

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 12 JUNE 2018

(C/2024/3374)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2018-2019 SESSION

Sittings of 11 to 14 June 2018

STRASBOURG

Contents	Page
1. Opening of the sitting	3
2. Preparation of the European Council meeting of 28 and 29 June 2018 (debate)	3
3. The Economic and Monetary Union package (debate)	31
4. Resumption of the sitting	47
5. Voting time	48
5.1. State of play of recreational fisheries in the EU (A8-0191/2018 - Norica Nicolai) (vote)	48
5.2. Clearing obligation, reporting requirements and risk-mitigation techniques for OTC derivatives and trade repositories (A8-0181/2018 - Werner Langen) (vote)	48
5.3. Common rules in the field of civil aviation and European Union Aviation Safety Agency (A8-0364/2016 - Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vote)	48
5.4. CO ₂ emissions from and fuel consumption of new heavy-duty vehicles (A8-0010/2018 - Damiano Zoffoli) (vote)	48
5.5. Modernisation of education in the EU (A8-0173/2018 - Krystyna Łybacka) (vote)	48
5.6. Towards a sustainable and competitive European aquaculture sector (A8-0186/2018 - Carlos Iturgaiz) (vote)	48
6. Explanations of vote	49

Contents	Page
6.1. State of play of recreational fisheries in the EU (A8-0191/2018 - Norica Nicolai)	49
6.2. Clearing obligation, reporting requirements and risk-mitigation techniques for OTC derivatives and trade repositories (A8-0181/2018 - Werner Langen)	51
6.3. Common rules in the field of civil aviation and European Union Aviation Safety Agency (A8-0364/2016 - Marian-Jean Marinescu)	52
6.4. CO ₂ emissions from and fuel consumption of new heavy-duty vehicles (A8-0010/2018 - Damiano Zoffoli)	52
6.5. Modernisation of education in the EU (A8-0173/2018 - Krystyna Łybacka)	53
6.6. Towards a sustainable and competitive European aquaculture sector (A8-0186/2018 - Carlos Iturgaiz)	56
7. Corrections to votes and voting intentions : see Minutes	58
8. Resumption of the sitting	58
9. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting : see Minutes	58
10. Iran nuclear agreement (debate)	59
11. Negotiations on the modernisation of the EU-Chile Association Agreement (debate)	80
12. Presentation of the annual report on human rights and democracy in the world 2017 and the EU's policy on the matter (debate)	89
13. Corrigendum (Rule 231): see Minutes	100
14. Documents received: see Minutes	100
15. Georgian occupied territories ten years after the Russian invasion (debate)	100
16. EU-NATO relations (debate)	112
17. Further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine (debate)	126
18. Cyber defence (debate)	134
19. Cohesion policy and the circular economy (debate)	143
20. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes	155
21. Closure of the sitting	155

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF 12 JUNE 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Opening of the sitting

(La seduta è aperta alle 9.02)

2. Preparation of the European Council meeting of 28 and 29 June 2018 (debate)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulla preparazione del Consiglio europeo del 28 e 29 giugno 2018 (2018/2590(RSP)).

Monika Panayotova, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, in June, leaders will take a strategic look at several important issues that will affect Europe in the coming years. A first topic is how, in today's world, we as Europeans do more for our own security. The European Council will take stock of progress in a number of areas where we are deepening cooperation in security and defence.

The agreement we reached together on the European Defence Industrial Development Programme will allow the European Union to fund, for the first time, a programme on defence capabilities. We are also in favour of making headway on improving military mobility, and working to strengthen our resilience to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear-related risks and our capabilities to address hybrid threats. The European Council will also assess progress in the field of civilian CSDP, and leaders will provide further guidance on PESCO and our important cooperation with NATO.

As you know, migration is also on the agenda. Much has been achieved over the past years in terms of strengthening our overall migration policy, with tangible results on the ground. There is broad agreement on most elements of our migration policy, including better protecting our external borders and controlling illegal migration.

As the Presidency, we have worked diligently on the reform of the Common European Asylum System to help bridge differences in approaches and develop concrete solutions. Intensive negotiations have taken place in the Council on the various proposals of this package. The Dublin reform remains difficult, but in most other files good progress has been made. The European Council will now look at the broader picture. To this end, President Tusk is currently conducting consultations with his peers.

The June European Council will also be the opportunity to spell out our vision for an innovative and digital Europe in the years ahead, following the leaders' debate in Sofia. Technology-driven innovation is increasingly shaping our lives. The pace and scope of change that the next waves of innovation will bring are unprecedented.

To play an active part in this global transformation, we in Europe need to do better when it comes to the way we generate ideas, turn them into business and help businesses grow on the global stage. We need to deepen Europe's innovation capability and nurture, in particular, breakthrough and disruptive innovation.

As we reinvent the way we do things, we should also stay true to ourselves and to our values. This is not only true with respect to innovation, but also in relation to our digital endeavours. By creating an environment where innovation can thrive while guaranteeing high standards for the protection of users, we will foster high levels of trust in technology.

The next Multiannual Financial Framework is a key tool to shape our common future. The European Council will discuss the future handling of the proposals concerning the MFF, including the timeline.

Turning to jobs and growth, the European Council will conclude the European Semester for 2018. It will also take stock of the leaders' discussion on taxation held in March under the Leaders' Agenda process. The European Council will also have the opportunity to address international developments, including the latest trade issues. As you know, the European Council is also expected formally to adopt the decision on the composition of the European Parliament, on which you will be voting tomorrow.

Finally, the European Council, in terms of Article 50, will meet on the next day to review the state of the negotiations with the United Kingdom.

In the margins, the Euro Summit will meet in an inclusive format. It will discuss measures on the Banking Union and to further develop the European Stability Mechanism, and will provide additional guidance on the way forward.

Presidente. – Prima di dare la parola al Vicepresidente Timmermans, volevo ricordare al Consiglio che il Parlamento europeo, già da mesi, ha approvato una proposta di riforma di Dublino.

Dopo i risultati dell'ultimo Consiglio «Giustizia e Affari interni», credo che sia giusto affrontare ed esaminare attentamente il testo approvato da parte di uno dei colegislatori qual è il Parlamento europeo.

Io ho sottolineato, in tutte le riunioni del Consiglio, l'importanza di affrontare la questione di Dublino e l'importanza di esaminare come testo base quello del Parlamento europeo, che coniuga contemporaneamente fermezza e solidarietà.

Lancio un appello al Consiglio affinché non venga sottovalutata o ignorata la proposta seria che ha avuto un grande consenso da parte di questa Aula per una riforma di Dublino, cosa che mi pare, fino ad oggi, non sia stata fatta da parte degli Stati membri.

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, it's an honour to address this House, this time on behalf of President Juncker, who is returning from G7 duty in Canada. I think I would be remiss if I did not start with what happened in Charlevoix. I'm not one to declare that the rules-based international system so carefully built up after the Second World War is now collapsing before our very eyes. However, it is the first time since 1945 that an American President has not seen it as an American strategic interest to work hard to ensure a vibrant and unified Europe and a robust transatlantic relationship.

This means that the EU needs to take its destiny more into its own hands and we should be confident about our ability to do so, because our foundations are strong. Our Union is built upon Member States that voluntarily and democratically decided to link their destinies and shape the future together. The basis for the shared destiny is a tripod of democracy, the rule of law and the respect for human rights. This is how one creates unity between big and small, how one creates unity in full respect of our diversity. It is in turn our unity that gives us strength globally to pursue better and more sustainable standards for everyone; to defend global trading rules; to boldly address climate change; to protect our citizens against geopolitical and/or goeconomic challenges, and to better grasp the opportunities that globalisation has to offer.

And so, this month's European Council comes at an auspicious time, and it is a good opportunity to show political will, decisiveness and unity. But we should look beyond the daily Twitter feed and also keep our eyes on the ball with regard to the work that lies ahead of us. Last December, leaders agreed to come back to a number of issues in March. In March, they agreed to come back to the same issues in June. While important decisions take time, we cannot postpone decisions indefinitely. The situation in the Mediterranean is a stark reminder that we cannot wish problems away. No fence is high enough and no sea is wide enough to render our countries immune to the greatest pull factor there is – the freedom, the prosperity and the stability of our Union.

In recent months, under the guidance of the Bulgarian Presidency, the European Union has shown what is possible when we are united and committed to finding European solutions. We agreed, for instance, on the difficult issue of the Posted Workers Directive, thanks in large part to this House. Equal pay for equal work in the same place will now become a reality for all Europeans. We made substantial progress on our digital single market with regard to the abolition of roaming and on clarifying and strengthening audiovisual media services or telecoms rules.

With regard to Brexit too, the EU is united. Our goal is to ensure we, together with our British partners, do as little harm as possible to either side and to work together towards an orderly process in the interest of all citizens in the EU and in the United Kingdom.

The European Council of June will take stock on a number of issues, in particular the question of Ireland and Northern Ireland, as well as the future relationship between the UK and the EU. We still have three more weeks to go, and it is important to use this time to achieve real progress in the interests of all. Parliament, Council and Commission are working together to deliver.

In the next months, we also have to deliver on the legislative files we identified as our common priorities under the two joint declarations. From plastics to migration, from energy to transport, from the European Solidarity Corps to the European Citizens' Initiative. We've promised this to the European citizens before the next elections. It will be our collective achievement. The joint declarations guide our work, so let's stick to our commitments.

As we approach the June European Council, this then is the spirit and the approach that all leaders must take. United by our values, linked by our interests and concerted in our actions.

Das gilt auch für die Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Denn je stärker diese ist, umso mehr verleiht sie der Union als Ganzes Kraft, was sich wiederum positiv auf den Lebensstandard der Europäerinnen und Europäer auswirkt. Deshalb ist es unsere Pflicht, den Euro zu stärken. Die Kommission hat bereits im Dezember ein umfassendes Paket vorgelegt, um unserer Gemeinschaftswährung zusätzliche Stärke und Handlungsfähigkeit zu verleihen. Wir haben außerdem vor wenigen Wochen konkrete Haushaltsinstrumente vorgeschlagen, um Reformen zu fördern und Investitionen im Euro-Raum selbst in Zeiten asymmetrischer Schocks zu gewährleisten.

Dass die Mitgliedstaaten die Vorschläge der Kommission diskutieren, ist ein erster wichtiger Schritt. Doch es reicht nicht, wenn wir lediglich feststellen, was notwendig und geboten ist. Wir haben zwar bereits Fortschritte gemacht und Lehren aus der Krise gezogen – sei es bei der Reduzierung notleidender Kredite im europäischen Bankensektor, beim Aufbau der Kapitalmarktunion oder bei der Einigung im ECOFIN-Rat im Mai, als wir Maßnahmen ergriffen haben, um die Risiken im Bankensektor weiter zu reduzieren. Das war ein wichtiger Schritt hin zur Vollendung der Bankenunion.

Der Gipfel im Juni – die *Leaders' Agenda* – ist der Moment, die Ideen und den politischen Willen endlich auch in konkrete Entscheidungen und Taten umzusetzen. Wir müssen uns endlich darauf einigen, dass der Europäische Stabilitätsmechanismus die Letztsicherung für den einheitlichen Abwicklungsfonds übernehmen kann. Und dafür müssen wir endlich auch beim Einheitlichen Europäischen Einlagensicherungssystem weiterkommen, das nicht nur über Nacht aufgebaut werden kann, sondern für das Vorbereitungen, Vorbedingungen zu erfüllen sind.

Gestatten Sie mir, auch den mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen zu erwähnen. Ich glaube, dass wir uns vor den nächsten Wahlen unbedingt einigen müssen.

En ce qui concerne la gestion des migrations, la situation n'est en rien comparable à ce qu'elle était il y a trois ans, mais ici également, nous avons encore du travail à faire pour compléter la mise en place d'une politique migratoire fondée sur la responsabilité et la solidarité, tout en assurant une meilleure protection de nos frontières extérieures. Les négociations ont déjà bien avancé sur une bonne partie des éléments proposés par la Commission pour réformer notre régime d'asile européen commun, notamment sur l'harmonisation des conditions d'accueil et les conditions standard de protection ainsi que sur un cadre commun de réinstallation pour renforcer les voies d'entrées légales.

Nous avons également accompli des progrès sur le renforcement d'Eurodac – la base de données de l'Union européenne contenant les empreintes digitales des demandeurs d'asile – et nous avons déjà un accord politique sur le renforcement de l'agent de l'Union européenne pour l'Asie.

Le Parlement s'est engagé dans toutes ces négociations avec détermination et a réussi à améliorer la qualité du texte et je voudrais saluer les efforts considérables accomplis par la présidence bulgare dans ce domaine. Mais pour finaliser un accord sur l'ensemble de la réforme de notre politique d'asile, il faut maintenant trouver un compromis sur le mécanisme de Dublin et je veux soutenir, avec tout l'appui de la Commission, les propos du président du Parlement à cet égard.

Là aussi, on peut noter des avancées, en particulier la création d'un volet préventif de ce mécanisme. Prévenir la crise future est aussi important que la gestion de la crise elle-même. Mais évidemment, il faut reconnaître et respecter les différentes positions et sensibilités qui existent dans nos pays sur ces questions très délicates.

Il est temps de résoudre ce problème. Tous les éléments sont sur la table, il est temps d'agir, je suis en parfait accord avec le président du Parlement européen. Ainsi, la Commission attend des chefs d'État et de gouvernement qu'ils se penchent sérieusement sur la question de Dublin et esquissent les orientations nécessaires pour parvenir à des solutions équilibrées qui aient l'appui de tous et qui soient des solutions solides et durables fondées sur nos valeurs communes. Nous risquons non seulement de perdre nos valeurs mais aussi de porter atteinte à notre humanité même si nous ne trouvons pas des solutions qui permettent de voir des personnes en crise comme des êtres humains qui ont besoin de notre aide.

(Applaudissements)

Étant donné l'importance de ce défi – existentiel, je crois, pour l'Union européenne –, la Commission proposera cet après-midi un renforcement ambitieux et important des moyens financiers pour soutenir notre politique commune au cours des prochaines années.

Manfred Weber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die heutige Debatte wird angesichts des G7-Gipfels sicher von Unsicherheit und Instabilität geprägt sein. Deswegen möchte ich zunächst mit der positiven Meldung beginnen: Gerade erreichen uns alle auf unseren Mobiltelefonen die Meldungen aus Singapur. Wenn sich Kim und Trump darauf verständigen, dass es eine große Chance für ein nuklearwaffenfreies Korea gibt, für eine koreanische Halbinsel, die nuklearwaffenfrei ist, dann ist das ein großer Erfolg, und wir sollten froh sein darüber, dass es diese Ergebnisse gibt. Diplomatie wirkt, auch Sanktionen wirken. Aber ich hoffe, dass in Washington erkannt wird, dass Diplomatie nicht nur dann gut ist, wenn Donald Trump sie unterschreibt. Wir haben nämlich mit dem Iran-Abkommen bereits einmal ein sehr positives diplomatisches Ergebnis erzielt. Damals hat Obama unterschrieben, und das war genauso gut wie das jetzige Ergebnis, das uns für Korea vorliegt.

Wenn wir jetzt auf den Gipfel, auf den Europäischen Rat blicken, dann besteht vielleicht wieder die Gefahr, dass wir große Ziele beschreiben und am Ende vielleicht wieder mit wenigen Ergebnissen dastehen. Deswegen möchte ich mich darauf konzentrieren, zwei konkrete Punkte herauszugreifen, wo wir als EVP-Fraktion jetzt Klarheit und Ergebnisse einfordern und wo auch die Chance dazu besteht: Das erste sind die Handelsfragen – ein Thema, das viele umtreibt, die derzeit um ihre Jobs bangen. Da muss Europa der Europäischen Kommission volle Rückendeckung geben. Die Zölle auf Aluminium und Stahl sind ohne Grund verhängt worden. Und deswegen sind geschlossene Gegenmaßnahmen, so wie die Kommission sie angestoßen hat, der richtige Weg. Wir erwarten vom Rat, dass das voll unterstützt wird. Und wir sind auch der Meinung, dass das Gespräch richtig ist. Wenn Jean-Claude Juncker jetzt den Arbeitsauftrag bekommen hat, nach Washington zu fahren und über eine Welt ohne Zölle zu reden, dann ist das der richtige Ansatz.

Ich möchte noch ergänzen, dass derzeit für uns Europäer durch die Problematik mit Amerika auch eine Reihe von Chancen entstehen. Es ist so, dass wir in Kanada erlebt haben, dass es sechs zu eins steht. Wir haben also viele Partner, die nach wie vor für den regelbasierten Handel eintreten. Mit denen sollten wir reden, ins Gespräch kommen und schnellstens mit Japan, mit Mexiko, mit dem Mercosur die Verträge abschließen, die jetzt realistisch sind.

Ich möchte im Rückblick nochmal daran erinnern: Wir hatten ja hier im Parlament viel Streit über die Frage CETA – ich möchte das nochmal in Erinnerung rufen –, und wir spüren in der jetzigen Lage, wie dankbar wir sind, dass wir zumindest mit Kanada, mit einem Land, das unseren Werten verpflichtet ist, in der Lage sind, solche Verträge abzuschließen. CETA ist für uns nach wie vor ein Vorbild für die zukünftige Gestaltung der Handelspolitik.

Zu guter Letzt ein zweiter Punkt, nämlich die Euro-Diskussion: Auch hier reicht die Debatte. Wir können jetzt, glaube ich, zu Ergebnissen kommen. Der Europäische Währungsfonds ist zum Greifen nahe, damit wir zukünftig die Unabhängigkeit von internationalen Strukturen bekommen. Der *backstop* ist nahe. Wir werden die Parlamente stärker beteiligen können mit den Strukturen, die jetzt angedacht sind. Das heißt, diesen Schritt sollte man tun, genauso wie den Schritt, den die Kommission bereits im Dezember vorgeschlagen hat, mit dem Investitionsbudget jetzt voranzukommen. Nach dem Aspekt Reformen und nach dem Aspekt Budgetstabilisierung liegt jetzt der Schwerpunkt auf den Investitionen. Da sollten wir vorankommen.

Deswegen: Jetzt handeln, in diesen beiden Punkten! Rückenwind sollte uns geben, dass wir beim Euro große Erfolge haben. Seit Beginn der Krise haben wir in der Euro-Zone zehn Millionen neue Arbeitsplätze geschaffen und haben ein Wachstum von 2,5 % – deutlich stärker als die Amerikaner und übrigens auch die britischen Freunde. Deswegen sollte uns die Reformpolitik, die wir bisher praktiziert haben, dafür Rückenwind geben.

Ich wünsche mir, dass beim Rat jetzt nicht mehr geredet wird, sondern bei diesen beiden Punkten gehandelt wird!

Udo Bullmann, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, this is the House of the European people and, having said that, I cannot avoid raising again and again the situation in the Mediterranean Sea. There is a boat in the middle of the sea. Many of those people – children, pregnant women – are in a disastrous situation, not for the first time and, unfortunately, perhaps not for the last time.

We have a general idea. Those who disembark in one of our countries disembark in the European Union. This is our principle. Article 80 of this Treaty speaks about responsibility and about solidarity. Yes, it is true that Italy has taken the lion's share of the responsibility in the past, but – forgive me, dear colleagues, this is to Mr Salvini – if you need to demonstrate what you think is your strength at the expense of pregnant women and children, you have no idea how poor you are.

(Applause)

This is a change in Italian politics which is by no means defensible.

And let us talk about the re-emergence of the Spanish people and the Spanish Government. Yes, Pedro Sanchez, thank you. You gave grace to the European Union again and what you did was marvellous. This is the new style of the Spanish people and of Spanish politics and we appreciate that. Thank you to the new government and all those who support it.

But since this is not an isolated situation – and now we come to the Council – no, you don't have time to postpone the issue of migration. No you cannot stay sleeping. No, there is no excuse for not doing anything and this is one of the major issues that have to be discussed in the next European Council. And this is also to Mr Kurz's incoming Presidency. Mr Kurz, ask yourself whether you are happy. Are you still proud that you closed – this is one of your favourites – the Balkan route without any alternative? Are you still proud of your comradeship with Mr Orban, demonstrating it in each and every situation? No, we will not let him pass into this House of the People when he arrives in the second half of this year with a stance like that! This will not be the policy of my group, the Socialists and Democrats, and this will not be the policy of the European Parliament, dear friends. What we have to make clear ...

Und das bezieht sich auch auf meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen der Europäischen Volkspartei in Deutschland, lieber, verehrter Kollege Weber: Nein, das ist nicht drin! Wir können hier nicht pro-europäisch reden und zu Hause mit Orbán schäkern und die Europäische Union in einer zentralen Frage ohne Perspektive lassen. Das werden wir nicht tolerieren!

Und das müssen wir auch an Frau Merkel adressieren: Nein, Frau Merkel, der Enthusiasmus, den Sie zeigen, der Enthusiasmus in Lösungen der Probleme – man kann nicht weiche Knie kriegen, nur weil Trump mit dem Handelskrieg droht. Der Wirtschaftsminister in Deutschland muss das kapieren: Das reicht nicht, was da geliefert wird!

Und das gleiche gilt für unser Engagement, mit dem wir insgesamt die Europäische Union stark machen müssen. Auch Frau Merkel muss kapieren: Nur eine vereinte Europäische Union, nur eine starke Europäische Union wird in der Lage sein, unsere Gesellschaft in eine erfolgreiche Zukunft zu führen. Dafür steht meine Fraktion, dafür werden wir arbeiten. Und wir freuen uns auf die Diskussionen, die in diesem Haus zu dem Thema noch anstehen.

Roberts Zīle, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, I will increase the number of languages used here so I will ask you to use the headphones, and also to symbolically extend the core of the European Union, I will speak Latvian.

Priekšsēdētāj! Protams, nav nekāds jaunums, ka nacionālo politisko uzvaru dēļ Eiropas Savienība un citas dalībvalstis bieži vien tiek izmantotas kā ringa pretinieks, un pēc šīm saldajām uzvarām tiek kronēts nacionālais čempions. Taču pēdējā laikā šī situācija sasniedz jaunu intensitāti, un uzvarām noder gan viesstrādnieku uzvaras — kaut gan īstenībā tie ir tikai pāris procentu no darbaspēka tirgus —, gan arī migrācijas jautājums un Dublinas konvencijas pārskatīšana. Tagad, gatavojoties Padomes sēdei, es faktiski pieskaršos tikai pāris punktiem No Eiropadomes dienas kārtības.

Pirmkārt, par migrāciju, Dublinas pārskatīšanu un kvotām kā sastāvdaļu no tām. Trīs gadu laikā, kopš Eiropas Komisija nāca klajā ar šo kvotu priekšlikumu, es domāju, ka visiem ir skaidrs, ka šī sistēma nevar un nevarēs strādāt arī nākotnē, jo faktiski migrantu un arī kontrabandas organizētāju kartē ir tikai dažas Eiropas Savienības dalībvalstis, kas ir galamērķis, kur šiem migrantiem nokļūt. Visas pārējās valstis ir vai nu tranzīvalstis, vai tādas, kuras vispār nav kartē, kā, teiksim, tās valstis, kas ir pārāk nabadzīgas, lai tur kādreiz kāds vispār nokļūtu. Teiksim, manā valstī, Latvijā, tika uzbūvēts simts vietu migrācijai — labas, iekārtotas, — patversmes bāze, kura parasti ir aizpildīta labi, ja ar vienu trešdaļu. Izpildot mūsu brīvprātīgās kvotas, cilvēki, kas tur nejauši nokļūst, pazūd ar dokumentiem vai bez dokumentiem jau burtiski nākošajās dienās. Tas nozīmē, ka šāda sistēma faktiski nedarbojas, un mēs joprojām trīs gadu laikā neesam atraduši citus risinājumus.

Otrs jautājums — daudzgadu finanšu budžets, par ko arī tiks runāts Padomē. Manuprāt, ir ārkārtīgi svarīgi akcentēt to, ka Eiropas Komisijas priekšlikums, neskatoties uz *Brexit* naudas iztrūkumu, tomēr rada lielākas iespējas kopumā šajā finanšu daļā, tajā pašā laikā ļoti mērķēts kohēzijas politikas samazinājums atkarībā no konkrētās dalībvalsts. Šajā gadījumā kāda ziņa tā ir paaudzēm, kas ir jaunā paaudze šajās valstīs? Mēs runājam par periodu No 2020. gada līdz 2027. gadam, kas faktiski nozīmē 10 gadu garumā daudzām jaunākām dalībvalstīm tā ir ziņa jaunajai paaudzei: 'Jums nākotne ir vēl sliktāka nekā pašlaik šajās dalībvalstīs, un tas nozīmē, ka jums ir jābrauc prom uz tām valstīm, kuras ir turīgākas, jo tām pat subsidēs darbvietas jaunatnes nodarbinātībai'. Nav gan skaidrs, vai arī iebraucošajiem jauniešiem no citām valstīm vai tikai vietējiem jauniešiem.

Jāatceras tas, ka dažās valstīs t. s. universālā 'universal income base' bāze ir augstāka nekā vidējā alga citās Eiropas Savienības dalībvalstīs, un visā šajā kopējā mērķē mums ir ļoti grūti uzrunāt Eiropas Savienības pilsoņus, ka ir kopīga vērtības, kā *Timmermans* kungs teica, ka ir kopīga vienota izpratne par Eiropas vērtībām. Ir grūti un gandrīz neiespējami paskaidrot šādu valstu, Eiropas Savienības valstu, pilsoņiem, ka tā ir.

Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, I have to say to you that if I hear Mr Weber and then Mr Bullmann afterwards, I ask myself whether there is a government in Berlin or have I missed something? I have not the impression that there is – in any way, on a number of issues – a common German position for the moment and that is one of the problems for the moment in the European Union, but that is not my item. Ms Panayotova, the next European Council can talk and talk and talk and discuss and write conclusions on whatever issue that you want, and there is a long list of issues – Brexit, the governance of the eurozone, the defence union, the Multiannual Financial Framework, the Trump and Kim Summit – you name it, but in my opinion – and Mr Bullmann has already said it – there is one item, one crisis, which I urge you not just to talk about this time, but to act on now, and it is this ongoing migration crisis in the Mediterranean Sea.

I think we all agree on this – you, the Commission, the whole Parliament, all the political groups – that what is happening there is a disgrace, it is a scandal, and already for years now. I am contradicting Mr Timmermans a little bit now when he says yes, it is not the same as in the past. No, it is not the same as in the past, but since the start of this mandate, Mr Timmermans, there will be more than 10 000 people who will have died in the Mediterranean Sea. And since the beginning of this year, there are 800 people, men, women and children, who have drowned in the Mediterranean Sea. And now it is the same with this boat – 600 people, seven pregnant women, pushed from country to country. It is a disgrace, it is a scandal.

I will not point my finger in this debate at one individual country, not at Malta, not at Italy. I do not think we have to point a finger at Mr Muscat and say it's your fault, or at Mr Salvini even. I reject completely the ideas of Mr Salvini, but I think we have to point the finger not at you personally, so don't take it personally, but at all of you, at the whole of the European Council which is not capable until this moment to take a position on this migration issue and on the reform of the Dublin system. It is a collective responsibility. I am always asking myself why we made the European Council an official institution of the European Union under the Lisbon Treaty. In the Lisbon Treaty we said, yes, the European Council has to become an official institution of the European Union, to take decisions, to steer the Union, and what we see today is exactly the opposite, the incapacity of the European Council to take a decision on this. So my question to you – I have only one simple question – is: when for God's sake will the European Council take a decision on this migration issue, and when will you take responsibility?

I want also to urge you to do two things at the next European Council. I think there are two things you need to do. The first is to have this common position of Dublin; Mr Bullmann and others have already recalled this. But the second thing in my opinion is to do another thing, and that is to create as fast as possible, very urgently, what I call European reception centres in the transit countries so that we take our responsibility in these transit countries to give decent protection to these people, and that these people can ask in these reception centres for asylum, for protection, so that it is not necessary for them to jump into the arms and into the hands of these criminal gangs in Libya or in these gangs of human traffickers – because that is what needs doing at the moment.

And to media colleagues, the picture of the year – because everybody is talking today about what will be the picture of the year – will it be six European leaders humouring Mr Trump in Canada, or will the picture of the year be the handshake between Trump and Kim? I think, unfortunately, and to our disgrace, the picture of the year could be again another little Alan who is the victim of our bad policies on migration. I say to you Mr Tajani, I support you fully in what you said at the beginning of the debate. If the Council fails again at its next meeting, in my opinion we should really put the question if we have to invite Mr Tusk to our next meeting in July. Or more, I think we have to consider going to court under Article 265 of the Treaty. Article 265 of the Treaty will give the Commission and the European Parliament the possibility to go against the Council if the Council fails to act, which is the case here today.

Ska Keller, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, the expectations for this summit were indeed rather high. A lot of things are to be decided at the summit. The eurozone reforms have been mentioned – and this would be high time because we have been having a kind of eurozone crisis since 2010, so it is not really early – and also Brexit. While this is a newer topic than 2010, it is also one with a very tight deadline just around the corner and a lot of problems to solve.

Then, of course, there is the migration issue that has already been addressed by many colleagues. We all know that the current Dublin rules don't work. We have been saying this for years here in Parliament. We have been making proposals for years about how to fix it and it hasn't been getting better. We all know the pictures of overcrowded camps in Greece. We all know about the refugees living on the streets in Italy. We all know this constant blame game between different countries – whichever it is at the moment – and it is outrageous how this is going. It is always countries trying to say that they want the lowest number of refugees possible so the only thing they can ever do is close the borders, but that is not a policy that we can carry out as the European Union if we value anything of our own and if we stand at all for the human rights that we tell other countries that they should adhere to.

So Dublin urgently needs to be reformed. This Parliament has shown how it can be done. The thing about this Parliament is that we are not some sort of weird extra-territorial something parliament, but we are the same parties, the same countries, present here as are present in the Council and as are going to be present at the summit. So I wonder why it is that if we – same country, same parties – can come to an agreement, why can't the Heads of State and Government do that? I really don't see any reason, except for lack of political will and a lack of will to lead somewhere, to help people and to really go to the heart of the matter.

Without solidarity, our common European asylum policy is bound to fail, and Member States are already engaged in this vicious circle of deterrence and responsibility shifting. So yes, it is outrageous that Italy cannot follow the principle – the most basic humanitarian and sea law – but also, Malta has not wanted to open its port for years. We didn't hear anything from France. So I'm really thankful to Spain, but this cannot be the only solution. We also see in other countries – Austria, Denmark, Germany – that everyone is closing their borders; everyone is settling on deterrence.

So human rights have become a matter of campaigning in the European Union. We are doing politics – pretty much all parties are doing politics – on the back of those most vulnerable. I think that this is totally unacceptable in a European Union that is worth any of what Mr Timmermans mentioned before. It is also very interesting that the approaching Austrian Presidency has told the Bulgarian Presidency that 'Dublin is dead'. That is probably also quite unprecedented.

On the eurozone reform – thank you for reminding us of that – it is urgent that we fix the problems there. The problems are known. There are solutions on the table and, while we Greens don't agree with all the details of what Mr Macron has put forward, at least there is someone who has put proposals forward. So we should finally get somewhere and the German Government cannot hide any longer. They also need to get their act together, finally get real and offer something, because this is something that all Member States should understand. They should not hide behind what they call their national interests. Actually it is in their national interests to have a strong and functioning European Union and a strong and functioning eurozone. This is something that is in all of our interests. The world is turning less and less predictable. All the Member States should be so happy that they have a reliable and strong Union that they are part of and a strong partnership that they are part of, but they need to do something for it and they might even need to pay euro or two for it, but I think it is worth it.

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Wir reden hier im Europäischen Parlament wieder wenige Tage vor dem nächsten Gipfel miteinander, mit der Kommission und mit der gegenwärtigen Ratspräsidentschaft. Wir können eigentlich nur festhalten, dass es inzwischen eine ritualisierte Form ist, wir uns jedes Mal hier treffen, anschließend nach dem Gipfel wieder ein Treffen haben und konstatieren: Wir sind keinen Schritt weitergekommen!

Ich denke, das hat auch etwas damit zu tun, wie Politik sich sowohl in den Mitgliedstaaten, aber auch in den EU-Institutionen gegenwärtig darstellt. Wir nehmen viel zu wenig zur Kenntnis, was sich in unseren Gesellschaften, in den Mitgliedstaaten, in der EU tut und was sich auch außerhalb der EU tut. Ein Großteil der Menschen ist von außerhalb unserer Politikangebote, die wir unterbreiten. Und wir lassen es zu, dass letztendlich die gesamte Problematik, auch die der Migrations-, der Asylkrise, innerhalb der Europäischen Union, die Unfähigkeit, wirklich gemeinsame Solidarität zu entwickeln und sich verantwortlich zu fühlen, dazu führt, dass wir Rechten, Rechtspopulisten, Rechtsextremen, Nationalisten den roten Teppich ausrollen und sie letztendlich einladen, den Menschen, die in Armut leben, etwas weiszumachen, sie zu missbrauchen, ihre Not zu missbrauchen, um letztendlich zu sagen: Diese Gesellschaften sind gespalten, und wir müssen uns gegen den Solidaritätsgedanken zur Wehr setzen. Ich denke das kann und darf nicht so bleiben. Wir haben hier eine gemeinsame Verantwortung.

Und mit Blick auf das Schiff, die Aquarius: Ja, Dank an Spanien und auch – wie ich zwischenzeitlich gehört hatte – an die Landesregierung von Korsika, hier helfen zu wollen. Aber eines wird wirklich deutlich: Wir können nicht glauben, dass wir tatsächlich mit nur spontanen Rettungsaktionen in der Lage sind, eine nachhaltige Politik der Europäischen Union zu entwickeln, die sich dem weltweiten Problem der Migration überhaupt stellt. Wir können auch – da sehe ich durchaus auch Unterschiede zwischen uns –, wir können doch nicht glauben, dass wir im Zuge der Dublin-Verhandlungen meinen, ein Abschottungssystem aufzubauen, das auch die pauschale Ablehnung von Asylbewerbern, von Flüchtlingen aus sogenannten „sicheren Drittstaaten“ umfasst, z. B. aus den Maghreb-Staaten. Wir müssen ebenfalls zur Kenntnis nehmen, dass offensichtlich die Deals mit der Türkei und mit Libyen auch weiter sehr problematisch bleiben.

Herr Verhofstadt, Sie haben vorhin eine ganze Reihe von Zahlen genannt. Ich möchte eine hinzufügen: Seitdem wir diese Deals haben, sind 3000 Menschen im Mittelmeer ertrunken beziehungsweise gestorben. Das gehört genauso zu einer realistischen Einschätzung, was wir können, was wir tun müssen, wozu wir verpflichtet sind.

Die bulgarische Präsidentschaft hat versucht, einen Vorschlag zu erarbeiten, den ich ebenfalls für nicht gelungen halte. Ich glaube nicht, dass es funktionieren wird, in einem dreistufigen Verfahren zu sagen: Nur in bestimmten Situationen kann man von anderen Ländern erwarten, dass sie sich mehr beteiligen sollen oder dass sie stärkere finanzielle Leistungen übernehmen sollen.

Das Kernproblem wird weiter bleiben. Sind die Mitgliedsstaaten bereit, eine Mindestzahl von Flüchtlingen gemeinsam aufzunehmen und dafür zu sorgen, dass man in Krisensituationen gemeinsam und solidarisch miteinander handelt? Das muss unser Punkt sein! Dafür werden wir streiten! Dazu fordern wir alle auf! Wir brauchen die Lösung jetzt, nicht irgendwann! Wir können nicht noch weiter darauf warten, dass irgendwie eine Regierung sich erbarmt, ein Schiff aufzunehmen.

Wir haben grundsätzliche Regeln zu schaffen, und wir sollten Abstand davon nehmen, dass wir glauben, wenn wir Mauern errichten, dann richten sich diese Mauern nur nach außen – die richten sich auch nach innen. Was wir den einen nicht gestatten, ist auch eine Einschränkung von Freiheit in unserer Europäischen Union, in unseren Mitgliedsstaaten.

Gerard Batten, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Mr President, one big problem facing the Council is, of course, Brexit and the big hole that it's going to leave in the EU budget. But we're not really any closer to leaving the European Union than we were the day after the referendum. Mrs May is a remainer who doesn't really want to leave and, of course, as you found out, she couldn't negotiate her way out of a wet paper bag. The whole process for the last two years has been about to delay and impede in the hope of eventually overturning the result of the referendum. This week the Commons votes on the Withdrawal Bill, and that's entirely dependent upon this House voting on the Withdrawal Agreement later this year. Of course, you could vote against it. The whole thing then reverts to square one, like a game of political snakes and ladders.

But it doesn't have to be that way. Under the right leadership, Britain could leave the European Union quickly and decisively, and this is how it should be done. First of all, forget Article 50 – that's your device, not ours. Parliament should repeal the European Communities Act of 1973 as a first step, and then we would have left under our law, not your law. We can offer you a free trade agreement with everything except the free movement of people, or trade on WTO terms. It's going to be your choice anyway: take it or leave it, one way or the other.

And we could easily reach an agreement on the reciprocal rights of citizens. Parliament can then repeal or amend all the EU-derived law in accordance with its own timescales and priorities, and I'm sure that can be done in a spirit of friendly cooperation with our good friends here in Europe.

Her Majesty's government shouldn't be asking the European Union how it can leave; it should be telling you how it's going to work. But, of course, that is never going to happen under Mrs May. Mrs May should go now and make way for a prime minister who actually wants to leave the European Union. That would be good for us, but it would actually be good for you as well.

Nicolas Bay, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, en Italie, après le discours, voilà les actes!

Dimanche, le ministre de l'intérieur et vice-Premier ministre italien, notre ex-collègue Matteo Salvini, a pris une première mesure forte. Souverainement, au nom de son pays, il a décidé d'interdire l'accès aux ports italiens à un navire en provenance de Libye et gagné son bras de fer avec les autorités maltaises.

Affrété par une ONG soi-disant humanitaire, ce navire transportait plus de 600 migrants clandestins.

Les mafias de passeurs qui prospèrent sur le trafic d'êtres humains, encouragés par les discours irresponsables de certains dirigeants européens, M^{me} Merkel en tête, avaient promis à ces migrants un Eldorado européen qui n'existe pas, qui n'existe plus!

La seule solution face au défi migratoire, la seule solution véritablement humaine, juste et responsable, c'est la fermeté qui consiste à refuser cette espèce de chantage permanent aux droits de l'homme!

Trop, c'est trop! Nous ne pouvons plus accueillir de «migrants». *Basta! No way!*

Matteo Salvini applique ainsi la même méthode que l'Australie qui a permis d'assécher totalement les flux d'immigration clandestine à destination de ce pays.

Mais alors qu'attendez-vous? Qu'attendez-vous donc pour entendre enfin nos peuples qui vous demandent de mettre fin, une bonne fois pour toutes, à ces flux migratoires totalement anarchiques?

Il est urgent de protéger nos frontières nationales et de mettre en œuvre une véritable coopération européenne pour défendre efficacement les frontières extérieures en s'inspirant de l'action de la Hongrie hier et de l'Italie aujourd'hui.

Les moyens, qu'ils soient législatifs, technologiques, financiers ou humains, nous les avons! Ce qu'il nous manque, ce qu'il vous manque, c'est une réelle volonté politique.

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, the June European Council should be an opportunity to make strides towards the United Kingdom's amicable and orderly exit from the European Union. Those who claim it is a last-chance saloon for a deal on the border limit what can be achieved. They fail to realise that agreeing future trade and avoiding friction on the border go hand in hand.

Yet, Mr Barnier continues to disrespect the integrity of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom Government's proposal on the backstop would apply to the entire United Kingdom. The Commission response has been to revert to the annexation of Northern Ireland as part of specific customs or regulatory arrangements. Let me be clear once again in this House: not only is this damaging to the economy of Northern Ireland, it is a position that the Prime Minister has said No British Prime Minister could ever agree to. Furthermore, it is damaging to community relations in Northern Ireland.

If a Brexit border solution is to succeed, it must find peace with both communities, and that includes the unionist community as well. This reflects a practical reality and is in line with the consent principle of the Belfast Agreement. We want to see a sensible solution without the infection of a political dogma, but our relationship must be about respect and reflect the realities of open trade.

Presidente. – Signora Panayotova – mi rivolgo a Lei in quanto rappresentante del Consiglio ovviamente –, dopo aver ascoltato le parole di tutti i gruppi politici, visto anche quello accade con la vicenda della nave Aquarius, con i contrasti tra Italia e Malta, se il Consiglio avesse risolto il problema della riforma di Dublino, non ci sarebbe tutto quello che sta accadendo oggi. L'egoismo degli Stati rischia di far peggiorare la situazione invece di farla migliorare. Così non risolviamo né il problema dell'immigrazione, né il problema dell'Africa.

Come Lei sa, il Parlamento europeo ha anche approvato, in una delle ultime risoluzioni, un testo dove si insiste per avere più investimenti nel prossimo bilancio comunitario per l'Africa. Il problema dell'immigrazione è il problema dei problemi. C'è un forte ritardo.

Le chiedo, a nome di tutto il Parlamento, di fare in modo che il prossimo Consiglio non sia soltanto un Consiglio dove si discute formalmente della questione Dublino e migrazione. Mezzo miliardo di cittadini europei hanno bisogno di risposte e queste risposte purtroppo non sono arrivate e non stanno arrivando. Noi continueremo a far ascoltare la nostra voce finché non sarà risolta la questione immigrazione, finché non sarà risolto il problema della riforma di Dublino.

Angelika Niebler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Europäischen Kommission, Frau Ratsvertreterin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich kann nahtlos an das anschließen, was unser Parlamentspräsident gerade sagte: Wir brauchen bei zwei Themen einen Durchbruch beim Europäischen Rat, beim Gipfel: Das ist das Asylthema, und das ist die Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion. Beim Asylthema kann ich nur sagen: Wir brauchen gemeinsame Regeln, die die Zuwanderung steuern und begrenzen. Wir können nicht den Schleppern die Entscheidung überlassen, wer nach Europa kommen darf oder nicht. Ich hoffe sehr, dass jetzt dann beim Gipfel Fortschritte erzielt werden.

Ich möchte meine Redezeit dafür nutzen, um über die Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion zu sprechen. Lassen Sie mich vielleicht damit beginnen, dass ich finde – zurückblickend –, dass die Väter des Euro vor über 25 Jahren mit dem Maastrichter Vertrag und mit dem Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt eigentlich gute Arbeit geleistet haben, dass wir eigentlich einen funktionsfähigen, festen Rahmen geschaffen haben, dass vernünftige Regeln und Mechanismen entwickelt wurden, um den Euro stabil zu halten. Nach der Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise 2007 ist das weiterentwickelt worden. Aber ich glaube, der Rahmen, der damals gesetzt wurde, gilt noch heute, nämlich dass die Mitgliedstaaten auch für ihre Finanzen eigenverantwortlich sind. Das heißt, dass wir nicht übergehen sollten in eine Schuldenunion, in eine Risiko- oder Haftungsverlagerung. Ich glaube, wir sollten bei den Grundwerten der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion bleiben. Für mich ist immer noch das Wichtigste, dass die Stabilitätsregeln eingehalten werden. Das ist der beste Schutz vor Krisen.

Wenn ich das vorausschicke, dann glaube ich, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, können Sie verstehen, dass ich den Vorschlägen zur Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion nur in Einzelbereichen etwas abgewinnen kann. Ich finde es gut, wenn wir einen Europäischen Währungsfonds ins Leben rufen. Aber auch hier finde ich wichtig, dass Konditionalität gilt. Konditionalität ist für mich das A und O. Das heißt: Hilfen ja, aber eben gegen Strukturreformen, sonst funktioniert das einfach nicht. Wir müssen endlich mal an die enorme Reduzierung der Risiken bei den Banken herangehen. Ich möchte dazu einfach auch nochmal anregen und vielleicht auch die Kommission nochmal fragen, warum wir nicht endlich mal anfangen, wegzugehen von der Nullgewichtung der Staatsanleihen. Also ich verstehe bis heute nicht, warum wir hier die Kredite und die Staatsanleihen nicht entsprechend ihrem Risiko auch in Bilanzen gewichten.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Madam President, the European Parliament is being very clear – the next European Council can no longer delay key decisions and must make very clear choices. The world is changing, it is so clear, and it is also clear that we need a strong Europe, a united Europe, to protect people. The solution is certainly not closing the borders, but neither is the solution to keep open borders without protecting people. We need to have a Europe which is open but protecting people.

This is the case when we organise the European border. Of course we need to ensure that we have a proper European asylum system to protect refugees who are looking for our help, but when we negotiate trade agreements we need to ensure we are open to the world but we need to protect our people and our standards.

If we want a Europe that protects, the next European Council must push the negotiations on the European budget also for a budget which will be there to protect people. I am concerned, on behalf of my group, that the current proposal on the Community budget does not ensure the proper level of economic and social vision of cohesion. This is too weak to ensure our unity. The same applies to the proposals to reform the eurozone, because we don't have proposals to ensure strong investment to converge, to ensure that the social pillar is really applied everywhere. So this is missing, and we want to strengthen European unity on the internal front, with a united Europe, for us to be able to cope with external challenges. This is the solution the next European Council should adopt without any kind of hesitation.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Według danych Eurostatu za 2016 rok Unia przyjęła średnio 4,6 imigranta na każdy 1000 mieszkańców. W Polsce było to 5,5 – Ukraińców, Białorusinów, Gruzinów i innych narodowości. Nie uzyskano zgody w sprawie przymusowego mechanizmu relokacji w Radzie. Pani Minister to nie powinno zostać wpisane do projektu konkluzji Rady.

I jeszcze jedno, budowa gazociągu Nord Stream I pozwoliła Rosji na aneksję Krymu. Co możemy spowodować, budując Nord Stream II?

Cecilia Wikström (ALDE). – Madam President, we have been getting used to seeing the failures of summits lately. I regret it very much that the EU Heads of State have consistently failed to show leadership on asylum reforms, and only last week we saw President Trump crash the G7 Summit.

Leadership should now be exercised and the tyranny of low expectations should be left behind. It is now high time for Heads of State to rise above national egoism and show citizens all over the EU that we can deliver substantial, meaningful reforms of the Dublin Regulation, for which I happen to be the rapporteur. I know that some Member States – and also Members of this House – are tempted to declare the Dublin reform process dead and suggest instead some form of externalisation of responsibilities in the field of asylum, pretending that we can wave a magic wand and send the asylum seekers to faraway camps, which would of course be an enormous error for the simple reason that it would never work. Even if you ignore the obvious moral issues, there are still practical and legal issues. It would be a waste of time.

Instead, what we need today are practical solutions, not castles in the sky. It is now high time for the Council to join the European Parliament at the Dublin Regulation negotiating table. I can promise you that this House – and I, myself – stand ready for discussions. No more excuses and delays. It is high time to deliver. We owe it to the citizens of Europe.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, I'm sure I was not alone in feeling a cold shiver down my spine when I saw that chilling photograph of the world leaders at the G7. For those of us who believe in a rules-based international system, Trump's deliberately disruptive behaviour in Quebec and at the United Nations, the World Trade Organization and now in Singapore is deeply disturbing. Trump's treatment of Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau was despicable but typical of his bullying style. He doesn't want to be isolated in a room-ful of cooperative world leaders, he wants to corner them one by one, so that he can make America great again at their expense.

If the UK does go ahead with leaving the EU at a time when the global rules-based system is being shredded by Trump faster than the promises made by Brexiteers, we face a very dangerous future. That's why I will be marching twice in London in the next few months: first on 23 June to demand a people's vote on the Brexit deal, and then again on 13 July to oppose the visit of President Trump to the UK.

Those of us who believe in democracy and the rule of law know that Brexit and Trump are two sides of the same coin – a coordinated attack on the global system that has ensured peace and prosperity since the Second World War. Both must be confronted and both must be overcome.

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, we have perfidious Albion. The British Foreign Minister believes that worrying about Ireland is a folly. If Boris Johnson has his way then the border in Ireland will be hardened and strengthened. Positive and constructive proposals accepted by the British Government in December are rejected by them within days. Fantasy proposals are put in place instead. Perfidious Albion. And to buy a bit more time for the coalition agreement by the British Government and their allies in the Democratic Unionist Party – the Jurassic Party – agreements are torn up, and rights are denied.

Enough is enough.

The whole of the EU and Europe knows what needs to be done, and it is up to the Dublin government and to all of the EU Council Member to stand up to perfidious Albion in June and not to be persuaded by the disgraceful *Irish Times* editorial of yesterday, or by the nonsense by Diane Dodds MEP. The DUP do not speak for the people of the North on Brexit. The British Government does not care, unfortunately, about the people of Ireland – north or south – having to salvage ourselves from the Brexit wreckage.

Laura Ferrara (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in vista del prossimo Consiglio europeo, il mio pensiero non può che andare alla situazione del Mediterraneo, dove sta naufragando l'idea di riformare il sistema comune europeo di asilo, dove sta naufragando l'idea di riformare il regolamento di Dublino, che è profondamente iniquo rispetto ai paesi transfrontalieri, dove sta naufragando l'idea di rivedere radicalmente il progetto europeo e di dimostrare che nell'Unione europea esiste l'Unione.

Abbiamo i paesi transfrontalieri, come l'Italia, che continuano ad essere lasciati completamente soli. In Italia devono avvenire gli sbarchi, in Italia devono avvenire le identificazioni e le registrazioni. L'Italia deve farsi carico della prima accoglienza. Scatta il regolamento di Dublino: l'Italia deve essere responsabile per l'esame della domanda di protezione internazionale.

Cosa fanno gli altri paesi? Gli altri paesi sospendono Schengen, gli altri paesi reintroducono i controlli alle frontiere interne in modo da blindare tutti in Italia. Allora cosa c'è di più penoso in tutto questo dibattito? È il puntarsi il dito l'uno contro l'altro, senza capire che se siamo preoccupati dei sentimenti di odio, se siamo preoccupati dal deflagrare del progetto dell'Unione europea, allora dobbiamo dimostrare che l'Unione europea esiste e che c'è ancora tanto da fare.

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

Nicola Danti (S&D), domanda «cartellino blu». – Io credo che la retorica non abbia fine in quest'Aula. Abbiamo ascoltato ora la rappresentante del governo italiano – quelli che adesso sono al potere in Italia, quelli che in quest'Aula hanno votato contro la riforma del sistema di Dublino, quelli che la settimana scorsa con il loro Ministro Salvini hanno affossato definitivamente in Consiglio la riforma di Dublino – dirci che è un problema dell'immigrazione in Italia.

Cara Presidente, io chiederei alla collega Ferrara quali solo le intenzioni del governo italiano la prossima settimana? Avete affossato Dublino la settimana scorsa, pensate di resuscitarlo questa settimana? Vergogna!

Laura Ferrara (EFDD), risposta a una domanda «cartellino blu». – Ringrazio il collega Danti e restituisco immediatamente al mittente la vergogna, perché fossi in lei mi vergognerei molto nel non sapere quale sia stata la proposta del Consiglio europeo che penalizzava ulteriormente l'Italia e il motivo per il quale il Movimento 5 Stelle ha votato contro la posizione invece del Parlamento europeo. Una soluzione di compromesso che non vedeva un ricollocamento dei richiedenti asilo automatico, ma era un ricollocamento filtrato, filtrato da procedure di verifica sulla sicurezza e sul merito della domanda.

Noi invece vogliamo un ricollocamento automatico ed obbligatorio. Quindi stia tranquillo che noi le idee le abbiamo ben chiare, probabilmente siete voi che non le avete chiare e lo avete dimostrato con i vostri anni di governo finora in Italia.

Mario Borghezio (ENF). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, bisognerebbe fare un monumento al Ministro degli interni Salvini e a tutto il governo italiano per aver gettato un sasso nello stagno, visto che finalmente ha provocato questa discussione e l'invito del nostro Presidente – al quale mi associo – perché il Consiglio adotti finalmente una decisione e si decida ad affrontare seriamente in fondo il problema dell'immigrazione.

Un monumento perché ha svegliato quest'Europa assente, disattenta e anche ipocrita, ipocrita perché siete per l'accoglienza, ma l'accoglienza da fare nelle case degli italiani, e gli italiani hanno ripreso la loro sovranità con questo governo, che non è né razzista né xenofobo visto che assiste i minori e le donne incinte molto meglio di quello, cioè niente, che avete fatto voi fino adesso.

Allora non facciamo il solito pateracchio nel prossimo Consiglio, ma esaminiamo delle soluzioni di decisione per non lasciare nessun paese come l'Italia nel dramma dell'immigrazione, esaminando per esempio la proposta che è stata formulata – a cui mi associo – di creare dei centri di accoglienza fuori dai confini dell'Europa per assicurare un filtro di coloro che meritano di essere accolti perché hanno diritto all'asilo e respingere quell'immigrazione economica che non è nell'interesse dell'Europa e che interessa forse solo a grandi interessi dei vostri amici...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Madame la Présidente, la hausse unilatérale des droits de douane sur l'acier et l'aluminium et le camouflet du président Trump au G7 vous ramènent enfin aux réalités. Enfin on entend dire ici qu'il faut nous affranchir de la tutelle américaine, jusqu'ici considérée par beaucoup comme bien confortable. Mais j'y croirai quand nous quitterons enfin l'OTAN, dont l'existence ne se justifie plus. J'y croirai surtout quand vous renoncerez au libre-échange négocié avec le monde entier pour revenir au principe de réciprocité inclus dans la charte de La Havane de 1948.

Quant à votre politique migratoire, j'y croirai quand l'examen des demandes d'asile se fera exclusivement à partir des pays d'origine et non dans nos pays, où toutes les mesures prises jusqu'ici ont eu l'effet d'un appel d'air pour de nouveaux flux d'arrivants. M. Bullmann et d'autres orateurs nous parlent des femmes enceintes et des enfants qui errent sur un bateau en Méditerranée; ce n'est pas M. Salvini qui est responsable de cette situation, ce sont plutôt les propos de M^{me} Merkel et les vôtres qui les incitent à risquer leur vie.

Quant au discours sur les droits de l'homme, j'y croirai quand les vrais réfugiés politiques, comme Edward Snowden ou Julian Assange, seront bienvenus dans l'Union européenne.

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non mi voglio soffermare sul Mediterraneo perché abbiamo domani il dibattito su questo, ma vorrei soltanto dire che resto un po' sorpresa quando mi sembra di vedere tanto entusiasmo nel proteggere il diritto all'immigrazione, che è un sacrosanto diritto, ma molta reticenza quando qualcuno invece vorrebbe proteggere il primario diritto di ogni persona a vivere nella sua patria e a non emigrare. Quindi qui mi nasce qualche sospetto.

Detto questo, io penso davvero che il Consiglio debba fare una seria riflessione su come sta procedendo su tanti aspetti. Noi qui in Parlamento facciamo tanto lavoro e riusciamo a trovare delle sintesi, riusciamo a trovare delle soluzioni che spesso naufragano, quelle si affogano, all'interno delle discussioni di un Consiglio che è bloccato nelle posizioni rigide di paesi che non riescono invece a trovare altrettanto una sintesi.

Io vedo tante cose che non funzionano. Qui abbiamo lavorato tanto per il PNR. PNR che però, anche se verrà attualizzato, con i buchi che ci sono nei vari paesi, sarà una coperta piena di buchi. Abbiamo lavorato per mettere in piedi qualcosa che costa al contribuente e che sarà una coperta piena di buchi. Stessa cosa per la interoperabilità tra le varie banche dati. Inutile avere tante banche dati, se poi non parlano tra di loro e anche qui tanti soldi del contribuente che forse non sono messi così a frutto.

La sicurezza è il primo tema per i cittadini, ma se vogliamo davvero coniugarlo con i nostri valori ascolti quanto ha detto prima il Presidente del Parlamento Tajani: date attuazione alla riforma del regolamento di Dublino votata dal Parlamento, miglioratela casomai, ma non fate quei passi indietro indecenti, indecorosi, che umiliano l'Unione europea e tutti i suoi cittadini.

Lei ha anche accennato alla protezione civile. Abbiamo lavorato a spron battuto, con un'agenda fitta, lei lo sa, per rafforzare la protezione civile e dare sicurezza ai nostri cittadini anche su questo fronte. Sembra che il Consiglio ancora non sia pronto per il negoziato. Ancora una volta, noi lavoriamo e voi rallentate. Non ve lo potete permettere.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! In den letzten Jahren gab es kaum einen Gipfel, der sich nicht mit dem Thema Flucht und Migration beschäftigt hätte. Das könnte man grundsätzlich als Indiz dafür betrachten, wie wichtig den Mitgliedstaaten eine Lösung der Frage ist. Wenn dem aber so wäre, dann müsste jedem Gipfel eine Serie von Maßnahmen folgen. Das ist leider nicht der Fall. Die ungelösten Probleme werden von Mal zu Mal mehr. Und wenn einmal etwas geschieht, dann wird es noch dazu schlecht kommuniziert.

Das alles hat bei der Bevölkerung ein Gefühl der Unsicherheit entstehen lassen, und viele Menschen fühlen sich von Europa im Stich gelassen. Es hat den Anschein, dass dieser Zustand manchen Regierenden gar nicht so unrecht ist, weil das Spiel mit der Angst schon längst zum erfolgreichen politischen Geschäftsmodell geworden ist. Das gefährdet aber langfristig die Existenz des europäischen Projekts, und es ist daher notwendig, dass die Staats- und Regierungschefs endlich diesen unerträglichen Lähmungszustand überwinden und sich mit uns auf konstruktive Verhandlungen über das Asylpaket einlassen. Wenn das wieder nicht passiert, dann sollten wir zu rechtlichen Schritten greifen.

Bernd Kölmel (ECR). – Frau Präsidentin! Die nächste Ratssitzung sollte sich unbedingt mit der Eurokrise beschäftigen. Wir hören jetzt seit Jahren von unverantwortlichen Politikern, der Euro sei gerettet, der Euro sei eine Erfolgsgeschichte. Das ist glatt gelogen! Die Bürger Europas werden hier angelogen: Die Eurokrise ist mehr denn je da. Wir sehen das ganz aktuell an den Vorgängen in Italien, wo man sich zu Recht dagegen wehrt, dass der Euro ein Korsett anlegt, dem Italien nicht gewachsen ist. Der Euro wird derzeit künstlich am Leben gehalten durch eine Nullzinspolitik der Europäischen Zentralbank und Anleihekäufe. Das ist ein Betrug an den Sparern. Die Sparer werden um ihre Zinsen betrogen.

In diesem Parlament beschäftigen wir uns sehr intensiv und mit Recht damit, dass wir eine Million da oder dort ausgeben wollen. In dem sogenannten Verrechnungssystem TARGET2 im Euro werden jeden Monat Dutzende von Milliarden Euro an Garantien fällig, und kein Mensch beschäftigt sich damit. Dafür werden überhaupt keine Entscheidungen getroffen. Das ist nicht in Ordnung. Wir müssen uns endlich dieser Frage stellen und Ausstiegsszenarien schaffen, damit Länder den Euro geordnet verlassen können.

Josep-Maria Terricabras (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, in the meeting of the Council at the end of the month, I hope that the Member States will take a more firm position on migration than they have done so far. Have they, for instance, the political will to effectively reform Dublin? We don't need nice words with no real political content. What happened two days ago, against international law, with the boat in Italy and Malta is just the latest scandal in which the EU must intervene, if it still has the capacity of speaking on its own and wishes to be taken into account.

The reaction of Valencia or of Barcelona or of Corsica, offering themselves to receive those migrants in danger, is a good example of humanity and decent politics. I hope you will talk in your meeting about these things. I hope you will explicitly mention those who are not living up to their responsibilities and that you will mention those who feel responsible for the needs of others. Something is now clear and urgent. To talk about the future of Europe means to talk about the Europe of the future.

Barbara Spinelli (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, premetto che concordo con l'inviato dell'ONU Cochétel: la solidarietà europea non va discussa mentre arriva una nave di migranti sofferenti; la priorità è dar loro subito il porto più sicuro, non farlo è illegale.

Al tempo stesso dobbiamo riconoscere che l'Italia resta il paese che per primo registra gli arrivi e che nessuna riforma di questa regola iniqua è in vista. Il blocco delle navi è frutto velenoso del blocco negoziale su Dublino IV e usa i migranti come ostaggi. Se il Consiglio europeo cercherà l'unanimità su Dublino, confermerà che c'è del marcio nell'Unione.

Al mio governo vorrei dire: fate propria la riforma del Parlamento; ha difetti, è vero, ma è la più avanzata possibile. Gran parte del Consiglio vuole ucciderla, guardatevi da alleati come Orban: non accetterà redistribuzione di quote, non è amico del governo italiano.

Rolandas Paksas (EFDD). – Lyg skrajojantis olandas po Viduržemio jūrą blaškosi laivas nuo Libijos krantų. Jis ilgai negali plaukti į Europos Sąjungos uostus, nes nei viena Bendrijos šalis nebenori spręsti svetimų problemų, savų per akis. Kaip indėnų tamahaukas ore kasdien švytuoja kirvis, skelbiantis prekybos karą tarp Amerikos ir Europos Sąjungos. Vadinamąją teisės viršenybės politika nepatenkintos šalys savo „nesutinku“ reiškia vis garsiau. Laukia nesutarimai dėl naujojo Europos Sąjungos biudžeto po dvidešimtųjų. Apie visa tai bus kalbama, diskutuojama Tarybos posėdyje, tačiau vėl tik padiskutuota, nusifotografuota, ir vėl iki kito posėdžio. Lietuvos ir, manau, kitų Europos valstybių piliečiams reikia ne fotografijų, reikia gerų, ryžtingų sprendimų, o ne diskusijos dėl diskusijos.

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Madam President, you lot had better wake up. The world is moving on while you still sit there and discuss the same old thing, month after month after month. Trump and Kim: let's celebrate it. Austria, Italy, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia: they're all moving on. Your regime has become more and more irrelevant.

In London on Saturday, 20 000 people attended a rally to free political prisoner Tommy Robinson, and those 20 000 people supported Brexit. In May, another 10 000 people marched in support of free speech. They too support Brexit. 17.4 million people voted for Brexit. They still support Brexit. The majority of the people want the government to get on with Brexit.

You people entertain UK remoaners – the modern-day devil, George Soros: a foreigner kicked out of his own country, an open-borders billionaire who openly fights democracy. He openly pays MEPs to dance to his tune. You're all suffering from DDD – democracy deficit disorder – and that's why we're marching again in London on 23 June. We want our country back.

President. – Ms Atkinson, you are going too fast.

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Don't cut me off.

President. – Could I just ask – can you listen? Because I think we can both speak English, so we can be very clear. What I was trying to do was help you communicate. You are going far too fast for the interpreters.

Janice Atkinson (ENF). – Yes, but do you know, I'm not speaking to all of them in here; I'm speaking to the UK. I'm speaking to Mrs May. I wasn't sent here to talk to any of you. I was sent here to defend the British people.

Most of you understand English. English is the language of the world. English is the language of this Parliament.

President. – Ok, let's calm down. Could I ask you, Madam, to sit down, with respect, and could I just say to you, as somebody who speaks very clear English: in this Chamber we are all elected by citizens, and the one remark that I had some concern about was your opening line, where you said 'You lot'. Because, as far as I am concerned, we are all elected by citizens to represent our citizens' many points of view. Thank you for your contribution.

Colleagues, please, there's no need for this. Stay calm. Madam is leaving the Chamber. Thank you and good morning.

Steven Woolfe (NI). – Madam President, a class war is being waged across the United Kingdom and Europe, a class war that pits the snobbish sect of the upper classes against the working and unemployed masses. A snobbish sect that thinks the lower classes are too thick, too dumb, too stupid, for voting for populists and Brexit. A snobbish sect that pits the young against the old, the rich against the poor, the university-educated against those that didn't go to university. A snobbish sect that have bribed and cajoled academics to support the EU with grants and awards, that have bribed lobbyist think-tanks and corporations with EU funding and subsidies and provided politicians with money and positions. A snobbish sect that today will unleash their crony cohorts of politicians in the UK Parliament to overthrow the Brexit bill. Well I hope those crony MPs and MEPs enjoy their 50 pieces of euro silver as they dump on the face of democracy and seek to deny Brexit.

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

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D), blue-card question. – Madam President, it seems that Mr Woolfe and Ms Atkinson are speaking only to the UK, to Mrs May and to the British people. Why are you here within the European Parliament? You should have to go home to speak, because here you speak to the Europeans, you speak to all the European Union countries and people. Why don't you go home? Probably, it might be time.

Steven Woolfe (NI), blue-card answer. – Madam President, I will be going home at the end of March 2019, thanks to the 17.4 million people that decided Brexit was a brighter future for Britain outside of the European Union. But I also do speak for those people up there who understand that there is a class war going on in Europe as well. A class war that is seeking to deny those who have been voted in in Poland and Hungary, in Slovenia. Those people who have voted for those in Germany in the AfD; for those in Holland, those in France, those who seek a different future for Europe, not an [...]orientated future...

(Microphone suddenly cuts out)

... that you, and many MEPs in this Chamber, support.

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Vice-Presidente da Comissão, primeiro queria registar a forma como lamento aquilo que se está a passar no Mar Mediterrâneo. É absolutamente inaceitável aquilo a que assistimos. Não ouviram da minha parte uma condenação da Itália ou de Malta porque eu considero que os países – em particular a Grécia, a Itália, Malta, a Espanha – têm sido muito abandonados pela União Europeia no tratamento da questão da migração e, portanto, isso é uma responsabilidade coletiva dos 28. Nós não podemos deixar morrer seres humanos no Mar Mediterrâneo, nós temos de resolver esta questão de uma vez por todas.

Segundo ponto, queria chamar a atenção para que é essencial que o Conselho dê um sinal no avanço da reforma da zona euro para consolidar o projeto do euro, nomeadamente avançando definitivamente com a união bancária e avançando com um outro conjunto de reformas tendentes essencialmente a que haja um orçamento para a zona euro que permitam tornar esta moeda uma moeda amigável para todas as economias que fazem parte da moeda única.

Queria também dizer que é fundamental ser bastante firme na questão do Brexit e, nomeadamente na questão da fronteira irlandesa. Este é um ponto essencial que terá, aliás, desenvolvimentos esta semana, mesmo hoje no parlamento britânico.

Finalmente, já que o Sr. Vice-Presidente tocou no assunto, permita-me falar sobre as perspetivas financeiras. É inaceitável que haja uma política de coesão e convergência em que um país como a Lituânia perde 23% dos fundos e um país como a Finlândia recebe 5, um país como a Itália sobe 6 e um país como a Croácia perde 6. Isto não é convergência, isto não é coesão, isto é o contrário da convergência e da coesão, isto não pode ser aceite.

President. – Apologies to Mr Jurek: you had indicated during the speaking time, so you have the floor for a point of order.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Artykuł 11 ustęp 3 Regulaminu zobowiązuje nas do wzajemnego szacunku posłów wobec posłów, ale tym bardziej do szacunku dla naszych wyborców.

Pani Przewodnicząca zwróciła uwagę pani poseł Atkinson, ale pan poseł Frunzuličá, reagując na wystąpienie naszego kolegi posła Woolfe'a, zakwestionował legitymizm posłów reprezentujących wyborców brytyjskich, którzy głosowali za brexitem. Oni są dzisiaj ciągle takimi samymi obywatelami państwa Unii Europejskiej jak każdy. Jeżeli odmawiamy im prawa do reprezentacji, negujemy demokratyczny charakter Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego proszę Panią Przewodniczącą o reagowanie na tego typu antydemokratyczne wypowiedzi nacechowane zresztą brakiem szacunku, do którego zobowiązuje nas regulamin.

President. – Mr Jurek, thank you for your point. The question allowed the speaker, Mr Woolfe, to respond, and he did so in due time. So I think we had quite a frank exchange, but thank you for your point.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hemos llegado a un punto tan bajo en la gestión de la migración en Europa que una decisión humana, solidaria, inteligente y acorde con el Derecho internacional, como es la que ha adoptado el presidente del Gobierno de España, Pedro Sánchez, es una excepción que nos llena de esperanza.

Es verdad, como decían otros colegas, que en Italia, España, Grecia y Malta estamos solos en la gestión de la migración. Eso es cierto, pero al señor Salvini le decimos que la crueldad con otros seres humanos nunca puede ser una victoria.

Necesitamos hacer una política coordinada, y llevamos diciéndolo en este Parlamento años. Y al Consejo tenemos que decirle: «No hacen ustedes nada». Sí, hacen una cosa: darle gasolina a los xenófobos en Europa. La inacción del Consejo está convirtiendo la xenofobia en una galopada política incesante.

Hagan algo. Este Parlamento les ha dicho cómo tienen que reformar el Reglamento de Dublín. Hagan algo, porque este está siendo el principal problema de Europa: están socavando la credibilidad del proyecto y dándoles alas a todos los xenófobos y antieuropeos. Hagan algo, y felicitemos al Gobierno español por haber sido capaz de conectar con el sentimiento de muchos europeos solidarios.

(La oradora se niega a que se le formule una pregunta con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 162, apartado 8, del Reglamento))

Sander Loones (ECR). – Dank u wel, mevrouw de Voorzitter. Anderhalf jaar is een lange tijd in de Europese politiek. Anderhalf jaar geleden was meneer Verhofstadt aan het onderhandelen met meneer Beppe Grillo. Hij wilde de Italiaanse Vijfsterrenbeweging in zijn ALDE-fractie. Intussen lijkt de liefde wat te zijn bekoeld.

Anderhalf jaar geleden ging het alleen over spreiden, spreiden, spreiden van migranten, alsof dat dé oplossing zou zijn voor de asiel- en migratiecrisis. Intussen praten we ook over wat anders, praten wij over sterkere Europese grenzen, praten wij over *push backs*, praten wij over meer en betere opvang in de regio. Stukje bij beetje komen de inzichten, komt het gezond verstand, ziet men in dat dit de enige manier is om massamigratie te controleren, om mensenhandelaars te kraken, en om die verdrinkingen in de Middellandse Zee eindelijk te stoppen.

Dat inzicht komt er, bij de lidstaten tenminste, maar bij dit Europees Parlement helaas nog altijd veel te weinig. Daarom worden de volgende zes maanden zo cruciaal. Dan zit Oostenrijk de Europese Raad voor. Ik wens meneer Kurz alvast bijzonder veel succes om deze realistische agenda verder door te duwen in de toekomst.

Νεοκλής Συλικιώτης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, παρ' όλες τις κατά καιρούς διακηρύξεις για κοινωνική Ευρώπη, για θέσεις απασχόλησης, για καταπολέμηση της ανεργίας, για ανάπτυξη, η Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο ακολουθούν πιστά την άγνοια και αδιέξοδη νεοφιλελεύθερη πολιτική της λιτότητας και της απορρύθμισης των εργασιακών σχέσεων, τις πολιτικές που οδηγούν στη διάλυση του κοινωνικού κράτους, στη διεύρυνση των κοινωνικών και περιφερειακών ανισοτήτων, στη φτωχοποίηση και τη στρατιωτικοποίηση.

Περικόπτονται συνεχώς κονδύλια από προγράμματα στήριξης της αειφόρου ανάπτυξης και της κοινωνικής συνοχής, χρηματοδοτούνται μόνιμοι μηχανισμοί εσωτερικής τρόικας στα κράτη μέλη, χρηματοδοτείται το νέο ειδικό ταμείο για την άμυνα προς όφελος της κερδοφορίας των στρατιωτικών μονοπωλίων. Επίσης χρηματοδοτούνται νέοι φραγμοί στα σύνορα στην πορεία για την Ευρώπη-φρούριο.

Ως Ομάδα GUE επιμένουμε ότι για να επιτευχθεί ανάπτυξη και να δημιουργηθούν νέες θέσεις εργασίας χρειάζεται επενδυτική στροφή προς κοινωνικές επενδύσεις και προγράμματα, χρειάζονται δημόσιες μακροχρόνιες επενδύσεις που να δημιουργούν μόνιμες και αξιοπρεπείς θέσεις εργασίας, επενδύσεις στην πραγματική οικονομία για επαναβιομηχανοποίηση των περιοχών που έχουν ανάγκη, επενδύσεις που να προωθούν την κοινωνική ανάπτυξη και την αλληλεγγύη μεταξύ των λαών.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD). – Fru talman! Brexit är en av punkterna i dag, och det för mig osökt in på budgeten där man totalt ignorerar det inkomstbortfall som uppstår när Storbritannien lämnar detta hus. Istället ska höga avgifter tas ut från kvarvarande medlemsländer och egna inkomster ska skapas i form av tullar och dylikt. För Sverige föreslås en höjning med 15 miljarder svenska kronor. Låt mig vara mycket tydlig när jag nu säger att svenska skattebetalare inte är intresserade av att betala ytterligare avgifter till detta hus. Vi kräver att EU tar ansvar för skattebetalarnas pengar och vi kräver att ni tar hänsyn till inkomstbortfallet som uppstår när Storbritannien lämnar. Görs inte det är det den svenska regeringens skyldighet och ansvar inför svenska folket att begära en omförhandling av avtalet då vi nu mest blir utnyttjade som en kassako av EU.

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

Maria Grapini (S&D), Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”. – Stimate coleg, în intervenția dumneavoastră, ați spus că după Brexit vom avea un buget mai mic – și așa este – și ați făcut referire la faptul că statele membre, cetățenii, ar trebui să contribuie mai mult. Nu credeți că s-ar putea ca, prin măsuri foarte coerente, Comisia să găsească alte resurse pentru suplinirea bugetului pe ieșirea Brexit? De exemplu, evaziunea din TVA și evaziunea din neplata taxelor în cadrul pieței interne? Mulțumesc.

Peter Lundgren (EFDD), svar ("blått kort"). – Tack för frågan. Nej, det anser jag inte. Vad gäller moms och skatter är det en klar och tydlig nationell kompetens; det är ingenting som ska ligga på detta huset. Och EU ska inte ens söka möjligheterna att ha egna inkomstkällor; EU ska förhålla sig till de pengar de får in via medlemsavgifter. Vad gäller Sveriges fall har vi alltid varit en nettobetalar. Jag anser inte att vi får ut vad vi ska av det avtalet och därför bör det omförhandlas.

Harald Vilimsky (ENF). – Frau Präsidentin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich darf zunächst meiner Freude Ausdruck verleihen, dass seit über fünf Monaten – mit einer stark steigenden Zustimmung aus der Bevölkerung – in Österreich eine Regierung am Arbeiten ist, die den illegalen Migrationsströmen endlich Einhalt gebietet, die Islamismus bekämpft, die Kriminalität bekämpft und diesen Migrationsströmen, die seit 2015 Richtung Europa unterwegs sind, von österreichischer Seite Einhalt gebietet.

Vor diesem Hintergrund ist es eine hervorragende Sache, dass auch in Italien eine Person aus unserem Parteienbündnis, Matteo Salvini, als Innenminister am Werken ist. Und Recht hat Matteo Salvini, wenn er den über 600 Personen auf der Aquarius, diesem Schiff, endlich Einhalt gebieten möchte und ihnen die Einreise nach Italien verwehrt. Schlüssel kann doch nur sein, dass die Menschen, die hier nach Europa strömen, vor Ort Hilfe erhalten. Und wenn Schiffe versuchen, nach Europa zu kommen, den Menschen zu helfen, ihnen Lebensmittel zu geben, Medikamente angedeihen zu lassen, aber sie wieder heimzubringen in den Ursprungshafen und dort in ihren Regionen Hilfe angedeihen zu lassen und nicht alle nach Europa zu holen. Das ist der falsche Weg.

Ελευθέριος Συναδινός (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει καταστήσει ουραγός των εξελίξεων, τις οποίες περισσότερο ακολουθεί παρά διαμορφώνει. Αποδεικνύεται από την αναμενόμενη, αλλά ελλιπώς προετοιμασμένη σύγκρουση με τις ΗΠΑ, στη σύνοδο των G7, τις άστοχες και καταστροφικές αντιδράσεις της στην περίπτωση της προσάρτησης της Κριμαίας από τη Ρωσία, τον χειρισμό της Τουρκίας στον εκβιασμό της με όπλο τη λαθρομετανάστευση, την αντιμετώπιση του Daesh με αποτέλεσμα την αύξηση της τρομοκρατίας.

Σε όλα αυτά έρχεται να προστεθεί και ο υπόγειος εκβιασμός μιας ανύπαρκτης πολιτικά, εγκληματικής εθνικά, αριστερίζουσας ελληνικής κυβέρνησης, που λέει σε όλους «ναι», μόνο και μόνο για να κρατηθεί στην εξουσία. Ένας εκβιασμός από πλευράς της Ένωσης μέσω της Γερμανίας όσον αφορά στο θέμα της ονομασίας των Σκοπίων, που προωθείται χωρίς να υπολογίζεται ότι οποιαδήποτε οικειοποίηση του ελληνικού ονόματος της Μακεδονίας ενδέχεται να πυροδοτήσει ένοπλες συγκρούσεις και αστάθεια στα Βαλκάνια.

Αν επιθυμούμε μια ενωμένη Ευρώπη δεν θα πρέπει να στηριζόμαστε στην αρχή «διαίρει και βασίλευε» προς όφελος οικονομικών συμφερόντων συγκεκριμένων χωρών, αλλά στις ανάγκες και απαιτήσεις των πολιτών μας.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, puno je tema na sljedećem summitu, od Brexita, višegodišnjeg financijskog okvira, obrambene unije. Ali, ipak mi se čini da tema koja će dominirati tom sjednicom jest tema migracija. Migracije nas najviše trebaju zanimati i ja sam uvjeren da se niti jedna zemlja ne može nositi sama s tim problemom i stoga s ovog mjesta apeliram na Europsko vijeće da se konačno upusti u donošenje Dublinske reforme i pravila za azil.

Veliki se problemi, to smo svi vidjeli, pojavljuju u Italiji, ali imate probleme ponovno i na tzv. balkanskoj ruti, imate probleme kroz Bosnu i Hercegovinu, gdje se događaju nove migracije i dolaze na granice Hrvatske. Vi znate da je Hrvatska država s 1300 kilometara vanjske granice Europske unije, a istovremeno imamo žicu na mađarskoj granici, na austrijskoj granici, na slovenskoj granici. Mi mislimo da žica nije rješenje, stoga je potrebno da zajedno rješavamo taj problem putem sistema azila.

Isto tako mi se čini da je Schengen jako poljuljan. Ako mi stavljamo provjere unutar schengenskih granica, onda je istovremeno poljuljana cijela Unija. Stoga mislim da je rješenje da konačno i Hrvatska dobije političku privolu zajedno s Rumunjskom i Bugarskom da uđe u schengenski prostor i da na taj način zajedno rješavamo probleme. U svakom slučaju migracije će biti dominantna tema, ali se očekuje puno jači angažman od strane Vijeća i da se konačno Dublinska pravila donesu u skladu s onim što je Parlament već prije donio.

Patrizia Toia (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, dico al Consiglio, con modo molto accorato: se non siete completamente incoscienti – e lo dico anche alla Commissione – voi avete il dovere, al vertice di giugno, di dare qualche risposta concreta per quanto riguarda almeno l'immigrazione, prendete una decisione.

Volete dare risposte – e il Parlamento in questo senso ha posto un punto fermo con la riforma del vertice di Dublino – o volete aspettare che tutti i governi populistici come in Italia reggano i loro conti, facciano campagna elettorale permanente, senza badare a un minimo di civiltà, a un minimo di valori, e prendendo in ostaggio la vita delle persone nel Mediterraneo, come stanno facendo, o portando persone a 1 400 chilometri di distanza? Guardate la cartina geografica: dove dista la località della nave al porto di Valencia?

È possibile questo? E di chi è anche la responsabilità? Loro, di quelli che fanno questa finta politica, queste vittorie di Pirro, ma è anche vostra. Se continuerete a non guardare la realtà, se non avete dato risposta agli appelli che abbiamo fatto, alle azioni parlamentari, alle azioni politiche che il precedente governo e noi parlamentari italiani abbiamo fatto, voi soccomberete sotto questa durezza, sotto chi usa gli esseri umani come pressione, vorrei dire come pallottole umane, con una pistola puntata contro l'Europa, quell'Europa in cui crediamo.

Noi non soccomberemo a questa deriva culturale e sociale. Però bisogna che questa Europa si metta in moto e che il Consiglio faccia la sua parte adesso, a giugno, e nella giusta direzione.

Jussi Halla-aho (ECR). – Madam President, the Dublin reform should be forgotten. Distributing asylum seekers hasn't worked and will not work. It only encourages more migration from sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere.

Recently, Italy refused entry to an NGO boat full of migrants. That was the right thing to do. In the Mediterranean, we are seeing a repetition of what happened at land borders in 2015. First, one Member State finds the courage to do the right thing and close the border, next that Member State is heavily criticised by everyone else. Finally, other Member States do exactly the same thing.

Systematic pushbacks at external borders, better returns policy and strict adherence to the first safe country principle are the only realistic way forward. Our obsession with relocation only postpones decisions that are both necessary and inevitable.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, εμείς πιστεύουμε συνειδητά στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Πιστεύουμε στη δύναμη, στις δυνατότητες, στις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και θεωρούμε ότι χωρίς την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση η Ευρώπη δεν έχει μέλλον, δεν έχουν μέλλον ούτε οι λαοί ούτε οι χώρες μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Εμείς πιστεύουμε ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι το παρόν και το μέλλον όλων μας, γι' αυτό την προασπιζόμαστε με όλες μας τις δυνάμεις. Όμως απαραίτητη προϋπόθεση για να συνεχίσουμε να έχουμε ισχυρή, δυνατή, αλληλέγγυη, αξιόπιστη Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι να σέβεται η ίδια η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τις αρχές και τις αξίες της.

Πολύ ορθά η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση επέβαλε κυρώσεις σε χώρες που δεν εφαρμόζουν τις αρχές, τις αξίες και τους κανόνες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Την ίδια στιγμή, όμως, από το 2005 χρηματοδοτεί με δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ μια χώρα η οποία παραβιάζει όλες τις αρχές του διεθνούς και ευρωπαϊκού δικαίου, μια χώρα που δεν αναγνωρίζει χώρα μέλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία, μια χώρα που σήμερα που ομιλούμε παραβιάζει ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, απειλεί χώρες μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο, ενώ πρόσφατα απείλησε την Αυστρία αλλά και όλη την Ευρώπη με θρησκευτικό πόλεμο. Και εμείς συνεχίζουμε να την επιβραβεύουμε. Με αυτό τον τρόπο όμως η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση χάνει ουσιαστικά την αξιοπιστία της, τη δύναμή της, τις αρχές και τις αξίες της.

Αγαπητέ φίλε, αντιπρόεδρε της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, κύριε Timmermans, εσείς ζήσατε την τουρκική αδιαλλαξία και προκλητικότητα και στο Crans-Montana, όπου εκεί πολύ ορθά υπερασπιστήκατε τις θέσεις του Προέδρου της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας Νίκου Αναστασιάδη ότι στην Κύπρο πρέπει να εφαρμοστεί το ευρωπαϊκό κεκτημένο, να αποχωρήσουν τα στρατεύματα, να καταργηθούν οι εγγυήσεις και τα επεμβατικά δικαιώματα. Μπορεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να συνεχίζει να ανέχεται αυτή τη στάση και τη συμπεριφορά της Τουρκίας; Το ίδιο ερώτημα θέλω να απευθύνω και στο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο, το οποίο επιτέλους πρέπει να αναλάβει την ευθύνη του και να διασφαλίσει στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση τον σεβασμό των αρχών και των αξιών της, εφαρμόζοντας τους νόμους και τους κανόνες για όλες τις χώρες.

Sylvie Guillaume (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, tous les Conseils européens sont importants, mais celui de juin présente un caractère particulier. Il s'agit de l'ultime occasion de démontrer que l'Europe refuse de rester paralysée face à la question migratoire. C'est une question de crédibilité pour les 28, c'est leur responsabilité.

Le sujet sur lequel le Conseil doit sortir de l'ornière est la révision du règlement Dublin, tout le monde en a convenu aujourd'hui.

Nous y sommes parvenus au Parlement, alors que nous sommes bien plus nombreux et quelquefois bien plus divers, donc cela n'est pas une mission impossible. Mais pour cela, il faut que les chefs d'État cessent de se voiler la face. Les migrations ne vont pas s'arrêter du jour au lendemain, et ils sont dans l'obligation de trouver une solution partagée, sinon ce qui va se passer est assez simple: chaque État membre proche d'une route migratoire va continuer de dépenser son énergie à repousser les personnes de l'autre côté de la frontière ou bien en mer, sans trouver – ni même chercher, d'ailleurs – de réponse structurelle.

Dans ce contexte, il est assez clair que les élections européennes de 2019 seront le théâtre d'une exploitation politique hystérique du sujet de l'immigration, au détriment de tous les autres, et d'une certaine manière, je suis désolée, c'est aussi ce qui s'est passé aujourd'hui.

Birgit Sippel (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Wie privat, wie geschützt ist unsere Kommunikation? Die Vertraulichkeit von Kommunikation ist ein Grundrecht, und mit der sogenannten – anderes Thema – *ePrivacy*-Verordnung soll dies endlich auch im digitalen Umfeld gelten. Das Parlament ist seit Herbst 2017 startklar, doch die Mitgliedstaaten im Rat stehen auf der Bremse, auch nach den Enthüllungen um Cambridge Analytica und millionenfachen Datenmissbrauch. Ein Termin letzten Freitag brachte wieder kein Ergebnis.

Der Rat lässt sich von den großen Konzernen beeinflussen und verhindert damit klare Regelungen auch für Plattformen wie Facebook. Privatsphäre und Grundrechte für die Bürgerinnen und Bürger scheinen für den Rat nicht von Bedeutung. Deshalb meine klare Aufforderung an die Regierungen: Bevor Sie sich in immer neue andere Gesetzgebungen stürzen, liefern Sie endlich auch Ergebnisse zu *ePrivacy*, zum Schutz von Kommunikation und letztlich Demokratie!

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D). – Señora presidenta, hoy la vida de más de 600 personas corre peligro: niños y niñas — más de 120 menores no acompañados—, mujeres y hombres que llaman a las puertas de Europa huyendo de la guerra y del hambre. Y, ante esta realidad, la actitud del Gobierno italiano, negándose al rescate, muestra la cara más oscura de Europa: la que mira a otro lado, la que hace del populismo y de la xenofobia un peligro para Europa. Al señor Salvini habrá que recordarle que, por mucha victoria que cante, hay algo que no podrá recuperar y es la decencia y la dignidad.

Pero hay un espacio para la esperanza, y el Gobierno de España se ofrece a acoger a estas personas, cumpliendo compromisos internacionales y respondiendo ante una crisis humanitaria. Y con ello se gana la autoridad moral de exigir en el Consejo más política europea al respecto.

Hay quien se siente patriota por envolverse en una bandera. Hoy somos muchos más los que sentimos orgullo de país, orgullo de una España solidaria que atiende a quien más lo necesita.

Richard Corbett (S&D). – Madam President, there are only three weeks to go to the next European Council, but there is no sign that the British will be at all ready for the discussion that will take place there on Brexit. Two years after the referendum, it does not even have a starting position for the negotiations as regards a key issue such as what kind of customs arrangements we might have for a future. It has now promised a white paper to set out its vision for the future, which will only be published after the European Council, well after two years after the referendum.

Only yesterday, Theresa May was forced to plead with her own Conservative MPs not to vote against her in the key votes that will take place today in the British House of Commons and tomorrow. She is desperately trying to avoid defeat at the hands of her own MPs. Personally, I hope enough of them will put country before career, patriotism before party and Britain before a bad Brexit.

Elly Schlein (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, cari governi, sono due anni che avete la riforma di Dublino sul tavolo, è vergognoso che ancora non troviate accordo sulla solidarietà interna. I vostri egoismi tengono in ostaggio l'Unione. Il 28 giugno al Consiglio prendete esempio da questo Parlamento che, dopo un lungo negoziato, ha votato con una maggioranza storica per cancellare il criterio del primo paese di accesso e sostituirlo con il ricollocamento automatico che obblighi tutti i paesi europei a fare la propria parte.

La solidarietà finanziaria non basta e non accetteremo di negoziare i dossier che volete, senza cambiare Dublino. La vostra inerzia ha aperto le porte al rigurgito nazionalista e fascista nei nostri paesi. Presidente Macron, Cancelliera Merkel, se non volete che il vostro europeismo sia solo di facciata, sostenete la nostra proposta al Consiglio, l'unica davvero europea. Presidente Orban, non si possono volere solo i benefici di far parte dell'Unione senza mai condividere le responsabilità.

E il governo italiano la smetta di essere vigliacco: la battaglia si fa al Consiglio e non sulla pelle delle persone in mare. È il momento di dare sostanza alla solidarietà. Il tempo è scaduto e vi ricordo che tutti avete firmato i trattati che implicano il principio di solidarietà e di equa condivisione delle responsabilità.

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Themenwechsel: Der Rat wird sich auch mit dem westlichen Balkan beschäftigen, und wir sollten von hier aus noch einmal deutlich machen: Unserer Meinung nach ist es Zeit zum Handeln. In Mazedonien weht ein neuer Wind – der Vertrag mit Bulgarien hat es gezeigt –, und wir sollten uns anerkennend zeigen gegenüber dem, was die Regierung Tsipras und die Regierung Zaev an ernsthaftem Bemühen zeigen, um die Namensfrage zu lösen. In Albanien gibt es deutliche Fortschritte, und wenn es um Rechtsstaatlichkeit geht, entwickelt sich hier einiges besser als anderswo, auch in der EU.

Jetzt liegt es an uns, Wort zu halten. Eröffnen Sie die Verhandlungen mit diesen beiden Staaten! Eröffnen Sie neue Kapitel mit Serbien und Montenegro! Und denken Sie in diesem Sommer auch daran, dass Kosovo seine Bedingungen erfüllt hat, um Visafreiheit zu bekommen.

Parallel dazu müssen wir die EU reformieren – das wissen wir alle. Aber man kann es parallel tun, weil der Start von Verhandlungen ja nicht bedeutet, dass man automatisch hineinkommt und dass das sehr kurz sein wird. Der Rat muss jetzt beweisen, dass wir es ernst meinen, dass wir die Menschen aus dem westlichen Balkan wollen. Sie haben es verdient. Alle 15 Jahre ein Balkangipfel reicht auf jeden Fall nicht.

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il problema dell'Unione europea è la lentezza nel decidere. Occorre che gli Stati membri se ne rendano conto e accettino di votare sempre a maggioranza, quando ciò è già possibile, e che utilizzino la clausola passerella, cioè il passaggio al voto a maggioranza in tutte le materie per le quali oggi si applica la regola dell'unanimità. Altrimenti non si riuscirà mai a decidere e noi abbiamo bisogno di un'Europa capace di decidere.

I temi sono molti. Prima di tutto, lo hanno ricordato quasi tutti i colleghi, il nuovo regolamento di Dublino. In secondo luogo, abbiamo bisogno che si decida sulle risorse proprie, che non sono sufficienti – la proposta della Commissione, peraltro avversata, non è sufficiente – e su un livello adeguato per il bilancio dell'Unione. Abbiamo bisogno che si decida su un pacchetto di politiche per la zona euro e, infine, vorremmo sapere, lo chiedo soprattutto al Vicepresidente Timmermans, i tempi e i modi per realizzare in modo il più possibile completo la *roadmap* sul futuro dell'Unione.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, un grande pensatore moderno, Antonio Gramsci, nel 1930 dal carcere, descrivendo ciò che stava avvenendo in Italia e in Europa, scriveva che, quando il vecchio mondo muore e quello nuovo tarda a comparire, è proprio in questo chiaroscuro che nascono i mostri. Ed è un po' quello che sta avvenendo, e non per caso, in questo nostro vecchio continente e non ce ne stiamo accorgendo a sufficienza.

Mi preoccupa la cecità della classe dirigente europea, mi preoccupa l'indifferenza della politica europea, mi preoccupa la disarmante normalità dell'azione del Consiglio dinanzi a questi cambiamenti straordinari.

Cara rappresentante del Consiglio, Aquarius è semplicemente la punta dell'iceberg verso il quale sta puntando il Titanic europeo. Non c'è molto tempo per cambiare rotta e non farlo vi renderà storicamente responsabili di questa pericolosa deriva europea.

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le vice-Président, Madame la représentante du Conseil, le Parlement européen respecte l'existence du Conseil européen, de fait, mais j'ai l'impression que la réciproque n'est pas toujours vraie.

Vu l'enjeu de ce Conseil européen, je m'étonne quand même que M. Donald Tusk ne juge jamais utile de venir échanger avec la représentation parlementaire.

Car dans quel contexte sommes-nous? Nous venons de vivre un G7 où le président Trump semble ignorer ce qu'est la solidarité transatlantique ou même la bonne coopération transatlantique. Nous sommes dans un contexte où M^{me} Theresa May, après avoir pris la tête d'un gouvernement chargé d'organiser le Brexit, est incapable de dire ce qu'elle veut pour le futur de son pays. Tout cela fait peser sur l'avenir européen une responsabilité immense alors que ce Conseil devra traiter à la fois des questions de migration, de la question de la réforme de la zone euro et de la question de la défense.

Nous souhaiterions donc savoir comment M. Tusk compte proposer une feuille de route sur le futur de l'Union européenne pour obtenir un bon accord au regard de ces trois éléments indispensables, pour que chacun de nos concitoyens puisse continuer à avoir confiance en l'Union européenne et ne lui tourne pas le dos, comme nous venons de le voir en Italie.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Rada má na svém programu několik témat, ale já se domnívám, že by se především měla věnovat otázce řešení migrace. Pokud skutečně chceme zastavit nárůst populismu a nárůst extremismu v členských státech.

Chci se tedy zeptat, EP přehlasoval menšinu, která nesouhlasila se zprávou LIBE v otázce společného azylového systému, tzv. Dublinu IV. Já se chci zeptat, kam míří Rada, jestli i Rada hodlá hlasovat o této otázce kvalifikovanou většinou. Jestli i Rada hodlá přehlasovat ty, kteří nesouhlasí a jsou v této věci zatím v menšině a chtějí stanovisko, které bude konsenzuální, které nebude nátlakové a které bude řešit otázku migrace tak, aby zde byla flexibilní solidarita.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il nuovo governo italiano ha chiuso i porti e non ha permesso l'attracco di una nave, l'Aquarius, con 630 persone a bordo, tra cui donne incinte e bambini, speculando politicamente sulla pelle degli ultimi e degli indifesi. Ringrazio sentitamente la Spagna e il suo nuovo Premier Pedro Sánchez per il suo gesto.

Ma l'Italia è stata lasciata da sola per troppo tempo a far fronte al flusso migratorio dal resto degli Stati membri, raccogliendo solo belle parole. Anche l'aumento dei fondi destinati all'immigrazione nel prossimo bilancio non servirà a nulla in queste condizioni. Sempre più spesso sentiamo dire che la colpa è dell'Europa, che l'Europa deve fare qualcosa, che l'Europa ha lasciato soli i paesi del Mediterraneo, ma sappiamo bene che non è così. Sono gli Stati membri che, per interessi politici, paralizzano l'Europa di Schuman, di Adenauer e di De Gasperi.

Questo Parlamento ha approvato la riforma di Dublino da mesi. Il Consiglio deve rispondere subito e concretamente, perché nel frattempo esseri umani muoiono e le forze populiste avanzano.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι τελευταίες εξελίξεις με αφορμή το πλοίο Aquarius έδειξαν ότι το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο οφείλει να δράσει άμεσα για την αντιμετώπιση των αυξημένων μεταναστευτικών ροών. Και αυτό σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να καταργηθεί εδώ και τώρα το Δουβλίνο III, που έχει μετατρέψει την Ελλάδα και την Ιταλία σε μια απέραντη αποθήκη ψυχών.

Η Ελλάδα δεν αντέχει άλλους πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες. Τα νησιά του Αιγαίου και ο Έβρος έχουν πλημμυρίσει από χιλιάδες παράνομους μετανάστες. Όμως μέχρις ότου αποφασίσει να δράσει το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο, η Ελλάδα πρέπει να ενεργοποιήσει το άρθρο 72 της Συνθήκης Λειτουργίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για λόγους δημόσιας τάξης και ασφάλειας και να αναστείλει τη λειτουργία του Δουβλίνου III, καθώς και τη λειτουργία της Συμφωνίας Σένγκεν, για να πάψει επιτέλους η Ελλάδα να αποτελεί μαγνήτη για τους χιλιάδες πρόσφυγες και παράνομους μετανάστες τους οποίους ο Ερντογάν και οι δούλεμποροι διοχετεύουν στην πατρίδα μας.

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, el Consejo Europeo y los Estados deben responder a las peticiones de solidaridad de la inmensa mayoría de la ciudadanía europea, que no acepta que dejemos morir a la gente en la mar. El Gobierno español ha decidido recibir al «Aquarius», y el lehendakari vasco se ha ofrecido a acoger en el País Vasco al 10 % de esas personas por dignidad y respeto a los derechos fundamentales.

Euskadi es un país pequeño. La solidaridad acogió a los vascos cuando buscamos protección o quisimos superar la pobreza, y se la debemos a quienes ahora necesitan lo mismo. Por eso, cuando se efectuaron los primeros repartos de cuotas, el País Vasco ya organizó una respuesta interinstitucional operativa y efectiva para asumir nuestra parte. No ha podido aprovecharse hasta hoy porque nuestro Estado miembro, sencillamente, había incumplido sus obligaciones en esta materia.

Señora Panayotova: hay medios para resolver este problema, solo hay que movilizarlos. Falta decisión y coraje político para enfrentar con humanidad y solidaridad la xenofobia y el antieuropeísmo. Señor Timmermans: abrir las fronteras europeas es una decisión global, pero acoger e integrar a los inmigrantes es un desafío al que responden las comunidades locales y regionales. ¿Para cuándo cree usted que debe integrarse plenamente este nivel en el diseño de la solución a la inmigración?

(La presidenta retira la palabra a la oradora)

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a União Europeia demonstra a sua verdadeira natureza. Os migrantes que se afundam no Mediterrâneo, embarcações em risco com mulheres grávidas e crianças embatem na fria desumanidade de quem opta por criminalizar as organizações humanitárias envolvidas nas operações de busca e salvamento.

Faltam recursos para a coesão, para apoiar o investimento nos países que dela mais necessitam, para apoiar o emprego com direitos e o combate às desigualdades e assimetrias, mas como o vai demonstrar o próximo Conselho Europeu não faltam recursos para o complexo militar industrial europeu, para reprimir as migrações e os migrantes, não faltam recursos para insuflar ainda mais os lucros das multinacionais das principais potências europeias, nem faltam as ditas *reformas estruturais*. Outra forma de dizer: retirada de direitos e privatização das funções sociais do Estado.

A anunciada reforma do euro não é senão outra forma de apertar mais as amarras que impedem o desenvolvimento soberano dos povos. Derrotar a UE para salvar a Europa é uma exigência com reforçada atualidade.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI

Vicepresidente

Henna Virkkunen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, edessä oleva kokous on erittäin tärkeä. Vuosi ennen EU-vaaleja on tärkeää, että pystytään edistämään kaikkia niitä asioita, joista olemme viime vuodet keskustelleet ja jotka ovat välttämättömiä Euroopan tulevaisuuden kannalta.

Olemme edistyneet hyvin joillakin sektoreilla, kuten EU:n puolustus- ja turvallisuusalalla. Siihen on nyt esitetty myös rahoituskehityksessä entistä enemmän varoja, ja tiedämme, että monet toimet tällä alalla ovat edenneet erittäin positiivisesti. On tarpeen, että Eurooppa ottaa enemmän itse vastuuta omasta puolustuksestaan, ja turvallisuus on yksi tärkeimmistä sektoreista, joilla meidän on edistytävä.

Sen sijaan toivon, että tulevassa huippukokouksessa puhutaan myös hyvin vakavasti eurooppalaisesta arvopohjasta eli siitä, että unioniin liittyessämme olemme kaikki sitoutuneet Eurooppaan ja puolustamaan yhteisiä demokraattisia arvoja. Nyt osa jäsenmaista on liukumassa näistä huolestuttavasti pois. Tämä asia on otettava nyt vakavasti esille myös päämiesten huippukokouksessa.

On erittäin hyvä, että tulevaisuudessa myös jäsenmaiden rahoitus aiotaan sitoa oikeusvaltioperiaatteen noudattamiseen. Se on erittäin keskeistä Euroopan tulevaisuuden kannalta.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, trebuie să vă spun că sunt de acord cu tot ceea ce ați specificat aici. Uniunea Europeană se află la o răscruce de drumuri. Dumneavoastră ați prezentat că, pentru prima dată din 1945, avem un președinte american care ignoră relația cu Uniunea Europeană. De asemenea, ați spus Consiliului că trebuie să fie hotărât. Suntem de acord aici.

Problema este că, dacă Consiliul își pune pe ordinea de zi – și am fost foarte atentă la ce ne-a prezentat reprezentantul Consiliului – atât de multe subiecte și toate foarte importante, nu cred că se poate lua vreo decizie. Și este important să luăm decizii.

Dumneavoastră ați anunțat că s-au amânat anumite lucruri. Membrii, reprezentanții statelor membre trebuie să țină cont de interesul Uniunii Europene dacă vrem să o mai avem, dacă vrem să nu avem eurosceptici, nu de interese naționale. Și cred că aici este cheia succesului în reglementările pe care le luăm. Pentru că, da, noi aici ajungem la un consens și suntem 751. Nu înțeleg cum nu pot 28 de state, 27 de state să ajungă la un consens în ceea ce privește un interes al Uniunii, al pieței interne, al comerțului nostru, al protecției lucrătorilor și tot ceea ce am discutat astăzi aici.

Miriam Dalli (S&D). – Mr President, here I respectfully address Council. I for one have had enough of meaningless speeches about addressing the immigration issue during Council summits – but then you do nothing. Frustration is understandable, and I place the blame on those Member States who want to do nothing about the immigration issue. No Member State – except two, Malta and Ireland – fulfilled their allocation of quotas from Italy and Greece. With all due respect, where are the others? What solidarity do you believe in?

I commend Spain's decision to step in in the MV Aquarius situation, but that ended only this particular situation. Because boat crossings from Libya will not stop, particularly in the summer, and they will most likely increase. So let's see how interested the Member States are in actually addressing this issue and not continuing to put it on the back burner, because so far they have not been prioritising this at all, and instead they preferred to pass the buck from one to the other.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wiceprzewodniczący Komisji, pan Timmermans, przewodniczący grup, panowie Weber i Verhofstadt, wymieniali długie listy problemów stojących przed Unią, które należy omówić na posiedzeniu Rady Europejskiej. Była mowa o imigracji, o euro, o handlu, tylko nikt nie powiedział – być może z wyjątkiem naszej koleżanki Anny Fotygi – o Nord Stream 2 i o agresywnej polityce energetycznej wobec co najmniej jednej czwartej państw leżących na wschodzie Unii Europejskiej. Kiedy Amerykanie wypowiedzieli umowę nuklearną z Iranem, przedsiębiorstwa europejskie zaczęły się martwić, czy nie powinny brać pod uwagę stanowiska rządu Stanów Zjednoczonych. Natomiast Unia Europejska dużo mówi o solidarności, a nie potrafi w najmniejszym stopniu nakłonić niemieckich przedsiębiorstw do tego, żeby respektowały politykę naszych niestety dosyć fikcyjnych sankcji.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhor Presidente, a Europa está à deriva porque é um navio que representa a vergonha, é um barco que leva à singradura na indiferença do poder. Quero dizer ao Conselho e à Comissão que demonstrem humanidade ao ouvirem os xenófobos e racistas deste parlamento. Querem ser cúmplices destas políticas desumanizadas? Querem ser cúmplices de Estados que olham para o outro lado enquanto 600 seres humanos podem morrer no meio do mar? Mulheres grávidas e crianças que poderiam ser nossos filhos? Queremos ser um cemitério no mar?

Acelerem o Regulamento de Dublin. Precisamos de regras comuns para os requerentes de asilo. É necessário dar uma ordem humanitária na Europa para salvar vidas.

É tão difícil entendê-lo quando esta câmara está cheia de xenófobos e racistas que não têm humanidade – e isso há que dizê-lo! E devemos ajudar precisamente por razões humanitárias, para evitar uma catástrofe e para devolver à Europa um mínimo de dignidade, um mínimo de dignidade!

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le vice-Président de la Commission, chers collègues, tout d'abord en ce qui concerne la discussion autour de la coopération Union européenne/OTAN et des orientations pour la poursuite des travaux sur la défense, je souhaiterais souligner que le partenariat stratégique entre l'Union européenne et l'OTAN est fondamental pour relever les défis de sécurité et que les actions de ces deux organisations devraient être davantage complémentaires sur le plan de la sécurité afin de mieux faire face aux nouveaux défis sans précédent et multiformes en la matière, à l'est et au sud.

Enfin, je souhaiterais rappeler, pour ce qui est des aspects liés à l'emploi, à la croissance et à la compétitivité, l'engagement de renforcer les efforts afin de faire aboutir, à la fin du cycle législatif actuel, la stratégie pour le marché unique, la stratégie pour un marché unique numérique, le plan d'action pour un marché des capitaux et l'union de l'énergie.

L'Union européenne doit continuer d'œuvrer à l'achèvement d'un marché unique pérenne et équitable adapté à l'ère numérique et facilitant la compétitivité, l'innovation, la durabilité et la cohésion européenne, car c'est assez important pour les pays de l'Europe centrale et orientale.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin etwas erstaunt über diese Debatte. Angesichts der Tatsache, dass wir durch die chinesische Politik und deren klare strategische, politische und wirtschaftliche Interessen weiter zurückgedrängt werden, der Kriegspolitik Putins, des Verhaltens von Trump reden die Rechten über die Auflösung der Europäischen Union, und die Linken haben auch kein Konzept.

Wir brauchen auf diesem Europäischen Rat Entscheidungen, wie es mit der Verteilungspolitik weitergeht, wie wir das Asylrecht hinbekommen, wie wir eine anständige Afrikapolitik hinbekommen und dass wir dies alles mit Geld bezahlen müssen; dass man hier eine klare Regelung bekommt. Und wir brauchen auch eine krisenfestere Europäische Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion.

Das sind Aufgaben, die wir im Reformprogramm lösen müssen, um den Themen zu begegnen und gleichzeitig in der Lage zu sein, unsere Bürger für dieses Europa zurückzugewinnen. Und diejenigen, die dieser Linie nicht folgen, rechts und ganz links, müssen wissen, dass sie ihre eigenen Völker an die Amerikaner, an die Russen und an die Chinesen verkaufen.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αναμένεται ότι και αυτή τη φορά το Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο δεν θα λάβει ουσιαστικές αποφάσεις. Άλλωστε μας έχει συνηθίσει να προσεγγίζει τα σοβαρά θέματα όχι πραγματιστικά, αλλά με μια φιλοσοφική διάθεση και με ευχολόγια. Το ίδιο κάνει και με το σοβαρό θέμα της παράνομης μεταναστεύσεως. Αντί να λάβει αποφάσεις και μέτρα ώστε να πάψουν οι συνεχιζόμενες ροές κυρίως προς την Ιταλία και την Ελλάδα, παρακολουθεί με απάθεια την κατάσταση, βλέπει ορισμένα κράτη να κλείνουν τα σύνορά τους και αφήνει τις χώρες εισόδου να αντιμετωπίσουν μόνες τους το πρόβλημα.

Τώρα οι περισσότερες χώρες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση κατηγορούν την Ιταλία διότι έκανε το αυτονόητο για να προστατεύσει τη χώρα. Πριν τρεις ημέρες, όμως, όταν ο Ερντογάν κατήγγειλε τη συμφωνία με την Ελλάδα για την επιστροφή κάποιων παράνομων μεταναστών, ουδείς αντέδρασε. Ποιος έχει το δικαίωμα να μετατρέψει την Ελλάδα σε ένα απέραντο στρατόπεδο εξάθλιωμένων, παρανόμων μεταναστών; Και αν κάποια στιγμή η Ελλάδα λάβει μέτρα και κλείσει και αυτή τα σύνορά της, τότε τι θα συμβεί; Θα κατηγορηθεί η Ελλάδα ως ξενοφοβική;

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, there's a lot of talk about borders this morning in this debate, and – rightly so – around migration. I want to talk about a border that isn't a border, much closer to my home in the Republic of Ireland, as it borders invisibly with Northern Ireland.

I have to say that, while I welcome a paper from the United Kingdom on their proposals for a temporary customs arrangement, it is, to say the least of it, insufficient and incomplete, and I am really troubled that time is marching on. But we have to have faith in politics, and we will watch the UK House of Commons with great interest this week.

I listened very carefully to the exchanges on Ms Dodds, and can I say to her very directly: there is no disrespect to her position; there is no annexation of Northern Ireland; and indeed to Martina Anderson, both of whom have left this Chamber: could they please sit down in an assembly in Northern Ireland and properly represent the people of Northern Ireland, so that their voices can be heard in this vital debate?

(Fine della procedura «catch the eye»)

Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I have been listening very carefully to the debate on migration, and having dealt with this issue over the last four years, I try to formulate for myself why it has been impossible to find a solution so far at the European level. I think the answer lies in the concept of moral hazard. There is a lack of confidence between the Member States that the other state will do what they agreed to do to find a solution. Indeed, Italy and Greece for a very long time complained and said 'you're leaving us alone; we need to find a solution; Dublin doesn't work; we're swamped; we're overwhelmed by the numbers of refugees arriving'. And then for too long they got the answer 'that's Dublin, deal with it. It's your task'.

And then of course, we arrived at a situation of waving through, and this led to a lot of suspicion in other Member States: they're not doing their job; they're waving through refugees in large numbers. So there is no state that can claim to be completely innocent in the situation we have found ourselves now.

I also believe there is some criticism possible if people in Italy keep saying 'we were left completely alone; we were completely abandoned'. Yes, for a long time that was true, but I find it difficult to explain that when I go to Germany. Look at the numbers of refugees that were taken in in Germany. Look at the number of refugees that were taken in in Sweden. An incredibly vast problem is now the integration of these refugees in many countries.

As long as we keep refusing the idea that we have a collective problem that can only be tackled with collective solutions, we will not find a solution. As long as Member States just stick to their own solution and say 'we are the only ones who are right' and as long as the rest of the Union does not do what we do, we will not find a solution. And we will fail collectively.

Given the size of the migration challenge the world faces, not just Europe, given the developments in Africa, do you really think that building walls and fences and refusing to accept ships is going to bring a solution? Will that stop the pressure? Do you really think that if we do not stick together on this, individual Member States will be able to reach agreements with the states of origin to take back their migrants if they do not have the right to asylum? Do you really think that, individually, we can create a prospect for Africa that will allow young Africans to see a future in their own countries instead of feeling the need to come to Europe? Do you really think that if we take away a bit of the humanity of people on ships and say these are just migrants, that we will continue our policy on the basis of our values and human rights? Don't you agree that by denying other people's humanity, we take away part of our own humanity? Doesn't that kill us morally if we continue like that?

I am not saying everyone who wants to come to Europe should be welcomed, but I am saying we need to put an end to the dying in the Mediterranean. This can only be done if Europe collectively devises stronger protection of our external borders; if we finally devise a common European asylum policy; if we finally make headway in having agreements with the countries of origin so that they take back the citizens; if we finally have a realistic plan of investment in Africa so that Africa develops in a way that makes people want to stay in Africa; and if we finally come to terms with the fact that in a time of crisis, and one or two or three of our Member States are overwhelmed, they should be able to count on the solidarity of all Member States.

The only way we will find a sustainable solution for the migration issue – which will not go away, whatever we do – is if we do all these things at the same time. According to your political preferences, you have a preference for one or other of the solutions, but none of you can close your eyes to the fact that you can only deal with it if all these solutions are part of our approach. And if we do not do this as Europeans, who else will? Member States will not be able to do it on their own, whatever their policies are.

Let me end on one point. We are at a risk, in this time of turbulence and huge challenges, of falling into the trap of entering into Faustian deals. To handle the migration issue, perhaps we should not have as much of the rule of law or the respect for human rights as is good for us. Please, please, stay away from that Faustian deal, because you will lose on all scores.

What is the price of unity of the European Union? Should the price of unity of the European Union be 'let's not make a point of the rule of law and human rights just so we can have unity'? I can guarantee you if respect for the rule of law and human rights is no longer a quintessential element of our Union, we will lose human rights, the rule of law and the European Union. That is a price that is far too high to pay.

(Applause)

Monika Panayotova, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I am here today to intervene on the state of play of the preparations for the European Council and to listen to your proposals, ideas, comments and remarks. I will bring all of them to the attention of the President of the European Council. I would like to thank the President of the European Parliament, Mr Tajani, for his remarks with regard to the important input made by the European Parliament in the discussion on the Common European Asylum System, in particular on the Dublin Regulation. I will bring his message to the attention of President Tusk.

You will also have heard that President Tajani will have the opportunity to express the views of the European Parliament to the Heads of State and Government at the opening of the European Council. Tomorrow, we will have a further opportunity to discuss the humanitarian emergencies in the Mediterranean and solidarity in the European Union.

All of you underlined that reform of the asylum system needs to strike the right balance between responsibility and solidarity. I can assure you that the Presidency also shares your sense of urgency. I would like to share with you that the Bulgarian Presidency has taken as its point of departure not only the conclusions of the European Council of October 2017, which tasked us with seeking consensus and with looking for ways to keep the right balance between responsibility and solidarity in order to ensure resilience to future crises, but also the results of the negotiations under the previous Presidencies, which called for a comprehensive approach to the whole area of asylum reform.

Based on this, we have built into the Dublin Regulation a new approach and a new crisis mechanism for managing the migration and asylum systems in the Union when under pressure. It tries to strike a balance between responsibility and solidarity by including clear criteria for determining the responsibility for asylum applicants which don't shift or seize easily. The amended rules make the procedure more efficient so that pull factors and secondary movements are effectively prevented.

We believe that the text of the Dublin Regulation, resulting from the discussions led by our Presidency in the last five months, offers a good and fair basis for striking the requested balance between responsibility and solidarity. The process is now being led by the President of the European Council, and it will be up to him and the leaders to look for further compromises that will help reach a consensus in view of the meeting of the Heads of State and Government at the end of June. I am confident that the Council will make every effort to find a solution and an agreement on a mandate for negotiations with the Parliament, as we all agree that Dublin III needs to be revised.

In terms of the trade questions, I would like to say that the European Union is sending a strong message on its ambition for an open, rule-based trading system, and all trade and external relations are on the agenda. But I cannot prejudge the outcome of the leaders' discussion.

In terms of the eurozone and the completion of the banking union, we also cannot prejudge what the leaders will decide at the June Euro summit, but I would like to say that the Presidency worked hard so that the Council could finally agree on a general approach on the banking package last month. The Council certainly looks forward to working with the Parliament to bring this file to implementation, hopefully still in the coming months.

Progress on the banking package gives me reason to be optimistic that the leaders can, later this month, reach concrete results around the issue of the common backstop to the Single Resolution Fund, likely in the context of the broader and not yet finalised work on the European Stability Mechanism. Progress on the European Deposit Insurance Scheme will take more time, but it has not been ruled out that the political discussions could still start in the coming months.

In terms of Brexit, I would like to say that unity among our institutions is paramount, and we value the contributions that the European Parliament is making through its resolutions. We expect this to continue until the end of the negotiations. We attach the utmost importance to safeguarding the rights of European Union citizens in the United Kingdom and vice versa, and to those citizens being able to effectively enforce their rights. The UK has given credible guarantees to this effect, as now translated in the text of the Withdrawal Agreement. It remains to ensure that this is implemented in a faithful and enforceable way.

There are actually many other important issues on the table for the leaders in June, and it would be really naive to expect that they can all be solved easily and rapidly. Some will require further time and effort, but it's important to continue to build common ground. In accordance with well-established practice, President Tusk will be in plenary on 3 July 2018 for an open debate with you on the progress achieved on those topics, for, in the face of global turbulence, we should make sure not only that we remain united in dealing with the immediate consequences of instability, but that we – the three institutions together – also continue to work to shape the course of the years ahead in the interests of our citizens.

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE), schriftlich. – Zur Vorbereitung des Europäischen Rates ist es mir wichtig, dass wir uns auf die wichtigsten Punkte konzentrieren. Europa ist umzingelt von Krisen und Problemen. Umso wichtiger ist es, dass wir auf dem Europäischen Rat keine großen Ziele beschreiben, sondern konzentriert an wichtigen Punkten arbeiten. Wir sind auf dem Weg in einen Handelskrieg. Hier brauchen wir eine klare europäische Linie. Die geschlossenen Gegenmaßnahmen der Kommission sind in meinen Augen der richtige Weg, das muss vom Rat bekräftigt werden. Wir müssen uns auf die Kernaufgaben konzentrieren. Im Moment ist nicht die Zeit für Visionen, sondern für pragmatische und solidarische Lösungen.

Laurențiu Rebega (ECR), în scris. – Ce preferați să mâncați: o porție mică preparată de șefi bucătari de prestigiu, din ingrediente naturale proaspete, sau un castron uriaș de *junk food*? Unde preferați să locuiți: într-o casă proiectată de un arhitect strălucit sau într-un Turn Babel ridicat de o mulțime de muncitori necalificați? Pe scurt: vrem calitate sau cantitate? Vrem o Uniune mai bună sau o Uniune mai mare?

În acest moment istoric, răspunsul e unul singur! Trebuie să ne întoarcem la ceea ce ne unește fără compromisuri și să lăsăm chestiunile divergente pentru mai târziu. Susțin cu tărie ideea ca Parlamentul European să transmită Consiliului un mesaj clar: deciziile privind viitorul Uniunii trebuie luate prin consens! Orice decizie importantă luată prin majoritate calificată slăbește unitatea, crește inegalitățile și corupția, subminează democrația și ne compromite viitorul.

3. The Economic and Monetary Union package (debate)

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione sull'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sul pacchetto sull'Unione economica e monetaria, presentata da Roberto Gualtieri, a nome della commissione per i problemi economici e monetari (000047/2018 — B8-0027/2018) (2018/2724(RSP)).

Roberto Gualtieri, autore. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo nostro dibattito si svolge in un passaggio decisivo per il futuro dell'Europa e dell'area euro. Noi diamo atto alla Commissione di aver messo sul tavolo un ampio ventaglio di proposte che delineano i pilastri di un'Unione economica e monetaria più completa e meglio in grado di generare crescita, occupazione, coesione, resistenza agli shock. Notiamo però che alcune di queste proposte definiscono più un embrione degli strumenti di cui abbiamo bisogno che una loro compiuta realizzazione e che permangono criticità.

La proposta più rilevante è senza dubbio l'introduzione di uno strumento di stabilizzazione macroeconomica, attraverso un fondo per la protezione degli investimenti, durante le fasi avverse del ciclo. Si tratta di una funzione decisiva perché l'assorbimento degli shock asimmetrici non può essere svolto in modo efficace dalla politica monetaria né dai bilanci nazionali. Se avessimo già avuto questo strumento durante la crisi, probabilmente ci saremmo risparmiati la seconda recessione e tutte le sue conseguenze economiche, sociali e politiche.

A chi parla di *moral hazard* facciamo notare che, al contrario, questo strumento determinerebbe un incentivo alla condotta di politiche di bilancio responsabili e alla correzione di squilibri macroeconomici. Bene quindi che ci sia una proposta, anche se essa appare insufficiente sul piano delle dimensioni, e un'indennità di disoccupazione rappresenterebbe uno stabilizzatore automatico più efficace e più trasparente.

In linea con le raccomandazioni di questo Parlamento è anche il programma di sostegno alle riforme. Qui è importante che il concetto di riforme strutturali sia adeguato alle vere sfide del mondo di oggi, che non richiedono una svalutazione del lavoro e una competitività di prezzo, ma una capacità d'innovazione e di sviluppo che si fonda anche su una società coesa.

Per quanto riguarda la gestione delle crisi, è positiva la proposta di rafforzamento del Meccanismo europeo di stabilità, che lo renda indipendente dal Fondo monetario internazionale e ampli la gamma degli strumenti a sua disposizione, a partire anche da quella di *backstop* per il Fondo di risoluzione delle banche.

Su questo vorrei però esprimere la frustrazione di questo Parlamento per l'evidente intenzione degli Stati membri di non seguire la proposta della Commissione d'integrazione del fondo nel quadro giuridico dell'Unione. Vorrei chiarire una volta per tutte che la giustificazione utilizzata per questa scelta, e cioè che altrimenti verrebbe meno il potere di controllo dei parlamenti nazionali, non corrisponde al vero, è una. Nulla cambierebbe, da questo punto di vista, se si seguisse la strada proposta dalla Commissione. Come già detto molte volte, il Parlamento europeo non userebbe il suo diritto di consenso per alterare gli equilibri istituzionali di un organismo che utilizza risorse degli Stati membri.

Infine, vorrei consigliare alcuni Stati membri di evitare formulazioni su meccanismi per la ristrutturazione di debiti sovrani non solo controproducenti per la stabilità finanziaria ma che farebbero anche venir meno la necessaria unanimità per la riforma dell'ESM. Circa l'attribuzione al nuovo fondo di compiti di sorveglianza delle politiche di bilancio, ribadisco che sarebbe non solo sbagliata, ma violerebbe chiaramente i trattati europei, e non è infatti, giustamente, nella proposta della Commissione.

Del pacchetto della Commissione fa parte anche l'integrazione dell'articolo 3 del *Fiscal Compact* nella legislazione europea. Qui devo dire che la Commissione ha perso un'occasione. Noi dobbiamo semplificare e migliorare le nostre regole di bilancio e ciò richiederebbe, in primo luogo, di assicurare un trattamento diverso alla spesa per investimenti e di evitare meccanismi prociclici. È evidente che la proposta presentata sul *Fiscal Compact* non andrà lontano e che occorre fare molta strada per adeguare le nostre regole di bilancio alle sfide dei tempi.

Infine, è bene ribadire a tutti, anche in questo Parlamento, che senza un meccanismo che assicuri lo stesso livello di protezione dei depositi, non solo l'Unione bancaria ma anche la stessa Unione monetaria risulta incompleta.

Signor Presidente, signor Vicepresidente della Commissione, il Parlamento cercherà di migliorare le proposte della Commissione e di assicurare coerenza tra di esse e l'MFF. Auspichiamo che tra gli Stati membri non prevalga una concezione minimalista, che rischierebbe di non farci utilizzare appieno la finestra di opportunità decisiva rappresentata da quest'ultimo scorcio di legislatura.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, honourable Members, let me thank you for this timely oral question on the deepening of our economic and monetary union. Democratic accountability is one of the key principles on which this work is based, and I am happy to be here to respond and to hear your views.

A well-functioning EMU is at the core of EU integration. Our economic and monetary union is more resilient now than it was before the crisis, but the work is not yet complete. A more integrated and performing euro area is needed to bring increased stability and prosperity to all Europeans. Reconciling very different views on these matters is sometimes difficult, but we are making some progress. The general approach on the 2016 banking package at the May Ecofin is a major milestone that lays the basis for further progress on the banking union, including on the risk-sharing side. We hope that at the June Summit it will be possible to take the concrete decisions which are expected, notably regarding the completion of the banking union and further development of the European Stability Mechanism. We would like to see agreement on key principles and clear milestones for future work.

Coming more specifically to Mr Gualtieri's questions on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON): with regard to the integration of the ESM into the EU legal framework, regrettably the Council has not yet started legislative negotiations on the Commission's proposal, as several Member States are not in favour of anchoring the ESM in EU law. However, there is general support for the goal of converting the ESM into the European Monetary Fund. Discussions on related issues, such as the role of the ESM as a backstop for a Single Resolution Fund or the new ESM instruments, are taking place in an intergovernmental format. The Commission's position is that integration of the ESM into the EU legal framework is important to allow full accountability and democratic and judicial oversight of ESM activities, to promote the interests of the whole Union and to ensure swift and timely ESM actions under the well-defined framework.

The Commission also considers that any reforms of the ESM should not undermine the institutional prerogatives set out in the Treaties, in particular when it comes to fiscal and economic surveillance. We also remain convinced that the incorporation of ESM into the Union framework can be done by means of Article 352 of the Treaty. We also maintain that Article 126(14) is an appropriate legal basis for the directive transposing into Union law the key provisions as set out in the fiscal compact. This legal basis has also been used in the past to introduce comparable fiscal rules and obligations.

As regards the involvement of the European Parliament, let me recall that we put the community method at the centre of the EMU package precisely to increase transparency and accountability. The Community method would increase the European Parliament's and the national parliaments' oversight of EU economic governance. The Commission attaches great importance to the views of the European Parliament. In preparing our proposals we have taken into consideration the recent own-initiative reports on the budgetary capacity of the eurozone; the Böge-Berès report on the possible evolutions and adjustments of the current institutional set up of the European Union; the Verhofstadt report; and, on improving the functioning of the European Union, building on the potential of the Lisbon Treaty, the Brok-Bresso report.

We look forward to the input from the European Parliament in a formal legislative process and remain fully available to hold regular exchanges of views and debate on these topics. A first exchange of views took place in the ECON Committee on 27 March with Commissioner Moscovici and myself.

Finally, let me say a few words on the two EMU-related proposals, which we adopted on 31 May in the context of the next Multiannual Financial Framework. The European Investment Stabilisation Function will help Member States to absorb large asymmetric shocks by helping to protect public investment levels. It will work through a provision of loans of up to EUR 30 billion, guaranteed by the EU budget, and grants to cover the related interest costs. To receive this support, Member States will have to comply with strict eligibility criteria based on sound fiscal and macroeconomic policies.

The Reform Support Programme will provide financial and technical support to the structural reforms. A budget of EUR 25 billion will be divided among three instruments: a reform delivery tool providing financial support for agreed reform packages (EUR 22 billion), a technical support instrument continuing the successful experience with the current Structural Reform Support Programme (EUR 840 million), and a convergence facility to offer dedicated financial and technical support to those non-euro-area Member States that take demonstrable steps towards adopting the euro (EUR 2.16 billion). The package will complement other EU programmes and funds in support of jobs and growth, notably the Structural and Cohesion Funds and the new Invest EU Fund. An important theme of our MFF proposal is a stronger link between the EU budget and the European Semester, which is a framework for economic policy coordination.

It is now time to decide and to live up to our commitments to reform the EMU. Our end goal is to achieve better living and social standards for all Europeans. That is what matters in the end. I count on your support in this process.

Presidente. – Vi devo informare che a mezzogiorno e mezzo ci sono le votazioni, per cui non è possibile prendere indicazioni per quanto riguarda il «*catch the eye*» né utilizzare le *blue card* in questa discussione perché abbiamo una lista lunghissima di oratori.

Brian Hayes, on behalf of the PPE Group. – Mr President, I very much welcome this debate ahead of the June Summit on the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) package. Despite all of the pain of the financial and sovereign debt crisis, Europe has come back strongly. We are living through a jobs-rich recovery. That success is based on prudent budgeting, new investment, structural reforms and a commitment to stick to the rules of the fiscal compact.

Firstly, it is absolutely useless dreaming up new ideas if we're not delivering on what we said we would do already. Let us deliver on our existing commitments. Secondly, if you're a small, big or medium-sized country, the rules apply to everyone. And thirdly, whatever change is proposed, it must be an inclusive format. That means, from our perspective, no euro-area parliament, no railroading of small or indeed any Member States.

So where do we go from now? I see five areas of potential improvement. I think we need to complete the Banking Union, to deliver on the European Deposit Insurance Scheme (EDIS). That means risk-sharing and risk reduction must go hand in hand. It means a credible resolution of the NPL problem.

Secondly, Europe must be open for business, which means more trade deals, delivering on the potential of the single market economy and freeing the EU economy of protectionism. We also need a functioning capital markets union for new finance, alongside Juncker's / the EFSI plan. Turning the ESM into a fully-fledged European Monetary Fund makes sense, but it needs to be accountable to this Parliament. We also need to be prepared to reform and turn the European budget – the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) – into an instrument of innovation and growth.

Could we do the impossible, colleagues? That is, agree a better budget by the time of the next European Parliament elections. We need to – it would send out a powerful signal from this House, were we to obtain that agreement.

Finally, I hope that once and for all, the idea of having an EU finance minister is dropped. It is a crazy proposal. It sends out the wrong message to national parliaments, to EU citizens. It does not have national public support. It is a weapon of euroscepticism. It is time that it was finally discarded from the technocratic dreamworld from where it came.

Pervenche Berès, au nom du groupe S&D. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le vice-Président, dans ce débat que nous menons depuis longtemps, j'ai un regret, c'est qu'au fond le débat sur le renouveau du cadre financier pluriannuel est un débat qui est lancé, qui va aboutir à un moment ou à un autre, alors même que nous n'avons pas fondamentalement d'accord sur le futur d'un budget de la zone euro. Or, il y a une articulation entre les deux et on le voit bien lorsque M^{me} Merkel nous dit: «On discutera du budget de la zone euro après avoir discuté du cadre financier pluriannuel». Alors que restera-t-il pour organiser le chemin parallèle de ces deux outils?

Ma deuxième remarque concerne la fonction de stabilisation et la façon dont la Commission européenne a mis une proposition en ce sens sur la table. Le fait que vous reconnaissiez que cette fonction doit être remplie, le fait que vous mettiez une proposition sur la table, est évidemment la bienvenue, mais reconnaissez que lorsque nous qualifions votre proposition d'embryon, nous sommes quasiment en dessous de la réalité, car ceux qui, dans cet hémicycle et ailleurs, cherchent toujours à tirer des enseignements de la conduite des affaires par le FMI n'écoutent pas suffisamment le FMI qui, de ce point de vue, nous dit que nous avons besoin d'un véritable stabilisateur automatique, comme nous l'avons dit également dans le rapport Berès-Böge que vous avez cité.

Ma troisième réflexion porte sur la transformation du Mécanisme européen de stabilité en un Fonds monétaire européen. Nous vous invitons à ne pas utiliser cette terminologie, il doit s'agir d'un fonds de stabilisation européen. Le fonds monétaire ne peut pas être décalqué au sein de l'Union européenne. Nous soutenons la Commission pour que cela ne conduise pas à détricoter vos compétences en matière budgétaire et nous sommes aussi à vos côtés pour plaider pour que la méthode communautaire soit intégralement appliquée dans ce domaine.

Sur le fond, je regretterais infiniment que ce Conseil européen n'avance pas de concert et soit une avancée radicale sur la voie de la transformation du MES en Fonds monétaire européen, et qu'il soit ridicule lorsqu'il s'agit de cette fonction de stabilisation dont nous avons tant besoin.

Sander Loones, namens de ECR-Fractie. – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Vandaag debatteren wij over de invoering van een EMF, een Europees Monetair Fonds, de Europese variant van het IMF. Dat fonds zou lidstaten kunnen helpen die in slechte papieren zitten. Op zich een interessante idee, alleen is niet duidelijk wat precies met dat EMF wordt bedoeld, hoe dat zal worden ingevuld. Zal dat een EMF zijn volgens de strikte variant van meneer Schäuble, de voormalige Duitse minister van Financiën, of wordt dat de meer lakse invulling van de Europese Commissie?

Als ik kijk naar de oorsprong van dat idee van de EMF, dan kom je terecht in 2010 bij een opiniestuk in *The Economist* geschreven door Daniel Gross en Thomas Meyer. De Europese Commissie ging vervolgens aan de slag met dat idee van een EMF. Wat interessant is, is dat Gross en Meyer een half jaar geleden, in december 2017, een update geschreven hebben van hun paper waarin zij de voorstellen van de Europese Commissie beoordelen en analyseren. En wat is hun conclusie? Zij wilden een Europees Monetair Fonds dat zorgt voor meer begrotingsdiscipline en voor een sterker schuldbeheer.

Als ik kijk naar de voorstellen van de Commissie, dan lijkt zij eerder te willen aansturen op een zoveelste solidariteitsmechanisme, terwijl wij weten dat transfers onverantwoordelijk gedrag in de hand werken in plaats van dat meer verantwoordelijkheid wordt genomen. Gross en Meyer zagen het EMF bovendien als een niet-politieke instelling die neutraal en economisch kan oordelen. Ze willen ook dat er gesproken wordt over een exitscenario uit de euro, dat dat geen taboe is. Beide voorstellen opnieuw worden niet gedragen door de Europese Commissie.

Samengevat: De Commissie dreigt onverantwoordelijkheid aan te moedigen. En opeens is ze dan verbaasd dat de noordelijke lidstaten niet willen meespelen, dat de noordelijke lidstaten de touwtjes in handen willen houden en een intergouvernementele oplossing willen. Het is duidelijk wat wél moet gebeuren. Het is tijd dat de Commissie het over een andere boeg gooit.

Ramon Tremosa i Balcells, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, just a couple of ideas in two minutes. On the European Monetary Fund, I think double accountability will have to be introduced. National parliaments should continue to be in charge of accounting for their programmes and actions from the IMF, but so should the European Parliament. How can we explain to our voters that the European Parliament – the institution that wants to represent democracy in the EU – does not have a say over the conditions in bailouts? This anomaly needs to be addressed – otherwise, if MEPs cannot decide on Europe-wide important issues, why should people go to vote in the next European elections? By excluding the European Parliament from crucial decisions, the ground is ready for the next generation of eurosceptics.

The second idea: on the other hand, it is important that the fiscal compact is implemented through EU law. I think it is a good moment to check how its application has worked in different Member States, and how we can improve it. For example, in the case of Spain, the central government has arbitrarily put a much more stringent deficit objective to regional governments than to the central government. This has been a way to force cuts in welfare state and social policies. Similarly, many local governments in Spain with very low debt are not allowed by the central government to use the cash they have in the banks for investments on social policies. So control of excessive spending should not be a new excuse for recentralisation.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, cela fera bientôt 150 ans que l'Allemagne est unifiée et 30 ans qu'elle est réunifiée.

Cette union politique avait été précédée par une union douanière et monétaire et, depuis, l'Allemagne n'est toujours pas économiquement homogène. Mais personne ne met en doute sa pérennité.

Qu'est-ce qui fait donc tenir l'Allemagne ensemble? Sur le plan politique, bien sûr, une langue et des institutions communes; sur le plan économique, c'est un marché unique régi par des règles fiscales et sociales largement communes.

Cette fiscalité fédérale alimente un budget fédéral de plus de 10 % du PIB qui, avec une sécurité sociale fédérale, constituent des mécanismes de solidarité économique extrêmement robustes. S'y ajoute même un système de transferts budgétaires directs entre les régions, de sorte que, à ce jour, trois régions contribuent plus à la fédération qu'elles ne reçoivent, et les treize autres c'est l'inverse.

Je prends l'Allemagne pour exemple car c'est à la fois l'État membre auquel l'Union économique et monétaire profite le plus et l'un de ceux où la résistance à tout changement de structure de l'euro est la plus forte.

L'histoire de l'Allemagne nous montre surtout comment l'Union économique et monétaire devrait évoluer si elle veut éviter de se disloquer.

Nous avons bâti un marché unique puis une monnaie unique adossée à une banque centrale fédérale, mais sur ce marché et face au reste du monde, les États membres se livrent à une concurrence fiscale, sociale et commerciale à peine régulée et le seul mécanisme de redistribution économique dont nous disposons est le très modeste budget de l'Union européenne, qui représente 1 % du PIB. Faut-il s'étonner que cet ensemble produise de la divergence plutôt que de la convergence?

Croire que l'euro a un avenir dans ce cadre relève du déni de réalité.

Si nous voulons lui donner un avenir, les solutions sont connues: union bancaire, y compris la garantie commune des dépôts; un budget commun beaucoup plus robuste abondé par des recettes propres, typiquement une fraction de l'impôt sur les sociétés ou du prix du CO₂; enfin, à défaut d'unification sociale et fiscale, nous devons à tout le moins abandonner la compétition au profit de la coopération. Sans cela, le retour aux monnaies nationales sera inéluctable.

Certains, y compris dans cette salle, le souhaitent, soit parce qu'ils pensent que la volonté politique pour accomplir les réformes nécessaires n'existera jamais, soit parce qu'ils pensent que l'État-nation est le seul espace où peut s'exercer la souveraineté démocratique.

Ce n'est pas notre choix. Nous sommes convaincus que la fin de la monnaie unique entraînerait dans son sillage l'Union européenne dans la spirale de la décomposition, décomposition qui laisserait les États membres comme des pions face aux multinationales, dans une situation où les Trump, les Poutine ou les Xi de ce monde se feraient un plaisir de monter les uns contre les autres à notre détriment commun.

Nous, Européens, seront bientôt 5 % de la population du monde. Que nous le voulions ou non, notre unité est la condition de notre souveraineté, souveraineté politique et fiscale, souveraineté sociale et économique.

Alors, je vous le demande: est-ce que Donald Trump va être le catalyseur de cette prise de conscience? Nous l'espérons, mais nous n'en voyons pas encore les signes. Au contraire, nous voyons encore trop d'États membres présenter la question sous un jour moral: les États vertueux du nord ne devraient pas subventionner les États pêcheurs du sud. À ceux-là, je voudrais rappeler que l'Allemagne, pays dans lequel ce discours moralisateur est omniprésent, Monsieur le Président, est aussi la patrie de Deutsche Bank, l'une des banques les plus pourries de la planète et d'une industrie automobile qui a sciemment trompé les citoyens depuis des décennies.

Personne, aucun pays, n'a le monopole de la vertu, ni du vice! La survie de l'euro est une question d'intérêt partagé, osons espérer que celles et ceux qui auront à en décider en prendront conscience à temps.

Miguel Viegas, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, o euro representou para Portugal um elemento de destruição da nossa economia. Desde que Portugal entrou no euro a sua dívida pública passou de 55 para 130% do PIB. Os salários reais baixaram 20%, 500 mil jovens tiveram que sair do país à procura de emprego no estrangeiro e a questão que colocamos é porque é que a União Europeia insiste em manter e aprofundar a União Económica Monetária com o Fundo Monetário Europeu e com esta proposta de pseudo-capacidade orçamental da zona euro?

A resposta é simples: é que o euro sempre representou e representa um instrumento político fundamental para impor as reformas estruturais aos Estados-Membros obrigando países como Portugal a privatizar os seus serviços públicos e as suas empresas estratégicas.

É óbvio para nós que o euro não correspondeu às promessas de desenvolvimento e defraudou expectativas e para nós é óbvio que Portugal deve libertar-se dos constrangimentos do euro, reconquistar a sua soberania monetária para poder escolher o seu próprio modelo de desenvolvimento.

Marco Valli, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono passati quasi vent'anni dall'introduzione della moneta unica e non abbiamo ancora creato i meccanismi di reale condivisione e mutuo supporto tra i paesi membri in caso di crisi. La soluzione presentata in questi anni è stata la svalutazione salariale e dei diritti nel sud d'Europa, punendo i cittadini italiani, greci, spagnoli, portoghesi e francesi con riforme spesso dannose e ingiuste, mentre il surplus delle partite correnti in Germania continua a violare indisturbato le regole del Six Pack, e mi rivolgo al Commissario Dombrovskis su questo.

La stabilità e sostenibilità dell'Eurozona sono vincolate alla creazione di un'area valutaria ottimale. Abbiamo quindi bisogno di strumenti come Eurobond e trasferimenti fiscali, non di meccanismi di finta solidarietà sponsorizzati dalla Germania su modello della troika. Tutti i leader dell'Eurozona devono scegliere se seguire l'imposizione ideologica tedesca e portare l'Eurozona al collasso nella prossima crisi economica che si presenterà oppure dotarsi di veri strumenti europei ed efficaci.

Marco Zanni, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io credo che quando si parla di Eurozona si debba partire da due elementi. Il primo elemento fondamentale è un'analisi e una riduzione degli squilibri macroeconomici e delle asimmetrie che sono stati causati dalle folli politiche portate avanti negli ultimi anni e stanno distruggendo l'Europa.

Il secondo punto è una riflessione seria sul cambiamento del modello socioeconomico su cui si basa oggi l'Eurozona. È un modello folle, basato esclusivamente sull'export e sulla riduzione dei costi interni, ed è un modello che sta creando distruzione e che dipende troppo dalle decisioni di paesi esteri, come la guerra sui dazi sta dimostrando in questo momento.

L'Italia non affonderà per la follia di seguire uno strumento macroeconomico sbagliato. L'Italia rigetterà ogni proposta di riforma che non parta dalla volontà di ridurre questi squilibri. No al Fondo monetario europeo. I cittadini italiani non metteranno più un euro e non manderanno più un euro a Bruxelles per riceverlo indietro nel momento del bisogno con delle condizionalità imposte.

L'ultimo punto che voglio evidenziare è basta con la falsa narrativa che oggi qualcuno in Europa stia pagando per l'Italia. L'Italia, sin dalla sua partecipazione alle istituzioni europee, ha sempre dato molto di più di quello che ha ricevuto da Bruxelles. Non accetteremo più moralismo da chi oggi cerca di farci lezioni non avendo in mente i dati che sono lì per tutti da guardare. L'Italia rigetterà qualsiasi condizionalità attaccata a nuovi fondi legati all'eurozona.

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, την ώρα αυτή που η κυβέρνηση ΣΥΡΙΖΑ-ΑΝΕΛ, με ουσιαστική συμφωνία των άλλων αστικών κομμάτων παρά τις ανούσιες επικοινωνιακές διαφοροποιήσεις τους, ψηφίζει στην ελληνική Βουλή τέταρτο μνημόνιο μακράς πνοής, ξαναληστεύοντας τον λαό, ξανασητρίζοντας το κεφάλαιο, η συζήτηση εδώ στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο για εμφάνιση της νομισματικής ένωσης αποδεικνύει ότι τα μνημόνια διαρκείας δεν είναι ελληνική ιδιαιτερότητα, αλλά γενικευμένη στρατηγική του κεφαλαίου που συντονίζει η Ευρωπαϊκή του Ένωση.

Ο ESM μετεξελίσσεται στο ίσης βαρβαρότητας Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο. Η ενιαία οικονομική διακυβέρνηση, το Δημοσιονομικό Σύμφωνο, το Ευρωπαϊκό Εξάμηνο, το Σύμφωνο του Ευρώ, δηλαδή σιδερένιοι κανόνες επιτήρησης της αντιλαϊκής πολιτικής των κυβερνήσεων, ενσωματώνονται στο κοινοτικό δίκαιο και τις εθνικές νομοθεσίες. Στόχος είναι να συναινέσουν οι λαοί στα μνημόνια διαρκείας, να βάλουν πλάτη με αιματηρές θυσίες στα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων. Μονοπώλια, Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, αστικές κυβερνήσεις και μνημόνια ταυτίζονται. Για τους λαούς καθαρή έξοδος από αυτά σημαίνει οργάνωση, αντιμετώπιση, αποδέσμευση από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, απαλλαγή από τα μνημόνια και την εξουσία τους.

Luděk Niedermayer (PPE). – Mr President, the euro is one of the symbols of the European Union. It is an important economic tool, supporting the efficiency of the single market and reducing costs for people and for businesses. I am glad that, despite the fact that some people wrongly blame Europe for mistakes that have nothing to do with the currency, support of the euro among Europeans is strong – actually, probably the strongest it has been since its introduction.

The Monetary Union, as well as the EU, is a work in progress. That's why the Commission has proposed that the Package be released in December. This forms a very good basis for the debate on how to improve the European Monetary Union (EMU) and the EU. But this package is by no way a replacement for responsible and good economic policy in the Member States: we can only achieve a successful, stable and growing Europe with such reforms.

Not all parts of the package have the same importance and same urgency. Let me mention just two that I consider the most important. The first is the European Monetary Fund: I believe that this proposal is a hectic way of creating the European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism (ESFM)/European Stability Mechanism (ESM), and it can incorporate other policies into the framework of this huge amount of money that is used for supporting and strengthening European policy. I guess this is a good proposal.

The second one is completion of ongoing initiatives, especially in the area of the banking union. I'm talking about single backstop and completion of the European Deposit Insurance Scheme (EDIS). I believe that a compromise can be found, and I hope it will be found soon.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ*Αντιπρόεδρος*

Mercedes Bresso (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, grazie anche al Commissario per la citazione della relazione fatta con il collega Brok, ma vorremmo capire della riforma in senso democratico, assolutamente necessaria della zona euro, che cosa ne è. Ci fa piacere la citazione, ma dove è finita la responsabilità che il Parlamento deve avere – il Parlamento ha il potere di codecisione – su tutte le questioni che riguardano la zona euro. È inutile dire che il Parlamento europeo è il Parlamento dell'euro, se poi i poteri per quanto riguarda l'euro non gli sono attribuiti.

Ai colleghi che hanno ricordato l'eccedente commerciale della Germania vorrei ricordare che anche l'Italia ha un eccedente commerciale, quindi è inutile provare a utilizzare questi argomenti. I veri argomenti che credo dobbiamo utilizzare sono quelli del perché i cittadini europei sono sempre più diffidenti nei confronti della moneta unica. Credo che sia perché la moneta unica viene presentata essenzialmente come una gabbia, e invece non deve essere una gabbia, deve creare opportunità soprattutto per i giovani europei.

Certamente serve un bilancio della zona euro, ma serve un bilancio che aiuti i giovani europei a essere forti e competitivi in un mondo dove l'Unione europea ha sempre più bisogno di essere competitiva. Quindi non tanto per fare riforme di tipo *austerity*, ma per fare delle riforme che diano veramente ai nostri cittadini delle opportunità per contrastare fortemente la situazione difficile dal punto di vista competitivo che oggi l'Europa conosce rispetto al resto del mondo.

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. DAVID-MARIA SASSOLI*Vicepresidente*

Pirkko Ruohonen-Lerner (ECR). – Arvoisa puhemies, jälleen kerran komissio on tuottanut pitkiä tekstejä suhdannevaihteluiden tasoittamisesta tarjoamatta poliittisesti realistista ja taloudellisesti toimivaa mallia Euroopan talous- ja rahoitukselle.

Velkojen ja maksuvastuiden siirtäminen euron kanssa paremmin selviävälle maille ei ratkaise euroalueen perustavanlaatuisia ongelmia, kuten kasvavia eroja kilpailukyvyssä. Professori Hans-Werner Sinnin mukaan ero eurosta on ainoa tapa estää niiden revähtäminen. Se on myös ainoa tapa estää euron hallitsematon hajoaminen.

Euroopan keskuspankki ei saa omistaa yli kolmasosaa yksittäisen maan velkakirjoista, mikä Saksan osalta on jo lähes täynnä. Seuraavassa taantumassa Euroopan keskuspankki on voimaton. Kuten kolumnisti Wolfgang Münchau on huomauttanut, jokaisen maan tulisikin varautua euron hajoamiseen.

Caroline Nagtegaal (ALDE). – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Dank u wel, commissaris. Er wordt hard aan de Europese Commissie getrokken. En de Commissie trekt ons met volle vaart vooruit, terwijl Italië ons juist in de tijd terug wil trekken. In een hoog tempo zijn er voorstellen gelanceerd om nieuwe Europese potjes op te richten, of juist direct je schulden bij de burens neer te leggen. En soms lijkt het wel alsof dit Huis maar twee versnellingen kent: óf volle vaart vooruit óf keihard op de rem.

Maar wat mij betreft is er een derde. En dat is de optie waarbij we onszelf aan de afspraken houden die we met elkaar hebben gemaakt. Dat is de optie waarbij we onze economieën veerkrachtig maken, en we zo een groot economisch blok van de wereld blijven. Dat is de optie, wat mij betreft, waarbij we elkaar niet de rekening sturen, maar waarbij we handel met elkaar drijven.

Afspraken maken is eigenlijk heel makkelijk. Maar pas als we onszelf aan die afspraken houden, dan is er wat mij betreft de ruimte om in vertrouwen die risico's met elkaar te delen. Dat is wat mij betreft de volgorde: afspraken maken, ons aan de afspraken houden, vertrouwen zaaien en welvaart oogsten.

Martin Schirdewan (GUE/NGL). – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Euro-Zone droht aufgrund ihrer Konstruktionsfehler, die zugleich das Erstarken nationalistischer Kräfte begünstigen, auseinanderzubrechen. Und endlich positioniert sich auch die Europäische Kommission zur Zukunft der Euro-Zone.

Allein, die vorliegenden Vorschläge gehen das Problem nicht an der Wurzel an; sie gleichen eher einem Herumdoktern an den Symptomen. Die Euro-Zone wird dann auseinanderbrechen, wenn die Handelsbilanzdefizite darin nicht abgebaut werden. Und ein Hauptproblem besteht doch am deutschen Exportüberschuss. Das heißt zuallererst aber eben nicht, im Rest Europas zu sparen und zu kürzen, das heißt dass wir in Deutschland höhere Löhne brauchen. Wir benötigen zudem öffentliche Investitionen in die Zukunftsfähigkeit der EU. Zukunft wird aber nicht über Investitionen ins Militär und mit PESCO gemacht, sie wird gemacht durch Investitionen in Köpfe und in Beton. Sparen wir uns stattdessen diese neoliberalen Betonköpfe und ihre zerstörerische Austeritätspolitik und geben wir besser Geld aus für eine moderne Wirtschafts- und Sozialstruktur, die Digitalisierung und moderne Technologien ebenso berücksichtigt wie Investitionen in Bildung, Forschung und Gesundheit!

Bernard Monot (EFDD). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le vice-Président, en matière d'union économique et monétaire, ne nous voilons pas la face: la Commission propose, mais l'Allemagne dispose.

M. Macron, vassal de M^{me} Merkel, a déjà fait une demi-douzaine de discours sur les vertus de l'Europe fédéraliste et la Commission européenne a proposé, le 6 décembre dernier, son train de mesures sur l'approfondissement de l'UEM.

Depuis, Macron et Juncker attendent fébrilement la réponse de la Pythie de Berlin, Angela Merkel, et cette réponse confirme mes pires craintes économiques concernant le futur Fonds monétaire européen. Ce FME version allemande, conçu par Schäuble et Goldman Sachs, représenté par M. Kukies, deviendra le gendarme budgétaire de la zone euro. Gare aux États membres qui ne respecteraient pas la discipline budgétaire allemande de cette nouvelle BCE du budget, indépendante des gouvernements élus.

M^{me} Merkel veut que le FME soit habilité à déclencher la restructuration automatique de la dette souveraine d'un État membre et que le FME ait plus de pouvoir de contrôle budgétaire de cet État. C'est donc la fin de l'indépendance financière et la mise sous tutelle potentielle d'une nation.

Inutile de vous dire que je combattrai politiquement ce totalitarisme financier de l'Union européenne. Nous ferons en sorte en France que cette aggravation de la gouvernance économique de la zone euro ne voit jamais le jour. Non à l'austérité contre les Européens!

Barbara Kappel (ENF). – Herr Präsident, Herr Vizepräsident der Kommission! Ende Juni steht ein Euro-Gipfel bevor, der die Weichenstellungen für zentrale Fragen der Vertiefung der Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion und der Stabilisierung der Euro-Zone vornehmen wird. Es geht dabei insbesondere um die Umwandlung des Europäischen Stabilitätsmechanismus in einen Europäischen Währungsfonds und um zusätzliche Finanzinstrumente zur Förderung von Investition und Innovation sowie um einen *common backstop* für die Bankenabwicklung.

Für uns geht es aber auch um demokratische Legitimität, d. h. um die angemessene Beteiligung des Europäischen Parlaments und nationaler Parlamente in Zusammenhang mit diesen Finanzinstrumenten. Die deutsche Kanzlerin hat dazu in der vergangenen Woche konkrete Vorschläge gemacht, und führende Kommentatoren sind sich einig darüber, dass sehr viel mehr als das, was Merkel in die Debatte eingebracht hat, von den Staats- und Regierungschefs Ende Juni nicht beschlossen werden wird.

Diese Vorschläge sind drei modifizierte Finanzinstrumente: erstens eine Kurzfristkreditlinie des neuen Europäischen Währungsfonds für Mitgliedstaaten, die durch äußere Umstände in Schwierigkeiten geraten sind, zweitens ein Investitionshaushalt und drittens ein zusätzliches Budget zur Implementierung von Strukturreformen.

Die Kommission wird diese Vorschläge lieben. Ich bitte Sie nur, Herr Kommissar Dombrowskis, dass Sie dem Prinzip der demokratischen Legitimität und Rechenschaftspflicht nachkommen und die nationalen Parlamente ...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Heute ist für Österreich ein besonderer Tag: Vor 24 Jahren haben die Österreicherinnen und Österreicher in einer Volksabstimmung mit Zwei-Drittel-Mehrheit „Ja“ zur Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union gesagt und damit klargemacht, dass unsere Zukunft engstens mit der Zukunft der Europäischen Union verbunden ist und dass wir uns aktiv an jedem Integrationsschritt beteiligen.

Wir hatten wenige Jahre nach Maastricht „Ja“ gesagt. Maastricht hat den Euro geschaffen, unsere gemeinsame Währung als politisches Projekt, das eint und nicht spaltet. Und wir wussten ganz genau, dass wir derzeit nur eine gemeinsame Währung haben, aber die einzige gemeinsame Währung, die keine gemeinsame Budget-, Fiskal-, Wirtschafts- und Steuerpolitik hat. Und wir wussten, wir müssen an dieser gemeinsamen Budget-, Fiskal-, Wirtschafts-, Sozial- und Steuerpolitik arbeiten, um den Euro zu stabilisieren und eine starke gemeinsame Währung im Binnenmarkt zu schaffen. Wir sind damit noch nicht fertig, aber wir müssen Tempo aufnehmen.

Die Lehren: Wir müssen die Vollendung von Schlüsselinstrumenten für das gemeinsame Eindämmen und Schultern von Risiken sowie mehr Verhältnismäßigkeit schaffen: Bankenunion, Kapitalmarktunion. Wir müssen institutionelle Reformen durchführen und den Europäischen Stabilitätsmechanismus zu einem gemeinschaftsrechtlichen Europäischen Währungsfonds schaffen. Und wir brauchen ein Euro-Budget im Rahmen des neuen EU-Budgets und auf Basis von Eigenmitteln.

Maria João Rodrigues (S&D). – Mr President, the Commission has come with a proposal on fiscal capacity for the eurozone which we really want discussed at the next euro summit. Finally, the eurozone, which is the only monetary zone without a budget, recognised that we do indeed need a budget in order to have a future in the eurozone.

However, what should be the objectives of this budget? There should be not only stability, but also growth and upward economic and social convergence. From this viewpoint, we need to go beyond the Commission's proposals, because if we want to support convergence, we should be clearly in favour of reforms, growth, increasing the sustainability of our social welfare systems, and coupling reforms with investments. Something is missing in this instrument.

Secondly, the instrument to support investment is necessary not only to protect against shocks, but also to make sure that Member States undertaking deep rebalances of the budgets can maintain a decent level of social investment, which is not the case so far. We need to go beyond, because if we do not improve these proposals, and we have combined these with co-financing being reduced for structural funds, we can already predict that divergences will continue in the eurozone.

Νότης Μαρτιάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ευρωζώνη έχει οδηγήσει σε συσσώρευση πλούτου στις χώρες του σκληρού πυρήνα και σε τεράστια οικονομική αφαίμαξη των χωρών της ευρωπαϊκής περιφέρειας. Γέμισε τον ευρωπαϊκό Νότο με στρατιές φτωχών και ανέργων και με υπερμεγέθη εμπορικά πλεονάσματα τη Γερμανία. Απαιτείται λοιπόν όχι μόνο εγκατάλειψη της λιτότητας και της βίαιης δημοσιονομικής προσαρμογής, αλλά και αλλαγή της δομής της ευρωζώνης και κατάργηση του δρακόντειου συμφώνου σταθερότητας.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα πρέπει να μετατραπεί σε ύστατο δανειστή των κρατών μελών με παράλληλη πρόβλεψη έκδοσης ευρωομολόγων. Επιπλέον, το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύστημα Κεντρικών Τραπεζών πρέπει να λειτουργήσει αποκεντρωμένα και τα κράτη μέλη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και ιδίως της ευρωζώνης πρέπει να ανακτήσουν τη νομισματική τους κυριαρχία, ούτως ώστε οι εθνικές κεντρικές τράπεζες να μπορούν να ασκούν αυτοτελή νομισματική πολιτική μέχρι του ύψους του ποσοστού συμμετοχής της κάθε εθνικής κεντρικής τράπεζας στο μετοχικό κεφάλαιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Κεντρικής Τράπεζας.

Nils Torvalds (ALDE). – Herr talman! Varje gång vi diskuterar den europeiska ekonomiska och monetära unionen tycks vi förfalla till allvarlig glömska. Ingen vill komma ihåg det tråk vi befann oss i efter det att Bretton Woods-systemet hade brutit samman. Varje valuta har sitt underliggande värde i produktiviteten. Vi kommer inte ifrån kravet på en ökande och växande produktivitet. Varje inlägg i det här huset som förnekar det här, förnekar verkligheten, men det är ju för sig ingen nytt. Vi har alltså skapat ett system – i kommissionen var man kanske lite överoptimistisk när man läste Robert Mandells artikel från 1961 och trodde att det var lösningen. När kommissionen i dag kommer ut med nya förslag på hur vi förbättrar det här systemet ska vi vara tacksamma och kritiska. Men vi ska komma ihåg att produktiviteten, den underliggande produktiviteten, under alla omständigheter är utgångspunkten.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Dombrovskis, όσα προτείνετε – και όπως τα ροκανίζει και τα περιορίζει ακόμη περισσότερο και τα αναβάλλει το Συμβούλιο – είναι too little too late, γιατί η εμμονή στις νεοφιλελεύθερες πολιτικές και η άρνηση των αναγκαίων αλλαγών στο περιεχόμενο της πολιτικής και στις δομές τρέφουν τις εντεινόμενες ανισότητες, κοινωνικές και περιφερειακές, και φουσκώνουν τα πανιά της άκρας Δεξιάς. Το είδατε και μέσα στην αϊδουσα.

Χρειαζόμαστε στροφή στην ανάπτυξη, εμβάθυνση της ευρωπαϊκής ενοποίησης, ισχυρό ευρωπαϊκό προϋπολογισμό, ενίσχυση της δημοκρατικής λογοδοσίας, Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο που να λογοδοτεί στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, ευρωπαϊκό σύστημα εγγύησης καταθέσεων, που χωρίς αυτό δεν υπάρχει τραπεζική ενοποίηση. Η άρνηση αυτών των αλλαγών από τον νεοφιλελεύθερο δογματισμό και από τον εθνικό εγωισμό της δεξιόστροφης γερμανικής κυβέρνησης βλάπτουν την ανάπτυξη, την ευρωπαϊκή ενοποίηση και ωφελούν μόνο την άκρα Δεξιά.

Jörg Meuthen (EFDD). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kollegen! Wir reden heute über den Europäischen Währungsfonds EWF, den die Kommission und einige andere notorische Umverteiler erschaffen wollen. Sie können es drehen und wenden, wie es Ihnen beliebt: Sie haben für den EWF keine Rechtsgrundlage im Unionsrecht. Im Jahr 2010 war das freilich noch eine Sensation, wenn in der Europäischen Union ohne oder sogar contra geltendes Recht vorgegangen worden ist. Damals haben Sie im Vorbeigehen die Nichtbeistandsklausel gebrochen. Heute, im Jahr 10 der Banken- und Währungskrise, haben sich Beobachter an das rechtswidrige Verhalten offenkundig längst gewöhnt. Das ist traurig.

Ihr Vorschlag für einen EWF verstößt auch gegen das deutsche Grundgesetz, wie das Centrum für Europäische Politik letzte Woche klar analysiert hat. In dringenden Fällen darf nicht ohne den Bundestag Geld bewilligt werden.

Hören Sie auf, an der Fiktion festzuhalten, dass Staatsanleihen nicht ausfallen und Staaten nicht bankrottgehen können! Hören Sie auf mit Ihren sinn- und erfolglosen Bail-outs! Denn eine Währung, die man ständig retten muss, ist keine funktionsfähige Währung. Sie funktioniert nicht – weder für die einen noch für die anderen. Gestehen Sie sich das ein und ziehen Sie endlich die alleinrichtigen Konsequenzen!

Siegfried Mureşan (PPE). – Mr President, recent weeks have shown us all continuing high volatility on the markets. This means that markets are nervous, and this means that risks still persist. The question is: what is the origin of this nervousness? It is without any doubt due to recent political developments. That is why the key question for me is: who is stronger in Europe – populism or our currency? We have to make sure that our common currency, on which the prosperity of 500 million citizens in Europe is based, is stronger than populism, which wants to harm the euro. The question is: what do we have to do? We have to strengthen the euro to prevent the next crisis, because managing a crisis is always politically difficult, it is harmful for the people and it is expensive. The better way is, of course, to prevent the next crisis. Therefore, Vice-President Dombrovskis, my questions are: when we are looking to the European Stability Mechanism and eventually reflecting upon developing it into a European monetary fund, what goal do you foresee for a possible European monetary fund in preventing the next financial crisis?

My next question is: could you clarify how a European monetary fund would be based on the EU legal framework? What role do you foresee for the European Parliament after the possible creation of the EMF? But also before, while we decide on the creation of the EMF: what role do you foresee for Parliament to ensure democratic legitimacy for that creation?

Pedro Silva Pereira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, a recente turbulência nos mercados causada pela crise política italiana veio mostrar uma vez mais que seria um erro, e um erro grave, adiar uma reforma ambiciosa da União Económica e Monetária. E todos sabemos o que essa reforma do euro devia ser. Um fundo monetário europeu digno desse nome, uma nova capacidade orçamental, uma união bancária completa e uma governação económica mais democrática com o reforço do Parlamento Europeu e o respeito pelos parlamentos nacionais.

A cimeira de junho é, por isso, a hora da verdade. Por isso o que queremos saber, Senhor Comissário Dombrovskis, é se podemos contar até ao último minuto com a Comissão para estar do lado certo em defesa de uma reforma ambiciosa do euro, que não continue a adiar para amanhã aquilo que tem de ser feito já hoje.

Joachim Starbatty (ECR). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar Dombrovskis, Sie haben in Ihrem Reflexionspapier im letzten Jahr geschrieben: Unsere Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion ist nicht hinreichend in der Lage, das aus der Krise resultierende soziale und wirtschaftliche Auseinanderdriften zwischen den Euro-Ländern aufzuhalten oder umzukehren. Ja, genau das ist das Problem! Darüber sprechen wir ja auch hier. Und da wird ganz stolz gesagt: Die Beschäftigung steigt ja an. Wer die Zahlen kennt, weiß, dass diese zusätzliche Beschäftigung in prekären Arbeitsplätzen besteht, dass zwar mehr gearbeitet wird, aber für weniger Geld.

Weiter höre ich, dass Deutschland am meisten vom Euro profitiere. Ich will sagen, wie es ist: Für uns ist der Euro unterbewertet, wir exportieren zu viel, zu billig, und wir importieren zu wenig, wir verschenken Wohlstand. Und was ist die Konsequenz? Wir haben eine Billion Forderungen gegen Notenbanken, die nicht zahlungsfähig sind. Das ist die Realität. Sie haben völlig Recht: Der moralisierende Ton der Bundesregierung geht mir auch auf die Nerven.

Enrique Calvet Chambon (ALDE). – Señor presidente, señor vicepresidente Dombrovskis, usted ha pedido el apoyo del Parlamento para hacer un euro que esté al servicio de los ciudadanos. Mire usted, de todos los que creen en Europa, en mi circunscripción, que es toda España, o aquí en el Parlamento, de todos los que entienden que no hay futuro en una Europa dividida —entre otras cosas, porque será mucho más dependiente de las locuras de un Trump, por ejemplo— de todos ellos, usted tiene el apoyo. Pero la construcción de esa moneda única tiene que basarse en dos pivotes: reformas estructurales, sin duda —no hay que pretender que hemos alcanzado la perfección—, y solidaridad.

Por ejemplo, en mi país, ojalá llegáramos a la reforma estructural de nuestro sistema delirante de regiones, que nunca nos permite llegar a cumplir el déficit. Pero solidaridad supone mutualización de riesgos, sin ambages, y supone acabar el EDIS muy pronto. Y no tenemos tiempo que esperar. En junio tiene que darse el primer pistoletazo para que Europa vaya creando una moneda única con mucha más decisión y mucha más urgencia.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, ondertussen 16 jaar geleden werd de euro ingevoerd in 12 landen van de Europese Unie. Gedaan met de frank, de mark, de peseta, de gulden. Eén en dezelfde munt, één monetair beleid, één wisselkoersbeleid.

Het was en het is nog steeds een historisch project. Maar het was en is eveneens een project dat nog niet klaar is. De monetaire Unie kan enkel werken in samenhang met een budgettaire en een politieke Unie. Het economische beleid van de lidstaten moet op elkaar worden afgestemd. Ieder moet zijn overheidsschuld in bedwang houden.

Dat wisten we, en toch hebben we jarenlang de andere kant op gekeken, tot en met de financiële crisis van 2008. De constructie van de eurozone, die was en die is in feite nog altijd niet helemaal afgewerkt. En de zon schijnt, dames en heren. Daarom moeten we vandaag ons Huis repareren. De Europese Unie heeft er een handje van om enkel in zwaar weer herstellingen uit te voeren. Maar iedereen met een beetje gezond verstand weet dat we nú actie moeten ondernemen. Want nu schijnt de zon. Er is economische groei, de werkloosheid daalt en de investeringen nemen weer toe. Maar blijkbaar is goed weer niet alleen voldoende om het dak te repareren. We moeten ook werkelijk de ladder nemen, op het dak klauteren en aan de slag gaan.

Daarom deze oproep, collega's. De economische voorwaarden zijn er, maar wij moeten de politieke moed tonen. Laat ons van het goede weer gebruikmaken, want vroeg of laat steekt de storm weer op. Ieder van ons moet thuis gaan uitleggen waarom het zo belangrijk is dat we die bankenunie verder afwerken, waarom de eurozone nodig is en waarom de begrotingsregels geen vodge papier zijn, maar cruciaal zijn om dit project te laten slagen.

Jakob von Weizsäcker (S&D). – Mr President, in order to succeed with a more sustainable architecture of the euro area, we need to observe four kinds of logic: the logic of sensible stabilising and preventative rules that are actually observed; the logic of fair insurance contracts concluded ex ante and paying out in times of economic shock, big European unemployment insurance or banking union; the logic of crisis management by strong institutions; and, last but not least, the logic of democracy.

For the political sustainability of the common currency, it will be essential that rules, insurance contracts and strong crisis management capabilities strengthen democracy at the European and national level, rather than weaken it. In practice, this means proper accountability to the European Parliament, and it means that our architecture needs to be based on solid federalism by exception, not an attempt to micromanage policies of Member States at all times, which would only serve as a permanent support programme for populists and nationalist political parties set on destroying the European project.

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Voorzitter, voordat we nadenken over verdieping van de EMU, moeten we eerst gemaakte afspraken nakomen. De bepalingen van het stabiliteits- en groeipact zijn inmiddels 150 keer geschonden. Absurd! Dat ondergraaft de geloofwaardigheid van de eurozone. Ik steun de positie van de Nederlandse regering die wil dat regels worden nagekomen en risico's worden afgebouwd.

En er hangt nog een donkere wolk boven de euro. De nieuwe regering-Conte wil fors meer gaan uitgeven dan er binnenkomt. Dus zal de torenhoge staatsschuld van 130 % van het BNP in Italië verder stijgen. Zo komt de positie van de euro in gevaar. De ECB en de Commissie moeten die plannen stoppen.

Tegelijk zeg ik: de Europese Unie moet solidair zijn met Italië en ook met Griekenland. Bij deze landen komen nu de meeste migranten aan en veel lidstaten kijken de andere kant op. Onaanvaardbaar! Europa moet de opvang samen gaan regelen en landen die dat niet doen, moeten gaan meebetalen aan die opvang.

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE). – Domnule președinte, salut propunerile Comisiei Europene pentru finalizarea uniunii economice și monetare. Consider, însă, că, chiar dacă vom pune la punct toate instrumentele și politicile necesare acestei uniuni, ea nu va fi completă până când statele membre care nu sunt în zona euro vor adera la euro. Și aceste state membre, în momentul în care au aderat la Uniunea Europeană, și-au luat angajamentul că vor îndeplini toate condițiile pentru a putea adera la euro. De aceea, cred că acea facilitate pentru convergență prevăzută în noul cadru financiar multianual 2021-2027 va trebui folosită pentru acele state membre care își iau angajamentul și au un plan de acțiune concret, în care să prevadă timpii exacți, măsurile pe care trebuie să le îndeplinească pentru a adera la euro.

Jonás Fernández (S&D). – Señor presidente, la crisis de ese barco repleto de refugiados, en los últimos días, llamado Aquarius nos ha recordado que no podemos tener una Unión Schengen sin una frontera, sin una gestión común de las fronteras nacionales.

En el mismo sentido, la crisis de la zona del euro nos ha recordado a su vez que no podemos tener un pilar monetario —una política monetaria común— sin una estructura fiscal, sin un instrumento fiscal que permita suavizar las crisis, que permita conducir a la zona del euro por aguas complicadas. Por eso es vital cerrar ya la unión bancaria. Este Parlamento tiene que hacer su trabajo para cerrar ya y llegar a un acuerdo con el seguro de depósitos, y necesitamos responder a las propuestas de la Comisión para construir un instrumento fiscal, un estabilizador automático, para acompañar la política monetaria. Es el momento de hacerlo.

Es el momento de que esta Europa solidaria responda a la crisis de refugiados, como ha hecho el Gobierno de España, y de que Europa responda también a la crisis de la zona del euro.

Werner Langen (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wenn man die Diskussionen hier hört, dann kann man nicht glauben, dass die Mehrheit der Bevölkerung in Griechenland, in Frankreich, in Italien, in Spanien – also in den Staaten, die angeblich nicht davon profitieren – uneingeschränkt für den Euro ist. Der Euro ist ein Erfolg, trotz der Ungleichgewichte. Und wenn die Regeln nicht eingehalten werden, dann bewirken auch kurze und kleine Änderungen nichts. Deshalb müssen wir über die Grundstruktur nachdenken. Die Schwächen und Geburtsfehler der Währungsunion liegen auf dem Tisch, und trotz kräftiger Konjunkturerholung bleiben sie.

Ich muss in dem Fall Professor Starbatty Recht geben: Aus deutscher Sicht ist der Euro unterbewertet bzw. Deutschland ist im Euro unterbewertet. Deshalb exportieren wir Wohlstand. Die Exportüberschüsse zeigen sich in den Notenbankverpflichtungen auf der anderen Seite. Die Notenbankverpflichtungen Deutschlands betragen Ende Mai 956 Milliarden Euro, die Guthaben von Italien, Frankreich und Spanien addiert 964 Milliarden Euro. Wer das vergisst, verschweigt die Wahrheit.

Und wenn wir heute einen Europäischen Währungsfonds gründen wollen, dann muss er in nationaler Verantwortung bleiben. Denn dort, wo die Steuern herkommen, muss auch die Haftung bleiben. Ich glaube, wenn der Währungskommissar zusätzlich Durchgriffsrechte wie die Wettbewerbskommissarin bekommt, dann können wir auch endlich die Durchsetzung der Regeln verbessern.

Paul Tang (S&D). – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Wat goed dat er zoveel leden zijn verzameld voor dit belangrijke debat over de euro. Want de euro moet veranderen om te kunnen blijven bestaan, zoveel is duidelijk. Zoveel is ook de kiezers duidelijk. Bezuinigen in slechte tijden leidt tot nog slechtere tijden, met Griekenland als meest pijnlijke voorbeeld.

Maar begin bij het begin. Schrap de domme en verschrikkelijke regels voor het tekort. Laat landen verantwoordelijkheid nemen voor de ontwikkeling van uitgaven en van schuld. Het is eenvoudig: met veel schuld is er weinig ruimte, en omgekeerd. En dan nog is er een vangnet nodig, voor landen en voor banken, een Europees Monetair Fonds. Maar laat de euro van ons zijn. Kies voor een democratische verankering van het fonds. Kies voor een Eurozone-Parlement met nationale en Europese parlementariërs. Verantwoordelijkheid, solidariteit, democratisering, die verandering is nodig om de euro te laten bestaan in het voordeel van ons allemaal.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'architecture de l'Union économique et monétaire a beaucoup évolué ces dernières années avec le développement de l'union bancaire et de l'union des marchés des capitaux, ainsi qu'avec la mise en place du Mécanisme européen de stabilité, qui a joué un rôle majeur pour garantir la stabilité de la zone euro lors de la crise des dettes souveraines en rassurant les marchés et en fournissant une aide financière à différents États membres.

Parce qu'elle est, aujourd'hui encore, vulnérable face aux risques de déstabilisation économique et financière, il convient d'aller plus loin dans la construction de l'Union économique et monétaire en transformant le Mécanisme européen de stabilité en Fonds monétaire européen.

Cette nouvelle étape doit renforcer et améliorer l'efficacité de la zone euro afin de la rendre plus résiliente et de renforcer la protection de nos épargnants. Ce fonds devra avant tout poursuivre le travail du Mécanisme européen de stabilité dans la prévention et la gestion des crises. Mais de nouvelles fonctions devront lui être attribuées pour encourager les investissements et être le filet de sécurité du fonds de sauvetage des banques.

Avancer sur l'Union économique et monétaire ne pourra se faire sans légitimité démocratique, voilà pourquoi le Parlement européen devra être pleinement associé, tout comme les parlements nationaux.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Οικονομική και Νομισματική Ένωση υπήρξε το οικονομικό θεμέλιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης που μας έφερε ως εδώ. Χωρίς όμως περισσότερη εμπέδυνση, αυτή δεν μπορεί να είναι λειτουργική και επ' αυτού συμφωνούμε οι πλείστοι.

Ωστόσο, στο επικείμενο Συμβούλιο θα πρέπει να ληφθούν αποφάσεις. Για παράδειγμα, έχουμε ανάγκη από ένα Ευρωπαϊκό Νομισματικό Ταμείο εδραιωμένο στη νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αλλά και σύμφωνο με τις δικές μας προτεραιότητες. Για παράδειγμα, οι μεγάλες οικονομικές αποκλίσεις οδηγούν σε αύξηση των πολιτικών αποκλίσεων και των άκρων, τροφοδοτώντας επικίνδυνα τον λαϊκισμό. Χρειαζόμαστε μια ΟΝΕ η οποία θα λογοδοτεί περισσότερο, θα λογοδοτεί δημοκρατικά σε αυτό εδώ το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Και τέλος, κύριε Πρόεδρε, δεν μπορούμε να προχωρήσουμε αν δεν έχουμε πανευρωπαϊκή εγγύηση των καταθέσεων.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Mr President, the good news is that the euro area has strongly recovered after the series of crises ten years ago, and now the euro enjoys very strong popular support among European citizens. According to Eurobarometer, two thirds of European citizens are happy to use the euro. Also No Member State wants to leave the euro area; just the opposite. There are new countries waiting for accession.

In this context, I would like to support the initiative submitted by the Commission that aims at strengthening the general institutional infrastructure of the euro area. I have no problem with the European Monetary Fund or with the incorporation of the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance into Union law, but I think that the proposal to establish a budgetary instrument for the euro area, especially when it comes to its stabilisation functions, deserves more attention and more discussion. First of all, it raises the problem of moral hazard, as does every insurance instrument. Secondly, it is politically unpopular in Member States, and it would require a lot of political capital in order to introduce it. But third, and most important: there is no proof that this instrument is necessary if countries follow the rules of the Stability and Growth Pact because, in that case, it always has a sufficient fiscal space to confront the asymmetric shocks.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – EMU:n kehittämisen jatko ei ole ravintolan buffet-pöytä, josta jokainen käy poimimassa ne elementit, jotka sillä hetkellä tuntuvat parhaiten maistuvan, vaan se on kokonaisuus, joka – samalla tavoin kuin vankurit ja pyörä – tarvitsee eri osasia toimiakseen.

Komissio on tehnyt hyvää työtä. Pohjaesitys pitää sisällään sekä eurooppalaisen valtiovarainministerin että vakausmekanismien kehittämisen eurooppalaiseksi valuuttarahastoksi ja jatkossa myös yhteisen investointimekanismin, millä voidaan tukea valtioita epäsymmetrisissä shokeissa, ja siitä muodostuu tämä kokonaisuus.

On erittäin tärkeää, että siihen liitetään myös pankkiunionin jatko, tiukemmat säännöt vakaus- ja kasvusopimuksen noudattamiseksi ja itse paketin ulkopuolelta sosiaalisen ulottuvuuden ja työelämän pelisääntöjen vahvistamista ja myös verovälttelyä, epäreilua kilpailua ja sosiaaliturva- ja verokilpailun välttämistä koskevat periaatteet ja keinot jatkossa. Vain näin Eurooppa voi olla vahva.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, I will begin at the end – that is, the end of Commissioner Dombrovskis' speech. His final words to us today were that the EU must provide better living and social standards for our citizens; that is what matters. Indeed, that is what matters, and we must take measures to ensure that happens, because rarely do we discuss the social and living standards of our citizens when we talk about high finance. So what can be done?

Number one: the EU Banking Union must encompass a European deposit insurance scheme that would be powerful for our citizens. The Commissioner also referred to the EU Invest Fund, and I am pleased to say that I have been appointed rapporteur for that, and I look forward to working with the Commissioner and others to ensure that it benefits especially the smaller businesses right across the European Union.

I also want to mention a few points that my colleague Brian Hayes mentioned. We do not need a European finance minister. Indeed, the word 'minister' is almost an exclusive competence for Member States at this stage, and it is almost an usurpation of their right to be talking about a minister at European level. We do not want a eurozone parliament. There is one parliament – this is it. And we must agree the MFF before the next elections.

Finally, I want to say that the rules must apply to all, and it would be a good idea if we made it clear to populists when they are going for election what the consequences are for their citizens' standards of living if they break the fiscal rules. That might help to fight populism.

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, I will speak on the democratic accountability of the EMU. I think we all agree that there is a strong link between parliamentary scrutiny and democratic legitimacy; this matters today more than ever. But, when it comes to the EMU, the mechanism behind this link is far from perfect: there is a democratic accountability gap, and colleagues spoke a lot about that today.

A year ago, Parliament adopted a series of resolutions on the future of Europe, where you opted strongly for a single institutional framework, but we believe that the democratic legitimacy of the EMU can be further improved without a treaty change. We also believe that the less complex, more efficient and more transparent the governance, the more effective its scrutiny. This relationship should be an underlying principle in the ongoing reforms.

We also believe that an interinstitutional agreement between Parliament, the Council and the Commission could provide for better parliamentary scrutiny of different elements of economic governance. In particular, such an agreement could help with the better handling of the issues which require double legitimacy. We strongly support the incorporation of the ESM, the fiscal compact and the SRF into the framework of European law; I think this is the quickest way to upgrade the European Parliament to a fully-fledged participant in defining economic policy goals and improving the democratic oversight of European governance.

Valdis Dombrovskis, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, as today's discussion on deepening of economic and monetary union showed once again, we will only be able to make progress if we pursue a balanced approach: an approach where solidarity and responsibility, risk-sharing and risk reduction advance hand-in-hand. This is one of the guiding principles which we have been pursuing in this work.

We had a lot of discussions on deepening the EMU during this mandate, starting with the Five Presidents' Report and with reflection papers; we put forward a package of proposals in December last year, we put forward further proposals this May, and we think it is now time to move from discussions to decisions. Therefore, we see the June summit as a critical milestone, and I am glad that I also heard a number of Members of the European Parliament call for action and concrete decisions.

It is important to strengthen democratic accountability, to improve the resilience of the euro area, to restart the process of convergence, and at the end of the day to achieve higher living standards for all Europeans. The Commission counts on your support for driving this process of deepening the EMU, and also the various dossiers still open during this mandate.

Presidente. –La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 162)

José Blanco López (S&D), por escrito. – La unión económica y monetaria está incompleta, como la crisis mostró. La unión bancaria ha puesto remedio, parcialmente, a esta situación, para la zona del euro, con la armonización de la regulación bancaria a través de la Autoridad Bancaria Europea, y la supervisión única establecida en el Banco Central Europeo. Sin embargo, la unión bancaria sigue sin estar terminada, al no haberse todavía implementado el seguro europeo de depósitos, ni haberse acordado que el Mecanismo Europeo de Estabilidad (MEDE) sea el respaldo fiscal del insuficientemente dotado Fondo Único de Resolución. Asimismo, ni la unión monetaria ni la unión bancaria pueden funcionar eficazmente sin un activo libre de riesgo que pueda eliminar el exceso de deuda pública nacional en los balances de los bancos y que pueda estabilizar al euro en los mercados financieros. También es necesario contar con un presupuesto anti-cíclico en la zona del euro, que pueda además otorgar credibilidad a la emisión de títulos de deuda, e integrar el MEDE en el acervo comunitario. El Consejo Europeo de junio de 2018 debe dar estos y otros pasos, de acuerdo con las propuestas de la Comisión y del presidente de Francia, para alcanzar la plena federalización de la Eurozona.

Iratxe García Pérez (S&D), por escrito. – La UEM está incompleta, tal y como demostró la crisis. La unión bancaria ha puesto remedio, parcialmente, en la zona euro, con la armonización de la regulación bancaria a través de la Autoridad Bancaria Europea y la supervisión única establecida en el Banco Central Europeo. Sin embargo, la unión bancaria permanece incompleta, al no haberse todavía implementado el seguro europeo de depósitos, ni haberse acordado que el Mecanismo Europeo de Estabilidad (MEDE) sea el respaldo fiscal del insuficientemente dotado Fondo Único de Resolución. Asimismo, ni la unión monetaria ni la unión bancaria pueden funcionar eficazmente sin un activo libre de riesgo que pueda eliminar el exceso de deuda pública nacional en los balances de los bancos y que pueda estabilizar al euro en los mercados financieros. También es necesario contar con un presupuesto anti-cíclico en la zona euro para otorgar credibilidad a la emisión de títulos de deuda e integrar el MEDE en el acervo comunitario. El Consejo Europeo de junio de 2018 debe dar estos y otros pasos, de acuerdo con las propuestas de la Comisión y del presidente de Francia, para alcanzar la plena federalización de la Eurozona.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D), por escrito. – A conclusão da União Económica e Monetária (UEM) é uma prioridade para que a União Europeia, em geral, e a zona euro, em particular, possam enfrentar com sucesso os novos desafios colocados pelas alterações na geopolítica global e nos equilíbrios económicos delas decorrentes, respondendo em simultâneo às expectativas e às necessidades dos cidadãos europeus.

No caminho que terá que ser percorrido, o papel do Parlamento Europeu como representante direto dos povos europeus deve ser valorizado e potenciado. Em particular, é fundamental que o avanço na concretização da UEM contribua para a estabilização da zona euro, para a promoção da convergência, para o reforço do investimento e para a criação de emprego de qualidade.

A conclusão da União Bancária com um sistema sólido de garantia é um passo que deve ser dado de imediato ao mesmo tempo que o Mecanismo Europeu de Estabilização deve evoluir de forma consistente para um Fundo Europeu de Estabilização que beneficiará de forma integrada todos os Estados-Membros e reforçará a competitividade global da zona euro.

(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti)

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. FABIO MASSIMO CASTALDO*Vicepresidente***4. Resumption of the sitting***(La seduta è ripresa alle 12.46)*

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). – Mr President, on a point of order under Rule 147. Everybody can be at risk from mechanical delays, but yesterday on the special train that brought many of us from Brussels there were delays: we had the most appalling circumstances and we were kept in difficult conditions. Can I as Quaestor ask you to join me in apologising to all of those people who were stuck on that train? But it's not just that train. Many other MEPs and staff had travel delays getting to Strasbourg, and it highlights the absurdity of dragging us 500 kilometres to Strasbourg every month. There are MEPs, parliamentary staff, committee staff, Group staff, Commission staff, Council staff – they all have to come to Strasbourg. It wastes our time, it wastes money and it brings this institution into disrepute.

Mr President, please can we ask you to talk to the President of this House and ask him to bring it up again with President Tusk and look again at the Treaties to reflect the will of this House and give us a single seat in which to work?

(Applause)

Marisa Matias (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, é apenas para fazer um apelo. Eu creio que é uma vergonha para esta instituição, que é a casa da democracia, ter intérpretes a trabalhar sob sequestro. Foram-lhes impostas condições de trabalho que são draconianas, que não respeitam os seus direitos e nós estamos aqui a trabalhar todos como se nada fosse, com intérpretes requisitados atrás de nós. Defendemos a democracia, o direito à greve e, por isso, peço que o Parlamento medeie esta negociação. Nós não podemos fazer o nosso trabalho sem intérpretes e não podemos ter intérpretes a trabalhar sem direitos.

Presidente. – Grazie collega. Abbiamo affrontato la questione anche ieri all'Ufficio di presidenza e le assicuro che ci sarà un pieno impegno da parte di tutti i membri per risolverla, come auspichiamo, in modo consensuale.

Un altro richiamo al regolamento da parte dell'on. Flack.

John Flack (ECR). – Mr President, on a happier note, can I just call a point of order to invite Parliament to congratulate the Bulgarian authorities for saving Penka the cow, showing that common sense and compassion can trump EU rules?

Σωτήριος Ζαριανόπουλος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα αναφερθώ πάλι στο ζήτημα των διερμηνέων. Το ζήτημα δεν είναι μονάχα πού συνεδριάζει το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο. Το Ευρωκοινοβούλιο απέδειξε τη δήθεν δημοκρατική του ευαισθησία. Απαγόρευσε σε εργαζόμενους να ασκήσουν το απεργιακό τους δικαίωμα. Αυτή είναι η δημοκρατία! Εργαζόμενοι που εργάζονται σε απαράδεκτες συνθήκες, δωδεκάωρα, χωρίς διαλείμματα, μετακινούμενοι πολλά χιλιόμετρα με συμβάσεις της μιας ημέρας. Πρέπει να καταδικαστεί ομόφωνα αυτή η απόφαση! Να παρθεί τώρα πίσω η απόφαση του Ευρωκοινοβουλίου! Να αφειθούν ελεύθεροι οι εργαζόμενοι! Να καταργηθεί η επίταξη! Εκφράζουμε την αλληλεγγύη μας στους εργαζόμενους συναδέλφους στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο.

Presidente. – C'era un richiamo anche dall'on. Coburn.

Colleghi vi prego, io cerco di essere tollerante, ma non abusate della mia tolleranza nella concessione degli interventi sul richiamo al regolamento, grazie.

David Coburn (EFDD). – Mr President, I was interested in what Ms Bearder was saying regarding the delay on the EU gravy train coming to Strasbourg. May I say: now she knows what it's like for her everyday constituents travelling by rail to work. I think she's living in another world, on another planet.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, très rapidement, je suis vraiment désolée de la panne de train qu'il y a eu hier et je comprends le désagrément pour les collègues et surtout pour l'ensemble des collaborateurs. Mais nous sommes ici au Parlement européen et nous devons respecter les traités, donc je voudrais simplement rappeler, chers collègues, que le siège de Strasbourg est aujourd'hui le siège du Parlement européen et que nous devons avoir cela à l'esprit.

Presidente. – Procediamo con le votazioni, abbiamo avuto troppi richiami al regolamento. L'articolo 184 bis parla chiaro, molti sono intervenuti senza neanche menzionare l'articolo del regolamento. Per favore procediamo, grazie.

5. Voting time

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

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

5.1. State of play of recreational fisheries in the EU (A8-0191/2018 - Norica Nicolai) (vote)

5.2. Clearing obligation, reporting requirements and risk-mitigation techniques for OTC derivatives and trade repositories (A8-0181/2018 - Werner Langen) (vote)

— *Prima della votazione:*

Werner Langen, Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident! Vielen Dank für das klare Votum. Ich bitte, die Schlussabstimmung zurückzustellen, damit wir in den Trilog eintreten können und keine Gesetzeslücke entsteht, und damit um die Zurücküberweisung an den Ausschuss.

Presidente. – Pongo in votazione la proposta del relatore. La questione è rinviata alla commissione competente per l'avvio dei negoziati interistituzionali.

5.3. Common rules in the field of civil aviation and European Union Aviation Safety Agency (A8-0364/2016 - Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vote)

5.4. CO₂ emissions from and fuel consumption of new heavy-duty vehicles (A8-0010/2018 - Damiano Zoffoli) (vote)

5.5. Modernisation of education in the EU (A8-0173/2018 - Krystyna Łybacka) (vote)

5.6. Towards a sustainable and competitive European aquaculture sector (A8-0186/2018 - Carlos Iturgaiz) (vote)

Presidente. – Con questo si conclude il turno di votazioni.

(La seduta è sospesa per pochi istanti in attesa delle dichiarazioni di voto)

6. Explanations of vote

6.1. State of play of recreational fisheries in the EU (A8-0191/2018 - Norica Nicolai)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Liadh Ní Riada (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, thug mé tacaíocht don tuairisc seo mar go dtugann sí aitheantas don ghéarghá atá lenár mbáid bheaga a chosaint agus a fhorbairt. Léiríonn sí go gcaithfear tuiscint a bheith ann ar an difríocht idir iascaireacht mar chaitheamh aimsire agus iascaireacht mar shlí bheatha.

Tuigimid go mbeidh fás agus borradh ar thurasóireacht atá bainteach le slatiascaireacht mar chaitheamh aimsire agus aithnímid gur rud maith é seo, ach ag an am céanna tá sé tábhachtach nach gciallódh sé seo go mbeadh aon laghdú ar dheiseanna d'iascaireacht phroifisiúnta agus nach gcuirfeadh sé isteach ar an earnáil leis na flíteanna beaga.

Bheadh sé níos deise a bheith ag caint mar gheall air seo dá mbeadh an tigh ciúin! Tá sé an-deacair a bheith ag caint nuair atá daoine ag cadráil.

Ar aon chuma, cuirim fáilte roimh an nglaoch ón gCoimisiún chun airgead a infheistiú chun an earnáil turasóireachta i dtaobh iascaireacht mar chaitheamh aimsire a fhorbairt agus ba chóir go mbeadh eolas faoi acmhainní á roinnt.

É sin ráite, caithfidh mé a rá go bhfuilim an-bhuartha faoin droch-thionchar a bheadh ar an gcóras eicea-uisce úr de bharr an baol a bheadh ann dá mbeadh speicis neamhdhúchasacha ag cur isteach ar ár n-aibhneacha, go mbeidh slatiascairí ag iascaireacht iontu i gcoitinne.

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i pescatori ricreativi apportano all'economia un contributo di circa 10 miliardi e mezzo di EUR. L'impatto di questo tipo di pesca è molto importante sotto il profilo economico, sociale ed ambientale. Per questa ragione abbiamo chiesto che la Commissione valuti il ruolo della pesca ricreativa nella futura politica comune della pesca, inclusi i piani pluriennali, in modo che entrambi i tipi di pesca commerciale e ricreativa possano essere gestiti in maniera equilibrata, equa e sostenibile.

Al contempo esiste un problema legato alla carenza, o in alcuni casi alla totale assenza, di dati disponibili e aggiornati. Ricordiamo però che il FEAMP prevede finanziamenti per la raccolta di dati anche riguardo alla pesca ricreativa. Per questo abbiamo chiesto alla Commissione di ampliare il futuro ambito di applicazione del FEAMP, affinché fornisca sostegno finanziario per la ricerca e per l'analisi dei dati raccolti e quindi finanziare progetti di monitoraggio per le specie maggiormente soggette a pesca ricreativa.

Altresì abbiamo esortato la Commissione ad istituire un registro dati disponibile per i ricercatori, al fine di monitorare e valutare costantemente lo stato delle risorse ittiche. Anche in questo caso si potrebbe ricorrere a finanziamenti nell'ambito del FEAMP.

Infine, abbiamo affrontato il problema della definizione di pesca ricreativa, una definizione importante, in modo che l'attività sia differente da quella illegale, non dichiarata e non regolamentata. Questo è un nodo cruciale, poiché solo a seguito di una corretta definizione e regolamentazione sarà possibile difendere gli interessi dei pescatori commerciali e ricreativi, garantendo la tutela dell'ambiente e degli stock, perché tra i due tipi di pesca non ci deve essere un conflitto, bensì collaborazione per la difesa delle risorse. Tutte queste istanze sono state accolte dalla relatrice e quindi abbiamo supportato appieno la relazione.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ζητώ συγγνώμη. Προηγουμένως είχα ζητήσει τον λόγο για ένα διαδικαστικό θέμα. Λυπούμαι που πρέπει να το αναφέρω τώρα. Θέλω όμως να ενημερώσω το Σώμα για το εξής: πριν από λίγες μέρες ανακοινώθηκαν τα ονόματα των βραβευθέντων Ευρωπαίων πολιτών με το Βραβείο του Ευρωπαίου Πολίτη. Ανάμεσα σε αυτούς είναι και ο Τουρκοκύπριος συνάδελφος και συναγωνιστής *Şener Levent*. Άνθρωπος τον οποίον εκτιμώ βαθύτατα, άνθρωπος που μου είναι πάρα πολύ συμπαθής, τον οποίο αγαπώ και του οποίου στηρίζω επίσης την υποψηφιότητα. Δεν θεωρώ σωστό βραβεύεις με το Βραβείο του Ευρωπαίου Πολίτη να εμφανίζεται με αρθρογραφία υπό την ιδιότητα αυτή, καταγγέλλοντας εμένα, τον συνάδελφο Νεοκλή Συλικιώτη και το Κόμμα μας ότι είμαστε υπέρ της κατοχής και της παρουσίας κατοχικών στρατευμάτων και εγγυήσεων στην Κύπρο.

Πράγμα τελείως λανθασμένο! Γνωρίζετε όλοι τους αγώνες μας εδώ και θεωρώ ότι εκ μέρους του ήταν μια άστοχη κίνηση. Όταν σου επιτίθεται ένας φίλος θέλει πολύ γενναιοψυχία για να κρατήσεις ένα επίπεδο που να συντηρεί τη σχέση. Κρατώ αυτή τη δυνατότητα, θέλω να συντηρήσω τη σχέση με τον συγκεκριμένο άνθρωπο και του εκφράζω και από εδώ την εκτίμησή μου για τους αγώνες του κατά της κατοχής. Ας επιτρέψει και σε εμάς να κρατάμε την ίδια δυνατότητα και τον ίδιο πατριωτισμό.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já bych vás chtěl vyzvat, abyste postupoval striktně, protože toto je část, která se věnuje vysvětlení hlasování, a *point of order* je možný pouze právě pro tuto část a myslím, že pan kolega k tomu vůbec nehovořil. Nicméně k tomu, co chci říci já.

Já jsem podpořil tuto zprávu, která se týká rekreačního rybolovu, z několika důvodů. Za prvé je jasné, že nejde o volání po nové legislativě. To je myslím, že velmi důležité sdělit na začátku, že to je zpráva z vlastní iniciativy, která popisuje problém, ale nevolá po nové legislativě.

Za druhé je zřejmé, že tento rekreační rybolov plní samozásobitelskou roli v několika regionech. Je to skutečně velmi důležité i pro regionální ekonomiku a i z tohoto důvodu jsem podpořil tuto zprávu.

Potřebujeme jednotnou definici, potřebujeme více dat pro analyzování daného problému, tudíž já jsem podpořil toto stanovisko, resp. tuto zprávu i z důvodu toho, aby byly nalezeny tyto jednotné definice a předána příslušná vědecká data.

Presidente. – Grazie on. Polčák. Per chiarire, a norma dell'articolo 184 bis, i richiami al regolamento sono possibili in qualsiasi momento e hanno sempre la precedenza su qualsiasi altro tipo di mozione e su qualsiasi altro tipo di richiesta di intervento.

Chiaramente ci sono alcuni colleghi che alle volte forzano un po' il regolamento e intervengono per richiami del regolamento che non sono strettamente afferenti a una violazione di una regola di procedura.

Io cerco di essere bilanciato e, come ha visto, quando ho visto che c'era un'eccedenza di interventi li ho fatti posticipare proprio per non turbare la procedura di voto. Proseguiamo con le richieste.

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, it nice to see you in the Chair. Congratulations on how you handled the session.

This report is a neat symbol of how the European Union can't see anything that it doesn't want to regulate. The idea that recreational fisheries – something that has been self-regulating for as long as human civilisation has existed, or indeed longer – needs to be brought within the jurisdiction of the European Union and subjected to the strictures of the common fisheries policy is a measure of the ambition that we have in these Brussels institutions.

The European Union, I think, has learned from the bad PR of the last time that it tried to do this, when it was literally wanting to count every fish landed, even from people fishing on the rocks. It has now done what it usually does, which is to pay for a lobby group, supposedly representing the anglers, who are in fact a group created by the Commission, and then pretend that the legislation is representative of the sector. But stand back and ask the question: why does any of this need to be regulated at EU level at all? If we can't allow this kind of activity to be flourishing outside the sphere of political control, then truly we have no limits whatever to our ambition.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, mi explicación de voto es justamente la contraria de la del colega que ha hablado anteriormente. He votado a favor de este informe sobre la pesca recreativa porque considero que va teniendo un crecimiento cada vez más relevante y que sí tiene una incidencia muy importante en los recursos marinos. Por tanto, es competencia de los países, no es una competencia de la Unión Europea; pero, debido al peso que está cogiendo, tenemos que tenerla en cuenta y es esencial para gestionar mejor nuestros recursos marinos. Por eso, creo que es conveniente que haya una regulación en el futuro dentro de la política pesquera comunitaria. También me ha resultado esencial en este informe que tengamos datos reales de este sector que no conocemos. Ahora mismo especulamos, pero no sabemos cuáles son los datos reales y, por supuesto, necesitamos definiciones claras de pesca recreativa, pesca deportiva y pesca comercial.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, I support my colleague who has just spoken about the need for regulation. I think the question is: will it be effective? I know that those engaged in recreational fisheries are concerned also that the regulation we bring in will work for them.

While I have the floor in my support for this report, there is a huge voluntary effort amongst fishermen and -women, both at sea and inland, who look after our resources on a voluntary basis, who teach and encourage young people into the skill and hobby of fishing.

Lastly, those whom I know who enjoy recreational fishing tend to have a good disposition, so it does a great deal for the wellbeing of those who engage in this activity. We want it to be sustainable, we wanted it to continue. So if we are regulating (and we are), let's be effective in how we do it.

6.2. Clearing obligation, reporting requirements and risk-mitigation techniques for OTC derivatives and trade repositories (A8-0181/2018 - Werner Langen)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Catherine Stihler (S&D). – Mr President, when we were talking about clearing obligations, I want to use my time to talk about the importance of the single market. Today in the House of Commons, British MPs will begin debating amendments on the Brexit Bill.

It will come as no surprise to this House that, as a Labour MEP who has committed my time in politics to Europe, I am against Brexit and I do not support the UK leaving the European Union and thus the single market. Yet the UK could remain as part of the single market through an amendment on the EEA. I urge those who are in the House of Commons today and tomorrow and who will be voting on these issues to look at the EEA amendment to support jobs, support livelihoods and to support prosperity.

An estimated 300 000 jobs in Scotland alone rely on our access to the single market. The estimate across the UK is something in the region of 3 million. So for the future of my country, if we are no longer going to be part of the single market through the EU, we need to be part of the single market through the EEA, an option that is open to MPs. I urge them to support the amendments today in the House of Commons.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A rendelet összhangban van a Bizottság célravezető és hatásos szabályozási programjával, a pénzügyi stabilitás megőrzését és a kockázatok csökkentését szolgálja. Sürgős intézkedésekre van szükség a pénzügyi rendszert fenyegető veszély mérséklésére és a pénzügyi piacok átláthatóságának növelésére. A rendelet egyben a kereskedési adattárak szolgáltatását pontosítja, és lehetővé teszi a kölcsönös hozzáférést.

Az ellenőrzési jogosítványok visszatartó erővel bírnak azokra a gazdasági szereplőkre nézve, akik ki akarják használni a piacot spekulatív célokra. A bírságok szigorítása is ezt a célt szolgálja. A rendelet módosítja a nyugdíjkonstrukciós rendszerekre vonatkozó szabályokat és növeli a biztonságot. Megítélésem szerint ezen a területen egységes közösségi szabályozásra szükség van, ezért a jelentés elfogadását támogattam.

6.3. Common rules in the field of civil aviation and European Union Aviation Safety Agency (A8-0364/2016 - Marian-Jean Marinescu)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση συζητεί τους κοινούς κανόνες στον τομέα της πολιτικής αεροπορίας και τις διατάξεις για τον Οργανισμό Αεροπορικής Ασφάλειας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά ταυτόχρονα κλείνει τα μάτια σε αυτό που συμβαίνει στο Αιγαίο, εκεί όπου η Τουρκία παραβιάζει τον ελληνικό εναέριο χώρο. Τα τουρκικά μαχητικά καθημερινά παραβιάζουν το FIR Αθηνών. Δεν τηρούν τους κανόνες που έχουν σχέση με τις πτήσεις. Τα πολεμικά αεροσκάφη της Τουρκίας παρενοχλούν όχι μόνο στρατιωτικά αεροσκάφη αλλά και πολιτικά αεροσκάφη τα οποία υπερίπτανται του FIR Αθηνών. Υπάρχει λοιπόν κίνδυνος ατυχήματος και πρέπει να ληφθούν μέτρα ενάντια στην Τουρκία, προκειμένου να διασφαλιστεί η ασφάλεια των πτήσεων στο Αιγαίο. Γι' αυτό λοιπόν πρέπει να σταλεί ένα αποφασιστικό μήνυμα στην Τουρκία ότι θα κινδυνεύσει με τη διακοπή των αεροπορικών πτήσεων Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Τουρκίας εάν συνεχίσει να παραβιάζει το FIR Αθηνών.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! To dobre sprawozdanie, i niezwykle potrzebne. Koledze Marinescu należą się podziękowania za dość szybką pracę. Podkreślam, że my dziś nadrabiamy czas, a właściwie go gonimy. Szkoda, że z pewnymi kosztami. Natomiast chcę zwrócić uwagę na jeden element, który cały czas nam umyka. Otóż musimy skoncentrować się nie tylko na regulacjach prawnych, ale także na konieczności zbudowania systemów sprawnej identyfikacji przede wszystkim dronów oraz innych pojazdów, które naruszają przestrzeń. Drugi element, również ważny, dotyczy możliwości ich neutralizacji. Nad tym powinniśmy pracować niezwykle szybko, bo to tak naprawdę będzie decydowało o bezpieczeństwie, a nie same przepisy w zakresie identyfikacji czy rejestracji pojazdów.

Alex Mayer (S&D). – Mr President, I welcome this report's new rules, so that the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) can collect data on links between poor working conditions and flight safety. I believe it is vital, as exploitative employment models soar at low-cost airlines. Take Ryanair pilots and first officers, based at Stansted in my constituency. Many are not directly employed by the airline but are employed as contractors, meaning that they do not have access to sick pay. Some Ryanair pilots have told me that they go into work not feeling 100%, as otherwise they won't get paid. I have yet to meet a passenger who wants their pilot to be feeling a bit under the weather. When you're hurtling through the air at 500 miles an hour at 30 000 feet, you want a pilot to be on top of their game.

Of course, currently this is all anecdotal, but thanks to this vote, now we've got the power to truly discover what price safety.

6.4. CO₂ emissions from and fuel consumption of new heavy-duty vehicles (A8-0010/2018 - Damiano Zoffoli)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, es muy buena noticia que podamos garantizar, por fin, un sistema eficiente de monitorización y de notificación de las emisiones de vehículos pesados. Es un paso importante, aunque no sea un paso definitivo. Creemos que sería oportuno hablar también aquí del transporte de los alimentos, un tema precisamente en el que el mundo rural y el mundo urbano se encuentran de frente; porque tenemos que volver al consumo de proximidad, a conectar campo y ciudad si de verdad queremos salvar este planeta.

Hay informes que estiman que los volúmenes de mercancías transportadas por carretera aumentarán en Europa a un promedio anual de un 3 % hasta 2020; por eso, la mejora en la eficiencia de los combustibles y de los vehículos tal vez no sea suficiente. Necesitamos una legislación europea que de verdad combata la contaminación del aire, que camine hacia la práctica eliminación de los vehículos que funcionan con motor de combustión, que son, precisamente, la principal causa de este tipo de contaminación.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já jsem hlasoval pro návrh této zprávy, protože cílem zprávy je odstranění znalostního nedostatku a dosažení transparentnosti trhu. Díky tomuto kroku bude možné relevantní údaje vypočítané výrobci v souladu s certifikační metodikou sledovat a zpřístupňovat je veřejnosti.

Tyto údaje sdělované Komisi budou moci být také předány třetím stranám, což oceňuji, které o to tedy požádají. Tyto třetí strany, mimo jiné univerzity, regionální vlády, nevládní organizace, budou tedy mít možnost nezávisle ověřovat pravdivost těchto údajů, které výrobci poskytnou, a zabránit tak novým skandálům, jako byl např. skandál související s emisemi z naftových motorů.

Dalším navazujícím krokem je stanovení přísnějších norem pro emise CO₂ u těžkých vozidel v souladu s Pařížskou úmluvou. Tady bych chtěl říci, já samozřejmě podporuji Pařížskou úmluvu a z tohoto důvodu jsem podpořil i návrh této zprávy.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A nehézgépjárművek az Unió széndioxid-kibocsátásának 5 százalékáért felelősek, ezért a szabályozás indokolt ezen a területen. A jelenlegi uniós keretek nem teszik lehetővé, hogy a rendelkezésre álló információk összehasonlíthatóak legyenek. Ez a helyzet így nem ösztönzi a piaci szereplőket az energiahatékonyság fokozására és az innovációra.

A rendelet az EU-ban nyilvántartásba vett új nehézgépjárművek széndioxid-kibocsátásának és üzemanyag-fogyasztásának nyomon követését szolgálja. Az adatokat az Európai Környezetvédelmi Ügynökség fogja kezelni, amit a tagállami hatóságok és a gépjárműgyártók nyújtanak be, és ezek nyilvánosan hozzáférhetőek lesznek. A javaslat kétségtelenül pozitív eredményeket fog hozni az üzemanyag-hatékonyság növekedése, és a légszennyezés csökkentése terén. Fentiekre való tekintettel támogattam a javaslatot.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Votei favoravelmente este dossiê porque entendo que, para cumprir com as metas do Acordo de Paris, todos os setores de atividade têm de dar a sua contribuição e a realidade é que o mercado de veículos pesados está a demorar a adaptar-se à nova realidade, que exige uma maior eficiência do setor para podermos cumprir com a redução das emissões de CO₂.

Sem uma regulação que seja simultaneamente ambiciosa e eficaz nunca lá chegaremos. Os Estados-Membros e o setor empresarial que entendem a prioridade das alterações climáticas pedem reduções da ordem dos 24% nas emissões de CO₂ para veículos pesados. O setor precisa de medidas que obriguem ao cumprimento destes objetivos e que seja um claro sinal de que a mudança é imediata. Precisamos de mais transparência na monitorização e verificação das emissões de CO₂ e vejo com bons olhos a harmonização europeia através do sistema de testes Vecto para uma maior comparabilidade entre veículos, que se utilizem medições de tempo real e que laboratórios independentes possam verificar os dados. Espero que este seja um caminho para acabar com as culpas que tem adiado o inevitável.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, ja som rád podporil toto uznesenie, pretože úsilie o postupné znižovanie emisií je správne, samozrejme. Nákladná doprava vytvára približne štvrtinu emisií v rámci cestnej dopravy a tento podiel stále rastie, a preto je dôležité motivovať výrobcov, aby vyrábali nielen bezpečnejšie, ale aj ekologickejšie vozidlá. O to viac, že Európska únia je na rozdiel od krajín, ako sú Spojené štáty, Čína, Kanada alebo Japonsko, jediným celkom, ktorý neuplatňuje limity na emisie kamiónov. Myslím si, že to je taká prekvapivá vec, pretože toto je veľmi vážne. Tie emisie kamiónov sú obrovské. Je však rovnako dôležité, aby členské štáty prichádzali s konkrétnymi riešeniami na pomoc ľuďom, ktorí stratia v budúcnosti prácu v ekologicky náročných odvetviach, pretože cestná doprava, či už nákladná či autobusová, je nie len ekologicky náročná, ale aj oblasť ohrozená robotizáciou, a to autonómnymi automobilmi. Aj preto sa musíme zamyslieť, či nové dokonalejšie automobily nepredrazia prepravné služby a nebudú vážnym zásahom do odvetvia. Predsa tu pracuje množstvo ľudí, aj na Slovensku, a majú dôležité obchodné kontrakty so zahraničím, ktoré nepriamo zamestnávajú množstvo ľudí na Slovensku.

6.5. Modernisation of education in the EU (A8-0173/2018 - Krystyna Łybacka)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Rory Palmer (S&D). – Mr President, this report rightly sets a vision for education that is about broadening horizons and encouraging young people to have the highest possible ambition and aspiration. But that will never be fully possible while we still have universities that have admissions systems that disadvantage young people from certain backgrounds, while university fees are too high, while we have Erasmus opportunities not available to enough young people from working class backgrounds, and while we still have the outrageous scandal of unpaid internships in this House, in other political institutions and in other sectors as well. The best educational opportunities are not a luxury for the richest. They must always be for the many, and not the few.

Jeroen Lenaers (PPE). – Dank u, Voorzitter. Onderwijs is een zaak van de lidstaten en dat moet ook vooral zo blijven. Maar er is wel nog een wereld te winnen als het gaat om de samenwerking tussen de lidstaten op dit gebied. En juist lokale initiatieven kunnen het verschil maken. Als ik in mijn eigen regio kijk: uitwisselingsprojecten tussen Nederlandse en Waalse scholen, leraren die tijdelijk bij een Duitse school gaan werken om de taal te leren, grensoverschrijdende stageprojecten en ga zo maar door. Daar zit de meerwaarde van grensoverschrijdend onderwijs. En dat hoeven we niet in Brussel te regelen, maar we kunnen het wel faciliteren en aanmoedigen en ik ben blij dat dat vanuit dit Huis onderschreven wordt.

Er is wel een duidelijke Europese uitdaging als het gaat om bijvoorbeeld kinderen van reizende ouders zoals kermisondernemers of circusartiesten. Wij moeten ervoor zorgen dat deze mensen voor hun kinderen via de computer toegang hebben tot direct hoogwaardig onderwijs, waar in Europa ze ook zijn. Er is al een aantal lidstaten, waar dit een mogelijkheid is. Maar laten we er alsjeblieft voor zorgen dat dit voor alle kinderen in Europa mogelijk wordt.

Urszula Krupa (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Sprawozdanie w sprawie modernizacji edukacji w Unii zawiera niektóre treści trudne do akceptacji. Dlatego głosowałam przeciwko. Edukacja w klasycznym rozumieniu obejmuje nauczanie, wychowanie z kształtowaniem postaw wobec dobra i zła oraz profilaktykę.

Brakuje definicji tożsamości człowieka, który, działając kreatywnie i pragmatycznie, dąży do kariery, samorealizacji i dobrostanu. Jednak zdrowie psychiczne opiera się w dużym stopniu na przestrzeganiu zasad moralnych. A moralność oparta na destrukcji prowadzi do zaburzeń. Wartości etyczne wynikają z rozumienia idei prawdy o transcendentalnej naturze człowieka. A tak zwana etyka stanowiona, oparta jedynie na ludzkim rozumowaniu jest z natury błędna, co dotyczy także zwalczania stereotypów związanych z płcią, z wykluczeniem naturalnych różnic między kobietą a mężczyzną. Podobnie położenie nacisku na wizualizację jest ograniczające, gdyż głównym nośnikiem kształcenia jest słowo.

Stefano Maullu (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che il tema sia di grandissima attualità, soprattutto nella nostra Unione europea. Sono 6,3 milioni i ragazzi che dai 14 ai 25 anni in quest'arco di età abbandonano la scuola e ciò significa un danno permanente per le generazioni che vanno a seguire, soprattutto in termini di competitività e di integrazione.

Io credo che si debba spingere chiedendo agli Stati membri uno stanziamento fisso aggiuntivo, soprattutto per poter garantire un'istruzione scolastica all'altezza della competizione che l'Unione europea ha a livello mondiale, fatta ormai per grandi aree geografiche, soprattutto per uno sviluppo tecnologico e per uno sviluppo che veda anche la possibilità di essere multilingue. Questo credo sia un *gap* che in alcune zone d'Europa deve essere colmato colmato con una marcia accelerata.

Poi c'è un altro aspetto che va sottolineato: la crescita del bullismo nelle strutture scolastiche che deve essere combattuto con forza, con determinazione e con approcci che consentano ai ragazzi di evitare questo genere di tendenza che è sempre più presente. Io credo che proprio su questi temi valga la pena di continuare a investire. La relazione va proprio in questa direzione, per cui l'ho votata con grande convinzione.

Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Głosowałam za sprawozdaniem o modernizacji edukacji, ponieważ uważam ten temat za jeden z najważniejszych w dzisiejszej polityce. Rozwój nowych technologii przyniósł liczne wyzwania dla systemów edukacyjnych, a fala zmian nadchodzących wraz z cyfryzacją określana jest przez wielu mianem tsunami, na które nie jesteśmy gotowi. Tradycyjne miejsce zdobywania wiedzy, czyli szkoła, jest dziś uzupełnione o wiele innych dostępnych źródeł informacji, przy czym nie zawsze są one wiarygodne i rzetelne.

Zmiany zachodzące w gospodarce, w tym cyfryzacja, automatyzacja, robotyzacja rynku pracy, wywołały wzrost popytu na pracowników posiadających wysoki poziom kwalifikacji oraz określone umiejętności. Do 2020 r. w sektorach związanych z nowymi technologiami będzie ponad 750 000 stanowisk nieobsadzonych przez specjalistów, a w sektorach związanych z naukami przyrodniczymi i matematyką niedobór pracowników osiągnie w tym okresie 200 000 osób.

Największym problemem unijnego rynku pracy – również krajowych systemów edukacyjnych – jest brak siły roboczej o kwalifikacjach odpowiadających potrzebom gospodarki. Warto pamiętać, że ponad 40% Europejczyków nie posiada podstawowych umiejętności cyfrowych, co prowadzi do pojawienia się poważnych barier w ich wchodzeniu na zaawansowany technologicznie rynek pracy. Dlatego też wszelkie zmiany w systemach edukacyjnych powinny prowadzić do poprawy umiejętności cyfrowych wśród obywateli poprzez odpowiednie kształcenie już na wczesnym etapie. Zaczniemy działać, bo już jest bardzo późno.

Zoltán Balczó (NI). – Elnök Úr! A jelentés számos pozitív elemet tartalmaz, és van, amihez hozzárendeli a megvalósítási eszközt is, így például az Erasmus+ program esetében. Ennek ellenére a népszavazáskor tartózkodtam a következők miatt: minden tagországtól elvárja a jelentéstevő, hogy a középiskolai tananyagba építsen be egy egyoldalú uniós propagandát, és alakítson ki egy külön nem létező, EU-s állampolgár identitást. A migránsok oktatásának, képzésének kérdése olyan túlzott hangsúllyal szerepel, ami annak elfogadását jelenti, hogy a következő években az európai kontinens a bevándorlók kontinensévé válik. A jelentés megfogalmazása, a kötelező elvárások figyelmen kívül hagyják azt a tényt, hogy az oktatás egyébként nemzeti hatáskör.

Jan Zahradil (ECR). – Pane předsedající, stalo se takovým zvykem, musím říci špatným zvykem v tomto Parlamentu, že se vyjadřuje neustále k věcem, které nejsou v jeho kompetenci nebo vůbec v kompetenci EU, a to je přesně případ této zprávy o modernizaci výuky.

Já samozřejmě mohu souhlasit s mnohými částmi této zprávy, s tím, že klade důraz na digitalizaci, na tzv. znalostní společnost nebo na úlohu vědeckých a technických předmětů ve výuce, ale o to přeci nejde. Jde o to, že výuka nebo politika vzdělávání a vyučování není kompetencí EU, ale kompetencí členských států. Ty určují strukturu vzdělávání a požadavky, které jsou kladeny na vzdělávání. EU může samozřejmě přispět organizací a spolufinancováním různých výměnných programů, jako je třeba ERASMUS, ale neorganizuje výuku, a proto bychom neměli překračovat tyto hranice, jakkoli chápu, že někteří kolegové si těmito zprávami vylepšují parlamentní statistiku.

Já jsem proto pro tuto zprávu nehlasoval a zdržel jsem se hlasování.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Vážený pán predsedajúci, ak budeme dnes naše deti učiť tak, ako sa učili včera, okrádame ich o budúcnosť. Žiaľ, tento úvod uznesenia o modernizácii vzdelávania presne opisuje problém aj nášho slovenského školstva. Presne toto totiž robia naši ministri a na ich hazard doplácajú deti, ktoré nedostávajú kvalitné vzdelanie. Správa Európskeho parlamentu jasne hovorí, že učitelia musia byť zapojení do reformy nie ako pokusné králiky, ale ako spoluprotvorcovia. Vedenie školstva u nás však robí úplný opak a ignoruje požiadavky učiteľov o potrebných zmenách.

V dohľadnej budúcnosti nás čakajú výzvy ako robotizácia. Najlepšou možnosťou udržania konkurencieschopnosti pre Slovensko je práve investícia do školstva. Školy musia byť centrom kritického myslenia, tréningu, riešenia problémov, tímovej práce, budovania vzťahov. Mňa veľmi mrzí, že naše deti samy cítia, že jediný spôsob, ako získať kvalitné vzdelanie, je štúdium v zahraničí. A tak, ako sú rodičia zo Slovenska nútení odchádzať za prácou ďaleko od svojich rodín, tak až tridsaťtisíc mladých ľudí odchádza študovať do zahraničia, pričom polovica z nich chce po ukončení štúdia zostať v zahraničí.

Napriek tomu som toto uznesenie nemohol podporiť, nakoľko opäť úplne nezmyselne obsahuje paragraf o genderovej ideológii a zasahuje v tejto oblasti, no aj v iných, do subsidiarity členských...

(Predsedajúci rečníka prerušil.)

Момчил Неков (S&D). – Гласувах в подкрепа на доклада за модернизирани на образованието в Европейския съюз, защото смятам, че той извежда на преден план наболели проблеми в тази сфера. На първо място, напълно място подкрепям тезата, че на учителите трябва да се обърне специално внимание. Те са стожерите на всяка образователна система и без тяхното пряко участие нито една образователна реформа не може да бъде успешна. Достойното възнаграждение не е достатъчно. Учителите трябва да имат достъп до възможности за преквалификация и повишаване на квалификацията през цялата кариера, за да могат по-лесно да се приспособяват към новите предизвикателства.

На второ място, защитавам тезата, че модернизиранието на образованието не трябва да се разбира единствено като подобрене на материалната база на училищата и инвестирането в модерна дигитална инфраструктура. Наличието на модерни технологии не дава гаранция, че знанията, уменията и компетентностите се усвояват по-добре. На територията на Европейския съюз все още има 70 милиона европейци, които не разполагат с базови умения като четене, писане и смятане. Тази статистика е достатъчно красноречива.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, quiero destacar que en el informe sobre la modernización de la educación en la Unión, aprobado hoy, se recomienda en su apartado 134 que los Estados miembros integren el aprendizaje sobre la Unión en sus planes de estudio de educación secundaria para familiarizar a los estudiantes con el funcionamiento de la Unión, su historia y los valores de la ciudadanía europea.

Me parece muy bien. Desde hace años vengo reclamando que en los centros escolares de los Estados miembros se promueva un mejor conocimiento de las instituciones de la Unión Europea, sus antecedentes, su funcionamiento y sus objetivos. Solo se valora lo que se conoce. De ahí que haya solicitado reiteradamente la creación de una especie de «asignatura europea». Y, en este sentido, quiero destacar que el mes pasado precisamente el Consejo aprobó una recomendación propuesta por el comisario Navracsics que va precisamente en esta línea.

La Unión Europea acompañará a los jóvenes europeos a lo largo de sus vidas. Conviene que la estudien con detenimiento en sus centros familiares. No se debe estudiar de forma ligera o superficial, como cualesquiera otras organizaciones internacionales. La Unión Europea es para los jóvenes europeos mucho más importante que el resto de las organizaciones internacionales nacidas tras la Segunda Guerra Mundial y, por ello, deben conocerla bien.

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Mr President, thanks to two very excellent programmes, I get to spend a lot of time in schools. One of them is run nationally in Ireland, and it is called the Blue Star Programme for primary school children. It does an exceptional job in telling and teaching children about culture, heritage and history, and when I go into schools I am invigorated by the little ones telling me back what they are learning, and they love it. I recommend it to you, and I will spread the word. And thank you to the wonderful teachers who promote this programme.

The second is our own programme: the Ambassador School Programme for secondary level pupils, and here again, the tremendous engagement in those schools that are part of this programme is just to behold. It roots out cynicism and ignorance about the European Union, and promotes an absolutely wonderful ideal for Europe, which we have yet to attain.

While I still have the floor for four seconds, I would say to our teachers and schools around Europe that we do value the work you do and we want to work more closely with you.

6.6. Towards a sustainable and competitive European aquaculture sector (A8-0186/2018 - Carlos Iturgaiz)

Dichiarazioni di voto orali

Norbert Erdős (PPE). – Elnök Úr, tisztelt Ház! Első szavam az elégedettségé. Az Európai Parlament egy világos, átlátható, megvalósítható víziót rakott le az Iturgaiz-jelentésben az európai akvakultúra ágazat fejlesztésére, ezért ezt örömmel megszavaztam. Üdvözlöm, hogy a jelentésben számos javaslatomat sikerült keresztül vinni. Szeretném azonban kiemelni, hogy egy észszerű javaslatomat sajnos nem támogatta a Parlament. A haltenyésztőket jelenleg nem jutalmazták azokért az ökoszisztéma-szolgáltatásokért, amelyek természetvédelmi szempontból fontosak, mindamellett, hogy európai jelentőségű élővilágot tartanak fenn.

Az édesvízi tógazdaságok például a recirkulációs rendszereiknek köszönhetően visszaszolgáltatják az általuk használt vizet, általában jobb minőségben, mint amikor kivették azt. Ezek a halastavak a vonuló és vándormadaraknak, illetve a hazai vizekhez kötött életű faunának pihenő-, táplálkozó- és költőhelyet jelentenek. Ezért a haltenyésztők ugyanúgy megérdemelnének egy zöldítési jövedelemtámogatást, mint a gazdák. Ez a WTO zöld dobozos támogatás jelentősen stabilizálná a haltenyésztők megélhetését. Kérem az Európai Bizottságtól, hogy tegyen majd javaslatot egy ilyen támogatás bevezetésére a 2020 utáni halászati politikában.

Estefanía Torres Martínez (GUE/NGL). – Señor presidente, me gustaría de verdad que el ponente de este informe nos explicase cómo se compatibiliza el fomento de la economía local y de la sostenibilidad con leyes de acuicultura como la que su partido, el Partido Popular, quiso impulsar en Galicia, por ejemplo.

Que nos diga qué sostenibilidad era esa que hablaba de obtener el máximo aprovechamiento productivo, que permitía actuaciones en espacios protegidos y que, además, permitía también el cultivo de especies exóticas invasoras. Y es que la economía azul, como la economía verde, no busca fomentar, no pone el foco en la sostenibilidad de los recursos, sino que lo pone, muy al contrario, en cómo seguir haciendo negocio con ellos sin tener en cuenta que son limitados.

La acuicultura sostenible no se puede convertir bajo ningún concepto en la excusa perfecta para dar mayor coartada y favorecer a las grandes empresas. Una acuicultura sostenible significa apostar por la economía local y por las empresas familiares, fomentar el consumo responsable y reducir el desperdicio de alimentos.

La gente de la mar hace tiempo que viene denunciando que existe una clara intención de dismantelar la flota pesquera artesanal y favorecer un modelo muy determinado que va a poner en valor a las grandes empresas en detrimento de las pequeñas y a las economías de escala en detrimento del consumo de proximidad. ¿Hasta cuándo vamos a seguir fomentando este tipo de comercio y de mercado desde estas instituciones?

Rosa D'Amato, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la crescita blu colloca l'acquacoltura tra i settori con il maggiore potenziale in termini di posti di lavoro e crescita sostenibili. Tuttavia, la produzione acquicola dell'Unione europea sta attraversando una fase di recessione e, poiché il settore dà lavoro direttamente a circa 85 000 persone in Europa, soprattutto piccole e medie imprese e micro imprese, tale decrescita ha anche importanti ripercussioni sul mercato del lavoro europeo e anche italiano. Solo sul nostro territorio nazionale operano circa 800 impianti che producono 140 000 tonnellate all'anno di prodotti freschi, ovvero circa il 40 % della produzione ittica nazionale.

Nonostante questi numeri, il settore è ancora vittima di non pochi problemi, primo fra tutti lo scarso supporto finanziario all'interno del FEAMP, circa il 15 %, o ancora la poca trasparenza sulle concessioni, che spesso porta alla mancata applicazione delle norme ambientali.

Inoltre, bisogna fornire informazioni sull'utilizzo di vaccini e antibiotici in acquacoltura, in considerazione dei possibili rischi per la salute umana e anche per l'ecosistema e tenendo a mente il problema della resistenza antimicrobica e antibiotica a livello dell'intera catena.

Infine, i mangimi a base di pesce devono provenire da fonti sostenibili e non devono compromettere gli obiettivi di rendimento massimo sostenibile della politica comune della pesca, possibilmente incrementando l'utilizzo di alghe marine e altre alghe. Tutte queste istanze sono state accolte dalla collega e quindi abbiamo supportato il suo lavoro.

Clara Eugenia Aguilera García (S&D). – Señor presidente, he votado a favor de este informe, que me parece importante para resaltar la importancia de la acuicultura en Europa y alguno de los problemas que tiene actualmente.

La Unión Europea es el primer mercado mundial para los productos de la pesca y de la acuicultura. Los Estados miembros actualmente están importando el 60 % del total de lo que consumimos todos los europeos. Esto indica que la acuicultura puede jugar un papel mucho más relevante, y este sector tiene, por tanto, un gran potencial en la Unión Europea.

Y, sin embargo, lo que está sucediendo no es eso. La producción mundial fuera de la Unión Europea ha crecido un 7 % anual desde el año 2000, mientras que la producción de acuicultura en Europa ha entrado en recesión en la última década. Por eso la oportunidad de este informe. Significa que tenemos potencial para seguir creciendo y, para ello, hay que hacer inversiones en innovación. La acuicultura, finalmente, aporta productos de alta calidad, con altos estándares de sostenibilidad y protección al consumidor. Por eso, es obligado que la Unión Europea apoye este sector.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señor presidente, quiero expresar mi apoyo al informe «Hacia un sector europeo de la acuicultura sostenible y competitivo» que ha elaborado mi compañero Carlos Iturza. Su objetivo es que la acuicultura ocupe un lugar destacado en la economía de la Unión Europea donde, desgraciadamente, no está progresando. Si bien en los últimos diez años la acuicultura crece de forma espectacular en otras partes del mundo, en particular en Asia, la producción europea en general está estancada. En España es una actividad importante, especialmente en mi tierra —Galicia—, por ejemplo, el prestigioso sector mejillonero.

La Unión Europea constituye el primer importador mundial de productos pesqueros. Muchas de esas importaciones proceden de la acuicultura. Más de la mitad del consumo acuícola europeo es atendido por productos extraeuropeos. Por consiguiente, nuestro mercado ofrece a la acuicultura europea un amplio espacio para desarrollarse, pero nuestras empresas chocan con numerosas dificultades burocráticas y también con obstáculos para acceder a espacios adecuados.

Además, no es fácil abrirse camino por la ya importante competencia de los productos extraeuropeos. Todo ello significa pérdida de oportunidades de riqueza y también de empleo en una Europa, sobre todo la del sur, que necesita seguir creando puestos de trabajo. De ahí la necesidad, señor presidente, de impulsar firmemente la acuicultura en Europa como persigue el informe que acabamos de votar.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jak słusznie powiedział wcześniej poseł Hannan, zasięg troski Unii Europejskiej wydaje się nieograniczony. Poseł musi znać się na wszystkim i na każdy temat wypowiedzieć. Dopiero co martwiliśmy się, czym się różni sportowe wędkarstwo od rekreacyjnego, a już posłowie frasują się, jak to złowroga dorada sroży się przeciwko naszym ślimakom.

Są plusy tego sprawozdania, ono wzywa do liberalizacji wydawania licencji, żeby nie zniechęcać inwestorów, ale z drugiej strony Unia szczeni się w nim swoimi restrykcjami, restrykcyjnymi wymogami. I to działa tak, że najpierw Unia nakłada restrykcyjne wymogi, wskutek czego produkcja na miejscu staje się nieopłacalna. Konsumenci wybierają tańsze produkty importowane, wobec czego Unia zakazuje im importu, nakłada restrykcje na produkty importowane i wzywa do tego, żeby ten proces pogłębiać. A następnie poucza cały świat i pomstuje na cały świat, że wszyscy powinni robić tak, jak ona. To prowadzi tylko do tego, że konsumenci są niezadowoleni.

A na dokładkę pkt. 74, oczywiście, podkreśla się istotną rolę kobiet w sektorze akwakultury. Czy nie możemy przyjąć jednej deklaracji, w której podkreślimy istotną rolę kobiet we wszystkim po prostu i zakończymy wreszcie ten temat? Głosowałem przeciwko.

Presidente. – Prima di chiudere la seduta, ci tenevo a ringraziare di nuovo gli interpreti per aver svolto il loro importantissimo lavoro, oggi come sempre, e rinnovare l'impegno mio e degli altri membri dell'Ufficio di presidenza per una positiva risoluzione dell'attuale stallo nelle negoziazioni. Sicuramente da parte mia e da parte degli altri colleghi ci sarà il massimo impegno e la massima disponibilità per trovare una soluzione che auspichiamo essere assolutamente consensuale.

7. Corrections to votes and voting intentions : see Minutes

(La seduta è sospesa alle 13.48)

PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN PAVEL TELIČKA

místopředseda

8. Resumption of the sitting

(Denní zasedání pokračovalo v 15:00.)

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

10. Iran nuclear agreement (debate)

President. – The next item is the debate on the statement by the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on the Iran nuclear agreement (2018/2715(RSP)).

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, I believe it is very timely that we are discussing the nuclear deal with Iran just today. You know that just a few hours ago the United States and the DPRK ended their summit in Singapore. Today's summit between the two proves that diplomacy and dialogue are the only way forward, in this case towards lasting peace on the Korean peninsula and beyond.

Let me say that, in more general terms, this is a clear sign of the fact that the diplomatic track is often challenging, is often the most difficult one to be followed, but it is always the rewarding one and needs to be sustained over time. It was the same track that the international community and the European Union followed for over a decade with Iran, resulting in the signing, almost exactly three years ago, of the nuclear deal. We did it because it was in our security interest – our European security interest and the global security interest. Through this deal we prevented nuclear proliferation, we avoided a regional escalation and we made sure that Iran would never acquire a nuclear weapon – ever.

Three years on, the deal is delivering. Iran abides by its nuclear-related commitments, as has been confirmed 11 times by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the last time was just a few weeks ago. Our position as Europeans has not changed. On the contrary, we have seen the reasons why this agreement was a good agreement. We remain committed to the full and effective implementation of the nuclear deal with Iran.

What today is different is that on 8 May the United States took the unilateral decision to withdraw from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the nuclear deal with Iran, which is a multilateral agreement unanimously endorsed by the UN Security Council with resolution 2231.

The European Union reacted in an immediate and united manner, as also agreed at the top level by the Heads of State and Government of all European Union Member States, in Sofia, on 16 May and reconfirmed, just a couple of weeks ago, by the Foreign Ministers of the 28 Member States at our last Foreign Affairs Council. Since a month ago, the bulk of the international community has confirmed and reiterated the strong support for the nuclear agreement with Iran, simply for a very pragmatic reason – that there is no better alternative and the world cannot afford a nuclear arms race. In particular, I would add, the world cannot afford a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

This support from the rest of the international community is something I experience every single day in my meetings, be it with the Chinese Foreign Minister or the Japanese Foreign Minister or the African Union Chairman or our colleagues from Latin America or the rest of Europe that are not part of the European Union. This features always very high on the agenda. How can we partner together and make sure that the agreement stays in place. And, let me say, here the European Union has a responsibility also to share with partners around the world, which is how to maintain one of the few functioning pillars of the nuclear non-proliferation architecture.

This support was also reiterated by the other co-signatories of the nuclear agreement – France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Russia and China. We convened and we chaired, as the European Union, the first Joint Commission without the United States on 25 May in Vienna. The work on the implementation of nuclear-related commitments continues. This is essential for security. For instance, the Arak reactor modernisation project led by China continues, as does the conversion of the Fordow facility into a Nuclear Physics and Technology Centre, a project led by Russia. A dedicated workshop on Fordow is foreseen to take place later this week.

It is essential for our own security and for the security of the region that implementation work continues and we are guaranteeing that this happens, regardless of the US withdrawal. Implementation must continue, both on the nuclear commitments and also on the economic track, because the other essential part of the nuclear deal is the lifting of sanctions and the opportunities it creates for normalised trade and economic relations. From this perspective, the US decision to withdraw from the JCPOA and to re-impose all secondary sanctions is extremely problematic and needs to be addressed, first of all by the European Union, by its Member States, and by the rest of the international community at large. Many European companies have chosen to do business with Iran after the agreement was signed and are doing so in good faith, based on commitments made by the international community, as I said, based on the implementation of the UN Security Council resolution unanimously adopted. Some of them have already announced now that they would

discontinue their engagement so as to avoid US penalties. Others have informed that they would withdraw from negotiations that had already started – leaving, by the way, the economic investment space to other players in the world, which also is not in the European interest. This has created, as you can imagine, and as you know, enormous pressure inside Iran, especially from those who have always opposed the agreement, and the credibility of the entire international community, of the multilateral system, of the UN system, is being questioned. The recent statements by Iran on uranium hexafluoride must be seen in this context. These announcements are clearly not a violation of the nuclear deal, but it is also clear they do not contribute to build confidence and they are meant to put pressure on the international community. The letter sent by President Rouhani to the Heads of State and Government of France, Germany and the UK is to be interpreted exactly in the same context.

It's clear that our strategic and security interest is to save, to preserve this nuclear deal. We have reacted in a firm, decisive and united manner to protect at the same time our security interests, and let me say, in this way, our economic sovereignty. This is also an incentive, I would say the incentive, for Iran to continue to comply with its nuclear restrictions. Any other alternative could have tragic consequences and it would make us all less secure, with no exceptions.

As a first major step, last Wednesday, the European Commission adopted two delegated acts. The first is an update of the blocking statute, which forbids EU companies to comply with US secondary sanctions. The second is an extension of the lending mandate of the European Investment Bank to support economic activities in Iran. After a period of non-objection, both acts should enter into force on 5 August, just before the first batch of US sanctions takes effect on 6 August. The support of this Parliament to conclude both processes swiftly will be of the essence and extremely important, also as a political sign.

We are also working on concrete measures aimed at sustaining our cooperation in key economic sectors, particularly on banking and finance, trade and investment, oil and transport. In this work we keep a strong focus on small and medium-sized enterprises which are less engaged in the US market.

The most important challenge now is to find solutions on banking and finance, because legitimate trade and investment need banking partners and financial models that work. These issues are being addressed through intensive expert consultations, happening basically on a daily basis, including in Brussels and in Tehran last week, but also at the political level.

As I mentioned, we worked on this with EU Member States' Foreign Ministers at the last Foreign Affairs Council. We focused in particular on the need to combine our work at EU level, with the two measures I just mentioned and the work that is ongoing at the expert level, with action from single Member States to protect national economic operators. This is the only way to be effective in this endeavour – to combine EU-level measures and national measures in a coordinated manner.

This is why we decided, and we have started to do so, to set up a network of national focal points of all EU Member States to further coordinate and intensify our work. This is essential to keep Iran in the nuclear agreement.

Of course, Iran also needs to do its part – and this is very clear – to improve its standards against money laundering and terrorist financing and step up banking reforms. These are essential steps to make Iran more attractive to European businesses and banks.

Last week, the Foreign and Finance Ministers of France, Germany and the UK, together with myself, wrote a letter to the US Secretaries of State and of the Treasury. We expressed our expectation that the extra-territorial effects of US secondary sanctions will not be enforced on EU entities and individuals, and that the United States respect the good faith of economic operators within EU legal territory, and we asked for a number of specific exemptions.

Let me be very clear. First of all, this is not an economic issue for Europe. This is a security issue for Europe, and the main thing is the nuclear non-proliferation efforts we're making. Second, our determination to preserve the deal is also in the interests of the United States, because preserving the nuclear deal is essential to our common security, both for Europe, for the United States and for the entire Middle East, which might otherwise fall into a spiral of nuclear proliferation and of an even more dangerous level of conflictuality.

Think for one moment of the scenario without the nuclear agreement in place tomorrow and you'll realise how dangerous this would be for all of us.

Preserving the nuclear deal is also essential to maintaining our unique and precious – even if difficult – channels of communication with Iran. The nuclear deal was never meant to solve or to address all issues in our relations with Iran. On the contrary, at the very beginning, meaning some 15 years ago now, that the purpose of the agreement would have been limited to only nuclear issues. Like it or not, that was the mandate the High Representative at that time received from the UN Security Council, and this is the mandate that was fulfilled.

Having a nuclear deal in place with Iran has opened up a window to address other issues that are not nuclear-related and that are there and that are our issues of concern as much as they are American issues of concern. They are outside the scope of the nuclear deal; they always have been. They need to be addressed. We believe that they can be better addressed on the basis of maintaining the nuclear deal with Iran, rather than on the basis of destroying it.

I'll give you a couple of examples of small windows that have opened up in our dialogue and political talks with Iran on issues that are not related to the nuclear ones. We have had the opportunity to discuss ballistic missiles, regional issues and human rights in the EU-Iran high level political dialogue and in other meetings – quite a unique formation, especially for the West.

I'll be very clear, we have serious issues with Iran's behaviour and stance in those fields. This is no mystery – either for us, or for them – but they are not linked to the nuclear agreement implementation and they would not be easier to deal with at all without the nuclear deal in place. On the contrary, let me say by experience that during all the years of negotiations of the nuclear deal anything else that was not nuclear-related was basically off the table. Once you keep and consolidate the nuclear deal with Iran and make its survival beyond question, then the space opens up to deal with other issues.

We are addressing these issues in their own right, in direct contacts such as on Yemen. On this, I would like to share with you that we have set up a regional dialogue with Iran, chaired by us, by the European Union, with the participation of France, Germany, Italy and the UK. So far this dialogue has focused on Yemen and it has already delivered one step that was important – helping organise the visit of the UN special envoy Mr Griffiths to Sana'a at the beginning of June, to meet with the Houthi leadership. We will discuss further steps of this work exactly with the special envoy of the United Nations at the next Foreign Affairs Council to see how we can use our channels to try and make the work to solve the Yemen crisis more effective.

If the nuclear deal collapsed, it would also be much more difficult to address our non-nuclear concerns that we have. The current tensions on the nuclear deal have already narrowed the space for discussing all the other issues and we believe it is in nobody's interest to close the channels that currently remain open. Again, the only outcome would be to give more space to those in the region, including in Iran, that argue for more radical positions.

Our position on the Iran nuclear deal is based on our principles and it is based on pragmatism. The nuclear deal makes Europe more secure and prevents a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It brings economic benefits to the people of Iran, and it should continue to do so, and it opens precious new channels – albeit difficult ones, as I said – for diplomacy and dialogue.

This is why we are determined to preserve the nuclear deal and prevent a new escalation of tensions in an already troubled region and world, because Europe and the world cannot afford wasting all of this.

David McAllister, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich möchte zunächst Ihnen, verehrte Frau Mogherini, herzlich danken für die umfassende Darstellung der Lage und auch persönlich danken – ich glaube im Namen aller Abgeordneten, die sich für auswärtige Angelegenheiten in diesem Parlament interessieren – für Ihr ganz persönliches Engagement in dieser überaus wichtigen Frage.

Wir sind uns sicherlich alle einig in diesem Hause: Das Iran-Abkommen war nie perfekt, das muss uns allen bewusst sein. Dennoch bleibt es der richtige Weg, um einen nuklear bewaffneten Iran zu verhindern, wie Sie das eben gerade dargelegt haben. Und dass es nach Angaben der Internationalen Atomenergiebehörde „keine glaubwürdigen Hinweise“ auf ein iranisches Atomwaffenprogramm nach 2009 gibt, ist eben vor allen diesem Abkommen zu verdanken. Deshalb ist die amerikanische Entscheidung so schwer nachzuvollziehen.

Aber ich möchte noch einen Punkt machen: Die innen- und außenpolitische Rolle des Irans bleibt weiter höchst problematisch. Frau Mogherini, Sie haben das gerade eben angesprochen: Die massiven Menschenrechtsverstöße, das ballistische Raketenprogramm, die destabilisierende Rolle in Ländern wie Irak, Syrien oder Jemen, die Unterstützung der Hisbollah im Libanon und nicht zuletzt auch die aggressiven Bedrohungen gegenüber Israel sind für uns inakzeptabel, und wir wünschen uns, Frau Hohe Vertreterin, dass diese Probleme weiterhin auf allen politischen Ebenen offen und unmissverständlich angesprochen werden. Dabei haben Sie die Unterstützung des Europäischen Parlaments verdient.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I will start by saying that there is nothing strategic in dismantling our common EU-USA achievements throughout history, dismantling the multilateral rule-based system or calling into question the high value of multilateral diplomatic victories.

For the sake of clarity, the Iran deal required the country to eliminate 98% of its uranium stockpile, dismantle and seal two thirds of its centrifuges, cap uranium enrichment at levels well below weapons grade and remove the core of its plutonium reactor. Today the sweeping inspections regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency certifies that Iran is complying with all its commitments. Yes, the deal is key for nuclear non-proliferation and should be kept in place as long as possible. This is key for global peace and security and is in the interests of the international community, including the USA and Iran.

The credibility of the USA negotiating future nuclear agreements, notably the one with North Korea is now at stake. Today, after the summit between President Trump and President Kim Jong-un I can only hope that the North Korean deal will be as ambitious as the Iranian one. At the same time, this is to protect European companies in the light of the reintroduction of American sanctions.

Thus, the S&D Group welcomes the Commission proposal to activate the blocking statute. It goes without saying that the dialogue with the United States should continue. Nevertheless, in order to address separate issues, such as Iran's presence in Syria and its support for the bloody Assad regime and the development of ballistic missiles, in parallel we call on the EU to take all necessary measures to ensure tangible economic benefits for Iran.

Finally, we are living in turbulent times. It is therefore key for the European Union to stand firm and unite in the face of this challenge.

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the signing of the JCPOA with Iran in 2015 was a breakthrough to halt the march towards nuclear proliferation in an unstable region. According to the IAEA's verification and monitoring programme, although the limits were probed and are being probed, no outright violations have been detected to date. I would like also to take the opportunity to acknowledge the role of Baroness Ashton and the role of the European External Action Service in bringing the deal to fruition back in 2015.

President Trump's decision, therefore, to pull out now and risk unravelling this finely-tuned agreement is baffling. It sends all the wrong signals to the other wannabe nuclear states, including the DPRK. The remaining EU signatories have a vital role now. On the one hand, the US must be persuaded that the deal is still our best tool against nuclear proliferation, and on the other hand, Iran must be encouraged to continue to meet all its obligations. Finding ways to financially protect the European Union companies doing business with Iran will indeed be challenging.

In Europe, of course we do not share common values with the Iranian Government. There are still other major issues of concern to be addressed, such as the Iranian ballistic missile programme, its involvement in proxy wars in the region, gross human rights violations and supporting terrorism, but we must not let one poorly-advised anti-multilateralist president destroy an agreement that has, at its heart, the desire to maintain a more peaceful world. I am very grateful that brexiting Britain is backing the European Union, not its traditional 'special relationship' partner, the United States, on this very important issue.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, after the G7, President Trump left not a millimetre of doubt about his opposition to his main allies. Anyone who was not yet convinced now knows the EU needs foreign and security autonomy. Our strength is tested in the process of keeping the spirit of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) alive. The EU has chosen, with international partners, to bind and verify Iran's nuclear programme through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and our part of the deal is lifting sanctions.

Of course, we are committed to peace, diplomatic solutions and, first and foremost, that which we ourselves have signed up for. So to have this policy autonomy is key. Certainly, to have the US choose to abandon one of the biggest diplomatic successes at times where these are few and with so much at stake is enough for us to absorb, and so we simply cannot accept that Washington spells out which sanctions our European companies are bound by. I would be interested in what is possible to mitigate US extra territoriality without pushing private-sector risks into public institutions.

At the same time, our autonomy must be clear in Tehran. Iranian leaders cannot and must not dictate what we in Europe should do. Iran itself must build confidence that they are committed to their part of the deal if they expect us to try and work hard to absorb the challenge of the US stepping back. I'm interested to learn a bit more about how conversations with China and Russia are going, because the spotlight is so much on us.

In previous debates, I have made clear that I believe that we have lost too much time focusing only on Iran's nuclear programme and not on the country's toxic role in the Middle East as well as the systematic human rights violations against the Iranian people. I urge you to make sure the EU has a broad agenda in relation to Iran and not to be trapped in the single issue of saving the deal, however important that may be.

Klaus Buchner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Auch ich möchte mich sehr herzlich bei Ihnen für Ihr Engagement und für die Dinge bedanken, die Sie bereits jetzt erreicht haben, Hohe Vertreterin. Wenn Europa dem Willen von Präsident Trump folgt und ebenfalls die Sanktionen gegen den Iran wieder anwendet, dann wird der Iran die Produktion von Atomwaffen wieder aufnehmen, und ein nukleares Wettrüsten im Nahen Osten wird beginnen. Denn wenn der Iran über Atomwaffen verfügt, dann lässt sich sein Erzfeind Saudi-Arabien sicher nicht davon abhalten, ebenfalls welche zu beschaffen. Und Saudi-Arabien wäre sicher nicht das einzige Land, das einerseits nach der Bombe greift und andererseits Terroristen unterstützt. Das müssen wir mit allen Mitteln verhindern.

Europa muss sich gegen Donald Trump durchsetzen, der alle Firmen bestrafen will, die mit Iran Handel treiben. Unsere beste Maßnahme dagegen ist eine alte Verordnung, die Sie, Hohe Vertreterin, bereits erwähnt haben: die Blocking-Verordnung, die den europäischen Firmen hilft, die mit dem Iran Handel treiben wollen. Durch diese Verordnung werden alle Firmen entschädigt, die wegen ihres Handels mit dem Iran ihre Aktivitäten in den USA nicht mehr durchführen können. Es bleibt uns keine andere Wahl, als die von Ihnen vorgeschlagenen Maßnahmen zu treffen. Der Handel zwischen Europa und dem Iran darf nicht gestoppt werden. Ich erwarte, dass das Europäische Parlament und auch der Ministerrat Ihnen schon im Vorhinein zustimmen und signalisieren, dass diese Maßnahmen bestätigt werden, denn alles andere würde eine tödliche Bedrohung für uns alle bedeuten.

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

Paul Rübzig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Herr Kollege Buchner, wir alle sind daran interessiert, dass sich die Wirtschaftsbeziehungen Europas mit allen Ländern dieser Welt so positiv wie möglich entwickeln. Wir haben dafür ja auch die WTO und den *Appellate Body* und wir bemühen uns wirklich, nicht nur multilateral, sondern auch plurilateral die Dinge in die richtige Richtung zu bringen. Glauben Sie, dass es möglich ist, auch mit Iran hier eine dementsprechende Grundlage zu schaffen, dass unsere Betriebe, dass die Wirtschaft sich gerade dort mit den kleinen und mittleren Betrieben zusammenfinden kann und auch auf beiden Seiten für eine friedliche Lösung sein wird?

Klaus Buchner (Verts/ALE), *blue-card answer*. – Yes, I think it is possible. We have already started some business and the point is not the money transfer, which is already possible now. The point is what you, High Representative, have mentioned, namely that European banks also give loans and that the usual business with money transfers works. So the answer is yes.

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich habe ziemlich lange überlegt, was ich jetzt sage. Denn einerseits sendet Präsident Trump Zeichen zur Beendigung des Krieges und zur Denuklearisierung auf der koreanischen Halbinsel, was wir natürlich begrüßen, und andererseits kündigt er einen Vertrag zur Denuklearisierung mit dem Iran. Er unterzeichnet eine Erklärung des G7-Gipfels, um sich wenige Minuten später davon loszutwittern. Er tanzt vergnügt mit dem saudischen Despoten beim Staatsbesuch in Riad und beschimpft die Länder, die ihm nicht passen, als Drecksländer. Die US-amerikanische Außenpolitik ist unberechenbar geworden und damit auch beliebig. Die Vereinigten Staaten sind als seriöser Partner nur noch schemenhaft wahrnehmbar, und ihre Führungsrolle, auf die sie immer wieder pochen, haben sie längst verloren.

Wir müssen die UNO stärken und dürfen nicht wie das Kaninchen vor der Schlange hocken und hoffen, dass sie nicht zubeißt. Es ist längst der Zeitpunkt gekommen, eigene Wege konsequent zu gehen, sich auf die eigenen Kräfte zu besinnen, die Dinge zu tun, die getan werden müssen. Das Iran-Atomabkommen muss erhalten werden.

Eine weitere Eskalation im Nahen und Mittleren Osten kann in dieser wichtigen Region einen Flächenbrand auslösen und auch die Hoffnung so vieler Menschen zerstören. Das wollen wir nicht. Frieden – lassen Sie mich das abschließend sagen – und nur Frieden macht es möglich, Wirtschaft zu entwickeln, Korruption zu bekämpfen, die Lage von Menschen zu verbessern und Menschenrechte wirksam zu verteidigen. Gehen wir diesen Weg!

Fabio Massimo Castaldo, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Alto rappresentante, guardati dal nemico ma dall'amico guardati cento volte. Questo aforisma calza a pennello alla complicata situazione che si è creata a seguito della decisione americana di ritirarsi unilateralmente dall'accordo sul nucleare iraniano.

Questo ha portato la Commissione ad estendere il mandato della BEI all'Iran per supportare le nostre imprese e a rispolverare il cosiddetto statuto di blocco, che proibisce alle compagnie europee di adeguarsi alle sanzioni extraterritoriali statunitensi. Questa partita a scacchi rappresenta un problema tanto grande quanto complesso. Nonostante l'Unione e gli Stati membri abbiano a più riprese affermato il nostro supporto all'accordo, con la conferma delle sanzioni secondarie verrebbero meno gli incentivi economici per l'Iran, che infatti ha minacciato di uscire a sua volta.

Credo, che la decisione statunitense di lasciare unilateralmente l'accordo rappresenti un errore storico e sono fermamente convinto che sia nostro dovere fare tutto il possibile per salvaguardarlo, nonostante gli strumenti a disposizione forse non siano ancora sufficienti per l'arduo compito.

Voglio fare un ultimo appello al Presidente Trump: sediamoci assieme e, partendo dall'attuale base, che è appunto l'accordo stesso, un accordo che sta funzionando, cominciamo i negoziati per ampliarlo, venendo incontro alle vostre preoccupazioni. Come gesto di buona fede, però, gli Stati Uniti rinuncino quantomeno ad applicare le sanzioni secondarie alle compagnie europee.

Se dovessimo fallire assisteremo ad un precedente pericolosissimo, non solo per l'ulteriore destabilizzazione e l'escalation nella regione, ma perché si renderebbe evidente che gli Stati Uniti in primis e l'Occidente tutto non sono più partner affidabili nel mantenere la parola data. Ne va della nostra sicurezza, come lei ha detto, e non solo del nostro commercio.

Cari colleghi, la fiducia si guadagna goccia a goccia, ma si perde a litri. È essenziale che su questo dossier non ci siano spaccature tra noi, e agli alleati statunitensi dico: attenzione ad abbandonare il multilateralismo in favore di confronti bilaterali, può essere un'arma a doppio taglio anche per voi. Come dice un antico proverbio persiano, «se il gatto e il topo trovano l'accordo, il droghiere è rovinato».

Mario Borghesio, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho l'impressione che di fronte a una realtà oggettiva, cioè, piaccia o non piaccia, che l'accordo nucleare con l'Iran è appeso a un filo, la risposta dell'Europa appaia, come dire, opaca.

Vi è stata la lettera siglata da Francia, Germania, Gran Bretagna e dalla signora Mogherini per l'Unione europea, con la quale di fatto si è un po' supplicato gli Stati Uniti di esentare le imprese europee dalle conseguenze delle sanzioni. Ho sentito anche in quest'Aula parlare e insistere, giustamente e polemicamente, su questo concetto dell'extraterritorialità americana.

Ma quando mai è stata ostacolata in precedenza? E quando mai, nel corso delle numerose occasioni nelle quali abbiamo commentato e generalmente è stato esaltato questo accordo, si è previsto lo scenario – bisogna sempre prevedere un piano B – che improvvisamente questo accordo potesse essere vanificato? E quale sarebbe stato il risultato per le nostre imprese? Si dice che si vorranno tutelare le piccole e medie imprese, ma quelle che vanno ad affrontare i lavori e le grandi conseguenze, in un paese come l'Iran non propriamente tranquillo, sono le grandi imprese e queste stanno scappando tutte.

Quello che non si dice chiaramente, in questo dibattito, da parte della signora Mogherini, è che scappano tutte, se ne vanno via tutte, quelle dell'auto, quelle del petrolio, disegnando uno scenario molto pericoloso per l'Iran, soprattutto, e quindi per le conseguenze di geopolitica e anche di sicurezza molto pericolose per tutto il mondo.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η συμφωνία για το πυρηνικό πρόγραμμα του Ιράν αποτελεί αναμφίβολα την μεγαλύτερη ίσως επιτυχία της εξωτερικής πολιτικής της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, διότι, πέραν του ελέγχου του πυρηνικού προγράμματος αλλά και των δραστηριοτήτων του Ιράν, έδωσε τις βάσεις για την ειρηνική επίλυση του προβλήματος της Μέσης Ανατολής και παράλληλα έδωσε και την δυνατότητα εμπορικών σχέσεων με το Ιράν. Μεγάλες εταιρείες, όπως η Airbus και η Total, έχουν συνάψει εμπορικές συμφωνίες, αυξήθηκε και ενισχύθηκε η οικονομία της χώρας, αυξήθηκαν κατά 700 000 οι θέσεις εργασίας και το Ιράν διέθεσε ένα μέρος των κονδυλίων για την αντιμετώπιση της τρομοκρατίας.

Για όλους τους παραπάνω λόγους η απόφαση του Προέδρου Trump να αποχωρήσουν οι ΗΠΑ μονομερώς από τη συμφωνία εγκυμονεί κινδύνους. Κατ' αρχάς το Ιράν απειλεί ότι θα αποχωρήσει και αυτό μονομερώς από κάποια άλλη συμφωνία που έχει υπογράψει με άλλες χώρες και θα επαναλάβει σε εθνικό πλαίσιο το πυρηνικό πρόγραμμα, ενώ πρόσφατα ανακοίνωσε την επιθυμία του να αποκτήσει δυνατότητες για τον εμπλουτισμό ουρανίου. Επιπλέον υπάρχει κίνδυνος να επαναληφθούν οι συγκρούσεις των ναυτικών δυνάμεων των ΗΠΑ και του Ιράν στον Περσικό Κόλπο.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute Représentante, l'accord nucléaire iranien est, on le sait tous, un pilier de l'architecture globale de sécurité et une réalisation importante de la diplomatie européenne que vous dirigez.

Lors de la mission AFET/DROI qui s'est rendue à Téhéran en février, j'ai pu mesurer l'inquiétude de nos interlocuteurs iraniens par rapport au changement de la politique américaine, parce que eux, à l'époque, étaient déjà convaincus que Trump allait faire ce qu'il a fait.

Nous avons essayé d'assurer à nos interlocuteurs iraniens que l'Europe allait œuvrer pour préserver cet accord et ce que vous faites et ce que les ministres des affaires étrangères font.

Mais j'ai également retenu l'insatisfaction de nos interlocuteurs iraniens quant à nous Européens. J'ai été choqué par leurs critiques, notamment pour ce qui est des retombées économiques: ils nous reprochent, ils vous reprochent qu'elles ne soient pas là, et on a dû vous défendre, Madame la Haute Représentante.

Ce qui m'inquiète, c'est qu'ils continuent à faire cela, et ils continuent à dire des choses qui ne sont pas toujours dans la philosophie politique de cet accord.

Récemment, l'ayatollah Khamenei a parlé de l'augmentation de la capacité nucléaire iranienne dans le cadre de l'accord, ce qui est tout à fait inacceptable.

Je termine en disant que je suis content de ce vous avez dit concernant la possibilité de discuter sur les droits de l'homme. Mais j'aimerais voir aussi des résultats concrets.

Nous avons discuté la dernière fois, ici, de nouveau du cas d'Ahmadreza Djalali. C'est un citoyen qui a aussi la nationalité suédoise et j'aimerais le voir libéré...

(le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Frau Mogherini, wir begrüßen Ihre klare Haltung und die klare Haltung der Kommission, inklusive des Mandats für die Europäische Investitionsbank und inklusive der wieder in Kraft gesetzten Blocking Verordnung. Ich will nicht alles wiederholen, was schon gesagt worden ist. Der Iran hat sich an seine Abmachungen gehalten, die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika haben es nicht. Sie sind einseitig ausgeschieden, und falls sie die Sanktionen wirklich verhängen sollten, haben sie einen Vertragsbruch beziehungsweise Bruch internationaler Regeln in Kauf genommen.

Ich halte das nach wie vor für völlig verantwortungslos. Die Sicherheit in dieser Region hat viel mit unserer Sicherheit zu tun. Und wenn der Iran seine Vorteile nicht erhält, warum sollte er sich an seinen Teil der Abmachung halten? Das wird eine Gefahr für uns alle werden, weil Saudi-Arabien angekündigt hat, was dann geschieht; Israel hat es auch. Diese Gefahr für uns alle dürfen wir nicht einfach hinnehmen, nur weil ein Präsident der Vereinigten Staaten keinen Respekt vor seinen Alliierten mehr hat.

Lassen Sie mich eine Bemerkung machen, die mir auch sehr wichtig ist. Ich glaube, dass wir noch einmal unsere Partner im Iran drängen sollten, dass wir endlich auch eine Mission der EU im Iran aufmachen können. Es wird nicht durch uns blockiert, wenn ich das richtig verstanden habe, sondern es wird bisher durch Teheran blockiert. Wenn wir vertieft zusammenarbeiten wollen, dann muss es manchmal auch schnell gehen und auf einem direkten Wege. Und deshalb wäre eine solche Mission der EU in Teheran exakt das Richtige.

Anders Primdahl Vistisen (ECR). – Hr. formand! Atomaftalen med Iran var fra begyndelsen problematisk. Problematisk, fordi den amerikanske præsident, der indgik den, udmærket godt vidste, at den ikke kunne ratificeres demokratisk i senatet i USA. Derfor står vi nu i nøjagtig samme situation, som i forhold til Paris-klimaaf-talen, at det er den til enhver tid siddende præsidents prerogativ at beslutte, om man vil overholde eller forlade aftalen. Ud over det er der den helt fundamentale problemstilling omkring aftalen med Iran, at den ikke tager de mange aspekter af iransk problematisk adfærd med. Vi taler her om udvikling af ballistiske missiler, om en situation, hvor Iran spreder terror både i Mellemøsten og i Europa. Helt grundlæggende er aftalen derfor ikke god og grundig nok. Derfor kan man selvfølgelig godt sidde, som mange gør her, og beklage, at amerikanerne har trukket sig fra aftalen. Vi kunne også prøve at finde en mere konstruktiv model, hvor vi rent faktisk – sammen med amerikanerne – finder en måde til at inddæmme den skadelige iranske indflydelse, både i regionen og i resten af verden.

Javier Nart (ALDE). – Señor presidente, hago mías todas las palabras de usted, señora Mogherini. Ha sido impecable, correcta y ha hecho un análisis impecable de toda la situación.

Cuando estuvimos en Teherán hablando con Ali Akbar Velayati, dijo una cosa que era muy evidente: «Nosotros respetamos el acuerdo si el acuerdo nos respeta a nosotros». Y, en consecuencia, si somos capaces de cumplir el intercambio entre la seguridad nuclear con la multiseguridad y el desarrollo. Si somos incapaces de asegurar el desarrollo porque Estados Unidos a través de su presión económica, del control estratégico que tiene de los movimientos financieros, lo bloquea, no solamente debemos acudir al Reglamento de bloqueo.

Mire, señora Mogherini, yo creo en la amistad y en la colaboración con los Estados Unidos, de la misma forma que creo que la distancia entre Washington y Bruselas es la misma distancia que entre Bruselas y Washington. Y de esa forma, para ser respetados, tenemos que ser respetables y no podemos simplemente cumplir con nuestro dinero a través del Reglamento de bloqueo. Si nos realizan las presiones económicas de las que somos víctimas, el único lenguaje que entiende ese hombre de negocios tocosco que es Trump es, sencillamente, la contradicción.

Σοφία Σακοράφα (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Επίτροπε, είναι θετικό καταρχάς ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση εκδήλωσε την απόλυτη στήριξη της στην πυρηνική συμφωνία και μάλιστα διαφοροποιήθηκε για πρώτη φορά κάθετα από τις ΗΠΑ. Φυσικά όλοι γνωρίζουμε ότι αυτή η διαφοροποίηση αφορά στη σύγκρουση ενεργειακών συμφερόντων και όχι αποκλειστικά στα πυρηνικά. Αν όμως όντως θέλουμε να παραμείνει ενεργή η συμφωνία, απαιτούνται παρεμβάσεις που θα το αποδεικνύουν σε όλα τα επίπεδα και όχι μόνο για προστασία επιχειρήσεων και επενδύσεων. Αυτό σημαίνει ενίσχυση της ευρωπαϊκής θέσης κατά των πυρηνικών, αλλά ενίσχυση με πράξεις. Το ελάχιστο πρώτο δείγμα θα ήταν να προσχωρήσουν στη Συνθήκη για την Απαγόρευση των Πυρηνικών Όπλων όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Ας μην ξεχνάμε ότι μέχρι σήμερα την έχει κυρώσει μόνο η Αυστρία.

Κύριε Επιτροπε, αν πράγματι ενδιαφέρεστε για την ειρήνη στην περιοχή, ασκήστε πίεση στον σημαντικό σας εταίρο, όπως τον αποκαλείτε, το Ισραήλ, που δεν έχει προσχωρήσει ούτε καν στην πρώτη συνθήκη για τη μη διάδοση των πυρηνικών. Ας κάνουμε έστω και τα ελάχιστα που θα αποδεικνύουν την αξιοπιστία των προθέσεων μας.

Tiziana Beghin (EFDD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, grazie all'accordo sul nucleare e alla fine dell'embargo, l'Iran si è aperto al mondo e molte aziende italiane ed europee hanno ripreso a commerciare con questo paese, investendo in Iran miliardi di euro per creare infrastrutture e servizi.

Tramite il commercio possiamo migliorare la situazione del popolo iraniano e creare nuove opportunità di lavoro e sviluppo per le nostre imprese, non solo quelle grandi come all'inizio, ma anche per le piccole e medie imprese si apre un mercato decisamente interessante visto le dimensioni ma anche semplicemente facendo riferimento a quanto era già abbastanza rilevante per le nostre aziende prima del periodo dell'embargo.

È chiaro che le sanzioni decise oggi dagli Stati Uniti ostacoleranno questi progetti e, in base all'approccio americano, ogni impresa che commercia con l'Iran rischia di perdere l'accesso al mercato americano e la facoltà di usare il dollaro come moneta per gli scambi, in pratica la perdita di un mercato essenziale e la paralisi del credito.

È evidente che non c'è nessuna legittimità in queste sanzioni, perché l'Iran ha rispettato tutti i termini dell'accordo sul nucleare. Quindi l'Europa, come è già stato ricordato, deve farsi trovare preparata e aiutare le imprese europee. L'Unione dovrebbe negoziare delle esenzioni specifiche con gli Stati Uniti, permettendo alle nostre imprese di continuare a fare affari, ma si dovrebbe anche consentire agli Stati membri di dotarsi di fondi ad hoc per sostenere le imprese colpite dalle sanzioni ed estromesse dai canali di credito, senza che questa forma di supporto sia considerata un aiuto di Stato.

Ogni misura dovrebbe essere concordata e armonizzata tra i diversi Stati, perché proprio il mancato coordinamento tra gli Stati europei creerebbe un danno enorme alle nostre aziende. E bisogna ovviamente capire chi pagherà se queste subiranno delle perdite. Il commercio con l'Iran è sicuramente importante per gli iraniani, ma lo è anche per le nostre aziende, e se non vogliamo perderlo dobbiamo correre ai ripari e dobbiamo farlo tutti uniti.

Nicolas Bay (ENF). – Monsieur le Président, pour les entreprises françaises, l'accord de Vienne sur le nucléaire iranien représentait un espoir, celui de reconquérir des parts de marché dans un grand pays avec lequel la France a longtemps eu des relations privilégiées.

PSA y a fait un retour spectaculaire avec 450 000 véhicules vendus l'année dernière et de belles perspectives dans ce pays de 82 millions d'habitants. Le constructeur français a ainsi repris la place qu'il avait dû céder à son concurrent américain General Motors après un décret signé par Barack Obama en juin 2013. Peugeot et Citroën sont implantés depuis longtemps en Iran et le marché iranien est redevenu pour eux le premier marché étranger devant la Chine.

L'Iran est également un enjeu stratégique pour un autre géant industriel français, Total, qui a signé un très gros contrat gazier en juillet 2017. Rappelons en effet que l'Iran détient les deuxièmes plus importantes réserves de gaz naturel au monde, juste après la Russie.

Au lieu de vous époumoner en vain contre la hausse des tarifs douaniers décrétée par le président Trump, dénoncez et agissez donc contre le scandale de l'extra-territorialité du droit américain, qui nuit gravement à nos intérêts économiques. Un règlement du Conseil de novembre 1996 est censé protéger les entreprises européennes mais il n'a jamais été appliqué, faute d'avoir le courage d'assumer un vrai bras de fer avec les États-Unis.

En 2014, nous aurions dû empêcher la justice américaine d'infliger à BNP une amende record de 9 milliards de dollars, déjà à cause de l'embargo américain sur l'Iran.

Les États-Unis défendent leurs intérêts, il est temps que les nations européennes défendent les leurs.

James Carver (NI). – Mr President, recently in Yemen the Houthis announced that their missiles could now reach Abu Dhabi and that Emiratis could expect similar attacks to those carried out against Saudi targets. Let me be clear: all these missiles are Iranian. The Houthis are unable to fight the legitimate authorities in Yemen without the active involvement of Iran.

Madam High Representative, if you consider the destabilisation in Lebanon, the tragedy in Syria and the resurgence of Hezbollah, there is one common denominator: Iranian regional aspirations. Why no mention of the human rights abuses against the Iranian people and the murder of Iranians speaking out against this despotic regime? Why are you not speaking about these criminal acts? Why not hold the Revolutionary Guard to account, or are drug smuggling and money laundering no longer a concern of anyone here? Are you seriously suggesting that we can trust this regime, and indeed saying that we should reward them? Perhaps you are so guided by your anti-American rhetoric that you will stubbornly take everyone down this disastrous path, although, as always, it will be others who will ultimately pay the price of your folly.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señor presidente, la alta representante nos ha recordado la necesidad de insistir en el mantenimiento del acuerdo nuclear con Irán por razones de seguridad, siempre que Irán cumpla sus obligaciones. Según la Agencia Internacional de Energía Atómica, dos tercios de las centrifugadoras han sido destruidas, el 95 % del uranio enriquecido está fuera del país y el reactor nuclear de Arak está inoperativo.

Sin embargo, señora alta representante, hay una pregunta que flota en el ambiente: ¿Se arriesgarán las empresas europeas con intereses en Estados Unidos a sanciones de este país? Usted lo acaba de decir: ¿Podrá la Comisión obtener exenciones? La verdad es que después de los aranceles al acero y al aluminio y de la reunión del G7, es dudoso.

Si volvemos la vista en estos momentos a Singapur, vemos que el autócrata norcoreano, sobre la base de sus sesenta bombas nucleares y más de 1 000 misiles, ha obtenido su minuto de gloria. No hay alternativa a lo que nos propone la alta representante. Es muy importante mantener este acuerdo nuclear, pero también son muy importantes los derechos humanos que se están degradando continuamente en el país.

Elena Valenciano (S&D). – Señor presidente, yo encuentro a todos mis colegas muy prudentes, la verdad.

Algunas cosas ya sabemos: que Trump ha venido a volar el sistema de relaciones internacionales, cuidadosamente construido después de la Guerra Fría, ya lo sabemos, ya ha sucedido; que el presidente Trump ha decidido tener una mala relación con sus aliados del G-7, con su vecino del norte, Canadá, con su vecino del sur, México, y con la Unión Europea también lo sabemos, eso ya ha pasado; que sus provocaciones y bandazos permanentes han convertido al mundo en un lugar más inseguro, también lo sabemos. Ahora queda por ver cómo reaccionamos nosotros ante algo que ya es una certeza: que este comportamiento es un comportamiento que hace que el mundo sea hoy más peligroso de lo que era antes de que Trump fuera el presidente de los Estados Unidos.

La manera de reaccionar a esto, sin duda ninguna, es defender nuestros intereses de manera unida. Lo que le queda a este Parlamento, por lo tanto, en esta tarde, tal y como estamos haciendo, es reforzar la posición de la Unión Europea y sostener con firmeza la acción de la alta representante en la defensa de un pacto nuclear que es, probablemente, una de las herramientas más importantes para nuestra seguridad y nuestra estabilidad.

Tenemos que saber ya que en la Casa Blanca no tenemos a un amigo, y tal vez así podamos nosotros reforzar nuestra propia amistad dentro de las fronteras europeas, hacernos más fuertes a nosotros mismos, en la medida en que lo que tenemos enfrente, desgraciadamente, es un fenómeno nuevo. Y es un inquilino de la Casa Blanca que no ha venido a ayudarnos, sino a todo lo contrario.

Y creo que el trabajo de la alta representante en estos últimos meses en la defensa del acuerdo nuclear es un excelente trabajo. Creo que estamos todos convencidos de que nuestra estabilidad y nuestra seguridad dependen en gran medida de que ese acuerdo se mantenga, y por eso hoy quiero apoyar firmemente la tarea de la alta representante.

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Уважаеми г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, уважаема г-жо Могерини,

Позволете ми първо да Ви поздравя за Вашата навременна и полезна за Европейския съюз позиция, която изразихте в първите часове на тази криза. Позицията беше правилна и тя трябва да бъде следвана и от нашите колеги.

Уважаеми колеги, споразумението с Ислямска република Иран е полезно за Европейския съюз и за неговите членове. Това споразумение работи, това споразумение може и ще създава работни места във всяка една от държавите членки. Може, е и ще бъде допълнителен гарант за сигурността на гражданите в тези държави.

Не можем и не трябва да позволяваме на трети страни да застрашават интересите на държавите-членки на Европейския съюз. Не можем и не трябва да бъдем заложници на непремерена и волунтаристична политика. Когато говорим за човешки права, трябва ясно да си даваме сметка и да знаем докъде стигат възможностите не да се месим във вътрешните работи на суверенни държави. Това е споразумение е добро, ние трябва да го уважаваме и да го развиваме.

Urmaz Paet (ALDE). – Mr President, it is very bad that we have come to a situation where allies such as the European Union and the US have such diverging opinions on Iran and how to move forward. The Iran nuclear agreement is not perfect, but to change it, the allies – meaning the US and the European Union – should work together, not act unilaterally. The unilateral actions of the US undermine this much-needed alliance and also the international legal environment.

It is also clear that some expectations that came with the Iran nuclear agreement have not been fulfilled, such as the way Iran is spending the money that it has received due to the lifting of sanctions. Instead of using this money to build up its country and help people, it is using the money to enhance its military structures and support conflicts in its neighbouring countries like Yemen, Syria and Iraq. Also, the continued threats against Israel are unacceptable and must be addressed also by the EU. Of course, the EU should think of Plan B, should Iran go ahead and resume the enrichment of uranium, as the Iranian President has threatened.

Mike Hookem (EFDD). – Mr President, the Iran deal is dying before our eyes and only Europe is still clinging on to this flawed plan. Lauded as a means of ensuring peace and security for generations, its only effects have been to potentially catalyse yet more death and destruction in the already unstable Middle East, and to drive a wedge in western diplomacy, as Trump actually follows through with his campaign pledges and ends US participation.

The USA will be re-imposing sanctions on Iran. It was also reported last week that the Iranian regime is looking at options to boost uranium enrichment in case the deal fails. So let's be clear: Iran is preparing for the failure of the nuclear deal. But what is the EU's reaction to all this? The Commission is trying to force through a delegated act to make Iran eligible for European Investment Bank funding. Not content with clinging to a dying deal, you actually want to give economic and political support to the Iranian regime. It makes sense though doesn't it? Trump pulls out of the nuclear deal and you see an opportunity to make the EU look like big players on the world stage.

This is more about EU vanity than it is about solving complicated political issues. It is almost as if the EU is trying to fight a proxy war against America in the Middle East. Our ability to influence Iran is greatly weakened without US participation. If the EU and Europe's major powers continue down this line, its only real impact will be to tilt backwards towards the anti-Americanism that seeps through the seams of these institutions.

So how will this affect potential economic projects financed by the EIB? How will this influence the deteriorating trade and diplomatic relations between the EU and USA? According to Reuters internal sources, the EIB is unhappy with the Commission proposal because the EIB raises funds on US markets. To make matters worse, a delegated act is a power the unelected Commission has to adopt legislation without any anyone who was elected having a vote. So this proposal is far from being democratic and accountable.

Whilst we will of course continue to work closely with European allies when our interests converge, this is not one of those times. May's government is too scared to fully embrace the opportunities and independence that Brexit provides, and is continuing to follow EU policies and legislation, no matter the cost to the UK. Don't get me wrong. I don't want an independent Britain to be the 51st state of America. But the British people certainly voted to stop being the EU's 28th State. This is going to be one of the first big tests for the UK to refind its place in the world as an independent nation. The whole point of Brexit was to make our own democratic rules and pursue our own interests, but like the rest of the negotiations, Ms May will surrender to the EU, following EU rules and policies as closely as possible, completely against the express will of the British people.

The UK Government, packed with remainers, could not see the benefits of Brexit before the vote and is too scared to seize them now. This is not academia or a domestic political squabble, but will have real and long-lasting effects on our standing in the world, driving a wedge between the UK and our most important strategic partner, the USA. We should not follow Mogherini's vanity project at the expense of our most important global relationship. It is time for us to follow our American allies and call it as we see it. The Iran deal is dead, and we must seek out a new style of diplomacy, one that actually gets results, as we are seeing on the current Korean Peninsula ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

President. – Colleagues, once again, I have been as tolerant as I could be as Chair, but next time I really will be cutting off the microphone within seconds of when you should finish. I think it is unfair to your colleagues.

Michał Marusik (ENF). – Panie Przewodniczący! Słuchając tej debaty, z niepokojem zauważam, że wielu mówców bardzo umiejętnie broni tezy, która niestety jest nieprawdziwa. Otóż już starożytni wiedzieli, że jeśli chce się mieć pokój, trzeba być przygotowanym do wojny. Kraje, które dysponują strategicznym potencjałem odwetowym, nie są atakowane. To nie słabość jest ostoją i gwarancją pokoju i bezpieczeństwa. Ostoją pokoju i bezpieczeństwa jest siła. Silnych nikt nie atakuje. Proszę zauważyć, że kraje Afryki Północnej nie dysponowały możliwością strategicznego odwetu i zostały zniszczone. Jeżeli więc zależy nam na światowym pokoju, to powinno nam zależeć na tym, żeby kraje miały możliwość obrony i nie były atakowane. A w ogóle kto może decydować o tym, który kraj będzie miał możliwość odwetowego działania, a który takiej możliwości mieć nie powinien? Nam chyba takie prawo nie przysługuje.

Udo Voigt (NI). – Herr Präsident, Hohe Vertreterin! Als ich vor drei Wochen im Iran war und dort auch Gespräche mit führenden Mitgliedern des Wächterrates hatte, habe ich dort Folgendes gesehen: Auf der einen Seite ist das Vertrauen in die Länder Europas groß, dass sie wenigstens Wort halten, auf der anderen Seite ist ein starkes Misstrauen da, dass letztendlich Europa wieder nach der Pfeife der USA tanzt.

Ich denke, die Hoffnung, dass auf der einen Seite die EU, Europa sich einen eigenen Weg freimacht und sich absetzt von den Vereinigten Staaten und endlich einmal die Wirtschaftskraft von fünfhundert Millionen Europäern ausspielt, diese Hoffnung ist groß und darf auf keinen Fall enttäuscht werden. Donald Trump, die USA sind out. Neuverhandeln wurde auch diskutiert – warum denn nicht? Warum nicht eine atomwaffenfreie Zone im ganzen Nahen Osten schaffen, unter Einschluss von Israel, damit der Frieden dort endgültig garantiert wird?

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es geht darum, den Atomwaffensperrvertrag zu retten. Deswegen ist es wichtig und deswegen wünsche ich Ihnen, Frau Mogherini, viel Erfolg, dass der von Ihnen ausgehandelte und von uns getragene, von den drei EU-Mitgliedsländern – die demokratisch sind – durchgesetzten Vertrag jetzt mit den anderen Partnern auch gegen die extraterritorialen Ansprüche der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika verteidigt wird.

Gleichzeitig sollten wir darauf achten, dass es natürlich Kritikpunkte am Iran gibt: wegen der inneren Struktur, der Menschenrechtsverletzungen, des Raketenprogramms, der Beteiligung an den Kriegen im Mittleren Osten und wegen der Israelpolitik. Aber wir müssen deutlich machen, dass Präsident Trump, wenn er den Iran-Deal zerstört, keine Glaubwürdigkeit mit Nordkorea haben wird. Im Übrigen wünsche ich ihm sehr viel Erfolg für seine Verhandlungen. Wenn er die Verifizierungen mit Nordkorea herausbekommen sollte, die Sie, Frau Mogherini, im Falle Irans verhandelt haben, dann hat er ein gutes Ergebnis. Das, was heute herausgekommen ist, ist eine schöne Erklärung ohne jegliche Absicherung, dass Nordkorea sich daran hält.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Das Atomabkommen mit dem Iran wurde mit Recht als ein Triumph der Diplomatie gewürdigt. Ein schier unlösbares Problem konnte durch Gespräche und vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen gelöst werden, und ganz wesentlich für diesen Erfolg waren die Bemühungen der Hohen Beauftragten für die Außenpolitik, Federica Mogherini. Es war nicht nur ein Beweis dafür, dass europäische Außenpolitik funktionieren kann, sondern auch ein kräftiges Signal für Multilateralismus. Mit dem Abkommen wurde auch die Tür aufgestoßen für mögliche Entwicklungen in der Region, für Frieden, für mehr Wohlstand, Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit, insgesamt mehr Stabilität – das alles abhängig davon, ob sich der Iran an die Vereinbarungen hält. Die Internationale Atomenergiebehörde stellte wiederholt fest, dass die Vereinbarungen erfüllt wurden.

Die Entscheidung des amerikanischen Präsidenten, sich mutwillig über das alles hinwegzusetzen, ist unverantwortlich und stellt einen radikalen Bruch des Vertrauensgrundsatzes dar. Auf welcher Basis sollen künftig Konflikte gelöst werden, wenn man nicht mehr darauf vertrauen kann, dass Vereinbarungen eingehalten werden? Es ist daher zu begrüßen, dass wir zu unseren Vereinbarungen stehen.

Es darf aber nicht beim guten Willen allein bleiben, es braucht robuste Absicherungen – auch im Interesse der europäischen Unternehmen, die im Vertrauen auf die Gültigkeit internationaler Abkommen Entscheidungen getroffen haben. Hier ist die Europäische Investitionsbank gefragt. Alle bisherigen Projekte im gemeinsamen Interesse müssen weiter fortgeführt werden, wie der erst langsam in Fahrt kommende Menschenrechtsdialog, der sehr wesentlich ist und entscheidend sein wird, oder die gemeinsamen Anstrengungen im Kampf gegen den Drogenhandel oder die regionale Sicherheitskooperation. Und es wäre überaus hilfreich, nun endlich auch die Eröffnung einer EU-Delegation in Teheran in Angriff nehmen zu können. Nur durch intensive diplomatische Aktivitäten kann die gegenwärtige Krise gelöst werden, wie schon einmal.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κυρία Επίτροπε, με τη συμφωνία του 2015 η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση δεσμεύτηκε για τον αποτελεσματικό έλεγχο του πυρηνικού προγράμματος του Ιράν με ταυτόχρονη άρση των κυρώσεων κατά της χώρας αυτής. Αναμφίβολα τασσόμαστε υπέρ της συμφωνίας, ακόμη και μετά την υπαναχώρηση των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών που ακολουθούν αλλοπρόσαλλη πολιτική, υπό τον όρο βεβαίως ότι και το Ιράν θα τηρήσει τις υποχρεώσεις του.

Η άρση των κυρώσεων θα έχει θετικό αντίκτυπο στην επιβίωση του φτωχού λαού του Ιράν, θα βοηθήσει στην ανάπτυξη της δημοκρατίας και στην ανατροπή του καθεστώτος, αλλά ταυτόχρονα θα βοηθήσει και τις οικονομικές σχέσεις της Ένωσης με τη χώρα αυτή. Να θυμίσω ότι πολλά αεροπλάνα του Ιράν έπεσαν κατά καιρούς παρασύροντας στον θάνατο εκατοντάδες ανθρώπους, γιατί σύμφωνα με τους ισχυρισμούς της Τεχεράνης δεν πουλούσαμε εξαρτήματα για τη συντήρησή τους. Επισημαίνω ότι η εφαρμογή κυρώσεων είναι αποτελεσματική όταν δεν είναι επιλεκτική, είτε αναφορικά με το ίδιο έγκλημα, όπως για παράδειγμα για την απόκτηση και διάδοση των πυρηνικών όπλων, είτε όσον αφορά παρόμοια εγκλήματα, όπως για παράδειγμα για την κατοχή ξένων εδαφών. Εφαρμόζουμε κυρώσεις εναντίον της Ρωσίας, αλλά χαϊδεύουμε την Τουρκία.

Marcus Pretzell (ENF). – Mr President, this debate is based on a number of fake news items on the so-called Iran deal. There never was a deal. I cite the Obama Administration: ‘The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is not a treaty or an executive agreement, and it is not a signed document’. I cite Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif: ‘No agreement has been reached, so we do not have any obligation yet,’ and Iranian leader Ali Khamenei: ‘Nothing has happened yet’.

In the US it was a decision taken only by one person, the former President of the United States, against the articulated democratic majority of the US Congress by all of its Republican – and some of its Democrat – members. It was an agreement without any binding obligations, as the leaders of Iran very openly and precisely made clear on the very day this so-called deal was published. It was an agreement that solely stated the personal and political trust of the former President of the United States in the Iranian leadership. It signalled the trust of this utterly overrated President in a government that repeatedly announces its will to extinguish Israel; a government that supports a number of Islamic terrorist organisations all over the Middle East; a government that has shown its disrespect for most of our values for almost four decades.

This deal was established undemocratically; it was non-binding and was a clear proof of the inappropriate visions – not to say lack of visions – of Obama’s foreign policy, which the vast majority of this Parliament still follows against any intelligent understanding of the situation. Let’s go for a new deal. Let’s go for a real deal. Let’s go for a deal that respects the vital and legitimate interests of Iran’s neighbours, and especially Israel.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, l'insupportable prétention des États-Unis à imposer l'universalité de leurs sanctions au monde entier, après leur dénonciation unilatérale de l'accord avec l'Iran, est totalement inacceptable.

Nous payons l'absence totale de réaction lorsque naguère, nous avons laissé la banque française BNP Paribas être rackettée par les États-Unis à hauteur de 7 milliards d'euros – 9 milliards de dollars – en raison du fait que sa filiale suisse avait continué à travailler avec l'Iran.

Je suis le seul député à avoir alors interpellé la Commission et le Conseil. Vos réponses ont été indigestes, comme celle du président français Hollande alors en visite dans cet hémicycle. Aujourd'hui encore, vous opposez les paroles – point de contact, poursuite des discussions, loi de blocage –, mais déjà les entreprises européennes – Total, Peugeot, Airbus – ont renoncé à leurs projets dans ce pays.

Les seules mesures efficaces seraient de nous préparer à placer sous séquestre des avoirs américains équivalents aux avoirs européens qui seraient spoliés par les autorités américaines.

Nous avons été les alliés des États-Unis d'Amérique, nous ne sommes pas leurs vassaux.

Arnaud Danjean (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, ce n'est pas par complaisance ni avec naïveté que les signataires du JCPOA (Plan d'action global commun) ont privilégié la voie diplomatique sur le nucléaire iranien, mais c'est parce que pendant 15 ans, il a été fait un constat lucide, à savoir qu'il n'existait pas d'alternative réaliste pour traiter cette menace, car c'est bien d'une menace grave dont il s'agit.

Les Européens doivent être, sur la scène internationale, un pôle de stabilité et de fiabilité. La parole d'un accord multilatéral oblige ses signataires, au-delà des querelles politiques domestiques. S'en affranchir brutalement n'offre aucune solution satisfaisante à personne.

Cet accord ne répond bien sûr pas aux problèmes posés par la politique de Téhéran dans la région ni à la préoccupation légitime quant au développement des capacités balistiques iraniennes.

Mais d'une part, nous connaissions très bien ces données lorsque nous avons négocié l'accord et d'autre part, il est incohérent de penser que ces contentieux pourront être résolus en commençant par remettre en cause l'accord sur le nucléaire, qui est un socle, même fragile, à toute négociation plus générale.

L'aventurisme militaire dans un Moyen-Orient profondément instable a déjà provoqué suffisamment de dégâts.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, tem o meu apoio nos seus esforços para preservar o acordo nuclear com o Irão que é a pedra angular do regime global da não proliferação nuclear e, assim, absolutamente estratégico para a União Europeia, para a segurança da região e para todo o mundo.

Besides, the JCPOA can, with the lifting of sanctions, foster economic, social and people-to-people exchanges, thus enhancing political dialogue with Iran and bringing to that dialogue questions like regional issues and human rights – including in Iran. We need this channel of dialogue; it can actually encourage Iran to play a responsible role in the region, in contrast with the Wahhabism fuelling terrorism from neighbouring Saudi Arabia and proxies.

To counter those who want to destroy the JCPOA, I support the Commission's proposal to reactivate the blocking regulation, making it possible to protect legitimate EU trade with Iran, and to empower the European Investment Bank to finance trade with Iran. We must refute Trump's hypocrisy in opposing the verified JCPOA when he is trying to sell his unverified deal with the North Korean dictator, and all those who try to pretend – like Israel and the Saudis backing Trump – that Iran is the only source of trouble in the Middle East.

No doubt, I condemn many of the Iranian policies – namely violating human rights in Iran, and namely supporting the regime of Assad in Syria – but Iran is not the only troublemaker in the region. We should equally condemn all those who are fostering trouble and fuelling conflicts, like the UAE, which is now preparing an assault on the port of al Hudaydah in Yemen, which the UN has warned could lead to catastrophic humanitarian consequences. The divergence with the Trump administration over the JCPOA is actually part of a deeper problem in transatlantic relations: trade wars, withdrawal from the climate agreement, from the migration global compacts, brazen interference against our Union in European countries, supporting populist far-right policies. This is a bigger problem, and we need...

(The President cut off the speaker)

David Campbell Bannerman (ECR). – Mr President, three years ago I spoke here against the disastrous Iran nuclear agreement, the JCPOA. I have to ask Ms Mogherini: what are you celebrating by signing this deal? Is it the freeing up of USD 100 billion in frozen assets so Iran can sponsor terrorism, funding Hezbollah in Lebanon and Syria, Hamas in Gaza, Houthi rebel missiles in Yemen, annexing Iraq and destabilising Bahrain? Iran is a septic octopus with its poisonous tentacles wrapped all around the Middle East. Or are you proud that Iran lied to you about its nuclear ambitions (as secret papers released by the Israelis prove) or has engaged in five ballistic missile tests since the deal was signed? Or was it that, even if it fully complies, that regime can still have uranium enrichment? Or is it the fat contracts for Total, Airbus, Peugeot and Citroen? I fully agree with President Trump's bold decision to withdraw the US from the deal and return to sanctions. Trump is right. The EU is wrong.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Verehrte Hohe Beauftragte, ich unterstütze voll und ganz die Linie, die Sie hier politisch vertreten. Ich bin doch sehr überrascht über Kollegen, die die Ablehnung dieses Abkommens mit dem Iran nicht etwa damit begründen, der Iran verletze dieses Abkommen, sondern sie begründen das mit anderen kritikwürdigen politischen Aktivitäten des Iran. In der Tat, das ist alles zu kritisieren, und es ist alles aufgezählt worden, was wir am Iran nicht gut finden. Aber das hat nichts mit dem Verhandlungsgegenstand zu tun.

Als wir damals diese Dinge verhandelten – ich kann mich noch erinnern, ich war damals schon dabei –, da war die Priorität der Prioritäten die Verhinderung der iranischen Bombe. Und es war richtig, dieses Abkommen abzuschließen. Und ich frage mich schon: Ist die Sicherheit Israels zum Beispiel dann besser gewährleistet, wenn der Iran sich etwa nicht mehr an das Abkommen gebunden fühlt? Das glaube ich nicht.

Ansonsten meine Frage im Bereich der Wirtschaft: Können wir nicht unseren Handel mit dem Iran insgesamt eher auf Euro umstellen, damit wir auch von amerikanischen Banken nicht mehr so abhängig sind?

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo nostro dibattito si colloca nel quadro di un profondo mutamento delle relazioni internazionali e ne è testimonianza anche l'ultimo G7. L'attuale amministrazione americana sembra aver adottato una linea disarmante nella sua semplicità nelle relazioni esterne, bene interpretata anche nel caso iraniano da Mike Pompeo.

Se vuoi essere considerato amico degli americani, allora devi accettare le condizioni che ti vengono poste, dodici nel caso iraniano, o pagare le conseguenze del rifiuto. In ciò c'è tutto l'azzardo, che magari può forse pagare nel caso nordcoreano, ma dubito funzioni con l'Iran, con il rischio di una escalation pericolosa.

Penso che non bisogna dare pretesti all'atteggiamento americano. Parliamoci chiaro: in questo momento, non c'è nulla che possa essere ragionevolmente fatto per convincere Trump, Netanyahu e Bin Salman per spingerli in direzione di una posizione di dialogo e di razionale analisi della situazione.

Se l'Europa, così come l'Iran, vuole avere una chance di uscire da questa difficile situazione, è indispensabile che questa chance venga vista soprattutto nella capacità di logorare i loro propositi attraverso il buon senso e la pazienza. Le condizioni di Pompeo, tra l'altro, rappresentano più uno strumento nelle mani dell'amministrazione israeliana che in quelle statunitensi, aprendo la porta per una legittimazione di un conflitto di fatto già iniziata da alcune settimane sul suolo siriano. Un piano ben impostato che l'Europa e l'Iran possono scardinare solo attraverso la pazienza diplomatica, nell'ottica di far chiudere quella finestra di opportunità che oggi Netanyahu sembra voler gestire in prima persona.

Per questo, signora Alto rappresentante, nel sottoscrivere la sua linea, le chiedo innanzitutto di lavorare per evitare, qui e nella regione, che venga creato un casus belli che possa produrre conseguenze difficili da gestire.

Bas Belder (ECR). – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Ik kijk uit naar een rationeel en moreel Europees beleid versus de Islamitische Republiek Iran in geopolitiek opzicht, economisch opzicht en in moreel opzicht.

Geopolitiek, meneer de Voorzitter. Laat de Europese Unie samen met de Verenigde Staten optreden tegen de expansionistische koers van Iran en destabiliserende koers van Iran in het Midden-Oosten.

Ten tweede, economisch. Laat de EU niet zijn nauwe financiële, economische en handelsbetrekkingen met de VS op het spel zetten voor onvergelijkbaar zwakke relaties met Iran.

Bovendien, we gaan toch niet de Iraanse Revolutionaire Garde steunen met haar terroristische acties, intern en extern. Immoreel! De EU moet zich niet nucleair laten chanteren. Dat is vanaf het begin al zo geweest, vanaf het begin van de nucleaire deal met de onderhandelingen door Zarif nota bene. En bovendien, over moreel gesproken, een appeasement-politiek bedrijven tegenover een regime dat de eigen bevolking en de regio terroriseert en Israël wil vernietigen; laat de EU deze politiek laten varen, want die is immoreel.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, there is no doubt that the JCPOA has been an important achievement that could guarantee security in the region and bring Iran back onto the international scene. It is very unfortunate, therefore, to see the US backpedalling on this deal. The consequences for international relations and for security in the region could be dire.

The EU finds itself in a difficult situation. I agree that we should keep Iran tied to this deal. It will be tough, but in the given circumstances we have no other choice. We will have to work, moreover, out of the uncertainties around the investments that the EU made in Iran. This concerns in particular the sanctions the USA could bring to businesses interested in investing in Iran. We also have our own EIB investments in Iran. It would be very unfortunate if they were subject to US sanctions. The situation will need a diplomatic solution.

Flavio Zanonato (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non si può negare che la decisione di Trump di ritirarsi dall'accordo sul nucleare iraniano, oltre a danneggiare la credibilità degli Stati Uniti, mette in pericolo la stabilità dell'intera regione ed è un passo indietro nel percorso di non proliferazione delle armi nucleari.

Noi europei dobbiamo salvaguardare i risultati ottenuti dalle nostre diplomazie, impedendo che si vanifichino gli sforzi di più di dodici anni di negoziato. Dobbiamo essere garanti di una piena implementazione dell'accordo, assicurandoci che l'interruzione delle sanzioni migliori le relazioni economiche con l'Iran e che ciò abbia un impatto positivo anche sulle condizioni di vita della popolazione iraniana.

Ho apprezzato e condivido fino in fondo l'intervento dell'Alto rappresentante Federica Mogherini. Dobbiamo come Parlamento europeo appoggiare fino in fondo il suo sforzo e il lavoro che finora ha fatto e dobbiamo persuadere, con tutti i mezzi che ha disposizione l'Unione europea, l'Iran a mantenere gli impegni, nonostante il ritiro statunitense. Questo favorirà anche...

(Il Presidente interrompe l'oratore)

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, I will make three points. One element is missing here. There was not one serious word addressed to the Iranian people. You mentioned just the human rights dialogue, which has failed to produce any tangible results. I think that an issue which is no less important than the nuclear deal is the continued repression of the Iranian people by the extremist fundamentalist regime.

Second, I am worried that the EU approach has been tilted towards protecting EU companies' access to the Iranian markets rather than protecting with equal commitment human rights and civil liberties there.

And third, Ms Mogherini mentioned that the deal has avoided regional escalation. I think the opposite is true. The Iranian military expansion in the Middle East has recently reached the Israeli borders. There is a direct threat to the very existence of Israel, as Tehran has repeatedly called for the annihilation of the Jewish state. Has there been any serious reaction to that from the EU?

Jytte Guteland (S&D). – Herr talman! Utrikesrepresentant Mogherini! För mindre än två veckor sedan stod vi här och debatterade mänskliga rättigheter i Iran. Även om debatten i dag handlar om kärnteknikavtalet vill jag börja med att betona vikten av att EU står upp för de mänskliga rättigheterna och emot dödsstraffet. Jag vill upprepa ett av kraven från senast: Frige Ahmadreza Djalali, Iran! Gör det nu!

Om dagens ämne vill jag säga att det ensidiga beslutet från USA:s sida att dra sig ur avtalet är både oroande och oansvarigt. Flera har sagt det: det ökar spänningarna i regionen och det kan gynna de minst reformvänliga krafterna. Kärnteknikavtalet är inte fulländat, men det är resultatet av tolv års diplomatiska ansträngningar. Överenskommelsen har inneburit att vi haft en kontrollmekanism på plats. Det har varit viktigt för vår säkerhet och för det globala icke-spridningsarbetet. Nu måste EU sluta upp bakom Mogherini och skapa sig en helhetsbild över situationen. Parallellt med arbetet mot kärnvapen måste vi fortsätta trycka på inom de alarmerande områdena.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Mr President, as Europeans we believe in political dialogue and disarmament. At the same time, the JCPOA is a deal with serious flaws, the first one being that the negotiations leading up to the deal were a missed opportunity to improve the human rights situation in the Islamic Republic.

Secondly, the deal allowed Iran to keep its nuclear infrastructure intact. It was designed to put off problems, not to deal with them once and for all. Thirdly, the revenue from lifted sanctions went into the pockets of the revolutionary guard, rather than to the country's suffering people.

The EU should now look at these failings and condition our future commitment to the JCPOA on human rights improvements, a complete stop to the sponsoring of terrorists, and the full dismantling of the Iranian nuclear infrastructure.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Mr President, while US President Trump claims to champion denuclearisation in one part of the world – signing a deal with North Korea built on shaky grounds of Twitter diplomacy and laced with vague, noncommittal wording – he abandons the strong, solid nuclear deal with Iran: the product of years of negotiations by the international community, and the effectiveness of which is attested by at least 10 International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reports.

High Representative, in your address to us earlier, you stressed the importance of the joint comprehensive plan of action (JCPOA). The majority of this House agrees, but now it is vital that we ensure that the re-imposition of US sanctions does not spell an end to the deal. So my questions to you are: the EIB, as we've heard before, has been asked to extend its activities to Iran to help shield businesses from the US sanctions, but it is hesitant because it is worried about US retaliation. But as far as I'm concerned, their core mandate is to carry out our policies, and there's nothing more important than carrying out this particular deal.

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, točno je gospođo Morgherini, kao što ste rekli, da je nuklearni sporazum s Iranom stup sigurnosti u ovom području Bliskog istoka. Slažem se s vama. Isto tako se slažem da je uzdrman taj stup sigurnosti izlaskom Sjedinjenih Američkih Država iz tog sporazuma. Jedini put da se zaustavi stvaranje iranske nuklearne bombe bio je upravo ovaj sporazum, i stoga je on u tom dijelu pozitivan. Međutim, činjenica je da postoji veliko kršenje ljudskih prava u Iranu, koje ovdje rijetko spominjemo.

Nedavno sam imala priliku biti s delegacijom AFET-a u Iranu i osobno sam se mogla uvjeriti, iz razgovora, na koji način se taj režim tamo održava i na koji način se krše osnovna ljudska prava građana Irana. Mislim da o tome moramo razgovarati. Isto tako, nemojmo zaboraviti agresivnu politiku Irana prema Izraelu. U svakom slučaju, smatram da tamo treba osnažiti demokraciju i da treba poraditi na mijenjanju režima. To će biti jedini način da se smiri stanje na Bliskom istoku.

(Zastupnica je pristala odgovoriti na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice (članak 162. stavak 8. Poslovnika))

Udo Voigt (NI), Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“. – Ich wollte Sie nur fragen: Wenn Sie von Menschenrechtsverletzungen im Iran sprechen, warum schweigen Sie über Menschenrechtsverletzungen in den Vereinigten Staaten und in Israel?

Dubravka Šuica (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Das ist eine interessante Frage.

Zanimljivo je vaše pitanje, međutim, današnja tema je upravo Iran i nuklearni sporazum. Nismo danas govorili o stanju ljudskih prava u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama, koja je demokratska država, i tema danas nije Izrael, ali činjenica je da Iran ima agresivnu politiku u odnosu na Izrael, i to možemo i dokumentirati.

Javi López (S&D). – Señor presidente, hoy desde aquí, desde el Parlamento Europeo, queremos condenar de forma enérgica la decisión unilateral de la Administración Trump de violentar el acuerdo nuclear con Irán.

Un acuerdo que, además, tenía mecanismos de verificación, y sabíamos que se estaban cumpliendo los compromisos que de él se derivaban. Un acuerdo que para nosotros es mucho más que un acuerdo. Es una pieza fundamental para evitar una escalada nuclear en una región hoy con fortísimas tensiones. Por eso, queremos apoyar de forma decidida los esfuerzos de la alta representante y del Consejo para salvaguardar este acuerdo y enviar dos mensajes. Hoy no hablamos de Irán. Hablamos de la diplomacia y del multilateralismo como mecanismos para ordenar las relaciones internacionales —la palabra frente a la fuerza—; eso es lo que hoy Europa defiende. Y hablamos de las relaciones transatlánticas, que se están rompiendo.

La falta de confianza que hoy tenemos en la nueva Administración estadounidense tiene que tener una respuesta firme en defensa de nuestros intereses y nuestros valores desde Europa.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, gospođo povjerenice, Iran je suočen s gospodarskom krizom, nezaposlenošću, siromaštvom, zatiranjem temeljnih ljudskih sloboda, a posebice prava žena. Ne smijemo zaboraviti niti činjenicu da je Iran u protekloj godini nakon Kine bio prva zemlja s najvećim brojem egzekucija, što je u suprotnosti s našim vrijednostima u Europskoj uniji, jer mi ne odobravamo smrtnu kaznu kao pravnu sankciju.

U Iranu postoje unutarnji prioriteti na kojima je potrebno raditi, kako bi se građanima osigurali dostojanstven život, sloboda i temeljna prava. To su problemi koje nuklearni sporazum ne može i neće riješiti. Prava iranskog naroda, svakog djeteta i svake žene, svakog političkog zatvorenika, moraju biti stavljena na prvo mjesto. Smatram kako su upravo ta prava morala biti i preduvjet za potpisivanje ugovora.

Iranski nuklearni sporazum je važan i njegova namjera je bila dobra, no on ne smije ostaviti po strani kršenje ljudskih prava i nebrigu o vlastitom narodu, te Europska unija mora na to primjereno reagirati.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, antes de mais deixe-me felicitá-la pelo seu excelente trabalho neste dossiê que é tão difícil como todos nós sabemos. Senhora Mogherini, é um facto que o plano de ação conjunto global foi um instrumento histórico em matéria de diplomacia multilateral que deve, apesar das suas imperfeições, constituir uma pedra angular para uma solução futura de maior alcance pós 2025 que englobe o programa de mísseis balísticos Ariane iranianos e que abranja um conjunto mais vasto de atores regionais.

A incapacidade do Presidente Trump em compreender esta estratégia inovadora ratificada pelo Conselho de Segurança, constitui uma ameaça para a não proliferação de armas nucleares e para a segurança do Médio Oriente e da Europa.

Senhora Alta Representante, concordo consigo que, neste momento particularmente crítico, a União deve continuar a apostar na manutenção do acordo com o Irão reforçando a sua monitorização e verificação sem, no entanto, Senhora Alta Representante, esquecer que, ao mesmo tempo o regime dos ayatollahs pede a não aplicação dos efeitos extraterritoriais das sanções secundárias norte-americanas, continua o carácter repressivo de um regime que, apesar das promessas de reforma, continua a deter um triste recorde de violações dos direitos humanos e que é líder das execuções *per capita* do mundo.

Senhora Mogherini, peço-lhe que não se esqueça destes iranianos que todos os dias sofrem brutalmente nas mãos de um regime tão brutal.

Elnökváltás: LÍVIA JÁRÓKA*alelnök*

Jude Kirton-Darling (S&D). – Madam President, as the eyes of the world focus on the Iranian nuclear deal and Trump's unilateral decision, I ask colleagues to keep in mind the people of Iran. Human rights in Iran continue to deteriorate, with peaceful protests facing intimidation, violence, detention and torture. While we work to preserve the nuclear deal, we must never lose sight of the principles and values upon which this Parliament was built. We must never stop standing up for those without a voice and holding those with power to account. We must never stop in our efforts to promote democracy, free speech, the rule of law and the right to peaceful protest.

This House must stand in solidarity with the people of Iran, who desire these most basic of freedoms, and this House must stand in solidarity with those in Iran currently in prison, enduring torture, or those who face the death penalty for the simple belief that tomorrow may be better than today.

Branislav Škripek (ECR). – Madam President, there is a major loophole in the current nuclear deal, and that is the lack of any limits on Iranian military expansionism. Iran is directing a massive army of Shia militias in both Iraq and Syria, and in both countries has a direct military presence in the shape of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. In Syria especially this Iranian presence is very clear. It is obvious that any economic support from the EU to Iran will go directly to the companies owned by Ayatollah Khamenei and his family and to the companies owned by the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. This is the very force that helped Assad drive refugees to Europe.

My question is why the EU policy towards Assad has changed so fundamentally that we plan to support the forces he is depending on. Why should the EU support the forces that are harassing the Christians in Iraq? The EU needs to consider these consequences before there is any continuation.

Patricia Lalonde (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute Représentante, Madame Mogherini, chers collègues, l'accord sur le nucléaire iranien doit être préservé en l'état malgré le retrait des États-Unis.

L'idée de vouloir y rajouter trois clauses, comme l'ont suggéré certains dirigeants des États membres européens, est irréalisable. Jamais les Iraniens ne l'accepteront et nous prenons ainsi le risque que l'Iran ne reprenne l'enrichissement d'uranium. L'Iran n'est pas la Corée du Nord. Le peuple iranien sera solidaire de ses dirigeants et toute velléité de la part des Occidentaux d'orchestrer un changement de régime risque de plonger la région dans un chaos total dont l'Europe risque d'être la première victime.

Les Iraniens réclament le droit à l'autodéfense, la guerre Iran-Iraq a fait plus d'un demi-million de morts et reste présente chez les Iraniens, comme le rappellent ces affiches des martyrs sur les façades des rues de Téhéran, comme dans toutes les villes en Iran.

Il faut que l'Europe fasse jouer la diplomatie pour obtenir des Iraniens un retrait du sud syrien. Il faut aboutir à de vraies négociations sur le Yémen avec les Houthis plutôt que d'acculer l'Iran par des menaces vaines.

Chers collègues, nous devons tout faire pour que les sanctions contre l'Iran soient levées et essayer de contourner les sanctions américaines pour que les entreprises européennes puissent rester en Iran. Il en va de l'avenir de l'Europe, je sais, Madame Mogherini, combien vous en êtes convaincue.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Mogherini, συζητάμε και δίκαια καταγγέλλουμε τη στάση του κυρίου Trump απέναντι στη συμφωνία αποπυρηνικοποίησης του Ιράν. Δεν νομίζετε όμως ότι υποχρεούμαστε να διευρύνουμε λίγο το ζήτημα; Δεν θα βρούμε να πούμε μια λέξη με αφορμή αυτό το θέμα υπέρ της αποπυρηνικοποίησης του πλανήτη;

Πρόσφατα ήταν εδώ εκπρόσωπος οργάνωσης που βραβεύτηκε με το Βραβείο Νόμπελ και υποστήριξε πάρα πολύ σωστά, καταχειροκροτήθηκε δε από όλους, ότι, από τη στιγμή που εφευρέθηκαν τα πυρηνικά, κάποια στιγμή θα χρησιμοποιηθούν, είτε από λάθος είτε σκόπιμα. Αυτό το μεγάλο θέμα, αυτή τη μεγάλη καταστροφή πάνω από τα κεφάλια της ανθρωπότητας δεν μπορεί να την αφήνουμε έξω από τη συζήτηση, όταν μιλάμε για την αποπυρηνικοποίηση συγκεκριμένου κράτους ή συγκεκριμένης περιοχής.

Επιτρέψτε μου, κυρία Mogherini, να ανακαλέσω στη μνήμη σας – και αναφέρομαι σε προσωπικό θέμα, αλλά είμαι υποχρεωμένος να το κάνω – το μαχητικό μας παρελθόν υπέρ της αποπυρηνικοποίησης του πλανήτη.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, Ιράν: άλλο ένα πεδίο σφοδρών ανταγωνισμών για τα κέρδη του κεφαλαίου. Η συμφωνία δεν χωρά τα συμφέροντα όλων των μνηστήρων για τον έλεγχο του πλούτου αυτής της χώρας. Γι' αυτό οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες τορπιλίζουν τη συμφωνία, ενώ η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, η Γερμανία, η Γαλλία και η Ρωσία, που έχουν αποσπάσει πολλά και μεγάλα συμβόλαια για τα μονοπώλιά τους, προσπαθούν να την προφυλάξουν βάζοντας ταυτόχρονα όρους κατά του Ιράν.

Ο κίνδυνος είναι μεγάλος, υπολογίζοντας επιπλέον την ένταση της επιθετικότητας του Ισραήλ, που δολοφονεί τον παλαιστινιακό λαό, βομβαρδίζει τη Συρία και εκτοξεύει απειλές κατά του ιρανικού λαού με την κάλυψη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, των ΗΠΑ και του NATO. Από αυτούς τους ανταγωνισμούς και τις λυκοσυμφωνίες οι λαοί μόνο απώλειες και αιματοχυσίες θα γνωρίζουν. Γι' αυτό πρέπει να παλέψουν ενάντια στον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο, τις συμμαχίες και τις συμφωνίες του κεφαλαίου που λυμαινούνται τον πλούτο που οι ίδιοι οι λαοί παράγουν και αυτοί πρέπει να τον καρπώνονται.

Petri Sarvamaa (PPE). – Madam President, argument number one seems to be that we, as the European Union, must cherish stability in the Gulf region by sticking unconditionally to the JCPOA. However, you only need to look into the present situation to understand that, with the Mullah regime, we are far from stability.

The reaction from Ayatollah Khamenei to the withdrawal of the United States from the agreement speaks volumes. The Tehran dictatorship is actually using the opportunity to milk the Union and keep oppressing its own people. The main issues for the Iranian people are freedom, human rights, women's rights, poverty – and not the nuclear deal. But the main thing for the Union seems to be the deal and all the other deals that come with it.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, whilst I am hugely concerned about Trump's irresponsible and dangerous foreign policy, tearing up a landmark, EU-brokered deal designed to presage a more peaceful world, I want to remind those in positions of power and influence that many people remain unfairly imprisoned in Iran, a country with an appalling human rights record.

Nazanin Zaghari-Ratcliffe is a British-Iranian dual citizen, who is currently detained in Evin prison on trumped up charges, her situation sadly made worse by Boris Johnson's ignorant and careless words. Having met Nazanin's husband, Richard, I can testify to the terrible pain being experienced by her family.

So I urgently call on the High Representative to use all the means in her power to urge the Iranian authorities to release Nazanin and others like her. I'd also like to express my solidarity with the Iranian people, who occupied the streets to protest against corruption and rising prices. Despite calling itself moderate, the current government continues to violate human rights and disregard the Iranian people's wish for a more open country.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, condenamos a decisão da Administração norte-americana de denunciar o acordo nuclear e de impor novas sanções ao Irão, desprezando a Carta das Nações Unidas e o direito internacional.

Uma provocação inserida na sua política de confrontação, configurando um risco de escalada de agressão dos Estados Unidos e dos seus aliados no Médio Oriente, nomeadamente contra o Irão ou o Líbano, sequente às guerras de agressão ao Afeganistão, ao Iraque, à Líbia, à Síria e ao Iémen.

Sublinhamos o papel belicista e de sistemático desrespeito pelo direito internacional de Israel e pela Arábia Saudita, vossos aliados, países ambos responsáveis por guerras de agressão contra povos do Médio Oriente. As reações da União Europeia e das suas principais potências não apagam a sua responsabilidade e conivência com as operações de ingerência e de agressão dos Estados Unidos, ou da NATO, na região, como recentemente na Síria, ou naquelas guerras de agressão com base em mentiras da propaganda de guerra.

A defesa da paz no Médio Oriente passa pelo fim das guerras de agressão e pela defesa dos princípios das Cartas das Nações Unidas.

(„Catch the eye” eljárs vége.)

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, first of all, let me thank you all for having expressed quite clearly a sort of convergence and a certain unity behind the work we are doing to try to preserve the nuclear deal with Iran. It is the same unity that I have seen in the Commission, the same unity that I have seen in the European Council, in the Foreign Affairs Council, and the same unity that I have seen uniting the European Union within our Union, but also with our international partners all around the world.

Let me stress this point because we have a responsibility as Europeans at this time. The world is looking at us to try and preserve this achievement – no achievement is perfect, but it's an achievement – and it's also looking at us to find ways themselves – our international partners – to contribute to preserving these agreements.

I have heard a certain confusion on the extreme right of the Chamber. You know I never enter into these discussions, but I think I have to clarify a couple of things. One is the nature of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) because fake news can produce fake news and can itself become fake news. Let me be very clear on this: the nuclear deal with Iran is not a treaty. It has never been a treaty. It is a multilateral agreement that was negotiated for 12 years under the mandate of the UN Security Council, which mandated the High Representative of the European Union to facilitate the negotiations between Iran, on one side, and Germany, France, the UK, the US, China and Russia, on the other side, to reach an agreement that then became a UN Security Council resolution annex. So the legal framework that legitimates the JCPOA is not in the nature of being a bilateral or multilateral treaty. This is why it has not been ratified by Parliament, but it is an annex to the UN Security Council resolution. There is a UN Security Council resolution that unanimously endorsed and approved the text of the JCPOA and if you want to see it – sorry, the colleague has disappeared, as fake news disappears from time to time – the signed version of the JCPOA is in my office. You're free to come and see it. It exists. It's 102-3 pages long – it takes some time to read it and probably a lot of time to understand it – but it exists and it's available on the website for everybody to consult it. Indeed it has a legal basis, being a UN Security Council resolution document. As such, technically speaking, the unilateral move of the United States Administration is the unilateral decision to stop complying with the UN Security Council resolution the United States itself voted. That is just to clarify what the JCPOA is.

The second element of confusion I see especially – well, only – on the extreme right part of the Chamber is this – and I understand the political dilemma that some political forces might have at this stage, namely following the Trump agenda of destroying multilateralism and going only to bilateral agreements or affirming European autonomy. In French I would say *'c'est où votre souverainisme?*', because for me protecting and preserving European interests – security interests, economic decisions – at this stage is a matter of priority. I'm surprised that some forces that have always argued for sovereignty and autonomy are now tempted to follow not Brussels but Washington. I think this is a mistake. This is a mistake that goes beyond the nuclear deal with Iran, but I leave this for political reflection in some parts of Europe.

What is at stake today? First of all, what is a stake is the risk that Iran decides to restart its process to achieve a nuclear weapon. This is what we are talking about. The agreement is not perfect. I don't know about you, but I don't know anything in diplomacy – not even in life – that is perfect. No agreement, no deal is perfect, but this agreement is working. This agreement's purpose was – and still is – to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon and it is preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. That's it. The risk is that, were this agreement not in place tomorrow, what would be the immediate consequence? Nuclear proliferation? Iran developing a nuclear programme that is not peaceful? The region going into a spiral of nuclear proliferation? And we know the region. We know the conflictuality of the region and some of you were perfectly right: the risk of slipping into a major scale conflict is real. It's perfectly possible.

There are two other issues at stake: the credibility of multilateralism and of international agreements – I would say of UN Security Council resolutions. The arguments that whatever is signed can be destroyed unilaterally after a few years is a dangerous one. I often gave this example in Washington. If a private company signs an agreement, when the CEO changes the agreement stays in place. If we introduce the element of uncertainty of agreements signed, the entire world collapses and the credibility of any negotiation – of any negotiation – collapses, and the international system also goes in that direction. So what is at stake is – and our responsibility is big in this – to try to maintain the credibility of diplomacy and multilateralism and, at the end of the day, bilateral agreements as well, because if you can unilaterally withdraw from a multilateral agreement, why shouldn't you do the same on a bilateral agreement if at a certain moment you change your mind?

Third, what is at stake is the autonomy of the European Union. This goes beyond the nuclear agreement with Iran. This would lead us to a different kind of debate, one that we will surely have at some point, but it is essential that the European Union, together with our international partners, is able to take decisions based on merit, based on our interests and our values, and based on what we think and decide is good for us and for the rest of the region and the world, that, by the way, was a joint analysis and a joint decision not only with our American friends, but also with the rest of international community. Otherwise, the UN Security Council resolution would not have been unanimously adopted. We didn't move from where we were, and our analysis of what is in our interest and the global interest stays the same, especially after 11 reports that the deal has worked and that Iran is compliant. I believe that we need to be able to affirm that the European Union positions are determined in Europe.

Having said that, the risk of not managing to save this agreement is real and I think we should not underestimate that we are running a risk. Even if we do all we can – and we are doing all we can – to preserve this agreement, there is a risk that this derails. I think we have the power and the instruments, together with our Member States and together with the other international partners we have, to prevent this agreement from being completely disrupted. But there is a risk that this work does not succeed. I think this is the worst case scenario because this would undermine security – nothing to do with stability – and would undermine the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the credibility of the West and of multilateralism and diplomacy. This is why I believe that, even if it's difficult – and I see all the limitations – we have the responsibility to try to achieve this result. Even if it's difficult, we must do all we can together to preserve this agreement, and this is exactly what we are doing because, again, the scenario of not having the agreement in place would be a disaster for Europe, for the security of the Middle East, for the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and I believe also for the United States of America.

(Applause)

Elnök. – A vitát lezárom.

11. Negotiations on the modernisation of the EU-Chile Association Agreement (debate)

Elnök. – A következő napirendi pont a Charles Tannock által a Külügyi Bizottság nevében benyújtott, Az EU–Chile társulási megállapodás korszerűsítéséről folyó tárgyalások című jelentésről folytatott vita (2018/2018(INI) (A8-0158/2018)

Charles Tannock, Rapporteur. – Madam President, having been around long enough in this House as an MEP to remember the first association agreement agreed between the European Union and Chile, as long ago as 2002, it is rather fitting that in my final months as a Member I find myself proudly authoring the recommendation report ahead of the ongoing negotiations for its upgrade.

As the European Union has emerged as one of the leading forces in the global free trade agenda, I welcome its attention to third-generation updated agreements such as we see today with Chile, rather than wholly pursuing new deals from scratch.

We are focused on the political operation aspects but let us not forget that these negotiations are also concerned with trade issues. Chile has re-emerged over the last three decades as a mature democracy with a strong internationalist outlook. As a member of the Pacific Alliance, the Organisation of American States and the Union of South American Nations, not to mention being a member of the OECD. Its links and areas of cooperation go well beyond its immediate region and are truly global.

Although already cooperating in EU crisis management operations– this would include in fact things like the CSDP operations, Eurofor in Bosnia – since 2014, it is also hoped that the renewed association agreement will see further cooperation being developed in the coming years.

We proposed in our recommendation an ambitious level of commitment, one that is no less wide-ranging than the similar EU agreements recently concluded with Canada, New Zealand and Australia. This includes working together in the international arena to promote democracy and the rule of law to fight climate change, particularly critical in the Pacific region, combating terrorism and tackling organised crime and corruption.

In the area of education, the European Union seeks to continue cooperation via Erasmus+, but also to work towards full mutual recognition of academic and professional qualifications and diplomas. We have also highlighted the important role the parliamentary oversight and scrutiny has in monitoring such agreements, and so we have endorsed the continued role for the Joint Parliamentary Committee which met for its 25th occasion back in January of this year.

As the negotiations progress we will hope to see continued engagement from the Commission as to the latest developments. Its decision to publish the negotiating mandate and directives in November of last year was an important precedent and one which we welcome and are very keen to see continued. Indeed, we have made reference to this in the recommendation.

With the third round of negotiations concluded in Brussels on 1 June 2018, I am confident that the talks are progressing well. The bulk of discussions are now focusing on trade rather than the political aspects, which are in my recommendation. Chile is clearly a natural partner with common democratic interests and aspirations everywhere. This was further reflected by the positive dialogue concluded with members of European civil society groups that was arranged as part of the latest talks between the EU and Chilean negotiators.

I will conclude my remarks therefore now, although I look forward to making a brief intervention at the end of the debate when I will be happy to address any issues raised, and to make a few comments regarding the two key amendments I have tabled to the resolution for a vote.

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, on behalf of the High Representative / Vice-President, I would like to thank the European Parliament, and in particular the rapporteur, Charles Tannock, for his recommendation. It shows how much we all value our relationship with Chile, and it proves that there is strong support within Parliament for the work done throughout the negotiations.

Chile was the first country in Latin America to sign an association agreement with us. The new agreement we are now negotiating will once again be a model for other deals. This is not only about trade: it is about human rights; it is about the protection of the environment; it is about sustainable development and culture; it is about energy and workers' rights.

Europe and Chile are very far apart geographically, but we see the world with the same eyes. *Vemos el mundo con los mismos ojos.* Pronunciation in Spanish! We both believe in the UN system and in the power of multilateralism.

Chile has taken part in our CSDP mission in Bosnia, and it was the first Latin American country to sign a framework agreement for participation in our missions. We work together on scientific research, for instance under the Copernicus Programme, and when last year Chile was hit by a wave of wild fires, we sent our fire-fighting planes and our fire-fighters from many European countries to contain the emergency.

We both believe in solidarity as a driving force in international relations. Let me also thank Chile for having opened its doors to many Venezuelan refugees fleeing from their country. I saw the situation when I was in this region just two months ago.

These negotiations show the potential for cooperation between like-minded partners like us. Our updated agreement will not only aim to strengthen our economies, it will also protect our workers, our trademark products, and our environment. It will demonstrate there is no better way to protect our interests than through strong cooperation with our partners.

This is international cooperation at its best. We want to show that globalisation can be governed together, with more rights, more protections, making international trade both free and fair. The negotiations are making good progress, and we have the ambition to conclude them as soon and possible, and certainly before the end of this Commission's mandate.

On the occasion of the next round of negotiations on the political and cooperation pillar on 21 June, we will also hold an EU-Chile Association Committee, with a focus not only on bilateral issues, but also on the regional and international situation. Once negotiations are concluded, we look forward to holding an EU-Chile Association Council, which the High Representative will co-chair with Foreign Minister Ampuero.

Let me also stress that the work we are doing with Chile comes at a moment of strong engagement with the whole of Latin America and the Caribbean. Our negotiations with Mexico and Mercosur are also moving on, and by the end of the mandate we will present a new Strategy for even closer relations with Latin America and the Caribbean. I know we can count on Chile as a strong partner not only in our bilateral relations, but also in the larger context of relations between our two regions. Right now, we are working together to prepare the next EU-CELAC ministerial meeting, and we are also willing to expand our relations with the Pacific Alliance. We are currently working on a joint declaration with the four members of the Alliance, to identify precisely the fields where we could work together, in the interest of all our citizens.

We live in a complex and confused moment in the history of the world, unfortunately, when nothing seems certain and even the most basic international rules are called into question. But our relationship with Latin America is here to stay, and will only get stronger. Our peoples and our economies are tied. We share the same principles and worldview. Europe and Latin America are closer than ever, and have the strongest interest in getting even closer. Together, we can be a force for good for the people of Europe, for the people of Latin America, and for our troubled and confused world.

Željana Zovko, u ime kluba PPE. – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, poštovani povjereniče, zahvaljujem na lijepim riječima i na izuzetno inspirativnom govoru koji ste rekli o Čileu kao jednoj od najvažnijih poveznica s Latinskom Amerikom i moram reći da sam izuzetno ponosna što sam imala mogućnost da sudjelujem kao *shadow reporter* u izradi ovog izvješća, i kao Hrvat, zbog uloge hrvatske dijaspore koja je izgradila Čile, a koja je nakon rata u Hrvatskoj pomogla izgradnju i Hrvatske, i koja je očuvala mir u Bosni i Hercegovini svojim sudjelovanjem u mirovnim trupama.

Zahvaljujem kolegi Tannocku na odlično pripremljenom izvješću koji poziva na dodatno jačanje suradnje između Europske unije i Čilea, kroz novi modernizirani sporazum o pridruživanju. Čile je država koja svojom uspješnom demokratskom tranzicijom može samo biti primjer drugim državama, i jedan je od ključnih partnera Europske unije po pitanju suradnje na poljima gospodarstva, investicija, zaštite ljudskih prava i kulturne raznolikosti. U ovom novom sveobuhvatnom i osuvremenjenom sporazumu želi se dodatno ojačati multilateralna suradnja na polju migracija, sigurnosti, obrane (opet spominjem njihove trupe u Bosni i Hercegovini koje su bile jedan od svijetlih primjera), u borbi protiv terorizma, organiziranog kriminala i klimatskih promjena, kao poticanje redovnog dijaloga po pitanju smanjenja socioekonomskih razlika, jačanja ljudskih i temeljnih prava.

Ono što smatram izuzetno bitnim i što ću opet spomenuti, to je poziv na jačanje kulturne suradnje i jačanje uloge dijaspore kao poveznice između Latinske Amerike i Europe, a to se vidjelo na ovim primjerima koje sam na početku navela. Znači, oni koji su otišli u Južnu Ameriku, koji su izgradili jednu zemlju, vratili su se i uspješno su udarili temelje i novim zemljama u razvoju. Znači, nadam se kako će ovo izvješće poslužiti kao dobra podloga za završetak pregovora i da će omogućiti Čileu da ostane, kao i dosad, europska poveznica na kontinentu.

Francisco Assis, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, começaria por saudar o relator, o senhor Charles Tannock, pela qualidade do trabalho que aqui nos apresenta. O Chile é hoje uma democracia muito sólida, o país mais avançado em vários domínios da América Latina e um parceiro fundamental para a União Europeia. É um país muito aberto ao mundo nas mais diversas dimensões. Um país com uma presença muito forte em todas as alianças regionais em que está integrado e muito aberto ao mundo no plano político, diplomático, no plano económico, no plano comercial, um defensor do multilateralismo e, por isso, pode e deve ser um parceiro muito forte de uma União Europeia que ela própria se deve abrir cada vez mais ao mundo e deve apostar cada vez mais em ter uma participação ativa na regulação política, económica e comercial do mundo.

Este processo que está agora em curso de negociações tendo em vista a modernização deste acordo de associação entre a União Europeia e o Chile está felizmente a correr muito bem e, por isso, temos todos a convicção de que ele vai ter um final feliz. Que ele sirva de exemplo para outras negociações em curso, muito em particular aquela que neste momento está a decorrer entre a União Europeia e o Mercosul tendo em vista a celebração de um acordo associação entre ambas as partes.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señora presidenta, quiero felicitar a Charles. Es una gran facilidad poder trabajar con él. Es una persona de trato sencillo, abierto y que además conoce bien los expedientes. Es fácil y es muy útil trabajar con él.

Chile es un ejemplo en Iberoamérica. Chile es un ejemplo en la democracia, en la estabilidad, en lo que significa su inclusión social, su apertura económica y la fiabilidad de sus instituciones administrativas y judiciales. Es, en ese sentido, un ejemplo para todo el resto de países en América.

También es cierto —y lo ha dicho el comisario, señor Stylianides— que es un país receptor de decenas de miles de venezolanos, en menor intensidad por su distancia geográfica, pero también con un abierto espíritu solidario.

Chile ha hecho de su reto geográfico —su excentricidad americana— una solución extraordinariamente exitosa. Y, en ese sentido, hay algo que es fundamental: la Alianza para el Pacífico.

Estamos siendo objeto de una fractura continuada, de un cambio de paradigma por parte de la Administración norteamericana. La última ha sido el desprecio, vía Twitter, el pensamiento Twitter del señor Trump, donde ha despreciado olímpicamente a sus homólogos, tanto de la Unión Europea como de otros países. Nuestra proyección tiene que ser estratégicamente con Iberoamérica, y, dentro de Iberoamérica, hay una parte fundamental, que es la parte que tiene la ventana al Pacífico.

La Alianza para el Pacífico es la asociación más importante y más efectiva de todas las que existen en América. Y, en ese sentido, es trascendente que Europa tenga allí incluso una presencia de observador en la Alianza para el Pacífico. Entiendo que nuestro proyecto de mejora con Chile es un proyecto estratégico y, desde luego, lo apoyamos.

Jordi Solé, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Señora presidenta, la modernización de un acuerdo es el momento adecuado para hacer un balance de lo que ha ido bien y de lo que no y, en este caso, intentar remediarlo. No veamos la modernización tan solo como una oportunidad para alcanzar más lucro a toda costa.

En el caso del Acuerdo de Asociación Unión Europea-Chile de 2003, si bien ha propiciado avances en algunos ámbitos, vemos muy claramente cuáles son los temas pendientes. Temas que han perpetuado la clásica división norte-sur y ámbitos donde no se ha conseguido dejar atrás la nefasta herencia del pinochetismo.

Quiero mencionar algunos ejemplos. El código del agua en vigor convierte el agua en mercancía y establece derechos que se pueden vender. La consecuencia: acaparamiento de agua por parte de grandes inversores nacionales e internacionales para agricultura de exportación. Los pequeños campesinos, así como comunidades enteras, se quedan sin este bien esencial y tienen que comprar agua de camiones cisterna. Esto ocurre, por ejemplo, en Petorca, cerca de la capital, Santiago.

El informe tal y como llega al plenario reafirma el acceso al agua como derecho humano. Les pido que no apoyen la enmienda que reduce el contenido.

En cambio, sí que debemos apoyar a los que reciben amenazas en Chile por defender este derecho y pedir a la delegación de la Unión en Santiago que defienda públicamente la organización Modatima y a su presidente Mundaca.

Otra herencia fatal del pinochetismo es la discriminación de los pueblos indígenas: la justicia antiterrorista se aplica solo a los mapuche. No puede ser que se les robe sus tierras y se talen los bosques nativos para plantar eucaliptos para que nosotros tengamos papel barato; la modernización del Acuerdo tiene que contener un lenguaje muy claro al respecto. Les pido que voten en contra de la enmienda que banaliza el agudo conflicto todavía existente.

Y, finalmente, desde que entró en vigor el Acuerdo demasiado poco ha pasado en Chile para que deje de ser básicamente proveedor de productos primarios, y esto no es un efecto colateral. Este es el principal efecto del Acuerdo y tenemos que cambiar esto si queremos unas relaciones Chile-Unión Europea más equitativas.

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

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D), pregunta de «tarjeta azul». – En este Parlamento hemos venido defendiendo y defendemos y defenderemos el derecho a regular de cada una de las partes en cualquier acuerdo de asociación y a decidir cómo cada parte organiza y gestiona los servicios públicos. Y la pregunta que le hago es: ¿Cree usted que deben ser las instituciones europeas, a través de un acuerdo con un tercer país, quienes le digan cómo tiene que regular y organizar sus servicios? Al margen de que yo defiendo que el agua sea un servicio público, pero no es esa la cuestión. Defiendo por encima de todo el derecho de las partes a decidir y la no injerencia. Y la forma en que Chile tiene organizada la prestación del agua está recogida en su Constitución. ¿Cree que debe este acuerdo comercial cambiar la Constitución de Chile?

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE), respuesta de «tarjeta azul». – Gracias, señora diputada, por esta pregunta. Yo lo que creo es que el agua es un bien esencial que debería ser público, y lo creo para los europeos y también para los no europeos.

Evidentemente, no vamos a decidir nosotros por ellos, pero sí que tenemos el derecho de defender nuestros ideales, nuestros principios en todas partes. Y solo recordar, como he hecho en mi intervención, que las propias Naciones Unidas dicen que el derecho al agua es un derecho básico y fundamental, y yo creo que la gestión pública de un bien esencial es la que corresponde en todas partes.

Jaromír Kohlíček, za skupinu GUE/NGL. – Paní předsedající, Chile je nesporně podle řady ukazatelů i podle indexu lidského rozvoje jednou z nejpokročilejších zemí Latinské Ameriky. Kontakty na politické i ekonomické úrovni mezi EU a Chile se dlouhodobě a rychle rozvíjejí.

Chile přispívá k rozvoji dialogu v kolumbijském mírovém procesu. Dlouhodobým problémem zůstává vztah k původnímu obyvatelstvu, který v nedávné minulosti vyvrcholil konfliktem s kmenem Mapuche. Podobně delikátní je i otázka jednání o možnosti přístupu Bolívie k Tichému oceánu. Tato se s různou intenzitou vrací od chilsko-bolívijsko-peruánské války z 80. let 19. století. Smíšený parlamentní výbor EU-Chile ve svých společných prohlášeních vyjádřil podporu modernizační dohody o přidružení, a to naposledy na svém zasedání 22. ledna 2018. Zásadní je snaha o dodržování lidských práv a základních svobod. V Chile došlo ke změně tvrdě restriktivního potratového zákona. Důležitá je i vzájemná shoda na nutnosti boje proti změně klimatu. Významným prvkem je podpora snahy, aby lidé s nejnižšími příjmy měli v Chile neomezený přístup k vysokoškolskému vzdělání, což je žádoucí propagovat i v zemích EU. Dohoda podporuje rozšiřování výměny studentů a mládeže v rámci různých programů, jako představuje např. ERASMUS+.

Přes řadu pozitivních prvků mám rezervovaný vztah k rozšíření zapojení v hospodářské a vojenské spolupráci obou partnerů, a proto v konečném hlasování se zdržím.

Georg Mayer, im Namen der ENF-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Ja, eine Modernisierung dieses Abkommens, das ja aus dem Jahr 2003 stammt, ist auch dringend notwendig. In dieser Zeit hat sich in Chile viel getan; es hat sich im Allgemeinen viel getan in Südamerika. Aber Chile nimmt hier schon eine besondere Stellung ein. Ich denke, dass wir als Union viel zu inaktiv sind, was Südamerika betrifft. Chile hat diese besondere Stellung, und das sollten wir nicht aus den Augen verlieren. Insbesondere gilt für Gesamt-Südamerika: Überall, wo wir hinkommen, sind die Chinesen oft schon da, und das müssen wir im Kopf behalten.

Meine Erfahrung, die ich vor Ort immer wieder gemacht habe, ist, dass diese Entwicklung ganz besonders in Chile seit der letzten Wahl 2017 noch einmal einen Katalysator bekommen hat. Ich habe zum Beispiel auch mit unserer Außenministerin schon darüber gesprochen, dass wir demnächst einmal als Österreicher eine Reise dorthin machen werden, um die Beziehungen zu verbessern.

Wirtschaftlich bewegt sich in diesem Land sehr viel. Das ist nicht nur aufgrund der zahlreichen Bodenschätze so, sondern dieses Land ist tatsächlich ein wohlhabendes Land. Die Menschen vor Ort sind sehr gebildet, und ich denke, es ist nur logisch, dass wir ein besonderer Partner für Chile sein können.

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, quisiera en primer lugar felicitar al ponente, señor Tannock, por la excelente Recomendación que presenta hoy al Pleno.

Chile es un socio positivo y activo de la Unión Europea. Se encuentra ya vinculado por un Acuerdo de Asociación, que ha funcionado, en nuestra opinión, excelentemente. Yo creo que tenemos que dejar a cada país que fije cómo explota sus recursos naturales. Ya hemos tenido algunas experiencias sobre la propiedad pública o privada de los medios de producción, y lo que nos encontramos en los países de Europa Central y Oriental al levantar la alfombra.

A mí me gustaría decir que Chile es un país que participa activamente en la región; es miembro destacado de la Organización de Estados Americanos; es miembro fundador de la Alianza del Pacífico; es miembro de Unasur; es el primer país latinoamericano que ha accedido a la OCDE y es miembro también del Grupo de Lima. Por lo tanto, es un socio fiable para la Unión Europea a la hora de afrontar los retos globales y regionales.

De todas las iniciativas que sugiere el señor Tannock para reforzar la cooperación con este país, me ha llamado la atención particularmente lo que se refiere a los ámbitos de seguridad y de defensa y, en ese sentido, todo lo que se refiere a las operaciones de gestión de crisis y de mantenimiento de la paz, sobre la base de la ya experiencia positiva que hemos tenido con este país.

Señor comisario, me gustaría mandarle un mensaje para tratar de dinamizar un poco estos trabajos: la próxima ronda con la Comisión para el acceso al mercado está fijada en el mes de octubre; usted ha dicho que Chile ha sido el primer país en concluir un acuerdo asociación con la Unión Europea. No nos gustaría que fuera el último en concluirlo.

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señora presidenta, yo me sumo a las ideas que establece el comisario a favor de que América Latina y Europa tienen mucho que hacer juntas. Estoy totalmente de acuerdo. Con Chile en particular, también. Yo querría destacar dos ideas que son claves en este acuerdo.

En primer lugar, me parece importantísimo que Europa sea capaz de considerar la importancia de la plataforma de Chile hacia Asia. El mundo económico europeo y, desde luego, las empresas europeas tienen mucho que hacer en Asia a través de la Alianza del Pacífico, y el acuerdo con Chile es clave en esa dirección.

Y, en segundo lugar, yo me incorporo a la idea de que los acuerdos son buenos: los acuerdos comerciales y políticos son buenos en sí mismos y hay que fomentarlos; con países amigos como Chile, más todavía. Ahora, hay que hacerlos bien. Hay que aprovechar esta negociación para hacer un acuerdo mejor; un acuerdo que establezca condiciones en materia de derechos humanos, de estándares laborales, etcétera, favorables, avanzados, progresistas y al mismo tiempo que nos permitan que ese acuerdo sea en favor de los Estados, no de los inversionistas. Por eso hay que hacer buenos acuerdos y hay que hacerlo bien en el caso de Chile.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, con questa risoluzione sulla modernizzazione e attualizzazione dell'accordo di associazione UE-Cile il Parlamento europeo chiede giustamente di migliorare la cooperazione in settori che riteniamo importanti, quali quelli legati ai diritti umani, all'implementazione degli accordi internazionali sul cambio climatico, delle convenzioni dell'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro, al rispetto dei diritti sociali dei lavoratori e delle lavoratrici, delle donne, delle persone LGBTQI.

Nella recente risoluzione approvata dalla commissione per il commercio internazionale e dal Parlamento sulla parte commerciale, per la prima volta viene sostenuta la creazione di un apposito capitolo di genere. Queste note positive e in primis la conferma delle buone relazioni con il Cile non possono però esimerci dal segnalare altre parti della relazione che non condividiamo, come gli obiettivi di ulteriore liberalizzazione dei mercati.

Non è certo l'apertura alla ferocia della concorrenza a definire la bontà e l'ambizione di un accordo, le buone relazioni fra paesi. Inoltre, sono necessari grande trasparenza e coinvolgimento della società civile nelle negoziazioni. Ci sembra fra l'altro molto inopportuna la richiesta inserita nella relazione di far diventare l'UE osservatrice dell'alleanza del Pacifico. Non crediamo che spetti all'Unione europea decidere quale tipo di integrazione debbono seguire i paesi latino-americani, con i quali abbiamo iniziato un importante percorso nell'ambito dei vertici UE-CELAC. Per queste ragioni ci asterremo.

Joëlle Mélin (ENF). – Madame la Présidente, le renforcement et la modernisation de l'accord d'association Union européenne-Chili relève de l'évolution normale de toute relation bilatérale. Évoluer au gré des événements politiques locaux, régionaux et, accessoirement, de données commerciales et diplomatiques régionales comme mondiales.

Dans ce cas de figure, il nous est proposé un texte portant certes sur des domaines fondamentaux, des relations internationales qui doivent être resserrées, mais aussi sur des données parfois dérisoires qui n'intéressent qu'une minorité de Chiliens, comme des considérations sur les orientations sexuelles.

Pour le reste, la situation chilienne, même si elle semble plus stable malgré une alternance politique régulière, révèle des points de fragilité, dont la situation des étudiants, toujours non réglée, le coût des matières premières, toujours très volatil, et le cas des peuples autochtones qui attendent leurs droits.

Enfin, l'adhésion du Chili au traité transpacifique, entre autres, doit nous alerter quant à la multiplicité des accords régionaux, qui risque de créer des incohérences dans les différentes coopérations internationales. Cela doit nous inciter à cerner avec beaucoup de précautions les champs d'action de l'association avec ce pays particulièrement proche.

Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, señorías, este informe llama a fortalecer considerablemente la cooperación entre dos socios de ideas afines, sobre la base de los valores y principios compartidos.

No debemos olvidar que es de suma importancia asegurar que el Acuerdo modernizado con Chile sea ambicioso, integral y equilibrado. La colaboración multilateral desempeña un papel importante en la promoción de la seguridad internacional y la lucha eficaz contra los desafíos regionales y mundiales, por lo que este Acuerdo debe prever la cooperación en materia de seguridad y defensa, la lucha contra la corrupción, el lavado de dinero y la evasión fiscal, entre otros temas, ya que constituye una parte importante de nuestras relaciones.

Del mismo modo, debe reflejar plenamente la naturaleza transformadora de la Agenda 2030 de Desarrollo Sostenible y el papel de la cooperación internacional al desarrollo para alcanzar los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Necesitábamos objetivos estratégicos que movilicen los recursos necesarios para alcanzarlos. Este Acuerdo modernizado tiene que tener el potencial para reforzar significativamente la relación existente y, además, debe basarse en una fuerte participación parlamentaria.

Aprovecho para unirme al llamamiento para que se aceleren las negociaciones sobre el Acuerdo, con el objetivo de permitir su ratificación por el Parlamento antes de que finalice la actual legislatura europea, lo que hace de él un socio clave para Europa, un país amigo. Este Acuerdo mejorado es bueno para ambas partes.

Constanze Krehl (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich habe die große Ehre, der Chile- Delegation des Europäischen Parlaments vorzustehen, und habe dabei eines sehr intensiv erlebt: Chile ist ein politisch stabiles Land, vielleicht das stabilste in ganz Lateinamerika. In den letzten Jahren hat es eine sehr gute, nicht nur wirtschaftliche, sondern auch politisch-demokratische Entwicklung genommen. Präsidentin Bachelet hat viele Reformen angestoßen, z. B. ein neues Wahlrecht, wodurch auch Frauen sich nun stärker an der aktiven Politik beteiligen können, eine Steuerrechtsreform, Reformen der Ausbildung, sie hat eine Rentenreform begonnen und eine neue Verfassung nach Pinochet in die Wege geleitet.

Ich selbst habe erlebt, dass im Zuge der Diskussion um die Modernisierung des Assoziierungsabkommens zum Beispiel *Gender* sehr viel stärker von den Chilenen eingebracht worden ist, der Dialog mit der Zivilgesellschaft viel stärker und viel besser funktioniert als jemals zuvor. Wir sollten als Europäisches Parlament genau diese Entwicklung unterstützen, und ich unterstütze tatsächlich die Forderung danach, dass dieses Europäische Parlament noch über diese Modernisierung des Assoziierungsabkommens entscheiden kann.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, Chile es un actor clave para la Unión. Su colaboración en el proceso de paz de Colombia, su participación en las conversaciones de Santo Domingo y su implicación en la misión EUFOR Althea en Bosnia muestran su compromiso con la comunidad internacional.

Es necesario reforzar la cooperación entre la Unión Europea y Chile en todos los campos: economía, comercio, educación y en los valores compartidos de democracia y derechos humanos. Pero es necesario insistir en el refuerzo de la cooperación en seguridad, en la lucha contra el narco, el terror y el crimen organizado; la cooperación en seguridad y defensa en lo que respecta a la prevención de conflictos; la gestión de crisis; la seguridad marítima, el desarme y la no proliferación son también muy necesarios. La lucha contra la corrupción, el lavado de dinero y la evasión fiscal son también parte importante de nuestras relaciones.

Finalmente, cuando China y Rusia están penetrando tanto en América Latina, es necesario que socios que comparten valores refuercen sus relaciones y sus compromisos.

Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández (S&D). – Señora presidenta, Chile es un país pequeño pero muy relevante política y comercialmente y del que también tenemos muchas cosas que aprender, como el ejemplar proceso de traspaso de poderes tras unas elecciones. Compartimos vínculos y somos socios a nivel regional y global en defensa de los mismos principios y valores que hoy son precisamente más necesarios que nunca.

Mantenemos unas excelentes relaciones bilaterales, pero el mundo ha cambiado mucho desde que entró en vigor el Acuerdo actual y necesitamos modernizarlo. Pero no cualquier acuerdo, un acuerdo como pide este Parlamento, que sea ambicioso, integral y equilibrado, que fortalezca el diálogo y la cooperación ante los desafíos globales que compartimos, en cooperación científica, técnica, ante el cambio climático, en defensa de los derechos humanos, en defensa de los derechos de los pueblos indígenas y, desde luego, de la igualdad de género.

Pero creo que la negociación por parte de la modernización del pilar político y de cooperación adolece de transparencia. Este Parlamento debe tener acceso a todos los textos de la negociación, siendo fundamental el papel de la Comisión Parlamentaria conjunta en su seguimiento. Y debemos garantizar la implicación y la participación de la sociedad en todo el proceso de negociación y en su implementación. Esperamos que tengan en cuenta estas recomendaciones.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, Chile es un país importante que dispone de sólidas instituciones democráticas y de una economía próspera. Las relaciones de la Unión Europea con Chile no han hecho más que crecer desde la firma del Acuerdo de Asociación en 2002. Se incrementaron los intercambios comerciales y también las inversiones. Ahora se trata de modernizar y ampliar el Acuerdo. Me gustaría que en 2018 podamos terminar las negociaciones, y la Reunión Ministerial UE-Celac de julio, en Bruselas, podrá ser una ocasión para impulsarlas.

Si a los acuerdos con México, Centroamérica y Cuba y al Acuerdo Multipartes sumamos el de Chile y el posible acuerdo con Mercosur, tendríamos una vasta red de acuerdos con los países de América Latina que reforzarán las relaciones entre los dos continentes. No olvidemos que está creciendo mucho la presencia de China en América Latina.

Compartimos con Iberoamérica valores y principios. Somos aliados naturales, como ha dicho Charles Tannock con toda razón. Y termino, convendría que en la dinámica Alianza del Pacífico, donde se encuentra Chile, la Unión Europea pudiera participar como observadora, como ya hacen países europeos, entre ellos España.

(„Catch the eye” eljárs.)

Javier Couso Permuy (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, la Recomendación sobre la negociación del Acuerdo de Asociación modernizado con Chile, como es habitual en este tipo de acuerdos, habla de la cooperación en materia de derechos humanos y, en particular, anima a Chile a encontrar una solución al conflicto con el pueblo nativo mapuche.

La comunidad mapuche en Chile lucha por su reivindicación como pueblo originario y por el reconocimiento de sus tierras ancestrales, frente al rechazo del Gobierno chileno al derecho fundamental, amparado por las Naciones Unidas, a la descolonización. La represión del Gobierno chileno contra los pueblos originales se ve recrudecido por el Plan Araucanía, ese llamado Acuerdo Nacional, que ahonda más en el problema al criminalizar la lucha y equipararla con el terrorismo.

La Unión Europea debería modernizar este Acuerdo, pero modernizarlo para que se respeten los derechos del pueblo mapuche y para lograr detener las abominables prácticas de algunas multinacionales europeas, que contribuyen a deforestar y a contaminar las tierras mapuches y que empujan a sus habitantes a la extrema pobreza y a la marginación.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, las relaciones bilaterales entre Chile y Europa son muy importantes. Por eso queremos llamar la atención en estas negociaciones sobre los derechos del pueblo mapuche, que tiene derecho a su autodeterminación política, económica, social y cultural.

Ya se lo dijimos al señor Piñera cuando estuvo en este Parlamento. Se lo dijimos claramente y le recordamos su compromiso en materia de derechos humanos, que fue incumplido. Le queremos recordar ahora también tres cuestiones.

Primero, no se puede asociar el conflicto mapuche con el terrorismo. Esta medida criminalizante ha quedado patente en la extrema militarización de la Araucanía, en la creación de una policía especial, en la continuidad del uso de testigos protegidos y, sobre todo, en la falta del cumplimiento del compromiso de Chile con el Convenio n.º 169 sobre pueblos indígenas y tribales de la OIT.

En segundo lugar, también le recordamos que estas comunidades en resistencia precisan diálogo y respeto, y no garrote como en tiempos de la dictadura.

Y por último, ¿dónde está el plan de lucha contra la pobreza infantil y de lucha contra la pobreza en general y los compromisos en materia de educación? En un acuerdo bilateral por supuesto que nos tenemos que hacer cargo de los compromisos en materia de derechos humanos.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Señora presidenta, catorce años después de su entrada en vigor, la Unión Europea está a punto de renovar el Acuerdo de Asociación con Chile, un país amigo con el que siempre hemos compartido profundas raíces culturales y nuestro socio comercial más antiguo en América Latina.

Hoy renovar este Acuerdo significa reforzar el papel de Europa como socio clave de América Latina, en un momento en el que el liderazgo mundial de Estados Unidos es cada vez más incierto y en el que otros países, como China, están adquiriendo cada vez más influencia en la región.

Hay algunos puntos críticos: los derechos humanos y la protección de los pueblos indígenas. Me complace ver que ambos se abordan en el informe. La Unión Europea debe animar a Chile a resolver el problema mapuche, el pueblo de la Tierra, el único grupo étnico nativo de Sudamérica que ha sobrevivido extraordinariamente a la colonización europea, cuyas tierras han sido arrebatadas desde 1867 y ocupadas arbitrariamente por el Gobierno chileno, que está aún aplicando una ley de antiterrorismo de la época de Pinochet.

Por lo tanto, espero que el Acuerdo se renueve sobre esta base, que se extienda una mano amiga a este país amigo y que se establezca una relación equilibrada, que aporte beneficios tangibles a todos los ciudadanos de ambos lados del océano. Defendemos a los mapuches y su libertad.

(„Catch the eye” eljárás vége.)

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, this has really been a very useful exchange and I thank so much the honourable Members for their interventions. I would also like to congratulate again Mr Tannock on his report. From this debate I conclude that we all share a common interest in ensuring we conclude an ambitious, comprehensive and progressive-oriented modernised association agreement with Chile.

I also note a wide convergence of views between what the European Parliament wants to see in the modernised agreement and what we are currently negotiating. We will continue working with our services in the Member States to ensure all concerns expressed here today are conveniently addressed.

I would like to clarify something about the rights of the indigenous people. I can indicate that the issue has been touched upon in the context of the regular annual discussions on human rights between Chile and the EU and will continue to be addressed if there are reasons for concern.

May I close by signalling once again my appreciation for Parliament’s input in these negotiations, which will in turn contribute to a successful agreement.

Charles Tannock, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I too would like to thank the Commissioner for his kind words and in particular the words from the shadow rapporteurs and the various interventions from colleagues. I too am proud that the European Union’s Member States sent firefighters to Chile to help fight fires, that Chile welcomes refugees from the Maduro Venezuelan dictatorial regime and that Chile does scientific research jointly with the European Union’s Member States’ scientists under the Copernicus programme. These show what kind of mature and advanced country Chile really is.

The wider EU-Latin American cooperation project is also one which is a natural fit of like-minded continents with shared history, culture, and, largely, respect for democracy, with sad exceptions like Cuba and Venezuela. But Latin America, by and large, is a democratic continent; we need to respect that and we need to work closely with it.

I would just like to briefly mention my two amendments: Amendment 1, which is to change the word ‘dispute’ to the word ‘matters’. In my view, there is no conflict with the Mapuche people. I wish to soften the text by doing that. I hope that colleagues will support that.

In Amendment 2, I disagree with the intervention from my Green colleague. Access to water is, of course, a human right everywhere, but the economic model that is employed is a Chilean national sovereign matter, not for interference by the EU or by our report. Water companies are often privately owned within EU Member States, so it would be totally ridiculous for us to prescribe an economic model to Chile and interference in their domestic affairs. So please support Amendment 2.

Finally, thank you very much colleagues. It has been an interesting debate, and I think that Chile-EU relations will go from strength to strength.

Elnök. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra holnap, szerdán kerül sor.

12. Presentation of the annual report on human rights and democracy in the world 2017 and the EU’s policy on the matter (debate)

Elnök. – A következő pont a Bizottság alelnökének és az Unió külügyi és biztonságpolitikai főképviselőjének nyilatkozata az emberi jogok és a demokrácia világbeli helyzetéről szóló 2017. évi éves jelentés és az ezzel kapcsolatos uniós politika ismertetése (2018/2751(RSP)).

Christos Stylianides, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, human rights are about real people, each one with their own story to tell. In the last year we have constantly tried to show this: when we talk about principles and values we talk about human beings. When we work for human rights, we work to make a real difference to millions of lives around the world. This was the main focus of the campaign we launched to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and this is also the logic that drives the new annual report.

We live in a difficult moment for human rights around the world. In too many countries the situation has become worse, not better. This moment tells us that progress can never be taken for granted, and this is why we should continue working for positive change.

But the report also shows that our action can make a real difference. Progress can happen, and it is happening in many parts of the world – thanks also to our commitment. For every violation of human rights, there are many more good stories to tell. For every criminal, there are many more human rights defenders.

In this fight for justice, we know where we stand. And the report I am presenting today on behalf of the High Representative shows what our commitment means in practice. It maps our work firstly to strengthen democracy. Secondly, to end the death penalty. And thirdly, to support the rights of minorities. These are just a few examples.

Let me say a few words on the structure of the report. Last year you recommended making the report more readable and publishing it without delay. So this year we have decided to focus on thematic issues and use country-specific examples, rather than going through each country one by one.

Country reports now feature on our website so that the process is still transparent but also much faster. With the report we do not only want to provide a picture of the activities we do, but also to show our impact and give concrete examples, once again to show that human rights are not only about international law – the strictly legalistic approach – they are about people's lives and they are the foundation of more solid societies.

The report, for instance, mentions the cases of violence against vulnerable children in Fortaleza, Brazil, that have been cut by two thirds thanks to our support. And Federica Mogherini has just come back from Jordan, where she took part in the graduation ceremony for over 100 Syrian refugees who were able to finish university thanks to our financial support. But let me also mention the first ever election observation mission that we deployed in The Gambia to accompany the country's extraordinary path from dictatorship towards a truly inclusive democracy.

I would like to thank in particular the EU Special Representative for Human Rights, Stavros Lambrinidis, who has contributed to many of these 'good human rights stories' and for making them more visible. 'Good human rights stories' is the name of a new initiative to be launched at the UN General Assembly high level week in September. The aim is to show, together with a broad alliance of countries from across the globe, examples of where positive human rights practices have made fundamental changes to individual lives, communities and societies.

In the coming year we will be celebrating these stories. They show where strong human rights protection frameworks have been put in place, where communities have been made stronger through the work of civil society organisations and where countries have shown that poverty reduction and sustainable development can be achieved hand-in-hand with making progress in human rights.

Stavros Lambrinidis is also putting into practice one of the main ideas from our human rights action plan: the need to engage with all actors at all levels, because only through engagement can we improve the human rights' situation around the world.

Last year we published the mid-term review of the EU action plan. The review showed an encouraging trend concerning human rights dialogues, which are gaining in legitimacy and exerting a more positive impact on third countries. Again, this should only reinforce our commitment to engaging constantly with our interlocutors, particularly where and when human rights are not respected.

In this respect our European Union delegations around the world are at the forefront of our daily work. Our staff in delegations monitor and follow up on cases of human rights violations. They meet with the lawyers of jailed human rights defenders and attend trials as observers. And they lead local dialogues on human rights with the national authorities. They are very often the face of the European Union in the world, and it is also thanks to their work that we are known as a credible and reliable force for democracy and human rights.

This is not an easy moment for fundamental rights, democracy and human rights defenders. In a moment like this, it would be easy to fall into cynicism and despair. We must continue to critically assess our own approach and adjust, where necessary. The scrutiny of this Parliament is indispensable in this regard. But as we do this, we must also keep in mind all the progress we have achieved together, and all the lives that have improved thanks to the European Union's commitment.

There is always hope, even in difficult times like these. And precisely in difficult times like these we must redouble our efforts.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, je salue le travail fait en 2017 en matière de promotion des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie dans les quatre coins du monde par les institutions de l'Union européenne.

Ce travail est résumé dans le rapport annuel adopté par le Conseil il y a quelques semaines. Je salue aussi le nouveau format du rapport, plus court et plus concis. J'ai été particulièrement satisfait, à sa lecture, du fait que la promotion de la démocratie occupe une place plus importante, tout comme du travail que les institutions européennes et nos délégations dans des pays tiers réalisent au jour le jour. J'ai milité pour cela tout au long de ce mandat et surtout quand j'ai été rapporteur du Parlement sur le rapport annuel.

En effet, j'estime que nous ne pouvons en aucun cas imaginer une situation où les droits de l'homme seraient respectés en l'absence d'un cadre démocratique bien établi.

En 2017 encore, nous avons pu constater comment des régimes autoritaires bafouent les droits les plus élémentaires de leurs citoyens. Je pense aux Vénézuéliens, dont la liberté d'expression est remise en cause et dont les droits économiques et sociaux n'existent tout simplement plus. Dans ce même sens, je pense à Cuba, mais aussi à la Corée du Nord, vers laquelle les yeux de la planète se tournent aujourd'hui en oubliant que c'est une des pires dictatures de l'histoire.

De plus, en 2017, un certain nombre de dirigeants se sont tournés vers le mirage de l'autoritarisme, comme en Turquie.

Par rapport à tous ces cas, je crois que nous devons continuer à agir et redoubler d'efforts de concert avec nos États membres.

Elena Valenciano, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señora presidenta, yo también saludo el trabajo y los esfuerzos hechos en la defensa de los derechos humanos en el mundo por las instituciones de la Unión Europea; desde luego el trabajo de la alta representante y también del señor Lambrinidis.

Yo no voy a caer en el pesimismo de decir que los derechos humanos retroceden. Es verdad que depende mucho de las regiones y que nuestro esfuerzo siempre es bienvenido fuera de las fronteras de la Unión Europea. Lo que sí digo es que tenemos un problema de coherencia. El comisario decía: no es un buen momento, no son buenos tiempos para la defensa de los derechos humanos, del derecho internacional, de los derechos fundamentales. No lo es; es verdad que no lo es y que hay regiones enteras del mundo que están cayendo en el cuestionamiento de los derechos fundamentales, de la universalidad de los derechos humanos.

Eso es así, y tenemos líderes políticos muy importantes que defienden este cuestionamiento de los valores fundamentales. Por eso la Unión Europea tiene que reforzar su trabajo; pero, claro, también nosotros enviamos mensajes muy negativos ¿no?, y estoy pensando en la última decisión del Gobierno italiano de mantener fuera de sus aguas a un barco cargado de personas que sufren y necesitan ayuda; o algunas de las actuaciones y decisiones del presidente Orban. Es decir, es muy difícil dar lecciones al resto del mundo sobre derechos humanos cuando nosotros mismos incumplimos de manera tan flagrante los principios fundamentales, como el caso de Italia ayer mismo.

Y yo no creo que sea Salvini el único responsable, ni Orban; yo creo que somos todos. Y aquellos que se sientan en el Consejo Europeo con Salvini y con Orban tienen la responsabilidad de señalar la irresponsabilidad que suponen esas actuaciones y hasta qué punto cuestionan nuestro papel en el mundo, que es un papel fundamental y que creo que la Unión Europea está haciendo bien.

Monica Macovei, în numele grupului ECR. – Doamna președinte, trăim o perioadă neagră pentru jurnalismul de investigație și pentru presa liberă. Sunt abuzuri, violențe, tortură, presiuni și s-a ajuns și la crimă. Daphne și Jan au fost uciși pentru că purtau această luptă împotriva corupției, criminalității și mafiei. Tocmai ca jurnalist de investigație și dezgro-pând toată mizeria politicienilor. Adevărul nu trebuie plătit cu viața. Adevărul trebuie aplaudat și premiat.

Un pericol împotriva acestor jurnaliști de investigație sunt procesele deschise în alte țări, în alte jurisdicții, împotriva jurnaliștilor, pentru că asta îi intimidează, costurile sunt foarte mari, nu fac față și riscă să ajungă la faliment sau să renunțe la tot ce au pentru astfel de procese. Au început să se practice aceste procese împotriva jurnalistului de investigație. Singura soluție este să modificăm și să adoptăm o legislație modernă *anti-SLAPP*, cum se numește în engleză, pentru aceste procese deschise în alte jurisdicții la nivelul Uniunii Europene, și asta cât mai repede.

Petras Auštrevičius, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Madam President, this year, while celebrating 70 years of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we all must admit that justice and dignity across the globe are severely threatened. Therefore, I see this Commission report as a good stock-taking exercise, which is giving us an opportunity to identify the existing loopholes in our human rights policy and adjust it accordingly so that the situation can actually be improved.

2017 was marked by ongoing conflicts and humanitarian catastrophes, terrorism and radicalisation, as well as a tighter grip of authoritarian regimes on human rights defenders, civil society and populations in many parts of the world and even in European Union's vicinity.

In addition, in the EU itself, we have seen an unprecedented flow of fake news and propaganda, which have been used by governments and populists to spread anti-human-rights narratives, manipulate electoral processes and challenge liberal values.

We urgently need to intensify our efforts to keep human rights at the centre of Europe's Global Strategy and the EU's external action. To foster civil society and stand up for human rights defenders around the world, it is crucial to build human rights alliances regionally and internationally with our United Nations partners.

To resist the regimes and governments violating human rights, all tools at the European Union's disposal must be applied with consistent resolve and determination. Real progress can only be achieved if human rights are never used as a bargaining chip in favour of EU or national economic and trade interests. Freedom and human rights are not for sale!

Barbara Lochbihler, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin! Der EU-Menschenrechtsbericht 2017 ist ein eindrucksvolles Dokument mit vielen sinnvollen und notwendigen Initiativen, gerade in einer Zeit des zunehmenden *backlash* bei Menschenrechtsschutz, Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Demokratieförderung. Die fortlaufenden und sich verstärkenden Angriffe auf die Unabhängigkeit und Arbeitsfähigkeit der Zivilgesellschaft und von Menschenrechtsverteidigern erfordern erhöhte Aufmerksamkeit. Gerade das *Protect Defenders Programme* sollte unbedingt weitergeführt und ausgebaut werden.

Im Hinblick auf die aktuelle Diskussion um die Finanzierung und Zusammenführung der außenpolitischen Instrumente möchte ich betonen, wie wichtig die Eigenständigkeit des Europäischen Instruments für Demokratie und Menschenrechte ist. Dessen Wirksamkeit gerade in schwierigen politischen Kontexten darf nicht gefährdet werden.

Fachkompetente Stimmen aus der Zivilgesellschaft berichten von einem schleichenden Nachlassen der EU beim Menschenrechtsschutz. Diese Kritik höre ich nicht zum ersten Mal, und sie muss vom Europäischen Auswärtigen Dienst und der Kommission ernst genommen werden. So ist es zum Beispiel nicht hinnehmbar, dass das Partnerschaftsabkommen zwischen der EU und Ägypten im Jahr 2017 unterzeichnet wurde, obwohl der ägyptische Präsident während der Verhandlungsphase ein verschärftes NGO-Gesetz unterzeichnet hat. Das ist nur ein Beispiel von vielen, bei denen die EU an Glaubwürdigkeit verliert.

Nicht nur in der Handelspolitik, sondern ganz massiv auch in der Flüchtlingspolitik sehe ich im Jahr 2017 und auch heute die größten Defizite der EU, sich mit den Doppelstandards ihrer Menschenrechtspolitik auseinanderzusetzen und konsequent das Leben und die Rechte der Flüchtlinge an unseren Außengrenzen zu schützen. Ein ganz aktuelles Beispiel ist die Weigerung eines Mitgliedstaats, in Seenot geratene Flüchtlinge an Land gehen zu lassen. Dies zeigt, mit welcher wachsenden Selbstverständlichkeit Mitgliedstaaten und die EU wegschauen, wenn es um die Menschenrechte von Flüchtlingen geht.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Madame la Présidente, la lecture de ce rapport est toujours un grand moment tant il illustre «satisfecit» et «deux poids, deux mesures».

Loin de moi l'idée de dire que l'Union européenne ne fait rien, mais nous savons tous ici que globalement les droits de l'homme vont mal et que nombre d'entre eux régressent y compris, cela a été dit, dans l'Union européenne.

Quelques exemples, parlants me semble-t-il.

Entreprises et droits de l'homme: on sait combien les entreprises européennes bafouent les droits de l'homme dans le monde, combien il a été difficile pour l'UE de participer aux travaux de l'ONU sur la création d'un outil contraignant dans ce domaine, combien elle fait tout pour en minimiser la portée.

Idem pour les dialogues politiques sur ces questions avec l'Asie et l'Amérique du Sud. Ce sont les pays où les entreprises européennes sont en première ligne pour accaparer les terres et déforester. Le Brésil est cité en exemple, là où un tiers de la forêt amazonienne a été détruite, sans parler des populations locales déplacées, voire assassinées.

En quoi l'Union européenne a-t-elle fait évoluer les choses?

Il en est de même pour les efforts de soutien à la CPI. On cite une déclaration de la Haute Représentante de novembre 2017 sur la visite de M. El-Béchir en Ouganda, en Russie et au Tchad. Mais l'UE coopère avec le Soudan et le légitime au niveau international grâce au processus de Khartoum.

Et que dire du cynisme sur les politiques migratoires: on se félicite des vies humaines sauvées en oubliant les morts en Méditerranée, près de 15 000 en trois ans, dans le désert mais aussi sur le sol de l'Union européenne. Des personnes refoulées, expulsées, y compris vers des dictatures, telles que le Soudan.

Même chose encore quand on se félicite d'une déclaration de M^{me} Aung San Suu Kyi sur les Rohingyas et, plus drôle oserais-je dire, du dialogue sur les droits sociaux avec Cuba.

Tout cela manque de modestie, de réalisme et pour le moins d'un minimum de sens critique.

Marie-Christine Arnautu, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, cet attachement à la démocratie à travers le monde est remarquable, mais ici, au Parlement européen, il me semble prioritaire de nous préoccuper de la démocratie en Europe et, pour ma part a fortiori, en France.

En Europe aussi, les libertés sont bafouées. Les gouvernements hongrois et polonais, démocratiquement élus, défendent l'identité de leur peuple, vous les menacez.

Les Italiens portent au pouvoir deux partis soucieux des intérêts de leur peuple, les eurocrates appellent à ne pas respecter leur volonté.

Mais est-ce bien étonnant de la part d'une Commission présidée par M. Junker qui, pour faire plier la Grèce, affirmait qu'il ne saurait y avoir de choix démocratique contre les traités européens?

Au prétexte de lutter contre les *fake news* et les discours de haine, toute expression dissidente est censurée sur les réseaux sociaux.

En France, les identitaires notamment en ont fait l'amère expérience, tout comme Tommy Robinson en Angleterre, pour avoir dénoncé les méfaits de l'immigration.

Ce grave recul des libertés en Europe est profondément dangereux et pourtant vous le cautionnez et vous l'encouragez.

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se guardiamo la realtà, non possiamo non sottolineare che il movimento per i diritti umani è in crisi. Dopo decenni di conquiste, molti paesi sembrano aver fatto passi indietro. Molti leader populistici e uomini forti esprimono in modo sistematico un disprezzo totale nei confronti dei diritti umani e di chi li difende. Devo dire però che forse il movimento per i diritti umani non sembra trarre insegnamenti corretti dalle difficoltà. Oggi, nell'anno in cui ricorre il 70° della Dichiarazione universale, dobbiamo interrogarci come approcciare il tema, se intensificando le vecchie strategie o se invece allargando il campo.

Comprendiamoci: è indubbio che l'attivismo può smuovere le persone, ma se le cose che diciamo sugli obblighi morali avessero fatto la differenza il mondo oggi sarebbe in condizioni migliori. Noi che ci occupiamo e abbiamo a cuore i diritti umani dobbiamo chiederci cosa spinge così tante persone a votare uomini forti nel mondo e in Europa. A ben guardare, l'espansione delle politiche internazionali a favore dei diritti umani si è accompagnata al fenomeno economico che ha portato all'ascesa del populismo radicale e del nazionalismo. Non doveva andare così. Si presumeva che la Dichiarazione universale avrebbe avuto cura delle tutele sociali e invece la lotta per i diritti umani ha lasciato troppo sullo sfondo l'aspetto della cittadinanza sociale.

Ecco, se vogliamo indicare un campo più largo oggi, allora dobbiamo unificare sempre di più diritti umani e diritti sociali. Mentre saluto positivamente la relazione e il lavoro fatto da Federica Mogherini e da Stavros Lambrinidis, ritengo che dovremmo agire per un'agenda più ambiziosa, che sia capace di offrire valide alternative ai mali della nostra epoca.

Beatriz Becerra Basterrechea (ALDE). – Señora presidenta, señor comisario, hoy es un buen día para recordar algo muy sencillo: que los derechos humanos son los derechos de los seres humanos y que la mitad de los seres humanos en el mundo son mujeres.

Hoy es un buen día para recordar que muchas mujeres, como en Arabia Saudí, reclamaron un derecho, como el de conducir, y que están ahora en la cárcel. Hoy es un buen día para recordar la represión que sufren las mujeres iraníes que se han atrevido a quitarse el velo en público o para recordar a la egipcia Amal Fathy, arrestada por las autoridades de su país por hablar del acoso sexual en Facebook.

Hoy podemos recordar que la mutilación genital femenina sigue afectando a 30 países y a más de 200 millones de mujeres y niñas. O recordar que en El Salvador el aborto se castiga en todos los casos y que hay mujeres en prisión, incluso por abortos espontáneos. Recordemos todo esto hoy y cada día, porque es nuestra función llevar esperanza y garantizar los derechos a todas las mujeres en el mundo.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Madam President, we all want to see the state of democracy and human rights improve throughout the world and would wish the European Union could play an even stronger role in its promotion when dealing with third countries. However, there is a great need for consistency between EU internal and external actions. If we don't achieve coherence between what we do at home and what we would like others to do abroad, our capacity to achieve real change in the world is seriously hindered. Let me give you an example. Some of us will always remember that in 2017 a Member State of the European Union, Spain, used police violence to stop a vote – a democratic exercise in Catalonia and that, in the run-up to that vote and afterwards, the same Member State committed breaches of fundamental rights. And when that happened, the European Union basically looked the other way, instead of trying to defend EU's citizens' fundamental rights and Europe's core values.

It is therefore imperative for the European Union, and for the credibility of its external action, not to use double standards when it comes to democracy and human rights, whether inside or outside our borders.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, en un debate sobre los derechos humanos en el mundo es importante también que hablemos de lo que está pasando en Europa. Porque aquí las políticas de austeridad han afectado a los derechos básicos de la población, como la educación, la sanidad, la Seguridad Social o la vivienda.

Además, estamos siendo testigos de cómo el populismo punitivo se utiliza con la excusa del terrorismo y de la inmigración para generar un discurso del odio. De esta forma, la extrema derecha ha conseguido que sus discursos antiinmigración, antirrefugiados e islamófobos sean adoptados en muchos países por los principales partidos y, sobre todo y más preocupante, por gobiernos como el de Hungría o ahora también como el de Italia.

Tenemos también países europeos que continúan aplicando legislaciones que permiten detenciones sin cargos ni juicios y, con la excusa de la seguridad, normalizan la represión y la restricción del derecho a la manifestación o la libertad de expresión. Estamos ante una involución autoritaria de nuestras democracias, de la cual Valtouros o Alsasua son claros ejemplos.

No seamos hipócritas, no exijamos a terceros países lo que no cumplimos en los nuestros. Esforcémonos en respetar en Europa los derechos humanos y la libertad de expresión.

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Es ist noch nicht lange her, da standen die Menschenrechte im Mittelpunkt der internationalen Politik, und kein Staat wagte, dagegen zu argumentieren. Heute sieht das ganz anders aus: Viele sehen das als *nice to have*, manche Staaten machen sich sogar offen lustig darüber. *Human rights* NGOs werden in ihrem Bewegungsspielraum eingeengt und ihre Aktivisten verfolgt – immer häufiger und immer dreister. In einer solchen Welt ist es wichtig, dass nicht alle diesem Zeitgeist nachgeben.

Die Europäische Union ist mittlerweile der wichtigste globale Akteur auf dem Gebiet der Menschenrechte; die europäische Außenpolitik ist auf deren Einhaltung zentriert. Wir haben eigene Instrumente entwickelt, und unsere Delegationen sind überall auf der Welt zu Hotspots für Menschenrechtskämpfer geworden. Das alles sollte uns aber nicht zur Selbstzufriedenheit verleiten. Wir müssen uns noch mehr anstrengen, wir müssen unsere Instrumente verbessern, die Mitgliedstaaten mehr einbinden, und wir müssen nach Verbündeten suchen. Vor allem aber gilt es, weltweit die Selbstheilungskräfte – und das ist die Zivilgesellschaft – zu stärken.

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). – Madam President, if not the EU, then who would lead on protecting and promoting universal human rights in the world? In this room, during this debate, I doubt anyone questions the need to uphold values and principles. But looking at the practice, a more troubling picture emerges: ‘migration management’ or ‘countering terrorism’ are increasingly blanket excuses to turn a blind eye to the rights of people. And privatised law enforcement, where private companies are filtering what people can and cannot see online without oversight, is another area to watch out for.

I think it is essential that we don't fall into the trap of the short-term populist objectives, also with an eye on the new MFF. For Europe, interests such as security and values such as human rights protection should never be traded off because they overlap. So I urge for more political leadership that is unequivocal and that is not traded away at difficult moments.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, o respeito pelos direitos humanos no mundo, no último ano, conheceu acabrunhantes retrocessos. Para eles também contribuíram, lamentavelmente, contradições, disfunções e políticas perversas da União Europeia, que nos descredibilizam.

Em países grandes e pequenos onde a União tem influência, como a Etiópia ou o Barém, porque se calou diante de abusos sistemáticos, incluindo tortura, prisões arbitrarias, massacres. Ou como no Sudão, ou Myanmar, porque financiou e cooperou com governos que vivem de violar os direitos humanos. Porque deixou escalar na Síria, e noutros locais, os conflitos onde chega até, é o caso da Síria, sem saber ou querer, a financiar equipamento militar do regime de Erdogan, que persegue cruelmente curdos, jornalistas e quaisquer opositores dentro e fora do país, o regime com o qual a União Europeia fez um negócio imoral sobre refugiados.

Ou na Palestina, onde a União se resigna diante da ocupação israelita, que, além de inviabilizar a solução de dois Estados, significa repressão e humilhação de todo um povo que já conta centenas de manifestantes pacíficos assassinados em Gaza só neste ano. Nestes e noutros casos, a nossa credibilidade está em causa. Como podemos ser credíveis a promover os direitos humanos no mundo se também não olhamos para dentro da União Europeia?

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND*Vizepräsident*

Andi Cristea (S&D). – Domnule președinte, anul 2017 a fost un an de referință în ceea ce privește activitatea globală a Uniunii Europene în domeniul drepturilor copilului, prin actualizarea liniilor directoare privind promovarea și protecția drepturilor copilului, care datează încă din 2007. Prea des, copiii sunt expuși abuzurilor specifice și, prin urmare, au nevoie de o protecție sporită. Munca în rândul copiilor, recrutarea acestora în conflicte armate și căsătoriile timpurii și forțate reprezintă în continuare probleme critice în anumite țări. De asemenea, un număr însemnat au nevoie de ajutor, în special în domeniul sănătății și al accesului la educație, apă și salubritate.

Consider că este esențial ca, la nivel european, să elaborăm un plan de acțiune pentru următorii ani prin care să acordăm prioritate drepturilor copiilor în cadrul politicilor externe ale Uniunii Europene. Uniunea Europeană are obligația morală să continue eforturile pentru a proteja copiii în fața violenței, abuzurilor și exploatării.

Francisco Assis (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o presente relatório constitui uma útil radiografia da situação dos direitos humanos e da democracia no mundo. Dos avanços alcançados, mas também dos retrocessos verificados. Temos assistido, por exemplo, a um agudizar da repressão dos defensores dos direitos humanos com um aumento do número de homicídios destes ativistas em vários países; temos também constatado, infelizmente com grande preocupação, uma hostilização crescente da sociedade civil por parte diferentes governos, através de leis que dificultam as atividades das suas organizações ou até que as criminalizam com base em interpretações abusivas do próprio conceito de terrorismo.

O contexto internacional é exigente e as instituições europeias têm de estar à altura das suas responsabilidades. A União Europeia deve ser cada vez mais atuante e deve reforçar a exemplaridade do seu comportamento. Por exemplo, a União Europeia deve aumentar o nível de exigência no que toca às suas responsabilidades extraterritoriais quando estão em causa empresas ou investidores europeus cujas operações negligenciam os direitos humanos em países terceiros.

A verdade é que milhões de pessoas, cujos direitos humanos são desrespeitados em diversos pontos do mundo, muitas vezes vislumbram ainda na União Europeia uma última esperança de alcançarem algum apoio e alguma proteção. A nossa responsabilidade é correspondermos às expectativas dessas pessoas.

Cécile Kashetu Kyenge (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, anche nel 2017 i diritti umani sono rimasti al centro dell'azione esterna dell'Unione europea. Abbiamo lavorato per l'affermazione su scala mondiale degli stessi principi che hanno ispirato la creazione dell'Unione: democrazia, Stato di diritto, rispetto dei diritti umani e fondamentali, principi di uguaglianza e di solidarietà.

Abbiamo lavorato affinché questi principi trovassero una collocazione all'interno di tutte le politiche, soprattutto quelle con una forte dimensione esterna. Mi riferisco, in particolare, alle politiche in materia di sviluppo, commercio, migrazione. Ma il 2017 ha segnato anche una tappa molto importante per quanto riguarda il riconoscimento dei diritti dei minori, suggellata anche dalla comunicazione della Commissione sulla protezione dei minori migranti.

Se l'Unione vuole essere credibile nel suo ruolo guida di sostenitore della promozione e della protezione dei diritti umani sulla scena mondiale, deve anche essere pronta a sanzionare quegli Stati che vi si oppongono sia all'interno che all'esterno delle sue frontiere.

Wajid Khan (S&D). – Mr President, every year we evaluate the situation of human rights and democracy in the world. It is upsetting to admit that not only are we making insufficient progress, but we are also going in the opposite direction. We are witnessing a growing number of attacks against human rights defenders, as well as a reduced space for civil society organisations. Many governments have introduced repressive laws to curtail basic freedoms for citizens.

In front of an increasingly challenging international context, the EU stands as the leading human rights actor. The first review of the EU action plan has shown positive results in mainstreaming human rights in our external action. The next step is to make sure that each international agreement includes a human rights clause so that companies based in third countries, as well as in Europe, comply with international standards. In this regard, the EU has a responsibility to act and be a global leader. We cannot let non-democracies take the lead and impose their anti-rights agenda. Now, more than ever, we need to be at the forefront of the promotion of human rights and steer the wheel in the right direction. I know the Commissioner is a very passionate ambassador of human rights. I'm sure he'll do a great job.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Az Európai Unió egy olyan térségként tűnik fel a világban, amely magas szinten biztosítja az emberi jogokat, és amely ezt várja el partnereitől is. Az emberi jogok mindenkit megilletnek, azokat is, akik menedéket keresnek nálunk az üldöztetés elől, és egy olyan országból jönnek, ahol nemhogy emberi jogaikat nem biztosítják, hanem az életük is veszélyben van. Ez azonban nem jelenti azt, hogy nem szeretnénk megtartani Európát annak a helynek, ahol a bűnszínház, vallása vagy etnikai származása miatt nem érhet diszkrimináció senkit sem, és ahol a nők a férfiak egyenjogúságát nem vonják kétségbe.

Az emberi jogok az európaiakat is megilletik, és ha a mi fogalmainktól eltérő társadalmi normákat valló személyek érkeznek, azoknak alkalmazkodniuk kell ahhoz a modellhez, amelynek mentén mi szervezzük az életünket, és amelyre felépítettük az Európai Uniót is. Meggyőződésem, hogy az emberi jogok biztosításához is elsősorban törvényes rendre és ennek betartására van szükség, másképpen nem maradhat Európa az emberi jogok biztosításának éllovasa.

Κώστας Μαυρίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, αυτή η έκθεση αφορά την προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων σε τρίτες χώρες. Φυσικά η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση οφείλει να είναι ο θεματοφύλακας των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων χωρίς διακρίσεις, διότι εκείνο που μας διαφοροποιεί ανά την υφήλιο είναι το γεγονός ότι τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα είναι το θεμέλιο της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Λυπάμαι όμως να παρατηρήσω ότι, ενώ έχουμε άποψη για την Ουγκάντα, για τη Λατινική Αμερική, για τη Ρωσία, δυστυχώς κάνουμε διακρίσεις στον τρόπο που χειριζόμαστε χώρες. Και θα είμαι απόλυτα ειλικρινής με ένα συγκεκριμένο παράδειγμα: η αναξιοπιστία, για να μην πω ίσως και η υποκρισία, της Επιτροπής φαίνεται από τον τρόπο που διαχειρίζεται την Τουρκία. Δυστυχώς η Επιτροπή δεν εκπροσωπεί τα συλλογικά συμφέροντα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με σωστό τρόπο. Για να συγκαλύψει την Τουρκία, την «πακετοποίησε» μαζί με επτά χώρες από τα Βαλκάνια, ενώ στην πραγματικότητα βρίσκεται σε ενταξιακό καθεστώς και έπρεπε να τηρεί αυστηρά τους νόμους και τους κανονισμούς της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Dank u wel, Voorzitter. Wij zijn allemaal bezorgd over de toenemende mate waarin mensenrechten, rechtsstaat en democratische waarden nog altijd bedreigd worden. En de EU wil terecht de universaliteit van de mensenrechten en fundamentele vrijheden in haar extern beleid bevorderen.

Maar we hebben een probleem, commissaris. We hebben een probleem met onze geloofwaardigheid en onze slagkracht, als we intern niet toepassen wat we extern propageren. Ik was zelf getuige hoe in Catalonië brutaal en buitensporig politiegeweld werd gebruikt tegen vreedzame kiezers. Politici en leiders van de burgerbeweging zitten gevangen, ver van huis, sommigen al zeven maanden, als politieke gevangenen. De EU is een vrijhaven voor wie vervolgd wordt aan de andere kant van de aarde en dat is goed.

Maar voor Catalaanse en dus Europese burgers, wier democratische rechten repressief beknot worden, is de EU maar weinig solidair. En dat ondermijnt onze geloofwaardigheid. En het is een van de redenen waarom het vertrouwen in dit Europese verhaal ernstig onder druk staat.

Patricija Šulin (PPE). – Poročilo o človekovih pravicah in demokraciji v svetu za leto 2017 je pomembno za poglobljen pregled stanja na tem področju. Če se oddaljimo od demokracije in zavzemanja za človekove pravice, se bomo podali na napačno pot.

Akcijnski načrt za človekove pravice in demokracijo, ki ga je sprejela Evropska unija za obdobje 2015-2020, je potrebno prilagoditi učinkovitejšim politikam Evropske unije na tem področju – tudi z državami zunaj Evropske unije.

Uveljavljanje človekovih pravic žensk, otrok in manjšin mora ostati v ospredju. Želim opozoriti na trgovanje z ljudmi, ki je globalen pojav in dobiva večje razsežnosti. Na tem področju bi morali storiti več.

Za doseganje ciljev na področju človekovih pravic je zelo pomemben instrument za demokracijo in človekove pravice, ki podpira organizacije in združenja ter posameznike, ki se zavzemajo za človekove pravice in temeljne svoboščine.

Za obdobje 2014-2020 so namenjena sredstva v višini 1,3 milijarde evrov, ki bi jih morali natančneje ...

(Predsedujoči je govornico prekinil.)

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η προστασία των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων και της δημοκρατίας σε όλο τον κόσμο πρέπει να γίνεται με πράξεις και όχι με λόγια. Το να υπάρχει μόνο μια έκθεση με ευκολόγια δεν λέει τίποτε. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να βγάλει συμπεράσματα και να επιβάλει κυρώσεις.

Kai αναφέρομαι ξεκάθαρα στην Τουρκία, η οποία παραβιάζει τα δημοκρατικά δικαιώματα, παραβιάζει τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Ο Ερντογάν έχει βάλει τη μισητή Τουρκία στη φυλακή και απλά εδώ στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο ακούγονται λόγια, χαϊδέματα προς την Τουρκία. Πρέπει να επιβληθούν μέτρα, να υπάρξουν άμεσες κυρώσεις, να απαγορευθεί η πώληση στρατιωτικού εξοπλισμού στην Τουρκία, να απαγορευθεί οποιαδήποτε δυνατότητα να δίνονται ευρωπαϊκά κονδύλια στην Τουρκία, να σταματήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων να δίνει χαμηλότοκα δάνεια στην Τουρκία, να σταματήσει κάθε προενταξιακή βοήθεια. Μόνο έτσι θα καταλάβει ο σουλτάνος!

Marijana Petir (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, gospodine povjereniče, 3666 kršćana ubijeno je u prošloj godini prema podacima organizacije *Open Doors*. U 50 zemalja svijeta koje ova organizacija istražuje 250 milijuna kršćana izloženo je nekom obliku nasilja, od neprijateljstva ili diskriminacije pa do teškog fizičkog nasilja, i u konačnici ubojstva. To su strašne brojke koje govore o stvarnim prijetnjama kojima su kršćani diljem svijeta izloženi na dnevnoj bazi.

Svakodnevno razgovaramo o ljudskim pravima, no imam dojam da se prečesto bavimo temama koje izlaze izvan okvira temeljnih ljudskih prava i koje ne bi trebale biti u fokusu djelovanja Europske unije. Smatram kako bi se Europska unija trebala više baviti zaštitom ljudskih prava, posvetiti se zaštiti ljudi koji strahuju za svoj život, roditelja koji gube djecu, djece koja gube bezbrižno djetinjstvo, a pomoć drugih zemalja ne dopire do takvih područja. Pitanje jest: ako nećemo mi pomoći, tko će? I koja je naša uloga ako dopuštamo da se ljudska prava šutke krše?

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Christos Stylianides, Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank you for this indeed very fruitful debate in this extremely demanding field. I cannot agree more with the majority of the examples you mentioned. Also, I cannot agree more that maximising the efficiency of our tools in promoting and protecting human rights and democracy is of utmost importance. No doubt about this.

To achieve our ambitious goals of improvements for democracy and human rights across the globe, we have to ensure a strategic and systematic approach. I would like to focus on this because the majority of you also emphasised this: our systematic and strategic approach.

Finally, let me express my deep appreciation for the very constructive and enhanced cooperation with this House. In this challenging global context, I find it more important than ever to ensure that we all speak with one voice in upholding democratic values and the universality of human rights. I think it is quite important to insist on this in order to be more efficient and effective on the ground. My experience in many conflict areas around the world convinces me that this is the only way to improve the situation on the ground.

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 162 GO)

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), *per iscritto*. – Nella relazione si afferma che, nel 2017, la dimensione dei diritti umani, è stata integrata in tutte le aree dell'azione esterna dell'UE e che l'Europa ha giocato un ruolo leader, dei diritti umani, a livello globale. Certamente, sono stati compiuti degli sforzi, ma la situazione attuale appare tutt'altro che rassicurante. In Myanmar, una vera e propria campagna di omicidi di massa, stupri e violenze di vario genere ha costretto ben 655.500 Rohingya, a fuggire nel vicino Bangladesh, dall'agosto 2017. In Colombia, l'esercito e le imprese multinazionali, continuano a espropriare gli afro-colombiani delle loro terre, approfittando del vuoto lasciato dalla guerra civile. In Cina, le sparizioni forzate della minoranza turcofona degli Uiguri, sono drammaticamente aumentate nel 2017, con l'introduzione dei campi di «rieducazione» nella regione autonoma dello Xinjiang. Come i Rohingya, gli afro-colombiani e gli Uiguri, tanti altri popoli subiscono ancora oggi violenze, semplicemente per la loro etnia. Ma il 2017 è anche un anno da record per il numero di giornalisti incarcerati, di cui 153 solo in Turchia, e per gli attivisti uccisi: almeno 312. Un anno tragico, questo 2017. Cominciare ad ammetterlo è forse il primo passo per un approccio meno ipocrita, ma più costruttivo e realista.

Livia Járóka (PPE), *írásban*. – Ukrajnában elharapódtak az etnikai kisebbség ellenes atrocitások. Az utóbbi pár hónapban szélsőséges szervezetek több roma táborát támadták meg lakóikkal együtt. A rendőrség senkit sem tartóztatott le. Ukrajnában több százezer roma él, legtöbbjük mélyszegénységben, és naponta szembesülnek diszkriminációval, míg igazságszolgáltatáshoz való hozzáférésük rendkívül korlátozott.

Kérem a Bizottságot és a tagállamokat, hogy gyakoroljanak nyomást Ukrajnára, hogy lépjenek fel az ilyen atrocitások ellen, ítélik el azt és tegyék meg a megfelelő lépéseket az elkövetők felelősségére vonására és az ilyen típusú nacionalista szervezetek betiltására, ahogy ez Magyarországon is már megtörtént. Kérem a Bizottságot és a tagállamokat, hogy fokozott figyelmet szenteljenek a csatlakozásra váró országokra: A volt jugoszláv tagállamokban igen kényes a romák helyzete, nincsenek megfelelő jogi keretek a diszkrimináció ellen való fellépésre.

A leszakadó kisebbségek helyzete is aggasztó. Tűrheteretlenek és elfogadhatatlannak tartom, hogy ilyen esetek megtörténjenek Európában. Gazdasági lépésekkel, akár kisebbségvédelmi jogszabályokkal, de meg kell akadályozni az ilyen eseteket. Az Anti-gipsysm kifejezést az Európai Parlament és az Európai Bizottság is elismert fogalomként tartja számon. A soron következő európai romastratégiába mindenképp szervesen be kell építeni ezt a fogalmat, és cselekvési tervvel megerősíteni az ellene való küzdelmet.

Ilhan Kyuchyuk (ALDE), *in writing*. – Unfortunately, in 2017 we continue to witness a decline of human rights and civil society worldwide. It is important to note that in 2017, the EU remained a leading player in the universal promotion and protection of human rights at multilateral level, working in particular through the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) and the United Nations Human Rights Council (HRC). The EU strongly supports civil society space and the protection of human rights defenders, focused on reversing crackdowns and new restrictive laws on non-governmental organizations in certain countries, on releasing imprisoned human rights defenders and peaceful activists and on supporting their freedom to conduct their work in numerous concrete ways. However, it is necessary to witness progress in the promotion and protection of human rights and democracy in the next 2018 human rights and democracy report. To achieve this progress, the EU should strengthen its cooperation with all international and regional organisations working in both fields. Furthermore, we must continue our full political and financial support for advocates of liberty, democracy and human rights throughout the world.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE), *na piśmie*. – W kontekście debaty na temat rocznego sprawozdania dotyczącego praw człowieka i demokracji na świecie oraz polityki UE w tym zakresie chciałbym odnieść się do konferencji grupy PPE, która miała miejsce w Parlamencie Europejskim 5 czerwca i poświęcona została sytuacji społeczeństwa obywatelskiego na Białorusi. Fotografia, która wyłania się z relacji przedstawicieli społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, uzupełniona o interwencje laureata Nagrody Sacharowa w 2006 roku, pana Aleksandra Milinkiewicza, i profesora Andrew Wilsona, autora książki „Białoruś – ostatnia dyktatura w Europie”, podkreśla, że Białoruś jest dzisiaj innym krajem niż w 2010 lub 2014 roku.

Stary, czarno-biały paradygmat przeciwstawiający sobie społeczeństwo obywatelskie i państwo staje się stopniowo nieaktualny, społeczeństwo obywatelskie staje się coraz bardziej hybrydowe, a granica między organizacjami wspierającymi i zdecydowanie odrzucającymi reżim coraz bardziej się zaciera. Najważniejsza konkluzja, która nasuwa się po spotkaniu, podkreśla, że przede wszystkim nie można zapominać o organizacjach społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, realizując politykę unijną w zakresie praw człowieka. Ich przedstawiciele stanowią cenne źródło informacji, które nie są nacechowane politycznie, a odzwierciedlają nastroje zwykłych ludzi, do których skierowane jest unijne wsparcie. Dlatego nie należy wykluczać tej perspektywy w procesie negocjacji, nie tylko tych dotyczących praw człowieka i demokracji, ale także

rozmów dotyczących współpracy sektorowej.

13. **Corrigendum (Rule 231): see Minutes**

14. **Documents received: see Minutes**

15. **Georgian occupied territories ten years after the Russian invasion (debate)**

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärung der Vizepräsidentin der Kommission und Hohen Vertreterin der Union für Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zum Thema „Besetzte Gebiete in Georgien zehn Jahre nach der Invasion durch Russland“ (2018/2741(RSP)).

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, ten years after the war in 2008 in Georgia, we, as the European Union, have not stopped working for peace and for a true solution to the conflict. I thank this Parliament for having this debate today.

At the height of the war, the mediation of the European Union (you might remember that) prevented further escalation and ultimately resulted in a cessation of hostilities. Since then, the European Union has been a central actor in the process to manage the consequences of the conflict, to improve the lives of all people in the region and to find a lasting solution.

We have, as the European Union, a very special role to play, particularly because of our European Union monitoring mission to Georgia. To date, we are the only international monitoring presence in the field. The mission has fulfilled an indispensable function of stabilisation, to the benefit of all the communities afflicted by the conflict. The mission can currently count on over 200 civilian experts in areas adjacent to Georgia's breakaway regions. Its mandate is not only to monitor the stabilisation and normalisation processes but also to actively build confidence, reduce tensions and prevent new escalations.

As we work on the ground with the mission, we continue, also, to have a strong non-recognition policy. We continue to condemn Russia's recognition of Georgia's breakaway regions, and very recently the Syrian Arab Republic also announced that it would establish diplomatic relations with Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and we immediately condemned this move, together with the entire international community. It is a violation of international law and it will only make the resolution of the conflict more difficult to achieve.

We are also denouncing the steps taken by Moscow to consolidate what it calls new realities on the ground. Among other things, we do not accept Russia's military build-up in the breakaway entities and its construction of physical barriers on the dividing lines.

All our actions aim at improving the life of all people in the region. Together with the OSCE and with the United Nations, we continue to steer the Geneva international discussions to address the consequences of the conflict. The European Union special representative for the South Caucasus and the crisis in Georgia co-chairs these talks, with a focus on ensuring security and stability on the ground, as well as tackling humanitarian issues that impact on the life of the local population.

Progress in these discussions is limited, as you might know, in particular when they address improved modalities for security and stability, but also issues related to internally-displaced persons and refugees. In spite of this, the discussions have helped make the security situation on the ground relatively manageable. Above all, the discussions are an opportunity for us to remind participants – starting with the Russian authorities – that the situation is unsustainable and unacceptable. It is not only unacceptable for the violation of international law, but first and foremost for the impact it has on all the people in the two entities, elsewhere in Georgia and in the entire region.

Of course, our engagement with Georgia goes well beyond our monitoring mission and also well beyond the Geneva discussions. It is a true partnership – I would say friendship – a strong one, based on political association and development cooperation, on economic exchanges as well as on a strong friendship between our people. Our approach is to include the breakaway regions in our programmes in Georgia whenever this is possible. This is what we are doing, for instance, with our programmes on agriculture, on rural development and vocational training.

We are also assisting civil society initiatives in the entities. We support all initiatives that can help re-establish confidence between the sides, such as people-to-people contacts, dialogue processes and academic exchanges. All our actions within the two regions are fully coordinated – I would like to underline this, because I think it's a very important point – are fully coordinated and approved by the government of Georgia and in full line with the Georgian engagement policy.

In light of the recent peace initiative of the Georgian State Ministry of Reconciliation, we are now looking at the possibility of providing further support. For instance, there is a clear interest from the breakaway regions to increase trade with the rest of Georgia, but also with the rest of the region, and this would represent a major improvement for the life of local communities, and for all people in the wider region. We are also considering a mobility scheme for academics from the breakaway regions, and this could also be facilitated by the peace initiative I just mentioned.

Our policy is one of non-recognition but also of engagement with Abkhazia and South Ossetia, exactly in line with the approach of the Georgian Government. The conflict has impacted first and foremost on the people of these two regions. They're not free to explore the full economic potential of their lands; jobs and opportunities are lost, and beyond Abkhazia and South Ossetia, an entire region suffers from the consequences of the conflict.

So, ten years after the war, we do not and will not stop working: first of all for achieving a true solution, and secondly for all local communities, for their development and for their dignity.

Cristian Dan Preda, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, je suis très satisfait de la tenue de ce débat, qui vise à marquer les 10 ans de l'invasion russe du territoire géorgien.

Je suis aussi content que mon groupe, avec l'aide de quelques autres collègues, ait pu stopper les initiatives qui venaient de l'extrême-gauche et, il est vrai, de certains socialistes aussi, qui voulaient parler plutôt d'une guerre entre la Géorgie et la Russie, reprenant ainsi la rhétorique du Kremlin. Ce qui s'est passé en 2008 est bel et bien une invasion par la Russie du territoire d'un pays indépendant voisin, il faut le rappeler.

De plus, 10 ans après ces événements – il faut aussi le dire –, les Russes font tout sur le terrain pour annexer de facto l'Abkhazie et l'Ossétie du Sud, en violation de tous les principes du droit international. C'est bien sûr inacceptable et il faut se rappeler aussi le fait que, juste avant cette invasion, malheureusement, l'OTAN n'a pas pu prendre la décision d'inclure la Géorgie. La situation actuelle est un effet de ce manque de solidarité et d'intelligence politique.

Il faut aussi rappeler que la Russie de Poutine cherche à contrôler par la force militaire les pays qui l'entourent, comme à l'époque de l'Union soviétique. C'est pour cela qu'on a de vrais trous noirs dans la carte de l'Europe: en Transnistrie, territoire moldave, dans l'est de l'Ukraine et en Géorgie.

Victor Boştinaru, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, the occupation of the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia by Russia was the result of Georgia's NATO ambitions at the Bucharest Summit ten years ago. Georgia paid a high price for its aspiration but, in these ten difficult years, Georgia has managed to make incredible progress along its European integration path and, in particular, to visa liberalisation and the Association Agreement. This is the best sign that Russia did not manage to take Georgia and the Georgian people away from their dreams and will not manage to succeed with Ukraine. Ten years after, Georgia is a much stronger and more developed country, a model for the East European partners of our Union, and an example also in the way it deals with the occupied territories – especially with the initiative aimed at peace and reconciliation by the Georgian Government.

The S&D fully back the European path for Georgia and condemns all actions undertaken by Russia in undermining any prospect for peace, including the de facto integration of Abkhazia and South Ossetia into the Russian customs system, the referendum and the name change of South Ossetia and the military deals with the two regions. We also condemn Russian disinformation and hybrid war and we call on the EU to help our Georgian friends to face all these challenges and to take the lead towards a permanent solution guaranteeing Georgia's territorial integrity and sovereignty.

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

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI), ερώτηση «γαλάζια κάρτα». – Ευχαριστώ, κύριε συνάδελφε, που αποδέχαστε την ερώτησή μου. Είναι αλήθεια ότι καταδικάζουμε την επέμβαση της Ρωσίας στη Γεωργία. Καταδικάζετε επίσης και την επέμβαση και την εισβολή της Τουρκίας στην Κύπρο και την παράνομη κατοχή επί 44 χρόνια ενός τμήματος του νησιού;

Victor Boştinaru (S&D), *blue-card answer*. – Any violation of international law, any illegal occupation of a territory belonging to a sovereign state, should be condemned. This is why, definitely, we condemn the occupation of the northern part of Cyprus as well as we condemn any occupation, be it the two provinces of Georgia or Crimea, by Russia.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, during the Bucharest NATO summit, the future membership of Georgia was agreed. Five months later, Russia questioned this decision by the use of force and the occupation of territories of Georgia. Thanks to the rapid trip of CEE leaders, led by the late president of Poland, Lech Kaczyński, further Russian gains in Georgia were prevented.

Now we stand by Georgia. We support the country's European and transatlantic vocation, peace initiatives and the request for a sanctions list condemning and punishing the targeted killings of Russian citizens, in particular Otkhozoria and Tatunashvili. We also praise the EUMM role in Georgia. During two SEDE missions to Georgia we were also able to monitor territories adjacent to South Ossetia and Abkhazia, and we are very much concerned about the situation of people living there.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señor presidente, Georgia es el país más prometedor del Cáucaso. Es un país que camina firmemente en el camino de la democracia, sin duda. Y naturalmente que apoyo y respeto la integridad territorial de Georgia, como apoyo y respeto a la integridad territorial de Ucrania y también de Azerbaiyán.

Y este es el gran problema: todos estamos de acuerdo en respetar la integridad territorial, sin duda ninguna. Pero, ¿qué hemos hecho con el conflicto de Nagorno Karabaj? Hemos ido desde la declaración primera, que significa el respeto a la integridad territorial, a la última del mismo acuerdo de Madrid de Minsk, que habla del derecho a la autodeterminación.

Quiero recordar que las Asambleas autónomas, tanto de Osetia como de Nagorno Karabaj, aprobaron el no integrarse ni en Georgia ni en Azerbaiyán, y hemos creado un peligrosísimo dominó admitiendo en Nagorno Karabaj la deriva hacia la autodeterminación. Porque la pregunta resulta inevitable: si admitimos el derecho a la autodeterminación en Nagorno Karabaj, ¿qué ocurrirá posteriormente en Osetia o incluso en Crimea?

Todos estamos de acuerdo en declaraciones magníficas; estamos todos de acuerdo en que hubo una invasión; estamos todos de acuerdo en que hubo una agresión. Pero la realidad es que nuestra falta de concreción y de ser homogéneos en nuestras resoluciones ponen en peligro seriamente aquello que después apoyamos con declaraciones retóricas, como la misma declaración de la integración en la OTAN. En España decimos que hay amores que matan.

Heidi Hautala, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, certainly when we look back to 08.08.08 we can see that it was a turning point in the international order and it was a day when we should have realised that Russia was going to continue even more to violate countries which used to belong to the Soviet Union. We could see that in 2014 when the Crimea was illegally occupied and Russia started to support the war in the east of Ukraine. So I think we should have understood even better that 08.08.08 was a turning point and it should have been a wake-up call.

I believe that a very useful way of looking at these kinds of occupied regions in our Eastern neighbourhood is to take the human rights lens. What you see is that people living in these 'breakaway' or 'occupied' regions are denied their basic human rights. They have no chance to express their will and their wishes freely and they have no right to education in their native language. I think we have to praise the peace initiative that Georgia has undertaken, which is a step to a better future whereby they invite the people living in these occupied areas to enjoy certain human rights like health, education and so on.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Hohe Vertreterin! Ich will ganz klar sein: Wer in diesem Haus den Krieg Georgiens vom Sommer 2008 negiert oder in eine russische Invasion umdeuten will, der betreibt bewusst Geschichtsrevisionismus – Kollegin Fotyga und Kollege Dan Preda –, denn er bräuchte nur in den Bericht Tagliavini zu schauen.

Bleiben wir bei den Fakten: Gleich seinem ultranationalistischen Vorgänger Gamsachurdia hatte Saakaschwili einen Waffengang gegen die Abchasen und Südosseten mit dem Ziel angezettelt, sie der Zentralgewalt zu unterwerfen und zugleich ihrer historischen Identität zu berauben – in der Tradition des Zaren und auch der russischen Realität unter Stalin. In einer Region, wo die auf engstem Raum lebenden Völker noch heute die Form eines gemeinsamen Zusammenlebens nicht finden, ein abenteuerliches Unterfangen.

Ich lege Ihnen ans Herz: Gehen Sie entspannt mit der heutigen Fragestellung um, denn die politische Lage vor Ort ist positiver als hier dargestellt. Die in Tiflis, Tchinwali, aber auch in Moskau und Suchumi regierenden Eliten arbeiten daran, den Modus operandi von vor der Rosenrevolution wieder herzustellen, Handel und wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit zu entwickeln, die schwierigen Lebensbedingungen der Menschen zu verbessern. Obwohl die Grundfrage, in welcher Form die hier lebenden Völker in ihrer nationalen Identität zusammen leben können, ungelöst bleibt, geht es in kleinen Schritten – durchaus nicht frei von Widersprüchen – um eine Entspannung in den Beziehungen. Darüber sollten wir debattieren, und die besten Ressourcen von EAD und Europäischem Parlament einsetzen für die Beantwortung dieser Frage, damit die EU hierbei eine friedensstiftende Rolle spielen kann, einschließlich der Forderung an Moskau, endlich dem ICC beizutreten.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, l'histoire de l'Ossétie du Sud est tragique. Rappelons le génocide perpétré par le pouvoir géorgien en 1920, rappelons la suppression unilatérale de l'autonomie de l'Ossétie et de l'Abkhazie par le pouvoir géorgien en 1991, la guerre et le cessez-le-feu.

La volonté américaine, celle des présidents Clinton ou Obama, de couper l'Europe de la Russie a entraîné la Géorgie dans une agression militaire contre l'Ossétie du Nord avec une déroute de son armée. Ceci est un fait, nos témoins et nos renseignements en témoignent.

Chers collègues, Madame Mogherini, la politique de la Russie en Géorgie, c'est notre politique en Serbie avec le Kosovo avec moins de justice (le Kosovo fait partie historiquement de la Serbie), avec moins de violence (les Russes n'ont pas détruit la Géorgie comme nous avons détruit la Serbie).

Sommes-nous donc hypocrites au point de ne pas voir ces faits.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ακόμη και ο τίτλος της σημερινής συζήτησης είναι εντυπωσιακός, καθώς επιτυγχάνει να χωρέσει μέσα σε μια μικρή πρόταση τόσες πολλές ανακρίβειες. Μια μικρή ιστορική αναδρομή θα βοηθήσει ώστε να αποκαλυφθεί η αλήθεια: οι Δημοκρατίες της Νότιας Οσετίας και της Αμπχαζίας δημιουργήθηκαν κατά τη διάρκεια της πτώσης της Σοβιετικής Ενώσεως. Θεωρώ πως το δικαίωμα στην αυτοδιάθεση των λαών είναι αδιαμφισβήτητο. Όμως τότε η Κυβέρνηση της Γεωργίας επιτέθηκε εναντίον τους. Στη συνέχεια επιτεύχθηκε ανακωχή που διατηρούσε την ειρήνη υπό την επίβλεψη των ρωσικών στρατευμάτων. Όμως το 2003 οι χρηματοδοτούμενες από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ΜΚΟ οργάνωσαν πραξικόπημα με το οποίο ανέτρεψαν τη νόμιμη κυβέρνηση και στη θέση της τοποθετήθηκε ο καταδικασμένος πλέον στη Γεωργία και την Ουκρανία Saakashvili και ήταν αυτός που εισέβαλε το 2008 στη Νότια Οσετία.

Η πραγματικότητα λοιπόν είναι τελείως διαφορετική από αυτή που θέλετε να παρουσιάζετε. Στην πραγματικότητα καμία κατοχή δεν υπάρχει στην Αμπχαζία και στη Νότια Οσετία. Αντιθέτως πιστεύω πως έφτασε ο καιρός να υποδεχτεί η διεθνής κοινότητα αυτούς τους λαούς που τόσο άδικα έχει αποκλείσει.

Αντίθετα υπάρχει πραγματική συνεχιζόμενη κατοχή στην Κύπρο, αλλά βέβαια εκεί η Ένωση ακολουθεί διαφορετική τακτική, καθώς η Τουρκία είναι φίλος και σύμμαχος πολλών κυβερνήσεων της Ευρώπης, οπότε εκεί μπορείτε εύκολα να παραβλέψετε τα εγκλήματα πολέμου.

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Mr President, during the war of August 2008, I was in Georgia. Tbilisi's schools were turned into refuges for 200 000 people. I talked to the refugees and I visited the wounded. I met the human rights groups who documented the Russian war crimes. I went to Gori. In the almost deserted city, I stood next to a bombarded house and listened to an old man's painful story about his neighbours who had been killed. At the ruins of the cadet school, an old woman asked me if I felt the smell of corpses. Yes, I felt it.

Today South Ossetia and Abkhazia are still occupied territories and refugees have no place to return. The August 2008 war was a warning for Europe which was not heard at the time. Thus, we have to do everything to help Georgia to cope with the consequences of the aggression. Aggression in Ukraine and the hybrid war against the west are now a reality. I hope we have learned from our mistakes.

Clare Moody (S&D). – Mr President, 10 years have passed since the August 2008 war between Russia and Georgia. Yet the Russian Federation continues its illegal occupation of the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali, South Ossetia. The regime continues to deny access to the vital and constructive EU monitoring mission, and human rights monitors from the UN, the OSCE and the Council of Europe, in the occupied regions.

Russia has intensified its military build-up in both areas including the stationing of fully operational military bases. Illegal detentions and kidnappings continue to take place, undermining international law and violating human rights. Crossing points over the so-called occupation line have been closed, aggravating the humanitarian situation and further isolating the regions.

The S&D Group strongly supports the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia, while the resolution of this conflict is crucial to enhancing security and stability across Europe. We must demonstrate our solidarity with the citizens of the occupied regions and support our Georgian colleagues' peace initiative, 'A Step to a Better Future'.

I hope that despite 10 years of occupation, we can help to achieve better relations between those kept apart by the fences of the occupied regions and the rest of Georgia.

Charles Tannock (ECR). – Mr President, ten years on since the end of the war between Georgia and Russia, which left a frozen conflict over Russian occupation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, it's clear that the two countries have taken a very distinctly different path – one a democratic one, one an authoritarian one.

As a long-standing friend of Georgia, I stand with the EU in commending the country's transition away from its Soviet past and towards a free, democratic one with Euro-Atlantic aspirations and an open state and an open society. I especially praise Georgia's dedication to modernising its defence capabilities and its close cooperation with international partners in seeking a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

Russia, by contrast, continues to undermine the international rules-based system through its actions in Georgia and, I might also add, in Crimea and in eastern Ukraine. Its breach of the 2008 EU-mediated ceasefire agreement by engaging in ethnic cleansing, placing physical borders between Georgia and the occupied territories, engaging in borderisation and more, is to be condemned in the strongest terms.

I reaffirm my Group's support for the territorial integrity of Georgia and truly hope for a peaceful resolution to this conflict. This, however, must first begin with Russia fully acknowledging and acting on its international law and human rights obligations.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Mr President, 10 years ago, when Russia launched its invasion of Georgia, many in the free world were tempted to see it as an isolated incident. Far too many were tempted to continue business as usual with the Kremlin. The much larger invasion of Ukraine just a few years later showed the colossal price of such wishful thinking. Had we woken up in 2008, a lot of trouble could have been avoided.

Today, as we express solidarity with Georgia, I call on this House to support the Georgian Parliament's decision to sanction Russian officials directly responsible for grave human rights abuses in the occupied territories, including the recent murders of Georgian citizens – the Otkhozoria and Tatunashvili list.

Finally, Georgia too must stick to its political obligations. I therefore appeal to Tbilisi to respect fully the decision of last November of the European Court of Human Rights on the former Prime Minister, Vano Merabishvili.

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Zuerst möchte ich hier festhalten, dass meiner Meinung nach der Wunsch nach Mitgliedschaft in der NATO oder der Wunsch nach Mitgliedschaft in der Europäischen Union keineswegs eine Rechtfertigung sein darf – nicht sein durfte, nicht sein darf, auch in Zukunft nicht sein darf –, um gegen ein Land kriegerisch vorzugehen. Die Invasion, die Georgien im Jahr 2008 erlebt hat, bleibt bis heute ein großes Trauma für die georgische Gesellschaft, das einem immer wieder begegnet.

Die Folterung und Ermordung von Archil Tatanaschwili zu Beginn dieses Jahres war ein Moment, in dem man wieder sehen konnte, wie dieses Trauma immer wieder aktiviert wird, und dass Russland, das für die Besetzung der Regionen in Georgien verantwortlich ist, bisher keinen verantwortungsvollen Umgang mit diesen Regionen gefunden hat. Georgien hat heute keine Möglichkeit, eine militärische Lösung dieser Situation zu suchen. Gut ist: Georgien will das auch gar nicht. Aber da ein Drittel des Territoriums Georgiens heute besetzt ist, wäre jeder Kompromiss mit Russland zum Völkerrecht meiner Meinung nach eine Katastrophe für Georgien. Deshalb ist es gut, dass wir heute diese Entschließung so eindeutig auf dem Tisch haben. Es ist auch ein Zeichen gegen den Versuch Russlands mit Wladimir Putin an der Spitze, die Dekolonisierung der Sowjetunion und des großen sowjetischen Reiches rückgängig zu machen und in Frage zu stellen.

David McAllister (PPE). – Mr President, as we have already heard this afternoon, following the war in 2008, Russia has made deeply concerning steps towards the de facto annexation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, thereby undermining international law and violating the EU-mediated ceasefire agreement.

As one of the initiators of this resolution, let me point out that the European Parliament should seize the opportunity to fully support Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity within its internationally recognised borders. In my view, three actions by Russia are required in order for the conflict to be solved. Firstly, Moscow should unconditionally fulfil all the provisions of the ceasefire agreement, especially the commitment to withdraw its military forces and guarantee the EU Monitoring Mission access to the occupied territories. Secondly, Moscow should cease the borderisation of the administrative boundary line and refrain from advancing further into Georgian territory. Thirdly, the expulsion of Georgian citizens, human rights abuses and discrimination on ethnic grounds must end. This is a frozen conflict, but it shouldn't be a forgotten conflict.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Mr President, I am deeply concerned about the situation in Abkhazia and South Ossetia and I am deeply concerned about the coercive EU measures inflicted upon these regions. The sanctions are having a direct negative impact. They lead to isolation and can lead the people of Abkhazia and South Ossetia to poverty, hopelessness and despair.

In the meantime, the EU continues to issue resolutions. For 10 years already the EU has been issuing resolutions. We politicised the issue because we couldn't resolve it, nor about negotiations nor by legal means. I suggest that we finally start seeing people on the ground, see the degradation and demographic collapse of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Why don't we come up with a project aimed at regional development and cooperation? We could provide assistance to schools, we could equip hospitals and we could help the infrastructures.

As the standing rapporteur on Georgia in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have nothing against resolutions, but let's act.

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

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE), *blue-card question*. – Mr Mamikins, would you agree with me that, for 50 years, the Western countries, which stood so strongly for the Baltic countries' independence and never recognised our occupation – did they make a mistake then, not recognising us and standing firm and demanding from the former USSR release and giving us independence? Would you agree that those countries were right and now we are wrong, speaking about the Georgian occupied territories?

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D), *atbilde uz zilās kartītes jautājumu*. – Augsti godātais Auštrevičius kungs! Es atbildēšu Latvijas brīvvalsts valsts valodā. Jūs laikam sajaucāt tematu, par kuru mēs debatējam. Šobrīd debates ir par Gruziju un par Gruzijā okupētajām teritorijām, nevis par jūsu fantāziju un par to, kas notika vēsturē.

Sajjad Karim (ECR). – Mr President, Madam High Representative, you speak about the realities on the ground and you say we recognise and react accordingly. The realities on the ground today mean that a body can be returned without the organs inside. The realities mean that the actions of others should dictate our thoughts, and our thoughts should become our words, and our words our actions.

I have put my name to this resolution today, as chair of the respective committee from this Parliament, because we as a parliament are absolutely clear: this is an occupation. High Representative, your words were lacking today, yet again in this regard. Follow the lead of this House, you are a sister institution. This is an occupation in South Ossetia and Abkhazia. Our sister institutions must recognise that. If you cannot do that today when you once again address this Parliament, please make sure that at least your institution starts to back up the true feelings of the ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). – Spoštovana visoka predstavnica, spoštovani kolegi. V regiji, ki je vse od razpada Sovjetske zveze obremenjena s problemi postsovjetskega ekspanzionizma in etničnih napetosti ter lokalnih vojn, predstavlja Gruzija primer uspešne tranzicije države, ki uveljavlja pravila demokracije in vladavine prava.

Vse to drži kljub težki hipoteki, ker Rusija ne priznava njene suverenosti nad velikim delom države in s podporo separatistom v Abhaziji in Južni Osetiji pripravlja dokončno aneksijo odcepljenih delov gruzinske države.

S celovitim asociacijskim sporazumom iz leta 2016 in ukinitvijo viz lani je Evropska unija dala razvoju Gruzije, kot stebra stabilnosti v regiji, odločilno podporo. Pomembno je, da podpiramo ozemeljsko celovitost države in da povsod v svetu, kjer so podobne situacije, denimo v Gorskem Karabahu, v Palestini, Zahodni Sahari ali Ukrajini, vztrajamo pri spoštovanju mednarodnega prava, človekovih in manjšinskih pravic in s tem prispevamo k reševanju problemov in zagotavljanju miru.

Bronis Ropė (Verts/ALE). – Lietuvoje mes turime patarlę – „nieko nėra pastovesnio už laikina“. Ji puikiai tinka iliustruoti padėtį Gruzijos valdžios nekontroliuojamose šalies teritorijose – Abchazijoje ir Pietų Osetijoje. Prieš dešimt metų Europos Sąjungos valstybių diplomatinėmis priemonėmis pavyko sustabdyti Rusijos agresiją. Deja, ta pati diplomatija, kuri padėjo sustabdyti agresiją, kartu ir išaldė padėtį, kai geras trečdalis šalies lieka per marionetines valstybes valdomas Rusijos. Nenoriu būti blogu pranašu, tačiau, labai panašu, kad ir Rusijos faktiškai kontroliuojamose rytinėse Ukrainos teritorijose formuojasi kažkas panašaus. Esu įsitikinęs, kad jei norime rimto ir ilgalaikio sprendimo užtikrinančio taiką Europos rytuose, ateities santykių su Rusija sąlyga turime kelti marionetinių režimų Gruzijos, Moldovos ir Ukrainos teritorijose likvidavimą. Tai ne tik parodys mūsų ištikimybę vertybėms, bet ir padės pačiai Rusijai atsikratyti sovietinio imperializmo likučių.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Pane předsedající, před 10 lety uloupila ruská armáda vyslaná do oblasti Vladimírem Putinem velký kus gruzínského území. Okupovaná Abcházie a Jižní Osetie tvoří dohromady pětinu gruzínského státu.

Jsem přesvědčen o tom, že pokud by nebylo vlažné reakce mezinárodního společenství na agresi ruské armády v Čechě v 90. letech, nebylo by útoku na Gruzii. Pokud bychom se jasně a sebedovědomě v roce 2008 postavili na stranu Gruzie, možná bychom se ani nedočkali anexe Krymu. Gruzínský konflikt není zamrzlý. V roce 2018, 10 let po okupaci Jižní Osetie, Ruská federace podniká *de facto* kroky k anexi Abcházie a Jižní Osetie a připojení k Ruské federaci.

Reagovat na agresii, křivdu a bezprávi vládně, tak jak to zde dělá Komise, se v dlouhodobém horizontu nevyplácí nikdy. Rusko je bezpečnostní riziko pro EU, paní vysoká představitelko.

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a União Europeia tem de atender o pedido que nos chega de Tbilisi, do Governo e da oposição singularmente unidos, e aplicar a (*palavras ininteligíveis*) inspirada no «Magnitsky Act».

Com sanções direcionadas sobre os esbirros que raptam, prendem e torturam cidadãos da Geórgia na Ossétia do Sul e na Abcásia, zonas ilegalmente controladas por Moscovo, poderemos ajudar a fazer justiça às vítimas da estratégia imperialista de Putin. As sanções devem incluir proibições de entrada na União Europeia e congelamento de ativos que estes criminosos detenham em Estados-Membros, em resultado de esquemas corruptos e de branqueamento de capitais, como os expostos no caso Skripal no Reino Unido. Temos que passar a ter um «Magnitsky Act» europeu.

Passam dez anos da ocupação russa na Geórgia. Temos de passar, nós, das palavras aos atos, não só para apoiar eficazmente a integridade territorial na Geórgia, mas para combatermos estrategicamente o regime de Moscovo que, tal como interfere na Geórgia e na Ucrânia, interfere na União Europeia, fomentando e financiando forças xenófobas racistas e populistas para destruir a nossa União.

Kosma Złotowski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Rosyjska inwazja na Gruzję była przede wszystkim testem dla nas, dla naszych górnolotnych deklaracji, dla gotowości do reagowania na konflikty i dla wiarygodności wobec partnerów. Niestety podobnie jak fiasko szczytu NATO w kwietniu 2008 r. także ta agresja pokazała, jak niewiele tak naprawdę Europa chce i może zrobić, by bronić pokoju i bezpieczeństwa w starciu z Rosją.

W sierpniu 2008 r. niewielu przywódców miało odwagę mówić o tym głośno. Tylko prezydent Rzeczypospolitej Lech Kaczyński rozumiał, że brak zdecydowanej reakcji na obecność rosyjskich wojsk w Gruzji zachęci prezydenta Putina do stosowania identycznych metod w przyszłości. I prezydent Putin zastosował je. Wojna na Ukrainie, aneksja Krymu, rosyjska obecność w Syrii czy trwająca nieustannie wojna informacyjna to dzisiejsze skutki bierności Unii Europejskiej w tamtym momencie, 10 lat temu. Pan poseł Javier Nart powiedział, że miłość czasem zabija. U nas się mówi: „wśród serdecznych przyjaciół psy zająca zjadły”.

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Wenn man einen völkerrechtswidrigen Ist-Zustand nicht von heute auf morgen ändern kann, muss man wie folgt vorgehen: Man muss zunächst mal klarmachen, dass man rechtlich, völkerrechtlich diesen Zustand nicht anerkennt. Das ist der erste Schritt. Und im zweiten Schritt muss man dem Opfer einer solchen Aggression Hilfe leisten. Das tun wir in Sachen Georgien. Es ist richtig, dass wir die Politik, die wir mit dem Assoziationsabkommen und auch mit der Visumfreiheit eingeleitet haben, fortführen. In diesem Zusammenhang sollten wir auch alles unterstützen, was im Rahmen der Vereinten Nationen in Genf möglich ist.

Auch wenn es nur kleine Schritte sind, sollten die doch Russland davon überzeugen, dass es künftig seine Politik und seine Interessen besser dadurch verwirklicht, dass es versucht, mit seinen Nachbarn in Frieden und auf eine freundliche Art zu leben. Die Art, wie es bisher agiert, bewirkt nur, dass Russland sich isoliert.

Andi Cristea (S&D). – Mr President, it is now 10 years since the Russian military aggression against Georgia, and the Russian Federation still continues the illegal occupation of the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, undermining basic international law. Today we reaffirm our strong support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia within its internationally-recognised borders, and we reiterate our solidarity with the people of occupied Georgia. The EU has not forgotten what took place in 2008.

The 2008 invasion was a major Russian open attack against the European order and was followed by the annexation of Crimea and the war in Eastern Ukraine. It is time for the Russian Federation to unconditionally fulfil all the provisions of the cease-fire agreement and to withdraw all its military forces from the territory of Georgia.

The EU must continue pressure against the Russian Federation and support even further the association-agreement countries of Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine on their European path.

Othmar Karas (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin! Die Probleme, die wir auf der Krim, die wir in der Ukraine, die wir in Georgien haben, haben alle eine gemeinsame Ursache: Russland hält internationale Verträge nicht ein, Russland interveniert militärisch und besetzt und Russland achtet die Souveränität der Nachbarstaaten nicht.

Wir müssen uns aber, wenn wir über die zehn Jahre sprechen, heute auch sagen: Wir haben bei Georgien weniger stark, weniger geschlossen, weniger entschlossen reagiert, als wir bei der Ukraine und nach der Kriminvasion reagiert haben. Vielleicht hätten wir in der Ukraine und auf der Krim einiges verhindern können, hätten wir bei Georgien so entschlossen und geschlossen agiert.

Daher ist die Lage eindeutig: Russland muss sich an die internationalen Verpflichtungen halten und seine Streitkräfte aus dem Territorium abziehen. Die Beobachtungsmission in den Gebieten Südossetien und Abchasien ist zuzulassen. Und das Stabilisierungsabkommen zwischen der EU und Georgien, in dem wir auch weiterhin erfolgreich zusammenarbeiten, muss ausgebaut und vertieft werden.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Als ich gerade den Kollegen Karas hörte, erinnerte ich mich daran, dass wir beide vor zehn Jahren, in Tagen des Kriegs, in Georgien unterwegs waren, auch hinter den russischen Linien waren, in Gori. Und wenn ich mir die Grenze dort heute anschau, dann ist sie gewachsen, ist sie an Lebensadern Georgiens herangewachsen, was die Pipeline angeht, was die Hauptmagistrale dort angeht. Und wenn ich das mal weiter anschau, dann geht heute die Grenze durch Dörfer. Die Menschen können ihre Friedhöfe nicht besuchen, weil dort Stacheldraht gezogen ist. Wir sollten sehen, dass dies gegenüber den Menschen unerträglich ist. Das erinnert mich ein bisschen an das geteilte Deutschland, wie da die Grenzziehungen ablaufen und wie das durch die Dörfer geht.

Zweitens muss man feststellen: Es ist russische Strategie – in Nagorny Karabach ein bisschen anders –, Georgien, Transnistrien, Krieg in der Ostukraine. In all diesen Ländern werden Konflikte geschürt, wird das aufrechterhalten, um die Länder handlungsunfähig zu machen in ihrem Entwicklungsprozess. Dies ist im gesamten Raum russische Strategie, die nicht akzeptabel ist und die völkerrechtswidrig ist.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Mr President, military ventures into neighbours' territory should have been a thing of the past. However, the actions in August 2008 clearly show that violations of the rule-based international system remains continue in the post-Soviet era. Georgia's territory has been compromised. Russia further continues to illegally occupy Abkhazia and South Ossetia, thus breaking the ceasefire for almost a decade.

In these difficult times we have to show our commitment to Georgia and its Euro-Atlantic aspirations. The EU has a variety of instruments which support the peaceful resolution of the conflict, including the EUSR and the EU Monitoring Mission (EUMM). The EUMM remains the only international force in the country monitoring the administrative borderline. Russia continuously violates this line. Our instruments must be coupled with clear determination against military incursions and a firm stance on subsequent undermining of Georgia's territorial integrity.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Mr President, today I think it is time to draw lessons from the half-hearted reaction by the EU to the Russian invasion of Georgia 10 years ago. It is crucially important that the EU unconditionally continues to stand up in support of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Georgia. We have a clear and firm resolution on it, but it was alarming that attempts were made yesterday to define Abkhazia and South Ossetia just as self-styled breakaway territories.

The fact is that aggression is progressing. Encroachment into the Georgian territory continues from one week to another, metre by metre. Russia is reinforcing its military presence in Georgia's occupied territories. The Russian Government, as the occupying power, is directly responsible for the abnormal situation in Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

We need to show strong solidarity with the Georgian people and it is vitally important that only a consistent and firm stance against Russian aggression can assure a peaceful solution to the conflict.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Mr President, almost 10 years have passed since Russian military forces invaded Georgia. Today, Russian troops still occupy Abkhazia and South Ossetia and threaten Georgia, including key transit links, railways, and pipelines connecting the region and Europe.

Although there is a ceasefire agreement in place, Russia still refuses to implement it. Instead, since 2011, Russia has implemented a policy of illegal fence and barrier constructions to move the borders forward, to separate communities and divide the Georgian population.

People also disappear in the occupied territory, and they are held in detention. The destiny of many is unknown until their dead bodies are returned to their families. Colleagues, we should never forget that Georgia is the victim of the Russian aggression, not the other way around. Georgia, which has more than 20% of its internationally-recognised territory occupied, was, is, and will remain a reliable partner of the EU and NATO.

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, it was a military invasion of a free and independent country, and it is a military occupation of a free and independent country. If we can't stand up for the freedom and sovereignty of Georgia, we can't stand up for the freedom and sovereignty of other European nations and of the European Union.

It is one example of far too many of how Russia is implementing aggressive policies versus its neighbours. Military forces, warfare, support to separatist groups, disinformation, propaganda, economic blockades: Russia is responsible for all that is happening under the occupation in South Ossetia and Abkhazia regarding human rights, and all we can do is to call on Russia to withdraw its military troops and respect international law.

Асим Адемов (PPE). – Статистиката от руската инвазия през 2008 г. посочва стотици загинали, хиляди ранени и пострадали, десетки останали без домове и изселени от родните си места, които в собствената си страна се превърнаха в бежанци. Така започна дълго планираната инвазия, имаща за цел да свали правителството на Грузия и да засили контрола на Москва върху този регион. Но противно на някакви очаквания, Грузия се възроди. Демократичните институции се развиват, чуждите инвеститори се връщат и светът трябва да признае, че поведението на Русия не е приемливо.

Този развой е заплаха за всички свободни страни, които вярват, че международните граници не бива да се променят със сила. Наблюдателите бяха изгонени от тези територии, медиите биват заглушавани, а на грузинските граждани е забранено да се връщат по домовете си. В същото време Русия строи военни бази и продължава пълзящата окупация на грузински територии. Ето защо трябва да призовем другите страни да настояват за териториалната цялост на Грузия и да не признават окупираните територии.

Spontane Wortmeldungen

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Pane předsedající, já se zde přihlásím k tomu, co říkají moji kolegové z PPE. Ten názor na situaci v Gruzii je jednoznačný. Jedná se o okupaci gruzínského území ze strany Ruské federace.

My k tomu nesmíme být lhostejní, zvláště my poslanci, kteří jsme z bývalých komunistických, socialistických států, víme, co je Rusko zač a bohužel Rusko dále prosazuje politickou doktrínu blízkého sousedství. V této situaci si myslím, paní vysoká představitelko, že by Evropská komise měla být mnohem aktivnější ve vztahu ke Gruzii a měli bychom nabídnout více programů a větší ekonomickou podporu této zemi.

Gruzie je klíčovým partnerem pro EU v tomto regionu. Je to země, kde se relativně rozvíjí demokracie, buduje se tam relativní právní stát a my bychom tuto zemi měli mnohem více podporovat.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Mr President, Russia's disregard for international law increases every day as it continues to impose its own unilateral and outdated agenda and to protect its own cynical interests, regardless of international condemnation. Georgia and Ukraine have been victims of this aggressive foreign policy, amongst many others. And when it comes to domestic policies, Russia also repeatedly violates international human rights law, cracking down on freedom of expression and assembly, causing its own citizens to live in fear of state-sponsored and extra-judicial reprisals.

In a global context, where the leading role cannot be played by the US anymore, it is crucial that we in the EU continue to push for international relations guided by the rule of law. It is our responsibility to uphold international law, and multilateralism is the only way forward.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Úr! Amikor a Kaukázus országainak biztonságpolitikai helyzetét elemezzük, nem hagyhatjuk figyelmen kívül Oroszország lépéseit és mozgását. A grúziai eseményekről már sok szó esett, ennek kapcsán fel szeretném hívni a figyelmet egy másik országra, amely nemzetközileg elismert, és területén jelen van az orosz hadsereg. Ez a Moldovai Köztársaság, amelynek történelme során gyakran kellett megküzdenie a környező nagyhatalmak bekebelezési szándékaival.

Moldova speciális kapcsolatot ápol Romániával, a lakosság nagyobbik része román anyanyelvű, és politikai elitjének jelentős része az európai integráció híve. Mégis, nem hagyható figyelmen kívül itt sem, hogy a Dnyeszter-menti Köztársaság területén állomásozik az orosz 14. hadtest, és Oroszország több alkalommal is jelét adta, hogy figyelemmel követik ennek a területnek a sorsát. Ennek a realitásnak a figyelembevételével szükséges megtervezni azokat a lépéseket, amelyek az EU keleti partnerségi politikáját alkotják Moldova vonatkozásában.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Pane předsedající, my si připomínáme 10 let od vpádu Ruska do Gruzie, Abcházie a Jižní Osetie. Tato okupace i dále pokračuje. Bohužel, v té době jsme nezaregistrovali žádnou větší odmítavou a důraznou reakci Západu. Možná i proto bylo Rusko povzbuzeno k další expanzi, protože pak jsme zažili okupaci Krymu a také části Ukrajiny. Nevyplácí se tedy mlčky přihlížet.

Jsem proto ráda za vyjádření paní představitelky Mogheriniové, za to, že EU podporuje Gruzii a také zabraná území, kde vytváří určité programy proto, aby tato území byla dále integrována ke Gruzii a k demokratické Evropě.

My si připomínáme také 50 let od okupace Československa a chci připomenout panu kolegovi Scholzovi, že tehdy se také tomuto říkalo bratrská pomoc, ale byla to okupace a v Gruzii je to okupace.

José Inácio Faria (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, em Agosto de 2008, Moscovo rasgou o manual de segurança da Europa pós-guerra fria ao atacar a soberania e integridade territorial da Geórgia. Uma década depois, milhares de tropas russas continuam a ocupar a Abcásia e a Ossétia do Sul e os sobreviventes daquela guerra continuam a viver em condições precárias, a sofrer discriminações por motivos étnicos no seu dia-a-dia e a ser vítimas de rapto e detenções junto às linhas de demarcação, enquanto os responsáveis pelos crimes de guerra continuam impunes.

Senhora Alta Representante, o acordo de associação, o regime de liberalização de vistos e os apoios no quadro da assistência macrofinanceira espelham o reconhecimento da Geórgia como parceira estratégica da União Europeia na região e reiteram o nosso apoio à sua soberania e integridade territorial, pelo que devemos continuar a apoiar todo os esforços de guerra que permitam encontrar uma solução pacífica ao conflito, lembrando, ao mesmo tempo, que imperialismos expansionistas não têm lugar no século XXI. E termino dizendo que no final da década de setenta os Fischer-Z lançavam a música «Another warning, another warning. Remember Russia.» Let's not today forget the real threat, remember Russia.

(Ende der spontanen Wortmeldungen)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Mr President, first of all, let me thank everyone for their support for the work we are doing together with the authorities in Georgia, to, first of all, make sure that this conflict is not forgotten. Those of you who mentioned this are perfectly right. There is that risk, because of the proliferation of crises and conflicts around us. Making sure that this is not forgotten and doesn't slip into the shadows is our priority, together with the authorities in Georgia.

Thank you for this report on the policies that we have put in place over the years and that we are determined to continue, first of all the search for a solution through our diplomatic action, through our work on the Geneva talks, the focus on people and citizens which, at the end of the day, are the reason for our work and, in particular, through our work in the monitoring mission, that I have heard many of you support, and in all the different fields of work we have in our partnership with Georgia. I would like to stress here that it is a partnership that is deep. It is a friendship that also goes beyond this work we are doing on Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Mr President, if you allow me, I would like to take the opportunity, as I have the floor and before we start the next debate, to share with you one positive feeling that today we are lucky enough to have.

Just a few moments ago, respectively in Skopje and in Athens, Prime Minister Zoran Zaev and Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras announced that they had found a bilateral agreement, under UN auspices, on the name issue. I think they deserve all our support and our congratulations for an historic moment ...

(Applause)

... that will be important not only for the two countries, but also for the entire region, for Europe and for the world, showing – as we have mentioned several times today – that through dialogue, perseverance, leadership, courage and diplomacy, solutions are possible, including to the most difficult issues. I will be honoured to join them for the signature of this agreement in the coming days.

Thank you also for the signal of support that you showed a moment ago. I think this is very important for both of them and for the entire region.

IN THE CHAIR: MAIREAD McGUINNESS

Vice-President

President. – Colleagues, just not for now, please don't heckle. I think Ms Mogherini has finished her intervention.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Thursday, 14 June 2018.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Monica Macovei (ECR), în scris. – La 10 ani de la începutul așa-numitei operațiuni de menținere a păcii a Federației Ruse în Georgia, peste 20 % din teritoriul oficial recunoscut al Georgiei încă se află sub ocupație rusească. Agenții Kremlinului continuă să avanseze în teritoriul georgian, mutând în repetate rânduri linia de demarcație. Oamenii s-au culcat azi în Georgia, iar a doua zi s-au trezit de cealaltă parte a gardului, sub ocupația Rusiei. Operațiunea din Georgia a dat tonul implementării politicii imperialiste a regimului Putin. Aici Moscova și-a testat tehnicile de anexare, folosite mai apoi în Crimeea.

Dacă noi rămânem spectatori, ne vom trezi sub dictatură. Unii uită că democrația trebuie apărată în fiecare zi. Moscova trebuie să abandoneze politica de anexare și să respecte integritatea teritorială a vecinilor săi.

Urmas Paet (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Sel aastal 100ndat sünnipäeva tähistaval Gruusial täitub augustis ka kümme aastat päevast, mil Venemaa okupeeris Abhaasia ja Lõuna-Osseetia alad.

Kahetsusväärset ei ole Venemaa pidanud kinni 2008. aastal sõlmitud relvarahukokkuleppest. Järjepidevalt nihutab Venemaa administratiivpiiri aina sügavamale Gruusia territooriumile, keeldub andmast ELi vaatlusmissioonile ligipääsu kokku lepitud piirkondadele, jätkuvad inimõiguste rikkumised okupeeritud territooriumidel. EL ja rahvusvaheline kogukond peavad Venemaa okupatsiooni osas võtma järjepideva, kooskõlastatud ja ühise seisukoha. Jätkuvalt tuleb toetada Gruusia suveräänsust ja territoriaalset terviklikkust ning töötada konflikti rahumeelse lahenduse suunas.

Samas peab Rahvusvaheline Kriminaalkohus jätkama konflikti käigus toime pandud sõjakuritegude ja inimsusvastaste kuritegude uurimist. Mõistagi on kõige olulisem, et Venemaa lõpetaks Gruusia okupeerimise. Gruusia konflikti lahendamine on oluline kogu Euroopa julgeoleku ja stabiilsuse suurendamiseks.

Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE), kirjalikult. – Kümme aastat tagasi, kui Venemaa ründas olümpiamängude rahuperioodi ajal oma tillukest naabrit Gruusiat, tegin koos Priit Heinsaluga ajalehes Eesti Ekspress üleskutse, et vabatahtlikud Eesti reservohvitseride seast läheksid Gruusiasse agressiooniga võitlema. Suuremat sõda sellest algatusest ei sündinud, kuid ootamatult reageeris Euroopa Parlament, mille toonane liige, Saksa kommunist Sahra Wagenknecht, esitas kirjaliku arupärimise. Et miks eestlased tahavad kogu Euroopa ja NATO sõtta kiskuda mingi tühise intsidendi pärast. Ta sai vastuse ka. Meenutan seda intsidenti ja Wagenknechti vaid seepärast, et osutada, kui võrd ohtlik on kommunistlik naivism, „putin-versteherlus” ja arvamine, et Kremliil on õigus kõiki oma naabreid jõuga terroriseerida.

16. EU-NATO relations (debate)

President. – The next item is the report by Mircea Pașcu, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on EU-NATO relations (2017/2276(INI)) (A8-0188/2018).

Ioan Mircea Pașcu, Rapporteur. – Madam President, it is no secret that in the light of a marked deterioration of Europe's security environment, the relations between the EU and NATO have got a new increased relevance. Indeed now that internal and external security are inextricably interlinked, putting together the best abilities of the two organisations in providing security in general for the European citizens becomes imperative.

Since Crimea in 2014, the basis and substance of collaboration between the EU and NATO have accelerated and enlarged, so that today we speak about no less than 74 common actions. However, as of late, the transatlantic relationship has become strained following the recent trade disputes between the US and their allies.

Under the circumstances, besides trying to manage these disputes so that they do not get out of hand, one should also attempt on the one hand to insulate the security dimension of that relationship from its commercial one, and on the other, preserve and accelerate the existing good momentum in the EU-NATO collaboration.

In general, given the existing fragile setting, what otherwise are normal differences of opinion between the two organisations today require more sensitive management so that we can overcome the difficulties of the moment. The changing atmosphere related to the topic has been felt during the consultation and writing of the present report, a fact illustrated by comparing its first draft with the version used for the vote in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The report is based on the premise that the EU and NATO, both confronted with the same challenges and threats, share the same values in their complementary activity devoted to preserving peace and security in a rules-based international system.

In regard to those threats and challenges, the upsurge in Russia's military assertive behaviour and activities, political manipulation and cyberattacks, as well as direct interference in European countries' internal affairs aiming at undermining their unity, are equally concerning to both the EU and NATO, a reality underlined by the fact that many of the 74 common activities mentioned above are directly devoted to countering exactly such actions.

The report is addressing, understandably, the transatlantic relations and is stressing that the EU's own increased defence and security efforts, apart from responding to US previous appeals, see for instance the 'adios' speeches of both defence secretaries Gates and Panetta, are a concrete contribution to burden-sharing, reinforcing both NATO and the security bond with Britain after Brexit.

The EU-NATO joint declaration and the subsequent implementation actions mark a new and substantive phase of the strategic partnership. In that context, the report looks forward to the new joint declaration to be adopted at the approaching Brussels NATO summit in July. As expected, special attention is given to the collaboration between the two organisations in military mobility, recently identified as a priority area of cooperation between them, and in this respect suggest that the west-east axis should be complemented with a new one running north-south, which would confer the necessary coherence to their eastern flank.

Controlling hybrid threats, countering cyberattacks, building resilience, sharing situational awareness, increased information-sharing, fighting terrorism and continuous improvement of cooperation on mission and operations at both strategic and tactical level, represent concrete domains for collaboration between the EU and NATO that were mentioned and supported in the report.

Federica Mogherini, *Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Madam President, let me first of all thank the rapporteur for the excellent work on one of the central issues in the work we are doing for a stronger Europe of Defence. The report wishes for 'a more substantive partnership within the European Union and NATO'. Not only do we share 22 members, we also face similar challenges and we have converging security interests. Almost 95% of citizens of the European Union live in NATO countries, so protecting these people is the first of our shared interests.

At the same time, the report is also very clear that EU-NATO cooperation should be complementary, as it is, and respectful of each other specificities, as it is. We are different organisations; we, the European Union, are not a military alliance, and we do not intend to become one. Our European way to peace and security is unique, and we are proud of the work we do and the way we do it. Our friends at NATO appreciate the specificity of what we do. Our missions, both civilian and military, carry out some very different tasks compared to NATO operations, so complementarity is in the nature of our partnership. We do different things, and this is why we are increasingly working together on the ground, taking advantage of our complementarity.

This is why the NATO leadership, starting from the Secretary-General, Jens Stoltenberg, has been so supportive of our work towards a stronger Europe of Defence. All the work we've done inside the European Union has always been done hand-in-hand with strong NATO support and with the deepening of the partnership with NATO.

On the one hand, we are working to strengthen the capabilities of our Member States, and in most cases these are also NATO allies. They have one set of forces that can be used in European missions and in NATO missions alike – and let me also add in UN missions – and in this way, a stronger European Union in the field of defence makes NATO stronger. On the other hand, we are also investing in our complementarity; for example, in our civilian capabilities.

As you know, last week, together with the Secretary-General of NATO, we presented to our respective councils, to the European Union Council and to NATO Council, the third progress report on the implementation of our joint declaration, which we signed during the last NATO summit in Warsaw.

Let me just highlight some key achievements that are mentioned in this progress report, which, by the way, will also constitute a good basis for our further work looking ahead to the next NATO summit in Brussels. First, the clearest progress is probably on military mobility. Today more than ever, rapid response has become an essential requirement for our security, getting our assets where they are needed, and doing so swiftly, is a necessity we need to ensure at all times.

But this is also about how efficient we are in our defence spending, because if we invest in the best military capabilities and the most advanced defence systems, but then they get stuck at the border for customs checks, obviously we have an efficiency issue. If we cannot move our assets rapidly, we will need to buy more of them to make sure that they are in the right place at the right time. This is clearly not an efficient way to invest the defence budgets, so it's relevant for operational reasons and for budget reasons.

A big part of the work here is going on at European Union level, where obviously we have competencies and instruments to address these issues, with a project under the permanent structured cooperation, as well as with the proposed new investment from the Commission. We are working in constant coordination with NATO; experts from NATO are taking part in our work, and NATO has shared its parameters for transport infrastructure. There is no better example of how a stronger European Union in the field of defence also makes NATO stronger.

The second field that I would mention as an example is hybrid threats. After the Salisbury attack, the European Council called for increased EU engagement on cyber security, strategic communication and counter-intelligence, as well as close cooperation with NATO on chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear issues. We are currently working to respond to this task, and our proposals will be reflected in three documents that will be presented in the European Council at the end of this month: a joint communication on the follow-up to Salisbury; a joint report on the progress of the implementation of the 22 joint EU NATO actions on hybrid threats; and the 15 Security Union progress reports.

Our European and NATO staffs are working together on hybrid threats in a number of different contexts on a daily basis. I will mention not only the European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats, but also our Task Force on Strategic Communications and the EU Hybrid Fusion Cell for situational awareness.

The next EU-NATO parallel and coordinated exercises are to take place next November. And similarly to last year, the exercises will be based on a hybrid scenario and will aim at synchronising our two organisations' crisis response.

The third area of cooperation is our work to build the capacities of our partners. In particular, we have intensified the exchange of information at staff level on three pilot countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Moldova and Tunisia, but work has also intensified on Ukraine, Georgia and Jordan. We are also working together in Ukraine on issues such as strategic communications, training and security sector reform.

Finally, the first ever EU-NATO staff-to-staff dialogue on counterterrorism took place at the end of May. It focused on cooperation against terrorist threats, collaboration on the global coalition against Daesh, capacity building of partner countries and development of scenario-based discussions. These are just few examples – still many, and I apologise for being long – that clearly demonstrate the new engagement between the two organisations. Our cooperation has never been better, it has never been wider and has never been deeper.

On our side, we Europeans have finally decided to take full responsibility for our own security, and this is also in the interest of our partners in NATO. We are autonomous, but we are partners – very good ones. We are different, but we do share the same interests and we could not afford to walk in opposite directions. It would not be efficient, it would not be safe, and it would not be smart, and this is why we do not do it and we will never do it.

As your report rightly says: it is time for a more substantial partnership between the European Union and NATO, and this is precisely what we are doing today, and we will continue to do even more in the future. Last but not least, I apologise, I just realised while I was speaking that I should have changed seats in addressing this debate. I will move to the other side of the plenary in a minute.

President. – Thank you, Madam Vice-President. I perhaps should have spotted that too so I don't think we are too concerned.

Arnaud Danjean, au nom du groupe PPE. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Haute Représentante, nous n'allions pas vous tenir rigueur de ce placement.

Merci avant toute chose à Ioan Paşcu qui a fait un excellent travail, qui a construit ce rapport en s'appuyant sur les contributions de tous les groupes, et je voulais vraiment le remercier très solennellement de la qualité du travail qu'il a accompli pour faire un rapport très équilibré sur un sujet qui donne trop souvent lieu à des débats très idéologiques – j'allais presque dire théologiques – alors que nous avons besoin de concret.

Vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Haute Représentante, le rapporteur l'a rappelé, nous avons besoin de travailler de façon pratique et pragmatique.

Pratique, parce qu'il y a depuis le sommet de Varsovie de 2016 plusieurs dizaines de points très concrets à mettre en œuvre. Vous avez rappelé les domaines dans lesquels les progrès sont déjà enregistrés, c'est cela qui compte.

Pragmatique, parce que c'est la complémentarité qui doit primer. Il y a trop d'enjeux de sécurité autour de nous en Europe pour qu'on perde du temps à se chamailler entre ces deux organisations.

Nous avons les moyens de travailler de façon complémentaire et efficace. Les deux bornes qui doivent guider l'engagement européen sont, d'un côté, la reconnaissance du rôle essentiel de l'OTAN dans la défense collective – et cela personne ne peut le contester – et, d'un autre côté, l'affirmation de notre ambition d'autonomie stratégique, parce que l'autonomie stratégique, ce n'est pas la solitude stratégique, ce n'est dirigé contre personne, mais c'est la capacité à décider avec qui nous faisons des choses et nous voulons faire des choses. C'est cela l'autonomie stratégique et nous devons aller dans cette direction, nous devons garder cette ambition.

Je crois que le rapport est parfaitement équilibré entre ces deux exigences qui doivent guider l'action européenne.

Tonino Picula, *u ime kluba S&D*. – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, gospođo povjerenice, čestitam kolegi Ioanu na izvrsnom izvješću jer obuhvaća čitav katalog suradnje Europske unije, NATO-a, te onih područja kojima je tek potrebna nadogradnja. Od vojnih kapaciteta, mirovnih misija, hibridnih prijetnji do pružanja pomoći partnerskim, ali i susjednim zemljama u izgradnji njihovih mogućnosti i jačanju otpornosti. Prijetnje postojećem načinu funkcioniranja NATO-a politička su realnost. Rasprave odnosa Europske unije i NATO-a obuhvaćaju čak i trgovačke povlastice. Jednako tako, izlaskom Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva čak će 80% fiskalnih kapaciteta NATO-a biti izvan Europske unije.

Europska unija je nastala zbog čuvanja mira. To treba biti njena temeljna funkcija i na globalnoj razini. Međutim, Europska unija mora prihvatiti geopolitičke promjene i biti pripravna doprinosti globalnoj sigurnosti adekvatnim vlastitim kapacitetima. Iz jačanja obrambenih sposobnosti Europske unije valja razviti djelotvornije reagiranje na krize, učvrstiti transatlanske veze i doprinosti NATO-u. Izvješće kolege Paşcu dobro sažima poziciju Parlamenta o ovom važnom pitanju te kvalitetno doprinosi raspravama o budućnosti obrambene i sigurnosne suradnje na globalnoj razini.

Geoffrey Van Orden, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, there's much in the Paşcu report on which we can agree, in particular the final paragraph which recognises the need for the EU to ensure a close security and defence partnership with the United Kingdom after Brexit. The UK is, after all, and will remain, the pre-eminent European military power.

As referred to by Ms Mogherini, it is also right that due attention be given to the ease of mobility of allied forces across Europe, not just in times of tension but also for exercise purposes when necessary. Particularly at a time when there is some friction in transatlantic relations, and as we approach July's NATO summit, it is doubly important that European nations signal to the United States our willingness to bear more of the defence burden. The Americans, after all, have increased their European Reassurance Initiative, which further confirms US resolve to defend Europe, by some 40% to USD 4.8 billion. Just this local increase by the United States is more than the total defence spending of at least 10 - European countries.

I suggest that European burden sharing is not improved by the creation of separate defence structures, by the exclusion of major third countries from defence industrial projects or from pursuit of an elusive and ill-defined EU strategic autonomy. This is all about European political integration, not defence, and is the central weakness – I'm sorry to say – of the report.

Javier Nart, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE*. – Señora presidenta, el informe tiene una permanente referencia al rol estratégico fundamental de la OTAN, y es verdad. De vez en cuando aparecen algunas tímidas referencias a lo que significa la necesidad de una defensa y de un concepto de seguridad autónomo europeo, lo cual es evidente.

Si tenemos en cuenta incluso las referencias que se hacen a la CEP y que actualmente la CEP acaba de indicar que en los planes CEP de inversión no van a participar las empresas extraeuropeas, esto es, norteamericanas, está claro que el paradigma ha cambiado, y el paradigma ha cambiado porque Trump ha dejado de ser una anécdota para ser una anécdota categórica. Y la anécdota categórica se llama: la expulsión del Tratado Atlántico de Comercio, que estábamos negociando; la ruptura del Acuerdo con Irán; la ruptura del Acuerdo contra el cambio climático... y la última han sido los desprecios intolerables en el G-7, que llegan incluso a la ofensa personal.

Estamos ante el «pensamiento twitter» del señor Trump, que es fundamental porque es el principal poder en este momento en el mundo. Y esto lo que significa es que Estados Unidos ha dejado de ser el socio fiable permanente que teníamos en la Unión Europea —y estas son palabras de la señora Merkel, que me da la impresión de que no es una extremista determinante—. Respecto a ello tenemos que responder y poder responder con nuestros propios retos.

Frente a «*American first*» tenemos que determinar que la OTAN es un pilar fundamental en la defensa y la seguridad europeas, pero ciertamente no el único; porque un día nos despertaremos cuando el señor Trump llegue a un acuerdo con el señor Putin y estaremos como aquel chiste que decimos en España que hay un pintor pintando el techo, llega alguien, le quita la escalera y le dice «agárrate a la brocha, compañero»: así quedaremos.

Tamás Meszerics, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Thank you, Madam President. This is certainly not the first time, and much less the last, that we have the chance to talk about the relationship between the European Union and NATO. And I fully agree with the rapporteur that this has been an important report: it offered the chance to clarify this rather complicated relationship.

However, I regret to say that we feel that at some crucial points the report itself has been more of a missed opportunity. Instead of clarifying, at some points it has indeed further complicated this relationship that was otherwise not very easy.

Despite the laudable work that went into the file on behalf of the rapporteur and the shadows, we are not able to support it, on many grounds. Let me start with the simplest, and the easiest one. The report makes reference and emphasises, rightly, the security, defence and political challenge that Russia poses for the European Union. However at almost all points of the text this sounds as if it is an exclusively eastern problem. We seriously disagree with that.

Just witness the political meddling in the Brexit process or a number of European general elections, so indeed this is not just an issue for the east to consider, and this is not an issue for NATO's eastern flank. This is a larger concern to that we need to deal with. The second and, probably much more important, point is that the report claims that Article 42, paragraph 7 of the Treaty contributes to a stronger NATO.

I don't think I need to remind my honourable colleagues that this particular article is not traditionally understood as an obligation for collective response. This is an obligation for a bilateral, individual response between Member States. And considered in such a way, actually many analysts think that this further complicates the issue rather than clarifying it. Much as I would like to avoid this, we cannot simply support this file as it stands now. Thank you very much.

Javier Couso Permuy, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, alta representante, estamos ante otra oda a la sumisión europea, un verdadero panegírico a las cadenas militaristas, agresivas y expansionistas de la OTAN. Este informe sobre las relaciones Unión Europea-OTAN muestra con meridiana claridad una política exterior y de defensa encuadrada en una estrategia estadounidense organizada a través de la OTAN y que es no solo ajena, sino contraria a los intereses de la propia Europa.

Es un tiro en el pie a cualquier participación como sujeto autónomo en el tránsito a la multipolaridad que vive el mundo. Es la consolidación de una Unión Europea que, sin política exterior propia, suena como una orquesta desafinada a remolque de Estados Unidos.

Se habla de las tensiones en el Este o en la vecindad meridional, pero se ocultan muchas de sus causas. Y la participación de la OTAN, claro, como en el ataque a la República Federal de Yugoslavia —fuera de la legalidad internacional—, que echó por tierra los acuerdos de Helsinki. O la expansión de la OTAN a las fronteras rusas —que también echó por tierra la Carta de París—, o las intervenciones occidentales en Irak o de la OTAN, en particular, en Libia.

La Asociación Unión Europea-OTAN no es fundamental para la política común de seguridad y defensa, es justo lo contrario: niega una política autónoma e imita la peor política que representa la OTAN.

Frente a esta propuesta de sumisión militarista, frente al rearme y la intervención, hace falta una política de defensa verdaderamente independiente y que abogue por la distensión y la paz.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, αποκαλυπτική και πολύ επικίνδυνη είναι η έκθεση για τις σχέσεις Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης – NATO, καθώς παραθέτει την πολεμική προετοιμασία των δύο ιμπεριαλιστικών συμμαχιών. Κυρία Mogherini, μιλήσατε για τα επιτεύγματα του NATO και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Όμως η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το NATO είναι δυνάμεις ανασφάλειας για τους λαούς και αποσταθεροποίησης στα Βαλκάνια και την ευρύτερη περιοχή. Διέλυσαν τη Γιουγκοσλαβία και, μεταξύ πολλών άλλων, ευθύνονται για αλλαγές συνόρων και διάλυση κρατών, για μακελέματα λαών.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση και το NATO ενισχύουν τη στρατιωτική τους ετοιμότητα στα πλαίσια του ανταγωνισμού με τη Ρωσία και την Κίνα, ενισχύουν στρατιωτικές αποστολές και ασκήσεις με γενίκευση της λεγόμενης στρατιωτικής κινητικότητας. Τι σημαίνει αυτό δηλαδή; Άρση και των τελευταίων εμποδίων, ώστε το NATO και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να αλωνίζουν ανεμπόδιστα με τα στρατεύματά τους ανά την Ευρώπη. PESCO, μηχανισμοί αξιολόγησης, ταμείο άμυνας θωρακίζουν τα αυτοτελή συμφέροντα των ευρωπαϊκών ομίλων στον ανταγωνισμό με τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, που η έκθεση βαφτίζει με νόημα ως παρανοήσεις των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Οι λαοί με την πάλη τους πρέπει να είναι σε επαγρύπνηση για καμία αλλαγή συνόρων και αποδέσμευση από αυτές τις λυκοσυμμαχίες. Με τον λαό στην εξουσία είναι ο μόνος δρόμος!

Michael Gahler (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte dem Kollegen Paşcu für seinen sehr zeitgemäßen Bericht herzlich danken. Ich denke, wir stellen dort dar, wie wir die Zusammenarbeit von EU und NATO optimieren können. Es gibt Dinge, die kann die NATO besser und muss sie besser leisten, aber es gibt Dinge, die wir auf der EU-Ebene besser erledigen können.

Deswegen ist es jetzt wichtig, dass wir uns klar werden, dass wir mit einer besseren Arbeit innerhalb der EU auch den europäischen Pfeiler der NATO stärken. Wenn wir CARD, die *Defence Review*, jedes Jahr durchführen, dann wissen wir, was wir brauchen. Wenn wir dann anschließend im Bereich Verteidigungsforschung und Fähigkeiten-Entwicklung weitergehen, wenn wir den *Defence Fund* auflegen und dann auch im EU-Haushalt für Kooperationen in unseren Verteidigungsindustrien unsere Beiträge besser leisten, dann werden wir besser untereinander und auch besser im NATO-Rahmen.

Aber wichtig ist auch, dass wir dann eine strategische Autonomie dafür entwickeln, wenn andere NATO-Partner nicht wollen, dass wir agieren. Ich denke, wir müssen als Europäische Union notfalls auch unabhängig von der NATO agieren können.

Soraya Post (S&D). – Madam President, I say ‘no’ to NATO. The EU does not need to strengthen relations with NATO, but rather the opposite. I cannot accept the continuation of old-school militaristic thinking, with priority afforded to military alliances and increased spending on defence budgets and militaries globally, leading to tensions between countries.

As a feminist and a pacifist, I call for a transformation towards a feminist security policy that puts human security, personal integrity and safety from interpersonal violence at the centre of our defence and security agenda. For a safer world we need to invest in conflict-prevention and mediation. The EU is meant to be a peace project, not a military project.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga (ECR). – Madam President, we hope for added value arising from cooperation between the EU and NATO. There are challenges, though, and in order to avoid them we have to fulfil certain preconditions – first to avoid duplication, and therefore well-defined modalities of cooperation that are needed. Secondly, the key importance of transatlantic cooperation, despite tensions in other areas, and cooperation with the UK after Brexit. Otherwise without these modalities we cannot fulfil the strategic autonomy of the EU. We do not have enough potential to bring greater security to the region, and therefore I am very cautious about the stressing of strategic autonomy in this report.

We look forward to cooperation in areas like cybersecurity, military mobility and tackling hybrid threats.

Bodil Valero (Verts/ALE). – Fru talman! Det här är ett betänkande som är väldigt motsägelsefullt, å ena sidan hävdas att EU och Nato har olika uppgifter, men sedan pekar allt i riktning mot en total sammanblandning, med terrorismbekämpning, kamp mot irreguljär migration etc. Trots rubriken, ett mer konkret partnerskap, så är det mesta väldigt luddigt.

Jag kommer själv från ett land som inte är Nato-medlem och ser frågan också ur det perspektivet. I punkt 33 nämns att medlemsstater som inte är Nato-medlemmar bör ha andra skyldigheter inom ramen för den europeiska försvarsunionen. Tala gärna om vilka skyldigheter som menas. I punkt 9 står det att samarbetet även ska fördjupas vid kriser, inte krig, på den europeiska kontinenten. Vilken sorts kriser? Är det stormar och översvämningar, flyktingströmmar eller terroristattacker som menas?

Betänkandet presenterar möjligheten till gemensamma EU- och Nato-insatser på EU-territorium, men talar inte om hur och under vilka omständigheter det kan ske. I praktiken skulle det kunna betyda turkiska soldater i Grekland eller Nato-styrkor i neutrala EU-länder. Vem bestämmer vem som ska göra vad, och vad som ska göras? Texten öppnar också upp för det upp det frivilliga permanenta strukturerade samarbetet för Nato innan det ens har startat, och det är också väldigt problematiskt både rent strategiskt och politiskt för oss, men kanske också juridiskt.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! To jest jeszcze jedno kłopotliwe sprawozdanie. W większości jest rozsądne. Wprawdzie może niczego istotnego nie wnosi, ale przemawia przez nie świadomość rosnących zagrożeń, chociażby ze strony Rosji, i konieczności zwiększania wydatków na obronę, w przeciwieństwie do zupełnie nieodpowiedzialnych głosów jak ten, który przed chwilą słyszeliśmy ze strony pani Post. Ale zawiera ono też szalenie niebezpieczny ustęp 33, w którym podkreśla się, że państwa członkowskie UE powinny być w stanie prowadzić niezależne misje wojskowe również wówczas, gdy NATO nie chce podejmować działań lub gdy działania UE są odpowiedniejsze. To jest próba wywrócenia do góry nogami porządku bezpieczeństwa opartego na NATO. Próba ustawienia się przez Unię w kontrze do działań NATO i zapewnienia sobie swobody manewru przez mocarstwa europejskie, które starają się od Ameryki uniezależnić. Z tego powodu nie mogę poprzeć sprawozdania.

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, comme mes collègues l'ont déjà fait, je voudrais saluer l'ouverture de cette nouvelle ère dans la coopération entre l'Union et l'OTAN depuis la déclaration de Varsovie de 2016.

Complémentarité, coopération opérationnelle, coordination plus efficace, ce sont des mots clés, et comme mon collègue Danjean l'a rappelé, il faut toujours avoir en tête ce couple défense collective assumée par l'OTAN et autonomie stratégique de l'Union. Je crois que c'est un bon plan à suivre. C'est comme cela d'ailleurs que l'Europe sera un partenaire crédible, surtout dans les conditions actuelles, à savoir un regain d'agressivité russe aux frontières baltes et dans les pays d'Europe de l'Est, y compris dans les Balkans occidentaux.

Je ne pouvais pas terminer sans féliciter M. Paşcu pour son rapport. Je me permets de lui suggérer aussi de transmettre ce rapport à son chef de parti à Bucarest, il a beaucoup plus à dire sur l'Union et l'OTAN que M. Dragnea, qui vient de dire que l'Union et l'OTAN ont financé ce qu'ils appellent «l'État parallèle».

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrte Hohe Vertreterin! Es ist wichtig, dass das Europäische Parlament sich mit den Beziehungen zwischen EU und NATO beschäftigt, vor allem mit Blick darauf, dass die EU sich gerade in der eigenen Verteidigung neu definiert. Ich unterstütze eine gemeinsame europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik, die auf das Prinzip der Zusammenlegung und gemeinsamen Nutzung von Rüstungsgütern setzt. Gleichzeitig unterstütze ich eine Politik der Konversion und europäisch abgestimmter Rüstungsexporte als Instrument einer gemeinsamen Außenpolitik.

Als Mitglied der Europa-SPD fordere ich jedoch eine Revision des 2 %-Ziels der NATO in Richtung eines angemessenen Verteidigungshaushalts der EU-Mitgliedstaaten. Eine einfache Erhöhung der Ausgaben alleine ist nicht der richtige Schritt, um die Sicherheit der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu gewährleisten. Wir brauchen eine effizientere Europäisierung der Verteidigungsindustrien aller Mitgliedstaaten, die Hand in Hand mit einer gemeinsamen Strategie geht. Deshalb habe ich beantragt, über den entsprechenden Absatz im vorliegenden Text gesondert abzustimmen. Eine Unterstützung für das 2 %-Ziel der NATO wird es mit uns Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament nicht geben.

Marek Jurek (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Pani Wysoka Przedstawiciel! Planowana współpraca obronna Unii Europejskiej służyć będzie albo bezpieczeństwu naszych państw – i wówczas musimy pamiętać, że trzy czwarte naszych państw jest sprzymierzona w Sojuszu Atlantyckim – albo wyłącznie uniezależnieniu wymiaru obronnego od realnej polityki, a więc dostarczeniu władzom Unii Europejskiej kolejnego instrumentu i stopniowemu budowaniu supremacji w stosunku do naszych państw. Spytałem dzisiaj, Pani Wysoka Przedstawiciel, wiceprzewodniczącego Komisji, pana Timmermansa, o Nord Stream 2, a on długo mówił o bieżących wyzwaniach, które stoją przed Unią Europejską. Nie tylko nie odpowiedział na pytanie, ale wręcz odmówił zajęcia stanowiska, kiedy zwrócono mu uwagę. Wszyscy od czasów Clausewitza wiemy, że wymiar obronny musi służyć polityce. Jeżeli temu nie służy, to służy wyłącznie władzy.

David McAllister (PPE). – Sehr verehrte Frau Präsidentin, Frau Hohe Vertreterin, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit dem Europäischen Verteidigungsfonds, mit der Ständigen Strukturierten Zusammenarbeit und mit der Koordinierten Jährlichen Überprüfung der Verteidigung hat die Europäische Union in den letzten zwei Jahren in der gemeinsamen Verteidigung vermutlich mehr erreicht als in den Jahrzehnten zuvor. Davon werden sowohl die Europäische Union als auch die NATO insgesamt profitieren.

Ich möchte ein ganz konkretes Beispiel in dieser Debatte nennen. Anfang dieses Jahres habe ich die *NATO Battle Group Lithuania* in Rukla besucht. Dort wurde mir berichtet, wie hoch der logistische und administrative Aufwand ist, um Gerät und Fahrzeuge ins Baltikum zu transportieren. Wochenlang im Voraus müssen Genehmigungen eingeholt werden und Dutzende verschiedene Formulare, die sich wiederum in jedem Land unterscheiden, ausgefüllt werden. Deshalb begrüße ich das PESCO-Projekt zur Verbesserung der *Military Mobility* ausdrücklich. Wir können es uns eben nicht leisten, dass militärische Transporte, wenn es darauf ankommt, durch bürokratische Hürden und unzureichende Transportnetze gebremst werden. Das ist ein gelungenes Beispiel für die Zusammenarbeit von Europäischer Union und NATO. Da sollten wir weitermachen.

Neena Gill (S&D). – Madam President, NATO is facing unprecedented challenges. It is forced to expand its operations for the first time since the Cold War, to extend its actions into domains of counter-terrorism and cybersecurity. Transatlantic unity is vital to NATO, but it's crumbling, as we evidenced at G7 earlier this week. That's why next month's NATO summit has to sustain the momentum in the creation of the European Defence Union. We cannot waste over EUR 25 billion a year on inefficiencies.

My questions to the High Representative are: whilst Russia is clearly a top priority, what about the world's second largest defence spender, increasingly aggressive in the South and East China Sea and spectacularly growing its military footprint in Africa – China? I do recognise that there have been talks at staff level with China that have resumed, but the EU and NATO need to engage more actively in this part of the world to avoid being behind the curve.

Secondly, regardless of Brexit, UK and EU security will remain closely entwined. What is the architecture of our future cooperation? How do we ensure unity remains the watchword for our security?

Ангел Джамбазки (ECR). – Позволете ми в началото да изразя своите съболезнования на семействата на двама български военни пилоти, които загинаха в катастрофа с военен хеликоптер вчера вечерта при изпълнение на тренировъчна задача.

Тази катастрофа показва колко се нуждаят нашите държави от по-тясно сътрудничество помежду си, от закупуване на нова бойна техника, която да бъде съвместима и която да изпълнява натовските стандарти. Няма съмнение, всеки един отбранителен съюз, включително НАТО, трябва да има ясна командна линия.

Да, необходимо е партньорство между Европейския съюз и НАТО. Да, необходимо е европейските държави да осъществяват засилено взаимодействие в закупуването на оръжие, във вложенето на 2% от брутния си вътрешен продукт в това да обновят своите оръжейни системи и да бъдат адекватни, и да бъдат готови да отговорят на всякаква външна заплаха. Това е още по-важно за държави като България и Румъния, които се намират в черноморския регион, регион с изключително голяма несигурност.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – И аз искам да се присъединя към съболезнованията за близките на загиналите пилоти в България. Това показва още веднъж колко е важно да имаме надеждна техника, която да бъде съвместима в НАТО.

Първо искам да заявя, че НАТО е нашият отбранителен съюз. От нас зависи колко ефективен и силен е НАТО и затова Европейският съюз трябва да бъде ефективният и силен стълб на НАТО в Европа. Европейската отбранителна структура не може да бъде дублираща, а трябва да бъде допълваща към НАТО. Предизвикателствата пред нас са огромни, както тероризъм, екстремизъм, така и кибертероризъм, несигурно съседство, както от юг, така и от изток.

Общата ни цел е гарантирането на сигурността за европейските граждани. Никой няма право да разделя света на сфери, особено без да пита тези, които ще бъдат разделени. Такова нещо сме виждали след Втората световна война и това никога повече не трябва да бъде допускано. След Брексит 80% от разходите за отбрана на НАТО ще бъдат от страни извън Европейския съюз и три от четирите батальона на изток ще бъдат ръководени от държави, които не са членки на Европейския съюз.

В тази връзка наистина ние тук, в Европейския съюз, трябва да инвестираме много повече в отбранителната област, както в закупуване, така и в разходите за иновативни дейности и технологии.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, la Unión Europea y la OTAN son las dos grandes organizaciones internacionales que han asegurado la paz y la prosperidad en Europa después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial. Obviamente, la cooperación entre ambas, cada vez más dinámica desde 2014, es muy beneficiosa, y quiero felicitar al señor Paşcu por su informe.

Por otra parte, en la etapa actual de la construcción europea, uno de los grandes objetivos es el fortalecimiento de la Unión en el ámbito de la seguridad y defensa. Este desarrollo será también muy útil para la cooperación con la OTAN y reforzará el llamado pilar europeo.

Además, la Unión Europea y la OTAN se complementan. Esto es conveniente, por ejemplo, para las amenazas nuevas, como las híbridas, los atentados a la ciberseguridad, las crisis humanitarias y también frente al propio terrorismo. Estos desafíos y otros no se pueden afrontar solamente con medios militares. La variedad de recursos de la Unión Europea puede ser muy adecuada para afrontarlos.

Seamos pragmáticos. Estamos en un mundo complejo, interconectado, crecientemente multipolar. Por eso resulta necesario reforzar nuestras alianzas, aunque resulte difícil, y fortalecer también las relaciones entre las dos grandes organizaciones. Espero que a ello contribuya a la declaración conjunta que está prevista para el mes próximo con ocasión de la próxima cumbre de la OTAN en Bruselas.

Elmar Brok (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Hohe Vertreterin, meine Damen und Herren! Frau Präsidentin, herzlichen Dank für die Möglichkeit, noch einmal sprechen zu können. Ich möchte sagen: Die NATO ist trotz aller Krisen, die wir haben, eine höchst erfolgreiche Verteidigungsgemeinschaft, die wir für die kollektive Sicherheit Europas brauchen. Wir sollten das nicht vermischen mit Ärger über einen bestimmten amerikanischen Präsidenten. Aber wir sollten auch deutlich machen, dass wir ein Pfeiler, ein gleichberechtigter Pfeiler der NATO sein wollen und nicht Vasallen. Aber das bedeutet, dass wir stärker sein müssen. Und deswegen sollten wir uns nicht allein auf diese 2 %-Diskussion einlassen, sondern wir sollten deutlich machen, dass die Europäische Union die Synergieeffekte schaffen muss, die in der Verteidigungsunion vom Dezember angedeutet worden sind. Wenn wir diese Synergieeffekte schaffen, werden wir mit erträglich viel Geld militärisch stärker und können eine große Rolle spielen. Deswegen ist die Frage der Europäisierung unserer Verteidigungspolitik auch ein entscheidender Ansatzpunkt, die NATO glaubwürdig zu stärken.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Paní předsedající, svět kolem nás se mění. Pro zajištění bezpečnosti našich občanů musí Unie podstatně více spolupracovat s NATO. Navíc EU musí zvýšit svoji vlastní odpovědnost za svou bezpečnost a obranu. Stálá spolupráce v oblasti obrany PESCO by měla být jen prvním krokem.

NATO a EU v současnosti pojí více než 40 opatření, ve kterých rozvíjí vzájemnou spolupráci. Musíme se např. společně naučit, jak čelit hybridním hrozbám nebo spolupracovat v oblasti kybernetické obrany. Další možnost spolupráce vidím v diverzifikaci zbrojního průmyslu. Zjednodušeně řečeno, EU zbraně vyrábí, NATO zbraně v případě nutnosti obrany používá.

V současnosti je státním aktérem, který nejvíce ohrožuje mezinárodní mírové soužití, Ruská federace. Proto vítám posílení představené přítomnosti NATO na východní hranici aliance a rozmístění čtyř nadnárodních bojových skupin v Estonsku, Lotyšsku, Litvě a Polsku. Jsem rád, že zpráva říká, že je třeba posílit společný strategický přístup obou organizací vůči Rusku.

Lars Adaktusson (PPE). – Madam President, with developing instability around the world, EU cooperation on defence and security is a necessity. With this in mind, we should welcome increased European cohesion on research and development. Projects like Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) and the European Defence Fund are really significant. At the same time, some EU representatives consider this the first step towards a common EU army. Therefore, let me stress that the EU is not a military alliance. The relevant and credible military structure of Europe is NATO. Since 1949 NATO has been an effective, powerful instrument for security, stability and peace. So let's spend our time and our resources efficiently. Let's not contribute to a parallel military structure in Europe.

Željana Zovko (PPE). – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, visoka povjerenice, moje čestitke izvijestitelju na odlično pripremljenom izvješću koje ima za cilj naglasiti važnost strateškog partnerstva između Europske unije i NATO-a u suzbijanju zajedničkih prijetnji i izazova na globalnoj sceni. Hibridne prijetnje, terorizam, migracijski pritisci koje danas vidimo putem balkanske rute, kibernetički napadi kao i dezinformacijske neprijateljske kampanje, samo su neki od izazova s kojima se suočavaju države članice Europske unije i NATO-a, pa sukladno tome oni zahtijevaju zajednički odgovor s ciljem njihova uklanjanja.

Isto tako, suradnja Europske unije s NATO-om predstavlja integralni stup europske stabilnosti i sigurnosti, a kao dio globalne strategije Europske unije, ta suradnja pridonosi postizanju mira i stabilnosti na globalnoj razini. Međutim, moram naglasiti važnost donošenja daljih koraka ka stvaranju vlastitih snaga Europske unije s ciljem održavanja mira, stabilnosti i sigurnosti na vlastitim granicama i u susjedstvu.

Ako uzmemo u obzir činjenicu da neke države članice NATO-a imaju ozbiljnih problema u poštivanju temeljnih ljudskih prava, onda mislim da bi slijedeći logičan korak bio stvaranje europskih kapaciteta koji bi bili garant mira i stabilnosti u regiji, a posebice na zapadnom Balkanu, uz poštivanje temeljnih ljudskih prava koja se danas tako lako gaze u nekim našim partnerskim državama.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Madam President, in the past years, the EU and NATO have achieved a remarkable degree of cooperation. With many shared members, common interests and challenges, we were working in close cooperation and have stepped up in such areas as hybrid and cyber threats, military operations and exercises, and the fight against terrorism.

Especially we, the EU, have lately shown extensive efforts on defence, with concrete steps: for example, additional investments and better capabilities to share the burden of peace, security and defence equally. The launch of PESCO shows further the potential of how we can strengthen the European contribution within NATO.

EU-NATO cooperation should be further enhanced against hybrid and conventional threats in the East and South of the EU, with NATO remaining the keystone of collective defence in Europe. I welcome these steps brought forward and included in this report. They are timely and aimed in the right direction.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Współczuję koledze Paşcu. Prowadzi jednocześnie dwa ważne sprawozdania w sprawie PESCO i w sprawie dzisiejszej debaty i muszę powiedzieć, że te 360 poprawek zgłoszonych do tego sprawozdania, wiele, wiele poprawek zgłoszonych do tego drugiego dokumentu i pojawiające się elementy sabotażu na skrajnych częściach tej sali to nie jest sabotaż pracy naszego kolegi, ale warunków bezpieczeństwa Europy w trudnych okolicznościach, w trudnych kontekstach finansowych, gospodarczych, ekonomicznych, politycznych. Z jednej strony chcę podziękować za te wypracowane kompromisy, nie jeżeli chodzi o optymalne rozwiązania bezpieczeństwa, ale o kompromisy przede wszystkim do pewnej politycznej zgody, aby na tej sali uznać stosunki Unii Europejskiej i NATO za ważne, wymagające pracy, wymagające modyfikacji, wymagające wzmocnienia. Jestem oczywiście zwolennikiem tego sprawozdania i dziękuję za wykonaną pracę.

Catch-the-eye procedure

Jiří Pospíšil (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já velmi vítám tuto zprávu a jsem připraven pro ni hlasovat.

Jsem velmi rád, že zde hovoříme o spolupráci NATO a EU a že zde se nepokoušíme hovořit o alternativních vojenských strukturách, které bychom vytvářeli a které by vůči NATO měly být konkurencí. Pro nás v ČR je toto mimořádně důležité. My, EU, nejsme vojenský obranný spolek. Máme jaksi jiná pravidla a je třeba tedy, aby ta obranná složka, obranná část byla primárně na úrovni NATO.

To nebrání tomu, abychom my, členské státy EU, více spolupracovaly v oblasti vojenského výzkumu, v oblasti vojenských zakázek, aby zde případně byla další forma spolupráce, ale neměla by zde vznikat evropská armáda. To je myslím velmi důležité a ta zpráva jde správným směrem. NATO je partnerem, nikoliv konkurentem a já ji velmi podporuji.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, NATO je ključni okvir za europsku sigurnost. Iako postoji potreba za reformom kako bismo učinkovitije odgovarali na nove sigurnosne izazove, važno je da i Europska unija i Sjedinjene Države ostanu posvećeni ovom savezu.

Legitimna je želja članica Unije za ostvarivanjem europske posebnosti u odgovorima na sigurnosne izazove. Prirodno je da svatko želi svoju sudbinu držati prvenstveno u svojim rukama i kroititi sustav za obranu prema svojim potrebama.

Suradnja s globalnim partnerima u okviru NATO-a nije prepreka tome. Dapače, poziv američkog predsjednika Trumpa na veće izdvajanje europskih država za obranu otvara priliku za jačanje europskog političkog utjecaja i naših obrambenih kapaciteta unutar saveza.

Petras Auštrevičius (ALDE). – Madam President, NATO is, and will remain for years to come, the most vital security partnership framework. In this phase of multifaceted security challenges coming both from east and south, the EU and NATO have been deepening their cooperation during recent years.

I'm very glad to see that many European Union countries, including my home country – Lithuania – have met and even exceeded their obligation to allocate 2% of GDP for national defence this year. I believe we have to ensure even better coordination of our capabilities and resources, as well as coordination at the strategic level.

However, despite these achievements of deeper integration, we still lack today tools at our disposal to guarantee the most efficient, collective defence of European citizens and NATO allies.

EU budget spending on the Union's and its partners' security must be regarded positively and will lead to an increase in public confidence.

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κατά την άποψή μου, εάν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ήθελε πραγματικά να γίνει ένας πόλος ειρήνης, ανεξάρτητος και διαφορετικός από άλλους στρατιωτικούς άξονες, θα έπρεπε να αναπτύξει την τάση της προς την κατεύθυνση της ειρήνης και των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, μακριά από στρατιωτικούς εξοπλισμούς.

Ταυτόχρονα υποτίθεται ότι υπάρχει αλληλεγγύη μεταξύ των κρατών που είναι ενταγμένα στο NATO. Θα ήθελα όμως να σας διαβάσω μια δήλωση του κυρίου Μπαχτσελί, βασικού υποστηρικτή του Ερντογάν, απέναντι στην Ελλάδα. Στη δήλωση αναφέρονται τα εξής: «Η Ελλάδα παίζει παιχνίδια με τα νησιά του Αιγαίου και πρέπει να γνωρίζει τα όριά της. Να μην ξεχνάνε τι πέρασαν οι παππούδες τους στον βυθό του Αιγαίου. Η θέληση του λαού της Τουρκίας, δόξα σοι ο Θεός, εξακολουθεί να υφίσταται και το Αιγαίο θα αποτελέσει τάφο των Ελλήνων». Δεν πρέπει να καταγγελθεί αυτή τοξική δήλωση;

Επιπρόσθετα ερωτηθείς γιατί παρουσιάζει την Κύπρο σε προεκλογικό σποτ ως τουρκική είπε: «Ναι. Είναι και θα παραμείνει τουρκική». Του λέω λοιπόν ότι η Κύπρος είναι πατρίδα Ελληνοκυπρίων και Τουρκοκυπρίων και, αν σήμερα η Κύπρος είναι αιχμάλωτη της Τουρκίας, κάποια στιγμή η πολιτική της Τουρκίας θα καταστεί αιχμάλωτη της Κύπρου.

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, gentile Alto rappresentante, un'importante relazione sulla cooperazione e complementarietà tra UE e NATO dovrebbe esprimersi con realismo e pragmatismo piuttosto che con approcci ideologici o dogmatici.

Una NATO che guarda quasi esclusivamente ad Est, dimenticandosi del lato balcanico dove ha operato per vent'anni, è una NATO senz'altro miope. Una relazione che accoglie con favore la continua tendenza ad aumentare la spesa per la difesa tra i membri della NATO non va in una direzione positiva, anzi. Un'eccessiva insistenza sul fianco orientale piuttosto che sul Mediterraneo è errata, dal momento che proprio in quest'area si nascondono diversi attori potenzialmente destabilizzanti per molti Stati membri, senza dimenticare le palesi criticità della Turchia che in alcun modo sono state sottolineate.

Avere un approccio bilanciato nei rapporti UE-NATO significa chiedere che in futuro i rapporti bilaterali siano a favore di alcuni obiettivi comuni e non necessariamente rivolti contro terzi. Serve un approccio bilanciato, serve un approccio che sappia valorizzare le necessità di sicurezza dei vari Stati membri delle due organizzazioni, un approccio che però sembra mancare in questa relazione e noi ci asterremo.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το NATO και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι οι δύο μεγάλοι Οργανισμοί της Δύσεως που έχουν το κοινό χαρακτηριστικό ότι πολλά κράτη μέλη του ενός είναι και μέλη του άλλου. Αυτό το δεδομένο συνηγορεί υπέρ της μεταξύ τους συνεργασίας, στους τομείς όμως εκείνους που δικαιολογείται μια τέτοια συνεργασία. Το NATO είναι στρατιωτική συμμαχία και έχει ως αποστολή τη διεξαγωγή της συλλογικής άμυνας και έτσι πρέπει να παραμείνει. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει να αντιμετωπίσει απειλές από την τρομοκρατία, επιθέσεις στον κυβερνοχώρο και υβριδικές επιθέσεις και η αντιμετώπιση αυτών των προβλημάτων αποτελεί κυρίως αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών, σε συνεργασία με την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση γενικότερα.

Αυτή τη στιγμή κανένα κράτος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως δεν αντιμετωπίζει κίνδυνο απειλής και επιθέσεως από τρίτη δύναμη, με εξαίρεση την Ελλάδα και την Κύπρο που απειλούνται ευθέως από την Τουρκία. Συνεπώς δεν υπάρχει λόγος να μεταβληθεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σε στρατιωτική συμμαχία. Εάν συμβεί κάτι τέτοιο, οι σχέσεις με το NATO θα είναι αλληλοσυγκρουόμενες, αλλά θα πρέπει να εξηγηθεί εναντίον τίνος θα στρέφεται αυτή η συμμαχία.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε για τις σχέσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και του NATO, αλλά δεν άκουσα τίποτε ούτε από τον εισηγητή ούτε από την κυρία Mogherini σε σχέση με την επιθετικότητα της Τουρκίας απέναντι στην Ελλάδα. Διότι είναι γνωστό ότι η Τουρκία απειλεί την πατρίδα μου συνεχώς. Έχουμε δηλώσεις Τούρκων αξιωματούχων ότι θα διεξάγουν και πόλεμο κατά της Ελλάδος, έχουμε συνεχείς παραβιάσεις του ελληνικού εναέριου χώρου και των χωρικών μας υδάτων από την Τουρκία και κυρίως έχουμε δύο Έλληνες στρατιωτικούς, οι οποίοι συμπλήρωσαν πάνω από 100 ημέρες φυλακισμένοι παράνομα στις τουρκικές φυλακές υψίστης ασφαλείας. Και η Τουρκία συνεχίζει αυτή την πολιτική. Πρέπει να απαιτήσουμε την άμεση απελευθέρωση των δύο Ελλήνων στρατιωτικών και να καταγγελθεί η Τουρκία για αυτό. Σας καλώ, κυρία Mogherini, να κάνετε εδώ μια δήλωση επί του θέματος αυτού για άμεση απελευθέρωση των δύο στρατιωτικών.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε θα ήθελα, όπως έκανε και η Αντιπρόεδρος της Επιτροπής Federica Mogherini, να ανακοινώσω στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο μια σημαντική συμφωνία που έγινε πριν από λίγες ώρες. Ο Πρωθυπουργός της Ελλάδας Αλέξης Τσίπρας και ο Πρωθυπουργός της Πρώην Γιουγκοσλαβικής Δημοκρατίας της Μακεδονίας Zoran Zaev με ρεαλισμό, διορατικότητα και τόλμη έκαναν μια συμφωνία που ανοίγει θετικούς δρόμους και για την Ελλάδα και για τη FYROM και για τα Βαλκάνια και για ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη. Και είμαι βέβαιος ότι και το Συμβούλιο και η Επιτροπή και το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, στη συντριπτική του πλειοψηφία από όλες τις πολιτικές ομάδες, θα χαιρετίσει και θα στηρίξει τη συμφωνία, όχι μόνο με θετικές δηλώσεις, όπως έκανε ήδη η Αντιπρόεδρος Federica Mogherini, αλλά και με έμπρακτη στήριξη των δύο λαών. Έγινε σήμερα ένα σημαντικό θετικό βήμα.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – De NAVO en de Europese Unie blijven de twee hoekstenen van de Europese veiligheidsarchitectuur. Wij steunen voluit de nauwere samenwerking tussen de EU en de NAVO. Door onze defensie-inspanningen internationaal beter op elkaar af te stemmen ontwikkelen we een meer efficiënte en slagvaardige defensie. De huidige hybride bedreigingen, cyberaanvallen, terrorisme enzovoort, zijn maar enkele van de uitdagingen die ons daartoe nopen.

Mijn delegatie is ook gewonnen voor de uitbouw van een Europese defensiegemeenschap. Specifieke samenwerkingsverbanden tussen bepaalde EU-lidstaten zijn daartoe een eerste stap. Zo werken België en Nederland nauw samen bij gezamenlijke aankopen en het onderhoud van fregatten en mijnenjagers of bij luchtbewakingsopdrachten. De permanente gestructureerde samenwerking op het vlak van defensie (PESCO) moet daarin een centrale rol spelen. Maar de verdere invulling laten we graag over aan de lidstaten, die op dat vlak exclusief bevoegd zijn.

(End of catch-the-eye procedure)

Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. – Madam President, first of all, let me thank Mr Paşcu for an excellent report and all of you for the good support that you have provided to the work we have done in these years. Many of you reminded us of the crucial steps we've made, both in strengthening the European Union defence but also in cooperation with NATO.

I would like to use these few minutes just to reassure you on the fact that, first, we will continue having a pragmatic, realistic approach as Mr Danjean mentioned. I believe we are beyond the ideological debate and we are focusing on the practical things we can and we have an interest in doing, and that the work will continue on the European way to defence and security, which is a particular one and which sometimes implies a military component but is never exclusively military.

We will continue doing this, obviously, in the Council. Just in a couple of weeks from now, we will have another session of the Foreign and Defence Ministers together in the Council to prepare the European Council at the end of June, with further progress, especially on the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO) but also on the EU-NATO partnership. That, I believe, will contribute also to the good preparation of the NATO summit for what concerns NATO issues. Then there might be other issues coming up on the agenda that do not relate to defence and security, strictly speaking.

I would also like to say that I believe that work will continue also in strong cooperation with other European institutions. I am thinking of the European Commission that is supporting this work for the first time ever, with especially the European Defence Fund and the proposed Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), but also with the European Defence Agency, which is doing a fantastic job in supporting technically all this work.

So, thank you for the support. Thank you also for the indications. Last point: some of you mentioned the future relations with the UK. Let me say very clearly this will have nothing to do with relations between the European Union and NATO; clearly so. It has something to do with our work in the Permanent Structured Cooperation. Member States will come to that point later this year to define ways in which third countries might be invited to join some PESCO projects, but is not for now and it is not for NATO. I believe that, including our strong EU-NATO cooperation, we will find ways to have constructive work between the European Union and the UK after Brexit happens, because we share the same security objectives, and I believe that in this field we will manage to build strong cooperation in the future.

Ioan Mircea Pașcu, Rapporteur. – Madam President, I would like to start by thanking the High Representative, Ms Mogherini, because she gave us a lot of extra information in the beginning, so we now know more about the collaboration, but also because she responded to some of the problems raised by my colleagues here and makes my task easier from this point of view.

Our debate has been another example of the classical paradigm in which a bunch of blindfolded men are touching an elephant, and everyone is touching one part of that elephant and is describing a totally different animal. So although we have the same report in front of us, you saw how differently we present it.

To Mr Van Orden and I would say that, instead of still using the old the image of a half-empty and a half-full glass, I would say that we have a glass which we fill from the two faucets at the same time. This probably better indicates the reality. I did not know that I have to bring something new in this report, because I did not know that this should be considered a PhD thesis. Some colleagues would like to see the novelty and when they don't, they don't like it.

I am not a good Samaritan. My life experience up until now indicated to me that practically turning the cheek for another slap is not always the right thing to do, and that's why I support the EU's efforts in the field of security and defence. I would also say thank you to Mr Preda for his congratulations, but I'm also regretting the fact that he could not isolate himself from bringing internal politics into our discussion today.

I would like to conclude by saying thanks to all the rapporteurs. Indeed we worked very, very well. There were many amendments. We found the compromises, which are reflected in the report. At the same time I'm thanking everybody who has said good words about the report but also the critics, because it indicates that they took the effort to read the report.

President. – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Wednesday, 13 June 2018.

Written statements (Rule 162)

Vladimír Maňka (S&D), písomne. – Základom spolupráce medzi EÚ a NATO musia aj do budúcnosti zostať hodnoty demokracie, mieru, ľudských práv, slobôd a rešpektovanie suverenity a nezávislosti členských štátov oboch subjektov. Spolupráca a koordinácia dotknutých zložiek, posilnenie taktickej a operačnej spolupráce v oblasti bezpečnosti, obrany a ochrany pred vojenskými útokmi spolu s budovaním náležitej vojenskej techniky a nových technológií však musia zohľadňovať aj nové formy hrozieb a útokov spojené najmä s digitalizáciou a kybernetickými útokmi. Treba dbať na to, aby táto podpora nebola zneužívaná napr. na podporu terorizmu alebo na činnosti a útoky vyvolávajúce konflikty. Okrem toho netreba zabúdať, že samotné navyšovanie výdavkov na zbrojenie a koordinácia výdavkov nestačí. Je potrebné vyzvať našich partnerov, predovšetkým USA, aby viac zdrojov smerovali na rozvojovú pomoc. Bez financovania vzdelávania nedokážeme riešiť chudobu a nezamestnanosť napríklad v Afrike, ani obrovský demografický boom na tomto kontinente, ktorý v spojení s chudobou je rizikom nielen pre Afriku, ale pre nás všetkých.

Jarosław Wałęsa (PPE), na písmie. – Współpraca Unii Europejskiej z innymi międzynarodowymi organizacjami jest istotnym aspektem jej polityki zagranicznej. Na marginesie szczytu NATO, który odbył się w Warszawie w 2016 r., została podpisana wspólna deklaracja UE-NATO. W sprawozdaniu przeprowadzona została szczegółowa analiza podobieństw i różnic obu organizacji, a także zakres ich adaptacji do nowego i wciąż wymagającego ewaluacji środowiska geopolitycznego. Sprawozdanie podkreśla szeroką gamę narzędzi (twardych i miękkich), które w celu wzmocnienia wzajemnej komplementarności obu organizacji mogą zostać wdrożone w razie, gdy zajdzie taka potrzeba.

Skuteczniejsza i wydajniejsza współpraca między UE a NATO nie jest celem samym w sobie, ale oznacza osiągnięcie wspólnych priorytetów związanych z bezpieczeństwem, a także wzmacnianie wzajemnych wartości, takich jak liberalna demokracja, multilateralizm, ochrona praw człowieka i praworządność. Kooperacja pomiędzy obiema organizacjami musi być komplementarna i respektować wzajemne specyfikę, rolę i autonomię podejmowania decyzji.

W sprawozdaniu podsumowano także postęp osiągnięty w dwustronnej współpracy między UE a NATO od 2016 r. Należy podkreślić jednak, że jest to proces ciągły, który wciąż trwa. Główne obszary współpracy obejmują: bezpieczeństwo i ochronę cyberprzestrzeni, poszerzanie możliwości rozwoju dla przemysłu i badań, wysiłki na rzecz budowania solidniejszego wzajemnego partnerstwa, analizę i przeciwdziałanie zagrożeniom hybrydowym, kwestie bezpieczeństwa morskiego, walkę z terroryzmem, mobilność wojskową, pomoc dla obszarów dotkniętych konfliktami, utrzymanie pokoju i bezpieczeństwa państw członkowskich i stowarzyszonych.

17. Further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine (debate)

President. – The next item is the report by Jarosław Wałęsa, on behalf of the Committee on International Trade, on the proposal for a decision of the European Parliament and of the Council providing further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine (COM(2018)0127 – C8-0108/2018 – 2018/0058(COD)) (A8-0183/2018).

Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, deputising for the rapporteur. – Madam President, I am speaking on behalf of rapporteur Jarosław Wałęsa, who is not able to be here due to family reasons (he is about to become a father, which is always I suppose a very happy thing). Macrofinancial assistance is an exceptional emergency mechanism aimed at addressing severe balance of payment difficulties in third countries. In other words, it is a financial instrument and its purpose is economic stabilisation.

This is the fourth time that the Commission proposes macrofinancial assistance (MFA) for Ukraine since the beginning of the war in 2014. This time, the Commission proposes EUR 1 billion to be dispersed as medium- and long-term loans. The assistance is also intended to trigger reforms in Ukraine, which is done by agreeing with the Ukrainian authorities a Memorandum of Understanding. This Memorandum sets out the supporting policy measures which are conditional for the disbursements of the funds.

In that context, I would like to highlight three key elements. First, the worsening conflict and casualties in the east of Ukraine and all the many socio-economic consequences of this aggression. Second, the economic recovery, which remains fragile. Third, the reform process, which has been important but is not really steady until now. Hence, the need for support for these reforms in the context where many interests can play against, especially in pre-election years. That being said, to address any doubts that may arise during this debate, the MFA is not an unconditional support. There are firm conditions to ensure that this money will serve economic stabilisation and support the reforms.

It is very important to remind that the Commission cancelled the last tranche of the third MFA programme when some of Ukraine's commitments were not fulfilled. Therefore, it is crucial that the two unfulfilled anti-corruption measures will be part of the new conditions. If corruption is not addressed drastically, MFA funds should not be delivered to Ukraine.

A step in the right direction is the adoption of the law on the high anti-corruption court this last week. In addition, the newly adopted law was signed yesterday by the President of Ukraine. The rapporteur welcomes this news with great satisfaction: it means that Ukrainians take the commitment seriously.

I believe that our common goal is to help Ukraine, but it is true that we need to closely follow the situation. If we are serious about our goal, we cannot slow down the procedures. This means that the rapporteur does not support any amendments tabled to the plenary and recommends closing the file at first reading.

To end, I would like to underline once again that this report is just a legal base for the Commission to disburse the money, but they will do so only when Ukrainians manage to fulfil all the agreed and outstanding conditions. The rapporteur is very sure that the Commission will take this role actively and will pay great attention to political evolutions in Ukraine.

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me first thank the rapporteur, Mr Wałęsa, and the Committee on International Trade (INTA) for their work on this report. I would also like to thank the Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) for its valuable contribution to this debate.

The partnership between Ukraine and the EU has grown deeper and stronger. Today I am seeking your support to maintain this momentum through the adoption of a further proposal for macro-financial assistance (MFA). A look at the past MFA operation from 2014 shows how important this support is for Ukraine.

First, back in 2014, the MFA was a key EU instrument to provide immediate financial assistance to Ukraine in order to stabilise its economic and financial situation. Ukraine returned to economic recovery and growth in 2016 and 2017, after two years of steep recession. It is an important success story, not only for Ukraine, but also for the EU.

Second, the MFA has played a major role in supporting reforms in Ukraine and, in particular, in stabilising Ukraine's economy in the medium term. Through this programme, the EU has supported a broad range of anti-corruption reforms, including the establishment of the anti-corruption infrastructure, spearheaded by the National Anti-Corruption Bureau. Reforms to its energy and public procurement markets also helped to eliminate major sources of corruption. It has also helped Ukraine to improve its public finance management, to clean up its banking sector and to improve its business environment, for example, by automating VAT returns and reducing red tape.

However, despite its recovery, Ukraine's economic situation remains fragile. Russia's destabilising actions in eastern Ukraine continue, and the security situation remains tense. Ukraine is paying a high price. For example, its defence spending reached 5% of GDP last year, which otherwise could be used for the development of Ukraine. Ukraine's debt repayment obligations will increase substantially in 2018 and 2019, putting a very heavy burden on the state budget. We cannot afford to let Ukraine fail. Therefore, the new MFA operation is necessary, along with other international support, in particular from the International Monetary Fund.

Having stressed the importance of this MFA proposal, let me add a clear message on the reforms in Ukraine. As always, this MFA proposal is strictly linked to reform conditions. Due to delays with the implementation of agreed anti-corruption reforms, the Commission cancelled the last disbursement under MFA III in January 2018. In order to give a clear political signal to the Ukrainian authorities that the newly proposed MFA operation will also be subject to state conditionality, Parliament, the Council and the Commission have agreed – on Parliament's initiative – to attach a joint statement to the legislative decision. I am convinced that this joint statement adequately addresses the key concerns of MEPs voiced in the committee process.

First, the joint statement recalls that the political preconditions of the MFA require Ukraine to respect democratic mechanisms, including a multi-party system, the rule of law and human rights under the scrutiny of the Commission and the European External Action Service. Second, the statement makes clear that the fight against corruption will be at the heart of the policy conditions of the memorandum of understanding to be agreed between EU and Ukraine for this MFA operation. Related issues, like money laundering and tax evasion, will also be taken into account for the conditionality of this operation. Specifically, the unmet anti-corruption conditions from the previous MFA operation should be implemented. These conditions were the establishment of the verification system for asset declarations and verification of companies' beneficial ownership data.

Further MFA assistance will be conditional on progress in setting up a well-functioning anti-corruption court. Importantly, last week the Ukrainian Parliament adopted the law on the high anti-corruption court by 315 votes. That is 88 votes more than needed for a majority. Yesterday, the law was signed by the President of Ukraine. Let me also say that, behind that, Commissioner Hahn and I have raised the issue of abolishing the obligation of e-declarations on anti-corruption activists. This remains an urgent issue to be addressed, just like the reform of the Central Election Commission.

We are at a crucial point in time in Ukraine, with the expiry of the IMF programme in March 2019 and presidential and parliamentary elections also looming next year. The window of opportunity for reforms may be closing as the election approaches, so it is important to get this MFA programme up and running in the shortest possible time. If we delay or turn our backs on Ukraine, the risk of reform reversals would be high. So I hope that we will have your full support going forward.

Michael Gahler, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Affairs*. – Thank you very much, Madam President, dear Commissioner and dear rapporteur. I am very grateful that we are where we are now. Indeed, Ukraine needs this support and it deserves this support, and it is very appropriate to have this next programme now.

As the Commissioner and the rapporteur outlined, we have attached conditions to it, and rightly so, because it is about the people in the country that expect their politicians to deliver, in particular as regards the fight against corruption. This endemic, systemic problem needs to be addressed, and I hope that, by the end of this legislature in March next year, we will see the Court working to address major violations of the rule of law in the area of corruption.

As Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET), we were perhaps more ambitious than the Committee on International Trade (INTA). We wanted to attach real political conditions, namely the court, the abolition of e-declarations for NGO activists and the reform of the central and the other election commissions. I am grateful to the Commissioner that you – although it is not included in the joint declaration – explicitly referred to that, because that is what it is also about. We need to be very clear in this regard.

I was grateful that the President of the Parliament, when I was in Kyiv on Saturday and we were sitting together on the panel, showed me his fresh signature on this very law. He promised that he would go to the President and see to it that the President initiated the implementing law, which is still required. The Verkhovna Rada should then vote on the implementing law in the following week. We are looking forward to seeing that, and that is what we can expect.

Sandra Kalniete, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, our decision on the macro-financial assistance to Ukraine is a message of strong continued support for a democratic and European Ukraine. It is a message to the people of Ukraine, to its government and also to Russia.

I admire the Ukrainian civil society that has been the driving force behind many reforms in Ukraine. I commend the women and men in Ukraine's public service who work hard on implementing these reforms. I encourage all the Ukrainian politicians to follow through on their promises to fight and prevent corruption. The Ukrainian people expect it and their patience is wearing thin. Work hard not to repeat the mistakes of the past. I would also like to send a message to Russia that building a democratic, strong and independent Ukraine remains our strategic objective.

Aleksander Gabelic, *för S&D-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Kommissionär Dombrovskis! Först vill jag tacka mina kollegor som arbetat med det här förslaget. Ukraina är en viktig granne. Det är därför av största betydelse att EU fortsätter att stödja landets utveckling åt rätt håll. Särskilt i tider av oro är det extra viktigt att vi inte ger upp. Vi kan inte överge de reformvänliga krafterna och det viktiga civilsamhället i Ukraina.

Ända sedan vi började arbeta i Europaparlamentets handelsutskott har jag varit mycket tydlig med att kommissionen inte kan förvänta sig att vi per automatik godkänner dess förslag. Vi måste ges tid att granska och debattera förslaget. Vi måste få göra vårt jobb som medlagstiftare. Vi vill därför vara lika tydliga i dag gentemot både kommissionen och Ukraina om vad som krävs för att det här makroekonomiska stödet ska göra faktisk skillnad till det bättre för hela samhället och inte bara några få.

De överenskomna villkoren om att bekämpa korruptionen måste vara omfattande och tydliga. En särskild domstol mot korruption har nyss godkänts av Ukrainas parlament, men nu måste den komma på plats och faktiskt fungera i praktiken. De överenskomna villkoren måste också främja en hållbar och socialt ansvarsfull utveckling, som skapar sysselsättning, bidrar till ökad jämlikhet och minskar fattigdomen.

Efter mycket diskussion i både handels- och utrikesutskottet tycker vi att vi har lyckats hitta en god kompromiss och en förstärkt position genom ett tydligt och starkt gemensamt uttalande från alla tre institutionerna. Nu förväntar vi oss att kommissionen och rådet fortsätter stå helt och fullt bakom vårt gemensamma uttalande. Vi förväntar oss att kommissionen fortlöpande rapporterar om det makroekonomiska stödet och uppfyllandet av villkoren. Vi förväntar oss också att kommissionen presenterar samförståndsavtalet snarast.

Petras Auštrevičius, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I certainly welcome today's deliberations and the good speed with which we are moving towards the adoption of a new package of macrofinancial assistance to Ukraine. Let me say from the outset: the proposal on the table, as adopted by the leading committee (Committee on International Trade, INTA), is a very balanced step forward.

Just to look back a little bit: in my view, the conditions set for the previous MFA package – 21 policy measures in total – were far too many and too complicated. In all fairness, it was also the EU's mistake that the last MFA instalment to Ukraine was refused even though 17 conditions had been fulfilled. This time we are given proof: Ukraine is able to deliver once it receives clear-cut signals and expectations from our side.

Establishment of the High Anti-Corruption Court is with no doubt a very meaningful step in the creation of a future and European Ukraine. I would like to stress very clearly that, even though we are right to expect many more things to be accomplished by Ukraine on its European path, we cannot deny the truth. And the truth is that it is precisely Ukraine which is setting an example for the whole world on how a country which is in a state of war is able to progress with reforms and great transformation. Yes, implementation is that important, but there is always a stage of adoption beforehand. Let me mention just a few more acts of legislation recently approved by the Verkhovna Rada: the law on pension reform, the law on healthcare and the law on education. These are the facts.

I wish to conclude by saying that clear-cut responsibilities also remain with us, the EU: the EU's policies and conditions must be tailored in such a way that eventually help to protect Ukraine's independence and do not jeopardise the socio-economic life of its people.

Puhetta johti HEIDI HAUTALA

varapuhemies

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte mich in dieser Debatte bei meinen Kollegen Rosati, Gahler und Auštrevičius bedanken. Wir sind im letzten Jahr immer wieder zusammengekommen – in Kiew und in Brüssel. Wir haben die Vertreter der Antikorruptionsinitiativen AntAC und Transparency Ukraine getroffen. Wir haben unsere Kollegen Hrojsman, Klympusch, Marija Ionowa, Herrn Parubij und viele andere Kollegen aus der Werchowna Rada getroffen und um Schritte zur Korruptionsbekämpfung in der Ukraine regelrecht gerungen.

Die Entscheidung für die Schaffung eines Antikorruptions-Gerichtshofs ist eine Entscheidung, die in einer aktiv geführten Auseinandersetzung um eine bessere Zukunft der Ukraine getroffen worden ist. Und ich finde, dass diese Abstimmung in der Werchowna Rada wirklich ein Moment gewesen ist, den wir zusammen eigentlich feiern sollten. Ich wünschte, ich könnte hier ein Glas Champagner erheben.

Ich weiß, dass mit dieser Entscheidung nicht alles gewonnen ist. Ich weiß, dass diese Auseinandersetzung weitergeht. Die Erklärung von Herrn Dombrovskis und das aktive Engagement aller europäischen Botschafter und der EU-Botschaft und des IWF für die Reformen in der Ukraine mit den Ukrainern zusammen – das ist vielversprechend für eine erfolgreiche Reform in der Ukraine. Das wird nicht morgen zu Ende sein. Ich glaube, wir reden über einen Prozess, der über eine gesamte Generation gehen wird. Das Geld, das wir jetzt freigeben, ist gar nicht so wahnsinnig viel verglichen mit anderen Summen, die wir an andere Länder geben, auch innerhalb der EU, und das wird den Ukrainern helfen.

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar! Unsere Anträge, die Makrofinanzhilfe an die Ukraine direkt im Gesetz mit klaren Konditionen zu belegen, wurden von Kommission, Rat und Berichterstatter mit der Begründung zurückgewiesen, dass die Zeit dränge. So hohe Summen im Eilverfahren zu beschließen, wird jedoch weder der Sache gerecht noch der Demokratie. Wohl nicht nur meiner Fraktion drängt sich der Verdacht auf, dass es sich bei dieser Eilentscheidung genau zu diesem Zeitpunkt auch um einen sehr teuren Akt der Wahlkampfhilfe für die Regierung Poroschenko handelt.

Ich respektiere jedoch, dass Sie in dieser Situation sogar bereit waren, wichtige Forderungen, auch der Linken, zu akzeptieren, Herr Dombrovskis. Sie haben sich schriftlich verpflichtet, dass die mit der Auszahlung verbundenen Auflagen den sozialen Zusammenhalt in der Gesellschaft der Ukraine nicht gefährden. Neben ökonomischen und fiskalischen Auflagen wurde Armutsbekämpfung nun erstmals zum Ziel erhoben. Die EU-Kommission wird über die sozialen Auswirkungen der Politiken berichten müssen und – ich ergänze – auch über die Umsetzung dieser Politiken und der vielen Gesetze, die jetzt schon genannt wurden.

Spätestens hier wird klar: Wir sprechen auch über einen politischen Schritt, der weit über die Bedeutung einer Vorwahl-Situation in der Ukraine hinausgeht – auch wenn wir über die überfällige Installation des Antikorruptionsgerichts und der Bekämpfung der endemischen Korruption sprechen.

Beweisen Sie es jetzt in der Praxis! Der IWF fordert, Energiepreise nun völlig den Marktmechanismen zu überlassen. Für alle Haushalte würde das Heizen noch einmal um vierzig Prozent teurer werden. Fragen Sie Kommissar Hahn: Ein kalter Winter droht, und die Regierung befürchtet soziale Unruhen. Reden Sie dem IWF diese Forderung aus!

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth, *on behalf of the EFDD Group*. – Madam President, to start off with, let's address corruption in Ukraine. The finance minister for Ukraine was dismissed last week. The stated reason for the dismissal was disseminating false information. One has to ask: what was this? Very simply, the now ex-finance minister revealed, exposed, spilt the beans on corruption in Ukraine.

Hopefully, everyone here will agree that we must not condone – let alone be fellow travellers to – corruption. Indeed, we must actively oppose it. Transparency International is a globally respected organisation, especially on anti-corruption. On its criteria, Ukraine is categorised as the second most corrupt country on the entire European continent. To put it another way: Ukraine rates even worse for corruption than the gangster-influenced regimes of Albania and Kosovo. Ukraine has delayed and delayed over and over again the establishment of an anti-corruption court. Vote or no vote, let us see how long it is before the president implements that vote. Worse, campaigners against corruption have been intimidated and, in some cases, imprisoned. To provide an example: on 15 March this year, one Nadia Savchenko testified on the corruption in the office of the President of Ukraine. One week later, Ms Savchenko was placed under arrest and charged with terrorism offenses. The same president had previously awarded Ms Savchenko Ukraine's highest honour for bravery against terrorists.

These practices must be deemed to be unacceptable. Every informed person – and that has to include the EU embassy in Ukraine, and therefore the Commissioner – knows about the appalling level of corruption in Ukraine. The sacking of the finance minister last week for opposing corruption should have caused the alarm bells to ring. Instead, the considered response of the Ukraine groupies in the Commission and, regrettably, in this Parliament (and there are many honourable exceptions) is simply to hand out to Ukraine – without question, without adequate audits, and without enough consideration – these very large sums of money, all paid for by the taxpayer. What we are discussing this evening with such rapidity is over EUR 1 billion. By comparison, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) is holding back on its assistance programmes to Ukraine, precisely because of well-founded concerns on corruption. On the objective criteria of the IMF, Ukraine does not pass muster as a worthy recipient of large-scale funds. The EU should follow the same course as the IMF: these payments should not be made.

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

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE), *blue-card question*. – Could you name one other single country which gets macrofinancial assistance, is fighting corruption and has created independent institutions such as a national anti-corruption office and is preparing its own high anti-corruption court? And could you please also tell me what, in London, you are supporting as measures in the city against the international money-laundering systems?

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFDD), *blue-card answer*. – I'll just deal with Ukraine, and not the City of London. What Ukraine is doing is too little, too late – it's not enough. These funds should be held back. I would point you again – if I may presume to do so – to the example of the IMF: that is the view that the IMF has taken. I strongly recommend that the EU and the Commission do the self-same thing. And thank you very much for your interruption.

France Jamet, *au nom du groupe ENF*. – Madame la Présidente, oui, vous avez raison M. Dartmouth! La situation en Ukraine, Mesdames et Messieurs, empire de jour en jour. La guerre du Donbass, la corruption – l'Ukraine occupe la 131^e place sur 176 à travers le monde en matière de corruption –, déni de démocratie, liberté de la presse bafouée, criminalité en hausse, y compris jusqu'au sommet de l'État; et souvenons-nous de l'affaire Babtchenko.

Non, le régime de Kiev, Madame, ne fait aucun effort et vous le savez! Nous ne voyons dans cette énième assistance macrofinancière que l'expression d'une farouche volonté de la part de Bruxelles de maintenir des tensions avec la Russie.

Mais au-delà de cette forme d'interventionnisme de la Commission à l'égard de l'Ukraine, je dénonce ici l'intention de la Commission de profiter de la situation pour accroître ses compétences et réduire ainsi le rôle de notre Parlement à celui d'une simple chambre d'enregistrement.

Enfin, Madame le Président, chers collègues, ces sommes importantes seraient bien mieux employées à soutenir nos agriculteurs pris en otage depuis 2014 à la suite des sanctions prises contre la Russie et qui paient aujourd'hui le prix fort de choix politiques ubuesques et désastreux auxquels nous sommes fermement opposés.

Dariusz Rosati (PPE). – Madam President, first of all, I would call on this House to approve the macrofinancial assistance for Ukraine tomorrow. Ukraine has made a lot of effort and has taken a lot of important steps in order to fight corruption. I very much share the concerns that have been raised by a number of colleagues here. This is not work which has been completed; this is a work in progress. But the progress has been substantial. Just a few days ago, Ukraine established an independent anti-corruption court, which had been the key pre-condition for the release of macrofinancial assistance.

Of course, there is still a lot to be done. We want Ukraine to exempt NGOs from the e-declaration obligation, and this has been promised and is under execution. We want anti-corruption court legislation to be implemented by the president, and we have had a promise that it will be done as soon as possible – within the next few days. If we don't take the decision right now, the whole thing may be postponed by several months. So I would kindly request colleagues to support this motion and open this possibility of financing to Ukraine.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospođa predsjedavajuća, zahvaljujem izvjestiteljima na predstavljenim stajalištima i svima koji su pregovarali o tekstu zajedničke izjave. U proljeće 2014., Ukrajina je započela s provedbom programa reformi kako bi stabilizirala gospodarstvo i poboljšala životne uvjete građana. Ukrajina i Unija zajednički su utvrdili program reformi, poznati su podaci o prethodnim isplatama, kao i problemi s isplatom posljednje runde pomoći zbog neispunjavanja svih kriterija. To uključuje antikorupcijske reforme i transparentno trošenje dodijeljenog novca. Ti su uvjeti opravdani, ali potrebno je pozdraviti postignute rezultate u nepromijenjeno teškoj političkoj situaciji u Ukrajini, koja kao da tone na listi vanjskopolitičkih prioriteta uslijed pojave nekih novih kriza.

Pozdravljam usvajanje Zakona o antikorupcijskom sudu kao važan iskorak u traženim reformama za dobrobit građana Ukrajine, stoga sutra trebamo glasovati bez potrebe da usvojeni tekst nadograđujemo dodatnim elementima, koji bi otvorili međuinstitucionalne procese i dodatno odgodili isplatu. Međutim, podržavam i nastavak praćenja provedbe reformi, osobito kada je u pitanju ispunjavanje uvjeta povezanih s prošlim i budućim programima makrofinancijske pomoći. Radi se o jačanju neovisnog pravosuđa, sposobnog za učinkovitu borbu protiv korupcije te jamčenju poštivanja ljudskih prava, što treba biti sadržaj posebnog memoranduma o razumijevanju s Ukrajinom.

Makrofinansjijska pomoć pomogla bi gospodarskoj stabilizaciji i strukturnim reformama u Ukrajini, našoj važnoj susjedi, zbog čega podržavam novu isplatu.

Eleonora Forenza (GUE/NGL). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, io sono una terrorista internazionale. Ovviamente non lo sono realmente, lo sono per il regime di Poroshenko, che mi ha accusato di terrorismo internazionale per essermi recata in Donbass insieme alla carovana antifascista a portare solidarietà e generi di prima necessità alle popolazioni che stanno subendo una guerra.

Io mi sono davvero stupita che questo Parlamento stia prendendo in considerazione di sostenere questa quarta tranche, perché parliamo di un governo non solo corrotto, di un governo appoggiato da forze neonaziste, di un governo che nega i più elementari diritti umani, che uccide i giornalisti, e stiamo sostenendo un colpo di Stato, come quello dell'Euro- Maidan, soltanto perché è filo-Unione europea. Stiamo sostenendo un governo che viola i diritti umani, viola gli accordi di Minsk.

Io credo che, se si vuole davvero costruire un'Europa antifascista, bisognerebbe smettere di finanziare regimi come quello di Poroshenko e sostenere invece opere e azioni politiche come quelle delle carovane antifasciste, che personalmente ringrazio.

Eduard Kukan (PPE). – Madam President, I support macroeconomic assistance, and I am glad that we are going to extend our help to Ukraine. This assistance should help Ukraine to balance part of its external financing needs for late 2018 and early 2019. It is therefore important that we could agree on sending the assistance at the right time. This, however, does not mean that Ukraine has already finished with the reform agenda. We should closely follow developments and, if necessary, put pressure on the Ukraine authorities to timely implement the agreed reforms.

I think that Ukraine has made progress in its transition from an oligarchic to a more Western, liberal, democratic system. Those of us who come from behind the Iron Curtain know that there is no easy way to do it. Ukraine has enormous potential to modernise and become a leader in the reforms. It is in our interests to support it in this difficult transition.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE). – Nepaisant besitęsiančios Rusijos agresijos prieš Ukrainą, praėjusią savaitę įveiktas sunkus etapas. Ukrainos parlamentas priėmė įstatymą dėl antikorupcinio Teismo įsteigimo. Tai labai svarbus ir ilgai lauktas sprendimas. Ukrainos valstybė vykdo savo išpareigojimus, ir jai tenka veikti labai sunkiomis sąlygomis, kai beveik kasdien žūsta kariai ir civiliai, kai dalis valstybės teritorijos, Krymas yra okupuotas. Galime pasidžiaugti, kad mes ir Ukraina turime Asociacijos ir Laisvosios prekybos susitarimus bei bevizį režimą. Kita vertus, yra daugybė būtinų reformų, kurias Ukraina turi įgyvendinti. Situacija yra sudėtinga, todėl mūsų vertinimai turi būti ypatingai objektyvus. Dėl to palaikau Komisijos pasiūlymą suteikti naują vieno milijardo eurų vertės makrofinansinę paramą Ukrainai. Ši finansinė parama padės Ukrainai žengti pirmyn, vykdyti reikalingas reformas, stabilizuoti ekonomiką ir vykdyti struktūrines reformas.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Państwa Partnerstwa Wschodniego oczekują od nas, po pierwsze, zainteresowania, po drugie, środków finansowych, czyli wsparcia, ale po trzecie, dzielenia się także własnymi doświadczeniami, praktyką. Stawianie warunków Ukrainie to dobry pomysł, przede wszystkim dlatego, aby środki finansowe – krótko mówiąc – nie były zmarnowane. Skoro jednak stawiamy warunki, wyznaczamy określone progi, przekazujemy sugestie dotyczące określonych rozwiązań, to te środki, które obiecaliśmy, koniec końców do tej Ukrainy powinny trafić. Powinniśmy pamiętać, że wschodnia granica Parlamentu Europejskiego Unii Europejskiej to właśnie Ukraina, Białoruś, to także Mołdawia. To także zainteresowania tymi państwami od strony ich kondycji gospodarczej, kondycji politycznej, kondycji także społeczno-politycznej. Bądźmy cały czas, z jednej strony cierpliwi, z drugiej strony – konsekwentni, ale pamiętajmy o tym, że bez tej pomocy Ukraina zostanie skazana wyłącznie na kontakty ze Wschodem.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Madam President, macrofinancial assistance (MFA) is important for Ukraine, not only to cover its additional financial needs, but also to provide incentives for speeding up the nation's reform efforts.

We now look forward to the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding next month. The EU is standing, and continues to stand, with the Ukrainian nation and Government. By adopting last Thursday the benchmark law on a special independent court for addressing corruption, a significant step was made. However, the eternally crucial issue remains: that of the implementation. We expect an informal but radical and determined effort by the rule of law establishment to enter into the space of shady business and to take accountability of all those who distort law and justice in their own or in their group's interests.

At the same time, Putin's regime will do everything to compromise the newly opened path to transparency justice. Only by taking real control of corruption can Russian aggression and intervention be credibly depleted.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, EU macrofinancial assistance should, of course, support Ukraine's commitment to values shared with the Union, including democracy, the rule of law, good governance, respect for human rights, sustainable development and poverty reduction. As we know, this step change requires a strong civil society. So, as a long-standing friend of Ukraine, I wish to put on record that one of the things we must do is to guard against the continuation of an old boys' club. The women and youth of Ukraine are immensely talented: full of ideas and energy, and ready to step up to make the changes that are required in a 21st-century modern democracy. But such a transformation requires men to step aside and to understand that, when women take a seat at the table, everyone wins.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Het leek wel de processie van Echternach, maar na twee jaar tegensputteren krijgt Oekraïne eindelijk een anti-corruptiehof. Dit is het noodzakelijke sluitstuk in de strijd tegen de endemische plaag van corruptie en een noodzakelijke voorwaarde voor nieuwe Europese macrofinanciële bijstand, die we dan ook voluit steunen. De bevolking en het maatschappelijk middenveld in Oekraïne steunen die strijd tegen de corruptie. Het Oekraïense volk heeft daarvoor overigens zeer zware offers gebracht tijdens de Euromaidan-revolutie.

Vandaar dat het mij blijft verbazen dat Kiev, met de huidige leiders aan het stuur, zo vaak het gaspedaal indrukt en tegelijk de handrem optrekt. Op die manier blijven hervormingen al te vaak haperen, verwateren ze en kon de strijd tegen corruptie tot nu toe niet echt overtuigen. De oprichting van het anti-corruptiehof, met onafhankelijke rechters, is een stap in de goede richting. We moeten de concrete implementatie goed opvolgen, net als de hele hervormingsagenda. Die zal bijvoorbeeld ook moeten leiden tot een modernere en democratischer kieswet en een operationele rechtsstaat.

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Szanowni Państwo! Debatujemy dziś o pomocy makroekonomicznej dla Ukrainy. I nie ma wątpliwości, że bez wsparcia ze strony Unii ten kraj nie poradzi sobie z reformami. Jednakże jako przewodniczący Komisji Rolnictwa nie mogę nie odnieść się do kwestii nadużyć ze strony ukraińskiej, do jakich dochodzi w ramach umowy o wolnym handlu, o czym zaalarmowali mnie unijni producenci drobiu. Chodzi o import pewnych części kurczaka, które nie mieszczą się w kategoriach określonych w umowie handlowej. W rezultacie ukraińscy importerzy obchodzą postanowienia umowy i ustanowione tam kontyngenty na produkty wrażliwe i bezcłowo wwożą na teren Unii duże ilości niestandardowych wyrobów drobiowych, które po nieznacznym przetworzeniu na terenie Unii sprzedawane są jako tradycyjne produkty. Biorąc pod uwagę dużo niższe koszty produkcji, niższe standardy na Ukrainie, import ten poważnie zagraża unijnej branży drobiarskiej. Komisja Europejska poinformowała nas ostatnio, że zna sprawę i próbuje jej zaradzić, lecz mamy obawy, czy unijni producenci przetrwają do czasu uregulowania tej kwestii.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já bych chtěl na úvod říci, že Ukrajina je tak trochu naše černé svědomí. Připomeňme si Budapeštské memorandum uzavřené v roce 1994, které garantovalo právě pod patronací i např. Velké Británie, USA, územní svrchovanost a nezávislost Ukrajiny. Protože jsme nemohli Ukrajině pomoci vojensky, tak musíme pomáhat alespoň tedy finančními nástroji a dalšími pomocemi právě pro Ukrajinu.

Nezávislý protikorupční soud, který byl zřízen před několika dny, je důkazem toho, že Ukrajina přeci jen postupuje v reformách, i když ten postup by měl být nepochybně razantnější. Je třeba udělat vše, nejde pouze samozřejmě jen o reformy, ale jde i o otázky osob, které plní určitou úlohu.

Já vnímám pokrok, ke kterému na Ukrajině dochází, byť bych i já přivítal razantnější postup. Myslím si, že Ukrajina potřebuje naši pomoc a já rád podpořím tento návrh usnesení.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank you for the rich debate and for the support expressed to the Commission's proposal to grant further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine. The Commission shares many of the concerns expressed here today about Ukraine and its reform path. Ukraine has made a lot of progress, but progress has also been uneven across areas, and a lot remains to be done in order to make reforms irreversible. This is precisely why the MFA is so important. It is an instrument for the EU to support reform-minded forces in Ukraine and to continue to exercise EU leverage so that the still strong vested interests can be overcome.

As I said during my opening remarks, if we turn our back on Ukraine, the risk of reform reversals could be high, and a lot of the achievements that Ukraine has without doubt made since 2014 would be at risk. Our message to Ukraine through this decision and the joint statement is crystal clear: solidarity goes hand in hand with a call for taking forward the reform drive with renewed vigour. One cannot go without the other. The EU committed to stand with the people of Ukraine. We cannot let Ukraine down and we cannot allow Ukraine to fail. Therefore, I count on your support tomorrow for the decision to grant further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine without further amendments.

Laima Liucija Andrikiienė, *deputising for the rapporteur*. – Madam President, on behalf of our rapporteur, Jarosław Wałęsa, who is absent today for family reasons, I would like to thank all colleagues who participated in the debate tonight and also to thank Commissioner Dombrovskis for his statement on behalf of the Commission and for his work.

We will be voting on this file tomorrow, and I hope that Parliament will express its strong support and will give its consent to further macro-financial assistance to Ukraine.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 13. kesäkuuta 2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Artis Pabriks (PPE), *rakstiski*. – Uzskatu, ka Eiropas Komisijas priekšlikums piešķirt Ukrainai makrofinansālo palīdzību, lai samazinātu Ukrainas šā brīža finansiālo ievainojamību, ir viennozīmīgi atbalstāms. Vēl jo vairāk — šis aizdevums viena miljarda eiro apmērā tiek piešķirts ar stingriem nosacījumiem, kā arī tas ir tiešā veidā atkarīgs no reformu īstenošanas Ukrainā, kas cita starpā sevī ietver korupcijas mazināšanu un īpašās pretkorupcijas tiesas izveidi, tādējādi Ukrainai sniedzot neaizvietojamu atbalstu ceļā uz valsts ekonomisko un demokrātisko stabilitāti. Latvija vienmēr ir atbalstījusi Ukrainu, jo Eiropas Dienvidaustrumu stabilizēšanās veicina arī Latvijas drošību, tāpēc tas ir arī mūsu valsts stratēģiskajās interesēs. Diemžēl vakar 11. jūnija Normandijas grupas sarunas Berlīnē, kurās piedalījās Vācijas, Francijas, Krievijas un Ukrainas ministri, lai runātu par iespējamo miera procesu Ukrainā, nevainagojās ar atzīstamu progresu. Tomēr arī gadījumā, ja Minskas līgums tiktu ievērots, tas nesniegtu tūlītēju stabilitāti. Tādēļ Eiropas Savienībai ir jāturpina atbalstīt Ukrainu ne tikai finansiāli, bet arī — kas ir ne mazāk svarīgi — politiski. Mēs nekādā gadījumā nedrīkstam padoties, un ir jāapzinās, ka līdz situācijas atrisinājumam vēl ir tāls ceļš ejams.

18. Cyber defence (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana keskustelu Urmas Paetin ulkoasiainvaliokunnan puolesta laatimasta mietinnöstä kyberpuolustuksesta 2018/2004(INI) (A8-0189/2018).

Urmas Paet, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, dear colleagues, cybersecurity has fast become an indivisible part of global affairs. Cybersecurity threats are real, they can be very damaging and may bring about lethal consequences.

One can only imagine the effects of a successful cyber-attack on a nuclear plant, on an air traffic control facility or on a hospital. EU Member States are often subject to cyber-attacks by either state or non-state actors for political, economic or security purposes, including attacks on critical infrastructure, cyber-espionage and disinformation campaigns.

Therefore, urgent reinforcement and development of European offensive and defensive capabilities is needed. We need to build up and improve our cyber-deterrents and defence if we are to truly modernise European defence.

While cyber-defence remains the core competence of the Member States, nevertheless, due to the borderless nature of cyberspace, it is not possible for any one state alone to tackle the threats and challenges.

Member States must cooperate closely and this is where the EU can be of help. The EU can provide a platform for European cooperation and ensure that the new endeavours are closely coordinated at an international level and within the transatlantic security architecture.

As we have all seen, with the development of the European defence policy over the last few years, so too has the cyber-defence domain been developing. PESCO and the European Defence Fund are the latest initiatives with the necessary scope to facilitate co-operative projects in the cyber domain.

We have a huge deficit of cyber-defence specialists. While there are already some initiatives in this field that need continued support, like the Military Erasmus programme and some others, we see the need to do more.

It is important to increase the availability of virtual cyber-defence training. We need to create wide-ranging technical platforms and establish a community of EU experts to develop a platform to facilitate the pooling and sharing of training and exercises.

In 2016, at the NATO Summit cyberspace was recognised as an operational domain, together with land, air and sea. This was a big step at the time. We need to broaden cooperation with NATO in cyber-defence by increasing operational cooperation and coordination and expanding capacity-building efforts, intensifying joint training for staff, building trust and conducting joint exercises. Like-minded strategic partners should also be taken into account.

As regards international norms and rules, I am glad that the UN Group of Governmental Experts would agree on some of the concepts concerning cyberspace. It was agreed that international law applies and should be enforced in cyberspace. However, it is necessary for the EU to assume a leading role in the ongoing and future debates on international norms in cyberspace.

On civilian-military cooperation, again trust is a key issue. This needs to be developed further between companies and defence and civilian end-users. Also, private companies have a great role in preventing, detecting, containing and responding to cyber-security incidents, as well as in stimulating innovation. It is therefore also imperative that there is more cooperation with the private sector.

So in conclusion, we need to continuously update European cyber-defence capabilities. We need more cooperation at the level of Member States, the EU, NATO and other like-minded countries by building trust, training more experts, having more joint exercises and improving accountability. The next attack might create far more damage than we have seen so far.

Julian King, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, honourable Members, thank you on behalf of the Commission and the High Representative. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Paet, for today's report and the light he is shining on this very important subject. In recent years, as he said, the cyber-threat landscape has changed dramatically, underlining the need for a strategic approach to cyber-threats and challenges. That includes the need to look at the defence dimension.

The best way we have to face such a rapidly evolving series of challenges is to join forces and to mobilise all the resources we have. To protect our cyberspace we need better capabilities, more research, more training and exercises on how to respond to eventual attacks, and in the last few months and years I'm glad to say we have joined forces across the institutions – the European Commission and Member States, the External Action Service and the European Defence Agency – all in close coordination with our partners at NATO.

The report we are discussing today provides an excellent strategic vision and puts forward a series of very realistic recommendations. The report will help further reinforce our ongoing efforts to support Member States' capability development for cyber-defence and deterrence. Cyber-defence of CSDP missions and operations, cyber-defence education and training, international norms applicable to cyberspace, civil military cooperation, public-private partnerships and EU NATO cyber-cooperation.

We are working to build the EU's resilience to cyber-attacks, provide for better defence capabilities and to build a credible cyber-deterrence. Indeed, these were the key elements of the Commission's cyber package brought forward in September last year.

In taking this work forward, we need to remember that most cyber-infrastructure is in civilian hands, so an important part of strengthening our cyber-resilience – making ourselves harder to attack – involves strengthening civil cooperation, which is why we proposed transforming ENISA into an EU cybersecurity agency and developing an EU-wide certification framework for cybersecurity. We also need to send a clear message to those who wish to cause us harm, and in this regard we welcome the reference in the report to Europol's role in coordinating the law enforcement response to cyber-threats. I'd also like to draw your attention to the recent Commission proposals for facilitating access to e-evidence.

But we also identified the need to further invest in the development of dual use cyber-technologies and cyber-skills. Earlier this year, the European Defence Agency, led by the High Representative, set up an EU cyber-defence, education and training exercise evaluation platform. It will help advance training and educational opportunities within the Member States to cover the full range of cyber-defence training. This initiative will also bring together civilian and military training needs. The EAS and the European Defence Agency have in fact been engaged with Member States for some years now to develop capabilities for cyber-defence. In March this year, they conducted a survey of the Member States on their cyber-defence requirements in order to update the EU cyber-defence policy framework. That survey showed that some Member States are already very advanced in terms of structures and doctrine and that all of our Member States have at least minimum cyber-protection capabilities in place and are building their national cyber-defence systems.

We've identified several areas where the EU could support these efforts further, such as investment in research and technology, providing training and education opportunities and facilitating civil-military cooperation. The funding through the European Defence Fund should be focused on delivering these capability priorities. Some Member States, as has been mentioned, have also agreed to invest together in cybersecurity through the new permanent structured cooperation on defence. Member States have set up to cyber-related PESCO projects. One of them focuses on the sharing of cyber-threat intelligence through a network platform with the objective to strengthen national cyber-defence capabilities, the second aims to set up cyber rapid response teams to respond together to cyber-attacks.

In order to strengthen cyber-deterrence, we continue to step up EU response to malicious cyber-activities and incursive cyber-operations in the framework for a joint EU diplomatic response to malicious cyber-activities. This sets out several EU measures to prevent and respond to cyber-attacks by state and non-state actors.

Mr Paet's report also highlights the role of international law and cyber norms in cyberspace. In this respect, we work closely with Member States to develop a strategic framework for conflict prevention and cyber-stability, promoting adherence to existing international law and implementation of cyber-norms and confidence-building measures are, and will remain, a centrepiece of our efforts.

Finally, we are working to deepen EU-NATO cooperation on cyber-defence, including against hybrid threats. You were talking about EU-NATO cooperation earlier today. We will continue to foster interoperability through coherent cyber-defence requirements and standards, to strengthen cooperation on training exercises, to harmonise training requirements and to mainstream cyber aspects into crisis management.

The report also makes some recommendations on institutional reinforcement, such as developing cyber aspects further in a white book for security and defence, to invest more in cyber-defence in the next MFF, to strengthen the EU Intelligence and Situation Centre and set up a new cyber-defence council.

I want to assure the rapporteur that we will consider all of these ideas very closely. Further investment in cyber-defence has already been highlighted in the current discussions on the next MFF.

In conclusion, we've made considerable progress in the past few years on this range of issues connected to cyber-defence. We will continue to work to strengthen Member States' capabilities and reinforce civ-mil synergies. We will continue to strengthen deterrence by bolstering our resilience and stepping up diplomatic responses to cyber-attacks.

Thank you again for focusing on this issue and I look forward to our discussion.

Antonio López-Istúriz White, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Urmas Paet, who has done some wonderful work.

Seamos claros, el mundo de hoy es muy diferente al de ayer, es más dinámico, tiene un ritmo acelerado. También lo son las amenazas, que son múltiples y están en constante cambio. No podemos ser ingenuos. Los ciudadanos de la Unión exigen que la Unión les proteja; una Unión que lucha por mantener un ciberespacio abierto, libre y seguro.

Resulta evidente que con la digitalización de nuestras economías y sociedades estamos expuestos a muchas más amenazas, y estos ataques tienen el potencial de alterar la vida cotidiana de los ciudadanos europeos, como hemos visto desgraciadamente ya en demasiadas ocasiones.

Fortalecer la cooperación y la coordinación en el ya denominado 'quinto dominio de la guerra' —el ciberespacio— es de suma importancia. La defensa cibernética puede y debe tratarse de una forma cooperativa, puesto que su ámbito operativo no tiene fronteras, ni nacionales ni de organización, y el trabajo conjunto resuelve ineficiencias y confiere credibilidad.

Me enorgullece el hecho de que, durante los últimos veinticinco años, mi partido, el Partido Popular Europeo, haya sido un líder en políticas de seguridad y defensa. Me alegro de que ahora se sumen a nuestras preocupaciones las demás fuerzas políticas.

Agradezco el apoyo a este esfuerzo institucional viable y realista que he propuesto y que se refleja en la figura de una autoridad cibernética de la Unión Europea, autoridad que coordinará las operaciones, generando confianza entre los Estados, sirviendo como punto de enlace entre las autoridades cibernéticas de los Estados miembros y colaborando estrechamente con la OTAN.

Insisto, los ciudadanos europeos exigimos una Unión que nos proteja, y este informe, que aprobaremos mañana, es una respuesta a esta demanda con propuestas reales y tangibles que contribuirán a lograr una Europa más segura.

Clare Moody, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I wish to thank the rapporteur for his excellent report. It has been a pleasure to work with him and the other shadows on this serious issue. The report recognises that cyber-security and the defence of Europe's cyberspace is one of the most important challenges that we face now. It also emphasises that there needs to be an integrated policy response with cooperation between civilian, security and military stakeholders.

The threats we face are multiple, coming from individuals, criminal gangs and states. In the UK last year our health service was severely affected by a cyber-attack launched by North Korea. That was not the only state-sponsored attack which the EU has suffered. It is essential that Europe stand united against attacks such as WannaCry and NotPetya.

Cyber-attacks, whatever their source, do not respect national boundaries, making it all the more important to work together at an EU level. In the same week that the new European Defence Fund is launched, we want to see more invested in Europe's ability to defend itself. As the report makes clear, there needs to be more investment in cyber-expertise, emphasising the need for more experts in the cyber-defence domain and the facilitation of cooperation between existing experts. We also need to develop our capabilities to ensure better attribution of cyber-attacks, enabling a stronger coordinated response to those specific attacks that impact all of us across Europe. The EU should also fulfil the role it plays so well in other areas: namely, leading the development of international laws and standards in this field. Our job as parliamentarians is to build a safer, more secure, EU. I believe the recommendations in this report are fundamental to delivering that safety and security to our citizens.

Anna Elżbieta Fotyga, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, in the rapidly-growing digital world, Urmas Paet's report helps us in understanding the complexity of cyber-threats in peace and war and the somewhat blurred border between both at a time of hybrid threats, because 'cyber' is part of this – also in the division between civilians and the military and between private and public. We have to understand that many times, the targets of cyber-attacks are civilian institutions and civilian infrastructure. Therefore we need an international legal system tackling 'cyber' and also an international humanitarian system referring to 'cyber' if we consider the cyber-domain as an operational domain, as defined by NATO.

I welcome this report, but I stress once more the necessity to cooperate between like-minded countries and societies, because the problem is so complex. I welcome cooperation between the EU and NATO. Quite rightly, cyber is the flagship of this cooperation, starting from the Declaration at the Warsaw NATO Summit.

Marietje Schaake, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the challenge to ensure safety and security involves more and more technological components. We see attacks on critical infrastructure, electoral systems, and really matters of democracy and peace at stake. With this global phenomenon, it only makes sense that we engage in the defence of the global open internet and all its users at EU level, as an integral part of our foreign and defence policies. We must certainly avoid fragmentation of steps taken between Member States. We need resilience of our networks, safety of devices, but also ways to attribute attacks when they do take place. This does not happen often enough, and if the rule of law should have meaning online there must be consequences to attacks.

Let's also look at ourselves. The cybersecurity of the internet of things, the use of software vulnerabilities, and the Commissioner mentioned the development of dual use technologies, but we are still exporting harmful ones to dictatorships and that cannot help our cybersecurity. The EU should lead on the basis of values and aspire to achieve global norms here too.

Javier Couso Permyu, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, las nuevas tecnologías de la comunicación han mostrado su lado oscuro, al servirse de *hackers* que son capaces de introducirse en los sistemas de competidores, de empresas o instituciones para espiarlos o sabotearlos. Se ha puesto de manifiesto, igualmente, la vulnerabilidad de los usuarios de redes de comunicación y redes sociales por parte de poderosas empresas de inteligencia o que transforman nuestros datos en negocio.

Como ejemplos recientes, están los casos de Facebook o las agencias de inteligencia, como la NSA, que roban y acumulan vulnerabilidades de día cero, manteniéndolas en secreto. Este informe no protege a los ciudadanos vulnerables, a los usuarios de las redes, contra las poderosas empresas o las agencias de inteligencia que roban nuestros datos para su control o sus negocios.

El Grupo GUE/NGL votará en contra de este informe porque apoya un mercado único para la ciberseguridad, promoviendo sinergias entre mercados civiles y militares; porque insta a los Estados miembros a utilizar el marco previsto por la cooperación estructurada permanente o el Fondo Europeo de Defensa; porque apoya la cooperación de la Unión Europea y la OTAN para la defensa informática; porque apoya las políticas de seguridad y restricciones de los derechos y las libertades de los ciudadanos de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, o porque defiende, para la ciberdefensa, la utilización de algunos instrumentos del marco financiero plurianual.

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Madam President, Commissioner King’s presence here is very much welcomed. Essentially, cyberspace comes down to trust and cooperation. Since the very beginning of debates on cyber issues we have been calling for deeper and wider cooperation among Member States and among the EU Institutions.

Furthermore, cybersecurity and cyber-defence have been mainstreamed into common foreign and security policy. We have been calling on this continuously and we call on it again. EU-NATO cyber-cooperation is crucial. A prime practical example of that cooperation was last year’s strategic high-level exercise in Estonia with the participation of the NATO Secretary-General.

Lastly, may I make a personal call on cyber-hygiene. Everything comes down to the individual user. Cyber-hygiene is essential in every domain by people who deal with critical infrastructure and information, yet we do not even have cybersecurity training for European Parliament staff, not to mention students in schools.

Let me congratulate colleague Paet for continuing this work and for proving himself a true liberal by accepting practically all the amendments to this report.

Janusz Zemke (S&D). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Obywatele Unii oczekują, że Unia weźmie znacznie większą odpowiedzialność za wspólne bezpieczeństwo. I to znajduje wyraz w całym szeregu działań, jakie są podejmowane w ostatnich czasach. Warto przypomnieć tutaj o powstaniu PESCO. Warto przypomnieć o powołaniu funduszu obronnego, ale także o tym, że w planach na lata 2021-2027 przewiduje się aż 32 mld euro na wspólne bezpieczeństwo. Jest to przyrost o 28%. Wydaje mi się, że właśnie w tych wyższych kwotach mamy także szansę na to, żeby znaleźć znacznie większe środki na cyberobronę, bowiem dzisiaj są to zagrożenia, z którymi spotykamy się, każdego dnia. Ale przecież można łatwo przewidzieć, że będzie tych zagrożeń coraz więcej. Trzeba zatem także wydawać więcej pieniędzy na cyberbezpieczeństwo.

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! W jakimś sensie cyberwojna już trwa. Chcę zwrócić na to uwagę dlatego, że przyglądając się także tym zgłoszonym poprawkom – 338, o ile dobrze pamiętam – także w nich widać niezbyt korzystne dla walki z cyberatakami propozycje zapisów. Także w ramach dyskusji widać, jak bardzo mocno w tej przestrzeni informatycznej są wpisane rozmaite interesy, aby także w procesach legislacyjnych cyberbezpieczeństwo nie było do końca zapewnione. Martwi mnie to. Ale chcę podkreślić, że wszystkie elementy, które znalazły się w wypowiedzi Pana Komisarza, są tak dobrze zbudowane, że chętnie się pod nimi podpiszę. Ważne jest, aby nie tracić czasu. Ważne jest, aby nie tracić pieniędzy. Ważne jest także, aby nie lekceważyć sygnałów, które płyną w tej chwili przede wszystkim z prywatnego biznesu, dotyczącymi: inwigilacji, zagrożeń bezpieczeństwa danych, jak również bezpośredniego zagrożenia militarnego.

Arne Lietz (S&D). – Sehr geehrte Frau Präsidentin! Cybersicherheit kann nicht nationalstaatlich, sondern nur europäisch erfolgreich angegangen werden. Wenn wir den Cyberraum für unsere Bürgerinnen und Bürger sicher machen wollen, müssen die Mitgliedstaaten noch mehr Kooperationsbereitschaft zeigen. Ich begrüße deshalb das kürzlich erweiterte Mandat für die Europäische Agentur für Netz- und Informationssicherheit ENISA.

Gerade bei Cybersicherheit ist die Grenze zwischen militärisch und zivil oft fließend. Betroffen sind nicht nur öffentliche Institutionen wie Ministerien und Parlamente sowie das Militär, sondern auch zivile Einrichtungen wie beispielsweise die Stadtwerke und die Privatwirtschaft. Wir brauchen deshalb über diesen Bericht hinaus eine breitere, ressortübergreifende Diskussion zur Cybersicherheit. Dieses Thema kann nicht nur im verteidigungspolitischen Bereich abgedeckt werden, sondern gehört vor allem auch in die Innen-, Wirtschafts- und in die Justizpolitik. Auch der außenpolitische Diskurs und die Agenda der EU muss Cyberdiplomatie stärker verankern. Die EU sollte sich als treibende Kraft dafür einsetzen, dass internationale Normen für den Cyberraum entwickelt werden.

Jaromír Štětina (PPE). – Paní předsedající, Varšavská deklarace ze summitu NATO konaného v roce 2016 uznala kyberprostor jako operační okruh, ve kterém se musí NATO bránit tak účinně, jako se brání ve vzduchu, na zemi a na moři.

Kybernetický prostor nezná hranice, nepřátelské útoky mohou být politické, bezpečnostní nebo ekonomické. Jedná se o útoky na životně důležitou infrastrukturu, kybernetickou špionáž, hromadné sledování občanů EU, dezinformační kampaně, šíření škodlivého softwaru, omezování přístupu k internetu a fungování systému IT. Původci útoků jsou nejrůznější státy – Rusko, Čína a Severní Korea – a i nestátní aktéři.

Evropská agentura pro kybernetickou bezpečnost ve své zprávě z roku 2017 říká, že existují neochvějně důkazy o útocích na demokracii a o kybernetické válce. Tyto činnosti ohrožují naši bezpečnost, veřejný pořádek, demokracii a naši strategickou autonomii. Odpovědí na závažné incidenty by měla být vždy společná reakce EU, včetně restriktivních opatření.

Caterina Chinnici (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la rivoluzione digitale ha reso più facile la nostra vita ma ci ha esposto a nuove minacce, quali cibercriminalità, terrorismo informatico e ciberattacchi provenienti talvolta addirittura dagli Stati.

A fronte dei gravi rischi collegati ai potenziali attacchi provenienti dal ciberspazio, seppure gli Stati membri rimangono responsabili della sicurezza nazionale, l'Unione europea deve sviluppare una politica comune e globale di ciberdifesa.

In tale ottica, il Centro per la lotta alla criminalità informatica di Europol dovrà essere potenziato per divenire un punto focale per lo scambio di informazioni fra agenzie governative che si occupano di cibercriminalità, oltre che per fornire assistenza agli Stati membri.

La Commissione poi dovrà adoperarsi per rafforzare i partenariati pubblico-privato, per creare sinergie e soluzioni innovative fra i mercati civili e militari e per rafforzare la ciberdifesa attraverso la cooperazione internazionale e con la NATO per una più efficace difesa dai nostri paesi.

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). – Señora presidenta, si bien las competencias en ciberdefensa recaen en los Estados miembros, es necesario que exista cooperación y coordinación entre todos ellos. Hay que reconocer los avances a través de la Agencia Europea de Defensa y de la nueva cooperación estructurada permanente (CEP). Sin embargo, la cooperación entre interlocutores dista aún de ser organizada.

Las estructuras europeas, desde el EC3 de Europol al Equipo de Respuesta de Emergencia Informática, pasando por ENISA, aún débil, carecen de un sistema de cooperación robusto y necesitan mejoras importantes.

La cooperación Unión Europea-OTAN es fundamental. Los esfuerzos y conocimientos compartidos son necesarios para poder neutralizar los ataques —4 000 diarios en 2016—. Una mejora sustancial en las capacidades de ciberdefensa repercutiría en la autonomía de la Unión, fundamental para la Estrategia Global de Seguridad 2016. Además, permitiría reducir la dependencia de nuestros socios internacionales, como es el caso de los Estados Unidos.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, sekä komissio että muut EU-elimet ja parlamentti ovat tehneet erittäin hyvää työtä ja suunnitelmia kyberturvallisuuden parantamiseksi mutta – pahoin pelkään – enemmän tämän päivän ja eilisen uhkiin mitoitettuna.

Kun otamme huomioon, että informaatioteknologia kehittyy eksponentiaalisesti eli noin viiden tai kymmenen kertomella ja tulee tosiasiallisesti meidän elämämme kaikille osa-alueille, informaatioyhteiskunnan johtamisessa, big datassa, ihmisten henkilötiedoissa, terveystiedossa, itseohjautuvissa autoissa ja muussa liikenteessä jne. on kysymys siitä, miten voimme ennakoida mahdollisia tulevia uhkia torjumatta silti tätä teknologiaa ja miten voimme paremmin myös ennalta varautua sekä tuplajärjestelmillä – rinnakkaisjärjestelmillä – että myös turvallisuusohjelmilla. Sitä varten mielestäni Euroopan unioni tarvitsisikin hyvin laajan ja hyvän kyberturvallisuuskeskuksen, jossa on sekä tutkimusta että ennakoivia.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, the internet should be a force for good: a common space that promotes quality education and inspired learning, better communication, creativity and intercultural dialogue. The internet should support fair and sustainable trade and uphold human rights, and it should most definitely not be prey to those wishing to hijack democracy, such as was evidenced by the Cambridge Analytica, AIG and Facebook scandals that were behind the Trump and Brexit campaigns and the Kenyan presidential election in August 2017, which was subsequently annulled by the Supreme Court.

One way to improve cyber-defence is to improve internet governance, and the annual Internet Governance Forum (IGF) is an excellent example of multi-stakeholder engagement in a pressing issue that concerns us all. I'd like to particularly commend the work of the Youth IGF, a network of young people in developed and less-developed countries who are active in their local communities and in the online space.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η άμυνα έναντι των κυβερνοεπιθέσεων αποτελεί πράγματι σημαντική πρόκληση στη σύγχρονη εποχή. Θα ήθελα να θέσω υπόψη της Επιτροπής και του κυρίου King τις κυβερνοεπιθέσεις που γίνονται αυτή τη στιγμή από Τούρκους χάκερς σε διάφορες ιστοσελίδες ελληνικών δημοσίων υπηρεσιών αλλά και εταιρειών.

Το διάστημα μεταξύ 30 Απριλίου και 2 Μαΐου έγιναν κυβερνοεπιθέσεις από Τούρκους χάκερς πρώτα από όλα στο Αθηναϊκό Πρακτορείο Ειδήσεων, επιπλέον σε μια εφημερίδα στην Κρήτη, επίσης στην Ομοσπονδία Χάντμπολ, επιθέσεις που συνοδεύονταν από απειλές, στις οποίες αναφέρουν, μεταξύ άλλων, οι Τούρκοι χάκερς: «Ελλάδα ξεχνάς γρήγορα. Ρίξαμε στη θάλασσα τους προγόνους σας. Θα το ξανακάνουμε!». Είναι μια απαράδεκτη κατάσταση και θα ήθελα να καταδικαστεί και από εσάς, κύριε King.

Nadja Hirsch (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Letzte Woche gab es am Hamburger Flughafen massive Störungen wegen eines Stromausfalls. Es war kein Cyber-Angriff, sondern nur ein ganz normaler Kurzschluss. Aber ich denke, so ein Vorfall zeigt sehr deutlich, wie verletzlich unsere kritische Infrastruktur ist. In den letzten Jahren beobachten wir immer häufiger Cyber-Angriffe aus Russland, China, Nordkorea oder auch von länderübergreifenden Akteuren.

Cyber-Spionage, Desinformationskampagnen oder auch Erpressungssoftware, Ransomware, sind inzwischen ein Teil unseres Alltags geworden. Durch die offenen Grenzen des Internets ist es unmöglich, dass sich die Staaten separieren. Deswegen ist es umso wichtiger, dass die Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union zusammenarbeiten. Daher gilt es jetzt tatsächlich, einen EU-Cyber-Reaktionsdienst einzurichten und die Koordinierung viel stärker zusammenzubringen. Cyber-defence muss von vornherein beim Aufbau der Europäischen Verteidigungsunion eine ganz zentrale Rolle spielen. Das ist für uns extrem wichtig.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, jsem velmi ráda, že EU usiluje o posílení svých pravidel kybernetické bezpečnosti s cílem řešit narůstající hrozby. 86 % Evropanů se domnívá, že se riziko kybernetické trestné činnosti zvyšuje, a z toho důvodu je nutné se tomuto tématu věnovat a přinášet řešení.

Je třeba mít akceschopný plán reakce na kybernetické útoky velkého rozsahu, bránit evropské společnosti a hlavně naše občany. V této souvislosti nesmíme také zapomínat na vzdělávání obyvatel. Snížení rizika pomocí dostatečného uvědomění si hrozeb je metoda prevence, která se vyplatí všem členským státům. Pouze poučená populace také bude lépe rozumět výzvám, které s kybernetickou hrozbou souvisí.

I zde totiž platí, že pokud nebudeme problém řešit komplexně, může to mít negativní dopad na naši bezpečnost.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι επιθέσεις στον κυβερνοχώρο αποτελούν μία από τις μεγαλύτερες σύγχρονες απειλές ακόμη και κατά της ίδιας της υποστάσεως ενός κράτους. Πρέπει λοιπόν το θέμα αυτό να αντιμετωπίζεται με ιδιαίτερη προσοχή. Κάθε κράτος οφείλει να έχει τη δυνατότητα να προστατεύσει τον κυβερνοχώρο του και, για να το επιτύχει αυτό, θα πρέπει να αποκτήσει τις απαιτούμενες δυνατότητες. Πρέπει κατ' αρχάς να δημιουργήσει κατάλληλες υποδομές και να επενδύσει σε υψηλή και σύγχρονη τεχνολογία. Επιπλέον πρέπει να υπάρξει συνεργασία σε επίπεδο κράτους, Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αλλά και NATO. Επίσης θα πρέπει να δημιουργηθούν εμπειρογνώμονες, να ανταλλάσσονται πληροφορίες, να γίνονται κοινές ασκήσεις και να διεξάγεται συνεχής έρευνα. Για την άμυνα στον κυβερνοχώρο, λόγω του στρατιωτικού αλλά και του μη στρατιωτικού χαρακτήρα της, επιβάλλεται να επιτευχθεί συνεργασία μεταξύ του στρατιωτικού αλλά και του ιδιωτικού φορέα. Τέλος η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σε όλη αυτή την προσπάθεια πρέπει να διαδραματίσει συντονιστικό ρόλο.

(Pyyntöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Julian King, *Member of the Commission, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission / High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Madam President, I would like to thank honourable Members for this report and this debate. I agree that this is a very important subject and it is timely that we review the steps that we have taken and the work that is still required.

We will continue our work to build our cyber-resilience and cyber-deterrence, as well as to reinforce international cooperation and defence cooperation. The EU institutions together will work with the Member States, with partners and with international organisations, notably NATO, as many of you have underlined. We will work to bring together the civilian and the military dimensions of this challenge and the public and the private dimensions of this challenge. We need to develop our capabilities, and we need to continue to drive and focus our research and development to reinforce our cyber-security.

A number of you mentioned other detailed points that we can look at. Overall, I want to say how much we share the thrust of this report. We need to be ready. We need to meet the cyber and cyber-enabled threats that we face because that is indeed what our citizens expect.

Urmaz Paet, *Rapporteur.* – Madam President, I wish to thank everyone for all the comments and feedback we have heard and, of course, I especially thank all the shadow rapporteurs for the very efficient and effective cooperation we had preparing this report.

We have a responsibility at all levels to increase the security of our citizens, and this means also increasing cyber-defence at Member State level, as well as that of the EU, NATO and like-minded countries.

I want to stress that I believe it is imperative that top-level exercises are also held every now and then to bring the matter closer to the leaders of our countries to make them realise the problem is not going away. Each and every country must do their utmost, each on their own, but of course also together.

Thank you very much, and I really hope that tomorrow during the vote we can have the result which is long awaited by our citizens from our Member States.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 13. kesäkuuta 2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Eugen Freund (S&D), *schriftlich.* – In unserer global vernetzten Welt genießen wir dank moderner technischer Möglichkeiten viele Vorteile, vieles wird uns leichter gemacht. Leider beinhaltet der Wandel hin zu einer digitalen Gesellschaft auch Gefahren und Bedrohungen. Auf diese entsprechende Antworten zu finden und passende Reaktionen zu entwickeln, ist Teil unserer politischen Verantwortung. Cyberbedrohungen sind eine Gefahr und werden immer gegenwärtiger.

Für mich besonders wichtig ist der Schutz von kritischer Energie-Infrastruktur vor Attacken aus dem Internet – ein Bereich, der erst in letzter Zeit höhere Aufmerksamkeit bekommt und in dessen Schutz man nicht genug investieren kann. Die Infrastruktur im Energiebereich bietet einen essenziellen Dienst, denn nur durch sie ist das Funktionieren einer einwandfreien modernen Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft gesichert. Gerade in diesem Bereich kann eine Cyberattacke besonders verheerende und beängstigende Auswirkungen haben. Käme es zu einem Cyberanschlag auf unsere Energieversorgung, wären wir nicht in diesem Raum, wir wären nicht in Straßburg, wir wären vermutlich eingesperrt in unseren Häusern. Lampen, Handys, Kühlschränke, unsere Wasserversorgung, Tankstellen und vieles weitere – nichts würde mehr funktionieren.

Deshalb ist auch die Debatte über eine EU-Reaktion auf sogenannte *cyberthreats* eine wichtige. Sie sollte in aller Ausführlichkeit, mit der angemessenen Ernsthaftigkeit und dem nötigen Pragmatismus geführt werden.

Antanas Guoga (PPE), *in writing.* – I want to congratulate Mr Paet on the report. This report clearly shows that cyber security has to be the top priority in the EU because it covers many areas like trade, services, and most importantly security and defence matters of the Member States. The report acknowledges the importance of coordination between Member States, which has been already emphasised in the NIS Directive. Cyber security is a cross-border matter and alone we cannot protect ourselves to the maximum level. That is also why the role of the European Defence Agency, European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA) is important. The EU agencies have to enhance Member States to help them not only to fight cyber-attacks, but most importantly to increase cyber resilience.

Dominique Martin (ENF), *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen a voté le 12 juin 2018 une proposition de résolution sur la cyberdéfense: une bonne initiative (dans la théorie...) qui s'inscrit juridiquement dans la continuité du cadre stratégique de cyberdéfense de l'Union européenne du 18 novembre 2014 et de la résolution sur la lutte contre la cybercriminalité du 3 octobre 2017.

Nous nous félicitons que Bruxelles prenne au sérieux la menace des cyberattaques dont il n'est plus à démontrer le nombre d'incidents et les menaces tant économiques que terroristes. Malheureusement, la cyberdéfense est comme une serrure dont il ne faut pas distribuer les clés. Si chaque État membre a son propre système, c'est d'autant plus compliqué à attaquer. À l'inverse, l'uniformisation ou la coordination des systèmes les rend vulnérables: il suffit de trouver une clé pour faire tomber l'ensemble du système.

Dans le même sens, l'évolution permanente de ces techniques oblige à une grande réactivité, impossible à mettre en œuvre à 27 États membres: nous en sommes témoins... Par ailleurs, cette cyberdéfense intégrant des dimensions militaires et le cyberspace étant de plus en plus considéré comme le «cinquième domaine de la guerre», la France doit conserver son indépendance dans ce secteur particulièrement sensible.

João Pimenta Lopes (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Ciberdefesa. Um dos mais atuais temas da agenda política da segurança e defesa, colocado na ordem do dia pela União Europeia, conivente e subserviente à estratégia da NATO e à sua agenda bélica e de agressão. Agora, procuram legitimar e regulamentar mais uma frente de guerra que completa o Mercado Único Digital. Trata-se, em rigor, de aumentar e ampliar capacidades de escrutínio, controlo e criminalização no espaço cibernético, fora do escrutínio judicial, a pretexto de pretensas ameaças, mas criando capacidades para intervir também sobre países terceiros, complementando a estratégia de desestabilização interna que já protagonizam em vários países.

O relatório é mais um contributo para o reforço do pilar militarista da UE, com mais orçamento e capacidades para a guerra. A Europa que defendemos é, pelo contrário, uma Europa de paz e cooperação entre Estados soberanos iguais em direitos, assente no respeito e na firme defesa dos direitos, liberdades e garantias dos cidadãos.

19. Cohesion policy and the circular economy (debate)

Puhemies. – Esityslistalla on seuraavana Davor Škrlecin aluekehitysvaliokunnan puolesta laatima mietintö 2017/2211(INI) (A8-0184/2018).

Davor Škrlec, *izvjestitelj*. – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, drage kolegice i kolege, prije svega dopustite mi da zahvalim svim izvjestiteljima u sjeni i njihovim timovima koji su bili vrijedni i nezamjenjivi partneri u stvaranju ovog izvješća. Također, puno hvala i kolegicama i kolegama iz Odbora ENVI na doprinosima kroz njihovo mišljenje. Žao nam je što danas nije s nama gospođa Crețu, ali vjerujemo kako će naše današnje poruke doći do nje i da možemo na nju računati u borbi za jaču kružnu ekonomiju u europskim fondovima.

Izvješće o kohezijskoj politici i kružnoj ekonomiji dolazi u pravom trenutku s konkretnim prijedlozima i snažnom podrškom Odbora za regionalni razvoj. Komisija nam je predstavila nacрте Višegodišnjeg financijskog okvira, kao i nacрте Zajedničkih odredbi i strukturnih i investicijskih fondova. Pozitivno je što se u nacrtima kružna ekonomija prepoznaje kao jedna od vodećih javnih politika Europske unije, također pozdravljam prijedlog Komisije kako odlaganje nesortiranog otpada, mehaničko biološko tretiranje otpada i spaljivanje otpada bez uporabe više neće biti financirani europskim sredstvima. Trenutno se nalazimo u izazovnoj poziciji u ostvarivanju ciljeva Direktive o otpadu zato što se nismo vodili hijerarhijom gospodarenja otpadom i dugoročnim planiranjem. Ovo izvješće upozorava na navedene loše prakse te nudi rješenja kako bi kroz europske javne politike promijenili negativne trendove.

Kružna ekonomija ne smije biti nametnuta briselska politika, već politika promišljena na lokalnoj, regionalnoj i nacionalnoj razini, zbog toga predlažemo ex-ante uvjet u obliku strategije za kružnu ekonomiju kao preduvjet da na lokalnoj i nacionalnoj razini promislimo što je kružna ekonomija za naše zajednice, kako je najbolje možemo ostvariti, otvoriti nova zelena radna mjesta i ostvariti europske ciljeve na dobrobit lokalne zajednice. Kao Parlamentu, iznimno nam je bitno kako se troši europski javni novac, zato je potrebno razviti metodologiju i indikatore praćenja potrošnje novca za kružnu ekonomiju, kako bi mogli kvalitetno evaluirati potrošnju i na vrijeme reagirati.

Potencijali za naše regije i lokalne sredine su veliki, otpad većini predstavlja veliki politički problem, ali mi ga u kružnoj ekonomiji gledamo kao rješenje. Razvoj sekundarnih tržišta sirovina, korištenje zelene i kružne javne nabave, poticanje investicija u bio-ekonomiju, ulaganje u obnovljive izvore energije kao i napredne mreže te poticanje malog i srednjeg poduzetništva na inovacije i razvoj poslovnih modela u suglasju s principima kružne ekonomije samo su neki alati pred državama, regijama i lokalnim vlastima.

Kroz kohezijsku politiku i kružnu ekonomiju jačamo solidarnu, dugoročno održivu i ekonomski otpornu Europsku uniju.

Julian King, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, Ms Crețu sends her apologies as she cannot be with you this evening, but rest assured that she will take a close interest in the results of this work, and indeed this debate. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to welcome this debate and the opportunity to discuss cohesion policy's contribution to the circular economy.

As you know well, the Commission's Circular Economy Action Plan was adopted in 2015 when the framework for the 2014-2020 cohesion policy was already in place. Nevertheless, many priorities and principles have been key components of our cohesion policy, acting as a stimulus to local and regional development: waste prevention, recycling, eco-design and similar measures create savings, increase turnover and create local jobs in various sectors.

In the 2014-2020 period, cohesion policy invests in improved waste management with more than EUR 5.5 billion. Furthermore, we invest in resource efficiency, SME support and close-to-market innovation. Beyond funding, cohesion policy provides possibilities for capacity building, technical assistance, promoting green public procurement and cooperation across borders. To avoid lock-ins, the system of ex-ante conditionalities was introduced, as mentioned. For waste, this means that the investments are made based on waste management and prevention plans, and for innovation, on smart specialisation strategies. All of this will go forward and continue in the next MFF.

In addition, we will place more emphasis on the transition towards a circular economy. This is a broad challenge, profoundly changing our economies, which requires innovation, behavioural change, improved waste prevention and management, know-how, skills and administrative capacity, among other things. With its integrated policy framework, cohesion policy is well placed to help regions to face this challenge.

Among the priorities included in the Commission's proposal is an increased focus on the upper strategies of the waste hierarchy, excluding landfilling and the least desirable treatment operations from the scope of the funds, to adapt regional waste management systems to the new long-term targets. We also increase the focus on smart specialisation, which helps regions to promote emerging industries and new value chains and business models – leading, we hope, to breakthroughs for the circular economy transition. That is our objective. We welcome this discussion.

Stanislav Polčák, *navrhovatel Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin*. – Paní předsedající, já bych se chtěl v dnešním projevu projevit jako konkrétní, důsledný obhájce kohezní politiky a pográtulovat panu zpravodaji k velmi dobré zprávě.

Kohezní politika není důležitá pouze pro regiony, protože odstraňuje znevýhodnění, ale tím, že konkrétně pomáhá a že také vychází ze zdola. Nemusíme se tvářit, že kohezní politika je nějakou Popelkou, naopak dokáže využívat nejnovějších vědeckých postupů. Právě tím, jak kohezní politika skutečně pomáhá, tak i tím je zaměřena na nové technologie a inovace.

V kohezní politice najdeme spoustu dobrých projektů, předcházení vzniku odpadů, jejich recyklace, vrácení do oběhu, zvýšení účinnosti, snížení spotřeby, např. při energetickém využívání. Důležitá je rovněž role obcí a měst při využívání nových technologií, biologických odpadů v zemědělství.

Nemusíme se tváriť, že kohezní politika je nějaká statická veličina, naopak je veľmi živá a v té zpráve je řada dobrých návrhů, konkrétních opatření. Já ji proto plně podporuji.

Franc Bogovič, v imenu skupine PPE. – Najprej čestitke poročevalcu Škrlecu za poročilo in hkrati tudi za odlično sodelovanje in upoštevanje predlogov, ki smo jih podali poročevalci v senci.

Akcijski načrt za krožno gospodarstvo nadaljuje aktivnosti, ki so se v okviru kohezijske politike in tudi ostalih politik na tem področju v Evropski uniji izvajale že v prejšnjih letih. Vsekakor je teh 150 milijard, ki jih je približno predvidenih v perspektivi 2014-2020 zelo pomembnih za prehod na to področje. Politike so tako znotraj kohezijske politike, kmetijske politike, tudi na drugih področjih, kot je *Horizon*.

Predvsem pozdravljam tako imenovani *Bio-based Industries Joint Undertaking*, ki kar celo milijardo evrov namenja biogospodarstvu. S tem področjem krožne ekonomije in pa v povezavi z vsemi evropskimi fondi, zelo spodbujamo okoljske cilje, rabo virov in pa hkrati tudi zelena delovna mesta. Ta delovna mesta so običajno na podeželju, tam, kjer je težje tudi ustvariti nova delovna mesta.

Upam in zagotovo je to naša skupna naloga, da tudi v novi finančni perspektivi po letu 2020 zagotovimo znotraj kohezijske politike zadostna sredstva, kajti sredstva, ki se namenjajo v okvir krožnega gospodarstva, so sredstva za našo prihodnost.

Veselim se sodelovanja pri kohezijski politiki in pa tudi tega, da bomo skozi nove ukrepe pomagali regijam, občinam širom po Evropi.

Monika Smolková, za skupinu S&D. – Vážená pani predsedající, aj ja sa chcem poďakovať spravodajcovi a všetkým spoluspravodajcom, ktorí pracovali na uvedenej správe, pretože téma obehového hospodárstva je veľmi aktuálna a potrebná.

Pre väčšinu ľudí ostáva myšlienka obehového hospodárstva abstraktným, ak nie úplne vzdialeným pojmom. Svedčí o tom aj štatistický údaj, ktorý udáva, že viac ako 60 % odpadu sa nerecykluje. Končí na skládkach. Lahko sme si osvojili model „urob, spotrebuj, zahod“.

Obehové hospodárstvo je model produkcie a spotreby, v rámci ktorého sa veci bezhlavo nevyhadzujú, ale sa zdieľajú, požičiavajú, opätovne využívajú, opravujú a recyklujú dovtedy, pokiaľ sa to dá. Dnes na odpad vyhadzujeme výrobky z dreva, textilu, skla, plastov, ale aj stavebný materiál, železo, prakticky všetko, čo už z akéhokoľvek dôvodu nepotrebujeme pre vlastnú potrebu. Z tohto dôvodu je nanajvýš potrebné, aby budúca kohézna politika mala aj stimulačný aspekt pre obehové hospodárstvo tam, kde sa bude aj reálne uplatňovať.

To znamená, že do tohto prechodu musia byť integrálne zapojené miestne a lokálne orgány. Dnes už poznáme viacero svetlých príkladov, kde to boli práve malé obce, ktoré vytvorili vlastnú lokálnu stratégiu obehového hospodárstva a stali sa energeticky nezávislými. Chcem tým podčiarknuť fakt, že obce či miestne zastupiteľstvá majú znalosti, know-how, ktoré skutočne fungujú. Preto musia byť priamo zapojené do vytvárania stratégií udržateľného a regionálneho rozvoja a na druhej strane musia mať dostatok priestoru a finančných možností na vytváranie vlastných rozvojových stratégií obehového hospodárstva.

Obehové hospodárstvo nie je samoúčelné. Prináša výhody vo forme kvality životného prostredia, zvyšuje bezpečnosť dodávok surovín, zvyšuje konkurencieschopnosť, prináša inovácie, rast a vytváranie nových pracovných príležitostí. Spotrebiteľom ponúka trvácnejšie a kvalitnejšie výrobky, ktoré šetria ich peniaze a zvyšujú kvalitu života. To všetko by sme mali mať na pamäti, ak budeme schvaľovať rozpočet po roku 2020, aby politika súdržnosti a obehové hospodárstvo išli ruka v ruku, aby sa navzájom dopĺňali.

Ruža Tomašić, u ime kluba ECR. – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, zaštita okoliša i održivost važan su dio svih europskih politika, a kružno je gospodarstvo ključan model za ostvarivanje naših ambicija u tom području. Zato želim čestitati kolegi Škrlecu na kvalitetnom izvješću i doprinosu raspravi o budućnosti ovog modela gospodarenja.

Ono što moramo imati na umu visoki su troškovi koji često prate prelazak na održivo upravljanje resursima i u tom kontekstu doista postoji veliki potencijal korištenja kohezijskih fondova kako bi se javnim i privatnim dionicima olakšala tranzicija.

Izvješće s pravom ističe da kružno gospodarstvo ne obuhvaća samo gospodarenje otpadom, već, među ostalim, i učinkovitu uporabu resursa, obnovljivu energiju, upravljanje vodama i poboljšanje kvalitete zraka.

Upravo su to neka od važnijih pitanja koja muče građane Hrvatske. Onečišćeni zrak u Slavanskom Brodu, problem gospodarenja otpadom u Zagrebu, Splitu i drugim većim sredinama te plastični otpad u moru mogu biti kvalitetno adresirani upravo snažnijom implementacijom mjera predloženih u ovom Izvješću.

Zato još jednom moram naglasiti da su predviđeni rezovi u sredstvima za kohezijsku politiku poslije 2020. za Hrvatsku neprihvatljivi jer će joj, između ostaloga, otežati transformaciju prema održivom gospodarstvu.

Ivan Jakovčić, u ime kluba ALDE. – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, želim odmah na početku naglasiti da su kohezijska politika i kružno gospodarstvo najbolji primjeri kako neke politike idu ruku pod ruku, kako su neke politike koje mi ovdje zagovaramo, o kojima govorimo u Europskom parlamentu, u stvari dvije strane iste medalje. Ja bih ovdje rekao zlatne medalje. Jer, ono što je kohezijska politika i što je kružno gospodarstvo zaista zaslužuje, olimpijskim rječnikom rečeno, zlatnu medalju. Zato želim iskoristiti priliku da se zahvalim i čestitam kolegi Škrlec u njegovom izvještaju i svima nama koji smo radili na ovome izvještaju, jer vjerujem da ono zaista oslikava ono što nije budućnost Europske unije, nego ono što je sadašnjost Europske unije.

Neophodna potreba za otvaranjem zelenih radnih mjesta je nešto što je potreba današnjice, a ne sutrašnjice. Upravljanje otpadom, sve ono što se zaista dešava u našem okolišu, govori koliko je prijeko potrebno investirati i novce iz kohezijske politike u kružno gospodarstvo. Imamo puno primjera na našem kontinentu, odličnih primjera, ali na žalost imamo i puno onih drugih primjera i o njima trebamo govoriti.

Želim istaknuti jednu relevantnu činjenicu – nema uspjeha u zbrinjavanju otpada, nema uspjeha u kružnom gospodarstvu, nema otvaranja zelenih mjesta, ako se snažno ne uključe lokalne i regionalne samouprave. Ima puno dokaza za to i moje osobno iskustvo vrlo jasno govori u tom pravcu i zato pozivam Komisiju da razgovaramo i o tome što su bili promašaji kada govorimo o investiranju u gospodarenje otpadom, jer i toga imamo, i što ćemo učiniti da saniramo te promašaje.

Puno je tema otvoreno ovim izvješćem i zato vjerujem da je to izvješće izneseno upravo u pravom trenutku i očekujem od Komisije da pronađe sredstva da može i financirati to izvješće.

Bronis Ropė, Verts/ALE frakcijos vardu. – Sveikinų kolegą Davorą (Davor Škrlec) parengus gerą pranešimą ir šiek tiek keista frakcijos kolegų parengtą pranešimą pradėti komentuoti neigiamais epitetais. Visgi noriu pasakyti, kad yra blogai jog svarstome žiedinės ekonomikos plėtros perspektyvas. Blogai yra tai, kad žiedinė ekonomika vis dar lieka kažkuo egzotišku ar kažkuo tokiu be ko galima ir apsieiti. Blogai yra tai, kad reikia įrodinėti, kad žiedinė ekonomika, švaistymo masto mažinimas, žaliavų perdirbimas gali būti naudingas. Manau, kad šios tezės turi būti aksioma. Taupymo, perdirbimo, atsakingo požiūrio į žaliavas ir į planetos ateitį principai ne turi, o jau senokai turėjo tapti ne tik viešosios politikos bet ir švietimo sistemos ar žmonijos sąmonės dalimi. Mes turime tik vieną planetą. Puiku, kad Europa prieš keletą metų priėmė atliekų dokumentų rinkinį. Puiku, kad ieškoma būdų kaip panaudoti atliekas ir puiku, kad kolegų Davoro (Davor Škrlec) pranešime vis daugiau dėmesio skiriama tam, kad žiedinės ekonomikos dalyviais padarytume kuo daugiau veikėjų. Ne tik pavienius piliečius ar verslą, bet ir vietas savivaldą, regionų savivaldą, bendruomenes. Ir taip padarytume atliekų perdirbimą motyvuojantį.

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, όταν μιλάμε για κυκλική οικονομία, εννοούμε να βρούμε τρόπους, αξιοποιώντας τη σύγχρονη τεχνολογία, την καινοτομία, όχι μόνο για να προστατεύσουμε τον περιβάλλον, αλλά και για να δημιουργήσουμε καινούργιες επιχειρήσεις και θέσεις απασχόλησης. Πρέπει να αλλάξουμε τον τρόπο με τον οποίον αντιμετωπίζουμε τα απορρίμματα. Αντί να θάβουμε το 60% των απορριμμάτων στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, να τα χρησιμοποιούμε για να εξοικονομούμε πόρους, για να κερδίζουμε χρήματα και για να δημιουργούμε εκατομμύρια θέσεις απασχόλησης.

Για αυτό χρειάζεται ώθηση από την Επιτροπή, στήριξη από τις κυβερνήσεις, αλλά και ισχυρότερο ρόλο των δήμων και των περιφερειών, που μπορούν να δημιουργήσουν πράσινη επιχειρηματικότητα και να μας βοηθήσουν να περάσουμε στη νέα εποχή. Πριν μία εβδομάδα γιορτάσαμε την Παγκόσμια Ημέρα του Περιβάλλοντος. Πρέπει να την γιορτάζουμε 365 μέρες τον χρόνο προωθώντας έμπρακτα την κυκλική οικονομία. Και προς την επίτευξη αυτού του στόχου, έστω και με καθυστέρηση, πρέπει να τρέξουμε αξιοποιώντας αυτή τη θετική έκθεση.

Isabella Adinolfi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, vorrei ringraziare prima di tutto tutti i colleghi per il lavoro svolto. La relazione sull'economia circolare che ci apprestiamo a votare è molto ambiziosa e piena di significato soprattutto per chi, come me, proviene dalla Campania che, è bene ricordarlo, è stata martoriata per decenni da sodalizi criminali che, in sprezzo a qualsiasi norma, anche etica, hanno causato l'inquinamento e la distruzione di uno dei territori più belli d'Italia.

Ridurre i rifiuti che finiscono in discarica e mettere in sicurezza e bonificare le discariche, legali e illegali, è una priorità assoluta del testo che stiamo approvando. Credo che questa sia questa la direzione giusta. Alla Commissione ora si chiede un intervento e uno sforzo straordinario, volto alla bonifica di aree utilizzate per lo sversamento e l'interramento illegale di rifiuti pericolosi, che pregiudicano la salute e il benessere economico e sociale delle popolazioni coinvolte.

Come ho avuto modo di ribadire, quanto accaduto nella Terra dei Fuochi è un fenomeno che travalica i confini nazionali e quindi merita un'attenzione anche da parte dell'Unione europea. Penso che un riferimento esplicito a fenomeni di questo tipo sia un segnale positivo. Si tratta di un messaggio importante delle Istituzioni europee rivolto ai cittadini che abitano in quelle zone la cui vita è stata stravolta completamente. Mi auguro quindi che questa richiesta non rimanga lettera morta e che la Commissione agisca al più presto a tutela della salute e dei diritti dei cittadini.

Ogni volta, quando parto e prendo l'aereo e vedo il Vesuvio, penso che davvero sto ammirando uno dei paesaggi più belli che abbia mai visto. Eppure, l'uomo riesce a distruggere quello che la natura crea in maniera magnifica.

Il compito della politica è quello di dare delle risposte e delle soluzioni ai problemi delle persone e far sì che il diritto a vivere in un ambiente salubre sia rispettato. A questo proposito, ringrazio i carabinieri e tutte le forze dell'ordine che quotidianamente combattono in questo territorio. Però è giunto anche il tempo che l'Europa agisca.

Joëlle Mélin, au nom du groupe ENF. – Madame la Présidente, le XXI^e siècle voit l'émergence d'une nouvelle économie, celle de la gestion de nos produits de consommation après usage.

Économie à part entière, elle est fondée non seulement sur un principe économique de valorisation, de profits et de création d'emplois, mais aussi sur une vision nouvelle de la consommation, car il s'agit bien entendu de l'objet lui-même de consommation, de notre alimentation quotidienne aux véhicules automobiles, en passant par nos habitations ou nos auxiliaires et robots, mais aussi de leurs emballages comme de leurs déchets.

L'idée nouvelle est de prendre en compte tous ces paramètres avant consommation, par anticipation, et non plus a posteriori. Changement radical qui peut nous éviter de disparaître sous nos propres objets et déchets.

Dès lors, le financement globalisé peut-être acceptable, surtout si à la clé, il y a de grandes économies.

Le fait que les emplois créés soient souvent peu qualifiés et locaux est une possibilité sans égale pour lutter contre le chômage qui touche les plus précaires.

Alors oui, le recyclage doit se faire au plus près de leur lieu de consommation.

Lambert van Nistelrooij (PPE). – Dank u wel voorzitter, rapporteur en commissaris. Het is goed dat we deze kwestie nog eens vanuit de regionale fondsen bekijken, want de grote winst voor mensen, groei en banen ligt inderdaad in regio's en steden, dicht bij de mensen. Daar kun je die circulaire economie organiseren.

Ik was rapporteur voor de biogebaseerde industrie. In het kaderprogramma Horizon 2020 is 1 miljard euro bestemd om die ontwikkeling aan te sturen.

(De voorzitter onderbreekt de spreker omdat er geen Finse vertolking is)

Waar ik vooral wil op aandringen is dit: begin in de circulaire economie met de natuur en niet met de fossiele bronnen. Daarom wil ik ervoor pleiten om veel meer producten, zoals plastics, uit biomaterialen te maken.

Ten tweede. Ik heb jarenlang exposities met nieuwe materialen voor het publiek georganiseerd. Vaak vragen mensen zich daar af: Waar kun je zoiets nou kopen? Bovendien, commissaris, is er daarvoor geen Europees keurmerk. In Nederland heb je bijvoorbeeld "Biobased content", in Duitsland "DIN-geprüft" of in Frankrijk "Biobased Vinçotte". Maar er is geen Europees keurmerk aan de hand waarvan burgers kunnen weten dat producten biogebaseerd zijn. Wilt u daar eens een antwoord op geven? Is het niet zo dat er gewerkt moet worden aan duidelijkheid voor de consumenten, zodat ze weten waar te kopen, maar ook wat ze precies kopen? Dat is circulair. Het heeft geen zin te praten over wat in Italië wordt weggegooid. We moeten vanuit de agrarische industrie afval voorkomen, en dat kan goed. Daar laten we een kans liggen. Ik wil graag uw mening daarover. Dank u.

Michela Giuffrida (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nella programmazione 2014-2020 l'economia circolare non è stata inclusa tra le priorità dell'Unione europea. Oggi sappiamo quanto invece questa possa costituire uno dei punti principali per lo sviluppo sostenibile di una regione e come questa offra risposte alle sfide delle comunità locali. Se non c'è dubbio che sono auspicabili un coordinamento e una maggiore cooperazione tra regioni, piccole e medie imprese e altri soggetti pubblici e privati, è anche vero che, in osservanza ai principi stessi della coesione, vanno accompagnate e maggiormente seguite quelle regioni non ancora in grado di allinearsi alle buone pratiche.

Credo per questo che la possibilità di introdurre una nuova disposizione in materia di condizionalità ex-ante per realizzare l'economia circolare nel quadro della politica di coesione possa a volte trasformarsi in un vincolo anche insormontabile, mentre è più che opportuno il monitoraggio del contributo della politica di coesione alla realizzazione dell'economia circolare, anche alla luce dell'aumento della spesa.

È assolutamente necessario, come sostiene l'ottima relazione, un intervento straordinario di bonifica delle aree utilizzate per lo sversamento e l'interramento illegale di rifiuti pericolosi, che pregiudicano la salute e il benessere economico e sociale delle popolazioni coinvolte. Sono proprio i territori più in difficoltà quelli che maggiormente ne registrano la presenza. È proprio attraverso una maggiore collaborazione tra tutti gli attori coinvolti nei processi dell'economia circolare che si possono raggiungere gli obiettivi stabiliti dall'Unione europea.

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Przedłożone sprawozdanie o gospodarce o obiegu zamkniętym w ramach polityki spójności mimo wygłaszanych tu peanów budzi wiele kontrowersji. Dotyczy recyklingu i to o szerszym niż dotychczas zakresie. Na początku, w motywie A stwierdza się, że kluczowe znaczenie dla powodzenia proponowanej zmiany mają władze lokalne i regionalne. A skoro tak, to powstaje pytanie, czy było to wcześniej z tymi władzami konsultowane? Mówi się, że osiągnięcie celów pakietu odpadowego nie jest możliwe bez wsparcia finansowego polityki spójności, na którą obecnie Komisja Europejska chce przecież drastycznie zmniejszyć środki. Dlaczego więc w sprawozdaniu nie ma o tym mowy? W ustępie 12. dokumentu odnotowano, że surowce bazowe, czyli naturalne – mówił o nich pan van Nistelrooij – kosztują mniej niż produkty uzyskane w wyniku recyklingu. To oznacza, że ma być drożej, bo Unia podniesie ceny produktów wytwarzanych tradycyjnie. Wszystko to dowodzi, że Unia Europejska brnie dalej, próbując sztucznych regulacji oraz kontroli rynku z poziomu Brukseli.

Elsi Katainen (ALDE). – Kiitoksia puhemies, kiitoksia myös esittelijälle. Euroopan ja koko maapallon suuri kysymys on, kuinka muuttaa talouskasvu laadultaan kestäväksi ja hillitä uusiutumattomien luonnonvarojen kulutusta.

Kiertotalouden tarkastelu koheesipolitiikasta käsin on raikas ja hyvin ajankohtainen näkökulma. Sen avulla meillä on mahdollisuus kannustaa paikallisia toimijoita kehittämään uusia vihreitä ratkaisuja ja innovaatioita, teknologiaa ja työpaikkoja. Samalla tuemme myös maaseudun elinvoimaa kestävällä tavalla.

Aluekehittämisellä on vauhditettu kiertotaloutta jo nyt merkittävästi. Paikalliset aluekehittämisen menestystarinat liittyvät muun muassa teollisten symbioosien hankkeisiin, joissa on hyödynnetty resursseja eri toimijoiden kesken. Samalla on luotu uutta yrittäjyyttä. Toinen päätavoite, vihreämpi hiiletön Eurooppa on hieno avaus ja luo puitteet kiertotalouden liittämiseksi vahvemmin osaksi eurooppalaista aluepolitiikkaa, mutta meidän on katsottava pidemmälle. Seuraavan komission agendalla onkin oltava kiertotalous 2.0, jossa kestävä metsäbiotalous, biokierrätys sekä siirtyminen pois muun muassa meriämme saastuttavasta muovista otetaan nykyistä vakavammin.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Madame la Présidente, l'Union européenne, c'est 2,5 milliards de tonnes de déchets par an dont 25 millions de tonnes de déchets plastiques. L'économie circulaire est donc devenue un impératif urgent. Mais ne nous méprenons pas: la mise en œuvre d'une économie circulaire dans la politique de cohésion ne sera pas suffisante. C'est toutes les politiques de l'Union qui doivent être mises au pas de l'écologie et cela suppose une révolution copernicienne des esprits, cela suppose de sortir du consumérisme, de l'économie du jetable, de la société du déchet. Et mon collègue Lambert van Nistelrooij a raison: nous devons aussi soutenir la recherche pour favoriser les innovations technologiques afin de tendre vers cet objectif.

Piernicola Pedicini (EFDD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, io mi rivolgo principalmente a lei perché, se l'obiettivo delle politiche di coesione è quello di ridurre il divario a livello sociale, il divario economico e anche in termini di sviluppo fra le diverse aree dell'Unione europea, e questo obiettivo giustamente lo si vuole perseguire anche rispecchiando quelli che sono i principi cardine dell'economia circolare, allora io mi chiedo se lo strumento della procedura di infrazione, così come è stata concepita fino ad ora, è uno strumento utile per raggiungere questi obiettivi.

Io vengo dall'Italia. L'Italia, per colpa dei governi che ci hanno preceduto, è stata condannata a pagare sanzioni per 68 discariche abusive. Siamo stati condannati per l'emergenza rifiuti in Campania – è stata prima citata – e per l'inquinamento delle acque reflue urbane. Siamo stati recentemente deferiti alla Corte di giustizia europea per altre 44 discariche irregolari, per la mancata messa in sicurezza dei rifiuti radioattivi e per lo sfioramento dei limiti di emissioni di PM10 e DN.02. Siamo quindi molto lontani da quei principi virtuosi dell'economia circolare di cui stiamo parlando e pagheremo invece multe salatissime per una cifra complessiva che supera il miliardo di euro.

Allora io chiedo come pensate di ridurre il divario economico e sociale, se questi cittadini di serie B vedono ripetutamente prevaricare il loro diritto fondamentale alla salute e alla tutela ambientale e alla fine devono anche pagare le multe salatissime che gli scaricate addosso. Noi diciamo che, se queste multe debbono essere pagate, allora l'importo economico non deve finire nel budget dell'Unione europea, ma deve essere speso nello stesso Stato membro che le paga per affrontare le cause stesse che hanno determinato la multa.

Krzysztof Hetman (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Gospodarka o obiegu zamkniętym daje Unii Europejskiej szansę na szybszy wzrost oraz większą konkurencyjność i produktywność. Dlatego tak ważne jest pełne i skuteczne wdrożenie rozwiązań na tym polu. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że konieczne jest podejmowanie dalszych intensywnych działań w zakresie poprawy gospodarowania odpadami oraz położenie większego nacisku na podniesienie wydajności oraz ponowne użycie produktów.

Wykorzystanie w tym celu instrumentów polityki spójności może przynieść doskonałe rezultaty. Musimy jednak pamiętać, że ważne jest spełnienie kilku warunków. Po pierwsze, konieczne jest zapewnienie większej niezależności władzom regionalnym i lokalnym, które są w stanie najlepiej zidentyfikować właściwie dla danego obszaru problemy i zaproponować skuteczne rozwiązania. Po drugie, proponowane cele muszą być realne do osiągnięcia i odpowiednio rozłożone w czasie. Po trzecie, należy docenić rolę małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw w tworzeniu nowych rozwiązań i modeli opartych na obiegu zamkniętym i aktywnie wspierać te działania poprzez różnego rodzaju zachęty i atrakcyjne finansowanie. I dodać do tego jeszcze można kwestię środków finansowych wspierających badania naukowe w tej dziedzinie.

Ramón Luis Valcárcel Siso (PPE). – Señora presidenta, hablar de economía circular es hablar de aprovechar lo que tenemos, un concepto regenerador que permite ahorrar y también avanzar en protección medioambiental. Por eso, la transición hacia un modelo de economía circular debe ser, cada vez más, una prioridad. Es positivo que los fondos para potenciar la economía circular se integren en la política de cohesión, ya que la gestión de residuos es competencia municipal y regional.

Además, esto ayudará a que el dinero europeo llegue mejor a las pymes y a las empresas de la economía social. La Estrategia Europa 2020 ha contribuido a avanzar en este ámbito, fomentando la especialización inteligente, las ayudas a la innovación y las medidas para proteger el medio ambiente. Es mucho lo que se hace, pero queda mucho por hacer. Pensemos, por ejemplo, en el potencial de la bioeconomía o de la contratación pública ecológica. De esta forma se destinarán más fondos a la sostenibilidad, se gestionarán bastante mejor y, gracias a la Unión Europea, nuestros pueblos y ciudades podrán hacer realidad la transición hacia un modelo de economía circular.

Ahora bien, los Estados miembros tienen que hacer su parte. Es preciso elaborar una estrategia nacional de economía circular que complemente la estrategia europea con estos ejes: agroalimentación, turismo, industria y construcción. Porque hacer más sostenibles los sectores claves de nuestra economía es invertir en el futuro o, lo que es igual, es dejar un mundo mejor a las generaciones venideras.

Liliana Rodrigues (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, no período de programação 2014-2020 a economia circular não foi reconhecida como domínio de ação prioritário na União Europeia. Na proposta para o próximo quadro plurianual este objetivo foi incluído e congratulo a Comissão por essa decisão.

É o reconhecimento de que o uso pouco eficiente dos recursos leva a prejuízos ambientais, sociais e económicos. Em 2014 a União Europeia produzia 2,5 biliões de toneladas de lixo. Precisamos de reduzir, reciclar e reutilizar. É, portanto, urgente combater o desperdício. Se queremos uma Europa mais sustentável, a economia circular tem de ser um compromisso assumido, não só a longo prazo, mas como objetivo permanente. A economia circular enfrenta desafios que implicam a mudança de todo o sistema de produção e que precisa, de facto, do auxílio financeiro da política de coesão.

Temos, por isso, de proporcionar às autoridades locais e regionais, bem como às pequenas e médias empresas, aos investidores, às instituições educativas e de investigação, autonomia funcional e financeira adequada, permitindo-lhes preparar e implementar as estratégias que entendam ser as melhores para as suas regiões, nomeadamente o desenvolvimento local de base comunitária e os investimentos territoriais integrados.

É fundamental ainda combinar diferentes financiamentos, inclusive os da investigação, e não será demais relembrar o uso privilegiado do fundo ambiental que, por exemplo, irá suportar inteiramente a agenda para a economia circular de uma das regiões ultraperiféricas europeias, a Região Autónoma da Madeira.

Nos negócios circulares os modelos de desenvolvimento e de progresso já não assentam apenas no lucro, mas na proteção do ambiente. Para isso temos de reforçar e reabilitar os aterros, já aqui foi dito, em todo o território europeu. Todos os investimentos, diretos ou indiretos, na economia circular deixaram de ser uma opção, como diz o senhor relator, elas são uma necessidade para o bem da nossa espécie e de tudo o que é vivo neste mundo.

Nuno Melo (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, percebemos que a redução do orçamento da União Europeia por causa do Brexit implique cortes, mas o que não aceitamos é que quando a coesão existe para aproximar os países mais pobres dos mais ricos, alguns dos mais ricos têm um aumento nos fundos para a coesão e alguns dos mais pobres sofrem cortes.

Disse a Comissão, em conferência de imprensa com o Comissário Katainen presente, que se pretende continuar a orientar os recursos para as regiões que mais precisam de recuperar em relação ao resto da União Europeia e garantir um tratamento equitativo para todos.

Eu devo dizer que a declaração é, no mínimo, exótica. Portugal tem um PIB per capita de 77% da média da União Europeia, a Finlândia natal do Comissário Katainen um PIB per capita de 109% da média da União Europeia, tem por isso um PIB superior à média da União Europeia, a Finlândia terá aumentos de 5% e Portugal terá cortes de 7%.

Pior, países como o Luxemburgo, com um PIB per capita de 258% da média da União Europeia, ou a Áustria, a Holanda, a Bélgica, a Suécia, ou a Dinamarca, todos acima da média da União Europeia, não sofrem cortes, mas Portugal, até há pouco tempo intervencionado pela troika, terá cortes de 7%.

Pior, países como a Espanha ou a Itália, muito mais ricos do que Portugal, terão aumentos de 5 e de 6%, mas Portugal terá cortes de 7% nos fundos para a coesão.

Queria terminar dizendo, Senhora Presidente, que os cortes que a Comissão quer impor a Portugal são absolutamente injustos, inexplicáveis e, nesta medida que eu referi, até arbitrários.

Tenham disso a noção porque decisões assim e com decisões assim é toda a natureza do projeto europeu que é posto em causa.

John Howarth (S&D). – Madam President, I welcome the report and I support the development of the circular economy as one of the five cohesion policy goals post-2020. Even though I would treat some of the figures that are thrown around on job creation with caution, the potential for the creation of new jobs from circular markets is clear – as are, indeed, the sustainability benefits of moving from new materials in an extractive economy: they're also self-evident. But I have two observations. If viable circular markets are to develop, then a strategy for supporting those markets has to emerge, otherwise they will not be able to compete effectively against existing linear markets. Secondly, central and local government will be vital, within that strategy, in underpinning the development of mature circular markets through sustainable procurement, as it will in sustainable waste management processes on which the circular economy will depend.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, fără discuție, politica de coeziune reprezintă una dintre politicile europene fundamentale, iar aceasta oferă cele mai bune instrumente de punere în aplicare a economiei circulare. Creșterea economică durabilă necesită utilizarea resurselor de orice tip, cât mai eficient și responsabil, deoarece acestea sunt limitate. Implicarea autorităților locale și regionale, dar și a celorlalți parteneri în procesele de elaborare a strategiilor pentru economia circulară este esențială și trebuie să aibă în vedere consolidarea parteneriatelor pe orizontală.

În același timp, trebuie să se rețină faptul că regiunile mai puțin dezvoltate se confruntă, în general, cu probleme ce țin de lipsa capacității administrative. În acest sens, apreciez că programele de finanțare trebuie adaptate mai mult la profilul regiunilor care să urmărească exploatarea potențialului durabil al acestora, iar sprijinul acordat trebuie orientat către o tranziție cât mai lină către principiile economiei circulare. Iată, deci, că se impune astfel o creștere a cheltuielilor legate de economia circulară în politica de coeziune după 2020.

Elena Gentile (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non vi è dubbio, oggi vi è una nuova consapevolezza, che la crisi non solo economica ma anche valoriale ha contribuito a rendere patrimonio condiviso, la consapevolezza che occorra consolidare la cifra dell'innovazione per sostenere un'altra idea di sviluppo.

Una vera e propria rivoluzione, dunque, quella dell'economia circolare e dell'innovazione, che restituisce dignità all'ambiente e al capitale umano e che non può essere vissuta solo come innovazione industriale di processo e di prodotto, ma che deve coinvolgere e valorizzare territori, comunità urbane, comunità rurali e capitale umano, anche per sconfinare ogni resistenza al cambiamento.

Insomma, una nuova chiave di lettura per le politiche di coesione. Costruire dentro la visione di successo di questi anni una nuova connessione tra le politiche, la ricerca al servizio della sostenibilità, politiche attive per il lavoro, orientate ai processi di promozione del sistema di impresa, una visione sempre più inclusiva della comunità.

Λευτέρης Χριστοφόρου (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θεωρώ ότι οφείλουμε όλοι μας να υπερασπιστούμε την πολιτική συνοχής και την πολιτική της κυκλικής οικονομίας. Είναι πολιτικές οι οποίες πάνε μαζί και πρέπει να αποτελέσουν την ύψιστη προτεραιότητα όλων μας. Γι' αυτό συμφωνώ απόλυτα με τον αγαπητό συνάδελφο Nuno Melo, ο οποίος τόνισε ότι δεν μπορούν να υπάρξουν περικοπές στην πολιτική συνοχής, γιατί τούτο αποτελεί ουσιαστικά επίθεση προς την περιφέρεια, προς τις φτωχές χώρες που έχουν ανάγκη την πολιτική συνοχής. Αυτή η πολιτική που αποδείχτηκε επιτυχημένη για τόσο μεγάλο χρονικό διάστημα δεν μπορεί σήμερα να απειλείται από οποιονδήποτε.

Η στήριξη σε αυτές τις πολιτικές σημαίνει στήριξη των αγροτικών περιοχών, σημαίνει στήριξη των περιφερειών, σημαίνει πράσινη οικονομία, σημαίνει πράσινη ανάπτυξη, σημαίνει θέσεις εργασίας. Οφείλουμε να τις υπερασπιστούμε αυτές τις πολιτικές και είναι ώρα να το πράξουμε για να αναδείξουμε και την ίδια την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Μικρές χώρες και απομονωμένες, όπως είναι η πατρίδα μου η Κύπρος, έχουν ανάγκη αυτών των πολιτικών, γιατί βρίσκονται σε δεινή θέση, ιδιαίτερα ο αγροτικός τομέας, η περιφέρεια και η ύπαιθρος. Γι' αυτό στηρίζουμε αυτές τις πολιτικές και θα τις θωρακίσουμε με όλες μας τις δυνάμεις.

Emilian Pavel (S&D). – Doamna președintă, domnule comisar, în primul rând, vreau să felicit Comisia Europeană și vreau să îi transmiter doamnei Crețu, mai ales să o felicit pe dânsa, pentru că printre primele cinci priorități a trecut și economia circulară pentru politica de coeziune. Este foarte important pentru că, atunci când vorbim de economia circulară, vorbim de o schimbare radicală față de modul în care gândim, realizăm și folosim produsele din viața noastră de zi cu zi.

Europa poartă povara responsabilității de a deveni lider global în acest domeniu, mai ales în privința unor decizii ale unor parteneri strategici de-ai noștri. Nu mai putem continua după principiile actuale, din moment ce resursele devin din ce în ce mai puține, fiind mai costisitor și mai dăunător de obținut pentru mediul înconjurător. Cercetarea și inovarea ne oferă astăzi alternative la procedee dăunătoare, dezvoltate în trecut, dar folosite astăzi. De ce nu folosim *best technology*, domnule comisar, atunci când vine vorba de fondurile de coeziune, când vine vorba de țări care astăzi nu au sisteme de colectare eficiente. Haideți să investim în ceea ce trebuie!

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Madam President, in this Cohesion Fund period, the circular economy was indeed not embedded among the finance priorities, and because of that we have used quite a lot of the money on the wrong courses with good intentions, namely, funding the construction of landfill and incineration while we already have an overcapacity of waste incineration in Europe. Indeed, we are still financing waste incineration, which should be brought to an end as soon as possible.

We are creating a double benefit when we remove subsidies from the wrong courses that work against the circular economy and put those resources to work for the circular economy. The Cohesion Policy and the Committee of the Regions have a great role to play here because they gather together SME groups. They can develop the kind of hubs that serve as platforms for the development of new business models and new types of public procurement.

In the future, only the projects that support the circular economy, sustainability and social inclusion should be financed from the Cohesion Fund. Hopefully, with the Committee of the Regions, a sharing mechanism can be created where the best practices can be shared between different regions.

Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Polityka spójności zawsze odgrywała ważną rolę rozwojową. Była i jest polityką innowacyjną, kreującą nowoczesne formy działalności gospodarczej, a także nowe rozwiązania technologiczne, które sprzyjają dobru środowiska oraz przeciwdziałają zmianom klimatycznym i wykluczeniu społecznemu. Polityka spójności podejmowała zawsze ważne, strategiczne, ale i trudne wyzwania. Do nich należy zaliczyć gospodarkę o obiegu zamkniętym. Recykling odpadów prowadzi do zmniejszenia zanieczyszczenia środowiska i ograniczenia zużycia zasobów naturalnych. Choć to kosztuje dziś więcej, to w perspektywie długookresowej się opłaca. Te działania związane z biogospodarką są szczególnie widoczne na obszarach wiejskich, a także w rolnictwie, gdzie dobrze rozwijają się np. odnawialne źródła energii, służąc rozwojowi wsi i rolnictwa.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Cumbria Recycling in my North West constituency is an excellent best practice example of the circular economy. It operates in a deprived peripheral region that has benefited hugely from EU cohesion policy and financial support. Working within the parameters of EU waste directives and operating as a successful social enterprise, Cumbria Recycling diverts electronic waste away from landfill through the collection and sustainable reuse of electronics: waste that others may deem as useless. Cumbria Recycling processes over 2000 tons annually of waste and electrical and electronic equipment for the reuse and sorting for recycling of raw materials. In the post-Brexit world, it will be hugely important for the UK to maintain its commitment to the highest environmental standards and also to continue to provide support for enterprises like Cumbria Recycling, who fundamentally understand the social return on investment that comes with the circular economy.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η κυκλική οικονομία επί της ουσίας αποτελεί ένα νέο μοντέλο το οποίο συμβάλλει στη δημιουργία εκατομμυρίων θέσεων εργασίας και αποσκοπεί στην προστασία του περιβάλλοντος. Πρόκειται λοιπόν για ένα λειτουργικό μοντέλο το οποίο μπορεί να δημιουργήσει πράσινες θέσεις εργασίας, ιδίως στον τομέα της ανακύκλωσης και της επαναχρησιμοποίησης των υλικών, πολύ δε περισσότερο στον τομέα της διαχείρισης των αποβλήτων, όπου σημαντικό ρόλο μπορεί να διαδραματίσει η τοπική αυτοδιοίκηση σε όλα τα επίπεδα, και σε επίπεδο δήμου και σε επίπεδο περιφέρειας. Θεωρώ ότι πρέπει να δοθούν κίνητρα και πρέπει να αναλάβει σημαντικό ρόλο και ο κλάδος των μικρομεσαίων επιχειρήσεων. Οι δήμοι μπορούν επίσης να διαδραματίσουν αποφασιστικό ρόλο και πρέπει να στηρίξουν και την καινοτομία. Για αυτό όμως πρέπει να λάβουν και τα ανάλογα κονδύλια.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, politika soudržnosti je klíčem k tomu, aby se oběhové hospodářství stalo realitou i v zemích, které pokulhávají s odpadovou infrastrukturou.

Pokud chceme dosáhnout zákazu skládkování komunálního odpadu tak, jak jsme si zde nedávno schválili, je potřeba chudším zemím dát možnost, jak toho docílit. V zemích jako Česko, Slovensko či Polsko dlouhodobě zaostáváme v budování infrastruktury pro třídění i recyklaci a energetické využití je u nás zatím v začátcích. I když se i tady situace pomalu mění. Víme, že zrušit skládkování a splnit cíl ve zvýšení recyklování nebude snadné.

Proto jsem velmi ráda, že se Evropská komise rozhodla finančně podpořit oběhové hospodářství nejen v rámci tohoto programového, již končícího období, ale i v novém programovém období, a tím jim umožnit hladší přechod na nízkouhlíkovou a oběhovou ekonomiku. Tato podpora je tak příkladným naplněním samotné podstaty politiky soudržnosti, která vychází z požadavku snižování rozdílů mezi úrovní rozvoje různých členských států.

(Pyynnöstä myönnettävät puheenvuorot päättyvät)

Julian King, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you again for this report and for the debate that we've had this evening. I think we're all agreed that, if we get it right, the circular economy has the potential to support economic growth and regional development, while at the same time boosting environmental protection. We've discussed, this evening, a number of the potential gains and, from the Commission side, we agree with many of the points that have been made in the debate.

We have sought to target support during the current period, but, as many of you have stressed, it's also important that we integrate these objectives in our proposals for the next period – the post-2020 period.

The transition to a circular economy is now included in the policy objectives that we are earmarking. Although the circular economy strategies are not yet implemented widely enough to be a new enabling condition, we are excluding the least desirable waste management options from the scope of funding.

Again, the monitoring framework includes new indicators more closely linked to the circular economy and the objectives we've been discussing, such as the use of recycled waste as raw materials. Now we'll also have a tracking methodology that supports environmental objectives next to the tracking of climate objectives.

A number of other points have come up in discussion and, as we undertook at the beginning, we will make a careful report on all of those to Ms Crețu and her team.

The circular economy requires considerable changes to the way we live our lives and run our economies, and that requires the effort, support and engagement of a wide range of stakeholders who are trying to make the circular economy happen in all regions, local authorities and cities, but it is worth the effort. That is the main message that I take away from tonight's debate.

Davor Škrlec, Rapporteur. – Gospođa predsjedavajuća, zahvaljujem svim kolegicama i kolegama i povjereniku na doprinosima današnje diskusiji. Ja ću se osvrnuti na samo nekoliko detalja za koje smatram da su važni da ih možda istaknemo i da ih još jače zapravo objasnimo našim građanima.

Prvo je jako važno ojačati kapacitete naše lokalne i regionalne samouprave. Kao činjenicu tome, dajem podatak da je na prošlogodišnjem natječaju Europske komisije za konsultativnu pomoć jedinicama regionalne samouprave, upravo u državama središnje i istočne Europe bio vrlo slabi odaziv. Dakle, taj dio Europske unije nije prepoznao na vrijeme kružnu ekonomiju kao potencijal za razvoj svojeg gospodarstva.

Također, ulaganje u sektor poduzetništva je jako važno kako bismo ga osposobili za tranziciju prema kružnoj ekonomiji. Tu ću opet navesti jedan primjer – neki dan sam u jednom europskom trgovačkom lancu kupio drvene žlice, vilice, noževe, kao zamjenu za jednokratne plastične proizvode koje danas koristimo, ali ono što me je iznenadilo jest da je to bilo proizvedeno u Kini, a ne u Europskoj uniji. Dakle, Kina je prepoznala politiku Europske unije u kružnoj ekonomiji i primjenila zapravo biomaterijale koje danas prodaje nama na tržištu. Dakle, moramo naše poduzetništvo osposobiti da postane konkurentno onom na globalnoj razini.

Bila je spomenuta „pametna specijalizacija“, to je jako važno kako bi naše regije prepoznale svoje lokalne potencijale. Upravo kako bi, ja bih rekao, kroz novi Horizon Europe u istraživanju i razvoju novih materijala korištenjem biomaterijala zapravo razvile proizvode, odnosno one koji se danas baziraju na jednokratnoj plastici. Zato podržavam inicijativu Komisije za Prijedlog direktive o ograničenoj upotrebi jednokratne plastike i, naravno, Prijedlog direktive o izmjeni Direktive za pitku vodu.

I na kraju, htio bih samo istaknuti koje su zapravo naše najvažnije poruke, što je naša kolegica Pietikäinen već istaknula, a to je da u ovom programskom razdoblju imamo projekata, imamo novac iz europskih fondova koji je loše upotrebljen. Znači, ex ante uvjeti kojima se poštuje hierarhija gospodarenja otpadom zapravo su uvjeti za financiranje cirkularne ekonomije, odnosno tih projekata. Razvoj nacionalnih strategija koje će biti, zapravo, u skladu s europskom politikom cirkularne ekonomije i, ono što je povjerenik istaknuo, da imamo jasnu metodologiju praćenja indikatora ulaganja u projekte cirkularne ekonomije.

Puhemies. – Keskustelu on päättynyt.

Äänestys toimitetaan keskiviikkona 13. kesäkuuta 2018.

Kirjalliset lausumat (työjärjestyksen 162 artikla)

Tamás Deutsch (PPE), írásban. – A körforgásos gazdaság környezetbarát alternatívát kínál a jelenleg elterjedt „Vedd meg! – Használd! – Dobd ki!” modellel szemben, erősítéséhez a kohéziós politika támogatására is szükség van. A körforgásos gazdaság termékei és szolgáltatásai iránti kereslet nem elegendő, aminek oka sokszor abban rejlik, hogy drágábbak a lineáris termékeknél és szolgáltatásoknál, melyeknek azonban negatív velejáróit és az éghajlatváltozásra gyakorolt hatásokat nem veszik figyelembe.

A körforgásos gazdaság sokkal átfogóbb a hulladékgazdálkodásnál; felöleli a megújuló energia, az erőforrás-hatékonyság, a biogazdaság, az agrár- és a halászati politikák, az élelmiszer-pazarlás, a levegőtisztaság, a kutatás-fejlesztés, innováció területeit. A körforgásos gazdaság hatékonyság támogatja a fenntartható fejlődést és az éghajlat-változás elleni küzdelmet, a benne rejlő lehetőségek feltárása és kihasználása ezért fontos feladat.

Adam Gierak (S&D), na piśmie. – Struktura tworzyw używanych w wyrobach materialnych podlega w trakcie ich eksploatacji nieodwracalnym zmianom wskutek wzrostu entropii wewnętrznej. Powrót do stanu wyjściowego, tj. rozkład surowców wtórnych na składniki wyjściowe, choć teoretycznie możliwy, okupiony byłby większym nakładem energetycznym niż ten, który zachodził w przypadku korzystania z surowców pierwotnych.

Wychodząc z bilansu egzergetycznego, widzimy, że „prosty recykling” ma swoje ograniczenia energetyczne. Wielokrotny recykling termoplastycznych tworzyw sztucznych prowadzi do skrócenia łańcuchów polimerowych, tj. do gwałtownego spadku ich właściwości mechanicznych. Podobnie ma się rzecz z recyklingiem w przypadku wytwarzania stali na bazie złomu stopów żelaza. Im więcej cykli przetopu, tym większe prawdopodobieństwo, że w strukturze stali pojawią się trudne do usunięcia niskotopliwe, szlachetniejsze od żelaza składniki, np. miedź. Takie stale są kruche i mało plastyczne. Nie nadają się na karoserie samochodowe.

Gospodarka o obiegu zamkniętym winna uwzględniać egzergetyczne ograniczenia surowców wtórnych, opracowując nowe technologie ich wykorzystania. Za klasyczny przykład takiego podejścia może służyć wykorzystanie zużytych opon samochodowych do produkcji różnego rodzaju kształtek o strukturze gumowo-poliuretanowej (poliuretan jako spoiwo), które cechują się korzystnymi właściwościami tłumienia drgań. Nietrudno przewidzieć, że „prosty recykling” byłby w tym przypadku niesłychanie skomplikowany i energochłonny.

20. Agenda of the next sitting : see Minutes

21. Closure of the sitting

(Istunto päättyi klo 23.22.)

Key to symbols used

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

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

Abbreviations used for Parliamentary Committees

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

Abbreviations used for Political Groups

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