Официален вестник
на Европейския съюз

BG
Серия C

C/2024/4415

12.7.2024 г.

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА ОТ 11 ФЕВРУАРИ 2020 Г.

(C/2024/4415)

ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ

СЕСИЯ 2019—2020

Заседания от 10 до 13 февруари 2020 г.

СТРАСБУРГ

Съдържание

Страница

1. Откриване на заседанието 3

2. Предложение за мандат за преговори за ново партньорство с Обединеното кралство Великобритания и Северна Ирландия (разискване) 3

3. Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протокола 26

4. Сключване на Споразумението за свободна търговия между ЕС и Виетнам — Сключване на Споразумението за свободна търговия между ЕС и Виетнам (резолюция) — Споразумение за защита на инвестициите между ЕС и Виетнам — Споразумение за защита на инвестициите между ЕС и Виетнам (резолюция) (разискване) . . 26

5. Възобновяване на заседанието 48

6. Съобщение на председателството 48

7. Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание: вж. протокола 48

8. Европейска централна банка — годишен доклад за 2018 г. (разискване) 48

9. Нарушение на Решение 2017/2074 на Съвета относно ограничителни мерки с оглед на положението във Венесуела — незаконно влизане на територията на държава — членка на ЕС, на включено в списъка със санкции лице (разискване) 63

10. План на САЩ за Близкия изток: отговор на ЕС в съответствие с международното право (разискване) 70

11. Настоящото положение със сигурността в Сирия (разискване) 80

12. Новата всеобхватна стратегия ЕС—Африка (разискване) 87

Съдържание Страница

13. Борба с антисемитизма, расизма и омразата в цяла Европа (разискване) 96

14. Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протокола 112

15. Продължаващата заплаха за върховенството на закона в Полша (разискване) 112

16. Състав на Парламента: вж. протокола 125

17. Незаконната търговия с домашни любимци в ЕС (разискване) 125

18. Одобрение на протокола от настоящото заседание: вж. протокола 134

19. Дневен ред на следващото заседание: вж. протокола 134

20. Закриване на заседанието 134

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА ОТ 11 ФЕВРУАРИ 2020 Г.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

1. Откриване на заседанието

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.06)

2. Предложение за мандат за преговори за ново партньорство с Обединеното кралство Великобритания и Северна Ирландия (разискване)

Presidente. – Buongiorno colleghe e colleghi. Saluto la Presidente della Commissione von der Leyen e la ministra della Presidenza di turno.

L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulla proposta di mandato per i negoziati per un nuovo partenariato con il Regno Unito di Gran Bretagna e Irlanda del Nord (2020/2557(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, following the entry into force of the Withdrawal Agreement and the actual withdrawal of the United Kingdom, we are about to embark on the new phase of negotiations. In order to do so, we obviously need to give a mandate to the Union negotiator. Such a mandate should be put on sound foundations. I would like in this respect to set out a few considerations that should guide us when preparing this mandate.

First of all, given the comprehensive mandate called for by the European Council, the scope of the negotiations is very broad. We cannot therefore afford to delay their start. An early start calls for an early adoption of the mandate.

We intend to do that at the General Affairs Council on 25 February. This time constraint is made all the more stringent by Prime Minister Johnson's decision not to extend the transition period beyond the end of 2020. Given the broad scope of the mandate, this will require that several strands of negotiations have to proceed in parallel.

This is a negotiating mandate, not the final outcome of the negotiations. Therefore, it cannot spell out in full detail our expected landing zones, our final offers and the trade-offs we may have to contemplate. Adequate negotiating space should be preserved. Besides – and this goes back to my point about unity and time constraints – a very prescriptive mandate would require more time to resolve possibility, diverging interests and priorities. What we should focus on is the Union's interest in achieving an outcome that is fair and equitable for all Member States and their citizens. Last, we have to factor in the UK red lines. The UK Government's intention is to discontinue free movement, with an obvious impact on mobility and citizens' rights, and also to diverge from the Union's regulatory framework with no less obvious consequences in terms of access to the single market and trade in general.

On the substance of the mandate, regarding the various sectors that should be covered, I think that we largely share the view in the Parliament's position, as reflected in your draft resolution. This means a fair degree of ambition as compared to the Union's relationship with other countries. It should be clear, however, that this cannot amount to giving the UK the same benefit as a Member State, especially in the light of its red lines.

But let me focus briefly on more horizontal aspects of the partnership: governance and level playing field. There should be no doubt here. The EU might be prepared to offer an ambitious free trade agreement with significant market access, but this cannot be to the detriment of the competitive position of EU companies, social and health standards, or state aid rules. In other words, the partnership should include wide ranging provisions on a level playing field, based on high standards. This is all the more relevant given the UK's stated intention to diverge from the European Union. In my view, this is closely linked to the issue of effective dispute settlement enforcement and remedies. There is no point in developing wide ranging level playing field provisions if they cannot be enforced.

I will make two important remarks before closing. First, although we are well aware that the line of the UK's Government is to put an end to the free movement of persons, we should see to it that the future relationship that we will start to negotiate shortly will be ambitious enough in terms of mobility.

Second, and this is a link to my previous remark, these negotiations will keep both our institutions and the Commission busy for quite some time, but this should not make us forget about the Withdrawal Agreement. We should continue to monitor its thorough implementation. There is therefore once again a shared interest all along the coming negotiations in pursuing the good cooperation that we expected during the Brexit phase.

Ursula von der Leyen, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it's just two weeks ago that we bid farewell to our British friends by singing 'Auld Lang Syne', and I think it was a most emotional, a very powerful moment in this Parliament: a moment to celebrate the good old times, and I thank you very much for the grace and the kindness of this gesture. This was extraordinary.

Since then, we've set our sights on the future of our relations with the United Kingdom, and we will enter these negotiations with the highest ambition. Because good old friends like the UK and us shouldn't settle for less than this. Prime Minister Johnson said in Greenwich earlier this month that the United Kingdom will, I quote, 'be a global champion of free trade'. Frankly, this is music to our ears, because at a moment when the rules-based trade system is so challenged, we need our partners to join us in making the system fairer and stronger.

And this is what we Europeans have always fought for over the years: a trade system that is open on one side and that is fair on the other side. Because what do free trade agreements do? Free trade agreements must replace uncertainty with a sound set of rules. They create new markets for small and medium enterprises. Free trade agreements must benefit the people. And this is just the rationale that is behind our trade agreements, for instance with Canada and Japan. They are not just increasing our bilateral exchanges of goods, services, people and ideas. They do that too, but not only. They also raise standards on a broad range of issues, from labour rights to environmental. And this is what makes us proud of them: ask our Japanese friends or ask our Canadian friends. They are glad that we have joined forces to put fairness into our globalised economic system. They are glad that they could join forces with the European Union, because frankly, in today's world, size does matter – and we have a Single Market of 440 million people. What I just described – this is the ambition we have for our free trade agreement with the United Kingdom.

And when we agreed the Political Declaration with the United Kingdom, we ambitioned zero tariffs and a zero-quota trade relation for all goods: something we have never ever before offered to anybody else. A new model of trade, a unique ambition in terms of access to the Single Market. But of course, this would require corresponding guarantees on fair competition and the protection of social, environmental and consumer standards. In short: this is plain and simply the level playing field.

We are ready to discuss all different models of trade agreement. But all these models, whatever you choose, have one thing in common: they all come not only with rights, but also with obligations for both sides. For example, if we take the Canada model – and this is a model Prime Minister Johnson referred to – of course, our deal with Canada eliminates tariffs on a wide set of goods, but not on all. And of course, our deal with Canada eliminates most quotas, but certainly not all. For instance, there are still quotas on beef and sweetcorn. And of course, we still have our standards that have to be respected.

And honestly, I was a little bit surprised to hear the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom speak about the Australian model. Australia, without any doubt, is a strong and like-minded partner. But the European Union does not have a trade agreement with Australia. We are currently trading on WTO terms. And if this is the British choice, well, we are fine with that, without any question. But in fact, we are just in the moment where we are agreeing with Australia that we must end this situation, and we work on a trade deal with them.

Of course, the UK can decide to settle for less, but I personally believe that we should be way more ambitious. And the Prime Minister's speech in Greenwich is an encouraging starting point. He recalled everything the United Kingdom has achieved in terms of social protection, climate action, competition rules, and I commend the UK for all of that. Indeed, it is not the time to lower social protection or to be lukewarm on climate action. It is not the time to decrease in terms of competition rules. I have heard ambition in Boris Johnson's speech: ambition on the minimum wage, ambition on parental payments, and he has an ally in me where that is concerned. I have heard ambition on cutting carbon emissions. Ambition on guaranteeing that our firms are competing in full fairness. This is what we also want. Let us formally agree on these objectives. We can trigger an upward dynamic competition that would benefit both the United Kingdom and the European Union.

To our British friends I say: it's in our mutual interest. And most importantly, it would be consistent with the values we share – values of openness, values of fairness, values of social justice and free enterprise. These are not only values for the good old times. These are values to stay.

Thank you very much for your attention. I just wanted to inform you that the Task Force is ready to start the negotiations. We're all set.

(Applause)

David McAllister, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the resolution on the draft mandate, which we are debating this morning, is the first proof of work of the newly created UK Coordination Group. As the Chair, I would like to thank all members of our group, as well as the involved Committees and the political groups, for their contributions in an extremely short period of time. In my opinion, the result is a very good and balanced resolution only nine days after Michel Barnier presented the Commission's draft mandate.

Our resolution contains Parliament's views on the content and on the architecture of a future EU-UK relationship. Let me highlight three main principles of particular importance.

Firstly, the integrity and the correct functioning of our internal market, the customs union and the Four Freedoms must be maintained. Secondly, a third country cannot have the same rights and benefits as a Member State of the EU. And thirdly, a level playing field is an overall priority and precondition for any future agreement. We should not, and we will not, enter a race to the bottom.

As Ursula von der Leyen has pointed out, together with our British friends, we should aim for a partnership that goes well beyond trade and is unprecedented in scope: everything from climate action to data protection, fisheries to energy, transport to space, financial services to security. We are indeed ready to design a new partnership with zero tariffs, zero quotas and zero dumping. However a free trade agreement with the UK will not be equivalent to frictionless trade.

Ladies and gentlemen, besides the negotiations on the future relations, the implementation of the Withdrawal Agreement is of particular importance. This concerns especially citizens' rights, financial duties on the protocol on Ireland-Northern Ireland.

Our chief negotiator Michel Barnier, whose work is highly appreciated across party lines in the institutions, has already assured us in the UK coordination group's first meeting to keep Parliament fully informed at all stages of the procedure.

(Applause)

Iratxe García Pérez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, en nombre del Grupo socialdemócrata queríamos agradecer a la Comisión Europea, y en particular al equipo del señor Barnier, su esfuerzo en la elaboración de las directrices para la negociación del futuro marco de relación entre la Unión Europea y el Reino Unido.

Con la resolución que este Parlamento se dispone a aprobar, juntos lanzamos un mensaje firme: la ambición de la futura relación dependerá de la voluntad del Gobierno británico de aceptar la conformidad con las normas comunitarias en materia social, laboral, fiscal y medioambiental.

El pasado 1 de febrero el Reino Unido se convirtió formalmente en un país tercero y perdió todos sus derechos políticos. Pero en todo lo demás nada cambiará hasta que termine este periodo transitorio. Tenemos once meses para negociar un complejo acuerdo que defina nuestras relaciones futuras. En la construcción de esta nueva asociación debemos asumir que nada será tan próspero como los derechos y los beneficios de la pertenencia a la Unión Europea.

El Grupo socialdemócrata se ha comprometido a alcanzar un acuerdo integral con el Reino Unido. Sin embargo, cuantas más barreras levante el Gobierno británico, más difícil será lograr un acuerdo ambicioso. Por el contrario, si el Reino Unido tiene la voluntad de mantenerse en un terreno de juego equilibrado como un competidor leal, estaremos en condiciones de ofrecer una asociación que garantice la prosperidad de los ciudadanos y ciudadanas de ambos lados del Canal de la Mancha. Y, para garantizar esta prosperidad, estamos dispuestos a ofrecer un ambicioso acuerdo de libre comercio, sin aranceles ni cuotas, para todos los bienes que entren en el mercado común y otro para los servicios.

Además, si queremos que este beneficio sea real también necesitamos una asociación sólida en materia de cooperación judicial, de seguridad y defensa, de apoyo al orden multilateral, así como abordar cuestiones como la pesca, el transporte, la energía y los servicios financieros.

Pero nuestra oferta no puede hacerse a cualquier precio. Permítanme que sea clara. El Reino Unido tiene que garantizar una competencia leal, autorizar el acceso de las flotas europeas a sus aguas y mantener su compromiso con el Tribunal Europeo de Derechos Humanos en cuanto al cumplimiento de sus sentencias. Además, exigiremos que España tenga la última palabra en los debates entre la Unión Europea y el Reino Unido que afecten a Gibraltar, tal y como ha sido ratificado en las directrices de la Comisión.

Nuestro éxito en las negociaciones dependerá de si somos capaces de hacer prevalecer la que ha sido hasta ahora nuestra mejor arma: la unidad. Solo con la Comisión como única interlocutora con el Reino Unido, y con la plena implicación de este Parlamento para la aprobación última, podrá la Unión Europea preservar el nivel de unidad alcanzado hasta ahora. Juntos hemos logrado proteger la integridad del mercado único, la Unión Aduanera y las cuatro libertades — incluyendo la libre circulación de los ciudadanos—.

No olvidemos que nuestro proyecto se articula sobre la base de un compromiso con valores que son exactamente los contrarios a los manifestados por algunos líderes británicos, impregnados de nacionalismo y de una falsa idea de superioridad. Ahora que afrontamos la relación futura, tenemos la obligación de defender los principios democráticos y las libertades fundamentales que han permitido que nuestro proyecto europeo siga adelante.

Nathalie Loiseau, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Monsieur le Président, le Royaume-Uni a choisi de quitter l'Union européenne et nous, nous avons choisi de la renforcer. Certains pourraient y voir une contradiction qui rendrait la négociation sur l'avenir de notre relation plus ardue. Je crois qu'il n'en est rien.

Il n'en est rien, parce que nous respectons le choix des Britanniques. Ce choix de sortir non seulement de l'Union européenne, mais aussi du marché unique et de l'union douanière, est un choix assez radical, mais nous le respecterons. Il a des conséquences qui sont loin d'être négligeables et qui changent profondément la relation que nous pouvons bâtir ensemble.

Il n'en est rien, parce qu'une Europe forte est dans l'intérêt du Royaume-Uni. Nous sommes des voisins, des alliés et nous sommes le premier partenaire de Londres en termes d'échanges commerciaux, mais aussi d'échanges humains. La géographie est têtue, les faits sont têtus, et nous devons les regarder en face.

Il n'en est rien, parce que nous avons d'immenses défis à relever ensemble: le changement climatique, le terrorisme, les cyberattaques, les virus se moquent des frontières. Il nous faut inventer de nouvelles manières de les combattre ensemble car séparément, nous serions tous perdants.

Nous sommes prêts à un partenariat étroit, solide, durable avec le Royaume-Uni, mais nous sommes aussi porteurs de convictions fortes auxquelles nous sommes profondément attachés et que le Brexit ne peut remettre en cause. Nous avons des normes élevées pour protéger les consommateurs, pour protéger les travailleurs, pour protéger la vie privée et les données personnelles de nos concitoyens et pour protéger notre planète. Nous ne sommes pas prêts à marchander ce pourquoi nous nous sommes tant battus, ce pourquoi nous continuons à nous battre.

Le projet de mandat que nous soutenons pour la négociation avec le Royaume-Uni est l'illustration de ces convictions fortes qui nous animent; il propose un partenariat sans précédent par son étendue et par son ampleur, à la hauteur de ce qui nous rassemble. Il demande donc en retour des contreparties sans commune mesure avec celles qui figurent dans d'autres accords avec d'autres partenaires de l'Union européenne – parce que le Royaume-Uni n'est pas pour l'Europe le Canada, ni le Japon, ni la Corée du Sud, ni Singapour; il est bien plus proche, bien plus important, bien plus interdépendant. Le Brexit n'a vocation à détruire ni les liens qui unissent nos économies, nos cultures et nos peuples depuis des siècles, ni à détruire la construction européenne.

Peter Kofod, *for ID-Gruppen*. – Hr. formand! Briterne er og bør fortsat være vores gode venner, tætteste allierede og nærmeste samarbejdspartnere. Jeg ønsker en aftale med briterne, der klart tilgodeser og respekterer de britiske ønsker om at kunne bestemme mere selv hjemme i nationalstaten, f.eks. over, hvem man ønsker at give adgang til sit eget land eller give adgang til forskellige ydelser.

På samme tid ønsker jeg et stærkt samarbejde med briterne, f. eks på handelsområdet, hvor det er væsentligt hjemme, i mit eget land, i Danmark, for fortsat at kunne holde fast i en af vores tætteste og allerbedste handelspartnere. Faktisk trådte Danmark i sin tid ind i det, der var forløberen for EU, netop fordi vi ønskede at blive ved med at handle med Storbritannien.

Da briterne meldte sig ud, gjorde de det klart, at det ikke var en udmeldelse af verden eller Europa, men at det bare var en udmeldelse af EU-systemet. Det synes jeg på mange måder er sympatisk. Jeg håber, vi kan lave en aftale med briterne, der betyder, at brexit respekteres, samtidig med at vi fortsat kan have et meget tæt partnerskab til glæde og gavn for briterne og for os andre, hvor vi reelt deler interesser og værdier; et samarbejde, der baserer sig på sund fornuft og ønsket om fælles bedste i stedet for nærmest nyreligiøs dyrkelse af EU-føderalisme, hvilket desværre engang imellem kan ske i dette hus.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, deux faits: le premier, c'est que le Royaume-Uni et l'Union européenne sont liés par la géographie. Ça ne risque pas de changer, donc nous avons intérêt à entretenir des relations aussi étroites et aussi amicales que possible. Deuxièmement: tout le monde au Royaume-Uni, loin s'en faut, n'est pas un nationaliste anglais. L'Union européenne compte au Royaume-Uni beaucoup, beaucoup d'amis; ne nous les aliénons pas.

En matière commerciale, a priori, les ambitions de l'Union européenne et du Royaume-Uni sont antagoniques, puisque le Royaume-Uni souhaite un accès maximal au marché européen, mais refuse l'alignement réglementaire qu'exige, de son côté, l'Union européenne.

Je nous invite donc tous à être créatifs en la matière. Je m'explique: en règle générale, les accords de libre-échange sont utilisés par les milieux d'affaires, je veux dire les détenteurs de capitaux, pour forcer un nivellement par le bas des conditions de travail et de rémunération, des normes sociales, environnementales ou fiscales. Nous pourrions nous saisir de l'occasion d'un traité de libre-échange avec le Royaume-Uni pour faire l'exact inverse.

Aujourd'hui, les législations du Royaume-Uni et de l'Union européenne sont parfaitement alignées dans les domaines de compétence de l'Union européenne, mais donc pas en tout. Dans certains domaines – je pense à la protection de la vie privée, je pense évidemment aux normes sociales – l'Union européenne a des normes plus ambitieuses que le Royaume-Uni. Mais il est d'autres domaines où c'est le Royaume-Uni qui a des normes plus ambitieuses que l'Union européenne – pour certains aspects de la politique environnementale, ou encore en matière de régulation bancaire.

Nous pourrions fixer dans le nouvel accord une règle par laquelle les deux partenaires s'engageraient à appliquer celle des deux normes qui est la plus ambitieuse – et par la plus ambitieuse, j'entends la plus protectrice de la santé, de la vie privée, des conditions de travail et de rémunération, de l'environnement. De la sorte, nous aurions une forme d'émulation vers le haut entre le Royaume-Uni et l'Union européenne. Vous allez me dire que cela ne s'est jamais fait. Eh bien, figurez-vous que je pense que c'est le genre d'accord de libre-échange que beaucoup de nos concitoyens souhaitent aujourd'hui, autrement dit à des lieues de celui que nous allons voter bientôt avec le Viêt Nam.

Derk Jan Eppink, *on behalf of the ECR Group.* – Mr President, the EU and Britain have entered a tense year. Time is limited and pressure is mounting to agree on an FTA this year. Formally, the negotiation is aimed at agreeing to a legal set of rules, but there is more to it. There is a mindset that varies on both sides of the Channel.

Every bureaucracy tends to cling to its own rules, awarding them holy status. In that respect the EU bureaucracy is not much different from the mandarins that once ruled the Chinese empire. It regards itself as the centre of the world, and of all wisdom. The British mindset is different. Having been an empire itself, Britain derives cultural self-confidence from the idea that it is still is an empire. The old empire does not want to be run by a possibly new one, so it left.

What are the lessons, Mr President? The EU should not be bitter. Brexit is done and we have to put our citizens first. The EU has to be pragmatic and purpose-driven rather than rules-obsessed; focussed on tangible mutual interests, not on bad feelings. The current British government is the most stable in Western Europe – a big majority for five years. Who else can say that? But it should not overestimate the margins of divide and rule that worked for centuries – but not anymore.

Results will only be attainable through political will: the will to succeed. This – though wordy – resolution is the starting point to negotiate. Mr Barnier, you are an experienced negotiator. I hope you will be able to bridge both mindsets – divided by 30 kilometres of water, but still two worlds apart.

Martin Schirdewan, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident! Bei den Verhandlungen über die zukünftigen Beziehungen zwischen dem Vereinigten Königreich und der Europäischen Union geht es eben nicht nur darum, wie die zukünftigen Wirtschafts- und Handelsbeziehungen gestaltet sein werden – nein, es geht um viel mehr: Es geht eigentlich um die Zukunft der Europäischen Union und – missverstehen Sie mich nicht, das ist nicht das Endspiel, und die kommenden elf Monate werden auch kein Endspiel werden, aber es kann ein entscheidender *game changer* sein. Das Ergebnis dieser Verhandlungen wird auch darüber entscheiden, ob die Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union oder eine Entwicklung außerhalb der Union das attraktivere Entwicklungsmodell ist.

Bislang fehlt in dieser Debatte hier heute ein zentraler Aspekt: Es ist am Ende nicht die Wirtschaft, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sondern es sind die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, es sind die sogenannten einfachen Leute, die darüber entscheiden werden, welches das attraktivere Entwicklungsmodell sein wird. Das lehrt uns der Brexit. Das Mandat, das wir hier besprechen, muss deshalb die Interessen der Bevölkerung der Europäischen Union und der britischen Bevölkerung in das Zentrum der Verhandlungen stellen.

Meine Fraktion begrüßt die klaren Aussagen zur Vermeidung von Steuerdumping, zum Schutz von Arbeitnehmerinnenrechten und Arbeitsstandards, zum Verbraucherschutz, zum Umweltschutz. Kein Mensch braucht einen weiteren verschärften Steuerdumpingwettbewerb, kein Mensch will schlechtere Arbeitsbedingungen, außer denen, die davon profitieren, und das sind nicht die Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Kurz, wir wollen höchste Standards, den Schutz des Friedens in Nordirland und die demokratische Kontrolle des Verhandlungsprozesses. Viele andere Aspekte des Mandats sehen wir jedoch sehr kritisch bis ablehnend, zum Beispiel die Fragen der militärischen Zusammenarbeit, den positiven Bezug auf die NATO, die geheimdienstliche Zusammenarbeit. Wir werden uns im Interesse unserer Wählerinnen und Wähler konstruktiv in den Planungsprozess einbringen, in dem Wissen, dass ein harter Brexit noch immer möglich ist und das in niemandes Interesse ist.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, au terme de la phase de transition, le coût du Brexit aura dépassé les contributions cumulées du Royaume-Uni au budget depuis son adhésion, il y a 47 ans. Ce fait ne vient que confirmer la conviction de tous ceux qui disent que le Brexit est une folie du point de vue économique.

Le Royaume-Uni quitte l'Union, mais reste en Europe et restera sans aucun doute l'une des économies les plus dynamiques à nos portes.

En tant que rapporteur de la commission du commerce international, je dis clairement que ce que nous offrons au Royaume-Uni va au-delà de tous les accords de libre-échange conclus à ce jour par l'Union européenne. Nous offrons une relation libre de droits de douane et libre de quotas limitatifs. Ce qu'on demande en contrepartie, c'est une concurrence à armes égales, pour éviter toute course vers le bas en matière réglementaire, fiscale, environnementale et sociale.

Ce qu'on appelle dans notre jargon le *level playing field* doit être digne de la *Premier League*, aujourd'hui et après la phase de transition. à cette fin, nous avons aussi besoin d'un arbitre à la hauteur du défi. Pour ce Parlement, il est clair que lorsqu'il s'agit de droit européen, cette instance ultime ne peut-être autre que la Cour de justice européenne.

Il est évident qu'un accord de libre-échange ne pourra jamais reproduire l'appartenance au marché unique, mais soyons clairs: le niveau d'ambition de cet accord sera aussi fonction du calendrier restreint imposé par la contrepartie britannique.

ELNÖKÖL: KLÁRA DOBREV

alelnök

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Madam President, we are here to discuss a very important resolution on the political guidelines for the negotiations between the European Union and the UK – 21 pages, 103 paragraphs, but perhaps the most important is the front page, the signatures of the leaders of a number of major political groups in this Parliament, showing that there is a vast majority supporting this resolution and how united we are in defending our common vision and our common interests. We call on the Member States to do the same, to refuse any bilateral negotiations at this stage, and to act as a bloc, with the Commission and Mr Barnier being the sole negotiators on our part.

We are clear about what we want to achieve – a sound and ambitious strategic, political and economic relationship – but we also say, loud and clear, that we will ensure open, but also fair, competition, a proper level playing field and no regression on the high European standards of environmental, social and labour protection, and also consumer rights and food safety.

We've heard some messages of refusal of this by the UK Government, but this will have proportional consequences in terms of the access of the UK to the European market, undermining the ambition of our trade agreement.

Let me conclude by recalling that the first pillar of the future economic relationship with the UK was already agreed in the Withdrawal Agreement. It has to do with Northern Ireland, the alignment of Northern Ireland and border controls in the Irish Sea. So we will work for a new agreement for the future, but we will also ensure full implementation of the commitments in the existing Withdrawal Agreement.

Morten Petersen (Renew). – Fru formand! Det er på alle måder trist, at et så stort og nærtstående land har valgt at melde sig ud. Det er trist for dem, det er trist for os. Til gengæld er det godt og stærkt, at den beslutning, vi behandler her i dag, er så omfattende, og at den er udarbejdet af så bredt et flertal i Europa-Parlamentet, som tilfældet er. For det sender et meget vigtigt politisk signal om, at vi fra Europa-Parlamentets side vil sikre ensartede og fair spilleregler i det videre samarbejde, såkaldt level playing field. Hvorfor? fordi det ikke går, hvis vi skal konkurrere på lavere standarder inden for miljø, inden for klima, inden for forbrugerbeskyttelse. Det går ikke, hvis vi skal konkurrere på lavere skattesatser, og det går ikke, hvis England måtte forvente fuld og fri adgang til EU's indre marked uden samtidig at leve op til de regler og krav, der måtte gælde her.

Vi må ikke gamble med EU's indre marked. Det er en kronjuvel i samlingen, som vi skal passe på.

Vi har på helt kort sigt en ganske særlig udfordring hvad angår fiskeriet: Der er mange jobs på spil, der er mange menneskers levebrød på spil. Det er vigtigt at sige i den sammenhæng, at forhandlingerne om fremtidens fiskeri hverken kan eller skal ses isoleret fra forhandlingerne om samhandlen generelt.

Så det bliver alt sammen svære forhandlinger på en meget trist og dramatisk baggrund, men ambitionen må være, at vi skaber et stærkt partnerskab til glæde for alle.

Nicolas Bay (ID). – Madame la Présidente, oui, nous devons, bien sûr, avoir une relation privilégiée avec le Royaume-Uni. Notre niveau de vie similaire et notre civilisation commune nous y invitent. Mais cela ne signifie pas pour autant qu'il faille tout lui céder.

Monsieur Barnier, vous avez proposé il y a quelques jours, je cite, «d'éliminer tous les droits de douane et tous les quotas sur les biens échangés avec le continent». En clair, il s'agirait d'un accord de libre-échange et Philippe Lamberts, il y a quelques instants, a fait la même proposition. Vous passez des accords de libre-échange avec le monde entier – ce sera le cas tout à l'heure avec le Vietnam – mais vous ne supportez pas, finalement, que le Royaume-Uni ne fasse plus partie de l'union douanière. Il est désormais un pays tiers, et il faut s'en rendre compte.

Le risque serait de le transformer demain en une porte d'entrée des produits venus du monde entier ne respectant pas nos normes et de mauvaise qualité. La priorité est de protéger nos intérêts, par exemple ceux des pêcheurs français qui réalisent 30 % de leur chiffre d'affaires dans les eaux britanniques. Soixante-dix pour cent des exportations de pêche du Royaume-Uni sont faites vers l'Union européenne; nous avons là un levier colossal pour les négociations futures, pour qu'elles nous soient favorables. Je sais que vous n'appréciez pas la méthode Trump, mais elle fonctionne en matière économique. Nous devons nous en inspirer. Notre marché, nos consommateurs et nos pêcheurs ont droit à ces protections que vous leur refusez systématiquement.

Le Brexit est l'occasion de changer de modèle et d'en mettre en place un nouveau.

Terry Reintke (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I have to be honest: it's a very special moment I think, because it's the first time that we discuss Brexit here in this House without having our UK colleagues being here, and I must say that apart from a bunch that was sitting over there, I really truly miss them, and I think it shows again how sad it is that this Brexit is happening.

Now, I had the great pleasure and the honour to do my Erasmus year in the beautiful city of Edinburgh. Still, when I go there today, I really feel at home, and I think these are really the ties that we have to cherish also for the future.

And the economic and trade relationships are going to be absolutely crucial in the future. But if we want to build strong foundations, we also have to look at other issues, and that is why I think we have to fight to keep the United Kingdom in the Erasmus programme. Young people did not vote for Brexit, and I think it would be wrong to take away the opportunities from them that I and many millions of Europeans had in the past after Brexit. And that is why, if we want to build a strong relationship for the future, we should fight for a strong Erasmus programme with the UK in it.

Let us leave a light on and build bridges so that the Brits can find their way back home.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Projekt rezolucji zawiera wiele trafnych stwierdzeń i myślę, że grupa ECR może go poprzeć. Bardziej niepokoi jednak duch, który może ożywiać, lub wręcz przeciwnie, negocjacje. Ostatnia wymiana argumentów między Brukselą a Londynem nie napawa wielkim optymizmem. Jest przy tym oczywiste, że kraj trzeci nie może mieć tych samych praw i korzyści co członek Unii, członek EFTA czy członek EEA, ale Wielka Brytania nie będzie jednym z wielu krajów trzecich. Także poza Unią pozostaje wielkim krajem europejskim związanym z innymi krajami Europy historią, gospodarką, współpracą w zakresie bezpieczeństwa. Trzeba przypomnieć, że w najciemniejszych chwilach europejskiej historii w latach 1939-1945 to Wielka Brytania, podobnie jak Polska, heroicznie broniła wartości europejskich. W interesie Europejczyków po obu stronach kanału La Manche leży to, aby nasze wzajemne relacje były jak najlepsze. Nasi negocjatorzy nie powinni o tym zapominać.

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la salida del Reino Unido nos abre una ventana de oportunidad para aprender de los errores cometidos y no volver a cometerlos.

Los discursos del odio, la desafección o la incertidumbre pesan sobre quienes entienden que el proyecto europeo debería ser un espacio de progreso y solidaridad y se sienten decepcionados. No podemos ahondar en modelos fallidos que están expulsando a la ciudadanía afuera.

Ahora tenemos la responsabilidad de garantizar los derechos de la gente, de los ciudadanos que viven en el Reino Unido —casi 140 000 españoles residen actualmente allí—. Nos preocupa la situación de los trabajadores, de las 15 000 personas que cruzan cada día la frontera de Gibraltar, cuya situación todavía es incierta.

Necesitamos luchar de forma decidida contra el dumping social y fiscal. No estamos de acuerdo con gran parte del contenido de este mandato en el ámbito de la política exterior y en el de defensa. Creemos que es necesario cambiar hacia posiciones mucho más anticipatorias de los conflictos y no ahondar en sanciones que solo pagan los pueblos.

Desde este grupo parlamentario vamos a seguir trabajando por blindar los derechos de la ciudadanía, los derechos medioambientales y los del sector primario —agricultura, ganadería— para evitar la despoblación de nuestros pueblos. Hay que evitar que se conviertan en moneda de cambio de otros intereses.

Antonio Tajani (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il testo che voteremo punta a rafforzare l'unità tra i 27 paesi e a sostenere in maniera forte Michel Barnier per tutelare i nostri interessi durante la trattativa.

Primo fra tutti interessa tutelare la difesa del mercato interno. Il Regno Unito non può rientrarvi, come un cavallo di Troia, senza rispettare regole e standard. Tutto ciò per garantire sempre di più cittadini ed imprese. La salute degli europei, deve essere garantita, impedendo che entrino prodotti agroalimentari che non rispettino i nostri standard, né facciano concorrenza sleale. Noi siamo italiani e vogliamo mangiare Parmigiano e non Parmesan e credo che tutti gli europei preferiscano mangiare il Parmigiano e non il Parmesan.

I diritti dei cittadini vanno tutelati, per esempio, garantendo l'utilizzo di documenti cartacei e non solo online. E poi le nostre commissioni parlamentari dovranno impegnarsi per tutelare i settori chiave, come la pesca, lo spazio, l'energia, e poi gli interessi della pace in Irlanda e gli interessi spagnoli a Gibilterra, e naturalmente la difesa e la lotta contro il terrorismo.

In conclusione, dobbiamo evitare che il Regno Unito si trasformi in una Singapore europea, che magari non abbia severe regole antiriciclaggio. Tutto ciò per avere relazioni sempre più positive con Londra, che è uscita dall'Unione europea ma che rimane Europa.

Bernd Lange (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Entschließung zeigt, dass wir bereit sind, zu verhandeln. Und ich glaube, wir können es auch schaffen, innerhalb von neun Monaten Handelsabkommen zu organisieren, denn die Situation ist nun ein bisschen anders. Normalerweise haben wir zwei unterschiedliche Partner, die sich irgendwie aufeinander zubewegen, und man verständigt sich über gemeinsame Standards oder erkennt Standards an. Jetzt haben wir ein harmonisiertes System und müssen entscheiden, wie weit wir auseinandergehen können. Insofern ist das ein bisschen komfortabler als bei anderen Handelsverhandlungen. Deswegen die drei Pfeiler, normale Handelsverhandlungen müssen eben in den Blick genommen werden. Die Frage der Zollfreiheit ist das gemeinsame Ziel. Das kann man auch aushandeln, wenn sichergestellt ist, dass die Produkte aus Großbritannien, die in die Europäische Union kommen, auch wirklich britische Produkte sind und nicht Produkte, die über Großbritannien aus anderen Ländern in die Europäische Union kommen.

Zum Zweiten geht es um die Standards von Produkten und Dienstleistungen. Da haben wir ein klares Set von Regeln, was Verbraucherschutz und Gesundheitsschutz betrifft. Die SPS-Standards werden in gar keiner Art und Weise anzugreifen sein. Also glaube ich, auch da wird es leicht sein, sich zu verständigen.

Und der dritte Pfeiler ist der komplizierteste. Natürlich gilt es, auch Regeln, die den Handel betreffen, zu diskutieren, damit keine Wettbewerbsverzerrungen da sind. Also die Frage der gleichen Arbeitnehmerrechte, die Frage der gleichen Umweltstandards, die Frage der gleichen Beihilferegelung – ganz wichtig – und die Frage eines harmonisierten Steuersatzes. Denn ansonsten würden wir Wettbewerbsverzerrungen haben, und das kann nicht sein. Wenn es Wettbewerbsverzerrungen geben sollte, dann werden wir natürlich Zölle einführen müssen, um das auszugleichen. Es ist völlig absurd, zu meinen, es gibt eine Dumpinginsel jenseits des Kanals mit vollem freiem Marktzugang.

Luis Garicano (Renew). – Madam President, I would like to thank Mr Barnier for his work and his words.

As the EU and the United Kingdom embark on this new relationship, which I hope is a fruitful one, I want to send a very clear message to the United Kingdom. This Parliament will not allow the United Kingdom to become a tax haven or a money laundromat just offshore Europe. I want to remind you about paragraph 21 of the resolution. It says, 'We strongly believe that the UK should adhere to the evolving standards on taxation and anti-money laundering legislation within the EU acquis, including tax transparency, the exchange of information on tax matters and anti-tax avoidance measures'. This applies to the territories as well. I would remind you that British overseas territories include Bermuda, the Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, the Virgin Islands: crown dependencies include all of those islands that have no taxes on deposits, etc.

Mr Barnier, this is an existential question for Europe. If we allow tax avoidance and money laundering just offshore Europe, our way of life is in danger and our welfare state is in danger. This has to be one of the highest, if not the highest, priority for our negotiations.

Marco Campomenosi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io vedo tanta ipocrisia. Certo, la risoluzione di domani è un testo che probabilmente è fatto anche molto bene, ma il nostro emiciclo di Bruxelles, dove ci siamo riuniti due settimane fa, è ancora bagnato dalle lacrime di molti di voi. Vedo un atteggiamento schizofrenico anche nelle parole usate dalla Presidente della Commissione, che continua a insistere chiamando amici, amici, amici chi avete cercato di umiliare per tre anni. Perché di tre anni persi, stiamo parlando, perché potevamo essere già molto più avanti se qualcuno non avesse fatto finta che la Brexit non ci sarebbe mai stata, che i cittadini britannici si sono sbagliati.

Quindi parliamo di standard, ma domani voterete un accordo commerciale con un paese asiatico che da questi standard che voi pretendete dalla Gran Bretagna è lontanissimo. Quindi dovete solo sperare che non facciano l'accordo prima con gli Stati Uniti, che sostituirebbero i nostri prodotti, e dovete ascoltare i nostri produttori che esportano tanto in Gran Bretagna. Il tempo perso in questi anni è un danno a loro ed è tutta responsabilità vostra.

Geert Bourgeois (ECR). – Voorzitter, het is nu aan de Commissie om snel te handelen, vernuftig te handelen en tegelijkertijd pragmatisch te handelen. In dit verband ga ik akkoord met het zeer brede mandaat voor de Europese Commissie en stel ik mijn volle vertrouwen in Michel Barnier, die tot nu toe een uitstekend parcours heeft gereden.

Het doel moet zijn een allesomvattend handelsakkoord zonder barrières, met respect voor onze rode lijnen: de correlatie tussen een *level playing field* en de diepgang van het akkoord, maar ook een "plusverdrag": O&O, veiligheid, visserij, defensie, noem maar op.

In dit verband een vraag aan de Commissie: is de Commissie inderdaad van plan om een einde te maken aan de samenwerking met het Verenigd Koninkrijk in de *North Sea Energy Corporation*? Ten eerste: volgens mij is de Commissie niet bevoegd. Ten tweede: het zou een kapitale fout zijn. In de 21e eeuw moeten wij intenser samenwerken in de *blue economy*: de 21e eeuw wordt de eeuw van de oceaan!

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir alle sind uns bewusst, dass es sehr viele und wichtige Aspekte unseres Verhältnisses zu Großbritannien gibt, die nun geregelt werden müssen. Das ist unsere Aufgabe – im Sinne unserer Bürgerinnen und Bürger, in der wirtschaftlichen, sozialen, ökologischen und auch kulturellen Dimension. Deshalb geht es weniger um ein Freihandelsabkommen, sondern mehr um faire und inklusive Handelsbeziehungen. Ich halte es für bedenklich, alles in einem einzigen De-facto-Assoziierungsabkommen regeln zu wollen, wie es bei TTIP der Fall war. Fragen der Kooperation von Streitkräften, Fragen der Energie- und Netzkooperation, Fragen der polizeilichen Zusammenarbeit oder die Regelung des Luftraums dürfen nicht der parlamentarischen Kontrolle entzogen und den innerhalb des Abkommens geschaffenen Ausschüssen überantwortet werden.

Ich appelliere an den Rat: Schaffen Sie Transparenz, wahren Sie demokratische Ansprüche! Ich lobe ausdrücklich den Ansatz der Kommission, die UN-Nachhaltigkeitsziele zu verankern, dem Pariser Abkommen, der ILO und den Grundrechten, inklusive Datenschutz, großen Raum zu geben. Bremsen Sie nur nicht den ambitionierten Ausbau unserer künftigen Regulierung zum Schutz von Umwelt und Produktsicherheit, indem Sie Themen als eine Frage von Handelshemmnissen handhaben.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta, cuando alguien organiza un *Brexit* es para irse, no para quedarse de otra manera. El Reino Unido no puede tener más ventajas estando fuera que las que se tienen estando dentro. Hemos pasado tres años lamentando que se fueran. Ahora no puede confundirnos la nostalgia porque se fueron. Ahora son un país tercero. Negociemos con ellos duramente -como hacemos con todo país tercero- y defendamos a los nuestros.

Defendamos la descolonización de Gibraltar; que no se convierta en un paraíso fiscal, que no siga siendo un paraíso fiscal. Defendamos a nuestros pescadores, que todos los días tienen que jugarse la vida para poder ganarse el pan. Defendamos a nuestros agricultores. Defendamos nuestros productos. Si ellos, si los políticos británicos han querido ser un país tercero, tratémoslos como lo que son en la negociación, un país tercero. El Reino Unido se ha ido de Europa. No consintamos que se convierta en el nuevo Sudeste Asiático a la puerta de nuestras casas.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Europski parlament mora jasno predstaviti svoje prioritete o budućim odnosima s Ujedinjenom Kraljevinom.

Je li moguće postići sporazum do kraja ove godine? Kakav sporazum? Treba naglašavati da nijedna zemlja izvan Unije ne može uživati ista prava kao članica. Pregovori se zasnivaju na četiri temeljne slobode, a dobrobit i prava građana Europske unije u Ujedinjenoj Kraljevini i obratno moraju ostati u fokusu.

U kontekstu vanjskih poslova i obrane nadam se da će Ujedinjena Kraljevina kao stalna članica Vijeća sigurnosti NATO-a nastaviti dijeliti s nama ciljeva i vrijednosti. Isto se odnosi na zajedničke civilno-vojne misije, usklađenost sankcija, sporazum s Iranom te sporazume o kontroli oružja i neširenju nuklearnog oružja. Nadam se da ćemo kao Europska unija i tijekom ovih pregovora zadržati jedinstvo, uspješno postignuto u pregovorima o izlasku.

Hvala još jednom britanskim kolegama na dugogodišnjem radu i njihovom velikom doprinosu europskim standardima koji su našim građanima poboljšali kvalitetu života.

Liesje Schreinemacher (Renew). – Madam President, today it is time to start building our future relationship with our British friends. So let's look at our common interests and goals and see how these can best be served instead of only looking at what divides us.

Therefore, I insist on an ambitious Free Trade Agreement that creates the right conditions for open and fair competition. Having said that, a third country can obviously not enjoy the same benefits as an EU Member State, and the openness of our markets must directly correlate with the willingness of the UK to align with EU rules and standards.

It remains essential that the EU continues to stand united. We need to maintain our high standards, have clear rules on state aid and competition and strive for a Fisheries Agreement before the summer.

I regret Brexit and will continue to do so, but now it is time to move forward and build our new relationship.

Ivan David (ID). – Paní předsedající, obávám se, že velmi mnoho nadšenců pro integrovanou EU bez národů a hranic hrozí touhou pomstít se za brexit. Pan Verhofstadt řekl jasně, že Spojenému království neměla být v ničem přiznána autonomie. Jenže dnes je Spojené království členem Evropského sdružení volného obchodu, takže na základě Smlouvy mu nemůže EU klást omezení v obchodu s průmyslovými výrobky.

Fakticky tedy zbývá jako nástroj kamionová doprava, finanční služby a zemědělství. Jenže v době internetového bankovnictví nelze účinně překážet britským bankám. Pokusy o překážky v zemědělském trhu mohou dopadnout mnohem hůře na EU podobně jako odvetné sankce Ruské federace. Ta bez dovozu z Evropy dosáhla soběstačnosti za 2 roky. Spojené království sotva stojí o poškozování svého zemědělství dovozem za dumpingové ceny. Nevstřícnost ke Spojenému království poškodí mnohem více EU než naopak.

Jorge Buxadé Villalba (ECR). – Señora presidente, señor Barnier, señorías, se acabó el circo de la salida del Reino Unido del club comunitario y hay que ponerse a trabajar.

Hay que ponerse a pactar acuerdos comerciales y económicos que garanticen los derechos de nuestros nacionales. Como ejemplo, el derecho a pescar en aguas británicas de los pescadores españoles o tratados comerciales que garanticen efectivamente la libre competencia de los productos agrícolas del Reino Unido, pero también en materias como la seguridad o la cooperación judicial.

Negociemos fuerte, pero negociemos no menos fuerte de lo que se tiene que negociar con otros países ajenos a Europa con los que cerramos también acuerdos comerciales. En este sentido, creo que es el momento adecuado para dar la batalla y acabar con el proceso de descolonización de Gibraltar, impidiendo que esa colonia británica en territorio nacional español siga parasitando la economía española con prácticas fiscales desleales. Bajo el paraguas de la Unión Europea, Gibraltar se ha consolidado como una base para el lavado de dinero proveniente de actividades criminales.

Por tanto, le exigimos a la Comisión que plante las bases para ese proceso de descolonización. Sabemos que es responsabilidad del Gobierno de España, pero de socios leales, como son los de este club, debe exigirse la colaboración y el respeto a la dignidad de nuestra nación.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to talk about financial services, which I believe are crucial for future relations with the UK. We know that an FTA can have only a very small chapter on financial services, addressing only the right of establishment and prudential carve-out mechanism, and EU financial services are about the single market, and it is clear now that it will be an equivalence mechanism that will provide the main framework for the relationship. The Commission has just a few months to prepare all those unilateral equivalence decisions – around forty, I understand – and the financial industry should be fully aware of how little time they have to adjust to the future situation.

Efforts have been made recently, also in this House, to enhance the equivalence framework as the main regulatory tool for financial services in the future relationship with the UK. As equivalence is a unilateral discretionary policy tool, in order to make it deliver, we will need constructive cooperation with UK regulators and supervisors to protect the financial stability and integrity of our financial markets, protect investors and consumers, as well as ensuring LPF. But all of us here in this House must also be aware that for an ambitious, beneficial and successful future relationship with the UK in the area of financial services, it is our duty also to complete as soon as possible the Banking Union and build a genuine capital market union. The EU will preserve regulatory and supervisory autonomy, but so will the UK, and we just heard from the former governor of the Bank of England that the UK will not be a rule-taker. So let me emphasise that, while we should maintain close and ambitions relations with the UK in financial services, we should also spare no effort to reduce potential systemic risk.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, capo negoziatore Barnier, dopo una delle pagine più buie della storia dell'Unione, abbiamo l'obbligo di fare oggi tutto il possibile per garantire ai nostri cittadini i risultati ottenuti in 45 anni di integrazione europea, salvaguardando i nostri rapporti con il Regno Unito e basandoli sul principio dell'equità sociale e ambientale e della equa concorrenza.

Serve un accordo ambizioso, che impegni il Regno Unito a mantenere i nostri standard produttivi e di sicurezza alimentare e scongiuri il rischio che l'accesso al mercato unico dei prodotti d'oltremanica rappresenti un cavallo di Troia per prodotti che metterebbero a rischio la salute dei nostri consumatori e la sostenibilità economica delle nostre aziende.

Le relazioni future non possono prescindere dalla condivisione di un patrimonio culturale comune, che include anche le produzioni agroalimentari di qualità. Per questo tutte le nostre eccellenze dovranno vedersi garantito l'attuale livello di tutela.

Proprio su questi principi si fonda la nostra convinzione che dopo la Brexit non ci sarà il vuoto, ma un'Europa sempre più forte e sostenibile, pronta a difendere i suoi cittadini.

Barry Andrews (Renew). – Madam President, it is with mixed feelings that I make this first contribution to the proceedings of this Chamber because, naturally, it has been difficult to see the departure of the UK for any Irish person, given the very close political, social and cultural affinity that we have with the UK. I'd much rather be here in very different circumstances, but it is fitting that I should speak, for my first contribution, on Brexit, because essentially it is one of the reasons I put my candidacy forward a year ago and, ironically, one of the reasons that I've ended up here in the difficult circumstances.

We're at a delicate stage in proceedings, and there is no example in history where negotiating parties are seeking to impose trade barriers. So it will be difficult. It is amazing to continue to hear UK government officials expressing astonishment that the EU would exercise power, leverage and influence in trade negotiations, given the fact, on the one hand, that the UK were one of the architects of this system and that they have benefited from it so much.

So I would call upon Mr Barnier to continue to speak about the UK as a trading partner and not a trading competitor, and not to imagine that the UK has to be punished in order for the EU to thrive.

Harald Vilimsky (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich möchte die Gelegenheit nutzen, nachdem die britischen Mandatare heute zum ersten Mal nicht mehr unter uns sind, Großbritannien alles Gute zu wünschen für die neu gewonnene Unabhängigkeit und dass nicht länger Brüssel das Zentrum ihrer Entscheidungen ist, sondern in London das Epizentrum der politischen Willensbildung entsprechend vorhanden ist. Das kann einem gefallen, oder das kann einem nicht gefallen. Faktum ist, dass es auf Basis eines demokratischen Mehrheitsentscheides passiert.

Man hat lange genug versucht, hier mit Tricks eines zweiten Referendums und ähnlichem die Briten zu zwingen, in dieser Gemeinschaft zu bleiben. Aber erst die Wahlen ins britische Unterhaus haben klargemacht, dass diese britische Mehrheitsentscheidung eine unerschütterliche ist. Jetzt wird es an Ihnen liegen, an der Europäischen Union liegen, wie man den Briten in ihrer neu gewonnenen Unabhängigkeit begegnet: in Freundschaft und mit Flexibilität, oder dass man die Briten weiter mit einer Regulierungswut so malträtiert, dass sie in weiterer Konsequenz sagen werden „nein, danke" und sie in eine transatlantische Achse mit den Amerikanern getrieben werden – zum Nachteil auch Europas, zum Nachteil der Arbeitsplätze und der Wirtschaft in Europa. Und Sie werden es bewerkstelligen müssen, den Briten mit Freundschaft und Flexibilität zu begegnen.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, o quadro de relação futura entre o Reino Unido e a União Europeia dependerá, inevitavelmente, da natureza das forças que o negoceiam.

O que temos, de um lado e do outro, são forças apostadas na liberalização e mercantilização dos serviços públicos, no ataque às funções sociais do Estado, na limitação da intervenção dos Estados na economia, na desregulamentação social e laboral, numa perigosa escalada militarista no quadro da NATO e numa agressiva e intervencionista política externa.

Opomo-nos e combatemos firmemente este caminho. Não vemos razão para que não se mantenham, e mesmo reforcem, laços de cooperação mutuamente vantajosos com o Reino Unido, além do campo económico, em domínios como a ciência, o ensino e a cultura, entre outros.

Um quadro de cooperação leal, respeitador da soberania de cada país e dos direitos das comunidades migrantes, em que ganhem os povos, e não um quadro concorrencial que aproveite o grande capital à custa dos povos.

Não é aceitável, em nenhuma circunstância, que se impeça os Estados de construírem este quadro assente nas relações bilaterais com o Reino Unido, nem é aceitável que se atribua o exclusivo do direito de negociação à União Europeia. Dessa forma sabemos sempre que interesses serão servidos e em detrimento também de que interesses.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, dear Michel Barnier, please continue to work as you have done in recent years, preserving the unity of all European institutions. Dear colleagues – let's be aware – let me underline that Brexit was tearing apart the UK society for years. It was tearing apart political parties, it was tearing apart the UK government and it needed two early elections to settle.

Meanwhile, in the European Parliament, we have fulfilled our mission. We work in a noiseless, very professional way to fulfil our missions. For this I would like to thank colleagues from all political groups which were part of this united majority.

What do we need to achieve as of now? Priority number one needs to be citizens' rights. We need to give certainty to students, to farmers, to researchers about the future relationship. The objective needs to be as close a relationship as possible, but the instruments are clear – a rules-based relationship. The principle is clear – please respect the rules – and the outcome needs to be in line with today's mandate of the European Parliament. Only then can we approve it in the end.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Fru talman! Brexit är ett sorgset kapitel i Europas historia. Vi behöver mer samarbete, inte mindre. På så sätt tryggar vi stabiliteten och freden på vår kontinent – en kontinent där konflikter och krig en gång i tiden avlöste varandra.

Nu när de nationalistiska krafterna i Storbritannien har fått sin dröm uppfylld gäller det att vi som tror på samarbete ser till att vi får ett avtal som sätter framtiden först. Det gäller att vi lyckas få till stånd ett avtal som möjliggör ett bra handelsutbyte men likväl står upp för EU:s inre marknad, skyddar EU:s rättsordning, inte tummar på miljö- och klimatpolitiken, står upp för våra arbetstagares rättigheter samt grundläggande fri- och rättigheter.

Boris Johnson kan inte äta kakan och ha kakan kvar. Hans lögner har redan ställt till alltför mycket. Vill han säkerställa ett bra frihandelsavtal, gäller det att han även står upp för de krav som jag nyss nämnde.

Till ungdomen i Storbritannien, som i överlägsen majoritet röstade för att stanna kvar i EU, vill jag slutligen säga: Ge inte upp! Vi är många som ser fram emot en framtid där ni får styra. Våra vägar kan gå samman igen.

Sophia in 't Veld (Renew). – Madam President, we have heard tough language on assuring a level playing field and not lowering our European standards, for example when it comes to food safety or environmental standards. But I do hope that the negotiating team will be just as tough when it comes to data protection standards. I'm quite worried to see the eagerness of the Commission to issue a so-called 'adequacy decision' when it is far from clear that the UK Government can be trusted with our data. I refer to recent scandals like the gross abuse of UK access to the Schengen database.

In addition to discussing our future relationship, let's not forget the implementation of what has been agreed so far and in particular citizens' rights. I strongly urge the Commission to make sure that the rights of 3.5 million EU citizens in the UK and 1.5 million British citizens in the EU27 will be secured not just on paper, but also in practice.

Markus Buchheit (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren hier im Plenarsaal! Ich werde wahrgenommen als ein Vertreter einer Gruppe, die gemeinhin Ängste schüren würde, unbegründete Emotionen und dergleichen mehr. Nun, wir haben zumindest nichts gesagt in Bezug darauf, dass es in Großbritannien nach dem Brexit zu Lebensmittel- oder Arzneimittelengpässen kommen würde, oder gar zu Verkehrschaos an den Grenzen. Das waren nicht unsere Worte, diese Ängste wurden hier von Vertretern der selbst ernannten bürgerlichen Mitte geschürt.

Ich darf Sie nur um eines bitten – und ich weiß, es fällt Ihnen insbesondere in diesen Tagen schwer –, und das ist die Anerkennung eines demokratischen Prozesses, eines demokratischen Entscheides in Großbritannien: Akzeptieren Sie Großbritannien als Partner, als Gesprächspartner auf Augenhöhe, und betrachten Sie die nun kommenden Möglichkeiten eines neuen Freihandelsabkommens eben auch als Möglichkeit eines Neustartes, als Möglichkeit zum Brückenbau – statt hier mit harter Hand, wie es eben gefordert wurde, vorzugehen – und zum Neustart für unsere Beziehungen diesseits und jenseits des Kanals.

François-Xavier Bellamy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, nous le savons bien: la relation qui se construira entre l'Union européenne et le Royaume-Uni, entre nos pays et le Royaume-Uni, sera décisive dans de très nombreux secteurs.

Beaucoup de choses importantes ont été dites, mais je voudrais revenir sur un point fondamental, qui est la question de la pêche. En effet, nous le savons bien, la pêche a été dans le débat britannique un enjeu essentiel qui a décidé du Brexit. Aujourd'hui, nous aurions tout à perdre si la pêche devait être séparée de la négociation globale avec les Britanniques. Je me félicite, je suis très heureux que, grâce au travail énergique de Michel Barnier, en particulier, la pêche ait pu être incluse dans ce mandat de négociation pour faire en sorte qu'un accord global soit négocié, incluant cette dimension.

En effet, si nous n'arrivons pas à avoir d'accord sur la pêche, les tensions seront très vives en mer et le désastre pourrait être grand d'un point de vue économique, mais aussi d'un point de vue écologique. Il nous faut une politique commune de la pêche pour préserver les espèces et cet aspect-là est fondamental pour l'avenir de nos pays.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Fru formand! Målet med vores forhandlinger her må være at få en ambitiøs frihandelsaftale mellem to nære allierede, EU og Storbritannien. Vi skal i mål, det er efter min mening en bunden opgave; men vi skal også være rigtig klare i vores krav til briterne. Og vores krav er, at vi siger nej til, at briterne svækker arbejdstagerbeskyttelsen eller miljøbeskyttelsen. Vi siger nej til, at briterne sænker deres skatter og hæver deres statsstøtte. Med andre ord: Vi skal være krystalklare i vores krav om at sikre fair konkurrence, lige konkurrence, level playing field.

Når det er sagt, så er det også i EU's interesse at få en aftale, og vi må derfor ikke lade ærgrelsen over, at vi fik et brexit, stå i vejen for, at vi finder løsninger, der for eksempel sikrer, at EU-fiskere fortsat kan få adgang til britisk farvand. Det er i vores allesammens interesse, at vi får en god handelsaftale med briterne.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Presidência croata, Comissão, Senhor Michel Barnier, julgo que será de sublinhar dois aspetos que não foram, talvez, ainda devidamente sublinhados aqui.

O primeiro, é que é essencial, em qualquer circunstância, que as questões de segurança sejam reguladas na relação entre o Reino Unido e a União Europeia. Basta pensar no que foram os atentados terroristas, no que foi a cooperação policial entre os serviços do Reino Unido e os serviços de vários Estados europeus para ter uma ideia do que seria não ter uma base de acordo entre os dois lados do Canal da Mancha.

Finalmente, parece-me também importante que se possa estender este acordo à área da defesa e a algumas áreas da política externa. Basta, por exemplo, olhar para o que foi a questão do Irão para verificar que o Reino Unido está muito mais alinhado com a visão da União Europeia do que com outras visões. E, por isso, nós devemos trabalhar, quer no campo da cooperação criminal e da segurança, quer no campo da política de defesa e externa.

Clara Aguilera (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor Barnier, usted ha sido un buen negociador durante todo el proceso y estoy convencida de que nos va a llevar a un gran acuerdo. Necesitamos, en primer lugar, que haya acuerdo. Como dice mi colega Juan Fernando López Aguilar, necesitamos un acuerdo antes para evitar el abismo.

En segundo lugar, necesitamos que el acuerdo con el Reino Unido sea ambicioso y que defienda y represente bien los intereses del sector agrario y del sector agroalimentario europeos, con nuestros estándares de calidad, que bien conoce el Reino Unido.

Uno de los aspectos importantes del mandato negociador y al que se han referido varias señorías es la pesca. También usted lo conoce perfectamente, puesto que ha tratado estos temas como ministro de Pesca en Francia. Es importante que pudiera cerrar un acuerdo antes del 1 de julio para poder saber si podemos hacer un reparto responsable del TAC y de las cuotas y que, desde luego, nuestro sector pesquero no se vea indefenso ante esta situación

Y, por último, preservar la opinión de España en todo lo que se negocie con Gibraltar. Es muy importante para nuestro país y yo creo que para la Unión Europea.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, many thanks to the Commission and Michel Barnier for their excellent work, and also thanks to the team drafting Parliament's resolution. This is a very good resolution and I guess the debate was also good. At the end, almost everything was said, so let me just stress a few points.

First of all, free goes together with fair. These elements cannot be divided. And the second, rights goes together with obligation. Based on those principles, we would be able to build a very extensive, very deep agreement with the UK. We could, but it's probably not very likely, because we have two constraints. The first is too many red lines and the second is too little time. Nevertheless, we should try our best, and there should be two principles guiding us. First of all, we cannot give up our principles. Principles are very important for us and for our partners. The second was stressed by the Council. Time is short; we must be quick and flexible to get the best results for all Europeans.

Johan Danielsson (S&D). – Fru talman! Det är viktigt att förhandlingarna nu sker efter tydliga principer. För det första måste vi förhandla som en union; det kan inte fortgå parallella, bilaterala förhandlingar. För det andra måste varje grad av tillträde till vår gemensamma marknad följas av motsvarande regelefterlevnad från Storbritanniens sida. Den framtida relationen ska, som flera redan har sagt, bygga på konkurrens på lika villkor, inklusive arbetsrättsliga och sociala standarder.

Ta transportområdet som exempel. För att kunna garantera fortsatta transporter mellan EU och Storbritannien behöver vi ett avtal. Utan avtal, inga transporter, vilket vore en katastrof, både för EU och för Storbritannien.

Samtidigt måste det märkas att Storbritannien inte längre är en medlem. För vägtransporter, till exempel, är det inte rimligt att Storbritannien fortfarande har möjlighet till cabotagetrafik i EU, och möjligheten till transit genom Kontinentaleuropa måste åtföljas av att EU:s regelverk respekteras fullt ut.

Kris Peeters (PPE). – Voorzitter, de brexit is een feit en de volgende stap is een nieuw associatieakkoord met het Verenigd Koninkrijk. De Britse regering wil dit akkoord binnen slechts acht maanden sluiten, zo niet belanden wij bij een harde brexit, hetgeen voor België betekent dat 42 000 jobs op het spel staan.

Het is dus van essentieel belang dat wij een akkoord sluiten dat vanaf 1 januari 2021 in werking kan treden. Maar vergis u niet: in acht maanden tijd een volledig associatieakkoord sluiten is praktisch onmogelijk. Daarom moeten wij prioriteiten durven stellen.

Ten eerste: onze vissers moeten kunnen blijven vissen in de Britse wateren. Ten tweede moet er een gelijk speelveld zijn voor de handel. Onze voedingssector, textielsector en farmaceutische sector verdienen zekerheid. Ten derde moet er ook een akkoord zijn over de samenwerking op het vlak van defensie en justitie. Het Verenigd Koninkrijk zal immers een naaste buur blijven.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, yo solo quiero referirme a un asunto de gran importancia en las relaciones entre la Unión Europea y el Reino Unido: la pesca; en particular, la continuación del acceso recíproco a aguas y recursos pesqueros tan necesaria —como bien conoce el señor Barnier—.

A mí me parece imprescindible —como otros ya han mencionado— que los pescadores europeos mantengan el acceso a las aguas y los recursos del Reino Unido. Son muchas e importantes las comunidades pesqueras y las regiones altamente afectadas por esta cuestión.

Por otra parte, no podemos olvidar que los consumidores europeos constituyen el principal mercado para los productos de la pesca de los pescadores británicos. Son pues intereses complementarios, por así decirlo. Pero lo que yo quiero subrayar especialmente aquí es que tenemos que ser firmes en la defensa de una vinculación que vaya más allá de lo expresado anteriormente. Para mí —como para el propio señor Barnier, según sus declaraciones públicas—, un acuerdo que mantenga el acceso a las aguas y los recursos del Reino Unido es condición necesaria para que pueda haber un acuerdo de libre comercio.

Me gustaría que esto quede muy claro en el mandato negociador que adopte el Consejo y, desde luego, celebro que la propuesta de Resolución del Parlamento recoja claramente esta vinculación en su apartado 24.

„Catch the eye eljárás"

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor negociador Barnier, después de tres años agónicos para evitar el abismo de un *Brexit* sin acuerdo, nos enfrentamos ahora en apenas diez meses a un escenario no menos estresante -la necesidad de un acuerdo- y que solo puede ser afrontado desde el criterio de la unidad, la exigencia de reciprocidad y el respeto de los estándares europeos con el Reino Unido, que nunca fue Schengen, nunca fue euro y ahora ha pasado a ser un país tercero con todas las de la ley.

Y es importante asegurarlo para evitar que exista un paraíso fiscal en nuestra fronteras -por ejemplo en Gibraltar-, evitando esa tradición de fraude, ocultación de capitales y contrabando, pero, sobre todo, garantizando en la inclusión del acuerdo el tratamiento que merece la circulación de personas, la cooperación judicial y policial en materia de seguridad y la protección de datos y evitando que pueda producirse nunca más un escándalo como el de la violación de las reglas europeas de protección de datos en el Sistema de Información Schengen. Es importantísimo, por tanto, prestar la atención que merece este capítulo sobre la circulación de personas y las libertades al que hago referencia como presidente de la Comisión de Libertades Justicia e Interior.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, I say to Michel Barnier: to use your phrase, 'the clock is ticking'. And we all know that it took three years, three torturous years, to negotiate the Withdrawal Agreement with only three key points in it. So, therefore, in 10 months we have to do much more and we have to be very careful of the detail. As others have said, we need a level playing field, we need a good relationship with the United Kingdom, so I wish us well in those negotiations.

Colleagues will also know that there is and has been a general election in Ireland and there will be a new government. We hope that that government gets into place rather swiftly, because there is much work to be done.

I hope, too, that they can build on the incredible work and achievements of Taoiseach Leo Varadkar, Tánaiste Simon Coveney, and Minister for European Affairs Helen McEntee, who helped and worked with the European Union to reach that Withdrawal Agreement, in particular on the Irish Protocol.

Ten months is a very short space of time. This Parliament will be watching under the leadership of David McAllister, and we have to work together to keep our unity.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, sometimes, when I come in here I wonder am I living on the same planet as everyone else. I heard someone say that we shouldn't allow the UK to become a tax haven.

My God, right now sub-Saharan Africa loses three times as much in capital flight each year as it gains in aid investment and loans. And much of it is channelled, illegally and legally, through the banks in the city of London. It is a tax haven, and it has a network of tax havens to work with. If you are in denial about that, I just don't understand the thinking.

Unfair trading practices, talk about the merits of a free trade. The truth be told: unfair trade practices are killing farmers, indigenous people trying to make a living all over the planet. When is it ever going to stop?

Brexit should be used as an opportunity to move towards a system in which capital is embedded in local economies, and not moving all over the planet at the expense of the environment and the people of the planet.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamna președintă, avem nevoie de un parteneriat cuprinzător cu Marea Britanie. Este evident în interesul nostru, dar este și în interesul Regatului Unit. Un astfel de parteneriat presupune să negociem în detaliu fiecare componentă a acestui acord, în interesul cetățenilor pe care îi reprezentăm.

Am vorbit de protecția datelor, de protecția inovației, de schimburile comerciale, de standardele europene, dar, evident, toate aceste lucruri trebuie să ia în considerare și nevoia unui parteneriat care să cuprindă și alte dimensiuni: partea de securitate și de apărare, protecția drepturilor europenilor care locuiesc acolo și, de ce nu, poate continuarea participării Marii Britanii la o serie de programe europene, în măsura în care își doresc acest lucru și noi ne dorim acest lucru.

De aceea, sunt convins că negociatorul nostru, domnul Michel Barnier este mai mult decât capabil să facă lucrul acesta. Am avut plăcerea să lucrez cu el în trecut și sunt convins că putem livra un astfel de parteneriat strategic în timp util, în așa fel încât toate aceste lucruri să fie garantate pe mai departe.

Eugen Tomac (PPE). – Doamna președintă, domnule Michel Barnier, avem o situație pe care noi nu ne-am dorit-o. Nu noi am dorit ca Marea Britanie să plece din Uniunea Europeană, nu noi am dorit să creăm acest moment pe care trebuie să-l gestionăm în prezent. Însă, vă rog un lucru foarte important, să respingeți ferm orice condiționalități inacceptabile, orice chestiuni absurde pe care guvernul de la Londra va dori să le discute cu noi. Trebuie însă să vă gândiți la trei elemente importante: să vă gândiți și la britanicii care nu și-au dorit ca Marea Britanie să plece din Uniunea Europeană; atunci când discutăm cu Londra, să vă gândiți că sunt 3,5 milioane de cetățeni europeni în Marea Britanie și 1,5 milioane de cetățeni britanici în Uniunea Europeană. Pe ei trebuie să-i protejăm. Și nu în ultimul rând, toată acțiunea noastră trebuie gândită în perspectivă, pentru că într-o zi, Marea Britanie va trebui să revină alături de noi.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W Polsce mówi się, że nie szkoda róż, gdy płonie las, więc wspólnie powinniśmy ten pożar pobrexitowy ugasić. Podkreślam: wspólnie. I mam nadzieję, że takie intencje wszystkim nam tu przyświecają. Oczywiście nie po to był brexit, żeby było, tak jak było. Jako Unia Europejska i Zjednoczone Królestwo będziemy trochę ze sobą współpracować, trochę konkurować. Ale jedną z naszych pierwszych potrzeb jako Europejczyków jest bezpieczeństwo. Zatem czy zechciałby Pan Komisarz powiedzieć kilka zdań na ten temat? Chodzi mi w szczególności o bezpieczeństwo zewnętrzne. Czy nie widzi Pan jakiegoś zagrożenia w tym obszarze? Jest to bowiem dla nas wszystkich bardzo ważne.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, as an Irish citizen, we've obviously always had a very close and intertwined history with the UK – not all of it welcome, but that's another story. But that relationship will continue, and it is in our mutual interest that it should be a cooperative one.

Now, Ms von der Leyen talked about there needing to be rules to bring fairness to the heart of business. But the key question is: fairness for who? Because if the rules continue to favour big business, the big corporations, the arms industry, the big farmers, and so on, then citizens will be left behind. That was one of the reasons for Brexit, and it was one of the key reasons for the almighty trouncing that Leo Varadkar's team got in the Irish election this weekend. It was a rejection of neoliberalism.

Now, I wish you well in your negotiations. You have a number of issues to deal with, not least the situation of the medical profession and the need for you to work inter-institutionally to deliver progress. I echo the points of my colleagues about the data issues and the breaches by the UK. But critically, I urge you to protect, and have no backtracking on, the Good Friday Agreement.

Александър Александров Йорданов (PPE). – Уважаема г-жо Председател, г-н Барние, между нас и Великобритания тепърва ще има проблеми. Вече е ясно, че те ще проличат в преговорите за търговското споразумение, но тези преговори, тези проблеми, не трябва да се отразят на общите интереси и политика в сферата на сигурността и отбраната. Необходимо е да засилим сътрудничеството си в рамките на НАТО, като единствен в момента гарант за европейската, а и за световната сигурност.

Трябва да бъдем в позиция да координираме взаимоотношенията си с Великобритания във външната политика. Имам предвид съществуването на горещи или замразени конфликти като Руската агресия срещу Украйна, кризата в Сирия, напрежението в Близкия Изток, политиката на Иран, тероризма. Ситуацията всъщност след Брекзит ни дава възможност за по-добро сътрудничество в триъгълника Европейски съюз – Великобритания – Съединени щати.

Robert Hajšel (S&D). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, ja by som sa chcel naozaj zastaviť nad tým, ako by mali vyzerať naše vzťahy do budúcnosti s Veľkou Britániou. Musíme sa snažiť naozaj o najvyššiu, čo najvyššiu možnú úroveň vzťahov a usilovať sa o niečo viac, ako je jednoduchá zmluva alebo dohoda o voľnom obchode. Musíme aj počas týchto negociácií zostať dôveryhodnými partnermi, ktorí sa môžu spoľahnúť na seba aj z hľadiska pretláčania zahraničnopolitických priorít. Potrebujeme férovú súťaž, aby tu nebol žiadny dumping, aby sme naozaj mohli spolu obchodovať bez nejakých bariér, ale zároveň Veľká Británia tiež nemôže napríklad aplikovať prehnanú štátnu pomoc, nemôžu, nemôže uvoľniť zo svojich vysokých európskych, doteraz európskych sociálnych a environmentálnych štandardov, ale musí sa pridržiavať svojich záväzkov v rámci boja s klimatickými zmenami. V prvom rade však ide o zaistenie čo najvyššej úrovni práv pre našich občanov, ktorí tam študujú, pracujú alebo obchodujú. Musíme im dať istotu, aby mohli žiť čo najlepšie, tak ako žili doteraz.

(„Catch the eye" eljárás vége)

Michel Barnier, *Chef de la task-force pour les relations avec le Royaume-Uni.* – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, Madame la Ministre, à l'occasion de votre dernière session à Bruxelles – et Ursula von der Leyen a fait référence à cette séance émouvante –, vous avez dit au revoir à tous vos collègues britanniques quittant le Parlement en raison du Brexit. Vous me permettrez, au début de cette session, de saluer les nouveaux collègues qui vous rejoignent et de leur dire, aussi, la disponibilité qui est la nôtre, celle de la Commission, pour leur mandat.

Je voudrais commencer par vous remercier pour votre confiance, qui me touche, et encourage une équipe exceptionnelle que j'ai l'honneur d'animer et qui est celle de la Commission européenne, qui est aussi votre équipe de négociation. Je voudrais aussi vous remercier pour le contenu de votre résolution, qui marque des principes, des valeurs, des positions. Votre négociateur a besoin et aura besoin tout au long des mois qui viennent de cette détermination, de cette résolution, pour l'aider dans cette négociation, qui sera difficile.

Tout à l'heure, Mairead McGuinness a dit: «the clock is ticking». Je veux juste rappeler, sur ce sujet du temps, que le temps de la transition, qui est fixé dans le traité de retrait, est un temps en effet limité, qui peut être prolongé d'un an ou de deux ans par un accord commun. S'il n'est pas prolongé, comme nous le comprenons, cela veut dire que le Royaume-Uni quittera le 31 décembre de cette année le marché unique et l'union douanière. C'est un choix, et ce choix du temps est fixé par le premier ministre britannique, pas par nous.

Et il faut que chacun comprenne bien que ce temps contraint, avant que le Royaume-Uni ne quitte le marché unique et l'union douanière, ce temps contraint choisi par le premier ministre britannique a des conséquences. Chacun doit évidemment les assumer. Cette contrainte du temps, ce n'est pas nous qui la posons dans la négociation.

Mais cette contrainte veut dire aussi une chose, car nous ne sommes pas dans une négociation commerciale – quand nous négocions avec le Canada ou avec le Japon, nous essayons de nous rapprocher, de faire de la convergence. Certains pensent que cette convergence n'est pas suffisante, mais nous y arrivons. Si nous ne parvenons pas à un accord avec ces pays, nous prenons plus de temps. Nous donnons plus de temps à la négociation: un an, deux ans… Pour le Canada, cela a pris sept ans. Et en attendant de trouver un accord, c'est le statu quo, pour les deux parties.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je veux rappeler que, dans le cas précis où nous sommes, ce ne sera pas le statu quo. Si nous ne trouvons pas d'accord le 31 décembre sur le commerce, ce ne sera pas le statu quo puisque ce jour-là, comme l'a choisi le premier ministre britannique, et pas plus tard que ce jour-là, le 31 décembre prochain donc, le Royaume-Uni sortira du marché unique et de l'union douanière et reviendra en arrière, si je puis dire, dans le cadre de l'OMC.

Ce qui veut dire qu'au-delà des contrôles que nous ferons de toute façon, en raison du Brexit, sur l'ensemble des produits qui viendront du Royaume-Uni (comme nous faisons ces contrôles sur tous les produits qui viennent de pays tiers et qui entrent dans le marché unique, pour protéger les consommateurs et les entreprises), au-delà de ces contrôles, qui de toute façon sont nécessaires, il y aura dans ce cas précis, s'il y a un échec, s'il n'y a pas d'accord, il y aura des quotas et des droits de douane sur tous les produits britanniques. Voilà la conséquence, si nous ne parvenons pas à un accord dans cette contrainte de temps choisie par le premier ministre britannique.

Mesdames, Messieurs, tous vos groupes ont appelé à une relation forte, à la hauteur de notre histoire commune. Et nous n'oublions pas, je n'oublie pas, cette histoire commune et cette solidarité du Royaume-Uni, en particulier dans les heures les plus sombres du siècle dernier. Une relation logique, évidemment, Philippe Lamberts le disait, quand on regarde la géographie. Une relation nécessaire, quand on mesure les intérêts économiques, mais aussi les enjeux climatiques ou les enjeux de sécurité. Une relation lucide et exigeante, quand on écoute – ce que je fais très soigneusement – certains discours britanniques en ce moment sur l'usage qui serait fait – je parle au conditionnel, je ne veux pas faire de procès d'intention – de la nouvelle capacité de divergence réglementaire que le Royaume-Uni a voulu obtenir avec le Brexit.

Cette relation forte, ambitieuse, lucide, exigeante, c'est l'état d'esprit de la Commission européenne, comme l'a dit notre présidente Ursula von der Leyen tout à l'heure, et c'est ce qui est contenu dans la proposition de mandat qui est sur votre table et qui est en discussion au Conseil pour être approuvé, j'espère, le 25 février prochain.

Une négociation, Mesdames et Messieurs, avec un partenaire – je reprends les mots de Barry Andrews tout à l'heure –, un partenaire qui doit bien comprendre – et je le dis calmement mais fermement – que l'ouverture de nos marchés, l'accès aux données – je réponds, Madame in't Veld, à votre question –, les équivalences pour les services financiers – évoquées par Danuta Hübner –, je répète: l'ouverture de nos marchés, l'accès aux données, les équivalences – je dis bien les équivalences pour les services financiers – seront proportionnelles aux engagements pris ensemble pour respecter un vrai *level playing field*. Une cohérence réglementaire dans certains domaines, la protection des citoyens et, je me permets de l'ajouter, n'ayons pas la mémoire courte: la stabilité financière de notre continent et de la zone euro.

Je voudrais télégraphiquement répondre à quelques points précis.

D'abord, Geert Bourgeois a évoqué tout à l'heure la question de la coopération, notamment en mer du Nord, sur l'énergie. Je ferai d'ailleurs le point aujourd'hui avec le vice-président Timmermans sur cette question. Nous souhaitons évidemment, Monsieur Bourgeois, une coopération avec le Royaume-Uni dans cette région de la mer du Nord sur les questions énergétiques. Cette coopération est d'ailleurs prévue dans notre projet de mandat. Mais le Brexit a des conséquences mécaniques et logiques. Les Britanniques ne sont plus dans l'Union européenne, donc le cadre de coopération doit être revu, logiquement. Le Royaume-Uni ne participe plus aux instances européennes parce qu'il l'a voulu, c'est son choix, et donc nous devons trouver, Monsieur Bourgeois, un autre moyen de coopérer avec eux et nous le rechercherons.

Paulo Rangel tout à l'heure, M. López Aguilar à l'instant, M. Rzońca également, ont évoqué la sécurité interne et externe. C'est aussi dans notre mandat que d'ouvrir plusieurs tables de négociations sur les sujets de la sécurité intérieure, la coopération en matière d'extradition, Europol, Eurojust, *anti-money laundering*, Prüm, le PNR… Autant de sujets qui exigent un accord avec les Britanniques dans l'intérêt commun, pour la protection de la sécurité des citoyens. Mais aussi, et M. Alexandrov l'évoquait à l'instant, la sécurité extérieure. Je veux dire à ce sujet de la défense et de la politique étrangère que le Brexit ne doit pas normalement avoir de conséquences sur la coopération bilatérale que plusieurs de vos pays ont avec le Royaume-Uni – je parle de coopération entre tel ou tel pays de l'Union et le Royaume-Uni –, et donc ne doit pas non plus avoir de conséquences sur ce que nous faisons ensemble dans l'OTAN.

Ce dont il s'agit là, pour cette négociation, c'est la coopération entre l'Union européenne, notamment les nouvelles initiatives que nous prenons pour la défense, et le Royaume-Uni, s'il le veut bien. Donc, nous avons fait une proposition et nous avons confirmé cette proposition d'ouverture d'une table de négociation sur ces sujets. La déclaration politique fait référence clairement à la sécurité extérieure et à la défense. Nous avons besoin de textes sur ces sujets pour insérer dans le droit et dans les textes juridiques des coopérations administratives ou politiques – je pense à l'Agence de défense, je pense à la lutte contre les cyberattaques, je pense à la coopération entre les services de renseignement, je pense aussi à la possibilité pour les Britanniques de participer, s'ils le veulent, à des opérations extérieures de l'Union, militaires ou civilo-militaires, et je pense évidemment à la coopération politique avec un pays très important qui reste membre du Conseil de sécurité des Nations unies.

Tout cela doit se traduire dans des textes et nous sommes prêts à en discuter, encore faut-il que nous soyons deux pour le faire. Donc, nous sommes ouverts et nous restons ouverts à cette négociation pour améliorer la gestion en commun des enjeux de sécurité et de la stabilité du continent.

Nous sommes également prêts à discuter de tout le reste. Tout à l'heure, Mme Terry Reintke évoquait Erasmus. Nous devons évidemment continuer la coopération en matière universitaire, la coopération en matière de recherche, la participation des Britanniques, s'ils le souhaitent, aux programmes européens. Et nous aurons une table de négociations, dès le mois de mars, sur l'ensemble des programmes européens – je dis bien l'ensemble des programmes, y compris Erasmus –, mais ce sera avec un cadre juridique et un cadre financier différents d'aujourd'hui.

Danuta Hübner a évoqué tout à l'heure la question des services financiers et de cette relation que nous devons avoir avec le Royaume-Uni. Au-delà de ce qui est écrit dans le projet de mandat et de ce que nous faisons habituellement dans des accords avec des pays tiers, il n'y aura pas de négociations à proprement parler sur les services financiers. En revanche, nous devons trouver une relation avec le Royaume-Uni, compte tenu de l'importance de la place de Londres et de la City, que je connais bien. Nous allons donc utiliser – Danuta Hübner y a fait référence – la boîte à outils des équivalences. Comme nous le ferons en matière de données, nous utiliserons la boîte à outils des *adequacy decisions*. Nous ne négocions pas sur ces sujets avec le Royaume-Uni, nous vérifions la cohérence et, quand nous le jugeons possible, nous donnons des équivalences sur tel ou tel secteur de l'industrie financière. C'est ce que nous avons fait avec le Canada, ce que nous faisons avec les États-Unis, ce que nous faisons avec le Japon, et ça marche. Je ne vois donc pas pourquoi ça ne marcherait pas avec le Royaume-Uni.

Mais je voudrais profiter de cette session pour dire clairement à certains responsables britanniques qu'il ne doit pas y avoir d'illusion sur cette question: il n'y aura pas d'équivalence générale et globale, ou permanente, sur les services financiers. Il n'y aura pas non plus de cogestion d'équivalence financière avec le Royaume-Uni. Nous garderons la maîtrise de ces outils et nous garderons l'autonomie de décision. Je veux aussi, parallèlement, rappeler que dans cette période-là, nous avons des raisons supplémentaires de continuer à agir, et c'est l'objet du travail de notre vice-président Valdis Dombrovskis pour l'union des marchés de capitaux et la poursuite et la consolidation de l'union bancaire.

Enfin, la pêche. M. Bellamy, mais aussi M. Millán Mon, M. Peeters, Mme Schaldemose, Mme Aguilera ont évoqué, parmi d'autres, cette question que je connais assez bien pour avoir eu l'honneur d'être ministre des pêcheurs de mon propre pays pendant quelques années. Je veux simplement dire à ce sujet que l'accès réciproque aux eaux territoriales et aux marchés – je dis bien l'accès réciproque aux eaux et aux marchés – sera un point indissociable de l'accord de commerce, car il s'agit bien de commerce. Ce sera donc un point indissociable de l'accord de commerce et du *level playing field* dans cette négociation.

Mesdames et Messieurs, nous avons toujours respecté, même si nous l'avons regretté, le choix du Royaume-Uni de quitter l'Union européenne. Le premier ministre, Boris Johnson, que nous respectons, a dit qu'en quittant l'Union européenne, le Royaume-Uni ne quittait pas l'Europe. Nous sommes heureux de cette résolution. La question qui est posée et à laquelle, pour l'instant, nous n'avons pas de réponse est la suivante – elle est assez simple, mais assez grave: le Royaume-Uni quitte l'Union européenne, quitte le marché unique et l'union douanière, mais veut-il aussi quitter ou s'éloigner de notre modèle économique, social et réglementaire européen? Un modèle qu'il connaît bien, puisque nous l'avons construit avec lui depuis 47 ans. Telle est la question à laquelle nous attendons une réponse. De quelle distance le Royaume-Uni veut-il s'éloigner de notre modèle social, économique et réglementaire? Et je voudrais simplement dire que c'est lui, Mesdames et Messieurs, je le dis avec beaucoup de clarté et de calme, c'est le Royaume-Uni qui fixera le niveau d'ambition de notre future relation dans ces domaines, c'est lui qui choisira le niveau de cohérence réglementaire, qui déterminera, du coup, l'ambition, ou qui choisira le niveau de concurrence réglementaire. Et je recommande que la réponse à cette question que nous posons soit bien réfléchie dans le temps contraint que nous avons devant nous.

Je termine par trois réflexions télégraphiques. Mesdames, Messieurs, j'ai toujours dit la vérité devant vous et je continuerai. Le Brexit, ça ne peut pas être *business as usual*. Il y a des changements dans tous les domaines. Certains changements peuvent être plus ou moins grands ou temporaires, d'autres changements sont définitifs. Le Brexit fait que le service financier britannique perd son passeport financier. Il n'y a pas de reconnaissance mutuelle.

Le Brexit a pour conséquence qu'en toute hypothèse, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous imposerons le 1er janvier prochain des contrôles sur tous les produits qui rentreront dans le marché unique, comme nous le faisons pour tous les autres pays tiers du monde. Nous devons cette protection aux consommateurs, aux budgets nationaux et européens, et nous la devons aussi aux entreprises. Donc, ce ne sera pas *business as usual*. Mais nous allons essayer de limiter les conséquences en trouvant un bon accord.

Deuxième réflexion: nous devons nous attacher à faire respecter et à respecter aussi nous-mêmes l'accord de retrait. Ce n'est pas une banalité. L'accord de retrait comporte 600 pages, il est maintenant ratifié par vous et par la Chambre des communes, il doit être mis en œuvre. Je ferai rapport publiquement devant vous et devant le Conseil, régulièrement, sur l'état de préparation tout au long de cette année, en particulier sur la mise en œuvre du protocole en Irlande, qui garantit une paix toujours fragile.

Enfin, cette négociation sera difficile, très difficile, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés. Je recommande donc que nous restions prêts à toutes les hypothèses, y compris celle où nous ne parviendrions pas avant le 31 décembre à un accord basique. Nous restons prêts à mener cette négociation avec du respect, comme je l'ai toujours fait, et beaucoup de calme, sans aucune agressivité. Je ne perdrai jamais de vue, au-delà des difficultés de la négociation quotidienne, la nécessité de trouver, en votre nom, un accord ambitieux avec un grand pays ami, voisin et allié, et je continuerai toujours, avec une détermination totale, à défendre les intérêts de l'Union européenne, de ses citoyens, de ses entreprises, à défendre l'intégrité du marché intérieur et unique, qui ne sera pas, n'a jamais été et ne sera jamais négociable.

Enfin, évidemment, Madame la Présidente, le Parlement peut être assuré que la Commission européenne, que votre négociateur, seront toujours prêts à travailler avec vous, à vous écouter, à faire rapport devant vous. Je marquerai donc la même disponibilité, comme je l'ai dit tout au long de ces trois années avant le Brexit et comme je l'ai dit l'autre jour– c'était un groupe animé par Guy Verhofstadt, en présence de David McAllister et du groupe de coordination et en présence de tous les présidents de groupe – je continuerai d'être totalement disponible pour travailler avec le Parlement européen, en confiance avec vous.

VORSITZ: KATARINA BARLEY

Vizepräsidentin

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, I also join Mr Barnier in greeting the new Members of the European Parliament and I'm looking forward to our discussions here.

With your vote on the resolution on the proposed mandate for negotiations for a new partnership with the UK, you will provide a timely and useful input into the finalisation of this mandate. We should aim to build a relationship that is comprehensive, based on high standards and that guarantees a level playing field. The very comprehensive nature of the proposed mandate and likely long negotiations that may ensue in certain sectors will probably call for further debates in the coming months and years.

This new phase should not make us forget about the Withdrawal Agreement, which has just been concluded, and the need to remain vigilant as regards its implementation, first and foremost with respect to the preservation of citizens' rights, be it during the transition period or under whatever future relationship with the United Kingdom.

But our vigilance will have to be no less thorough when considering the intended economic partnership, where strong safeguards and robust governance will be called for to protect the integrity of the EU single market and the competitive position of EU firms. We will therefore count on your cooperation in this respect as well.

Die Präsidentin. – Gemäß Artikel 132 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wurde ein Entschließungsantrag eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 12. Februar 2020, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Carmen Avram (S&D), *în scris.* – Aparent, din Brexit, UE iese slăbită, ca imagine, dar și numeric. Dar forța Uniunii nu stă în numere, pentru că, dacă ar fi stat, nu ar fi fost atât de puternică și de atractivă încă de la început. Țările membre au ales de bunăvoie să adere, nu au fost forțate. Tăria Uniunii reiese din valori și principii și din grija constantă pe care o are față de cetățenii ei. Suma acestor elemente o face nu doar puternică, ci și un model pe care și alții au ales fie să-l respecte, fie să și-l dorească. De aceea, chiar dacă în negocierile din acest an trebuie să se țină seama că în spatele fiecărui sector sunt oameni, e vital să nu renunțăm la niciuna dintre valorile, principiile și convingerile noastre. Ele ne-au ținut laolaltă în toate aceste decenii și au făcut din Uniunea Europeană cel mai de succes proiect geopolitic din istorie. Un parteneriat supranațional unic. Dacă am arăta că suntem dispuși să ne compromitem valorile, am încuraja alte state membre să-și rezolve diversele dispute amenințând cu exit-ul. Trebuie să ne asigurăm că pozițiile Uniunii vor fi respectate. Trebuie să negociem ca și până acum, dintr-o poziție de putere, cu fermitate.

Εμμανουήλ Φράγκος (ECR), *γραπτώς.* – Μετά το Brexit, της 31ης Ιανουαρίου 2020, είναι σημαντικό να οικοδομηθεί μια ισχυρή νέα συνεργασία της ΕΕ με το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο, προς όφελος των πολιτών του Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου και προς όφελος όλων των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών. Το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο θα παύσει να έχει τα προνόμια ενός κράτους μέλους και την πρόσβαση σε κοινοτική χρηματοδότηση. Πιστεύουμε ότι η οριστική συμφωνία μεταξύ ΕΕ και Ηνωμένου Βασιλείου πρέπει να στοχεύει, κατά κύριο λόγο, στο ελεύθερο εμπόριο, βάσει όμως —πάντοτε— των αρχών του ελεύθερου ανταγωνισμού. Σημαντικό, επίσης, θεωρούμε ότι είναι το ζήτημα των ελεύθερων μετακινήσεων των φοιτητών, των τουριστών και των εργαζομένων· ένα δικαίωμα που πρέπει να διασφαλιστεί. Τομείς στενής συνεργασίας πρέπει να αποτελέσουν και τα ζητήματα της καταπολέμησης της τρομοκρατίας και της ασφάλειας. Τέλος, ζητούμε να διασφαλίσει η Ένωση τα συμφέροντα των ευρωπαϊκών επιχειρήσεων και των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών, στον βαθμό που κλονίζονται από το Brexit.

Maria Grapini (S&D), *în scris.* – Plecarea Marii Britanii din UE nu este o bucurie, dar este un fapt împlinit. Accentul trebuie pus acum pe Acordul care se va încheia între UE și Marea Britanie. Fără taxe și cote este un principiu care ar fi benefic pentru ambele părți. Important este să se respecte standardele de produs pentru a avea o concurență corectă și o securitate a consumatorilor. Parteneriatul economic, securitatea și respectarea principiilor nediscriminării și reciprocității depline în domeniul mobilității sunt lucruri care trebuie cuprinse în acord. Transportul terestru și cel european trebuie abordate ambițios în acordul negociat cu Marea Britanie și trebuie identificate soluții optime pe aceste subiecte. Drepturile cetățenilor trebuie respectate și trebuie să fie plasate pe primul loc în Acordul de retragere.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE), *rakstiski.* – ES nākotnes partnerībai ar Lielbritāniju jābalstās vienlīdzīgas konkurences apstākļos, un pēc iespējas ciešāka asociācijas nolīguma pamatā jāliek ekonomiskā partnerība, partnerība ārlietās un konkrēti nozaru jautājumi. Tāpat AK kā "trešā valsts" nevar baudīt tādas pašas priekšrocības kā ES dalībvalstis, un visos apstākļos jānodrošina vienotā tirgus un muitas savienības nedalāmība. Turmpāk Lielbritānijas konkurencei ar ES ir jābūt atvērtai un taisnīgai, kas nozīmē garantēt vienlīdzīgus standartus attiecībā uz sociālo aizsardzību, vides aizsardzību, nodokļiem, valsts atbalstu, patērētāju aizsardzību un klimatu. Tas nozīmē arī Lielbritānijas un ES normatīvu "dinamisku saskaņošanu". Mēs EP prasām arī Lielbritānijas garantijas iedzīvotāju tiesību un pārvietošanās brīvības jomā, attiecībā uz datu aizsardzību, finanšu pakalpojumiem, situāciju Īrijā un Eiropas Tiesas lomu strīdu izšķiršanā.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D), *in writing.* – In the discussions concerning future relations between the European Union and Great Britain we have to remember that we are talking not only about the economy, not only about capital flows, taxes or physical borders. We are also talking about education, culture and exchange of scientific research. We should create such conditions in which the latter are not hindered by the mere fact that Great Britain is not a member of the EU anymore. Most young people in Great Britain voted against Brexit – some polls say that 7 out of ten young Britons, aged from 18 to 24 years of age, voted against it. Thus, it is my strong belief that Great Britain should be as closely involved in programmes like Erasmus+, Creative Europe, Horizon Europe etc. as possible. If the bridge between the EU and the Great Britain is to connect and be ready for a future come-back of Great Britain to the EU, it has to be open. As a former Erasmus student myself I can testify to the power of such connections first-hand.

Grace O'Sullivan (Verts/ALE), *in writing.* – The result of the Irish election this weekend was a Green wave of two shades, delivered big gains for Greens and for Sinn Féin. Brexit did not figure in the election, thanks to the EU's work in minimising the damage to Ireland from the UK's exit. But challenges remain, and this election result could foreshadow more issues regarding the Irish border into the future. This Parliament, and the Commission, must do all they can to ensure that the free movement of peoples and the permeability of the border is maintained into the long term. We need clarity from the UK government on the protocol for Northern Ireland, and the highest level of alignment possible. Another immediate issue facing the negotiations is the July deadline for an agreement on reciprocal access to each other's waters so we can allow our fishers to keep fishing in a sustainable manner, with minimised disruption. Such a timeline seems unrealistic for an area of such complexity, and the Parliament's PECH Committee will have to play an active role in ensuring we reach a deal that prevents significant damage being done to both EU and UK fishers and the sustainability priorities of the CFP.

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), *schriftelijk.* – Groot-Brittannië mag dan vertrokken zijn uit de EU, het land blijft niet enkel een naaste buur maar het liefst ook een trouwe bondgenoot waarmee we nauwe betrekkingen onderhouden. Het Parlement is duidelijk: wij verlangen een ambitieuze deal met onze Britse vrienden, niet alleen over onze toekomstige handelsbetrekkingen, maar ook over andere aangelegenheden waar samenwerking in ons beider voordeel is. Zo'n hechte relatie veronderstelt dat het VK de Europese sociale, arbeids- en milieunormen respecteert.

Maar laat ons duidelijk zijn: wij willen een hechte, duurzame relatie met het VK, haar burgers, ondernemers en wetenschappers, niet noodzakelijk met de huidige regering. Regeringen zijn tijdelijk. De deal die we beogen, moet lang meegaan. Laten we dus koelbloedig blijven als de regering-Johnson bizarre voorstellen doet die mogelijk leiden tot een No Deal en erop gericht zijn de Europese lidstaten uit elkaar te spelen. Wij moeten nu standvastigheid tonen en aan de regering-Johnson duidelijk maken dat we een zeer nauwe samenwerking willen, maar mocht de Britse regering alsnog de sprong in het duister wagen, dan is Europa klaar voor een No Deal. De regering-Johnson moet goed beseffen dat de EU solidair aan één zeel trekt.

Loránt Vincze (PPE), *in writing.* – The mobility of persons and workers was always directly linked to the smooth functioning of the internal market of the European Union the United Kingdom would like frictionless access to. Over the years, however, it has also changed the social fabric of the societies on both sides of the channel. A too severe approach to immigration risks tearing apart myriad links in this fabric. We can just think of the relatives of the 3.5m citizens of EU countries who have the right to remain in the UK, whose relatives would not be able to move back and forth between their countries of residence and the UK under current UK plans. But we can also think of UK citizens remaining in Europe who would be tied to their EU countries of residence and the young Britons who treasure the possibility to go to Europe without a visa and get study, work and life experiences on the continent. Any ambitious agreement on the future relationship should be mindful of these social links and would need to ensure the continuation of rights for EU and UK citizens to the largest degree possible.

3. Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протокола

4. Сключване на Споразумението за свободна търговия между ЕС и Виетнам — Сключване на Споразумението за свободна търговия между ЕС и Виетнам (резолюция) — Споразумение за защита на инвестициите между ЕС и Виетнам — Споразумение за защита на инвестициите между ЕС и Виетнам (резолюция) (разискване)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die gemeinsame Aussprache über

— die Empfehlung von Geert Bourgeois im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel zu dem Entwurf eines Beschlusses des Rates über den Abschluss des Freihandelsabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und der Sozialistischen Republik Vietnam (06050/2019 — C9-0023/2019 – 2018/0356(NLE)) (A9-0003/2020),

— den Bericht von Geert Bourgeois im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel mit einem nichtlegislativen Entschließungsantrag zu dem Entwurf eines Beschlusses des Rates über den Abschluss des Freihandelsabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und der Sozialistischen Republik Vietnam (2018/0356M(NLE)) (A9-0017/2020),

— die Empfehlung von Geert Bourgeois im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel zu dem Entwurf eines Beschlusses des Rates über den Abschluss im Namen der Union des Investitionsschutzabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und ihren Mitgliedstaaten einerseits und der Sozialistischen Republik Vietnam andererseits (05931/2019 — C9-0020/2019 – 2018/0358(NLE)) (A9-0002/2020) und

— den Bericht von Geert Bourgeois im Namen des Ausschusses für internationalen Handel mit einem nichtlegislativen Entschließungsantrag zu dem Entwurf eines Beschlusses des Rates über den Abschluss im Namen der Europäischen Union des Investitionsschutzabkommens zwischen der Europäischen Union und ihren Mitgliedstaaten einerseits und der Sozialistischen Republik Vietnam andererseits (2018/0358M(NLE)) (A9-0014/2020).

Geert Bourgeois, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, tomorrow we will vote on the EU-Vietnam Free Trade Agreement and the Investment Protection Agreement. These are the first state-of-the art trade and investment agreements on which this newly-elected Parliament is asked to give its consent.

It's a unique opportunity for this Parliament to underline the ambition of the EU to become a geopolitical actor and player: not as an empire that imposes rules, but as a global power that defends multilateralism, resists protectionism and reaches out to partners such as Vietnam. It is up to the European Union to promote rules-based trade and show by example that trade delivers, brings peoples together and raises standards worldwide on safety, labour, environment and human rights. It's also a question of credibility. We need to show Vietnam and future trading partners that the EU is a credible partner that sticks to its commitment and that we are still able to negotiate, sign and conclude trade agreements.

Eight years after starting the negotiations with Vietnam, this Parliament has been given the opportunity to debate the most comprehensive trade deal between the EU and a middle-income country in its history. As such, this deal with Vietnam sets a new benchmark for Europe's engagement with emerging economies. If we look at this trade agreement, it is of the utmost importance to stress, first of all, the economic value that will give a boost to the prosperity of both the EU and Vietnam. It represents a great opportunity for European exporters and investors. It will eliminate 99% of tariffs within seven years, and this will result in additional exports in both directions. This will clearly result in many tens of thousands of new and, on average, better-paid jobs through increased use of international standards. This deal will also cut non-trade barriers and reduce costs for our companies. We will gain better access to each other's public markets, including for SMEs.

Vietnam has a vibrant economy of more than 90 million consumers, a growing middle class and a young, dynamic workforce. The country is open to the world and embraces modern standards. Vietnam was the first in the world, even before Canada, to accept the principle of a modern investment court system (ICS), a modern ICS proposal that has mostly been drafted by this very Parliament with independent judges, a code of conduct, protection of the right to regulate and facilitated access to the court for SMEs. This agreement thus brings new opportunities for companies, both big corporations and SMEs.

Vietnam is also the gateway to the entire Asian region. This agreement brings the long-term goal of an EU-Asian trade agreement from region to region a step closer, and this should be our objective. These agreements are also instruments to promote and protect European standards and values. Vietnam respects clear commitments to the ratification of two additional core International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions: its revised Labour Code, its improved labour and human rights situation and the implementation of the Paris climate agreement.

For all these reasons and the creation of prosperity by free and fair trade and the fact that the EU is taking responsibility to set the standards worldwide and taking the lead on rules-based trade in times of rising trade tensions, protectionism and unilateralism, I therefore ask for the consent of this House so that the peoples of the European Union and the people of Vietnam can further strengthen their ties in the future and so that we can allow free and fair trade to bring people closer together.

(Applause)

Phil Hogan, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the Free Trade Agreement and the Investment Protection Agreement with Vietnam are the most ambitious ever concluded with a developing country.

The agreements will further reinforce our already-strong trade and investment ties, and they will also provide an additional opportunity to strengthen the cooperation established under other EU instruments, for example on illegal logging or IUU (Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated) fishing.

The agreements will strengthen our presence in Asia, following the 'new generation agreements' in force, such as those with Korea, Japan and Singapore. They will constitute an additional stepping-stone towards our engagement with the ASEAN region.

The benefits of the agreements are many: preferential access to a vibrant economy of almost 100 million people; removal of non-tariff barriers for our exporters, which they currently face, for example, on cars, on wines, and spirits; harmonised sanitary and phytosanitary rules allowing for more predictable procedures; and removing access barriers for EU products.

EU companies will have access for the first time to the Vietnamese public procurement market, and there will be protection of the European geographical indications such as Parmigiano-Reggiano, Champagne and Rioja wines. We will also have improved access to the Vietnamese market in services, such as finance, distribution, logistics or environmental services.

The Investment Protection Agreement, similar to agreements with Singapore and Canada, includes the modern and reformed investment protection framework with an investment court system for the resolution of investment disputes.

However, our agreements will be on trade and investment, and I'm aware that the European Parliament has put a strong emphasis on the trade and sustainable development chapter of the Vietnam Agreement. And I fully agree with this approach. It is encouraging to see the level of engagement by Vietnam in order to prepare for the implementation of their commitments, with important progress made even before the agreements are in force at all. The pressure that has been exerted by the European Union is bearing fruit, and I welcome this development.

On labour issues, Vietnam adopted a new labour code last November, which recognises the principle of freedom of association at enterprise level. The revised code also includes new provisions on collective bargaining in line with the ILO Fundamental Convention, which was recently ratified by Vietnam.

Vietnam has now ratified 6 out of the 8 ILO conventions, and it has a clear plan to ratify the outstanding conventions by 2021 and 2023. Work is also ongoing in Vietnam to eradicate child labour, with encouraging preliminary results unveiled recently by the ILO, which is a significant reduction of more than 40% since the last survey of 2012.

So these developments are remarkable. But nevertheless, the Commission will scrutinise implementation to ensure that Vietnam effectively pursues this ambitious labour reform agenda.

Vietnam has also started preparing the ground for the institutional structure that is foreseen under the Free Trade Agreement, including the involvement of independent civil society organisations, such as domestic advisory groups.

The human rights situation is certainly an area of concern in our relationship with Vietnam, but I remain convinced that constructive channels of communication, including the Annual Human Rights Dialogue, is the way to voice our concerns and address these shortcomings.

So Madam President, I firmly believe that these agreements will create the best platform for further engagement and constructive dialogue with Vietnam in all fields. On the other hand, our failure to ratify the deal would leave the European Union with fewer options to pursue a reform agenda in Vietnam and would undermine the credibility of the European Union as a reliable partner.

Isabel Wiseler-Lima, *rapporteure pour avis de la commission AFET.* – Je vais voter pour ces deux accords avec le Viêt Nam, parce que je suis intimement convaincue qu'ils sont une chance tant pour le peuple vietnamien que pour les Européens.

Du point de vue des droits humains au Viêt Nam, bien sûr que nos réticences sont énormes, mais là aussi, je suis convaincue que nous devons profiter de l'ouverture que crée l'implantation d'entreprises et d'investissements européens soumis à des critères et obligations européens. L'isolation du Viêt Nam serait à mes yeux la pire des situations. Avec cet accord, le gouvernement vietnamien s'engage à respecter les droits fondamentaux et surtout, il accepte le suivi de l'application des règles par une commission conjointe des parlements européen et vietnamien. L'accord prévoit également, et c'est une grande victoire, que la Commission européenne instaure un mécanisme de plaintes indépendant en ce qui concerne les droits de l'homme. Enfin, le Viêt Nam a proposé que la commission des droits de l'homme du Parlement européen participe au dialogue Viêt Nam-Union européenne sur les droits de l'homme. Ceci est une première et permet au Parlement d'être présent à une table de négociations où d'habitude il ne siège pas. Profitons de toutes les ouvertures pour faire avancer les droits de l'homme.

Tomas Tobé, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Development.* – Madam President, free trade is one of the best tools to lift people out of poverty. History proves that with all clarity.

With this agreement, we ensure that Vietnam can go forward on a path of inclusive growth, and also with this Free Trade Agreement we set a very high standard as a comprehensive agreement with a developing country. And, as Chair of the Development Committee, I'm very pleased that this agreement has a very dedicated chapter also on sustainable development, and this needs to be effectively implemented.

I would also welcome the timetable from Vietnam on when to ratify the outstanding core ILO conventions, and I urge both parties to make full use of the provisions in the agreement in order to contribute to strengthening human rights in Vietnam and towards the Sustainable Development Goals.

I also urge the Commission to work closely with civil society to ensure that growth in Vietnam now also will strengthen environmental protection and labour rights. To conclude, the Committee on Development recommends that we give our consent to this agreement.

Pietro Bartolo, *relatore per parere della commissione per la pesca*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo di libero scambio con il Vietnam prevede un capitolo che include l'importante commercio di prodotti ittici già esistenti tra i due partner. Assieme ai colleghi della commissione per la pesca abbiamo lavorato ad un parere che non si limitasse a un'accettazione passiva dell'accordo ma che potesse contribuire al dibattito parlamentare, alzando l'asticella e fissando priorità ben precise.

Il Vietnam ha senza dubbio compiuto sforzi significativi per allineare il proprio settore ittico ai nostri standard e ha dimostrato di volere continuare anche in futuro a lavorare per migliorare la situazione esistente. Al contempo non si possono negare le numerose lacune che ancora persistono, in particolar modo in materia di pesca illegale. Proprio per questo in commissione per la pesca abbiamo chiesto che la Commissione europea rimanga vigile e attenta per assicurarsi che il Vietnam continui negli sforzi già intrapresi e che al contempo utilizzi tutti i mezzi a sua disposizione, incluso il cartellino rosso nel caso il Vietnam non dovesse adempiere alle condizioni di sviluppo sostenibile concordate con l'Unione europea.

Iuliu Winkler, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, honourable colleagues, distinguished Commissioner, the negotiations between the European Union and Vietnam started in 2012. They were first concluded in 2015, subsequently reopened and then finalised in June 2019.

These eight years has witnessed dramatic progress in Vietnamese society, economy, labour conditions, environmental protection and sustainability. One of the crucial ferments of these changes is the European Union. The perspective of enhancing EU-Vietnam cooperation by implementing the Free Trade Agreement and the Investment Protection Agreement gives positive motivation to the Vietnamese authorities.

Just recently we have received a work plan on domestic advisory groups, a work plan and implementation plan on the Labour Code and a positive answer to the establishment of a Joint Parliamentary Oversight Committee between the National Assembly of Vietnam and the European Parliament.

This House faces tomorrow a crucial choice: to grant or not to grant consent to the EU-Vietnam agreements. Postponement would be the 20th century choice. When we give homework to Vietnam and then send them home to do the work. Granting consent is the 21st century European choice, when we formulate our expectations and then we say to our Vietnamese partners: 'let's do it together'.

As the shadow rapporteur for the EPP Group, my appeal is to vote for consent tomorrow and then to work together – the EU and Vietnam – for a better, freer and more sustainable future.

Bernd Lange, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Willy Brandt hat vor fünfzig Jahren das Konzept „Wandel durch Annäherung" entwickelt, um mit Ländern, die fundamental andere Auffassungen haben, trotzdem in den Dialog eintreten zu können und über eine Verbesserung der Situation für die Menschen vor Ort zu diskutieren. Das ist genau der richtige Weg, auch in der Beziehung zu Vietnam zu versuchen, über einen Dialog eine Verbesserung der Situation der Menschen vor Ort zu erreichen – gerade mit Vietnam, einem Land, mit dem wir viel Handel treiben. Ich bin überzeugt, dass viele von Ihnen, meine lieben Kolleginnen und Kollegen, Kleidungsstücke aus Vietnam tragen, Schuhe aus Vietnam tragen, alle Smartphones von Samsung kommen aus Vietnam, alle Tablets von Samsung kommen aus Vietnam. Und ich möchte, dass wir hier Regeln setzen, damit die Produktion in Ordnung ist, was die Standards anbetrifft, was den Einsatz von Chemikalien anbetrifft und vor allen Dingen, was die Arbeitnehmerrechte anbetrifft. Und Herr Kommissar, bei aller Wertschätzung: Diese Errungenschaften hat das Europäische Parlament durchgesetzt. In den letzten zwei Jahren haben wir intensiv verhandelt. Und ich bin stolz auf dieses Parlament, dass es die Möglichkeiten, die wir haben, genutzt hat, indem wir durchgesetzt haben, dass fundamentale ILO-Kernarbeitsnormen ratifiziert und umgesetzt werden, dass wir es hingekriegt haben, dass ein verbindlicher Umsetzungsplan, der von der ILO kontrolliert wird,

von Vietnam auf den Tisch gelegt worden ist, dass wir es durchgesetzt haben, dass die *Domestic Advisory Groups* der zivilgesellschaftlichen Organisationen durch unabhängige zivilgesellschaftliche Organisationen besetzt werden, dass der Raum für die Zivilgesellschaft erweitert worden ist, dass wir wirklich eine Verbesserung auch der Menschenrechtssituation hingekriegt haben, dass der Unterausschuss für Menschenrechte des Europäischen Parlamentes erstmalig in den Menschenrechtsdialog integriert worden ist – das hat es bisher noch nie gegeben –, und dass wir auch eine Zusammenarbeit der Parlamente bei der Umsetzung des Abkommens durchgesetzt haben. Also insofern können wir als Parlament wirklich stolz sein, dass wir das erreicht haben.

Aber ich sage auch: Die Arbeit fängt jetzt an, weil wir weiter dafür streiten werden, dass durch das Abkommen die Situation der Menschen vor Ort verbessert wird. Also die Arbeit fängt an!

Karin Karlsbro, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, honourable Commissioner, Members of Parliament, Europe stands strong for free trade. Tomorrow we can make history. These are the most ambitioned agreements that the EU has ever negotiated with a developing country. There will be an economic win-win for both parties.

The EU and Vietnam are already important trading partners. This trade will continue, with or without agreements. But with these agreements, our trade will become more equitable, more predictable and more sustainable for the environment, for the people and for the climate.

During the negotiation, Vietnam has improved workers' rights; 6 out of 8 ILO conventions have been signed; child labour has been significantly reduced. We know that some voices have been raised wanting to postpone tomorrow's vote, as the democratic development in Vietnam has not been enough, and yes, we wish that we could have seen much more progress when it comes to democracy and human rights. But we have to ask ourselves in this Chamber: do we want to have a better chance to promote democracy without the Agreement?

Let's not make the reformists or the freedom fighters who want more EU presence disappointed. We should take every opportunity to use these agreements as platforms for freedom and for democracy, and during the last week under the Parliament's scrutiny, some small positive signals have come.

Let us now vote in favour of these agreements, and let us use the monitoring time to promote democracy, to promote human rights in Vietnam together.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, prima ancora di qualsiasi valutazione commerciale, dobbiamo ricordare che il Vietnam è uno Stato politicamente repressivo in cui il partito comunista ha il monopolio del potere e non ci sono media indipendenti. Nessun dissenso è tollerato, le critiche al governo sono punite con lunghe pene detentive, non vi sono sindacati liberi, i culti religiosi sono controllati dallo Stato. Molti degli impegni enunciati dalle autorità vietnamite sono formulati senza precise scadenze. Accontentarsi di dichiarazioni di intenti troppo generiche è un'imperdonabile ingenuità.

A livello ambientale è evidente il contrasto con i sacrifici che l'UE impone ai suoi paesi membri: in Vietnam il carbone è la principale risorsa per la produzione di energia elettrica, si prevede un contributo del carbone al mix energetico di oltre il 40 % e il completamento di circa 100 centrali a carbone entro il 2030. Mancano poi sia i progetti che un serio impegno finanziario per la depurazione delle acque industriali e di quelle del fiume Mekong, una minaccia per i mari e per la salubrità di quel riso vietnamita a cui si vorrebbe concedere l'accesso a dazio zero in Europa per un quantitativo di 80 000 tonnellate all'anno, con rischio di triangolazioni da paesi limitrofi come la Cambogia. Questo purtroppo è indice della scarsa sensibilità mostrata dalla Commissione verso un settore importante e sensibile come quello risicolo.

Resta pericolosamente in bilico la questione della tutela della proprietà intellettuale, oggi affidata in Vietnam ad una normativa farraginosa e per nulla efficace. Ciò potrebbe causare danni alle nostre aziende.

Abbiamo il dovere di non dimenticare queste considerazioni al momento del voto, affinché non vengano traditi quei valori che la nostra Europa proclama da sempre e che dovrebbe anche difendere invece di pensare solo al tornaconto economico.

Saskia Bricmont, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE.* – Madame la Présidente, après avoir voté contre un report de l'accord hier, notre assemblée s'apprête à faire le premier grand écart depuis l'investiture de la Commission européenne: entre ses valeurs, ses principes, ses déclarations en matière de respect des droits humains – dont votre rapport, Madame, le rapport Wiseler-Lima sur les droits humains dans le monde, que nous votions pas plus tard que l'an dernier –, mais aussi le pacte vert, en ratifiant l'accord de libre-échange et d'investissement avec le Viêt Nam.

Le Viêt Nam s'est engagé dans une réforme de son code du travail, certes, et ratifiera les conventions de l'OIT, mais pour rendre effectives la liberté d'association et d'expression et l'émergence de syndicats indépendants, c'est une réforme du code pénal qui doit avoir lieu; elle est indispensable. Et c'est ce que nous avons demandé par des courriers adressés aux autorités vietnamiennes; nous avons demandé un report du processus de ratification pour y travailler ensemble avec le Viêt Nam, par le dialogue. Mais, Monsieur Lange, le Viêt Nam a opposé une véritable fin de non-recevoir à ces questions, à ces demandes.

Nous savons donc aujourd'hui que les réformes demandées n'auront pas lieu, notamment au niveau pénal, et nous serions pourtant prêts, en tant qu'assemblée parlementaire, à accepter cela, au nom de quoi? D'intérêts économiques. Mais lesquels, Monsieur Hogan, lesquels, Monsieur Bourgeois? Puisque le rapport, l'évaluation économique de la Commission européenne montrent que le déficit de notre balance commerciale va être encore aggravé par cet accord. Nous n'avons apparemment pas rencontré les mêmes secteurs économiques du bois, du textile, du riz, qui demandent, comme nous, un report de cet accord. Pire, les autorités vietnamiennes justifient l'arrestation de journalistes indépendants – pour ne pas le citer, M. Pham Chi Dung –, au nom des limites à la liberté de la presse. Un beau pied de nez pour notre assemblée qui, par la voix de son président, avait interpellé le Viêt Nam à ce propos. Un grand écart aussi avec le pacte vert. Effectivement, nous allons récompenser un pays qui pratique pêche et déforestation illégales en renforçant sans condition un accord de libre-échange et nos investissements sur place.

C'est sans parler aussi du conflit d'intérêts potentiel qui secoue ce dossier depuis le début, puisque nous avons continué nos travaux comme si de rien n'était. Chers collègues, ces dernières semaines, vous avez reçu comme moi les appels de centaines d'ONG, de citoyens, de syndicats qui, apparemment, n'ont pas votre oreille aujourd'hui. La demande de report est relayée de leur part aussi au motif de la dégradation ces dernières semaines, ces derniers mois, ces dernières années, de la situation des droits humains au Viêt Nam.

J'osais espérer, chers collègues libéraux socialistes, un revirement de votre part par rapport à la négociation que nous avons depuis quelques semaines. Force est de constater aujourd'hui que le pacte vert et les droits de l'homme ne sont pas encore en voie d'être respectés par notre assemblée.

Jan Zahradil, *za skupinu ECR.* – Paní předsedající, po 8 letech vyjednávání a projednávání jsme skoro u cíle. Dovolte mi proto několik slov z pozice bývalého zpravodaje těchto smluv od začátku až do loňského podzimu.

Především bych rád zdůraznil, že tu smlouvu dojednala řádně Evropská komise podle zásad obchodní politiky EU a podle mandátu, který udělila Evropská rada. Myslím, že EU musí vyslat signál, že stojí na straně volného obchodu, že stojí na straně odstraňování obchodních překážek v době rostoucího protekcionismu a v době, kdy Spojené státy se stáhly z již dojednané obchodní dohody se zeměmi jihovýchodní Asie. Máme jedinečnou šanci toto vakuum vyplnit.

Žádná jiná dohoda s žádnou jinou zemí jihovýchodní Asie v tuto chvíli není na cestě, není v dohledu. Myslím, že Vietnam vyrůstá v geopolitickou mocnost, je to země s více než 90 miliony lidmi. Je to předsednická země ASEAN, je to nestálý člen Rady bezpečnosti OSN a je v politickém i v ekonomickém zájmu EU tuto dohodu mít. Pokud ji neuzavřeme, nevyhraje EU, vyhrají Spojené státy nebo Čína, ale my z toho rozhodně profitovat nebudeme.

Emmanuel Maurel, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL.* – Madame la Présidente, alors, est-ce qu'il faut approfondir un partenariat avec le Viêt Nam? Oui, nous sommes tous d'accord. Est-ce que ça passe nécessairement par un accord de libre-échange? Eh bien non, et c'est là que le débat intervient entre nous.

Vous, vous pensez – c'est un peu la pensée magique – qu'un accord de libre-échange, ça règle forcément tous les problèmes. Or non, ce n'est pas vrai. D'abord, je ne partage pas l'optimisme de la Commission, qui dit que c'est un accord gagnant-gagnant. Non! Aujourd'hui, le déficit de la balance commerciale de l'Union par rapport au Viêt Nam représente 30 milliards. Dans l'étude d'impact de la Commission, on nous dit que d'ici 10 ans, ce sera 40 milliards. Et qui va payer? Sans aucun doute, un certain nombre de salariés européens dans les secteurs les plus vulnérables, par exemple le textile. Alors, pour faire du Viêt Nam une sorte de grand atelier du monde, le risque, c'est quand même des délocalisations.

On nous dit que les salariés vietnamiens vont y gagner parce qu'ils vont adopter les normes de l'OIT, mais enfin, on a des exemples! Regardez la Corée du Sud: on nous avait fait des promesses qui n'ont jamais été tenues.

Donc moi, je crois que vous faites preuve soit d'une grande naïveté, soit d'une vraie hypocrisie, une hypocrisie sur les droits de l'homme, parce que franchement, on ne peut pas dire aujourd'hui que le gouvernement vietnamien ait répondu à nos attentes. C'est même tout le contraire: au dernier classement sur la liberté de la presse, le Viêt Nam arrive 176e sur 180 pays dans le monde.

Mais surtout, je renvoie la Commission à cet incroyable double langage: on vote l'état d'urgence climatique, on vote le pacte vert européen et en même temps on passe, *business as usual*, un accord de libre-échange qui est clairement climaticide et qui ne protège pas le développement durable. Franchement, ça donne l'impression d'une Union européenne qui préfère toujours le commerce à des valeurs fondamentales qui devraient normalement tous nous animer dans cet hémicycle.

Tiziana Beghin (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, tre anni fa, votando la mia risoluzione sulla Strategia commerciale per l'Unione europea, il Parlamento chiedeva a gran voce accordi con paesi ad alto tasso di crescita. Ed è stato ascoltato!

Il Vietnam è la nuova tigre asiatica: con un PIL che aumenta del 7 % all'anno, è un paese che sta diventando velocemente più prospero e che incrementa quindi la sua richiesta di beni ad alto valore aggiunto, proprio i beni che noi produciamo qui in Europa.

L'accordo porterà a zero quasi tutti i dazi doganali su questi ed altri prodotti. Alcuni di questi dazi, come quelli sui vini e sui formaggi per esempio, oggi arrivano fino al 50 %, per non parlare poi di quelli delle auto fino all'80 %.

Quest'accordo poi tutelerà 169 DOP, DOC e IGP, di cui ben 38, il 22 %, sono italiane. Quindi, se penso per esempio al mio paese, l'interscambio non fa che aumentare. Le nostre esportazioni sono aumentate del 12 % lo scorso anno, spingendo l'import-export a quota 3,7 miliardi e facendo del Vietnam il nostro primo partner commerciale per quel che riguarda i Paesi ASEAN. È un numero che migliorerà ancora grazie all'accordo. La domanda di prodotti italiani è altissima: oltre 300 milioni di euro per il nostro export di moda, oltre 65 per il cibo e quasi mezzo miliardo per i macchinari.

Colleghi, non c'è dubbio che l'accordo da un punto di vista strettamente commerciale sia vantaggioso, e che quindi meriti il nostro voto favorevole, ma c'è un problema. La situazione dei diritti umani in Vietnam non sembra fare progressi e alcune riforme migliorative in questo senso sono ancora in corso di approvazione.

Personalmente sono certa, come altri colleghi, che l'accordo porterà prosperità, aiuterà a cambiare la situazione in futuro e per questo, se ci sarà il voto domani, lo approveremo. Ma io vorrei chiedere a voi colleghi di posticipare la votazione. Vorrei chiedere di lasciare tempo agli amici vietnamiti per completare le riforme democratiche che abbiamo chiesto loro, mostrandoci ancora un po' di buona volontà. Vorrei inoltre che il Vietnam liberasse i prigionieri politici e di coscienza, che approvasse le convenzioni fondamentali sui diritti dei lavoratori. Colleghi, il Vietnam è un paese amico. Non c'è dubbio che l'accordo entrerà in vigore prima o poi, ma è proprio agli amici che si deve chiedere di più.

Christophe Hansen (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, le gouvernement américain affirme que la règle du plus fort serait le principe directeur des modèles commerciaux du XXIe siècle. Demain, Mesdames et Messieurs, nous aurons la chance historique de leur prouver le contraire, montrant au monde entier que notre engagement au regard d'un commerce juste et basé sur des règles claires, indépendamment de la taille du partenaire, reste la règle d'or à suivre.

Oui, le Viêt Nam est un pays en voie de développement et évidemment, le processus de modernisation économique, environnementale et surtout sociale est loin d'être achevé. Or la ratification de cet accord n'équivaut pas, comme le président Bernd Lange l'a souligné à juste titre, à mettre fin à la conversation, il n'équivaut pas à fermer les yeux sur la situation des droits de l'homme au Viêt Nam, et surtout pas à donner un chèque en blanc au gouvernement vietnamien. D'ailleurs, notre Président Sassoli rencontre le vice-ministre aux Affaires étrangères, Bùi Thanh Son, aujourd'hui, ici, au Parlement européen.

Quarante-cinq ans après la fin de la guerre du Viêt Nam et trente ans après l'ouverture de nos relations diplomatiques, l'approbation que je soutiens et qui n'attend que d'être prononcée nous permettra justement d'intensifier le dialogue avec nos homologues vietnamiens en nous appuyant, cette fois-ci, sur de véritables leviers et plateformes crédibles. Le comité conjoint revendiqué et obtenu par ce Parlement nous permettra justement de faire pression afin de promouvoir le changement socioéconomique et l'amélioration de la vie de tous les Vietnamiens.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono indubbi i vantaggi che questo accordo potrà portare sia all'economia europea e all'economia italiana, alle esportazioni italiane, sia certamente anche in quel paese per un salto in avanti anche del loro sviluppo. Ne siamo ben consapevoli e lo consideriamo un fattore importante.

Tuttavia, non possiamo nasconderci. La situazione è ancora molto critica che permane in quel paese. Critica sotto il profilo dei diritti umani in generale, per quanto riguarda i diritti sindacali, per quanto riguarda le libertà politiche e i prigionieri. Io continuo a sottolinearlo, e mi stupisco che non ci sia attenzione anche dalla Commissione – signor Commissario, posso avere la sua attenzione? Posso avere la sua attenzione? Mi rivolgo alla Commissione! Vabbè scriveremo –, per chiedere che ci sia, anche per quanto riguarda l'intervento della cooperazione allo sviluppo, qualche cosa di coerente. Sottolineo il tema del lavoro forzato minorile e del lavoro delle donne in condizioni non accettabili.

Non è colpa solo del Vietnam. È la catena del valore globale che porta alcuni paesi a essere subfornitori di lavoro al minimo ribasso. Dobbiamo ribellarci a questo. Allora non so, certamente i passi avanti sono stati fatti, lo dico con orgoglio a nome di chi del mio gruppo ha trattato e ottenuto moltissime cose. Però, forse, dobbiamo ancora chiedere di più per il lavoro delle persone, donne e bambini. Quindi dovremo monitorare molto bene quest'accordo. Qui si giocherà la serietà della Commissione e in particolare di chi si occupa di cooperazione internazionale.

Svenja Hahn (Renew). – Madam President, let's be clear: Vietnam is a communist country. It's not a democracy, and a trade agreement won't make it one overnight. But the agreement will boost economic development. It will lift people out of poverty and give them more rights and protection. The new Labour Code especially protects vulnerable groups. Unions will be allowed and freedom of assembly will follow. Increased transparency and international observation bear huge potential for better protection of human rights.

We are already trading with Vietnam. This is not about if we want trade or not. This is about improving the circumstances. So let's send a strong signal of cooperation to the whole ASEAN region, to reformist forces that believe in cooperation with the European Union, and let's not give room to actors that don't want to combine trade and values, like China. Let's support the agreement and let's support the people of Vietnam in their development.

Herve Juvin (ID). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, nous ne voterons pas un traité dont nous estimons qu'il n'est pas bon pour l'Union européenne, qu'il n'est pas bon pour la France et qu'il n'est pas bon pour le Viêt Nam.

Depuis des années, nous dénonçons l'aberration écologique des *supply chains* qui font trois fois le tour de la planète. Depuis des années, nous soulignons les dangers de la dépendance stratégique à l'égard de sources d'approvisionnement situées à des milliers de kilomètres et où, en dépit de nos belles intentions, nous ne contrôlons rien réellement. Et depuis des années, nous dénonçons aussi les ingérences dans les affaires intérieures de pays souverains auxquelles donnent trop souvent lieu les traités de libre-échange.

Voilà pourquoi nous ne signerons pas ce traité, parce que nous pensons que le XXIe siècle tourne la page du libre-échange et de la globalisation. Nous considérons que le XXIe siècle va être celui des relocalisations, de la poursuite de l'autonomie industrielle des nations, conscientes des exigences de leur indépendance. Par-dessus tout, nous considérons que le XXIe siècle va être le siècle du patriotisme économique.

Nous souhaitons que le Viet Nam, comme l'Union européenne, travaille à son indépendance et à ses libertés stratégiques.

Anna Cavazzini (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, this Parliament decided in November that the Paris Agreement should be anchored in all chapters of our trade agreements, and this Parliament decided in December that all our trade agreements would have enforceable environmental and social standards. Also, this Parliament considers itself to be at the forefront of human rights, and yet the majority of this House is ready to vote 'yes' on the trade and investment deal with Vietnam, in a situation where human rights are deteriorating in Vietnam and the numbers of political prisoners has been on the rise since 2016; in a situation where civic and political rights are systematically being cracked down; and in a situation where the deal on the table still does not contain enforceable social and environmental standards – and not only the Social Democrats in this House always pretended that this was a red line. I understood that there is a majority in this Parliament to make trade more sustainable and climate-proof, which is good. But dear colleagues, we really make a fool of ourselves if we then, at the first best opportunity, give in and let a trade deal pass that does not live up to the Green Deal. I urge you today: say no to this deal. Let's ask the Commission to renegotiate and to align the Vietnam deal with the Green Deal. And let's send a strong signal to the Vietnamese Government to improve the devastating human rights situation before we sign the deal and not after.

Mazaly Aguilar (ECR). – Señora presidente, lo acabamos de oír esta mañana. Globalmente, el Acuerdo comercial con Vietnam beneficia a varios sectores de la Unión Europea y, en el ámbito agroalimentario, la carne o el vino o el queso pueden ser varios de ellos. Sin embargo, es lamentable, una vez más, que la Comisión Europea renuncie a proteger a uno de sus sectores sensibles, como es el arroz.

Vietnam tienen los precios del arroz más bajos de todo el Sudeste Asiático y compite directamente con variedades que se producen en España e Italia. Los arroceros españoles están indignados con esta nueva concesión y su impacto en los precios de un sector ya de por sí en crisis.

Ser deficitarios en la producción de arroz no significa que la apertura de fronteras no cause un daño irreparable a la producción europea. No consigo entender por qué, después de aplicar la cláusula de salvaguarda a principios del año 2019 con Myanmar y Camboya, la Unión Europea siga cometiendo los mismos errores y no valore el impacto que estas importaciones van a causar en el mercado europeo y en un producto sensible como es el arroz.

El sector arrocero europeo cumple un papel clave tanto en la economía como en la conservación de áreas geográficas con un alto valor ambiental. Exigimos a las autoridades de la Unión Europea que realicen estudios de este impacto y que den los pasos necesarios para aplicar nuevas y más efectivas cláusulas de salvaguardia.

Ivan Vilibor Sinčić (NI). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, mnogo je razloga za odbacivanje ovog sporazuma. Treba samo reći da je ovaj ugovor, odnosno ugovori pošto imamo objedinjenu raspravu, napisan na način da je prilagođen interesu korporacija.

Navest ću tri stvari. Prva stvar, ugovor daje posebna prava investitoru, dakle radi se o ISDS-u, odnosno *state dispute settlement* mehanizmu, radi se o tome da kada dođe do nekog spora nije nadležan domaći sud, nego nekakav tamo daleki međunarodni arbitražni sud.

Mnogo je tragičnih primjera i ovdje kod nas u Europi na narodu Europe gdje se takav mehanizam pokazao štetnim, navest ću samo recimo iz regije Abruzzo gdje je odbijeno, dakle, produljenje koncesije na eksploataciju ugljikovodika i onda su naftne korporacije tužile tu regiju. Ili recimo kod nas u Dubrovniku gdje je investitor u slučaju golfa na Srđu izgubio na hrvatskim sudovima. To mu nije bilo dosta pa je pokrenuo arbitražni spor za 500 milijuna dolara.

Ovaj mehanizam jednostavno potkopava vlastite institucije, kakve jesu da jesu, i suverenitet zemalja pa će tako i Vijetnama. Zamislite jedan veliki sraz između neke općine u Hrvatskoj od par tisuća stanovnika i desetak milijuna kuna proračuna protiv neke mega korporacije u milijardama. Zamislite tek kako bi to moglo biti u Vijetnamu.

Ovdje nema govora o zelenom planu u koji se Komisija toliko kune. Također, kao što se krše ljudska i temeljna prava recimo u Hrvatskoj, što Komisija ignorira, Hrvatska je članica, zamislite što će tek biti u Vijetnamu. Mi u Hrvatskoj znamo dobro kako to izgleda, tu stradaju prava okoliša, samo se bogati establišment.

Jörgen Warborn (PPE). – Fru talman, kommissionär Hogan, ärade kollegor! Vietnam är, efter Singapore, EU:s viktigaste handelspartner i Sydostasien. I och med avtalet tar vi bort nästan alla tullar och ger europeiska företag tillträde till en marknad med nästan hundra miljoner konsumenter, en snabbt växande medelklass och ökad köpkraft.

Det här innebär fina möjligheter för de cirka 600 företag från Malmö i söder till Vilhelmina i norr som exporterar dit, men också en stor potential för alla dem som importerar från Vietnam. Min förhoppning är att det ska bli ännu enklare för företag att börja handla med denna stora marknad.

Jag reste med Europaparlamentets delegation till Vietnam i höstas. Alla som vi träffade – från partilojala ministrar till människorättsaktivister, näringslivet, humanitära organisationer och den internationella arbetsorganisationen – alla uppmanade oss att ratificera det här avtalet.

EU:s export till Vietnam förväntas öka med 16 procent. Det här är bra för svenska företag och europeisk konkurrenskraft. Det är bra för tillväxten, det är bra för jobben. Det är bra för företagandet. Därför kommer jag att rösta ja till de här avtalen.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, nous avons décrété l'état d'urgence climatique, nous avons voté le pacte vert il y a tout juste un mois de cela et demain, on nous demande quoi? On nous demande de voter un accord de libre-échange de plus, comme si de rien n'était.

Cet accord, contrairement à nos promesses écrites noir sur blanc dans la résolution sur le pacte vert européen, ne comprend aucun mécanisme contraignant concernant le chapitre «Développement durable». Alors la question qui se pose à nous est simple: accordons-nous le moindre prix à nos paroles, à nos propres paroles?

Chers collègues, le Viêt Nam enferme les activistes écologistes, les syndicalistes, les défenseurs des droits humains. L'un d'entre eux, Pham Chi Dung, a été arrêté précisément parce qu'il nous a écrit une lettre pour nous demander de ne pas signer l'accord en l'état. Si vous n'accordez aucun prix à vos propres paroles, ayez la décence d'accorder du prix à ses paroles à lui. Ne validez pas l'accord tant qu'il est en prison pour nous avoir parlé.

Chers collègues, il y a quelque chose au-dessus du dieu Commerce. Il y a notre avenir à tous, il y a nos principes. Eh bien demain, c'est l'occasion de le démontrer.

Marie-Pierre Vedrenne (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, le Viêt Nam est notre deuxième partenaire économique en Asie du Sud-Est et l'Union européenne attend de nombreux bénéfices de cet accord commercial. Oui, cet accord permettra de protéger 169 indications géographiques, dont 36 AOP françaises. Nos entreprises pourront exporter de nombreux produits sans droits de douane. Nous bénéficierons d'un meilleur accès aux marchés publics. Autant de points offensifs obtenus dans ces négociations.

Mais la situation des droits de l'homme reste préoccupante. De nombreux prisonniers politiques et journalistes sont toujours détenus, malgré les demandes répétées de libération de l'Union européenne.

Si des progrès ont été réalisés avec les ratifications de conventions internationales, nous devons être intransigeants sur le respect du chapitre sur le développement durable. Notre politique commerciale doit être guidée par nos valeurs et le respect des droits de l'homme, mais la ratification de cet accord, chers collègues, n'est pas une fin en soi. La clé de la réussite résidera dans le succès de sa mise en œuvre, tout cela dans un contexte international synonyme de guerre commerciale.

Roman Haider (ID). – Frau Präsidentin! Um es gleich vorwegzunehmen: Ich werde diesem Abkommen zustimmen. Ich bin prinzipiell ein Befürworter des Freihandels. Der freie Handel hat sich immer als gewinnbringend für beide Seiten und auch als Wachstumsmotor erwiesen. Das trifft auch in ganz besonderem Maße auf die Verbindungen zwischen Europa und Ostasien zu. Vietnam ist dazu noch ein ganz besonders dynamisches Land in einem auch sehr dynamischen Umfeld. Das Wirtschaftswachstum Vietnams liegt seit den 90er Jahren konstant über 5 %, und auch die Infrastruktur und die Rechtssicherheit sind in den letzten Jahren stark ausgebaut worden. Und dazu ist Vietnam auch noch als Exportland für Europa besonders interessant.

So positiv das alles klingt, so möchte ich doch auch die negativen Seiten Vietnams nicht verschweigen: Kritische Journalisten, religiöse Minderheiten, Menschenrechtsaktivisten werden vom sozialistischen Regime unterdrückt, außer Landes gejagt oder sterben unter ungeklärten Umständen. Es bleibt deswegen zu hoffen, dass dieses Freihandelsabkommen auch dazu beiträgt, die Menschenrechtslage in Vietnam zu verbessern.

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, que n'avons-nous pas entendu pendant la campagne électorale des européennes, partout en Europe? C'en était fini des accords de libre-échange qui donnent des droits aux multinationales contre les États, contre les législations environnementales, contre les législations de protection de la santé ou des droits sociaux. C'en était fini de ces accords de libre-échange qui participent au dérèglement climatique, notamment à travers la déforestation. C'en était fini des accords de libre-échange qui attaquent la biodiversité, par exemple à travers la pêche illégale. C'en était fini de ces accords de libre-échange contraires à la démocratie, aux libertés individuelles.

Et là, le premier accord arrive et tous ces groupes, les sociaux-démocrates, Bernd Lange, les libéraux et En marche, les conservateurs: vous allez tous voter un accord de libre-échange contraire aux déclarations et aux engagements de la Commission européenne sur le pacte vert, sur les valeurs de l'Europe et sur une mondialisation régulée.

Comme par hasard, nous avons ce débat après un débat sur le Brexit. Mais n'avez-vous pas compris aussi que le Brexit a été voté parce que nous abandonnons les classes populaires ici pour aller les exploiter dans des conditions abominables sans liberté, sans droits sociaux, de l'autre côté de la planète?

Alors, chers collègues, un peu de décence vis-à-vis des Vietnamiens, un peu de décence vis-à-vis de vos électeurs. Rejetez cet accord de libre-échange qui n'est en rien compatible avec les valeurs de l'Europe.

Eugen Jurzyca (ECR). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, hoci Vietnam nie je demokratická krajina, zmluvu s ním podporujem z nasledujúcich dôvodov:

v roku 2009 bol Vietnam tridsiatym druhým najväčším importérom z pomedzi krajín EÚ, do krajín EÚ, v 2008 už bol na desiatom mieste. Táto zmena prebiehala a bude prebiehať zo zmluvou alebo bez zmluvy. Rozdiel je v tom, že ak bude prebiehať so zmluvou, tak sa dramaticky zvýši šanca, že sa vo Vietname vďaka zmluve pretlačí viac demokracie. S odchodom Veľkej Británii z EÚ narástlo riziko zmenšenia obchodného priestoru, teda aj potenciálu ekonomického rastu. Navyše EÚ predsa ostáva možnosť uvaliť sankcie, či dokonca odstúpiť od zmluvy, ak by sa demokracia vo Vietname nezlepšovala. Verím, že po desiatich rokoch od podpisu týchto zmlúv bude Vietnam oveľa demokratickejší a bližší trhovej ekonomike, než je dnes. Bude bohatší, bude v ňom žiť menej chudobných, prevažovať bude trhová ekonomika a ľudské práva budú chránené lepšie, rovnako ako životné prostredie.

Miroslav Radačovský (NI). – Vážená pani predsedajúca, budem podporovať dohodu uzavretú s Vietnamskou socialistickou republikou, a to z toho dôvodu, dňa 5.2.2020 som sa zúčastnil konferencie v Bruseli za účasti predstaviteľov Bangladéša.

Riaditeľka asociácie odevných výrobcov a exportérov Bangladéša okrem iného uviedla: „Prijatím dohôd medzi Európskou úniou a Vietnamom by prišiel Bangladéš o vývoz textílií do USA v zruba v hodnote 13 miliárd ročne."

Je každému z nás zrejmé, že Európska únia je najväčším importérom odevov z Bangladéša. Ak Vietnam ako hlavný konkurent Bangladéša získa nulové dovozné cla do EÚ, bangladéšsky podiel na trhu sa výrazne zmenší.

Verím, že odporcovia dohôd medzi EÚ a Vietnamom nie sú ovplyvnení veľkými kooperáciami v odevnom priemysle. Všetci vieme, aké pracovné podmienky vrátane pre maloleté deti pri výrobe odevov, ktoré nosíme, sú v Bangladéši. A ešte jedna vec, som jeden z mála teda europoslancov, ktorý si pamätá vojnu vo Vietname. Pamätá si dedinku My Lai, pamätá si Dien Bien Phu, my sme dlžní Vietnamu, hrdinskému ľudu Vietnamu, aby sme túto dohodu uzatvorili. Neuzatvorením tejto dohody by sme opätovne bombardovali vietnamský národ. To je všetko.

Sven Simon (PPE). – Madam President, this trade agreement between the EU and Vietnam is proof that we can establish European standards in the world through trade agreements. A significant improvement in workers' rights; a ban on forced labour; the approval of independent unions; an enforcement mechanism for the Paris Agreement, which we wouldn't have without the agreement. What a great success.

Colleagues from the Greens and the left are generally against trade agreements. They share this in common with the right-wing populists, by the way. The question you have to answer is now: how do you want to implement European standards worldwide? Through speeches in this House? Demonstrations? Letters?

The only realistic way to promote European influence globally in an age of shifting geopolitical distribution of power is through trade agreements. Those who vote against it will have to explain how they want to realistically achieve our common goals while, at the same time, following an agenda which is isolating and disabling the European Union as a trading partner.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, i dati ci dicono che nel 2018 l'interscambio commerciale di beni tra l'Unione europea e il Vietnam è pari a circa 40 milioni di euro. Questo significa che già oggi il Vietnam è un partner commerciale importante e che ogni giorno i nostri cittadini usano prodotti «made in Vietnam».

Questo accordo può migliorare le relazioni commerciali e politiche con un partner strategico in un'area molto importante come il sud-est asiatico, inquadrando queste relazioni in un sistema di regole certe e condivise.

Il Vietnam, in questi anni ha avviato un percorso di riforme significative, soprattutto sul diritto del lavoro, i cui progressi sono stati certificati dall'Organizzazione mondiale del lavoro. Certo, questo è solo un punto di partenza e dovremmo pretendere sia su questo che sul rispetto dei diritti umani e delle libertà di espressione fatti e atti concreti da parte delle autorità vietnamite.

In questo senso l'accordo commerciale rappresenta una leva importante nelle mani dell'Unione europea per stimolare e richiamare il Vietnam al rispetto degli impegni solennemente presi.

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Madam President, Mr Commissioner, this will be the first major trade agreement that this new Parliament will ratify, and it will send several positive messages. Firstly, to an ever more protectionist world, that the EU still believes in rule-based free trade. Secondly, to the region, bringing us one a step closer to a regional ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) agreement. Thirdly, to our citizens and businesses, that we are dedicated to expanding better conditions for business to thrive, grow and generate more jobs. And finally, it is proved that trade can positively influence other areas. The negotiations helped push Vietnam towards important labour reforms. By having this framework in place, we will now have a way to constructively engage on topics ranging from human rights to the environment and, as with any agreement, implementation will be the key. And you can count on this Parliament to do our job.

Marco Campomenosi (ID). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, bisogna usare le parole giuste per commentare quello che dice la Commissione europea. Bugia: no sviluppo locale, non creerà sviluppo ad aziende vietnamite, servirà solo a incentivare la delocalizzazione di imprese europee e di grandi multinazionali verso un paese come il Vietnam.

Ennesimo colpo, peraltro, al settore risicolo italiano ed europeo, in generale. Vergogna! Vergogna, perché – l'hanno detto in molti – i diritti umani non sono certo rispettati in Vietnam, gli standard sociali sono bassissimi. Ennesimo accordo commerciale che favorirà una concorrenza salariale al ribasso e i nostri lavoratori lo sanno bene.

Ipocrisia! Ipocrisia perché il *Green New Deal* che volete imporre alle nostre aziende e che costerà loro moltissimo, ovviamente non può essere imposto al Vietnam e il Vietnam si guarderà bene dall'andare in quella direzione, peraltro con standard che pretendete magari di chiedere alla Gran Bretagna, che già rispetta, e invece non vi fate alcun problema, nella vostra fallimentare politica commerciale, a stringere accordi con paesi lontanissimi da ogni livello di tutela sociale e ambientale.

Heidi Hautala (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, agreements between the EU and Vietnam are undoubtedly important geopolitically, and Vietnam has also made progress in reforming its labour laws – but it has, on the other hand, failed to amend its penal code to allow workers to enjoy those rights. Oppression has become more severe even during the last stage of the finalisation of these agreements. Parliament, if giving its consent tomorrow, takes a heavy responsibility of making its own demands happen in reality on sustainable development, human rights and participation of an independent civil society, and, as our own Committee on Foreign Affairs demands, the Commission and its Vietnamese counterparts still must set up an independent monitoring mechanism on human rights and an independent complaints mechanism with the recourse to remedy. So this all is why our Group, the Greens/European Free Alliance, cannot yet support these agreements.

Adam Bielan (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zarówno umowa o wolnym handlu (FTA), jak i umowa o ochronie inwestycji (IPA) to rzeczywiście najambitniejsze umowy tego rodzaju zawarte kiedykolwiek z krajem rozwijającym się. Negocjując je, Komisja starała się osiągnąć dwa podstawowe cele: po pierwsze, zapewnić podmiotom gospodarczym z Unii możliwie najlepsze warunki dostępu do wietnamskiego rynku; po drugie, zapewnić cenny drugi punkt odniesienia (po umowie z Singapurem) dla innych negocjacji prowadzonych przez Unię w tym regionie. Oba te cele zostały w pełni osiągnięte. Umowy wykraczają poza istniejące zobowiązania podjęte w ramach WTO w wielu obszarach, takich jak usługi, zamówienia, bariery pozataryfowe oraz ochrona praw własności intelektualnej, w tym oznaczeń geograficznych. We wszystkich tych obszarach Wietnam zgodził się również przyjąć nowe zobowiązania, które znacznie wykraczają poza to, do czego zobowiązał się w innych umowach, w tym we wszechstronnym i progresywnym porozumieniu o partnerstwie transpacyficznym. Umowy zniosą niemal wszystkie ograniczenia celne dla wzajemnej wymiany handlowej. Są dobrze zbilansowane i pozytywnie wpłyną na gospodarkę zarówno Unii, jak i Wietnamu. Dzięki tym umowom Unia zyska większe możliwości wywarcia nacisku na Hanoi w kwestii praw człowieka. Dlatego apeluję o głosowanie za ratyfikacją tych dokumentów.

Enikő Győri (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Látom, a szélsőségek összeérnek ma ebben a Házban. Javaslom az ellenzőknek átgondolni, hogy mi is a mi elsődleges dolgunk. A mi dolgunk az, hogy az európai vállalatoknak lehetőségeket teremtsünk, és ebből pedig a mi polgáraink hasznot húzzanak. A több kereskedelem Vietnám polgárainak is esélyt jelent a fejlődésre, és arra, hogy a mi normáink követésével a szabadságuk kiteljesedjen. Szereptévesztésben van az, aki azt gondolja, hogy az Uniónak állandóan oktatni és kioktatnia kell, ahelyett, hogy kis tisztelettel közelít a partnerekhez és jó kapcsolatokra törekszik. A párbeszéd és a vállalások ellenőrzése fog hozzájárulni Vietnám emberjogi, munka- és környezetvédelmi fejlődéséhez, nem pedig az, ha hátat fordítunk.

Aki a két egyezmény ellen érvel, az nem akarja, hogy az európai vállalatok hozzáférjenek, Hanoi vagy Ho Si Minh-város közbeszerzési piacához. Kedves ellenzők, ne akarjanak rosszat az európai vállalatoknak és a vietnámiaknak. A Bizottságtól azt kérem, hogy naprakész, gyakorlati információkkal segítse, hogy az európai kkv-k a legteljesebb mértékben kihasználhassák a két egyezményt.

Inma Rodríguez-Piñero (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor Hogan, el acuerdo entre la Unión Europea y Vietnam tiene una gran importancia estratégica por el impulso que da a nuestras relaciones comerciales con la región de la ASEAN y por el firme compromiso de Vietnam en defensa del multilateralismo y del desarrollo sostenible cuando el mundo más lo necesita.

Se ha negociado una reducción arancelaria ambiciosa, una cooperación reforzada y, sobre todo, un capítulo vinculante de desarrollo sostenible que define un marco de relaciones laborales con Vietnam más acorde a los principios y convenios de la OIT.

El Parlamento Europeo, gracias al empuje de mi grupo parlamentario y también de otros grupos, ha conseguido medidas y compromisos fehacientes del Gobierno vietnamita en materia de derechos laborales y de respeto de los derechos humanos, especificados en programas de trabajo. Y quiero agradecer los esfuerzos realizados a las autoridades de Vietnam. Pero todavía queda mucho por hacer y a los socialistas nos sigue preocupando la situación de los derechos humanos, en especial en lo que afecta a las libertades fundamentales.

Por ello seguiremos de cerca el cumplimiento de lo acordado y le pido, señor comisario, que también tome las medidas adecuadas para asegurarnos de que este acuerdo no perjudica a los agricultores europeos y, en particular, a los productores de arroz. Pero creo que este acuerdo es un instrumento importante para avanzar y lo apoyaré.

Pierre Karleskind (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais rejoindre notre collègue Bartolo, qui était rapporteur pour la commission PECH, sur la nécessité de lutter contre la pêche illégale.

Lutter contre la pêche illégale, c'est évidemment assurer une gestion durable des ressources halieutiques, c'est aussi s'assurer d'éviter la concurrence déloyale avec les pêcheurs qui sont soumis aux contraintes que nous avons sur notre continent.

Le Viêt Nam a un carton jaune sur la pêche illégale, mais il faut souligner les efforts qui ont été entrepris par ce pays, notamment dans le cadre des négociations qui aboutissent aujourd'hui à cet accord de libre-échange. Il faut aussi noter que dans cet accord, il est mentionné explicitement que les partis qui signent l'accord lutteront activement contre cette pêche illicite.

Alors est-ce suffisant? Eh bien, si ce n'est pas suffisant, allons plus loin. Allons plus loin et mettons en place des garde-fous, comme la suppression des tarifs préférentiels pour les produits de la pêche tant que, à l'avenir, il y aura carton jaune. C'est le sens de l'amendement que Renew a déposé et que je vous invite à soutenir.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Handel nutzt grundsätzlich beiden Seiten. Als ständiger Berichterstatter für Bangladesch und andere Länder weiß ich, wie Entwicklungsländer auf Vietnam schauen, weil zum ersten Mal ein Schwellenland die Möglichkeit erhält, sich über ein individuelles Freihandelsabkommen an die europäische Wirtschaft anzukoppeln und zu entwickeln. Gerade deshalb ist dieses Abkommen wichtig, weil es den vielen Schwellenländern eine Chance und einen Weg bietet, den wir ihnen einräumen sollten. Aus diesem Grunde werbe ich um Ihre Zustimmung.

Das Freihandelsabkommen ist ausgewogen, es reflektiert die verschiedenen Ansichten hier im Hause zum Handel mit anderen Ländern, und es macht allen Schwellenländern ein eigenes europäisches Angebot für die weitere Entwicklung, damit es zu einem Wohlstand in der Heimat kommt und nicht dazu, dass diese Menschen ihr Glück anderweitig und in anderen Ländern suchen müssen.

Insofern: ein gutes, ausgewogenes Abkommen, das ein positives Licht auf Europa und den Handel wirft. Ich bitte um Ihre Zustimmung.

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE). – Paní předsedající, volný obchod obecně vytváří bohatství pro obě strany. Jak tedy jako proevropská politička mohu být proti ratifikaci současné dohody EU-Vietnam? Protože tím dáme autoritářskému režimu bianko šek na obchod s největším ekonomickým blokem na světě bez vymahatelných podmínek. Ratifikací smluv dnes komunistické straně Vietnamu řekneme, že EU podporuje sledovací stát s monopolem jedné strany, který utlačuje své obyvatele. Nenechte se totiž mýlit tzv. zárukami lidských práv a demokratických reforem. Za 8 let vyjednávání této dohody se situace ve Vietnamu zhoršila.

Nejde jen o lidská práva, nejsou-li někomu dost. Zahodit silnou vyjednávací pozici je chyba i pro samotný obchod. Na dohodě vydělá značně více Vietnam než EU a v takovou chvíli máme my chtít záruky pro naši politiku a byznys. Otázka zní: Skutečně chceme Evropu, kterou mohou autoritáři všech zemí hýbat, jak potřebují, bez nutnosti uvolnit své režimy?

(Řečnice souhlasila s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 171 odst. 8 jednacího řádu))

Sven Simon (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte".* – Frau Kollegin, ich verstehe eins nicht an Ihrer Argumentation: Sind Sie der Meinung, dass wir mit dem Abkommen oder ohne das Abkommen mehr Einfluss auf das autoritäre Regime haben? Das ist doch die Frage, die im Raum steht: Sind wir mit dem Abkommen einflussreicher in Vietnam oder ohne das Abkommen?

Markéta Gregorová (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer.* – I will answer in English if you don't mind. We see that the agreement didn't help to do anything for now, because apparently the negotiations haven't been led properly with regard to human rights. So what is necessary is actually to follow what we originally approved as the European Parliament also, and to push for the reforms and for what we want. As I said, we are now giving a blank cheque on our trade, because they didn't do anything that we wanted from them and that they promised to us.

Carlo Fidanza (ECR). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo accordo tra UE e Vietnam presenta come sempre aspetti contraddittori. Il tema dei diritti umani ripetutamente violati, alcune opportunità significative per le nostre imprese e una tutela ampia per le nostre denominazioni d'origine.

Eppure rimane una grande criticità irrisolta su un settore cruciale come quello del riso. La produzione risicola italiana, la più importante dell'Unione europea, e quella europea sono già da anni sotto attacco per via dell'accordo EBA con Cambogia e Myanmar. La clausola di salvaguardia è stata applicata tardi e male ed è di questi giorni la notizia che nell'ambito del blocco delle agevolazioni commerciali con la Cambogia non rientrerà il riso. In questo quadro è evidente che l'immissione sul mercato di ulteriori ingenti quote di riso vietnamita a bassissimo prezzo rischia di mettere in ginocchio un settore già provato.

La nostra delegazione non intende quindi essere complice di questo disegno e non sosterrà questo accordo fino a quando non verrà salvaguardato il riso italiano ed europeo.

Άννα-Μισέλ Ασημακοπούλου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στηρίζουμε τη συμφωνία ελεύθερου εμπορίου μεταξύ Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και Βιετνάμ, διότι είναι μία πολύ καλή συμφωνία η οποία έχει οικονομικά οφέλη για όλους: με τη σταδιακή κατάργηση σχεδόν όλων των δασμών, με την άρση των δασμολογικών ποσοστώσεων, ανοίγοντας τις αγορές στους παρόχους υπηρεσιών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και δίνοντας πρόσβαση στους διαγωνισμούς δημοσίων συμβάσεων. Η συμφωνία έχει οφέλη για πολλά κράτη μέλη, μεταξύ των οποίων και για τη δική μου χώρα —την Ελλάδα, όπου θα βοηθήσει στις εξαγωγές φαρμακευτικών ειδών και αγροτικών προϊόντων, εξασφαλίζοντας την προστασία γεωγραφικών ενδείξεων σημαντικών ελληνικών προϊόντων, όπως είναι η φέτα και το ούζο. Επιπλέον, η συμφωνία θα θωρακίσει τα εργατικά δικαιώματα, θα ενισχύσει τη δημοκρατία και τον σεβασμό των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και θα συμβάλει στη μάχη κατά της κλιματικής αλλαγής. Οπότε, στην εποχή των εμπορικών πολέμων, έχει και μία συμβολική αξία. Καταδεικνύει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επιμένει σε ένα πολυμερές σύστημα ελεύθερου εμπορίου βασισμένο σε δίκαιους κανόνες, που συνάδει με τις αρχές και τις αξίες της ενωμένης Ευρώπης. Σας καλώ να την υπερψηφίσουμε.

Marianne Vind (S&D). – Fru formand! I en tid, hvor frihandel og samarbejde er under pres for gamle venner, er det vigtigere end nogen sinde, at EU bliver ved med at åbne markeder. Vi er nu garanten for retfærdig og bæredygtig og regelbaseret handel. Derfor bør vi også godkende denne aftale, der er den mest omfattende handelsaftale nogensinde imellem EU og et udviklingsland.

Vietnam har forpligtet sig til alle ILO's otte kernekonventioner, og seks af dem er allerede ratificeret. Et land med kommunistisk styre har nu anerkendt retten til kollektiv forhandling og er på vej mod forsamlingsfrihed. 95 millioner flere mennesker har i dag ret til at organisere sig og til at kæmpe sammen. Det er et stort skridt, der aldrig var sket, hvis vi ikke havde rakt hånden frem.

Aftalen med Vietnam er langt fra perfekt. Men politik handler ikke om perfektionisme. Det handler om konkrete fremskridt for konkrete mennesker, og det får vi ved at holde Vietnam tæt.

Angelika Winzig (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Geschichte hat gezeigt, dass Handel und offene Märkte Wohlstand schaffen und sichern. Ich komme aus einem Land mit einer 60 %-igen Exportquote, sechs von zehn Euro werden im Ausland verdient, und jeder zweite Arbeitsplatz hängt direkt oder indirekt vom Export ab, und es soll mir jemand sagen, wie wir in Zukunft ohne Export unsere Sozialsysteme weiter sichern.

Das Handelsabkommen mit Vietnam ist in der Tat ein besonderes, weil es in dieser Form noch nie mit einem kommunistischen Schwellenland geschlossen wurde und weil es auch ein Türöffner für weitere Abkommen sein wird. Es hat neben der Implementierung europäischer Standards auch eine große politische Dimension, nämlich die Einhaltung der Grundrechte. Deshalb wurden Mechanismen für die Evaluierung der Grundrechte, aber auch Sanktionen bei Verstößen verankert.

Positiv anzumerken – und Herr Lange hat es ja bereits gesagt – sind die Arbeitsrechtsnormen, die 2023 endgültig ratifiziert werden. Die politischen Alphawölfe haben kein großes Interesse an einem wirtschaftlich erfolgreichen Europa, und deshalb ist es wichtig, dass wir unsere erfolgreiche Handelspolitik mit weiteren Abkommen auch konsequent fortführen.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner Hogan, our rapporteur, Mr Bourgeois, and others have outlined many of the benefits of this Free Trade Agreement, both for Vietnam and for the European Union, because free trade agreements are, after all, about a win-win for both sides.

As a standing rapporteur for the ASEAN region and a former rapporteur for the EPP for Singapore, I welcome our Free Trade Agreement with Vietnam. This is the first really comprehensive agreement we will be doing with a developing country, and that's very important. Because it's one thing to do it with a developed economy, and it's another thing – so it's a very positive message – to be doing agreements with developing countries like Vietnam.

To those who oppose it, I would say to them: will any of the issues that you have be improved by opposing this agreement? The answer is no. As has been pointed out, there were already huge improvements even during negotiations that will continue when we develop the Agreement.

Juan Ignacio Zoido Álvarez (PPE). – Señora presidenta, comisario Hogan, el acuerdo de libre comercio con Vietnam supone una señal importante, tanto fuera como dentro de Europa.

Fuera, porque la Unión Europea demuestra una vez más que es la gran potencia comercial a nivel mundial; demuestra que, a pesar de los intentos de los populistas por levantar barreras arancelarias y volver al proteccionismo, Europa sigue siendo la mayor defensora del libre comercio.

Y es importante también dentro de Europa; es importante para las miles de empresas que ven en la desaparición del 65 % de los aranceles una gran oportunidad de negocio, un nuevo mercado que se abre cuando otros se cierran.

Para España esto será esencialmente beneficioso para sectores como el cárnico, cada vez más presente en Asia, así como para el sector del aceite de oliva, del vino y de las bebidas espirituosas, que ven reconocidas muchas de sus indicaciones geográficas y denominaciones de origen.

Para aquellos que no resulten beneficiados estaremos vigilantes para garantizar que este acuerdo no se firme a costa de nadie y que todos los españoles y los europeos salgamos ganando con él. Por ello, pido el apoyo para este acuerdo.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Madam President, Vietnam is an important partner in Southeast Asia. This year they hold the chairmanship of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and we aspire to foster closer trade relations with them. With this free trade agreement we are starting a new era in our relations. Vietnam is a fast-growing economy and by facilitating European-Vietnamese trade, this agreement offers ample opportunities for companies on both sides.

We encourage cultural and economic cooperation. We create a stepping stone to the European Union's longer term goal of region to region EU-Southeast Asia trade relations. In addition, we will enhance European visibility in the emerging Asian market.

But next to closer trade cooperation we should also keep in mind the situation of human rights in our partner country. We see that the government restricts the freedom of religion through legislation and surveillance. Local authorities often seize properties in places of worship. Next to our strengthened trade with Vietnam, the European Union should also push for improved inter-religious dialogue. We should not only work on strengthening the economic ties but also respect the right of belief as a fundamental aspect of our future relations. I do support this trade agreement but also I expect much closer …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Hildegard Bentele (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Kollegen und Kolleginnen! Ich unterstütze den Abschluss des EU-Vietnam-Abkommens, weil wir damit neben der Schaffung und dem Erhalt von Arbeitsplätzen in Vietnam und auch in der EU eine gute Entwicklung in Gang gesetzt haben, die insgesamt eine positive Auswirkung auf die vietnamesische Gesellschaft haben kann. Das Wichtigste ist, dass wir mit dem Abkommen einen festen Rechtsrahmen, eine Plattform für Dialog, Kontrollmechanismen und eine ständige Kommission, die mit Abgeordneten aus beiden Ländern besetzt ist, eingesetzt haben, in denen wir nicht nur über die Inhalte des Handelsabkommens sprechen können, sondern auch über die Umsetzung des Pariser Klimaabkommens und den *Green Deal*, über Pressefreiheit und über Menschenrechte. Wir geben eben keinen Blankoscheck. Wir stehen am Anfang einer Partnerschaft, die wir mit Leben erfüllen müssen. Die

Kommission und wir als Abgeordnete haben jetzt die Verpflichtung und Aufgabe, dieses Abkommen zum Modell und Vorbild zu machen. Ich freue mich, dass offensichtlich eine große Mehrheit in diesem Haus diese Chance nutzen möchte.

Lídia Pereira (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, caros Colegas, o acordo de comércio livre entre a União Europeia e o Vietname, além de economicamente vantajoso, já conseguiu influenciar a adoção de um novo código de trabalho no Vietname.

Os reconhecimentos do direito à negociação coletiva, juntamente com o direito à liberdade sindical, devem-se à nossa ação. No entanto, não posso deixar de sinalizar que devíamos ter sido mais ambiciosos no prazo para a ratificação da Convenção da OIT sobre a Abolição do Trabalho Forçado e na adoção de medidas para o cumprimento do Acordo de Paris.

As alterações climáticas não conhecem fronteiras e temos pouco tempo para o muito que há para fazer. Ainda assim este acordo é um excelente exemplo da utilização da nossa política comercial para a promoção dos princípios e dos valores europeus.

Caro Comissário, caros colegas, perdemos o Reino Unido, mas não deixámos de ser uma potência comercial e não podemos, por isso, dar qualquer passo atrás no exercício da nossa capacidade para a promoção dos direitos humanos, para o reconhecimento dos direitos sociais e laborais e, não menos importante, para a proteção do meio ambiente e da biodiversidade.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, it is clear that business is already booming in Vietnam: huge growth and opportunities in profits, and it is an opportunity to exploit a population of almost 100 million people. That's why we've had the substantial lobbying by the European institutions and the various business organisations not to defer ratification of this Treaty.

Don't kid ourselves that we're doing this for the benefit of the Vietnamese people, that this agreement is to lift them out of poverty, as somebody ridiculously claimed. These agreements have resulted in a transfer of wealth from the Global South to the West, exploiting their resources and their assets and undermining jobs in countries like those in the European Union.

Someone asked how will these issues be sorted out if we don't deal with them? The arrogance of such a question! They'll be dealt with by the Vietnamese people organising themselves in the same way as people did in these countries. And if we were serious about their concerns we'd listen to the NGOs and the trade unions who are telling us not to ratify this deal.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (Renew). – Señora presidenta, comisario, la política de acuerdos comerciales que está desplegando la Unión en los últimos años se está revelando como una de las herramientas más eficaces para extender nuestros estándares sociales y ambientales en el mundo global; también para fomentar avances en materia de derechos humanos, algo muy notable en este Acuerdo.

Así, la Unión Europea es capaz de implementar políticas imposibles Estado a Estado. Añade valor; se revela como el actor global que necesitamos; resulta útil a la ciudadanía. Me alegro, además, de que este proceso en favor de un comercio mundial más justo no olvide ningún sector.

Considero un enorme acierto haber incluido una salvaguardia para garantizar que nuestros productores —especialmente las empresas transformadoras de productos de la pesca y, muy en particular, las conserveras— vean defendidos sus legítimos intereses y reconocidas sus buenas prácticas frente a las amenazas de la pesca ilegal no declarada y no reglamentada.

Mientras la Comisión no retire la tarjeta amarilla a Vietnam por esta razón, la Unión debe proteger sus producciones contra el dumping social y ambiental propiciado por estas prácticas pesqueras.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, voter un accord commercial libéral avec un régime autoritaire communiste au nom de la défense des droits de l'homme relève vraiment du surréalisme – et vous savez que je suis belge d'origine, pays du surréalisme, comme M. Bourgeois. Mais je pense qu'ici, nous décrochons la palme d'or.

Pourtant il était, il est possible de faire mieux par rapport à cet accord. Pourquoi le mécanisme de règlement des différends entre États ne couvre-t-il pas le développement durable? Pourquoi, quand il s'agit des droits sociaux et environnementaux, n'y a-t-il plus de mécanismes contraignants assortis de sanctions?

Un changement de ce type, Monsieur le Commissaire, est tout à fait possible, mais encore faut-il en avoir la volonté politique. Vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, mais aussi nous, en tant que Parlement, donnons-nous le temps encore de modifier cet accord, comme nous l'avons fait avec l'ISDS en son temps. Tout le monde, ici au Parlement, disait que l'ISDS était magnifique. Nous avons mené la bataille, nous avons gagné en changeant l'ISDS en ICS. Nous avons une bataille à mener ici: faisons du développement durable un chapitre contraignant, avec sanctions.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, Commissioner, you told us that human rights was an issue of concern in Vietnam. Now Phil, tell me, in God's name when did you ever allow any concerns about human rights to interfere with our business interests? I mean, we even do business with Israel and Saudi Arabia. These trade deals don't do anything for the people from these regions. They decimate indigenous industry, they impoverish small farmers. The people of Vietnam will not benefit from this. Big business in Vietnam will benefit from it.

The main problem with this type of agreement is that it guarantees enforceable rights to foreign investors and multinationals through the arbitration clause but doesn't provide a mechanism for sanctions for noncompliance with social and environmental standards. What are the chances of trading with someone on the far side of the planet being good for our environment? Zero. What are the chances of being consistent with the Paris Agreement? Zero.

Jordi Cañas (Renew). – Señora presidenta, la ignorancia no debería ser excusa que justificase argumentos demagógicos. Sinceramente, el comercio existe con Vietnam. Es que a algunos parece que se les tiene que explicar lo obvio. El comercio existe: 43 000 millones en importaciones; 13 000 millones en exportaciones. Es que, de verdad, existe.

Entonces, ¿queremos que ese comercio este ajustado dentro de unas reglas y unas normas? Sí. ¿Este acuerdo beneficiará e impulsará el cumplimiento de esas normas, el cumplimiento de los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, de los derechos humanos, de condiciones medioambientales? ¿Las mejora o no? Las mejora. Es mejor un acuerdo que un no acuerdo.

Yo no sé si algunos quieren cambiar el mundo desde declaraciones, desde posiciones extremistas, Savonarolas medioambientales, pero así igual ganan votos, pero no contribuirán a mejorar la calidad de vida de ningún ciudadano en ninguna parte del mundo. Este es un acuerdo que puede intentar lograrlo, que define un marco y crea obligaciones. Y será nuestra responsabilidad intentar que se ejecute adecuadamente, y ahí tenemos que ser vigilantes. Pero lo que no lo haremos será desde declaraciones extremistas que solo tienen como objetivo reforzar y ganar votos en vez de intentar avanzar en los derechos humanos, en los derechos sociales, en los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible y en el respeto medioambiental.

Bogdan Rzońca (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jestem za wolnym handlem i dlatego oczywiście będę popierał zawarcie tej umowy. Mam tylko jedną wątpliwość i proszę ewentualnie o odpowiedź. Należy bowiem przypuszczać, że po wejściu w życie tej umowy import towarów spożywczych z Wietnamu do Unii Europejskiej wzrośnie. Teraz jest to piąta czy czwarta pozycja, w przyszłości może być tych towarów dużo więcej. Chciałem zatem zapytać, czy Unia Europejska jest przygotowana na dobrą kontrolę napływu tej żywności wysokiej jakości? Czy nie będzie zakłóceń na rynku spożywczym spowodowanych przemytem czy nielegalnym transferem do Europy żywności niższej jakości?

Helmut Scholz (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin! Blicken wir auf die zweite Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts – Stichwort Befreiungskrieg, Vietnamkrieg, Agent Orange –, wird die gewaltige Dimension der Herausforderung der wirtschaftlichen Aufholprozesse, der Transformation in Vietnam durchaus deutlich – und damit auch die Aufgabenstellung, die sich die damalige Führung gestellt hat: Öffnung hin zum Weltmarkt, um diese wirtschaftliche Sozialentwicklung zu ermöglichen.

Deshalb, liebe Kollegen Simon und Cañas: Anstatt ein reines Freihandelsabkommen und zusätzlich noch ein Investitionsschutzabkommen mit der Sozialistischen Republik Vietnam abzuschließen, hätten wir die Gelegenheit nutzen sollen, ein Kooperationsabkommen abzuschließen. So hätten wir die Verbesserung der Lebens- und Arbeitsbedingungen in Vietnam, die Fragen des Klimawandels gemeinsam mit unseren Partnern in den Vordergrund rücken können. Ich begrüße durchaus die Schritte Vietnams zur Ratifizierung bestimmter Kernarbeitsnormen der ILO und erkenne die Hoffnung an, die vietnamesische Gewerkschafterinnen und Gewerkschafter dieser Entwicklung entgegengebracht haben. Dem Kapitel über Arbeits- und Umweltschutz fehlen jedoch die Zähne. Deshalb meine Unterstützung für den europäischen Gewerkschaftskongress, wenn er vor dem Abkommen in der jetzigen Form und seiner Ratifizierung warnt.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Phil Hogan, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, first of all, I want to thank the House for their contributions, but it is an opportunity as well to thank some people that have been involved in the EU-Vietnam negotiations.

Can I thank Mr Lange, the Chair of the Committee on International Trade (INTA), Mr Bourgeois, the rapporteur, and all the shadows who have been involved in the scrutiny of this particular deal? To note that the four committee Chairs that are indirectly involved in this scrutiny have given their support for the deal. Can I thank former Commissioner, Cecilia Malmström, and the DG TRADE officials for their tremendous work over many years in relation to this deal?

As many speakers have said, these are the first trade and investment agreements to be voted on by this Parliament. And I hope that they will receive your approval so that our companies, particularly our SMEs that have been mentioned by many of you, can start tapping into the potential and generate growth and employment.

In such uncertain times for global trade, a positive vote of course will send a strong signal in relation to the EU's commitment to an open and fair trade based on rules and values. I can assure you that we will monitor implementation very closely, because I agree with many of you that there are issues that have to be resolved and will constantly require us to ensure the Vietnam lives up to its commitments. I'm fully aware of these particular sentiments.

But, in relation to some of the specifics that we mentioned, horse trade is usually associated with market access, and this has been a very good deal in terms of EU-Vietnamese reciprocity in so many products. Mr Juncker has mentioned issues in relation to food and can I confirm that the Free Trade Agreement liberalises all EU export offensive interests, like beef, pork, poultry, wines, spirits and beer, but it also has safeguards for some of our sensitive issues, like rice, sugar, sweetcorn and canned tuna.

These safeguards are a new dimension in relation to our free trade agreements in recent years, which includes for the first time a free trade agreement that we are ratifying where safeguards are given in respect of tariff rate quotas (TRQs). We have also got recognition by Vietnam in this deal for the European Union to be treated as a single entity for sanitary and phytosanitary terms, which will reduce a lot of the non-tariff barriers that we have. Equally, our 169 geographical indications right around the European Union have been protected.

On the trade and sustainable development (TSD) chapter, improving the implementation and enforcement of all our agreements is very important, and this is a key priority for the Commission. Vietnam is a good example of where they are making considerable efforts even before the deal has been implemented in relation to TSD matters, with important progress being made.

So the pressure that you've applied is certainly bearing fruit. But we have also established an institutional structure through the domestic advisory groups, which will include all stakeholders, including NGOs, civil society, businesses and all the services that will have an input in relation to the implementation of this agreement.

The implementation is very important. That's why we're establishing as well in the Commission a chief trade enforcement officer during the course of the next few months. The new labour code, which was adopted in November 2019, recognises the principle of freedom of association possibly to set up independent trade unions at enterprise level, as I mentioned earlier, which is outside the scope of the dominant Vietnam general confederation of labour.

So Vietnam has started the implementation. It has a master plan that's going to be implemented by January 2021 and one of the aspects is to check its consistency with all other legal documents, including the penal code and the criminal code. The ILO Conventions has said that six out of eight are implemented. We're at the same stage as we were in terms of the implementation of this agreement with Japan. So I think this is good progress by Vietnam.

Vietnam has started preparations to set up these independent civil society organisations, and last week they gave me an action plan and a timescale in relation to their implementation. I mentioned child labour. There has been a 40% reduction since 2012 and of course they are committed to a new action plan to eradicate poverty over the 2021-2025 period.

Some Members have mentioned human rights, and rightly so. It does remain an area of concern in our relationship with Vietnam, but we must take into account where the country has come from and see clear evidence of progress in the last 25 years, notably in the socioeconomic domain.

Human rights improvements are central to our engagement, and there's a binding and enforceable link between the FTA, investment protection agreement (IPA) and the partnership and cooperation agreement (PCA) that allows for total or partial suspension of the agreement in case of systemic or severe breaches on human rights. We also have an annual human rights dialogue and there's a meeting next week in Hanoi so these are all, I think, positives.

There are divergences between us and I'm not saying anything otherwise, but we are convinced that the agreements provide an initial platform to engage with Vietnamese society and governments on these issues. This is the view of several Vietnamese NGOs who say that the implementation of this agreement would open more space for civil society. Now clearly Ms Daly and Mr Wallace have not heard those particular voices in relation to that part of the deal.

The EU is of course also closely concerned about political prisoners and persons of concern. We have a list of persons of concern that we have been regularly raising in our exchanges at the highest level. And we are striving to make sure that the EU delegation are not only consistently ensuring that these people are released, but also attending trials, meeting family members and providing the best possible facilities for the families of these political prisoners.

The FTA and the IPA will create another important and conducive environment to ensure that these issues are not put under the table, but are consistently high on the agenda. The lack of ratification of the agreement would leave the European Union with no instrument at all to support a reform agenda for Vietnam, and we will push Vietnam closer to other partners that do not necessarily share the same values if we don't have this agreement.

The institutional set up again, as I mentioned in the context of various fora to speak about these issues, is very important. Environment was mentioned: of course Vietnam is one of the countries that are most affected by climate change. So surely they are interested in implementing the Paris Agreement, which they have signed up to. And, under the trade and sustainable development chapter, this is explicitly mentioned. So their national determined contributions are going to ensure, like other partners around the world where we do deals, that are going to have to implement this in a legally binding way, as they have signed up to in relation to the Paris Agreement.

So this is another win and another example of where we are providing the framework where we can implement, through this free trade agreement, the necessary leverage to ensure that these commitments are met.

Vietnam has also concluded with the EU a forest law enforcement, governance and trade voluntary partnership agreement (FLEGT VPA), which has been enforced since 1 June 2019. And this particular partnership agreement aims to ensure that all timber products imported into the European Union from Vietnam are legal. This is very significant as Vietnam is a major processing hub, importing timber from over 80 countries, including from a number of high-risk countries in the region such as Cambodia.

Under the VPA, Vietnam has to introduce mandatory due diligence obligations for its importers. Vietnam is currently working on the implementation of this particular scheme through the various licences that will have to ensure traceability.

So our one major success in this field has been the open and constructive participation of all the relevant stakeholders in Vietnam during the negotiation phase. These are the issues that have come to the fore and we have got a response. We have to continue ultimately of course to reach our final destination and our objectives.

Finally, on this issue in relation to concern about the investment court system, following the European Parliament's demands, the investment protection agreement with Vietnam includes the most modern and reformed investment protection framework in any agreement with an investment court system for the resolution of investment disputes, replacing the traditional investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) arbitration mechanism, and this has been confirmed as the proper way to go by the European Court of Justice decision that was recently made.

So all of the elements of the ISDS under CETA are included in the IPA with Vietnam, which is an additional stepping stone towards the establishment of a multilateral investment court.

Finally, in conclusion, could I say that, by voting in favour of this free trade agreement, you are voting in favour of a deal that will give us the political and institutional influence and the proper structures to make improvements on issues like human rights, like labour rights, like climate change and like environment policies. By voting 'no' you are consigning our influence to resolutions and letters that may or may not be taken into account and will most probably be ignored.

This agreement puts the EU and Vietnam together in a political structure and enforcement mechanisms that will deliver common objectives, in particular in the policy areas that have been mentioned in this House. I know that many of these issues have been of concern for many years. Now we have a structured way in which we can deal with these issues. So it is time to be positive, to acknowledge that the EU stands together with the people of Vietnam, and vote positively for this deal.

Geert Bourgeois, *Rapporteur.* – Mr President, at the end of the debate, first I want to thank my colleagues in the Committee on International Trade (INTA), the shadow rapporteurs, and especially our Chair, Mr Lange. I want to thank my predecessor, the former rapporteur Jan Zahradil, and I would also like to thank Commissioner Hogan for our good cooperation and for rightfully underlining the importance of this trade and investment agreement with Vietnam. I totally agree with your conclusion, Mr Hogan, and I take note of your clear commitment to oversee all aspects relevant for the implementation of the agreement and the continuous assistance of the Commission in order to help Vietnam pursue its reform process and to lend the country the financial and technical aid necessary to achieve its goals.

I would like to thank colleagues for all their valuable contributions. Most of the points of concern raised during this debate were also my concerns. However, I think we have sufficiently addressed most of the concerns during our preparatory work. I believe these agreements will serve as an effective instrument to promote fundamental values and create a more level playing field.

Vietnam has committed to a series of important measures, and I agree with you, Mr Lange: thanks to the clear political messages of this Parliament, I'm happy to say that during the negotiation process ahead of this debate and during my own interactions, the Vietnamese Government has demonstrated a trustworthy and clear political will to deliver on important issues. The role of the European Parliament was, and is, essential in this respect. We will continue to closely follow up on the proceedings of the independent organisations taking part in the domestic advisory groups. After ratification, we are also looking forward to strengthening political dialogue with our Vietnamese colleagues through the establishment of a joint parliamentary cooperation framework. We will also look into the proposal of associating our colleagues on the Subcommittee on Human Rights (DROI) to the already existing annual human rights dialogue.

Vietnam is a country in transformation. I believe these agreements will further contribute to the improvement of its prosperity, labour, human rights and living standards. The EU needs to support this aim fully in order to bring forward this positive agenda for change in Vietnam, and therefore I passionately call upon all my colleagues in this House to vote tomorrow in favour of the consent for both agreements, so that the EU can take up its role as a geopolitical actor in the region and show Vietnam that we are a genuine and reliable partner today and for the future.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 12. Februar 2020, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Dominique Bilde (ID), *par écrit*. – Pendant que Donald Trump élague les facilités accordées à des partenaires soi-disant en développement – la Chine n'en est-elle pas un du point de vue de l'OMC ? – l'Union européenne s'enfonce dans un suicide économique dont les résultats désastreux sont toujours plus apparents.

Sans discernement dans l'octroi des préférences généralisées, dont le Viêt Nam bénéficie, elle aura été tout aussi inepte dans les négociations commerciales. Les échanges avec ce pays devaient pourtant la placer en position de force. Il n'en est rien. Un exemple cocasse le démontre: alors que l'Union européenne reconnaît 39 IGP vietnamiennes, le Viêt Nam n'en reconnaîtrait que 36 françaises, dont le champagne – avec une période transitoire de dix ans!

L'accord n'est évidemment pas une bonne nouvelle en matière de droits de l'homme. Outre la liberté syndicale, en 2012, 1,75 million de Vietnamiens âgés de 5 à 17 ans étaient toujours concernés par le travail des enfants. Quant à nos industries – notamment le textile, historiquement implanté dans le Grand Est – elles paieront par une nouvelle saignée cette course au moins-disant social, les salaires vietnamiens plafonnant à 59 % des salaires chinois, ce qui explique vraisemblablement l'empressement déployé pour conclure cet accord.

Robert Hajšel (S&D), *písomne*. – Vietnam je dynamicky sa rozvíjajúcou krajinou juhovýchodnej Ázie, ktorá má pre obchodné vzťahy EÚ so štátmi ASEAN strategický význam. Navyše, vláda tohto ázijského tigra podporuje multilaterálny prístup k medzinárodnému obchodu a Vietnam na rozdiel od niektorých iných štátov prijal na seba aj záväzky v boji proti klimatickým zmenám, čím je pre nás spojencom aj v dekarbonizácii, kde chce byť EÚ svetovým lídrom. Schválením štyroch rezolúcií týkajúcich sa ratifikácie dohôd o voľnom obchode a ochrane investícií sa úroveň našich vzťahov posunie ďalej, poslúži ako páka pre ďalší rozvoj, ako aj pre ďalšiu demokratizáciu politických pomerov v krajine. Mnohí z radov europoslancov, ako aj mimovládnych organizácií vyčítajú Vietnamu nízku úroveň ochrany ľudských práv a pracovného práva, ale aj v týchto oblastiach urobil Hanoj nepopierateľný pokrok. Nedávno sa Vietnam pripojil k ďalším dohovorom v rámci Medzinárodnej organizácie práce a uskutočnil reformu pracovného práva. Ďalší pokrok sa očakáva v oblasti zabezpečenia práva na kolektívne vyjednávanie. Vietnam musí vyvinúť ďalšie úsilie v zabezpečení základných ľudských práv a slobôd, najmä pokiaľ ide o právo prejavu a zhromažďovania sa. EÚ a jej inštitúcie nemôžu nad nedostatočným stavom v tejto oblasti zatvárať oči, ale ratifikácia dohôd je isto nielen na prospech obchodu, ale aj kvality života vietnamského ľudu.

Urmas Paet (Renew), *kirjalikult*. – ELi-Vietnami vabakaubandusleping loob uusi võimalusi nii Eesti ja ELi kui ka Vietnami jaoks. Lisaks omab see ka märksa laiemat tähendust, sest ajal, mil mitmepoolsetel eeskirjadel põhinev kaubandus on kahtluse alla seatud, tugevdab Euroopa Liit suhteid Aasiaga (varem on juba sõlmitud sarnased lepingud Singapuri ja Jaapaniga). See annab ülejäänud maailmale ja eriti just protektsionistlikele suundadele signaali, et EL on konstruktiivsele rahvusvahelisele koostööle avatud. ELi ja Vietnami vabakaubandusleping on kõige terviklikum ja ambitsioonikam sedalaadi kokkulepe, mis on kunagi ELi ja arenguriigi vahel sõlmitud. Vietnamis elab peaaegu 100 miljonit inimest ning see on üks kiireima majanduskasvuga Kagu-Aasia Maade Assotsiatsiooni ehk ASEANi riike. Lepinguga kaotatakse kümne aasta jooksul peaaegu kõik Vietnami ja ELi vahelised tariifid, kaitstes samas sümboolse tähendusega Euroopa tooteid ja võimaldades Euroopa ettevõtjatele juurdepääsu Vietnami riigihanketurule. ELi peamine import Vietnamist hõlmab telekommunikatsiooniseadmeid, rõivaid ja toiduaineid. Vietnamisse eksporditakse EList peamiselt masinaid ja transpordivahendeid, kemikaale ja põllumajandustooteid. Veel annab leping jõustumisel ELile suurema võimaluse avaldada Vietnamile mõju inimõiguste ja keskkonnaga seotud küsimustes. Vabakaubandusleping hõlmab kohustust kaitsta töötajate põhiõigusi, elanike inimõigusi laiemalt ja keskkonda.

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu*. – Susitarimas dėl laisvosios prekybos su Vietnamu yra šansas visam Europos Sąjungos ūkiui padidinti naujų prekybos rinkų kiekį ES prekėms. Susitarimas taip pat sudaro ES prekybinių santykių su kylančiais ūkiais modelį. Modelis, pagal kurį vedame derybas kaip partneriai vienodomis sąlygomis ir dalijamės ekonomikos augimo ir užimtumo skatinimo, konkurencingumo palaikymo, kovos su skurdu ir konsolidavimo struktūrinių reformų programa. Vietnamas yra augančios, konkurencingos ir susietos ekonomikos šalis, turinti beveik 100 mln. piliečių, augantį vidurinįjį sluoksnį ir jauną bei dinamišką darbo jėgą. Vietnamas taip pat yra viena iš sparčiausiai augančių ASEAN šalių – jo vidutinis BVP augimo rodiklis 2000-2018 m. buvo apie 6,51 %. Vietnamas taip pat yra viena iš labiausiai atvirų ir į laisvąją prekybą orientuotų ekonomikos šalių regione. Susitarimas dėl laisvosios prekybos padės atverti naujas ekonomikos augimo ir vystymosi galimybes abiem šalims, nes pavyzdžiui, bus gerokai sumažinti muitai ES produktams, įskaitant automobilius, automobilių dalis, mašinas ir naminius paukščius, bet tuo pačiu metu bus saugomi ypač jautrūs sektoriai. Šiuo metu ES yra didžiausia Vietnamo prekybos partnerė po Kinijos ir antra pagal dydį eksporto rinka po JAV. Vertėtų šitą tendenciją išlaikyti ir ateityje.

Monika Vana (Verts/ALE), *schriftlich.* – Wir Grünen lehnen sowohl das Handels- als auch das Investitionsschutzabkommen mit Vietnam ab. Es handelt sich dabei um „Abkommen der alten Schule“ mit Sonderrechten für Investoren und ohne einklagbare Umwelt- und Sozialstandards. Die EU vergibt mit diesem Handelsabkommen die Chance, sich aktiv für Menschenrechte und Umwelt entlang der globalen Produktionsketten einzusetzen, obwohl das Europäische Parlament am 15.1.2020 in der Entschließung zum *European Green Deal* die EU-Kommission dazu aufgefordert hat. In Vietnam beobachten wir Menschenrechtsverstöße und Repressionen gegenüber organisierten Arbeitnehmern und Arbeitnehmerinnen. Wir brauchen endlich einen Paradigmenwechsel in der europäischen Handelspolitik. Die EU-Kommission muss den *European Green Deal* in zukünftigen Handelsabkommen umsetzen!

(Die Sitzung wird um 12.41 Uhr unterbrochen)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID MARIA SASSOLI

Presidente

5. Възобновяване на заседанието

(La seduta è ripresa alle 15.07)

6. Съобщение на председателството

Presidente. – Conformemente al regolamento ho deciso di irrorare una sanzione nei confronti di Ioannis Lagos per aver turbato la seduta in Aula del 29 gennaio 2020 con l'uso di un linguaggio ingiurioso e l'esposizione e lo strappo di un foglio che simboleggiava una bandiera nazionale.

La sanzione consiste nella perdita del diritto all'indennità di soggiorno per un periodo di sette giorni e nella sospensione temporanea dalla partecipazione alle attività del Parlamento e dei suoi organi per un periodo di quattro giorni consecutivi a partire da oggi 11 febbraio.

Questa decisione è stata notificata naturalmente oggi all'interessato che può introdurre un ricorso interno contro questa decisione dinanzi all'Ufficio di presidenza conformemente al regolamento.

7. Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание: вж. протокола

8. Европейска централна банка — годишен доклад за 2018 г. (разискване)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Costas Mavrides, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari, sulla relazione annuale della Banca centrale europea per il 2018 (2019/2129(INI)) (A9-0016/2020).

Do la parola subito al relatore, onorevole Mavrides, e saluto per la loro presenza in Aula la signora Lagarde e il Commissario Dombrovskis.

Costas Mavrides, *Rapporteur.* – Mr President, this report reflects the well-established relationship between the European Parliament and the ECB. In fact, such a report is the main instrument for expressing our views towards ECB policies for maintaining price stability and strengthening the eurozone economies, thereby leading to a higher degree of real economic convergence.

The timing is important. This report is the first of the new legislative term and following the election of the new ECB President. And, of course, like the President has said, we are very glad to have you here today with us, Ms Lagarde. The report focuses on the review of the current ECB policies, future monetary policy, actions against climate change, and a stronger global role for the euro.

Regarding the monetary policy actions of the ECB in 2018 and their impact on the euro area economy, we welcome the ECB's role in safeguarding euro stability. The non-standard monetary policy measures put in place by the ECB contributed to economic recovery, to an improvement in financing conditions and to compressing yields across a wide range of asset classes. We also stress that the very low or negative interest rates offer opportunities to consumers, companies (including SMEs), workers and borrowers who can benefit from stronger economic momentum, lower unemployment and lower borrowing costs. At the same time, we ask the ECB to keep monitoring potential risks to its balance sheets, asset price inflation, disadvantages to savers and the potential impact on pension and insurance schemes. However, we are concerned that after a short economic recovery, euro area growth momentum has slowed to 1.1% of GDP in the euro area, and therefore we note the need to maintain both the liquidity conditions and a degree of monetary accommodation. Recognising the sustainable growth cannot be achieved by monetary policy alone. We underline that supportive fiscal policy is also necessary.

We also agree with ECB President Christine Lagarde's statement that a review of the ECB's monetary policy framework is timely and warranted, and we stress that this should be done by organising a public consultation and involving Parliament. An important point also raised in this report is the finding of the European System of Central Banks Expert Group on low wage growth, stating the disconnect between wage growth and labour market recovery *ceteris paribus*. Accordingly, the unemployment rate in August 2019 stood at 6.2% in the EU and 7.4% in the euro area, the lowest since July 2008. But this drop in unemployment has not been reflected in wage growth.

Two words strengthening the role of the euro area. It requires the right structural conditions, including the deepening of the European Monetary Union, the completion of the Banking Union with the European Deposit Insurance Scheme and the completion of the Capital Market Union. Special emphasis is given to the fight against climate change and the implementation of the Paris Agreement. We stress that the ECB is bound by the Paris Agreement on climate change and this should be reflected by implementing the environmental, social and governance principle into its policies.

We underline other aspects interrelated with ECB policies regarding Brexit, the Capital Markets Union, crypto-assets, the need to increase monitoring and to have a comprehensive regulatory framework, the importance of micro, small and medium-sized businesses in the EU and their access to credit, more efforts to ensure the financing of the real economy and much more.

On accountability, we welcome the increasing accountability under the Presidency of Mario Draghi and we express our will for even greater accountability, dialogue and openness with the current President.

A final point. It is essential to formulate our monetary policy but also to communicate it to our citizens, as they need to understand the importance and the impact of those policies on their lives. I would like to thank all the shadow rapporteurs for their constructive and fruitful collaboration during the negotiations, and I do believe that the European Parliament and the ECB have a common objective. This was my primary objective when I drafted this report – to improve the lives of our citizens by achieving real economic convergence and to strengthen the role of the EU as it is our common home.

Christine Lagarde, *President of the European Central Bank.* – Mr President, Executive Vice-President Dombrovskis, rapporteur Mavrides, honourable Members of the European Parliament, I am delighted to participate for the first time in a plenary session and to discuss your draft resolution on the ECB's Annual Report for 2018.

Independence and accountability are two sides of the same coin for the ECB, and one will not exist without the other. This is why the ECB's relationship with the European Parliament is so important. The ECB's Annual Report is a central element of this relationship, and Parliament's resolution and the subsequent feedback we publish are evidence of the good dialogue between our two institutions.

Having only joined the ECB almost to the day 100 days ago, I read the draft resolution with particular interest. What struck me in particular was our shared assessment of many of the challenges facing the ECB and the euro area. I felt exactly the same as I was listening to you, Mr Mavrides. Indeed, the universal nature of these challenges underscores the need for our continued dialogue.

Today, I would like to focus on two of the overarching concerns that stand out from the draft resolution. Number one, the role of monetary policy in the current economic environment and, number two, the structural challenges facing the euro area economy.

Euro area growth momentum has been slowing down since the start of 2018, largely on account of global uncertainties and weaker international trade. Moderating growth has also weakened pressure on prices, and inflation remains some distance below our medium-term aim.

Against this background, the ECB's Governing Council has acted in a determined fashion to achieve price stability, which is the mandate that we have under the ECB Treaty. The ECB's monetary policy since 2014 relies on four elements: a negative policy rate, asset purchases, forward guidance, and targeted lending operations. These measures have helped to preserve favourable lending conditions, support the resilience of the domestic economy and – most importantly in the recent period – shield the euro area economy from global headwinds.

Our policy stimulus has supported economic growth, resulting in more jobs and higher wages for euro area citizens. As you just mentioned, Mr Mavrides, euro area unemployment, at 7.4%, is at its lowest level since May 2008. Wages, as you have mentioned as well, increased at an average rate of 2.5% in the first three quarters of 2019, significantly above their long-term average. 2.5%.

But monetary policy cannot, and should not, be the only game in town. The longer our accommodative measures remain in place, the greater the risk that side effects will become more pronounced. We are fully aware that the low interest rate environment has a bearing on savings income, asset valuation, risk-taking and house prices. We are closely monitoring possible negative side effects to ensure that they do not outweigh the positive impact of our measures on credit conditions, job creation and wage income. Such reflections played a role, for example, when the Governing Council decided to introduce a new regime for remunerating the excess reserves held by banks with the Eurosystem, the famous clearing system that we introduced.

Other policy areas – notably fiscal measures and structural polices – also have to play their part. These policies can boost productivity growth and lift growth potential, thereby underpinning the effectiveness of our measures. Indeed, when interest rates are low, fiscal policy can be highly effective: it can support euro area growth momentum, which in turn intensifies price pressures and eventually leads to higher interest rates. The European Green Deal and national initiatives to finance the ecological transition could add to these dynamics by contributing to stronger and more sustainable growth.

The European Parliament's draft resolution on the ECB's Annual Report highlights three structural developments affecting the ECB's operating environment: digitalisation, climate change and the institutional architecture of Economic and Monetary Union. I would like to use the remaining time that I have to discuss very briefly these three challenges.

Digitalisation and climate change were not made in Europe. They are global phenomena. They will not wait for us to gear up and get ready; they will affect us whether we are ready or not. So we need to prepare as best we can. In this spirit, the ECB is assessing the potential and implications of technological developments for payment services and financial stability, and it is also making an active contribution to such innovations.

To this end, we set up a Eurosystem task force in January to investigate the opportunities and challenges associated with different potential designs for a central bank digital currency and to test how they would work in practice. In particular, we want to assess whether a central bank digital currency could serve a clear purpose for the public and support the ECB's objectives. Together with five other central banks and the Bank for International Settlements, we will share experiences in this area and assess the potential cross-border use of such digital currencies.

We also have to gear up on climate change – and not only because we care as citizens of this world. Like digitalisation, climate change affects the context in which central banks operate. So we increasingly need to take these effects into account in central banks' policies and operations.

The ECB has already moved in this direction. First, we are working to extend our knowledge about the economic impact of climate change and ensure that its effects are better reflected in our economic analyses, in our models and in our forecasting methods. Second, through its financial stability tasks, the ECB is monitoring systemic risks stemming from climate change and the transition to a carbon-neutral economy. This work will ultimately enable us to test how well the euro area banking sector is able to withstand climate-related risks.

Finally, the ECB has taken steps to align its own investment decisions with the objectives of the Paris Agreement. This is so in our staff pension fund, for instance, where we decided to switch to a low-carbon index, and we are investigating what else we can do in our market operations.

The strategy review launched by the ECB's Governing Council last month will also take stock of how rapid digitalisation and the threat to environmental sustainability – together with globalisation and evolving financial structures – have further transformed the environment in which monetary policy operates. The strategy review will consider all aspects of the ECB's policy framework. We need to reflect on how we can best deliver on the ECB price stability mandate for the benefit of all European citizens. As part of this process, we will consult with the public and listen to their views, expectations and concerns with an open mind.

We will indeed also work very closely with those in your Parliament who are directly interested and concerned about those particular matters and we have begun that journey.

While I have thus far focused on the ECB, it is important to recognise that digitalisation and climate change are universal developments that affect all of us in Europe and worldwide. But Europe is uniquely positioned to master these challenges. Building on common safeguards and competitive incentives, the Single Market offers enormous potential for economic modernisation. Europe can harness this potential in its quest to design effective and affordable responses to the challenges at hand.

But an important pillar of Europe's response to an increasingly globalised world – Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) – should not be forgotten in the process. And the role of the European Parliament, as co-legislator, in getting our response right cannot be understated.

Over recent years, the euro area's architecture has evolved substantially. But as you know, some essential elements are still missing or are incomplete, hampering its ability to deliver its full potential for euro area citizens. This is why the ECB has been advocating and will continue to make the case for a more complete EMU: Economic and Monetary Union.

Very quickly, I will remind you of what I mean by that. It is a full banking union underpinned by a common deposit insurance scheme; it's a true capital markets union that channels investment to innovative and productive uses; and it is a central stabilisation function as a common line of defence in case and when we have shocks. A more resilient Economic and Monetary Union with these elements would not just help to protect our living standards from adverse domestic and global developments. It would also support Europe's influence in the world, including by making the euro more attractive worldwide.

Let me close by highlighting the joint nature of the challenges. What I have discussed will require all parties to do their bit to enable Europe to perform at its best for all of its citizens. This includes the ECB, which within its mandate is ready to play its part. As I said at the beginning, the universal nature of these challenges also underscores the need for continued dialogue between the ECB and the European Parliament. In this spirit, I am very much looking forward to the exchange that we will have during the rest of this afternoon.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, it's a pleasure to be here today to discuss with you and with Christine Lagarde, President of the European Central Bank (ECB), the very timely report on the ECB annual report.

By a coincidence of the calendar, the European Central Bank launched a review of its monetary policy strategy on 23 January, the day of adoption of the report at committee level. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Costas Mavrides, and the members of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) for their work.

The Commission largely shares the general lines of the report. We concur with the view that the ECB's statutory independence in the conduct of monetary policy is crucial to the objective of safeguarding price stability.

Today's debate reinforces this independence in that it bridges political independence and democratic accountability. Like the report, the Commission considers that monetary policy alone, which is an ECB competence, is not sufficient to achieve sustainable growth and price stability. The euro area economy should also be supported by a mix of growth-friendly structural reforms and by appropriately-differentiated fiscal policy. This is all the more important as the European economy, while continuing to expand, has entered a period of more subdued growth. This is linked to the less-supportive external environment, ongoing structural shifts and high uncertainty, for instance regarding trade policies.

Let me make specific reference to a couple of points in the report that are relevant to the Commission's political agenda. First, the Commission has made the transition to a climate-neutral economy a priority with the European Green Deal. The European Green Deal will make consistent use of several policy levers: regulation and standardisation, investment and innovation, national reforms, dialogue with social partners and international cooperation.

In the context of the European Green Deal, we agree with the ECB's conclusion that climate-change-related financial stability risks hold the potential to become systemic for the euro area, in particular if markets are not pricing these risks correctly. We will soon launch a consultation on the next steps on the sustainable finance agenda. Our aim is to develop a renewed sustainable finance strategy by early autumn which, among other things, will aim to improve the way climate and environmental risks are managed and integrated into the financial system. We will also establish the EU Green Bond standard and explore how it can increase public and private finance for sustainable investments.

The review of our own economic governance framework will, just like the ECB strategic review, look into the effectiveness of our rules in delivering on its key objectives. Debt sustainability remains important, as financial stability is a precondition for growth and job creation. But we will also encourage broad debate on the framework in order to make it more efficient.

Second, we welcome the call for swift completion of the Capital Markets Union and the Banking Union, including setting up a European deposit insurance scheme. A strong monetary union is key to fostering the international role of the euro. In this respect, we welcome Parliament's encouragement to work with the ECB and all relevant stakeholders on those projects.

The Commission has started technical work on crisis management and insolvency law. This is an important avenue to be further considered to complete our crisis management framework and help make progress towards a steady-state Banking Union.

Third, I would like to underline the importance of our work on payments and crypto-assets. I would like to thank the ECB for their crucial work on payment infrastructure. This is essential to make instant payments in Europe a reality. I also welcome that the ECB and other central banks are looking at the potential of central bank digital currency and are engaging with European payment actors to bring about faster, more efficient and cheaper payments.

I have no doubt that today's debate will be very fruitful, and I trust that you will confirm the constructive engagement that has developed between the European Parliament and the ECB over the past years.

Markus Ferber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Präsidentin, Herr Vizepräsident, liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Zunächst einmal ein ganz herzliches Dankeschön, dass Sie heute zum ersten Mal in Ihrer Funktion als Präsidentin der Europäischen Zentralbank zu uns gekommen sind. Sie lösen damit auch ein Versprechen ein, das Sie uns im Ausschuss für Wirtschaft und Währung gegeben haben, sich nicht nur um die Geldwertstabilität zu kümmern, was ja Ihr Mandat ist, sondern auch einen intensiven Dialog mit der Öffentlichkeit zu führen, und das über diesen Resonanzboden des Europäischen Parlaments. Dafür ein herzliches Dankeschön.

Ihr Vorgänger, der auch regelmäßig hier erschienen ist, hat mit seinen geldpolitischen Maßnahmen sicherlich einen Beitrag dazu geleistet, Zeit zu kaufen, die die Mitgliedstaaten hätten nutzen sollen, um ihrerseits entsprechende Vorbereitungen auch für schwierigere Zeiten zu treffen. Sie haben jetzt angekündigt, eine neue geldpolitische Strategie vorzulegen und zu diskutieren, und ich hoffe, dass in der Phase, in der diese Diskussion innerhalb der Zentralbank stattfindet, geldpolitische Entscheidungen nicht auf Eis gelegt sind, sondern Sie trotzdem in der Lage sind, aktuell zu reagieren, denn Ihr eigener Finanzstabilitätsbericht weist ja mittlerweile doch auf eine Reihe von Problemen hin, mit denen wir es aufgrund dieser langen Phase von niedrigen Zinsen zu tun haben, mit denen wir konfrontiert sind.

Ich bin Ihnen sehr dankbar, dass Sie heute das Thema angesprochen haben, über eine eigene Digitalwährung nachzudenken. Ich sage Ihnen ganz offen: Wir als EVP haben lieber eine Digitalwährung der EZB als eine von Facebook, und in dem Sinne haben Sie unsere Unterstützung.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Jonás Fernández, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor presidente, presidenta, vicepresidente, en primer lugar, quiero agradecer los nuevos prismas, los nuevos aires que la presidenta del BCE ha traído a esta Cámara y ha traído al Banco Central Europeo. Pero me gustaría insistir en que aún estamos lejos de cumplir con el mandato de la institución —que, además, los agregados monetarios, la evolución del crédito, no apuntan hacia el cumplimiento rápido del objetivo de situar la inflación cerca del 2 %— y, por lo tanto, dentro de la independencia de la institución, me gustaría insistir en la necesidad de nuevos instrumentos, de nuevas políticas, para poder situar la inflación cerca de su objetivo.

Por otra parte, me gustaría también recomendarle o pedirle que pida un apoyo sincero desde el lado fiscal para ayudarla a usted a cumplir con el objetivo de inflación. Y celebro el inicio de esa revisión estratégica, que debería ser algo más que un retoque en la metodología del índice de inflación, para introducir nuevos objetivos, nuevos instrumentos, nueva comunicación —como usted quiere— en el trabajo del BCE.

Luis Garicano, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Dombrovskis and to welcome Madame Lagarde. It is really great to have her here.

First of all, I would like to thank Mr Costas Mavrides for his excellent work on the report. As you see in the report, Madame Lagarde, we are worried about the incompleteness of our banking union. I'm glad to hear Mr Dombrovskis say that the Commission's work programme is going to push in this direction.

We share very much the views that you expressed about what the priorities are, Madame Lagarde. We think that the 'doom loop' is alive and well. We think that it is still the case that, if we have a big bank fail, there will only really be states behind that bank and that our construction will not be sufficient. Because we have done a banking union that was supposed to consist of three pillars.

The first pillar, which is supervision, is in place. The second pillar, which is resolution, is kind of in place, but not really in office – 'in office but not in power' I guess is a better way to put it. It is not really acting to resolve most situations and most banks which are failing. The third pillar, as Madame Lagarde has pointed out, the deposit insurance, is not yet there.

We believe that we need a banking union that cuts this knot between the banks and the states. We think that we need this principle of bail-in, rather than bail-out, to be enforced. And that means that the Commission has a lot of work to do.

We will support that work and will really encourage you. We realise that it is politically difficult. I think the Parliament is ready to come behind a solution and I ask Madame Lagarde for your support. And Mr Dombrovskis for your work on this, thank you very much.

Gunnar Beck, *im Namen der ID-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Anwesende, sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin! Mit diesem Jahresbericht huldigt dieses Haus Mario Draghi. Die EZB schaffe Wachstum und Beschäftigung, nur die Inflation müsse steigen, deshalb werde weiter Geld gedruckt. Draghi hat fürwahr mehr Geld gedruckt als irgendwer, irgendwann, irgendwo seit 1925. Die EZB druckte 40 % der Wirtschaftsleistung, Fed und Bank of England nur 25 % und 15 %, und freudiger als Draghi brach noch niemand EU-Recht. 2009 war die Wirtschaft der EU deutlich größer als die US-Wirtschaft. Auch die Finanzkrise traf die USA härter.

Dann kam Draghi, und 2018 hatte die EU weiter mehr Menschen, aber die kleinere Wirtschaft. Die Jugendarbeitslosigkeit in Südeuropa beträgt bis zu 35 % – welch ein Erfolg bei immer weniger Jugendlichen! In Deutschland schmelzen Erspartes und Altersversorgung dahin wie die Gletscher im Sommer. Draghi hinterlässt verbrannte Erde. Wem zum Nutzen? Erstens den Großvermögenden, die weiter das Ihre mehren, und zweitens den unverantwortlichen Regierungen, denn ohne Draghis Negativzinsen könnte sich Frau Merkel ihre Weltrettungsfantasien gar nicht leisten.

Stasys Jakeliūnas, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I'd like to thank Mr Mavrides, the rapporteur, for working and putting together all the different opinions of the different groups, and putting that into a future vision for the ECB and for us here, at Parliament.

Let me highlight a couple points in addition to what was already said.

Madame Lagarde, when we asked you about the Central Bank digital currencies at the ECON hearing, you responded that we need to 'rush slowly' and welcome you elaborating on that here. Mr Dombrovskis also concurred. That means that the importance of this project is well understood, and I think that it will be supported by Parliament here.

The second point I would like to mention is probably the need to renew discussion on the financial sector supervision architecture. It remains very fragmented in the European Union with four models or so being used, and the mandates of the European institutions either overlapping or not very clear. If we are very serious about the banking union, capital markets union, etc., if we want the financial sector – which is a significant part of the economic infrastructure – to work for people, we need to revitalise discussion on that. I would welcome your participation in that discussion too. The European Commission, and we at the European Parliament, would be ready to contribute to revitalising that discussion.

Johan Van Overtveldt, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, Madame Lagarde, I think price stability was and remains the primary objective of the ECB. You cannot have price stability without financial stability; financial stability is a precondition for price stability. Now what do we see in the world and in Europe today? Extreme low interest rates, strongly-reduced credit spreads, softened credit terms, feverish mergers and acquisition activity, high levels of speculative IPOs, spectacular growth of shadow banking, equity valuations totally out of line with historic price-earnings ratios, and USD 15 trillion of negative-yielding debt. I think it's fair to say, if you see those eight developments all together, that financial stability is under a lot of pressure – and that's an understatement. Unconventional monetary policies have been contributing to these developments and so should really be, basically, fundamentally reconsidered.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κυρία Lagarde, σας καλωσορίζουμε στην ολομέλεια, όπως και εσάς, κύριε Dombrovskis. Νομίζω ότι ο μεγάλος ένοχος γι' αυτά που κάνουν το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να ανησυχεί είναι απών από αυτήν τη συζήτηση. Το μεγάλο φρένο σε αυτά που πρέπει να κάνουμε είναι το Συμβούλιο· είναι οι κυβερνήσεις. Εκεί μπλοκάρει η ολοκλήρωση της τραπεζικής ενοποίησης και ο τρίτος πυλώνας, κύριε Garicano· στο Συμβούλιο. Γιατί η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα ζητάει το EDIS, η Επιτροπή το προτείνει και στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο η πλειοψηφία το θέλει. Και ο κίνδυνος δεν είναι μόνον η οικονομική επιβράδυνση. Ο κίνδυνος είναι μια νέα οικονομική κρίση, κυρία Lagarde.

Δέκα χρόνια μετά την κρίση που ξέσπασε στις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες έχουν ανακάμψει και εμείς ακόμη συζητάμε το ενισχυμένο πλαίσιο της οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης που θα βαθύνει την οικονομική πολιτική και τη νομισματική ενοποίηση και θα καταστήσει την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και την ευρωζώνη πιο ισχυρές. Και αυτό λείπει. Όπως λείπουν και τα χρηματοδοτικά μέσα για να υλοποιηθεί το Green Deal. Διότι —και πάλι— το Συμβούλιο θέλει να περικόψει τον οικονομικό προϋπολογισμό για το νέο πολυετές πλαίσιο, σε αντίθεση με το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο που ζητάει περισσότερα χρήματα για να μειωθούν οι ανισότητες, για να επενδύσουμε στην αντιμετώπιση της κλιματικής κρίσης, για να κρατήσουμε την πολιτική συνοχής και για να φύγουμε μπροστά με επενδύσεις στην καινοτομία. Επομένως, η έκθεση του κυρίου Μαυρίδη είναι μια ευκαιρία για να δούμε τι πρέπει να αλλάξει για να συμπαρασύρουμε και αυτούς που βάζουν φρένο.

Márton Gyöngyösi (NI). – Mr President, as the report quite rightly points out, the euro is more than just an economic and monetary instrument. It is a symbolic issue, hence a political project too. But if we want to see the euro as a global reserve currency and stand competition, then we have to deal with the root of the problem, and the root of the weaknesses that are mentioned in the report.

The long-term stability of the euro as a currency depends on whether the European Central Bank can tackle the geographic differences and the structural nature of differences that persist between Member States of the European Union and that manifest themselves in extraordinary wage differences between old and new Member States. These imbalances have a detrimental social effect, not only in growth and in competitiveness but in youth unemployment and in extreme labour migration across the European continent.

As you quite rightly pointed out, Ms Lagarde, not only monetary instruments but fiscal instruments and cohesion policy must be taken into consideration and the fight against corruption must be taken on board to close the wage gap across the Member States of the European Union.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to wholeheartedly thank Ms Lagarde, and congratulate the European Central Bank (ECB) and its new leadership for, may I say, finally taking the climate and environmental risks as economic risks, as financial stability risks and, hopefully, also as systemic risks to be judged by the systemic risk board in the future.

I am very happy to hear that that is going to be reflected in the ECB's strategy review, and I am looking forward to that. I hope that will be reflected in all of the ECB's market operation that these substantial amount of financial flows we have to use either against or for the environment.

Also, I'm glad to hear that the Commission is moving rapidly with the sustainable finance package and a plea for both actors: please ensure that indicators, the metering system and the lifecycle analyses there is harmonised and, overall, used in the same methodology in different institutions so that we duly know what we are doing.

Irene Tinagli (S&D). – Mr President, this report to the European Parliament expresses its support for the ECB's monetary policy and recognises that the measures implemented are consistent with its mandate, and have been decisive in preserving the euro area from deflation and also in contributing to the ongoing economic recovery. I challenge anyone to prove that today we'd be better off had we adopted different policies.

But many of the challenges we face today are new and they require further innovation in the way monetary policy is conducted. Madame Lagarde, you mentioned many of those: climate change, digitalisation… I would also add economic inequalities, especially in certain areas. All of these factors will have a significant structural impact on the way the economy works. They will affect key economic variables, financial stability and the effectiveness of monetary policy.

To fulfil its mandate of delivering price stability, the ECB will better understand how the changing climate, technological innovation and economic inequalities will affect the behaviour of households, firms and financial institutions. The ECB has the analytical capacity and resources to push the frontier of knowledge on these issues and we are definitely keen to do our part.

Stéphanie Yon-Courtin (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, Madame la Présidente Lagarde, merci de votre présence parmi nous; merci, Monsieur le rapporteur, pour votre excellent rapport.

Nous partageons, Madame, vos constats quant à une situation économique en faible croissance et aux nombreux défis qui sont à relever pour l'économie. Représentants directs des citoyens européens, nous constatons toutes ces inquiétudes sur nos territoires. La croissance modérée n'apporte finalement pas l'effet escompté sur les salaires, ni sur la consommation. Les prix du logement dans certaines régions augmentent de façon exponentielle. Plus globalement, le ralentissement de l'activité économique en Chine ou le Brexit risquent de perturber davantage l'économie.

Dans cette période d'incertitude et de transition numérique et écologique, je me réjouis de votre initiative de lancer la révision de la stratégie de politique monétaire de la BCE, qui devra intégrer tous ces changements. De nombreux chantiers sont donc à prendre en compte dans cette feuille de route de la BCE, notamment la réalisation de vrais progrès – bien réels – en matière d'équilibre hommes-femmes dans la nomination aux postes à responsabilité; l'étude de la pertinence d'une monnaie numérique BCE, certes, mais également la surveillance de l'évolution des cryptomonnaies pour lutter plus efficacement contre le blanchiment d'argent dans le financement des territoires; et des efforts visant à conférer une vraie dimension internationale à l'euro et à renforcer son rôle de monnaie de réserve.

Dans l'élaboration de cette stratégie, Madame, je me réjouis de la méthode de dialogue et d'ouverture que vous envisagez, conformément à l'engagement pris lors de votre première audition au Parlement. Je salue enfin, à ce titre, les consultations publiques que vous allez mener, dont la première fin mars à Bruxelles avec la société civile, et j'espère que nous y serons associés.

Hélène Laporte (ID). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, Madame, vous êtes connue pour faire preuve de sagesse en raison de votre habileté à gérer des intérêts contradictoires, un tableau qui est très flatteur, mais qui va être mis à rude épreuve à ce poste de présidente de la BCE, tout d'abord parce que la future revue de la politique monétaire, c'est un petit peu le serpent qui se mord la queue. Pour lutter contre la déflation et le chômage, votre prédécesseur, Mario Draghi, a adopté, en plus de la baisse des taux d'intérêt directeurs, des mesures non conventionnelles. Cette politique présente malheureusement les défauts de ses qualités: les taux d'intérêt négatifs sont nuisibles aux épargnants et favorisent l'émergence de bulles spéculatives, appelant une normalisation de cette politique monétaire, normalisation qui fragilise la reprise économique. Tout d'abord, comment comptez-vous sortir, entre guillemets, de cette impasse?

Par ailleurs, en dépit de votre attachement à l'indépendance la plus totale de la BCE, vous avez déclaré vouloir faire du changement climatique un sujet prioritaire pour répondre aux attentes de la Commission. En somme, une BCE plus verte, mais surtout, il faut l'admettre, plus politisée. Une orientation qui risque pourtant d'outrepasser les statuts de la BCE en empiétant sur les compétences souveraines des États membres. Comment appréhendez-vous cette contradiction?

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Lagarde! Vielen Dank für Ihre Worte hier und gut, Sie hier zu sehen. Ich möchte Sie eigentlich ebenso wie ein Vorredner auch auffordern, sich diesen Bereich der Kryptowährungen und der Chancen der Digitalisierung für neue Zahlungsverkehrsmethoden genau anzuschauen. Eine Zentralbank, die tatsächlich Bürgerinnen und Bürgern über Methoden des Internets und der Digitalwährung direkt Zugang zum Zahlungsverkehr verschafft, kann letztlich dafür sorgen, dass digitale Dienstleistungen billiger werden, und damit etwas in der öffentlichen Hand halten, wo es auch hingehört. Digitale Währungen sind kein Raum für Kriminelle wie heute, wo illegaler Zahlungsverkehr durchgeführt wird, und digitale Währungen gehören auch nicht in die Hand von transnationalen Unternehmen. Daher bieten Sie doch hier einen echten Vorteil für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, indem Sie selber elektronisches Geld auf den Weg bringen, mit der Sicherheit der Zentralbank und den neuen Technologien, die uns zur Verfügung stehen. Ich hoffe, das nehmen Sie mit auf den Weg.

Piernicola Pedicini (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente Lagarde, noi non voteremo a favore di questa risoluzione del Parlamento sulla relazione annuale della BCE perché non bastano le buone intenzioni di voler combattere i cambiamenti climatici per assolvere la BCE dal fallimento nelle azioni di sostegno all'economia reale. Perché non basta la scusa delle incertezze internazionali della Brexit per giustificare il calo improvviso del PIL che c'è stato nell'area euro tra il 2018 e il 2019 ma non in quegli Stati dell'Unione che non hanno adottato l'euro.

Le misure non convenzionali poi sono state l'ennesimo rifinanziamento alle banche, agli istituti bancari, ma le famiglie e le imprese non hanno visto un euro di quel denaro. Denaro che la BCE ha anche prelevato dagli Stati membri più indebitati per distribuirlo agli Stati più ricchi e per darlo alle banche piene di derivati e piene di crediti deteriorati. È per questo che la produzione industriale è calata vertiginosamente in questi anni e adesso la BCE si deve prendere la piena responsabilità di questo fallimento.

Stefan Berger (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Frau Lagarde, ich finde es gut, dass Sie angetreten sind, einen neuen Stil in der EZB zu etablieren, dass Sie die Politik überprüfen wollen und auch neu kommunizieren und besser erklären wollen. Das ist richtig, das ist notwendig, aber wenn sich nach der Überprüfung herausstellt, dass die Politik falsch ist, dann kann sie nicht nur anders kommuniziert werden, sondern sie muss dann auch geändert werden.

Der Bericht zeigt, dass der HVPI – also der Wert, in dem Inflation gemessen wird – 1,2 % für 2019, 1 % für 2020 und 1,5 % für 2021 aufweist. Wenn das so ist, dann werden Sie Ihr Ziel von 2 % nicht erreichen. Und wenn das so ist, dann stellt sich doch die Frage, ob die EZB vielleicht ihr Ziel nicht mal in einen Korridor stellen sollte, denn wir sehen, dass nach einer Dekade Niedrigzinsen insbesondere Staaten wie die Bundesrepublik Deutschland durchaus von negativen Effekten betroffen sind. Wir sind eine Nation von Sparern mit hohen Spareinlagen bei den Banken, und das ist ein schwieriges Problem. Deswegen bitte ich Sie, diesen Punkt in ihre kritische Überprüfung mit einzubeziehen.

Letzter Satz: Die EZB möchte die Bankenunion und die europäische Einlagensicherung vorantreiben. Das ist grundsätzlich in Ordnung, aber bevor man die Einlagensicherung vorantreibt, müssen die Voraussetzungen geschaffen sein. Man schließt keine Feuerversicherung mit einem Partner ab, dessen Haus schon brennt. Ich bitte Sie, dass Sie auch das berücksichtigen.

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, como este Parlamento já reconheceu, a intervenção do Banco Central Europeu, sob a liderança de Mário Draghi, foi essencial para corrigir os erros iniciais de resposta à crise, salvar o euro e ajudar a economia europeia a recuperar da grande recessão.

Hoje, com a nova liderança da Sr.ª Lagarde, há ventos novos, designadamente uma revisão estratégica importante para alinhar a política do BCE com os objetivos de combate às alterações climáticas e o Pacto Verde, sem prejuízo do seu mandato. Mas se o que está a mudar é importante, não menos importante é o que se mantém: uma política monetária de estímulo à economia que continua a ser necessária com o atual abrandamento económico e a necessidade de cumprir as metas de inflação confiadas ao BCE.

Enquanto os governos com margem de manobra orçamental se recusarem a contribuir com uma política orçamental mais expansionista é de uma política monetária expansionista que a zona euro continua a precisar.

Engin Eroglu (Renew). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin Lagarde, sehr geehrter Herr Dombrovskis, liebe Kollegen! Ich möchte bei dem Bericht einen Fokus legen, und zwar ist das das Bargeld. Sie, Frau Lagarde, haben in letzter Zeit sehr oft darüber gesprochen, dass Sie das Vertrauen der Bürger gewinnen wollen. Das habe ich mir zu Herzen genommen und möchte Ihnen da gerne etwas auf den Weg mitgeben: Die Bürger in der Europäischen Union haben Angst vor der Abschaffung des Bargelds. Die Abschaffung des 500-Euro-Scheins ist sozusagen ein Indiz dafür. Dadurch verlieren die Bürger weiter an Vertrauen in die Europäische Union. Bargeld ist jedoch ein wichtiges Zeichen von Freiheit und Unabhängigkeit. Hinzu kommt, dass Bargeld vor Negativzinsen geschützt ist. Daher war es für mich wichtig, die Beibehaltung des Bargelds als Position des Parlaments hervorzuheben, und ich habe einen Änderungsantrag gestellt, der nunmehr auch in Nummer 75 in diesem Papier dargestellt ist. Ich möchte Ihnen gerne mitgeben, dass Sie den Bürgern sozusagen die Gewissheit geben, das Bargeld zu erhalten als vertrauensbildende Maßnahme, und aber auch, um Unabhängigkeit und Freiheit der Bürger zu gewährleisten.

Antonio Maria Rinaldi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Presidente Lagarde, dalla lettura delle relazioni annuali della BCE vi è il costante elogio dei tassi negativi come la migliore strategia per il rilancio dell'economia dell'eurozona.

Non crede invece che il perdurare di questa politica di tassi negativi abbia avuto come effetto deleterio quello di aver messo in ginocchio le banche commerciali, il vero motore propulsivo per le piccole e medie imprese oltre che per le famiglie, riducendo ai minimi i margini d'intermediazione, quindi lo stimolo a concedere credito, paradossalmente invece favorendo le banche d'affari, proprio quelle a più forte operatività speculativa?

Inoltre, non crede che, dopo le operazioni straordinarie come il QE, che hanno aumentato il bilancio della Banca centrale europea a più di 4,65 trilioni di euro facendo esplodere la massa monetaria M3 senza tuttavia né raggiungere, se non marginalmente, l'economia reale né il *target* inflativo, ottenendo uno stato di deflazione permanente, sia arrivato il momento di prendere in considerazione strategie da «*Helicopter money*» per rilanciare i consumi, visto i dati catastrofici delle produzioni industriali registrati nell'eurozona?

Frances Fitzgerald (PPE). – Mr President, I would like to welcome Madame Lagarde. Last week in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON), you said that more attention should be given to the cost of housing and home ownership when it comes to the European Central Bank (ECB) inflation measure.

I want to welcome those comments. We just had an election in Ireland where the cost of housing was one of the main issues that dominated voters' intentions. Serious advances have been made to address the problems but in Dublin, for example, rental prices have doubled since 2010 and property prices have gone up 85% since 2013. I think one should be putting more focus on the fact that house prices and rent rises are increasing rapidly across Europe and I think that we need to have more diverse financial instruments to deal with this. It goes back to a very important remark that you made yourself before you were appointed President of the ECB. You said the ECB needs to understand and explain to people not only the markets.

I think if we are to rebuild trust with citizens, I think your consultation project in the Member States is very important. I see that as really democracy building, very important, but I think the housing issue is crucial because if we want to keep in touch with our citizens, we need to understand properly and account for the serious issues that they face in society. I think that we really need to look at this. It's an emerging serious social and economic issue across many, many Member States and I think it's one where you and the ECB could have a very crucial role to play in terms of leadership and understanding and looking at alternative solutions.

Alfred Sant (S&D). – Mr President, congratulations to my friend Costas Mavrides on an excellent report. I would also like to focus on an area which merits greater attention in my view, but from a different perspective to what has been done up to now, namely the situation of banks, big and small, in the eurozone.

We are underestimating how difficult the situation has become. Discussion of the subject is constrained because many would not like it to sound as an attack on the ECB's monetary easing policies. True. So long as fiscal policy is not being deployed to bolster economic growth, such policies remain essential, and I agree with that. But, they're also causing collateral damage to banks.

Other very significant factors are adding to the damage, like an overload of regulations raising operational costs. Yet, while the Capital Markets Union is being promoted in Europe, the reliance on banks for business financing has grown. Banks are curtailing their services to cut costs and to remain profitable, with negative economic and social consequences.

It is illusory to hope that this will lead to the emergence of European champions in the banking sector. If eurozone banks retract their capillary outreach in national economies, citizens and SMEs – but not only they – will suffer.

Roman Haider (ID). – Herr Präsident! Der vorliegende Bericht ist gelinde gesagt eine Verhöhnung des Europäischen Parlaments. Dieser Bericht ist geradezu ein Paradebeispiel für Schönfärberei einerseits und Vertuschung andererseits. Das leichte Wirtschaftswachstum in der Eurozone wird als Ergebnis der fatalen Niedrigzinspolitik dargestellt, obwohl es dafür überhaupt keine Anhaltspunkte gibt. Die enormen Verluste, die die Sparer in der Eurozone erleiden müssen – kein Wort in diesem Bericht. Die immer höheren Risiken, die institutionelle Anleger, wie etwa die Pensionskassen, nehmen müssen – nicht in diesem Bericht. Die Überhitzung der Finanzmärkte durch die lockere Geldpolitik – nicht in diesem Bericht. Die durch die Geldpolitik verursachte steigende soziale Ungleichheit – kein Wort dazu in diesem Bericht. Die durch die Geldpolitik verursachten ausufernden Staatsschulden in der Eurozone – kein Wort in diesem Bericht. Mich erinnert dieser Bericht an die Berichte im kommunistischen Ostblock. Darin stand auch immer nur das, was die Parteiführung wollte, und wozu das geführt hat, das wissen wir alle sattsam.

Aurore Lalucq (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je remercie Mme Lagarde d'être avec nous.

Vous avez choisi, Madame, de poursuivre une politique monétaire dite d'assouplissement quantitatif pour soutenir l'activité économique, et nous sommes nombreux dans cette maison à avoir reçu cette annonce avec un certain soulagement car, du fait des égoïsmes nationaux et de l'idéologie dominante sur ce continent, nous n'avons malheureusement toujours pas de budget réel, ce qui est absolument incroyable et inconcevable pour la première puissance économique mondiale. Mais cette situation fait que beaucoup repose sur vos épaules et que votre politique doit être parfaite.

Nous avons entendu énormément d'avancées dans votre discours, mais il manque encore un point, qui est celui de la spéculation. Sur ce point, je reste sur ma faim. Nous savons que les politiques d'assouplissement quantitatif ces dernières années ont certes soutenu l'économie réelle – il fallait le faire –, mais qu'elles ont aussi engendré une hypertrophie de la sphère financière, et je voudrais savoir ce que la Banque centrale européenne compte concrètement faire pour lutter contre la spéculation.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Mr President, I would like to welcome Ms Lagarde. A fresh wind is blowing through the ECB. No public spats, but a constructive dialogue: how can we prop up eurozone growth? How can the ECB stop funding polluting activities? How can we promote gender equality among ECB decision-makers? And of course, every new job starts with credit, and the trick is: don't waste it.

That is why, Ms Lagarde, I call upon you to make real progress now that you can. The ECB needs to get in gear to implement the EU taxonomy and avoid activities that do 'significant harm'. Besides, you should encourage governments to invest substantially in sustainability, reaping the benefits of the low interest rate and pushing that rate upwards, and in that way restore the full potential of monetary policy. Continue confidently along this path, Ms Lagarde, and I have no doubt that the male central bankers will dance to your tune.

Agnès Evren (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, le rapport annuel sur la Banque centrale européenne 2018 que nous voterons demain en séance plénière sera le premier document que nous vous transmettrons au nom du Parlement européen. J'espère que ces recommandations permettront de servir de base pour un dialogue fréquent avec notre commission des affaires économiques et monétaires.

Dans ce rapport, nous évoquons notamment les enjeux auxquels seront confrontées nos économies, et donc la Banque centrale européenne, dans les années à venir. En janvier, à Davos, lors du Forum économique mondial, vous avez notamment évoqué la nécessité de renforcer la cyber-résilience en Europe. Dans le top 5 des risques mondiaux pour 2020, une cyberattaque de grande ampleur aurait des conséquences considérables pour l'économie européenne.

Il est donc plus urgent que jamais de renouveler l'architecture de coopération européenne et internationale en la matière. Nous devons élaborer des stratégies communes et déployer des efforts coordonnés pour faire face aux risques créés par la transformation numérique.

L'acceptation des risques auxquels nous sommes confrontés est une première étape, mais la prochaine doit être l'action. Nous devons garantir la résistance des infrastructures des marchés financiers et promouvoir la coopération en la matière entre les banques de la zone euro. Je sais, Madame Lagarde, pouvoir compter sur votre fermeté et votre implication pour relever ce défi.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Γεώργιος Κύρτσος (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταρχήν να ευχαριστήσω τον κύριο Μαυρίδη και όσους συνεργάστηκαν μαζί του για την πολύ καλή έκθεσή του, και να ευχηθώ στην κυρία Lagarde να έχει παρεμβάσεις εξαιρετικά σημαντικές —ακόμα πιο σημαντικές και από εκείνες του κυρίου Draghi— στην πορεία της. Θα ήθελα να προσθέσω δύο ερωτήσεις —σε έναν βομβαρδισμό ερωτήσεων, βέβαια.

Η πρώτη έχει σχέση με το ελληνικό τραπεζικό σύστημα. Ξέρουμε ότι από το 2018 η κατάστασή του έχει γίνει καλύτερη, αλλά θα ήθελα αν μπορεί συνοπτικά να μας πει δυο πράγματα, δηλαδή προς ποια κατεύθυνση πρέπει να κινηθούμε και πόσο γρήγορα. Υπάρχει και ένα δεύτερο θέμα, το οποίο είναι ευρύτερου ενδιαφέροντος και τέθηκε από συναδέλφους που προηγήθηκαν. Είναι φανερό ότι για να πάμε στην πράσινη μετάβαση χρειαζόμαστε πρόσθετες επενδύσεις και, όπως έλεγε ο Draghi και το 2018 αλλά και γενικότερα, πρέπει να βελτιώσουμε τη σύνθεση των δημοσίων δαπανών ώστε να τις κάνουμε περισσότερο ποιοτικές και —αν είναι δυνατόν— επενδυτικές. Θα ήθελα λοιπόν κάποιο σχόλιο και από την κυρία Lagarde.

Margarida Marques (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, parabéns Mavrides pelo teu relatório, obrigada Senhora Lagarde. Todos sabemos que precisamos de progressos significativos na união bancária e no mercado de capitais. Até hoje esses progressos têm sido lentos e muito limitados. O terceiro pilar da União Bancária está longe de estar finalizado. Um papel fortalecido do euro precisa, antes de tudo, de vontade política. Há que completar a união económica e monetária como um instrumento orçamental capaz de responder a choques exógenos e com *safe assets*.

O BCE precisa de ter um papel fundamental neste debate, como precisa de ter um papel fundamental no combate às alterações climáticas. O BCE tem que trabalhar com as restantes instituições europeias e com os seus pares para fortalecer o papel do euro como moeda de reserva, nomeadamente nas instâncias internacionais onde está presente.

Billy Kelleher (Renew). – Mr President, just to say at the outset, Madame Lagarde, I want to raise the issue of the Stability and Growth Pact and the restrictive practice that it has on European economies and their ability to invest in both the Green Deal, but in just normal fiscal stimulus that is required to stimulate the broader economies of the European Union.

And I think in that context, the EU Commission is carrying out a review of the Stability and Growth Pact in the near future, and I'm wondering whether or not the ECB will have an official role in observing that particular review and having input into that particular review. Because we have to accept that if we want to create a dynamic European economy, I believe that the Stability and Growth Pact is too restrictive on the ability of governments to invest in the economic aspects of economies across the eurozone.

Finally, I would ask that you would also look at Irish banks and the interest rates that they are charging for mortgages and small and medium-sized businesses. Bearing in mind we're in the eurozone and our banks are charging two to three times the interest rates that the rest of Europe pays in mortgages and lending to small and medium-sized businesses.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, como aqui foi reconhecido, as prolongadas medidas não convencionais de política monetária não têm sido suficientes por si só para travar a pronunciada desaceleração económica, além de que tendem a esgotar o seu alcance.

Não sabemos quando virá o próximo pico da crise, mas sabemos que encontrará as economias da periferia da zona euro tão desprotegidas como há uma década. Com um elevado endividamento, ele próprio uma consequência da moeda única, e esgotado o alcance das medidas não convencionais ficará exposta, mais exposta, toda a sua vulnerabilidade, a vulnerabilidade destes países, presos na armadilha do euro, armadilha que impõe políticas, designadamente no plano orçamental, que trava o crescimento, esmaga o investimento e os salários, degrada o aparelho produtivo e os serviços públicos. Os mesmos que dizem ser necessária uma política orçamental favorável ao crescimento tudo fazem para impor o obstinado cumprimento de um pacto de estabilidade em versão revista e reforçada.

Eis a armadilha do euro. Dizem que é preciso aprofundá-la. O que é necessário, porém, é desmontá-la.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la strada verso una Unione economica e monetaria più solida è piena di questioni ancora irrisolte. Questioni che richiedono sforzi da parte di tutti per la loro soluzione. Dopo alcuni progressi timidi registrati durante la crisi, il ritmo delle riforme è totalmente rallentato. Alcuni progetti, anche se fra i meno controversi, sono stati attuati, ma una proposta fondamentale per completare l'unione bancaria come il sistema europeo di assicurazione universale dei depositi fatica ancora a procedere.

Data la persistente vulnerabilità dell'Eurozona e il completamento dell'EDIS, un pezzo fondamentale per garantire i risparmiatori con un rafforzamento delle misure di riduzione dei rischi, restano una necessità per l'Unione. Andando avanti con l'EDIS potremmo ridurre la frammentazione finanziaria, garantendo un ruolo più ampio ai capitali privati nell'ammortizzare gli shock economici e finanziari.

Ma voglio ribadirlo: insistere solo sulla riduzione del rischio come condizione preliminare per il lancio dell'EDIS è sbagliato. Non si può cercare di ridurre il rischio mettendo ponderazione, ad esempio, sui titoli di Stato. Sarebbe assurdo. Lasceremo un sistema finanziario europeo più fragile e sottoposto all'influenza dei contingenti. Dobbiamo agire subito, il prezzo da pagare sarebbe terribile per rimanere immobili.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, first of all, it is good to see Madame Lagarde here. I congratulate her on her appointment. And, indeed, herself and her predecessor Mr Draghi are to be congratulated on keeping the euro afloat and keeping the European economy in a stable position. Having said that, I want to ask one question in particular.

We have had an election in Ireland and one of the big issues there was in relation to housing. Mr Kelleher referred to the interest rates, but not only the interest rates, but also the rules of borrowing. We have a situation now where people who are well educated, with very good jobs, cannot afford to buy a house.

There are other issues in relation to the supply of housing, but even where the supply is available, this is causing a huge concern for them. And many people are now living with their parents because, while having been well educated, as I said, good jobs, well paid, they cannot afford to buy a house because of the rules implemented by our banks.

Can she offer some leeway in that regard and some hope to those people that what was the norm in the past can apply in the future – you have a good job, you can buy a house?

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, señora presidenta Lagarde, vicepresidente Dombrovskis, yo, en primer lugar, quiero trasladar mi apoyo al informe que ha preparado Costas Mavrides, del Grupo Socialista. Creo que es muy completo y contiene los elementos esenciales.

Quizás un elemento adicional, en la línea de lo que también ha señalado el portavoz en la materia del Grupo Socialista, el señor Fernández, es la consideración de nuevos instrumentos. Yo creo que es evidente que, solamente con los tipos ultrabajos y con el programa de compras, va a ser difícil conseguir el objetivo. Es verdad que se necesita el apoyo fiscal, pero el objetivo de inflación del Banco Central Europeo es incondicional; debe tender, debe cumplir su mandato, de manera incondicional.

Tal vez este instrumento, a su consideración, podría ser una transferencia directa a los hogares de la eurozona para impulsar el consumo y alcanzar de esta manera el objetivo de cerca pero debajo del 2 %.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Executive Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, this debate has demonstrated that there is a large convergence of views on most aspects of the report and I'm very pleased to see the common ground emerging from the views of the three institutions.

Let me conclude by mentioning the point directly concerning the Commission. Your last report encouraged the Commission and the ECB to study schemes such as a central bank digital currency and digital base money and to liaise closely. Like many central banks and institutions, the Commission and the ECB are now analysing the potential benefits and challenges associated with these schemes. Further work is needed, but these examples show that the three institutions – and this includes the European Parliament – can fruitfully interact in respect of their respective roles. So we count on your continued support in building the foundations for sustainable growth in Europe.

Der Präsident. – Ich darf nun die Präsidentin der Europäischen Zentralbank, Frau Lagarde, ersuchen und ihr gleichzeitig für die nette Aufnahme der Mitglieder des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung gestern in Frankreich und die sehr offene, konstruktive Aussprache danken.

Christine Lagarde, *President of the European Central Bank.* – Mr President, I didn't know that you had to be standing to address this Assembly, so I offer my apologies for not having done so in the first place and therefore I will align with the rule that you seem to have amongst you. I would like to first of all thank you very much for this dialogue that we had. It's very much part of what we at the European Central Bank, and more broadly within the euro system, want to actually have with public opinions, with civil society representatives, but more importantly, with those who represent the citizens of Europe: that is you, Members of Parliament, who have been elected by them. This is very much part of the accountability that we have towards you and, through you, to the citizens of Europe. We have conducted a few changes in the last few months, but certainly one of those that I very much look forward to implementing as we go into the strategy review that has been approved last month, is the constant dialogue that we need to have, and what we have called the outreach with you and, through you, with the citizens of Europe. So thank you for that.

I thought I would just touch on some items of our strategy review to address some of the points that you have made. First of all, some of you have touched on the monetary policy and the current components of the instruments that we use in order to implement our policy and have been doing so since 2014. To those who argue that this monetary policy, and particularly its unconventional tools, have been counterproductive, I would very strongly encourage them to look at the impact that those unconventional tools have had on the economy – in which way it has actually increased growth and helped our economies around Europe and the euro area in particular to fare better than it would have had it not been for those instruments that were used as part of the unconventional policy.

It's obviously very difficult to quantify carefully and precisely by how much growth has been lifted in the euro area, but our models actually indicate that that growth has been probably higher by a margin of about 2.5% to 3% ever since those policies were put in place. In the same vein, it has contributed to inflation which, as you know, ever since the euro was put in place and ever since the strategy was revisited in 2003, is measured with reference to inflation, and clearly those unconventional tools that have been used since 2014 have helped inflation go up a bit. Well, certainly we would have liked it a lot more than that, and maybe this would have been the case if other tools had been used in conjunction with our monetary policy. But be it as it was, certainly inflation has increased by a factor of about half a percentage point probably, which is certainly not bad, given the level where we are. To those who were mentioning, by the way, that inflation was hovering around 1%, I would simply remind you that in January inflation was at about 1.3%, which is certainly not the goal that we have, but certainly a bit more than the 1% that was mentioned.

Those unconventional tools that were used and the instruments that were deployed helped our economies and continue to help our economies. When you look at the volume and the number of new financing that are put in place for the real economy, whether it's the corporate or whether it's the households, we are seeing clearly financing that is very low in terms of cost, and I take the point that you made, sir, about the Irish banks and how much they charge and what interest rates they include, and we'll look into that for sure. But the cost of financing has been low and lower for the real economy. And number two, the volume of financing of the economy has increased and has continued to increase. You will have seen some comments recently about the fact that this continuum is slowing down. Yes, it is a little bit – for the corporate, not for the households – but it is continuing to grow nonetheless. So I would contend that, in the main, it has had a very positive effect on our economies, and as part of our strategy review, we'll look at how much and how effective it has been. But we will also look, as some of you have mentioned, to the potential side effects and to the accumulated side effects that it could have on citizens and on the economies as well. So that will be very much part and parcel of our review.

The second point that I would like to emphasise briefly, and I've focused on the monetary policy tools and how we will look at them and measure them and measure the benefits as well as the negative effect, is climate change. Nobody can ask the European Central Bank to substitute what governments should do and what policies should be in general. As former managing director of the IMF, I think I'd be remiss not to remind all of us that one of the key tools in relation to climate change is clearly the proper pricing of carbon, and this is not something that a European Central Bank or any central bank in the world can actually decide. So as we go through our strategy review, we will determine where and how the issue of climate change and the fight against climate change can actually have an impact on our policies, whether it's in relation to our price stability primary objective and how it impacts this primary objective, or whether it's in relation to the management of risk that we are accountable to our European citizens and to you when we look at the composition of our portfolios and the one that we manage, and whether or not risks are actually properly priced and whether the climate change risks associated with some of the collateral that we have in our portfolios, for instance, are measured or not. So in that respect, climate change will be one of the items that we will take into account, together with the more traditional aspects that we will be measuring, and it's in the context of that strategy review, Mr Vice-President, that we will continue this dialogue, not only with you, but also with the Committee on Economic and

Monetary Affairs (ECON). The president of ECON was here and many members of the Committee are present in this room. We will continue to engage: we will have that dialogue, and we want that very much to be a two-way street.

Now, I offer our apologies to those who had very specific questions on particular countries, but I propose to take that up bilaterally with those who are interested in specific countries or banks going forward.

Der Präsident. – Ich kann Ihnen nur persönlich und im Interesse der Europäischen Union und im globalen Interesse für Ihre Arbeit alles erdenklich Gute wünschen.

Costas Mavrides, *Rapporteur.* – Mr President, I too will be brief. I'd like to note two points. Madame Lagarde, today you have seen that in the European Parliament we can have different views. And a thing about the past, about Mr Draghi. Mr Draghi might not have been perfect, but his legacy was that he was determined to save the eurozone, and in fact I would say that maybe he has also saved the European project. Some people cannot forgive him for that.

As far as today is concerned, though, you rightly said in your initial statement that we basically share the same view about challenges, and I would add that even Mr Dombrovskis and to some extent the Commission shares that same view.

That's why I would add to that, though, that certain elements, just like what you noted before, are missing. I think that the major challenge for all of us is to deliver – to deliver to the European citizens and to improve their lives in certain specific ways – completion of the Banking Union, completion of the Capital Markets Union, and much more. Therefore it is up to you, Madame Lagarde, and we are going to support you in striving towards a real convergence of the economies. Thank you for being here today with us.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 12. Februar 2020, statt.

9. Нарушение на Решение 2017/2074 на Съвета относно ограничителни мерки с оглед на положението във Венесуела — незаконно влизане на територията на държава — членка на ЕС, на включено в списъка със санкции лице (разискване)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Rates und der Kommission zu dem Verstoß gegen den Beschluss (GASP) 2017/2074 des Rates über restriktive Maßnahmen angesichts der Lage in Venezuela – Illegale Einreise einer in der Sanktionsliste genannten Person in das Hoheitsgebiet eines EU-Mitgliedstaats (2020/2564(RSP)).

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, the current subject of debate concerns an alleged breach of European Union sanctions currently in force vis-à-vis Venezuela. These were put in place in 2017 as part of the European Union's efforts to foster a credible and meaningful process that can lead to a peaceful, negotiated solution for the reinstatement of democracy and the rule of law in Venezuela.

These measures include a travel ban and asset freeze regarding 25 individuals, among them the Vice-President of Venezuela, Delcy Eloína Rodríguez Gómez, included on this list having been designated by the European Union on 25 June 2018. A travel ban requires the European Union Member States to take the necessary measures to prevent the entry into, or transit through, their territories by the listed persons.

As you know, there is a division of competences in the area of sanctions within the European Union. First of all, Member States are responsible in all cases for the implementation and verification of sanctions adopted by the European Union in their own jurisdictions. Member States, I repeat, are responsible in all cases for the implementation and verification of sanctions adopted by the European Union. Therefore, when the issue of a possible violation of sanctions arises, for example an assets freeze or, as here, a travel ban, it is for the Member States concerned to investigate and determine whether this has in fact been the case.

With regard to the wider oversight of the implementation of sanctions, the Commission has an overall monitoring role concerning the uniform application of such measures in an area with these competences. For example, this is the case for asset freeze and sectoral measures, but it is not the case for travel bans or arms embargoes. We can discuss the political appropriateness for Member States to give this competence to the European Union, although this would require a treaty change. But the situation, for the time being, is clear. The Commission cannot initiate any infringement procedure regarding a possible travel ban violation. Travel bans are, in practice, only contained in Council decisions and they do not therefore fall under Union law. Consequently, the Commission does not play a role in monitoring the implementation and cannot initiate an infringement procedure.

As High Representative, talking here from the side of the Council, I am also responsible for ensuring the consistent application of the common foreign and security policy, including sanctions adopted by Member States in Council. In this context, the European External Action Service, in consultation with the European Union, where competent, would be directly in touch with the European Union Member States regarding alleged violations in order to ensure that these sanctions are being applied in a homogenous way in all Member States.

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

Dolors Montserrat, *en nombre del Grupo PPE.* – Señor presidente, Venezuela y la política venezolana han venido a España de la mano de Iglesias y Monedero. No son mis palabras, sino las de Pedro Sánchez, actual presidente del Gobierno de España. Las dijo en el año 2016, y ahora sabemos que para él no era una crítica, sino un elogio. Hoy, Iglesias es el vicepresidente de su gobierno y la política chavista ensucia la imagen de su gobierno.

El Gobierno de Sánchez es quien ha abierto las puertas de Europa al chavismo, porque un ministro socialista, José Luis Ábalos, se reunió con la vicepresidenta del dictador Maduro, Delcy Rodríguez, en territorio español, en suelo europeo, vulnerando el régimen de sanciones que la Unión Europea impone a un régimen totalitario, que pisotea los derechos humanos.

El Gobierno de Sánchez no solo ha incumplido. El Gobierno de Sánchez miente. Cualquier nueva versión sobre el encuentro convierte en mentira la anterior. Ha perdido toda la credibilidad y deben ser las instituciones europeas las que investiguen la verdad.

El venezolano es un pueblo hermano para el español. Por los millones de venezolanos pisoteados por el déspota Maduro, por los millones de venezolanos que han huido de su país, necesitamos conocer la verdad y que se cumpla el régimen de sanciones.

Los españoles y el resto de los europeos, este Parlamento, siempre hemos alzado la voz en defensa de la libertad de Venezuela. Por ello, pedimos al Consejo de la Unión Europea que investigue lo ocurrido, que ayude a esclarecer la verdad y que nunca más se repita un escándalo que avergüenza a Europa.

(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 171, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Cristina Maestre Martín De Almagro (S&D), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul».* – Señor presidente, quisiera preguntarle a la señora Montserrat si ve procedente utilizar el Parlamento Europeo como instrumento para atacar al Gobierno de España, incluso sabiendo que esta Cámara no tiene competencias en lo que usted está trasladando. Si la respuesta es que sí es procedente, tal vez algunos grupos políticos se vean tentados a llevar otros asuntos de interés nacional, sobre los que muchos ciudadanos quieren saber, como, por ejemplo, que por primera vez dos presidentes del Gobierno, Aznar y Rajoy, hayan sido llamados… *(el presidente retira la palabra a la oradora).*

Dolors Montserrat (PPE), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul».* – Como siempre, cortinas de humo. La campaña contra España es la que hacen ustedes, abriendo las puertas de Europa al chavismo. Ustedes lo saben, han incumplido el régimen de sanciones. Ustedes han mentido, expliquen el porqué. Ustedes han perdido toda la credibilidad y pretenden que todos los españoles perdamos toda la credibilidad detrás de ustedes. Por tanto, les pedimos que ustedes sean los que se alejen del populismo y del chavismo y que realmente defiendan a Europa, hoy, aquí.

Javier Moreno Sánchez, *en nombre del Grupo S&D.* – Señor presidente, señorías, Dolors, Jordi, en este debate nueve de los diez oradores somos españoles. A los promotores de esta iniciativa les pregunto —además el hemiciclo está casi vacío—: ¿Siguen pensando que este es un debate europeo? ¿No estarán haciendo el ridículo? ¿Piensan seguir utilizando esta Cámara para hacer oposición desleal al Gobierno de España?

Señorías del PPE, de Ciudadanos y de Vox, ustedes son unos irresponsables y unos desleales que están dañando gravemente la imagen de España en este Parlamento. Ustedes no han pensado ni un minuto en el pueblo venezolano, que lo que espera de nosotros es apoyo, diálogo, unidad, y no división y confrontación.

El Gobierno de España ha actuado y actúa como interlocutor reconocido por el Gobierno y la oposición venezolana para conseguir una solución política, democrática y negociada, que conduzca a unas elecciones libres y justas. Y, en ese momento, en ese momento, el Parlamento Europeo actuará enviando una misión electoral.

Por favor, aprendan a trabajar en esta casa y no hagan el ridículo.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 171, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL), *blue-card question.* – Mr President, I would like to put a question to the last speaker. He says that the European Union is doing the right thing by recognising Spain's position here. I have no problem with Spain's position on this, but I have had a big problem with Spain's position on a lot of aspects in relation to Venezuela, and in particular to the Europeans' attitude. Do you not agree that the recognition of Guaidó is an absolute embarrassment to anyone who has to occupy this Chamber and it is a disgrace on the part of the Member States of Europe that so many of them have recognised an unelected gobshite?

Javier Moreno Sánchez (S&D), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul».* – Señor presidente, brevemente -creo que ya lo he dicho- el Gobierno socialista de España es coherente. Lo que queremos es buscar una solución con todos los venezolanos. La diferencia es que nosotros buscamos el diálogo y no la confrontación y la división. Solo se podrán encontrar soluciones —porque el pueblo de Venezuela está sufriendo— si unimos a los venezolanos y no los dividimos, y por eso el Gobierno de España está haciendo todo lo posible para buscar una solución -como he dicho- negociada, pactada, democrática, y que le permita… *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Moreno Sánchez.

Herr Kollege Wallace: Ich rufe Sie für die Verwendung des Begriffs „Dreckskerl“ zur Ordnung.

Jordi Cañas, *en nombre del Grupo Renew.* – Señor presidente, va a ser complicado sobrevolar el barro socialista, pero lo voy a intentar.

A mí, señor Borrell, me hubiera gustado que usted hubiera intervenido como alto representante y no como exministro de Asuntos Exteriores del Gobierno del señor Sánchez. Y le explicaré el porqué. Pues porque este no es un debate nacional. Este es un debate sobre la legitimidad, la credibilidad de la política exterior europea y sobre el respeto a esta Cámara. Yo no sé cómo respetan esta Cámara trayendo aquí este chapapote. Sinceramente, lo lamento muchísimo, lo lamento muchísimo.

Porque el respeto a esta Cámara significa respetar lo que impulsa. Y esta Cámara, por ejemplo, ha pedido redoblar los esfuerzos, redoblar las sanciones contra el régimen de Nicolás Maduro —con su voto, quiero recordar—. Por lo tanto, cuando un Estado miembro decide violar las Resoluciones de esta Cámara está faltando a la legitimidad que tiene esta Cámara y el conjunto de sus instituciones.

¿Cómo van a confiar los demás en la Unión Europea cuando ni los Estados miembros respetan las decisiones adoptadas por esta Cámara y sus instituciones? Tenemos que recordar que esas Resoluciones nos obligan a todos, también a los Estados miembros, al Consejo y, perdone, a la Comisión. Porque la Comisión tiene el rol de velar para que los incumplimientos se sancionen. Es evidente que el Gobierno de España ha faltado a la verdad, es evidente que ha incumplido la decisión adoptada por esta Cámara.

Lo que es evidente es que la Comisión no ha hecho nada. Y es muy sencillo. ¿Notificó el Gobierno al Consejo la excepción al Gobierno del señor Maduro? No, no lo hizo. ¿Está ese documento al alcance de los ciudadanos? No, no lo está. Y a usted no le preocupa… *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege.

Sie haben nicht mehr das Wort, Herr Kollege Cañas.

Ich weise darauf hin, dass es meine ständige Praxis ist, Kollegen, denen ich wegen überzogener Redezeit das Wort entzogen habe, keine „blaue Karte“ zuzugestehen.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE.* – Señor presidente, no hay caso europeo, porque la aplicación de las sanciones y de la decisión del Consejo es una competencia nacional. Lo que hay es que se ha traído aquí un debate que debería estarse produciendo en el Congreso de los Diputados. Y yo quiero pedir perdón al conjunto de señorías por haber ocupado una parte del debate del Parlamento Europeo con un debate que, básicamente, estamos manteniendo nueve españoles entre nosotros, y creo que es bastante lamentable.

Tengo que decir, además, de forma muy honesta, que creo que, haciendo este tipo de cosas, degradamos la imagen de la delegación española en esta casa, y me parece que no deberíamos hacer este tipo de ejercicios —de verdad lo digo y lo digo con toda sinceridad—. Y después me gustaría trasladar un mensaje a los diputados europeos de Renew y del Partido Popular Europeo que hoy no han venido —la gran mayoría, algunos sí; a los que están les respeto mucho— y, en cambio, el lunes decidieron votar celebrar este debate.

¿Qué vamos a hacer a partir de ahora? ¿Cada vez que en algún Estado miembro haya un debate de política nacional vamos a traerlo aquí? ¿En qué vamos a convertir esta Cámara? Yo pido un poco de respeto y de responsabilidad por los trabajos muy serios e importantes que tenemos que hacer aquí, en esta casa.

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Urtasun.

Ich will das noch einmal erläutern, weil Rückfragen kamen. Es gehört zu meiner ständigen Praxis, dass ich einen Redner, dem ich das Wort entzogen habe, weil er die Redezeit überschritten hat, nicht damit belohne, dass ich ihm eine Frage zukommen lasse.

Und ich werde auch, Herr Kollege Cañas, Ihre „blaue Karte“ jetzt nicht zulassen.

Hermann Tertsch, *en nombre del Grupo ECR.* – Señor presidente, la verdad es que tiene guasa, señor Borrell, que nosotros —el Parlamento, la Comisión, el Consejo—, que estamos haciendo injerencias permanentemente en todas partes, resulta que es una injerencia que reaccionemos a la violación de una decisión de la Unión Europea de imponer sanciones a una serie de criminales que gobiernan en esa mafia comunista y narcotraficante de Venezuela. Tiene guasa que ante eso resulta que nosotros no podemos hacer nada, cuando nos estamos metiendo en la educación de los húngaros, nos estamos metiendo en la justicia de los polacos, etcétera, etcétera.

Y, por otra parte, por Dios, no digamos que esto es un debate español. Esto es un debate sobre el respeto de las reglas de la Unión Europea, que han sido violadas groseramente por un gobierno socialcomunista que tenemos en España desde hace un mes y que ya ha hecho una cita clandestina con un régimen criminal en territorio español, quién sabe para qué, quién sabe con qué condiciones y quién sabe con qué razones oscuras.

Idoia Villanueva Ruiz, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL.* – Señor presidente, miren, es absolutamente grotesco e irresponsable el uso que se hace, una y otra vez, del pueblo de Venezuela. Solo les deja en evidencia —bastante poco les importan a ustedes los venezolanos y las venezolanas—. Venezuela es un país dividido. Lo que necesita es responsabilidad; necesita que acabemos con las sanciones que sufre el pueblo, que apoyemos el diálogo, la negociación y que se puedan celebrar elecciones con garantías.

Veíamos al señor Tertsch mandar un mensaje a todo el Parlamento Europeo diciendo que en España creaba una enorme ansiedad con quién se encuentra el ministro de nuestro país. ¿En serio? ¿De verdad? ¿Ansiedad? Ansiedad, señor Tertsch, genera el poder dar un futuro a nuestros jóvenes; ansiedad generan los agricultores que no están recibiendo precios justos; ansiedad generan los cortes de luz en Granada por parte de multinacionales como Endesa que se saltan los derechos fundamentales. Pero poco les veo yo a ustedes defender los derechos de los españoles y las españolas frente a esas élites.

Ustedes criminalizan el diálogo, alientan a rebeliones armadas. Y yo les digo solo una cosa. Nuestro país, España, es mucho mejor que el blanco y negro con el que ustedes lo quieren pintar. Nuestro país tiene futuro y lo va a llevar adelante nuestra gente.

Leopoldo López Gil (PPE). – Señor presidente, la verdad es que no se trata de un debate sobre España ni sobre Venezuela. Es una necesaria actuación sobre el valor de nuestras sanciones y nuestros principios. Hay valores intrínsecos a la formación de esta Unión, como lo es el funcionamiento de un país que respete su Estado de Derecho, la transparencia, la legalidad.

Recientemente hemos conocido como el Gobierno de España ha burlado la aplicación de las sanciones aprobadas por el Consejo en junio de 2018. Son medidas que prohíben la entrada al territorio europeo a la vicepresidenta del régimen de Maduro, sanciones que castigan por violar la democracia, por usurpar los poderes a la Asamblea Nacional.

Pedimos al Consejo que investigue a fondo este asunto mediante la sección de sanciones del Grupo de Consejeros de Relaciones Exteriores —el RELEX— e informe oportunamente a esta Cámara.

Ciertamente, nadie debe estar por encima de la ley. Tampoco los Estados ni sus gobernantes.

Mónica Silvana González (S&D). – Señor presidente, efectivamente, este no es un debate europeo, este es un debate que se debe discernir en el Congreso español. Están ustedes haciendo el ridículo y, por mucho que se pongan todos juntos, son los que son. Son una minoría que no alcanzan a construir una mayoría en el Parlamento español.

Yo también pido disculpas al resto de diputados por tener que soportar un debate que debería haberse producido en el Congreso de España. Obedece a que su fuerza política no tiene más que diez diputados; su fuerza política va a desaparecer, porque todas las estadísticas, todas las encuestas, dicen justamente que son insignificantes. Así que, señor Cañas, señorías del Partido Renew, señorías de Ciudadanos, traigan a este Parlamento soluciones constructivas para aliviar el dolor del pueblo venezolano.

Les invito a que vengan a la Comisión de Desarrollo y busquemos juntos soluciones para paliar el dolor con ayuda humanitaria y desarrollo para el pueblo venezolano.

Señorías, aquí no hay caso, porque la vicepresidenta de Venezuela no estuvo en territorio Schengen. Por lo tanto, no cruzó ningún filtro de pasaporte. ¿Creen ustedes que esto aporta algo para aliviar el dolor del pueblo venezolano? El Gobierno de España continuará, liderado por Pedro Sánchez, buscando una solución democrática… *(el presidente retira la palabra a la oradora).*

Dita Charanzová (Renew). – Señor presidente, parece que soy la única extranjera en este debate. Pues quiero decir que tenemos el debate hoy porque ayer la mayoría de esta Cámara votó en favor de este debate. Y lamento que esto se haya convertido en un debate nacional español, cuando se trata de las sanciones europeas y lo que está en juego es la credibilidad de la Unión Europea.

Este caso socava seriamente nuestra credibilidad frente a los ciudadanos venezolanos que esperan justicia y nuestro apoyo. Ustedes, especialmente los que estuvieron aquí en el último mandato, sabrán que, cada vez que tenemos un debate sobre Venezuela, he dicho lo mismo: sanciones selectivas.

Pasaron tres años antes de que el Consejo diera por fin el primer paso. Las sanciones selectivas son la herramienta pacífica más fuerte que tenemos para presionar al régimen para negociar y parar la represión violenta contra los venezolanos.

(La oradora acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 171, apartado 8, del Reglamento interno))

Ibán García Del Blanco (S&D), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul».* – Señora Charanzová, quería preguntarle a su señoría, que se lamentaba profundamente de que esto se hubiera transformado en un debate español, que qué esperaba. Si, al final, evidentemente, esto es un asunto de política nacional, que se va a dirimir, además, en el Congreso de España, que tiene un debate previsto para los próximos días. Al final, aquí, simplemente se trata de la imposibilidad de un Grupo que no acaba de encontrar su espacio político y que, de alguna manera, quiere saber qué es lo que tiene que hacer y cuáles son las competencias de cada uno de los parlamentos ¿No se siente usted engañada por sus compañeros de Ciudadanos?

Dita Charanzová (Renew), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul».* – Ustedes han votado en contra de la investigación en el Congreso español hoy. Por eso tenemos el debate. Y, como ya he dicho, es un problema europeo, son las sanciones europeas y es la credibilidad europea frente a los ciudadanos de Venezuela.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, sin duda, lo que está en juego es la credibilidad de la Unión Europea. La credibilidad de esta Cámara, que se dedica ahora a fiscalizar la labor de los gobiernos nacionales. Porque esto es lo que hoy estamos debatiendo aquí.

No es que hoy Borrell haya dicho que, competencialmente, son los Estados miembros y los gobiernos los que aplican las sanciones. Es que lo han dicho una docena de portavoces durante las últimas semanas. Una Comisión Europea que, por cierto, tiene miembros del Partido Popular Europeo y de los liberales —que les han repetido una y otra vez el mismo mensaje—. Y, además, hoy merece la pena recordar que, este debate, ¿qué es lo que nos muestra? Que a ustedes les importa poco España y nada Venezuela. Lamentablemente, ustedes traen aquí el debate para tapar sus problemas a la hora de fiscalizar y hacer su labor en el Congreso de los Diputados.

Los socialistas continuamos comprometidos con Venezuela, y no con el uso político del dolor de los venezolanos, que es lo que ustedes hacen aquí una y otra vez. El dolor de un pueblo como el de Venezuela no es un arma arrojadiza y menos para hacer política nacional aquí en el Parlamento Europeo.

(El orador se niega a que Hermann Tertsch le formule una pregunta con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul»)

Der Präsident. – Wir kommen dann zu den spontanen Wortmeldungen. Ich habe mehr als doppelt so viele Wortmeldungen wie die, für die wir Zeit haben. Ich werde auch spanische Kollegen berücksichtigen, aber die nichtspanischen jedenfalls auch. Herr Kollege López Aguilar.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, soy canario, próximo al pueblo venezolano, que incluye a los descendientes de la comunidad canaria en Venezuela.

He participado en todos los debates sobre Venezuela y advertí al alto representante Borrell de que no habría Pleno sin un debate sobre Venezuela. He votado las Resoluciones que intentan apoyar el cambio democrático en Venezuela y que exigen la unidad del Parlamento Europeo.

Pero esto no es un debate sobre Venezuela, ni sobre el sufrimiento del pueblo venezolano. Ni siquiera es un debate sobre España. Es un debate traído por quienes se oponen al Gobierno de España, porque están en minoría en el Congreso de los Diputados y pretenden, por tanto, banalizar, multiplicando los debates sobre Venezuela, la posición del Parlamento Europeo, haciéndole daño también al Parlamento Europeo y a su credibilidad, que tanto invocan.

Porque nada perjudica tanto la credibilidad de las Resoluciones del Parlamento Europeo como la desunión en el Parlamento Europeo, intentando criticar al Gobierno de España a propósito del sufrimiento del pueblo de Venezuela. Por tanto, señores del Partido Popular y de Ciudadanos, no hagan el ridículo ni rayen en lo grotesco. Ayuden al pueblo venezolano en lugar de traer aquí un debate que no tiene otro objetivo que criticar al Gobierno de España.

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, se preciso fosse ainda, este debate descredibiliza, ainda mais, a direita mais reacionária e descabelada deste Parlamento. O ódio que os move leva-os agora a transportar a política espanhola aqui, para o Parlamento. No fundo, tudo serve para alimentar esta sanha irracional.

Uma sanha que omite as consequências desumanas das sanções que continuam a defender, para o povo venezuelano e para as comunidades imigrantes na Venezuela, designadamente a comunidade portuguesa. Uma sanha que expõe, que os expõe, aliás, como à União Europeia, ao ridículo internacional pelo não reconhecimento de um Governo sucessivamente sufragado pelo voto popular e pela insistência no apoio a um fantoche de Trump, que perdeu qualquer crédito, mesmo junto da oposição venezuelana.

E, enfim, quem assim age, movido pelo ódio, e só pelo ódio, acaba, inevitavelmente, a tropeçar nos próprios pés, como aqui ficou demonstrado neste debate.

Sira Rego (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, yo no sé ustedes, pero, con este debate, yo tengo la sensación de estar ante el berrinche de un niño al que se le ha roto un juguete. Solo así se puede entender que el grupo parlamentario que más representación ha perdido en las elecciones generales en mi país se empeñe en mantener abierto un debate que hasta la propia Comisión Europea entiende que está cerrado.

La verdad es que es lamentable ver que, mientras nuestro gobierno hace un esfuerzo porque les vaya bien a las familias trabajadoras —subiendo el salario mínimo interprofesional, reforzando los servicios públicos, luchando contra la ludopatía—, ustedes se dedican, aquí y en otros lugares, a lo mismo, al chascarrillo, al veto fanático y a hacer piña con sus amigos de la extrema derecha. Yo les pediría que nos hicieran un favor y nos ahorraran a todos y a todas este bochorno, ahora y en el futuro, y sugeriría un poquito más de responsabilidad y un poquito más de trabajo por los intereses de nuestro pueblo.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, I think it's an absolute joke, actually, that we are here discussing this nonsense. I've been very open in my criticism of the Spanish Government in different situations, so now, when they do something that's correct, I will be equally forthright in welcoming the initiative that they took, and in their stance in supporting dialogue in this situation. How else do you think that this situation is going to be resolved!

We should be discussing here, actually, the situation where we have supported the imaginary president Juan Guaidó, the chosen one of a nakedly US-backed coup, a defeated attempt, a crowd who have been exposed for embezzling the humanitarian aid and squandering it. We should be dealing here with the impact of the sanctions on the people of Venezuela, the hardship that that has caused, the difficulties there. That is not something that any of us should be standing over – we should be working to end that nightmare. I salute the efforts that have been taken, and I condemn the initiatives taken here to derail that project.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vicepresidente de la Comisión / Alto Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad*. – Señor presidente, en efecto, se trata de sanciones europeas. Pero, de acuerdo con las normas europeas, la implementación de estas sanciones y la vigilancia de las mismas corresponde a los Estados miembros. Eso también es una norma europea. ¿O no lo es? Para cambiarla haría falta cambiar el Tratado.

Ustedes saben —o deberían saber perfectamente— que esta clase de restricciones a los viajes son decisiones del Consejo y, por lo tanto, no caen bajo el control de la ley europea, no son *Union law*. Puede que a un ciudadano normal, un ciudadano que no es un experto en estas cuestiones, le pueda sorprender, pero a ustedes no les debería sorprender. ¿Por qué les sorprende? Es la decisión del Consejo y, como tal, no es *Union law*. Y, en consecuencia, la Comisión no tiene ningún papel en controlar su aplicación y no puede iniciar un procedimiento de infracción.

Ustedes son eurodiputados. Ustedes deben saber eso, ¿no? ¿Les sorprende? Les sorprende. Pues tendrán ustedes que estudiar un poco más, porque no les debería sorprender. Que una decisión del Consejo no es *Union law*, eso lo saben ustedes de sobra, y, por lo tanto, la Comisión Europea no puede intervenir ni puede iniciar un procedimiento de infracción. Y también, de acuerdo con nuestras normas, hemos dicho que son los Estados miembros quienes tienen que vigilar su implementación.

Entonces, se trata de una norma europea que tiene que aplicar un Estado miembro y cuya aplicación tiene que ser controlada a nivel del Estado miembro. ¿Dónde está el fallo lógico en mi argumento? Porque, si yo no tengo fallo lógico, lo tienen ustedes.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Este Parlamento promoveu mais um debate sobre a Venezuela, país constantemente atacado pela direita mais reacionária que não aceita a luta de um povo que resiste de pé. Desta vez, o ódio que os move impeliu-os a trazer a política espanhola para este parlamento, continuando a alimentar os sentimentos mais antidemocráticos e ingerencistas, insistindo no não reconhecimento de um governo sucessivamente sufragado pelo voto popular e na insistência no apoio a um fantoche de Trump, que perdeu qualquer crédito já mesmo junto da oposição venezuelana. Prosseguem na defesa de sanções cujos principais prejudicados são o povo venezuelano e as comunidades imigrantes na Venezuela, como a comunidade portuguesa. Ao povo venezuelano que resiste e não se vende, apesar das sanções e de todos os ataques externos, expressamos a nossa solidariedade.

10. План на САЩ за Близкия изток: отговор на ЕС в съответствие с международното право (разискване)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und Hohen Vertreters der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zum Plan der USA für den Nahen Osten: Reaktion der EU im Einklang mit dem Völkerrecht (2020/2559(RSP)).

Ich möchte Sie auch daran erinnern – während der Kommissar auf Wanderschaft ist –, dass Sie spontane Wortmeldungen und Wortmeldungen nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ sowohl auf herkömmliche Weise als auch elektronisch beantragen können. Die Anleitung finden Sie am Eingang zum Plenarsaal.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, I am really grateful for having this opportunity to address you today on the Middle East peace process. This issue is of fundamental strategic importance to the European Union. For too long, we have been witnessing a conflict that has caused endless suffering for generations of Israelis and Palestinians alike. The increasingly dire situation on the ground, including violence, terrorism, incitement, settlement expansion – illegal, by the way – and the consequences of the ongoing occupation, has destroyed hope on both sides and reduced the viability of a two-state solution.

At an international level for a number of years there has been little or no substantive engagement in efforts to resolve the conflict. Indeed, as one observer pointed out to me recently, there is neither peace nor a process. In recent years, we on the European Union side are perhaps the only actor who has stayed the course. We have been vocal in our support for a negotiated two-state solution based on the internationally agreed parameters and in accordance with international law. This means a two-state solution based on the parameters set in the Council Conclusions – our Council – of July 2014, that meets Israeli and Palestinian security needs and Palestinian aspirations for statehood and sovereignty, ends the occupation that began in 1967, and resolves all permanent status issues in order to end the conflict.

Our vision, our European vision, is a principled one and a pragmatic one. It reflects our broader attachment as Europeans to the rules-based international order. We are also active on the ground. No other international actor has been as engaged as we have been in practical efforts to build a future Palestinian state. In 2019 alone, the European Union and its Member States had an open portfolio of some 600 million in assistance to the Palestinians. I said during my hearing: it means – 600 million is almost EUR 1.5 million a day.

Where are we today? It remains my firm view that there is still a way forward if both parties are willing to resume credible and meaningful negotiations. International support for any such efforts would clearly be crucial to their success. In this regard, the tabling of concrete proposals, such as the United States one, could be helpful, both as a catalyst for deeper reflection on the way forward and as a potential opportunity to quick-start a political process which has been at a standstill for too long.

However, as I have said, the proposal tabled two weeks ago clearly challenges the internationally-agreed parameters, and it is difficult to see how this initiative can bring both parties back to the table. 25 out of 27 Member States in the Foreign Affairs Council supported this consideration. Two were against, so it was not a unanimous decision of the Council and I could not present it like this, but as a statement of the High Representative, which I am repeating here again.

Last week I was in Washington; they were very busy days, talking with all foreign affairs external policy higher authorities of the US Government. I put this point to my interlocutors. We need to ask ourselves whether this plan provides a basis for progress or not. We need to know whether the proposals themselves are really open for negotiation. Is it the starting point, or the end point? For the European Union's part, our position is clear. We are ready to work with the international community to revive a political process in line with international law, which ensures equal rights and which is acceptable to both parties. Thank you for your attention and I am looking forward to an important discussion, which I'm sure will follow.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, I would say the following to Mr Borrell.

Mr Borrell, you stated that the United States Middle East peace plan departs from internationally agreed parameters. You also used rather pointed language originally when you said that part of this plan, if implemented, could not pass unchallenged. Naturally this evoked a reaction from our Israeli friends, who warned that this type of – what they called – 'threatening' language could lead to the EU's role in the peace process being minimised. Meanwhile, the Palestinian leadership has angrily dismissed President Trump's plan as a conspiracy.

I think it's frankly unreasonable to expect that either side would greet this proposal with any real enthusiasm, but I would like to choose to view the glass as half full and not half empty. So this plan could perhaps serve as a basis for resuming talks in earnest with the understanding that there are, in fact, painful concessions to be made on both sides. This is your moment to shine, Mr Borrell. Europe could perhaps assume a much more prominent role, an active role, as an honest broker of just and lasting peace. It could encourage both sides to consider the plan as a starting point for reopening meaningful goodwill negotiations.

Kati Piri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, we do not know what President Trump's deal of the century actually is apart from being one-sided, illegal and intentionally provocative, but it is most certainly not a genuine effort at finding a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Let me be clear, negotiations between Israel and Palestine were broken off in 2014 and must be resumed as soon as possible. But that is not what this plan will lead to. This plan disregards the international rules-based order. It not only normalises illegal settlements but also clears the way for the utterly illegitimate annexation of the Jordan Valley and 30% of the West Bank. We must make clear that such actions will have serious consequences for our relationship with Israel if that happens. Inevitably, it will also lead to more suffering for the Palestinian people, whether that is because their land is annexed, their water resources are taken or because they lack control over their own borders. This is a cynical plan of two far-right leaders seeking a cheap popularity boost ahead of elections. This is a slap in the face of Israelis and Palestinians who genuinely want to find a solution. I therefore call on you, Mr High Representative, to continue supporting all efforts that truly involve both parties. The people of Israel and Palestine need a real peace plan and if we, as Europeans, can play a constructive role in that, we should do so.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte hoge vertegenwoordiger, wij zijn de afgelopen weken weer eens meegezogen in een Trumpiaanse *rabbit hole*: een tweestatenoplossing voor Israël en Palestina, met alle voordelen voor Israël en de kruimels voor de Palestijnen. Trumps plan was eigenlijk niet meer dan een eenstaatplan voor Israël, vermomd als tweestatenoplossing. Een gemiste kans, zou je zeggen, ware het niet dat Trumps voorstel de fragiele relatie tussen Israël en Palestina nu helemaal heeft doen afspringen.

Daarom, mijnheer Borrell, is er meer dan ooit een rol voor de Europese Unie weggelegd. Amerika heeft de voorbije jaren veel te eenzijdig de Israëlische kaart getrokken. De geloofwaardigheid van de VS in het Midden-Oosten ligt aan diggelen. Een geloofwaardigheid die u, die Europa nog wel heeft. Gebruik deze geloofwaardigheid dus, door op te treden als onpartijdige partner, als *honest broker*, om als het ware de door Trump gemaakte brokken te lijmen, zodat Israël en Palestina opnieuw aan tafel gaan of zodat er op zijn minst indirecte onderhandelingen kunnen plaatsvinden.

En laten wij duidelijk maken dat onze Europese rode lijnen breed gedragen zijn door de internationale gemeenschap. Ik denk, meneer Borrell, dat een internationale vredesconferentie op hoog niveau waarvan u de leiding neemt, de weg vooruit is. Onze steun heeft u alvast.

Anna Bonfrisco, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, egregio Vicepresidente e anche Alto rappresentante, questa è una discussione particolarmente delicata. Come Unione europea abbiamo l'obbligo di chiarire la nostra posizione, soprattutto perché Belgio, Estonia e Germania, come membri non permanenti, stanno affiancando la Francia nel Consiglio di sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite.

Essendo poi avvenuta la Brexit, siamo chiamati a esercitare un'azione di politica estera che sia allo stesso tempo nuova e prospettica, in una geopolitica da XXI secolo, che passa dalla tutela della sicurezza europea, dal grande tema dell'immigrazione, dall'energia, dal cambiamento climatico, dal 5G fino agli investimenti europei in quei paesi.

Il trattato di Lisbona le attribuisce la promozione della pace e della sicurezza nel mondo. E per questo, con riguardo al Medio Oriente, la invito a considerare principalmente tre elementi: la minaccia esistenziale allo Stato di Israele è viva più che mai, e questo è inaccettabile. Israele è primariamente uno Stato nazione ebraico. Noi europei, nella nostra radice più profonda, siamo ebrei. Non perda, signor Alto rappresentante, la sua più importante occasione di dimostrare da che parte sta l'Europa.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, a great number of victims of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have long been languishing for a peace plan. Such a peace plan must, of course, include painful concessions, but concessions from both sides. It must include security for Israel, but it must also include a viable sovereign, contiguous state for the Palestinians living side by side with the Israelis.

This is not what Trump is presenting to us. It's not a fresh start, it's a dead end. The so-called peace plan is neither about peace, because it doesn't overcome it prolongs the conflict, nor is it a plan as a point of departure for negotiations. It's rather a dictate. When they talk about a peace plan they are effectively pushing for annexation – and a two-state solution is different from one state plus one canton. We cannot …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Charlie Weimers, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, High Representative Mr Borrell, you called on both sides to reengage and refrain from any unilateral actions that would exacerbate tensions. This is a peace plan widely accepted in Israel, but fully rejected on the Palestinian side. Fine, but Palestinians will not even sit down at the table. Many in the Palestinian population prefer violence.

In fact, last month, Palestinian NGOs refused EU funding rules prohibiting our aid to be channelled to terrorist groups. In their refusal, these NGOs, 70% funded by the EU, are calling what they believe to be your bluff. High Representative, show them that the EU means business; encourage long-term re-engagement and easing of tensions; say a thousand times: no, no, no to EU funding Palestinian rejectionist and terrorist policies.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Manu Pineda, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL.* – Señor presidente, el tándem Trump-Netanyahu, en un alarde de cinismo sin precedentes, ha presentado lo que ellos han calificado como el «gran acuerdo del siglo». Pero no es legítimo hablar de acuerdo cuando una de las partes afectadas, el pueblo palestino, ni ha sido consultado ni ha firmado ningún tipo de pacto.

Esta parodia no es legal, porque vulnera el Derecho internacional e infinidad de resoluciones de las Naciones Unidas. Así que, si esto ni es acuerdo, ni es legal, ni es legítimo, no se puede llamar el «gran acuerdo del siglo». Podríamos llamarlo la «gran estafa del siglo», que tiene como objetivo acabar con el pueblo palestino y, además, tapar las vergüenzas de dos criminales perseguidos en sus distintos países. Podríamos hablar de eso y sería más acertado.

El señor Borrell hizo recientemente un pronunciamiento que me parece que es excelente, y quiero desde aquí felicitarle y agradecérselo. Pero creo que es el momento, señor Borrell, de pasar a los hechos. Es necesario su pronunciamiento, pero es necesario que en un momento como este la Unión Europea rompa el Acuerdo de Asociación con Israel y reconozca al Estado… *(el presidente retira la palabra al orador).*

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Mr President, each and every force in this world is more than welcome if this force puts a proposal for a solution on the table, especially when it's a proposal for a solution with the objective of a two states perspective in it – a two states solution in the end.

The EU has not contributed much with a concrete proposal in the past, so we should deal with the proposal from the United States constructively. The EU is contributing a lot in terms of development aid and other terms, but has not proposed anything in the past, so let's deal constructively with the US proposal. If somebody reacts with violence to a solution proposal, this is not a reliable partner, and reaction with violence in the past has been wrong. Dear Commissioner, take that into consideration in order to deal constructively with the US proposal and in order to be connected with the values of the pro-western powers in this world.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Sven Mikser (S&D). – Mr President, it is hard to regard the most recent US peace plan as credible since it does not meet the principal parameters for peace. It is not fair and even-handed, it does not follow the basic principles of international law and its drafters only managed to engage one of the two parties to the conflict.

Whatever domestic political ends in the US or in Israel the plan's launch may have served, its chances of revitalising the peace process are, unfortunately, virtually non-existent. Moreover, if Israel, following Palestinian rejection of the plan, were to restart settlement activity or go on to annex parts of the occupied territories, it may be entirely counterproductive to sustainable peace and eventually prove detrimental to the two- state solution altogether. The EU must stick to its principal position of holding firm to international law. We must continue to uphold the position that only a negotiated two-state solution can, in a sustainable manner, address the legitimate Israeli security concerns and deliver a Palestinian statehood.

But, in addition to having a clear and principled understanding of where we need to be at the end of the process, the EU also needs a credible plan of its own on how to get there from where we are today. This is ever more critical as the US appears to be abandoning its role as an even-handed broker.

Bernard Guetta (Renew). – Monsieur le Président, comme il a tort! Comme M. Trump se trompe avec ce plan de paix qui n'en a que le nom, car enfin la paix, Monsieur le Président, n'est pas seulement celle des rapports de force. La paix, Monsieur le Président, doit être fondée sur assez d'équité pour assurer un avenir d'entente et non pas seulement de coexistence.

Entre Israël et la Palestine, il n'y aura de paix durable et vraie qu'à cette condition: l'équité. Et ce n'est pas elle que vous proposez. Alors, nous ne vous appuierons pas, nous ne vous suivrons pas, mais continuerons à dire à nos voisins et amis israéliens et palestiniens que Jérusalem doit être la capitale partagée de deux peuples égaux en dignité, sécurité et bien-être. Les aveugles diront que ce n'est plus possible, car les faits accomplis primeraient. Mais le réalisme, le vrai, commande de s'en tenir à l'utopie de la justice, celle qui, toujours, finit et doit finir par triompher.

Jaak Madison (ID). – Mr President, first of all I think it's a very important debate because in the last weeks it has been the main topic in the media – a peace plan by the US in the Middle East. First of all, I think it's very important for the European Union to understand international law, because in international law we have to understand that it has to be respected on both sides, by Israel and also by Palestine.

From the Palestinian side, we have to recognise that they haven't really understood the meaning of international law – that you can't support terrorist organisations against Israel. You can't support the way you're using your children, how you're using them like bombing attacks against neighbouring countries. So in this case I think Palestine is really breaking international law, something we have to also recognise.

The second thing is there have been many critics against the US about this peace plan, but I've never heard of any other solution or any other plan for the Middle East, so I really want …

(The President cut off the speaker)

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. formand! Tak til hr. Borrell for den klare erklæring om Israels ulovlige besættelse af Palæstina. De har både ret og pligt til at sige sådan, uanset hvad for eksempel Ungarn måtte mene. Hvis EU passivt lader Israels besættelse ekspandere, bryder vi ikke bare FN's, men også vore egne love. Jeg vil imidlertid godt vide, hvad der konkret menes med, at annekteringer ikke vil forblive »unchallenged«. Forhåbentlig at EU omsider reagerer med handling, ikke kun med ord.

I 2016 vedtog FN's sikkerhedsråd resolution 2334. Den omfatter også »differentiation«, altså en adskillelse mellem Israel og bosættelserne. Vi bør derfor gøre »differentiation« til EU's styrende princip og stoppe al samkvem med bosættelserne om handel, økonomi, kultur osv. Og så har vores høje repræsentant myndighed til ikke blot at fordømme Israels ødelæggelse af EU's betalte projekter, til at lindre palæstinensernes liv, men også til at kræve kompensation. Israel har ødelagt for millioner. De penge skal tilbage til EU's skatteborgere. Men tak for indsatsen indtil nu.

Bert-Jan Ruissen (ECR). – Voorzitter, wij kunnen natuurlijk van alles vinden van het vredesplan en op allerlei onderdelen kritiek gaan leveren. Maar laten wij dat vandaag alstublieft niet doen. Dat brengt het vredesproces echt geen stap verder. De meerwaarde van het plan is nu juist dat er tenminste iets op tafel ligt. Laten we dat dan ook een eerlijke kans geven.

Ik heb eigenlijk maar een oproep aan de Palestijnse Autoriteit: stop met het in bescherming nemen van terroristen, erken de staat Israël en ga rond de tafel zitten, ga praten.

Ik neem nadrukkelijk afstand van de verklaring van de hoge vertegenwoordiger. U komt in uw verklaring van 4 februari niet verder dan Israël en de Verenigde Staten te bekritiseren, waarmee u feitelijk tegen Abbas zegt: "Ik kan heel goed begrijpen dat u niet gaat onderhandelen, ik zou het zelf ook niet doen."

Ik vind dat een verkeerde boodschap op het verkeerde moment. Ten onrechte heeft u deze verklaring geuit als een verklaring namens de Europese Unie. Als ergens geen unanimiteit over bestaat in de Raad, kunt u niet namens de EU een standpunt uitdragen!

Niyazi Kizilyürek (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, the so-called 'deal of the century' is a plain violation of international law. It was prepared without consulting one of the parties concerned – the Palestinians – and it tends to legitimise illegal Israeli settlements, which is a crime of war.

It rolls back from the agreements of 1967 and denies Palestinians issue to Jerusalem as their capital. I regret to say that Trump's plan is not only an assault on Palestinian rights, but also an attempt to put forward a new regional order that completely undermines international law. It is a deal which can harm the whole region and is not less unacceptable and not less dangerous than the colonialist Sykes-Picot Agreement from 1916.

In an era of chaotic international relations, the EU must stand firm and continue to support the two-state solution with an independent Palestinian state within the 1967 borders. Furthermore, the EU should make a stand against Israeli settlements which violate the relevant UN resolutions and show support for the right of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes.

Evin Incir (S&D). – Herr talman! Jag vägrar att kalla Trumps förslag för en fredsplan, som vissa vill göra, för det enda förslaget är en plan på, det är hur Trump ska säkra sin valvinst i november i USA och hur han ska säkra sin vän Netanyahus valvinst i det israeliska valet. Planen går stick i stäv med internationell rätt, ger grönt ljus för annektering av ännu mer palestinsk mark och omöjliggör möjligheten till en tvåstatslösning där två demokratiska stater – Israel och Palestina – samexisterar sida vid sida i fred och säkerhet.

I en tid där USA inte längre respekterar internationell rätt gäller det att EU nu visar att vi inte bara pratar om våra grundläggande värderingar, utan att vi också kämpar för dem, oavsett var i världen orättvisor dyker upp.

Det palestinska folket och det israeliska folket förtjänar båda sina respektive stater. Tiden är nu inne för att alla EU länder ska erkänna Palestina enligt 1967 års gränser. Det gjorde min svenska regering 2014, vilket jag är stolt över.

Min fråga till den höga representanten är därför: Hur kommer kommissionen konkret att agera för att internationell rätt ska respekteras?

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Herr Präsident! Als ich zur Grundschule ging, stand über dem Gebiet von Ostdeutschland, also dem der ehemaligen DDR, die Zeile: „Zurzeit unter sowjetischer Verwaltung", und bei den weiter östlichen Gebieten Pommern und Schlesien stand „Zurzeit unter polnischer Verwaltung". Das war eine der großen Lebenslügen der Nachkriegszeit: der Glaube, dass die im Krieg verloren gegangenen Gebiete jemals zurückkommen würden. Erst Willy Brandt hat mit dieser Lüge Schluss gemacht.

Eine ähnliche Lüge herrscht seit 53 Jahren in Bezug auf Gaza und Westjordanland. Beide Areale gingen den Arabern verloren, weil sie Kriege gegen Israel verloren. Wenn man einen Krieg beginnt, muss man damit rechnen.

Die Zweistaatenlösung von 1967 ist die große Lebenslüge der UN, und sie ist auch die große Lebenslüge der EU. Präsident Trumps Friedensplan ist keineswegs ideal, aber er bringt immerhin Bewegung in eine völlig festgefahrene Situation. Seit mehr als 50 Jahren sind Gaza und Westjordanland Konfliktzonen. Wollen wir also weiter an einer Lebenslüge festhalten? Der Friedensplan der UN von 1967 mit der Zweistaatenlösung: funktionieren – das tut er nicht.

Mounir Satouri (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, le plan pour le Moyen-Orient de l'administration Trump est un pas en arrière dangereux et une étape de plus dans la négation du droit international. Ce n'est pas un accord, mais la validation de la politique du fait accompli d'Israël. Une vision unilatérale du conflit que vous avez le mérite, Monsieur Borrell, d'avoir condamnée.

On se contente décidément de bien peu face à la gravité des faits. Puisque les États membres sont incapables d'unanimité pour appeler au respect des résolutions des Nations unies, faisons respecter le droit avec les moyens qui sont les nôtres. D'abord, exigeons d'Israël qu'il compense ou restitue ces destructions de projets financés par l'Union. Pas moins de 97 structures sont concernées, pour une valeur de 500 000 euros en 2019. Approfondissons la politique de différenciation entre les frontières internationales reconnues d'Israël et les colonies. Condamnons clairement l'institutionnalisation des discriminations. Enfin, j'allais dire, et surtout, remettons sur la table, comme le demandent les Palestiniens, une conférence internationale pour la paix au Moyen-Orient.

Tanja Fajon (S&D). – Spoštovani gospod predsednik, Trumpov tako imenovani mirovni načrt za Bližnji vzhod je prevara, je umazana igra in je udarec mednarodnemu pravu proti prizadevanjem pri iskanju mirovne rešitve za enega najbolj perečih vprašanj Bližnjega vzhoda. Miru, zato ne bo.

Načrt ameriškega predsednika je še en korak na poti do uveljavitve popolnega apartheid režima, ki ga Izrael že izvaja nad Palestinci in v praksi povsem onemogoča vzpostavitev suverene in sploh mogoče palestinske države. Trump se očitno ne zaveda, da miru na Bližnjem vhodu, predvsem za Izrael, ne bo mogoče doseči brez rešitve izraelsko-palestinskega konflikta. Zato vas, spoštovani Borell, podpiram pri vztrajanju pri mednarodnem pravu in boju proti nezakoniti priključitvi Zahodnega brega in doline reke Jordan Izraelu.

Evropa bi morala takoj prepovedati uvoz izdelkov, proizvedenih v nezakonitih judovskih naselbinah, ter ustaviti vse evropske investicije. Izraelski dostop do programov Unije pa nujno pogojiti z napredkom v mirovnem procesu.

Laura Huhtasaari (ID). – Mr President, the 1967 Israeli border is not realistic anymore, because the circumstances in the region have changed completely in the past 50 years. The Americans have promised to invest USD 50 billion in the Palestinian state if Trump's Israeli–Palestinian peace plan is implemented. Israel will also commit not to build any new settlements for the next four years. At the same time, this treaty will safeguard the security of the State of Israel.

The EU should support this plan. This could be the last chance to achieve lasting peace after many decades of violence. It is time to put an end to this pro-launch and hard conflict. The EU should not object to this deal because the EU hates Trump.

Ernest Urtasun (Verts/ALE). – Señor presidente, el plan de Trump supone una voladura del consenso internacional sobre el conflicto israelopalestino. Está basado en la unilateralidad, en la anexión, en la desigualdad de derechos, en el desprecio del Derecho internacional y provocará una ocupación perpetua y un conflicto permanente. Como decía mi colega anteriormente, no es un plan de paz, es un dictado.

Ante ello, quiero agradecer el comunicado valiente del alto representante sobre la materia y también decir que es el momento de defender los consensos básicos internacionales en materia de este conflicto: que queremos un proceso político negociado, una solución de dos Estados, el respeto del Derecho internacional y la igualdad de derechos. Y para ello creo que los Estados miembros, para mantener y seguir manteniendo viva la esperanza de una solución con dos Estados, deben empezar a considerar seriamente el reconocimiento de Palestina como Estado para hacer que ello sea posible.

Y, finalmente, quisiera pedir al alto representante —y eso es muy importante en estos momentos— que la política de diferenciación entre las fronteras del 67 y las anexiones ilegales de territorio por parte de Israel sea mantenida por parte de la Unión Europea.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi unisco a molti colleghi nel condannare e rigettare fermamente il piano proposto da Trump per la soluzione della questione israelo-palestinese, un puro atto di propaganda elettorale a favore di Netanyahu, il quale da mesi cerca di recuperare una solida maggioranza e sviare l'attenzione dai suoi processi per corruzione, e un atto di propaganda per Trump stesso, che cerca di mostrarsi un leader mondiale di grande influenza.

Il piano è inaccettabile. Nessuna consultazione dei palestinesi, l'annessione della Cisgiordania, Gerusalemme capitale esclusiva di Israele: questi sono solo alcuni punti dell'accordo che viola il diritto internazionale praticamente in ogni modo possibile.

Penso che abbia fatto bene, quindi, signor Alto rappresentante a rigettarlo con fermezza e ribadire la posizione europea per una soluzione a due Stati sulla base dei confini del '67. Ha fatto bene ad avvertire che qualsiasi atto di annessione avrà gravi conseguenze. È ora di cominciare a dirlo, non può l'Europa essere condiscendente. Noi non staremo mai in silenzio davanti alla negazione della storia e del diritto internazionale.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, nijedan mirovni plan ne može uspjeti ako nema podršku svih sukobljenih strana, a način na koji je objavljen ovaj plan najviše govori o političkim slabostima dvojice lidera koji su ga predstavili.

Plan je izraz unilateralne politike trenutne američke administracije i kroničnog odbacivanja multilateralizma. Sjetimo se Pariškog sporazuma, odnosa prema Kurdima, uloge u Siriji, sporazuma s Iranom. Određeni elementi koji su predstavljeni kao veliki ustupci zapravo su već dogovoreni tijekom ranijih pregovora i pokušaja pronalaska rješenja. Posebno zabrinjavaju dijelovi plana koji se odnose na Jordansku dolinu i dijelove Zapadne obale.

Ovaj prijedlog samo demonstrira dubinu razlika između suprotstavljenih dionika. Svi uključeni trebaju se suzdržati od jednostranih poteza i iskreno se uključiti u istinske pregovore o pronalasku trajnog rješenja, a ono je dvije neovisne, demokratski konsolidirane suverene države, koje će omogućiti miran i siguran suživot ljudi s obje strane granice. Takvo rješenje mora, naravno, biti utemeljeno na međunarodnom pravu.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Milan Zver (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, pozdravljam Trumpov bližnjevzhodni mirovni predlog, predvsem zaradi tega, ker je uravnotežen, nekaj dobijo Izraelci, zagotovilo za mir in varnost, nekaj pa tudi Palestinci, in to svojo državo.

Demokratske države so več ali manj ta predlog podprle, vse tiste druge, ki to niso, pa so ga zavrnile skupaj s Palestinci, ki jim očitno ta status quo ustreza in nočejo miru. Tudi Iran je to zavrnil, ta predlog. Vprašal bi gospoda Borella, ki je nedavno bil v Iranu, ali ste se z oblastmi v Iranu pogovarjali o tem predlogu? In drugič, ali ste režim opozorili na drastične kršitve človekovih pravic v tej državi? In pa tretjič, zakaj ste sploh bili tam glede na to, da samo pomagate legitimirati režim, ki drastično krši človekove pravice?

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señor presidente, señor alto representante, Josep Borrell. Yo respaldo el comunicado que ha emitido. Me parece importante también en términos procedimentales para superar los bloqueos que se dan a menudo en el Consejo por solamente uno o dos países. Y sobre la materia, que es la propuesta de paz del presidente Trump, no voy a repetir lo que ha dicho usted y lo que ha dicho la mayoría de los oradores sobre los problemas que presenta y que, por tanto, es impracticable.

Pero, también, algunas señorías han aludido a la necesidad de que haya una alternativa europea. Si bien no una propuesta detallada como la que ha presentado el señor Trump, quizás algún tipo de iniciativa procedimental en el sentido de una nueva conferencia de paz sobre Oriente Medio —como la que en su día tuvo lugar en Madrid en el año 1991— y, si no es posible en este momento, empezar a trabajar para que se den las condiciones para que se pueda realizar.

Nicolae Ștefănuță (Renew). – Domnule președinte, domnule Înalt Reprezentant Borrell, în ultimele decenii de negocieri pentru pace în regiune, întreaga comunitate internațională a afirmat importanța promovării unui plan bazat pe principiile dreptului internațional. Orice plan de pace este binevenit, atât timp cât este în conformitate cu aceste principii, este incluziv și propune existența a două state, două state pentru două popoare, care să coexiste în pace și în securitate. În lipsa unui astfel de plan, *status quo*-ul actual se va menține, din păcate. Nu putem grăbi oportunist ceea ce pentru decenii a trenat în durere. De aceea, vreau să menționez ideea colegei Vautmans, potrivit căreia o conferință de pace multilaterală, care să asigure un format incluziv, unde să fim și noi la masă, este direcția în care trebuie să mergem.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Przysłuchiwałam się dzisiaj tej debacie: z jednej strony zwolennicy planu pana prezydenta Trumpa, a z drugiej strony przeciwnicy tego planu. Bardzo mało konkretów, a tam rozgrywają się dramaty. Każdy, kto był chociażby w Jerozolimie, rozmawiał, wie, że tych dramatów jest bardzo wiele i że tak naprawdę dorasta nowe pokolenie, które znowu możemy nazwać pokoleniem straconym, bo jest przygotowywane do tego, jak ze sobą walczyć, a nie jak ze sobą współistnieć po obu stronach.

Panie Przedstawicielu, Pan powiedział, że odbył Pan bardzo wiele rozmów z partnerami w Stanach Zjednoczonych. Proszę powiedzieć, z kim Pan odbył te rozmowy i jakie są konkluzje tych rozmów. Plan konstruktywny jest bardzo potrzebny. Każdy, kto o takim planie myśli i przedstawia konstrukcje, propozycje, może nas przybliżyć wreszcie do tego, żeby w tym regionie nastąpił pokój. Dlatego myślę Panie Przedstawicielu, że… *(Przewodniczący odebrał mówczyni głos)*

Silvia Modig (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, YK on todennut moneen kertaan, että miehitetyille alueille siirtokuntien rakentaminen on kansainvälisen oikeuden mukaan laitonta. Siten USA:n esittämä malli on kansainvälisen oikeuden näkökulmasta täysin kestämätön. Se on myös täysin vastoin kahden valtion periaatetta – sitä mallia, joka takaisi myös palestiinalaisille oman valtion. Mikä ikinä onkaan se malli, jolla tälle alueelle saadaan rauha, sen on taattava palestiinalaisille oma valtio, täysi vapaus ja täysi oikeus saada päättää itse omista asioistaan.

Tämä Trumpin "rauhanratkaisumalli" on aivan muuta. Se antaa Israelille hedelmälliset viljelymaat ja palestiinalaisille aavikkoa. Se pirstaloi palestiinalaisalueet siten, että palestiinalaiset ovat jatkuvasti alisteisia Israelin kontrollille. Trumpin ehdotus on luultavasti huonoin koskaan tehty esitys saada rauha tälle alueelle. Toivon, että korkea edustaja aloittaisi proaktiivisen toiminnan saadakseen israelilaiset ja palestiinalaiset saman pöydän ääreen käymään neuvotteluja, jotta alueelle saadaan aito kahteen valtioon perustuva rauhan malli.

Λευτέρης Νικολάου-Αλαβάνος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, καταδικάζουμε το απαράδεκτο σχέδιο των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών για το Παλαιστινιακό, που διαιωνίζει και θωρακίζει την ισραηλινή κατοχή. Η προωθούμενη συμφωνία εντάσσεται στους ιμπεριαλιστικούς σχεδιασμούς των ΗΠΑ στην ευρύτερη περιοχή. Προβλέπει παραχώρηση της Ιερουσαλήμ στο Ισραήλ, προσάρτηση της κοιλάδας του Ιορδάνη και διατήρηση των εποικισμών. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και οι κυβερνήσεις της —και οι ελληνικές κυβερνήσεις της Νέας Δημοκρατίας και του ΣΥΡΙΖΑ— έχουν πάρα πολύ βαριές ευθύνες. Κρατούν ίσες αποστάσεις μεταξύ θύτη και θύματος· επέκτειναν και αναβαθμίζουν συνεχώς την πολιτική, οικονομική και στρατιωτική συνεργασία με το ισραηλινό κράτος.

Η τοποθέτηση του κυρίου Borrell, που βρίσκει την πρόταση Trump συγκεκριμένη και βοηθητική, επί της ουσίας έρχεται σε αντίθεση με τα συμφέροντα του παλαιστινιακού λαού. Παράλληλα, εάν η θέση που εξέφρασε η κυρία Ασημακοπούλου είναι και θέση της ελληνικής κυβέρνησης, τότε είναι και απαράδεκτη και επικίνδυνη. Τέτοιες τοποθετήσεις αποκαλύπτουν τους λόγους για τους οποίους δεν τίθενται σε εφαρμογή οι αποφάσεις κοινοβουλίων που έχουν αναγνωρίσει το ανεξάρτητο παλαιστινιακό κράτος.

Υποστηρίζουμε τον δίκαιο αγώνα του παλαιστινιακού λαού για τερματισμό της ισραηλινής κατοχής και για ανεξάρτητο παλαιστινιακό κράτος στα σύνορα του '67 με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, I would like to thank all of you. We know this is a very divisive issue. It is in the Council and it is in the Parliament. But I would like to remind you that I'm not expressing my personal opinion. My job is to be the High Representative of the Council and I have to represent what I think is the opinion of the Council.

Mr Zver, I haven't said that this statement was the position of the European Union. I precisely said – and you should have listened to me – that since it was not unanimous – and it is in the records – I could not present an agreement of the Council. It was a statement of the High Representative, representing whom? Representing the 25 Member States who agreed with the statement. I said very clearly – you didn't notice – so I will repeat it. It was not a statement of the European Union. It was a statement of the High Representative and was not unanimous.

Mr Zver, why did I go to Iran? Because I have a mandate – a unanimous mandate – from the Member States of the Council asking me to go and talk with everyone in the broader region of the far Middle East to try to see if there is any possibility for us, the European Union, to contribute to increasing stability and peace in the region. I have a mandate to go and talk to everybody. Everybody means everybody, and I have been talking with the Foreign Affairs Minister of Saudi Arabia, I went to Jordan, I have been talking with the Emirates, I went to Tehran and I will go to Iraq in order to have a look at what we Europeans can do in order to contribute, if we can, to the peace and stability of this region.

I am sorry, Mr Zver. I was confused. It was not you who spoke about what was or was not in the statement of the European Union. I think it was our colleague, Mr Ruissen. Sorry, I made a mistake. So my answer was directed to Mr Ruissen. My answer to you was relating to what I did in Iran. For sure we talked with the Iranians about everything that worries them and that worries us, but the main purpose was to ask what we can do in order to save the nuclear deal and what we can do in order to stabilise the region. We didn't spend much time talking about the Israeli-Palestinian issue because the Iranians are very much aware that they have nothing to say on that problem.

Another Member – I think it was Ms Kempa – asked with whom I have been talking in the USA. Well, with the most prominent people, with Secretary of State Pompeo, with the National Security Advisor, Mr O'Brien, with Mr Kushner, the author of the plan, and with Ms Nancy Pelosi. And for sure the first three were very much in favour of their plan, while Ms Nancy Pelosi, who as you know is a Democrat, was very critical of it.

As I say, I am not expressing my opinion. In fact my opinion is of no interest here. I am expressing the majority of the Council, and the majority of the Council has supported the statement in which we sent a message saying that, first, everybody has to refrain from any unilateral actions contrary to international law which could exacerbate tensions further. We are asking that no one annexes the Jordan Valley. Yet this may happen. If it happens, you can be sure that it is not going to be peaceful. Maybe for some it doesn't matter, but for us it matters a lot because we cannot provoke a wave of violence – another wave of violence – in Palestine.

We are asking Palestinians to keep calm and not go to violent demonstrations. We asked for the proposal to be considered as a starting point and I said clearly that maybe it could break the stalemate and create the dynamics in which we can go and talk again about what we can do in order to look for a solution to this very old, damaging and painful problem.

I am not denying the possibility of this being a starting point. What I am denying is not this possibility, but the fact that it is being considered as an end point because, if I tell you 'come and negotiate, but I'll tell you one thing. If we don't agree, I will implement my proposal anyway.' – this is not a big incentive to negotiate. 'Come and negotiate but be aware that, if you don't agree with me, I will implement the proposal anyway.' Do you call that a negotiation? That's what we refuse. And that is what we have been saying.

And believe me, we invited Secretary of State Pompeo to come to the Foreign Affairs Council to explain directly to all Member States their proposal. I know that there are some who are closer to this position and others who are very far away from it. I know that there is not going to be a unanimous position on this. It's too divisive. But we have to discuss and we have to look, if not for unanimity, for the majority – whatever it is – and, believe me, I don't think the majority of the Member States of the European Union are considering this proposal as a good starting point. But we'll do our best and talk with everyone in order to try to break this stalemate and push for negotiations.

Some very optimistic people asked me why we don't try to do something like we did many years ago in Madrid – the Oslo process and the Madrid process. I think we have the commitment to do something. We cannot just refuse. We cannot say that's not good enough. We have to look for something that works and this is going to be part of the discussions that we are going to have next Monday in the Foreign Affairs Council.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito.* – O plano Trump é uma agressão ao povo palestiniano e ao direito internacional. Este plano enquadra-se na escalada belicista do imperialismo norte-americano e do regime sionista de Israel, que serve uma estratégia de desestabilização, provocação e domínio, que poderá ter graves consequências para os povos do Médio Oriente e do Mundo. Com este plano são violadas décadas de resoluções da ONU que reconhecem e consagram os direitos nacionais do povo palestiniano. Procura-se legitimar décadas de ocupação e terror contra o povo palestiniano, Ao prever, entre outras inaceitáveis medidas, a ocupação e anexação efetiva por parte de Israel de Jerusalém e de cerca de metade da Margem Ocidental do rio Jordão, assim como a legalização e continuidade territorial dos colonatos israelitas construídos em território palestiniano, o plano da Administração Trump tem como principal objetivo impor um novo e mais grave patamar na ocupação e anexação por Israel de territórios palestinianos, e o abandono da solução de dois estados, com as fronteiras de 1967 e a capital da Palestina em Jerusalém Leste. O plano Trump configura um gravíssimo abandono de qualquer perspetiva para uma solução justa, negociada e duradoura da questão palestiniana. Merece um pronto e inequívoco repúdio. Aqui sublinhamos a importância da unidade e da solidariedade em torno da causa palestiniana.

11. Настоящото положение със сигурността в Сирия (разискване)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung des Vizepräsidenten der Kommission und Hohen Vertreters der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zur aktuellen Sicherheitslage in Syrien (2020/2560(RSP)).

Auch hier möchte ich Sie daran erinnern, dass Sie spontane Wortmeldungen und Wortmeldungen nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" sowohl auf herkömmliche Weise als auch elektronisch beantragen können. Die Anleitung finden Sie am Eingang zum Plenarsaal.

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, the war in Syria is now in its ninth year. It is the most severe humanitarian catastrophe and security crisis; it is unfolding right now in the north-west of the country, and in other parts of Syria we continue to see instability and dramatic human suffering.

Last Thursday, we heard the United Nations Special Envoy Geir Pedersen and the Head of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Mark Lowcock briefing the United Nations Security Council on the situation in Idlib. They described how regime forces led by Russia and Iran are launching heavy military offensives with no regard for the civilian population or civilian infrastructure. 'We appear to have lost sight of the principle of proportionality', the United Nations Special Envoy said.

The intensification of military operations in Idlib has resulted in the indiscriminate killing of hundreds of civilians. Attacks continue on civilian targets in densely populated areas, on medical facilities and settlements for internationally displaced people. These are blatant and serious violations of international humanitarian law. There has to be accountability for those responsible.

Since military operations began in Idlib in February 2019, one year ago, more than one million people have been displaced towards Turkey – we are talking about one million displaced people in one year – and every day more Syrians are fleeing the fighting and another wave of refugees is quite possibly in the making.

We also see clashes between the Syrian regime and Turkish forces, plus the risk of Turkish and Russian militaries confronting each other. These tensions could in turn trigger a wider regional conflict. The ceasefire agreed between Ankara and Moscow must be implemented. This is the situation.

Now, let me say this. After almost a decade of violence, the suffering of the Syrian people at the hands of the regime and its backers must cease. Too many people have died and those that are alive face a bleak future. The EU has major stakes in Syria, and in the surrounding region. We cannot afford more regional instability and another migrant crisis. We must avoid a resurgence of Daesh and other terrorist organisations on Europe's doorstep.

The EU has a duty to preserve the rules-based international order, including the legitimacy of the United Nations Security Council. Yes, I know, we say that again and again, and we have to continue saying that. Recent military gains by the Syrian regime are not translating into stability. On the contrary, the Syrian regime will not bring peace and stability to Syria if it continues to pursue on military logic and the repression of its people. The economic situation is deteriorating rapidly, exacerbated by the banking crashes in Lebanon. The regime must change its behaviour.

We have stated from the very beginning that only a comprehensive and inclusive political solution, in line with United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254, will allow sustainable peace and stability in Syria and the region. The EU will continue to support the efforts of United Nations Special Envoy Pedersen in relaunching the Constitutional Committee in Geneva. We also need to focus on other parts of this resolution, such as a nationwide ceasefire, the release of detainees, and making progress on the file of missing persons.

Let's recall that the European Union is, and remains, the largest humanitarian donor to Syria and its people, both inside, and to Syrian refugees and host communities in neighbourhood countries. We are supporting the resilience of ordinary civilians and civil society to maintain the social fabric of Syrian society. We are convinced that our support is a fundamental investment – it is not an expenditure, it is an investment – in the future of Syria and the region, which is part of our future, and as a partner of the global coalition to defeat Daesh the EU is conducting stabilisation projects in the north-east of Syria. We are always prepared to do more on all these lines of action, within the limits of our common red lines. These are: no normalisation with the regime, no risking of our funding being diverted to the regime or to the terrorists, and no reconstruction before a political process is firmly under way.

We will continue to apply European Union sanctions targeting individuals and entities associated with the regime and responsible for its repressive and inhuman policies – and not the Syrian people. As I said before, the conflict in Syria is a geopolitical struggle. The European Union has a responsibility to lead for the sake of the Syrian people and to protect our own interests. While difficult, we must redouble our efforts to identify common interests with our other international stakeholders – Russia, the US, Turkey and others – and maybe I will have occasion to update on our discussions with Washington about this issue.

PRZEWODNICTWO: EWA KOPACZ

Wiceprzewodnicząca

Michaela Šojdrová, *za skupinu PPE*. – Paní předsedající, vážený pane vysoký představiteli, děkuji za Vaši zprávu. Válka v Sýrii, jak jste již uvedl, trvá 9. rok. Provincie Idlíb je posledním bojištěm syrského konfliktu, kterým se zřejmě Asad vypořádá s opozicí a upevní svoji moc.

Civilisté utíkají před vládními Asadovými jednotkami k turecké hranici, ta je nepropustná a podle humanitárních organizací se tam tísní kolem milionu lidí, někteří se stěhují opakovaně. Souhlasím s tím, že EU musí těmto lidem poskytovat humanitární pomoc a apeluji také na pokračování v projektech v provinciích zasažených konfliktem.

Víme, že zhruba 70 % prchajících civilistů jsou ženy a děti. Právě proto chci vyzvat, aby EU pokračovala v podpoře vzdělávání dětí i ve velmi těžkých podmínkách uprchlických táborů. Víme, že je to důležité, aby tyto děti neztratily perspektivu, ale není to řešení, o které nám musí jít dlouhodobě.

V této chvíli je osud Idlíbu závislý na jednáních mezi Damaškem, Moskvou, Ankarou a Spojenými státy a já se chci zeptat: Jakou roli zde hraje a bude hrát EU? Vy jste zde velmi správně zmínil roli Spojených národů. Myslím si, že dlouhodobé řešení musí být v režii OSN. Sankce a humanitární pomoc, kterou prosazuje EU, jsou na místě, ale já Vás vyzývám k tomu, aby zde byla daleko silnější role EU pro dlouhodobé uspořádání v Sýrii.

Kati Piri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the title of today's debate on the security situation in Syria carries with it the painful irony of reality because, colleagues, the reality is that there is no security in Syria. There is no security for the millions of civilians first bussed into the province and now besieged, bombed and starved in Idlib. There is only despair, destruction and death for the injured in the sixty-eight attacked hospitals, for the 373 killed, for the 700 000 refugees stuck in the freezing mud with no place to go, no clothes and no food.

Once again the Syrian regime, and its Russian and Iranian backers, are using their inhumane tactics. By explicitly targeting civilians and hospitals, they act in direct violation of humanity. Colleagues, I hope one day soon we will see Bashar Assad in my city – the Hague – so some justice can at least be done to the suffering of millions of Syrians.

Hilde Vautmans, *namens de Renew-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, al sedert 2018 weten wij dat Idlib onder enorme druk staat, een cruciaal bolwerk van verzet tegen het Assad-regime. Amerika heeft de Syrische bevolking in oktober vorig jaar in de steek gelaten. En Europa heeft nagelaten ooit iets voor die democratische verzetsgroepen te doen, dat moeten wij eerlijk durven zeggen. Wij zijn nu in een uitzichtloos conflict beland. Iedereen zegt het hier al: een proxyoorlog tussen Rusland en Turkije, met miljoenen mensen op de vlucht.

De vraag wat Europa kan en moet doen, is natuurlijk eenvoudiger gesteld dan beantwoord. Dat besef ik heel erg goed. Maar Europa, daar moeten wij eerlijk in zijn, heeft de boel wel mee laten verrotten. Want wij hebben Poetin en Trump vrij spel gegeven en daardoor zitten wij nu in deze zeer onveilige situatie. Wat ons parten heeft gespeeld, dat moeten wij ook duidelijk durven zeggen, is de verdeeldheid in de Raad. Met onder meer, maar niet alleen, de Italiaanse regering die toenadering zocht tot Assad. Ik verwijt het de Italianen niet, maar ik verwijt Europa wel in dat verband geen eenheid te bereiken.

Europa kan enkel bijdragen aan een duurzame oplossing als wij één strategie hebben, één strategie die wij samen uitdragen. De tijd dringt, want zowel Turkije als Israël hebben redenen om de greep op Assad te lossen. Europa moet dus heel snel met een nieuw plan komen en zijn engagement verhogen, met als eerste doel voor mij – misschien het eerste en enige doel – een staakt-het-vuren. Daar hebben de mensen, de kinderen recht op.

Thierry Mariani, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, neuf ans d'erreurs et l'Europe persévère. L'Union européenne et bien des États membres ont tenu des positions radicales sur le conflit syrien. D'un côté, au départ, il y avait le bien: les rebelles; de l'autre, le mal: le gouvernement syrien. Et puis il y a eu la réalité: en quelques semaines, les favoris des Occidentaux et des Américains ont été mis sur la touche par les factions islamiques, parce qu'elles ne représentaient que peu de chose dans le conflit en cours.

Dans les camps de la rébellion, on fomentait des attentats contre la France, contre les minorités, notamment chrétiennes. On changeait d'allégeance pour plaire tantôt à M. Erdoğan, tantôt aux wahhabites saoudiens, tantôt aux Frères musulmans de Doha.

L'Union européenne a voulu mettre les casques blancs en avant; on découvre que leur centre de commandement côtoyait ceux des djihadistes à Alep. La France a voulu ignorer l'idéologie des groupes concernés, elle se retrouve la semaine dernière avec le porte-parole de Jaich al-Islam, qui a terrorisé la région de la Ghouta, arrêté à Marseille grâce à un visa Erasmus.

Puis ce fut le temps de la condamnation de Poutine. Ces bombes étaient pourtant aussi meurtrières que celles de notre coalition à Mossoul ou à Raqqa. Pourtant, il faudrait maintenant préserver les djihadistes à Idlib. Mais mes chers collègues, je vous rappelle la phrase du rapport du Conseil de sécurité, en juillet dernier: Idlib est désormais le plus grand dépotoir de combattants terroristes étrangers au monde.

Oui, il faut préserver les civils. Mais aujourd'hui, que fait-on de ces terroristes? On ne veut pas les reprendre en Europe. Excusez-moi, soit on les reprend en Europe, si ce sont de gentils rebelles, et personne n'en veut, soit on laisse le gouvernement syrien faire ce que ferait tout gouvernement sur son territoire, à savoir: reprendre le contrôle de son territoire et ramener la paix en exterminant les rebelles.

Hannah Neumann, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Nach Idlib sind all jene Menschen geflohen, die es bisher nicht aus Syrien heraus geschafft haben. Drei Millionen sind dort eingeschlossen – eingeschlossen in einem Stellvertreterkrieg auf dem Rücken der Schwächsten. Zivilisten werden gezielt angegriffen, Krankenhäuser und Schulen bombardiert, Streumunition eingesetzt – was in Idlib gerade herrscht, das ist das Recht des Grausamsten.

Ja, die EU leistet humanitäre Hilfe. Das ist wichtig, und es muss weitergehen. Aber sie kann mehr tun: voller diplomatischer Einsatz für einen Waffenstillstand, Dokumentation der Kriegsverbrechen, Ausweitung der Sanktionen auch auf Verantwortliche in Russland und der Türkei, und ja, Aufnahmekontingente für die Schwächsten, sollten sie es je aus Idlib heraus schaffen.

Herr Borrell, diese umfassende politische Lösung für Syrien, die hat gerade niemand. Aber gerade deswegen ist es so wichtig, dass wir die kleinen Schritte, die wir gehen können, auch konsequent gehen, um der Grausamkeit in Syrien etwas entgegenzusetzen. Ich hoffe, dass wir da am Montag auf dem Außenministerrat auch einen großen Schritt weiterkommen.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – Уважаема г-жо Председател, уважаеми колеги, уважаеми г-н Върховен представител, чувам от много от Вас въпроси какво трябва да направи Европа и защо нищо не прави.

Уважаеми, Вие прекрасно знаете, че нищо не може да се направи от Ваша страна, и че никой от Вашите правителства няма да направи нищо. Дотогава, докато продавате оръжие на Саудитска Арабия. Дотогава, докато си затваряте очите за един диктатор, какъвто е Ердоган. Дотогава, докато се правите, че има умерени ислямисти, нищо няма да направите, освен този дебат тук, който е чисто и просто измиване на гузна съвест и губене на време.

Защото, уважаеми, Вие прекрасно знаете, че „умерените" ислямисти режат главите на християните в Сирия. Вие прекрасно знаете, че тези групи, които финансират Вашите правителства, всъщност са военнопрестъпници. Дотогава, докато ги подкрепяте, няма да можете да направите нищо, съжалявам. Губите Вашето време, губите времето и на европейските данъкоплатци.

Γιώργος Γεωργίου, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL.* – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Borrell, δεν μας χρειάζονται Πόντιοι Πιλάτοι. Η τραγωδία στη Συρία είναι πλέον απερίγραπτη και κάθε νέα της πτυχή είναι και πιο ντροπιαστική. Το τελευταίο επεισόδιο διαδραματίζεται στο Ιντλίμπ, εκεί όπου επτακόσιοι Σύριοι φοιτητές έχουν απαχθεί από τρομοκρατικές δυνάμεις που υποστηρίζονται από την Τουρκία. Άλλοι ναρκώνονται και άλλοι φανατίζονται και ρίχνονται στην πολεμική κρεατομηχανή. Ένα εκατομμύριο άνθρωποι έχουν προστεθεί στις προσφυγικές ροές.

Η ζώνη ασφαλείας που θα δημιουργούσε ο Tayyip Erdoğan, ο ανηλεής Erdoğan, έχει ανοίξει τις πύλες της κολάσεως. Ακούτε τι συμβαίνει; Δεν μιλάμε για ψυχρούς αριθμούς, μιλάμε για ανθρώπους, μιλάμε για μικρά παιδιά τα οποία έχουν όνειρα και ψυχή. Ή μήπως αυτά δεν λογαριάζονται; Στη Συρία κρίνεται το μπόι της Ευρώπης· στην Ανατολική Μεσόγειο κρίνεται το κύρος της ανθρωπότητας. Τα λαμβάνουμε όλα αυτά υπόψη ή τα αφήνουμε σε διαβολικά μυαλά ή στις διαβολικές, δαιμονικές, δήθεν «συμφωνίες του αιώνα»;

Isabel Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, mais de trezentos e setenta mortos e quase seiscentos mil deslocados nos últimos dois meses. Estes são os números esmagadores da realidade no noroeste da Síria, palco de uma catástrofe humanitária devastadora num país destruído por nove anos de conflito que tem exposto os sobreviventes a um sofrimento atroz.

Ataques indiscriminados atingem a população civil e infraestruturas fundamentais, apesar dos constantes apelos ao fim das hostilidades. As populações deslocadas, neste momento, vivem com falta de abrigo e de bens elementares. É imperativo continuar o fornecimento de assistência humanitária à população, enquanto se empregam os esforços necessários para um acordo sustentável, em conformidade com a Resolução 2254 do Conselho de Segurança da ONU.

O Senhor Alto Representante Borrell e o Comissário Lenarčič lançaram um apelo a que sejam criados corredores humanitários e condições de segurança necessárias para que as equipas possam assistir as populações.

Gostaria de saber que resposta obtiveram a este apelo.

Jan-Christoph Oetjen (Renew). – Frau Präsidentin! Seite Februar 2019, Sie haben es erwähnt, Herr Borrell, ist der Konflikt neu aufgeflammt. Es gibt über eine Million Vertriebene, und seit Dezember 2019, das müssen Sie sich einmal vergegenwärtigen, wird die Provinz Idlib und ihre Umgebung fast täglich durch das Regime von Baschar al-Assad bombardiert und dabei von der russischen Luftwaffe unterstützt.

Seit Freitagabend hat die Türkei mehr als 600 Militärfahrzeuge über die gemeinsame Ländergrenze gebracht. Es wird befürchtet, dass die Lage weiter eskaliert und es zu einer direkten militärischen Konfrontation zwischen Syrien und der Türkei kommt. Allein seit Dezember sind über 500 000 Menschen in Syrien geflüchtet, davon sind 80 % Frauen und Kinder. Diese Vertreibung ist eine der größten seit dem Beginn des Konflikts im Jahre 2011.

Seitdem dauert der Konflikt nun an – fast neun Jahre. In dieser Zeit sind über 400 000 Menschen getötet worden – darunter 22 000 Kinder –, und wir Europäer schauen immer noch zu.

Wir müssen uns jetzt für einen Waffenstillstand einsetzen, die Geflüchteten schützen, eine politische Lösung des Konflikts fordern, das sagen auch Sie, Herr Borrell. Aber was soll das konkret sein? Ist eine Blauhelmmission der richtige Weg? Ich möchte Sie auch daran erinnern, dass wir eine Verantwortung gegenüber den Kurden und Jesiden in der Region und eine moralische Pflicht haben.

Ivan David (ID). – Paní předsedající, klíčovým problémem situace v Sýrii je mocenské postavení a vyjednávací pozice Turecka.

EU je slabá a podléhá korupci, protože v ní vládnou nadnárodní koncerny a ty mají v Turecku své významné investice. EU je vydíratelná a je vydírána. EU si nedovolí zavést proti Turecku opravdu účinné obchodní sankce, zato pomohla Turecku sankcemi proti Sýrii. EU si nedovolí ani zrušit s Tureckem přístupové pohovory. EU sice zrušila předvstupní pomoc ve výši 150 milionů EUR, ale současně navýšila platby za nevypouštění imigrantů o 500 milionů EUR. Proto si Turecko dělá v Sýrii, co chce, a bude v tom pokračovat, dokud nenarazí na odpor.

Turecko vojensky obsazuje severní Sýrii, vyhnalo téměř milion Kurdů a křesťanů a dalších a usídluje tam veterány Islámského státu. EU ani není schopna se zastat svých členských zemí a zabránit Turecku v kradení plynu, v dávné okupaci severního Kypru. EU nese za situaci v Sýrii odpovědnost, ale nabízí morální postoje.

Assita Kanko (ECR). – Madam President, the situation in Syria is dire. The conflict has killed almost 400 000 people since 2011. This is an entrenched conflict rife with opposing interests and objectives. A solution must be found. The suffering of the Syrian people and the risk to long-term global stability have been too great for too long. The EU and its Member States have provided more than 17 billion in aid and the Council has targeted sanctions in place. But these are sticking plasters on a gaping wound.

EU Member States, the US and other international players must do everything they can to push for de-escalation and the freezing of this conflict so that a cease-fire can be honoured and a fragile peace can be maintained. Europe's influence in achieving this aim will be severely diminished if it cannot speak with one voice at both an EU or NATO level. There are no elegant solutions available, simply the urgent need for pragmatism and diplomatic determination. Let's do this.

Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL). – Fru formand! Revolutionen i Syrien startede som et folkeligt oprør mod et brutalt diktatur. Oprøret blev mødt med ekstrem undertrykkelse fra Assad-regimet, og oprøret blev svigtet af Europa. Nu er Syrien blevet en slagmark for regionale og globale stormagter. Den tyrkiske præsident Erdogan bruger ekstreme islamistiske militser til etnisk udrensning og erobring i det nordvestlige Syrien. Putin og det iranske præstestyre bruger Assad-regimet til krigsforbrydelser og massemord.

Hr. Borrell, EU skal sige fra over for Erdogan, Putin og Assad. Hr. Borrell, EU skal støtte kurderne og de pro-demokratiske kræfter i deres kamp mod Daesh og Assad-regimet. Lad os anerkende selvstyret i det nordøstlige Syrien diplomatisk. Lad os indføre økonomiske sanktioner mod Erdogan, indtil han stopper invasionen, og lad os kræve indsættelse af fredsbevarende FN-styrker, så civilbefolkningen i det nordvestlige Syrien kan blive beskyttet mod etnisk udrensning og overgreb. Hr. Borrell, det er tid til handling!

(Taleren accepterer at besvare et blåt kort-spørgsmål (forretningsordenens artikel 171, stk. 8))

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL), *blue-card question.* – Madam President, I'd just like to ask the last speaker, does he not accept the role that the EU, the US, Saudi Arabia, UAE have played in destabilising the region? Do you not accept the fact that this is a war made by interference by these powers? You arm the jihadists with the hope that they destabilise Syria; you went for regime change. It's a nonsense to suggest that the Kurds are even fighting the Syrians. The Kurds have their problems with Turkey, not with Assad's regime. It's absolute nonsense. The EU has blood on its hands.

Nikolaj Villumsen (GUE/NGL), *blue-card answer.* – Of course there is due political interest in Syria, but as we all saw, there was a peaceful demonstration by hundreds of thousands of civilians in Syria demanding freedom and democracy, and that cry for help was met with brutal oppression from the Assad regime. What shall we do?

The EU must stand on the side of the Kurds and the pro-democratic forces in Syria to fight for democracy and freedom. That's the only way we can have stability and peace in Syria and in the Middle East.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, rat u Siriji traje već devet godina, a eskalacija nasilja u i oko grada Idliba rezultirala je, uz Jemen, najgorom humanitarnom krizom u regiji. Zbog sukoba turske i sirijske vojske gotovo 400 000 ljudi moralo je napustiti svoje domove od prosinca prošle godine. Većini to nije bio prvi put, 80 % ovih izbjeglica su najranjivije skupine, žene i djeca. 53 zdravstvene ustanove su morale prestati s radom, a među izbjegličkom djecom manje od četvrtine su u sustavu obrazovanja. Raste broj civilnih žrtava. Ukupno 2 800 000 ljudi treba humanitarnu pomoć. Humanitarnu krizu zaoštravaju zimski uvjeti.

Geopolitička komisija i Europska unija kao jedinstveni svjetski promotor mira, stabilnosti, dijaloga mora od pasivnog promatrača preuzeti ulogu aktivnog predlagatelja rješenja. To je naša uloga. Trebamo intenzivirati razgovore sa sukobljenim stranama, ali ponuditi multilateralnu platformu za postizanje sporazuma. Za početak razmotrimo i za ovaj slučaj format nedavne briselske konferencije koja je ipak postigla određene rezultate u slučaju Libije.

Raphaël Glucksmann (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, monsieur le Haut représentant, cher collègue, je vous invite tous à regarder les vidéos postées sur les réseaux sociaux ces derniers jours par les soldats de Bachar El-Assad. On les voit détruire des tombes, déterrer des corps, s'amuser avec la tête de leur victime. On les voit rire – et ce rire gras est un crachat à la face du monde. Actuellement, dans la région d'Idlib, le boucher de Damas et ses parrains russes rasent des hôpitaux, des écoles, des boulangeries, et nous les laissons faire comme nous les avons laissé faire depuis neuf ans.

Et aujourd'hui, qu'est-ce que j'entends? J'entends ici, dans cette enceinte, certains faire l'apologie du régime et exhorter à l'extermination des rebelles. Alors laissez-moi vous faire part de ma honte et de mon indignation et vous demander, Monsieur le Haut représentant, de jamais céder à ces sirènes de la normalisation avec le régime d'Assad. N'oublions pas qui sont les victimes et qui sont les bourreaux, et n'oublions pas que la place de Bachar El-Assad est devant la Cour pénale internationale.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Traian Băsescu (PPE). – Doamna președintă, legat de Siria trebuie să înțelegem că Uniunea Europeană a trecut prin mai multe etape. Prima etapă a poziției Uniunii față de Siria a fost aceea în care Uniunea Europeană voia pe loc capul lui Bashar al Assad. În ultimii 2-3 ani am ajuns să spunem: îl vom judeca, nu îi vrem capul, dar să organizeze alegeri în Siria. Asta arată inconsecvență.

În fapt, am ezitat de la bun început să intervenim, n-am știut cum să-i facem pe francezi să se oprească și astăzi ne plângem de ce este în Siria. Siria va rămâne sub control rusesc, ăsta e adevărul. Ne plângem că intră Turcia în nordul Siriei. Orice stat ar fi intrat pentru a-și proteja frontiera.

Așa că, dragi colegi, cât timp n-o să înțelegem că a fi parte a deciziei înseamnă a participa, o să stăm să jeluim ce dezastru este în Siria. Ori intervenim și îi lăsam foarte bine pe francezi s-o facă, ori dacă nu, trebuie să ne abținem, pentru că suntem responsabili.

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D). – Señora presidenta, gracias al alto representante por su planteamiento en la cuestión de Siria. Yo no voy a repetir: los ataques a la población civil en el noroeste de Siria, las muertes, las atrocidades. Lo han dicho muchos diputados en esta Cámara. Por supuesto, lo condenamos e insistimos en la necesidad de garantizar el acceso de la ayuda humanitaria, pero es verdad que parece que nos encontramos ante una situación en la que no podemos intervenir de una manera más práctica y efectiva.

En el caso de Libia, la Unión Europea ha sido exitosa en declarar un embargo de armas, y el alto representante impulsó que fuéramos los europeos los que vigiláramos en el mar ese embargo. Es evidente que el régimen sirio dispone de armamento y de municiones. La pregunta a la que a lo mejor tendríamos que tratar de responder es si podemos promover un embargo de armas al régimen de Bashar al-Asad.

Leszek Miller (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Mamy do czynienia z wielkim dramatem i tysiącami problemów. Chciałem powiedzieć o trzech. Po pierwsze mamy do czynienia z kryzysem humanitarnym i ponad milionem uchodźców, którzy uciekają przed działaniami wojennymi w kierunku Turcji. Ludzie ci koczują przy granicy tureckiej. Po drugie – z nielegalną inwazją turecką na Syrię, która ani nie zapobiega działaniom wojennym, ani też nie odgrywa żadnej roli w pomocy humanitarnej. Wreszcie po trzecie – z uzbrajaniem przez Turcję następców Al-Kaidy w Syrii oraz innych organizacji terrorystycznych. Ponieważ za każdym razem występuje tu Turcja, to jest wskazówka dla Unii Europejskiej, żeby negocjować i wywierać presję na Turcję. Trzeba też zdecydowanie przeciwstawić się prześladowaniom ludności

kurdyjskiej, masowym wysiedleniom, grabieżom, a także zbrodniom wojennym popełnianym przez uzbrojonych i opłacanych przez Turcję dżihadystów na tym jakże ciężko doświadczonym narodzie.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, να το ξεκαθαρίσω, κύριε Borrell, δεν είμαι καθόλου θαυμαστής του καθεστώτος Assad, του οποίου τα χέρια είναι βουτηγμένα στο αίμα. Αλλά, ακούγοντας σήμερα κάποιες από τις απόψεις, νομίζω ότι υπάρχει μια σύγχυση. Θεωρούσα μέχρι τώρα ότι είχαμε πάρει ομόφωνη απόφαση, ότι ο στόχος μας και ο στόχος της Δύσης, του πολιτισμένου κόσμου, είναι η εξουδετέρωση του ισλαμικού κράτους και των τζιχαντιστών. Αν αυτό άλλαξε, κάποιοι να το πουν δημόσια.

Επομένως, το ερώτημα είναι ποιος χρηματοδοτεί τους τζιχαντιστές; Ποιος στέλνει στρατεύματα για να συνεχίζουν τις σφαγές τους; Ποιος τους χρηματοδοτεί εδώ και χρόνια; Έχει όνομα· είναι ο νεο-σουλτάνος στην Άγκυρα και το όνομα αυτού είναι Recep Erdoğan. Αυτό είναι το μεγάλο πρόβλημά μας και όσοι το λέμε δεν είναι γιατί συγχωρούμε τα εγκλήματα του Assad. Είναι γιατί έχουμε την τόλμη να λέμε την αλήθεια· γιατί πιστεύουμε στις ευρωπαϊκές αξίες.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Przedstawicielu! Ja się zgadzam z tym, co Pan powiedział na początku, że w Syrii, a także w krajach ościennych, jest katastrofa humanitarna. Tylko w samym Aleppo jest około 10 tysięcy sierot, które wymagają natychmiastowego wsparcia. Mój kraj angażuje się. Oprócz wpłat do agend Unii Europejskiej, tak jak się zobowiązywaliśmy, angażuje również dodatkowe środki na pomoc humanitarną, szczególnie właśnie w Syrii, w Libanie, a także w Jordanii. Dlatego myślę, że to, co Pan powiedział (że wsparcie to inwestycja), jest ważne, ale trzeba nam dzisiaj powiedzieć, i to jest bardzo ważne, że Unia jest największym darczyńcą.

Chciałabym też powiedzieć, że mamy informacje, że z półtora miliona chrześcijan w Syrii zostało już tylko niewiele ponad dwieście tysięcy i ich sytuacja jest bardzo dramatyczna. Trzeba postawić na NGO, na misjonarzy, na tych ludzi Kościoła, którzy tam prowadzą wielką akcję pomocową, protezują dzieci, na pomoc medyczną. To jest wielkie apel do całego świata, a Baszar al-Assad tak naprawdę tę wojnę już wygrał.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, este debate surge num momento em que o exército árabe sírio e os seus aliados avançam a grande ritmo nas províncias de Alepo e Idlib, recuperando controlo sobre regiões ocupadas por organizações terroristas.

Mas, o que este debate procura aqui, em Estrasburgo, está alinhado com o que se passa no terreno, com a entrada de um comboio militar turco em Idlib e o ataque de mísseis israelenses, e mais não é do que dar proteção a terroristas, assegurar controlo sobre os recursos naturais sírios, questionar a legitimidade das autoridades sírias e a integridade do seu território e ocupar essa região nevrálgica do ponto de vista geoestratégico.

Os interesses do imperialismo são contrários à defesa dos direitos humanos e do direito internacional e expressa-se, como neste Parlamento, de forma absolutamente hipócrita. A resolução deste conflito exige o fim da desestabilização e da agressão externa contra a República Árabe da Síria, a defesa da sua soberania, independência e integridade territorial e o respeito pelo direito internacional e pela Carta das Nações Unidas.

Mick Wallace (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, the Syrian army is making progress against the Turkey- and US-backed jihadists in Idlib Province. The Syrian Government is restoring its own borders and finding troves of US-made weapons as the jihadists flee.

Idlib Province was controlled by Al Qaeda local affiliates for years. These genocidal fanatics were armed, trained and given logistical assistance by the US, Britain, Turkey, France, Saudi Arabia and the UAE under Obama's Timber Sycamore programme. This helped prolong the war for several years and resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths that were unnecessary.

The EU is now calling for unrestricted access for humanitarian aid to Idlib Province. You are imposing sanctions that are causing untold hardship on the Syrian people. You let these jihadists into the place: why won't you take them back out of it? You do not want them now. You were offered them; you won't take them.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, there's no doubt about it, the Syrian people have been suffering for nine years and more. But why did it happen? Because the discontent of the people against the Assad Government was hijacked by international players to try and achieve regime change. Armed by the US and some EU Member States, jihadists poured into their country through Turkey. And ten years on, they weren't able to overthrow the government, who have regained control. And as they regained control they settled with people: some agreed to come back to the Government, some didn't and went to Idlib. So this day was always going to come.

And there *is* an irony, when we talk about foreign fighters who came from countries here, and we won't take them back, but we expect the Syrians to deal with them. The key issue here is ending the sanctions, sitting down with the Syrian Government, and restoring peace in that country. Take responsibility for Europe's role in this disaster and acknowledge the role of the Syrian Government in stopping the jihadists and the rise of ISIS.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Josep Borrell Fontelles, *Vicepresidente de la Comisión / Alto Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad.* – Señora presidenta, gracias a todos los diputados al Parlamento que han participado en este debate. No puedo sino decirles que comprendo y comparto el sentimiento de frustración de muchas de sus intervenciones porque, ante la crisis siria, lo cierto es que la Unión Europea ha quedado impotente. Y por mucho que digamos «deben cesar, deben, deben, deben, deben, *il faut, il faut, il faut, they should, they should, they should*», ¿con qué *leverage*, con qué fuerza, con qué capacidad podemos actuar sobre los actores?

Nos hemos pasado muchos años diciendo que no había solución militar al conflicto en Siria y, al final, ha habido una solución militar. La está habiendo. ¿Por parte de quién? Por parte de los que son capaces de utilizar la fuerza militar. Y Europa no está en esa situación. Entonces, seguiremos urgiendo a todos a que paren los ataques contra la población civil, a que dejen de impedir el acceso de la ayuda humanitaria, a que respeten las reglas y las obligaciones del Derecho humanitario internacional, a que protejan a los civiles. Pero todos sabemos que eso es una declaración de principios que no se apoya en una fuerza coercitiva que permita hacerla realidad.

Lo que ha ocurrido en Siria es una gran lección para Europa. Es una gran lección para ese actor geopolítico que decimos querer ser. Y si de verdad lo queremos ser tenemos que tomar las medidas y tener los medios necesarios para ello. De lo contrario, seguiremos haciendo sesiones parlamentarias como esta para seguir diciendo «*il faut, il faut, il faut*».

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

12. Новата всеобхватна стратегия ЕС—Африка (разискване)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest debata nad pytaniem wymagającym odpowiedzi ustnej skierowanym do Komisji przez Tomasa Tobé w imieniu Komisji Rozwoju w sprawie nowej kompleksowej strategii UE–Afryka (O-000007/2020 – B9-0006/2020) (2020/2500(RSP)).

Tomas Tobé, *author.* – Madam President, the comprehensive EU-Africa strategy is a window of opportunity for a much needed fresh start for EU-Africa relations, and let us promise each other here today that we will now try to move forward beyond words and good intentions to concrete actions. Let us be strategically action-oriented and not waste any more time. A new strategy must recognise the strength and potential in the African economy, pursue the long-term strategic and mutual interests of the EU and our African partners, and support the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

For the EU-Africa strategy to be successful, I believe that three things are necessary. Firstly, a clear vision of the end game, and a concrete plan to use a comprehensive approach with all available tools. Secondly, an awareness of what can be gained if we succeed in strengthening our partnership and what is at stake if we don't. Thirdly, defining how we can better use aid-effectiveness tools at our disposal and that the Commission take a lead in coordinating all EU institutions and Member States.

There are plenty of mutually beneficial opportunities – economic growth, employment and trade. There are also immediate challenges – climate change, poverty, conflict and irregular migration. The high population growth that we see in Africa also means that poverty levels will continue to increase. In 2030, global poverty is expected to be almost exclusively centred in Africa. Conflicts tend to brew in countries facing poverty and with high levels of unemployment.

On behalf of the Committee on Development, I have tabled a series of questions to the Commission and hopefully today we can get some clear answers. Firstly, how does the strategy effectively contribute to the implementation of the SDGs and the fundamental objectives of poverty eradication? What measures and what mechanisms will be put in place?

Secondly, how will the new strategy contribute to the strategic interests and common priorities of both partners with a view to good governance, human rights, the fight against inequalities, climate change, etc.? Thirdly, how will the Commission ensure the involvement of numerous stakeholders, like national parliaments, governments, local authorities, the private sector, civil society, in the design of the strategy?

And fourthly, let me also express some concern regarding the potential for overlaps. What I'm talking about is the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI), in which Africa is of course a priority, as well as the negotiations on the future of the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement. To be concrete, how will the Commission ensure consistency and avoid the risk of developing overlapping strategic frameworks?

Finally, development policy coherence is something that is in our Treaty obligations and it's high time that we tried to deliver on that commitment. Therefore, I would like to know: how will you make sure to incorporate development policy coherence in the strategy design.

To conclude, from the colleagues in the Committee on Development: we do look forward to working together with the Commission. We have a huge task in front of us but also great opportunities. Let's get the work started together.

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, I would like to start by thanking you for inviting me to discuss such a milestone in Europe-Africa relations as the new EU strategy for Africa. As I committed during my hearing to do my utmost to strengthen and deepen the cooperation between the Commission and the European Parliament, I am glad to exchange with you here today.

How more appropriate for my first address to this Chamber than discussing our relationship with the African continent? I value your experience, knowledge and views and believe them to be important for a topic such as this one. On our first trip outside Europe, President von der Leyen and I went to Hear Africa. We experienced a continent of youth, brimming with confidence, full of potential and attractive for the global players. We met a partner that deserves a more positive engagement from us.

We have already paved the way for change with the Africa-Europe Alliance for Sustainable Investment and Jobs, supported by the External Investment Plan for sustainable investments, and have achieved, in such a short amount of time, tangible progress. Now we can capitalise on those achievements and go further. It is time for a new chapter that brings a step change in our relationship.

For that to happen, we need a new, comprehensive strategy, a strategy that supports Africa's potential political economic governance efforts and moves to bolster peace and resilience, a strategy with Africa that ensures partners' ownership and commitment, and a strategy that better positions the EU in the new global context, reflecting the aims of this geopolitical Commission and the ambitions of the European Green Deal.

The Abidjan priorities we set back in 2017 remain valid today. Our approach is not to change direction, but to step up a gear for better results. The strategy's comprehensive character will be ensured by its inbuilt links with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on climate change, the EU Global Strategy, the European Consensus on Development and Agenda 2063 of the African Union.

We will continue to work on economic continental integration, human development, mobility and migration. Thematically, apart from addressing the climate and environmental challenges, we will focus on digitalisation and gender equality, which are major enablers for development. There cannot be development without solid governance, respect for human rights, the rule of law and democracy. Therefore, we will pursue our efforts in these areas, along with the fight for peace and security, and against extremism.

Finally, yet importantly, we would like to work closer with our African partners on the multilateral rule-based system that is being called into question more and more. A key priority through my mandate, I will ensure that the implementation of this strategy supports the power that youth represents. Young people, including young women, must also own this strategy. Work on the new ambitious framework is already ongoing, both at political and technical level. In the meantime, we continue listening and trying to ensure broad ownership of the strategy, both by yourselves and our Member States, as well as by our African partners and civil society, including young people.

We will hold an EU-AU 'college to college' meeting on 27 February in Ethiopia and a ministerial meeting in May. Both events will provide key opportunities for dialogue with our African partners. I intend to travel to Africa in February and March to consult as broadly as possible. The proposal for the new strategy will be on our college agenda for adoption in early March. That will mark the beginning of more concrete work with our key stakeholders.

I look forward to our debate and hearing your views on what you see as priority areas for a renewed Africa-EU partnership.

Hildegard Bentele, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin! Weshalb brauchen wir eine neue EU-Afrika-Strategie? Weil sich die EU-Kommission ausdrücklich erstmals als geopolitisch definiert und sich als Ganzes der Umsetzung der VN-Nachhaltigkeitsziele verschrieben hat, wegen der drängenden Probleme Klimaschutz und Migration, weil das Cotonou-Abkommen neu abgeschlossen werden muss und wir den *Green Deal* haben, wegen der schnellen Entwicklung der Digitalisierung und einer neuen Freihandelszone in Afrika. Das alles sind neue Gegebenheiten, auf die eine EU-Afrika-Strategie eingehen muss.

Aus meiner Sicht ist es wichtig, dass wir den ganzen Instrumentenkasten der EU und der Mitgliedstaaten in kohärenter Weise zur Anwendung bringen und Lektionen aus der Vergangenheit ziehen. Das heißt in erster Linie: Fokussierung auf faire Handelsbeziehungen und Generierung von Steuereinkommen in den afrikanischen Staaten, Bildungsmöglichkeiten, Demokratie- und Rechtsstaatsförderung, leistungsfähige Verwaltung und Sicherheitsstrukturen, stärkere Förderung von Frauen und Mädchen und die Einbeziehung der regionalen und lokalen Ebene anstatt bloßer klassischer Budgethilfe. Ziel des Ganzen muss sein, dass jede Afrikanerin und jeder Afrikaner eine gesicherte Lebensperspektive in seinem Heimatland oder seiner Heimatregion hat.

Wir brauchen sowohl auf Seiten der EU als auch auf Seiten Afrikas Verantwortung für eine echte Partnerschaft, die zum beiderseitigen Vorteil ist. Unser Fraktionsvorsitzender, Manfred Weber, hat im letzten Jahr unter anderem mit seinem Vorschlag für einen Afrika-Kommissar sehr deutlich gemacht, welch hohe Priorität das Thema EU-Afrika für die EVP hat. Ich sage Ihnen hiermit jegliche Unterstützung und Engagement zu, damit wir am Ende dieser Wahlperiode die EU-Afrika-Beziehungen auf eine neue und bessere Grundlage gestellt haben werden.

Udo Bullmann, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir sind froh, dass Sie genau an dieser Stelle stehen und ein großes Herz für diese neue Aufgabe mitbringen.

Ja – Europa, Afrika, wir sind Partner. Und wir sind in einer Schicksalsgemeinschaft, und wir meistern unsere Probleme in den nächsten Jahren zusammen – oder wir werden beide scheitern. Deswegen ist die erste Konsequenz eine Partnerschaft auf Augenhöhe. Wenn wir das aber sagen, heißt das: keine kurzfristigen nationalen Interessen, auch nicht vermeintliche, kurzfristige europäische Interessen, sondern eine Partnerschaft für gute Ausbildung. Ja, lasst die Mädchen in die Schule gehen – insbesondere auch die Mädchen, mindestens für zehn Jahre –, damit sie ihrem Land helfen können; eine Gesundheitsversorgung für alle, gute Arbeit – und das ist mehr als *employability* – gute Arbeit, um die Länder aufzubauen, um nachhaltige Gesellschaften zu entwickeln, in Europa wie in Afrika.

Das ist unser Job, und dazu wollen wir von Herzen beitragen und Sie nach Kräften unterstützen.

Charles Goerens, *au nom du groupe Renew.* – Madame la Présidente, le Congo est le premier pays francophone au monde. Parmi les langues les plus parlées en Afrique figurent le portugais, le français et l'anglais. Par ailleurs, l'Union européenne est de loin le premier partenaire de l'Afrique en matière commerciale et dans le domaine du développement. Autant dire que nous avons, en tant qu'Union européenne, d'ores et déjà des liens extrêmement étroits.

Tabler sur le maintien du statu quo pourrait cependant s'avérer extrêmement contre-productif. Ce qu'il nous faut, c'est une stratégie globale couvrant tant les domaines politique, sécuritaire, développemental et économique que commercial. Une vraie stratégie de cette envergure se doit de fixer des objectifs clairs dans le temps, ainsi qu'une feuille de route pour les réaliser. En fait, c'est la transposition, d'une certaine façon, de la méthode Delors qui, dans les années 1990, a permis à l'Union européenne de faire des progrès considérables, dans nos relations avec le continent africain. De nos jours, le développement en Afrique est conditionné, de toute évidence, par les Africains eux-mêmes, mais aussi de plus en plus par la Chine, l'Inde et la Russie qui tissent des liens de plus en plus étroits sur le plan économique, politique et militaire. C'est sur cette toile de fond que doit s'affirmer la coopération de l'Union européenne avec l'Afrique.

Pourquoi n'avoir pas en commun une approche sécuritaire permettant à l'Union africaine de siéger au sein du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU? Pourquoi ne pas s'entendre, dès à présent, sur une démarche commune en matière de changement climatique? Qu'est-ce qu'on attend finalement pour mettre sur les rails une coopération commerciale visant l'instauration d'une zone de libre-échange entre l'Union économique et l'Union africaine? L'Afrique doit se développer elle-même, bien évidemment, ce qui n'exclut aucunement un partage de nos expériences.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ID*. – Madame la Présidente, ce n'est pas un hasard si, au tournant du Brexit, Londres lançait le 20 janvier dernier son sommet Royaume-Uni-Afrique. Cette initiative nous rappelle à quel point l'Union européenne risque d'y perdre encore du terrain, puisque privée de son allié britannique, acteur diplomatique et commercial majeur sur ce continent. D'autant que les sommets similaires se multiplient de la Russie en passant par la Chine ou le Japon, avec, la semaine dernière la tournée africaine du premier ministre canadien Justin Trudeau.

Dans ce contexte, les vagues promesses de partenariat d'égal à égal arrivent un peu tard, d'autant que, des accords de pêche inéquitables aux velléités d'ingérence politique accrue en Afrique, rien ne confirme ce soi-disant nouveau départ diplomatique et commercial.

Mais le plus consternant, c'est l'attentisme sur l'urgence migratoire, cruciale aux yeux de tant d'Européens. La question orale plaidait même pour l'élargissement du programme Erasmus, alors qu'on sait pertinemment qu'on ouvrira ainsi une nouvelle filière d'immigration africaine. Bref, l'Union s'apprête à rééditer l'échec de Cotonou, avec à la clé une décennie perdue.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, le partenariat entre l'Union européenne et l'Afrique est fondé sur une stratégie commune qui souligne la nouvelle coopération en matière de politique sur une base de valeurs négociée, partagée d'égal à égal, et qui détermine ces relations. Les nouveaux accords sur cette stratégie ont été conclus lors du sommet Union européenne-Afrique à Abidjan en 2017 par les chefs d'État, qui ont mis l'accent sur leurs priorités.

Ils ont identifié quatre priorités d'action commune, dont l'investissement dans le capital humain, la résilience, la paix, la bonne gouvernance ainsi que l'investissement dans des structures pour un développement durable et la migration. Ce choix en matière de coopération est aussi une façon de prendre ses distances par rapport aux relations paternalistes qui ont jusqu'ici prévalu. Aux négociations concernant les relations économiques et celles de développement vient s'ajouter, entre autres, le nouvel aspect de la stratégie.

Cette nouvelle initiative soutenue par la Commission européenne soulève cependant de nombreuses questions: comment parviendra-t-on à éradiquer la pauvreté? Comment parviendra-t-on à enrayer les grands mots qui freinent le développement et à donner une perspective sûre aux jeunes et aux femmes, qui représentent 60 % de la population sur ce continent?

Jadwiga Wiśniewska, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Pani Komisarz, pilnie potrzebujemy przede wszystkim nowej strategii Unia–AKP. Powinniśmy zmierzyć się z nowymi wyzwaniami, szczególnie z problemem migracji. Młodzież migruje z Afryki i z innych krajów AKP, bo ograniczone są możliwości jej dostępu do edukacji, do rozwoju osobistego, do godnego życia. Dlatego dziś powinniśmy postawić sobie pytanie i poszukać odpowiedzi na nie. Czego potrzebuje młodzież z krajów AKP? Przede wszystkim dobrej edukacji. Najlepszą inwestycją jest inwestycja właśnie w edukację. Niedostateczny dostęp do niej jest realną przeszkodą dla rozwoju gospodarczego i eliminacji ubóstwa. Tak więc stawiajmy na edukację i wspierajmy przedsiębiorczość młodych ludzi. Stwarzajmy im dostęp do mikrokredytów. Unia Europejska powinna ustanowić łatwy, prosty, skuteczny mechanizm, który pozwoli młodym ludziom zakładać firmy w krajach, z których się wywodzą. Oni chcą budować dobrobyt swoich ojczyzn.

Miguel Urbán Crespo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL.* – Señora presidenta, es evidente que la Unión Europea necesita una nueva estrategia para África. El problema es que parece ser que Europa quiere una estrategia que responda a los intereses de sus multinacionales y de las élites políticas y no a los objetivos de desarrollo y a los intereses de las mayorías sociales africanas. ¿Por qué? No nos hagamos trampas. Migraciones, seguridad, comercio o inversiones son en realidad la agenda geopolítica de la Unión Europea.

Lo que África y Europa necesitan es una relación duradera basada en los derechos humanos, el desarrollo social y la sostenibilidad medioambiental. Y, para ello, este tipo de estrategias no pueden ser herramientas de los intereses comerciales o securitarios europeos, sino que tenemos que darle una vuelta de 180 grados a nuestras políticas, para que sean coherentes desde un enfoque de derechos.

Empecemos practicando con África un comercio justo, abriendo vías legales y seguras para migrar y exigiendo a las empresas europeas que cumplan con sus obligaciones fiscales y con el respeto de los derechos laborales y de los derechos humanos.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, saúdo a opção da Comissão Europeia por se ter afirmado como uma Comissão geopolítica e escolhido as relações com África para demonstrar na prática essa opção.

A União Europeia precisa, para se posicionar com sucesso no quadro geopolítico em transformação, de continuar a desempenhar o seu papel de potência multilateral que promove parcerias entre iguais.

A parceria estratégica com a África tem que conter as ferramentas de resposta aos anseios dos povos num quadro de respeito pelos direitos humanos.

Estar alinhada com a concretização dos objetivos do desenvolvimento sustentável em todas as suas dimensões.

Apostar no empoderamento e reforço da sociedade civil.

Assegurar a consistência e a estreita articulação desta estratégia com o acordo pós-Cotonou de que é um dos pilares e garantir a valorização e o envolvimento dos parlamentos, designadamente através da manutenção da dimensão parlamentar da parceria ACP-União Europeia e das relações do Parlamento Europeu com o Parlamento Pan-Africano.

Este é um caminho de sucesso que juntos vamos trilhar.

Chrysoula Zacharopoulou (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, regardons l'Afrique de 2020: elle a un nouveau visage, celui de sa jeunesse et de ses femmes. L'Afrique est prête à relever les défis auxquels elle fait face, et le choix qu'elle fera aujourd'hui aura un impact décisif sur l'avenir du monde.

Regardons maintenant l'Europe de 2020: un continent de valeurs et d'expérience, mais aussi un continent qui, plus que jamais, a besoin d'alliés. L'Europe a besoin d'une Afrique forte et fière d'elle-même, comme l'Afrique a besoin d'une Europe unie qui lui parle d'une seule et même voix. C'est la condition pour faire vivre le multilatéralisme et atteindre les objectifs de développement durable.

Madame la Commissaire, la nouvelle stratégie devra incarner une relation refondée entre nos deux continents. Il faut mettre définitivement fin à l'époque postcoloniale et à ce récit. Nos partenaires africains sont demandeurs d'une relation d'égal à égal. Nous aussi, Européens, voulons écrire cette nouvelle page avec eux et élaborer une stratégie non pas pour l'Afrique, mais avec l'Afrique.

Nous avons aussi un autre devoir, celui de permettre aux Européens de comprendre l'Afrique dans toute sa diversité, et non plus sous le seul angle de la migration.

Madame la Commissaire, le nouvel intitulé de votre portefeuille, «partenariats internationaux», ouvre cette nouvelle page de notre histoire. En tant que parlementaire, je suis fière de l'écrire avec vous, avec le Conseil, avec nos alliés africains et avec tous mes collègues.

Maria Arena (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, madame la Commissaire, depuis la fin de la période coloniale et les indépendances des pays africains, l'Union a multiplié les accords de coopération avec l'Afrique. Nous avons eu, bien sûr, les accords de Yaoundé et de Lomé, l'accord de Cotonou, et j'en passe, mais la plupart de ces accords, avouons-le, étaient certes de nature à définir notre rapport à l'Afrique, mais surtout souvent là pour maintenir notre influence et nos intérêts sur le continent.

Le bilan, après un demi-siècle de coopération, n'est pas brillant. Il n'est pas brillant si on regarde les indices de développement, si on regarde la diversification économique, si on regarde les inégalités, ou encore la sécurité sur le continent africain. Loin de moi l'idée d'abandonner notre relation à l'Afrique, et je salue l'initiative de la future stratégie Union européenne-Afrique, mais il va de soi que nous devons faire preuve de plus de cohérence et de plus de transparence.

De la cohérence dans les différents instruments que nous avons, et c'est le travail que nous avons à réaliser dans le cadre du NDCI, mais aussi de la cohérence par rapport à nos politiques. Nous ne pouvons plus, par exemple, défendre une relation commerciale qui ne favorise pas le développement régional et qui détruit les agricultures locales au profit des agriculteurs européens. Il faudra aussi de la transparence et de la gouvernance, donc oui à une stratégie Union-Afrique, mais en évitant les erreurs du passé.

María Soraya Rodríguez Ramos (Renew). – Señora presidenta, señora comisaria, el continente africano no es el continente solo de la inmigración, es el continente del futuro, de los jóvenes y de las mujeres, que cada vez pisan más fuerte y pisan más lejos. Creo que esta nueva estrategia con Europa tiene que ser una estrategia verde. La lucha contra el cambio climático y las energías limpias tienen que ocupar un elemento central de nuestra nueva relación con el continente africano.

En el último siglo, África solo ha contribuido con un 2 % de emisiones al calentamiento global. Sin embargo, hoy sufre las peores consecuencias. Los efectos del cambio climático son una realidad, y es precisamente en África donde muere el mayor número de personas como consecuencia de las sequías y las inundaciones. Por lo tanto, adaptación, resiliencia, energía limpia, energía renovable tienen que ocupar un elemento central en nuestra nueva relación. Europa necesita más recursos, pero sobre todo necesita más responsabilidad por parte de la Unión Europea.

Giuliano Pisapia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel dibattito di oggi una sola parola si è ripetuta più volte: la parola «migrazione». Pur riconoscendo la sua portata e le sfide che l'accompagnano, sono convinto che lo sviluppo sociale, economico e democratico sia e debba essere l'obiettivo prioritario. Ridurlo a mero mezzo per frenare la migrazione è ciò che rende la nostra strategia debole, ipocrita e inefficace.

Pace, diritti e sviluppo sono il DNA dell'Unione europea. Condividiamoli con il popolo africano ed evitiamo gli errori del passato. I fondi europei devono essere investiti per la crescita del continente e non per finanziare i *lager* che macchiano la nostra coscienza. Il 2020 potrebbe e dovrebbe essere l'anno della svolta nei rapporti tra Unione europea e Africa.

Concludo con le parole di Nelson Mandela: «Nessuno è nato schiavo, né signore, né per vivere in miseria, ma siamo tutti nati per essere fratelli».

Samira Rafaela (Renew). – Madam President, firstly, I would like to thank Commission President von der Leyen for undertaking her first international trip to the African Union – an important signal. Africa and Europe are at a crossroads, and we need to change our mindset, it is time to see each other as equals.

We have the most promising continent right at our doorstep. Highly promising initiatives are being taken, and the African Continental Free Trade Area is the latest example of this. This ambitious project can transform Africa into a bastion of multilateralism. I call on the European Commission to do everything it can to support and facilitate the creation of the African Continental Free Trade Area.

The upcoming paper from the Commission should reflect this and contain a number of concrete measures on this. It is very much in our own interest to have a united African Union. We should embrace it when others seek to unite themselves, especially in times when certain forces are out there to defeat us. The partnership between the European Union and the African countries should be one of equals.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, África, este continente vecino, tiene que ser una prioridad. Debemos contribuir a su paz y seguridad, a su desarrollo, a la mejora de las instituciones de los países africanos y también a la formación de su juventud. Y es importante, asimismo, que los flujos migratorios procedentes de África sean ordenados.

Se trata de un continente, como es sabido, con un enorme reto demográfico. Necesitamos una nueva estrategia para África y también que la cumbre UE-África del próximo semestre sea un hito importante.

Quiero referirme a la ribera sur del Mediterráneo, a nuestra vecindad meridional, la más cercana. Se cumplen 25 años del llamado Proceso de Barcelona, pero no hemos podido construir ese espacio de prosperidad compartida, estabilidad y libertad que buscábamos. Me atrevo a decir que, en algunos casos incluso, la presencia de la Unión Europea ha retrocedido. ¿Qué potencias extranjeras están en Siria? ¿Quién tiene el protagonismo en Libia? ¿Desempeña algún papel la Unión Europea en el proceso de paz en Oriente Próximo? Las respuestas no ayudan al optimismo.

Insisto, tenemos que redoblar nuestros esfuerzos en África y, particularmente, en el Mediterráneo sur.

Maria Manuel Leitão Marques (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, África é hoje o continente mais jovem do mundo. Tal como entre nós, as tecnologias digitais despertam curiosidade e criam oportunidades. Oportunidades para encontrar novas soluções para velhos problemas. Para combater a mutilação genital feminina, através de uma *app* como as jovens do Quénia aqui mostraram. Para a inclusão financeira, através de moeda virtual, com o telemóvel, como o MPESA, no Quénia e em Moçambique. Para diminuir o desequilíbrio de género, na área da tecnologia, com o concurso *Miss Geek Africa* ou o *Tech needs girls* no Gana.

O foco na economia digital, a prevenção dos riscos que esta comporta, o investimento na formação, a capacitação dos jovens e mulheres nas STEM são, portanto, tão fundamentais em África como na União Europeia. Por isso, esta estratégia deve promover e estreitar as nossas parcerias, também na área da transição digital. Devemos olhar para a África como um parceiro, com necessidades, desafios e oportunidades iguais às nossas.

Beata Kempa (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Komisarz! Dziękujemy za nowe podejście i nową strategię dla Afryki. Strategia ta jest niezwykle potrzebna. Rozmawialiśmy o tym w komisji DEVE i dziękuję. Skupia się jak w soczewce: wojny plemienne, bezrobocie, ubóstwo, brak perspektyw dla młodych ludzi, co jest niestety źródłem nielegalnej imigracji. Bardzo ważne zjawisko, które nadal jest dzisiaj obserwowane w Afryce, to przede wszystkim handel ludźmi.

W Polsce w ubiegły piątek rozpoczęliśmy wielką akcję zbiórki, poprzez dwie organizacje: Pomoc Kościołowi w Potrzebie i Fundację HAART, na wsparcie osób, które wyzwalają się z tego potężnego procederu. Wiemy, że potrzeba też takiej pomocy dzieciom, które są sprzedawane do niewoli. To są często też pięcioletnie dziewczynki, które są sprzedawane do niewoli seksualnej. Są takie kraje jak Kenia, gdzie są targi i nadal odbywa się sprzedaż ludzi. Młody chłopczyk kosztuje trzysta dolarów. Pani Komisarz, myślę, że warto w naszej strategii dla Afryki, strategii Unii, ująć jednak też tę kwestię. Nie może być tak, że będziemy aktywni tam, gdzie jest zalegalizowany handel ludźmi.

Silvia Modig (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komissaari Urpilainen, pidän erittäin tärkeänä, että Afrikkaa tässä strategiassa lähestytään aidon tasavertaisen ja samanarvoisen kumppanuuden kautta. Sen tulee olla aitoa kumppanuutta niin koulutuksen, kaupan kuin ilmastonmuutoksen ratkaisujen saralla. Afrikka ja sen kehitys ovat monella tapaa aivan keskeinen kysymys koko maailman tulevaisuuden kannalta, mutta Afrikka mantereena on niin laaja ja suuri – yhtä laaja kuin edustaja Tobén tärkeä kysymys, joten siitä keskusteleminen veisi viikon aikaa.

Haluan nostaa esille yhden asian, jonka toivon näkeväni tulevassa strategiassa vahvana ja konkreettisena, eli naisten ja tyttöjen aseman. Naisten aseman parantaminen lisää kehityksen mahdollisuuksia kaikilla aloilla. Kuten myös Euroopassa, mikään mantere tai maa ei selviä, jos se ei ota toista puolta väestöstä mukaan. Naisten aseman kautta paranee myös tyttöjen asema, mahdollisuus koulunkäyntiin, seksuaaliterveyteen ja myös perhesuunnitteluun, jossa lasten määrä on vapaa ja positiivinen valinta, ei pakon sanelema. Toivottavasti tämä, komissaari Urpilainen, tulee näkymään vahvasti tulevassa strategiassa.

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, Madam Commissioner, I welcome your statement when you said you went with Ms von der Leyen to Africa, to Hear Africa. I think that was a very important trip and, as you said, it's a continent full of youth, confidence and potential. I think it's very important at this stage that we would review and have a look at the cooperation and the operations between the European Union and Africa. I think there has been success there but now, in times when we have developed sustainable development goals, when we have the Paris Climate Change Agreement, it is time for a renewed focus on that relationship.

I particularly think the issues around high-level unemployment is somewhere where Europe can act in facilitating and supporting job development and creation. I have visited the continent myself on a number of occasions in the previous mandate, and there is certainly a lot that Europe can do in supporting indigenous industries, in developing jobs there, and certainly through education also. So at this point, I think it's very positive for Europe that we would develop with our neighbours, Africa, a renewed strategy.

Clare Daly (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, I think the EU strategy on Africa can be loosely summed up as a lot of very nice soft language – we talk about empowerment, we talk about development, we talk about equality – but really in many ways they are just a figleaf for the imposition of neoliberal globalisation. We see it in many of the trade arrangements, where the least-developed countries in the ACP lose their non-reciprocal tariff exemptions and preferences, but meanwhile European, particularly the agricultural file and so on, keeps its protectionist mechanisms that we have adopted for ourselves.

I think that neoliberal trade agreements aren't the only feature of an unbalanced EU-Africa relationship. I think of particular concern is the growing military presence in that area, particularly in the Sahel, led by the French, backing up as a permanent aid to dictators in that region in order to try and support their French interests in raw materials and cheap labour. That isn't good enough when we're talking about equality.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Szanowne Koleżanki i Koledzy! Nowa strategia UE–Afryka musi być dopasowana do zmieniającej się sytuacji politycznej i środowiskowej. Jej podwaliną, a także podstawą jakichkolwiek wzajemnych relacji i porozumień muszą być prawa człowieka i demokracja. Aby promować wolność słowa i wprowadzać demokratyczne standardy, niezbędne jest pogłębienie dialogu politycznego i współpraca z Unią Afrykańską. W centrum strategii powinny znaleźć się działania na rzecz poprawy bezpieczeństwa, pokoju, redukcji ubóstwa, dobrego systemu edukacji i służby zdrowia, walki z terroryzmem i handlem ludźmi. W tym celu konieczne jest uruchomienie pomocy finansowej dla krajów borykających się z tymi fundamentalnymi problemami. Nie możemy zapomnieć o działaniach na rzecz klimatu. Unia Europejska powinna kontynuować wsparcie dla afrykańskiej inicjatywy dotyczącej energii ze źródeł odnawialnych.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Jutta Urpilainen, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, honourable Members, let me thank you for this constructive exchange. I have to say that I'm confident in our ability to build a new strategic and fruitful partnership with Africa which is focused on sustainable development. Your contribution to the strategy is key in the process of shaping its basis. The Commission, together with the European External Action Service, are still drafting the strategy in order to make it as comprehensive as possible.

Dear Members of Parliament, please be assured your comments here today have been noted. I am especially happy that so many of you mentioned youth and young people. The strategy will constitute a significant change in strengthening our partnership with Africa. The strategy will work towards fighting global challenges that both our continents simply cannot, and must not, ignore. 2020 will be a pivotal year for the Africa-Europe partnership. We agreed with the ACP chief negotiator, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Togo, Professor Robert Dussey, that we will aim at closing the post-Cotonou negotiations by the end of March, and we will hold in the run up to the African Union-European Union summit a number of side events, with the main stakeholders all providing opportunities to design our partnership together. We will also strive to ensure that we will dispose of the right means to implement our policies by facilitating the agreement of the MMF in good time.

We need to join forces as institutions to deliver on these important milestones. Only together – only together – we can create sustainable safe and peaceful communities in which our planet can recover and all of us can learn, work, grow and build fulfilling lives. I am really looking forward to continuing our fruitful exchange.

Przewodnicząca. – Zamykam debatę.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 171)

Kinga Gál (PPE), *írásban.* – Európa biztonsága és jövője függ az afrikai kontinenstől. Az kell a célunk legyen, hogy a Száhel övezet stabil legyen. Minden politikai, gazdasági és humanitárius támogatást meg kell adni azoknak az érintett országoknak, amelyek a stabilitás megőrzésének letéteményesei és a válságok továbbterjedésének megakadályozói. Olyan infrastrukturális fejlesztésekre van szükség, amelyek javítják a helyiek életminőségét, pontosabban az érintett országok egészségügyi, öntözéstechnikai, élelmiszeripari és vízgazdálkodással összefüggő rendszereinek működését. Például egy adott közösségnek víztisztító berendezést adva több ezer ember életminőségének javításához járulhatunk hozzá.

Magyarország a Hungary Helps humanitárius-segélyezési programján keresztül élen jár a téren tett erőfeszítésekben, 16 millió eurós ugandai ivóvízellátás fejlesztési programja követendő példát mutat. Az unió forrásait a migrációs válság gyökereinek kezelésére kellene használnia, hiszen segíteni ott kell, ahol a baj van, nem pedig a bajt kell Európába hozni. Egy élhető afrikai jövőkép tudatában az emberek nem indulnának el saját és gyermekeik életét kockáztatva Európába. Az afrikai problémákat csakis Afrikában lehet megoldani, Európának pedig vezető szerepet kell vállalnia az afrikai lakosság helyben maradásának segítésében.

György Hölvényi (PPE), *írásban.* – Tisztelt Biztos Asszony! Tisztelt Képviselő Társaim! Afrika lakosságánál, földrajzi helyzeténél, országai jelenleg zajló politikai átalakulása miatt is Európa elsődleges, stratégiai partnere, szövetségese kell hogy legyen. Jelenleg a két kontinenst összekapcsoló legnagyobb kihívás a migráció. A migráció kiváltó okainak kezeléséhez az afrikai országokban mindenek előtt a biztonság megteremtését kell segítenünk, valamint hozzá kell járulnunk a szegénység felszámolásához, a munkahelyteremtéshez, egyszóval a fenntartható fejlődéshez. Ennek elsődleges eszköze az oktatás kell, hogy legyen.

A minőségi oktatáshoz való hozzáférés az a kulcs, amellyel egyszerre, horizontálisan hathatunk a különböző szektorokra. Az oktatással képessé tesszük a fejlődő országok lakosait arra, hogy hazájukban, helyben segítsék saját közösségeik. Az alap- és középszintű oktatás mellett nem szabad megfeledkeznünk a felsőfokú oktatásról sem, amely innováció motorjai. E téren ösztöndíj programokkal tudunk a legtöbbet segíteni, ahogyan ezt Magyarország is teszi. Az új átfogó EU–Afrika Stratégiának a megoldást kell kínálnia az elvándorlás kiváltóokainak kezelésére, és hozzá kell járulnia a fenntartható fejlődéshez mind gazdasági mind pedig társadalmi téren az Afrikában.

Ehhez a Bizottság kezében a legfőbb forráscsoport a Szomszédsági, Fejlesztési és Nemzetközi Együttműködési Eszköz (NDICI) lesz, amely közel 30 milliárd eurót szán a Szub-Szaharai régió fejlesztésére. Bízom benne, hogy ez a hatalmas forrás érdemben tudja majd a helyben maradást elősegíteni Afrikában.

Karol Karski (ECR), *na piśmie.* – Stosunki Unii Europejskiej z państwami Afryki mają bardzo długą historię sięgającą Traktatu ustanawiającego Europejską Wspólnotę Gospodarczą.

Obecnie Afryka przechodzi dynamiczną transformację geopolityczną i gospodarczą, zajmując coraz ważniejszą pozycję w polityce międzynarodowej. To właściwy moment, by dokonać próby bilansu naszego zaangażowania w tym regionie oraz zasygnalizować kierunki możliwych zmian. Dlatego bardzo cieszy mnie zawarta w Strategii UE–Afryka wizja naszej przyszłej współpracy. Powinniśmy opierać ją na naszych wspólnych wartościach i na zasadzie partnerstwa rozwijać relacje gospodarcze. Naszym wspólnym celem jest zapewnienie bezpieczeństwa i dobrobytu. Przykładem kraju, który ma ogromny potencjał do rozwoju naszej współpracy w tym zakresie, jest Zambia, która w latach 2004-2014 zanotowała imponujący wzrost gospodarczy, sięgający średnio 7,4% rocznie.

Kraje Afryki dają nam obecnie ogromne pole do rozwoju naszych działań, między innymi w obszarze rolnictwa, badań naukowych czy edukacji. Musimy zagwarantować jednak, by realizacja Strategii UE–Afryka nie pozostawiła nikogo w tyle. Mam nadzieję, że dołożymy wszelkich starań, aby zwiększyć ilość inwestycji strategicznych i wzmocnić rolę sektora prywatnego w tworzeniu miejsc pracy.

Chciałbym zaznaczyć niezwykle ważną rolę inwestowania w kapitał ludzki poprzez rozwój edukacji, wspieranie lokalnej przedsiębiorczości i innowacyjnych rozwiązań. To właśnie kapitał ludzki jest kluczem do rozwoju Afryki.

Janina Ochojska (PPE), *na piśmie.* – Cieszy mnie fakt, że nowa Strategia UE–Afryka powstanie we współpracy z krajami afrykańskimi, czyli będzie oparta na zasadzie równości, partnerstwa oraz wspólnej odpowiedzialności. Oznacza to, że potrafimy wyciągać wnioski z przeszłości, kiedy to relacja dawca–biorca nie sprawdziła się. Mam też nadzieję, że będzie oparta na dogłębnych i szerokich konsultacjach ze społeczeństwem obywatelskim, które zna realne problemy na miejscu i w większym stopniu zostanie zaangażowane w realizację projektów pomocowych.

Przed nami wiele wyzwań, którymi chcielibyśmy się zająć. Zadbajmy o to, aby strategia była spójna z politykami na rzecz rozwoju, komplementarna w stosunku do nowej umowy o partnerstwie z Kotonu oraz by przyczyniała się do osiągniecia celów zrównoważonego rozwoju. Celem nadrzędnym polityki rozwojowej jest wyeliminowanie ubóstwa i temu przede wszystkim powinna ona służyć.

Mamy przed sobą także nowe wyzwania jak zmiany klimatu, które będą miały wpływ na kreowanie polityki migracyjnej oraz pomoc humanitarną. Pokój i bezpieczeństwo powinny więc stanowić ważny filar strategii. Musimy wspólnie zadbać o ochronę środowiska, w tym dostęp do czystej wody, odnawialne źródła energii, a także zapewnić szeroki dostęp do edukacji. Nasze działania powinny aktywizować i włączać młodzież! Strategia jest podstawą wzajemnych relacji, a jej realizacja wymaga zwiększenia ODA, naszym zadaniem jest uwzględnienie tych zobowiązań w wieloletnich ramach finansowych.

13. Борба с антисемитизма, расизма и омразата в цяла Европа (разискване)

Przewodnicząca. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest oświadczenie Rady i Komisji w sprawie walki z antysemityzmem, rasizmem i nienawiścią w Europie (2020/2561(RSP)).

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, having recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, this discussion is today more important than ever. For several years now, a worrying increase in the number of manifestations of hate speech, hate crimes, racism, xenophobia and intolerance in Europe has been observed, affecting minorities and other vulnerable groups, including Jewish people. In particular, we note with strong concern that anti-Semitic hatred remains widespread. Let me be clear on this: there is no justification for this phenomenon and we are obliged to take such issues extremely seriously.

There are a number of legal instruments that offer protection against racism and related forms of intolerance. All EU Member States have accepted the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The EU's Charter of Fundamental Rights also prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, colour, ethnic origin and religion or belief.

The EU has furthermore adopted specific legislation on combating intolerance and hatred. I refer in particular to the 2008 Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia. In June 2016, the Council invited Member States to ensure the effective transposition and implementation of the Framework Decision and other relevant hate-crime laws at national level. In addition, it asked Member States to develop effective methods to report and ensure proper recording of hate crimes.

On 6 December 2018, the EU Member State Governments also sent a clear message by adopting a Council Declaration on the fight against anti-Semitism and the development of a common security approach to better protect Jewish communities and institutions in Europe. The Council notes that anti-Semitic hatred remains widespread and invites EU Member States to take measures to tackle anti-Semitism and improve the security of Jewish communities.

Social media is one of the main vehicles enabling hate speech to go viral. One possible remedy against this epidemic is a harmonised and determined European response. In this area, the Council conclusions on the application of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, adopted in October 2017, welcomed the measures coordinated by the Commission's High Level Group on combating racism, xenophobia and other forms of intolerance. We also welcome and support the ongoing EU level dialogue with major IT companies, and address hate speech online, including through the implementation of the Code of Conduct launched in 2016 by the Commission for this purpose.

Last but not least, we should remember and commend the remarkable work done by the Fundamental Rights Agency in this field.

The countermeasures I have mentioned so far would, however, be insufficient without recognising the important role of education and youth work, and, more precisely, the need to develop democratic resilience, media literacy, tolerance, critical thinking and conflict resolution skills in the learning process.

It is important to bear in mind that the measures in place to fight hate crime can only fulfil their potential if victims report hate motivated harassment and violence to the police, and if police officers record such incidents as hate crimes. According to the Fundamental Rights Agency, only a fraction of victims report hate motivated harassment and violence and, when they do, police officers do not always recognise them as hate crimes. Fortunately, Member States are increasingly introducing measures to address this issue. This includes providing relevant guidance for police officers, requiring the collection of detailed data on crime and working with civil society organisations experienced in dealing with hate crime.

In short, the responsibility rests with all of us – politicians, teachers, civil servants, students, parents and, where appropriate, judges and prosecutors – not to close our eyes or ears and pretend not to see injustice, discrimination or hatred. From the horrors of Auschwitz, the world learned its lesson and built an order of peace, founded upon human rights and international law. We are all committed to defending this.

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS

Vizepräsident

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission.* – Mr President, two weeks ago we commemorated in Brussels the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Holocaust survivor Liliana Segre shared with us her moving story about the evils of humanity she confronted as a young girl. She reminded us that hatred, racism and anti-Semitism is still today haunting European societies and endangering our diverse societies and the minorities in our midst.

It is the duty of the EU to prevent history from repeating itself and to uphold the values upon which the Union is based. The Holocaust has shown us where anti-Semitism and racism can lead and its memory is at the very core of the European project of a Europe that protects its Jewish communities and all other minorities.

We have seen that fear and hatred against 'the other' has become normalised in recent years. It flourishes in mainstream media, in political debate and in the online world. It is a major challenge to our whole society and not only to the affected communities. The anti-Semitic attack against the synagogue in Halle is only the most recent example but, on a daily basis, minorities become victims of hatred online and offline.

It has been a key priority for the EU to ensure first and foremost the correct transposition and implementation of the relevant EU legislation, including the Racial Equality Directive, the Employment Equality Directive and the Framework Decision on racism and xenophobia. The Commission has been working closely together with Member State authorities and civil society in the EU High-Level Group on combating racism and xenophobia to ensure the effective application of the rules against hate speech and hate crime by the whole enforcement chain. The developed tools will assist Member States in strengthening a practical response to implement.

Dedicated formats of the high-level group will ensure in the future that the tools are implemented by Member States to make tangible progress in recording and responding to hate crime and hate speech. In particular, as regards hate speech, the Commission has pushed for stronger action; it initiated the code of conduct on combating illegal hate speech online whereby major IT companies have committed to review flagged hate speech within 24 hours and remove content when necessary. Fast progress has been achieved. In 2016, only 28% of the content was removed. Now it is above 70%, and 89% of the notices are assessed within the committed period.

We regularly monitor the progress. Next month we will present the results of the fifth monitoring exercise carried out together with civil society organisations. We managed to bring together all actors from civil society, IT companies and state authorities to strengthen our response to hate speech online. Our two coordinators on combating anti-Semitism and anti-Muslim hatred have been proactively reaching out to Jewish and Muslim communities, and strengthening the collaboration with international organisations, Member States' authorities and non-governmental organisations. We also intensively work on implementing the EU-Roma strategy containing measures against anti-Gypsyism.

The adoption of the Council Declaration on combating anti-Semitism was a milestone. All Member States unanimously agreed on actions and were invited to develop national strategies. The Commission created a dedicated working group to ensure concrete follow-up to the Council declaration and support Member States and Jewish communities to work together on developing these strategies. We are glad that the incoming German Presidency has announced already their intention to place the fight against anti-Semitism high on the agenda.

Distorting our common history has been one of the trademarks of fanning the flames of hatred and division, be it by third countries or within our own societies. Where today there are attempts to deny or distort the memory of the Holocaust, where people are vilified because they are Jews, this is where Europe is called into question. Attempts to distort our history are threatening our foundations. Disinformation and fake news attack our past but also, and first of all, our present. Our democracies must be harnessed to respond to this challenge and they must themselves adapt. Online platforms have been misused to disseminate and amplify manipulative messages to distort the democratic debate and interfere in the political process.

For four out of five Europeans, disinformation is a problem for democracy. We must ensure that democracy remains well protected in Europe. To better harness our democracy, the Commission will put forward a European democracy action plan. It will help counter disinformation and support free and independent media and will also aim to ensure greater transparency of paid political advertising and provide clearer rules on the financing of EU political parties. Transparency and accountability is essential, as well as not allowing external interventions in our democratic systems by those who wish to divide and destabilise our Union. This is a common priority for the Commission, European institutions and the Member States. As we see minorities under pressure again today, we must raise our voices and redouble our efforts to ensure that Europeans can go about their lives free from the threat of anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobic hatred.

The Commission is looking forward to working with the European Parliament and in particular the Anti-Racism and Diversity Intergroup and the Working Group on Anti-Semitism.

Roberta Metsola, *on behalf of the PPE Group.* – Mr President, I have listened to many speeches, but one that will stay with me for a long time to come was given by Marian Turski last month, 75 years after he, weighing all of 32 kilos, walked out of Auschwitz. He called for an end to indifference. 'Auschwitz did not fall from the sky,' he said. It happened slowly, because too many people turned a blind eye to justice, too many people found comfort in scapegoats, and too many people accepted prejudiced laws.

That is why we fight anti-Semitism, racism and any hatred everywhere today, because in Europe we know only too well the depths of horror that man has sunk to and can sink to. If we teach people not only about what happened, but about how it happened, slowly through gradually increasing measures, then maybe we can truly learn the lessons of history, even when the voices of the survivors can be heard no more.

Now, today, we still witness attacks on Jews and synagogues in Europe, we still see the scapegoating going on, and we are still seeing states move slowly away from the values this Union was founded upon. We see our fundamental rights under threat in too many places.

So we cannot be silent when Europeans live with a packed suitcase by their door, just in case. We cannot be silent in the face of injustice anywhere. Let no one fighting for justice ever look to Europe and be met as they have been met – with shrugs of shoulders or excuses that favour political expediency. Our European history has too often been built on the backs of the broken. When we say 'never again', we must mean it, and that means taking action.

And in conclusion, Roman Kent coined the eleventh commandment: 'Thou shalt not be indifferent'. May it become our guiding principle.

Kati Piri, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, 75 years ago we Europeans agreed on 'never again', and yet in 2020 anti-Semitism is on the rise. Hatred and intolerance across the European Union are on a trend of steady growth. Political parties, also in this House, fuel a climate of racism and anti-immigration with their rhetoric, be it against Jews, Muslims, migrants, Roma or LGBTI people.

We cannot tolerate populist rhetoric, prejudice and nationalism to become part of mainstream politics; to become the new normal. We cannot allow far-right parties, such as the AFD in Germany, Fidesz in Hungary, Lega in Italy, to become the dominant voice of our public debates. As progressives, we will always stand up for freedom: freedom for all to be who you want to be, to believe what you want to believe.

We need stronger commitments in the EU against hate speech and racism, and we will continue to fight for an EU in which minorities and vulnerable groups are protected from any form of discrimination. An EU with respect for rule of law and not the rule of a majority. We believe in a European Union in which we actually do justice to 75 years of liberation; in an EU where we stand up, we speak up and act when fellow Europeans are discriminated against.

Frédérique Ries, *au nom du groupe Renew*. – Monsieur le Président, il aurait eu 37 ans. Ilan Halimi a été enlevé parce que juif. Brûlé, poignardé, torturé à mort pendant trois semaines dans une cité HLM de la région parisienne. C'était il y a 14 ans, presque jour pour jour. Son meurtre nous ampute d'une petite part de notre humanité.

Sarah Halimi aurait eu 66 ans. Battue à mort, elle aussi, parce que juive, elle a ensuite été défenestrée par Kobili Traoré. Ce procès-là n'aura pas lieu, il a été déclaré pénalement irresponsable parce que sous l'emprise du cannabis. Le cannabis, la bêtise, l'ignorance comme circonstances atténuantes… Curieuse jurisprudence que celle-là.

L'antisémitisme tue. Aujourd'hui, à nouveau, des Européens ont peur parce qu'ils sont juifs, beaucoup s'en vont d'ailleurs. Aujourd'hui encore, écoles, synagogues et cimetières doivent être protégés.

Un tiers des Européens affirme ne connaître qu'un petit peu ou rien du tout de l'Holocauste. Se souvenir, éduquer, c'est essentiel, mais ça ne suffit pas. Barrer la route à la violence raciste qui gangrène les cours, les cités, les réseaux sociaux, c'est ne pas tolérer, c'est condamner, sanctionner.

Le monde entier avait les yeux rivés sur Jérusalem il y a 15 jours. Cinquante chefs d'État avaient fait le voyage pour commémorer les 75 ans de la libération du camp d'Auschwitz et prendre un engagement formel: plus jamais ça. Le président hongrois en était. Pourtant, il y a deux jours – je conclus, Monsieur le Président – à Budapest, plusieurs milliers de nazis sont venus des quatre coins d'Europe défiler sous les yeux de la police pour leur «jour d'honneur», je cite, hommage infâme à leurs héros du IIIe Reich.

Madame la Commissaire, on connaît tous votre engagement. Peut-on dire aujourd'hui vraiment que l'Europe en fait assez?

Filip De Man, *namens de ID-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, het geweeklaag over blank racisme was al niet min in de Belgische Kamer waar ik 23 jaar vertoefde. In dit Parlement is het al niet beter: overal ziet men racisten, antisemieten en nazi's.

Maar het echte probleem wordt zelden of nooit benoemd: de massale toestroom van moslimracisten die verantwoordelijk zijn voor 99 % van het antisemitisch geweld in de Europese Unie. Dat is de waarheid.

Collega's, houdt op met nazispoken na te jagen. Jullie lopen eigenlijk een oorlog achter. Voorts moet ik jullie aanmanen om te stoppen met rechtse nationalistische collega's racisten te noemen als zij kiezen voor het eigen volk en de bescherming van onze grenzen. Er zijn nu eenmaal verschillende culturen en religies en er bestaat een oplossing voor de problemen die dat geeft: grenzen.

Sergey Lagodinsky, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Die Dämme brechen – das war der erste Gedanke, den so viele von uns gehabt haben, als wir gesehen haben, wie der Rechtsextreme Höcke, der Freund von denen, die jetzt gerade gesprochen haben, und der frisch gewählte Thüringer Ministerpräsident Hände geschüttelt haben. Die Dämme brechen. Sie brechen lange schon, wenn der ungarische Ministerpräsident antisemitische Klischees vertont, wenn Rechtsradikale in Österreich und in Estland mitregieren und sich in vielen anderen Ländern warmlaufen, wenn jüdische Menschen hier in Europa sich nicht mehr wohlfühlen und die Sinti und Roma sowieso nicht mehr. Die Dämme brechen, sie brechen in unseren Köpfen, wenn es zunehmend normal wird, über jüdischen Einfluss zu scherzen, über jüdisches Kapital zu schimpfen, wenn es normal wird, ein paar Kilometer von hier, in Aalst, beim Karneval jedes Jahr Wagen zu haben, die antijüdische Motive haben, wenn es zunehmend normal wird, nichts dagegen zu sagen. Die Dämme – sie brechen.

Was tut die EU dagegen? Ich frage die Kommission, ich frage die Mitgliedstaaten, ich frage uns alle. Unsere EU-Präsidentinnen hielten schöne Reden letzte Woche in Jerusalem. Doch mit Worten alleine können wir nichts bekämpfen, wir brauchen mehr. Denn die Dämme brechen. Und wir brauchen nicht nur Betroffenheit, wir brauchen Haltung und Handlung! Was machen wir? Wir haben hier den Stab der Kommissionsbeauftragten gegen Antisemitismus ausgestattet. Hat sie genug Arbeitsressourcen, um diese Arbeit zu machen? Wie konkret gestalten denn die Mitgliedstaaten den Ratsbeschluss in der Wirklichkeit, wie setzen sie das um? Das wissen wir nicht. Auf diese Antworten warten wir, und diese Antworten erwarte ich nicht nur als Vorstandsmitglied der Arbeitsgruppe gegen Antisemitismus in diesem Haus, sondern als Bürger Europas. Denn die Dämme – sie brechen, und wir müssen ihnen standhalten.

Nicola Procaccini, *a nome del gruppo ECR*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sarebbe bastato essere dentro quest'Aula due ore fa per ascoltare parole di odio ed antisemitismo. Due ore fa il popolo di Israele è stato accusato di: apartheid, sfruttamento dei palestinesi, violenta annessione, violazione dei diritti umani, violazione del diritto internazionale, crimini di guerra.

A dire queste cose sono gli stessi che nascondono le responsabilità del radicalismo islamico nei confronti della maggior parte degli attacchi antisemiti in Europa, sono gli stessi che contestano al popolo ebraico il diritto di poter praticare le proprie tradizioni religiose in Europa. Allora forse ha ragione Goldschmidt, il presidente della Conferenza dei rabbini europei, che poche settimane fa in Italia ha detto: «Oggi i maggiori problemi li abbiamo dalle sinistre, questa è la grande novità sul fronte dell'antisemitismo».

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – *(Beginn des Redebeitrags bei ausgeschaltetem Mikro)* … natürlich grober Unfug, was mein Kollege hier gerade gesagt hat, indem er auf den Linken hier herumgehackt hat.

Angesichts der Tatsache, dass Synagogen wieder Ziele rechtsextremer Anschläge sind, schwer bewaffnet bewacht werden müssen, damit es überhaupt weitergehen kann, dass gläubige Juden auf Europas Straßen angefeindet werden, dass es in diesem Haus Parteien gibt, die den Hitler-Faschismus als Vogelschiss in der Geschichte bezeichnen – angesichts dieser Dinge ist es höchste Zeit zu handeln.

Und Handeln heißt eben nicht nur, bei Gedenkfeiern oder bei Anschlägen gewissermaßen die richtigen Worte zu finden: Es gilt, Geist und Tat der neuen und alten Nazis – ja der Rassisten aller Art – entschlossen zu bekämpfen: im Staat, in der Gesellschaft, auf der Straße, per Justiz, in Parlamenten und im Alltag. Dazu gehört auch, der Geschichtsklitterung in diesem Hause eine klare Absage zu erteilen, weil man Faschismus und Kommunismus nicht in einen Topf werfen kann.

Wir sind der Wahrheit verpflichtet, und auch Sie, die Sie dort sitzen. Den Opfern von Faschismus und Rassismus sind wir das auch schuldig.

Laura Ferrara (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fenomeni come antisemitismo, razzismo, xenofobia, omofobia e altre forme di intolleranza destano un grande allarme sociale in diversi Stati membri. Si nutrono di pregiudizio e odio, che hanno una preoccupante diffusione sia online che offline.

Proteggere persone e gruppi sociali da qualsiasi forma di discriminazione e violenza dettate da motivi legati al colore della pelle, alla religione, alle opinioni personali o all'orientamento sessuale significa non soltanto garantire a tutti il pieno godimento dei diritti umani e delle libertà fondamentali, ma anche avere una società più coesa e inclusiva.

È necessario che l'Unione europea e gli Stati membri adottino delle iniziative e delle misure di prevenzione, di educazione e di sensibilizzazione, soprattutto per i più giovani, in merito a crimini e discorsi di incitamento all'odio. La maggior parte di essi non viene ancora denunciata e perseguita in modo adeguato. Diverse condotte rimangono impunite, con gravi ripercussioni sulla protezione a sostegno delle vittime. È dunque nell'interesse generale dell'Europa invertire questa tendenza.

Peter Pollák (PPE). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, som veriaci a mnohí z vás sú tu tiež veriaci. Dokonca aj tí, ktorí sympatizujú s fašizmom a nacizmom, sa tvária, že sú veriaci. Boh však chcel, aby sme každí boli iní. Ak by dnes mohli neonacisti vládnuť, tak verte, že polovička z nás by tu dnes nebola. Možno sa líšime vierovyznaním, možno sa líšime kultúrou, či jazykom, možno sa líšime farbou pleti, no farba krvi každého z nás je rovnaká. V žilách Žida, Róma a každého Európana, dokonca aj neonacistu, koluje červená krv. Milióny ľudí zomrelo rukami tých, ktorí sa považovali za dokonalých. V mnohých krajinách zneužívali nacisti a fašisti na svoju zvrhlú ideológiu Boha.

V mojej krajine na Slovensku počas druhej svetovej vojny fašisti obhajovali svoje zverstvá heslom „Za Boha, za národ!" Boh však nie je nenávisť.

Na jednej strane, dámi a páni, je tu bohatá, prosperujúca Európa, na druhej strane korupcia, chudobné a úbohé regióny, v ktorých ľudia nepracujú, kde deti nedokáže škola pripraviť na pracovný trh, kde ľudia nemajú kanalizáciu, či prístupovú cestu, a dokonca niektorí ľudia pijú vodu z potoka. Aj toto je obraz Európskej únie 21. storočia. Ak budeme ignorovať tieto problémy, ujmú sa ich fašisti.

Ideológiu nadradenej rase môžeme poraziť aj tým, že politici začnú riešiť skutočné problémy ľudí. Zároveň je však dôležité, aby sme sa postavili k ideológii o nadradenej rase nie ako k názoru, ale ako zločinu. Ten kto hrá sa, hlása, že nejaká rasa je dokonalejšia ako tá iná, to nie je o slobode prejavu. To je o zločine. Je to zločin. Všetky demokratické inštitúcie sa musia postaviť k tomuto názoru ako k zločinu. História ukázala, kam môže zájsť extrémizmus, ak mu dovolíme rásť. História ukázala, že extrémizmus rastie vtedy, ak mu dáme príležitosť. Nedajme do rúk agendu extrémistom, ktorú sme schopní vyriešiť sami. Extrémisti v mnohých krajinách poukazujú na korupciu, neriešenie problémov migrácie, či chudobných rómskych komunít. Európa musí výrazne riešiť svoje problémy, ktoré trápia ľudí v Európe.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, vicepresidenta Jourová, este debate contra el antisemitismo, el racismo y el odio en Europa está cargado de sentido. No porque el Eurobarómetro indique que crecen las actitudes discriminatorias contra personas y categorías enteras de ciudadanos europeos —cuyos derechos fundamentales están protegidos por el Derecho europeo—, sino porque aumentan los delitos de odio, porque está aumentando la violencia real contra esas personas y categorías enteras.

Por eso, este Parlamento no solamente tiene el deber de expresar tristeza y preocupación sino, sobre todo, motivación para apoyar todas las actuaciones de la Comisión y del Consejo que conduzcan a ese combate y a fortalecer los instrumentos. Por eso aprobamos el 1 de junio del año 2007 nuestra Resolución sobre el antisemitismo y nuestro compromiso contra la negación del Holocausto.

Pero también por eso hemos dado seguimiento a la decisión que adoptó el Consejo Europeo en diciembre de 2018 para proporcionar los instrumentos necesarios para actuar en un doble campo: el de la educación contra el odio, pero también la legislación contra los delitos que instiguen directamente a la violencia. Y es ahí donde entra en juego la correcta transposición de la Decisión marco de 2008 y la necesidad de que la Comisión cuente con el apoyo del Parlamento Europeo para aportar todos los instrumentos necesarios.

Primero, formación de las autoridades competentes. Segundo, registro de los delitos de odio y, tercero, protección de sus víctimas y garantía de seguridad de esas comunidades amenazadas en Europa, no solo la comunidad judía —por supuesto—, sino también la comunidad gitana y cualquiera que sirva al discurso del odio como chivo expiatorio de actitudes de intolerancia y desprecio contra el prójimo que no pueden ser toleradas porque son profundamente incompatibles con el Derecho europeo.

Anna Júlia Donáth (Renew). – Mr President, recently, in Hungary, an anti-Roma governmental campaign has been launched. The Prime Minister approves of the segregation of Roma children in the countryside, discourages the payment of compensation for the segregation of these children and enrages others by saying that Roma people get this money without doing any work.

Hate speech and openly racist politics are on the rise in many EU countries. They have always been present in society, but in recent years they have been spreading instead of receding. Populist and racist movements have a strong role in this as they build on people's fear and designate scapegoats: others towards whom to channel negative emotions and fears generated by the changing world.

If we don't act now this can cause a domino effect, as extremists learn from each other. For example, with the spread of exclusionary law-making practices and propaganda methods. If we do not speak out and take decisive action now they will keep undermining EU values and principles which, like solidarity, respect of human dignity, human rights and non-discrimination will have no role to play in the future of Europe. We must act now.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Susanna Ceccardi (ID). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la storia del mondo occidentale ha dimostrato che l'antisemitismo è una cartina tornasole della decadenza di una società e ne prefigura il crollo. Chiunque abbia a cuore la società in cui vive dovrebbe combattere l'antisemitismo.

La lotta all'antisemitismo deve prevedere la difesa dello Stato di Israele nella sua integrità territoriale, politica e religiosa, poiché Israele è il baluardo delle libertà democratiche in Medio Oriente. Il contributo che la tradizione giudaico-cristiana ha dato alla formazione della cultura e della civiltà occidentale europea è stato fondamentale.

Combattere l'antisemitismo significa pertanto non solo difendere Israele, che al tempo stesso è la patria dell'ebraismo e il custode della memoria cristiana, ma anche difendere la stessa Unione europea dal terrorismo islamico, dal fondamentalismo religioso e da ogni movimento illiberale e antidemocratico.

Alice Kuhnke (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Det är nästan, men bara nästan, förförande att lyssna till alla vackra ord om hur vi ska bekämpa hatet mot judar, mot muslimer, mot dem som skiljer sig från mängden – sådana som jag.

Lyckligtvis är vi många som är medvetna om att det är en hel del tomt prat. Bakom retoriska krumbukter finns olika måttstockar och helt olika upplagor av rättigheter, beroende på var du kommer ifrån, var dina föräldrar kommer ifrån, vilket namn du bär och hur mycket pigment du har i huden. Rasismen och diskrimineringen sprider sig som en löpeld.

Vi måste ta hoten på allvar. Det är oacceptabelt att EU:s ledare, som har haft 15 år på sig, inte har lyckats skriva under antidiskrimineringsdirektivet.

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Rzeczywiście ta debata na temat źródeł antysemityzmu musi być oparta na prawdzie. Zatem jeśli prawda, to nie jacyś enigmatyczni naziści, nie 75. rocznica wyzwolenia obozu w Auschwitz, tylko wyzwolenie niemieckiego nazistowskiego obozu zagłady w Auschwitz. To po pierwsze. Po drugie ze zdumieniem słuchałem przedstawicieli lewicy, którzy oburzali się na stawianie znaku równości między faszyzmem i komunizmem. Tej oburzonej pani chciałbym zacytować jedną bardzo łagodną wypowiedź Stalina na temat Żydów właśnie. Mówił on, że należy robotnikom rozdać pałki, aby mogli sobie na koniec pracy pouzywać na Żydach. Polscy komuniści, których synowie zasiadają również dzisiaj w tej izbie jako demokraci, jeszcze w latach sześćdziesiątych przeprowadzali czystki antysemickie w polskim wojsku. Dlatego trzeba powiedzieć, cytując wielką pisarkę Zofię Nałkowską, „to ludzie ludziom zgotowali ten los". Natomiast antysemityzm będzie można

wyrugować jedynie pod warunkiem, że będziemy bardzo konsekwentnie, zgodnie z prawdą sprzeciwiać się tym, którzy stoją za antysemityzmem we współczesnej Europie, nie dbając przy tym o poprawność polityczną.

Clara Ponsatí Obiols (NI). – Mr President, one of the most hideous crimes against the Jewish people took place in 1492 when the so-called Catholic kings ordered the general expulsion of the Jews from Sepharad. This first episode of state anti-Semitism, one that Adolf Hitler admired and sought to surpass, stands as a cornerstone of the Spanish tragic record of intolerance.

Today, this intolerance takes the form of contempt for the rights of the Catalan minority. This happens in the background of laughter and indulgence with fascism apologies. While the Francisco Franco Foundation remains legal, Spanish judges use anti-hatred laws to prosecute Catalan teachers that criticise the violence of the Civil Guard. We do need laws to protect minorities from hatred but, without democratic judges to enforce them, they are useless.

Tomas Tobé (PPE). – Herr talman, ärade kolleger! Allra helst skulle vi inte behöva ha en debatt om antisemitism, rasism och hat i Europa, men den är viktig – och tyvärr så behövs den. Antisemitismen ökar i Europa, också i mitt eget hemland, Sverige. Enligt Eurobarometern växer antisemitismen som allra mest just nu i Sverige. Judar vittnar om att man inte vågar bära sin davidsstjärna eller sin kippa. Religionsfriheten begränsas.

Jag anser att arbetet mot antisemitism borde vara en mycket tydligare prioritering från kommissionens sida. Jag förstår inte varför det inte ens nämns i kommissionens arbetsprogram och skulle gärna vilja få en förklaring till varför det inte nämns.

Jag skulle avslutningsvis också vilja lämna tre konkreta förslag till initiativ som kommissionen borde ta. För det första: Öka finansieringen för att utbilda ungdomar om Förintelsen, kring rasism och kring hatbrott i Europa. För det andra: Se till att stoppa utländsk finansiering av extrema trossamfund genom hela Europa. För det tredje: Sätt stopp för hatpredikanters möjlighet att resa in i Europa och sprida sina extrema åsikter.

Visa att vi är beredda att göra någonting konkret för att stoppa antisemitism och rasism i Europa, för det hör inte hemma här.

Brando Benifei (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, negli ultimi anni abbiamo visto un aumento preoccupante dei casi di antisemitismo in Europa e nel mondo. Anche nel mio paese, l'Italia, di recente sono comparsi scritte e simboli antisemiti sulle case di sopravvissuti alla Shoah o di attivisti per i diritti umani. Si tratta di un fenomeno gravissimo che spesso viene coperto da partiti che usano il razzismo per guadagnare consenso. I leader di queste forze spesso fanno dichiarazioni antisemite, talvolta negano addirittura l'Olocausto.

Qualche settimana fa questo Parlamento ha ospitato Liliana Segre, sopravvissuta ad Auschwitz. Oggi è necessario seguire il suo esempio. Così come lei ha rifiutato l'invito a un dibattito sull'antisemitismo insieme a esponenti dell'estrema destra, noi dobbiamo dire chiaramente che solo essendo nettamente antirazzisti possiamo combattere veramente l'antisemitismo. Dobbiamo essere come Parlamento in prima fila, quindi a combattere tutto questo, e la ricostituzione del nostro gruppo di lavoro sull'antisemitismo è un segnale importante, ma dobbiamo proseguire in questa direzione.

Teuvo Hakkarainen (ID). – Arvoisa puhemies, jottei totuus unohtuisi, juutalaisille suunnatun kyselytutkimuksen mukaan väkivalta tai sen uhka Euroopassa suuntautui heihin pääsääntöisesti muslimien taholta. Toiseksi suurin uhkaryhmä on äärivasemmisto ja äärioikeisto. Kaikkeen tähän vainoon on luonnollisesti puututtava lujin ottein.

Rasismi sanana on kokenut täyden inflaation. Rasismisyytöksillä hyökätään erityisesti kaikkia kansallismielisiä kohtaan. Tässäkin salissa tuo syytös kuuluu hyvin usein. Kun omat faktat loppuvat, voi ainakin toisia rasistiksi syyttämällä röyhistellä rintaansa. Olihan fariseuskin onnellinen siitä, ettei ollut sen kurjan publikaanin kaltainen. Vihapuhe on kehitettyä uussanastoa, jolla käydään toisinajattelijoiden, siis kansallismielisten, kimppuun ja jonka perusteella jopa jaetaan tuomioita eri oikeuslaitoksissa.

Salima Yenbou (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, en janvier nous avons commémoré la découverte des atrocités du camp d'Auschwitz pour que ces horreurs ne se reproduisent plus jamais. Malheureusement, crimes et discriminations continuent depuis, entre autres en Europe (dans les Balkans), mais aussi contre les Tamouls, les Tutsis, les Yézidis, les Kurdes, les Coptes, les Falachas, les Ouïgours, les Indiens musulmans, les Rohingyas, les Palestiniens, les Roms…

Aujourd'hui, devant ce constat, nous devons repenser la lutte contre l'ensemble de ces atteintes morales, psychologiques et physiques. La lutte contre les discriminations ne doit plus être comparée, concurrencée par un vocable spécifique qui divise plutôt qu'il ne rassemble. L'intersectionnalité et le mot discrimination sont pertinents pour appréhender ce défi majeur avec solidarité et lutte par tous et pour tous.

Cet engagement contre les discriminations doit être universel, sans considération sur l'origine, le genre, la religion, l'orientation sexuelle ou tout autre critère pouvant définir l'oppresseur et l'oppressé. En effet, nul besoin d'être une femme pour défendre une femme, nul besoin d'être juif, chrétien, musulman pour défendre un juif, chrétien, musulman, nul besoin d'être homosexuel pour défendre un homosexuel. Levons-nous tous, à chaque fois qu'un être humain est discriminé.

Alexandr Vondra (ECR). – Pane předsedo, já myslím, že veškeré politické řeči blednou, když se podíváme na ta čísla. Antisemitismus v dnešní Evropě je na pochodu a je to mega problém. Jen za 10 let opustilo 60 000 Židů Francii. Z údajů Evropské agentury pro lidská práva je evidentní, že 38 % Židů zvažuje odchod z Evropy. Některá ta čísla jsou strašlivá. Německo zdvojnásobení na 44 % za 5 let. Švédsko zdvojnásobení na 35 % za 5 let. Francie 44 %, Belgie, kde je sídlo EP, 42 %. Naopak Maďarsko, které je tady často na tapetě, je jediná země, kde se snížil počet Židů, kteří chtějí odejít, o celých 10 %.

Čili: Co dělat? Ustavit definici antisemitismu, zakázat Hezbolláh a skončit s protiizraelskou antisemitskou zahraniční politikou.

(Řečník souhlasil s tím, že odpoví na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty (čl. 171 odst. 8 jednacího řádu).)

Stanislav Polčák (PPE), *otázka položená zvednutím modré karty.* – Já děkuji, že pan kolega přijal moji modrou kartu a že se třeba tento institut také může trochu více naučit. Já jsem velmi vnímal jeho vyjádření a musím říci, že mi mluvil samozřejmě z duše, ale chci mu poskytnout prostor pro to, aby zároveň reagoval na to, že rasismus není pouze omezen na antisemitismus.

Vy jste se ve své řeči vyjádřil pouze k židovskému rasismu, tzn. k antisemitismu, ale my máme i další formy rasismu. Vnímáte i ty ostatní formy jako zásadně důležité a odsouzeníhodné?

Alexandr Vondra (ECR), *odpověď na otázku položenou zvednutím modré karty.* – Samozřejmě, že je vnímám za zásadní a důležité, ale antisemitismus vzhledem na historii tohoto kontinentu, na to, co se odehrávalo ve 20. století, vnímám jako mega problém.

Z těch čísel to jasně vyplývá, že to je mega problém, že to souvisí prostě s naší politikou vůči migraci. Nesmíme toto prostě zastírat a ty politické řeči blednou ve světle těch čísel, která tady máme. Je to průzkum, kdy naše agentura, evropská agentura, se ptala 16 000 Židů, prosím pěkně. To není žádná skupina 500 dotázaných.

Anna-Michelle Asimakopoulou (PPE). – Mr President, in the last decade anti-Semitism has raised its ugly head again in Europe. Sadly, though this is factually substantiated, according to a 2019 Eurobarometer survey there's a striking discrepancy in the perception of anti-Semitism. Almost 90% of Jews feel that anti-Semitism is on the rise, but only 36% of European citizens agree.

Europe cannot allow the poison of anti-Semitism to spread. It needs to support, it needs to protect its Jews and it needs to effectively combat anti-Semitic perpetrators, and there is no question that Hezbollah, Iran's most deadly proxy, is an indoctrinated, violent anti-Semitic group which poses serious threats to Jews in Europe and not just in Europe. Yet the European Union refuses to follow in the footsteps of some of its most adored allies like the United States, like the United Kingdom, like Canada, and to end this false distinction between the political wing and the military wing of Hezbollah – a distinction which, by the way, Hezbollah calls a joke and dismisses. This hypocrisy must end now. The EU must place Hezbollah in its entirety on the EU terrorist list if it is going to be credible and, more importantly, effective in combating anti-Semitism and the atrocious acts it leads to.

Sylwia Spurek (S&D). – Mr President, as we've already heard, FRA and Eurobarometer research shows that anti-Semitic abuse and violence is increasing in the EU. According to the FRA survey, people cannot live a life free of worry for their own safety and the safety of their family members.

But racism and anti-Semitism are still denied by many politicians, media and scientists all over Europe. When I was a Deputy Commissioner for Human Rights, I often heard that there is no anti-Semitism in Poland, while dealing with anti-Semitic attacks, hate speech and violence. It is the 21st century and more and more people here in the European Union feel they can treat someone differently or hate someone because of his or her religion, ethnic origin or skin colour. It is unacceptable. The European Union urgently needs a strategy to fight anti-Semitism, racism and xenophobia, to prevent and combat these phenomena and to protect human rights.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Joachim Stanisław Brudziński (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Mam pytanie do mojej przedmówczyni. Czy w czasach, kiedy pełniła Pani funkcję u boku rzecznika praw obywatelskich, pamięta Pani, jak na wszelkie ekscesy antysemickie reagowała policja? Ja miałem zaszczyt być ministrem spraw wewnętrznych i administracji w rządzie Prawa i Sprawiedliwości i chcę podkreślić bardzo mocno, że każdy przejaw antysemityzmu spotykał się z natychmiastową reakcją polskiej policji i był zwalczany. Nigdy nie było akceptacji i nie może być akceptacji dla przejawów antysemityzmu, dlatego proszę nie wprowadzać tej izby w błąd.

Der Präsident. – Jetzt haben wir zwei Fehler gemacht:

Zum einen waren Sie als Redner dran, daher haben Sie kein Recht mehr auf eine „blaue Karte".

Zum Zweiten haben Sie jetzt keine Frage gestellt, sondern eine Feststellung gemacht. Ich überlasse es daher der Frau Kollegin Spurek, dazu Stellung zu nehmen – ja oder nein? Bitte.

Sylwia Spurek (S&D), *blue-card answer.* – Yes, I would like to answer this non-question.

Nie wystarczy, że policja reaguje. Nie wystarczy, że prokuratura ściga, a sądy orzekają, zwłaszcza że nie zawsze obserwowałam taką determinację, jaka jest potrzebna. Zabrakło mi w czasie pełnienia przeze mnie funkcji zastępczyni Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich całkowitego potępienia ze strony osób sprawujących wysokie funkcje publiczne w rządzie.

Jean-Paul Garraud (ID). – Monsieur le Président, le sujet en débat ce soir est souvent abordé dans cet hémicycle et c'est une excellente chose. Mais il est toujours traité d'une façon incomplète, partisane et à sens unique.

Incomplet, car personne, ici, de la majorité, n'abordera dans le cadre de ce débat le sujet pourtant considérable des actes antichrétiens dans le monde, visant des personnes mais aussi des biens, des églises quotidiennement vandalisées, des cimetières profanés.

Partisan et à sens unique, car une majorité de députés de cet hémicycle ne veulent pas poser la vraie question, celle qui gêne, celle qui dérange: quelle est la cause principale de la forte hausse des actes antichrétiens et antisémites? Vous connaissez la réponse: c'est évidemment la montée de l'islamisme, ce nouveau totalitarisme que vous refusez de voir, que vous vous interdisez de critiquer, alors que nos peuples le subissent et en souffrent.

Quant à la haine que vous dénoncez, vous vous trompez de cible. Vous visez toujours et encore ce que vous appelez avec dédain et mépris les «populistes». Vous devriez porter tous vos efforts sur ceux qui détestent notre civilisation européenne, nos cultures, nos identités, nos libertés individuelles. Vous devriez combattre ceux qui veulent violemment nous imposer une société barbare qui n'est pas la nôtre. Ce devrait être cela, notre combat commun: lutter de toutes nos forces contre l'islamisme, ce radicalisme, ce terrorisme qui est bien la menace la plus grave qui pèse sur nos démocraties du XXIe siècle.

Helmut Geuking (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Ich bin sehr verwundert, was ich hier gerade so alles gehört habe. Der Antisemitismus gipfelte einst in dem schlimmsten, menschenverachtendsten und grausamsten Völkermord, den die Menschheit je kannte. Er brachte das abgrundtief Schlechteste der Menschen hervor. Auch durch Neuordnung des demokratischen Europas nach 1945 verschwand der Antisemitismus nicht, er nahm aber neue Formen an. Antisemitismus wurde anpassungsfähig, veränderbar und verwurzelte sich dabei tief in unserer Gesellschaft. Das zeigte auch heute wieder die Debatte. Die Rechtspopulisten Europas bedienen den Antisemitismus nicht nur unterschwellig; offen schüren sie zielgerichtet Hass, um vorhandenen Antisemitismus in den Köpfen der Menschen in Stimmung und Stimmen umzuwandeln. Es ist unser aller Verpflichtung, dieser zynischen, menschenverachtenden Vorgehensweise in unserer Gesellsc-

haft und politischen Landschaft entgegenzuwirken. Es ist unser aller Verpflichtung, den Antisemitismus aus den Köpfen der Menschen zu tilgen. Dazu braucht es unberufene Helden – Bürger, die widersprechen und entschieden ihr Wort gegen jede Form von Antisemitismus erheben. Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren, zum Schluss: Werden auch Sie unberufene Helden in Ihren Ländern!

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, quando hoje se debate o antissemitismo, nomeadamente, homenageio o português Aristides Sousa Mendes, cônsul em Bordéus, exemplo ímpar de humanismo de dimensão mundial, que, durante a Segunda Guerra Mundial, foi responsável pelo salvamento de até trinta mil judeus que fugiam às atrocidades do nazismo. Pai de catorze filhos, quando Portugal era um país neutro, desobedeceu às instruções do governo, que então tinha suspendido a autorização de vistos a judeus, continuando a atribuí-los sem distinção de raça ou de religião. Pelo seu ato pagou o preço mais alto. Foi demitido da função de cônsul, despromovido, aposentado e até proibido de exercer a função de advogado por ter salvo da morte milhares de seres humanos. Perdeu tudo e morreu na mais completa pobreza, enterrado até com um fato vestido oferecido por caridade.

Em 1966, o Memorial do Holocausto em Jerusalém, Yad Vashem, prestou-lhe homenagem e atribuiu-lhe o título de *Justo entre as Nações*. Em Portugal obteve, a título póstumo, mas só recentemente, as mais amplas distinções. Merece, todavia, o reconhecimento mundial e merece, com toda a certeza, como extraordinário e superior ser dotado de verdadeira humanidade e amor ao próximo, a justa evocação neste Parlamento Europeu.

Como democrata cristão e português que sou, honra-me poder fazê-lo.

Łukasz Kohut (S&D). – Mr President, 75 years after the Holocaust, anti-Semitism, hatred, discrimination and xenophobia are all on the rise in Europe. In my own country, Poland, we have LGBT-free zones, which the Parliament has rightly condemned.

I'm not a Jew and I'm not an LGBT person, but this does not mean that I can stay idle, for hatred and discrimination are evil. They hurt people and they destroy the very fabric of democracy, freedom and solidarity. I also think: what if it were me, if they proclaimed Silesian-free zones, for example? As already mentioned, Marian Turski, a Holocaust survivor, said the Shoah did not suddenly fall from the sky: it took hold step by step, with society accepting small acts of discrimination, then bigger ones, leading to ghettos and extermination camps. We know this history in Europe all too well, and we must never let it repeat. As the European Parliament, we must be firm and fight hard all forms of hatred and discrimination.

Nicolaus Fest (ID). – Herr Präsident! Eines der Hauptprobleme ist die ungeheure Verlogenheit hier in diesem Hause. Frau Ries redet über einen gefolterten und ermordeten Juden in Frankreich, erwähnt aber nicht mal seinen Namen. Der hieß übrigens Ilan Halimi, und sie erwähnt vor allem nicht, wer der Täter war, nämlich natürlich ein muslimischer Einwanderer. Hier wird bei solchen Diskussionen nicht darüber diskutiert, dass natürlich BDS niemals auf die Liste terroristischer Organisationen kommt, und natürlich auch nicht – wie eben hier schon erwähnt – die Hisbollah. Gleichzeitig setzt sich dieses Parlament dafür ein, dass die Grenzen geöffnet werden, dass wir Resettlement-Programme bekommen und *global compact on migration*, also dass immer mehr Muslime nach Europa kommen.

Die Berliner Juden sagen, dass ungefähr drei Viertel aller Attacken von Muslimen kommen, und man muss ergänzen: Der Rest kommt wahrscheinlich von Antizionisten und Anhängern von *Boycott, Disinvest and Sanctions*. Und natürlich finanzieren Sie auch den Antisemitismus in Palästina, nämlich die Al Fatah und die Hamas mit 1,5 Millionen pro Tag, wie Herr Borrell heute sagte. Wenn Sie den Antisemitismus bekämpfen wollen, dann sollten Sie diese Finanzierung erst einmal stoppen.

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege, ich würde Sie bitten, das Wort „Verlogenheit" in diesem Raum nicht als Unterstellung gegenüber anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen zu verwenden.

Lena Düpont (PPE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kollegen! Die erste Debatte in diesem Haus zum Thema Antisemitismus in dieser Wahlperiode hatten wir vor dem Eindruck des tragischen Anschlags von Halle. Die Debatte heute findet vor dem Eindruck des Holocaust-Gedenktages vor zwei Wochen statt. Beide Ereignisse, wenn auch leider nicht nur diese beiden, führen uns vor Augen: Unser Einsatz gegen Antisemitismus ist heute wichtiger denn je. Er kann und er wird kein Ende haben. Antisemitismus, Rassismus, Hasskriminalität steigen weiter an. Unsere Aufmerksamkeit demgegenüber darf nicht sinken, unser Einsatz dagegen darf nicht beendet werden.

Noch nötiger aber als nur Aufmerksamkeit sind unsere Taten, die wir diesem Hass und dieser Spaltung entgegensetzen. Die OSZE hat in ihrem letzten Bericht zu Hasskriminalität herausgestellt, dass viele Taten gar nicht als Hasskriminalität eingestuft werden – auch, weil gleichzeitig viele Opfer die nötigen Informationen dazu nicht abgeben. Sie befürchten schlicht, dass es an ihrer Situation nichts ändert.

Für uns kann das nur eins bedeuten: Wir müssen die Situation der Opfer noch ernster nehmen, wir müssen Hassrede, Drohung, Antisemitismus im Internet online und offline bekämpfen und hier ambitionierter vorangehen. Denn nur alle gemeinsam können dagegen aufstehen.

Rasa Juknevičienė (PPE). – Mr President, anti-Semitism is a diagnosis of a serious disease in society. However, finding the right treatment requires knowing the causes. They are internal and external. The internal ones are clear. They are like mutating viruses, becoming active in the dirty environment of angry nationalism. We must root them out.

One of the external causes wasn't mentioned today. It comes from the double-faced Kremlin policy against Europe. On the one hand, they attack some countries for being anti-Semitic and pretend to fight Nazism, but on the other hand, they finance nationalistic parties in the EU. Putin's suggestion for Permanent Security Council Members to discuss threats of anti-Semitism in the UN is fake, because Russia itself is reviving totalitarian Stalinism based on hatred. The fight against anti-Semitism should be seen in the context of the fight against rehabilitation of all totalitarian regimes.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, vedeme tuto diskuzi, protože vidíme nárůst antisemitismu, rasismu a nenávistných projevů. My nechceme další eskalace, protože víme, že mohou vést k politickému zneužití, tak jako v minulosti vedly k diktaturám. 81 % židovské populace dnes v Evropě uvádí obavy z antisemitismu, ale to se nevyhýbá ani střední a východní Evropě, kde muslimská populace je nízká. Tady dokonce v Polsku uvádí pocit antisemitské nálady 48 % občanů a v Maďarsku 42 % občanů.

Jak se bránit těmto projevům nenávisti, ať už je to rasistická, antisemitská či jen obyčejná lidská nenávist, která je proti lidské důstojnosti? Především je potřeba znalost historie a také vzdělávání a já doporučuji etické vzdělávání, etickou výchovu. Netolerance a netolerovat ve veřejném prostoru tyto projevy. O mnoha nástrojích zde hovořila paní místopředsedkyně Komise.

Potom konkrétní příklad a já bych poprosila, abych ho mohla uvést, protože je to konkrétní příklad statečného projevu proti nenávisti, kdy se náš kardinál Duka jasně vymezil a ohradil proti nenávistnému nápisu na muslimské mešitě v ČR, a toto je třeba ocenit.

Magdalena Adamowicz (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziś już kilka razy wspominano poruszającą mowę Mariana Turskiego, byłego więźnia obozu Auschwitz. Pokazał on, skąd się wzięło Auschwitz, wytłumaczył, że nie spadło ono z nieba. Opisał mechanizmy stopniowego, początkowo niewinnego wykluczania, stygmatyzowania, alienowania, piętnowania, potem agresji, aż po eksterminację tego innego. Przemowa Turskiego jest przerażająco aktualna. Pokazuje, że brak reakcji, przyzwolenie, cicha akceptacja nieuchronnie prowadzą do tragedii. Zawsze. Dlatego odpowiedzialność spoczywa na nas wszystkich. Nie tylko na siejących nienawiść – oni muszą się opamiętać – ale także na nas wszystkich, którzy się temu przyglądamy i biernie akceptujemy.

Musimy powiedzieć „stop", musimy stanowczo działać. To nasz obowiązek. Milczenie oznacza de facto przyzwolenie, a potem już będzie za późno, jeżeli zaczniemy traktować to jako normalność. Dlatego Turski apelował do wszystkich, niezależnie od wyznania czy światopoglądu: „nie bądźcie obojętni". To jedenaste przykazanie. Nie bądźmy obojętni my, parlamentarzyści. Nie możemy sobie pozwolić na grzech zaniechania, gdy łamane są prawa mniejszości czy ograniczana jest przestrzeń życia bez nienawiści. Spróbujmy wyobrazić sobie świat bez nienawiści.

Peter van Dalen (PPE). – Voorzitter, 75 jaar na Auschwitz is jodenhaat in Europa nog springlevend. De Britse organisatie Community Security Trust (CST) houdt al sinds 1984 bij welke incidenten er zijn geweest tegen joden. CST concludeerde onlangs dat er in 2019 1 800 incidenten zijn geweest tegen joden in Engeland, het hoogste cijfer ooit.

Helaas kunnen we talloze dieptepunten noemen als het over jodenhaat gaat. Denk aan de aanslag van een rechts-extremist op de synagoge in Halle op Grote Verzoendag vorig jaar. Maar denk ook aan links: 7 leden van de Labourpartij stapten onlangs op omdat Corbyn onvoldoende optrad tegen jodenhaat in de Labourpartij. Of denk aan Frankrijk, waar de Holocaust-overlevende mevrouw Mireille Knoll op 23 maart 2018 werd vermoord in haar appartement in Parijs. Maar ook in mijn eigen land: begraafplaatsen die onlangs zijn beklad in Dordrecht.

Weg met antisemitisme. Steun onze petitie op stopantisemitism.eu: allemaal ondertekenen, die petitie.

Balázs Hidvéghi (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Ma egy nagyon fontos témáról van itt szó, amelynek kapcsán teljesen világosan ki kell mondani azt, hogy a második világháborút követően egyetlen lehetséges megközelítésként kizárólag a zéró toleráncia létezhet az antiszemitizmussal szemben. Magyarországon e kérdésben teljes a társadalmi és a politikai egyetértés. A zsidó közösség tagjai biztonságban élnek, gyakorolhatják vallásukat és megélhetik az identitásukat. Ennek biztosítása, amellett, hogy alkotmányos kötelezettség, egyben erkölcsi kötelességünk is.

Büszkék vagyunk arra, hogy Magyarországon virágzik, és ma reneszánszát éli a zsidó kultúra, a zsidó emberek és családok biztonságban érzik magukat és ápolják az örökségüket. Ezzel szemben Nyugat-Európában nő a zsidó közösségek elleni erőszakos cselekmények és támadások száma. Amellett, hogy minden ilyen támadást határozottan el kell ítélni és vissza kell utasítani, beszélni kell arról is, hogy a radikális muszlim antiszemitizmus európai megjelenése és terjedése hozzájárul az antiszemita támadások számának növekedéséhez. A nyugat-európai zsidóság elleni támadások tehát még egy indokot jelentenek arra, hogy az illegális migráció ellen határozottan fellépjünk.

Arba Kokalari (PPE). – Herr talman! Vi måste på allvar trycka tillbaka det hat, de hot och den diskriminering och rasism som judar i Europa utsätts för.

Judar i Sverige är alldeles särskilt utsatta. De är faktiskt angripna från flera håll, från både nynazister, vänsterextremister, islamister och dem som helt enkelt har ett stort hat mot staten Israel.

Vem är det då som höjer rösten när unga inte vågar visa sin judiska tro av rädsla för att få hot och diskrimineras i skolan? Vem agerar när synagogan i Malmö eller Göteborg utsätts för hat och attacker? Inte Sveriges regering i alla fall!

Jag vill att EU börjar agera för att skydda judarna i Europa, att vi utbildar fler skolungdomar och att vi satsar på att skapa EU-regler, som gör att vi tillsammans kan stoppa finansiering från extrema trossamfund som sprider antidemokratiska värderingar. Det räcker nu!

Асим Адемов (PPE). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, днес в този дебат осъждаме насилието и езика на омразата, основани на расова, етническа, религиозна принадлежност и антисемитската пропаганда. Това е логично, защото такива неща нямат място сред нас.

Но сега е времето всеки един от нас да си зададе един важен въпрос към себе си – след като се обръщаме към нашите избиратели и изискваме от тях да имат цивилизовано отношение към тези проблеми, дали ние с нашето поведение сме добрият пример.

На миналата мини сесия в Брюксел един наш колега от Гърция в пленарната зала, в храма на демокрацията, си позволи да скъса знамето на Република Турция. Питам аз това пример за уважение и добро поведение ли е или е проява на омраза. Имаме ли право ние, евродепутатите, да се отнасяме по този начин с националните символи не само на Турция, но и на която и да е държава?

Затова, колеги, аз мисля, че преди да изискваме от нашите избиратели да не допускат прояви на антисемитизъм, расизъм и омраза, самите ние с нашите действия трябва да дадем личен пример за европейско и цивилизовано поведение.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowni Państwo! Dosłownie kilkanaście dni temu obchodziliśmy w Polsce i w Europie rocznicę wyzwolenia obozu w Auschwitz. Wydawać by się mogło, że te tragiczne wydarzenia z II wojny światowej pozostaną dla nas wszystkich bolesną lekcją historii, o której każdy będzie pamiętać. Niestety nikt chyba nie może powiedzieć, że dziś, na początku 2020 r. nasz kontynent jest wolny od choroby antysemityzmu, rasizmu i ksenofobii, która doprowadziła do tragicznych wydarzeń zaledwie siedemdziesiąt parę lat temu. W dzisiejszych czasach cieszymy się wspólnym rynkiem czy swobodą podróżowania, lecz nie zapominajmy, że Unia Europejska narodziła się przede wszystkim z potrzeby zachowania pokoju i zapobieżenia nowym konfliktom. Dlatego też ochrona praw podstawowych, a do nich należy idea sprawiedliwych, pokojowych i tolerancyjnych społeczeństw, jest naszym

obowiązkiem. Komisja Europejska, Parlament i rządy państw członkowskich muszą wspólnie kontynuować działania na rzecz eliminacji wszelkich objawów rasizmu, ksenofobii i dyskryminacji w naszych społeczeństwach.

Milan Brglez (S&D). – Gospod predsednik, antisemitizem, rasizem in sovraštvo so pojmi, ki so se v zgodovini, žal tragični evropski in svetovni, napolnili s pomenom, vendar pa so danes pomembni predvsem zato, da prepoznamo, poimenujemo in obsodimo sodobne oblike tovrstnih pojavov, zato da bi jih lahko preprečevali.

V današnji Evropi je mogoče zmotno prepričanje, da je to odvisno zgolj od avtoritarnih voditeljev, ki vsiljujejo, manipulirajo ljudi. Dejansko pa lahko velik požar povzroči šop vžigalic stereotipov in predsodkov, ki temeljijo na nacionalni osnovi. Tako so se denimo včeraj v Italiji, na območju, kjer živi avtohtona slovenska narodna skupnost, pojavili številni neofašistični napisi, za katere pričakujem, da jih bodo italijanske oblasti obsodile in bodo ustrezno reagirale na ta skrajni desni pojav.

Vsekakor ni potrebe oz. ima evropska politika veliko odgovornost, da zatre vsako obliko nestrpnosti.

Илхан Кючюк (Renew). – Г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, взимам думата в този дебат, защото проявите на антисемитизъм, расизъм и език на омраза не са грижа на едно или друго малцинство, нито на една или друга общност. Това е общ европейски и световен проблем, който заплашва основните ни ценности.

Но как да се справим с него, когато в самия Европейски съюз той е овластен. Давам за пример моята родина Република България, където крайният националист Валери Симеонов бе избран за заместник-председател на българския парламент и то с подкрепата на политическите сили, членуващи в Европейската народна партия и Партията на европейските социалисти. И това е човек, който блъскаше възрастни жени на границата с Република Турция, дошли да гласуват или просто да видят родните си. Мотивът му – че са етнически различни.

Колеги, да не бъдем безгласни, никога не е късно злото и нас да ни настигне. Вдигнете глас, бъдете хора с достойнство и зачитайте правата и свободите на всички граждани.

Pierrette Herzberger-Fofana (Verts/ALE). – *(Beginn des Redebeitrags bei ausgeschaltetem Mikro)* … Antisemitismus und Gewalt machen sich in Europa immer mehr breit. Die Debatten in Sitzungen, auf der Straße oder im Alltag werden immer rauer, aggressiver und abwertender. Beleidigungen werden hingenommen und leider juristisch abgesegnet, wie in Deutschland die Debatte um das N-Wort. Dies wird als Freibrief seitens der Rassisten bewertet und ist indirekt Nährboden für entwürdigende Handlung. Rassistische Angriffe nehmen drastisch zu. Menschen anderer Hautfarbe oder Religionszugehörigkeit, schwarze Menschen, Juden, Sinti und Roma sind oft die Zielscheibe rassistischer Gewalt. Nach dem Anschlag in Halle gegen die jüdische Gemeinschaft im vergangenen Jahr wurde in der gleichen Stadt ein zweiter Anschlag gegen einen Abgeordneten des Bundestages mit afrikanischer Herkunft verübt. Erst letzte Woche bei der Wahl in Thüringen wurden wir Zeugen eines alarmierenden Tabubruchs, bei dem eine Partei der Mitte aus Machtgründen eine Allianz mit einer populistischen Partei einging.

Leider mussten ich und andere afrikanische Menschen vergangenes Wochenende in Ludwigsburg ein Theaterstück mit rassistischen und abwertenden Begriffen wie dem N-Wort ertragen. Die ausdrücklichen Hinweise verschiedener Akteure, das Stück in dieser Form nicht zuzulassen, wurden nicht angenommen. Die UNO hat für 2014-2024 die Dekade für Menschen afrikanischer Herkunft ausgerufen, denn wir sind immer noch Opfer von Rassismus, Diskriminierung und Intoleranz. Gerade in Zeiten, wo die schlechte Stimmung an Boden gewinnt und jede Anstandslinie überschritten wird, ist es wichtiger denn je, dass sich jeder von uns für eine politische Kultur der Gleichberechtigung, für Respekt und Solidarität einsetzt und sich klar gegen Rassismus positioniert. Die Menschenwürde gilt für …

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Gilles Lebreton (ID). – Monsieur le Président, l'antisémitisme connaît une recrudescence en Europe. En France, par exemple, le rapport 2019 du ministère de l'Intérieur fait état d'une augmentation de 74 % des faits antisémites en un an. Selon un sondage de janvier 2020, 34 % des juifs vivant en France se sentent menacés.

Il faut lutter contre ce phénomène inquiétant. Mais pour mieux le combattre, il faut d'abord prendre conscience qu'il y a aujourd'hui trois sources à l'antisémitisme. Il y a tout d'abord l'antisémitisme d'extrême droite, qui est le plus ancien, mais qui subsiste. Il y a ensuite, et c'est plus nouveau, l'antisémitisme d'extrême gauche, qui est une dérive haineuse de l'idéologie antisioniste. Il y a enfin un antisémitisme islamiste qui est né dans la plupart des États d'Europe de l'Ouest à la suite d'une immigration incontrôlée.

C'est ce dernier qui me semble aujourd'hui le plus dangereux des trois. On l'a trop longtemps laissé prospérer sans réagir. Il faut aujourd'hui mettre fin à cette honteuse tolérance et le combattre sans faiblesse.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovani predsjedavajući, rast antisemitizma i posljedično povećanje osjećaja nesigurnosti među europskim Židovima veliki je poraz moderne Europe. I dok europski *mainstream* političari redom pričaju priču o zaštiti ranjivih skupina, u isto to vrijeme veći dio židovske zajednice razmišlja o emigraciji. To je pravi primjer europskog licemjerja i nažalost nije jedini.

Neke su društvene skupine danas postale jednakije od drugih. I dok se nariče nad sudbinom onih koji u puno većoj mjeri ovise o pomoći države, uspješnije zajednice, poput one židovske, u potpunosti su zanemarene. Porast antisemitizma ujedno je i poraz europske integracijske i integracijsko-migracijske politike koja dozvoljava bujanje uvoznog ekstremizma na europskom tlu. Tome se mora stati na kraj dok je još vrijeme.

Sandra Pereira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, temos um grande património de luta e de solidariedade com todos os que foram ou são vítimas do racismo, da xenofobia ou do fascismo. Rejeitamos quaisquer revisionamentos históricos sobre o terror do nazi-fascismo. Não permitiremos que se instrumentalize o combate ao antissemitismo para criminalizar a ação e a opinião de todos os que condenam as ilegalidades e os crimes do regime de Israel contra o povo palestiniano. Não permitiremos a acusação de antissemitismo a quem se oponha à criminosa política de Israel, enquanto a cooperação económica e os acordos da União Europeia com o Estado israelita prosseguem.

A liberdade e a justiça defendem-se condenando a política de Israel que, com a cumplicidade da administração Trump e da União Europeia, afronta o direito internacional, as resoluções da ONU e os acordos internacionais e desrespeita os direitos humanos.

Não confundimos agressores com agredidos. É o povo palestiniano o agredido por um regime sionista que, na sua ação racista e de extrema-direita, desrespeita a história do seu próprio povo.

Vlad-Marius Botoș (Renew). – *(Deputatul se adresează președintelui în germană).* Nu voi vorbi despre principiile care stau la baza combaterii antisemitismului, rasismului și a urii. Este foarte clar că avem nevoie de o strategie închegată și de politici aplicate pentru combaterea lor. Doresc să atrag însă atenția asupra faptului că aceste politici trebuie să fie elaborate și aplicate cât mai repede, în toate statele membre ale Uniunii, de la capitalele lor, dar și în localitățile mici, în sate și-n comune. Fără această aplicare generală ne vom trezi că avem multe situații, precum cazul Ditrău de acum două săptămâni din România, unde doi bucătari de origine asiatică au fost nevoiți să accepte poziția de muncitori necalificați, pentru a nu supăra comunitatea locală revoltată de prezența unor muncitori străini în localitate. Instigarea cetățenilor la ură, la discriminare nu a fost pedepsită de autorități, ba mai mult, a fost acceptat ca cei doi bucătari să fie transferați la o muncă sub pregătirea lor, creând astfel un precedent extrem de periculos. Am avut în Europa mai bine de 1500 de ani de ură, de bigotism, de teamă de ceilalți, oricare ar fi ei, o numim Evul Mediu. Cred că trebuie să acționăm rapid și hotărât, pentru a nu ne întoarce acolo, la ororile trecutului.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Věra Jourová, *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, honourable Members, I am very grateful for the dedication and support of the European Parliament for this issue.

I say to the House: I would like to react on several comments. Indeed, you quoted here the survey of Fundamental Rights Agency and Eurobarometer, which really show alarming and shocking figures.

When you ask the Jewish citizen in the EU what is his or her main concern, the answer is security. When you ask the European people who are not of Jewish origin, they will say 'we have concerns about our health, our jobs, our family'. And this is really very alarming that the Jewish people have such an elementary fear and that they plan to leave Europe. Jewish people leaving Europe has never been a good sign, and this is not a Europe we want.

And I think it was Ms Ries, who left already, she asked whether we are doing enough. I regret to say 'no, we are not doing enough yet', and we have all of us the obligation to do much more.

The Commission worked hard to deliver or achieve some tangible results in the fight against anti-Semitism. We decided to promote the adoption of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of anti-Semitism, which now is used also by the majority of the Member States.

We are openly speaking and addressing the sources of anti-Semitism and it was also mentioned here: it is far-right, far-left, it is Islamist radicalism and also old conspiracy theories. That's why we urged the Member States, the ministers of home affairs, to adopt the decision to create the strategies on a Member States level. The anti-Semitism strategies, which will bring very concrete plans especially into areas, in the security area and in education.

The strategies are now in the in the process of creation and under the German Presidency, we will look at these strategies and will decide on how to continue further.

We want to see concrete measures accompanied with money. On security, I think it is absolutely intolerable that the Jewish communities have to finance their own security and the protection of Jewish premises, such as schools and synagogues.

We have to do much more on education. It should also be reflected in the national strategies and accompanied by money, and here comes also European money because we have in the values programme a dedicated amount for education in this field.

I was also in Auschwitz two weeks ago, commemorating the 75 years after liberation of the camp and I was listening to authentic testimonies of the survivors. We will not be able to hear these testimonies from authentic people very soon.

We have to find a way how to explain to the younger generation what the Holocaust was, and to change the narrative, because we keep discussing about the results of the Holocaust, the horrifying statistical figures. But we have to start speaking seriously about the sources of the Holocaust. How it started, because this is exactly what Marian Turski spoke about in Auschwitz-Birkenau, at that commemoration event.

He didn't speak about the past, he spoke about the present. How it can happen again. That it will be innocent at the beginning, slow and it will be driven by our passivity and our being indifferent. He warned very strongly against being indifferent.

The last comment on your contributions on online hate speech. We have an agreement with the big players in the tech industry to remove hate speech, but it cannot be enough. There must be a 'crime and punishment' principle also online. That's why I urged very strongly the law enforcement authorities in all the Member States to go after these cases and to show that it is not possible just to rely on the fact that, or the impression that, online has no law.

We have to do much more. Law enforcement authorities have started to be more active. But what they keep telling me is that in Europe, in the 21st century, crime has no boarders, the digital area has no more borders and that law enforcement authorities are trapped by the national borders. And they cannot reach for the evidence of crime in another Member State.

That's why I wanted to ask you to look at again at the regulation on evidence which the Commission developed because if this is adopted, it will help a lot to go after crime wherever it happens in the EU.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, let me assure you once again that the Presidency and the Council as a whole rejects any form of anti-Semitism, racism and hatred. We have a legal framework in place which needs to be effectively implemented in practice, but we also need to support it with targeted measures to prevent and tackle intolerance, such as education, public debate and counter narratives.

The Council will continue to follow the matter closely, and I can assure you that we pay particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate.

Der Präsident. – Ich möchte mich bei Ihnen allen für die Art und Weise, wie diese Debatte geführt wurde, und bei jeder und jedem Einzelnen für die Wortmeldungen recht herzlich bedanken.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Elżbieta Kruk (ECR), *na piśmie.* – Kiedy mówimy o „antysemityzmie", „rasizmie" czy „nienawiści", to warto zauważyć, że dziś coraz częściej spotykamy się także z antypolonizmem, również tu w Parlamencie. Widać antypolonizm w próbach zniekształcania historii II wojny światowej, w szczególności kiedy mowa o „polskich obozach śmierci", których nigdy nie było. Widać antypolonizm w oskarżeniach Polski o antysemityzm. Tymczasem Centrum Szymona Wiesenthala opublikowało listę najbardziej antysemickich wydarzeń 2019 roku. Najwięcej było ich w Wielkiej Brytanii, Francji, Włoszech, Niemczech, Szwecji, Danii, Stanach Zjednoczonych. W Polsce żadnych. Przed II wojną światową najliczniejsza populacja Żydów na świecie mieszkała właśnie na terenie Polski. Mieszkali na naszych ziemiach ponad 800 lat. I dziś wobec rosnącej fali antysemityzmu w Europie znów stają się bezpieczną przystanią. Polska przez stulecia stanowiła schronienie również dla innych mniejszości etnicznych i religijnych – prześladowanych w pozostałych częściach Europy.

Podczas II wojny światowej to poczynania takich polskich bohaterów jak rotmistrza Witolda Pileckiego miały na celu zwrócenie uwagi świata zachodniego na największą zbrodnię w historii świata – Holokaust. Ale świat milczał. Dziś wobec zła nie możemy milczeć. Ale pamiętajmy też, że ideologia hitlerowska odrzuciła wartości, na których opierała się europejska cywilizacja, w tym wartości chrześcijańskie. Bez tych wartości niemiecka demokracja przerodziła się w zbrodniczy totalitaryzm.

Ελισσάβετ Βόζεμπεργκ-Βρυωνίδη (PPE), *γραπτώς.* – Τα τελευταία χρόνια, ο αριθμός των κρουσμάτων αντισημιτικής βίας στα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ έχει, δυστυχώς, αυξηθεί σημαντικά. Ενέργειες όπως η πρόσφατη επίθεση στην εβραϊκή συναγωγή στην πόλη Χάλε της Γερμανίας, η βεβήλωση εβραϊκών μνημείων και νεκροταφείων και η επίθεση στο εβραϊκό μουσείο των Βρυξελλών δεν αποτελούν μεμονωμένα περιστατικά. Σύμφωνα με τον Ευρωπαϊκό Οργανισμό Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων, παρατηρείται αύξηση της βίας κατά των Εβραίων σε αρκετές ευρωπαϊκές χώρες, ακριβώς και μόνον επειδή είναι Εβραίοι. Η ρητορική του μίσους και κάθε μορφή βίας εναντίον της εβραϊκής κοινότητας στην Ευρώπη δεν συνάδουν με τις αρχές μας και δεν έχουν θέση σε μια Ευρώπη αξιών και δημοκρατίας. Τέτοιου είδους περιστατικά προκαλούν μόνο φόβο και μας θυμίζουν εφιαλτικές εποχές του παρελθόντος, που προσπαθούμε να ξεχάσουμε. Σημαντικό ρόλο στην πρόληψη και την καταπολέμηση κάθε μορφής μίσους και μισαλλοδοξίας μπορεί να διαδραματίσουν οι τοπικές κοινωνίες, η κοινωνία των πολιτών αλλά και η εκπαίδευση. Το σχολείο αποτελεί μοναδικό περιβάλλον για τη μετάδοση των αρχών της ανοχής και του σεβασμού, αφού μπορεί να απευθυνθεί σε όλα τα παιδιά, ήδη από μικρή ηλικία. Πρέπει να δράσουμε ενωμένοι και με αποφασιστικότητα για να καταπολεμήσουμε αυτήν τη μάστιγα· είναι χρέος όλων μας.

14. Състав на комисиите и делегациите: вж. протокола

15. Продължаващата заплаха за върховенството на закона в Полша (разискване)

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur anhaltenden Bedrohung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Polen (2020/2561(RSP)).

Das Handhaben der „blauen Karte“ sowie der Anmeldungen für das „Catch-the-Eye“-Verfahren brauche ich nicht zu wiederholen – sie sind bekannt.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, let me stress once more that the rule of law plays a crucial role in all our democracies. As recalled by the EU's strategic agenda, the rule of law is a key guarantee that our common values are well protected and complied with.

Democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights cannot be seen in isolation from one another. These elements are interlinked, interdependent and mutually reinforcing. One cannot exist without the others. It is a joint responsibility of the EU institutions and the Member States alike to ensure that respect for the rule of law is strengthened and that the rule of law remains the cornerstone of our common project. The independence of the judiciary is of crucial importance for the rule of law. It is also essential to ensure the application of EU law and the sound functioning of our common EU legal order.

As regards the Article 7 procedure concerning Poland triggered by the Commission on 27 February 2018, as I had the opportunity to tell you when we discussed this topic at your January part-session, three hearings took place in June, September and December 2018 at the General Affairs Council. Subsequently the Council was kept regularly informed of the developments on the ground in Poland. Updates on the state of play were discussed at the General Affairs Council repeatedly in the course of 2019, in February, April, July, September and December.

The Council remains seized of this matter and our Presidency is ready to continue proceeding at the General Affairs Council. At the same time, we very much hope that a continuing dialogue at the political level between the Commission and Poland will bear concrete results.

Věra Jourová, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, you will remember that on 15 January Commissioner Reynders and I updated you on the state of play of the rule of law in Poland. Since then, the Commission has been in contact with the Polish authorities. Commissioner Reynders met a representative of the Polish Ministry of Justice on 24 January, and I visited Warsaw on 28 January.

At that occasion, I made the speakers of the Sejm and the Senate, the Minister of Justice, the First President of the Supreme Court of Poland, the President of the Constitutional Tribunal, and the Ombudsman. I carefully listened to the arguments of the Polish Government and explained to them the Commission's stance. The Commission is committed and available to have an open and fair dialogue to resolve the issues at hand.

At the same time, the Commission will always fulfil its responsibility as the guardian of the Treaties. To that end, it will make use of infringement procedures whenever there are issues of compatibility with Union law. Likewise, the Article 7 process continues as long as the situation points to serious systemic threats to the rule of law.

At our last debate in this House, we informed you in particular about the draft new law governing the functioning of the judiciary. I explained that the draft legislation touches upon matters such as the independence of the judiciary, further raising the Commission's concerns in this area. For this reason, I sent a letter to the Polish authorities on 19 December 2019. The letter recalled that the Commission wants to work with the Polish authorities to strengthen the rule of law by preventing problems and by working towards resolving them when they arise. I also invited all state organs not to take forward the proceedings on the new draft legislation before carrying out all the necessary consultations.

On 16 January, the Venice Commission issued an urgent opinion on this new law raising serious concerns and recommending not to adopt it. On 24 January the new law on the judiciary was adopted by the Sejm, and on 4 February the President of the republic signed the law. This law raises a number of concerns as regards the rule of law. As noted by the Venice Commission, there is concern that this new law may further undermine judicial independence in Poland. It also raises concerns of compatibility with EU law and the Commission is now assessing these issues in detail. I can assure you that the Commission is committed to ensure the full respect of EU law and will take all necessary measures in that regard.

In addition to the adoption of the new law, a number of other developments took place. On 15 January, the Supreme Court issued two judgments implementing the preliminary ruling of the European Court of Justice regarding the independence of the disciplinary chamber. The Supreme Court confirmed the position taken in its ruling of 5 December 2019 and stated that the disciplinary chamber is not an independent court within the meaning of EU and national law.

Furthermore, in a resolution of 23 January the Supreme Court decided that the judges appointed at the request of the new national council for the judiciary, are not permitted to adjudicate cases. The resolution also invalidated all the rulings handed down by members of the disciplinary chamber.

Another important development is the fact that the Constitutional Tribunal has been seized on the constitutionality of the approach on judicial independence that had been developed by the Supreme Court following the Court of Justice preliminary ruling on 19 November 2019.

On 28 January 2020, the Constitutional Tribunal took an interim decision aimed at suspending the applicability of the Supreme Court's resolution. As regards the disciplinary regime, you will remember that on 14 January the Commission decided to make a request for interim measures, asking the Court of Justice to order Poland to suspend the functioning of the disciplinary chamber. Meanwhile, I can only observe that the disciplinary chamber continues to operate.

To conclude, I regret to say that these recent developments show that the situation is very serious. This is also reflected in the recent decision of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe to open a monitoring procedure over the functioning of Poland's democratic institutions and the rule of law. At the same time, I want to reiterate that the Commission remains ready to continue a dialogue with the Polish authorities to solve the issues at hand. During my visit to Poland, the authorities expressed openness for having such dialogue both at political and technical level.

I trust that we can embark on an open discussion with Poland. Respect for the rule of law is a matter for both EU institutions and Member States, and it is an essential element for the functioning of the internal market based on mutual trust and recognition.

Roberta Metsola, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, it is telling of the urgency of the situation that we are back here discussing Poland today. We are here because Polish citizens are Europeans too, and they are no less deserving of the same protection and the same rights as anyone in Sweden, Italy or Germany. Where every avenue for justice available to them on a national level has been blocked, neutered or taken over, then we will not shy away from playing our role. We are having this discussion now as a measure of last resort, as an appeal to the Polish Government to choose dialogue over confrontation, to choose justice over prejudice, and to choose European values over the failed populism of the past. I take no satisfaction in pointing out the irony of the fact that the last time the judicial system in Poland was under such pressure from the government was before 1989.

What this Polish Government has done is move to the past. They have used the same tired tactics of regression and oppression that fly in the face of everything Europeans have fought against and everything that Europe stands for today. But, if that is what the Government symbolises, then the brave judges stand for exactly the opposite and we look to those judges with respect and honour. Their bravery to their oath is a true symbol of the Polish courage that the world admires.

There are consequences to being an EU Member State. There are rules of this club that states agreed to follow. So now the Commission must use all the possible tools to immediately apply interim measures to prevent further repression, to protect the European way and to protect the Polish people. The disciplinary chamber, the 'Muzzle Law', the continued anti-European path of the Government means that Poland is drifting away and we are here extending a hand. Do not turn your backs on Europe.

(Applause)

VORSITZ: NICOLA BEER

Vizepräsidentin

Juan Fernando López Aguilar, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, vicepresidenta Jourová, como sabe, tengo el honor de presidir la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, que debate sobre el cumplimiento de los principios consagrados en el artículo 2 del Tratado de la Unión Europea: Estado de Derecho, democracia, que no es la regla de la mayoría, sino el respeto de las minorías, del pluralismo político y del derecho de la oposición a disentir, pero que requiere separación de poderes e independencia del poder judicial.

Por eso, lamentablemente, tuvimos que poner en marcha lo previsto en el artículo 7 en relación con Hungría. Y, de nuevo, con Polonia, que es la que ahora nos ocupa. Porque en Polonia hemos visto una acumulación de reformas legislativas que amenazan seriamente la independencia del poder judicial: la Oficina Judicial, la Cámara Disciplinaria, que ha sido declarada inconstitucional e incompatible con el Derecho europeo por el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea, y las amenazas de sanciones a los jueces que se atreven a discrepar, cuyo testimonio dramático hemos escuchado en este mismo Parlamento Europeo.

Por eso, todo nuestro apoyo para proseguir y para garantizar que lleva usted a cabo el mandato de la Comisión LIBE de que exista un mecanismo marco permanente —*framework for fundamental rights, democracy and Rule of Law*— que sea objetivo, permanente, comprensivo, que involucre a todos los Estados miembros y que, con carácter periódico, revise el cumplimiento de los principios proclamados en el Derecho europeo y en la Carta de los Derechos Fundamentales de la Unión Europea.

No podemos consentir, en ningún caso, que exista lo que se ha calificado como un *constitutional breakdown*, es decir, un *anticonstitutional populist backsliding* en ningún Estado miembro de la Unión Europea. Desde luego, no en Polonia.

Michal Šimečka, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, I remember when we had this debate last time, four weeks ago. I remember saying that the situation in Poland is unprecedented and that in fact never in the history of the EU has any Member State government exerted so much control over the judiciary. Now here we are, four weeks later, and the situation is even worse.

Poland is now the first Member State where applying EU law can actually get judges fired. Worst of all, the Constitutional Court, which is supposed to be the ultimate guardian of checks and balances, is actually doing the Government's bidding in its war on independent judges. Time is indeed running out because, if the Supreme Court is fully captured, which seems to be where we are headed, then it could spell the end of the separation of powers in one of our Member States. This is why the EU must indeed act.

As has been said, this is not to punish Poland or the Polish Government. This is for one simple reason: we must act to protect the civil and democratic rights of EU citizens, in this case Polish citizens. I often hear – and we'll hear it here as well – that there's a Western bias in our approach to Poland and that people in western Europe can't understand the legal tradition and what it means to inherit the communist judiciary and try to reform it. So let me say, as a Slovak politician and as someone whose parents and family were actually persecuted by the communist judiciary, that judicial independence and rule of law is not a matter of legal tradition, but is a core constitutional principle of the European Union.

(Applause)

Hynek Blaško, *za skupinu ID*. – Paní předsedající, je skutečně s podivem, že se na půdě EP opět probírá jakési pofidérní vyjádření o ohrožení právního státu v Polsku.

Normální člověk by se domníval, že se vyhodnotí, proč Velká Británie odešla, že se změní rétorika. Opak je pravdou. Znovu jsou pronášena silná slova o omezování národní suverenity, o tom, jak tvrdě potlačovat snahy o prosazování vlastenectví atd. Svazování občanů různými směrnicemi je dalším zásahem do jejich života.

Nyní zde máme tažení ochránců demokracie proti Polsku, které si dovolilo doma prosazovat svoje pojetí demokracie, což je pro ochránce nepřijatelné. Pouze jejich pohled je ten správný, a proto jsou Poláci povinni ho přijmout.

Jsem přesvědčen osobně, že nikdo nemá právo se vměšovat do vnitřních záležitostí suverénního státu, protože historie ukazuje, že kdykoli se tak stalo, nikdy to nedopadlo dle očekávání. Ve vzduchu visí otázka: Děláte vše proto, aby nastal dominový efekt?

Terry Reintke, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, one thing is true. There is not only one way to build a democratic system; not all legal traditions in Europe are the same. But for all democratic systems there is a precondition, and that is that winning a majority does not mean that you can undermine rule of law and fundamental rights. I mentioned both of them, because actually both of these are currently under attack in Poland.

The independence of the judiciary and thus the separation of powers, which is the cornerstone of rule of law instead of the law of the ruler, but also fundamental rights, especially of those from whom they are most easy to be taken away. I believe that in our reply in the future on the discussion under the Article 7 procedure and the mechanism on the rule of law and also in the future debate, we should take both of these dimensions into consideration.

Poland is a country in the heart of Europe. Without Poland, this Union could never be complete. Polish citizens are indeed European citizens. So instead of blaming Brussels or the European Court of Justice or whoever they want for what is going on, the Polish Government should actually engage in an open and constructive dialogue to solve these very urgent and important problems. And I urge you, colleagues, to also bring this message to Poland.

Colleagues, no matter where you stand in this debate, what we have seen in smear campaigns, in hate campaigns, also against Members of this Parliament in Poland in the past month and years, is absolutely unacceptable. We can only engage in a democratic debate if we uphold the rights of, and respect towards, the other.

Beata Szydło, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Polska wspiera wszelkie działania zmierzające do wzmocnienia ram praworządności w Unii Europejskiej, pod warunkiem że mają one bezpośrednie umocowanie w traktatach, szanują istniejące obszary kompetencji oraz tożsamość narodową państw członkowskich, a także mają charakter obiektywny i niedyskryminujący. Dlatego wyrażam ubolewanie, że Parlament Europejski prezentuje ton wyraźnie polityczny i tak jawnie nawołuje do instrumentalnego wykorzystywania praworządności. Polski system sprawiedliwości wymaga reform. Od 4 lat polski rząd zgodnie z konstytucją, w ramach kompetencji określonych unijnymi traktatami i zgodnie z oczekiwaniem Polaków, bo to oni są naszym suwerenem, takie reformy przeprowadza. Rozpoczęliśmy reformowanie wymiaru sprawiedliwości i tę reformę dokończymy.

Faktem jest, że w Polsce toczy się spór prawny i polityczny, ale rozstrzygnięcie tego pierwszego należy do polskich sądów i trybunałów, a tego drugiego do polskich polityków. Ustrój sądownictwa jest dziedziną nieobjętą prawem Unii Europejskiej i angażowanie w te sprawy Parlamentu czy Komisji Europejskiej narusza podstawowe zasady traktatowe Unii. Warto też zaznaczyć, że wprowadzane reformy są wzorowane na rozwiązaniach funkcjonujących już i niekwestionowanych nigdy przez organy unijne w innych krajach członkowskich. Na przykład nie są podważane przepisy zakazujące sędziom wypowiedzi o charakterze politycznym, funkcjonujące we Francji, czy mianowanie przez polityków sędziów w Czechach lub Niemczech.

Reforma sądownictwa jest oczekiwana przez większość polskiego społeczeństwa, a polski rząd działa w jego interesie, a nie w interesie wybranej grupy społecznej, zawodowej czy politycznej. Chcemy dokończyć reformy polskiego sądownictwa i zgodnie z traktatami, tak jak każdy kraj we Wspólnocie, mamy do tego prawo. Dzisiejsza debata ma niestety wymiar polityczny. Nie znajduję tutaj żadnego uzasadnienia dla jej prowadzenia.

Na temat praworządności w Polsce debatowaliśmy tutaj trzy tygodnie temu. Nie zostały wówczas wskazane żadne uzasadnione fakty dowodzące, że w Polsce łamana jest praworządność. Dzisiaj wracamy do tematu. Można by odnieść wrażenie, że Parlament Europejski na siłę takie fakty, taką fikcyjną rzeczywistość chce wykreować.

Pani komisarz Jourová była w tym czasie w Polsce. Uzyskała zapewnienie od najważniejszych osób w państwie o woli współpracy i gotowości do dialogu, ale żeby dialog i współpraca były możliwe, muszą chcieć ich obie strony, a ja odnoszę wrażenie, że póki co ta gotowość jest tylko po stronie polskiego rządu.

Od 4 lat tłumaczymy się z tego, co w innych krajach Unii Europejskiej funkcjonuje od dawna. Wyjaśniamy reformy, które są wprowadzane na wzór rozwiązań obowiązujących w innych krajach członkowskich. Odmawia się Polsce podejmowania suwerennych decyzji wynikających z traktatów. Dlaczego tak się dzieje? Odpowiedź na to pytanie pozostawiam Wam, Koleżanki i Koledzy, bo wydaje się, że potrzebna jest refleksja Parlamentu nie nad tym, co dzieje się w Polsce, ale nad tym, co dzieje się tutaj. Zastanówcie się, dlaczego Polska jest krytykowana za rozwiązania, które znacie z własnych krajów. Zadajcie sobie pytanie, dlaczego debatujecie nad kompetencjami, które traktaty unijne dały parlamentom narodowym, a nie nam tutaj. Zadajcie sobie wreszcie pytanie, czy chcecie być nadal wykorzystywani do politycznych rozgrywek, które nie są waszymi. Czy wreszcie nie jest waszym obowiązkiem strzeżenie Parlamentu Europejskiego przed traktowaniem go jako narzędzia w walce wyborczej w jakimś kraju członkowskim?

W Polsce trwa kampania wyborcza. Z dużym prawdopodobieństwem można założyć, że celem inicjatorów dzisiejszej debaty było uwikłanie Parlamentu w jej przebieg, chęć wpłynięcia w ten sposób na wynik wyborczy w Polsce. Instytucje unijne nie powinny mieszać się w proces wyborczy w żadnym kraju członkowskim. Dlatego zwracam się do Was, Koleżanki Europosłanki i Koledzy Europosłowie, nie ulegajcie presji politycznych frustratów, którzy, nie mogąc pogodzić się z demokratycznym wyborem, w ten sposób chcą wpływać na ten wynik. Mogę Was tylko przeprosić za tych polskich polityków, którzy nie rozumieją, że krajowe spory polityczne przenoszone na arenę unijną szkodzą Wspólnocie. Jest mi z tego powodu przykro i czuję się po prostu taką postawą zażenowana.

Polska jest członkiem Unii Europejskiej, ale przede wszystkim jest suwerennym krajem i jako taki ma prawo i obowiązek dbać o interes Wspólnoty i dobro obywateli, i to czyni polski rząd zgodnie z polską konstytucją, zgodnie z unijnymi traktatami. Współtworzymy Unię Europejską i współodpowiadamy za nią tak jak wszystkie kraje członkowskie i na takich samych zasadach chcemy być traktowani.

Wielokrotnie, również w przeszłości jako polski premier, mówiłam tutaj w Parlamencie Europejskim, a dzisiaj mówię to jako polski europoseł, że Polska jest krajem praworządnym, a polski rząd działa zgodnie z polską konstytucją i traktatami unijnymi. Polska jest członkiem Unii Europejskiej i jest suwerennym krajem. Tak jest i tak będzie.

Κωνσταντίνος Αρβανίτης, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL.* – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είναι άδικο να ακούγονται γνώμες ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ή οι ευρωβουλευτές δεν αγαπούν την Πολωνία. Είναι άδικο. Αλλά δεν μπορούμε να επιτρέψουμε ευκαιριακές πολιτικές σε κράτη μέλη για να καθορίζουν και να επαναδιατυπώνουν και να αλλάζουν τον οδικό χάρτη των θεμελιωδών δικαιωμάτων και των αρχών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Η τρέχουσα κυβερνητική πολιτική στην Πολωνία έρχεται σε αντίθεση και σε σύγκρουση με πολλές από αυτές τις αρχές: σε θέματα κράτους δικαίου, διάκρισης εξουσιών, ελευθερίας της έκφρασης, δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων, ακόμα και στο δικαίωμα των γυναικών για έκτρωση. Και στην Πολωνία —απ' ό,τι ξέρουμε— υπάρχει κυβέρνηση, δεν υπάρχει καθεστώς. Στη δημοκρατία οι κυβερνήσεις αλλάζουν· οι θεμελιώδεις μας αρχές όχι. Βελτιώνονται, ανανεώνονται, αλλά δεν ανατρέπονται. Αυτή είναι η θέση μας και σας παρακαλώ πολύ να ακούσετε όλες τις πολιτικές ομάδες και όχι την ακραία δεξιά. Το EPP, το Renew, τους Σοσιαλιστές, τους Πράσινους και την Αριστερά. Δεν είμαστε όλοι λάθος.

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI). – Madam President, today we speak about the rule of law in Europe and particularly in Poland. This is very necessary because if part of the Union lacks respect for the rule of law, this affects the whole Union.

The problem is, however, if the EU is applying a double standard, acting in a different way depending on the country. If the rule of law in the Union has to be protected, the EU institutions have to be ready to go until the end with any state. To be strong with the weak and weak with the strong is also a violation of the rule of law.

People from Poland that are following this debate can ask themselves: 'and what of Spain?' Why can Spain ignore the Committee of Human Rights of the United Nations or the resolutions of the European Court of Justice? Why is it okay when Spain imprisons political dissidents and its constitutional court manoeuvres to delay access to the European Court of Human Rights?

Seriously, to strengthen the rule of law in the European Union we must finish with double standards.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Domènec Ruiz Devesa (S&D), *pregunta de «tarjeta azul».* – Señor Puigdemont, con todo el respeto, cómo viene usted a la Cámara a darnos lecciones sobre el Estado de Derecho y el imperio de la ley. Usted fue el primero, como presidente del Gobierno de Cataluña, que despreció el Estado de Derecho cuando declaró unilateralmente la independencia, pasando por encima del Estatuto de Autonomía y de la Constitución española. Ignoró repetidas veces sentencias del Tribunal Constitucional. ¿No le parece inconsistente todo eso que usted ha hecho con la afirmación que acaba de hacer en la Cámara?

Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó (NI), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul».* – Señor Ruiz Devesa, gracias, me da usted una gran oportunidad para explicar un ejemplo claro de ese doble estándar. Fíjese, si yo mañana viajo a Polonia, estoy convencido de que en Polonia se va a respetar mi inmunidad como miembro de este Parlamento Europeo y no voy a ser detenido. Si mañana viajo a España, estoy convencido de que las autoridades españolas no van a respetar la inmunidad que me reconoce este Parlamento y voy a ser detenido y puesto en prisión por el resto de mi vida. Esa es exactamente la actitud que no le conviene a Europa para defender el Estado de Derecho donde está amenazado.

Andrzej Halicki (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rzeczywiście to nie jest debata o reformie sądownictwa, bo takiej reformy w Polsce nie ma. Dostęp do sądów jest dłuższy, opłaty droższe, obywatele rzeczywiście mogą czuć się zawiedzeni. To jest debata o chęci zawłaszczenia sądownictwa przez jedną partię, o zbudowaniu takiego systemu, który władzy daje bezkarność. Symbolem ostatnich dni w Polsce stał się nominat partyjny, rządowy, który podarł uchwałę, działając nie tylko niezgodnie z prawem, ale arogancko sugerując, że będzie bezkarny. Tak właśnie rząd chce traktować konstytucję, traktaty unijne czy inne zobowiązania i na to nie może być zgody.

Na to nie może być zgody w naszej wspólnocie, dlatego że obywatele mają prawo oczekiwać, że będą chronione ich prawa, prawa obywatelskie, prawa człowieka, a sędziowie są sędziami, którzy wykonują pracę w całej Unii Europejskiej na rzecz nas wszystkich, i też muszą mieć gwarancję prawną.

Słyszę, że Polska jest nękana przez Unię Europejską. No – nie. To wy – mówię do Prawa i Sprawiedliwości – nękacie sędziów i Polaków. Tu jest raport, który dotyczy 64 sędziów represjonowanych nielegalnie przez Izbę Dyscyplinarną, która nie powinna działać. To wy używacie fałszu i propagandy – i na to też nie ma zgody. Mam jednak jedną dobrą informację dla Komisji: polskie społeczeństwo w historii dawało radę tym, którzy gwałcili prawo i chcieli być bezkarni. Tak samo będzie teraz.

Katarina Barley (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Die unabhängigen Expertinnen und Experten der Venedig-Kommission hätten in ihrem Urteil nicht klarer sein können: Sollte Polen die jüngste Justizreform beschließen, werden Richterinnen und Richter in die – so wörtlich – unmögliche Situation gebracht, dass ihnen Disziplinarstrafen drohen, wenn sie europäisches Recht anwenden. Die Experten warnten die polnische Regierung eindringlich davor, dieses Gesetz zu verabschieden. Was haben wir letzte Woche gesehen? Der polnische Präsident unterschreibt genau jenes Gesetz gegen alle Warnungen.

Das hat Folgen für die polnische Gesellschaft, das hat auch sehr persönliche Folgen. Erst letzte Woche hat die Disziplinarkammer den Richter Paweł Juszczyszyn vom Dienst suspendiert und seine Bezüge um 40 % gekürzt. Sein Vergehen – sein angebliches: Er zweifelte die Besetzung eines Spruchkörpers an, die vom neuen regierungstreuen Landesjustizrat ernannt wurde. Jener Justizrat, den Polens Oberster Gerichtshof im Einklang mit einem Urteil des EuGH für rechtswidrig erklärt hat. Und von wem wurde er suspendiert? Von der Disziplinarkammer, die ebenfalls schon längst außer Funktion sein sollte. Auch sie wurde vom Obersten Gerichtshof Polens für rechtswidrig erklärt, und die EU-Kommission hat ihre sofortige Aussetzung beim EuGH beantragt.

Man sieht also, in vielen kleinen Mosaiksteinchen: Viele, viele kleine Gesetze führen dazu, dass in Polen der Vorrang des europäischen Rechts nicht mehr gelten soll, die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz nicht mehr gelten soll. Wir brauchen jetzt ein Tätigwerden der Kommission vor dem Europäischen Gerichtshof und wir dürfen nicht mehr zulassen, dass es ein *cherry picking* gibt. Es gibt nicht nur Rechte in der Europäischen Union, es gibt auch Pflichten, und die Rechtsstaatlichkeit gehört dazu.

(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte" gemäß Artikel 171 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)

Patryk Jaki (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Chciałem zapytać Panią Poseł, bo jest Pani z Niemiec. Mówi Pani bardzo ogólnie, ale porozmawiajmy o szczegółowych rozwiązaniach. We wspomnianej przez Panią ustawie, w artykule 107 mówi się, że za obrazę przepisów prawa, za działania mogące uniemożliwić funkcjonowanie organów wymiaru sprawiedliwości w Polsce sędzia odpowiada dyscyplinarnie. Natomiast mam tłumaczenie niemieckiego kodeksu karnego, zgodnie z którym sędziemu lub innej osobie prowadzącej sprawy w przypadku naginania prawa grozi od roku do pięciu lat pozbawienia wolności. Pytam Panią, która ustawa jest w takim razie kagańcowa: polska czy niemiecka.

Katarina Barley (S&D), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte".* – Also erstens, ich vertrete hier nicht Deutschland, ich vertrete hier Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union. Zweitens, Frau Szydło hat vorhin gelogen, indem sie gesagt hat, dass deutsche Richterinnen und Richter sich nicht politisch betätigen dürfen. Es gibt sogar Kolleginnen und Kollegen der AFD, ihrer sehr geliebten Schwesterpartei in Deutschland, die im Deutschen Bundestag sitzen. Also das ist gelogen. Und was Sie zitieren, ist Rechtsbeugung. Das ist etwas völlig anderes – das ist, wenn man Gesetze bewusst verdreht. Was Ihr Kollege gemacht hat, ist, ein europäisches Gericht anrufen zu wollen, Europarecht anwenden zu wollen. Dafür, dass man eine andere Rechtsauffassung hat, wird in Deutschland ganz sicher niemand bestraft, leider in Polen schon, und das ist der Unterschied.

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – Madam President, in January, judges from 20 European countries marched silently on the streets of Warsaw in solidarity with their Polish colleagues. We should manifest the same solidarity here with all those in the Polish legal system who are desperately trying to defend their independence – but not in words, in decisions.

Commissioner, you are right. What is going on right now in Poland, when it comes to the judiciary, is not reform but destruction. We cannot sit and watch when the Government is dismantling, bit by bit, what defines the identity of an EU Member State, because it is in the Union's legal DNA to have independent, impartial courts operating in accordance with fair trial rules which are able to uphold Union law.

Now the Polish authorities, through their recently-adopted legislation, are moving the country further away from Europe and threatening the supremacy of EU law. I was hearing my colleagues earlier speaking about reform. I think it is that reform, from the time of Arabela and Pani Rumburak and the magic ring, which made EU law and EU rule of law disappear. So please, Commissioner, go back to Poland and remind them that Poland is the main beneficiary of EU funds in the Union and then, when you come back, let's get that legislation done, making EU funding conditional on EU law.

(The speaker refused to take a blue-card question from Jadwiga Wiśniewska)

President. – Maybe you will have the possibility to answer if you accept a blue card. There were several blue cards, I can take only one, from colleague Wiśniewska. Do you accept it?

Ramona Strugariu (Renew). – *(start of speech inaudible)* somebody sitting in a European institution but ignoring European rules and rule of law.

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, with the 'Muzzle Law', the Polish Government has outlawed their judges. They are now not only intimidated, but also criminalised for exercising their profession, which is judging independently and in line with EU law. This is another alarming step towards a dictatorial and undemocratic state because this curtailment not only destroys the checks and balances, but it also deprives citizens of their right to be protected against their authorities, and, in the end, it affects all of us as it puts our core values at risk. Impunity also fuels the erosion of the rule of law elsewhere. I therefore urge the Commission to continue its actions and to start infringement procedures, asking for an interim measure in order to suspend the enforcement of the 'Muzzle Law'.

But I also urge the Member States not to leave the work only to the EU institutions. It's high time that government leaders take their own responsibility by addressing the Polish Government. They have all the instruments in place – political and legal ones – but, until now, have preferred to hide behind the Commission. The house of the rule of law is on fire and citizens, not only from Poland, rightly demand that we act.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Pani Przewodnicząca! Poprzedniczka Pani mówiła o tym, że w Polsce protestowali sędziowie przeciwko reformie wymiaru sprawiedliwości. Tak, protestowali w sposób pokojowy, bo polskie władze zapewniały bezpieczeństwo protestujących w przeciwieństwie do Francji, gdzie protestujących prawników pałowano. To po pierwsze.

Po drugie, gdzie ta wasza lewicowa wrażliwość? Kto upomni się o skrzywdzonych przez sądy, w tym na przykład o rolnika, któremu w obliczu niesprawiedliwości (bo trudno nazwać to sprawiedliwością) odebrano cały majątek życia i który zmarł w więzieniu niesłusznie skrzywdzony? Gdzie jest ta praworządność?

Tineke Strik (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer.* – Sorry, I really don't understand the context of this question. I'm sorry. There was a reference to the previous speaker, who talked about a silent protest, which is true. We have all seen that. They protested, very rightly, against the curtailment of their professional task, namely judging independently. You think that democracy is only the right of a majority, but that's not the case. Democracy is about protecting everyone, including minorities, and democracy cannot go without the rule of law.

Esteban González Pons (PPE). – Señora presidenta, las autoridades polacas parecen estar más interesadas en la confrontación que en el compromiso. Tras la visita de la comisaria Jourová esperábamos que se abriera el camino para un diálogo honesto, serio y transparente. En cambio, lo que hemos visto es esta nueva ley que supone otro ataque más a la independencia del poder judicial.

Solo desde enero de este año más de cuarenta jueces han sido puestos en el punto de mira por el simple hecho de no estar de acuerdo con las decisiones del gobierno. ¿Qué clase de justicia es la que persigue a los jueces? ¿Cuál es el verdadero propósito de esta reforma? ¿Mejorar la administración de justicia o poner la justicia bajo control político? Una justicia bajo control político no es compatible con los valores democráticos que nos hacen europeos.

Lamento decirlo tan crudamente, pero lo que vemos en Polonia no es reforma, es represión. Cuando la independencia de la justicia es puesta en peligro, es hora de que la Comisión, el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea y nosotros intervengamos. El papel de los jueces es asegurar que se cumpla el Estado de Derecho en la Unión Europea.

Robert Biedroń (S&D). – Od czasu przejęcia władzy przez PiS minister sprawiedliwości i prokurator generalny Ziobro na skinienie Kaczyńskiego niszczy polski system prawny. Zmierza niestety do całkowitego starcia z instytucjami europejskimi i własnymi obywatelami. Polski rząd jest gotowy doprowadzić do kolejnej katastrofy: do zamrożenia środków unijnych i do powolnego polexitu. Oczywiście przyświeca mu jeden cel: obrona swoich interesów partyjnych. I to jest realne zagrożenie, za które niestety zapłacić mogą zwykli obywatele.

Na szczęście w Polsce nadal nie ma znaku równości pomiędzy Polakami a partią rządzącą. Dziś Polska to ludzie, którzy bronią demokracji i chcą żyć w praworządnym kraju, a przez szalony amok PiS niestety nie mogą. Dlatego dzisiaj debatując o rządach prawa, musimy pamiętać o zwykłych ludziach, którzy przez nieudolność i szaleństwo rządów PiS mogą zapłacić największą cenę: zamrożenia środków i powolnego polexitu. I my, strona prodemokratyczna, musimy bronić pozycji Polaków przed Waszym szaleństwem.

(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 171 ust. 8 Regulaminu))

Joanna Kopcińska (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Pani Przewodnicząca! Każdy, kto mówi o polexicie, chce tylko i wyłącznie awantury. Jestem eurodeputowaną wybraną z Polski. Jestem Polką dumną ze swojego kraju, z narodu z przepiękną historią i przepięknymi ludźmi. Nie straszmy ludzi polexitem. Jest on tak samo możliwy, jak wyjście Niemiec czy Francji z Unii Europejskiej.

Robert Biedroń (S&D), *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Szanowna Pani Posłanko, ja też jestem dumny z Polski. Jestem dumny z kraju, który miał drugą najstarszą konstytucję na świecie. Jestem dumny z kraju, który obalał komunizm, ale wstydzę się, że w moim kraju żyją ludzie, którzy są gorsi od komunistów, bo zniszczyli ten kraj bardziej, niż zrobili to komuniści. I to jest największy wstyd III Rzeczpospolitej.

President. – Please, no debate, I will not allow a debate. I allowed the blue card but there was no question in the blue card, so I just state that the next blue card has to have a question inside – this is not additional speaking time.

Fabienne Keller (Renew). – Madame la Présidente, chère Madame la Commissaire Jourová, cher Monsieur Reynders, Commissaire à la Justice, Madame Brnjac, secrétaire d'État aux Affaires européennes, chers collègues, ce sont des mâts produits à Gdansk qui soutiennent les 27 drapeaux européens sur le parvis de notre Parlement. Nous respectons le peuple polonais. Nous ne le reconnaissons plus à travers son gouvernement.

Ce nouveau régime disciplinaire contre les juges réticents envers les réformes judiciaires qu'a mises en place le gouvernement actuel n'est pas acceptable. Nous assistons au démantèlement progressif, brique par brique, d'acquis historiques. Ce sont les piliers de l'état de droit et de notre modèle démocratique.

Or, chers collègues, nous avons besoin de renforcer l'espace de liberté et de justice, nous avons besoin d'institutions judiciaires fortes pour mettre en œuvre des textes ambitieux, importants, comme le retrait des contenus terroristes en ligne ou le recours aux preuves électroniques par les juges.

Madame, Monsieur le Commissaire, quelles actions allez-vous mettre en œuvre pour mettre fin à cette situation qui fragilise l'état de droit en Europe?

Vladimír Bilčík (PPE). – Madam President, Madam Vice-President Jourová, I am a proud European from Central Europe, a region where some 30 years ago our leaders followed a political vision of a return to democratic and free Europe. Let's remember: Central and Eastern Europe's return to Europe has changed the European Union fundamentally and for the better. Peace and democracy have spread across the continent, and the European sense of dignity, reliable rules and due justice should nowadays be the same across the different parts of our Union. The problem is that it is not. As a Slovak Member of this House, I am concerned about the quality of justice and credibility of European rules across the whole Union, and therefore I am standing here to defend the independence of both Polish and European justice. Do believe me, and I'm saying this is a fellow Central European: there is no hidden agenda other than our concern for quality of democracy and credibility of rule of law in Poland and our Union. Dear colleagues, for the sake of all Europeans, we cannot risk the return of a misuse of justice that will undo Europe as we know it now.

Lukas Mandl (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Lassen Sie mich damit einleiten, dass ich eine tiefe Verbundenheit mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern von Polen empfinde. Ich sage das besonders als Österreicher. Österreicherinnen und Österreicher haben Polen historisch viel zu verdanken. Wir müssen auch wissen, dass Polen unter den Ideologien des 20. Jahrhunderts besonders zu leiden hatte. Wir müssen auch wissen, dass der Zweite Weltkrieg mit einem Überfall auf Polen begonnen wurde, und an diesem nationalsozialistischen Verbrecherstaat waren auch Österreicherinnen und Österreicher beteiligt. Und der Überfall hatte eine Lüge zur Grundlage. Ich sage das deshalb, weil ich gleichzeitig sagen möchte, dass die Polinnen und Polen diese Führung, die den Rechtsstaat in Zweifel zieht, die den Rechtsstaat aushöhlt, nicht verdienen. Sie verdienen, wie alle Europäerinnen und Europäer, alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger dieser Union, eine Führung, die den Rechtsstaat lebt. Auch die Menschen in der Führung sollen an die Zukunft denken, an ihre Kinder und Kindeskinder, die einen Rechtsstaat verdienen.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE). – Madam President, the current Polish Government and the so-called Law and Justice Party proclaims the rule of law, but in fact it acts against the rule of law every day. We should look at the actions of this Government, not at the statements of this Government.

What the Polish Government sells to its people as judiciary reform is in fact erosion of democracy. They call it decommunisation, but we know it is censure. They say it is modernising the system, but we all recognise it is authoritarianism. More than this, we know that Poland is more than its current government. Governments come and go. We know that Poland is the honest judge who protects the independence of the judiciary and the rule of law, despite intimidation and repression. Poland is the courageous citizen who protects against the Government's attacks on the rule of law and Poland is the honest and objective journalist who defies the Government's propaganda by promoting the freedom of speech. We stand with the people of Poland, and to the Polish Government I say: listen to the people of your country.

(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 171(8))

Anna Zalewska (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki.* – Pani Przewodnicząca! Drogi Kolego! Nie wiem, czy Pan się orientuje, ale 20 tysięcy obywateli Polski stanęło w obronie polskiego rządu, chcąc, by dalej reformował sądy. To po pierwsze.

Po drugie, nie wiem, czy zna Pan Traktat o Unii Europejskiej i Traktat o funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej, ponieważ z żadnego artykułu i paragrafu nie wyczyta Pan kompetencji Parlamentu i Komisji Europejskiej do tego, żeby tego rodzaju debaty się odbywały.

I prośba na koniec do pani przewodniczącej. Pani Przewodnicząca! Bardzo Panią proszę, żeby nie używano epitetów w stosunku do żadnego kraju, żadnego kraju nie oskarżano i nie obrażano.

President. – There is no question, so how do you want the colleague to answer? For the last time I will give him the opportunity because you tried to have extra speaking time, but this is not acceptable. So please, 30 seconds, but we will only accept questions.

Siegfried Mureșan (PPE), *blue-card answer.* – Madam President, the question was clear: whether I know the Treaty of the European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. And the answer is simple: yes I do. And I also know the articles of the Treaty which speak about the European values, and I also know that it is our duty to defend the rule of law in every single corner of Europe, because this is a European value. And I also know about the tens of thousands of people in Poland who have gone to the streets, marched for the rule of law, spoken against the Government – and we are in solidarity with them.

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, bývalá premiérka Szydłová zmiňovala ve svém vystoupení také ČR. Paní kolegyně, já jsem byl 5 let ministr spravedlnosti v ČR a my české soudce za jejich politické názory netrestáme. Vy se mýlíte, my nemáme takovouto právní úpravu, já jsem sám připravil tyto zákony.

My trestáme soudce za průtahy v řízení a zjevné excesy, ale pokud někdo vyjadřuje své politické názory, má na to právo. Je to občan demokratického právního státu. Ten Váš zákon z 5. února, bohužel, je velkým excesem, není srovnatelný s tím, co je třeba v ČR nebo v jiných státech EU, a mě také mrzí jako mé kolegy, že místo snahy najít kompromis a najít řešení tak Váš pan prezident bohužel podepsal zákon, který přitvrzuje disciplinární odpovědnost soudců. Místo toho, abyste soudce trestali, pokud poruší zákony, pokud mají průtahy, pokud mají zjevné excesy, tak je trestáte za to, že mají svůj názor na Vaši reformu. Je to opravdu špatná úprava.

Radosław Sikorski (PPE). – *(początek wystąpienia poza mikrofonem)* … w Polsce dochodziło do łamania praworządności, domagając się przykładów. Otóż dam jej przykład z dnia dzisiejszego. Obecny rząd od lat próbuje wrobić poprzedniego przewodniczącego Rady Europejskiej Donalda Tuska w odpowiedzialność za urojony zamach smoleński. Jego adwokat, skądinąd były wicepremier w rządzie Jarosława Kaczyńskiego, powiedział, że postawienie mu zarzutów byłoby absurdalne. Za to na wniosek obecnego ministra został dzisiaj postawiony przed tzw. izbą dyscyplinarną. Zatem fakt, że adwokat mówi, że jego klient jest niewinny, już dzisiaj jest powodem do szykan. To nie jest europejskie rozumienie pojęcia praworządności. Dlatego dziękuję Pani Komisarz i Komisji za to, że próbują nam pomóc przywrócić praworządność w Polsce.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já jsem skutečně přesvědčen, že my máme společné hodnoty a společná pravidla, a pokud dochází k ohrožení těchto hodnot, tak musíme reagovat. To je důvod, proč se dnes zde bavíme. Já mám za to, že dochází k jasnému ohrožení právního státu v jedné zemi, a toto poškozuje naši vzájemnou důvěru. Takovéto chování je podle mého názoru zcela nepřijatelné.

Já bych byl velmi rád, kdyby i paní Szydłová si vzpomněla na svůj projev, který měla na tomto místě ještě v roli premiérky, kdy jsme debatovali o ústavních reformách, které prováděla, a ona nám řekla, že bude respektovat záběry Benátské komise. Nic takového se nestalo. Benátská komise vydala závěry, které byly jednoznačně proti polské reformě. A Vy si nám dnes dovolujete říci, že Vaše reformy jsou v pořádku? Takovéto chování je pro mne naprosto nepřijatelné. Podle mne byste se měla paní Szydłová stydět!

Sylwia Spurek (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Byłam zaskoczona, gdy po spotkaniu z Ursulą von der Leyen premier polskiego rządu stwierdził, że przedmiotem tego spotkania nie była praworządność. Jak to możliwe, że przewodnicząca Komisji Europejskiej nie poruszyła tego tematu podczas spotkania z premierem tego rządu? Jestem zaniepokojona, kiedy prezydencja chorwacka sugeruje, że praworządność nie jest jej priorytetem, bo nie wyobrażam sobie, żeby wstrzymać na sześć miesięcy debatę dotyczącą praworządności.

Wiemy, że wiele działań okazało się nieskutecznych. Wiemy, że artykuł siódmy jest nieskuteczny. Wiemy też, że bez mechanizmu łączącego praworządność i fundusze unijne nie zatrzymamy ciągnącego się od lat festiwalu łamania konstytucji. Oczywiście ten mechanizm ma uderzyć w sprawców naruszeń, a nie w obywateli i obywatelki. I będę tego pilnować, ale przede wszystkim musimy mieć świadomość, że czas dyplomacji dobiegł końca. Polki i Polacy oczekują od Komisji Europejskiej jasnych deklaracji i działań. Oczekują, co konkretnie chce Komisja zrobić, by bronić polskich obywateli i obywatelek, polskich sędziów nękanych za obronę polskiej konstytucji.

Pani Komisarz! Oczekujemy konkretnych działań.

Irena Joveva (Renew). – Gospa predsednica, Evropska unija je zgrajena na vladavini prava, na tem stoji ali pade. Parlament je že leta 2017 jasno izrazil stališče, da situacija na Poljskem predstavlja resna tveganja glede kršitev temeljnih vrednost Unije in neodvisnosti sodstva.

Nedavno smo ponovno potrdili to stališče in z resolucijo ocenili, da se je stanje vladavine prava od začetka uporabe člena 7 poslabšalo. Vendar očitno vse to ne pomaga, saj je sedaj, po sprejetju slavnega „muzzle law“, ki omogoča politiki, da kaznuje in odpusti sodnike, stanje na Poljskem še slabše. Resnično je skrajni čas in očitno tudi edini način, da izplačila sredstev Unije povežemo s finančnim mehanizmom spoštovanja vladavine prava in v primeru kršitev ta sredstva zamrznemo.

Pravila je pač treba spoštovati. To, kar se dogaja na Poljskem, pa vpliva na ves pravni sistem Unije. Da tokrat sploh ne govorim o tem, da lahko nespoštovanje vladavine prava vidimo tudi v nekaterih drugih državah članicah ali političnih strankah v njih.

Maximilian Krah (ID). – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Jedes Mal, wenn wir in Straßburg sind, diskutieren wir über die polnische Justizreform, und ich muss sagen, ich bin erstaunt, mit welchem Eifer die polnischen Abgeordneten von Links und der Mitte dabei sind, wenn es darum geht, ihr eigenes Vaterland in die Pfanne zu hauen. Sie sollten doch die Entscheidung des Europäischen Gerichtshofs vom 19.11.2019 gelesen haben. Allein deshalb, weil die Richter sich nicht selbst ernennen, sondern weil die Richter von dem Parlament und dem Justizministerium ernannt werden, steht die Gewaltenteilung nicht infrage, ansonsten gäbe es zum Beispiel in Deutschland oder den USA keine Gewaltenteilung. Das, was Sie in Polen fordern, nämlich, dass die Richter sich selbst ernennen und befördern können, ist ein polnischer Sonderweg, der mit Gewaltenteilung nichts zu tun hat. Gewaltenteilung heißt: Unabhängigkeit bei der Entscheidung, Unabhängigkeit nach der Ernennung, aber nicht Ernennung aus sich selbst.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, Poljska se našla na udaru europskih institucija zato što želi demokratizirati svoj politički i pravosudni sustav. To je tužna istina kojoj moramo pogledati u oči.

Nerazumijevanje koje stare članice i europska birokracija pokazuju prema postkomunističkim članicama, poput Poljske, dovodi do sukoba koji nikome nije u interesu. Stare demokracije moraju razumjeti da bez lustracije nove demokracije nikada neće dostići njihove standarde.

Korupcija i klijentelizam u postkomunističkim državama nisu slučajni. Radi se o sustavnoj pogrešci koja je posljedica činjenice da su dijelovi starog komunističkog sustava preživjeli i kao takvi su uklopljeni u novi demokratski sustav. Oni sprječavaju rasvjetljavanje prošlosti, štite političare, suce, javne djelatnike i poduzetnike komunističkih korijena i onemogućavaju dovršetak tranzicije koju nažalost sve postkomunističke države itekako trebaju.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Didier Reynders, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, allow me to come back to certain issues raised during this debate. First, as regards the new law (because there's a new law since our last debate some weeks ago), I would like to assure you that the Commission is always open to a fair dialogue with Member States to solve problems but will not hesitate to use all the tools at its disposal to ensure the respect of EU law.

The new law raises concerns of compatibility with EU law, including the principle of the primacy of EU law, the requirements of judicial independence under EU law, and the right to refer questions to the European Court of Justice. The Commission is analysing the law in detail, and in reply to comments from some Members, let me reiterate that the European Court of Justice ruled that until the organisation of justice in the Member States falls within their competence, the fact remains that when exercising that competence, the Member States are required to comply with their obligations under EU law. EU law requires respect for the rule of law, in particular judicial independence. This is crucial, because Polish courts are European courts and they have to ensure that Polish citizens can fully enjoy their rights under EU law. This is why I'm seriously concerned by the new law, and I can assure you, as Commissioner for Justice, that the Commission will take its responsibility as the Guardian of the Treaty and take all necessary measures to ensure the respect of EU law.

I also note that the Disciplinary Chamber continues to operate, despite the rulings of the Supreme Court. In those rulings, following the Court of Justice judgment of 19 November, the Supreme Court concluded that the Disciplinary Chamber is not a court within the meaning of EU and national law. I would like to stress that preliminary rulings of the Court of Justice are biding and need to be fully respected. National courts must apply national law in line with the interpretation of the Court of Justice. Notably, on 4 February 2020, the Disciplinary Chamber decided to suspend in office the first judge seeking to apply the ruling of the Court of Justice of 19 November 2019. He has also been subject to a 40% reduction of his salary. The Supreme Court also ruled that the National Council for the Judiciary is not an independent and impartial body. However, the Council continues to operate. As an example, on 31 January it selected six candidates to the Disciplinary Chamber, two of which being current members of the National Judicial Council.

In the light of today's debate, let me say a few words on the situation of the Constitutional Tribunal. I want to recall that in its reasoned proposal of December 2017 triggering the Article 7 procedure, the Commission concluded that the independence and legitimacy of the Constitutional Tribunal are seriously undermined and consequently, the constitutionality of Polish laws can no longer be effectively guaranteed. I can only note in this respect that, following the rulings of the Supreme Court and the European Court of Justice judgment, the tribunal has been seized by a number of authorities.

Your debate reminds me of statements warning that the current situation leads to legal chaos. I will simply reply that the remedy to such a situation is that rulings rendered by independent courts must be fully respected by all authorities.

To conclude, let me add that the Commission is working on a comprehensive European rule of law mechanism. It will be a preventive tool covering all Member States and will provide a synthesis of significant developments related to the different components of the rule of law. It will be based on a variety of sources of information in order to reflect the reality on the ground. This will allow us to identify and prevent early on rule-of-law-related issues. This new mechanism will cover all Member States in the same way.

The first annual Rule of Law Report is one of the key initiatives of the Commission Work Programme for 2020. The preparation of this report is already in an operational phase. We have established a network of contact persons of Member States which will help with its preparation. The report will also be part of the new rule-of-law cycle, with strong involvement of the European Parliament and the Council. However, let me be clear that this preventive mechanism does not replace response mechanisms like infringement procedures and the Article 7 procedure where they prove necessary. We will continue to use all the tools at our disposal to promote and protect the rule of law in all the Member States, including Poland.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, let me stress once again that the Presidency, and the Council as a whole, attach great importance to upholding the rule of law and protecting fundamental rights. They are at the heart of our concerns. I can assure you that the Presidency will pay particular attention to the views expressed here today during this debate.

On the next steps regarding the Article 7 procedure in the Council, although the rule of law is one of the priorities of the Croatian Presidency, the Presidency cannot prejudge the Council's deliberations nor the outcome of the procedure. The Council will continue to follow developments closely and will remain to be seized of this issue at the upcoming General Affairs Council meeting.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Bettina Vollath (S&D), *schriftlich.* – Die richterliche Unabhängigkeit ist das wesentliche rechtsstaatliche Prinzip, auf dem unsere Europäische Union basiert. In Polen beobachten wir mit Sorge, wie die rechtskonservative Regierung systematisch die Justiz umbaut. Das neue Gesetz schafft nun die richterliche Unabhängigkeit weitgehend ab. Das ist ein schwerer Angriff auf den demokratischen Rechtsstaat in Polen. Richter und Richterinnen politisch zu kontrollieren,, setzt das rechtsstaatliche System welches auf Gewaltenteilung aufbaut, außer Kraft. Zudem wird es polnischen Richterinnen und Richtern erheblich erschwert, Vorentscheidungen beim EuGH einzuholen. Das dürfen wir uns nicht gefallen lassen, denn polnische Gerichte sind europäische Gerichte. Der Europäische Gerichtshof hat in vielen Urteilen klar gestellt, dass die Ausgestaltung der Justizsysteme in den Mitgliedstaaten mit EU-Recht und europäischen Werten im Einklang sein muss. Ich möchte betonen: Alle Menschen in Europa haben das Recht auf bestmögliche, selbstbewusste und unabhängige Gerichte. Der Erfolg der neuen Kommission – als Hüterin der Verträge – wird sich schlussendlich an der Verteidigung der Rechtsstaatlichkeit in Europa messen lassen.

16. Състав на Парламента: вж. протокола

17. Незаконната търговия с домашни любимци в ЕС (разискване)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über

— die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an den Rat über den Schutz des EU-Binnenmarkts und der Verbraucherrechte vor den negativen Auswirkungen des illegalen Handels mit Heimtieren von Stanislav Polčák, Sylwia Spurek, Martin Hojsík, Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Anja Hazekamp und Eleonora Evi im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit (O-000010/2020 – B9-0003/2020) (2019/2814(RSP)) und

— die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über den Schutz des EU-Binnenmarkts und der Verbraucherrechte vor den negativen Auswirkungen des illegalen Handels mit Heimtieren von Stanislav Polčák, Sylwia Spurek, Martin Hojsík, Alexandra Louise Rosenfield Phillips, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Anja Hazekamp und Eleonora Evi im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit (O-000011/2020 – B9-0004/2020) (2019/2814(RSP)).

Ich darf noch einmal daran erinnern, dass Sie die spontanen Wortmeldungen und „blauen Karten“ sowohl elektronisch als auch mit dem Hochheben der jeweiligen Karten hier anzeigen können.

Stanislav Polčák, *autor.* – Paní předsedající, já věřím, že toto téma nebude tak výbušné a že budeme mít daleko vyšší míru jednoty a pochopení napříč politickými frakcemi.

Jedná se o ústní otázky Komisi a Radě a na ně navazující návrh usnesení ohledně nezákonného obchodu se zvířaty v zájmovém chovu EU. Chci říci, že zde navazujeme na práci mé kolegyně Renaty Sommerové z minulého období. Parlament již na tomto poli učinil řadu usnesení i v předchozím období, ale slova a sebelépe napsaný text usnesení však nestačí, a myslím si, že je třeba přikročit k činům.

Chci proto vyzvat Komisi a členské státy, aby nám pozorně naslouchaly a přišly s rychlou a účinnou reakcí. Jedná se o téma skutečně důležité pro každého, komu není lhostejné utrpení nelegálně chovaných zvířat. Jedná se o miliony poškozených spotřebitelů a samozřejmě o miliony poškozených zvířat i s ohledem na jejich pohodu, ve které mají být chována. Pašerákům dnes bohužel v cestě nestojí téměř žádné překážky a tito pašeráci na současném stavu nejvíce vydělávají. Tento nelegální obchod se zvířaty je, dámy a pánové, třetím nejvýnosnějším nelegálním byznysem hned po prodeji zbraní a drog.

Obrovským problémem zejména v zemích střední a východní Evropy jsou tzv. množírny, tedy chovná zařízení, kde psi a kočky jsou chováni skutečně v otřesných podmínkách s vidinou rychlého a snadného výdělku. Bohužel jsou také samozřejmě klamáni spotřebitelé, kteří se velmi často o původ zvířete vůbec nezajímají anebo jsou dokonce předkládány falešné podklady. Nelegální chovatelé také používají různé velmi rafinované triky, kterými potenciální kupující lákají ke koupi štěněte či kočky z množírny. Bohužel ti na ně velmi často slyší právě tím, že dostanou velmi rychle žádaného mazlíčka a mnohdy tedy za nižší cenu. To paradoxně za situace, kdy psí útulky jsou přeplněné jinými kvalitnějšími kusy.

Je zároveň třeba se připravit na to, že nelegální chovatelé i přes zpřísnění pravidel budou hledat cesty, jak tato pravidla obcházet. Pokud by někoho nepřesvědčilo to, že z množíren jsou vypouštěna do světa zvířata nemocná nebo náchylná k nemocem, doporučuji se podívat k sousedům přes Atlantik do USA, kde se aktuálně potýkají s epidemií nemoci, která je odolná proti většině antibiotik a která je právě spojená se štěňaty z množíren. Americké centrum pro kontrolu a prevenci nemocí v lednu informovalo, že toto vysoce infekční onemocnění již dostalo také nejméně 30 lidí. K tomu je důležité si uvědomit, že kromě negativních dopadů na samotná zvířata má nezákonný obchod se zvířaty v zájmovém chovu také samozřejmě širší dopady, např. na náš jednotný vnitřní trh, ochranu spotřebitele, který si právě nevědomky kupuje nemocné a traumatizované zvíře.

Proto vyzýváme Komisi a členské státy k vypracování strategií pro regulaci internetové inzerce zvířat v zájmovém chovu za účelem potlačení klamavé reklamy a lepší kontroly internetového prodeje koček a psů. Myslím si, že dnes je již naprosto zjevné, že neetické zacházení s domácími mazlíčky je skutečně celoevropský problém, který vyžaduje také celoevropské řešení, ten problém je skutečně přeshraniční. Součástí tohoto řešení by mělo být plošné a povinné značení domácích miláčků, jejich sdílená evidence, díky které budou také dohledatelná nejen domácí zvířata na obchod, ale zároveň veškerá zatoulaná zvířata, a také samozřejmě zpřísnění podmínek chovu.

Utrpení zvířat při nelegálním chovu a následném transportu napříč Evropou, při kterém ročně trpí statisíce štěňat a koťat, je třeba samozřejmě také učinit přítrž. Neobejde se to bez důsledných kontrol, které jsou v současnosti bohužel ovšem bezzubé. Právě divoké množírny v domech veterinářů často neodhalí, tam jsou samozřejmě pouze ty registrované chovné stanice.

Je toho hodně, co je třeba udělat pro zlepšení situace, a proto oceňuji dobrá jednání se svými kolegy. Je zde návrh několika zásadních změn, které by znamenaly velký krok vpřed v boji s nelegálním chovem se zvířaty v zájmovém chovu. Apeluji proto na Komisi a členské státy, aby tomuto problému skutečně věnovaly náležitou pozornost a vystoupily jasně a rozhodně na obranu těch, kteří se sami bránit nemohou.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, honourable Members of the European Parliament, in the recent years the illegal trade in companion animals has become a growing challenge for Member States' competent authorities, and it has also raised concerns among EU citizens.

The main difficulty relates to the abuse of the so-called 'pet travel scheme', the rapid development of online sales of companion animals and the risk associated with these activities. Indeed, we all know that illegal trade in pets may have negative consequences, not only in terms of public health and consumer protection, but also for animal welfare and animal health.

I agree that this situation requires our full attention, and I can assure you that the Member States are fully aware of this problem. At the end of 2018, 17 Member States participated in an EU-coordinated control plan on the online sales of dogs and cats in order to gain insight into practices in this field.

It turned out that a high percentage of the animals offered for sale was non-compliant. This confirmed the clear need to strengthen controls. I agree that identification and traceability of cats and dogs are key elements in this respect. The existing EU legislation already requires pet animals which are moved between Member States or imported into the EU to be marked. In addition, the new regulation on animal health and official controls offers further tools to fight illegal trade.

Proper enforcement of the existing rules is of crucial importance. This is primarily the responsibility of the Commission and the Member States. I should also mention that since the adoption of the new regulation on animal health and official controls, the Council working party of Chief Veterinary Officers has intensively discussed how to better fight illegal trade in companion animals. These discussions highlighted the complexity of the problem and the need for continued cooperation between all competent authorities, including among Member States.

We expect these discussions to continue within the Working Group on e-commerce that the Commission has established, as well as within the voluntary initiative group of the EU Platform on Animal Welfare devoted to the health and welfare of pets in trade.

Finally, I would like to remind you that the Council, in its recent conclusions on animal welfare, has encouraged the Commission and the Member States to continue their work on the effective enforcement of the existing animal welfare legislation. The Council has also invited the Commission to assess the need for the impact of the possible new legislation.

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, this is an issue that I personally feel strongly about and it's something that we, like Parliament, are committed to controlling and stopping. But in order to guide our discussion correctly, we need to start from the fact that the welfare of companion animals in the EU is mainly regulated at the national level. Member States have sole competence for cat and dog welfare, and they also have the sole responsibility for the identification, registration and conditions for keeping and moving these animals within their natural territory.

EU rules cover cross-border trade in cats and dogs. Clear rules apply to both commercial and non-commercial movements and cover both animals moved within the EU and also those entering from the outside. These rules are mainly designed to protect animal health and prevent the spread of animal diseases, especially rabies. They also ensure any dogs and cats entering the EU or moved between countries are properly identified and vaccinated.

Where illegal trade in cats and dogs is identified, it is therefore not due to a lack of legislation but because the legislation that is in place is not properly enforced by the Member States, and this is where we need to invest a lot more energy.

In recent years we have tried to strengthen the legal framework to help Member States tackle illegal trade. The new Animal Health Law, which comes into force in April 2021, has made important changes. Firstly, it requires compulsory registration of all establishments breeding dogs and cats, and all transporters who take dogs and cats between Member States. Secondly, it obliges Member States to improve all shelters and assembly centres from which dogs and cats are moved to other Member States.

These new measures will help to control trade of companion animals in a better way, and we consider that they are sufficient for tackling illegal trade. But again, it is crucial that these rules are properly applied and enforced, and for this we have taken several actions in Member States. The first of these is the EU coordinated control plan on the online sale of dogs and cats, this in order to give Member States insight into fraudulent practices and encourage them to control the online market more effectively. And the second is the voluntary initiative launched in the framework of the EU Animal Welfare Platform: the sub-group on health and welfare of pets, and this involves all relevant stakeholders and provides guidelines to ensure better animal health and welfare for companion animals.

Thirdly, and finally: training provided for national authorities via the Better Training for Safer Food initiative, which encourages best practices to control imports and trade of dogs and cats. One element the new rules do not cover is the development of interconnected databases, and I believe that this is a question of proportionality. We consider that this would be disproportionate to the animal health risk without a clear indication of EU added value. We will, however – and I want to be clear on this – monitor the situation closely, continue working with Member States and stakeholders to ensure the illegal trade in cats and dogs in the EU is brought to an end.

Liudas Mažylis, *PPE frakcijos vardu*. – Ponia pirmininke. Pirmojo pasaulinio karo metais šaunusis kareivis Šveichas turėjo patikimą verslą – prekiavo vogtais šunimis. Po šimto metų mes sumodernėjome, augintiniai perkami internetu, tik ne visada panaršoma dėl atsakomybės ir dėl rizikos. Suprantame zoonozių grėsmę, alima vardinti plačiai žinomus jų pavyzdžius, kad ir šiomis dienomis vis minima Koronavirusą. Gebame skiepais suvaldyti pasiutligę, bet nelegali prekyba augintiniais didina užkrato tikimybę. Pasiutligė atrodo įveikta ir Lietuvoje, ir Olandijoje, o va Olandijoje vėl užfiksuota. Skiepijami per jauni skiepyti gyvūnėliai. Kita grėsmė, netinkamos sąlygos, kurias patiria nelegaliam veisimui laikomi gyvūnai, jų transportavimas. Net ir teisėtai įsigytas gyvūnėlis traktuojamas kaip prekė, o juk tai yra gyvas padaras. Taigi kalbame ir apie sveikatą, ir apie gyvūnų gerovę, ir pagaliau apie vartotojų apsaugą. Privalomas Europinis kačių ir šunų ženklinimas būtų tam tikra išeitis. Ir jau nebe pirmame kontekste, šioje salėje tenka kalbėti, apie mokslinių tyrimų stygių. Be to, pritarčiau, kad įvairių lygių institucijoms, kurios žiūri į šį nelegalų verslą pro pirštus, būtų griežtinamos sankcijos.

Sylwia Spurek, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, each year a significant number of companion animals is illegally traded across the Member States. They are often subjected to long journeys across the EU without food and water. The trafficking in companion animals has negative implications not only on animal welfare, obviously, but also on public health and consumer protection. We need tougher sanctions on the traffickers, better cross-border cooperation on law enforcement, and stricter animal health requirements. We need training for the law enforcement to better react in specific cases related to illegal trade in companion animals.

We call on the Commission for stricter rules on the identification and registration of cats and dogs, as well as the registration and licensing of all breeders and sellers. The systems for registration shall be interconnected among the Member States also to secure online trading, since 80% of the whole illegal trade is online trade. Last but not least, more public awareness campaigns should be carried out to inform citizens about the negative effects of the illegal trade in companion animals and the importance of purchasing only companion animals that have been bred, kept and traded in a responsible manner and with due concern for animal welfare.

Moreover, we call on the Member States to carry out more information and awareness-raising campaigns to encourage adopting, rather than buying, companion animals. If more people adopted pets instead of buying, or at least did better research on animal breeders, illegal traders would see their business slowly diminish.

Martin Hojsík, *on behalf of the Renew Group*. – Madam President, dear Commissioner, dear Presidency, 100 000 puppies – that's the approximate estimate of the number of puppies exported from my country, Slovakia, every year. That's just the export, and it's an estimate because a large part of it is illegal trade: trade that is not only a problem for animal welfare of the puppies, of the kittens and other companion animals; trade that is also a problem from the point of view of organised crime, that I actually have witnessed first-hand as part of the animal welfare movement. The same organised crime that's handling people, that's handling heroin and weapons, is also handling puppies. It sounds weird, but that's the case. It's also a problem of the tax losses, and above all, it's also problem of human health.

There is a new phenomenon that is now dominating the entire trade, and that's the online platforms. And that's what makes it even more of a European problem.

That's why we need the European Commission to step up its efforts and to really provide proper guidance for identification and registration of animals across the borders, and for the Member States to actually start properly implementing and enforcing the regulation that's out there, especially the animal health law. Because what we face is a crisis, and what we need is action, not words.

Marco Dreosto, *a nome del gruppo ID*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Commissario, il traffico illegale di cuccioli non deve continuare a riempire le tasche della criminalità organizzata, minando la salute pubblica e soprattutto il benessere degli animali.

Secondo la Coldiretti, ci sono in Italia oltre 400 000 cuccioli di cani e gatti vittime dei trafficanti, per un giro di affari di circa 300 milioni di euro l'anno. Recentemente, la polizia italiana nel Friuli Venezia Giulia ha sgominato vere e proprie bande che trafficavano cuccioli provenienti dall'Est Europa, trasportati in condizioni orribili, strappati anzitempo alle loro madri.

Serve quindi una risoluzione che preveda un sistema di identificazione obbligatorio e l'inasprimento delle sanzioni, al fine di contrastare efficacemente la deprecabile pratica del commercio illegale dei cuccioli. Ben venga quindi il regolamento, ma è soprattutto necessaria la cooperazione transfrontaliera tra le autorità doganali dei paesi europei per combattere questo traffico illegale che fa così male a noi, ma molto di più ai nostri cari amici a quattro zampe.

Francisco Guerreiro, *em nome do Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Senhora Presidente, na Sérvia um *bulldog* francês custa em média trezentos e setenta e cinco euros, na Alemanha e França mil e quinhentos, já na Suécia estes valores podem chegar aos mil oitocentos e setenta euros.

Esta diferença de preços entre os vários países tem exponenciado o comércio ilegal de cães e de gatos na União Europeia. Este mercado negro incentiva, assim, os criadores ilegais a transportarem estes animais até aos países onde a sua venda é mais rentável. Mas este sistema, doentio e ilegal, que altera as idades e falsifica os boletins de vacinação destes animais, apenas é possível devido à ausência de um registo comunitário de criadores certificados.

Acrescem a esta omissão comunitária as condições deploráveis e ilegais em que estes animais são transportados dentro do espaço comunitário. E para travarmos este comércio ilegal a União Europeia tem que criar legislação que obrigue os Estados-Membros a garantirem registos oficiais de todos os animais de companhia, mas não só. Este sistema só será eficaz se as bases de dados nacionais poderem ser cruzadas a nível supranacional dentro da União Europeia.

A conclusão para nós é clara: qualquer lei nacional sem um sistema de registo europeu falhará.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, huisdieren zorgen voor veel plezier, maar achter de huisdierenhandel gaat ook enorm veel dierenleed schuil. Huisdieren worden in een opwelling gekocht en met hetzelfde gemak weer weggegooid. Elke dag worden in Europa dieren verwaarloosd, mishandeld, gedumpt of gedood.

Mevrouw de commissaris, wist u dat in Ierland windhonden drugs en steroïden krijgen om te presteren op de renbaan, waardoor zij aan het einde van het seizoen tandeloos en verzwakt zijn? Wist u dat in Spanje galgo's die gebruikt worden voor de jacht, worden gestraft door aan bomen te worden opgehangen tot ze uitgeput stikken? Wist u dat in veel Oost-Europese landen zwerfhonden in brand worden gestoken of gevoerd worden met antivries of gebroken glas? Wist u dat in heel Europa zwerfkatten worden vergiftigd, doodgeschoten, dat hun staarten worden uitgetrokken, oren worden afgeknipt of hele nestjes worden verdronken? Wist u dat voor de malafide puppyhandel puppy's worden gefokt in grote schuren, waarna ze via internet worden verkocht?

Mevrouw de commissaris, deze handel moet keihard worden aangepakt. Puppyschuren moeten voor eens en voor altijd worden verboden. Daarnaast moeten alle honden en katten verplicht worden gechipt en geregistreerd, moeten er meer controles zijn en moet er zwaarder worden gestraft, zeker voor het vervalsen van paspoorten en chips. Er moet een einde komen aan deze georganiseerde criminaliteit en aan dit dierenleed.

Eleonora Evi (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, chi acquista un cucciolo non vuole certo finanziare il terzo crimine organizzato più lucrativo in Europa, preceduto solamente da traffico di droga e di armi. Chi acquista un cucciolo non vuole certamente che migliaia di cani e gatti siano strappati precocemente alle loro madri e costretti a viaggi infernali in cui talvolta soltanto la metà arriva vivo a destinazione. Eppure questo è ciò che accade a moltissimi ignari cittadini europei che acquistano un animale tramite alcuni annunci online o senza effettuare i dovuti controlli. Questo incubo deve finire e la soluzione è a portata di mano.

Serve un sistema obbligatorio di identificazione e registrazione che sia armonizzato a livello europeo, che permetta la creazione di banche dati nazionali che siano interconnesse tra di loro così da rendere possibile una piena tracciabilità degli animali. Serve anche inasprire le sanzioni e i controlli, punire severamente, non solo chi traffica animali, ma anche veterinari e le autorità che si rendono complici di questo business.

Pascal Arimont (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Frau Ratsvertreterin! Wer kennt sie nicht? Den Hund oder die Katze als treuen Begleiter. Ich selbst komme von einem kleinen Bauernhof, wo man sehr würdevoll und sehr natürlich mit Tieren umging und umgeht. Tiere können nicht für sich sprechen, deswegen müssen wir das hier tun, und viele Hunde und Katzen werden in Europa nicht artgerecht behandelt. Illegaler Handel mit diesen Tieren floriert, oftmals unter sehr schrecklichen Bedingungen. An der Gesundheit und artgerechten Haltung der Tiere wird gespart, damit zusätzlicher Profit geschaffen wird. Wir müssen etwas tun.

Vier Maßnahmen schlage ich vor: Erstens, wir müssen die Kontrollen in den Mitgliedsstaaten verschärfen, das ist Mitgliedstaatskompetenz, nicht Kommissionskompetenz, dessen bin ich mir bewusst. Wir brauchen aber einheitliche Standards im Tierschutz. Drittens, wir brauchen ein einheitliches europaweites Registrierungssystem sowie verknüpfte Datenbanken; und viertens, wir brauchen bessere Regulierung im Internethandel. In Wallonien – dort, wo ich herkomme – gibt es diese Maßnahmen, dort hat man ein Gesetz gemacht, mit dem man den Onlinehandel reguliert, das kann man zum Vorbild nehmen, dann geht es den Tieren vielleicht ein Stück besser.

Tudor Ciuhodaru (S&D). – Doamna președintă, vorbim despre o problemă extrem de importantă, atât prin amploare, cât și prin gravitate. Eu sunt medic de urgență în Iași, România, Spitalul Clinic de Urgență „Nicolae Oblu” și consider, doamna comisar, la fel ca și dumneavoastră, că viața fiecărei ființe trebuie protejată.

Pe de o parte, cruzimea față de animale este inacceptabilă și cred că aici trebuie să venim cu măsuri mult mai dure. În România deja am depus un proiect în plenul parlamentului României prin care cruzimea față de animale este pedepsită cu ani grei de închisoare și aici sugerez că poate fi înăsprită legislația care condamnă acest fenomen. În al doilea rând, vorbim de o problemă importantă de sănătate publică și mai ales în contextul noilor îngrijorări legate de răspândirea bolilor infecțioase, mai ales că acum vorbim despre Coronavirus, cred că acest lucru trebuie făcut și la nivel european.

Așa că din punctul meu de vedere, trei lucruri clare trebuie făcute, chiar dacă aici vorbim despre politici de subsidiaritate. O legislație unitară la nivel european, o mai mare fermitate în ceea ce privește condamnarea celor care fac acest comerț ilegal și în al treilea rând, educație făcută la nivel european pentru a proteja viața acestor ființe.

Jan Huitema (Renew). – Voorzitter, ik kan me nog goed herinneren dat wij toen ik klein was een puppy kregen en dat was echt het beste cadeau ooit! Puk heeft ook echt een prachtig leven gehad op onze boerderij. Helaas is dat niet zo vanzelfsprekend in de Europese Unie en dat is eigenlijk schandalig. Het gebeurt nog steeds dat puppy's geboren worden in slechte hygiënische omstandigheden, dat ze de ontwormingskuren niet krijgen, de inentingen niet krijgen, zelfs mishandeld worden of geen daglicht zien.

Zulke puppy's komen dan bij liefdevolle gezinnen waarbij de puppy's ziek worden of zelfs doodgaan. Dit is onacceptabel dierenleed en het brengt ook heel veel leed bij die gezinnen teweeg. Ook moeten zij dan weer naar een dierenarts gaan en hebben zij hoge kosten.

Deze illegale handel, deze fok van katten en honden moet stoppen. Dit is de EU niet waardig en ik vraag de Europese Commissie daarom ook om streng te controleren en dit keihard aan te pakken.

Tilly Metz (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, chaque année, des milliers d'animaux de compagnie font l'objet d'un trafic illégal au sein de l'Union. Ces animaux sont mal nourris, séparés trop jeunes de leur mère, souvent malades et non soignés, puis vendus illégalement en Europe.

Au-delà du bien-être animal, c'est aussi une question de santé publique et de protection des consommateurs. Ces animaux ont parfois des maladies contagieuses et les consommateurs non avertis risquent de se retrouver avec des animaux condamnés, des factures impayées et un cœur brisé.

Pour faire cesser ce trafic illégal, nous demandons à la Commission, premièrement, d'améliorer la traçabilité en proposant un système harmonisé d'enregistrement des animaux. Deuxièmement, de mettre fin aux publicités illégales en ligne. Pour cela, nous exigeons l'identification systématique des vendeurs. Et troisièmement, d'améliorer la coopération entre les États membres pour arrêter ces trafiquants. Ces mesures sont urgentes et indispensables pour lutter contre ces réseaux criminels.

Antoni Comín i Oliveres (NI). – Señora presidenta, el Reglamento (UE) n.º 576/2013 se pensó para el movimiento no comercial de animales de compañía. Y el comercio ilegal dentro de la Unión Europea de este tipo de animales vulnera este Reglamento; además, atenta contra el buen funcionamiento del mercado único, porque a menudo estamos hablando de malas praxis en el ámbito de la compraventa digital.

El plan de acción de la Comisión ENVI para resolver este problema es claro: una mejor implementación del Reglamento; sanciones para los agentes que se involucran en este tráfico ilegal: veterinarios, comerciantes, vendedores, publicidad; instauración de un sistema europeo de identificación de gatos y perros; animar a los ciudadanos a que adopten animales como alternativa a la compraventa; y mejor cooperación y formación de las autoridades aduaneras.

Este es el camino. Además, no debemos olvidar que el bienestar de los animales va estrechamente ligado al bienestar de las personas. Traficar con animales, muchos de ellos no vacunados o sin las certificaciones necesarias, significa también traficar con enfermedades.

Una sociedad que protege los derechos de los animales es una sociedad más humana.

Sunčana Glavak (PPE). – Poštovana predsjedavajuća, procjenjuje se da se mjesečno među državama članicama Europske unije trguje s oko 46 000 pasa od kojih većina nije registrirana, mnogi su bolesni, nisu cijepljeni i imaju krivotvorene ili nikakve dokumente, ne zna se njihovo podrijetlo i mnoge životinje umiru kratko nakon prodaje.

Nezakonita trgovina životinjama najunosniji je kriminal na svijetu nakon droge i oružja. Osim zaštićenim i divljim životinjama, nezakonito se trguje kućnim ljubimcima. To ima negativne posljedice za javno zdravlje, dobrobit životinja i zaštitu potrošača. Zato su identifikacija i registracija svih mačaka i pasa prvi korak u borbi protiv njihove nezakonite trgovine.

U zaključcima Vijeća iz prosinca prošle godine, usvojenih tijekom predsjedanja Finske, Vijeće je dodatno pozvalo Komisiju na procjenu potrebe za novim zakonodavstvom o dobrobiti životinja. U Hrvatskoj je takvo zakonodavstvo dobro regulirano.

Kolegice i kolege, ovi podaci tužna su realnost koju svi zajedno moramo promijeniti.

Isabella Adinolfi (NI). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'articolo 13 del trattato di Lisbona sancisce che gli animali sono esseri senzienti e come tali devono essere trattati e tutelati. Eppure ancora oggi vengono considerati soltanto come degli oggetti. Qui parliamo di commercio illegale, con cuccioli stipati in camion e stive come qualsiasi merce o bagaglio per essere venduti illegalmente in diversi paesi dell'Unione europea, riportando traumi di natura fisica e psicologica.

Ma vorrei sollevare anche il problema del trasporto dei nostri animali domestici. Per molti cittadini europei viaggiare con i propri amici a quattro zampe è impossibile, in particolar modo se si tratta di un viaggio aereo. Non tutte le compagnie aeree infatti permettono di viaggiare con animali domestici, e quelle che lo prevedono pongono dei limiti di peso e di numero per l'accesso in cabina, e trasportando in stiva, come oggetti, gli animali in eccesso.

Dobbiamo aggiornare le norme, obbligando tutte le compagnie ad accettare gli animali e a prevedere che essi viaggino in tutta sicurezza. Viaggino, non che siano trasportati come dei pacchi. Adottate, non comprate!

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, paní komisařko, Vy jste řekla ve svém úvodu, že nelegální obchod se zvířaty v zájmovém chovu je věcí národních států. Promiňte, ale to považuji za alibismus.

My se v českém parlamentu pokoušíme prosadit tvrdší úpravu trestního zákoníku, postih množíren, postih tohoto obchodu a ty debaty jasně ukazují, že žádná členská země není schopna tento problém zcela vyřešit. Jedná se o organizovaný mezinárodní zločin, to zde kolegové jasně řekli, jedná se o statisíce štěňat a koťat, jedná se o obrovské utrpení těchto živých tvorů a bez toho, že EU a její orgány, konkrétně Evropská komise, připraví účinná celoevropská opatření, tak žádný členský stát tento problém sám nevyřeší, byť bude mít sebelepší vůli.

Já Vás prosím, věnujte se pořádně tomuto tématu. Vaše odpověď byla vyhýbavá. Snažte se najít řešení, které efektivně postihne tento organizovaný zločin, kde unikají miliardy na daních, ale hlavně trpí nevinná zvířata.

Petras Auštrevičius (Renew). – Gerbiama pirmininke, komisijos nare, kolegos. Europa uždraudė vergų prekybą devynioliktame amžiuje. Tačiau dvidešimt pirmajame amžiaus jo pradžioje negalime sudaryti normalių sąlygų mūsų mažiesiems draugams, apribodami nelegalią prekybą. Europos Sąjunga, kuri sugebėjęs sukurti pasaulinio lygio ekonominę gerovę, pirmauja technologinių išradimų srityje, tačiau tebestokoja valios sukurti privalomą šunų ir kačių registracija ir ženklinimą. Iškilmingai kalbėdami apie skaitmeninį amžių, apie būtinus pasiekimus, mes neturime vieningos registracijos duomenų sistemos mūsų Sąjungoje. Rizikuodami gyvūnų gerovę, apgaudinėdami neinformuotus pirkėjus ir pažeisdami visuomenės sveikatos reikalavimus, mes palaikome nelegalų ir nešvarų verslą. Kviečiu Europos Komisiją nedelsiant imtis privalomų sprendimų, kurie ir sukurs Europinę gyvensenos pagrindus gyvūnų gerovės srityje. Baikime šiuolaikinę vergovę.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Stella Kyriakides, *Member of the Commission.* – Madam President, I'd like to thank you all for this important debate. I have heard your interventions very carefully. What you don't need to do is to try and convince me that we need to do more. I am a very proud owner of a companion animal. I have myself been following what has been going on for the last few years online, and really I must admit that I share with you that a lot of what we are seeing is, to say the least, extremely sad and even shocking. So you don't need to convince me that more needs to be done.

Now I'm going to restate that the Commission, and myself personally, are committed to look at finding ways to end the illegal trade of cats and dogs.

I do believe that the new Animal Health Law will address many of these issues. It does have compulsory registration, finally, of establishments breeding cats and dogs, and we do now have, if not all the necessary measures, a great deal more necessary measures to help Member States prevent and detect this unacceptable practice. But it is also important that we enforce the rules, and I think we all need to understand that these are not being enforced. All the stakeholders have an important role to play in this by developing guidelines, and I was very interested and I agree that we need to also have more public awareness campaigns of this problem.

The new Official Controls Regulation provides far stronger penalties and more tools to address online sales, and I believe that by working together we can stop the illegal trade of companion animals. It is a threat to the internal market and public and animal health, as well as animal welfare, and what I can commit to, as a Commissioner, is that I will be looking at this even more closely and seeing how the Animal Health Law is implemented and, if necessary, what else we can do.

Nikolina Brnjac, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, to conclude, I wish to thank you for this useful debate on the protection of the internal market and consumer rights from the negative implication of illegal trade in companion animals. This is a complex issue which has to be tackled by Member States' competent authorities, which remain primarily responsible for ensuring, together with the Commission, enforcement of the rules adopted by the co-legislators. The recently-adopted Council conclusions on animal welfare are an important contribution for making further progress in this area.

Finally, let me also emphasise that we are looking forward to the continued discussion in the context of the EU Platform on Animal Welfare in the Working Group on e-commerce.

Die Präsidentin. – Gemäß Artikel 136 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung wurde ein Entschließungsantrag eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Mittwoch, 12. Februar 2020, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 171)

Miriam Dalli (S&D), *in writing*. – The illegal trade of companion animals is a highly organised criminal activity that puts animal and human lives at risk. The illegal dog trade alone impacts on approximately 8 million puppies annually, is the third most profitable organised crime network in the EU, and poses a massive public health risk to European citizens. Illegally bred pets are seldom vaccinated. They can spread infectious diseases and cause a re-emergence of once-eradicated diseases. They are also subject to unequal and appalling living conditions, leading to genetic defects and behavioural problems.

To fight the criminal trade in pets the EU must create a common definition of puppy and kitten farms. A common definition would eradicate differences in animal welfare standards, price inconsistencies and pet exploitation. We must also implement a mandatory, EU-wide system for pet identification and registration. All Member States should provide registers of authorised pet breeder and sellers. I also encourage people to adopt animals instead of purchasing them. Finally, I call on the Commission to implement tougher sanctions for criminals participating in the illegal pet trade. Member States must shut down these crime networks for the sake of our citizens' health and the safety of our pets.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), *kirjallinen*. – Arvoisa puhemies, eläinten kaupan laajennuttua verkkoon yhä useampi ostaa lemmikkinsä netistä. Jo 2017 EU-maissa tehdyn kyselyn mukaan yli puolet ostivat lemmikkinsä verkossa.

Suurimmassa osassa EU-maista ei kuitenkaan ole lainsäädäntöä eläinten verkkokaupalle. Sääntelyn puute ruokkii laitonta kauppaa ja helpottaa epärehellisten myyjien toimintaa. Lemmikkieläinten laiton kauppa lisää sairauksien riskiä sekä eläimillä että ihmisillä. Eläimen alkuperän ollessa epävarma on mahdotonta varmistua rokotuskorttien ja passien aitoudesta. Jos rokotuskortti onkin väärennetty, voi ulkomailta jäsenvaltioon tuotu eläin levittää eläinsairauksia, joita jäsenvaltiossa ei ole tavattu. Lemmikeillä voi olla perinnöllisiä sairauksia, pennut syntyvät ja kasvavat huonoissa olosuhteissa, eikä kasvattaja myöskään aina välitä, millaiseen kotiin pentu päätyy. Kaikki tämä myös kostautuu usein kärsimyksenä ja taloudellisena menetyksenä omistajalle.

Jokainen kissa ja koira ansaitsee arvoisensa elämän – kuten me kaikki muutkin elolliset – ilman kipua, kauhua ja kärsimystä. Me tarvitsemme EU:n tasolle seuraeläinlainsäädännön, johon sisältyisi lemmikkien sirutuspakko ja eurooppalainen rekisteri.

Peter Pollák (PPE), *písomne*. – Nelegálny obchod so zvieratami znamená často trýznenie, bolesť a krv. Počuli sme o ilegálnom obchodovaní vo viacerých členských krajinách EÚ, napríklad v Španielsku či Grécku. Naše členské krajiny potrebujú silnú legislatívu a pomoc. Ilegálny obchod so zvieratami je porovnateľný s inými formami čiernej ekonomiky, napríklad s obchodom s drogami a zbraňami. Odhaduje sa, že hneď po týchto nelegálnych oblastiach nasleduje práve predmetný sektor. Chcem upozorniť aj na predaj suvenírov, ktoré majú zvierací pôvod. Stále sa kvôli slonovine, kožušine či iným artefaktom zvieratá zabíjajú. Je potrebné, aby sa Európska únia zamerala aj na túto formu nekalých praktík.

Емил Радев (PPE), *в писмена форма.* – Отдавна призовавам за по-строги мерки в борбата с насилието срещу животни и нелегалната им търговия. Контрабандата и нелегалният трафик се свързват с наркотици и оръжие. Истината е, че друг незаконен бизнес изживява бум – търговията с домашни любимци. За ден в Европа има близо 400000 обяви за продажби на кучета. Предвид цената от стотици евро, ясно е какви са годишните печалби. По данни на Европол, дилърите на наркотици печелят 24 млрд. евро годишно, сумите от незаконната търговия на кучета са подобни. Сериозен проблем е липсата на задължителна общоевропейска система за идентификация и регистрация. Тя би ограничила незаконната продажба на домашни животни, защото проверката статута на животното е по-лесна – кога е родено, кой е собственика, какви ваксини има. Това ще спомогне за по-добрия контрол над общественото здраве и по-добрата защита на потребителите. Системата трябва да бъде обвързана с паспортите на животните, за да не може да се фалшифицират. Важно е обществото да налага граждански контрол и да настоява за спазването на законовите изисквания за хуманно отношение към животните. Това действа като двигател за въвеждането на промени. Призовавам всички отговорни институции да изработят европейска правна рамка за защита на домашните любимци и бездомните животни, чиято цел е справяне с незаконната търговия.

Edina Tóth (PPE), *írásban.* – A kisállatok illegális kereskedelme hatalmas méreteket ölt az Európai Unióban, nem áll meg az országhatároknál és rengeteg állat pusztulását okozza évente. A legtöbb esetben elmondható, hogy az illegális állatkereskedelem a háziállatok szaporításához vezet. A szaporítók a kölyökkutyákat és cicákat gyakran akár 4-5 hetes korban is elválasztják az anyjuktól, megfelő regisztráció és oltások nélkül adják el őket egyik tagállamból a másikba. Továbbá a kereskedelmi célból kutyát vagy macskát tenyésztő vállalkozások pedig a kedvtelésből tartott állatok nem kereskedelmi célú utazására vonatkozó uniós előírásokat használják ki jogosulatlanul.

Az ilyen illegális állatkereskedelem a benne rejlő közegészségügyi, állatjóléti és fogyasztóvédelmi kockázat mellett ráadásul a nemzetközi szervezett bűnözés számára is jelentős bevételforrássá vált. Éppen ezért az állatok illegális kereskedelmének azonnal véget kell vetni! Felszámolni a jelenséget azonban nagyon nehéz feladat. Úgy gondolom, hogy erre az évek óta tartó problémára kizárólag egy Uniós szintű szabályozással találhatunk megoldást, amellyel sok ezer kisállat életét menthetjük meg és biztosíthatunk számunkra jobb életet. Szükség van szigorításra és a büntetések bevezetésére.

18. Одобрение на протокола от настоящото заседание: вж. протокола

19. Дневен ред на следващото заседание: вж. протокола

20. Закриване на заседанието

(Die Sitzung wird um 22.47 Uhr geschlossen.)

Легенда на използваните символи

*	Процедура на консултация
***	Процедура на одобрение
***I	Обикновена законодателна процедура: първо четене
***II	Обикновена законодателна процедура: второ четене
***III	Обикновена законодателна процедура: трето четене

(Посочената процедура се базира на правното основание, предложено от проекта на акт.)

Съкращения на наименованията на комисиите

AFET	Комисия по външни работи
DEVE	Комисия по развитие
INTA	Комисия по международна търговия
BUDG	Комисия по бюджети
CONT	Комисия по бюджетен контрол
ECON	Комисия по икономически и парични въпроси
EMPL	Комисия по заетост и социални въпроси
ENVI	Комисия по околна среда, обществено здраве и безопасност на храните
ITRE	Комисия по промишленост, изследвания и енергетика
IMCO	Комисия по вътрешния пазар и защита на потребителите
TRAN	Комисия по транспорт и туризъм
REGI	Комисия по регионално развитие
AGRI	Комисия по земеделие и развитие на селските райони
PECH	Комисия по рибно стопанство
CULT	Комисия по култура и образование
JURI	Комисия по правни въпроси
LIBE	Комисия по граждански свободи, правосъдие и вътрешни работи
AFCO	Комисия по конституционни въпроси
FEMM	Комисия по правата на жените и равенството между половете
PETI	Комисия по петиции
DROI	Подкомисия по правата на човека
SEDE	Подкомисия по сигурност и отбрана

Съкращения на наименованията на политическите групи

PPE	Група на Европейската народна партия (Християндемократи)
S&D	Група на Прогресивния алианс на социалистите и демократите в Европейския парламент
Renew	Група „Renew Europe“
ID	Група „Идентичност и демокрация“
Verts/ALE	Група на Зелените/Европейски свободен алианс
ECR	Група на Европейските консерватори и реформисти
GUE/NGL	Група на Европейската обединена левица – Северна зелена левица
NI	Независими членове