamour for the removal of this product, and indeed the Member States are refusing, or failing, to come forward with a proposal to re-license it.

Sometimes, on environmental policies, we need coherence at political level and at Commission level, so that we can continue to use these products to improve the environment.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc, doamna președintă, domnule comisar, și eu vreau să felicit colegii care au formulat întrebările legate de evaluarea punerii în aplicare a politicilor de mediu EIR.

Întrebările sunt concrete și eu cred că dacă le citiți foarte bine veți vedea că aveți și răspunsuri. Sunt deja și propuneri în aceste întrebări și dau două exemple. În una din întrebări vă întrebă dacă vă gândiți să aveți un tabel de bord. Apoi, în altă întrebare este exemplificat dacă nu vă gândiți să faceți un exemplu de bune practici între state.

Problema este că statele sunt inegal dezvoltate, există bugete insuficiente, și locale și naționale, și, dacă vă gândiți, asta ar fi întrebarea mea, dacă vă gândiți să acordați sprijin acolo unde nu din rea credință nu se poate aplica politica de mediu, ci din lipsă de resurse financiare și poate găsim cu fondul strategic de investiții, cu alte surse de finanțare să sprijinim statele care nu pot, nu că nu vor.

Și, în final, aș vrea să vă spun că sunt de acord să existe o accesibilitate din partea publicului pentru a cunoaște ce se întâmplă în statele membre.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος πρέπει να αποτελεί θεμέλιο λίθο της πολιτικής μας, διότι ο πλανήτης καταστρέφεται και προκαλούνται θεομηνίες και φυσικές καταστροφές με πολλά θύματα, όπως ακριβώς συνέβη σήμερα τα ξημερώματα στην Ελλάδα, όπου τουλάχιστον 15 συμπατριώτες μου έχασαν άδικα τη ζωή τους από τις καταστροφικές πλημμύρες που έπληξαν τη Δυτική Αττική.

Έτσι, για άλλη μια φορά μια υποβαθμισμένη περιοχή, όπως η Μάνδρα, θρηνεί θύματα. Δυστυχώς, για άλλη μια φορά, αποδείχθηκε περίτρανα η έλλειψη αντιπλημμυρικών έργων. Εκφράζουμε την οδύνη μας για τον άδικο χαμό των συμπατριωτών μας, εκφράζουμε τα θερμά συλλυπητήριά μας στους οικείους τους, εκφράζουμε την πλήρη συμπαράστασή μας και τις ευχές μας για ταχεία ανάρρωση των δεκάδων τραυματιών και ζητούμε, κ. Hogan, από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να δρομολογήσει τις αναγκαίες διαδικασίες για την οικονομική ενίσχυση της Ελλάδας, προκειμένου να αποκατασταθούν οι ζημιές και να αποζημιωθούν πλήρως οι πλημμυροπαθείς.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, v obecné rovině vítám přezkum právních předpisů Evropské unie v oblasti životního prostředí jako potřebný nástroj. Obzvláště pak vítám výzvu ke společnému zasedání Rady, na níž by se mělo jednat o nových problémech s možnými přeshraničními dopady. To je přesně ta problematika, která by se měla řešit primárně. Nikoliv však pouze co se týče nových problémů, ale i těch stávajících. Jsou prostě v EU regiony, kde ať už kvůli špatné implementaci evropské legislativy nebo její ignoraci vznikají velmi silné lokální třenice mezi členskými státy, zejména pak co se týče emisí. Dlouho se nad tímto problémem zavíraly v evropských institucích oči a já budu jenom ráda, když tento problém začneme konečně řešit.

Nesouhlasím však s tvrzením, že nedostatky v oblasti administrativní kapacity a veřejné správy jsou hlavními příčinami neuspokojivého provádění. Neustále zde administrativní zátěž totiž jenom zvyšujeme. Vždyť jenom se podívejte, jak členské státy administrativně decimujeme v posledním klimatickém balíčku. O zimním energetickém balíčku se radši ani nebavím. Zamysleme se.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Members of the House for their support and for highlighting the issues that have been raised. I will convey these concerns and suggestions back to Commissioner Vella.

The Environmental Implementation Review is an example of how the Commission can work with Member States and other institutions to address the weak implementation of environmental rules and policy. As many of you have said, this is necessary in order to increase the European Union's credibility.

Ms Schreijer-Pierik mentioned issues in relation to water quality in the Netherlands. These are very important issues, and I see that, if water quality in a Member State is an issue where the spirit and content of the legislation in relation to our Water Framework Directive is not being implemented, infringement proceedings can be taken if necessary. I would, of course, agree that farmers should be seen as part of the solution rather than part of the problem.

I would say to Mr Flanagan that 31 European Court of Justice judgments against Ireland were on the desk of a certain Minister of the Environment in 2011, and that number was reduced in three years to nine because a dedicated unit was set up and human and financial resources were assigned to it. In other words, it was given political priority. This subsequently saved an enormous amount of money for the country. So implementation is a matter for the Member State, and it is in the interest of the Member State, if it wants to eliminate the possibility of expensive legal proceedings and fines, to take action. It is in the interest of our citizens that full implementation is actually achieved as quickly as possible. But I also agree with Mr Pospíšil that, sometimes, the manner of implementation of environmental law in Member States needs a lot of attention and monitoring, and I think Mr Flanagan was right in that regard as well. There can be gold-plating, in certain cases, and we have evidence and some examples of where that has been the case in some Member States.

Ms McGuinness, you have certainly come at the glyphosate debate from a different angle and it is an interesting one.

Ms Grapini, again, it is a matter for Member States to decide if they want to implement support packages and financial support with assistance from EU programmes, like the LIFE Programme, for example, which can offer financial assistance, if necessary, with the implementation of certain environmental law that has to be transposed and implemented by the Member States on behalf of the European Union.

Thank you again to all the contributors. I think it would also be useful if Members of the European Parliament would engage in promoting the Environmental Implementation Review in their national constituencies, in order to get feedback.

Matti Maasikas, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I would like once again to thank Parliament for the interest shown in this important initiative and for the questions and comments that have been made. We are at the beginning of a long-term process. We are embarking on a new, long road together and I am sure that we will have further opportunities to discuss these issues in this House and in other forums.

Puhemies. – Olen vastaanottanut yhden päätöslauselmaesityksen¹.

Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan huomenna torstaina 16.11.2017.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Aunque se requieren nuevas propuestas legislativas —como la de una directiva de suelos— para completar el acervo europeo en materia de protección ambiental, no hay duda de que el marco actual es un estándar exigente en la protección del medio ambiente. La implementación del mismo, sin embargo, difiere mucho entre los Estados miembros y es especialmente poco rigurosa en mi país, España. No es aceptable que la transposición de la Directiva marco sobre el agua no contenga todavía planes hidrológicos para las Islas Canarias, ni medidas que garanticen realmente la sostenibilidad de la gran mayoría de cuencas peninsulares. Tampoco es de recibo que, a pesar de numerosas sentencias del TJUE, el problema de los vertederos ilegales siga vigente, como nos recuerdan tragedias como la de Chiloeches. Las políticas neoliberales han agravado, sin duda, la sobreexplotación estructural de nuestra naturaleza. Pero incluso en los márgenes de las políticas económicas comunitarias, las Administraciones españolas, y especialmente el actual Gobierno del PP, no han demostrado más que indiferencia ante la protección del medio ambiente. Es indispensable, por lo tanto, mayor firmeza, y que la Comisión actúe frente a las numerosas denuncias por infracción de la normativa medioambiental que se acumulan en España.

24. Combating inequalities as a lever to boost job creation and growth (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Javi Lópezin työllisyysen ja sosiaaliasioiden valiokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö eriarvoisuuden torjunnasta työpaikkojen luontia ja kasvua edistävänä tekijänä (2016/2269(INI)) (A8-0340/2017).

Javi López, ponente. – Señora presidenta, en esta sesión el Parlamento Europeo va a decidir con este informe sobre la desigualdad colocar en su agenda —y especialmente colocarlo como una de sus grandes prioridades— el combate contra la desigualdad, no solo porque nos interpelan las injusticias socialmente insoportables que se viven y recorren el continente, sino porque reconocemos que la mejor forma de favorecer un crecimiento inclusivo, un crecimiento duradero y un crecimiento fuerte en la Unión Europea es combatiendo la desigualdad.

Combatir la desigualdad también es la mejor forma de asegurar la estabilidad en nuestras instituciones y la mejor forma de combatir los monstruos que hemos visto en el último periodo electoral en el mundo occidental. La Unión Europea, como sabemos, y sus instituciones hemos estado muy pendientes de una larga lista de crisis durante los últimos años —desde la crisis financiera, la crisis de la deuda soberana, algunas crisis de política interna que hemos padecido—, pero ahora que el crecimiento asoma la cabeza, que la estabilidad asoma la cabeza y podemos ver un futuro de cierta estabilidad, ha llegado la hora de marcar como prioridad rehacer nuestro pacto social y responder también a la larga lista de damnificados y de víctimas de los últimos años.

Un mercado laboral que sabemos que se ha transformado durante el último tiempo y ha dejado de ser la fuente de seguridad y prosperidad que había sido hasta no hace mucho. Atender a una lista de 115 millones de ciudadanos europeos que hoy viven en riesgo de pobreza o de exclusión social. Atender a las insoportables desigualdades que han aumentado durante los últimos años dentro de los países y, sobre todo, entre países, cuando habíamos sido hasta ahora una máquina de convergencia, como bien dicen los Tratados europeos.

Y para ello también hacemos y marcamos una hoja de ruta. No solo hacemos un llamamiento a la acción, no solo reconocemos el impacto económico de la desigualdad, sino que, como institución, decimos que tenemos que reequilibrar nuestra política económica e introducir la desigualdad en sus herramientas —las recomendaciones específicas por país o el Semestre Europeo—. Y, a la vez, tenemos que construir una verdadera dimensión social europea.

Y no es casualidad que aprobemos este informe en el pleno del Parlamento Europeo a pocos días de aprobar el pilar social europeo, una lista de derechos y objetivos sociales que tendrán los ciudadanos de la Unión. Pero esa lista, luego, debe poder convertirse en instrumentos, políticas, en normas europeas y en recursos. Y nosotros hemos lanzado algunas propuestas: desde la necesidad de tener una tabla de rentas mínimas a nivel europeo hasta estudiar la posibilidad de tener una caja que acompañe las prestaciones por desempleo, pasando por luchar contra la pobreza infantil con un sistema de garantía infantil como propuesta; continuar luchando también contra el desempleo juvenil, como hemos hecho durante los últimos años; atender al mercado laboral, a la mejora de los salarios, con un índice de salarios dignos; y atender también a las nuevas formas de empleo que hemos visto —algunas derivadas también de la digitalización— que nos preocupan.

Todo esto hay que hacerlo a la vez que le decimos a la Unión que hay tendencias económicas de fondo que nos preocupan, que generan crecimiento pero no distribuyen bien, como la digitalización y robotización o como el comercio internacional; que hay grupos que viven la vulnerabilidad de forma interseccionada: los discapacitados, la brecha de género —que nos preocupa mucho en este informe— o la brecha generacional. Para ello habrá que atender también a los impuestos, la otra cara de la moneda.

Con esto, la Unión marca como prioridad la lucha contra la desigualdad y, sobre todo, decimos que esa forma, la dimensión social, es la mejor forma de legitimar de nuevo a las instituciones europeas de cara a los ciudadanos, recuperando crecimiento, estabilidad y dignidad para este continente.

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I am presenting this point on behalf of Commissioner Thyssen, who, as you know, is on her way to the Social Summit in Gothenburg for the first time in 20 years.

I welcome the fact that your report focuses on inequalities as this is an important topic that deserves our full attention. Inequalities are not only dividing our societies, they are putting a brake on our competitiveness and economic growth. We therefore need economic growth that benefits all citizens while we still need to overcome the damage done by the economic crisis. In the Annual Growth Survey, the Commission asked the Member States to redouble their efforts on investment, structural reforms and responsible fiscal policies, but with an increased focus on inclusive growth and social fairness.

Your report calls on the Commission and the Member States to address issues that generate inequalities – wage settings, social protection systems which includes minimum income, gender equality, enabling social services, childcare, support to children, old age income, health care and access to housing. This is why we presented the European Pillar of Social Rights as a framework to also reduce inequalities and social risks. Parliament has been actively involved in the process that led to the adoption of the pillar and finally, as I said, to its proclamation this Friday by the three institutions at the Social Summit for Fair Jobs and Growth in Gothenburg.

The Commission acknowledges and thanks Parliament for its crucial role throughout the process, but the pillar should not be only words. Together with the pillar, we have already launched two social partner consultations. One is to collect views on the possible direction of an EU action to ensure that people in all forms of employment have adequate access to social protection and employment services. The second is on a possible revision of the Written Statement Directive, which would increase the protection for the most precarious workers, including digital workers. We have also put forward an initiative to support work-life balance for parents and carers.

We are looking forward to your report and we are hoping to get it through the legislative process as quickly as possible. The European Semester will have a key role in implementing the pillar. Combating inequalities has been and remains a priority of the European Semester. Several past country-specific recommendations have been addressed to Member States on issues that are relevant to inequality. We intend to build on this approach in the coming cycle to ensure that progress on implementing the pillar is properly reflected and monitored. Indeed, a new feature will be the use of the pillar's social scoreboard to monitor developments in Member States, looking across a wide spectrum of policy areas which will include inequality, poverty and social inclusion.

Finally, I particularly welcome the focus of the report on children. Investing in children is key to breaking the cycle of inequality and disadvantage through generations. As regards the implementation of the current preparatory action on a child guarantee, our aim is to investigate the feasibility of such an initiative and its added value compared to ongoing actions at the moment.

So as we speak, the recovery is ongoing, with improvements in the overall situation in the labour market in all Member States. It is essential now to prevent the risk that, as the recovery continues in Europe, some people are left behind. That is why your report and this debate are very timely.

Marisa Matias, *relatora de parecer da Comissão dos Assuntos Económicos e Monetários*. – Senhora Presidente, este relatório é da maior importância. De facto, combater as desigualdades é um mecanismo fundamental, é um meio fundamental para não só promover o emprego como também para promover o crescimento.

Infelizmente, nós vemos nos últimos anos como as desigualdades afetaram o desenvolvimento económico e o desempenho económico dos vários Estados-Membros e isso deve-se muito àquele que foi o desenho das políticas económicas que tivemos também nos últimos anos. Essas políticas económicas agravaram as desigualdades, nomeadamente através das políticas de austeridade, mas também através de políticas fiscais injustas, e nós temos aí uma série de casos para mostrar como a evasão fiscal e a fraude fiscal provocam, também elas próprias, não só apenas uma situação de profundo tratamento desigual como de desigualdade imensa.

O desemprego é um dos maiores problemas que temos e, portanto, combater as desigualdades é uma forma também de criar emprego e de poder ter um desenvolvimento económico e um desempenho económico que seja justo e sustentável.

Combater as desigualdades não pode ser apenas no papel, há um conjunto de propostas que são apresentadas. Cabe à Comissão implementá-las, cabe-nos a nós fiscalizar e apresentar a proposta legislativa.

Agnieszka Kozłowska-Rajewicz, *autorka projektu opinii Komisji Praw Kobiet i Równouprawnienia*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zwalczanie nierówności jest jednym z obowiązków państw członkowskich wynikającym z Traktatów. Jest też wyrazem sprawiedliwości społecznej i rozwoju społecznego i ekonomicznego.

Zgodnie z tezą zawartą w tytule sprawozdania, o którym dzisiaj mówimy, zwalczanie nierówności może przyspieszyć powstawanie nowych miejsc pracy. Mogę się założyć, że w tej Izbie jest wiele osób, które z tą tezą się nie zgadzają. Nie jest dla nich ona oczywista, gdyż działania równościowe kojarzą jako dodatkowy wysiłek i dodatkowy koszt, fanaberie rozwiniętego państwa, a nie dźwignię rozwoju. Dlatego cieszę się z poprawek, które przygotowała Komisja FEMM, które jasno pokazują, w jaki sposób większa równość pomiędzy kobietami i mężczyznami może przyczynić się do budowania i rozwoju rynku pracy.

Obecnie nierówności płciowe są nam dobrze znane: kobiety zarabiają mniej, mają niższe emerytury, blokady w awansach, pracują w niżej płatnych sektorach. Na to nakłada się konflikt praca-dom i nieproporcjonalnie większe zaangażowanie kobiet w nieodpłatną pracę domową. Utrzymywanie tych nierówności prowadzi do marnowania potencjału kobiet, częściowego tylko wykorzystywania ich wykształcenia, kwalifikacji i kreatywności, które odgrywają kluczową rolę w funkcjonowaniu na rynku pracy, jego rozwijaniu i w tworzeniu nowych miejsc pracy.

Ádám Kósa, *a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.* – Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Kollégák, az Európai Néppárt árnyék-jelentéstevőjeként csak jól tudok mondani López kollégám munkamódszeréről, illetve transzparens megközelítéséről. Maga a jelentéstervezet alapvetően nemes célokat szolgál, a munkahelyteremtést, a szociális biztonság növekedését, illetve a közös európai pénzalapok létrehozását, szociális programok finanszírozására.

Ez utóbbi kapcsán azonban számos, egyelőre homályos pénzügyi kötelezettséggel járó kezdeményezést is tartalmaz a jelentéstervezet, amiről jelenleg felelőtlenség lenne szavazni. Üdvözlöm, hogy a Néppárt számára is fontos elemeket sikerült elfogadtatni a közös munka során, de nem mindet. Ilyen például az a javaslatunk, hogy az egyenlőtlenségek és a szociális problémák mérésekor a versenyképességi szempontokra is figyelemmel kell lenni.

Összességében véve nagy eredménynek tartom azt, hogy kimondjuk, hogy a látványosan javuló teljesítményt mutató országoktól nem szabad csak azért elvonni az európai uniós forrásokat, mert hazai forrásból a többi tagállamnál jobban teljesítenek. Például Magyarországon a fiatalok munkanélkülisége is látványosan csökkent, ez azonban nem lehet ok arra, hogy idő előtt elvegyük az ifjúsági garanciából finanszírozott forrásokat. Kérem a frakciókat, hogy a holnapi szavazás során törekedjenek a kiegyensúlyozott szöveg elfogadására, ne ígérjünk felelőtlenül, viszont a rendelkezésre álló eszközöket használjuk ki teljes mértékben a jó célok érdekében.

Georgi Pirinski, *on behalf of the S&D Group.* – Madam President, the rapporteur has clearly stated that rising inequalities are today threatening the very future of the European project, eroding its legitimacy and damaging trust in the European Union as an engine of social progress.

Before 2008, the EU made some big leaps forward in terms of economic integration, but the financial crisis after 2008 led to a significant decline in relative income levels in the European periphery, while core Member States were generally more resilient. However, there is a broader backdrop to the whole issue of inequalities: namely, in general, in recent years, billionaires' fortunes have grown by an average of 7-8% per year, while total wealth has grown at just 3% annually.

Globalisation, deregulation and declining taxes have all been factors, but the other important factor has been the rise of a far-flung, global, cross-border wealth-management industry – so-called – dedicated to avoiding taxation of the wealthiest. The richest 1% of the world's population now owns more than half of global wealth and the top 10% owns about 90%, while data suggest that most of the gains at the top are coming at the expense of the rest of the population. What is more, the wealthy use the power that accompanies their money to exert political influence and reduce taxes and regulation.

I would like to highlight three main lines of action among the many that the rapporteur has indicated in his report.

First, enhanced social dialogue and collective bargaining for determining wages, recalling the fact that the right of collective bargaining and action is fundamental and that the decline in the bargaining power of workers and trade unions must be reversed.

Second, a call to the Commission to put forward initiatives to remove any kind of gender pay gap, setting penalties for workplaces that violate the right to equality by establishing different wages for identical job categories.

Third, both the Commission and Member States must finally take real action against tax avoidance and tax fraud, as one of the key means of reducing drastic economic inequalities.

Helga Stevens, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Dank u wel, voorzitter. Beste collega's, ik ga er volledig mee akkoord dat meer gelijkheid en opwaartse convergentie een prioriteit moeten zijn. Grote ongelijkheid schaadt ons allen. Het zet een rem op economische groei en werkgelegenheid. Maar de manier waarop in dit verslag wordt voorgesteld ongelijkheid aan te pakken, is verkeerd.

Ten eerste is het antwoord op ongelijkheid niet een steeds verdergaande europeanisering. De rapporteur wil bijvoorbeeld een Europese regeling inzake minimuminkomen, een Europese werkloosheidsregeling, een Europese richtlijn over het evenwicht tussen werk en privéleven, en noem maar op. Zo respecteert dit verslag de beginselen van subsidiariteit en evenredigheid niet. Wanneer de lidstaten sociale eenheidsworst moeten slikken, kunnen ze — zeker gezien de schaarse middelen — onvoldoende rekening houden met de behoeften van de eigen burgers. Dit heeft als onvermijdelijk gevolg dat we de burger nog verder van Europa vervreemden. Willen we dat?

Ten tweede betreurt ik de herhaaldelijke veroordeling van atypisch werk. Nee, we mogen absoluut geen werkende armen creëren. Maar het hebben van een baan is nog altijd de beste garantie tegen armoede. Via atypische arbeidscontracten kunnen mensen die anders uit de werkboot vallen, toch aan de slag. Flexibiliteit op de arbeidsmarkt creëren schept kansen en ik geloof sterk in het geven van kansen aan mensen, dit uiteraard in combinatie met een goed sociaal vangnet wanneer nodig.

Tot slot betreurt ik dat het jongerenwerkgelegenheidsinitiatief er niet in slaagt om jongeren op een structurele manier aan werk te helpen maar net leidt tot het tegenovergestelde. Het neemt bij de lidstaten en regio's immers de prikkels weg om hun arbeidsmarkt ernstig te hervormen en pakt bovendien de structurele oorzaken van jeugdwerkloosheid niet aan. We hebben net gerichte en fundamentele oplossingen nodig om jobcreatie en groei te stimuleren. Ik betreurt dat het verslag een andere weg is opgegaan. Dank u.

Enrique Calvet Chambon, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, por fin llegan las desigualdades a ocupar el Parlamento. Y es una buena noticia. Felicito a todos los que han trabajado en ello, porque han conseguido tres cosas. Es verdad que es un texto que se pierde mucho en las viejas recetas sociales, de las que ya hemos hablado en el pilar social, que repetimos cada vez que pasa un río por aquí —y por aquí pasa uno—, de acuerdo, y es verdad que las desigualdades no las va a arreglar jamás el mercado de trabajo —el mercado de trabajo es un instrumento para ajustar lo que hay—, pero este texto que voy a apoyar y que ALDE va a apoyar mayoritariamente tiene tres ventajas fundamentales.

La primera, llevar el tema de las desigualdades al corazón del Parlamento, porque esa salida desigual de la crisis en la que no todo el mundo está haciendo los mismos sacrificios, esa salida está minando la creencia en Europa de los ciudadanos. Tenemos que decirles que nos vamos a ocupar ahora, que parece que salimos de ella, de que haya una cohesión mayor individual entre las personas a nivel de renta.

Segundo, lo que dice, y es muy importante aparte de todas las recetas sociales, es que las desigualdades dependen de las políticas económicas. Ahí están las estructuras: política fiscal, política tributaria, política de rentas, política comercial, política industrial, política de inversiones.

Y, finalmente, dice que hay que introducir la medida, la vigilancia y el seguimiento de la dinámica desigualitaria dentro del Semestre Europeo. Ese es el gran mensaje.

Νεοκλής Σουλκιώτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η συγκεκριμένη έκθεση αποτελεί ακόμα μια έμμεση παραδοχή αυτού του Κοινοβουλίου πως η τεράστια αύξηση των κοινωνικών ανισοτήτων είναι αποτέλεσμα των νεοφιλελεύθερων πολιτικών λιτότητας. Συνεπώς, χαιρετίζουμε την πρόθεση της έκθεσης, τόσο για τη βελτίωση των εργασιακών και κοινωνικών συνθηκών όσο και για την ενδυνάμωση του κοινωνικού κράτους και την κοινωνική προστασία.

Οι προτάσεις για καθολική πρόσβαση στην υγεία, την παιδεία και τις κοινωνικές παροχές, στη βάση των προτάσεων του ILO, είναι πολύ ενθαρρυντικές. Ως ομάδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενωτικής Αριστεράς σε αυτό το Κοινοβούλιο, εμμένουμε στις θέσεις μας και πιστεύουμε ότι για να καταπολεμηθούν πραγματικά οι ανισότητες χρειάζεται αλλαγή πλεύσης από τον αιφνιδιασμό και τις πολιτικές λιτότητας, δίκαιη ανακατανομή του πλούτου, ενίσχυση του κοινωνικού κράτους, διασφάλιση όλων των εργασιακών δικαιωμάτων των εργαζομένων. Χρειάζονται δημόσιες επενδύσεις για δημιουργία αξιοπρεπών και μόνιμων θέσεων εργασίας και χρειάζεται να δημιουργήσουμε εκείνες τις συνθήκες που θα φέρουν περιφερειακή και κοινωνική συνοχή.

Jean Lambert, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur for the work done on this report, which my Group will support.

We know that inequalities damage our entire social fabric, they are costly to our societies in many ways and the European Union has a limited number of tools at its disposal. Part of the question is whether it is using the tools it has got as effectively as it might. I think all of us welcome the idea of the social pillar, we would just like to see something a bit less flimsy, which will, we hope, be more sustainable.

We also need to look at how we relate tackling inequalities to our commitments on the Sustainable Development Goals because they link with this report in many areas: on gender equality, on decent work, on poverty reduction and many others.

There is an obvious need, as we all acknowledge, to tackle extreme poverty. I think many of us are still affronted by the fact that the European Union has so many food banks because people cannot afford to feed themselves and their families. We need to look at how we use the European Semester as a way of moving forward on this social inequalities agenda.

Many Members have spoken about tax justice and it is true that the tax justice agenda is a crucial part of closing the gap. It provides additional monies for essential social investment, along with better targeting of the EU money we have available. We should be looking at the creation of decent work. It is scandalous that we are seeing a growth in in-work poverty, so issues such as the living wage are becoming essential. Health and care, the green economy, education and lifelong learning are areas ripe for increased investment, as is the social inclusion agenda. Part of that, of course, is making sure everybody has an equal opportunity in society, and that is where the anti-discrimination agenda becomes really important.

Laura Agea, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie al collega López per il lavoro che ha presentato. Disuguaglianze: cominciamo con dei numeri che devono cominciare a farci riflettere, ma più che altro a farci agire. L'Oxfam afferma che oggi nel mondo otto persone detengono la ricchezza della metà più povera della popolazione mondiale. Cioè in mano a otto persone, oggi nel mondo, c'è la stessa ricchezza che hanno tre miliardi e mezzo di persone.

Questo significa disuguaglianze, significa che abbiamo creato un abisso che separa pochissimi ricchi da tutto il resto di persone che vivono in povertà assolute. Allora la domanda che dobbiamo porci è che è ora di smettere di parlare, è ora di iniziare con azioni concrete, efficaci e immediate. Mi dispiace, Commissario Hogan, ma le devo dire che non siamo più in tempo per vedere se i nostri progetti di prenderci cura dei bambini che vivono in povertà assoluta sono più o meno efficaci. Ieri dovevamo avergli applicati, ieri avremmo dovuto prenderci cura dei bambini che vivono in povertà assoluta, perché l'esempio della Grecia e l'esempio dell'Italia sono sotto gli occhi di tutti.

O iniziamo oggi, ieri, ad agire concretamente per risolvere questo divario, per risolvere questa carneficina sociale con politiche di redistribuzione della ricchezza, oppure avremo fallito, oppure la nostra presenza qui, il nostro lavoro qui, il nostro impegno qui sono totalmente, completamente e assolutamente inutili e non dovremmo avere neanche il coraggio di presentarci ai nostri cittadini a dire che stiamo lavorando per loro se non riusciamo a sfamare i nostri figli. Da genitore trovo ignobile che questa Unione europea non sappia avere il coraggio di colmare un divario che è innegabile.

Servono politiche redistributive della ricchezza, serve sanare questo vuoto assoluto tra i pochi ricchi e i milioni di poveri, serve un reddito minimo garantito che sani la povertà, servono politiche efficaci espansive che creino lavoro e consentano alle persone di vivere in maniera dignitosa. Questo lo dobbiamo nel rispetto del nostro mandato, ma nel rispetto dei 500 milioni di cittadini che si aspettano un nostro lavoro concreto, efficace e risolutivo.

Gilles Lebreton, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, le rapport López a pour objectif de chercher à sensibiliser la Commission sur les inégalités économiques dans l'Union européenne. Vaste ambition, car l'aréopage de Bruxelles ne s'intéresse guère aux pauvres.

Mais le rapport ne tient pas ses promesses. Il trahit la cause des pauvres qu'il prétend défendre. Il la trahit en taisant la responsabilité des politiques européennes d'austérité dans la production de la pauvreté, car c'est bien l'ultralibéralisme de l'Union qui condamne les plus faibles à la précarité et à la misère. En procédant ainsi, il renforce les partis qu'il qualifie de populistes dans leur combat nationaliste. Faute d'avoir le courage de faire endosser à l'Union la responsabilité de la pauvreté, le catalogue de bonnes intentions qu'il déroule n'est pas crédible.

En définitive, le rapport López est révélateur de la cécité européenne en matière sociale. L'Union européenne ne veut pas regarder ses pauvres en face.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Asszony! Az indítvány hivatkozik egy olyan jelentésre, amelyik áttekintést ad a kormányoknak és a szociális partnereknek az „egyenlő munkáért egyenlő díjazást” elvvel kapcsolatos álláspontjára. Az egyenlőtlenségek közül a legsúlyosabb az a munkabérbeli szakadék, amely a centrumországok és a közép-kelet-európai országok között fennáll. Ez az oka a keletről nyugatra irányuló népvándorlásnak. Ez rossz a hazáját elhagyni kényszerülő munkavállalónak, és rossz a fogadó országnak, ahol társadalmi feszültséget okoz.

Ezért indította el a Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom azt az európai polgári kezdeményezést, amelynek célja a bérek felzárkóztatása, és ehhez hét országban talált partnert. A Bizottság befogadta a kezdeményezést. A felzárkózás eszköze lehet egy új kohéziós politika, amelyik támogatja a humán erő-fejlesztést és a nagy hozzáadott értéket előállító vállalkozásokat, mert ez lehet az alapja a munkabérek növelésének.

Thomas Mann (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Der besorgniserregende Trend zur Ungleichheit bei den Einkommen, Bildungschancen, beruflichem Aufstieg und Altersvorsorge hat zu Empörung, Frustration, ja Wut geführt. Die Folge ist ein Höhenflug von Populisten und Extremisten in einigen Mitgliedstaaten.

Ihren dumpfen Parolen setzen wir konkrete Veränderung entgegen. Die EU hat erstens klare Konzepte und zweitens wirksame Instrumente. Eine Grundlage ist unser europäisches Sozialmodell. Wirtschaftliche Dynamik der Märkte wird verbunden mit sozialem Ausgleich. Es geht um Chancengerechtigkeit, die Solidarität mit Benachteiligten, die Schaffung von hochwertigen Arbeitsplätzen, den Kampf gegen Armut und Ausgrenzung. Mit der Strategie Europa2020 soll die Beschäftigungsquote deutlich erhöht, die Zahl der Schulabbrecher erheblich reduziert und das Armutsrisiko weiter gesenkt werden.

Zur Umsetzung gehört auch die Feinjustierung des Europäischen Semesters, Herr Kommissar. Neben der Bewertung von Wirtschaftswachstum und Strukturreformen auf der einen Seite sollen ebenso soziale Komponenten berücksichtigt werden. Und der EFSI? Er sollte sicherlich den kleinen und mittelständischen Unternehmen deutlich helfen, andererseits der Förderung von Bildung und Ausbildung.

Eine weitere ambitionierte Idee ist die Jugendgarantie. Ja, sie hat zur Jugendbeschäftigungsinitiative geführt. Nach Anlaufschwierigkeiten zeigen sich erste konkrete Erfolge. Ich hoffe, es gelingt, dass die Mittel weiter erhöht werden.

Für nicht akzeptabel aber, Herr Berichterstatter, halte ich die Forderung nach einer europaweiten Arbeitslosenversicherung. Diese automatischen Stabilisatoren haben wir doch oft genug mehrheitlich abgelehnt. Sie sind der Einstieg in eine Transferunion; das können wir nicht durchhalten. Viel bedeutsamer ist, finde ich, die bessere Ausstattung des Europäischen Sozialfonds. Er fördert nachweislich soziale Integration, stabile Beschäftigung, Eingliederung in die Arbeitsmärkte und den Zugang zum lebenslangen Lernen.

Wir haben also stabile Instrumente. Wir wollen den Kampf gegen Ungleichheit erfolgreich führen und den sozialen Zusammenhalt herstellen.

Elena Gentile (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa così come continuano ad immaginarla non può non farsi carico del capitale umano più colpito, ferito dalle disuguaglianze e quindi prigioniero delle sue tante povertà. Dunque le disuguaglianze generano povertà, combattere le disuguaglianze significa offrire a ciascuno una pluralità di strumenti indispensabili per sconfiggerle.

La scelta di fondo, quindi, è quella di garantire l'esigibilità dei diritti. È questo il tempo in cui la politica deve assumersi tutta intera la responsabilità di ripensare il suo modello di sviluppo, mettendo al centro il tema della dignità delle persone e del valore del capitale umano, senza indugiare sulla lettura di comodo che lega, in una relazione di causa-effetto, l'impoverimento delle opportunità alla crisi economica.

È dunque questo il tempo in cui decidere di non contrarre la spesa pubblica, bensì di riorientarla per garantire diritti, combattere le disuguaglianze, contrastare le povertà. È questo il tempo che ci induce a generare un nuovo sentimento di comunità dentro un'idea di coesione sociale che leghi la filiera pubblica agli attori del territorio, per pensare a nuovi modelli di welfare dentro i luoghi di lavoro e nei luoghi di vita, per rispondere alla domanda di accessibilità a nuovi stili di vita, alla cura e alla prevenzione, in ogni età della vita e in ogni angolo d'Europa, per consentire ad ogni bambino e ad ogni bambina di poter crescere nella consapevolezza di poter competere da adulto in uno scenario che vogliamo sempre più generoso di opportunità per tutti, immaginando di poter costruire il proprio progetto di vita attraverso il lavoro, certamente equamente retribuito, ma di qualità e sicuro.

Insomma, l'Europa dello sviluppo e della crescita sostenibile ed inclusiva non può che partire da qui, dall'Europa delle opportunità per tutti e per tutte.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sprawozdanie wymagało wiele żmudnej pracy. Za to – specjalne podziękowania dla sprawozdawcy posła Lópeza. Eliminowanie dysproporcji społecznych w celu poprawy wzrostu gospodarczego wraz z tworzeniem nowych miejsc pracy jest słuszną ideą. Taki obraliśmy cel. Jednakże nie mogę się zgodzić z wieloma zapisami tego sprawozdania proponującymi m. in. ustanowienie europejskiego filaru praw socjalnych, wprowadzenie wspólnego europejskiego rynku pracy, wprowadzenie zharmonizowanego dochodu minimalnego w Unii Europejskiej, a także zbudowania globalnego rejestru finansowego. To nie są kompetencje Unii Europejskiej. Należy pozostawić państwom członkowskim ich kompetencje, do których to należy polityka społeczna. W przeciwnym razie te propozycje będą bardziej źródłem nieporozumień i konfliktu niż argumentem wzrostu i kreowania miejsc pracy.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Yana Toom (ALDE). – Madam President, the at-risk-of-poverty rate is unacceptably high in the EU at 24%. We face the phenomena of long-term unemployment and the working poor. I call on the Commission to use more actively the European Semester procedure to ensure full implementation of active labour market measures. Regrettably too many country-specific recommendations are not fulfilled by Member States.

I support the idea to create an EU Human Capital Fund as a more flexible and efficient instrument compared to the European Social Fund. In my opinion the fund should support policies required by the European Semester process, and backup activities related to the European Pillar of Social Rights.

Inequalities and poverty make our societies vulnerable and they jeopardise the overall competitiveness of the EU economy. I strongly believe that social minimum standards at EU level are a solution to the problem of extreme inequality and poverty, including the working poor, and these common standards should include at least minimum income agreements, adequate unemployment benefits and certain public services.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, este relatório apresenta-se contraditório. Por um lado afirma, e bem, que o combate às desigualdades se fará pela defesa da contratação coletiva, pelo aumento dos salários, pela regulação dos horários e combate ao trabalho precário, pelo aumento das prestações sociais, pelo reforço e universalidade dos serviços de proteção social e pela promoção de serviços públicos universais nas áreas da saúde e da educação.

Por outro, afirma que a mitigação dessas desigualdades se deve consolidar através do aprofundamento dos instrumentos que têm, inexoravelmente, atacado direitos laborais e sociais ou contribuído para o aumento das desigualdades. São eles o Semestre Europeu ou o aprofundamento da União Económica e Monetária, instrumentos que, sob a lavagem social que se lhes prepara, com o embuste que é o pilar europeu dos direitos sociais e que abarca conceitos como uma licença de cuidadores que empurrará a mulher para casa, impedindo a sua emancipação socioeconómica, continuarão a cavar o fosso das injustiças das desigualdades, da pobreza.

Tim Aker (EFDD). – Madam President, it is heartbreaking to hear constituents come to me – it seems week in, week out – who are suffering under zero-hours contracts. For people who don't know what zero-hours contracts are, it is where you go to work one day and you wait for a phone call to tell you whether you are needed in work the next day. For the purpose of statistics, the government considers that to be actual employment. That is an absolute disgrace. We have one million people in the United Kingdom, one million workers, who are on zero-hours contracts, which means they are going back to casual labour.

If any government wants actually to reduce the inequalities and give people back dignity and pride in the workplace, they need to clamp down and stop zero-hours contracts because we have so many problems in the United Kingdom. Universal credit has been a disaster: people have to wait six weeks for their benefit payments to come through. If you want to get people into work, get rid of zero-hours contracts, give them decent, well paid jobs that are for the long term and can sustain a family.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, les inégalités ne doivent pas être une fatalité. Profondes, elles le sont, avec un taux de personnes exposées au risque de pauvreté ou d'exclusion dépassant les 20 % en Europe, mais surmontables, elles le sont aussi. Alors, attelons-nous au niveau européen, comme au niveau national, à y apporter des réponses concrètes.

Si je ne veux pas établir de hiérarchie dans les difficultés que rencontrent nos concitoyens, je veux néanmoins insister sur une nouvelle forme d'inégalité: il s'agit de l'inégalité numérique. Alors oui, pour moi, la numérisation de l'économie et de la société crée de nombreuses opportunités pour nos citoyens, mais pas encore assez et pas encore pour tous.

Nous devons donc faire des propositions dans ce sens et, de mon point de vue, trois chantiers sont prioritaires.

Premièrement, je crois que nous devons d'abord et avant tout résorber la fracture numérique. Encore trop de zones rurales sont privées du haut débit, ce qui isole ces territoires, décourage les entreprises qui souhaitent s'y installer et pénalise ainsi ceux qui y vivent, ceux qui y travaillent et ceux qui recherchent un emploi.

Deuxièmement, il faut développer les compétences numériques dans le cadre de la formation initiale, mais aussi tout au long du parcours professionnel, afin de se prémunir contre le chômage technologique.

Troisièmement, il faut s'interroger sur la question du droit applicable aux plateformes numériques, qui risque de maintenir certains salariés dans une situation précaire.

Je dis oui au développement de ces nouveaux modèles économiques, mais cela doit se faire en respectant les règles sociales et fiscales pour assurer une concurrence loyale aux entreprises et une sécurité, une protection, à nos salariés.

Par conséquent, il nous faut un cadre équitable pour les contrats de travail. C'est indispensable. Et nous attendons donc les propositions de la Commission.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, é evidente que a desigualdade económica contribui de forma clara para a instabilidade financeira e para o desperdiçar dos recursos humanos. A profunda crise de 2008 foi espelho disso e as políticas de austeridade foram um desastre, em todos os sentidos que a austeridade tem.

Por outro lado, o crescimento económico não significa forçosamente a redução das desigualdades. Neste sentido, há objetivos prioritários que devem ser abraçados por todos nós e que estão presentes neste relatório: a educação universal que compreenda que os pontos de partida são desiguais, uma sociedade onde a prosperidade económica signifique salários dignos, a criação de empregos que beneficiem a economia, mas também os trabalhadores, um sistema fiscal mais justo que ajude à real redistribuição de rendimentos e que seja capaz de combater a fraude e a fuga fiscal.

Acima de tudo, e também está aqui presente neste relatório, é urgente reforçar as políticas de emprego, tendo como prioridade os jovens e os desempregados de longa duração. É ainda urgente combater as disparidades entre homens e mulheres no mercado de trabalho e reforçar o Estado social.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, τα τελευταία 30 χρόνια, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει προσχωρήσει στον νεοφιλελευθερισμό, εφαρμόζει τη σκληρή λιτότητα, εφαρμόζει βίαιη δημοσιονομική προσαρμογή και έχει δημιουργήσει εκατομμύρια ανέργους και εκατομμύρια φτωχούς· αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα. Προχώρησε στην κινεζοποίηση των μισθών, διότι θεωρούσε ότι δήθεν έτσι θα γίνει ανταγωνιστική η ευρωπαϊκή οικονομία.

Και τι αντιμετωπίζει; Αντιμετωπίζει την αγανάκτηση των ευρωπαϊκών λαών, αντιμετωπίζει κρίση νομιμοποίησης, και έρχεται τώρα να αναζητήσει άλλες πολιτικές, λέει ότι πρέπει να υπάρξει τόνωση της αξιοπρεπούς απασχόλησης. Πώς; Για ποια απασχόληση; Για τις συμβάσεις 24 ωρών της μερικής απασχόλησης; Βελτίωση της εργασίας υπό ποιους όρους; Με τους μισθούς πείνας; Είναι δυνατόν να προχωρήσει αυτή η κατάσταση;

Θυμήθηκε ξαφνικά η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση το κράτος πρόνοιας και την κοινωνική προστασία, ενώ τα έχει διαλύσει. Θυμήθηκε τη φτώχεια, ενώ έχει δημιουργήσει τη φτώχεια. Δυστυχώς, αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la igualdad debería ser el eje central de las políticas europeas. No puede haber democracia cuando millones de personas carecen de un empleo digno, sufren discriminaciones, falta de oportunidades y de acceso a una red de salud, educación y protección social pública y universal.

El informe y las medidas que debatimos hoy serían un buen punto de partida para comenzar a dar una respuesta a la ciudadanía europea si se cumplieran al menos dos condiciones. La primera es dotarnos de una legislación en la Unión Europea que establezca normas comunes en materia laboral y social, sobre la base del reconocimiento vinculante de los derechos inscritos en la Carta Social Europea y en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales. Y, en segundo lugar, modificar el marco. Es incompatible que se puedan desarrollar estas medidas en el contexto de la gobernanza económica y el Semestre Europeo, ya que entre sus prioridades no se encuentra la dimensión social.

Hay que invertir la prioridad. La economía debe estar al servicio de las personas, lo que exige una revisión de los actuales Tratados. Si no cambiamos la política, la irracionalidad y el fascismo seguirán descomponiendo Europa.

Sven Schulze (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Thema Ungleichheit ist ein sehr wichtiges Thema! Es ist eigentlich schade, dass wir das zu so später Stunde diskutieren. Ich hoffe, dass zumindest viele Menschen über Livestream diese Debatte verfolgen.

In meinem Heimatland Deutschland ist gerade eine Umfrage veröffentlicht worden. Dort wurde gesagt, dass 77 % der Menschen in Deutschland der Meinung sind, dass sie Angst vor Ungleichheit haben. Vielen von ihnen geht es ganz gut. Aber trotzdem haben sie Angst vor Ungleichheit. Wir wissen: Ungleichheit verursacht in unserer Gesellschaft wirtschaftlichen, sozialen und auch politischen Schaden. Was bedeutet das? Das bedeutet letzten Endes, dass Menschen die Möglichkeiten, die sie haben, vielleicht nicht ganz ausspielen können, vielleicht auch nicht so an der Gesellschaft teilhaben können, wie sie es möchten.

Für mich ergeben sich bei der Thematik Ungleichheit drei Fragen. Zum einen: Wie misst man das eigentlich?

Zum Zweiten: Wann ist ein kritisches Maß erreicht, das nicht mehr zum Ansporn des Einzelnen führt, besser zu werden, die Ungleichheit abzubauen, sondern zur Entmutigung ganzer sozialer Gruppen führt?

Die dritte Frage ist: Mit welchen Mitteln kann Ungleichheit reduziert werden?

Da gibt es einige, auch hier im Europäischen Parlament, die sagen, wir müssen einfach die Sozialsysteme ausbauen. Das Thema europäische Arbeitslosenversicherung, wie es die linke Seite hier im Parlament gerne hätte, das ist, glaube ich, keine Lösung. Wir sollten anders denken. Wir sollten das Thema Fördern und Fordern in den Mittelpunkt stellen. Investition in Bildung, ist wichtig, dass man den Menschen, die wirklich selbst aus ihrer Sicht ungleich behandelt werden, aber die Chance gibt, ihre Ungleichheit selbständig abzubauen.

Investitionen in Bildung, auch in die Jüngsten, in die jungen Menschen, ist viel besser, als Sozialsysteme aufzupumpen. Ich werde morgen auch gegen Ziffer 37 stimmen. Europäische Arbeitslosenversicherung – das kommt mit der EVP nicht in Frage.

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nella sua ottima relazione il collega López ha opportunamente sottolineato che la crisi ci consegna, a proposito delle disuguaglianze, due grandi blocchi di temi: il primo è quello di carattere sociale, il secondo è quello di carattere economico.

Nel corso di questi anni, alcuni paesi europei hanno contrastato la crisi con insensate politiche di rigore, diminuendo le protezioni sociali, riducendo l'effetto e la quantità di welfare a disposizione, nell'idea che l'economia sarebbe ripartita così, facendo costare di meno il costo del lavoro, mentre invece la competizione che deriva da parti più deboli di popolazioni del mondo ha avuto il sopravvento.

Dall'altra parte si sono infranti anche antichi, eppur già inefficaci, strumenti redistributivi. Gli scandali sistematici sul fisco, che è rimasto sostanzialmente intatto come elemento di pressione negativa sulla parte più povera della popolazione europea, quella che lavora e che ha un reddito dipendente, e ha consentito alle aziende, invece, di sfuggire dagli obblighi e dalla lealtà verso gli Stati, hanno fatto saltare gli elementi di coesione che garantivano anche un'adeguata capacità competitiva al sistema economico.

Quando il lavoro diventa precario e non è protetto e i diritti individuali e collettivi non sono riconosciuti la produttività ne risente inevitabilmente. Dunque, quello che oggi siamo chiamati a fare è cercare di rimettere in campo politiche redistributive eque, giuste, di proteggere i più deboli e di lottare contro la povertà. Per questa ragione, credo che il reddito minimo sia lo strumento giusto, è uno strumento universale che dà a tutti le stesse protezioni e le stesse occasioni. Poi bisogna migliorare le condizioni di lavoro, perché lavorando meglio le persone lavorano di più. Oggi, quello che abbiamo di fronte, invece, è un mondo nel quale si penalizzano quelli che lavorano e li si costringe a subire dei condizionamenti che inevitabilmente si riversano sulla quantità e qualità del loro lavoro.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, quiero felicitar al ponente por este informe, por el contenido y por el enfoque, que comparto, que plantea que la lucha contra la desigualdad debe ser una prioridad capital de la Unión Europea.

No debemos olvidar que el incremento de la desigualdad tiene que ver con decisiones políticas, con las políticas de austeridad y con las reformas laborales regresivas que se han aplicado en muchos países de la Unión Europea, especialmente en el sur. Y pongo el ejemplo de España, mi país, que es el segundo país donde más ha crecido en los últimos años. No debemos olvidar tampoco que cuando hablamos de desigualdad lo que unos pierden lo ganan otros.

Hay medidas urgentes señaladas en este informe, como la Directiva sobre una renta mínima o el seguro europeo de desempleo, que nos parecen absolutamente necesarias. Sin embargo, de poco sirven las medidas concretas si el proyecto europeo no cambia el rumbo. El objetivo principal de la Unión Europea debe ser combatir las desigualdades estructurales, fortalecer el equilibrio y la cohesión territorial y perseguir el bienestar de sus ciudadanos y ciudadanas, y hacia ese objetivo debe dirigir todos sus instrumentos.

Se trata de construir una Europa más justa, pero también más fuerte social y económicamente, una Europa que ofrezca soluciones.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, estamos a debater as desigualdades sociais como causa do desemprego e da falta de crescimento, e não como consequência. Isso quer dizer que nós temos que olhar para as desigualdades e vermos qual é a raiz do problema, vermos quais são as reais condições que fazem com que alguns cidadãos não tenham as mesmas oportunidades do acesso à educação, que abandonem a escola mais cedo, que não tenham as mesmas condições em procedimentos de requalificação profissional ou em programas de atualização de competências, que não tenham acesso a trabalho de qualidade.

Limitar, por isso, esta discussão ao rendimento mínimo torna-se hipócrita. Estamos a atirar dinheiro e não estamos a resolver o problema, porque temos que ter aqui uma abordagem absolutamente individualizada, porque, senão, vamos estar perante um ciclo vicioso de perpetuação de dependências.

Esta abordagem individualizada tem que fundar-se, em primeiro lugar, no acesso e na ação localizada de psicólogos, de professores, de técnicos de ação social, que seja complementar aos meios de assistência financeira. É necessário incluir e responsabilizar, responsabilizar também os Estados-Membros. Não podemos limitar o apoio aos mais desfavorecidos ao exercício da caridade, mas ativando verdadeiros mecanismos de solidariedade europeia que considerem os cidadãos como indivíduos únicos, com o fim da integração social.

O apoio aos mais desfavorecidos não é caridade, é inclusão, e as desigualdades não são fatalidades. Queiramos trabalhar nesse sentido.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, when there are inequalities there can be no social justice, and when there is no social justice there can be no fully functioning democracy. Growing inequality is not only a loss to economic potential, as this report brilliantly demonstrates, it is also at the root of the rising populism and extremism that sows division in our communities and threatens European values.

Years of austerity politics have only made things worse, in particular in my country, as well as in Greece, Portugal, Spain and Ireland. I want to highlight the particular situation of women, who are more impacted by public cuts and are at higher risk of poverty and precariousness. In addition, they face multiple discrimination. However, the economic potential of women can be unlocked across Europe through anti-discrimination measures and ambitious and efficient social policies.

I also want to reiterate that the number of children living in, or at risk of, poverty in our societies in 2017 is simply shameful. We need to adopt the EU Child Guarantee now, a guarantee that I have fought for in this House. Fighting inequalities can boost job creation and sustainable growth. We must include, therefore, a proper welcome for newcomers, refugees and asylum seekers, and include them in the labour market as part of the strategy.

Combating inequalities must mobilise all EU instruments, including the European Semester, the EU structural and investment funds and the Youth Employment Initiative and Youth Guarantee, and we must also be ready to apply the European Pillar of Social Rights and have recourse to the European Solidarity Corps.

We, as decision makers, need to mainstream this shared goal in our work across various policy areas, in a coordinated manner: working in silos is no longer the solution. The report demonstrates the importance of clear convergence between our duty as humans and our economic interest. The question is, therefore, what are we still waiting for?

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Madam President, increased inequality bears direct social costs: it reduces access to labour markets, decreases social mobility, hinders social inclusion and cohesion, and limits the self-fulfilling potential of individuals. It also undermines economic development. It also hampers productivity, especially if those with low incomes suffer poor health or if they do not have adequate access to education.

Worryingly, inequality has been on the rise recently. This is why it is so important that we deal with all factors determining it, such as the changes in the global economy, regional variations in competitiveness or the lack of structural reforms. Devising a cure to such problems also demands that we correctly identify where responsibilities lie, what are the measures Member States are responsible for and best placed to take, which are the areas where the EU can give effective support, how we avoid moral hazard, and how we avoid discouraging individual self-reliance.

Even though it does not always succeed in this task, the report has the merit of listing a great number of sectors where it is imperative to act in order to reduce inequality. Key among these, in my opinion, is education. If we want to lay the groundwork for more equal societies and economic success, the first thing we should do is to guarantee well-funded public education and lifelong learning systems.

Siôn Simon (S&D). – Madam President, first, I would like to congratulate my excellent colleague Javi López on his excellent report. It is a brilliant piece of work. Then I would like to use this little bit of time to pick up on two points in the report.

Point 31 refers, as we have heard from other colleagues, to zero-hours contracts. We have heard how in the United Kingdom there are now more than a million people on zero-hours contracts. My region, the West Midlands, contains proportionally more of those people than any other part of the United Kingdom, and the growth in the number of those people in the most recent year recorded by the UK's Office for National Statistics was 10%. This is a growing and serious problem and it requires legislative action to deal with it. A zero-hours contract is not work – it is exploitation, and it should not be acceptable in a civilised society in this day and age.

It is linked with the second point in the report that I would like to pick up on, point 42, about the failure to apply the Working Time Directive and the widespread abuse of unpaid overtime. There are five million people in the UK regularly, systematically working overtime for which they are not being paid. GBP 33 billion worth of overtime work that has been done has not been paid for. Why do employers get away with that kind of exploitation, with stealing GBP 33 billion worth of work from their employees? The answer is because at least a million of those employees are on zero-hours contracts or in similarly insecure forms of employment where they will put up with being exploited because they are frightened of losing their jobs. That is not the way it should be in a rich and supposedly civilised continent like ours in this century.

(The speaker declined to take a blue-card question from Mr Schulze)

Michaela Šojdřová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já souhlasím se zaměřením této zprávy hledat správný směr boje proti nerovnostem. Vychází z předpokladu, že větší ekonomická rovnost v rámci společnosti vede k většímu růstu a také k tvorbě pracovních míst.

Samozřejmě považuji za důležité zaměřit se na investice do vzdělávání i do sociálních inovací, do kvalitních služeb a také do podpory podnikání. Na to bychom neměli zapomínat. Myšlenka univerzálního minimálního příjmu je ke zvážení, ale měla by zůstat plně v kompetenci členských států a nelze ji zavádět z úrovně Evropské unie, například formou směrnice. Také nemohu podpořit návrh na zavedení evropského pojištění proti nezaměstnanosti jako nějaké nástavby k národním systémům. To je opět téma pouze pro členské státy.

Také bohužel nemohu souhlasit se zavedením evropské záruky pro děti, tzv. *youth child guarantee*, protože nemůžeme slíbat, že pro každé dítě v každém členském státě budeme umět zde na úrovni Evropy zajistit stejné standardy. Musíme ale podpořit členské státy v tom, aby dokázaly zajistit podmínky pro kvalitní vzdělání a pro zaměstnanost. To je úkol Evropské unie.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo fermamente che chiunque abbia a cuore l'Unione europea debba insistere che la priorità sia quella di abbattere le disuguaglianze sul continente, non soltanto disuguaglianze tra i suoi paesi, ma anche all'interno degli stessi, partendo da un concetto di base: il progetto europeo e l'integrazione politica economica dei suoi Stati membri e dei suoi popoli devono servire all'obiettivo di recuperare sovranità per le decisioni riguardanti il sociale e l'economia.

Sovranità che è stata progressivamente erosa dalle dinamiche della globalizzazione incontrollata e dal capitalismo finanziario. I dati chiaramente dimostrano che la crisi degli ultimi anni ha avuto un effetto drammatico sulla crescita delle disuguaglianze nelle sue più svariate forme: di reddito, di genere, di ceto, geografiche, intergenerazionali. Le divergenze sono cresciute in maniera più che proporzionale per le fasce più deboli, ed è quindi imperativo che l'Unione europea si faccia carico di rilanciare un'agenda sociale in grado di invertire questo trend.

Tra pochi giorni, a Göteborg, i capi di Stato e di governo si riuniranno per concludere l'accordo sul pilastro europeo dei diritti sociali. Dobbiamo essere in grado di trasformare questo solenne evento in un vero e proprio movimento, in grado di dotare finalmente l'Unione di una strategia sociale adatta alle sfide della modernità. Partiamo da iniziative concrete, non limitiamoci a elencare una serie di principi. A partire dalle istituzioni europee applichiamo una versione più estensiva del quadro di qualità per i tirocini, includendo una garanzia di remunerazione, vietiamo finalmente in Europa i tirocini non retribuiti e di bassa qualità.

Inoltre, questo Parlamento, voglio ricordarlo, ha proposto una direttiva quadro sulle condizioni di lavoro dignitose per tutte le forme di occupazione. Ci dimostri quindi, anche su questo fronte, la Commissione europea di volere per davvero un'Europa della tripla A sociale.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il tema su cui dibattiamo questa sera, come è stato appena ricordato, dovrebbe essere il filo conduttore alla base di tutto il lavoro che svolgiamo in questo Parlamento. Un Parlamento che, a mio avviso, dovrebbe mettere i diritti fondamentali dei cittadini europei e la lotta alla povertà al primo posto della sua iniziativa.

Ci troviamo purtroppo di fronte ad una crescita senza precedenti delle disuguaglianze economiche, sociali e culturali e questa situazione è alla base delle enormi difficoltà e del malessere sociale che i cittadini europei si trovano a vivere. Basti pensare che dal 2005 la povertà di reddito è stata in costante aumento e che, stando a un rapporto dell'Oxfam, nel 2015 in Europa c'erano 342 miliardari in euro e 123 milioni di persone, quasi un quarto quindi della popolazione europea, a rischio di povertà o esclusione sociale.

Le riforme regressive del mercato del lavoro in vari Stati membri, ahimè anche nel mio paese, hanno indebolito la rappresentanza e il potere contrattuale dei lavoratori, sfociando in condizioni di lavoro sempre più precarie e in salari più bassi. La mobilità sociale è praticamente scomparsa. Per contrastare questa situazione non è sufficiente ricorrere a politiche di tipo redistributivo, che sono comunque molto importanti, ma è fondamentale agire attraverso un vasto insieme di politiche che vanno da quelle macroeconomiche a quelle sull'educazione.

Per questo, ritengo imperativo intervenire sulla spesa sociale, affrontando il problema della povertà attraverso il sostegno alle famiglie, garantire l'accesso universale gratuito al servizio sanitario e introdurre un reddito minimo dignitoso per tutti. Altrettanto vitale è ridare centralità alle politiche pubbliche di promozione dell'occupazione e agli investimenti nelle infrastrutture, oltre che a migliorare la qualità e l'efficienza dei sistemi educativi e l'accessibilità ai servizi pubblici.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Ivica Tolić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitke izvijestitelju zbog izvješća i zbog strateške važnosti teme. Nejednakost, siromaštvo, nezaposlenost, iseljavanje mladih, nedovoljno dobri sustavi socijalne skrbi, obrazovanje, zdravstvo, stanovanje, mirovine, zaista su tema koja treba biti u fokusu ovog cijenjenog Doma i svih institucija Europske unije.

Puno više vremena trebalo bi posvetiti rješavanju ovih ključnih tema za naše građane, puno više nego iscrpljivanjima u ideološkom sučeljavanjima. Pozdravljam zato poziv Komisiji da se Parlamentu predstavi prijedlog mjera za prevladavanje nejednakosti proizašlih iz ekonomskih kriza. Predloženi plan treba ponuditi konkretne mjere poboljšanja radnih i životnih uvjeta, pozitivnog poslovnog okruženja, koje će poticati ulaganje, zapošljavanje, jačanje socijalne države i socijalne zaštite, uvažavajući specifična stanja država članica.

Potrebito je odgovoriti kako omogućiti pristup kvalitetnom sustavu obrazovanja, zapošljavanja mladih i njihovog boljeg rješavanja stambenog pitanja, kako omogućiti kvalitetnu zdravstvenu zaštitu svim građanima, sigurnost dohotka i dostojne mirovine iznad praga siromaštva, kako pronaći rješenja za prekomjerno zaduženje i spriječiti daljnje prekomjerno zaduženje. Podržavam izvjestitelja i Prijedlog Odbora te predlažem da se rješavanju ovih problema posveti puno više vremena u Parlamentu.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc, doamna președintă, domnule comisar, nu cred că cineva de aici mai pune la îndoială importanța acestui raport. Vreau să-l felicit pe raportor, pe toți colegii care au contribuit la amendamente și la forma finală a raportului.

Problema este că da, recunoaștem, există responsabilitate partajată între statele membre și Comisie dar, domnule comisar, trebuie să ne gândim la politicile mari, unde putem să influențăm.

Politica de coeziune nu și-a atins scopul. Avem disparități regionale nu numai între state, ci și în cadrul aceleiași stat. Și cred că trebuie să continuăm să creștem aceste fonduri de coeziune. Apoi, există foarte mari probleme cu situația copiilor în sărăcie și lipsa de acces, mai ales în zonele rurale, a copiilor la educație. Sistemele fiscale, s-a vorbit aici, se scot bani enorm în aceste paradisuri fiscale. Am dezbătut de foarte multe ori în cadrul Parlamentului ce am putea să facem să stopăm acest lucru.

Și, în fine, sistemele de justiție din statele membre și, aici, puteți și dumneavoastră, Comisia, să influențați pentru că, dacă ar funcționa justiția, nu ar putea să existe atâta evaziune fiscală.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση περηφανεύεται ότι θα αντιμετωπίσει μισθολογικές και κοινωνικές ανισότητες και θα φτιάξει, λέει, έναν καπιταλισμό ισότητας. Πρόκειται για ανέκδοτο· καπιταλισμός εξ ορισμού σημαίνει ανισότητα, αντίθεση κεφαλαίου-εργασίας.

Σήμερα όμως, ειδικά, υπάρχει πρόκληση. Σήμερα στην Ελλάδα, όχι στα θέρετρα των πλουσίων, αλλά στις φτωχογειτονιές, στις εργατικές γειτονιές της Αττικής, έχουμε μέχρι αυτή την ώρα 15 νεκρούς από πλημμύρες και ο μακάβριος κατάλογος μεγαλώνει. Αυτή είναι ανισότητα. Βλέπετε, τα αντιπλημμυρικά έργα δεν είναι προτεραιότητα ούτε της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης ούτε των κυβερνήσεων, που χρηματοδοτούν από τους ματωμένους φόρους του λαού επιχειρηματικούς ομίλους και όχι μέτρα προστασίας της ζωής του και της περιουσίας του.

Η δίκαιη ανάπτυξη σας είναι βαρβαρότητα. Οι βροχές είναι φυσικό φαινόμενο, θεομηνία είναι η πολιτική σας, που βαρύνεται με την ευθύνη για όλα αυτά τα δράματα. Αφήστε λοιπόν τα παραμύθια, ότι θα εξαλείψετε τις ανισότητες. Πάρτε σήμερα μέτρα, χρησιμοποιήστε τα λεφτά των φορολογουμένων για άμεση ανακούφισή τους, πλήρη αποκατάσταση των ζημιών των οικογενειών, αντιπλημμυρικά και αντισεισμικά έργα.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, nous sommes tous très inquiets de l'emploi en Europe et nous mettons en place un certain nombre de dispositifs encore très insuffisants. Mais la question de l'égalité des sexes par rapport à l'emploi se pose avec une acuité toute particulière, car ce sont les femmes qui sont les premières victimes du marché de l'emploi, non parce qu'elles sont inférieures aux hommes, mais parce que la société, dans son ensemble, n'a pas encore intégré la notion d'égalité hommes-femmes.

L'Union européenne doit prendre cette question très au sérieux, afin de permettre aux femmes d'accéder à l'emploi. La qualification, bien entendu, est une des composantes de la réussite, mais l'accompagnement des femmes dans leur fonction maternelle est aussi indispensable et je crois que cette fonction maternelle doit être absolument reconnue comme une fonction fondamentale socialement et être reconnue en tant que telle dans toutes ses dimensions, y compris celle de l'emploi, bien entendu.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η επιτάχυνση των διαδικασιών της παγκοσμιοποίησης από πλευράς Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως είχε ως αποτέλεσμα, από το 2008 και μετά, να υπάρξει μεγάλη οικονομική ύφεση η οποία επηρέασε αρνητικά τις ισχυρές οικονομίες των κρατών μελών. Έτσι είχαμε εκατομμύρια θέσεις εργασίας που απωλέσθησαν, υπήρξε αύξηση σημαντική του αριθμού των ανέργων και τελικά εξαλείφθηκε σημαντικά σε όλες σχεδόν τις χώρες η μεσαία τάξη. Δυστυχώς, στην Ελλάδα των μνημονίων η μεσαία τάξη έχει καταστραφεί πλήρως. Έτσι δημιουργήθηκαν ανισότητες στην κατανομή του πλούτου, οι πλούσιοι έγιναν πλουσιότεροι και λιγότεροι και οι φτωχοί φτωχότεροι και περισσότεροι. Τα κράτη αδυνατούν να αντιμετωπίσουν αυτή την κατάσταση, διότι έχει καταστραφεί η πρωτογενής παραγωγή και άρα δεν υπάρχει ανάπτυξη, δεν προστατεύεται η βιομηχανία. Έχουμε εισαγωγές προϊόντων από τρίτες χώρες, χωρίς δασμούς και χωρίς προδιαγραφές ασφαλείας, οι οποίες δημιουργούν αθέμιτο ανταγωνισμό για τα αντίστοιχα ευρωπαϊκά προϊόντα· έχουμε ένα άδικο φορολογικό σύστημα που ρίχνει τα βάρη στους οικονομικά αδυνάμους. Για να αντιμετωπιστεί όλη αυτή η κατάσταση, πρέπει να εκλείψουν τα αίτια που δημιούργησαν τις ανισότητες.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dopo anni di crisi economica, il dato che registro nel mio collegio è che le disuguaglianze sociali, minacciano il futuro del progetto europeo, ne erodono la legittimità e danneggiano la fiducia nell'Unione europea quale motore di progresso sociale.

Se è vero che con la Brexit si è aperta una finestra di opportunità per l'Europa, la riduzione delle disuguaglianze deve rappresentare una delle principali priorità politiche, non solo per far fronte alla povertà o promuovere la convergenza, ma anche perché costituisce il prerequisito per la ripresa economica, la creazione di posti di lavoro dignitosi, la coesione sociale e la prosperità condivisa.

L'uguaglianza e l'equità sono parte integrante dei valori europei. Abbiamo bisogno di un autentico pilastro europeo dei diritti sociali, che promuova la convergenza verso l'alto, e di una dimensione sociale più profonda e più equa dell'Unione europea, economica e monetaria, destinando ai cittadini dell'Unione europea gli strumenti legislativi, istituzionali e finanziari necessari per garantire il progresso sociale che deve essere la prossima tappa del processo di integrazione europea.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank all 35 contributors in this debate. It would be impossible to reply to all the comments, but I want to make a few general remarks on behalf of Commissioner Thyssen.

Combating inequalities is a shared priority. Rising inequalities undermine social cohesion, economic growth and the very stability of our political institutions, as many of you said.

As the report rightly points out, automation and digitalisation add to the existing challenges as they rapidly transform the world of work. So, along with the undeniable opportunities that are offered for social participation and for innovation and job creation, they also carry with them the risk of widening inequalities.

This debate is timely in the context of the social summit in Sweden, and I can assure the House that President Jean-Claude Juncker and Commissioner Thyssen and the Commission generally are committed to the implementation of the proposed actions that have been outlined by Commissioner Thyssen. The only appropriate response to the challenges that have been presented here this evening is to invest more and better in the people of Europe, and this means starting early on and continuing right throughout their lives.

This is the essence of what is contained in the European pillar of social rights. And following the pillar's proclamation, the Commission, for its part, is committed to following up with concrete actions. We are counting on the European Parliament's continued support in order to ensure that the pillar's principles and rights are translated into deeds on the ground.

Javi López, ponente. – Señora presidenta; yo, en primer lugar, quiero dar las gracias al comisario y a la comisaria Thyssen —que hoy no nos ha podido acompañar— por sus palabras, por el compromiso de trabajar como nunca lo ha hecho hasta ahora en el ámbito social la Unión Europea —porque le va la legitimidad en ello—, y recordar también que ha habido un trabajo conjunto de este Parlamento para llegar aquí.

Mañana aprobaremos un informe, pero aprobamos un informe después de un año de trabajo, de trabajo conjunto entre los diferentes grupos. Yo quiero agradecer especialmente también la colaboración que ha habido, una colaboración fructífera con el resto de grupos parlamentarios y, especialmente, con aquellos que han estado encargados de esta cuestión. Y hay que decirlo porque aprobamos —esperamos aprobar— mañana este informe, en un momento muy especial, justo a pocos días de la aprobación del pilar social, en una cumbre de la Unión Europea, con un compromiso firme de las tres instituciones para una hoja de ruta que defienda, reconozca y proteja los derechos sociales de los ciudadanos europeos.

Así que está en nuestra mano que mañana enviemos un mensaje fuerte, conjunto, de todos o de la mayoría, de la inmensa mayoría de los grupos políticos en este sentido, porque otra cosa no se entendería y quedaría además deslucido por los mensajes que el resto de instituciones van a enviar en pocos días.

Dicho esto, la desigualdad, porque nos interpela socialmente, moralmente, éticamente; la desigualdad, porque hemos aprendido que funciona, que actúa como un disolvente de la confianza entre ciudadanos, y entre los ciudadanos y las instituciones europeas; la desigualdad, porque, como hemos aprendido, la lucha contra la desigualdad favorece el crecimiento sostenible, duradero; y la desigualdad, porque luchar contra ella es la mejor forma de reconocer y combatir las ansiedades, las incertidumbres y los miedos que recorren los corazones de Europa, y es la mejor forma de recuperar su confianza en estas instituciones.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 16 November 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Monika Beňová (S&D), písomne. – Radikalizácia a nárast xenofóbie v jednotlivých členských štátoch Európskej únie je jedným z dôsledkov pretrvávajúcej nespokojnosti spôsobenej výraznými majetkovými nerovnosťami v rámci spoločnosti. Tento trend sa ešte výraznejšie prehlbil v dôsledku hospodárskej krízy a na ňu nadväzujúcich pravicových úsporných opatrení, ktorým bola Európa nútená v uplynulých rokoch čeliť. Európske, ani národné inštitúcie pritom doteraz nedokázali na problém zvyšujúcej sa nerovnosti dôrazným spôsobom reagovať. Nedostatočná podpora strednej triedy a roztvárajúce sa nožnice medzi chudobnými a bohatými sú dokázateľne príčinou nárastu frustrácie a posilňovania extrémistických politických síl. Zmenšovanie majetkovej a príjmovej nerovnosti musí byť prioritou ekonomických a sociálnych politík na všetkých úrovniach. Či sa to darí naplňať je zároveň potrebné dôsledne monitorovať. Súčasťou opatrení musí byť aj ďalšia podpora zamestnanosti orientovaná predovšetkým na mladých ľudí, či dlhodobo nezamestnaných.

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Pranešime dėl kovos su nelygybe kaip darbo vietų kūrimo ir augimo skatinimo veiksmų kalbama apie didėjantį atotrūkį pajamų ir turto požiūriu tarp daugiausiai ir mažiausiai ekonominės naudos gaunančių subjektų. Pranešimu siekiama iškelti nelygybės problemą kaip didžiausią Europos lygmens prioritetą ir siūloma tą nelygybę mažinti kovojant su skurdu ir socialine atskirtimi, bet taip pat gerinant gyvenimo bei darbo sąlygas ir aktyvią darbo rinkos politiką ar stiprinant profesinių sąjungų ir darbuotojų teises. Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad viena iš pagrindinių priežasčių, paaiškinančių pajamų atotrūkio didėjimą, yra pakilęs nedarbo lygis, pranešime siūloma stiprinti svarbiausias užimtumo politikos sritis, daugiausia dėmesio skiriant dviem itin pažeidžiamoms grupėms: jaunimui ir ilgalaikiams bedarbiams. Siekiant šalinti nelygybės reiškinių itin svarbu stiprinti ir modernizuoti gerovės valstybę ir socialinę apsaugą, kurią norime suteikti savo piliečiams. Kova su skurdu, visų pirma jaunimo ir vaikų, paaiškina vieną didžiausių susirūpinimą keliančių klausimų, kai susiduriame su nelygybės padariniais ne tik socialiniu požiūriu, bet ir atsižvelgiant į ateities potencialą. Lyčių nelygybės problemos sprendimas, kad visi darbo rinkoje veiktų vienodomis sąlygomis, sumažins nelygybę ir turės teigiamo poveikio tvariam augimui. Galiausiai, persikirstymo procesui itin svarbios mokesčių sistemos, jeigu jos gerai parengtos ir tinkamai veikia. Pabrėžtina kovos su sukčiavimu svarba, o tai šiandieniniame pasaulyje yra tarptautinio koordinavimo ir reguliavimo užduotis, kuriai Europos politinėje darbotvarkėje turi būti skiriamas didesnis prioritetas.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – Vrijdag vindt in Göteborg de sociale top plaats. Een top die hopelijk achteraf bekend zal staan als een van de markeerpunten waarin wij afscheid nemen van een EU waarin het louter draait om markt en munt. Dit adagium heeft er namelijk toe geleid dat de ongelijkheid tussen Europeanen zowel binnen de lidstaten als tussen de lidstaten is toegenomen. Daarom wil ik mijn complimenten uitspreken richting mijn collega López. Mede dankzij hem staat de ongelijkheid onder European op onze agenda.

Het is mij al jaren een doorn in het oog dat de jeugdwerkloosheid in een aantal lidstaten torenhoog is. Een verloren tweede generatie dreigt. Uitbreiding van de financiering om dit te bestrijden, zoals López wil, kan ik volledig ondersteunen. Hetzelfde geldt voor zijn oproep om nulurencontracten te beperken, omdat dit naar mijn mening zorgt voor onzekere inkomsten en daarmee het vergroten van de ongelijkheid. Zijn oproep dat collectief onderhandelen ook écht een EU-recht is, is gezien alle onzekere arbeidscontracten helaas nodig. De EU staat op een kruispunt. Wij moeten afslaan richting een sociaal Europa. Door een top wordt de werkloosheid niet teruggedrongen, stijgen de lonen niet en wordt de armoede niet bestreden. Daar is concrete actie voor nodig!

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie*. – Walka z nierównościami zdecydowanie jest potrzebna, hamują one bowiem prawidłowy, zrównoważony rozwój społeczeństwa. Nie możemy jednak pozwolić, by pod hasłami nawołującymi do większej równości społecznej wprowadzone również zostało jawne naruszenie kompetencji państw członkowskich, do których to należą zagadnienia polityki społecznej. Unia Europejska nie ma umocowania do harmonizowania polityki społecznej, wprowadzania filaru praw socjalnych ani zarządzania systemami opieki społecznej. *Acquis communautaire* nie upoważnia Unii do harmonizowania dochodu minimalnego w Unii Europejskiej i idąc dalej: wprowadzenia europejskiego systemu ubezpieczeń. Również kwestie podatkowe należą do uprawnień państw członkowskich. Eliminowanie dysproporcji społecznych w celu poprawy wzrostu gospodarczego jest zagadnieniem dużej wagi, ale tutaj, moim zdaniem, pod sztandarami ustanowienia równości społecznej wkracza się w domenę państw członkowskich, naruszając zasadę subsydiarności.

Verónica Lope Fontagné (PPE), *por escrito*. – La lucha contra las desigualdades tiene que afrontarse desde una triple vertiente que analice los aspectos económicos, sociales y territoriales. Para acabar con las desigualdades, lo primero es garantizar que los ciudadanos europeos disfruten de una igualdad de oportunidades a lo largo de la vida, con independencia del lugar en donde se viva. Hay que tener en cuenta que la desigualdad económica es el resultado principal del desempleo y que para reducirla, tenemos que actuar sobre la raíz del problema. En la UE hay demasiadas personas que viven en riesgo de pobreza y de exclusión a las que tenemos que integrar, en particular para romper ese círculo de pobreza del que es tan difícil salir. Por un lado, hay que favorecer el entorno para el establecimiento de empresas y promover políticas laborales que fomenten la integración y la permanencia en el mercado laboral. Por el otro, necesitamos unos sistemas de finanzas públicas sólidos que sirvan de apoyo a los que más lo necesitan y que garanticen una igualdad de oportunidades. Tenemos que combinar las políticas activas y pasivas para obtener resultados duraderos en vez de medidas que incrementen indiscriminadamente el gasto público, amenazando la sostenibilidad del sistema de bienestar.

Vladimír Maňka (S&D), *písomne*. – Jednou z hlavných výziev súčasnosti je potreba riešiť pretrvávajúce zväčšovanie rozdielov v príjmoch a bohatstve. Prehlbujúca sa nerovnosť spôsobuje zvyšovanie chudoby, dotýka sa najzraniteľnejších skupín obyvateľstva a prirodzene zvyšuje nespokojnosť. Základným prostriedkom na znižovanie nerovnosti je tvorba udržateľných pracovných miest, prostredníctvom ktorých sa získavajú nielen zdroje na obživu, ale sa aj zlepšuje celkový sociálny a spoločenský status ľudí. Za rovnako dôležité však pokladám aj možnosť získať dostupné a kvalitné vzdelanie, ktoré umožní lepšie sa zaradiť na trh práce. Záujem na znižovaní nerovnosti musí byť samozrejmosťou súčasťou vnútorných aj vonkajších politík Únie.

Dominique Martin (ENF), *par écrit*. – Le problème des inégalités économiques se manifeste plus fortement qu'auparavant dans la plupart des États membres de l'Union européenne. Plusieurs causes sont à l'origine de ces inégalités économiques: la mondialisation; les changements du marché de travail et notamment la précarité des emplois; le développement des technologies et notamment la robotisation; la crise économique et les politiques d'austérité qui y sont liées.

Le Front national évoque l'ensemble de ces raisons depuis de nombreuses années! Nos travailleurs perdent leurs emplois parce que les grandes entreprises préfèrent produire dans les pays tiers, moins coûteux en main d'œuvre, et que la globalisation facilite cette délocalisation. Ils perdent des emplois à cause de la robotisation, encouragée démesurément par l'UE, sans étude sérieuse sur les risques de chômage. Enfin, la précarisation des emplois est de plus en plus alarmante. Originellement conséquence de la crise économique, elle s'est développée avec l'application des politiques européennes d'austérité.

Le rapport de M. Lopez semble «oublier» ces raisons. En revanche, il propose de combattre le populisme qui «se nourrit des inégalités, en mettant en danger le projet européen», et d'inclure les migrants dans toutes les actions qui devraient résoudre ces problèmes.

Claude Rolin (PPE), *par écrit*. – Ce vendredi 17 novembre, les présidents de la Commission européenne, du Parlement européen et du Conseil signeront une proclamation visant à consacrer le socle européen des droits sociaux. Égalité des chances, meilleur accès au marché du travail, conditions de travail équitables, protection et inclusion sociales accrues, voici les différents objectifs que devront poursuivre ensemble la Commission européenne et les États membres.

Si la signature de cette proclamation est un premier pas dans la bonne direction, elle devra s'accompagner d'initiatives législatives aux niveaux européen et des États membres, ainsi que de nouveaux moyens financiers pour atteindre ces objectifs. Sans quoi, ce socle trouvera sa place dans l'armoire des belles promesses.

Je me réjouis donc que notre Parlement se soit prononcé largement en faveur de ce rapport sur la lutte contre les inégalités qui contient à mes yeux de nombreuses initiatives à mettre œuvre dans le cadre de ce socle européen des droits sociaux. Transformons maintenant ces promesses en actions concrètes pour améliorer le bien-être de tous les citoyens européens.

25. Russian ban – EU fruit and vegetable sector (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the oral question to the Commission on the Russian ban – EU fruit and vegetable sector, by Czesław Adam Siekierski, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (O-000082/2017 – B8-0610/2017) (2017/2950(RSP)).

Czesław Adam Siekierski, *autor*. – Czas szybko biegnie, to już czwarty rok od wprowadzenia embarga rosyjskiego, między innymi na produkty rolne z Unii Europejskiej. Stąd nasze kolejne działania – pytanie skierowane do Komisji zgodnie z artykułem 128 Regulaminu Parlamentu w imieniu Komisji Rolnictwa, która przygotowała to pytanie na wniosek koordynatorów.

Rosyjski zakaz importu pozbawił europejskich producentów owoców i warzyw ważnego rynku eksportowego, a przedłużenie embarga do dnia 31 grudnia 2018 roku bez wątpienia będzie przyczyną dalszych poważnych konsekwencji dla tego sektora w Unii. Zakaz ten trzeci rok z rzędu powoduje znaczne straty dla producentów w Unii, bez związku z konfliktem na Ukrainie – europejscy rolnicy nie mają żadnego związku z konfliktem Ukraina–Rosja.

Mając na uwadze utrzymującą się niestabilność rynków rolnych, rosyjski zakaz doprowadził do dalszego pogorszenia sytuacji unijnych producentów rolnych. Biorąc pod uwagę fakt, że otwarcie nowych alternatywnych rynków dla unijnego sektora owoców i warzyw, rynków dorównujących rynkowi rosyjskiemu w perspektywie krótko- i średnioterminowej nie jest wykonalne – zwłaszcza ze względu na pozataryfowe bariery handlowe – niezbędne jest znalezienie zrównoważonego rozwiązania tej sytuacji aż do samego końca obowiązywania rosyjskiego embarga.

W świetle powyższych uwag pojawia się pytanie do Komisji. Czy Komisja ma zamiar podjąć dalsze działania w celu wsparcia europejskich producentów i eksporterów owoców i warzyw? Jeżeli tak, to jakie konkretne i zrównoważone działania rozważa?

Po drugie, europejscy producenci owoców i warzyw nie mogą zostać pozostawieni sami sobie. Jakie w związku z tym środki podejmie Komisja i Rada w celu zagwarantowania przyszłości europejskich producentów i eksporterów owoców i warzyw?

Po trzecie, jakie działania podejmie Komisja, aby pomóc rolnikom zrekompensować straty spowodowane rosyjskim zakazem? Czy Komisja opublikuje badanie poświęcone skuteczności przekierowania na inne rynki i kształtowaniu się unijnej produkcji rolnej oraz dystrybucji i popytu od wprowadzenia rosyjskiego embarga, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem sytuacji małych producentów i skutków, jakie ponoszą?

To tyle względem pytań. Jeśli chodzi o komentarz, to należy wyrazić podziękowanie i rolnikom, i handlowcom, że bardzo intensywnie działali w zakresie poszukiwania nowych rynków zbytu z widocznymi efektami. Także Komisja Europejska w miarę możliwości starała się udzielać poparcia i zostały wygospodarowane finanse, środki, które pomogły przetrwać tę trudną sytuację rolnikom. Chciałbym też, korzystając z tej okazji, podziękować panu komisarzowi Hoganowi, który w tym względzie działał bardzo zdecydowanie.

Jednak chciałoby się wyrazić opinię trochę szerszą, że mało są skuteczne sankcje podjęte przez Unię Europejską wobec Rosji. Prezydent Putin, można powiedzieć, śmieje się, ale w odwecie wprowadza istotne restrykcje wobec rolników unijnych, którzy nijak się mają do przyczyny sankcji, to jest napaści Rosji na Ukrainę, ale ponoszą koszty tej sytuacji, o czym już mówiłem. Jeśli Unia chciała wprowadzić poważne, skuteczne sankcje wobec Rosji, to miała wiele innych możliwości, ale z nich nie skorzystała, tylko prowadzi różne interesy bardzo korzystne dla niektórych, ale nie dla rolników.

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, let me start by underlining the strong support that the European Union has provided to producers of fruit and vegetables since the beginning of the Russian embargo. Through our exceptional measures we have already provided a total amount of aid of EUR 490 million, which corresponds to a withdrawal of 1.7 million tonnes of fruit and vegetables.

These exceptional measures continue to operate and they sustain the market. The EU support allows producers to adapt to the new market situation and, in parallel, we are working to ensure a gradual opening of new markets for European Union apples by lifting sanitary and phytosanitary barriers, particularly in Asia, in countries like China, India and Vietnam, and in the American countries, particularly the United States and Canada.

I am disappointed, however, that the United States has not fulfilled its promise to open the market for fruit to Poland and Belgium in particular, as it promised to do some time ago. So this diversification of trade that we are seeking to open up is developing much more slowly for fruit and vegetables than originally expected.

However, I want to recall that the overall EU export figures for agrifood products are increasing. They total EUR 137 billion for the 12-month period from September 2016 to August 2017. This is well above the export figures of July 2014 when the Russian embargo was imposed.

These figures are no consolation to our farmers who are involved in the fruit and vegetable sector, who still need our support and who are continuing to suffer market losses and income losses. In view of the persisting market difficulties, the temporary exceptional measures in relation to fruit and vegetables have been prolonged after 1 July 2017 for one more additional year, and the matter can be reviewed again at that stage.

The support which we have focused in particular on certain fruit tree crops is important in terms of alleviating market disturbance. Last summer, the budget devoted to the scheme was increased following the peaches and nectarines crisis, as additional quantities for withdrawal were allocated to Greece, Italy and Spain.

In addition, many of you asked, in the context of the withdrawal of the product from the market, to increase significantly the support in terms of the withdrawal scheme and the amount of product for fruit and vegetables. This was done in a Delegated Act recently for producer organisations, and it is applicable since June of this year. This provides considerable additional support to the market.

I have promotion support as well for the marketplace, where Member States can allocate up to 70% assistance from the European Union to promote the possibilities for fruit and vegetables right around the world and diversify into other markets. By mentioning these particular issues I am saying that we are doing everything we possibly can, by all the means at my disposal, to help farmers in the fruit and vegetable area to overcome the market difficulties in the food and vegetable sector arising from the Russian embargo, and that farmers are not being left totally on their own.

I would also like to underline that in some Member States, and for certain products, such as peaches in Spain, or apples in Poland, there are structural problems of over-production in those countries, and we have to look at these issues and monitor them. These temporary exceptional measures cannot be considered as the appropriate way to remedy these types of situations and we will continue to look at those markets and those particular products with Member States in order to see what we have to do to address this problem of over-production in an appropriate way.

I would say to Mr Siekierski that the political decision regarding sanctions in respect of the Russian embargo, and their effectiveness or otherwise, is not a matter for the Commissioner for Agriculture, but a matter for political decisions that have been made elsewhere.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, desde el pasado agosto hasta el próximo mes de junio se van a retirar nada menos que 52 530 toneladas de melocotones y nectarinas. Casi 30 000 en mi país, España, pero también en Grecia, en Italia o en Portugal. Sé que retirarlas es posible gracias a los más de 70 millones asignados a los productos afectados por el veto ruso hasta el próximo verano. Pero eso es, ciertamente, hasta el próximo verano.

Por esto traigo este asunto al Pleno, por la permanente incertidumbre a la que se encuentran sometidos los agricultores. Cada año, desde hace tres, la Comisión anuncia la prórroga de ayudas, y cada año, desde hace tres, nuestros agricultores esperan con el corazón en un puño a conocer si los cupos y precios de retirada cubrirán o no sus necesidades. Es una situación insostenible, señor comisario, y sé que usted es sensible a ello.

No podemos permitir que nuestros productores sean rehenes del tactismo de Rusia. Es un hecho que el embargo nos está haciendo daño. También que ha generado un *boom* en la producción rusa. Un ejemplo: mientras que las importaciones de la Unión han caído un 40 % desde 2013, su compañía agrícola más grande —Rusagro— aumentó sus ventas un 16 % en 2016. Seamos, pues, realistas. El Kremlin no tiene prisa por levantar el veto.

Por eso, debemos pensar en la mejor forma de hacerle frente en el medio plazo. Yo he propuesto convertir las medidas de urgencia en medidas estructurales, porque si sabemos que el veto ruso va para largo, ¿por qué no protegernos mejor contra él? Pienso que un marco más estable de ayudas contribuye a reducir la incertidumbre.

También le pido que sigan trabajando en la apertura de nuevos mercados y le reconozco los éxitos cosechados, como la firma del tratado con Canadá. Ese es un buen camino a seguir.

Termino, señor comisario, señora presidenta, diciendo que en tierras como la mía es muy difícil explicar que productos de alta calidad tengan que echarse a perder. Por eso, le agradezco su participación hoy y le pido que trate este asunto como prioritario.

Jean-Paul Denanot, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, cela fait plus de trois ans que l'embargo russe prive certains producteurs de fruits et légumes européens de débouchés à l'exportation. Pour venir en aide à ces producteurs, l'Union a adopté des mesures de marché exceptionnelles qui ont permis le retrait d'environ 1,7 million de tonnes. Monsieur le Commissaire, je tiens à vous adresser mes félicitations à ce sujet.

Malgré ce dispositif de gestion de l'offre, qui doit malheureusement prendre fin prochainement, des productions comme les pommes, les pêches et les nectarines connaissent toujours de profonds déséquilibres.

Face à ce maintien de l'embargo, j'invite donc la Commission à tout faire pour faciliter la mobilisation des programmes opérationnels par les organisations de producteurs, afin de mieux planifier les productions en fonction du marché.

Notre Parlement a permis, je crois, d'avancer dans ce domaine avec l'Omnibus. Ces programmes opérationnels pourront recourir à des actions de soutien à l'exportation en cas de crise. Il faudra pleinement les utiliser.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Mevrouw de voorzitter, mijnheer de commissaris, collega's, we zijn drieën-half jaar na de Russische boycot. Drieën-half lange jaren. Men heeft onze landbouwers altijd gezegd: die crisis is tijdelijk. Het is nu verdorie de vierde oogst die we niet kunnen exporteren naar Rusland. Dat is niet meer tijdelijk. Dat is structureel. Het is tijd om het geweer van schouder te veranderen. De fruitboeren zitten met een structureel probleem. Maar u, mijnheer de commissaris, zit ook met een structureel probleem als u uw belofte wilt nakomen om de landbouwers te ondersteunen.

Ik denk dat we de portemonnee moeten openen om onze landbouwers te compenseren voor de geleden schade. Zij zijn het slachtoffer. Daarnaast moeten we inzetten op structurele oplossingen. Want het ligt niet aan de werkracht en de wil van onze boeren. Mijnheer de commissaris: heel wat boeren staat het water aan de lippen. Er gebeuren drama's. Ik doe heel veel terreinbezoeken. Heel veel bedrijven staan op de rand van het faillissement. Boeren leven in armoede. En wat erger is: in mijn streek plegen velen zelfmoorden. Bij ons ging 60 % van de Conférenceperen rechtstreeks naar Rusland. Dat vangen we niet op met kleine exporten naar nieuwe markten. Ik vraag u dan ook, mijnheer de commissaris, om over te stappen van tijdelijke naar gedegen structurele maatregelen. Ik zal u daarbij helpen. Ik hoop dat het Parlement na dit debat een resolutie aanneemt waarin we aandringen op echte compensaties voor de geleden schade.

Voorts dring ik aan op een actieplan voor nieuwe markten. Ik zou willen dat u met commissaris Malmström spreekt over een echt actieplan om ons fruit te promoten. We mogen als Europeanen trots zijn op het beste fruit en de beste groenten. Laten we die ook promoten. Ik weet wel dat de Europese Raad die sancties tegen Rusland treft, maar ik zou willen dat u met mevrouw Mogherini spreekt om onze landbouwrelaties met Rusland te verbeteren. Ik dank u.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Esta questão que debatemos hoje remonta ao golpe de Estado na Ucrânia e aos Acordos de Minsk. A União Europeia interveio diretamente no golpe a reboque da NATO e dos Estados Unidos, com enormes custos para o orçamento da União Europeia e para os produtores europeus. Este embargo tem sido renovado de seis em seis meses até hoje. O impacto na produção de frutas e legumes em Portugal tem sido enorme, representando cerca de 15 milhões de euros anuais. As ajudas conseguidas apenas conseguem compensar uma parte ínfima dos prejuízos.

Por isso, o que exigimos hoje, aqui no Parlamento Europeu, é que a União Europeia compense os produtores que não podem ser vítimas desta situação e repense a sua política de vizinhança com a Rússia. A agricultura tem pago um preço elevado pela política agrícola comum, cada vez mais liberalizada em prejuízo do rendimento de quem produz. Não se acrescenta mais esta fatura a quem já tem sido tão castigado.

Bronis Ropė, *Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu*. – Rusijos įvestas embargas maisto produktų importui iš Europos Sąjungos padarė juntamą poveikį. Gal ne visai tokį, kokio tikėjosi jo iniciatoriai. Europos, net ir labiausiai į Rusiją eksportavusių šalių, neištiko krizė, tačiau žemdirbių ir perdirbėjų pajamos gerokai sumažėjo.

Lietuvai šis Rusijos embargas nebuvo naujiena. Mes ir prieš jį iš Rusijos esame sulaukę įvairių eksporto draudimų. Ir tai visada buvo susiję su tam tikru politiniu kontekstu. Tad, nors ir buvusi pelninga gamintojams, Rusijos rinka niekada nebuvo prognozuojama.

Tačiau būtent šis keturioliktų metų visuotinis embargas iš esmės pakeitė ir Lietuvos žemės ūkio struktūros žemėlapi. Dėl didžiulių atskiruose sektoriuose patirtų nuostolių ir dėl ateities nežinojimo ūkininkai masiškai traukiasi iš gamybos ir dažniausiai pereina prie augalininkystės, daugiausia prie grūdinių.

Skaičiai iškaltingi, vien pieno sektoriuje nuo embargo pasikeitimo pradžios pieno gamintojų sumažėjo 34 proc. Didžioji dalis jų perėjo prie grūdinininkystės. Tai yra negerai, tai ne tik mažiau pelninga pačiam ūkiui, bet ir žalinga ekonomikai, nes grūdai masiškai eksportuojami. O žaliavos eksportas niekada nesukuria tokios pridėtinės vertės kaip, pavyzdžiui, pieno gamyba arba jo perdirbimas. Tokie pokyčiai neabejotinai nepalankūs ir klimatui, nes atsiranda disbalansas tarp augalininkystės ir gyvulininkystės sektorių.

Kalbant konkrečiai apie vaisius ir daržoves, Lietuvos ūkininkai, dėl embargo netekę stambiausios savo eksporto rinkos, po truputį persiorientavo, kai kas ėmėsi perdirbimo ir būtų galima pradėti džiaugtis, kad išmokome išgyventi ir be Rusijos rinkos. Jei ne Lietuvą šiais metais nuniokoję potvyniai! Ėmiausi iniciatyvos surinkti iš Lietuvos ūkininkų vaizdo medžiagą ir parodyti jums ežerus, kuriais dėl neregėto vasarą ir rudenį iškritusio kritulių kiekio virto Lietuvos laukai. Tad šiųmetis daržovių derlius masiškai apsemtas ir supuvo. Dar ir šiandien kai kuriuose rajonuose ūkininkai murkdo techniką ir mėgina kasti derliaus likučius arba jį aparti. Bet akivaizdu, kad žmonės patirs didžiulius nuostolius. Panašu, kad gamta mums irgi paskelbė embargą. Ir bijau, kad dar neatsigavusiems po keturioliktų metų ūkininkams jis gali būti prازیtingas.

Vilius, kad Europos Sąjunga solidariai pažiūrės į šią kritinę situaciją ir suras reikiamų išteklių skubiai pagalbai.

Philippe Loiseau, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, la question posée ici occulte le plus important, à savoir l'origine du problème. Pourquoi la Russie a-t-elle imposé un embargo sur nos produits agricoles?

Elle le fait à cause de l'Union européenne, de ses sanctions et de sa politique agressive. L'Europe a regardé la paille dans l'œil du voisin russe, en ignorant la poutre dans le sien.

En réalité, elle a voulu donner une leçon de morale à la Russie, à M. Poutine, voilà la réalité.

Et pourtant l'indignation de l'Union européenne est sélective. Où est-elle lorsque la commission du commerce international demande de moderniser notre union douanière avec la Turquie?

Sur l'échelle des valeurs de l'Union européenne, la Turquie serait donc un partenaire plus respectable que la Russie?

Où est l'indignation quand l'Union européenne accorde des préférences commerciales à l'Ukraine, un pays, je le rappelle, affligé par la guerre civile et la corruption depuis quatre ans. Que la Commission arrête cette hypocrisie.

L'embargo russe est une catastrophe pour tous les agriculteurs européens et il n'y a pas 36 façons d'y mettre un terme. Il faut tout simplement lever les sanctions européennes contre la Russie, qui n'ont pas lieu d'être.

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kollegen! Seit 2014 existiert das russische Importverbot für eine Reihe von landwirtschaftlichen Produkten, und wir alle waren der Meinung, dass wir heute darüber nicht mehr hätten diskutieren müssen. Wir alle waren der Hoffnung, dass es im Jahr 2017 dieses Importembargo nicht mehr geben muss. Deshalb finde ich es gut und richtig, dass unser Ausschussvorsitzender hier die Anfrage an die Kommission gestellt hat, weil wir leider von einem langfristigen Prozess ausgehen müssen.

Da stelle ich erst mal fest, das Kompliment kann ich an der Stelle an den Herrn Kommissar loswerden: Er hat sich ja wirklich bemüht, diesen Ausfall wieder auszugleichen, aber wir sind ein klein wenig wirklich die Reparaturwerkstatt. Ich bitte noch mal eindringlich auch die Kommission – ich glaube, der Kollege ist nicht hier. Wir leiden ja auch ein klein wenig unter der russischen Taktik, man könnte auch sagen, wir leiden auch ein wenig unter der amerikanischen Taktik. Also die europäischen Landwirte sind hier in die Schraubzwinde der Supermächte gekommen, die, wenn man so will, große Politik zulasten von Dritten machen, nämlich den mittelständischen Unternehmen, unseren Landwirten. Also, bitte, Herr Kommissar, lassen Sie nicht nach, in Ihrer Kommission darauf hinzuwirken, dass wir als Europäische Union normalerweise die Brücke zwischen Amerika und Russland, die wir sein müssten, endlich wieder bauen. Und, wenn man so will, fehlt es auch an der gemeinsamen europäischen Außenpolitik.

Sie haben sehr richtig gesagt: Als Minimum gehört dazu, dass natürlich, wenn die Europäische Union aus außenpolitischen Gründen sagt: „Wir beteiligen uns hier an der gemeinsamen Politik mit Amerika“, die amerikanische Seite gleichfalls die Dinge einhält, die sie uns versprochen hat.

Wir bitten Sie jetzt noch mal eindringlich – die Situation ist so, wie sie ist, das muss man einholen –, nicht lockerzulassen. Stellen Sie den Landwirten Geld zur Verfügung, denn das Mindeste, was wir tun müssen, ist, dass unsere Landwirte zumindest finanziell entschädigt werden. Aber meine zweite Bitte noch mal: Vergessen Sie auch die große Politik nicht. Wir müssen das Problem lösen. Wenn sich Große streiten, gibt es immer einen dritten Verlierer.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Макгинес, уважаеми г-н Хоган, чрез руското ембарго можем да разберем две неща. Едното от тях е, че трети страни използват селскостопанския сектор в Европейския съюз, което ни прави уязвими, а от друга страна непропорционалното субсидиране в различните държави членки при условие на затварянето на конкуренцията вътре в европейския пазар води до едни държави членки да могат да са по-конкурентноспособни от други държави членки.

След срещите ми с производители на ябълки, праскови, и зеленчуци, като картофи в България съм изключително притеснен, тъй като те казват, че ще прекратят своите дейности.

Г-н Комисар, обръщам се с апел към Вас да направите всичко възможно по силите си в бъдеще да използвате всички възможни инструменти като кризисния резерв и държавно дотиране, за да се постигне справедливост. За еднаква земеделска култура в Европейския съюз трябва да има еднакъв таван на максимално подпомагане от държавите членки. За силно европейско земеделие на единния пазар трябва да важат еднакви правила за производителите.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Het is heel goed dat dit punt vanavond op de agenda staat, mijnheer de commissaris. Inmiddels zijn we jaren verder sinds de boycot en helaas is er nog geen sprake van een oplossing. De effecten voor de sector zijn nog steeds voelbaar. Als voorbeeld noem ik tomaten. De sector in mijn land, Nederland, geeft aan dat de prijsvorming van tomaten nog steeds slecht is, uiterekend in de zomermaanden, precies de maanden waarin voorheen naar Rusland werd geëxporteerd. Ik roep de commissaris dan ook krachtig op om zich te blijven inzetten voor een heropening van de Russische markt. Dat wil ik echt onderstrepen. Commissaris Hogan: zet u in voor een heropening van de Russische markt. Veel succes.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la storia economica insegna che le sanzioni economiche di un paese verso un altro, o di una coalizione di paesi come nel caso dell'Unione europea, non raggiungono, nella stragrande maggioranza dei casi, i loro obiettivi.

Ma c'è una persona nel mondo, una persona che è convinta del contrario, e che dichiara che le sanzioni non hanno danneggiato i paesi dell'Unione europea. È Alice nel paese delle meraviglie? No, è la signora Mogherini, che, dicendo pubblicamente una cosa di questo genere, cioè che le sanzioni non hanno danneggiato l'economia europea, fa della «disinformatia» sovietica. Questo è inammissibile, visto che tutti sappiamo quelli che sono i dati, pesanti, che da quando ci sono le sanzioni l'Unione europea ha perso il 44 % del movimento economico verso la Russia.

Abbiamo danneggiato di più l'economia europea e ci sono dei paesi, e il mio non è certo l'ultimo visto che il *made in Italy* è crollato nelle esportazioni verso la Russia, c'è un danno incalcolabile. E di questo, se ci fosse giustizia, se ci fosse la possibilità di far pagare i danni agli idioti che hanno preso questa decisione, sarebbero molto pesanti questi danni, e Dio sa se un giorno non riusciremo a farli pagare a questi responsabili, cioè a voi della Commissione europea.

Michel Dantin (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, je regrette que nos collègues membres de la commission des affaires étrangères ne participent pas plus nombreux à ce débat et je remercie celui qui en est membre et qui y assiste, car le problème que nous cherchons à régler ce soir n'est pas du seul ressort de l'agriculture et n'est pas du seul ressort de votre portefeuille.

Pour autant, Monsieur le Commissaire, il incombe à la Commission – c'est sa fonction de par les traités – de gérer les conséquences des décisions prises par nos États. Vous l'avez bien compris puisque vous avez, sans relâche, usé du pouvoir qui est le vôtre pour tenter d'ouvrir de nouveaux marchés. Les chiffres ont été rappelés, ce travail porte, sans mauvais jeu de mots, ses fruits aujourd'hui.

Pour autant, ni les producteurs ni les consommateurs européens ne tirent bénéfice de ce travail. Les prix restent infiniment bas pour les premiers. C'est le cas des poires, des pommes, des pêches et des nectarines, en particulier. Les prix ne sont pas vraiment attractifs non plus pour le consommateur européen.

Dès lors, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame la Présidente, ne faut-il pas, une fois encore, s'interroger sur le fonctionnement de la chaîne alimentaire? Certains acteurs ne tirent-ils pas profit de cette situation en Europe?

Monsieur le Commissaire, l'Omnibus nous a appris à travailler avec M^{me} Vestager. Ne faut-il pas mobiliser ses services sur cette question-là aussi?

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor Hogan, como todos mis colegas han dicho, vamos ya por el tercer año consecutivo. Esto genera incertidumbre y el sector de las frutas y hortalizas, en unos casos peor que en otros, va intentando resolver la situación.

Pero la situación es mala. Es verdad que la Comisión ha puesto encima de la mesa 500 millones de euros, es verdad. Pero ¿qué está pasando? Yo he hablado esta mañana con un agricultor de Lleida, en Cataluña, un agricultor de melocotón. Ha recibido el precio de diecinueve céntimos de euro, diecinueve céntimos de euro el kilo. Los costes son treinta y cinco céntimos de euro. Hay una diferencia abismal. Ha tomado una decisión drástica —Joel se llama—: ha dejado la agricultura; deja la agricultura porque no puede vivir de ella.

Ese es el problema. Por tanto, la Comisión ha puesto dinero para este problema político que ha entrado en la agricultura, pero hay que hacer algo más. Lo ha dicho el señor Dantin y yo lo apunto: hay que resolver la situación, porque los agricultores de frutas y hortalizas están sufriendo, y los consumidores no se están beneficiando porque seguimos pagando caro las frutas y hortalizas.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – De Russische boycot heeft de groente- en fruitsector inderdaad rake klappen gegeven. Voor onze Vlaamse telers – en ik denk dan in de eerste plaats aan de perentelers – is het een ramp. Om die eerste schok op te vangen, om de landbouwers een inkomen te garanderen en om de continuïteit te verzekeren is crisissteun absoluut nodig. Maar een structurele oplossing is dat natuurlijk niet. Zeker als we weten dat een hervatting van de export naar Rusland niet voor morgen is. U hebt de cijfers genoemd, commissaris. Tot nu toe is 1,7 miljoen ton aan groenten en fruit opgekocht voor vele tientallen miljoenen euro's. Dan moet mij, en met mij vele mensen, van het hart dat ik het er moeilijk mee heb dat voor dat geld kwaliteitsproducten als compost of veevoeder eindigen of niet worden geoogst. Dat strijkt iedereen tegen de haren in, in de eerste plaats de telers zelf. Ik zie daarom liever dat we onze middelen volop inzetten om nieuwe afzetmarkten aan te boren, om sterke kwaliteitslabels in te voeren en te promoten, om ons fruit te verkopen in plaats van te vernietigen, en om na te denken over alternatieve modellen die geen overproductie en verspilling in de hand werken. Dat gaat maar op één voorwaarde lukken: met de medewerking van iedereen — politiek, telers, exporteurs, verwerkers en consumenten.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, sunt aici în calitate de coordonator pentru afaceri externe al grupului meu politic PPE. Atât eu cât și colegii mei susținem menținerea sancțiunilor decise de către Uniunea Europeană în ultimii ani la adresa Rusiei. Mai mult, cred că ar trebui să fim pregătiți să introducem și alte măsuri dacă acțiunile lui Putin o vor cere.

Reamintesc că aceste sancțiuni au fost hotărâte împreună cu cei mai importanți parteneri politici pe plan internațional ai Uniunii Europene, între care și Statele Unite. S-a ajuns la sancțiuni ca urmare a unor acțiuni foarte clare. Doar deputatul de la Frontul Național nu le-a văzut, văzuse cu totul altceva. E vorba despre anexarea de către Federația Rusă a Crimeei și e vorba, de asemenea, despre intervenția directă a Rusiei în estul Ucrainei. Repet, doar Frontul Național vede război civil acolo unde e vorba de intervenții foarte clare ale Rusiei. De trei ani și jumătate poziția Rusiei nu s-a modificat, Crimeea continuă să fie sub controlul Moscovei, iar acordurile de la Minsk sunt departe de a fi implementate.

Pe zi ce trece, în plus, ni se confirmă eforturile pe care le face administrația de la Moscova pentru a submina regimurile democratice dintr-o serie de țări din Uniunea Europeană, ultima oară în Spania, apropo de referendumul din Catalonia, dar sunt de asemenea subminate și alte regimuri democratice.

În acest context a face un pas înapoi înseamnă a ne pierde credibilitatea.

Sancțiunile au desigur un cost. Cele pe care Putin le-a introdus refuzând să vină la masa negocierilor îi afectează direct pe agricultorii europeni și consider că agricultorii europeni trebuie susținuți prin toate mijloacele posibile pentru a face față acestor dificultăți create de comportamentul iresponsabil al liderilor ruși.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il divieto di importazione imposto dalla Russia ha privato i produttori ortofrutticoli europei di uno dei principali mercati di esportazione e la sua proroga al 31 dicembre 2018 determinerà ulteriori danni. Da tre anni si registrano perdite significative per i produttori ortofrutticoli dell'Unione europea, non avendo essi mercati di sbocco alternativi comparabili a quello russo.

Concordo nel ritenere che la Commissione debba promuovere studi sull'efficacia del riorientamento verso altri mercati e sull'evoluzione della produzione, della distribuzione e della domanda nel settore agricolo da quando è iniziato l'embargo, ma vanno soprattutto individuate con urgenza soluzioni che siano di concreto sostegno al settore, vanno individuate misure strutturali.

Il settore ortofrutticolo va sostenuto aumentando le quantità ammissibili per il sussidio nell'ambito del nuovo regime di aiuti dell'Unione europea, va aumentato il livello dell'aiuto compensativo per il ritiro delle produzioni dal mercato, dando priorità a soluzioni alternative rispetto alla distribuzione gratuita e, soprattutto, sarebbe importante garantire che vengano accorciate le scadenze per i pagamenti agli agricoltori.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στις αρχές του καλοκαιριού οι παραγωγοί ροδάκινων στην Ημαθία αναγκάστηκαν να ριζούν στις χωματερές πάνω από 20.000 τόνους ροδάκινα, διότι γι' αυτούς η ρωσική αγορά ήταν μια σημαντική αγορά και μάλιστα είχαν επενδύσει αρκετά για να μπορέσουν να ανοίξουν αυτή την αγορά. Η οικονομική καταστροφή για τους Έλληνες αγρότες είναι τεράστια λόγω του ρωσικού εμπάργκο και δεν έχουν αποζημιωθεί. Οι αγρότες είχαν επενδύσει αρκετά στη ρωσική αγορά. Άλλοι Έλληνες αγρότες που ασχολούνται με τα οπωροκηπευτικά έχουν πάθει επίσης τεράστια ζημιά. Από το Σεπτέμβριο του 2014, σας είχα προειδοποιήσει κύριε Hogan γι' αυτό και σας είχα υποβάλει και σχετική ερώτηση αλλά δεν κάνατε τίποτε. Το ποσό των 123 εκατομμυρίων EUR που υποτίθεται ότι θα διαθέτατε ήτανε ψίχουλα για όλους τους αγρότες. Πρέπει λοιπόν να υπάρξει μία ρύθμιση, πρέπει να αποζημιωθούν οι αγρότες από το αποθεματικό για την κρίση, πρέπει να υπάρξουν ακόμη και κρατικές ενισχύσεις. Καταλάβετε το, οι κυρώσεις δεν πρόκειται να φέρουν κανένα αποτέλεσμα. Το μόνο αποτέλεσμα που έχουν φέρει είναι να προστατεύουν την ίδια τη ρωσική οικονομία, οι Ρώσοι πλέον αναπτύσσουν τη δική τους αγροτική οικονομία, τα δικά τους οπωροκηπευτικά και σε λίγο δεν θα έχουν ανάγκη από εισαγωγές. Το ανάποδο αποτέλεσμα έχετε καταφέρει με αυτή την πολιτική σας.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodo predsjednice, gospodine povjereniče, od 2014. godine raspravljamo ovdje u Europskom parlamentu o problemima s kojima se susreću europski poljoprivrednici zbog ruskog embarga. U međuvremenu, rusko tržište zauzimaju novi proizvođači, pretežito domaći, ali i proizvođači iz trećih država.

Ruska vlada iskoristila je uvedeni embargo kao mjeru zaštite svojih poljoprivrednika koje su podupirali programima jeftinih kredita za poljoprivrednike početnike. Broj takvih novih kredita samo u 2016. godini popeo se na preko 9 200, što je dovelo do povećanja poljoprivredne proizvodnje u Rusiji.

Naši proizvođači voća i povrća, kao i proizvođači mlijeka, nužno trebaju pomoć Europske unije i mjere koje sada imamo jesu dobre, ali nisu dostatne. Stoga se zalažem za uspostavu kriznog fonda izvan proračuna za poljoprivredu kako bi pomogli poljoprivrednicima u ovakvim situacijama nestabilnosti na tržištu, ali i zbog klimatskih promjena koje uzimaju sve veći danak.

Zbog spomenutih okolnosti hrvatski proizvođači mandarina, jabuka, ali i mlijeka, posljednjih su godina pretrpjeli značajne gubitke dok su njihovi ruski partneri pronašli nove dobavljače. Nakon uvođenja ruskog embarga, cijene voća i povrća u Hrvatskoj su znatno pale, a proizvođači koji su investirali u proizvodnju za rusko tržište u velikom su problemu jer moraju vraćati kredite, a nemaju kome prodati svoje proizvode.

Europske poljoprivrednike treba podržati kako bi našli nova tržišta za svoje proizvode i opstali do eventualnog povratka na rusko tržište, a za to im je potrebna financijska potpora Europske unije. Prema dostupnim informacijama o provedbi mjera povlačenja voća i povrća s tržišta, primijetila sam da pojedine države članice ne koriste novac koji im je odobren te predlažem da se neiskorištena sredstva preusmjere onima koji za to imaju potrebe, poput Hrvatske.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, dați-mi voie să salut demersurile colegilor care au făcut posibilă această dezbatere și, în același timp, aș dori să îi mulțumesc domnului comisar Hogan pentru eforturile făcute în vederea sprijinirii sectorului agricol.

Sectorul legumelor și fructelor a avut de suferit poate cel mai mult de pe urma embargoului cu Rusia. Prelungirea acestuia este de natură să provoace în continuare dezechilibre majore, inclusiv în statele membre care nu au avut raporturi comerciale directe cu Rusia.

În aceste state, cum este și România, piețele au fost invadate de legume și fructe din state care tradițional exportau în Rusia provocând scăderea semnificativă a prețurilor, ceea ce i-a adus pe fermierii autohtoni în pragul falimentului.

Apreciez astfel că este nevoie din partea Comisiei de un plan de acțiune concret care să aibă în vedere toate statele membre ale Uniunii Europene, și nu doar cele care au avut exporturi directe în Rusia. Găsirea de noi piețe de desfacere rămâne o provocare pentru Comisia Europeană.

Apreciem acordurile comerciale încheiate în acest sens, dar, domnule comisar, vă rog să rețineți un lucru ferm din partea Parlamentului European: nu putem fi de acord cu alte standarde de calitate la produsele agricole care sunt importate în Uniunea Europeană din statele terțe. Fie că vorbim de sectorul zootehnic sau vegetal, consumatorii din Uniunea Europeană trebuie să aibă garanția că produsele consumate au aceleași standarde de calitate indiferent de proveniența lor.

De asemenea, doresc să atrag atenția asupra problemelor pe care fermierii din statele membre le întâmpină și astăzi în relația cu retailerii. În ciuda existenței unor contracte ferme între părți, cu plata la maxim șapte zile de la vânzare, aceste condiții sunt în continuare încălcate de supermarketuri, iar anularea comenzii de pe o zi pe alta este astăzi o practică des uzitată, ceea ce creează dificultăți majore fermierilor.

În acest context, domnule comisar, apreciez că este în sarcina Comisiei Europene să dispună statelor membre întărirea mecanismelor de control pentru a se evita situațiile arătate mai sus.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, collega's, geachte commissaris, de boeren zijn het slachtoffer van dit embargo. De Europese interventiesteun was welkom, maar vaak onvoldoende om de kosten van de productie van hoge kwaliteit te dekken, waarbij ik denk aan de Conférencepeer. Een Porsche produceren kost nu eenmaal meer dan – met alle respect – een Lada.

Ten tweede, een markt van 130 miljoen consumenten vervang je niet zomaar. Varkens groeien, melkkoeien blijven melk produceren en de groei van kropsla, aardappelen of appels houd je niet zomaar tegen. Gevolg: overaanbod op de markten en kelderende prijzen. Voor de peren, bijvoorbeeld, loopt dit op tot 25 procent. Of het nu om Oekraïne, Rusland of de brexit gaat, telkens krijgt de landbouwer de rekening gepresenteerd.

Gelukkig zijn onze boeren creatief. Sommigen hebben geïnvesteerd in andere variëteiten. Men heeft ingespeeld op een groeiende middenklasse in Azië en Zuid-Amerika en de stijgende vraag naar groenten en fruit aldaar. Met resultaat. Dit jaar belandden voor het eerst meer dan 10 miljoen kilo Belgische appels op de Indiase markt.

Het is echter van het grootste belang dat we ook leren uit onze fouten. Als 40 procent van je uitvoer naar één land gaat, zoals Rusland, dan weet je dat je een risico neemt. Niet alle sectoren leren echter even snel. Het aandeel van varkensvlees dat naar Rusland ging, gaat vandaag naar China. Zo geven we opnieuw één land de macht om onze varkenssector met een vingerknip weer in een crisis te storten.

Mijn suggesties voor u, commissaris Hogan, zijn dan ook duidelijk. Zet alstublieft uw structureel beleid voort, want ja, mevrouw Vautmans, er wordt wel degelijk structureel beleid gevoerd. Blijf de export ondersteunen, maar houd rekening met de behoeften per sector. Evalueer de handel per sector en open dan nieuwe afzetmarkten per sector. Leren diversifiëren en investeren, dat is mijn credo.

Franc Bogovič (PPE). – Kot vsi ugotavljamo, evropski kmetje res nismo bili veliko krivi, zato da je prišlo do vojne na Krimu, do embarga. Zgodilo se je pa podobno, kot se zgodi pri šahu, so bili pač prva žrtev na šahovnici in posledice se čutijo še danes.

Ukrepi so bili sprejeti, nekateri so tudi prijeli. V mlečnem sektorju je situacija danes že dosti boljša, kot je bila takrat. Z največjimi težavami pa se ukvarjajo tisti sektorji predvsem v sadjarstvu, kjer so to trajne kulture, ki jih ne sadiš vsako leto, ampak rastejo 20 let in enostavno 10 let staro jabolko ali hruško ne moreš kar posekati. Cene na trgih so pa bile precej porušene ravno zaradi tega primera.

Zavedamo se, da je to triletno obdobje obdobje, ki se ga ne da gasiti samo z trenutnimi in pa gasilskimi ukrepi, ampak je potrebno nadaljevati z nekaterimi strukturnimi ukrepi. Zato pozdravljam to, kar so že tudi kolegi dejali, da je del rešitve v prestrukturiranju trgov in na tem delu smo bili do neke mere uspešni. Mislim pa, da imamo še veliko za narediti tudi znotraj EU-ja, predvsem kot smo že danes tudi dejali v poštenih trgovinskih praksah, kajti v kriznih situacijah je vedno najkrajši konec potegnejo kmetje, tisti ki so drugi v verigi znajo odrezati svoj kos kruha, kmetom pa pustijo tisto, kar na koncu ostane. Tudi ukrep pospeševanja potrošnje, se pravi konzumiranja sadja, zelenjave, je zelo pomemben, zato ukrepi kot so mleko, sadje v šolski prehrani eden izmed ustreznih ukrepov.

Vsekakor pa moramo igrati tudi bolj aktivno, bolj odločno vlogo na zunanje-političnem parketu in poskušati priti tudi do konca in do ukinitve teh sankcij.

Inese Vaidere (PPE). – Godātie kolēgi! Ir zināms, ka Krievijas noteiktais aizliegums ir radījis negatīvas sekas Eiropas augļu un dārzeņu ražotājiem. Mana valsts — Latvija — ir starp tām valstīm, kuras Krievijas embargo ir skāris visvairāk. Tomēr šī aizlieguma negatīvā ietekme uz ekonomiku lielā mērā ir pārvarēta. Latvijas zemnieki ir spējuši rast jaunus tirgus ne tikai augļu un dārzeņu, bet arī citu pārtikas produktu eksportam.

Latvijas zemnieki ir iekarojuši uzticamus tirgus. Galvenais dārzeņu eksporta tirgus ir Baltijas valstis — tur pārdodam gandrīz divas trešdaļas no visiem dārzeņiem un četras piektdaļas augļu un ogu. Ir pieauguši dārzeņu eksporta apjomi uz Vāciju, Norvēģiju, Poliju.

Latvijas ekonomikas rādītāji ir labvēlīgi. Straujā ekonomikas izaugsme pēdējos gados norāda arī uz mūsu valsts izcilo spēju pielāgoties Krievijas embargo radītajām sekām. Lielu problēmu gan radījušas lietavas un plūdi, un te nu gan mēs sagaidām Eiropas solidaritāti.

Krievija nav izpildījusi Minskas līguma nosacījumus. Tā atkārtoti pierādījusi, ka nav uzticams partneris. Tāpēc sankcijām ir jāpaliek spēkā. Mums, savukārt, jāmeklē jaunas iespējas pārtikas eksportam, turpinot atbalstīt mūsu vietējos lauksaimniekus, nevis čīkstot un sūdzoties, it kā Krievijas tirgus būtu vienīgais, kur mēs varam eksportēt savu produkciju. Šeit arī Komisijai ir darbs — palīdzēt atrast jaunus eksporta tirgus.

Es uzskatu, ka Eiropai ir jāturpina humanitārā un attīstības palīdzība un tās ietvaros mums ir jāeksportē pārtika uz tām valstīm, kurās cilvēkiem bads ir ikdienas problēma. Vēlēšanu novērošanas misijā Gambijā es redzēju, ka klimata īpatnību dēļ vairākus mēnešus augļi tur gandrīz nav pieejami. Klimata pārmaiņas izraisa badu ievērojamā Āfrikas kontinenta daļā. Un mums ir jābūt tālredzīgiem, ņemot vērā, ka nākotnē lielākais iedzīvotāju pieaugums būs vērojams tieši Āfrikā. Palīdzot tai, varam reizē atbalstīt arī savus zemniekus.

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, os agricultores estão a pagar a fatura de um problema que não criaram, sem, no entanto, serem devidamente compensados por tal. O esforço promovido pelo Senhor Comissário, que aqui referiu, é de louvar, mas ainda temos um longo período a percorrer com o objetivo de compensar a ausência do mercado russo e mitigar não apenas os seus efeitos diretos, mas também os indiretos.

Quem exportava para este mercado começou a vender no mercado interno e isto está a ter um efeito tremendo nas economias mais pequenas. Os preços baixaram e o setor deixa de ser competitivo para os pequenos produtores. Os produtores da minha região, os Açores, são também afetados por estes efeitos indiretos do embargo e também estes têm de ser ressarcidos.

À semelhança do que exigimos para o Observatório do mercado do leite, por proposta minha, é urgente que se defina o que se entende por crise no setor das frutas e dos legumes com uma observação individualizada das regiões ultraperiféricas. Só assim poderemos perceber a enorme dimensão deste problema e agir em conformidade.

Ademais, é urgente considerar as regiões ultraperiféricas na definição de qualquer pacote de ajuda adicional de combate a crises, como foi já exigido pelo Parlamento, também por proposta minha. As regiões ultraperiféricas não podem continuar dependentes da solidariedade nacional, da distribuição dos pacotes financeiros de ajuda da União Europeia. As regiões ultraperiféricas têm de ser consideradas autonomamente. Conto consigo neste desafio.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (ΝΙ). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πριν τριάντισι περίπου χρόνια και λόγω της εμπλοκής της Ρωσίας στην Ουκρανία, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση της επέβαλε κυρώσεις τις οποίες μάλιστα έχει παρατείνει μέχρι τέλος του 2018. Αυτό είχε ως απάντηση από τη Ρωσία την απαγόρευση της αγοράς και εισαγωγής οπωροκηπευτικών προϊόντων από τις χώρες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενωσης. Αυτή η εξέλιξη δημιούργησε τεράστια οικονομική καταστροφή στους παραγωγούς, πρωτίστως στους μικρούς και κυρίως τους Έλληνες, των οποίων η παραγωγή απορροφάτο σχεδόν εξ ολοκλήρου από την ρωσική αγορά, μία αγορά που είναι μεγάλη και, όπως έχει αποδειχθεί, δύσκολο να αντικατασταθεί. Για τον λόγο λοιπόν αυτό, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να προστατεύσει τους παραγωγούς της και να κάνει εκείνες τις κινήσεις που θα επιλύσουν το πρόβλημα. Το πρόβλημα δεν λύνεται μόνο με το να δίνουμε μια κάποια μορφή επιδοτήσεων, λύνεται με την ταχύτερη δυνατή άρση των κυρώσεων κατά της Ρωσίας.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (ΝΙ). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ερώτηση για τις επιπτώσεις του ρωσικού εμπάργκο στους αγρότες αναφέρει ότι αυτό δεν έχει σχέση με την κατάσταση και την αντιπαράθεση της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – Ρωσίας για την Ουκρανία. Γιατί κρύβει την αλήθεια; Γιατί κρύβει τον υπεύθυνο; Όλοι ξέρουν ότι αυτή είναι η αιτία, ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ξεκίνησε τις κυρώσεις κατά της Ρωσίας και ότι αυτή απάντησε με εμπάργκο. Εδώ και τρία χρόνια, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και όλες ανεξαιρέτως οι κυβερνήσεις, και η ελληνική, ανανεώνουν κάθε χρόνο τις κυρώσεις, άρα και τη ρωσική απάντηση, εν γνώση τους για τις συνέπειες στους φτωχούς αγρότες και ιδιαίτερα για τους ροδακινόπαραγωγούς που, ιδιαίτερα στην Ελλάδα, χτυπιούνται, ξεκληρίζονται και από την κοινή Αγροτική Πολιτική, και από το εμπάργκο, και από την τρομακτική πτώση των τιμών που αυτή προκαλεί. Η κοινοβουλευτική ομάδα του ΚΚΕ έστειλε εδώ και μήνες επιστολή στον Επίτροπο Γεωργίας και επιμένουμε ότι με ψίχουλα δεν λύνεται το πρόβλημα. Απαιτούμε άμεση αποζημίωση όλων των αγροτών για το σύνολο της ζημιάς τους από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αφού αυτή είναι αποκλειστικά υπεύθυνη για τη δραματική τους κατάσταση.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Phil Hogan, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I thank all of the speakers who have responded to the questions initiated by Mr Siekierski.

In relation to the Russian embargo, you can hear from the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs here this evening – for which we are grateful that they attended, including the Chair, Mr McAllister, and the rapporteur, Mr Preda – that there is a difficulty in relation to lifting the embargo and the Russian sanctions are going to remain in place. This is going to have a knock-on effect of retaliatory measures on the Russian part in respect of farming and agricultural products. I do not see any political sign that this policy on Russia that we have in the European Union at the moment is going to change politically. If it changes, it changes everything, but we have to be realistic that politically it is not likely to change in the short term.

Mr Valcárcel Siso was not reflecting on what I said in my contribution when I outlined all of the measures that are being taken within the budgetary framework available. EUR 490 million has been allocated in the last three years. I have extended the measures until the end of June 2018 and we will review the situation again then. We have increased the rate of aid for the withdrawal of products from the marketplace since last July under the Delegated Acts. These are the issues that we have been improving.

On Ms Petir's notion that we need to have a crisis fund outside of the budgetary position, we have had a crisis fund of EUR 1.5 billion mobilised for all sectors outside of the existing CAP budget. I am sure you noticed this in relation to all of your sectors in terms of your farmers. This was a significant amount of additional money that Ms Georgieva – the Vice-President of the Commission at the time – and I were able to mobilise for the farming community, and Member States were able to do more on top of that.

I take note of the fact that we have not sufficiently replaced the markets that were available in Russia from the fruit and vegetable sector. We have not been able to achieve the type of market options around the world to replace that particular market for fruit and vegetables. Therefore, there are no initiatives on promotion to target the food and vegetable sector which I am prepared to look at. I do not want to give anybody the impression that I have not been doing anything in relation to the marketplace. I have been to China twice on trade missions, Japan twice, Canada, Mexico, Colombia, Saudi Arabia and Iran last week, Vietnam and Indonesia, and I have been promoting all European products, including fruit and vegetable products, on trade missions and to companies throughout that time. I am probably the first Commissioner to get outside the office and into the marketplace to try and replace some of the markets that were lost at the time of the Russian embargo, and I am very happy to be able to do so.

In relation specifically to structural solutions, I certainly hear what Ms Vautmans has said in relation to the Belgian situation – that structural solutions are required. But in addition to the measures that I have already outlined and that we are implementing, I will certainly be prepared to consider what the Belgian Government is prepared to do in terms of state aids, in terms of modifying the rural development programme, for example, if it wants to look at structural solutions. In response to other Members here that have mentioned that, certainly if there are structural proposals that we can look at, we will look at them in the context of modification of our rural development programmes. That is an option that is open to them. It is an option to look at state aid provisions within the ceilings of EUR 15 000 per farmer as well.

We are allocating and promoting fruit and vegetables in various ways, not just through our promotion programmes, but through our school schemes as well. An extra EUR 50 million in addition to the original CAP budget was mobilised last year, arising from the decision that was made here to promote our school schemes, which include fruit and vegetables. I had the pleasure of visiting PC Fruit with Ivo Belet MEP and Tom Vandenkendelaere MEP. I was looking at the excellent work that PC Fruit is doing there, looking at options and varieties and new consumer tastes and patterns in order to find new markets. Some of the markets that we have had in the past, the products perhaps may not be suitable anymore in relation to these particular consumer markets, and we have to look at options and consider helping in the research area with companies like PC Fruit in order to develop alternatives in terms of consumer tastes and to promote those types of new products.

I agree that we have not solved the problem in relation to fruit and vegetables arising from the Russian embargo. I respect the sentiments that have been expressed in relation to that here tonight, but I am also being open about the fact that solutions are not going to be easy, particularly the ones that involve removing the sanctions, which had the consequence of stopping the export of our products to the Russian market.

But I do not accept, Mr Marias, that I did nothing. You know I did a lot for your country as well over a period of time. Maybe I will give you the full details in relation to what I did for Greek agriculture in the last three years, including in the fruit and vegetable area, and you might be surprised.

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – De ondersteuningsmaatregelen voor de fruittelers moeten van kracht blijven tot er een diplomatieke oplossing met Rusland is. We danken commissaris Hogan voor het werkbezoek dat hij aan het Proefcentrum voor Fruit in het Limburgse Velm heeft gebracht. De commissaris heeft toen ook bevestigd dat de steunmaatregelen de komende jaren van kracht blijven. Die hulpmaatregelen beginnen trouwens hun vruchten af te werpen. De Commissie heeft inderdaad werk gemaakt van het aanboren van nieuwe afzetmarkten in Mexico, India, Japan en Canada. We steunen die aanpak volop, maar we verzoeken de Commissie tegelijk naar een hogere versnelling te schakelen om de positie van de Vlaamse fruittelers te verstevigen.

We pleiten ook voor de ondersteuning van investeringen in het kader van de omslag van de fruitsector naar innovatieve en duurzame fruitvariëteiten. Innovatie en onderzoek in de fruit- en sierteeltsector zijn cruciaal met het oog op de komende onderhandelingen over het nieuwe meerjarig financieel kader van de EU. Als Europese christendemocraten willen wij dat de begroting voor landbouw niet wordt ingekrompen, maar dat er juist extra middelen worden uitgetrokken om te investeren in duurzame en innovatieve teelttechnieken. We hopen dat de andere politieke partijen deze strategie zullen ondersteunen.

Esther Herranz García (PPE), *por escrito*. – Hace más de tres años del inicio del veto ruso a los productos agrícolas de la UE. En total se han destinado más de 440 millones de euros en ayudas a los productores afectados hasta este mes de abril. Dado que el veto ha sido prolongado hasta el final de 2018 y que Rusia planea el autoabastecimiento agroalimentario como un objetivo para 2020, los productores europeos esperan que la Comisión reconsidere su intención de poner fin a las ayudas en junio del próximo año. De esta experiencia con Rusia hemos de sacar una clara lección: la necesidad de diversificar nuestros mercados. Le pido, por ello, al Ejecutivo comunitario que promueva acuerdos comerciales con terceros países e intensifique las campañas de promoción de los productos más afectados por el bloqueo ruso. Los acuerdos comerciales deben ser, no obstante, equilibrados a la hora de dismantelar barreras arancelarias y no arancelarias, velando por evitar una competencia desleal de productos importados procedentes de países terceros que no cuenten con los mismos estándares de calidad y seguridad alimentaria que la UE. Si conseguimos mejorar nuestra presencia en el exterior, no tendremos que lamentarnos en el futuro por cualquier nueva acción unilateral de países terceros contra nuestras exportaciones.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D). – Atunci când deciziile politice afectează sectoare economice, acele sectoare trebuie să fie sprijinite pentru ca producătorii să aibă un venit decent garantat. Din păcate, pentru al treilea an, embargoul rusesc a generat pierderi semnificative pentru producătorii europeni. Iar din cauza volatilității persistente de pe piețele agricole, interdicția impusă de Rusia are drept consecință faptul că situația producătorilor agricoli din UE s-a agravat. Sectorul fructelor și legumelor suferă de pe urma embargoului rusesc.

Este nevoie ca UE să răspundă concertat când vine vorba de deciziile sale. Cu această ocazie cer Comisiei să ia urgente măsuri de sprijinire a acestui sector pentru a compensa pierderile survenite și totodată să găsească piețe alternative care să absoarbă surplusul de producție de fructe și legume.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), *in writing*. – The Russian ban on EU fruit and vegetable imports has deprived European producers of a significant export market. Currently in its third year, the ban has caused significant agricultural market losses in this volatile market. Opening alternative trade routes in the short term was very difficult for all the affected stakeholders. The EU's strength could still be used to seek long-term solutions.

The Commission must look into the potential re-orientation towards other markets, as well as the evolution of EU agricultural production, distribution, and demand in the past three years since the introduction of the Russian ban. The actions taken up by the Commission to support European fruit and vegetable producers and exporters have indeed been needed and will still be needed. These measures must provide sustainable assistance to these important players in the European agricultural sector.

Both the Commission and the Council must ensure that the future of these producers is safe, with a special focus on small producers. As a perfect tool for revitalising the internal market for fruit and vegetables, let us start harmonising the VAT levels on food articles. Reducing to a common, very low level of VAT could have a positive impact on producers, consumers and the fight against fraud.

26. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes

27. Closure of the sitting

(The sitting closed at 22.45)

Key to symbols used

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

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

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

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

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

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