

C/2024/2681

19.4.2024

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 3 APRIL 2017

(C/2024/2681)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2017-2018 SESSION

Sittings of 3 to 6 April 2017

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Resumption of the session	3
2. Statements by the President	3
3. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting: see Minutes	3
4. Announcement by the President	3
5. Composition of Parliament: see Minutes	4
6. Composition of political groups: see Minutes	4
7. Verification of credentials: see Minutes	4
8. Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 69c): see Minutes	4
9. Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes	4
10. Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes	4
11. Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes	4
12. Major interpellations (Rule 130b) (submission): see Minutes	4

Contents	Page
13. Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes	4
14. Documents received: see Minutes	4
15. Order of business	4
16. European Solidarity Corps (debate)	10
17. Commission's answers to written questions (debate)	22
18. Trafficking in human beings (debate)	26
19. Palm oil and deforestation of rainforests (debate)	38
20. Composition of delegations : see Minutes	52
21. Fraudulent practices in the Brazilian meat sector (debate)	52
22. Characteristics for fishing vessels (debate)	67
23. Women and their roles in rural areas (short presentation)	71
24. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance	77
25. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes	82
26. Closure of the sitting	82

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 3 APRIL 2017

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.00)

1. Resumption of the session

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 16 marzo 2017.

2. Statements by the President

El presidente. – Quisiera transmitir en nombre del Parlamento Europeo nuestras condolencias y solidaridad con el pueblo colombiano tras la tragedia de Mocoa. La avalancha de agua y barro ha provocado muchas víctimas y hay, también, dos desaparecidos europeos. Quiero, por tanto, expresar la proximidad y el apoyo de este Parlamento a Colombia, a sus ciudadanos y, especialmente, a las familias de los fallecidos.

Voglio altresì esprimere le condoglianze e la solidarietà del Parlamento europeo al popolo russo e alla città di San Pietroburgo per l'attentato di oggi, che ha causato numerosi morti e feriti. Per proteggere i nostri cittadini è importante collaborare sempre più nella lotta contro tutte le forme di terrorismo.

I inform you that the President of the Eurogroup, Mr Dijsselbloem, has once again declined our invitation to take part in the plenary debate on Greece. I would like to stress that, even if there is no legal obligation for him to take part in our work, it might be expected that someone who asks European citizens to make huge sacrifices would also feel duty-bound to answer to their representatives.

(Loud applause)

This is also a question of common courtesy.

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

4. Announcement by the President

Presidente. – Conformemente all'articolo 166 del regolamento e dopo aver ascoltato l'interessato, ho deciso di comminare una sanzione all'on. Pedicini per aver usato insulti e un linguaggio offensivo nei confronti di altri deputati al Parlamento europeo durante il suo intervento in Aula del 14 marzo 2017. La sanzione consiste nella perdita del diritto all'indennità di soggiorno per un periodo di due giorni.

La decisione è stata notificata al deputato interessato, che si è scusato per le parole usate nel corso del suo intervento.

5. **Composition of Parliament: see Minutes**
6. **Composition of political groups: see Minutes**
7. **Verification of credentials: see Minutes**
8. **Negotiations ahead of Parliament's first reading (Rule 69c): see Minutes**
9. **Signature of acts adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure (Rule 78): see Minutes**
10. **Delegated acts (Rule 105(6)): see Minutes**
11. **Questions for oral answer (submission): see Minutes**
12. **Major interpellations (Rule 130b) (submission): see Minutes**
13. **Action taken on Parliament's positions and resolutions: see Minutes**
14. **Documents received: see Minutes**
15. **Order of business**

Presidente. – Passiamo ora all'ordine dei lavori.

Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di mercoledì 29 marzo 2017, è stato distribuito.

A seguito di consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula la seguente proposta di modifica del progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno: la dichiarazione del presidente dell'Eurogruppo sullo stato di avanzamento del secondo riesame del programma di aggiustamento economico per la Grecia è sostituita, a causa della decisione del presidente dell'Eurogruppo, da dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione con lo stesso titolo e nella stessa fascia oraria.

Vi sono obiezioni?

Manfred Weber, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Meine Fraktion, die EVP-Fraktion, unterstützt die Änderung des Titels. Ich möchte aber schon zum Ausdruck bringen, dass es ein ziemlicher Skandal ist, dass der Präsident der Euro-Gruppe, obwohl das Plenum und die Konferenz der Präsidenten das einstimmig gefordert haben und obwohl Sie als Präsident des Europäischen Parlaments ihm diesen Wunsch übermittelt haben, es nicht für notwendig hält, hier im Europäischen Parlament zu erscheinen, wenn wir über wichtige Fragen wie beispielsweise Griechenland diskutieren. Dieses Verhalten, Herr Präsident, ist inakzeptabel, ist respektlos gegenüber dem Europäischen Parlament. Wir bitten Sie, das auch gegenüber dem Chef der Euro-Gruppe zum Ausdruck zu bringen.

Ich möchte darüber hinaus die Sozialisten bitten, weil Herr Dijsselbloem ja immerhin Sozialdemokrat ist, auch Gespräche zu führen mit ihren Parteifreunden, ob es denn nicht möglich ist, dass Dijsselbloem hier mal erscheint.

Und ich möchte noch eines zusätzlich deutlich machen, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren. Der Kollege Dijsselbloem hat in den letzten Wochen Interviews gegeben. Wir als EVP-Fraktion wollen, dass wir den Euro zusammenhalten. Wir wollen auch, dass Regeln eingehalten werden. Aber er hat sich sehr, sehr abfällig über die Staaten geäußert, die in den letzten Jahren Probleme hatten, die Hilfe bekommen haben in der Eurozone. Aus unserer Sicht ist aufgrund dieses respektlosen Umgangs vor allem mit den Programmstaaten ein weiteres Verbleiben von Dijsselbloem im Amt nicht akzeptabel. Aus unserer Sicht sollte er zurücktreten.

Gianni Pittella, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la posizione del gruppo Socialista su questo tema è molto chiara: l'abbiamo espressa nella Conferenza dei presidenti più volte quando abbiamo detto che era inaccettabile la scelta di Dijsselbloem di non venire al Parlamento. La ribadiamo ora.

Abbiamo detto ben prima del collega Weber che era vergognosa e scandalosa l'intervista concessa da Dijsselbloem riguardo alle regioni mediterranee dell'Europa che spendono i soldi in donne e in alcol, ma anche irriguardosa e vergognosa nei confronti delle donne. E Dijsselbloem con quella intervista ha dimostrato – ma anche prima aveva dimostrato – di non avere l'attitudine per fare il presidente dell'Eurogruppo.

Questa è la posizione del gruppo Socialista. Questa è la posizione di molti dei leader socialisti. Io mi auguro che questa sia la anche la posizione dei leader cristiano-democratici, che finora sono stati i veri sostenitori di Dijsselbloem.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, je ne serai pas très long. Je soulignerai simplement que l'attitude du président de l'Eurogroupe fait partie de ces comportements méprisants – on l'a vu à l'égard des citoyens, on le voit maintenant à l'égard de notre institution – qui sont à la source de l'insurrection d'un nombre de plus en plus grand de citoyens contre les institutions démocratiques. En effet, je pense qu'il est important – comme vous l'avez fait – que ce Parlement manifeste son désaccord profond avec une arrogance qui n'est vraiment pas de saison.

Cela étant, Monsieur Weber, j'ai bien entendu que vous qualifiez M. Dijsselbloem de socialiste. Pour ma part, cela fait bien longtemps que j'ai arrêté de croire que c'est parce que l'on porte le dossard socialiste que l'on se comporte comme tel. Je sais encore faire la différence.

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Auch in aller Kürze: Wir haben uns bereits in der vergangenen Woche in der Konferenz der Präsidenten damit auseinandergesetzt. Sie hatten uns schon erklärt, dass Sie wenig Lust haben, Herrn Dijsselbloem zum wiederholten Male einzuladen und von ihm einen Korb zu bekommen. Und ich denke, was wir hier sowohl gegenüber dem Rat als auch gegenüber der Euro-Gruppe klarmachen müssen, ist, dass dieses Verhalten nicht tolerierbar ist. Herr Dijsselbloem hat eine wichtige Funktion, gerade bei der Umsetzung von Maßnahmen gegenüber einigen Ländern in der Europäischen Union, und hat überhaupt nicht das Recht, sich dann gegenüber den Abgeordneten hier zu verweigern.

Und was seine Interview-Geschichten betrifft – wir haben auch im Vorfeld schon gefordert: Herr Dijsselbloem ist der falsche Mann für die Euro-Gruppe, und er hat zurückzutreten und sollte nicht erst warten, dass er von irgendjemandem ersetzt wird.

Νότης Μαριάς, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας ECR*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εκ μέρους του ECR, θέλουμε να καταγγείλουμε τη στάση του κυρίου Dijsselbloem, διότι το Eurogroup είναι ένα όργανο το οποίο λαμβάνει μέτρα τα οποία μειώνουν τις συντάξεις και τους μισθούς, ασκεί αντιλαϊκή πολιτική, ενώ ο κύριος Dijsselbloem δεν τολμά να έρθει να υποστηρίξει τις αποφάσεις του Eurogroup. Επιπλέον, με τις επονειδιστές δηλώσεις του προκάλεσε όλους τους λαούς της Ευρώπης, προκάλεσε τους ευρωβουλευτές και γι' αυτό πιστεύουμε ότι δεν τολμάει να έρθει εδώ να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες του. Αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα.

Θεωρούμε ότι πρέπει να αποπεμφθεί από το Eurogroup. Και αυτό είναι ευθύνη των ηγετών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Τους καλούμε, λοιπόν, να πάρουν τις αποφάσεις τους. Δεν μπορεί ο κύριος αυτός να είναι πρόεδρος του Eurogroup και να προσβάλλει τους λαούς.

(χειροκροτήματα)

Marcel de Graaff, *namens de ENF-Fractie*. – Ik sluit me aan bij de kritiek op de heer Dijsselbloem die door mijn collega-voorzitters is geuit. Het is een schande en niet alleen respectloos voor alle inspanningen die in Zuid-Europese landen worden verricht en de ellende die mensen daar door alle bezuinigingen meemaken. Het is natuurlijk ook – en ik sluit mij daarin bij de heer Pittella aan – een schande dat er zo over vrouwen wordt gesproken. Dat kan echt absoluut niet. Ik hoop dat u deze kritiek in een brief verwoordt die u naar de heer Dijsselbloem stuurt.

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I am going to be very short. Beyond the fact that we are all scandalised by the attitude of Mr Dijsselbloem, we have to ask ourselves whether there is also a question of principle here. And the question of principle is the following: he is the President of the Eurogroup, and so he is saying 'my masters are the Eurogroup – the ministers of finance'.

That problem can be solved by us, and that is by doing what is already in a number of our reports: to make a permanent president of the Eurogroup who is under the scrutiny of the Parliament. One of the ideas is to say: why not make the president of the Eurogroup, for example, a vice-president of the Commission, and this vice-president of the Commission will automatically be accountable before the Parliament.

So it is very good – I agree with what Mr Weber all other the colleagues have said – but let us also take account of the consequences. We can solve this in the coming years by making a permanent president, who would be a member of the Commission, accountable to this House.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche il mio gruppo, l'EFDD, si dimostra contrariato da quelle che sono state le parole portate avanti da parte del presidente dell'Eurogruppo. È scandaloso quello che ha detto. Anche per noi dovrebbe dimettersi il prima possibile.

Starà ai capi di Stato, adesso, prendere una decisione, però riteniamo scandaloso che non abbia accettato un invito di questo Parlamento a parlare di una situazione gravosa come quella della Grecia, un paese del sud che ha insultato con le sue parole, e avremmo voluto, oltre che dibattere con lui di questo, magari fargli un qualche appunto su quelle che sono state le sue parole. Aspettiamo adesso una reazione da parte del Presidente e da parte anche di tutti i gruppi.

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, τη θέση μας όσον αφορά το φαινόμενο Dijsselbloem την εξέφρασε η πρόεδρος της Ομάδας μας, που μίλησε προηγουμένως: αποδοκιμασία, οργή για την προσβολή και προς συναδέλφους και προς το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Όμως, με την ευκαιρία αυτή και επειδή η συζήτηση γενικεύτηκε, κύριε Πρόεδρε, και ακούστηκαν ορισμένα θέματα αρχής, θέτω το ερώτημα: ποιος έδωσε τέτοιες δυνατότητες και τέτοιες εξουσίες στον πρόεδρο του Eurogroup και στο Eurogroup γενικά;

Ήταν καλός ο Dijsselbloem όταν ερχόταν εδώ βρίζοντας τους Κυπρίους, προχωρώντας στην περιστολή των καταθέσεων και στα μνημόνια; Ήταν καλός ο Dijsselbloem που ήρθε, όπως θυμόμαστε, πριν λίγο καιρό στην Ολομέλεια και παρουσίασε την έκθεση για το μέλλον της Ευρώπης εκ μέρους των πέντε προέδρων; Αντί να αποδοκιμάσουμε αυτή τη θεσμική στρέβλωση που έχει γίνει, αυτή την κυριαρχία του Eurogroup μαζί με τον κύριο Dijsselbloem, καλό είναι να σκεφτούμε τι έχουμε αποδεχθεί ως Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, τι έχουμε αποδεχθεί ως ευρωζώνη απέναντι στον Dijsselbloem και στις εξουσίες του Eurogroup.

Alain Lamassoure (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, en attendant une réforme du type de celle qu'a proposée très opportunément le président Verhofstadt, le Parlement ne peut pas laisser sans réponse ce mépris renouvelé de M. Dijsselbloem à son égard.

Je propose que nous lui appliquions un principe que nous avons appliqué à toutes les personnes et entreprises qui ont refusé de coopérer avec le Parlement européen, avec certaines de ses commissions et certains de ses groupes. Ce principe consiste à déclarer l'intéressé *persona non grata* dans les locaux du Parlement et à considérer que, puisqu'il ne veut pas venir en plénière, il ne sera plus jamais admis à aucune réunion du Parlement européen.

Je pense que c'est la moindre des réponses que nous pourrions apporter.

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, on behalf of everybody who has not spoken, I would like to express our denunciation of Mr Dijsselbloem too.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, merci d'inaugurer cette manière de procéder qui fait que, de façon tout à fait impromptue, un lundi à 17 heures, horaire parfaitement privilégié dans cet hémicycle, un débat s'ouvre sur la présidence de l'Eurogroupe.

Je note avec plaisir le soutien que M. Weber a apporté aux pays qui souffrent des agissements de la troïka. Je crois que c'est un jour qu'il faut saluer.

Le Président. – C'est donc une proposition pour l'ordre du jour? Proposez-vous quelque chose?

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, j'ai effectivement quelque chose à proposer.

Vous auriez dû clore ce débat bien plus tôt. L'essentiel est le débat que nous allons avoir demain pour savoir ce que font le Conseil et la Commission au sujet de la Grèce: chacun pourra s'exprimer dans ce cadre-là sur l'action de l'Eurogroupe sur place, y compris ceux qui lui donnent mandat, c'est-à-dire, au sein de l'Eurogroupe, un certain nombre de ministres des Finances qui ne veulent pas conclure la révision du programme.

Presidente. – Sono fiero di presiedere un Parlamento che all'unanimità respinge il tentativo del presidente dell'Eurogruppo di non rispettare una richiesta, anche se non è obbligato, dei rappresentanti dei popoli europei.

Invierò una lettera formale di protesta al presidente dell'Eurogruppo dicendogli che il Parlamento europeo, all'unanimità, non accetta un atteggiamento di questo tipo da parte di chi riveste un ruolo tanto importante.

Lunedì

Caspary e un numero di deputati pari alla soglia bassa hanno chiesto che l'interrogazione orale sulle risposte della Commissione alle interrogazioni con richiesta di risposta scritta, indirizzata alla Commissione, sia aggiunta come secondo punto dopo l'interrogazione orale sulla tratta di esseri umani.

Do la parola all'on. Caspary per presentare la richiesta.

Daniel Caspary (PPE). – Mr President, every one of us knows an example where we have put a simple written question to the Commission and did not get a proper answer. Because of this, I have organised a kind of grassroots initiative which has an oral question with debate to the European Commission about that. In the year 2015, 157 Members of this House signed, but after three months this oral question lapsed. I started this initiative again in January this year and 246 Members signed, but this oral question will again lapse if we do not put it on this week's agenda.

Dear colleagues, I think it is not acceptable that 246 Members ask for an oral question and nothing happens, but we have good luck because according to the services this week there is some time, and so we can add this point to the agenda without removing another one. I therefore ask you to support this request that we have the debate tonight and please, even if it is very short notice, take the opportunity to take part.

Presidente – Qualcuno vuole intervenire contro la proposta dell'on. Caspary?

Marco Zanni, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, volevo chiedere a nome del gruppo ENF di aggiungere domani pomeriggio, come quinto punto all'ordine del giorno, dopo la discussione sulla revisione del quadro finanziario pluriennale, una discussione sulla relazione Ashworth «Stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2018 — Sezione I — Parlamento europeo». La durata dei lavori, quindi, come lei ha detto, dovrebbe essere estesa sino alla mezzanotte.

Credo sia essenziale discutere in quest'Aula e di fronte ai cittadini europei di come questa istituzione gestisce il proprio bilancio. La trasparenza deve essere garantita sempre, e quindi non vedo ragioni per cui quest'anno si scelga questa procedura inusuale, che priva il Parlamento stesso di una delle sue prerogative più grandi. Chiedo quindi che si ponga in votazione questa modifica attraverso il voto per appello nominale.

Presidente. – C'è qualcuno che vuole intervenire contro?

Poniamo in votazione per appello nominale la richiesta del gruppo Europa delle Nazioni e della Libertà di tenere una discussione sulla relazione dell'on. Ashworth sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2018 — Sezione I – Parlamento europeo.

La votazione è aperta.

La votazione è chiusa.

La proposta è respinta, quindi l'ordine del giorno non è modificato.

Mercoledì

I gruppi ALDE, S&D e PPE hanno chiesto che una dichiarazione della Commissione sulla situazione in Venezuela venga aggiunta nel pomeriggio.

Il gruppo ALDE ha chiesto che questa dichiarazione sia aggiunta come sesto punto, dopo la relazione dell'on. Vajgl sulla relazione 2016 sull'ex Repubblica iugoslava di Macedonia. Il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che questa dichiarazione sia aggiunta come quinto punto, dopo la dichiarazione della Commissione sull'adeguatezza della protezione garantita dallo scudo UE-USA per la privacy (senza risoluzione). Il gruppo PPE ha chiesto che questa dichiarazione sia aggiunta come quarto punto, dopo la relazione dell'on. Gabriel sui paesi terzi i cui cittadini devono essere in possesso del visto o sono esenti da tale obbligo: Ucraina. Inoltre la discussione verrà conclusa da una risoluzione, che sarà votata nella tornata di aprile II.

Do ora la parola a qualche rappresentante dell'ALDE per illustrare la proposta. O passiamo direttamente alle votazioni? È sufficiente come l'ho illustrata?

On. Pimenta Lopes vuole intervenire contro?

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, muito haverá seguramente a discutir sobre a Venezuela, seguramente não em termos que esta casa conheça ou alguma vez faça, nomeadamente o exemplo que a Venezuela é de desenvolvimento soberano ao serviço de um povo.

A discussão que é proposta não é de solidariedade com o povo venezuelano. Ao invés, ignora as verdadeiras causas da crise económica, alimenta a direita mais reacionária que destabiliza o país, que promove o desacato e a desordem pública, que não respeita a separação de poderes que os senhores tanto gostam de evocar, que boicota o diálogo político. Este debate e a resolução anexa não contribuirão para a serenidade necessária ou para o diálogo em curso, antes se intrometem nas decisões soberanas de um país, pelo qual os rejeitamos.

Permita-me, Sr. Presidente, que lhe recorde duas questões sobre as recentes declarações que proferiu. O Sr. Presidente afirmou falar em nome do Parlamento Europeu. O Sr. Presidente não tem homólogos na Venezuela, pois não representa nenhum órgão de soberania.

Presidente. – Io mi sono attenuto sempre alle votazioni dell'Aula, ai documenti approvati dall'Aula. Tutte le votazioni sono state votate ad ampia maggioranza: il sostegno al popolo venezuelano contro la carcerazione dei detenuti politici, a favore della democrazia e della libertà.

E in questo il Parlamento europeo si è sempre espresso in questa direzione. Quindi io non ho fatto altro che esprimere la posizione del Parlamento europeo. Mi pare che anche quest'oggi ci sia una maggioranza ampia che vada in questa direzione. Onorevole Becerra Basterrechea, aveva chiesto di intervenire?

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, solamente quiero intervenir en nombre del Grupo ALDE para confirmar que la oportunidad de debatir aquí, el miércoles, en este Pleno, es incomparable: es imprescindible que ratifiquemos nuestra posición, que ya es de seguimiento al desmantelamiento que se ha ido produciendo durante todo este tiempo.

Lo que vamos a debatir aquí y lo que queremos resolver en esa Resolución común es que el orden constitucional en Venezuela ha sido evidentemente desmembrado. El propio movimiento del Gobierno de Maduro para hacer que el Tribunal Supremo quite todas las competencias a la Asamblea Nacional, que es la representante de los venezolanos, es tan anticonstitucional como la orden posterior de volverla a poner en marcha.

Ustedes hablan siempre de injerencia, hablan de soberanía, hablan de democracia... Lo cierto es que en Venezuela la democracia está abolida *de facto* porque no hay separación de poderes. Y nuestra obligación como Parlamento es reforzar la posición de la Unión Europea, que la propia señora Mogherini, esta misma semana, ha dejado muy clara: liberación de los presos políticos, restauración del orden constitucional y elecciones democráticas en Venezuela ya.

Y esta semana, además, es el momento en el que la Organización de los Estados Americanos va a adoptar una posición. Nosotros debemos estar con ellos.

Cristian Dan Preda, *în numele grupului PPE*. – Domnule președinte, grupul nostru susține, așa cum ați menționat, solicitarea de a avea o dezbatere despre Venezuela. Am vrea ca punctul respectiv să fie discutat cât mai devreme, miercuri, și nu aruncat la miezul nopții. Ne dorim, de asemenea, ca o rezoluție să fie votată în a doua sesiune din aprilie. Vă mulțumesc pentru atenție.

Maria João Rodrigues, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, let me clarify that the S&D Group supports the idea of a debate, but does not consider that we should have a resolution. We just want the debate to take place.

Presidente. – Adesso votiamo, e quindi si vedrà quali sono le decisioni dell'Aula.

La prima votazione riguarda la possibilità di aggiungere una dichiarazione della Commissione sulla situazione in Venezuela mercoledì pomeriggio.

La maggioranza è a favore dell'inserimento di un nuovo punto all'ordine del giorno.

Adesso bisogna votare quando deve essere introdotta la dichiarazione nell'ambito del dibattito. Come richiesto dal gruppo ALDE: come sesto punto, dopo la relazione dell'on. Vajgl; come richiesto dal gruppo socialdemocratico: come quinto punto; o come richiesto dal gruppo PPE come quarto punto?

Quindi votiamo prima la proposta dell'ALDE, come sesto punto.

La proposta è respinta.

Il gruppo S&D lo propone come quinto punto.

La proposta è respinta. Volete fare un controllo? Facciamo un controllo sulla proposta socialista, quindi come quinto punto. La votazione è chiusa. La proposta è respinta.

Come richiesto dal gruppo PPE, come quarto punto.

La proposta è approvata. Quindi verrà inserita come quarto punto.

Adesso pongo in votazione la richiesta del gruppo PPE di far seguire la discussione da una risoluzione, che sarà votata nella tornata di aprile II.

Mi pare che l'Aula sia a favore, però facciamo un controllo.

La proposta del PPE è approvata. Quindi riassumiamo: dichiarazione della Commissione mercoledì pomeriggio, come quarto punto, dopo la relazione dell'on. Gabriel, seguita da una risoluzione che sarà votata nella tornata di aprile II.

Edouard Ferrand (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, au sujet de ce débat sur le Venezuela, nous avons demandé plusieurs fois en Conférence des présidents un débat sur l'Union européenne et les États-Unis.

Depuis l'élection de M. Trump en novembre dernier, aucun débat n'a eu lieu. Je pense que nous mettons la charrue avant les bœufs, c'est-à-dire que nous nous intéressons au Venezuela sans le point de vue de l'administration américaine.

Aujourd'hui, je pense qu'il est nécessaire que nous ayons un vrai débat sur l'avenir des États-Unis, notamment en Amérique du Sud.

Presidente. – On. Ferrand, nel corso della discussione lei potrà dire tutto ciò che vorrà, e il suo gruppo politico potrà esprimere tutte le idee in proposito.

L'ordine del giorno è così fissato.

Comunico di non aver ricevuto nessuna richiesta di modifica dell'ordine del giorno definitivo, quindi andiamo avanti.

16. European Solidarity Corps (debate)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su:

— l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sul Corpo europeo di solidarietà di Petra Kammerevert, a nome della commissione per la cultura e l'istruzione (O-000020/2017 - B8-0210/2017), e

— l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sul Corpo europeo di solidarietà di Thomas Händel, a nome della commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali (O-000022/2017 - B8-0211/2017).

Președinte: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

Petra Kammerevert, Verfasserin. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Navracsics, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist erfreulich, dass so viele junge Europäerinnen und Europäer Interesse daran zeigen, sich als Freiwillige solidarisch für unser gesellschaftliches Zusammenleben zu engagieren: 25 000 Jugendliche haben sich bereits auf der entsprechenden Online-Plattform für das Europäische Solidaritätskorps beworben. Die Kommission hat mit der Veröffentlichung ihrer Online-Plattform und der Entsendung erster Freiwilliger jedoch Fakten geschaffen, ohne dafür eine gesetzliche Grundlage zu haben und vor allen Dingen ohne die Finanzierung geklärt zu haben.

Die Initiative der Kommission, Jugendliche mehr in den Mittelpunkt der europäischen Politik zu rücken, wird vom Ausschuss für Kultur und Bildung grundsätzlich begrüßt. Gleichzeitig stellen wir uns aber einige Fragen im Zusammenhang mit dem Format, der Funktionsweise, der Finanzierung und der langfristigen Tragfähigkeit des ESC. Wir weisen daher in unserer Entschließung auf die vielen Schwächen und Fehler der Initiative hin und zeigen auf, welche Bedingungen erfüllt werden müssen, um den ESC zu einem Erfolg werden zu lassen. Die Träger der Jugendarbeit und der Freiwilligendienste müssen künftig eng an der Entwicklung und Umsetzung des ESC beteiligt werden. Über ihr Engagement beim Freiwilligendienst verfügen sie über umfangreiche Erfahrung und Fachwissen. Es wäre geradezu fahrlässig, dieses nicht für den ESC zu nutzen. Es muss daher sichergestellt werden, dass die bisherigen Errungenschaften im Hinblick auf den Europäischen Freiwilligendienst nicht geschwächt werden.

Der Aufbau von Doppelstrukturen wäre nicht nur ineffektiv, sondern sogar schädlich. Neue Initiativen benötigen frisches Geld. Erasmus+ ist trotz der Mittelaufstockung chronisch unterfinanziert, gute Projekte – gerade im Bereich der Jugendarbeit – müssen massenhaft abgelehnt werden, weil das Geld fehlt. Erasmus+ jetzt auch noch mit einer neuen Idee zu überfrachten, ohne zu sagen, wo die erforderlichen Mittel herkommen sollen, kann vom Parlament nicht hingenommen werden. Der ESC darf nicht zulasten von bestehenden Programmlinien in Erasmus+ gehen, und auch die Jugendgarantie muss sakrosankt bleiben.

Es könnte ein positiver Nebeneffekt des ESC sein, die Beschäftigungsfähigkeit junger Menschen zu erhöhen, aber er ist kein arbeitsmarktpolitisches Instrument. Deshalb muss sichergestellt werden, dass reguläre Arbeitsplätze nicht durch billige Freiwilligentätigkeit ersetzt werden.

Wir erwarten von der Kommission ein überzeugendes und nachhaltiges Konzept für den ESC. Der Enthusiasmus der jungen Menschen kann sonst schnell in Frustration umschlagen, insbesondere dann, wenn klar ist, dass in diesem Jahr nicht mal die Hälfte aller Interessierten zum Zuge kommt.

Vor diesem Hintergrund stellen wir folgende Fragen: Erstens: Wie könnte der ESC den Europäischen Freiwilligendienst weiter stärken? Wie werden diese beiden Initiativen parallel koexistieren und sich kurz- und mittelfristig ergänzen? Wie sollen unnötige Überlappungen zwischen den beiden Initiativen vermieden werden, und wie werden die derzeit im Europäischen Freiwilligendienst involvierten Organisationen am Prozess beteiligt?

Zweitens: Mithilfe welcher EU-Förderprogramme wird der ESC in seiner Anfangsphase umgesetzt, und was sind die Budgetauswirkungen auf diese Programme? Was sind die Absichten der Kommission hinsichtlich der kurz-, mittel- und langfristigen finanziellen Nachhaltigkeit des ESC?

Und drittens: Wie wird die Kommission dafür Sorge tragen, dass die Freiwilligentätigkeit nicht systematisch ausgenutzt wird, um reguläre Arbeitsplätze zu ersetzen – egal, ob Vollzeit oder Teilzeit?

Ich freue mich auf die Antworten der Kommission.

Marita Ulvskog, author. – Mr President, on 7 December 2016 the Commission adopted a communication on a European Solidarity Corps. By voluntarily joining the European Solidarity Corps, these young people will be able to develop their skills and get not only work but also invaluable human experience. That is how it was spelled out by Mr Juncker.

In this communication the Commission states that the European Solidarity Corps will bring together two complementary strands: volunteering and occupational. The occupational strand touches upon subjects that fall directly within the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs' areas of competence, and this committee wishes to put a couple of questions to the Commission.

How does it intend to differentiate between volunteering – which can provide very valuable experience but is unpaid – and traineeships or apprenticeships, which should be paid? How does it intend to ensure that volunteering is not misused to replace regular paid forms of employment? How will it guarantee that the initiative reaches out to all young people, in particular those in more vulnerable situations? How will it guarantee that the traineeships and apprenticeships offered under this scheme are of a good quality? How will formal and informal skills be recognised? How will it rely on, reinforce and complement existing initiatives such as Erasmus+ and the Youth Guarantees that have already been mentioned?

Which share of the Employment and Social Innovation Programme and the Youth Employment Initiative and what additional funding does it envisage to allocate for the ESSC? Existing funds are already much needed given the social and employment situation in Europe. Does it consider resorting to other funds and programmes such as, for example, the ESF? How does it intend to avoid the duplication or replacement of existing programmes and tools such as Erasmus +, the European Voluntary Service and the European Youth Guarantee?

We also have concerns that this is replicating already existing grassroots initiatives. The Commission has to consider already existing initiatives and respect their autonomous organisation. It is not the role of civil society to act as cheerleaders for the European Union or any governmental body. Strong, independent grassroots organisations are at the heart of European values.

Finally, we would like an explanation of how it is possible that the initiative is already running, recruiting young people without the legal instrument. These questions I would like to have answered.

Tibor Navracsics, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the European Solidarity Corps is at the heart of the Commission's focus on youth. I am therefore pleased to discuss this important initiative with you today.

As we debate the future of the European Union, I think it is appropriate to talk about an action which addresses young people. They have a key role in building the Europe of tomorrow and in strengthening central European values, such as engagement and solidarity. The European Solidarity Corps is a unique opportunity to put European youth, their commitment to solidarity, and their potential at the very centre of our EU agenda.

Within a few months, as Ms Kammerevert mentioned, more than 26 000 young people have signed up and the first placements have started. But as with all decisions, we need to make sure we have considered all options and heard all voices. The Commission therefore welcomes your questions and your draft motion for a resolution which raised relevant concerns. These are shared by many of the stakeholders we are consulting. Let me reassure you that we take these concerns very seriously. They are part of our ongoing reflections as we prepare the legislative proposal, setting up a dedicated framework for the Corps. We have to make sure that our proposal is spot-on and meets the expectations of young people and participating organisations.

Regarding your question about how the different programmes interact within the Corps, the European Solidarity Corps currently builds on a broad range of programmes: Erasmus+; Employment and Social Innovation; LIFE; the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund; Europe for Citizens; the European Regional Development Fund; Health; and the Agricultural Fund for Rural Development. There is in a sense no need to reinvent the wheel. We want to use this experience and the existing structures of these programmes as a basis. Our aim is not to duplicate actions or discontinue what works well. On the contrary, we want to build on the strengths of existing programmes, to increase their visibility, create synergies and offer more opportunities, because the whole is more than the sum of its parts.

Most of the volunteering activities will build on the European Voluntary Service, which looks back on 20 years of experience in developing high-quality volunteering placements for young people. All stakeholders involved consider the European Voluntary Service a major success. Solidarity jobs and traineeship placements will build on the success of 'Your first EURES job' and are currently mainly supported by the Employment and Social Innovation Programme. A special call for proposals has been launched to get proposals from consortia that will provide solidarity-related placements.

The future legal base for the European Solidarity Corps will further improve, innovate and simplify the current approach. The Corps will bring together the activities available under the current programmes, add new activities addressing unmet needs, and use synergies wherever possible. The European Solidarity Corps portal as a single entry point for interested participants and organisations will ease access to volunteering opportunities, and it will provide digital tools to connect youth eager to express their solidarity with organisations looking for committed young people.

The key point is that with the Corps we create more opportunities for young people and make it easier for them to access these opportunities. The Corps will thus help to meet the real societal needs for solidarity across Europe, both within individual Member States and across borders. It will also harmonise and modernise the support services on offer. This includes, for example, preparation courses, language training, insurance packages and quality labels for organisations. It also includes participation certificates, as well as tools to recognise the skills acquired by young people during their placements.

We share your concerns about reaching out to young people in vulnerable situations. We believe that the European Solidarity Corps should be accessible to all youth. To reach out to those from less privileged backgrounds the Corps will ensure equal access and cater for the needs of under-represented groups by providing targeted and tailored additional support.

The forthcoming legislative proposal will be accompanied by appropriate communication and outreach measures. As for the risk of using placements as unpaid work, let me reassure you that organisations wanting to participate in the European Solidarity Corps need to be accredited. The arrangements to apply under the second phase will be proposed in the draft legal base. What I can tell you at this stage is that for the second phase we are currently considering three different types of placements: volunteering placements, job offers and paid traineeship placements. This way, the Corps will also complement the efforts made by Member States to implement the Youth Guarantee. It will provide additional opportunities for young people to make a start on the labour market by engaging in solidarity jobs or paid traineeships.

As to skills recognition, participants in the European Solidarity Corps will be entitled to receive a certificate when they have completed their placements. This could be complemented by a youth pass certificate. The Commission will work towards the recognition of the European Solidarity Corps certificate and related certificates at all levels.

You also raised the issue of the quality of placements. This is as important an issue to me as it is to you. Participating organisations have to comply with criteria that ensure that they provide only quality offers. In particular, organisations must commit to respecting the European Solidarity Corps Charter in which they pledge to foster the personal, socio-educational and professional development of participants; that they guarantee safe and decent working conditions; and that they provide adequate training for participants.

Employment offers under the occupational dimension are real jobs that will comply with national laws, regulations and collective agreements. Moreover, the principles outlined in the quality framework for traineeships will guide trainee placements offered under the Corps. Finally, the appropriate funding for the second phase of the European Solidarity Corps covering the period 2018-2020 is currently assessed by the Commission as we prepare the legal basis.

Honourable Members, in conclusion let me thank you again for your interest in this initiative. We can only make it a success together for the benefit of the many enthusiastic young people all over Europe eager to make a difference.

Sabine Verheyen, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich begrüße grundsätzlich den Vorschlag der Kommissionsspitze, ein Europäisches Solidaritätskorps einzuführen, welches bis 2020 mehr als hunderttausend junge Menschen motivieren soll, sich ehrenamtlich für Projekte einzusetzen und mit anzupacken. Diese Solidaritätsprojekte werden Gemeinden und Menschen in ganz Europa zugutekommen und sollen sozialen Gemeinschaften dabei helfen, auf Krisensituationen oder in Notfällen besser agieren und reagieren zu können. Wir als EVP teilen und unterstützen selbstverständlich das Ziel des Europäischen Solidaritätskorps, das Gefühl der Solidarität unter jungen Menschen in Europa zu fördern und eine inklusivere Gesellschaft zu schaffen.

Gleichzeitig möchte ich aber drei Hauptpunkte anmerken: Erstens, darf es nicht zu einer Konkurrenz zwischen dem ESC und dem bereits bestehenden Europäischen Freiwilligendienst, der bereits eine effiziente Beteiligung junger Menschen in der Freiwilligenarbeit geleistet hat, kommen. Die Europäische Kommission muss das Ziel und den Rahmen des Europäischen Solidaritätskorps rasch klären und sicherstellen, dass sie das gut laufende Programm des Europäischen Freiwilligendienstes nicht beeinträchtigt. Zweitens: Als Programm, das der Jugend gewidmet ist, halte ich es für dringend notwendig, die Jugendorganisationen in die Erarbeitung des Regulierungsrahmens stärker mit einzubeziehen und mit ihnen gemeinsam den Verwaltungsrahmen festzulegen. Drittens ist die Finanzierung des Europäischen Solidaritätskorps unseres Erachtens noch völlig unklar. Für dieses neue Programm muss meines Erachtens auch neues Geld zur Verfügung gestellt werden, und es darf nicht aus den Mitteln genommen werden, die bereits jetzt schon durch den mittelfristigen Finanzrahmen stark unter Druck stehen. Unsere Sorge ist, dass die Finanzmittel aus dem Erasmus+-Budget genommen werden. Das ist „linke Tasche, rechte Tasche“ und führt auf Dauer zu Frustration, denn wenn die Programme im Erasmus+-Bereich gekürzt werden, hilft uns auch das neue Solidaritätskorps keinen Schlag weiter.

Silvia Costa, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, commissario Navracsics, abbiamo accolto con favore la proposta di un corpo europeo di solidarietà avanzata da Juncker nel suo discorso sullo stato dell'Unione, come risposta all'esigenza di rafforzare il senso comune di appartenenza e responsabilità dei giovani europei nelle situazioni di aiuto, di impegno sociale, di risposte a esigenze specifiche di comunità territoriali o di emergenza, sulla base di un appello pubblico rivolto direttamente ai giovani e in collaborazione con le ONG nazionali ed europee che però abbiano maturato una specifica esperienza nel campo del servizio civile o della protezione civile, o del volontariato, e che consentano loro di vivere un periodo di impegno in paesi, io spero, diversi dal loro o, per una quota, anche nel loro paese.

Ma ricordo che le conclusioni del Consiglio sotto la Presidenza italiana avevano auspicato la nascita di un servizio civile europeo aggiuntivo allo SVE, ma distinto, per il quale nel 2016 era stato avviato già un progetto pilota, con l'acronimo IVO, che vede tre paesi partecipanti e quattro paesi osservatori. Forse sarebbe utile vedere questa esperienza come base del nuovo corpo. È importante ascoltare le ONG europee, come scriveva la nostra risoluzione, prima di definire la natura e compiti.

Noi chiediamo, con la nostra risoluzione, che questa iniziativa sia avviata con una base giuridica definita, come già ricordato, con risorse dedicate, auspicabilmente in collaborazione, credo, anche con le agenzie nazionali dei giovani, senza togliere fondi a programmi vigenti che hanno anche una sottostima economica, come invece sta avvenendo nella sperimentazione in corso che ha visto effettivamente – e questa è una risposta importante – oltre 25 000 giovani rispondere alla *call*. Ritengo però che il corpo, se è un corpo di solidarietà, non si possa confondere con il volontariato del servizio di volontariato europeo, che nei suoi 20 anni di storia ha rappresentato un quadro di riferimento per il volontariato europeo ed extraeuropeo, in collaborazione con ONG nazionali e accreditate, e nemmeno con gli *EU Aid Volunteers*.

Penso che sia anche importante che si specifichi la natura diversa di questo corpo, che naturalmente deve mantenere un profilo di servizio civico, anche se con rimborsi e garanzie assicurative, ma tenendo conto – e finisco – di specifiche vocazioni e anche eventualmente di occupabilità che si mette in gioco. In Italia, per esempio, si usa anche in parte come una delle tante opzioni della Garanzia Giovani, come lei ha citato. Ma deve essere molto chiaro che questo deve essere finalizzato soprattutto alla promozione della cittadinanza e della solidarietà europea.

Jana Žitňanská, *za skupinu ECR* – Vážený pán komisár, v úvode mi dovoľte poďakovať sa za túto iniciatívu, ktorú, verím, pomôže tisícom mladých ľudí zapojiť sa do dobrovoľníckych projektov alebo si nájsť stáž či pracovnú pozíciu. Ako pri spustení tejto iniciatívy odznelo a teraz ste to, pán komisár, aj potvrdili, projekt chce osloviť aj mladých ľudí zo znevýhodnených skupín vrátane mladých so zdravotným postihnutím.

Ako som však už bola upozornená, samotná webová stránka, kde sa môžu záujemcovia registrovať, nie je dostupná v posunkovom jazyku pre nepočujúcich ani preložená do ľahko čitateľného štýlu pre ľudí s mentálnym postihnutím, pričom je zrejmé, že bezbariérovosť musí byť zabezpečená na všetkých úrovniach, a teda nielen v rámci projektov, ale už aj pri samotnej registrácii účastníkov. Rovnako musí komisia zabezpečiť efektívnu kampaň, aby sa komunity, ktorým je iniciatíva adresovaná, dozvedeli o všetkých možnostiach.

Do programu sa už prihlásilo – bolo to tu povedané – viac ako 26-tisíc mladých ľudí, ktorí čakajú na ponuku stáže, učňovskej prípravy, pracovnú pozíciu alebo dobrovoľnícku činnosť. Toto číslo bude narastať a je nevyhnutné, aby bolo čo najskôr doriešené aj financovanie celého programu bez toho, aby ohrozil už dobre fungujúce programy ako Erasmus plus či európsku dobrovoľnícku službu.

Verím, že Komisia pri tvorbe svojho legislatívneho návrhu už teraz spolupracuje s tretím sektorom, najmä so zástupcami dobrovoľníckych centier, ktoré majú skúsenosti priamo z terénu. Aj týmto spôsobom môžeme uistiť, aby si dobrovoľníctvo zachovalo svoj charakter a nebolo zamestnávateľmi zneužívané namiesto platenej práce.

María Teresa Giménez Barbat, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, queridos compañeros, el nuevo Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad amplía y renueva el actual Servicio Voluntario Europeo creando oportunidades para que los jóvenes trabajen como voluntarios y colaboren en proyectos que benefician a comunidades y ciudadanos de toda Europa.

Desde el punto de vista del contenido, no encuentro novedades significativas. Así que, como ha expresado antes la señora Kammerevert, desde la Comisión de Cultura nos hacemos algunas preguntas sobre cómo va a funcionar esto y cómo se va a financiar —las declaraciones del señor Navracsics tampoco nos han dado muchas pistas sobre esto—.

Nos preocupa el hecho, que han subrayado algunos compañeros, de que puedan salir de otros programas, por ejemplo Europa para los Ciudadanos, ya infrafinanciado y para el que acabamos de pedir un aumento considerable de presupuesto.

Quisiera manifestar, en todo caso, mi admiración por la filosofía del Cuerpo Europeo de Solidaridad. Tal vez sus motivaciones parecerán ingenuas, pero considero noble y necesario reafirmar el valor de la «solidaridad» en los momentos difíciles que vivimos. La Unión Europea representa la ampliación del círculo moral a nivel supranacional y, por lo tanto, esto es un logro extraordinario.

El principio europeo de solidaridad está en la raíz de los valores que fundan nuestra Unión, y no debemos dejar de afirmarlo a pesar de las heridas que nos haya podido dejar el *brex*it, los egoísmos de algunas naciones o nuestra torpeza general con la gestión de la crisis de refugiados.

Este organismo dirigido a jóvenes voluntarios es un paso en la dirección correcta si queremos afianzar nuestros más básicos compromisos y nuestros principios fundamentales.

Tania González Peñas, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor presidente, parece una broma, y de mal gusto, que la misma Comisión que impide la entrada de refugiados en Europa y que ha condenado a toda una generación a un futuro de precariedad diga ahora que quiere que, en 2020, cien mil jóvenes sean voluntarios europeos cuando, en todo caso, el objetivo debería ser que estos jóvenes tengan trabajo y tengan futuro.

Después de haber diezmado el sector de la cooperación, quiere crear un nuevo cuerpo de voluntariado, además del que ya existe, que va a ser financiado con partidas destinadas nada menos que a combatir el desempleo juvenil. Ciertamente, queremos una Europa más solidaria e inclusiva; el problema es que todo esto parece más bien una farsa que sustituye trabajo remunerado y profesional por voluntariado gratuito.

Esta debería ser una ocasión para impulsar parte de ese empleo juvenil que tanta falta nos hace, a la vez que respondemos a otras de nuestras responsabilidades, como por ejemplo la de garantizar el derecho al asilo, ofreciendo un servicio profesional. Empecemos a construir puentes y dejemos de levantar muros.

Reinhard Bütikofer, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin den Kollegen dankbar, die diese Diskussion initiiert haben, weil das *European Solidarity Corps* in der Tat auch unserer Meinung nach ein Vorschlag ist, mit dem wir viele junge Menschen für Europa begeistern können. Und die Tatsache, dass sich schon in den ersten Wochen so viele gemeldet haben und signalisiert haben, sie wollen mitmachen, unterstreicht ja, dass dieser Vorschlag des Präsidenten Juncker in die richtige Richtung geht.

Allerdings sollten wir aufpassen, dass wir nicht nur eine neue Schaufensterdekoration produzieren, hinter der das alte Angebot steht. Und wir sollten sehr aufpassen, dass der Vorschlag sich nicht in bürokratischem Overkill verläuft, so wie das der Kommission leider mit der wunderbaren Idee des *Interrail Pass* für Jugendliche gelungen ist.

Es sind noch viele Fragen offen, die geklärt werden müssen. Und wir sollten diese Fragen nicht nur unter uns diskutieren, sondern – das wäre mein Appell – gerade auch mit den Kolleginnen und Kollegen in den nationalen Parlamenten darüber diskutieren, wie deren Vorstellungen sind, und das gemeinsam tragen.

Zwei rote Linien sehe ich. Die eine heißt: Es geht nicht ohne frisches Geld. Und die zweite heißt: Es darf keine Konfusion von arbeitsmarktpolitischen Instrumenten und Freiwilligenarbeit geben. Jenseits dessen aber, was im Moment schon diskutiert ist, wäre mir wichtig, dass die Kommission noch mal der Möglichkeit besondere Aufmerksamkeit schenkt, wie wir durch dieses *European Solidarity Corps* Jugendliche nicht nur engagieren können, sondern auch *empowern*, auch die Jugendorganisationen *empowern* können, damit sie sich in ihren eigenen Initiativen aktiv für Europa engagieren können.

Dominique Bilde, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, dans son discours du 14 septembre 2016 sur l'état de l'Union, le président Juncker a déclaré au sujet du corps européen de solidarité: «Les jeunes de toute l'Union pourront proposer leur aide là où elle sera le plus utile pour répondre aux situations de crise». Je crois que cette affirmation est un aveu d'échec de la part de cette Union européenne qui, depuis sa création, n'a eu de cesse de parler de solidarité que pour mieux l'abolir.

Comment pouvez-vous sérieusement, au fil de votre texte, vanter la solidarité de l'Union alors même que la concurrence sauvage qu'elle a imposée a dévasté des milliers de PME, mis au chômage des millions d'Européens et asservi plusieurs États membres aux diktats économiques et budgétaires de Bruxelles? Ce constat d'échec est également révélateur de l'impuissance totale de l'Union Européenne à résoudre les crises qu'elle a elle-même engendrées, puisque le corps européen de solidarité fait peser le défi de l'intégration des réfugiés, par exemple, sur les épaules des jeunes générations.

Mais je vous rassure, les jeunes ne vous ont pas attendus pour tenter au quotidien de recoller les morceaux d'une cohésion sociale que vous avez brisée. Dans l'Union européenne, un jeune sur quatre a pris part à une activité de volontariat organisée au cours des douze derniers mois. En France, plus de 136 000 jeunes se sont engagés dans le Service civique depuis sa création en 2010, particulièrement après les terribles attentats qui ont frappé notre pays.

Chers collègues, vous invoquez le mot solidarité comme on invoque un esprit d'outre-tombe. Retournez donc dans les campagnes et provinces de vos pays respectifs! Vous y verrez que la solidarité entre voisins ou entre concitoyens n'a pas attendu les grands humanismes de l'Union européenne pour œuvrer et combler les défaillances dont fait preuve Bruxelles depuis trop longtemps.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Mr President, the initiative of the European Solidarity Corps raises many questions, as we are hearing now. Although we all agree that the idea of the Corps is good, many misunderstandings could have been avoided if the Commission had consulted on its intention in time with youth volunteer organisations. I hope that in the preparation of the legislative decision the Commission is directly cooperating with the youth organisations.

Our committees rightly ask how the Corps will be organised and financed. We fundamentally disagree with the notion that the European Solidarity Corps could swallow other European programmes, for example the European Voluntary Service, which has more than 20 years of successful existence. The Commission's communication is very unclear on this matter. To make the project acceptable for us, it needs fresh money from the budget.

It is also not clear how the occupational strand would work: what are the financial links between the ECS and the Youth Guarantee, and will the provided job for young people be a truly rewarding experience?

My last question is about whether the Commission has already prepared concrete activities for the more than 25 000 young people who have already signed up to the Corps, in order to prevent their frustration if the Corps does not fulfil their expectations.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, volunteering experiences and mobility offer citizens, especially young people, opportunities to broaden their horizons and grow as a result of new encounters. This not only leads to the development of skills, competences and knowhow but most importantly opens the door to other cultures and different visions of the world. Volunteering can equip people with the necessary skills and attitudes to become active, responsible citizens open to intercultural dialogue, which is much needed in the turbulent times we live in.

Volunteering is particularly interesting in a broader context of occupational literacy. I agree, though, that in order to be successful the initiative proposed by the Commission must provide clear objectives and build on existing local grassroots organisations, so a close cooperation with NGOs, civil society and youth workers is needed. Citizenship and solidarity cannot only be piloted centrally, it must happen on the ground. Sport and arts must also be part of this and we must maintain a gender perspective. And we must reach out to the excluded young people as well as refugees and migrants. This, then, would be true solidarity.

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, I have been a strong, consistent supporter of volunteers and volunteering both before I came to this Parliament and since. So, was I overjoyed when I heard this proposal on the European Solidarity Corps? Initially yes, but there are many serious questions that need to be answered. How can we make a clear distinction between the volunteering and the occupational strands? What criteria do you intend to use, Commissioner? How can we ensure that there are no abuses in the system and that young, energetic, idealistic young Europeans do not find themselves on the fringes of precarious work?

Funding is a critical issue but we have no details. The target seems to be 100 000 volunteers. That needs real resources. I agree with you Commissioner, young people will play a key role in promoting and strengthening solidarity. It is crucial that the programme delivers a quality experience for volunteers and the communities they serve. You spoke of many different programmes –LIFE, Erasmus, European Citizens, rural development to name a few – but I need to know where is the coherence? We need that detail. You have used a lot of fine words and your intent is good but I am concerned that this is a rush job. It is not fully thought out and the clear parameters have not been set and sufficient funds are not in place. I want it to succeed but I am concerned that we have not yet put the proper structures in place.

Curzio Maltese (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, fra le tante trovate e annunci con i quali la Commissione Juncker cerca di mascherare il suo sostanziale vuoto politico, questa proposta dei corpi di solidarietà europei ha almeno il merito di avere incontrato la risposta entusiastica di migliaia di giovani cittadini europei.

Per non deludere queste speranze bisogna che la Commissione elimini molte ambiguità e molti pericoli da questa proposta. Ne hanno già parlato i colleghi, e non ripeterò: il rischio di fare doppioni, il rischio di offrire strumenti per l'ennesimo sfruttamento della manodopera giovanile.

Infine, non è in alcun modo accettabile che questo nuovo corpo venga finanziato con i fondi dell'Erasmus. Non è possibile spargere fiumi di retorica sulle meraviglie dell'Erasmus e poi usare le già scarse risorse di questo programma come un bancomat per finanziare altro.

Milan Zver (PPE). – Nova pobuda o vzpostavitev evropske solidarnostne enote bo mladim prinesla še dodatne priložnosti in izzive pri njihovi integraciji v družbo.

Ker gre za vseevropski projekt, ima zato še posebno dodano vrednost. Združevanje mladih iz različnih koncev Unije pri humanitarnih dejavnostih, ki krepijo vrednote, na katerih temelji Unija, je dobro zanj in za vsakega mladega posebej.

Kljub temu, da pobuda veliko obeta, pa bi rad izpostavil sledeče: Komisija predvideva, da se evropska solidarnostna enota v prvi fazi vzpostavi s pomočjo finančnih in človeških virov iz že obstoječih programov, med drugimi tudi programa Erasmus+ in sorodnega projekta evropska prostovoljska služba, ki že deluje v njegovem okviru vsaj dvajset let in o tem smo danes že govorili.

Zato delim skrb s svojimi kolegi, da se z vključevanjem evropske solidarnostne enote v program Erasmus+ otežuje učinkovito izvajanje tako enega kakor tudi drugega.

Namreč, v nedavno sprejetem poročilu o izvajanju programa Erasmus+, ki sem ga pripravil, sem opozoril, da program nima dovolj sredstev za financiranje vseh svojih osnovnih dejavnosti, kaj šele da bi bil zraven financiran še ta projekt, ta pobuda, kot je evropska solidarnostna enota.

Krystyna Łybacka (S&D). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Ja w pełni doceniam intencje twórców tego programu, ale mam cztery uwagi. Sprawa pierwsza: finanse (mówili o tym wiele moi przedmówcy). To nie może być finansowanie, które osłabia inne doskonale działające programy cierpiące na brak środków. Sprawa druga: istnienie lokalnego wymiaru tego programu jest ogromną szansą dla środowisk mniej aktywnych, dla środowisk osób niepełnosprawnych, dla tych osób, które mają opory przed mobilnością transgraniczną. Ale żeby zaktywizować te środowiska, muszą one być należycie wynagradzane. To nie może być darmowa siła robocza. Zaniepokoiło mnie zdanie, które Pan Komisarz powiedział, że będą staże i praktyki, w tym niektóre płatne. Czy to oznacza, że będą także staże i praktyki darmowe? Kolejna kwestia to skoordynowanie tego programu z innymi istniejącymi programami, przedstawienie go na przykład na platformie EURES. I ostatnia kwestia: zwrócenie uwagi na następne działania po odbyciu wolontariatu, żeby nie tracić jego efektów.

Bogdan Brunon Wenta (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Europejski Korpus Solidarności – o czym tu już wszyscy mówili – to szansa dla młodych poprzez wolontariat, staże i pracę. Ale uważam za istotne, aby działania związane z wolontariatem były jasno oddzielone od tych przewidujących zatrudnienie. Organizacje zaangażowane w działanie Korpusu nie mogą wykorzystywać młodych ludzi jako darmowych wolontariuszy – jak przed chwilą mówiła pani prof. Łybacka – w sytuacji, gdy będą dostępne dobrej jakości miejsca pracy. Ważne jest również, aby kwalifikacje zdobyte w ramach wolontariatu były później uznawane na rynku pracy.

Niewątpliwym plusem programu jest możliwość zwiększenia mobilności młodych ludzi i zdobycia przez nich doświadczenia niezbędnego w przyszłej pracy, jak również kształtowanie aktywnej postawy obywatelskiej. Program ma skłonić większą liczbę młodych do angażowania się w różne działania solidarnościowe. Kluczowe jest jednak jasne określenie ram – o których tu wielu kolegów wspominało – i finansowania programu, zwłaszcza że Komisja rozpoczęła już fazę wstępną realizacji Europejskiego Korpusu Solidarności. Przeniesienie środków z dobrze funkcjonujących programów takich jak Erasmus + czy Europa dla Obywateli nie jest – jak zauważył kolega Zver – dobrym rozwiązaniem. Europejski Korpus Solidarności powinien opierać się na istniejących inicjatywach, wzmacniać je i rozwijać, a nie je zastępować.

Podkreślić należy również, że wolontariat europejski to program z dwudziestoletnim stażem, który okazał się dużym sukcesem. Tworząc Europejski Korpus Solidarności, powinniśmy czerpać wiedzę i doświadczenie z działania wolontariatu europejskiego i zapewnić komplementarność tych programów.

Procedura „catch the eye”

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, there are various benefits of such involvement: it can reinforce civic participation, social cohesion, and solidarity. In an EU context, it can also increase a common sense of belonging. But it can also have a strong impact on the volunteers themselves by contributing to their self-fulfilment and their professional development.

Considering the level of EU youth unemployment, the suitability of volunteer action to respond to many of our time's challenges, as well as the need to give visibility to EU engagement, I think the Commission's initiative would be most welcome. A well-coordinated and adequately financed programme could also enable the spillover of positive examples from countries with longstanding volunteering traditions to ones where such involvement is less developed.

The new initiative should be set up and financed in a way so as not to have a negative impact on existing successful tools and programmes, such as Erasmus and the European Voluntary Service.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa ha bisogno di immaginare nuove modalità per soddisfare le ambizioni dei suoi giovani. Il corpo europeo di solidarietà dovrebbe costituire un ponte tra il mondo della formazione e quello del lavoro, offrendo tirocini formativi ed esperienze preziose per chi vi partecipa, ma va pensato bene, per evitare abusi del sistema.

Il mondo del lavoro è costellato da fenomeni di sfruttamento mascherati da percorsi formativi, fenomeni che alimentano la precarietà, il divario salariale e che minano ulteriormente la fiducia dei giovani nel futuro dell'Europa. E ciò accade con particolare frequenza nei luoghi dove la disoccupazione giovanile è più elevata.

L'istituzione del corpo europeo di solidarietà è un'occasione importante per strutturare un programma europeo trasparente ed al passo con i tempi, ma dobbiamo lanciare un messaggio chiaro: l'Europa è dalla parte dei suoi giovani e il problema dell'occupazione e della equa distribuzione del lavoro è la priorità tra le priorità.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedniče, poticanje solidarnosti važno je za izgradnju odgovornih društava koja se brinu za svoje najugroženije. Bez solidarnosti nema društvene kohezije, nema građanske i nacionalne svijesti, a na posljetku ni očuvanja naše kršćanske civilizacije kojoj je ona jedan od temelja.

Iza osnivanja europskih snaga solidarnosti stoji pozitivna namjera. O tome ne dvojim, ali čini mi se da će u ovom slučaju izvedba biti traljava. Postavlja se pitanje trebaju li nam snage solidarnosti kao zaseban program ili se njih moglo uklopiti u neki od već postojećih programa, poput europske volonterske službe. Moramo voditi računa da novi program, ako je doista potreban, ne bude dodatno opterećenje za porezne obveznike.

Komisija to, čini se, razumije, ali želi uzeti novac kvalitetnim programima poput Erasmus. To nije dobro. Ima dovoljno neučinkovitih programa koji se mogu ukinuti, umjesto da se oduzimaju sredstva onima koji predstavljaju dodatnu vrijednost.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, tijekom ove rasprave prisjetio sam se svoje mladosti. Prisjetio sam se omladinskih radnih akcija koje smo imali u Hrvatskoj, koje su bile na području tadašnje čitave Jugoslavije. Prijetio sam se onoga entuzijazma i volje, neovisno o ideologiji, i prijateljstva koja postoje među mladim ljudima koji su različiti i koji su dolazili iz raznih krajeva tadašnje države.

Ovo doživljam kao nešto što daje mogućnost da mladi ljudi u Europskoj uniji upoznaju sebe, upoznaju svoje bližnje, upoznaju vrijednost solidarnosti, vrijednost prijateljstva i zato ga podržavam, neovisno o nekim kontradiktornostima, ali očekujem da će se stvoriti sinergija sa svim drugim programima koji postoje i da će ovaj program zato i uspjeti.

Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlare di volontariato e del corpo europeo di solidarietà è senza dubbio qualcosa di positivo. Chi può dire il contrario? Tuttavia, non posso non rilevare l'esistenza di un grande velo di ipocrisia nell'affrontare questi temi, nonché un profondo scollamento dalla realtà, soprattutto se penso alle condizioni di vita di milioni di cittadini europei, soprattutto del sud.

Nella risoluzione, per esempio, si sancisce solennemente il principio di solidarietà, che significa condivisione dei vantaggi e degli svantaggi, e si indica come obiettivo quello di creare un senso di comunità, solidarietà e responsabilità sociale. Si tratta di parole bellissime ma smentite da quanto però accaduto nel recente passato, e da quanto continua ad accadere tuttora, nel sud Europa.

Io non ho dimenticato quanto capitato alla Grecia, stritolata dalle imposizioni della *troika*, né i dati allarmanti riguardo alla disoccupazione giovanile e al tasso di rischio di povertà, che è del 17 %. Si stima che in Europa ci siano 40 milioni di poveri. Il volontariato è un'attività sicuramente nobile, ma il nostro compito...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratrice)

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ιδέα της δημιουργίας Ευρωπαϊκού Σώματος Αλληλεγγύης είναι θετική και φαίνεται να ικανοποιεί την επιθυμία των νέων να προσφέρουν στο κοινωνικό σύνολο, παράλληλα όμως, να αποκτήσουν και τις προϋποθέσεις εκείνες που θα τους επιτρέψουν να βρουν μια αξιοπρεπή εργασία στο μέλλον. Για να έχει, όμως, επιτυχία αυτή η πρωτοβουλία, πρέπει να στηρίζεται σε πραγματικό ενδιαφέρον για τους νέους. Όπως γνωρίζετε, σε όλη την Ευρώπη και κυρίως στην Ελλάδα, που πλήττεται από τα μνημόνια, η ανεργία των νέων ανέργων ευρίσκεται σε πολύ υψηλό επίπεδο.

Αυτή η δημιουργία του Σώματος Αλληλεγγύης είναι δεδομένο ότι θα προσελκύσει το ενδιαφέρον των νέων. Το ενδιαφέρον αυτό, όμως, δεν πρέπει να γίνει αντικείμενο εκμεταλλεύσεως. Πρέπει να δώσουμε στους νέους τη δυνατότητα να αποκτήσουν προσόντα που θα τους βοηθήσουν στη μετέπειτα σταδιοδρομία τους και να μην αφήσουμε να γίνουν θύματα μιας απαιτήσεως για εξεύρεση εργαζομένων οι οποίοι θα εργάζονται με μισθούς πείνας, μόνο και μόνο επειδή έχουν ανάγκη να δουλέψουν.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte. Domnule comisar, cred că ați constatat din dezbaterile de până acum că nimeni nu critică inițiativa. Și eu o susțin, inițiativa este foarte bună, dar întrebarea vine la timpul potrivit: de ce lansați o inițiativă pe care nu o și explicați, nu o bugetați, nu explicați de unde vin banii, nu evaluați, nu spuneți cum veți evalua acest lucru, pentru că este o investiție și, până la urmă, din orice investiție trebuie să scoatem ceva. Este exclus să luați din alte programe, pentru că dacă ai într-un buzunar bani pentru pâine și îi muți în celălalt buzunar, nu poți să iei carne, tot atâția bani ai. Aici trebuie să lămurim: dacă nu bugetăm, este o inițiativă moartă. Și vreau să vă întreb, concret, care este bugetul? Care sunt criteriile de alocare? Cum le distribuiți pe țări, că ați spus că suplimentați la bugetele naționale și cum faceți evaluarea?

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όταν ανακοινώθηκε η ιδέα για την ίδρυση Ευρωπαϊκού Σώματος Αλληλεγγύης, ακούστηκαν μεγάλες κουβέντες, πολλά λόγια: ότι θα ενισχύσει την κοινωνική συνοχή, ότι με τη συμμετοχή των νέων θα υπάρξει ένα αίσθημα του ανήκειν, ότι θα ενισχυθεί η έννοια της ευρωπαϊκής ιδιγένειας, ότι θα υπάρξει αλληλεγγύη στην πράξη, ότι θα υπάρξει προσφορά στο κοινωνικό σύνολο και ότι ουσιαστικά επρόκειτο για ενέργειες εθελοντισμού και αλtruισμού. Βλέπουμε, λοιπόν, ότι υπάρχουν 25.000 εθελοντές. Και ξαφνικά ανακαλύπτουμε ότι εδώ πρόκειται για ένα σύστημα με το οποίο κάποιος θα βρουν δουλειά. Αυτό εμφανίζεται πλέον στη συζήτηση.

Τελικά, είναι άλλο πράγμα το Ευρωπαϊκό Σώμα Αλληλεγγύης, που έχει μια συγκεκριμένη κατεύθυνση για τους νέους που επιθυμούν να βοηθήσουν και να συμμετάσχουν, και άλλο πράγμα τα προγράμματα απασχόλησης. Αυτά ανήκουν στο Erasmus. Πρέπει να σταματήσει η διγλωσσία, παρακαλώ.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Mulțumesc, domnule președinte. Corpul european de solidaritate este o inițiativă importantă pentru tinerii din Europa. De altfel, tinerii sunt cei mai proeuropeni cetățeni ai Uniunii Europene. De aceea, este important, mai ales în contextul discuțiilor despre viitorul Europei, să dezvoltăm astfel de programe care să arate încă o dată avantajele oferite de o Europă unită. Dar trebuie să spun că cunosc foarte mulți tineri care au aplicat pentru acest program și așteptările lor, domnule comisar, sunt foarte mari. Trebuie să oferim tinerilor care participă la program sprijinul și încadrarea necesară pentru experiențe de calitate. Voluntariatul și schimbul de experiență nu trebuie să devină o sursă de abuzuri și de limitări ale drepturilor sociale. Trebuie să avem o finanțare adecvată și specifică, și sunt în Comisia pentru bugete și nu am observat-o, de recunoaștere a pregătirii prin certificate recunoscute pe piața muncii, de coordonare cu celelalte programe europene, de creștere a accesului la program pentru tinerii din toate mediile. Este important să facem din acest program unul de succes. Nu trebuie să ne oprim la birocrație, dar trebuie să fie foarte clar ceea ce propunem tinerilor, pentru a nu-i dezamăgi. Mulțumesc.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Mr President, the launch of the Commission's registration platform for potential young volunteers has spurred a tremendous amount of interest among young Europeans, including in my country, Romania. Yet this initiative could quickly turn into general frustration if the Commission does not present a convincing and sustainable approach soon. In view of the high number of registrations, the Commission needs to make sure that sufficient funding is dedicated to the initiative and that all stakeholders are sufficiently involved in the development and implementation of the European Solidarity Corps. We cannot reallocate funds from priority programmes, such as Erasmus+, often lacking sufficient resources to finance new policy initiatives. We need fresh money, and we cannot create a new initiative which goes against well-established and well-functioning programmes.

(Încheierea procedurii „catch the eye”)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I really appreciate this very fruitful exchange of ideas and let me first thank you for the support, the broad support, you have shown for the general objectives of the European Solidarity Corps. If we do it well the European Solidarity Corps can contribute to both European economic growth and the stability of European societies, because the volunteering part of the European Solidarity Corps can give the experience of living in a community for young people and working for the public good at the same time. And I think it is a very important issue from the point of view of stability of society, of the future society.

On the other hand the occupational side, the occupation pillar, can contribute to the employability of young people, the employability which is probably the most important virtue, the most important skill, for young people to get a proper job on the labour market in the future. So we really take it seriously, and that is why I appreciate all of your concerns, all of your feedback and all of your opinions because we will put it into the construction of the European Solidarity Corps.

But beyond the broad consensus let me address some of your concerns as well. First the funding, because definitely this is the most sensitive issue of the project. During this phase of implementation the European Voluntary Service funding was increased from EUR 62 million to EUR 89 million, out of which we estimate that EUR 58 million will be used for activities which fall within the scope of the European Solidarity Corps. The Commission continues funding Erasmus+ activities as foreseen in its legal base and financial programming, so no change in that. In other words, funding for volunteering has increased while there are no negative effects on Erasmus+ activities. Regarding the second phase covering the period 2018-2020 discussions on the appropriate funding for the new legislative proposal are still ongoing.

Let me thank Ms Žitňanská for her concerns on the accessibility of the portal. We are working on a more accessible format of the portal, because it is our personal mission as well to make it accessible for handicapped and fortunate people as well.

I agree with Ms Grapini's remarks. Yes, I think the European Solidarity Corps is really an investment, an investment in the future, and that is why we would like to do it very well. Actually it is happening, the first action of deployment happened last week. So the European Solidarity Corps is already in operation. However, we know that we have to improve in the future to make it more efficient.

The second sensitive issue is the difference between the European Solidarity Corps and the European Voluntary Service. The difference at the moment is mostly procedural. The European Solidarity Corps is needs-driven and builds on the synergies of the programmes involved. Most importantly it will offer new opportunities that do not yet exist under the current programmes. It offers a single, easily accessible entry point through the European Solidarity Corps portal and aims at the widest possible outreach to participating organisations and the young people involved. It will also develop an enhanced training, available before a placement, and recognition of learning outcomes after placement. Basically the European Solidarity Corps will not compete with national volunteering schemes. The European Solidarity Corps will enhance what is already on offer at national level, adding opportunities that were not available before. In this sense it complements national schemes and creates new synergies with them.

And, last but not least, the application procedure will be easier in the European Solidarity Corps portal and that is why it will be more accessible for young people, hopefully for handicapped people as well. So thank you once again for your feedback, for your support and for your opinions and I am really looking forward to working with you in the future as well on this project.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 6 April 2017.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Tunne Kelam (PPE), in writing. – The European Solidarity Corps (ESC) is a welcome and timely initiative. It is not only designed to complement and build synergies with other youth engagement and employment programmes. First of all, we have to catch the special nature of this programme as important promoter of European spirit, solidarity and citizenship. The future legal EU framework should prevent ESC becoming a mere substitute to creating jobs, or a sort of auxiliary to the European Voluntary Service. ESC should perform the role of a European civic service, engaged in public, private and NGO sector. Before launching the ESC on the large scale, the Commission has to come forward with a clear legal basis, also taking into account the views of youth organisations, networks and voluntary organisations. We have to ensure that young people who sign up to ESC will know about their rights and obligations, that their certificates would be globally recognised across Europe. The ESC's goal should be to reach out, as much is possible, to all young people, targeting especially vulnerable young people. In parallel, we must do our utmost to prevent both unnecessary bureaucracy as well as obstacles presented by national boundaries. I encourage the Commission to come forward with solid legislative proposal, including a solution for sustainable funding.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), in writing. – There is no doubt that the EU and its Member States need more solidarity particularly in the wake of financial and refugee crises that hit Europe. Namely in this context, the setting up of a European Solidarity Corps (ESC) has been seen by many politicians and analysts as the right initiative that will put into practice EU values of solidarity. This is so because the ESC aims to create opportunities for young people to volunteer or work in projects in their own country or abroad that benefit communities and people around Europe. Nevertheless, the ESC should not replace existing, successful initiatives like the European Voluntary Service (EVS) but rather, to reinforce and complement them. Expressed in other words, the ESC should avoid duplication or replacement of existing programmes and tools. In addition, I would like to stress that the ESC should ensure that volunteering, despite the fact that can provide valuable experience, will not replace paid forms of employment. I warmly welcome the intention of the ESC to spread solidarity among young Europeans (particularly young generations) but we should bear in mind that our prime goal is to create sustainable long-term employment opportunities for many unemployed young Europeans, the EU's lost generation.

Dominique Martin (ENF), par écrit. – Le Corps européen de solidarité (CES) a pour vocation d'aider les jeunes européens à développer leurs compétences et à obtenir un emploi. De prime abord, c'est un projet sain auquel il serait difficile de s'opposer ! Or, ce projet de CES est né dans le contexte de la crise migratoire et nourrit des objectifs bien différents, comme constituer une opportunité pour les communautés marginalisées (comprendre les migrants), ou encore développer chez les jeunes l'esprit fédéraliste de Juncker... En outre, le CES comporte plusieurs risques au sujet desquels la Commission n'a pas su donner de réponses satisfaisantes. D'une part, les volontaires (non rémunérés) risquent de remplacer, à terme, les stagiaires et apprentis, développant ainsi la précarité de la jeunesse. D'autre part, alors même qu'il existe plusieurs programmes tels qu'Erasmus+ et l'Initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes (IEJ), le CES risque de complexifier cet ensemble au lieu de le rationaliser. Ainsi, plus qu'un outil pour lutter contre le chômage des jeunes, c'est un outil de propagande européiste, que nous ne pouvons soutenir. Ce projet souhaite donner un cadre légal au CES, ainsi qu'un budget propre. Nous nous y opposons.

17. Commission's answers to written questions (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the oral question to the Commission on the Commission's answers to written questions by Daniel Caspary, Tiziana Beghin, Sven Giegold, Emma McClarkin, Alessia Maria Mosca, Helmut Scholz, Michael Theurer, Isabella Adinolfi, Marco Affronte, Laura Agea, Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, Daniela Aiuto, Jan Philipp Albrecht, Eric Andrieu, Laima Liucija Andrikienė, Maria Arena, Pascal Arimont, Georges Bach, Burkhard Balz, Heinz K. Becker, Ivo Belet, Bendt Bendtsen, Brando Benifei, Joëlle Bergeron, Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, Andrea Bocskor, Reimer Böge, Simona Bonafè, David Borrelli, Lynn Boylan, Elmar Brok, Klaus Buchner, Reinhard Bütikofer, Enrique Calvet Chambon, Nicola Caputo, Matt Carthy, David Casa, Fabio Massimo Castaldo, Lorenzo Cesa, Dita Charanzová, Nessa Childers, Kostas Chrysogonos, Salvatore Cicu, Alberto Cirio, Birgit Collin-Langen, Lara Comi, Ignazio Corrao, Andrea Cozzolino, Pál Csáky, Daniel Dalton, Rosa D'Amato, Nicola Danti, Michel Dantin, Dennis de Jong, Fabio De Masi, Angélique Delahaye, Andor Deli, Albert Deß, Tamás Deutsch, Herbert Dorfmann, Pascal Durand, Stefan Eck, Christian Ehler, Bas Eickhout, Frank Engel, Norbert Erdős, Ismail Ertug, Eleonora Evi, José Inácio Faria, Markus Ferber, Laura Ferrara, Santiago Fisas Ayxelà, Raffaele Fitto, Christofer Fjellner, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Eleonora Forenza, Michael Gahler, Kinga Gál, Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz, Elisabetta Gardini, Jens Gieseke, Julie Girling, Michela Giuffrida, Tania González Peñas, Esteban González Pons, Ingeborg Gräßle, Karoline Graswander-Hainz, Iveta Grigule, Takis Hadjigeorgiou, Marian Harkin, Monika Hohlmeier, György Hölvényi, Filiz Hyusmenova, Peter Jahr, Danuta Jazłowiecka, Eva Joly, Agnes Jongerius, Marc Joulaud, Josu Juaristi Abaunz, Syed Kamall, Othmar Karas, Rina Ronja Kari, Krišjānis Kariņš, Karol Karski, Tunne Kelam, Jude Kirton-Darling, Dieter-Lebrecht Koch, Ádám Kósa, Dietmar Köster, Stelios Kouloglou, Andrey Kovatchev, Werner Kuhn, Merja Kyllönen, Ilhan Kyuchyuk, Giovanni La Via, Alain Lamassoure, Philippe Lamberts, Bernd Lange, Werner Langen, Jeroen Lenaers, Peter Liese, Norbert Lins, Barbara Lochbihler, Sander Loones, Paloma López Bermejo, Javi López, Antonio López-Istúriz White, Sabine Lösing, Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska, Ulrike Lunacek, Thomas Mann, David Martin, Edouard Martin, Fulvio Martusciello, Jiří Maštálka, Barbara Matera, Marisa Matias, Gabriel Mato, Costas Mavrides, Valentinas Mazuronis, David McAllister, Mairead McGuinness, Morten Messerschmidt, Martina Michels, Miroslav Mikolášik, Siegfried Mureşan, Renaud Muselier, Victor Negrescu, Angelika Niebler, Luděk Niedermayer, Lambert van Nistelrooij, Artis Pabriks, Massimo Paolucci, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Aldo Patriciello, Eva Maydell, Piernicola Pedicini, Alojz Peterle, Marijana Petir, Pina Picierno, Tonino Picula, Markus Pieper, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Georgi Pirinski, Miroslav Poche, Salvatore Domenico Pogliese, Cristian Dan Preda, Franck Proust, Carolina Punset, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Julia Reda, Viviane Reding, Terry Reintke, Herbert Reul, Frédérique Ries, Michèle Rivasi, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, Claude Rolin, Bronis Ropė, Dariusz Rosati, Fernando Ruas, Tokia Saifi, Sofia Sakorafa, Anne Sander, Alfred Sant, Marielle de Sarnez, Petri Sarvamaa, Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, Algirdas Saudargas, Marietje Schaake, Christel Schaldemose, Elly Schlein, Sven Schulze, Andreas Schwab, Molly Scott Cato, Olga Sehnalová, Jasenko Selimovic, Remo Sernagiotto, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Birgit Sippel, Renate Sommer, Barbara Spinelli, Bart Staes, Joachim Starbatty, Ivan Štefanec, Jutta Steinruck, Dubravka Šuica, Richard Sulík, József Szájer, Tibor Szanyi, Adam Szejnfeld, Antonio Tajani, Hannu Takkula, Dario Tamburrano, Keith Taylor, Pavel Telička, László Tőkés, Ruža Tomašić, Romana Tomc, Evžen Tošenovský, Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, Helga Trüpel, Ernest Urtauson, Inese Vaidere, Ivo Vajgl, Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso, Marco Valli, Wim van de Camp, Tom Vandenkendelaere, Paavo Väyrynen, Sabine Verheyen, Daniele Viotti, Axel Voss, Jarosław Wałęsa, Renate Weber, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Lieke Wierinck, Hermann Winkler, Iuliu Winkler, Anna Záborská, Jan Zahradil, Marco Zanni, Flavio Zanonato, Joachim Zeller, Marco Zullo, and

Milan Zver (O-000003/2017 – B8-0216/2017).

Daniel Caspary, Verfasser. – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzter Herr Kommissar! Jeder von uns Abgeordneten kennt die Situation, dass man eine Anfrage zur schriftlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission stellt und nur eine sehr fragwürdige oder schlechte Antwort bekommt. Da gibt es sicherlich Fälle, bei denen die Kommission nicht antworten kann, weil sie Informationen schlicht nicht hat oder die Mitgliedstaaten das nicht zur Verfügung stellen. Es gibt aber Antworten, wo uns die Kommission hinhält, weil sie etwas prüft und sagt: Wir sind noch in einem Prüfungsverfahren und brauchen noch etwas, bis die Antwort kommt. Dann kommt aber in aller Regel keine Antwort nach. Es gibt Fälle, wo die Kommission nicht antworten will. Ich kann das manchmal, ehrlich gesagt, auch verstehen, weil es viele Kollegen gibt, die grenzwertig viele Anfragen stellen. Dazu sollten wir uns hier im Haus weiter Gedanken machen. Aber es gibt halt auch die Anfragen, wo die Kommission keine Antworten geben möchte, warum auch immer, – im Zweifelsfall, weil sie uns etwas verheimlichen möchte.

Wir haben hier im Europäischen Parlament schon viele, viele Einschränkungen für uns Abgeordnete selbst eingeführt, um die Kommission zu ermuntern, im Gegenzug ihre Antworten zu verbessern: Wir haben die Zahl reduziert, wir haben die Zahl dann nochmal reduziert, wir haben die Wortanzahl in den Anfragen reduziert, man darf nur noch drei Unterfragen stellen. Also wir im Parlament haben unseren Beitrag sicherlich geleistet. Und deswegen soll die heutige Debatte auch nur ein kleines Zeichen sein. Wir haben nur eine sehr kurze Debatte, wir haben bewusst keine Entschließung, aber wir wollen die Kommission daran erinnern, dass die Qualität sich bitte verbessern sollte. Wir haben eine Gegenbewegung, die wächst. Als wir das letzte Mal hier im Haus die Geschäftsordnung geändert haben, haben wir eine kleine und eine große Anfrage an die Kommission eingeführt. Das war eine Sache aus der Mitte der Abgeordneten heraus, weil wir einfach oft unzufrieden sind.

Deswegen lautet meine Bitte wirklich: Ändern Sie Ihre Praxis und versuchen Sie weiterhin, die Antwort zu verbessern. Folgendes würde uns konkret interessieren – hier haben heute 246 Abgeordnete diese Anfrage gemeinsam eingereicht: Erstens: Welche exakten Auflagen und Beschränkungen hat sich die Kommission selbst gegeben, und wie rechtfertigt sie die oft nicht vorhandenen substanziellen Gehalte? Zweitens: Auf welcher Rechtsgrundlage sind diese Auflagen eingeführt worden, und welche Ebene hat diese Entscheidung getroffen? Und drittens: Strebt die Kommission Veränderungen in der Beantwortungspraxis an, sodass ausführliche und bessere Antworten zu erwarten sind?

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, the Commission takes its replies to Parliamentary questions seriously. Today's oral question was added to the agenda at such short notice, making it difficult to give a complete response to the issues you raised. Nevertheless, I am able to make a few remarks in response.

As a sign of the importance that the Commission attaches to these matters, President Juncker wrote recently, on 13 March, to President Tajani on this very subject. In his letter the President said, once again, that the Commission, under his leadership, has been committed from the start to filling with new life the special partnership with the European Parliament as laid down in the framework agreement of 2010. Only together can we change and renew Europe and regain citizens' trust in the European Project.

Replies to written questions are an integral part of our close relations. The Commission sees them as an important democratic scrutiny tool, which must be given due consideration. Over the last two years, measures have been taken by both institutions to improve the system of written questions and answers.

The Commission welcomes the European Parliament's efforts to set a maximum number of written questions to be tabled by Members of the European Parliament. This is appreciated by the Commission in a spirit of cooperation between the two institutions.

The Commission makes every effort to reply in good time and to provide high-quality and politically-pertinent replies. The success of these efforts depends also on the quality of the questions. In 2016 the Commission replied to more than 9 500 written questions. An average of 40 replies a day was transmitted to the European Parliament throughout last year.

It is important to recall that, according to Article 230 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Parliamentary questions are to be answered by the European Commission and thus by the College, and not by individual Commissioners. This is why each reply is subject to wide internal consultation and agreed by the Commission through a collegial process, in order to enhance the quality and political relevance. It is in this context that the Commission has chosen to set an indicative limit to the length of replies in order to facilitate the smooth operation of the process and to avoid disproportionate costs arising. Derogations from this limit are made where necessary.

President Juncker has asked all Members of the College to pay the utmost importance to the replies to written questions of the Members of the European Parliament, to discuss the answers amongst Members to avoid silo approaches, and to give political answers to political questions. The Commission is ready to join forces with you to ensure that the limitation in the number of questions is matched with high-quality replies.

The Treaty does not set out any deadlines for replies, but the Commission makes all reasonable efforts to reply to written questions in good time and, wherever possible, within the target dates that Parliament has requested.

New efforts have been made in recent months to reduce the numbers of replies delivered after these targets, and these are already bearing fruit. In this context, the Secretariat-General of the Commission is in contact with the Secretariat-General of the European Parliament to work together to further improve the mutual performance of our institutions.

In this context I can inform you that a meeting between the responsible Deputy Secretaries-General of the two institutions is planned already for next week.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Tisztelt Elnök asszony, tisztelt Biztos úr! Az ön anyanyelvén és az én anyanyelvemen fogom most ezt a pár másodpercet kihasználni. Én elfogadom azt, amit ön mondott, nincs semmiféle kifogásom az ellen, hogy önök is átgondolják a helyzetet és igyekezzenek minél korrektebb válaszokat adni, de önnek volt egy mondata, és ezt én nagyon szeretném megragadni, hogy politikai kérdésekre politikai válaszokat kívánnak adni. Na, pont ez hiányzott.

Mi a Parlament részéről már megtettük azt, hogy korlátoztuk magunkat, tényleg nagyon kevés kérdés van, gondolom, az a kilencezer önöknek soknak tűnik, a Bizottság kapacitásához képest ezt talán kevésbé sok. De igen, amikor egy képviselő megkérdezi azt, amit éppen megkérdez, akkor ő egy politikai választ akar adni, amit föl tud mutatni a választóinak, vagy bármilyen közegben, hogy igen ez az Európai Bizottság álláspontja. A kérdések döntő többségére adott válaszuk jelenleg még mindig csak annyi: majd meglátjuk. Ezzel nem sokra megyünk.

Νότης Μαριιάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Navracsics, το θέμα που συζητούμε είναι ιδιαίτερα σοβαρό. Πρώτα απ' όλα, έχω διαμαρτυρηθεί επανειλημμένα σε αυτή την αίθουσα, γιατί υπάρχει μείωση του αριθμού των ερωτήσεων που μπορούν να υποβάλουν οι ευρωβουλευτές. Ξέρετε, μία από τις βασικές πτυχές της λειτουργίας αυτού του Κοινοβουλίου είναι η υποβολή κοινοβουλευτικών ερωτήσεων, διότι ο ρόλος μας είναι να ψηφίζουμε, αλλά και να ελέγχουμε την εκτελεστική εξουσία, να ελέγχουμε εσάς ως Επιτροπή. Άρα, το ότι απαντάτε 9.000 ερωτήσεις δεν μου λέει τίποτε.

Οφείλετε να απαντήσετε σε ερωτήσεις, διότι δράτε, διότι λαμβάνετε αποφάσεις, διότι χρησιμοποιείτε αρκετούς πόρους. Αυτό είναι το πρώτο. Το δεύτερο είναι ότι, όταν δίνετε κάποιες απαντήσεις, οι περισσότερες από αυτές είναι αόριστες, δεν απαντούν επί του θέματος, «πετάνε την μπάλα στην εξέδρα», όπως λέμε.

Άρα, λοιπόν, πρέπει να είστε πολύ πιο σαφής, να δίνετε απαντήσεις, να αντιμετωπίζετε τα ζητήματα και να βλέπετε τις ερωτήσεις ως μία ευκαιρία για να βελτιώσετε τη δική σας εργασία, να βελτιώσετε την απόδοση της ίδιας της Επιτροπής.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospodo predsjednice, poštovani gospodine povjereniče, uspio sam postaviti 519 pitanja Komisiji dosada. Potpuno se slažem s vama da sustav treba promijeniti i nije bitna kvantiteta pitanja, nego je bitna kvaliteta pitanja, a još bitnija je kvaliteta odgovora.

Ja sam postavio 518 konkretnih pitanja. Na njih sam dobivao uglavnom općenite odgovore. Nisam postavljao previše političkih pitanja, jer me to manje zanima. Ja uglavnom znam političke stavove Komisije o glavnim temama, ali postavio sam konkretna pitanja na koja sam dobivao općenite odgovore.

Na jedno pitanje, o tome što Komisija čini u zaštiti interesa Europske unije i zemalja članica kad je u pitanju svemir i mjesec, dobio sam protupitanje. Vrlo neozbiljno! Ja mislim da trebamo zaista promijeniti način odgovaranja na naša pitanja.

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a questão que aqui nos traz hoje, ou seja, as perguntas que podemos fazer à Comissão Europeia, é uma das formas, poucas, que estão à disposição dos cidadãos europeus de entrar em contacto com a Comissão Europeia através de nós, seus representantes, eurodeputados e euro-deputadas.

Creio que não é sério dizer que depende da qualidade da pergunta, porque muitas vezes são os cidadãos que conseguem identificar os problemas da não aplicação da legislação comunitária, por exemplo em matéria de ambiente, e nós somos os seus porta-vozes.

O que a Comissão faz muitas vezes é dizer que não tem nada a acrescentar, que a responsabilidade não é sua, que não tem culpa. Às únicas vias a que se dá ao trabalho de verdadeiramente responder, raramente acrescenta alguma coisa em relação àquilo que já sabíamos.

Quer dizer, Sr. Comissário, que esta é uma questão de profunda importância democrática, porque o défice democrático que nós temos entre cidadãos e Comissão também se mede pela qualidade das respostas da Comissão Europeia aos seus cidadãos, por via dos eurodeputados e das eurodeputadas e, nesse sentido, Sr. Comissário, não é um frete, é uma obrigação democrática que devem levar muito, muito a sério.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, le voy a poner un ejemplo de una pregunta sobre el sector del Contact Center en España, en la que planteábamos que este sector abusa de la contratación temporal y de la transmisión de la actividad entre distintas subcontratas, y que estas circunstancias incumplen las Directivas 1999/70/CE y 2001/23/CE.

Preguntamos a la Comisión si va a investigar estos casos y si tomará medidas para obligar al Estado español a cumplir la legislación europea. La respuesta es que la Comisión se pondrá en contacto con las autoridades españolas. Como ven, una respuesta que no dice nada y que de nada sirve.

El problema de no tomarse en serio las preguntas parlamentarias es que reducen al absurdo una de las herramientas de este Parlamento para obtener información y para responder a la ciudadanía a la que representamos.

Detrás de cada una de estas preguntas no solamente hay un trabajo de fundamentación legal y jurídica, sino que hay un trabajo con organizaciones sociales, con organizaciones sindicales, con asociaciones ciudadanas que se encuentran, en muchos casos, en una situación de abuso y de violación y vulneración de sus derechos, y tratamos de utilizarlas para representarlos. Que no se las tomen en serio es no tomarse en serio a la ciudadanía europea.

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). – Madam President, my apologies for being late in the Chamber. I just wanted to support the question that has been put down this afternoon because when many of us ask questions of the Commission or the Council, I get the impression that they sometimes think we are just doing it out of badness or just to make some political point, whereas often what we are trying to do is genuinely seek information and perhaps forward some useful political process. On a number of occasions I have put down questions and I have either had a delay, or when I have had a reply it has been a thoroughly inadequate response. For example, in December I put down a question about the negotiations going on in Cyprus and asking what sort of helpful role could the Council and Commission be playing in those negotiations, and it was not until February that I got a reply and it told me absolutely nothing at all, so I do think we need to seriously look at this issue.

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, written questions are a valuable tool for doing the job of representing our constituents when they want us to represent them in this place on issues which are affecting them, and they are one of the few ways that we can hold the Commission to account and ensure proper democratic scrutiny, and one of the few ways that we can gain information about the huge areas of responsibility of the European Commission. But it seems sometimes that when answers would be embarrassing to the Commission we do not get answers that fully respond to the question, if we get answers at all.

Parliament has already limited the number of questions that we can ask. It seems that the movement is all in one direction, but the system here is not working. It goes to the heart, in my view, of the distinction between an elected body and an unelected body and the principles of democratic scrutiny and transparency and that, sadly, in the EU institutions is so often a major failing.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable members, thank you for this short discussion. I have taken note of your concerns and observations. I think that there is a general consensus and nobody would put it into question that it is one of the fundamental rights of the Members of the European Parliament to question the European Commission, and it is one of the obligations of the European Commission and the Members of the European Commission to answer those questions. It is an non-waivable right, no hesitation and no question in that respect.

Let me refer to one issue raised in your interventions and that is the vagueness of the replies of the European Commission. I think there are two reasons for that. One is a political reason, and I agree with my fellow countryman Mr Szanyi that the European Commission is a political body – and this is the self-definition of the European Commission, that it is a political Commission – so if it is a political Commission it needs to give political answers. I agree, but let us not mix up political answers with party political answers or partisan answers, because the European Commission is not only a political body, but it is a political body of four political groups, representatives of four political groups and 28 Member States, or Commissioners sent from 28 Member States. We cannot afford to be party political or partisan. We give political answers but they are not party political answers.

The second reason for the so-called vagueness might be the limits of the competences of the European Commission. Sometimes our answers go beyond the real competences of the European Commission. So we must be vague because it is not in our competence to answer concretely those questions. If there are other examples of vagueness, I really apologise for that. We would like to improve the quality of the replies and I hope that we can improve the close relations between the two institutions and the meeting of the Deputy Secretaries-General will help in improving this cooperation.

President. – The debate is closed.

18. Trafficking in human beings (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the oral question to the Commission on trafficking in human beings by Barbara Lochbihler, Bodil Valero, Terry Reintke and Judith Sargentini, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group, Malin Björk, Cornelia Ernst, Barbara Spinelli, Marina Albiol Guzmán, Martina Anderson, Dennis de Jong, Kostas Chrysogonos, Eleonora Forenza, Jiří Maštálka, Kateřina Konečná, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Stelios Kouloglou, Kostadinka Kuneva, Josu Juaristi Abaunz and Marie-Christine Vergiat, on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group, Catherine Bearder, Nathalie Griesbeck, Cecilia Wikström, Louis Michel, Filiz Hyusmenova, Morten Helveg Petersen, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Sophia in 't Veld, Gérard Deprez, Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea, Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, Renate Weber and Petras Auštrevičius, on behalf of the ALDE Group, and Birgit Sippel, Anna Hedh, Soraya Post, Pier Antonio Panzeri, Elena Valenciano, Iratxe García Pérez, Roberta Metsola, Constance Le Grip, Andrzej Grzyb, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Mariya Gabriel and Cristian Dan Preda, on behalf of the PPE Group (O-000024/2017 – B8-0212/2017).

Barbara Lochbihler, author. – Madam President, I am very glad that we are having this debate now in plenary with the European Commission on such a vital human rights issue. A lot has already been said about the magnitude of these rights violations and about the relevance of the topic. Trafficking in human beings needs to be addressed with a human rights-based and victim-centred approach. Victims and vulnerable populations need to be put at the centre of all efforts. The prevention of trafficking in human beings and the protection of its victims must be our priority goal. Access to justice, support measures, shelter and education needs to be ensured, independent of the victims' willingness to cooperate in criminal proceedings.

The principle of non-criminalisation in this regard is also vital and needs to be implemented in all Member States. Further, demand needs to be tackled as it can be considered a root cause. Accountability needs to be ensured for both offenders, as well as knowing users. For the new strategy, I think that financial investigations and action against money laundering need to play a bigger part in fighting trafficking in human beings and to ensure that confiscated assets are used to support and compensate victims of trafficking. Does the Commission agree on this, and how does it intend to address this in the new strategy? I am also worried about the trend of trafficking in human beings being mixed up with other legally distinct concepts such as migrant smuggling, increasingly addressing trafficking in human beings through a security lens, for instance in the context of recent migration policies. How will the Commission counter this trend in its new strategy?

I also call for greater internal/external coherence in the fight against trafficking in human beings and to further enhance and deepen cooperation and coordination among all relevant actors. Finally, what exactly is the timeline for the adoption of the new strategy?

Κωνσταντίνα Κούνεβα, Συντάκτρια. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, πόσο αξίζει η ανθρώπινη αξιοπρέπεια; Για την Επιτροπή, πολύ φθηνά! Καθυστερεί πάλι να κάνει το αυτονόητο: να προστατεύσει στην πράξη θεμελιώδεις αξίες και δικαιώματα! Το «trafficking» είναι το πιο αναπτυσσόμενο έγκλημα στον κόσμο. Είναι η σύγχρονη δουλεία με πάνω από 30 εκατομμύρια θύματα, από τα οποία 5,5 εκατομμύρια είναι παιδιά. Και έχει πολλές μορφές: της πορνείας, της αναγκαστικής εργασίας, της υποχρεωτικής επαγγελματικής, του εμπορίου βρεφών και οργάνων...εκεί καταντήσαμε σήμερα. Ναι, έχουμε μια αρκετά καλή οδηγία κατά του «trafficking». Αλλά γιατί έχει φτωχά αποτελέσματα; Γιατί οι στρατηγικές που σχεδιάζει η Επιτροπή είναι αντιφατικές.

Πώς αντιμετωπίζει η Ένωση τους διακινητές; Μπλοκάροντας τους νόμιμους δρόμους μετανάστευσης; Μα έτσι σπρώχνει τους ανθρώπους στην αγκαλιά των παράνομων δικτύων. Τα κλειστά σύνορα θησαυρίζουν τους εμπόρους του «trafficking» και είστε όλοι συνένοχοι σε αυτό. Πώς θα αποτρέψει η Ένωση την έμφυλη βία; Καθυστερώντας να υπογράψει και να κυρώσει τη Σύμβαση της Κωνσταντινούπολης;

Γι' αυτό προτείνω μια βιώσιμη στρατηγική κατά του «trafficking». Τι σημαίνει βιώσιμη; Εννοώ να είναι στο επίκεντρο η μείωση της φτώχειας και της μεγάλης ανισότητας. Γιατί, για την Αριστερά, αυτές αποτελούν διαχρονικά τις πηγές της εμπορίας ανθρώπων.

Ναι σε περισσότερα κονδύλια για την ενημέρωση και την υποστήριξη των θυμάτων. Ναι σε πιο αυστηρές ποινές για τους «πελάτες». Πρωτίστως χρειαζόμαστε συντονισμό των ευρωπαϊκών πολιτικών κατά της ανισότητας και της φτώχειας, για να μην είναι ο άνθρωπος εμπόρευμα με ημερομηνία λήξης, συνάδελφοι.

Catherine Bearder, author. – Madam President, Commissioner, the European Union has built a tremendously-respected process of fighting human trafficking and protecting its victims. It is six years since the Anti-Trafficking Directive came into force. It is held up globally as the gold standard for its gender-specific and victim-centred approach. But new challenges are emerging, and the number of trafficked people continues to rise. The nature of this crime makes it hard, but not impossible, for authorities to obtain data and identify victims. It is therefore absolutely essential that we allocate EU funding in an effective, evidence-based system to address sexual exploitation and invest in prevention. Human trafficking is a high-profit crime. We need to know who buys and who profits. It is also vital that trafficked individuals are seen as victims, not criminals, and helped to recover. Europe can and must do more.

Human trafficking is still a threat and feeds on poverty. However, only ten Member States have so far established using a victim of trafficking as a criminal offence. Commissioner, this House demands that we continue our efforts to stop impunity and make prosecution of traffickers and their users our biggest priority. Although most victims are of European origin, the refugee crisis is feeding the supply, especially the thousands of unaccompanied, vulnerable minors.

We have made progress in the EU but we need to plan the next stage. Without action and funding we will slip backwards, and that is why we ask the Commission to publish its new strategy now. We – but more importantly, the victims – cannot wait. Human trafficking is happening now in Europe, where we all live, and we must open our eyes and continue the Commission's work on addressing human trafficking.

Anna Hedh, författare. – Fru talman! Direktivet mot människohandel som antogs 2011 var ett viktigt steg i kampen mot människohandel. Direktivet tog bland annat ett brett grepp mot människohandel, med åtgärder för prevention, definition av själva brottet människohandel, straffsatser för förövare och bekämpning av efterfrågan. Som komplement till lagstiftningen antogs 2012 även en EU-strategi.

Men trots alla åtgärder fortsätter människohandeln. Hundratusentals människor i Europa tvingas arbeta under slavliknande förhållanden. Ungefär tre fjärdedelar av människohandelsoffren utsätts för sexslavhandel. Människohandel är fortfarande ett av de mest vinstgivande och minst riskfyllda brott man kan ägna sig åt.

Jag är därför glad att vi idag har möjlighet att ställa frågor till kommissionen om kampen mot människohandel. Idag är det nämligen två saker som gör mig orolig och upprörd. Den första är att kommissionen ännu inte lagt fram en ny strategi mot människohandel. Den andra saken som gör mig upprörd är bristen på åtgärder från medlemsstaternas sida för att bekämpa efterfrågan. Artikel 18.4 i direktivet gör det valfritt för medlemsstaterna att kriminalisera utnyttjandet av offer för människohandel. Endast tio medlemsstater har valt att göra detta, och endast två medlemsstater har redovisat vilka alternativa åtgärder man vidtagit för att bekämpa efterfrågan. Detta är bedrövligt och helt emot åtagandet i direktivet.

Jag vill därför ställa följande frågor till kommissionen. 1: När kommer en ny strategi? 2: Vilka andra åtgärder planeras på grundval av de två genomföranderapporterna om direktivet mot människohandel? Kommer kommissionen att lägga fram ny lagstiftning, och om inte, varför?

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, author. – Madam President, trafficking in human beings is a slavery of our time. Figures are shocking and behind every story there is a human tragedy. Most victims are women and girls, exploited for prostitution in Europe and more and more are migrants and more and more are abused online. Trafficking is serious organised crime and should be prosecuted as such. It is a huge business industry with high profit and low risk. It is time to stop impunity and to ensure convictions. There should be no hiding places for traffickers in Europe and neighbouring countries. From the Urals through the Balkans, to the Black Sea, from Niger through the desert and the Mediterranean, actors are cross-border and sophisticated. Concerted action with third countries is necessary.

We should step up our European response on all fronts. More police and judicial cooperation, including with Europol and Eurojust, better sharing of information, an operational role for the Asylum Support Office and Frontex, tracking the money, confiscating the assets of both traffickers and agents through the legal chain such as transport and accommodation providers. Member States should also reduce demand and criminalise the users of sex services.

I welcome that Member States have finally transposed the directive but, as colleagues have said, much more needs to be done to implement it properly, in particular training of officials, access to health care, and sexual productive rights. Victims should receive unconditional assistance and psychological support. Madam President, many unaccompanied minors that disappear in Europe are exposed to trafficking and abuse. Members have to do more for missing children and ensure that they enter the protection system. I do fully support the anti-trafficking coordinator and in particular her call to focus more on child victims.

Commissioner, I urge you to present this year the new strategy on anti-trafficking, taking into account, and I finish on this Madam President, Parliament's recommendation including a gender perspective and external direction, and the European People's Party will continue to support you, and be committed to zero tolerance against trafficking.

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, let me start by expressing my thanks to all of you for this opportunity to discuss with you the very important and sensitive issue of trafficking in human beings. The European Parliament has been a strong and consistent supporter of our efforts to deal with this odious and appalling crime. It is a crime that takes advantage of the vulnerability and exploits the desperation of people in need of protection and support. As you know, trafficking was and remains a priority for us as reflected both in the European Agenda on Migration and in the European Agenda on Security.

Europe has globally a leading role in this field. We have developed a coherent and coordinated legal and policy framework to address trafficking in human beings. The Anti-Trafficking Directive and the 2012-2016 EU strategy has been our main instruments to develop, coordinate and implement our policy framework priorities.

Having delivered on the vast majority of actions envisaged in this strategy we do not feel that our job is done; quite the opposite. We cannot accept that irrespective of origin there are still and unfortunately more children, women, vulnerable people trafficked, abused and exploited. These are victims of the immoral and inhuman profit-making face of our societies. Now that the 2012-2016 strategy has come to an end the time has come to step up our efforts and continue delivering more intensively and in a more focused way. To this end the support and contribution of this House, of all of you, is of utmost importance.

The migration crisis and transnational security threats render people more vulnerable to criminal networks and exploitation. That is why more needs to be done to target the organised criminal networks and follow their money throughout the trafficking chain, to focus more on prevention and on better identification and protection of victims, to further strengthen coordination at EU level and to ensure more coherence in the external and internal dimensions of our anti-trafficking policy. Criminal networks target and exploit the most vulnerable. Recent data indicate that the vast majority of victims are female and children. The most widespread form of exploitation is sexual exploitation, with mainly women and young girls as victims. That is why the Anti-Trafficking Directive has a strong gender-specific dimension, and that is why we have also commissioned a study on the gender dimensions of trafficking in human beings.

It is also of major importance to increase our cooperation with third countries and further streamline our anti-trafficking priorities in the external dimension of our policies.

The two distinct notions of trafficking and smuggling are often confused. However, it is not only a matter of the correct use of terminology. It is also about ensuring a victim-centred and human rights based approach. Allow me to clarify here that smuggling is a cross-border activity while trafficking can also take place within the borders of a state. In smuggling there is consent of the smuggled person while in trafficking there is not. The exploitation of the vulnerable victim for profit making is an essential element in trafficking. These differences bear significant implications for the rights of the victims of trafficking and the respective obligations of Member States.

I would like to assure you that the respective EU legislative frameworks on smuggling and trafficking will remain clear and constant in any future policy initiative.

Regarding now the two reports based on the Anti-Trafficking Directive presented by the Commission last December we will continue to proactively monitor the situation in the Member States and examine potential options.

To conclude, and as far as our next steps are concerned, we are currently taking stock of the experience and achievements of the current strategy, examining trends and problems and assessing and discussing with stakeholders what future actions from all the different policy areas are needed. Our aim is to address the challenges created by the changing socio-political context. But we also want to maintain a coordinated, coherent and constant approach in the continuation of the efforts to fight this extremely pernicious but highly lucrative form of crime. The reflections and contributions of this House are of great importance for our work and I am looking forward with particular interest to our discussion today.

Alessandra Mussolini, a nome del gruppo PPE. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei ringraziare il commissario per l'impegno della Commissione su questo tema gravissimo. Io sentivo i colleghi dire, giustamente: «le donne e i minori, che sono persone vulnerabili». No, le donne non sono vulnerabili: vengono rese vulnerabili dagli uomini, dalle reti criminali che le vendono. Tra l'altro l'80 % dei minori sono di sesso femminile e l'altro 20 % maschile. Quindi è un problema enorme, un problema connesso anche ad altri fattori, non solo al fattore della prostituzione.

Vorrei introdurre un altro tema: quasi non se ne parla, è quasi un tabù, ma per quanto riguarda i minori c'è veramente il pericolo concreto, anche per i minori che scompaiono – abbiamo citato i minori stranieri non accompagnati – del traffico di organi. Noi ce ne siamo occupati: quando ero presidente della commissione per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza al Senato, abbiamo parlato proprio in Italia di questo tema con il ministro dell'Interno. Quindi è importante tutto quello che si può e si deve fare. L'impegno economico: spesso sono persone sfruttate; arrivano, quando sono vendute, che già hanno subito abusi, violenze inaudite. Sono in debolezza economica: ancora molto spesso le donne, anche nell'ambito familiare, hanno una debolezza economica rispetto agli uomini. Anche su questo dobbiamo combattere.

L'ultima cosa è legata – sembra non legata, ma è legata: combattiamo anche per la parità di trattamento economico delle donne con gli uomini: anche questa è riduzione in schiavitù.

Pier Antonio Panzeri, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la tratta di esseri umani rappresenta una violazione dei diritti fondamentali dell'uomo. Come già ricordato, il Parlamento europeo, insieme al Consiglio, ha da tempo adottato una direttiva che si propone di affrontare e risolvere il problema attraverso un approccio multilaterale, non solo al fine di reprimere la tratta di essere umani, ma anche di prevenirla e di garantire protezione alle vittime di tale abuso.

Vede, caro commissario, siamo d'accordo con lei sulla descrizione del problema; dove invece non lo siamo è sulla prescrizione. Come lei sa, non tutti gli Stati membri hanno portato a termine la completa trasformazione della direttiva e questo terribile abuso continua a persistere anche all'interno dei nostri confini.

E dunque il compito che abbiamo dinanzi è molto chiaro: quello di predisporre rapidamente una nuova strategia che sia molto più efficace e in grado di aggredire questo drammatico problema, salvaguardando pienamente i diritti umani e la dignità delle persone.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Avramopoulos! Menschenhandel ist ein milliarden schweres, menschenverachtendes und unglaublich dreckiges Verbrechen. Wer auf irgendeiner Ebene beteiligt ist – und es sind viele –, verdient harte Strafen und keine Gnade. Ich bin überzeugt, gerade als Europäische Union, als Union der Werte, müssen wir diesen Kampf gegen Menschenhandel jeglicher Art entschieden führen.

Dieses abscheuliche Verbrechen betrifft jährlich rund 21 Millionen arme Frauen, Kinder, werdende Mütter. Sie alle werden missbraucht zu Zwangsarbeit oder sexueller Ausbeutung. Verschließen wir davor nicht die Augen, bekämpfen wir jetzt Zwangsprostitution und fördern wir das nordische Modell.

Schützen wir unsere Kinder, gerade auch die Kinder von Flüchtlingsfamilien, hier in Europa. Tun wir grenzübergreifend alles technisch Mögliche, um entführte Kinder zu finden und ihnen wieder Heimat und Geborgenheit zu schenken. Hier müssen wir eine klare Stimme haben. Verurteilen und verbieten wir auch Leihmutterchaft als sexuelle Ausbeutung, als neue Form der Sklaverei, so wie es Europäisches Parlament und Europarat unmissverständlich fordern. Herr Kommissar, stimmen Sie mir in diesen Anliegen zu?

Cecilia Wikström, *för ALDE-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Att reducera till en handelsvara är bland det mest avskyvärda en människa kan utsättas för. I EU kommer 61 procent av identifierade traffickingoffer från ett EU-land. 96 procent av dem är flickor och kvinnor som utnyttjas sexuellt. Vi har under det senaste året också fått uppgifter från Europol om tusentals ensamkommande flyktingbarn som försvunnit spårlöst. I stället för att ha fått skydd och nya livsmöjligheter har de hamnat i klorna på skrupelfria människohandlare och blir utnyttjade sexuellt eller arbetar under slavliknande förhållanden. I EU. Detta är avskyvärt.

Nu måste vi se till att få till en ny framtida strategi som är verkningsfull och faktiskt fungerar i verkligheten. Gränsöverskridande brottslighet måste bekämpas gränsöverskridande. Och vi måste anta den här nya reviderade strategin just baserad på informationsutbyte mellan länderna. Det måste vara huvudpoängen. Och kom ihåg: människan är aldrig en handelsvara och det är vårt ansvar att bryta detta.

Ernest Urtasun, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, creo que es un buen momento para que analicemos de qué manera están funcionando nuestros instrumentos de lucha contra el tráfico de seres humanos y, sobre todo, de qué manera estamos abarcando todas las dimensiones de este fenómeno que es absolutamente repugnante y que afecta a nuestras sociedades.

Quiero recordar una cuestión esencial del artículo 1 de la Directiva 2011/36/UE, que establece que se debe tener en cuenta la perspectiva de género y reforzar la prevención de este crimen y la protección de las víctimas, y esa perspectiva de género, señor comisario, debe ser tenida en cuenta en muchas de sus facetas en la elaboración de la nueva Estrategia. En la última Estrategia ya estaba mencionada en algunas cuestiones, pero me gustaría reforzar otras, teniendo en cuenta que —como es bien sabido y muchos de los intervinientes lo han dicho— el 75 % son mujeres y chicas, un 96 % de las cuales son víctimas de explotación sexual.

Necesitamos una dimensión de género en todo el proceso de identificación de la víctima de tráfico. Eso es muy, muy importante, y también que, en todos los instrumentos de apoyo a las víctimas, esté esa dimensión de género que pueda acompañarse.

Y después, también hay otra cuestión que es muy importante. Evidentemente, tenemos muchos instrumentos en diferentes dimensiones y debemos garantizar una cierta coherencia de esa dimensión de género en cómo se coordinan las agencias Europol, Eurojust o, también, por ejemplo, en cómo otras estrategias —como la Estrategia de Seguridad de la Unión Europea— incorporan esa cuestión.

Por lo tanto, le apremiamos a que analicemos y hagamos una más profunda aplicación de los instrumentos que tenemos, y a que esa dimensión de género sea tenida en cuenta en todas sus características.

Margot Parker, on behalf of the EFDD Group. – Madam President, trafficking in human beings is on the rise and criminals are using the EU as a springboard for exacerbating this crime. New evidence from the UK National Crime Agency shows that criminals from former overseas territories of Member States are taking advantage of gaining EU citizenship and creating child-trafficking routes between those territories to the UK or the EU. An example of this is non-EU nationals who become naturalised as Portuguese citizens and are using Portuguese identity documents to set up bank accounts. This allows them to receive payments from former Portuguese territories such as Angola. They are scouting for their victims.

The UK's decision to withdraw from the EU will allow our national government to end the free movement of people, resulting in the return of UK control over UK borders. Criminal background checks and preventive measures will significantly help combat trafficking in human beings and sexual and labour exploitation, ensuring better protection for UK citizens.

Mario Borghezio, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, una delle definizioni più convincenti, anche dal punto di vista giuridico, della tratta degli essere umani è inserita nel protocollo addizionale della convenzione delle Nazioni Unite contro la criminalità organizzata transnazionale, ben conosciuto come «protocollo di Palermo», che ne delinea gli elementi caratterizzanti, cioè la minaccia o l'impiego della forza o altre forme di coercizione per reclutare persone col fine di sfruttarle.

Oggi, per quanto riguarda i traffici dall'Africa, c'è una forte emergenza sicuramente dalla parte occidentale, ma anche dal Corno d'Africa. È evidente tutto quello che è stato sottolineato, cioè il rischio che questi traffici coinvolgano in particolare i soggetti deboli, in particolare i minori. Ma c'è un aspetto che mi pare sia stato poco sottolineato, anche nella risposta del commissario, e che risulta dai dati raccolti dall'Organizzazione internazionale per le migrazioni (OIM), che mostra una realtà preoccupante, in quanto più del 70 % dei migranti in transito dal Nord Africa verso l'Europa è vittima di tratta, traffico di organi e altre forme di sfruttamento.

Questa è una realtà che noi abbiamo denunciato più volte, ma l'Europa dove sta? Si è accorta che la sua politica sull'immigrazione, delle porte aperte ipocrite, queste politiche dissennate, in realtà favoriscono questi traffici? E allora è inutile che qui dibattiamo su queste cose quando non si fa nulla per chiudere le frontiere ai trafficanti e si affida a certe ONG finanziate da Soros l'intervento pro-immigrati e pro-migranti, chissà in quali condizioni, per poi affidare alla Turchia, magari, i migranti che volevano raggiungere l'Europa da altre parti. Bel risultato!

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η παράνομη διακίνηση ανθρώπων αποτελεί τη σύγχρονη μορφή δουλείας. Είναι ένα ειδικό έγκλημα το οποίο εξυπηρετεί την προσωπικότητα και την αξιοπρέπεια του ανθρώπου, διότι τον αντιμετωπίζει ως αντικείμενο με σκοπό το κέρδος. Θύματά του είναι νέες γυναίκες οι οποίες ωθούνται στην πορνεία και παιδιά τα οποία είτε χρησιμοποιούνται σε καταναγκαστική εργασία κάτω από άθλιες συνθήκες είτε τους αφαιρούνται όργανα και διατίθενται στο παράνομο εμπόριο. Ιδιαίτερα εύκολα θύματα είναι γυναίκες και παιδιά τα οποία εισέρχονται παράνομα και ανεξέλεγκτα ως λαθρομετανάστες στις χώρες εισόδου, την Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία. Δυστυχώς, επειδή τα κέρδη από την παράνομη αυτή δραστηριότητα μπορούν εύκολα να διοχετευθούν σε φαινομενικά νόμιμες δραστηριότητες, τα κράτη δεν είναι εύκολο να αντιμετωπίσουν αυτό το έγκλημα.

Παρ' όλα αυτά, τα κράτη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης οφείλουν να συνεργαστούν και να θεοπίσουν αυστηρούς νόμους, ούτως ώστε να πατάσουν αυτό το απαράδεκτο φαινόμενο. Βασική προϋπόθεση για να έχει επιτυχία αυτή η προσπάθεια είναι ο αυστηρός έλεγχος των συνόρων. Σας πληροφορώ ότι, όταν τα σύνορα της Ελλάδος τα φρουρούσαν οι Ελληνικές Ένοπλες Δυνάμεις, η Ελληνική Αστυνομία και Ελληνική Ακτοφυλακή, η παράνομη διακίνηση ανθρώπων ήταν σχεδόν μηδενική. Από τη στιγμή κατά την οποία αυτό το σοβαρό έργο ανέλαβαν να το φέρουν εις πέρας αποτυχημένοι γραφειοκρατικοί οργανισμοί, όπως ο Frontex και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ακτοφυλακή και Συνοριοφυλακή, έχουμε αυτό το χάος, το οποίο όλοι γνωρίζετε ότι υπάρχει, δυστυχώς.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la trata de seres humanos, con fines criminales, afecta a todos los países del mundo. La explotación sexual, el trabajo forzoso, la servidumbre doméstica, la mendicidad infantil o la extracción de órganos y más. Según Europol, es un delito transversal y capital; el 65 % de los traficantes de drogas participan al tiempo en la trata de seres humanos y, en muchos casos, lo utilizan como medio de pago.

Los traficantes se aprovechan de la fragilidad de las víctimas y hacen uso fraudulento de los documentos de viaje, incluso abusando de canales legales como los visados de turismo, estudios o trabajo. En muchos casos, las víctimas tienen que utilizar documentos fraudulentos para ocultar su verdadera identidad y su edad.

Teniendo en cuenta que la lucha contra esta lacra es una prioridad para la Unión, tal y como ha recogido el SOCTA, y en el nuevo ciclo político ante el anuncio de la revisión de la Estrategia de la Unión, considero fundamental que la Comisión fortalezca los mecanismos de detección, protección y asistencia de potenciales víctimas; que se les conceda a los menores una especial protección; que se dé una respuesta integral incluyendo mecanismos y protocolos de cooperación entre autoridades policiales, judiciales, de asilo y del sector laboral —inspectores de trabajo—, a su vez fomentando la cooperación entre la Unión, los Estados miembros, Europol y Eurojust y los terceros países en cuestión, acelerando la interoperabilidad de los sistemas Eurodac. También un seguimiento intensivo en internet —hay que vitalizar la UNCI de Europol— y endureciendo mucho más los códigos penales.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Elnök asszony, Képviselő úr! Önt, mint az Európai Parlament legnagyobb pártcsoportjának képviselőjét kérdezem, valószínűleg azért, mert elég hatékonyak tudnak lenni. Nos, ön említette, és párttársai szintén, hogy vannak emberkereskedők és ártatlan áldozatok. A keresleti oldalról, tehát ezeknek a szörnyű szolgáltatásoknak az igénybevevőiről viszont nagyon kevés szó esik. Ön mit gondol, mit lehet tenni azért, hogy ne legyen igény erre az egész szörnyűségre?

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Bueno, no pretenderá usted que yo sea aquí el oráculo de Delfos y tenga la facultad de dar una solución a un problema de tanta complejidad. Lo que a mí me parece muy importante es reforzar los mecanismos inequívocamente establecidos para la prevención; modificar los códigos penales, endureciendo las penas por esto; y, fundamentalmente, instalar instrumentos de represión y de investigación en Europol y en Eurojust, con jueces y fiscales.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, das prioridades e dos objetivos na luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos, gostaria de ver respondidas três perguntas fundamentais. Que instrumentos estão a ser utilizados para detetar as vítimas de tráfico, existem dados reais sobre o número de vítimas, com o fluxo de migrantes na Europa como se tem desenvolvido a prevenção, como têm protegido crianças e mulheres que são os alvos principais dos traficantes? Mais, quantos traficantes foram detidos na União? Temos nós esses dados?

Esta falta de informação soa, de facto, a pouco, a muito pouco. Repare que há cerca de dez mil crianças migrantes desaparecidas em solo europeu. Muitas delas terão sido vítimas de tráfico, o que mostra, claramente, uma falta de coordenação, de cooperação e uma incoerência política quanto aos resultados.

O que é mais trágico é a nossa incapacidade de criar medidas eficazes e que, neste momento, entre os quase vinte e um milhões de crianças traficadas em todo o mundo, muitas estarão a trabalhar ou a ser vítimas de exploração sexual. A maior parte delas ainda tem fé em nós.

VORSITZ: ULRIKE LUNACEK*Vizepräsidentin*

Jadwiga Wiśniewska (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Koleżanki i koledzy! Handel ludźmi jest trzecim pod względem dochodowości nielegalnym biznesem zaraz po handlu bronią i narkotykami. Ofiarami handlu są głównie kobiety i dziewczynki i one stanowią 85% wszystkich ofiar. Skala tego przestępstwa jest ogromna: 30 milionów ofiar, w tym 5 milionów dziewczynek. Oczywiście powtarzamy tutaj, w tej sali, że głównym celem handlu ludźmi jest wykorzystywanie seksualne. Papież Franciszek nazwał handel ludźmi haniebną plagą, niegodną cywilizowanego społeczeństwa. Człowiek w tym procederze staje się towarem. To bezduszne deptanie godności ludzkiej. Ofiary tych przestępstw są często wykorzystywane jako dawcy organów, zmuszane do nielegalnej pracy. Ten problem występuje również w Unii Europejskiej. Jak to jest? Chcemy wyznaczać standardy, a sami nie jesteśmy w stanie ochronić dziewczynek, kobiet? Potrzeba pilnej koordynacji służb, wspólnego działania w czynieniu dobra.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, la estrategia para combatir el tráfico de seres humanos es, de acuerdo con las respuestas que hemos recibido desde la Comisión, la base en la que se apoyan las actuaciones para desarrollar una política comunitaria sobre desapariciones de personas. De hecho, este tráfico se identifica como responsable de la mayor parte de las 10 000 desapariciones de menores no acompañados y de una buena parte también de otras desapariciones forzadas que se registran anualmente en la Unión.

Además de las medidas que se centran en cuestiones relacionadas con la investigación y el esclarecimiento de este tipo de sucesos, quisiera preguntar si la Comisión es consciente de la peculiar situación legal en la que quedan las víctimas y los familiares de personas desaparecidas en la Unión, que origina una doble victimización, y si hay alguna previsión para revisarla en el marco de la política europea de atención a las víctimas de delitos.

Nos gustaría saber en concreto cuándo estarán disponibles los resultados del estudio que nos anunció la comisaria Jourová en noviembre pasado, sobre la transposición de la Directiva sobre las víctimas, que ha incluido un apartado específico sobre víctimas de desapariciones.

Daniela Aiuto (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i dati Eurostat relativi agli ultimi tre anni ci dicono che all'interno dell'Unione europea circa l'80 % delle vittime del traffico di essere umani è donna.

La motivazione primaria è legata allo sfruttamento sessuale, ma vi sono varie sfaccettature sulle quali non ci si sofferma abbastanza e si finisce per circoscrivere il problema alle diverse forme di prostituzione, quando invece non è così. Parlo, ad esempio, dei matrimoni precoci o dei matrimoni finti, i cosiddetti matrimoni *sham*, contratti dalle famiglie sulla pelle delle bambine, oppure del traffico di donne incinte per la vendita e l'adozione illegale di neonati. Tutto ciò avviene all'interno degli Stati membri. Ed è una tendenza destinata ad aumentare con il crescere dei flussi migratori e delle richieste di asilo.

La ricerca della residenza legittima all'interno dell'Unione porterà secondo Europol ad un incremento dei matrimoni forzati. Dobbiamo proteggere queste bambine, impedendo che, ad esempio, vengano inviate nei loro paesi d'origine durante le vacanze scolastiche e si ritrovino spose precoci di uomini molto più adulti di loro. Occorre richiamare l'attenzione su tali situazioni, che non possono essere tollerate nascondendosi dietro il rispetto per l'altrui cultura, perché chi sposa una bambina commette un'enorme violenza, non solo sessuale, nei suoi confronti, ma le ruba per sempre la possibilità di amare e di vivere da donna libera.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök asszony! Az emberkereskedelem jelensége az európai uniós polgárok óriási számát érinti, és ez a tény kevésbé ismert az európai közvélemény előtt. Nem csupán a prostitúcióval kapcsolatos hálózatok és bűnözői csoportok ténykedése ad okot aggodalomra, hanem a munkaerőpiaci kizsákmányolás nagyon súlyos esetei, egyfajta modernkori rabszolgaság jelensége is. Több ezer uniós polgár dolgozik vendégmunkásként az EU fejlettebb államaiban rendkívül rossz körülmények között, nagyon alacsony bérért, akár napi 12 órán keresztül és sokszor szexuális visszaéléseknek is kitéve.

Ez is az emberkereskedelem egyik megnyilvánulási formája, hiszen ezeknek a kihasznált embereknek a munkaerejét mások bocsátják áruba és nyereszkednek rajta, ráadásul minden érvényes szabályozást felrúgnak és kihasználják az áldozatok rászorultságát és tehetetlenségét. Ezek a jelenségek, azt gondolom, hogy visszaszoríthatóak akkor, ha a hatóságok keményen lépnek fel az elkövetők ellen. Lehetetlennek tartom, hogy adott esetben például több ezer mezőgazdasági munkás helyzete egy jól behatárolt területen belül ismeretlen lenne a hivatalos szervek előtt.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor commissario, malgrado l'adozione nel 2011 della direttiva sulla prevenzione e la repressione della tratta di esseri umani e la protezione delle vittime, il fenomeno resta davvero grave se, come attestato da uno studio dell'Alto commissariato delle Nazioni Unite per i rifugiati, il 70 % dei migranti in transito dal Nord Africa verso l'Europa è vittima di tratta, traffico di organi, prostituzione e altre forme di sfruttamento.

Naturalmente i più vulnerabili sono i minori, in particolare i minori non accompagnati, e le donne. Peraltro, la tratta degli esseri umani è uno dei più gravi reati transfrontalieri, ma al tempo stesso rappresenta uno dei più redditizi per le organizzazioni criminali, tanto da essere la terza fonte di reddito dopo il traffico di armi e di droga.

E allora? E allora è necessario che la Commissione adotti misure più incisive per far sì che tutti gli Stati membri recepiscono integralmente la direttiva, ed è necessaria una nuova strategia in materia di tratta degli esseri umani che, in coerenza con l'attuale agenda sulla migrazione, possa contrastare efficacemente tale gravissimo crimine.

Beatrix von Storch (EFDD). – Frau Präsidentin! Wir sprechen heute über Menschenhandel – also über Menschen, die verschleppt werden, um Prostituierte oder Zwangsarbeiter zu werden. Europol hat schon 2009 festgestellt, dass die offenen innereuropäischen Grenzen diesen Menschenhandel erleichtern. Früher, vor Schengen, war es schwierig, Menschen von Ost nach West zu schmuggeln. Heute sind Herkunftsländer wie Russland oder die Türkei nur noch eine Grenzkontrolle entfernt. Früher konnten nur hochentwickelte Kriminalbanden, Verbrecherorganisationen im Menschenschmuggel erfolgreich sein. Heute ist das kinderleicht, sagt Europol, und das ist das Problem.

Sie erinnern sich an das Ergebnis von zwei Wochen Grenzkontrollen beim G7-Gipfel in Elmau 2015: 120 Fahndungserfolge, 80 Strafverfahren. Grenzkontrollen sind wichtig, sie sind möglich und sie sind wirksam, und wer Menschenhandel beklagt, aber Grenzen nicht schützen will, der lügt sich in die eigene Tasche.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señora presidenta, comisario Avramopoulos, la esclavitud es un delito. El tráfico de seres humanos está tipificado como crimen transnacional grave en el Tratado de la Unión Europea y está proscrito por el Derecho internacional humanitario. Y, sin embargo, la esclavitud no está ni mucho menos erradicada de Europa, como se pone de manifiesto en este debate.

Miles de personas vulnerables son vendidas o intercambiadas a fines de explotación; sus órganos, extirpados y vendidos; a menudo, mujeres vulnerables objeto de trata para matrimonios forzados o adopciones ilegales. Y todo esto tiene lugar en el marco de una estrategia de la Unión Europea para combatir el tráfico de seres humanos. Se puso en marcha siendo yo presidente de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior en 2011 y concluyó en 2016.

Por tanto, es pertinente esta pregunta oral para urgir de la Comisión de inmediato la adopción de una estrategia que revalide el compromiso de género y de protección de las víctimas que quedó establecido en la primera Estrategia de 2011, culminada en 2016. Pero, sobre todo, que diga de qué manera vamos a reforzar, a la luz de la experiencia, el compromiso europeo en la lucha y la prevención contra el tráfico de seres humanos.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, las mafias comercian con personas, esencialmente mujeres y niñas que son engañadas, son torturadas, son obligadas a prostituirse en muchos casos. Hablamos de la esclavitud del siglo XXI, y sobre esta cuestión, sobre la trata de seres humanos, es indispensable que hagamos un mayor esfuerzo por parte de las instituciones.

Es fundamental tener un instrumento legislativo. La Directiva sobre la trata es importante que se ponga en marcha, y también que la Comisión Europea haga un estudio de la aplicación y la transposición a las legislaciones de los distintos Estados miembros.

Pero solo con una ley, solo con instrumentos legislativos no ponemos en marcha políticas que realmente avancen en esta situación. Necesitamos voluntad política, y el comisario todavía no nos ha dicho cuándo va a poner encima de la mesa la Estrategia europea de lucha contra la trata. Porque estamos hablando de vidas humanas, estamos hablando de vidas de mujeres, de niños y de niñas, de seres vulnerables. Y se nos exige, a aquellos que tenemos responsabilidades públicas, que pongamos en marcha todo el esfuerzo necesario para luchar contra ello.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario; este fenómeno ha sido descrito por todos mis colegas, es un fenómeno global, y de manera global hay que abordarlo. Está muy conectado, por cierto, con el fenómeno de los refugiados y de la inmigración. Pero voy a referirme al fenómeno local, porque, efectivamente, la mayor parte de las personas objeto de trata son mujeres y niñas —en el caso de la Unión Europea— para ser explotadas sexualmente. Es decir, para la prostitución. Traficamos con los cuerpos de las mujeres y de las niñas para la prostitución.

Pero la prostitución existe porque se consume prostitución y porque hay empresarios de la prostitución. Estamos ante este discurso hipócrita, enormemente hipócrita, de los responsables europeos, sobre todo en los Estados miembros, que no persiguen localmente la explotación sexual de mujeres y niñas. Todas las carreteras de mi país, señor comisario —y seguramente del suyo—, están llenas de lugares, de prostíbulos dentro de los cuales hay niñas y mujeres que han sido víctimas de este tráfico.

No hay que irse muy lejos; basta con recorrer nuestros países, basta con seguir la ruta de los que consumen prostitución, porque están consumiendo explotación directa de mujeres y niñas. Así que no nos vayamos muy lejos y actuemos directamente sobre nuestros propios países.

Die Präsidentin. – Ich muss mich wegen der Zeitnehmung entschuldigen. Sie hatten jetzt, glaube ich, etwas länger Zeit, aber wir hatten ein technisches Problem. Ab dem nächsten Redner funktioniert es jetzt wieder.

Für das nun folgende *Catch-the-eye-Verfahren* habe ich insgesamt ungefähr zehn Wortmeldungen. Ich werde alle zu Wort kommen lassen.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, thank you for taking all the speakers. I appreciate it. This is an enormous problem, not just in Europe but right across the world. As we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the treaty that set up our Union and has led to peace across the entire European Union for 60 years which is good, now we have to look at more details. Not just in terms of stopping war and bringing peace to our Union, but for individuals to be treated properly, with respect and dignity. There is far too much exploitation going on; there are far too many smugglers, human traffickers exploiting women, young children, etc. I think now is the time to reflect on what we can do to ensure that there will be peace both in terms of the continent, but also for individuals, where they can work and live properly and with dignity right across the European Union, and for smugglers and others to be prosecuted and dealt with.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la tratta degli esseri umani è una terribile forma di schiavitù dei tempi moderni. La prevenzione e la repressione di questo fenomeno devono essere una priorità assoluta per l'Unione europea, ed è necessario uno sforzo straordinario della comunità internazionale affinché queste forme di sfruttamento inumane vengano eliminate.

L'intollerabile fenomeno della tratta degli esseri umani non è solo, però, il risultato di disuguaglianze economiche e sociali, ma anche della disparità di genere. Le discriminazioni strutturali fanno sì che le vittime siano per l'80 % di sesso femminile: donne, ragazze e spesso bambine. Il fenomeno migratorio spesso si sovrappone a quello delle tratte. Il traffico di migranti...

(La Presidente invita l'oratore a parlare più lentamente)

Il traffico di migranti e la tratta degli esseri umani, pur rappresentando fenomeni diversi, tendono spesso a divenire complementari. Si tratta di un dramma nel dramma, di un problema che si somma agli altri e che ha bisogno dell'adozione di provvedimenti strategici specifici e mirati. È assolutamente improcrastinabile, dunque, una strategia complessiva che metta fine a questo assurdo dramma umanitario.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, κύριε Επίτροπε, όπως βλέπετε, όλοι συμφωνούν ότι πρέπει να υπάρξει αποφασιστική αντιμετώπιση της παράνομης διακίνησης ανθρώπων, του δουλεμπορίου, να υπάρξουν αυστηρά μέτρα, να υπάρξουν έλεγχοι στα σύνορα. Τεράστιες, όμως, είναι οι ευθύνες της Τουρκίας, διότι ανέχεται και καθοδηγεί τα δουλεμπορικά κυκλώματα στα νησιά του Αιγαίου, τα οποία έχει γεμίσει με πρόσφυγες και, κυρίως, με χιλιάδες παράνομους μετανάστες. Τελευταία δημοσιεύματα, κύριε Αβραμόπουλε, αποδεικνύουν ότι οι μυστικές υπηρεσίες της Τουρκίας (MIT) έχουν διαμορφώσει ένα δίκτυο κατασκοπείας στα νησιά του Αιγαίου. Αξιοποιούν τους δουλεμπόρους, αξιοποιούν ανθρώπους που συνεργάζονται με τους δουλεμπόρους και αυτό είναι ιδιαίτερα επικίνδυνο. Είχαμε μάλιστα και συλλήψεις.

Το επόμενο θέμα που μου κάνει εντύπωση είναι αυτά που είπε ο κύριος Tusk σήμερα στα Σκόπια. Εκθείασε τα Σκόπια που έκλεισαν τα σύνορα, ενώ ο ίδιος ο Ban Ki-moon είχε πει ότι αυτό ήταν παράνομο. Δηλαδή, να είναι κλειστά τα σύνορα για να μπορούν οι δουλεμπόροι να κάνουν τη δουλειά τους και να αυξάνουν τα ποσά τα οποία ζητούν; Απαράδεκτες οι δηλώσεις του κυρίου Tusk σήμερα στα Σκόπια.

Hilde Vautmans (ALDE). – Unicef heeft het gezegd: 50 procent van de slachtoffers van mensenhandel zijn kinderen. En daar gaat het mij vandaag om. Dat cijfer is natuurlijk maar een gok, want de mensenhandel met kinderen gebeurt clandestien en kinderen durven er niet voor uit te komen. Terwijl wij falen, mijnheer de commissaris, om hen te beschermen, worden die kinderen slachtoffer. We weten wat met hen gebeurt: ze belanden in de prostitutie, ze worden gedood voor hun organen en allerlei andere gruwelijkheden.

Wat met de tienduizend verdwenen minderjarige asielzoekers, commissaris? Ik heb er u al heel vaak naar gevraagd en ik zal dat blijven doen tot we een echt actieplan hebben. Vandaar natuurlijk, mevrouw de voorzitter, mijn vraag, samen met vele collega's hier: wat gaan we doen om de kinderen te beschermen? Zij zijn het hoogste goed van de maatschappij. Laten we daarop inzetten.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, je to již zhruba rok a půl, co jsem se dotazovala evropských institucí, co hodlají dělat s informací od britského deníku *The Guardian*. Ten napsal, že ve Velké Británii je proti své vůli vězněno a nuceno často i k nelegální práci na tři tisíce dětí z Vietnamu. Ano, ve Velké Británii.

Chtěla jsem vědět, jaká je reakce britské vlády a jakou reakci plánují evropské instituce, aby se situace co nejdřív vyřešila a nikdy se nemohla opakovat. V odpovědi jsem dostala seznam mezinárodních dohod, které nucenou práci a obchod s lidmi, a zejména dětmi zakazují. Znamená to tedy, že když o nějakém problému podepíšeme mezinárodní dohodu, problém okamžitě zmizí? Přiznám se, že míra cynismu obsažená v odpovědi na tuto otázku mi vyrazila dech. Podepisování dohody je jedna věc, ale faktem je, že i v jednadvacátém století jsme svědky obchodování s lidmi a musíme zabezpečit, aby se tomu tak již nedělo, a to i na území Evropské unie, která by měla být příkladem a měla by být tím, kdo tomuto bude zabráňovat, vždy a všude.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, throughout last year we received reports of 10 000 and more unaccompanied refugee children entering Europe, being registered and subsequently disappearing. These reports are no longer headline news, but the problem has not been addressed. These unaccompanied minors, especially women and girls, are often trafficked and taken into an underworld of sexual exploitation and abuse. This is a Europe-wide problem and it requires continuous EU-wide work, commitment, investment in resources and prosecution of criminal traffickers.

In my own country, the UK, hundreds of unaccompanied refugee children were discovered to be not given any safe haven and it is one of the reasons why the Dubs amendment to welcome refugee children in the UK was so important. Shame on the Conservative Government for going back on its word and ending the scheme when only 350 children had benefited instead of the 3 000 who were promised a safe haven. As a founder of the Children's Rights Intergroup I will never stop fighting for a compassionate, effective, legal, rights-based response.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjednice, trgovina ljudima jedno je od najtežih kaznenih djela i najgorih oblika kršenja ljudskih prava. Protiv nje se odlučno moramo boriti kvalitetnim politikama, boljom koordinacijom među nadležnim tijelima država članica, većom učinkovitošću na terenu i intenzivnijom suradnjom s državama s kojima dijelimo vanjsku granicu.

No, da bismo mogli ići naprijed i kvalitetnije se boriti protiv ovog teškog kriminala, moramo učiti iz vlastitih pogrešaka. Naše toleriranje ilegalnog priljeva migranata dovelo je do toga da biznis krijumčarima ljudi doslovno cvjeta.

Nastavimo li svojim politikama slati poruke kako smo spremni primiti sve unesrećene ovoga svijeta bez ikakvih kriterija, pritisak na naše granice samo će rasti, a krijumčari će imati još više klijenata. Bez odlučnog udara na krijumčare ljudima i jasnog odmaka od bezglave politike otvorenih granica, ovaj veliki problem, čak ni uz najbolju volju, neće biti riješen!

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, μιλούμε ουσιαστικά για ένα έγκλημα κατά της ανθρωπότητας. Και νομίζω ότι όλοι οι συνάδελφοι εξέφρασαν με πάρα πολύ έντονο τρόπο τη δυσφορία τους γι' αυτό το κακό. Ταυτόχρονα, όμως, νιώθω ότι μιλούμε απ' αυτόν τον ασφαλισμένο χώρο για ένα ζήτημα τόσο απόμακρο, σαν να το κοιτάζουμε από μακριά με τα κιάλια. Δεν μπορούμε να πλησιάσουμε το φοβερό κακό που συμβαίνει σε αυτούς τους εκατοντάδες χιλιάδες ανθρώπους, αν δεν καταφέρουμε να πλησιάσουμε πραγματικά την εικόνα αυτή. Και δεν υπάρχει άλλος τρόπος παρά να βγούμε έξω από αυτήν την αίθουσα και να πάμε στους χώρους όπου συμβαίνουν αυτά τα τραγικά γεγονότα. Και θα κλείσω με την πολύ γνωστή τοποθέτηση που ακούγεται συχνά πυκνά από την Αριστερά: πρέπει να συγκρουστούμε με τις αιτίες που προκαλούν αυτό το κακό και οι αιτίες είναι οι πόλεμοι και η πείνα. Δεν υπάρχουν άλλοι τρόποι!

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ricordo il grande impegno con cui nel 2011 in Parlamento abbiamo approvato la direttiva sulla tratta degli esseri umani come violazione dei diritti umani fondamentali, riduzione in schiavitù delle persone, sia sessuale che lavorativa, che coinvolge come si è detto la maggioranza assoluta di donne e un numero crescente di minori, specialmente non accompagnati.

Si chiedeva di ravvicinare le sanzioni fra i vari paesi, oltre ad azioni di informazione e tutela delle vittime anche con permessi di soggiorno umanitario. Ricordo che si prevedeva l'opportunità per gli Stati membri di adottare misure contro chi ricorre consapevolmente ai servizi sessuali o lavorativi di persone vittime di tratta. Ma è urgente che la Commissione, come ha detto prima il commissario, richiami con forza gli Stati membri che non lo hanno ancora fatto – e sono la maggioranza – perché recepiscano la direttiva, anche perché altrimenti è inutile aver messo in campo il coordinamento europeo e i coordinatori nazionali, se ci sono zone franche per gli sfruttatori.

Dalla relazione 2016 emerge che è ancora elevato il numero delle vittime non accertate, che restano così in una situazione di invisibilità, anche perché si confondono con l'immigrazione illegale e questo sta facendo cadere l'attenzione sullo status di vittime.

(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)

Dimitris Avramopoulos, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues for this very constructive and interesting debate. I would also like to thank you for your support in keeping the fight against trafficking in human beings high on the political agenda. The questions you raised today – the economic and financial aspects, the gender dimension and the coherence between the internal and external dimension – will fuel the development of a new, comprehensive EU anti-trafficking policy. It will certainly take due account of the actual and worrisome trends in Europe.

Mrs Wikström, trafficking existed prior to the migration crisis. It is not something new. But there is evidence that the current challenges have exacerbated vulnerabilities and I agree about the attention that has to be given to children. They represent 15% of the victims.

Mr Panzeri, in order to ensure policy coherence, it is important to take into account the latest deliverables. The first progress report on the fight against trafficking in human beings and the two reports of the Anti-Trafficking Directive delivered last September will also take into account the targeted consultation with all relevant stakeholders. The internal Commission processes are ongoing to ensure the best possible outcome for a future policy.

Mr Urtasun, the latest data for the European Union does indeed indicate that sexual exploitation is the most prevalent form of exploitation. It concerns 67% of victims with 95% being women and girls. The external dimension has been an integral part of EU policy to address trafficking in human beings. It constitutes one of its pillars and will continue to do so. Let me assure you once again that the Commission is monitoring the process in Member States towards the full transposition of the Directive on anti-trafficking. We will take all necessary steps to ensure full compliance with it.

Let me conclude by saying that the fight against trafficking in human beings is an imperative for the European Union to continue its struggle against unscrupulous criminals. You can be sure that we will do our best in order to take all the necessary action and all the necessary initiatives in the future, engaging all Member States in order to fulfil this commitment.

Die Präsidentin. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban. – Az emberkereskedelem, elsősorban a nő- és a gyermekkereskedelem az egyik legaggasztóbb jelenség a világban és sajnos az egyik leggyorsabb ütemben növekvő bűnözői iparágak közé tartozik. Sokunk számára lehetetlen elképzelni, de ma is emberek millióit kényszerítik a rabszolgasághoz hasonló körülmények között gyárakban, farmokon és otthonokban dolgozni. A Global Slavery Index becslése szerint napjainkban 35.8 millió ember él rabszolgaságban. Az Európai Bizottság legfrissebb emberkereskedelem elleni küzdelemről szóló eredményjelentésében évi 16.000-re teszi az EU-ban ezen aljas bűncselekmény áldozatául esők számát. Ez a helyzet tűrhetetlen és tarthatatlan!

Elfogadhatatlan, hogy akár egy személy is rabszolgaként éljen a XXI. században Európában, de bárhol máshol is a világon. Az emberkereskedelemmel szoros összefüggésben az embercsempészet is virágzik ma kontinensünkön és a világban. Az Europol szerint jelenleg több mint 5000 nemzetközi szervezett bűnözői csoport működik az EU-ban, ez nemhogy csökkenést, hanem jelentős növekedést mutat a 2013-as adatokhoz képest. Ezek a nemzetközi bűnözői csoportok pedig mind jobban összefonódnak a migráncsempészzel, amely már nemcsak a migránsokat juttatja be illegálisan Európába, hanem ösztönzi is őket az életveszélyes út megkezdésére. Ezért minden eszközzel fel kell lépünk az embercsempész-hálózatok felszámolásáért.

19. Palm oil and deforestation of rainforests (debate)

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Kateřina Konečná im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, öffentliche Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über das Thema „Palmöl und die Rodung von Regenwäldern“ (2016/2222(INI)) (A8-0066/2017).

Kateřina Konečná, zpravodajka. – Vážená paní předsedající, v debatách se mě lidé často ptají, proč mě zajímá právě téma palmového oleje. Proč se nevěnuji radši sóji, avokádu či jiným rostlinným olejům. Věřím, že se jedná o legitimní otázku, a proto ji chci zodpovědět i vám.

Téma palmového oleje se mi otevřelo někdy na konci roku 2015, kdy jsem se poprvé dozvěděla o požárech v Indonésii. Přiznám se, že jsem zcela užasla. Deštné pralesy byly v plamenech a s nimi všechno živé v nich. Ekologické škody byly závažné, ale zdálo se, že o tom vlastně nikdo neví. Jako bychom se všichni dívali na druhou stranu a nechali deštné pralesy hořet. Nikdo o tom neinformoval, málokdo o tom mluvil a zdálo se, že to nikdo neřeší. Začala jsem se tedy tématem zabývat a vůbec jsem přitom netušila, že otevírám Pandorinu skříňku. Požáry totiž souvisely s mnoha problémy, které se s produkcí palmového oleje obecně pojí – korupcí, zaslepeností, dětskou prací, ekologickou devastací, porušováním lidských práv a práv původních komunit, aktivitami nadnárodních korporací, post koloniálním rozvojem a migrací a mohla bych dále pokračovat.

Tato nevině vypadající složka, která se často přidává do cukrátek, kosmetiky, dětské výživy, brambůrek a dalších potravinářských a drogistických výrobků, má na svědomí, že v Indonésii v délce asi osmi tisíc kilometrů na více než dvou milionech hektarů hořel deštný prales. Tento požár za tři týdny vypustil do atmosféry víc CO₂ než zvládne Německo za celý rok. Orangutani, gibboni, sumaterští sloni a tygři přišli spolu s tisíci a možná miliony dalších druhů i o poslední zbytky svého přirozeného prostředí a hrozí jim likvidace. Šedesát devět milionů obyvatel Indonésie a Bornea dýchalo znečištěný vzduch a tisíce lidí zaplatilo za tyto požáry životem. Příčinou byla snaha vytvořit na úkor pralesa palmové plantáže.

Negativa takovéto produkce palmového oleje jsou jasná, ale nízká cena je schopna všechno přebít. Jsme tak svědky dalšího závodu na dno, při kterém se řídíme raději krátkodobým ekonomickým prospěchem než dlouhodobými zájmy udržitelnosti našeho života na Zemi. Jak je naznačeno, problém nespočívá pouze ve vypouštění škodlivých látek do našeho ovzduší, což samozřejmě napomáhá globálnímu oteplování, ale zejména v tom, že tak činíme v deštných pralesích, kterým právem přezdíváme plíce planety.

Jsem přesvědčena, že Evropská unie jakožto organizace silně podporující klimatickou dohodu z Paříže a cíle udržitelného rozvoje OSN musí v této věci konat. Jsem velmi ráda, že jsem ve stínových zpravodajích našla důležité spojení a dovoluji mi jim velmi poděkovat. A nejen jim, ale také všem jejich spolupracovníkům. Brali to téma s vážností, kterou si zasluhuje, a byli velkou oporou a velkými pomocníky. Možná, že jsme občas šli jinou cestou, ale směr zůstával stejný. Pro evropské spotřebitele, ale i občany ze zemí, které palmový olej produkují, jsme chtěli dosáhnout toho, aby se zamezilo odlesňování souvisejícímu s produkcí palmového oleje. Zabezpečit, že palmový olej dovážený do Evropské unie je pěstován a zpracováván způsoby trvale udržitelnými. Tlačit na co nejambicióznější certifikační schémata. Bojovat s porušováním lidských práv na plantážích a s pošlapáváním lidských práv původních komunit. Vyjádřit se rovněž k nelogičnosti toho, že v biopalivech první generace máme palmový olej, který způsobuje požáry zaplavující naše ovzduší značným množstvím CO₂.

Vážené kolegyně, vážení kolegové, těším se nyní na konstruktivní debatu o mé zprávě a o této problematice. Palmový olej jistě není největší zlo, které pod sluncem máme. Současný způsob pěstování a zpracování však představuje riziko pro naši planetu a z toho důvodu se domnívám, že o této problematice musíme nejenom mluvit, ale hlavně konat.

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all I would like to welcome this own-initiative report and particularly congratulate Ms Konečná and her colleagues in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI). I would also like to congratulate and thank the other three associated committees as well for their good work, and I am referring to the Committee on Development (DEVE), the Committee on International Trade (INTA) and the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI).

Addressing the environmental and social challenges of deforestation and forest degradation has been, and will continue to be, a priority for the European Union, and in particular for the Commission. That is the case now more than ever as part of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as well as for the Paris Agreement. Deforestation is a complex problem with many drivers such as infrastructure and agricultural expansion and with different dynamics in various countries, so there is no single solution. Tackling it requires action at many levels – at the international, national and local levels – and through joint efforts by different actors, acting together – governments, industry and business and civil society. It means working in partnership with countries which are most affected by deforestation and it means adopting a comprehensive and broad approach by identifying all the relevant policies, processes and tools we can work with.

The European Union has consistently been at the forefront of action in this area through both international and domestic initiatives. At the international level the European Union has proactively engaged in the UN Forum on Forests, in the Convention on Biological Diversity, in the implementation of the REDD+ framework, and under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Domestically, since 2003, the European Union has an ambitious forest law enforcement governance and trade action plan which has delivered key results such as the conclusion of VPAs (voluntary partnership agreements) to help partner countries combat illegal logging. But being a frontrunner does not mean that no further engagement is needed. The evaluation of our FLEGT Action Plan demonstrated that the work we have carried out so far to combat illegal logging is achieving significant results, but also that we need to work more and we need to work better, both internationally and domestically.

Addressing illegal logging is not sufficient on its own. The main drivers of deforestation are related to a broad range of societal factors. In that context we also have to look, for example, at our own consumption and agricultural commodities that are often associated with deforestation, such as soybean and palm oil here in the EU. We are of course aware of the degree of public concern at the environmental impacts of palm oil production, such as deforestation and biodiversity loss, greenhouse gas emissions and indigenous rights issues, but we are also aware of the opportunities that it presents, for instance contributing to lifting thousands of people out of poverty in producing countries.

The Commission believes that we need to address the issue of deforestation by looking at a much broader range of issues and drivers. As a follow-up to the 7th EAP, the Commission launched this last year in 2016 a study to consider the feasibility of options to step up EU action to combat deforestation and forest degradation. The results of this report should be available by mid-2017. The Commission believes also that it is essential to cooperate and to support the efforts of producer countries to minimise deforestation and other negative impacts that palm oil cultivation can have in order to achieve sustainable production of this commodity.

Tiziana Beghin, *relatrice per parere della commissione per il commercio internazionale*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'olio di palma è un prodotto pericoloso che causa danni enormi. L'Europa ne è il secondo importatore mondiale, ma proprio per questo è anche in grado di dettare le regole sul mercato internazionale di questo prodotto ed esigere il rispetto dei diritti umani e dell'ambiente molto più di qualunque convenzione o accordo.

Forti di questa considerazione, nella commissione INTE abbiamo formulato delle raccomandazioni precise: dazi doganali differenziati per premiare chi produce in modo sostenibile; completa tracciabilità dell'olio di palma lungo tutta la filiera per capire chi davvero produce rispettando le regole; e infine abbiamo richiesto di usare i trattati di libero scambio per promuovere norme chiare e vincolanti sullo sviluppo sostenibile, l'ambiente e i diritti umani nei paesi produttori. Questo significa mettere il commercio al servizio dei più deboli.

Ringrazio la relatrice e tutta la commissione per l'ambiente, che hanno deciso di fare proprie le nostre raccomandazioni principali e di rifletterle nel testo finale che vedrà sicuramente il nostro supporto.

Florent Marcellesi, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural*. – Señora presidenta, el monocultivo de aceite de palma es un desastre para los ecosistemas y un peligro para nuestra salud. Fjense, es responsable en Indonesia de la deforestación de bosques del tamaño de Alemania. Además, en Europa, consumimos unas cantidades dañinas de aceite de palma: unos sesenta litros de media al año por persona, es decir, más colesterol malo y más problemas de corazón.

Y, por si fuera poco, casi la mitad del aceite de palma importado en Europa se usa para agrocombustible. Con estas miles de hectáreas de cultivos, queremos dar de comer a las personas o dar de comer a los coches. Por tanto, la Comisión Europea debe actuar para excluir de los fondos públicos el uso del aceite de palma como agrocombustible, poner en marcha un plan de acción vinculante contra la deforestación, etiquetar los productos que contienen aceite de palma y garantizar en los países productores los derechos de las poblaciones locales.

Alberto Cirio, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, innanzitutto anch'io ringrazio la relatrice per il lavoro che ha svolto e che abbiamo svolto in questi mesi per trattare un argomento sicuramente importante, che ha che fare con l'ambiente, che ha a che fare con la salute delle persone, ma che doveva essere trattato con la dovuta serietà e anche con i dovuti approfondimenti.

Infatti la questione dell'olio di palma, e della necessità che venga coltivato in modo sostenibile, ci ha fatto aprire gli occhi su realtà come quella indonesiana, in cui il rispetto dell'ambiente non sempre è garantito, però ci ha fatto anche capire che invece ci sono altri paesi del sud-est asiatico – in particolare ci riferiamo ad altre realtà, ad altri Stati – in cui noi abbiamo trovato e abbiamo riscontrato un maggior rispetto per l'ambiente, una maggiore educazione, una maggiore maturità, una maggiore sensibilità, una maggiore consapevolezza per quanto riguarda la necessità di garantire una produzione che sia sostenibile e che venga fatta nel rispetto dell'ambiente.

Questo è fondamentale, se pensiamo a paesi come la Malesia, che hanno fatto investimenti anche importanti per differenziarsi da quelli che sono stati elementi di sfruttamento, di mancato rispetto dell'ambiente di queste produzioni. E se da una parte abbiamo riscontrato che alcuni paesi si differenziavano in positivo, dall'altra parte non dobbiamo dimenticare – perché qui siamo nella sede del Parlamento europeo – che le più grandi industrie europee che hanno utilizzato negli anni l'olio di palma in Europa lo hanno fatto sempre nell'autonomo e volontario rispetto di questo equilibrio sostenibile.

Noi adesso prevedremo una tracciabilità, noi prevedremo di fare interventi in etichetta, prevedremo di garantire il percorso dell'olio di palma da dove viene prodotto a dove viene consumato. Sappiamo, e dobbiamo saperlo, che grandi aziende italiane ed europee fino ad oggi lo hanno già fatto, lo hanno fatto volontariamente per impegno loro, perché la sensibilità è una sensibilità di utilizzare un prodotto che non è nocivo di per sé, perché è un olio vegetale che c'è in natura, ma che deve essere naturalmente utilizzato e commercializzato nel rispetto dell'ambiente.

Paul Brannen, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, the S&D Group are pleased with this own-initiative report. We have had good cross-group cooperation and agreement on the important issue of palm oil and deforestation.

At the eleventh hour a letter was received by some of us from ambassadors representing some of the palm oil producing countries outside of the European Union. The letter makes four criticisms of Parliament's own-initiative report on palm oil and deforestation. However, all of these can be countered.

The first criticism made in the letter is that palm oil is not the main deliverer of deforestation. In reply, it may not be the single biggest cause of deforestation but it is responsible for some 29% which is a significant amount of deforestation. The European Union has signed up to ending deforestation and as the third largest market for palm oil the EU cannot turn a blind eye. Consumers have responsibilities too.

The second criticism is that the report attacks the reputation of palm oil producing countries. No, it does not! Nor does it call for the phasing out of palm oil.

The third criticism, that the aim of a single certification scheme is redundant, is not true. Too many schemes are now confusing the customer. We need one certification scheme.

The fourth criticism is that the report is partial and not inclusive. In reply, this again is not true. The process involved a sustainable palm oil round table which involved growers, cooperatives, processors, traders, development NGOs, environment NGOs and social NGOs. It was inclusive. It is an inclusive report.

To conclude, the European Union signed up to the UN Paris Agreement on climate change and this report helps deliver the EU's obligations and should be supported by Members of Parliament.

Julie Girling, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Konečná, and her team for their work on this file. The text we will vote on is a true compromise text, and I appreciate the efforts made to accommodate all of our positions.

I am just going to concentrate on one thing here today, my personal priority in these discussions and something I am very pleased that has been included. It is the call for one single certification scheme at EU level. This is a scheme which businesses and consumers can easily recognise. I believe the existence of multiple certification schemes confuses consumers. You do not know which logo or scheme to trust when seeking to make a sustainable consumption choice.

I understand that there are difficulties. The main growers, most particularly in South-East Asia, the Indonesian and Malaysian growers, have not reached an agreement on what level of sustainability there should be and how it should be certificated. I am delighted that in our report we have laid that out really very carefully. A huge amount of work went on from the rapporteur to get that right, so that it is sensible, it is annotated, it lays out what we think could be done, what we think should be done. I believe that this is a huge step forward.

Rather than continue to demonise palm oil – some of the language even this evening I cannot possibly agree with, although I do recognise that deforestation is a bad thing – we should move ahead firmly with the certification schemes as laid out in this report and really get ourselves behind it here in the EU.

Dita Charanzová, *za skupinu ALDE*. – Paní předsedající, i já bych chtěla poděkovat paní zpravodajce, kolegyni Konečné, za práci odvedenou na této zprávě. Likvidace deštných pralesů kvůli pěstování palmového oleje je v současnosti jeden z největších ekologických problémů planety.

Alarmující je zejména rychlost a tempo likvidace deštných pralesů. Pralesů, které fungují jako plíce naší planety. Ohrožujeme tím naše budoucí generace, budoucnost lidí žijící v oblastech těžby, ohrožujeme tím řadu nejvzácnějších zvířecích druhů.

Jsem proto velmi ráda, že i Evropský parlament k této věci zaujal jasné stanovisko, že si uvědomuje naléhavost problému a potřebu jej řešit. I nebývalá shoda napříč politickými frakcemi je důkazem toho, že je zde vůle a snaha se problému věnovat. Vítám, že výsledkem jednání je materiál obsahující řadu konkrétních kroků. Ať už se jedná o zavádění minimálních standardů pro palmový olej dovážený do Evropské unie, prokazatelnost jeho původu, zajištění větší transparentnosti informací pro nás spotřebitele.

Evropská unie je třetí největší spotřebitel palmového oleje na světě. Jako i v řadě dalších oblastí i zde bychom se měli chovat zodpovědně a nastavovat tak standardy, které mohou inspirovat zbytek světa.

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL). – De Europese Unie is een gigantische afnemer van en een grote investeerder in palmolie en daarmee speelt Europa een grote rol in de vernietiging van onze planeet. Ten koste van toekomstige generaties en ten koste van leefgebieden voor mens en dier laat Europa oerbossen afbranden in Indonesië en Maleisië. Het certificeringssysteem voor duurzame palmolie heeft gefaald. Duurzame palmolie bestaat niet! Duurzame palmolie is een fabeltje om het geweten van consumenten, producenten en politici te sussen.

Laten we stoppen met het gebruik van conflictmaterialen zoals palmolie. Want niet alleen kolen en koper zijn funest voor onze planeet, maar palmolie is dat zeker ook. Laten we nu investeren in teelt in eigen bodem. Nu is de tijd om te investeren in biologische teelt van vlas, zonnebloemen en koolzaad. Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

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

Arne Gericke (ECR), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Dankeschön Frau Hazekamp. Sie sind ja aus aus den Niederlanden, soweit ich weiß. Ich glaube, Sie tragen eine ganz besondere Verantwortung für Indonesien, denn soweit ich weiß, ist West-Papua komplett entvölkert worden. Dort wohnen nicht mal mehr 50 % der ursprünglichen Bevölkerung, und auch dort wird Palmöl angebaut. Könnte man nicht da schon mal anfangen, entweder das Palmöl aus West-Papua zu etikettieren oder, wenn das nicht reicht, wenn sie damit nicht aufhören, dort das Land zu entvölkern, auch dort mit Sanktionen zu drohen?

Anja Hazekamp (GUE/NGL), “blauwe kaart”-antwoord. – Dank u wel voor deze vraag. Natuurlijk heeft Nederland een behoorlijk verleden in Indonesië en dat is niet een verleden waar we trots op hoeven te zijn. Als we nu kijken naar de rol van Europa bij de ontbossing van oerwouden in Indonesië en Maleisië, dan moeten we ervoor zorgen dat we ons over vijftig jaar niet opnieuw hoeven te schamen. En we moeten nu stoppen met de invoer van palmolie en het gebruik daarvan.

Benedek Jávor, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, first of all I would like to say thank you to Kateřina for her outstanding work with the file.

Palm oil is clearly one of the major drivers of tropical deforestation and it not only has climate-related problems but also has a disastrous effect on biodiversity, and it also has some human rights issues including land grabbing and forced eviction of indigenous people. So that makes it clear that for the EU there are some things to do. The EU is the world's largest importer of embedded deforestation and also one of the biggest markets for palm oil globally. We Greens, in line with the report, believe that there is a clear need for a fully sustainable palm oil supply chain by 2020. Also we call on the Commission to come up with an action plan on palm oil. There is a need for comprehensive sustainability criteria for palm oil products, also with independent auditing and monitoring of the certification schemes. In the long term we also need a mandatory certification scheme for palm oil in the EU, and also binding commitments, in particular an anti-deforestation guarantee in trade and development cooperation agreements with producing countries.

Altogether I think that we also have to go beyond palm oil, as there are other issues of deforestation as well, and we call on the Commission to come up with not only a palm oil action plan but also with a deforestation action plan as soon as possible.

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gli effetti disastrosi della coltivazione incontrollata di palma da olio sono sotto gli occhi di tutti. Nei paesi produttori, nonostante i numerosi proclami, manca ancora un cambio di rotta per mettere fine alla distruzione delle foreste pluviali, che forniscono servizi ecosistemici di valore inestimabile per noi e per le generazioni future.

Naturalmente non è l'olio di palma l'unico responsabile della deforestazione globale, lo sappiamo bene. La relazione che qui stiamo discutendo, tuttavia, segna un percorso preciso che dobbiamo seguire per questo ed altri prodotti, che corrispondono ancora ad un modello massificato e non sostenibile di produzione e di consumo, che è antitetico all'utilizzo e alla promozione di ingredienti e prodotti biologici, di qualità e preferibilmente anche a chilometro zero.

Vorrei che questa relazione domani venisse approvata anche perché incorpora molte delle richieste che il Movimento 5 Stelle ha avanzato nel lavoro della commissione per l'ambiente. Su tutte ne voglio ricordare due. La prima: la necessità di sostenere una mappatura del territorio nei paesi produttori, al fine di controllare l'espansione delle piantagioni e creare dei corridoi ecologici dedicati alla conservazione delle specie in pericolo critico di estinzione. In secondo luogo: la richiesta di congelare le superfici coltivate a palma da olio e di introdurre una moratoria sulle nuove concessioni nell'ambito del dialogo che l'Unione e gli Stati membri intrattengono con i paesi produttori a salvaguardia di ciò che rimane delle foreste pluviali. Ringrazio per il lavoro la collega Kateřina Konečná e tutti i relatori ombra.

Mireille D'Ornano, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, M^{me} la rapporteure propose des engagements fermes sur le travail ainsi que sur des critères sociaux et environnementaux en matière d'accords commerciaux. Pour autant, nous ne saurions diminuer notre dépendance à l'huile de palme sans envisager de solution de substitution pérenne.

Les huiles végétales qui pourraient s'y substituer exigent davantage de terrains cultivables. Un recours accru à ces cultures ne remédierait pas à la déforestation, à laquelle l'agriculture contribue pour 73 %. C'est donc à juste titre que M^{me} la rapporteure a nuancé la date de 2020 pour l'utilisation de l'huile de palme dans les biocarburants, qui représentent une part croissante de la consommation totale d'huile de palme. Il est donc urgent de développer les biocarburants de deuxième et troisième générations.

Cette transition énergétique doit s'accompagner d'une transition sociale. Les petits producteurs assurent environ 40 % de la production mondiale. Nous devons leur garantir un traitement équitable en matière de certifications.

Je prends acte du fait que ce texte traite toutes ces questions. Toutefois, l'ensemble de nos politiques doit établir un cadre cohérent pour notre futur approvisionnement énergétique.

Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, geschätzter Herr Kommissar! Der Verbrauch von Palmöl ist in den letzten 30 Jahren um rund 700 % gestiegen, und das Resultat ist mittlerweile wirklich ein eklatanter Raubbau und auch eine Ausbeutung in den produzierenden Ländern. Mittlerweile findet sich in nahezu allen Produkten – egal, ob in Lebensmitteln, Kosmetika, Waschmitteln und Sonstigem – als Zusatzstoff das Palmöl. In all diesen Produkten unseres Alltags ersetzt billiges, industriell produziertes Palmöl zum Teil auch wirklich nachhaltige und vor allem heimische Alternativen. Mich verwundert auch, dass vor allem auch politische Gruppierungen hier immer wieder auf die Kampagnen der Palmöllobby hereinfallen und zum Teil auch tierische Produkte und tierische Fette verteufeln, die aber vor allem in Europa zu viel, viel besseren und nachhaltigeren Standards produziert werden.

Ich möchte hier ausdrücklich die Forderungen nach einer transparenten Kennzeichnung von Palmöl in veredelten Produkten unterstützen und vor allem auch an die Konsumenten appellieren, bei ihren Kaufentscheidungen immer wieder auch darauf zu achten, wo Produkte produziert werden.

Außerdem möchte ich meine Forderung nach einer Butterfettstütze unterstreichen. Wir könnten einfach und wirklich auch sehr effizient über Maßnahmen Butterfett wieder stärker in die Lebensmittelproduktion einbringen und somit eben Palmöle ersetzen. Und außerdem sollte es wieder attraktiver werden, Öle in Europa zu produzieren – Pflanzenöle. Somit könnten wir den CO₂-Fußabdruck verringern und auch für mehr Regionalität sorgen.

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

Tibor Szanyi (S&D), Kékkártyás kérdés. – Elnök asszony, tisztelt Képviselő asszony! Én remélem jól értettem, amit mondott, de ha igen, akkor egy picit nekem hiányom van, mert olybá tűnt, mintha ön a termelő országokra helyezné a probléma megoldásának a súlyát, miközben a fejlett országok azok, amelyek keresletet támasztanak ezeknek a termékeknek. Nem gondolja-e, hogy a kereslet szűkítésével kéne inkább élni, mintsem kifelé mutogatni?

Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE), Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Das eine bedingt auf jeden Fall das andere, aber das, worum es mir eigentlich geht, ist, dass wir in Europa sehr viele Möglichkeiten haben zu produzieren und somit eben letztlich auch diese Abhängigkeit von den Importen zu verringern. Was wir hier nämlich immer wieder vergessen: Beispielsweise Speiseeiserzeugung und vieles andere mehr ist vor Jahren ersetzt worden durch billige Produkte, zum Teil eben auch Palmölprodukte, und das, was verdrängt worden ist, waren Milcherzeugnisse, und das könnte auch wieder rückgängig gemacht werden und somit natürlich auch die Nachfrage in Europa reduziert werden.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to start by saying thank you to Kateřina Konečná as rapporteur for her work on this report and also to our S&D shadow, Paul Brannen, because whilst progress has been registered in international, European and national policies and in the regulatory framework, and whilst various commitments have been made from political, financial and industry leaders, we still need to work harder to make sure that the business of clearing out forests for palm oil and timber plantation, of robbing indigenous people and invading the land and resources, will no longer be considered business as usual.

Sustainable policies addressing deforestation can stimulate economic growth and development. They can encourage agricultural productivity and reduce social conflict. They can be a win for our climate, for inclusive development, for economic growth, and for small-scale farmers and indigenous people alike.

But we need to act together. Only if we all do our part can we achieve these benefits. This is an appeal to promote forest protection as a new way of doing business and not as a threat to business. We require measures that are environmentally sustainable, measures that are socially responsible. Ultimately, it is our responsibility to support sustainable production and provide EU consumers with a choice based on informed decisions. Accepting palm oil from sustainable sourcing is our obligation if we want to address deforestation and prevent extinction of threatened species.

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE). – Gospođo predsjednice, nemamo što drugo nego priznati sami sebi da jednostavno nismo reagirali na vrijeme i da nam sada trebaju „vatrogasne mjere“. Simbolički spominjem „vatrogasne mjere“ jer znamo što znači kada vatra pohara šume. Mi njima sada haramo na drugi način, zbog želje za profitom, ekstra profitima, zbog korupcije. Uopće nas ne zanima zaštita okoliša ni osnovne vrijednosti koje promoviramo, prije svega, u vlastitom dvorištu. Kao da će ovaj mali planet živjeti samo od toga što ga mi štitimo na području našeg kontinenta.

Naša trgovina, naše tvrtke koje tako užurbano žele svoj razvoj i doći do kapitala na nekorektan način, bez poštene trgovine, neće pomoći ovom planetu. Zato sam ja i za sljedivost i certificiranje i za mnogo toga što je u ovom izvješću vrlo dobro izneseno.

Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la causa del 80 % de la deforestación mundial es la agricultura. Perdemos nueve millones de hectáreas en bosques —es lo mismo que la superficie de Portugal o tres veces la de Bélgica— cada año.

Los europeos somos parte de este problema, y el aceite de palma es una de sus caras más dañinas. No vale seguir mirando hacia otro lado; no podemos eludir nuestra responsabilidad como uno de los mayores importadores y consumidores de aceite de palma. No podemos eludir nuestra responsabilidad.

Según un estudio de la propia Comisión, la huella forestal de la Unión sigue sin crecer año tras año. Mientras sigamos funcionando como si no hubiera límites a la explotación de la tierra, seguiremos siendo cómplices de un desastre medioambiental y humano sin precedentes.

¿Cómo lo podemos evitar? Para empezar hay que establecer una normativa de carácter vinculante. Es lo que queremos con este informe: que en las importaciones de aceite de palma se garantice la sostenibilidad y la trazabilidad de la cadena de suministro. Es posible, necesario y, además, está en nuestras manos.

Para terminar, quería felicitar a mi compañera Kateřina por este importante informe.

Bas Eickhout (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I would like to thank rapporteur for this report on palm oil. I think at the core what we are seeing here is that we, as the European Union, should start using our bargaining power as a big market. We are the second importer of palm oil in the world. Twelve percent of the global production is imported into the EU. The standards that we are setting will be a global example. We are doing it, for example, for conflict minerals. Now it is time for us to take the next step: looking at palm oil production, knowing that there are cases of human rights violations, that there are cases of environmental destruction. If we set our standards and make sure that according to these sustainability criteria only the good stuff is used for import into the EU, we will set a global standard. And that is exactly what we should be doing, for the environment but certainly also for the people earning their money from these products, and that is what we are doing here and it is time we used that power.

Julia Reid (EFDD). – Madam President, the rapid deforestation on the islands of Sumatra and Borneo in Indonesia are of great concern, in particular the threat of extinction to the species that live there. In fact Borneo and Sumatra are the only places on earth where tigers, rhinos, orang-utans and elephants coexist. Such deforestation, caused by the increased demand for palm oil over the past 20 years, is driven in part by the demand for their use in biofuels and biomass, and has led to the decimation of parts of both the Indonesian and Amazonian rainforests. To add insult to injury, these wildernesses, teeming with wildlife, are being replaced by huge palm oil plantations, a sterile monoculture that supports very few living creatures. Coupled with illegal logging, we are witnessing an ecological disaster, as these wildernesses are being sacrificed on the altar of anthropogenic global warming climate change. However, my party UKIP, are unable to support this report as we believe that legislation such as this is too important to be decided by the European Union, and should be left to nation states collaborating at international, rather than at European, level.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, il est de notre devoir de faire le maximum pour lutter contre la déforestation.

En effet, les forêts jouent un rôle essentiel en matière d'adaptation au changement climatique et d'atténuation des effets de ce dernier. Or, le développement très rapide, ces dernières années, de la monoculture du palmier à huile est à l'origine d'une partie de la déforestation mondiale. L'Union européenne, en tant que consommatrice d'huile de palme, a donc un rôle majeur à jouer.

Plusieurs pistes ont été lancées dans ce rapport et certaines me semblent particulièrement importantes, notamment le soutien d'une production d'huile de palme durable, garante de la forêt, qui assure une grande transparence dans la production et une bonne traçabilité tout en permettant le maintien de l'agriculture locale et de ses emplois. Dans ce cadre, je soutiens les propositions en faveur d'une information plus simple et plus compréhensible pour les consommateurs sur l'huile de palme durable, ainsi que la mise en place d'une certification unique.

J'aimerais m'arrêter un instant sur la question des biocarburants. Il ne faut pas confondre la question de l'huile de palme avec celle, plus globale, des huiles végétales, telles que le colza, qui peuvent être des coproduits nécessaires à notre autosuffisance en matière de protéines tout en répondant à une logique d'économie circulaire.

À mon sens, ce sujet relève pourtant de la révision de la directive «Énergie» et je regrette que certains aient voulu utiliser ce rapport pour préempter les discussions.

Susanne Melior (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, verehrter Kommissar Vella! Wir haben hier heute mit Palmöl ein ganz wichtiges Thema auf der Tagesordnung. Ich danke der Berichterstatterin auch ganz herzlich für die gute gemeinsame Arbeit im Vorfeld. Wir haben bei verschiedenen technischen Treffen, aber dann auch im *shadow meeting*, ganz gut zusammengearbeitet und auch eine gute Empfehlung ausgearbeitet.

Es sind immerhin 40 % der weltweiten Entwaldung, die durch die Schaffung großflächiger Palmöl-Monokulturen verursacht werden. Dieses Problem ist von den Kollegen hier auch mehrfach angesprochen worden: Die Entwaldung bringt es eben mit sich, dass wir 1,5 Gigatonnen Kohlenstoffdioxid zusätzlich freisetzen. Das entspricht etwa einem Viertel der jährlichen Emissionen aus fossilen Brennstoffen hier bei uns in der EU. Dadurch werden fast 70 Millionen Menschen von ungesunder Luft betroffen, und es führt zu Tausenden vorzeitigen Todesfällen.

Aber auch wertvolle Pflanzen und Tiere gehen verloren. Von daher ist es das dringendste Problem, dass wir der Entwaldung entgegenstehen und ein einheitliches Zertifizierungssystem auf den Weg bringen, was dies mit beinhaltet.

Stefan Eck (GUE/NGL). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Die Palmölproduktion ist extrem schädlich für die Biodiversität, und riesige Regenwaldflächen wurden und werden dafür zerstört. Zahlreiche Tierarten verlieren ihren Lebensraum und sterben aus. Palmöl ist auch schädlich für die Menschen, denn der Landraub durch große Konzerne treibt die indigene Bevölkerung in den Ruin. Den Preis für billiges Palmöl zahlen also Menschen, Tiere und die Natur. Palmöl rangiert nach der globalen Fleisch- und Sojaproduktion an dritter Stelle der umweltschädlichsten Agrarerzeugnisse.

Der Bericht Konečná verdient unsere Zustimmung, da er gute Lösungsvorschläge enthält. Er appelliert an die EU, die dringend erforderlichen Maßnahmen zur Minimierung der negativen ökologischen und sozialen Auswirkungen der Palmölproduktion ins Auge zu fassen. Aber mit einer Tatsache müssen wir uns abfinden: Wirklich ökologisch nachhaltig und sozial produziertes Palmöl gibt es nicht und wird es auch in Zukunft nicht geben. Sagen wir also, Herr Kommissar, mit diesem Bericht der unregelten Palmölproduktion gemeinsam den Kampf an.

Martin Häusling (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Kommissar Vella, ich bin enttäuscht von Ihrer Antwort, die Sie gegeben haben. Das ist leider sehr unambitioniert, und Sie setzen auf freiwillige Partnerschaften. Damit wird das Problem nicht gelöst werden. Wir müssen was am Verbrauch tun, das haben viele Kollegen gesagt. Palmöl ist ein Billigmacher in Nahrungsmitteln und kann ersetzt werden. Aber was ein echter Skandal ist, ist dass 45 % des Palmöls – immerhin eine Million Hektar – tatsächlich in Agrotreibstoffe wandern. Das müssen wir doch sofort beenden und nicht erst 2020. Das ist schmutziger Treibstoff, und da kann man nicht noch ein Umweltetikett draufkleben.

Wir müssen aber auch angehen, dass europäische Firmen, europäische Banken noch an der Finanzierung des Geschäfts mitwirken. Da müssen wir einen Riegel verschieben. Aber wir sind uns ja alle im Klaren: Ein Großteil der Entwaldung geht auf das Konto von Palmöl, auch ein Großteil der Emissionen geht auf das Konto von Palmöl, und dann gibt es trotzdem noch welche, die dann mit Nachhaltigkeitszertifikaten wie dem Runden Tisch für Palmöl kommen. Es gibt im Moment keine nachhaltige Zertifizierung, die wirklich ihren Namen verdient. Wir müssen Kriterien anlegen, die wirklich nachhaltig sind, und nicht diesen Etikettenschwindel noch mitmachen.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che su una cosa oggi tutti quanti siamo d'accordo: dobbiamo utilizzare un olio di palma che sia prodotto in modo sostenibile e non ci deve più essere questa deforestazione selvaggia, soprattutto in Indonesia.

Tante altre cose però non sono comprensibili, e lì ci dividiamo. Intanto io vorrei ricordare che l'olio di palma viene coltivato oltre che in Malesia e in Indonesia anche in altri 17 paesi della fascia equatoriale, e fornisce così sussistenza economica a milioni di persone. Poi dobbiamo ricordare – come è stato già ricordato – che se noi sostituiamo l'olio di palma con altri oli vegetali andiamo a consumare ancora più terreno, perché l'olio di palma ha una resa superiore tra le cinque e le undici volte rispetto a tanti altri oli.

E poi non occorre parlare con le industrie, basta parlare con i tecnici e con i nutrizionisti per capire che l'olio di palma ha molte caratteristiche anche utili, per esempio per la salute, perché l'olio di palma, essendo praticamente solido a temperatura ambiente, non ha bisogno di idrogenazione e quindi è più idoneo a limitare, per esempio, i rischi di malattie cardiovascolari rispetto agli acidi grassi trans derivanti dal processo di idrogenazione. Sono tantissime le qualità che questo olio ha, e non può essere sostituito, per esempio, neanche dal burro – e qui sotto io ci vedo anche una guerra commerciale – perché il burro contiene leggermente più acidi grassi saturi, si irrancidisce più rapidamente e abbrevierebbe quindi la vita dei prodotti.

Quindi, per concludere, il nostro messaggio è questo: la soluzione non è boicottare l'olio di palma ma comprarlo sostenibile, assicurandone la tracciabilità.

Pavel Poc (S&D). – Paní předsedající, především bych chtěl pogratulovat a poděkovat kolegyni Kateřině Konečné, že se jí podařilo toto téma dostat na agendu plenárního zasedání Evropského parlamentu. Evropané se totiž zajímají o to, zda a jak svými spotřebitelskými preferencemi napomáhají k ničení životního prostředí, biodiverzity i místních komunit, v tomto případě ekosystému deštného pralesa a zemědělství a místních komunit v jihovýchodní Asii.

Nyní tedy konečně v tomto smyslu jasně vystupuje i Evropský parlament. Já doufám, že Evropská komise a členské státy teď skutečně udělají všechno pro to, aby od roku 2020 byl v Evropské unii používán výhradně palmový olej z udržitelné produkce, a to podle jednotné certifikace. V kompromisním textu také Evropský parlament požaduje postupné ukončení používání palmového oleje a dalších rostlinných olejů jako složky biopaliv s preferencí od roku 2020. V tomto ohledu bych uvítal tvrdší výsledek, ale toto je začátek a jsem za něj rád.

György Hölvényi (PPE). – Elnök asszony! Először is hadd köszönjem meg mindenkinek a munkát, mert itt azért látszik, hogy itt pártok között is van egyfajta tapasztalható konszenzus. Na most, a Fejlesztési Bizottság által készített vélemény néppárti felelőseként, mindenek előtt a pálmaolaj termelő vidéken élők és az ott dolgozók szempontjait szeretném kiemelni. Nagy kísértés lenne természetesen környezetvédelmi szempontokról is beszélni. A pálmaolaj-előállítás nagyrészt hatalmas piaccal rendelkező nemzetközi nagyvállalatokhoz köthető, habár ezek a cégek egyfajta munkát, megélhetést nyújtanak a lakosoknak, végtelenül kiszolgáltatottá is teszi az itt élőket.

Arról nem is beszélve, hogy a helyi kistermelőknek esélyük nincs versenybe szállni az óriásvállalatokkal. A pálmaolaj-kitermeléssel járó környezeti hatásokat, mindenek előtt az erdőirtás következményeit, amiről itt már ugye nagyon sok szó esett, a helyi lakosok szenvedik el. Szeretném megmondani, hogy látom, két feladatunk van: mindenképpen kísérjük kellő súllyal és figyelemmel, ezt tesszük ma itt is, az ott élők érdekeit. A fejlesztési politikánk kialakítása során környezetvédelmi és fenntarthatósági szempontokat együtt képviseljük, és egy biztos, hogy meggyőződésem, hogy Európa a pálmaolaj előállításának a jelenlegi rendjében nem lehet az erdőirtások és az embertelen munkakörülmények hasznélvezője.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o óleo de palma é largamente utilizado na indústria alimentar e também no setor dos cosméticos e biocombustíveis e a verdade é que, nos últimos 20 anos, a sua produção tornou-se insustentável e resultou numa desflorestação massiva, na perda de *habitats* naturais, à quase extinção de muitas espécies e ao consequente aumento das emissões de gases com efeito estufa. São também reportados muitos casos de trabalho infantil e de expropriação de terras indígenas para a produção de óleo de palma.

Neste quadro, a União Europeia – que é o terceiro maior mercado mundial desta matéria-prima – tem uma grande responsabilidade. Deve assumir um papel liderante no combate a práticas de desperdício e de abuso no consumo de óleo de palma e adotar critérios de mínimos de sustentabilidade nas suas importações desta matéria – que devem ser certificadas – e deve também ser eliminado gradualmente o uso destes óleos vegetais na produção de biocombustíveis, aumentada a rastreabilidade e a etiquetagem e também a informação aos consumidores. Este relatório é um passo na direção certa e, por isso, quero felicitar os seus relatores.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Mevrouw Kateřina, dank u voor het prachtige verslag. Het behoud van het regenwoud en de wereldwijde biodiversiteit zijn van levensbelang voor de toekomst van de mensheid, en daar spreken we over. Maar palmolie is niet de enige oorzaak van de wereldwijde ontbossing. De groeiende wereldvoedselvraag, de bevolkingsdruk en de illegale houtkap zijn ook oorzaken. Laten we daarom duurzaamheidsinspanningen van lidstaten en bedrijven, zoals in Nederland, ondersteunen en navolgen.

Europa, onze Europese Commissie en allen: onderteken de verklaring van Europa en van Amsterdam! Vóór het jaar 2020 gebruiken we dan alleen gecertificeerde duurzame palmolie. Duurzame palmolie is onmisbaar voor onze voedingssector, die zowel werkgelegenheid als natuurlijk ook een hele goede bron oplevert voor heel veel voedselproductie. Onderzoek en ondersteun daarnaast ook onze Europese oliën en vetten, zoals koolzaad, botervet, alternatieven, waardoor synergie met bestaand Europees beleid bereikt wordt. Nieuwe diervoeders en circulaire biobrandstoffen van de tweede en derde generatie zijn een deel van de oplossing!

Tot slot, Europese boeren voeden de wereldbevolking. Geef hun de ruimte, maar laat onze Europese akkers dan ook optimaal benut worden voor onder andere vlas zonnebloemen en koolzaad.

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já chci také poděkovat mé kolegyni Kateřině Konečné za zprávu, kterou se jí podařilo předložit ve spolupráci s dalšími poslanci. Je to vlastně příspěvek Evropského parlamentu k ochraně životního prostředí. Je to také naše odpovědnost, neboť Evropská unie je druhým největším dovozcem palmového oleje. Máme tak šanci změnit chování producentů oleje a docílit tak zlepšení této situace. Konkrétním přínosem by bylo vytvoření jednotného zavazujícího certifikátu, který by dával spotřebitelům jasnou informaci o původu palmového oleje a tady očekávám aktivitu od Evropské komise.

Samozřejmě by přispělo také vytvoření transparentnějšího pozemkového registru v producentských zemích, zde ale je jeho zřízení v rukou producentských zemí, jako je Indonésie či Malajsie. Evropská unie by v této věci měla být iniciativní v rámci mezinárodních jednání. Jen se obávám, aby rychlost těchto kroků byla rychlejší než nenapravitelné ničení přírodního bohatství.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, quiero felicitar a la ponente y a los ponentes alternativos —especialmente a Paul Brannen, mi colega— por este informe de iniciativa en el que se recogen, en particular, los impactos ambientales de la industria del aceite de palma, a la par que se fomenta una producción más sostenible de este producto.

En las últimas dos décadas, el cultivo intensivo de aceite de palma ha llevado a la deforestación masiva de alguno de los ecosistemas más preciados —y eso es un hecho incuestionable que todos debemos reconocer hoy aquí—, lo que ha llevado a algunas especies al borde de la extinción. La Unión Europea es el tercer consumidor de aceite de palma; por lo tanto, tenemos una gran responsabilidad.

Se han adoptado ya algunas medidas, pero aún no son suficientes para acabar con la creciente demanda de este aceite de palma. Hay que tomar medidas más estrictas en el ámbito europeo y realizar campañas informativas destinadas a los consumidores para que puedan tomar mejor sus decisiones; un régimen único de certificación es un buen camino para ello también.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, na semana passada, na cidade de Mocoa, no sul da Colômbia, 250 pessoas perderam a vida devido a intensas chuvadas e deslizamentos de terra que arrasaram dezassete bairros daquela povoação.

Na capital da Indonésia, também na semana passada, ocorreu um incidente semelhante que ceifou a vida a várias pessoas e deixou outras tantas desaparecidas. Um pouco por todo o mundo sucede-se este tipo de calamidades que, normalmente, afeta aqueles que são os mais vulneráveis da sociedade: os pobres e os indigentes.

A causa é recorrente: a destruição intensiva dos *habitats* florestais através da constante desflorestação para exploração agrícola e para a construção de infraestruturas, tais como diques e barragens.

Entendo que este é o momento certo para que a União Europeia promova um plano de ação contra a desflorestação e a degradação das florestas, bem como a produção de óleo de palma. São muitos os vastos problemas que hoje atingem os ecossistemas tropicais, que apenas ocupam 7 % da superfície terrestre. O óleo de palma está a ser cada vez mais utilizado como biocombustível e uma parte substancial da sua produção não respeita os direitos humanos, recorrendo à mão de obra infantil.

Este relatório destaca que o respeito pelos direitos humanos fundamentais, a proteção da floresta e a produção sustentável de óleo de palma são objetivos conciliáveis entre si. Resta agora a União Europeia empreender esforços para que, até 2020, a totalidade do óleo de palma consumido na Europa seja sustentável. Espero que a votação de amanhã possa refletir a urgência de uma ação.

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Palmių aliejus yra grėsmė ne vien atogrąžų miškams. Palmių aliejus jau senokai naudojamas maisto pramonėje kaip „augaliniai riebalai“. Pigus palmių aliejus iš vis didesnio kiekio maisto produktų išstumia natūralų sviestą, juo pakeičiami pieno riebalai. Kai kuriuose net kūdikiams skirtuose mišiniuose jis sudaro iki ketvirčio visos produkto masės. Tai turi tiesioginį poveikį visam Europos žemės ūkiui: naudodami importuotą palmių aliejų mes ne tik skatiname atogrąžų miškų naikinimą, tačiau ir atimame pragyvenimo šaltinį iš savo ūkininkų – pieno gamintojų bei perdirbėjų. Ar to reikia mums, europiečiams, ir taip turintiems pieno ir jo produktų perteklių? Todėl pritariu visoms iniciatyvoms, skirtoms palmių aliejaus naudojimui ir importui mažinti.

Jean-Paul Denanot (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, la révision de la directive sur l'énergie sera bientôt présentée au Parlement, je commence donc à travailler sur les questions de méthanisation. J'ai découvert avec beaucoup d'inquiétude que des systèmes de méthanisation utilisaient à la fois des céréales et des huiles alimentaires, dont l'huile de palme. Pour ma part, je refuse de voir des productions comestibles être massivement utilisées dans la production de carburant.

Dans le cas de l'huile de palme, cette question se double de problématiques de déforestation des forêts humides indispensables aux équilibres climatiques, de dérives sur les conditions de travail ainsi que d'une pollution extrêmement dangereuse pour les populations locales, tout cela au profit de quelques-uns.

Sans condamner l'huile de palme, il faut aujourd'hui prendre des dispositions afin que ce produit ne soit utilisé en Europe que pour les besoins indispensables. Il serait inconséquent de l'utiliser comme source de carburant, par exemple, mais aussi comme élément de friture, notamment dans les restaurations collectives.

En fait, il faut mettre en place une gestion durable, équilibrée et surveillée entre producteurs et consommateurs.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, палмовото масло намира все по-широко приложение заради по-евтината цена като суровина спрямо сходни такива продукти, но този спестен разход за тази суровина ще рефлектира в многократно по-високите разходи за обществено здраве и от държавните бюджети и цената, която ще трябва да платят потребителите.

Смятам за стряскаща информацията, че палмовото масло се използва в производството на детски и бебешки храни. Според оценка на експерти 50% от всички храни в Европейския съюз съдържат палмово масло. Наскоро Европейският орган за безопасност на храните публикува информация, че продуктът е канцерогенен и генотоксичен.

Порочните практики явно са предприети от недобросъвестни производители, но затова трябва да се намеси Европейската комисия и да забрани използването на суровината в хранително-вкусовата промишленост. Само за миналата година в моята страна България са използвани 12 хиляди тона в хранително-вкусовата промишленост.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Zehn Millionen Liter Palmöl fließen täglich in der Europäischen Union in die Treibstoffkanister, in den Tank. Alleine im Zeitraum 2010 bis 2014 hat die Beimischung von Palmöl im sogenannten Biotreibstoff sich versechsfacht. Durch die aufgezeigten Beispiele, von denen wir heute gehört haben, zeigt sich, dass hier der Gedanke, nachhaltig zu wirtschaften, ad absurdum geführt wird. Nur ein Beispiel: Alleine in Malaysia und Indonesien sind in den letzten 25 Jahren Wälder abgeholzt worden, die dem gesamten Waldbestand der Republik Österreich entsprechen. Weitere 30 % der österreichischen Flächen entsprechen jenen Flächen, die ursprünglich in Malaysia und Indonesien Moorböden waren. Wir sehen, hier wird nicht nur der Mensch geschädigt, hier wird die Natur geschädigt, hier wird die Biodiversität geschädigt. Wir müssen dem Palmöl das Aus ansagen.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all, I agree with Susanne Melior, who said that this is a very important discussion. I would like to thank you all for sharing your views on this important matter.

As you have confirmed, deforestation is a very complex issue and I think we can agree on a number of points. But we need to take a broader look at deforestation because it is not caused only by the palm oil industry. On the other hand, not all the palm oil industry produces deforestation. So we cannot take a black and white approach. Here I would like to draw a parallel with agriculture. As in all activities, agricultural activity has both good and bad practices. I agree totally that we need to have a more sustainable agriculture, but we cannot say that we have to scrap all agriculture.

A number of colleagues mentioned traceability. I think that traceability and informing consumers about the sustainable production of products also helps a great deal as consumers can take on – and I think consumers should take on – their environmental responsibilities as well. I agree with Bas Eickhout who said that the power of consumers cannot be underestimated. We all agree that we should stop irregular and unsustainable production, not just of palm oil, but any unsustainable production of any product. But do we all agree that all production of palm oil is irregular, illegal or unsustainable? Julie Girling also mentioned palm oil certification. The Commission is also specifically looking at the issue of palm oil certification schemes through a dedicated study which will inform its ongoing work on deforestation.

Some Members also mentioned palm oil as a biofuel. We need to work on sustainable production, but we also need to work on sustainable consumption, including biofuels. The Commission has already proposed revising the Renewable Energy Directive to gradually reduce the share of food-based biofuels after 2020. Already this directive does not allow biofuels to count towards renewable energy targets if they come from land that has been deforested since 2008.

I think the final speaker or the speaker before last also mentioned that palm oil in baby food is toxic and harmful. Here our information is that the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) is working on this, but there is no proof that these products are toxic or harmful.

I will conclude by saying that this report by Parliament is a very useful contribution to the debate. I have already mentioned that the Commission launched a study last year which will give us a better insight into this industry. In addition, the Commission will also be organising a conference on illegal logging and deforestation in the coming months in Brussels, bringing together producer and consumer countries, as well as private sector and civil society organisations. Here I would like to mention that Kateřina and all her colleagues could – and should – also participate in this conference. I trust that this conference will provide a very useful opportunity to strengthen our dialogue with third countries and trigger further contributions to the Commission's work on deforestation.

Finally, once again, I would like to thank Kateřina Konečná and her colleagues for their good work.

Kateřina Konečná, *zpravodajka*. – Vážené kolegyně a vážení kolegové, dovoluji vám moc poděkovat za tu debatu, která tady proběhla, a mám víru v zítřejší hlasování a v to, že snad už teď, byť by se to nemělo říkat dopředu, mohu říct, že se nám povedl obrovský kus práce.

Já bych chtěla snad jen podotknout, že se rozhodně téma palmového oleje a také to byl důvod, proč se ta zpráva rozšířila ze tří stran na dvacet, netýká pouze odlesňování, týká se obchodu s dětmi, lidské práce, týká se sociálních aspektů, týká se biodiverzity, týká se neskutečně spousty témat. A jak tady řekl jeden z kolegů – možná v tuto chvíli hasíme nejen požár v Indonésii, ale hasíme požár, který jsme dlouho přehlíželi právě tím, jak jsme dovolili, aby produkce palmového oleje rostla a naše spotřeba rostla neuvěřitelným způsobem.

Já chci jenom dodat to, že jsem moc ráda, že my tady v Evropském parlamentu jsme zvládli tu debatu jako debatu komplexní. Debatu, která možná nebyla tak vyhrocená a emoční, jak si někteří na začátku představovali, ale která byla věcná, apolitická, vyvážená a pevně věřím, že v té zprávě najdete vše, co se palmového oleje týká. Koneckonců to konstatovali nejen nevládní organizace, kterým moc děkuju za podporu, ale také průmysl, se kterým jsme o těch věcech otevřeně komunikovali, a všichni, kteří se o to téma zajímali, vyjma některých lobbistických organizací z některých zemí, které nás ani nekontaktovaly, ale nyní různě komunikují přes Twitter a Facebook a píšou vám e-maily o tom, jak je vše špatně. Garantuji vám, že kdyby se chtěly sejít, měly možnost a nikdy tak neučinily.

Komise má řadu doporučení, já za ně děkuju. Díky za tu studii, na kterou čekáme a podle mých původních informací měla být už v únoru. Ale nemůže to být o studiích, o doporučeních, o konferencích, pane komisaři, prosím, tohle už musí být o konkrétních věcech a konkrétních činech, nejenom Evropské komise, ale nás všech. My vám v té zprávě snad ukazujeme cestu. Já děkuji, že za tím společným cílem možná půjdeme různými cestami, ale dojdeme do toho společného cíle a dojdeme do něj včas. To bude to nejdůležitější, co pro budoucnost naší planety a naše děti můžeme udělat.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 4 avril 2017.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Carolina Punset (ALDE), por escrito. – Europa es uno de los mercados más importantes para el aceite de palma, pues destina casi el 50 % a la fabricación de biodiesel. Aunque nos empeñamos con fuerza en limitar las emisiones de CO₂, no tenemos ningún reparo en importar aceite de este tipo, un 300 % más contaminante que la combustión de diésel fósil, según recoge el informe Globiom, realizado para la Comisión. Nuestra extrema hipocresía nos hace eludir responsabilidades ambientales, sociales y ecológicas solo porque es el más barato de los aceites vegetales. La Comisión debe abordar el final del uso de aceite de palma como materia prima de biocombustible. Europa tiene la fuerza del tercer consumidor mundial para detener la mayor y más rápida deforestación de la historia de la humanidad, sobre todo en los bosques de Borneo y Sumatra. ¿Realmente existe un cultivo de palma sostenible? Creo firmemente que no y solo la falta de perspectiva del problema del calentamiento global nos hace pensar que esto pueda ser así. Mientras nos planteamos establecer tasas de ajuste en frontera a la importación de materiales de construcción y cemento, denuncio que nadie proponga establecer estas tasas para atenuar el descalabro que el monocultivo de aceite de palma conlleva para el calentamiento global.

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), in writing. – The EU renewable energy policy is driving demand for biofuels within and beyond Europe's borders. This has led to massive land-use change in various parts of the world and can have serious consequences. The competition for arable land has affected food security at local level as well as global food prices. Some biofuels can even emit more greenhouse gases than the fossil fuels they were supposed to replace. Given these concerns, I welcome the measures proposed in this report. A phasing out of palm oil will reduce the risk of associated deforestation and damaging land-use change. And certification based on sustainability criteria will reduce demand for the most damaging biofuels. Bio-based fuels are not infinite natural resources which can be exploited without consequences. Over-exploitation requires huge amounts of land, water, fertilisers and pesticides, causing pollution, soil degradation, and damage to ecosystem services. A bio-based economy must be developed in the right way, because using the wrong sources of bio-energy can do far more harm than good.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D), în scris. – Agenda 2030 angajează Uniunea Europeană să promoveze gestionarea durabilă a pădurilor, prin stoparea defrișărilor, refacerea pădurilor degradate și creșterea substanțială a împăduririlor și reîmpăduririlor. Acest deziderat este posibil prin oferirea de modele de producție și consum durabile și de practici durabile atât companiilor, cât și consumatorilor, în conformitate cu politicile și prioritățile naționale.

În același timp, consumul de ulei de palmier, preconizat a se dubla în 2050, solicită defrișări ale pădurilor tropicale, ceea ce înseamnă distrugerea habitatelor naturale, a ecosistemelor și biodiversității, precum și favorizarea schimbărilor climatice. Mai mult decât atât, producția de ulei de palmier aduce atingere drepturilor și libertăților fundamentale ale celor implicați în respectivul proces.

De asemenea, uleiul de palmier (Dende), cel mai folosit în industria alimentară, potrivit Autorității Europene pentru Siguranța Alimentară a Uniunii Europene (EFSA), este cancerigen.

Ca atare, sunt necesare intensificarea cercetărilor și campaniilor de informare privind impactul utilizării și consumului de ulei de palmier asupra sănătății și siguranței umane și asupra mediului, precum și cercetarea dimensiunii sociale a producției, utilizării și consumului uleiului de palmier.

20. Composition of delegations : see Minutes

21. Fraudulent practices in the Brazilian meat sector (debate)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur la question orale à la Commission sur les pratiques frauduleuses dans le secteur de la viande au Brésil de Czesław Adam Sierkierski, au nom de la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural (O-000025/2017 — B8-0213/2017) (2017/2635(RSP)).

Czesław Adam Sierkierski, autor. – Szanowni Państwo! Podejmujemy ważny temat dla funkcjonowania rynku światowego, w tym wypadku przede wszystkim dla naszych relacji handlowych z krajami Mercosuru. Najważniejszy jest tutaj problem standardów i przestrzegania pewnych zasad, ale również kwestie wzajemnego zaufania między partnerami. W tym właśnie kontekście należy rozpatrywać ostatnie incydenty w Brazylii, które – miejmy nadzieję – są tylko incydentami, a nie stałą praktyką związaną, po pierwsze, z wysłaniem na rynek unijny mięsa niespełniającego standardu, po drugie, z naruszeniem zasad współpracy, będących podstawą relacji handlowych.

W Unii Europejskiej mamy wysokie standardy. Nasi konsumenci i my wszyscy oczekujemy takich samych wymogów dla towarów importowanych. A tutaj mowa o żywności, która ma przecież istotny wpływ na zdrowie ludzkie.

Przejdę teraz do pytania zgłoszonego przez Komisję Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, a przygotowanego przy aktywnym udziale wielu członków naszej komisji, ale także innych posłów.

Operacja Carne Fraca – dwuletnie śledztwo brazylijskiej policji federalnej dotyczące dwóch największych brazylijskich zakładów przetwórstwa mięsnego (JBS i BRF) w siedmiu głównych brazylijskich stanach produkujących wołowinę – wzbudziła ogromne zaniepokojenie. Śledztwo ujawniło poważne nadużycia i korupcję w sektorze, w którym do łańcucha żywności wprowadza się potencjalnie niebezpieczne i oszukańcze produkty stanowiące zagrożenie dla europejskich konsumentów.

Według śledczych inspektorzy federalni otrzymywali pieniądze w zamian za ignorowanie fałszerstw lub wygaśnięcia terminu przydatności do spożycia przetwarzanej żywności. Fałszowano także zezwolenia sanitarne i świadectwa wywozowe. Ponadto śledztwo wykazało, że w celu poprawy wyglądu i zapachu przeterminowanego mięsa stosowano chemikalia, a także dodawano do mięsa tańsze produkty. Europejscy konsumenci są poważnie zaniepokojeni doniesieniami, że mięso zakażone salmonellą zostało wyeksportowane do Europy oraz że w celu poprawy wyglądu zepsutego mięsa stosowano kwas askorbinowy.

Brazylia jest największym na świecie eksporterem wołowiny i drobiu. Jest także największym dostawcą mięsa w Unii, który co roku wprowadza na nasz rynek setki tysięcy ton wołowiny i drobiu. Europejscy producenci i konsumenci oczekują, że całe mięso przywożone do Unii będzie spełniać wysokie europejskie standardy jakości w odniesieniu do żywności.

1. Czy Komisja może podać szczegóły dotyczące importu tych skażonych produktów do Unii z wyszczególnieniem wolumenu podejrzanych produktów oraz rynków europejskich, na które produkty te zostały sprzedane?

2. Dlaczego europejskie służby kontroli nie wykryły tego systemowego oszustwa polegającego na wprowadzaniu na rynek Unii sfałszowanego mięsa? Jakich porad Komisja udzieli państwowi członkowskiemu, aby mogły wzmocnić kontrolę w następstwie przedmiotowych doniesień?

3. Z uwagi na fakt, że skandal ten budzi zaniepokojenie co do bezpieczeństwa żywności, w jaki sposób doniesienia te wpłyną na toczące się negocjacje handlowe z państwami Mercosuru? Czy nadszedł już czas na przegląd negocjacji i wycofanie mięsa z planu negocjacji handlowych?

Koniec pytania. Przedstawiłem pytanie w imieniu Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi, a teraz mój krótki komentarz. Zaistniałą sytuację musimy wykorzystać do przeglądu naszych relacji w zakresie zasad i systemu kontroli po stronie brazylijskiej i jasno domagać się likwidacji błędów i niedociągnięć, które tam występują. Ważne jest, żeby strona brazylijska sama odkryła te nieprawidłowości, a jak wynika z informacji z Brazylii, jej służby zajmowały się tą sprawą od pewnego czasu. Szkoda jednak, że nie było w tym zakresie współpracy ze stroną unijną. Sądzę, że wspomniany przeze mnie przegląd może dokonać nowego otwarcia, które należy uwzględnić w negocjacjach z Mercosurem. Również my w Unii musimy wyciągnąć wnioski i przeprowadzić ocenę naszego systemu kontroli. Ta sytuacja powinna przyczynić się do lepszych relacji w przyszłości oraz respektowania przez stronę brazylijską wymogów unijnych.

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, thanks largely to the solid set of legislation, which aims to ensure that food is safe for consumers, the European Union has probably the world's highest food safety standards. Our European Union system imposes strict hygiene and safety controls on food imports, and in particular on animal products for which systematic documentary, identity and physical checks are compulsory.

Immediately after the information became known about the deficiencies in food licensing in Brazil, on 17 March, and following the Commission's advice, Member States – in addition to the existing documentary and identity controls – introduced reinforced physical controls to ensure the safety of imports from Brazil, focusing on food hygiene requirements. As soon as news came to light about the fraudulent practices in the Brazilian meat sector, the Commission asked the Brazilian authorities to ensure that there were no exports to the EU from any establishments in Brazil that could bear a risk of non-compliance with European Union requirements.

We immediately introduced a request to ban the imports from establishments implicated in the scandal; we requested the reinforcement of control checks at EU borders and we made clear to the Brazilian authorities our dissatisfaction, including learning of this crisis in the media rather than through official channels. We continue to ensure that Member States authorities are continuously informed about the evolution of the situation; we are preparing urgent audits of Brazil. In addition, let me stress that all consignments currently en route to the EU from the establishments implicated in the fraud will be rejected and returned to Brazil.

The importance of the controls on imports at the point of entry to the EU – at border inspection posts – is crucial. The Commission is in close contact with the Member States to ensure a harmonised approach as regards these reinforced checks. A full consensus was reached on these reinforced checks and on the way they should be selected. In particular, it was confirmed that there should be 100% physical checks on all consignments presented for import to the EU and 20% microbiological checks. It was also confirmed that importers would be liable for the cost of these reinforced checks.

In the light of the outcome of these reinforced checks, the evolution of the situation and the response of the Brazilian authorities to the demands for corrective measures, the Commission and the Member States will decide whether further measures are necessary. In this regard, the protection of European consumers will be the determining factor. The Commission will also undertake audits of Brazil as soon as possible and not later than mid-May. I would like to use this opportunity to thank Members of the European Parliament for their recent vote in favour of the new official control legislation which will enable the Commission to ensure even more vigorous controls of imported food products.

Let me also reassure you of my personal commitment to ensure the safety of European consumers. With this objective firmly in mind, I met with the Brazilian Minister of Agriculture, Mr Maggi, last Tuesday in Brazil. I had an open, long and frank discussion with the minister. I asked him to provide more information on the state of play and the next steps that he planned to take. I also stressed the need for Brazil to restore the trust, reliability, predictability and independence of the Brazilian official control system. In addition, I made a point of passing on to the Minister the positions and concerns of the Member States, as well as the requests coming from honourable Members of this Parliament.

My services also had a meeting with Brazilian officials on 30 March to further discuss this matter. It was agreed that the minister would send more details about the findings of the investigation and the possible food safety impact.

Important progress was also made on two other requests from the EU. First, the Brazilian authorities agreed on concrete steps to solve long-standing applications for export from the EU to Brazil, and to make the approval process more predictable. We also discussed how to improve our cooperation using the bilateral sanitary and phytosanitary mechanism. Second, in relation to avian influenza, Brazil also promised to accept the principle of regionalisation based on region of outbreak. Speaking about possible recognition of the EU as a single entity, the Brazilian counterparts showed some openings. However, more discussions will be needed.

In addition, we discussed cooperation on antimicrobial resistance and animal welfare. Just today we received a letter from Minister Maggi informing us, and I quote: 'the issues investigated by the federal police in the four establishments are authorised to export to the EU are related to conduct misbehaviour and economic fraud not representing any risk to food safety.' The Minister also informed me of the modification of Brazilian legislation for the inspection of products of animal origin, among other things.

Turning to the negotiations with Mercosur, trade relations between the EU and Brazil currently take place within the framework of the World Trade Organisation. However, the proposed future agreement with Mercosur would not undermine our high safety requirements.

Current as well as future imports from Mercosur countries will have to respect these requirements. This will not change. A future EU-Mercosur agreement will not lower our high regulatory standards for food safety. It will not authorise imports of agri-food products if they do not meet our high food safety requirements. The agreement will, however, reinforce cooperation with the authorities of Brazil and other Mercosur countries by means of updated provisions to establish solid information and notification systems in the sanitary and phytosanitary field. This would strengthen our reaction capacity via a privileged channel with the four countries concerned.

To conclude, let me emphasise that current and future imports into the EU will always have to meet the high quality and food standards established by our EU legislation and implemented through a credible certification and control system. Once again, a future EU-Mercosur agreement would not lower our high regulatory requirements and food safety standards for agricultural imports from Mercosur countries, including Brazil.

Mairead McGuinness, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for his detailed response. However, I have just some comments to make. On our first question we did look for some details and I am not sure that you have provided us with the details we would like. This investigation, which is a criminal investigation, was going on for two years and in that time products that were unfit for purpose were placed on the market and we need more clarity about the extent of it, and where they were sent to.

The second point I would make is in relation to the return of products on the high seas. I have to say, if I were a Brazilian consumer and I heard that this product was being returned to Brazil I would be very frightened. I would want this product destroyed somewhere and to have a guarantee of that if there is any doubt about its quality, because insofar as I worry about European consumers I clearly would have a worry too about Brazilian consumers.

In relation to how this was discovered, probably the only good part of this story is that there was an investigation and the system was found wanting. It reveals an all too close relationship between the industry and those who are inspecting it, and it reveals that where an industry is very large, then it is very powerful. While I like what you are saying, that there would be no lowering of EU standards, these are very fine words but the problem is that if you have this type of activity in an industry that is supplying the European Union today, how can you guarantee that it will not continue tomorrow? So we still have some questions.

Jean-Paul Denanot, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, à la suite du scandale de la viande avariée et à ses conséquences possibles, tant pour les consommateurs que pour les producteurs européens, la Commission a choisi de ne pas suspendre ses importations de viande en provenance du Brésil. Vous avez simplement ôté de la liste les quatre entreprises incriminées qui disposaient de licences d'exportation vers l'Union et vous avez adopté des mesures de contrôle supplémentaires en matière d'hygiène pour les viandes importées. Ces mesures sont à la fois insuffisantes et incohérentes.

Alors qu'un nouveau cycle de négociations commerciales vient de s'ouvrir entre l'Union européenne et le Mercosur, il apparaît indispensable de suspendre les importations de viande, du moins celles en provenance des régions où les défaillances ont été constatées. L'affaire «carne fraca» implique trente-trois inspecteurs du ministère de l'Agriculture dans ce vaste réseau de fraude, c'est donc bien l'ensemble du système de contrôle d'une certification de la viande au Brésil qui est remis en cause.

Dans ces conditions, Monsieur le Commissaire, quelles mesures concrètes comptez-vous prendre pour enfin protéger à la fois les consommateurs et les éleveurs européens?

James Nicholson, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I thank the Commissioner for what he has said tonight. This scandal, when I raised it in the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development – with the full support of the committee – certainly brought home to us how dangerous this situation can be. But I say to the Commissioner: this is not the first time Brazil has pulled the wool over Europe's eyes. They did it back in 2007 and 2008, and it took a delegation from this Parliament to go out there to prove that your Commission was not telling us everything.

So Commissioner, I have to say to you tonight – and the previous speakers and Ms McGuinness have referred to this – you have not answered all the questions that we asked. We need more answers. This is simply not good enough. And if they have pulled the wool over our eyes once again then we have got to ask the question: how long are we going to allow them to do similar actions as they have done in the past? I sincerely hope you are not telling us here tonight that nothing will change, because if that is the case that is unacceptable, certainly from my point of view and from the point of view of consumers throughout the European Union.

And you are quite right: you told us here tonight that we in Europe are the best, we have the highest possible standards that anyone can hope for. But that is something that has got to be kept right; and it is not right if we allow other countries to break that. And it is even more wrong that you say talks with Mercosur will go on and the negotiations there will go on. They must be ended as well.

Ulrike Müller, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Der aktuelle Fleischskandal um brasilianisches Fleisch ist auch für uns hier ein sehr sensibles Thema. Die Bürger der Europäischen Union verlangen vollkommen zu Recht, dass die hohen und weltweit anerkannten Standards innerhalb der EU auch für Importware gelten müssen. Dies bedeutet, dass diese Standards für die gesamte Produktionskette auch von unseren außereuropäischen Handelspartnern mit Nachdruck eingefordert werden müssen.

Um hier richtige Schlüsse zu ziehen und die notwendigen Maßnahmen einleiten zu können, müssen umgehend alle Fakten und Hintergründe auf den Tisch. Der Verbraucherschutz ist unbedingt zu gewährleisten. Die Bevölkerung erwartet hier eine klare Linie. Daran muss uns auch mit Blick auf die Zukunft unserer Handelsbeziehungen gelegen sein. Die Menschen wollen Transparenz und sichere, verlässliche Kontroll- und Schutzsysteme. Nur auf dieser Basis können wir das Vertrauen in die dringend notwendigen Handelsabkommen festigen.

Deshalb ist es auch in unserem Interesse, dass wir hier Gründlichkeit vor Geschwindigkeit stellen und mit einem funktionierenden, effektiven Kontrollsystem den kriminellen Machenschaften das Handwerk legen.

Matt Carthy, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Madam President, the truth is that if this Commission was prioritising the livelihoods of European farmers and the well-being of European consumers then the recent scandal relating to Brazilian meat imports would have immediately led to withdrawal from the Mercosur trade agreement talks.

Instead, last week, the Commission released a joint statement with the Mercosur trading bloc committing us to concluding a deal as soon as possible. Not a single mention whatsoever in that statement of the complete breakdown in trust following the emergence of the meat scandal just ten days previously. It appears that revelations that rotten meat, meat treated with carcinogenic chemicals, meat mixed with cardboard, that had made its way into the EU under your watch, could not dampen the enthusiasm of this Commission to try to conclude dangerous and regressive trade deals.

This time last year Commissioner Hogan told us that beef was temporarily off the table of these negotiations. But where is the follow-up timeline or detail of the conditions under which it will be brought back to the table? Where are the assurances for poultry, the sector which is actually the single largest category of meat consumed in Ireland, for example, and which faces far bigger Brazilian import quotas than even beef? What about the other sectors that stand to be impacted by cheaper, improperly treated agricultural products? Where are the assurances for consumers who should be confident that what they buy in the shops or order in the restaurants is properly treated? At what cost is this Commission actually prepared to continue pushing with these deals? It is time to protect our consumers and to protect our farmers. It is time for you, Commissioner, to ensure that we withdraw from the Mercosur trade talks.

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Kollegen! Herr Kommissar, Sie haben zwar bei dem Fall jetzt relativ schnell gehandelt, aber es stellt sich trotzdem die Frage: Was haben Sie denn vorher getan? Waren die Kontrollen effektiv? Und Sie haben auch nicht die Frage beantwortet: Ist denn wirklich Fleisch auf den europäischen Markt gekommen? Das haben Sie nicht definitiv beantworten können. Es handelt sich ja bei diesem Skandal nicht um irgendeine Bagatelle. Gammelfleisch wurde Chemie zugesetzt, das Fleisch war mit Salmonellen verunreinigt – also eine effektive Gesundheitsgefahr. Das heißt, da ist wirklich die höchste Alarmstufe angesagt. Und die Kommission macht jetzt so ein bisschen *business as usual* und sagt: „Alles kein Problem, wir haben es im Griff.“ Aber die Sache ist schwerwiegender, vor allem, weil dieser Skandal bei immerhin 21 Produktionsstätten gezeigt hat, dass da ein Systemfehler vorliegt. Massive Korruption, Betrug, auch in höchste staatliche Stellen hinein – das ist nicht mal ein kleiner Skandal, das ist ein Skandal sozusagen des ganzen brasilianischen Sektors. Und deshalb ist doch die Frage: Was für Konsequenzen ziehen Sie?

Heute ist schon mehrmals das Thema Mercosur-Verhandlungen angesprochen worden. Auch da kann es kein *business as usual* geben, da muss man doch Konsequenzen ziehen. Denn was dabei rauskommen wird, ist doch wahrscheinlich, dass die Verbraucherstandards, die Sicherheitsstandards nicht steigen werden, sondern man eher auch wieder in diesem Bereich liberalisiert und Verbraucherschutz und auch das Recht kleiner Bauern doch auch bei Mercosur eher zweitrangig ist.

Ich habe auch kein Vertrauen in die brasilianische Regierung, muss ich ganz ehrlich sagen. Wir haben ja den Agrarminister im Agrarausschuss erlebt, er ist selber ein Teil des Agrarbusiness mit 200 000 Hektar. Ich habe kein Vertrauen, dass, wenn so jemand den Skandal aufklären will, tatsächlich Konsequenzen gezogen werden.

Wir müssen als Europäer konsequent sein. Deshalb die Frage: Wird eine Delegation, eine Kommission nach Brasilien vor Ort geschickt, um sich vor Ort die Produktionsstätten anzuschauen und wirklich Konsequenz zu ziehen, Herr Kommissar?

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, this is the second time that the British beef consumers have been let down by the EU. In the first instance our consumers were conned into eating horsemeat when they thought they were eating beef. They were obliged to rely on the EU hack-up process of traceability which is only as good as the least honest person in the food chain. Now we discover that relying on the Commission to monitor the conduct of the Brazilian meat industry is a very naive aspiration. The Commission did not have a clue what was going on as grossly substandard meat arrived on EU shores from Brazil. This is particularly worrying as the Commission had ambitions for yet more Brazilian beef imports in its Mercosur negotiations.

British beef producers are subject to RPA inspections, assurance scheme inspections and the scrutiny of animal rights organisations, whilst the cost of meat processing is higher than it need be due to the EU's insistence on expensive veterinary surgeons to attend abattoirs when the experienced reliable British meat inspector had done an excellent job.

Brexit gives us the opportunity to address these problems.

Edouard Ferrand, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, ce qui nous inquiète dans ce scandale, c'est l'incapacité de la Commission à nous donner les vrais chiffres et à répondre à nos questions. Est-ce un débat pour rien? En tout cas, pour l'instant, nous n'avancons pas sur ce sujet.

Combien de temps nos concitoyens ont-ils été exposés à ce risque? Quelles quantités sont-elles réellement en cause? Ce que nous voyons, c'est que le Chili et la Chine ont immédiatement fermé leur marché alors que la Commission européenne a plutôt demandé au Brésil de revoir vaguement ses normes.

Comment est-il possible de demander aujourd'hui à nos éleveurs européens, notamment aux éleveurs français, d'observer des normes de protection sanitaires maximales alors que nous laissons entrer de la viande avariée?

Le Brésil, l'Ukraine ou la Turquie sont des pays gangrenés par la corruption et peuvent néanmoins exporter. Monsieur le Commissaire, je pense qu'il est temps de revoir nos normes et de faire en sorte que nous puissions, en Europe, effectuer des contrôles payés par les pays d'origine.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Madam President, it is vitally important to take food quality and food security seriously and the Brazilian meat scandal has reinforced this message. There can be no place for corruption at the heart of any food supply chain and we must congratulate the Brazilian police for tackling the problem. In Northern Ireland we make enormous efforts to ensure the safety and traceability of our food. However, many of the farmers and processors that I represent are questioning the ability of the Commission to guarantee that product entering the EU is of a comparably high standard. Why did the inspections not uncover this problem and leave it to the Brazilian press to break the story? Why is it that only now additional measures to ensure food safety are being adopted? As the Commission races ahead with the Mercosur trade deal, what measures will be put in place to ensure food standards and consumer safety?

Many farmers in Northern Ireland believe that the Commission has a laissez-faire attitude to imports which is quite contrary to the stringent and over-burdensome requirements placed on them. What we need is a full investigation. All affected plants must be delisted from exporting to the EU and any product from these plants removed from the food chain. If we do not get a satisfactory response from Brazil, then we should be prepared to consider a ban on imports until such times as we have a proper reassurance.

Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE). – Sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, es geht hier um Lebensmittelsicherheit, es geht hier um Transparenz, und es geht vor allem um einen fairen Wettbewerb. Der brasilianische Fleischskandal ist eine Verhöhnung der europäischen Produktions- und Tierwohlstandards, und ich glaube, dass hier wirklich der Vertrauensverlust ganz enorm ist und dass wir hier massive Schwächen bei den EU-Checks zu den Lebensmittelimporten aufgezeigt bekommen haben.

Ich frage mich aber auch, wo hier eigentlich unsere Verbraucherschützer sind, die sonst normalerweise, vor allem wenn es um europäische Produktionsstandards geht, bei den Kontrollen zum Teil wirklich nicht streng genug sein können. Wer den Zugang zum europäischen Markt haben will, muss sich an die gleichen europäischen Standards halten wie auch die europäischen Produzenten, und das auch dazuzusagen, halte ich wirklich für sehr wichtig.

Es ist höchst an der Zeit, dass wir bei den Mercosur-Verhandlungen und bei den Abkommen zum Agrarkapitel endlich auch einbremsen und stattdessen bei der Entwicklung eines Qualitätsaußenschutzes wirklich Gas geben. Konsumenten und Landwirte müssen sich darauf verlassen können, dass bei den Importen höchste Kontrollsicherheit und Qualitätsstrenge gilt.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, esta questão oral incide sobre um assunto de inegável importância já que estão em causa coisas tão importantes como a segurança alimentar e a salvaguarda da saúde pública.

A entrada, no espaço europeu, de carne estragada não pode ser tolerada, tenha ela a proveniência que tiver. Compete às autoridades comunitárias a prossecução das diligências indispensáveis para o apuramento do ocorrido e a sua imediata superação. O que não podemos é usar este caso singular como pretexto para pôr em causa o sucesso das negociações em curso visando o estabelecimento de um acordo de associação comercial entre a União Europeia e o Mercosul.

É, aliás, conveniente lembrar que este caso foi detetado e denunciado pelas próprias autoridades brasileiras e que afeta uma ínfima parte do vasto universo de produção de carne daquele país. Refere-se a 22 empresas, sendo que apenas 4 exportavam para a União Europeia.

A Comissão Europeia já veio, e bem, afirmar que a atual situação da carne brasileira não representa, de forma alguma, um obstáculo para as negociações do acordo UE-Mercosul. Resolvamos em conjunto com as autoridades brasileiras este problema fitossanitário.

Não caíamos na tentação de o transformar num grave problema de relacionamento comercial entre dois blocos regionais que têm todo o interesse em garantir a sua aproximação nos planos político, económico, cultural e também comercial.

Zbigniew Kuźmiuk (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Panie Komisarzu! Zabierając głos w debacie dotyczącej importu z Brazylii do Unii – potencjalnie niebezpiecznego dla konsumentów mięsa wołowego – chcę zwrócić uwagę, że unijne służby weterynaryjne i sanitarne tego nie wykryły, a o sprawie dowiedzieliśmy się z mediów. Taki proceder miał jednak miejsce i trwał całymi miesiącami, co potwierdza śledztwo brazylijskiej policji, prowadzone między innymi wobec największych zakładów przetwórstwa mięsa wołowego. Do Unii tylko w roku 2016 sprowadzono z Brazylii ponad 145 tys. ton wołowiny, co stanowi aż 42 % całego importu tego mięsa do krajów Wspólnoty, i raczej nie ulega wątpliwości, że niebezpieczne dla konsumentów mięso znalazło się na europejskich stołach, a to świadczy o ogromnej skali zagrożenia bezpieczeństwa zdrowia publicznego. W tej sytuacji proponowane przez Komisję wzmożone kontrole importowanego brazylijskiego mięsa są raczej półśrodkami. Moim zdaniem, do czasu wyjaśnienia tej afery należy wprowadzić zakaz importu mięsa wołowego z tego kraju.

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Beste collega's, beste commissaris, van kalf tot biefstuk en van big tot schouderham, Europese boeren en onze vleesverwerkende industrie voldoen aan de hoogste eisen op het gebied van voedselveiligheid. Regelrechte fraude in Brazilië met vlees komt dan ook hard aan. Voedselveiligheid moet gewaarborgd blijven. Het is daarom van groot belang dat we zo snel mogelijk alle feiten op tafel krijgen. Wanneer werd duidelijk dat de voedselveiligheid in het geding was? Waar is het vlees beland? Dit soort schandalen moeten we in de toekomst voorkomen en we mogen glasharde garanties verwachten.

Daarnaast is het niet uit te leggen dat Europa ondanks onze zeer strenge eisen geen rund- en kalfsvlees mag exporteren naar Brazilië. Andersom kan Brazilië zijn vlees nog wel exporteren naar de EU. Ik vind dat we beter op moeten komen voor onze belangen, want dit is de wereld op z'n kop.

Marco Zullo (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la ringrazio commissario, ma devo dire che le sue parole ci preoccupano perché da quello che ci ha detto emerge che noi non sappiamo niente del passato. Ha parlato del futuro, di quello che faremo, ma non di quello che è stato.

Ci siamo accorti di questo scandalo grazie alle autorità investigative brasiliane. E allora io mi chiedo: e le dogane europee come si sono comportate? È già successo in passato che attraverso i porti europei sia arrivato in Europa qualcosa che non doveva arrivare – mi riferisco per esempio al caso della *Xylella*. E allora mi chiedo se questa è una disattenzione o una volontà di immettere sul mercato europeo dei prodotti per poi generare delle sacche di concorrenza sleale.

A noi questo approccio non può andar bene. Non abbiamo garanzia dalle autorità sanitarie brasiliane che facciano parte del processo che ha causato questo scandalo sulla carne avariata. E in più non sappiamo dove siamo arrivati. Non sappiamo dove è arrivata questa carne, non sappiamo chi l'ha mangiata, non sappiamo se fa male, non sappiamo nulla. Allora, al di là dei propositi per il futuro, io mi auguro che avremo anche informazioni per sapere se oggi abbiamo attentato alla salute dei cittadini europei.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, la seguridad alimentaria de los ciudadanos de la Unión Europea no puede ni debe ser tomada a la ligera.

Yo quisiera felicitar a la Comisión por la diligencia en su reacción, por la visita a Brasilia y el encuentro con el ministro de Agricultura, y también a las autoridades brasileñas por haber destapado este caso. Es un caso que viene, como ha recordado el señor Assis, circunscrito a un número reducido de supuestos.

En todo caso, una cosa es la seguridad alimentaria de nuestros ciudadanos y otra cosa es aprovechar para tirar por elevación contra el Acuerdo de Asociación Unión Europea-Mercosur.

Yo quiero recordar que los jefes de Estado y de Gobierno, reunidos en Roma, han pedido una Unión Europea más activa en la escena internacional. Y quiero recordar que el último Consejo Europeo por unanimidad decidió apoyar estas negociaciones. Y decidió apoyarlas, señora presidenta, no por nada en especial, sino porque la Unión Europea y sus ciudadanos y sus empresas pagan más de 4 500 millones de euros anuales en aranceles, que redundan naturalmente en beneficio de nuestros ciudadanos y de nuestras empresas.

Por eso, evidentemente, insisto para que la Unión Europea pueda concluir un acuerdo que respete las exigencias de seguridad de nuestros ciudadanos, un acuerdo equilibrado y ambicioso en los mejores plazos posibles entre la Unión Europea y el Mercosur.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök asszony! Én azt gondolom erről az egész kialakult helyzetről, hogy nagy kár lenne ilyenkor, mondjuk a Mercosur tárgyalásokon ütni a brazil felet, tekintettel arra, hogy valamennyi jóindulatot mindkét oldalról föl lehet tételni. De, az hogy egyes család cégek, családok, bűnözők kihasználták az európai rendszer gyengeségeit, az viszont tény.

Magyarul, akkor van helyes válaszunk, hogyha a mi magunk határellenőrzését, élelmiszer-ellenőrzését és egyáltalán az egész rendszerünket erősítjük meg, oly módon, hogy az olyan erős legyen, az annyira jól látható legyen, hogy senkinek eszébe se jusson elindítani ide, ebbe a térségbe, erre a kontinensre romlott vagy mérgezett szállítmányokat. Én azt gondolom, hogy a saját portánk előtt kéne egy kicsit söprögetni, és nem feltétlenül azonnali tilalomért kiáltani, hanem sokkal erősebb ellenőrzésért.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Terwijl Europese producenten moeten voldoen aan de hoogste standaarden voor voedselveiligheid, heeft de Braziliaanse vleessector dat vertrouwen in één klap beschadigd. Dit is een zeer ernstige zaak. Ik heb dan ook een aantal vragen aan de Commissie. Om te beginnen de belangrijkste, en collega Huitema had het er al over: hoe kan het dat Europa keer op keer kansen geeft aan de Braziliaanse vleessector, terwijl Brazilië al jaren weigert om Europees vlees, ook kalfsvlees waarvoor het geen enkele concurrentie te duchten heeft, toe te laten op de Braziliaanse vleesmarkt? Dit is een zeer oneerlijke situatie en ik vraag de Commissie dan ook om een adequate aanpak van dit probleem.

Bij het schandaal zijn Braziliaanse overheidsambtenaren betrokken. Betreft het soms ook ambtenaren in de top van het ministerie?

Ten slotte, heeft de FVO de betrokken bedrijven in het verleden bezocht? In hoeverre kijken de audits naar de traceerbaarheid van vlees ná het moment van verpakking?

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je remercie mon collègue pour sa question orale.

Nous devons relayer les inquiétudes que suscite ce scandale sanitaire tant chez les consommateurs que chez les éleveurs de viande bovine. Il est légitime de s'interroger sur la place de la viande bovine dans les négociations de l'accord avec le Mercosur. S'il est excessif de vouloir mettre un terme à cet accord, cette affaire ne doit pas être sous-estimée. Ce scandale concrétise les préoccupations dénoncées depuis plusieurs années par les éleveurs bovins et doit être pris très au sérieux par la Commission.

Dans le cadre des négociations avec le Mercosur, deux risques sont à prendre en compte: le risque sanitaire pour les consommateurs et le risque économique pour les filières d'élevage. Faute de mesures fermes pour garantir la protection des consommateurs et des éleveurs de viande bovine, le message envoyé par la Commission sera de nature à renforcer l'euroscpticisme des citoyens et le rejet des institutions européennes par les agriculteurs.

Rappelons que l'esprit de la PAC est de protéger l'agriculture européenne. Je réaffirme que l'agriculture ne peut pas être une variable d'ajustement lors de négociations commerciales.

Nicola Danti (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor commissario, a fronte dello scandalo che nelle ultime settimane ha investito il settore della carne in Brasile, chiediamo con forza alla Commissione di garantire misure tempestive a tutela della salute dei consumatori europei, e chiediamo alle autorità brasiliane la massima collaborazione nell'accertare le responsabilità e salvaguardare la propria credibilità.

Lasciatemi però sottolineare che quella di cui dibattiamo oggi è una grave frode commerciale, che non deve essere strumentalmente utilizzata come scusa per un possibile stop ai negoziati con il Mercosur. Viceversa, proprio un accordo potrà fornire un quadro giuridico più solido a tutela dei cittadini europei. I negoziati sono oggi in una fase cruciale, e mentre altri propongono guerre commerciali e protezionismo, non dovremmo lasciarci sfuggire l'opportunità di rafforzare i legami già esistenti con quest'area strategica per l'Unione europea.

Julie Girling (ECR). – Madam President, I am saddened to hear so many colleagues using this crisis as an opportunity to trot out their dogmatic anti-global views. Our reaction to the Brazilian meat scandal should not be a purely protectionist attitude. Suggestions that the scandal could undermine the negotiation of the EU-Mercosur Agreement are not only unhelpful, they are also disproportionately excessive in my view.

Four plants eligible to export to the EU were implicated in the scandal. This is very manageable in terms of an investigation. Moreover, given the increasingly interdependent nature of the global environment such a closed-minded approach would be counter-productive and damaging at a much broader level. The focus should be on finding ways better to uphold Europe's high standards. This applies both to the delivery of consumers' expectations for quality as well as ensuring that the EU producers are not penalised for adapting to ensure these standards are maintained.

I would like to see a full report identifying lessons that we can learn and measures to be enforced. I know that Mr Siekierski summed up our questions at the beginning and we would like to hear full answers.

Fernando Ruas (PPE). – Algumas palavras enquanto Presidente da Delegação para as Relações com o Brasil. Em primeiro lugar, para enfatizar que as palavras a transmitir aos nossos concidadãos devem ser de esclarecimento, tranquilidade e confiança. De facto, as autoridades dos dois lados do Atlântico agiram de forma rápida e, ao que sabemos, também de forma eficaz.

Temos, contudo, um mercado sob pressão e se hoje falamos de carne brasileira, no passado já falamos da doença das vacas loucas, da carne dos equídeos mal rotulada, da gripe das aves, enfim, até dos avisos da Organização Mundial da Saúde.

E, na verdade, quando a carne está no prato poucos consumidores sabem a sua origem ou a sua nacionalidade.

Estamos perante um problema que afeta todos e não apenas os produtores de carne de determinado país. Exige-se, então, às empresas desta cadeia de valor com vendas na Europa que cumpram estritamente a legislação, mas também se exige às autoridades competentes que garantam este cumprimento.

Em segundo lugar para reafirmar que estamos perante um caso judicial. Sublinho, por isso, o mérito da investigação das autoridades brasileiras, que identificaram estas práticas irregulares, bem como a rapidez, a transparência e a eficácia das ações subsequentes.

A concluir, lembro que o Acordo Comercial entre o Mercosul e a União Europeia é bem-vindo, pois, para além dos evidentes benefícios económicos, reforçará a proximidade e a cooperação entre os nossos povos.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, estamos sin duda ante un fraude importante porque afecta a elementos tan sustantivos como son la seguridad alimentaria y la salud pública. Por tanto, se genera una gran preocupación en los ciudadanos y conviene aclararlo; que estos debates sirvan para aclararlo.

Al parecer, la detección la hacen las autoridades brasileñas. A mí me preocupa la parte europea. ¿Qué es lo que pasa con las inspecciones? ¿Cómo se hacen? Se está diciendo que las inspecciones que se hacen son básicamente documentales, y que no se realiza el porcentaje de inspección física. Por tanto, estamos poniendo en cuestión los controles de las importaciones en productos como esta carne que procede de Brasil.

Además, no sé si es culpa de los controles de los Estados miembros o de la inspección de la Unión Europea. Conviene aclarar todos estos aspectos, porque sin duda hay un gran problema: que la ciudadanía tiene una desconfianza hacia estas producciones. Es bueno aclararlo y no confundir con otros debates.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – De oproep van de Braziliaanse autoriteiten om vertrouwen te houden in hun vleessector heeft ons zeer verbaasd, vooral omdat de inspecteurs van het ministerie van Landbouw bij het fraudeschandaal betrokken waren. Ook houdt deze regering de invoer van Europees vlees, kalfsvlees, al jaren tegen omdat ze zegt geen vertrouwen in ons te hebben. Dat is te gek voor woorden, te meer als je weet dat met name onze Europese vleesindustrie tot de belangrijkste in de wereld behoort, de wereldtop. Dat geldt niet voor de Braziliaanse producenten die onder meer – en dat zeg ik niet zomaar – grote hoeveelheden chloorwater gebruiken voor de ontsmetting. Dat mag bij onze producenten niet gebeuren, daar mag niks op zitten. Dat is in Nederland en in Europa verboden. Toch verdienen de Brazilianen jaarlijks wel 12 miljard aan de export van vlees naar Europa.

Voorzitter, commissaris, onze boeren hebben gewoon recht op een gelijk speelveld en willen ze vertrouwen in Europa behouden – iedereen is er keihard mee aan de slag – dan moeten wij nu wat gaan doen.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Das erste, was mir dazu einfällt, ist: Wir brauchen die verpflichtende Herkunftsangabe auch bei verarbeitetem Fleisch, und wir brauchen sie auch in der Gastronomie, denn nur dann hat der Konsument und die Konsumentin überhaupt die Chance, eine informierte Entscheidung zu treffen, zu wissen, wo das Fleisch, das er auf seinem Teller hat, herkommt. Wir werden in der Europäischen Union in Bälde ein neues, in vielen Bereichen verschärftes Kontrollsystem der amtlichen Kontrollen haben. Dort wollen wir kontrollieren *from farm to fork*. Es wird strenger sein, wir werden mehr Transparenz haben, wir werden mehr Unabhängigkeit haben, versuchen, Interessenskonflikte zu vermeiden. Wir haben den Whistleblower eingebaut, sodass die Möglichkeit besteht, dass hier auch Informationen unter der Hand hinausgehen, um auf diese ungesetzlichen Vorgänge, z. B. in Produktionsbetrieben, hinzuweisen.

Es wird uns aber nichts helfen, wenn bei Importen die strengen Importkontrollen stattfinden, wenn wir uns aber in Bereichen wie z. B. dem Tierschutz nicht auf unsere Partner verlassen können. Wir brauchen auch Bestimmungen in den Handelsabkommen, die darauf drängen, dass unsere sehr strengen Gesetze, die in Europa gelten, auch für unsere Importeure entlang der gesamten Produktions- und Vertriebskette gelten.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, os agricultores europeus têm feito muitos esforços ao longo de anos para produzir melhor, com altos *standards* do mundo, os mais altos *standards* ao nível do bem-estar animal, da segurança alimentar e, no caso da produção de carne bovina, com a rastreabilidade individual, como a legislação europeia obriga.

É, obviamente, importante que a Europa, quando importa animais de países terceiros, exija, pelo menos, aos países exportadores as mesmas exigências que faz aos agricultores europeus para desta forma não destruir a confiança que os consumidores têm na carne vendida na Europa, que tanto esforço tem custado aos agricultores europeus e tantos recursos económicos à União Europeia.

Neste caso devemos reconhecer que foram as próprias autoridades brasileiras a denunciar o caso, o significa que a fiscalização no Brasil funcionou mas, ao mesmo tempo, significa que na União Europeia a fiscalização não foi eficaz, porque se a carne era adulterada não foi detetada como tal no espaço da União Europeia e é sobre esta fiscalização interna, na União Europeia, Senhora Presidente, que também nos devemos questionar.

Monika Smolková (S&D) – Vážení pán komisár, veľmi pozorne som vás počúvala, čo povieť na úvod rozpravy, a musím povedať, že ma to sklamarlo. To, že zlyhali brazílske kontrolné orgány je jedna vec, ale obrovskú diery v kontrolnom systéme máme u nás v Európskej únii. Ako sa mohlo stať, že sa v rámci EÚ rozdeľovalo množstvo pokazeného mäsa, ak by kontrola fungovala?

V týchto dňoch sa na Slovensku stiahlo z distribúcie 21 ton mäsa, ktoré obsahovalo salmonelu a bolo 2 roky v soli. Ak by sme to neurobili, možno už dnes by takéto mäso jedli deti v školách, pacienti v nemocniciach, v sociálnych zariadeniach a bežní klienti v reštauráciach. Konzumentov by bolo 210-tisíc; 210-tisíc ľudí by bolo ohrozených.

Vážený pán komisár, prosím, povedzte, čo máme povedať našim obyvateľom, ktorí takýmto kauzami strácajú dôveru v EÚ a už dnes rozširujú rady euroskeptikov. Aké viete dať garancie európskym občanom, že nekalé obchodné praktiky v potravinovom dodávateľskom reťazci sa nebudú opakovať? Povedzte, kedy označíte vinníka a kedy a ako bude aj potrestaný?

Sofia Ribeiro (PPE). – Nos acordos comerciais tenho vindo a defender um mercado regulado que garanta a segurança alimentar dos produtos que entram na União Europeia, bem como condições de equidade relativamente ao seu modo de produção. Temos de proteger os agricultores europeus da competição desleal, não permitindo a entrada de produtos sem os mesmos critérios de produção que os que exigimos na União Europeia, garantindo a equidade de custos. Não podemos admitir dois critérios, um mais permissivo para os externos e outro mais exigente para os nossos agricultores.

A situação em apreço é criminosa e pontual, mas evidenciou graves falhas ao nível do controlo, que são sistémicas. É introduzida na União carne adulterada e aditivada, com prejuízo dos nossos agricultores por falta de equidade.

Eu sou a favor do Mercosul, mas sou a favor de um Mercosul «regulado» e, neste momento, é por isso que defendo a revisão das negociações do Mercosul no que concerne à carne, por uma questão de proteção do consumidor e de proteção dos agricultores europeus.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I think there is a credibility issue here. Not so much for Brazil but for the European Commission. The credibility of Brazil has been questioned for a long time, as my colleague Mr Nicholson pointed out. They, Members here, the Irish Farmers Journal, the IFA, exposed the fraudulent activity 10 years ago and here we are with another scandal now. What does the Commission do? Nothing! They are letting down European consumers. We are supposed to have the highest standards in the world within Europe, but we do not for food coming into Europe.

The first thing we should do is ban Brazilian beef. Look what happened when BSE struck in Ireland and in Europe. It was banned, and it still has not yet been lifted in some cases. Seventeen years! That is how you act to defend your citizens and your consumers.

Tolerating and asking for guarantees is no good. We must ensure that guarantees satisfy us so that our consumers can know that they are getting the highest standard of food within Europe at all times.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Geachte commissaris, eerst en vooral bedankt dat u vanavond hier bent na uw vergadering met de Raad eerder vandaag. Ik denk dat ik hier niet hoeft te herhalen dat uw aanpak doorslaggevend zal zijn voor het herstel van het consumentenvertrouwen. Ik verwacht dat de Europese audit van Brazilië die dit voorjaar gepland is, uiterst ernstig wordt uitgevoerd. Het is een noodzakelijke voorwaarde om het consumentenvertrouwen te herstellen.

In Europa moet de nadruk liggen op harmonisatie tussen de lidstaten, op alle niveaus. Frauduleuze operatoren mikken op de zwakste schakels, waar de minste controle en/of de laagste kosten zijn. Grondigere inspectie en voldoende testen, overall in de Unie, zijn onontbeerlijk.

Commissaris, ik ben een Belg. Bij ons is er geen biefstuk zonder frieten. En ook over onze Europese frieten maak ik mij zorgen. Niet over de kwaliteit ervan, noch over de veiligheid, maar wel omdat er sinds februari Braziliaanse antidumpingmaatregelen van kracht zijn tegen Europese diepvriesfrieten. Ik stelde u daarover trouwens al een schriftelijke vraag op 7 februari. En hoewel ik besef dat het geen fytosanitair probleem is, durf ik u toch te vragen om de aanpak van de Commissie hierover toe te lichten.

Interventions à la demande

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE) – Vážený pán komisár, 145-tisíc ton mäsa bolo privezených z Brazílie. Nakazeného mäsa, ktoré je impetrované salmonelou, ktoré je ošetrované karcinogénmi a ktoré je distribuované v Európskej únii. Len na naše malé Slovensko bolo distribuovaných už 21 ton mäsa a boli jednoducho už v potravinových prevádzkach, v školách a v nemocniciach.

Pýtam sa vás, pán komisár, ako je možné, že európski kontrolóri, naši hygienici, centrálné orgány, mikrobiológovia, potravinové komory neprišli na to, že z Brazílie k nám prichádza poškodené mäso. To sme sa museli dozvedieť až o tom, že Brazília sama zistila tento hrozný škandál, keď brazílski kontrolóri boli podplácaní kartelmi a prižmurovali oči nad kvalitou mäsa? Pýtam sa vás, pán komisár, čo urobíte, aby sa toto viac neopakovalo?

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, as autoridades judiciais brasileiras identificaram fraudes diversas nalguns lotes de carne exportados pelo Brasil para a Europa e outras regiões do globo. Isto é lamentável! Mas deve sublinhar-se a eficácia da operação que detetou a fraude e a rápida reação das autoridades que suspenderam empresas, lançaram auditorias e processaram os funcionários do Estado envolvidos.

Uma outra dimensão do escândalo é o impacto que poderá ter na segurança alimentar no Brasil, ou fora dele. Temos de proteger os consumidores. Esta investigação tem de ir até ao fim. Mas, neste contexto, não é aceitável usar este caso como arma de arremesso para pôr em causa o acordo comercial entre a União Europeia e o Mercosul. Na atual ordem económica e política mundial deixar escapar uma aproximação estratégica entre a Europa e uma parte importante da América Latina por calculismos setoriais, a acontecer, seria também um grande escândalo, uma visão fraca sobre uma operação que se chama «carne fraca».

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Madam President, I have a question for the Commissioner. Commissioner, you spoke of the highest safety standards in the EU, but my question is: who is taking responsibility for ensuring the safety of meat imports into the EU? As my colleague Seán Kelly said, this is not the first time. Ten years ago in this Parliament we were discussing the absence of traceability of Brazilian beef, and tonight we are discussing an even bigger scandal which shows systematic failures in controls at all levels in Brazil. European consumers rely on the Commission to ensure safe food. European farmers rely on the Commission to ensure verifiable equivalence in the food products we import. The Commission has failed in this duty. Several countries moved swiftly to ban Brazilian beef. Some have relaxed that ban, but we sat on our hands and failed our citizens and farmers again. It cannot be business as usual in the Mercosur negotiations. The mutual trust that should be there has been shattered.

Luke Ming Flanagan (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, Commissioner Andriukaitis talks about current and future safety. I notice he did not talk about our past safety because we have been let down and it is too late on that. Then he goes on to talk about continuing these trade talks, but surely the best way to guarantee the safety of European citizens is to give them access only to meat that comes from the safest system – in other words, from the European Union. Surely it makes sense to have a short supply chain and interestingly enough, I have not heard many people talk here about the fact that we have signed up to doing something about climate change. How on earth, pardon the pun, does it make sense to bring meat from that far away across the planet and potentially send it the other way – although we are not allowed to do that yet, though potentially with trade talks.

Who is mandating you to do this? Because apparently we are not going to do this. As for safety checks, how can you increase physical checks? What are you going to do – have X-ray vision? You are already physically checking it.

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, otkrivena situacija prijevara u sektoru mesa zabrinjava zbog propusta službenih kontrola koje su znale da je meso nesukladno standardima kvalitete, ali unatoč tome nisu spriječile da bude izvezeno na europsko tržište.

U međunarodnoj trgovini povjerenje partnera je ključno, a ono je u ovom slučaju bitno narušeno – i u službe nadzora i u kontrole proizvoda. Takvo ponašanje krajnje je neodgovorno jer dovodi u pitanje postojeće međunarodne trgovinske ugovore između Brazila i Europske unije.

Navedeno šteti vjerodostojnosti Brazila u poštivanju pravila WTO-a u tom sporazumu. Ova situacija dovodi u pitanje i daljnje trgovinske pregovore sa zemljama Mercosura te prisiljava države članice Europske unije da s ciljem zaštite svojih građana podignu razinu povjerenja i provjere uvoznih prehrambenih proizvoda.

Ako ne možemo vjerovati deklaracijama i certifikatima trećih država, tada su nužne domaće provjere. Ako nema međusobnog povjerenja, ne može biti niti sporazuma o slobodnoj trgovini. Uostalom, ja se uvijek zalažem za kupnju domaćeg, jer domaćeg je najbolje.

Paolo De Castro (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor commissario, lo scandalo di cui stiamo discutendo impone una seria riflessione su due aspetti distinti ma strettamente correlati tra loro. Da un lato la protezione dei nostri consumatori, per la quale è quanto mai necessario un approccio armonizzato tra gli Stati membri con maggiori controlli, non solo sulla carne in entrata, ma anche sulle partite già importate dal Brasile; dall'altro gli standard che i nostri operatori devono rispettare e che rendono i prodotti europei i più sani e sicuri al mondo.

Il rispetto di questi standard, di cui come europei dobbiamo essere orgogliosi, implica tuttavia costi e sacrifici pesanti per i produttori dell'Unione, ponendoli spesso in una posizione di svantaggio competitivo rispetto ai nostri *competitor* globali. Chiediamo quindi, commissario, che anche attraverso gli accordi commerciali in corso di negoziazione e futuri venga garantito un mercato più trasparente, orientato al perseguimento del principio di reciprocità, a livello internazionale, degli standard qualitativi applicati dall'Unione.

Solo in questo modo verrà realmente valorizzato l'approccio alla crescita che può essere dato da un ampliamento degli scambi commerciali, senza ridurre le tutele di cui godono i nostri consumatori.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Vytenis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, first of all I would like to start with this very simple question: who is responsible? Me! I am responsible. I am required to do my best and to be responsible in this situation. I would like to continue my work in this style.

Of course it is not about a trade war, it is not about protectionism, I fully agree with all of you. It is about food safety, about trust, about reliability, predictability and effectiveness of official controls in Brazil and here. Of course the fraud was in Brazil, and we all know very well how it is difficult to detect fraud because we have our own experience when we are speaking about the horsemeat scandal. Now it is very difficult to detect fraud on the ground and the Brazilian police authorities did it. Of course we will ask the Minister once again to provide us with very informative, very detailed information. We will look at such a response from the Brazilian side. As you know, in Brazil they have only three states which have the right to use the European certificate. Twenty-one establishments were involved in this situation. Only four establishments were involved in that scandal.

Of course we will see how to monitor the situation. This is why we have asked to check, to reinforce controls here in the EU – because we are speaking about the past and not only about the future – but we will ask Member States to follow all situations and once again to provide very reliable information after official and enforced controls here in our Union.

Then we will ask also to see how to introduce stricter rules today. We organised two immediate meetings with senior officials, with senior veterinary officials and they all agreed about such a harmonised approach at the moment. As you know, we do not rule out the adoption too of further measures should the situation so require, be it through the outcome of the import controls, the Commission's audit in Brazil or the information provided by Brazil, and I am ready to inform you after a few months about the situation because it is about food safety, about consumer protection, about our trust and reliability.

Of course, there is no doubt we will do our best in this way, but it is not about war between the EU and Brazil, about war between the EU and Mercosur. This is not the situation when we are speaking about a rule-based trade agreement. A rule-based trade agreement! You need to understand that the EU-Mercosur agreement must be based on rules and of course we will guarantee all possibilities to provide clear instruments to defend food safety standards.

Of course you ask me about statistics. Such statistics are available. I can send you this information additionally. Just to illustrate: in 2016 imports from Brazil of bovine animals meat was EUR 449 million and of poultry EUR 163 million. As I mentioned, of course, you also know that we have a rapid alert system and in this rapid alert system they have all the figures. I do not know about some figures which were mentioned here, they are not in line with our figures which we have in our rapid alert system.

I would like to respond to all of your questions in more detail, but I will be more than happy to continue our discussions and then to provide you additional information after the audit, after the response from the Brazilian side and also after collection of additional new information in the EU.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Mario Borghezio (ENF), per iscritto. – Lo scandalo delle carni avariate brasiliane è di portata mondiale, tanto che Cina e Corea del Sud hanno adottato misure di blocco delle importazioni. L'UE, al momento, ha solo minacciato di adottare le stesse misure. E' necessario, che l'intervento europeo sia urgente, bloccando tutte le importazioni di carne brasiliana, non solo quella prodotta e lavorata dalle aziende coinvolte nello scandalo.

La Commissione intende intervenire in questo senso? E ancora: la Commissione sta monitorando che carne infetta non sia già arrivata nei supermercati e/o sulle tavole dei cittadini europei, i quali hanno il diritto alla salvaguardia pubblica della propria salute?

Nicola Caputo (S&D), per iscritto. – Dopo due anni di indagini, la polizia federale brasiliana ha portato alla luce frodi gravissime ed episodi di corruzione sistematica in alcune aziende di trasformazione delle carni. Gli enti di controllo brasiliani avrebbero dolosamente ignorato violazioni delle più elementari norme di difesa e sicurezza alimentare. Parliamo della falsificazione di certificati d'esportazione e di autorizzazioni sanitarie, a cui si aggiunge l'uso di sostanze chimiche per migliorare aspetto e odore delle carni scadute.

Sembra addirittura che in Europa sia stata importata carne contaminata da salmonella, trattata con acido ascorbico per nascondere l'aspetto. Si tratta di palesi violazioni di norme europee. È una falla enorme nella corretta gestione della filiera alimentare, ancora più grave perché arriva dopo le assicurazioni sull'efficacia dei controlli, date anche a questa assemblea in occasione della discussione sul CETA.

La credibilità dell'Europa è pesantemente minata da questi episodi, inaccettabili atti criminali che vanno contrastati con misure rigorose e tempestive per salvaguardare la salute dei consumatori.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR), γραπτώς. – Όπως αποδεικνύεται και από την έκθεση, οι δόλιες πρακτικές των βραζιλιανών αρχών, και ιδίως των περιφερειακών κρατιδίων, σε σχέση με τις εξαγωγές ακατάλληλων και επικίνδυνων κρεάτων προς την ΕΕ είναι στην ημερήσια διάταξη, καθώς αποτελούν συνηθισμένη πρακτική εδώ και πολλά χρόνια. Αυτό είναι αποτέλεσμα και της ανεξέλεγκτης τακτικής που επικρατεί σε επίπεδο ΕΕ, η οποία στο πλαίσιο της παγκοσμιοποίησης έχει ανοίξει τις πύλες της σε αδρόες εισαγωγές γεωργικών και κτηνοτροφικών προϊόντων αμφιβόλου ποιότητας. Επιπλέον, η ηγεσία της ΕΕ με τις πολιτικές που ακολουθεί στον τομέα της Κοινής Γεωργικής Πολιτικής έχει κυριολεκτικά διαλύσει τη γεωργία και την κτηνοτροφία, με αποτέλεσμα η Ένωση να εξαρτάται ουσιαστικά από τις εισαγωγές, προκειμένου να αντιμετωπίσει τις διατροφικές ανάγκες των ευρωπαϊκών πληθυσμών. Για όλους τους παραπάνω λόγους απαιτείται πλέον η επαναφορά της αρχής της κοινοτικής προτίμησης, προκειμένου η ΕΕ να προστατέψει τη γεωργία και την κτηνοτροφία και να χαράξει μια πολιτική η οποία θα της προσδώσει αυτάρκεια και επάρκεια ιδίως στην παραγωγή κρεάτων. Επιπλέον, εδώ και τώρα θα πρέπει να επιβληθούν αυστηροί έλεγχοι στην εισαγωγή κρεάτων από την Βραζιλία και άλλες τρίτες χώρες με ταυτόχρονη επιβολή αυστηρών μέτρων που θα περιορίζουν τις εισαγωγές κρεάτων από τρίτες χώρες.

Момчил Неков (S&D), в писмена форма. – Скандалът с вноското говеждо от Бразилия е само върхът на айсберга. С всеки регламент в областта на селското стопанство създаваме все повече условия за европейските производители. Същевременно обаче отваряме все по-широко вноса от трети страни на редица продукти. Европа трябва да бъде гарант за стабилност на дохода на европейските говедовъдци, а не дестинация на продукция със съмнително качество и стандарти от други части на света. Аз смятам, че флиртът на Европейската комисия с третите страни, чрез така наречените споразумения за свободна търговия, трябва да спре. Европейското селско стопанство губи своята конкурентоспособност, селските региони губят своя поминък точно заради подобни споразумения, като подготвяното с Меркосур, на който и Бразилия е член. През 2016 г. ЕС е внесъл 66 хиляди тона телешко в прясно и замразено състояние само от Бразилия. Говедовъдството е сектор, които ангажира местна работна ръка и суровини, създава поминък за няколко сектора. Повече защита за европейските производители означава по-силно европейско селско стопанство, повече местно производство и по-добро качество.

Pavel Poc (S&D), *písemně*. – Podle vyjádření komisaře pro zdraví Vytenis Andriukaitis na plenární debatě dne 3. dubna 2017 má EU nejvyšší standardy bezpečnosti potravin na světě. Přesto se v důsledku nekalých obchodních praktik dostalo na evropský trh maso, které vystavuje spotřebitele riziku. Vítám sice posílení kontrol importovaného masa z Brazílie, je ale potřeba mít záruky, že se taková věc nebude opakovat, ať by mělo jít o jakoukoli zemi. Je důležité uvědomit si, že vyšetřování brazilských úřadů probíhalo dva roky a za celou tu dobu Komise nevyslala jediný signál, že by bylo něco v nepořádku. Je třeba posílit kontroly dovozu masa ze třetích zemí obecně. Brazílie je největším světovým vývozcem hovězího a drůbežího, do EU každoročně vyveze 400 000 tun masa. Evropané spotřebitelé a producenti očekávají, že veškeré dovozy masa budou splňovat náročné evropské normy a standardy. Podporuji iniciativu kolegyně Smolkové, která požaduje odpovídající reakci Evropské komise, a proto podporuji i iniciativy mého členského státu, České republiky, která v návaznosti na skandál požaduje zákaz dovozu masa z Brazílie. Vítám také rychlou reakci státní veterinární správy, která na základě laboratorních vzorků analyzovala přítomnost patogenních mikroorganismů, inhibičních látek (antibiotik) a látek zadržujících vodu v mase a objevila závažná pochybení.

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Senhor Comissário, as elevadas normas e os controlos europeus fracassaram totalmente. A União Europeia não foi capaz de descobrir a fraude. Pergunto-me eu, assim como qualquer pessoa com sentido comum, quantas mais fraudes estão a acontecer com as importações de alimentos sem que sejam descobertas pela Comissão Europeia e os Estados?

Mas isto explica como são os métodos fraudulentos que permitem colocar produtos alimentares a baixos preços nos mercados de todo o mundo, pondo em risco a saúde das pessoas e arruinando a produtoras e produtores locais. E também mostra claramente por que razão as grandes empresas da carne não querem a rotulagem do país de origem da mesma, porque o negócio também está na utilização de carnes baratas em transformados de marcas reconhecidas.

No meu país diz-se que «ninguém vende pesos a quatro pesetas», ou seja, ninguém venderia um euro por oitenta centimos. A solução para tudo isto passa por acabar com a vocação exportadora das políticas agrárias e alimentares, acabar com a circulação em massa de alimentos em todo o planeta, conferir prioridade à produção local para os mercados locais e de proximidade, regular produções e mercados e definir preços mínimos que cubram custos e remunerem o trabalho.

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), *schriftelijk*. – Een nieuw voedselschandaal teistert de EU: de invoer van rot en ongezond vlees uit Brazilië. Eenentwintig Braziliaanse bedrijven staan onder verdenking. Vier ervan voerden vlees uit naar de EU. Dit schandaal vormt de top van een enorme ijsberg. Tussen 2000 en nu vermeldt het Snelle Waarschuwingssysteem voor Voedsel en Veevoer 258 notificaties over Braziliaanse vleesproducten en 553 notificaties inzake gevogelte. Tussen 17 november 2016 en nu zijn er 24 serieuze meldingen inzake Salmonella en 3 over E.coli in bevroren vlees en kip.

Dit schandaal is gelinkt aan intensieve landbouwtechnieken die zorgen voor massale ontbossing van de Cerrado, een savanne-achtig gebied waar de ontbossing 2 tot 3 maal sneller gaat dan in de Amazone. Dat heeft ook een directe impact op de mensenrechten: 207 milieuactivisten werden vermoord tussen 2010 en 2015.

Het voormalige FVO organiseerde 3 audits in 2016 en stelde vast dat de export van vlees niet voldeed aan Europese exportstandaarden. Toch had dat geen enkele invloed op het handelsverkeer. Het FVO doet ongelofelijk goed werk, maar er is onvoldoende politieke controle op de opvolging van hun conclusies en aanbevelingen. Daarom pleit ik voor een jaarlijks politiek debat over de aanbevelingen van het FVO.

Miguel Viegas (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A polícia federal brasileira revelou recentemente um gigantesco esquema de fraude e venda de carnes adulteradas envolvendo as principais marcas do país. Foram 29 as companhias investigadas, incluindo as duas gigantes JBS, das marcas Friboi, Seara e Big Frango, e a BRF, dona da Sadia e Perdigão.

Entre o rol de irregularidades investigadas destaca-se a reembalagem de produtos em fim de período de validade, injeção de água para aumentar o peso das mercadorias e uso de ácido ascórbico e ácido sórbico para maquilhar sinais de degradação da carne. Ambos os ácidos são cancerígenos quando usados em doses elevadas. A estes crimes está associada um rede de corrupção envolvendo funcionários dos serviços oficiais de fiscalização e controlo.

É fundamental que a Comissão Europeia avalie este escândalo vindo daquele que é hoje o maior exportador mundial de carne e o maior fornecedor de carne bovina à União Europeia e que tome medidas que protejam os consumidores e evite quaisquer dúvidas sobre a qualidade da carne comercializada no espaço europeu. É igualmente imperioso que esta questão tenha consequências sobre as atuais negociações com o Mercosul.

22. Characteristics for fishing vessels (debate)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le débat sur le rapport de Werner Kuhn au nom de la commission de la pêche sur la proposition de règlement du Parlement européen et du Conseil définissant les caractéristiques des navires de pêche (refonte) (COM(2016)0273 — C8-0187/2016 — 2016/0145(COD)).

Werner Kuhn, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Jetzt wird noch mal kurz gewechselt, die einzelnen Fachgebiete neu aufgeteilt, verehrter Herr Kommissar Vella. Ich grüße auch die Vertreter der maltesischen Ratspräsidentschaft. Ich möchte allen danken, die sich an diesem Bericht beteiligt haben. Das ist sicher ein sehr technischer, aber auch ein sehr umfassender und wichtiger Bericht. Und es ist schon notwendig, dass man die Verordnung zur Definition der Angaben zu Fischereifahrzeugen ganz klar darstellt. Da müssen technische und auch physikalische Angaben kohärent sein.

Der aktuelle Stand über diese Angaben der Fischereifahrzeuge wird in dieser Verordnung zusammengefasst. Jeder Mitgliedstaat muss fast jedes Jahr einen Flottenbericht abgeben über seine kleinen, mittleren und auch die hochseegehenden Fischereifahrzeuge, und dazu brauchen sie natürlich auch genaue Angaben, wie Schiffe vermessen werden, welche Antriebsleistung sie haben und ähnliche Dinge mehr.

Bislang waren die Angaben zu den Fischereifahrzeugen in der Verordnung – damals noch EWG – von 1986 geregelt. Aber vor dem Hintergrund, das Unionsrecht zu vereinfachen, also klarer zu gestalten, besser verständlich zu machen, ist natürlich dieser Rechtsakt jetzt sozusagen in einer Neufassung kodifiziert worden. Das heißt, eine systematische Zusammenfassung des für einen bestimmten Bereich geltenden Rechts in einem zusammenhängenden Gesetzeswerk, damit man das auch nicht immer in unterschiedlichen Paragraphen zusammenführen muss. Der materielle Inhalt dieses kodifizierten Rechtsaktes wurde dabei aber vollständig beibehalten, und es ist nur eine notwendige Anpassung an den aktuellen Stand der Internationalen Organisation für Normung, der ja auch alle Mitgliedstaaten angehören. Die Verordnung regelt den rechtlichen Inhalt, die Definition dieser Angaben: Länge über alles, Breite, die Tonnage – das heißt, die Bruttoreaumzahl –, die Verdrängung nach Archimedes, die Motorstärke – das heißt, welcher Pfahlzug, welches fischereiliche Gerät kann dort mit einer entsprechenden Schleppleistung auch geführt werden –, und natürlich das Schiffsregister und das Datum, wann das Schiff in Dienst gestellt worden ist.

Es muss für alle Mitgliedstaaten in der Europäischen Union mit gleichen Charakteristika gearbeitet werden. Denn das sind natürlich Dinge, die von Belang sind, auch wenn es um Einschränkungen von ganz bestimmten Fanggebieten geht, dann haben Fischereifahrzeuge bis acht Meter – kleine handwerkliche Fischerei – natürlich andere Möglichkeiten als die, die zwölf Meter und größer sind. Die über 15 Meter müssen ein elektronisches Logbuch haben, sie müssen ein *vessel monitoring system* haben und auch das AIS, das automatische Schiffsidentifikationssystem. Und deshalb ist es notwendig, dass wir uns auf die Übereinkommen, mit denen sozusagen die Mitgliedstaaten auch ihre Grundlage haben, uns verständigen: das Internationale Schiffsvermessungsübereinkommen von London 1969 und auch das Internationale Übereinkommen über die Sicherheit von Fischereifahrzeugen und deren Besatzung – das ist das Übereinkommen von Torremolinos –, beides unter der Schirmherrschaft der Internationalen Seeschiffahrtsorganisation.

Die Anpassung an den Vertrag von Lissabon – ich habe das bereits erwähnt – ist notwendig und bringt eine Befugnisübertragung in Form von delegierten Rechtsakten. Aber hier hat man besonders die Motorstärke, die Schleppleistung im Auge. Hier wurde von der Kommission ursprünglich gefordert, die delegierten Rechtsakte zeitlich nicht zu begrenzen. Das haben wir aber gemeinsam im Parlament getan, auf fünf Jahre. Es ist sozusagen ein *legal exercise*, und es ist notwendig, dass wir diese Charakteristika für Fischereifahrzeuge gemeinsam in Angriff nehmen.

Ein Wort noch zum Änderungsantrag der GUE und meiner Kollegin Ní Riada. Wir haben darüber diskutiert, ob es möglich ist, einen solchen Änderungsantrag zusätzlich noch mit einzubauen. Aber leider ist das große Problem dabei, dass wir hier keine kohärente Anpassung finden. Wir sehen das als sehr schwierig, hier bei den Charakteristika der Schiffe, wo es um Längen, um Antriebsleistung geht, jetzt genau zu definieren, was kleine Fischereifahrzeuge sind, welche *medium scale* und welche Hochseefischereifahrzeuge sind. Ich glaube, wir sollten uns mit dem Thema nochmal in einer anderen Situation befassen.

Allen nochmal ein herzliches Dankeschön, ich freue mich auf die Aussprache.

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would also like to thank my colleague, Werner Kuhn, the rapporteur on this file, for the very clear explanation that he has just given.

The Commission welcomes the agreement reached between the two co-legislators on our proposal concerning the recast of the regulation on characteristics for fishing vessels. As Werner explained, this is essentially a technical exercise consisting in codifying a rather old legal text dating back to 1986 and updating an empowerment to the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Lisbon Treaty. The Commission attaches great importance to simplifying and clarifying the law of the Union so as to make it clearer and more accessible and understandable to citizens. For this reason the codification of rules that have frequently been amended is essential to make the law clearer and more transparent.

The agreement reached in February is a step forward in this direction. I would like to thank the rapporteur once again.

Seán Kelly, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I think it is true to say that many sectors are very concerned about the fallout that may occur in relation to Brexit. In Ireland, the fishing industry is definitely a sector that is really concerned about what the terms of Brexit will be and what will transpire in relation to territorial waters, quotas and maximum sustainable yield, etc. For that reason the concerns, especially, of our coastal communities and their mainly small vessels fishing within quota, have to be taken into consideration, and the proposal by my colleague Liadh Ní Riada is one that tries to make that distinction. One size does not fit all and while we have to continually reform the common fisheries policy we have to be cognisant of the fact that there are big and small countries, big and small fishing vessels, and that each of them must be considered and given their due regard, especially where we, the coastal communities of Ireland, are concerned.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, quisiera, en primer lugar, agradecer al ponente, el señor Kuhn, el debate que hemos tenido sobre este dossier que es muy técnico, pero él es un gran conocedor de esta materia y nos ha ayudado a todos los demás, que no éramos tan expertos como el señor Kuhn. Así que quiero agradecerle el trabajo que hemos podido desarrollar —yo como ponente alternativa de mi Grupo—.

La política pesquera gestiona y establece el límite máximo de la capacidad total de las flotas pesqueras de los Estados miembros en términos de potencia de los motores y de tonelaje de los buques, teniendo en cuenta los recursos pesqueros disponibles.

Un número significativo de normas de la Unión Europea, en el marco especialmente de la última reforma de la política pesquera común, también se refiere y se aplica a los buques pesqueros en función de su potencia, de su tonelaje y otras características técnicas como la longitud, la anchura y la fecha de entrada en servicio.

Todos estos aspectos tienen mucha importancia —la han tenido siempre—, pero con la última reforma de la política pesquera común tienen un valor singular y requerían, además de por la antigüedad —a la que se ha referido el señor comisario; la antigüedad de unas normas que teníamos del año 1986—, también una adecuación a la realidad tras la nueva reforma de la política pesquera común. Y eso es lo que vamos a llevar a cabo.

También se ha dado más potestad a la Comisión en esos actos delegados para su aplicación posterior y, por tanto, aquí hay un gran acuerdo de todos los grupos que mañana se verá ratificado con la votación.

Y para finalizar, yo sí quiero decirle al señor Kuhn, cuando se ha referido a la enmienda en la que dice que hay que hacer una distinción entre los barcos de la pesca de altura y la pesca de pequeña escala, que estoy de acuerdo con ese fondo. Probablemente, el procedimiento no sea adecuado técnicamente, pero en el fondo estoy de acuerdo y vamos a votar favorablemente, señor Kuhn.

Ruža Tomašić, u ime kluba ECR-a. – Gospođo predsjednice, čestitam izvijestitelju Kuhnu i izvijestiteljima u sjeni na kvalitetnom izvješću koje adresira određene zakonodavne probleme koji već dugi niz godina predstavljaju administrativnu prepreku građanima u iskorištavanju njihovih prava. Nažalost, i u ovom domu i u nacionalnim te regionalnim parlamentima postoji jasan trend kompliciranja regulative koja je pisana od stručnjaka za stručnjake i običan se čovjek u toj šumi raznih pravila i normi često ne snalazi.

Ovo je izvješće čista suprotnost i stoga put u pravom smjeru. Regulatora mora biti što je moguće jednostavnija i što primjenjivija kako bi ostvarila željene učinke. Mora biti jasna onima na koje se odnosi, a ne samo stručnjacima. Dobro je da je pokrenuta inicijativa o kodifikaciji Uredbe o određivanju karakteristika ribarskih plovila iz 1986. jer skladna provedba Zajedničke ribarstvene politike podrazumijeva jednaka pravila i definicije.

No, kao što sam više puta isticala u ovome domu, Zajednička ribarstvena politika mora uvažiti regionalne i lokalne specifičnosti te socioekonomski i kulturni značaj ribolova u pojedinim regijama. Stoga mi je posebno drago što će se u procesu kodifikacije, osim samih tehničkih karakteristika plovila, u obzir uzeti i njihovu društvenu ulogu u obalnim zajednicama te ekološki učinak i ribolovni kapacitet. Ovakav prijedlog smatram velikim korakom u pravom smjeru i zato ću ga podržati na glasovanju.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, en nombre del Grupo ALDE. – Señora presidenta, señor comisario; el Reglamento que presentamos hoy —y quiero agradecer también al señor Kuhn, el ponente, el esfuerzo que ha realizado para que hayamos alcanzado un acuerdo tan amplio— es de vital importancia por dos razones.

En primer lugar, porque va a ser fundamental para poder determinar las condiciones de todos los Estados miembros para ver su capacidad de pesca y porque ofrece garantías para que se pueda medir el grado de respeto de los límites de capacidad establecidos en el Reglamento de base de la PPC. Por eso mismo, aporta seguridad jurídica y claridad a todo tipo de operaciones que están relacionadas en la Unión con el ejercicio de la profesión de la pesca.

Para conseguirlo se ha procedido en este Reglamento a fijar una definición de todos los parámetros que sirven para definir y describir los barcos de pesca, como la eslora, la manga de arqueo, la fecha de entrada en servicio y la potencia del motor, lo que va a permitir que estas definiciones se apliquen a todas las normas de la Unión Europea en materia de pesca.

Para realizar estas definiciones nos hemos fijado en las iniciativas de las organizaciones internacionales especializadas y, por supuesto, para aspectos específicos como la potencia de los motores, en las normas de la Organización internacional de Normalización (ISO) que se aplican habitualmente a las medidas que se adoptan en otros sectores de actividad.

Finalmente, son definiciones congruentes con la política común de pesca, y esto nos va a permitir darle coherencia a todas las políticas y a toda la normativa de esta Cámara.

Liadh Ní Riada, thar ceann an Ghrúpa GUE/NGL. – A Uachtaráin, Táim tar éis leasuithe mar a luaigh an tUasal Coonan san áit chéanna a mholadh ar reachtaíocht iascaigh maidir le tréithriú agus sonrú áirthe iascaireachta. Agus cé gur ghlac an Coiste leis seo níor cheadaigh an Chomhairle é, agus tá lochtanna an-mhór sa reachtaíocht mar nach sonraíonn sí idir iascaireacht mhionscála nó thraidisiúnta agus iascaireacht thionsclaíoch.

Is cúis náire é gur chuaigh siad i gcoinne mo leasuithe maidir le tréithriú áirthe a thabharfadh aird ar ról sóisialta na n-áirthe, ar a dtionchar timpeallachta, cumas iascaireachta, éifeachtúlacht bhreosla, aschur agus scála.

Tá dualgas ar an reachtaíocht tacú mar ba léir le rialáil na monarchana mara seo a dhéanann damáiste don timpeallacht, dár bpobail, agus dár n-iascairí mionscála.

Cuireann an Comhbheartas Iascach, cobhsaíocht choibhneasta, agus córas ITQ rialtais anois ar a gcumas éisc a bhronnadh ar na creachadóirí idirnáisiúnta agus ag an am céanna gnáthiascaireacht a chuir ar mhíbhuntáiste.

Tá gá le tréithriú agus sonrú teicniúil ceart a dhéanfaidh idirdhealú idir na hárthaí móra agus na cinn bheaga.

Agus glaoidh ar an bParlaimint vótáil ar son mo ráiteas a bheith curtha leis an iarscríbhinn. Agus tá súil agam go gcomhlíonfaidh an tUasal Coonan a gheallúint chun forbairt a dhéanamh ar an reachtaíocht seo agus plé a dhéanamh liom mar gheall air sa todhchaí.

Ricardo Serrão Santos (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, quero também saudar os relatores pelo trabalho realizado. Este Regulamento é importante, mas não responde a uma das principais ambições do mundo da pequena pesca da Europa em termos de definições. Não define o que é a pesca artesanal. Parece-me que o papel da União Europeia, neste caso, será estabelecer regras gerais para que esta definição possa ser estabelecida regionalmente.

De facto, a pesca artesanal depende da região onde se pratica. Sei que abdicar do poder de normalização é um passo difícil para a Comissão Europeia, também para o Conselho e, até certo ponto, para o Parlamento, que sonham harmonizar os procedimentos legais ao nível de todo um continente. Mas, da mesma forma que o artigo 349.º do Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia consagra especificidades regionais, sugiro à Comissão que proponha legislação que atribua às regiões da Europa a capacidade de definirem a sua pesca artesanal e tradicional.

Czesław Hoc (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na wstępie podziękowania i gratulacje dla pana Wernera Kuhna za bardzo dobre sprawozdanie. Jednakże mam do poruszenia istotną kwestię dotyczącą zakresu definicji statków rybackich. Otóż powinna ona być rozszerzona i powinna odróżniać statki przeznaczone do połowów przemysłowych, tzw. paszowce, od statków połowiających na małą skalę, tzw. łodziowców. To bardzo ważne, w szczególności dla Morza Bałtyckiego, które jest wrażliwym ekosystemem, gdzie połowy przemysłowe niszczą zasoby ryb, głównie zasoby dorsza. Prowadzi to także do bankructwa rybołówstwa przybrzeżnego. Zatem konieczne jest ustalenie definicji prawnej połowów na skalę przemysłową i definicji łodziowego rybołówstwa przybrzeżnego. Musimy chronić zasoby dorsza w Bałtyku, musimy chronić tradycyjne rybołówstwo łodziowe. To nasz święty obowiązek – wobec obecnych i przyszłych pokoleń.

Interventions à la demande

Νότης Μαρίñas (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, είχα ζητήσει και στην προηγούμενη συζήτηση «catch-the-eye» αρκετά έγκαιρα να λάβω τον λόγο, αλλά δυστυχώς δεν με είχατε στον κατάλογο.

Ο κύριος Επίτροπος ανέφερε ότι κωδικοποιούμε νομοθεσία του 1986. Αλλά, κύριε Επίτροπε, διερωτηθήκατε τι έχει γίνει στην αλιεία τριάντα χρόνια τώρα; Αν έχει αναπτυχθεί η ευρωπαϊκή αλιεία, ποια κοινωνικά προβλήματα και ποια επίπεδα ανεργίας αντιμετωπίζει; Επομένως, αυτό είναι ένα θέμα που πρέπει να μας προβληματίσει ιδιαίτερα σε σχέση με τους Έλληνες αλιείς, οι οποίοι πένονται αυτή τη στιγμή, καθώς αντιμετωπίζουν τα τεράστια αντιλαϊκά μέτρα που έχει επιβάλει η τρόικα.

Συμφωνώ ότι πρέπει να γίνει διαφοροποίηση μεταξύ μικρών και μεγάλων αλιευτικών σκαφών. Πρέπει, επίσης, να πάψει να είναι περίπλοκη η νομοθεσία, να μην υπάρχει διοικητικό άγχος, να μη δημιουργούνται κόστη και υπερβολικά έξοδα. Αυτά είναι θέματα που οπωσδήποτε πρέπει να τα λαμβάνουμε υπόψη, όπως επίσης και τις κοινωνικές ιδιαιτερότητες των παράκτιων κοινοτήτων.

Igor Šoltes (Verts/ALE). – Podpiram to, da se poenoti in kodificira to vprašanje in se pravzaprav čim bolj poenostavimo pravna pravila, zlasti zato ker obstoječa seveda segajo trideset in več let nazaj.

Je pa seveda treba reči, da je ribiška politika zelo zapleten proces, kjer je potrebno upoštevati tudi lokalne posebnosti, kjer je potrebno upoštevati tudi okoljske vidike in tudi to, kar so kolegi pred mano povedali: razlikovanje med t.i. malim ribištvom, obrtnim ribištvom, na eni strani in na drugi strani industrijskim ribolovom, ker imata popolnoma različen vpliv na mnoge sektorje.

Seveda poenotenje zahteva, tudi zelo, jasnost besedil, čeprav gre za tehničen dokument. Predvsem pa morajo biti zelo jasne in konkretne ter koherentne definicije pojmov v izogib temu, da se potem stvari različno interpretirajo in da potem države članice se to ne upoštevajo tako, kot bi morale.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the honourable Members for their constructive attitude towards this file. As already mentioned, rightly, the purpose of this proposal was to undertake a codification of Council Regulation No 2930/86 of 22 September 1986 defining the characteristics for fishing vessels. The new regulation will supersede the various acts incorporated in it and this proposal fully preserves the content of the acts being codified and, hence, does no more than bring them together with only such formal amendments as are required by the codification exercise itself. Further to codifying the above-mentioned regulation, the Commission proposal also includes a substantive amendment with a view to delegating powers to the Commission to this end. As a result, the proposal is being presented in the form of a recast. With regard to the two amendments refused, they were refused on formal procedural grounds as they would change the law. So this is a recast, but we still take note of all the concerns and all the comments. I would like again to thank Mr Kuhn, the rapporteur, the shadow rapporteurs, and all the MEPs who contributed to this debate.

Werner Kuhn, *Berichterstatter*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herzlichen Dank an meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen als Schattenberichterstatter. Es hat mir auch große Freude bereitet, konstruktive Vorschläge von Ihrer Seite mit in dieses Dossier einzubauen.

Wir sind bei der Grundverordnung immer wieder an den Punkt gestoßen: Wie können wir die kleine und handwerkliche Fischerei in besonderer Weise fördern? Und die Definition, so wie Ricardo Serrão Santos das vorhin gesagt hat, ist hoch kompliziert und regional sehr unterschiedlich. Und Frau Kollegin Ní Riada, es ist schwierig, in dieses sehr formelle Dossier – es ist eine Verordnung – jetzt eine Definition für kleine und handwerkliche Fischerei, die Fischereifahrzeuge in Zentimeter Länge über alles, Verdrängung und Motorleistung, einzubauen – das kann in einem anderen Land als in Irland schon wieder völlig anders sein – oder große Fabriksschiffe genau zu definieren, welche Antriebsleistung sie haben dürfen, welche Größe, wieviel Frost, Fang und Verarbeitungskapazität, wieviel Tonnage, wieviel Treibstoff sie mitführen dürfen und, und, und.

Deshalb würde ich den Vorschlag machen – denn das ist der einzige Dissens, den wir bei diesem Dossier haben, bei dieser Verordnung –, dass die Koordinatoren sich in der nächsten oder übernächsten Sitzung zusammenfinden, vielleicht auch mit Unterstützung des Kommissars, dass man einen Initiativbericht diesbezüglich in Angriff nimmt und die Definition – gerade was kleine und handwerkliche Fischerei betrifft und natürlich auch die *medium scale fishery vessels* und natürlich auch die hochseegehenden Fischereifahrzeuge – wenigstens so zu definieren versucht, dass die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten regional die Möglichkeit haben, darin eine klare Unterscheidung zu treffen, was die handwerkliche und die küstennahe Fischerei betrifft oder hochseegehende Fischereifahrzeuge und auch ganz normale Schlepper, die über 15 Meter sind, wo das *vessel monitoring system* ist und das AIS, automatisches Informationssystem, und vielleicht bekommen wir dort eine Lösung und kommen einen Schritt weiter voran.

Herzlichen Dank nochmal allen gemeinsam, dem Kommissar, meinen Berichterstattern, aber auch der maltesischen Rat-Präsidenschaft, die ja als Insel schon viele Erfahrungen in der Fischerei, aber auch im Schiffbau hat, und das hat mich da als Schiffbauingenieur besonders beeindruckt.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 4 avril 2017.

23. Women and their roles in rural areas (short presentation)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Marijana Petir et Maria Lidia Senra Rodriguez, au nom de la commission de l'agriculture et du développement rural et de la commission des droits de la femme et de l'égalité des genres, sur les femmes et leurs rôles dans les zones rurales (2016/2204(INI)) (A8-0058/2017).

Maria Lidia Senra Rodríguez, *relatora*. – Senhora Presidente, quero agradecer, em primeiro lugar, aos relatores-sombra as suas contribuições e também às equipas que tornaram possível este relatório.

No meio rural vivem diferentes tipos de mulheres com profissões diferentes e, à semelhança de todas as mulheres, estas sofrem as consequências de um sistema patriarcal que as oprime, discrimina e inviabiliza. Apesar do progresso das leis em matéria de igualdade, constatamos que existe um longo caminho a percorrer. É que as leis existentes não se aplicam totalmente ou são implementadas, muitas vezes, com uma base machista. Isto entrava o avanço dos nossos direitos.

Espero que este relatório sobre as mulheres nas áreas rurais contribua para reforçar a luta e para avançar em termos de pleno reconhecimento dos direitos das mulheres do meio rural. Os desafios são importantes: no âmbito profissional, no da conciliação, no âmbito dos serviços públicos e na luta contra a violência machista. A diferença salarial entre homens e mulheres persiste e o desemprego afeta em maior medida as mulheres.

Vou referir-me, sobretudo, à situação das mulheres agricultoras.

As políticas de desregulamentação da produção e dos mercados, impulsionadas pela PAC, provocaram a precarização e a perda de muitos postos de trabalho nas explorações agrícolas e no meio rural. O não reconhecimento da titularidade compartilhada nas explorações agrícolas familiares implica que apenas 30 % das agricultoras da União Europeia sejam titulares de explorações. Todas as outras mulheres neste tipo de exploração agrícola são privadas dos direitos que derivam de ser titular da mesma. Estamos a referir-nos, por exemplo, aos rendimentos económicos e aos direitos decorrentes da PAC. Estas mulheres também se defrontam com dificuldades para beneficiarem de ajudas no âmbito das medidas de ação positiva destinadas a apoiar mulheres trabalhadoras, como já tem acontecido em muitos Estados-Membros.

A forma de a PAC distribuir as ajudas, favorecendo as grandes explorações, prejudica também as mulheres que, normalmente, são titulares de explorações mais pequenas. Por exemplo, em 2013, em média, uma exploração gerida por uma mulher é de 8 hectares, em comparação com 20 hectares nas explorações geridas por homens, ou 8 unidades pecuárias em comparação com 26 dos homens. Mas também se dá o facto de que muitas agricultoras não são consideradas como tal por não contribuírem para a segurança social agrícola. Outras, por outro lado, têm poucos anos de contribuição quando chegam à idade da reforma e isso aprofunda o fosso nas pensões e traz maiores níveis de pobreza às mulheres. É essencial, portanto, atacar pela raiz esta situação de discriminação e de insegurança para as mulheres se realmente queremos manter as explorações agrícolas que são a base económica fundamental para o desenvolvimento de um meio rural vivo.

É proposta, neste relatório, a necessidade de que os Estados-Membros e a Comissão apostem na titularidade compartilhada nas explorações agrícolas familiares, nomeadamente através da elaboração de leis visando o seu estabelecimento e a sua aplicação efetiva onde ela já existe. A participação das mulheres em todas as áreas de tomada de decisão, como instituições, sindicatos, cooperativas e também nos processos de negociação deve ser garantida. Os serviços públicos e de qualidade devem visar o meio rural, o ensino, a saúde, os serviços sociais, os transportes ou os serviços de correios.

Para concluir, queria dizer que é fundamental dotar o meio rural de instrumentos para a implementação de medidas destinadas a prevenir e erradicar a violência machista e que sejam garantidos também serviços de apoio e aconselhamento para as mulheres afetadas por esta violência.

Marijana Petir, *izvjestiteljica*. – Gospođo predsjednice, žene koje žive u ruralnim područjima zaslužuju našu punu pažnju i naš puni angažman. Njihovi problemi su stvarni i da bismo ih shvatili, moramo shvatiti raznoliku ulogu žena u ruralnom području. One brinu o obitelji, čuvaju tradiciju i okoliš, rade u poljoprivredi, koja je jedna od najvažnijih gospodarskih grana svake zemlje, sudjeluju u procesu proizvodnje hrane. Žene u ruralnim područjima neprocjenjivo su vrijedne za svoja obiteljska poljoprivredna gospodarstva, važne su i za razvoj poduzetništva, održivi razvoj, kao i cjelokupni gospodarski razvoj.

No one nisu homogena skupina, stoga se zalažem za specifičan pristup prema njihovim raznovrsnim ulogama.

Žene na selu nemaju dobar pristup obrazovanju, slabe su informatičke pismenosti, a i dostupnost interneta još je na vrlo niskoj razini. Također, zbog udaljenosti liječnika specijalista i nedostupne dijagnostike, u većini slučajeva žene tek u poodmakloj fazi bolesti dolaze kod liječnika, što je nažalost za njih ponekad prekasno. Na selu najčešće ne postoji niti adekvatna društvena, socijalna i komunalna infrastruktura koja je nužna za dostojanstven život.

Žene čine manje od 50 % ukupnog radno sposobnog stanovništva u ruralnim područjima Europske unije te upravljaju sa svega 30 % obiteljskih poljoprivrednih gospodarstava. Tijekom 2014. godine žene su ostvarile oko 35% ukupnog radnog vremena u poljoprivredi, što je znatan doprinos poljoprivrednoj proizvodnji, a osim toga na poljoprivrednim gospodarstvima brinu o obitelji i domaćinstvu što je često okarakterizirano kao „nevidljivi” rad.

Žene na selu često su ekonomski ovisne o suprugu. Za njih ne postoji radno vrijeme, a bore se i s nedostatkom osnovnih socijalnih i mirovinskih prava poput bitno nižih mirovina ili pak neplaćenog porodiljnog dopusta. Gotovo polovica njih nikada ne odlazi na godišnji odmor, a u vrlo maloj mjeri sudjeluju u procesima donošenja odluka na lokalnoj i regionalnoj razini.

Niti jedna država članica Europske unije nije dosad uspostavila tematski potprogram za žene u ruralnim prostorima kakav primjerice postoji za mlade poljoprivrednike, iako je to predviđeno Europskim poljoprivrednim fondom za ruralni razvoj što je jasan pokazatelj kako se žene u ruralnim područjima jednostavno ne cijeni dovoljno.

Ovo Izvješće prepoznaje neprocjenjiv doprinos koji žene ostvaruju u gospodarstvu ruralnih područja te potiče države članice da više i sinergičnije upotrebljavaju instrumente dostupne u sklopu Europskog poljoprivrednog fonda za ruralni razvoj, programa Leader+ i Europskog socijalnog fonda.

Ženama je potrebno olakšati pristup zemljištu te osigurati sva socijalna prava koja trenutno nemaju jer njihov rad na obiteljskom poljoprivrednom gospodarstvu nije prepoznat i vrednovan stoga je potrebno regulirati profesionalni status seoskih žena.

Nadam se da će ovo Izvješće pomoći u osvještavanju problema s kojima se susreću žene u ruralnom prostoru te da će u tom smislu biti i korak prema njihovom rješavanju. Žene na selu prave su heroine i zato ovo Izvješće posvećujem njima.

Interventions à la demande

Michaela Šojdová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já sama pocházím z venkovského regionu a vím, že život na venkově je skutečně složitější. Je tam méně pracovních příležitostí, zejména pro vysoce kvalifikované profese, horší dostupnost služeb, obchodu, škol a lékařské péče. Právě to dopadá na ženy, které se většinou starají o děti a tyto služby potřebují. Znáám mnoho i malých obcí, kterým se daří podporovat tyto služby, vytvářet lepší prostředí, a to právě s podporou fondů Evropské unie nebo vládních programů.

Myslím, že to je dobrý příklad toho, jak je možné řešit lepší postavení žen. Zvláštní pohled z pohledu žen na tuto problematiku považuji za spíše umělý, ale respektuji ho. Rozvoj venkova je důležitý pro celou společnost, pro zajištění potravin, pro údržbu a tvorbu krajiny, je důležitý pro udržení našich tradic a kulturních kořenů.

Chci poděkovat paní kolegyni Petirové za podporu rozvoje venkova, že za ni bojuje a citlivě vnímá potřeby žen.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I would like to thank my colleague, Marc Tarabella, for his work on this report, which recognises the role of women as entrepreneurs in rural areas. It is indeed important for the Commission and Member States to invest in the empowerment of women in entrepreneurship in rural areas. It is also important to invest in access to technology and connectivity to the internet and in promoting education and training for women and girls in business, science, technology, engineering and green jobs, especially in places where such facilities are lacking. We should also emphasise the role of cooperatives, social enterprise and alternative business models in providing a powerful platform for women's economic empowerment and independence. The EU can make a significant positive impact with more funding in that field, as has happened with the ESF and ERDF programmes, such as Leader funding for rural areas like Cumbria, and the Daphne programme for women.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, το βασικό πρόβλημα αυτή τη στιγμή στην Κοινή Αγροτική Πολιτική είναι ότι υπάρχει τεράστια ανεργία και φτώχεια και αυτό πρέπει να δείτε. Η ίδια η έκθεση λέει ότι μεταξύ του 2005 και του 2010 εξαφανίστηκαν 2,4 εκατομμύρια γεωργικές εκμεταλλεύσεις, πράγμα που σημαίνει ότι τα πράγματα είναι ιδιαίτερα δύσκολα. Σε σχέση, λοιπόν, με τις γυναίκες, οι οποίες υποφέρουν πιο πολύ στον τομέα της αγροτικής οικονομίας –δεν αναγνωρίζεται η δουλειά που κάνουν, δεν έχουν αμοιβές, δεν προβλέπονται συντάξεις–, πρέπει να λάβουμε μέτρα και νομίζω ότι η έκθεση αντιμετωπίζει τα ζητήματα.

Πρέπει να υπάρξουν ρυθμίσεις για τη γυναικεία επιχειρηματικότητα, για την ενίσχυση των νέων τεχνολογιών, της κατάρτισης, της ένταξης των γυναικών με σύγχρονο τρόπο στην αγροτική παραγωγή. Επίσης, πρέπει να ενισχυθούν οι μικροί γυναικείοι συνεταιρισμοί, να αναβαθμιστεί η θέση της γυναίκας στη διοίκηση των συνεταιρισμών και να υπάρξει κοινωνική προστασία των γυναικών στην ύπαιθρο.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, quiero felicitar y dar las gracias a las colegas Petir y Lidia Senra por este informe, que quiere dar a las mujeres que trabajan en el medio rural, visibilidad, pero, además, políticas para que su aportación al desarrollo, sostenibilidad e innovación de este sector sea reconocida y apoyada. Para empezar, por justicia pero, además, por eficacia.

Por eso, hemos apostado —y así se ha recogido en el informe— por que este sea el primer paso hacia la redacción de un Estatuto europeo de las mujeres agricultoras, como el que ya se aplica en algunas nacionalidades históricas europeas como el País Vasco, y de cuyos contenidos proviene la mayor parte de las enmiendas que hemos presentado.

Necesitamos más mujeres titulares o cotitulares de explotaciones, en puestos de responsabilidad en cooperativas y empresas, y una PAC que mida seriamente y permita aflorar la aportación femenina, que la ponga en valor en términos de renta y talento, y que la apoye en consecuencia.

Ángela Vallina (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, este informe sobre las mujeres y su papel en las zonas rurales es muy importante porque exigimos a la Comisión Europea y a los Estados miembros que tomen medidas en favor del desarrollo en el medio rural, donde las mujeres tienen un papel esencial, pero no solo a nivel económico, sino también a nivel social.

Muchas de nuestras reivindicaciones a través de enmiendas, y gracias también al trabajo de mi compañera Lidia y de la señora Petir, quedan reflejadas en este informe. Por ejemplo, se puede asegurar un alto nivel de los servicios públicos en el medio rural, porque si no, será imposible fijar población.

Pedimos garantizar el derecho al acceso a la propiedad de las explotaciones agrarias para las mujeres y alentamos también unos presupuestos con perspectiva de género y, finalmente, recordamos la necesidad de reforzar los medios para la lucha contra la violencia machista en el medio rural.

En definitiva, si queremos que la igualdad de género y la cohesión no sean solo principios escritos en los Tratados, deben desarrollarse políticas públicas concretas para que subsista el medio rural.

Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, las mujeres producen más de la mitad de los alimentos del mundo, pero solo una minoría son dueñas de sus tierras: el trabajo invisible, el difícil acceso a la financiación, la poca representación de mujeres en puestos de toma de decisiones son constantes en el mundo rural.

Los Verdes consideramos que el actual modelo de agricultura, que es industrial, globalizado e intensivo, además de ser insostenible para el planeta también contribuye a perpetuar esta desigualdad entre hombres y mujeres.

En cambio, el modelo agrícola del futuro y también para la PAC, por ejemplo, es ecológico e igualitario. Ahí las mujeres son agentes del cambio y juegan un papel primordial en la creación de nuevos empleos rurales, como en la artesanía o el turismo de calidad.

Para ello, la Unión Europea tiene que liderar esta transición ecológica y de género. Necesitamos que las instituciones europeas y nacionales nos apoyen, las apoyen. Es una oportunidad para la sociedad en su conjunto.

Krisztina Morvai (NI). – Elnök asszony! Megint a szokásos helyzet, probléma van a címmel, nők helyzete vidéken, de melyik vidéken, kérem szépen, melyik tagállamban? Ausztriában mondjuk, ahol van egy erős vidéki polgárság, anyáról lányra, apáról fiúra adják át a földet, a kis gazdaságot, vegyes gazdaságot, esetleg kis fogadót, satöbbi, vagy pedig Magyarországon, tőle száz kilométerre, ahol ugye volt egy kommunista típusú termelőszövetkezeti rendszer, aminek vége lett, a jókor jó helyen lévők megszerezték a földeket, a nőknek nagyon nehéz földhöz jutni, helyesen beszélt a földhöz jutás nehézségeiről az előző kollega, csak nem beszélt arról, hogy egész más a helyzet azokban az országokban, ahol egyfelől oligarchák szerzik meg a földet, és ezen oligarcha csoportokba nagyon kevésé tartoznak nők.

Másfelől pedig önök, a kedves nyugati barátaink, akik elérték azt, hogy a tőke szabad áramlása fejezetbe kerüljön bele a termőföld, ez a gyalázat kérem szépen, ha szeretnének segíteni a vidéki nőkön, esetleg a közép- és kelet-európai országokban is, akkor szíveskedjenek megszüntetni azt, hogy a termőföld a tőke szabad áramlása fejezetbe tartozzon.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, aontaím go hiomlán leis an mbeirt rapóirtéirí nuair a deir siad gur laochra iad na mná go háirithe atá ag feidhmiú i saol na tuaithe. I ndáiríre tá siad ag coimeád shaol na tuaithe le chéile mar dheirfiúir-acha, mar mháithreacha, seanmháithreacha, oibrithe ar fheirmeacha agus gach uile rud. Freisin, tá siad ag cabhrú go mór leis na gluaisreachtaí deonacha a choimeád le chéile mar oibrithe deonacha, rúnaithe agus mar sin de agus ba chóir gach aitheantas agus cabhair a thabhairt dóibh. Aontaím go hiomlán gur cheart dúinn tuarastáil féaráilte a thabhairt dóibh, aitheantas a thabhairt dóibh, saol sóisialta níos fearr a thabhairt dóibh agus freisin seans a thabhairt dóibh chun brei-soideachas a fháil má tá sin ag teastáil uathu.

An tseachtain seo caite bhí grúpa ban agamsa sa Pharlaimint mar chuairteoirí agus bhí sé go hiontach iad a bheith linn agus tá súil agam go mbeidh mé in ann iad a thabhairt ar ais arís. Go raibh maith agat, a Uachtaráin.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nonostante i progressi degli ultimi anni, nelle zone rurali le donne continuano ad avere difficoltà di accesso al mercato del lavoro e nei consessi decisionali.

Affinché le donne possano beneficiare di regimi di aiuto nel settore agricolo, va innanzitutto riconosciuto il loro ruolo nell'impresa. Garantire protezione sociale alle donne attive in agricoltura è un elemento indispensabile per contribuire ad uno sviluppo moderno e sostenibile dello spazio rurale. Lo sviluppo professionale, la formazione, il perfezionamento delle donne in agricoltura sono altri elementi essenziali per assicurare lo sviluppo delle aziende agricole.

La parità tra donne e uomini rappresenta un obiettivo fondamentale dell'Unione europea e dei suoi Stati membri. Per realizzarla in agricoltura e nelle zone rurali è essenziale integrare la dimensione di genere nell'ambito della PAC e delle politiche di coesione nelle aree rurali, così come servono nuove azioni mirate ad incoraggiare la partecipazione delle donne al mercato del lavoro nelle zone rurali nell'ambito del FEASR.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Karmenu Vella, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, my thanks to Ms Senra Rodríguez and Ms Petir for this joint report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI) and the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM). The strength of support for your joint report reflects the fact that you have accurately identified the challenges faced by women in rural areas.

The Commission welcomes the report in terms of its recognition of the contribution that women make to the rural economy, and also of the opportunities for women both on- and off-farm. Gender equality is a fundamental EU value. As policymakers, we have a responsibility to ensure that the rights of women are fully protected and to enable women to realise their potential. This needs both legislative and non-legislative action. We are committed to mainstreaming the gender perspective into all policy areas and to promote gender equality in the preparation and implementation of EU programmes. This includes the CAP, the rural development policy, which is an essential element of the wider policies supporting both on-farm and off-farm investment to ensure the vitality and viability of our rural communities. The report emphasises the importance of the family farm model, which frequently involves the participation of all family members and often as many as three generations.

The modernised and simplified CAP will continue to foster and support European family farms. We need to provide opportunities to young men and women who wish to live and work in rural communities, so that they can make the most of their potential. Attractive rural communities will help generate balanced territorial development.

We also recognised the need to do more in relation to the roll-out of rural broadband, which is essential if we are going to encourage those who wish to live and those who wish to work in rural communities. Women have always played a huge role on family farms, even if not always adequately rewarded financially. Today, the numbers of women wishing to enter farming in Europe has probably never been higher, yet there are persistent barriers to entry that prevent many young men and women from taking up farming, and women face particular problems. The Cork 2.0 Declaration on a better life for rural areas includes strong messages that rural areas must be attractive places for people in which to live and to work throughout the different stages of life.

Your report addresses itself to the Commission and to the Member States. We must all take our respective responsibilities in formulating a comprehensive and considered response, and I trust that the Member States will take careful note of the report's observations and recommendations.

Honourable Members, this report reminds us all of the essential role that women play in rural areas and throughout society. It also reminds us that there are challenges facing women, but there are also opportunities. It reminds us that adopting legislation is not enough to remedy inequality. We must also make certain it is properly implemented.

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 4 avril 2017.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), per iscritto. – La dimensione di genere costituisce uno strumento applicabile anche ai fondi strutturali e di investimento UE, incluso il FEASR, e l'inclusione delle donne nell'istruzione e nel settore STEM favorisce il raggiungimento dell'uguaglianza di genere in settori diversi. Inoltre, il mantenimento di una popolazione attiva è di notevole rilevanza per la conservazione dell'ambiente e degli ecosistemi, e il turismo rurale è fonte di occupazione e incentiva la popolazione a rimanere in loco.

Se si pensa che tra il 2005 e il 2010 nell'UE sono scomparse più di 2 milioni di aziende agricole a conduzione familiare, si comprende quanto la questione sia importante e la relazione presentata ha lo scopo di evidenziare il ruolo multifunzionale e attivo delle donne nelle zone rurali poiché promotrici di un'agricoltura sostenibile ed ecocompatibile.

UE e Stati membri sono chiamati a sostenere ed incoraggiare l'accesso al mercato del lavoro per le donne nelle zone rurali, e di includere politiche focalizzate sul contributo offerto dalle stesse donne nei loro programmi di sviluppo rurale, in modo da incrementare la loro partecipazione alla PAC come di beneficiarie.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE), γραπτώς. – Οι γυναίκες στις αγροτικές περιοχές χρειάζονται και αξίζουν την πλήρη προσοχή μας και την πλήρη στήριξή μας, καθώς διαδραματίζουν έναν εξαιρετικά σημαντικό ρόλο στις οικογενειακές τους φάρμες και συμβάλλουν στην ανάπτυξη της επιχειρηματικότητας, στη βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη και γενικότερα στην ανάπτυξη της οικονομίας. Οι προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζουν οι γυναίκες στις αγροτικές περιοχές είναι πλείστες και καλούμε τα κράτη μέλη και τις περιφερειακές και τοπικές αυτοδιοικήσεις να συνεχίσουν να στηρίζουν τις γυναίκες αυτές και τα ενθαρρύνουμε να λάβουν πρόσθετα μέτρα.

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), in writing. – Equality between women and men is one of the basic values of the European Union and it should not be different in rural areas. Women in rural areas are under-represented in the executive bodies, and face, among other things, significant pension gaps, violence and difficulties to access childcare. We must safeguard the effective implementation of the Barcelona objectives concerning childcare facilities and urge Member States to ratify the Istanbul Convention to fight those challenges. In order to secure the possibilities for women, and not only for them, to develop their entrepreneurial potential, it is necessary to guarantee the connection of rural areas with economic centres. Therefore, I encourage Member States to use wisely the sources from the Cohesion and Structural Funds to expand the infrastructure and to provide full coverage by internet network. I would like to point out Finland as an example to follow regarding providing access to the internet for isolated areas. Furthermore, I call on the Commission to include the question of rural areas in the Digital Agenda, since digital development can influence the quality of life and boost competitiveness and employment.

Beata Gosiewska (ECR), na piśmie. – W mojej ocenie jest to bardzo ważne sprawozdanie, bowiem podkreśla doniosłość roli kobiet, których ciężka praca jak dotąd wydaje się nie być wystarczająco zauważana ani doceniana na obszarach wiejskich. Miałam przyjemność pracować nad tym sprawozdaniem w roli sprawozdawcy cienia, dzięki czemu udało mi się również wprowadzić do jego treści kilka korzystnych zmian dotyczących m.in. zwiększenia finansowania projektów pomocowych dla kobiet (teraz środki na ich finansowanie będą pochodziły zarówno z I, jak i z II filaru).

Jednak mimo że gorąco popieram szeroko rozumianą poprawę warunków pracy kobiet na obszarach wiejskich, niestety nie mogę zgodzić się z zaproponowanym w sprawozdaniu terminem „gender mainstreaming” („uwzględnianie aspektu płci”), jako że pojęcie to jest niejasne i niezdefiniowane w prawie międzynarodowym. Moje obawy budzi również apel o ratyfikację konwencji stambulskiej, która po pierwsze, również zakłada zmianę definicji płci, a po drugie, umożliwia nadmierną ingerencję Komisji Europejskiej w dziedziny polityki socjalnej i zatrudnienia, stanowiące wyłączną właściwość państw członkowskich.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), na piśmie. – Szanowni Państwo! W ramach UE dominują rodzinne gospodarstwa rolne, w których blisko 80 % pracy wykonywane jest przez członków rodziny. Biorąc pod uwagę, iż na obszarach wiejskich jedynie 60 % kobiet ma oficjalne zatrudnienie, oznacza to, że duża ich część wykonuje tzw. niewidoczną pracę. Jest to poważny problem, bowiem bardzo często nie są one przez to objęte systemem ubezpieczeń społecznych oraz nie dysponują własnymi środkami finansowymi. To z kolei sprawia, że są zależne od mężów i partnerów przez całe swoje życie.

Dlatego też w ramach UE powinniśmy się zastanowić, jak rozwiązać ten problem. Kompetencje w tym obszarze zasadniczo należą do państw członkowskich, ale warto byłoby pomyśleć o wprowadzeniu w ramy wspólnej polityki rolnej systemu zachęt do instytucjonalizacji pracy kobiet i innych członków rodziny, a także skonstruowaniu mechanizmu wymiany dobrych praktyk pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi. Część państw europejskich dostrzegła już problem „niewidocznej” pracy kobiet i istnieją w nich różne rozwiązania, w tym na przykład różnicujące statusy prawne współmałżonków pracujących w ramach rodzinnych gospodarstw rolnych. Dobrym przykładem jest Francja, gdzie członkowie rodziny mogą mieć status kierującego gospodarstwem, współpracownika lub pracownika.

Nadanie oficjalnego statusu zawodowego jest jedną z możliwości wzmocnienia niezależności finansowej kobiet i zagwarantowania im wyższych świadczeń emerytalnych. Jest to o tyle ważne, że bez podjęcia tych działań nie uda się powstrzymać wyludniania obszarów wiejskich.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Quiero felicitar a las ponentes, Marijana Petir y Lidia Senra, por su buen trabajo conjunto en un texto que recoge muchas de las peticiones que el Parlamento ya expresó en su informe sobre el futuro de la PAC. Es necesaria una perspectiva de género para combatir las enormes desigualdades en el acceso a la tierra y la propiedad agrícola entre hombres y mujeres, así como en el reconocimiento de su estatus y derechos como trabajadoras del campo. La Comisión debe tomar nota del grave retroceso de la situación de la mujer en el mundo rural e integrar esta perspectiva de género en el desarrollo de la PAC. Para ello, como bien señala el informe, habrá que mejorar también la implementación de las políticas en el medio rural facilitando la participación de las mujeres en la toma de decisiones.

24. One-minute speeches on matters of political importance

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle les interventions d'une minute sur des questions politiques importantes (article 163 du règlement).

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, a Venezuela esteve três dias sem Assembleia Nacional depois de o Supremo Tribunal ter deliberado usurpar as suas competências e privar os deputados da sua imunidade. Este golpe de Estado foi abortado pelos juízes do Supremo Tribunal que, pela forte contestação nas ruas, perceberam a gravidade do seu ato.

Foi, no entanto, apenas mais um episódio que ilustra a natureza antidemocrática e totalitária do Governo venezuelano, que começou por desrespeitar o resultado eleitoral de 2015, passou pelas manobras dilatatórias do Conselho Nacional Eleitoral para inviabilizar o referendo revogatório, pelas interferências do Presidente Maduro no sistema judiciário e até pela irracional decisão de expropriar as padarias, a maioria das quais de propriedade de emigrantes portugueses.

A situação na Venezuela é gravíssima. Na Venezuela morre-se de fome, morre-se de doenças que em nenhum outro sítio do mundo são mortais. Na Venezuela os cidadãos são tratados como animais à mercê dos caprichos do regime de Maduro. A crise humanitária na Venezuela atingiu proporções tão graves que nós, europeus, não imaginávamos que pudessem acontecer em pleno século XXI e num país que foi referência mundial de progresso e democracia.

Caros Colegas, torna-se urgente o auxílio ao povo martirizado da Venezuela. Os venezuelanos esperam de nós, europeus e democratas, que atuemos em seu socorro. Apelo a esta Casa para que desenvolva todos os esforços políticos e diplomáticos para que a abertura de verdadeiros corredores humanitários para a Venezuela seja possível.

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Г-жо Председател, по оценки на Европейската агенция за околна среда около 15 хиляди случая на преждевременна смърт в България през 2013 г. са се дължали на концентрация на замърсители във въздуха. От години слушаме от представителите на ГЕРБ колко добре и успешно е била управлявана България и колко добре се усвояват европейските фондове. Успехът не може да се базира на самооценка. Фактите говорят по-ясно от думите.

Случаите на преждевременна смърт ясно дават реална оценка за „успехите“ на управлението на ГЕРБ през годините. В допълнение на хилядите смъртни случаи, свързани със здравето, финансовите разходи от замърсяването на въздуха в България са над 3 милиарда евро на година, които включват и преките разходи за икономиката.

През годините ГЕРБ са харчили хиляди евро разходи по дела, за да оспорват решения на Комисията, вместо да направят въздуха за собствените си граждани по-добър. Този лукс сега ще трябва да бъде заплатен от българските граждани, обаче, след потвърждаване на решението на Съда на европейския съюз след два дни. И потърпевши и ошетени са българите и това благодарение на ГЕРБ.

Мислете за гражданите, колеги от ГЕРБ – не затова как да представяте стъкмистиката за „уж“ успешно управление.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Poštovana predsjednice, dugo se građani Hrvatske bune protiv Ovršnog zakona koji je, u trenutnom obliku, legalizirana pljačka običnog čovjeka. Na izborima su većinom birali stranke koje su obećavale izmjenu zakona, ali od svega nije bilo ništa zbog očite sprege politike s moćnim interesnim skupinama koje iza ovakvog zakona stoje i na njegovoj se primjeni bogate.

Sud Europske unije utvrdio je kako se hrvatski javni bilježnici, kad postupaju u ovršnim postupcima na temelju tzv. „vjerodostojne isprave“, ne mogu smatrati „sudom“ pri primjeni Uredbe o europskom nalogu za izvršenje i Uredbe o priznavanju i izvršenju sudskih odluka u građanskim i trgovačkim stvarima.

To znači da se takvim postupcima hrvatskih javnih bilježnika ne može ovršiti nikoga u Europskoj uniji, osim Hrvate. Riječ je o očitoj diskriminaciji i zato tražim od Komisije da se očituje je li ovakav zakon u skladu s europskom pravnom stečevinom.

Jasenکو Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, I would like to congratulate Mr Vučić on his election as the new Serbian President. At the same time, I would like to point out that the electoral campaign has now ended and it is time to leave nationalism aside.

The EU hopes to have a partner in President Vučić. We expect Serbia to remain a stable and trustworthy partner in enlargement talks and contribute to regional stability with an EU-oriented government. The EU expects the implementation of reforms, improvement of the socioeconomic status of the country and the establishment of an honest dialogue with Kosovo. Serbia should stay on the EU path and not fall back into the trap of nationalism and interference in the internal matters of neighbouring countries.

I wish President Vučić every good luck with the hope that we will see the best of Serbia in years to come.

Paloma López Bermejo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, vuelvo a traer a este Pleno la lucha de los trabajadores de la base de Rota. Se trata de un asunto de alcance internacional, porque la multinacional Louis Berger ha despedido a doce trabajadores, amenaza con nuevos despidos y pretende reducir los salarios hasta un 35 %. Y todo ello en el transcurso de la negociación del convenio colectivo, vulnerando además el derecho de huelga.

Asimismo, se incumple el convenio bilateral firmado con el Gobierno de España, por el cual debería contratarse a 370 trabajadores españoles en la base. El Gobierno de España permite que se incumpla la normativa europea de transferencia de empresas, de información y consulta, y de despidos colectivos, tolerando el chantaje de esta multinacional.

Si el Gobierno de España no va a actuar frente a los Estados Unidos, es misión de la Comisión recordarle y hacerle cumplir con sus obligaciones internacionales, porque ningún trabajador que lucha por sus derechos se merece la falta de apoyo institucional a la que se está sometiendo a los trabajadores de Rota.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, deseo denunciar dos cosas. Una, la atrevida intromisión de España en el futuro de Gibraltar, que ha decidido, casi por unanimidad, permanecer en la Unión Europea. Entrometerse ahora en Gibraltar, en beneficio propio, es dificultar cualquier negociación con Gran Bretaña en vez de ayudar a encontrar soluciones.

Segunda: es escandaloso el uso que España hace del dinero europeo para el Corredor Mediterráneo. Decir que el Corredor Mediterráneo va de Algeciras a Madrid es como decir que las líneas Berlín-Múnich o París-Lyon tienen que ver con el Canal de la Mancha.

El Gobierno de España lo retuerce todo, incluso la geografía, en beneficio de su proyecto centralista caro, inútil y anticuado. Pero ¿es posible que el Parlamento y la Comisión no sepan geografía y que den dinero para un traslado que provoca risa y pena a los niños de escuela primaria?

Estoy escandalizado. Se mire por donde se mire, Madrid no está en el Mediterráneo y parece que no lo estará en el próximo milenio.

Gilles Lebreton (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, la population de la Guyane française s'est révoltée pour protester contre son abandon. Plus rien ne fonctionne en Guyane: les hôpitaux, les écoles et les services publics sont en ruine; la sécurité n'est plus garantie et les frontières sont des passoires, incapables d'arrêter la submersion migratoire.

L'État français est le premier responsable de cette situation à cause de ses dirigeants qui ont tout laissé partir à vau-l'eau depuis 40 ans, à l'image de M^{me} Taubira, qui est pourtant guyanaise. Mais l'Union européenne est également responsable, car la Guyane est une région ultrapériphérique qui bénéficie des subventions du FEDER et du Fonds social européen. Or, ces subventions ont servi à financer des réseaux sans intérêt comme «un réseau d'animation destiné à créer une dynamique de territoire et une veille stratégique des projets structurants».

L'Union européenne prouve ainsi une nouvelle fois qu'elle est à cent lieues des véritables préoccupations des citoyens. Ce n'est pas d'animation dont les Guyanais ont besoin, mais de respect et de solidarité.

Janusz Korwin-Mikke (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Jak wszyscy porządni socjaliści, komuniści i inni lewacy wiedzą, kapitalista to straszny człowiek. Kapitalista tylko marzy o tym, żeby wyzyskać swojego robotnika. To jest jego ulubione marzenie i jego ulubionym zagranem jest wyrzucanie z pracy robotnika, który zarabia więcej, żeby na jego miejsce przyjąć innego, który zarabia mniej. Otóż gdyby kobiety za taką samą pracę dostawały szesnaście procent mniej, to na pewno kapitaliści wyrzuciliby wszystkich mężczyzn i na ich miejsce przyjęły kobiety. A poza tym sądzę, że Unia Europejska musi być zniszczona.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, chtěla bych upozornit na případ dvou mladých českých občanů, kteří byli zatčeni v Turecku v listopadu 2016. Miroslav Farkas a Markéta Všelichová navštívili oblast Rodžava v Sýrii, kde pomáhali zvládnout humanitární krizi v oblasti obývané převážně Kurdy a pomáhali při stavbě nemocnice.

V rámci této aktivity se také setkali se členy IPG, což jsou skupiny, které jsou v mnoha evropských státech uznány jako součást koalice bojující proti takzvanému Islámskému státu. Oba mladí lidé jsou momentálně v tureckém vězení a čekají na soud. Důvodem jsou právě jejich kontakty s IPG, která je v Turecku považována za teroristickou organizaci.

Nepřestávám věřit ve spravedlivý proces. Zním jejich rodiče, znám jejich příběh a jsem přesvědčena, že jsou nevinní. Spolu s kolegy usilujeme o jejich propuštění. Sepsali jsme dopis vysoké představitelce Evropské unie pro zahraniční věci a bezpečnostní politiku Mogheriniové, ve které požadujeme, aby podpořila jejich osvobození. Markéta a Mírek chtěli v dobré víře pomoci a nyní čelí nespravedlivým následkům. Přesto věříme, že zde bude spravedlivý proces, který je osvobodí.

Tibor Szanyi (S&D). – Elnök asszony! Az elmúlt pár napban a világ közel negyvenezer tudósa, akadémikusa, egyetemi professzora, köztük tizenöt Nobel-díjas közgazdász emelte fel a hangját, mert Orbán Viktor, magyar miniszterelnök be akarja záratni a régió legjobb nemzetközi egyetemét Budapesten, a Közép-európai Egyetemet. A magyar médiában közkeletű szavakkal, orbitális tetűségnek neveztem ezt a lépést, és tegnap tízezer fiatal hasonló véleménnyel tüntetett ezen ördögi terv ellen.

A hatalom flegma válasza ma az, hogy huszonnégy óra alatt fabrikál egy törvényt a gonoszsága legalizálására. Orbán Viktor, úgy is, mint Putyin és Erdogan leglelkesebb európai uniós követője, azonban nem csak az oktatást rombolja, hanem ezzel párhuzamosan egy másik szégyenletes törvénnyel az egész magyar civil szektort is. A magyar nép most Európa szolidaritásáért kiált.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Miesiąc temu w tej izbie mówiłem o kobiecie, którą bez jej zgody, mimo rozpaczliwych prób obrony, uśmiercono w jednej z holenderskich „leveneindekliniek”. Wzywałem wtedy do reakcji wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji, urzędowo zajmującego się prawami człowieka, pana Fransa Timmermansa. Dwa tygodnie temu, w czasie jego pierwszej od dwóch lat wizyty w Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych, próbowałem bezpośrednio uzyskać jego stanowisko. Wiceprzewodniczący odmówił, wyjaśniając, że nie to jest tematem jego wizyty w komisji. Taka postawa pokazuje rzeczywiste stanowisko kierownictwa urzędującej dziś Komisji Europejskiej wobec rządów prawa, wobec kontroli parlamentarnej, a przede wszystkim wobec praw człowieka i najbardziej tragicznych nieszczyć ludzkich.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, Francie chce učinit další nehorázný krok k narušení vnitřního trhu Evropské unie. Francouzské regiony totiž potichu zavádí takzvanou klauzuli Molière, podle které firmy ucházející se o veřejnou zakázku ve stavebnictví musí zajistit, aby všichni dělníci mluvili francouzsky.

Je zcela zjevné, že toto opatření má znovu diskriminovat cizince a ztěžovat jim přístup na francouzský pracovní trh. Tato podmínka je v naprostém rozporu s evropskou legislativou, jak již potvrdila i sama Komise. Hlavním důvodem pro zavedení tohoto opatření má být zvýšení bezpečnosti na stavbách. Skutečným důvodem je dle mého názoru jen další snaha o ochranu francouzského trhu. Nebo se nám snad Francie snaží říct, že v jiných členských státech se staví jinak než ve Francii?

Princip volného pohybu osob a služeb vyžaduje, aby byl požadavek na znalost jazyka toho daného státu zajištěn jen u povolání, u kterých je to nutné z důvodu komunikace. V současné době se se zaváděním různých diskriminačních a protekcionistických opatření přímo roztrnul pytel. Podobná opatření mohou vyvolat jen další protiopatření ze strany zbylých členských států. Opravdu je to cesta, kterou se chceme vydat?

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, now that Article 50 has been triggered everybody is focused on what will transpire in relation to negotiations. We in Ireland are well aware that we will probably be the most affected country in the European Union – economically, definitely, especially in relation to agriculture, but more importantly in relation to the border that hardly exists right now thanks to the good work of the European Union over many years, the USA and the two governments.

You could walk across the border now just as easily as you could walk from one of these rooms to the other. That is the way it has to stay, because if you unravel that you could set things back 20 years. It would upset trade, it would upset jobs but, above all, would upset peace. We cannot risk that in Ireland or the European Union, too much has been invested in it. This is not a bargaining chip. The border, which is invisible at this stage, must continue into the future.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Mulțumesc, doamnă președintă. Stimați colegi, anul trecut, în 7 iulie, aici, la Strasbourg, lansam către dumneavoastră propunerea ca, în condiții de post-Brexit, să facem împreună un prim pas către consolidarea unei Europe omogene, a celor 27, prin regândirea distribuției în teritoriu a instituțiilor Uniunii.

La acel moment v-am făcut cunoscută intenția mea de a declanșa și a susține relocarea de la Londra la București a Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente și mă bucur că sunteți alături de mine în acest demers. Mulțumesc, de asemenea, și premierului României, Sorin Grindeanu, că a răspuns mai mult decât pozitiv ideii mele, organizând un grup interinstituțional de lucru care se ocupă de pregătirea candidaturii României pentru relocarea la București a Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente.

Pentru cei care au încă dubii și pun întrebarea dacă România este pregătită pentru a găzdui o instituție de asemenea anvergură, vă anunț că în cel mai scurt timp vă voi pune la dispoziție un studiu întocmit la inițiativa mea și cu sprijinul Parlamentului European, unde veți găsi toate argumentele necesare susținerii propunerii de relocare în România a Agenției Europene pentru Medicamente. Vă mulțumesc.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in Europa l'autismo colpisce ben 5 milioni di persone, e i dati danno una tendenza in crescita. L'autismo comporta disabilità significative a chi ne è colpito e sconvolge intere famiglie. Parlare di autismo oggi fa meno paura rispetto al passato. Molte barriere sono cadute, c'è una sensibilità diffusa, c'è una conoscenza maggiore grazie anche ad iniziative come la giornata mondiale della consapevolezza dell'autismo, celebrata ieri.

Tuttavia, resta molto da fare in termini di ricerca, in termini di assistenza e qualità della vita di queste persone e delle loro famiglie. È necessaria e non più procrastinabile, anche alla luce della dichiarazione scritta sull'autismo adottata da questo Parlamento nel 2015, una risposta strategica da parte delle istituzioni europee. L'Unione europea deve saper rispondere in modo adeguato alla sfida dell'autismo ed assicurare assistenza adeguata alle persone con autismo e ai loro familiari. Non possiamo girarci dall'altra parte rispetto a chi soffre.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, the European Union has always been a project of peace, democracy and human rights, keeping the peace on this continent for decades, yet now, within days of triggering the UK's exit process, senior Tories are already threatening to go to war with Spain. How utterly foolish. It is imperative that we continue to speak out to the British people about the EU's role in promoting peace and human rights. One year ago today, British Iranian citizen Nazanin Zaghari-Ratcliffe, was imprisoned in Iran on unknown charges but, together with many fellow MEPs, I have sent a letter to key Iranian leaders urging her release, as well as that of EU Iranian prisoners Dr Jalali and Nazak Afshar. The EU must continue to be a pillar for human rights in the world, to take a stand when children are imprisoned in Bahrain, for example, or when LGBTI people are rounded up and killed in Chechnya, as is being reported. It is true that working together we can achieve more than alone and we must continue to speak that truth.

Emilian Pavel (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, ultimele date ale Comisiei Europene despre indexul economiei digitale și al societății plasează România pe o poziție surprinzătoare și dezamăgitoare.

Calitatea și viteza foarte ridicată a internetului sunt clar decuplate, deocamdată, de valorificarea deplină, economică și socială a digitalizării. România poate și trebuie să profite de revoluția digitală. Acest lucru trebuie pus în aplicare atât la nivel național, cât și la nivel local.

În acest context și în condițiile în care am mai prezentat această propunere încă de acum doi ani, doresc să fac și un apel din plenul Parlamentului European către autoritățile locale din orașul meu natal, Oradea. Consider că autoritățile locale trebuie să lucreze alături de mediul privat, de tineri și nu numai, de mediul educațional și de partenerii sociali pentru ca întreaga comunitate să poată profita din plin de progresul tehnologic. Oradea are vocația și potențialul de a deveni, printre altele, și un nou *hub* IT al României, în condițiile în care reușește să susțină un ecosistem propice inovării.

Ca inginer programator, dar și ca eurodeputat, voi face tot ce îmi stă în putință pentru a ajuta. Vă mulțumesc.

Victor Negrescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, lansez un avertisment cât se poate de ferm la adresa Comisiei Europene. România și statele din estul Europei nu trebuie forțate să plătească factura Brexit-ului.

Am primit cu îngrijorare mesajul recent al vicepreședintelui Comisiei Europene, domnul Oettinger, care vorbește de nevoia de a face economii consistente în viitorul buget multianual ca urmare a Brexit-ului. Acest lucru sugerează explicit că se dorește reducerea bugetului dedicat politicii de coeziune, în plus față de posibila creștere a contribuțiilor pentru statele membre. Ceea ce înțelegem este că statele din est, precum România, ar urma să fie dublu taxate în urma ieșirii Marii Britanii.

Se pregătește, deci, nu doar o Europă cu mai multe viteze, ci și un Brexit la suprapreț pentru cei din est. O reformare a politicilor de coeziune ar accentua dramatic toate inegalitățile pe care încercăm să le corectăm în Uniunea Europeană. Aceste tăieri ar echivala cu sacrificarea intereselor acestor state noi care au decalaje de dezvoltare foarte acute.

Comisia Europeană trebuie să facă tot posibilul să evite un astfel de tratament nedrept aplicat statelor precum România, pentru că rezultatul ar fi scindarea de facto a Uniunii Europene.

La Présidente. – Ce point de l'ordre du jour est clos.

25. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes

26. Closure of the sitting

(La séance est levée à 23 h 35)

—

Key to symbols used

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

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

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

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

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

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