

C/2024/3652

13.6.2024

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 10 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2018

(C/2024/3652)

PARLAMENTO EUROPEO

PERÍODO DE SESIONES 2018-2019

Sesiones del 10 al 13 de diciembre de 2018

ESTRASBURGO

Sumario	Página
1. Reanudación del período de sesiones	3
2. Apertura de la sesión	3
3. Declaración de la Presidencia	3
4. Aprobación de las Actas de las sesiones anteriores: véase el Acta	4
5. Composición de los grupos políticos: véase el Acta	4
6. Negociaciones antes de la primera lectura del Parlamento (artículo 69 quater del Reglamento): véase el Acta	4
7. Negociaciones antes de la primera lectura del Parlamento (artículo 69 quater del Reglamento interno) (seguimiento): véase el Acta	4
8. Firma de actos adoptados de conformidad con el procedimiento legislativo ordinario (artículo 78 del Reglamento): véase el Acta	4
9. Curso dado a las resoluciones del Parlamento: véase el Acta	4
10. Preguntas con solicitud de respuesta oral (presentación): véase el Acta	4
11. Presentación de documentos: véase el Acta	4
12. Orden de los trabajos	4

Sumario	Página
13. Establecimiento de un Programa de Medio Ambiente y Acción por el Clima (LIFE) (debate)	9
14. Protección de los trabajadores contra los riesgos relacionados con la exposición a agentes carcinógenos o mutágenos durante el trabajo (debate)	21
15. Transparencia y sostenibilidad de la determinación del riesgo en la cadena alimentaria de la UE (debate) . .	30
16. Plena aplicación de las disposiciones del acervo de Schengen en Bulgaria y Rumanía (debate)	46
17. Centro Europeo para el Desarrollo de la Formación Profesional (Cedefop) - Agencia Europea para la Seguridad y la Salud en el Trabajo (EU-OSHA) - Fundación Europea para la Mejora de las Condiciones de Vida y de Trabajo (Eurofound) (debate)	55
18. Movilidad militar (breve presentación)	63
19. La educación en la era digital: retos, oportunidades y lecciones para el diseño de las políticas de la Unión (breve presentación)	66
20. Nueva Agenda Europea para la Cultura (breve presentación)	70
21. Intervenciones de un minuto sobre asuntos de importancia política	73
22. Orden del día de la próxima sesión : véase el Acta	78
23. Cierre de la sesión	78

ESACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES DE 10 DE DICIEMBRE DE 2018

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ANTONIO TAJANI

Presidente

1. Reanudación del período de sesiones

Presidente. – Dichiaro ripresa la sessione del Parlamento europeo interrotta giovedì 29 novembre 2018.

2. Apertura de la sesión

(La seduta è aperta alle 17.03)

3. Declaración de la Presidencia

Presidente. – Onorevoli colleghi, oggi celebriamo il settantesimo anniversario della Dichiarazione universale dei diritti dell'uomo, adottata il 10 dicembre del 1948 a Parigi.

La dichiarazione ha rappresentato un punto di svolta nella storia dell'umanità, introducendo principi e diritti che sono oggi punti di riferimento irrinunciabili. La dichiarazione ha ispirato i nostri padri fondatori, che avevano sperimentato le atrocità e l'abisso a cui porta il disprezzo dei diritti dell'uomo.

La nostra Europa si fonda sul rispetto della libertà e della dignità della persona, garante della democrazia liberale e dello Stato di diritto. Questi valori sono l'essenza della nostra identità europea e hanno garantito settant'anni di pace e di rispetto reciproco.

Il Parlamento europeo è da sempre in prima linea nella difesa di questi valori. Da trent'anni, con il premio Sacharov, questo Parlamento rende omaggio e sostiene chi si batte, pagando spesso un prezzo altissimo, per i diritti umani.

Cinque vincitori del premio Sacharov hanno ricevuto anche il premio Nobel per la pace e proprio oggi, a Oslo, Denis Mukwege e Nadia Murad hanno ricevuto questo prestigioso riconoscimento. A loro vanno tutte le nostre congratulazioni.

Voglio anche esprimere il nostro cordoglio per la scomparsa di Lyudmila Alexeyeva, una pioniera del movimento per i diritti umani nell'ex Unione Sovietica. Questo Parlamento le ha conferito nel 2009 il premio Sacharov, in qualità di membro dell'associazione *Memorial*.

Ricordo che mercoledì, in quest'Aula, assegneremo il premio Sacharov 2019 al cineasta ucraino Oleg Sentsov, un simbolo della lotta per i diritti dei prigionieri politici in tutto il mondo.

Ma oggi voglio anche ricordare le prime sentinelle dei diritti dell'uomo, i giornalisti, che ovunque nel mondo rischiano la vita per la nostra libertà. Il mio pensiero va a Daphne Caruana Galizia, a Ján Kuciak e a Jamal Khashoggi, uccisi nella ricerca della verità, ma anche a tutti i giornalisti che sono imprigionati nel mondo ingiustamente.

(Applausi)

Matt Carthy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, on a point of order, when we speak of human rights, you will be aware that four of the nine Catalan political prisoners have embarked on a hunger strike. Considering that two of these political prisoners are former Members of this House and that their crimes amount to that of allowing people to vote to determine their own future, can I ask you, Mr President, when you intend to make a statement on this matter, knowing as you must do that the silence of EU leaders makes the EU institutions complicit in the Spanish Government's disregard for international norms relating to democracy and human rights?

(Applause)

4. Aprobación de las Actas de las sesiones anteriores: véase el Acta

5. Composición de los grupos políticos: véase el Acta

6. Negociaciones antes de la primera lectura del Parlamento (artículo 69 quater del Reglamento): véase el Acta

7. Negociaciones antes de la primera lectura del Parlamento (artículo 69 quater del Reglamento interno) (seguimiento): véase el Acta

8. Firma de actos adoptados de conformidad con el procedimiento legislativo ordinario (artículo 78 del Reglamento): véase el Acta

9. Curso dado a las resoluciones del Parlamento: véase el Acta

10. Preguntas con solicitud de respuesta oral (presentación): véase el Acta

11. Presentación de documentos: véase el Acta

12. Orden de los trabajos

Presidente. – Il progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno, fissato dalla Conferenza dei presidenti, ai sensi dell'articolo 149 del regolamento, nella riunione di giovedì 6 dicembre 2018 è stato distribuito. Sono state presentate le seguenti proposte di modifica:

Lunedì

Il gruppo ENF ha chiesto di aggiungere come primo punto all'ordine del giorno le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione su imprese e marchi storici dell'Unione che sono di proprietà di società non europee. Il riferimento è al caso Pernigotti 1860.

Mario Borghezio, a nome del gruppo ENF. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la vicenda è nota, se ne sono occupati anche vari parlamentari di vari gruppi, per il nostro gruppo voglio citare e ringraziare l'onorevole Lancini.

È una questione che per il nostro paese sta diventando annosa perché dall'olio allo zucchero, fino al formaggio, è ormai lunghissima la lista delle etichette storiche italiane, soprattutto del *food*, svendute all'estero e utilizzate per veicolare sotto la bandiera tricolore produzioni effettuate spesso molto lontano.

Inoltre, nel caso del cioccolato e dei cioccolatini gianduiotti Pernigotti, voglio anche ringraziare il Presidente, che si è speso personalmente per questa giusta battaglia a difesa non solo dei lavoratori – c'è una grande questione riguardante i lavoratori – ma anche dei consumatori, perché non dobbiamo dimenticare che la produzione che avviene in Piemonte tutela i consumatori dal punto di vista della genuinità e dell'integrità, mentre altrettanto non si può dire delle nocciole coltivate in Turchia.

Per questo motivo ritengo che l'Europa, che per adesso ha fatto sentire la sua voce solo attraverso il Presidente di questo Parlamento – e lo ringrazio – voglia finalmente, e questo dibattito servirà a questo, far sentire una voce e una forte pressione sulla Turchia e sulla proprietà turca, visti anche i risultati inconsistenti delle pressioni che fino adesso sono state esercitate, anche giustamente, dal governo italiano.

Ricordo che abbiamo chiesto il voto per appello nominale.

Presidente. – Visto che Lei ha riferito del mio interessamento, volevo informare l'Aula che sono andato a visitare la sede di questa fabbrica, che si trova in una piccola città del Piemonte. Ho incontrato i sindacati, ho incontrato i lavoratori, dopodiché ho cercato di avere informazioni dal governo turco sulle reali intenzioni, da parte della proprietà turca, di delocalizzare la produzione dei prodotti alimentari.

Ho ricevuto delle risposte interlocutorie, so che ci sono stati incontri anche con il governo italiano: il nostro obiettivo è quello di evitare la delocalizzazione al fine di non perdere posti di lavoro.

Mercedes Bresso, a nome del gruppo S&D. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, poiché io ho presentato, con altri colleghi che la firmeranno, un'interrogazione sullo stesso tema, chiederei di unificare anche l'interrogazione con la discussione richiesta.

In tal caso noi voteremmo a favore.

Presidente. – On. Borghezio, Lei è favorevole alla proposta dell'on. Bresso, cioè unificare anche l'interrogazione parlamentare presentata dal gruppo dell'on. Bresso alla proposta che fa il Suo gruppo?

(L'on. Borghezio accetta la proposta dell'on. Bresso.)

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta del gruppo ENF.)

Martedì

Ho ricevuto dal gruppo GUE/NGL la richiesta di rinviare la votazione sulla relazione di Juan Fernando López Aguilar sulla revisione del codice dei visti a una tornata successiva. Qualora la richiesta di cui sopra non riesca a trovare una maggioranza, il gruppo GUE richiede che una discussione su tale relazione sia aggiunta lunedì come ultimo punto prima delle brevi presentazioni.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL. – Monsieur le Président, la révision du code des visas est un dossier important, qui concerne, chaque année, environ 15 millions de personnes qui viennent pour un court séjour sur notre territoire.

Le rapport de M. López Aguilar, que je remercie pour tout son travail, fait plus de 70 pages. Il va être adopté à une vitesse jamais vue au sein du Parlement européen pour un tel rapport. Après le travail d'obstruction de quelques-uns lié au dossier sur les visas humanitaires, le travail réel n'a commencé que le 21 novembre, pour un vote au sein de la commission des libertés civiles, de la justice et des affaires intérieures le 3 décembre, avec un délai de dépôt des amendements en plénière avant le 7 décembre. Le texte consolidé n'a été mis en ligne que le 6 et nous ne disposons pour le moment d'aucune traduction. Pardon, depuis quelques minutes, nous avons la traduction en neuf langues.

Je trouve que tout cela n'est pas sérieux et tout cela me paraît contraire à un certain nombre d'articles de notre règlement, et notamment l'article 156. On veut nous faire voter demain sans débat pour avoir un trilogue jeudi. C'est un mépris total pour le travail législatif, pour ce Parlement. Ce dossier, qui est en souffrance depuis quatre ans du fait des blocages du Conseil, peut attendre quelques semaines de plus. C'est pourquoi nous demandons, d'une part, le report du vote à la prochaine plénière, et, d'autre part, à tout le moins, un débat en plénière ce soir.

Presidente. – Metto prima in votazione la richiesta di rinviare la votazione sulla relazione López Aguilar. Poi, se non sarà approvata, passeremo alla seconda votazione per avere una discussione lunedì, come ultimo punto prima delle brevi presentazioni.

(Il Parlamento respinge le richieste di modifica)

Mercoledì

A seguito delle consultazioni con i gruppi politici, desidero sottoporre all'Aula la seguente proposta di modifica del progetto definitivo di ordine del giorno.

La votazione sulla relazione di Petras Auštrevičius relativa alla relazione annuale sui diritti umani e la democrazia nel mondo nel 2017 e sulla politica dell'Unione europea in materia, prevista per mercoledì pomeriggio, sarà votata alle 12.00.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta di modifica)

Birgit Sippel, *on behalf of the S&D Group.* – Mr President, our Group had a request for Tuesday and now you are already on Wednesday. Can we just check this?

Presidente. – Sì, ha ragione. Torniamo a martedì.

Martedì

Il gruppo S&D ha chiesto che una dichiarazione della Commissione sull'adeguatezza della protezione dei dati personali offerta dal Giappone sia aggiunta alla discussione congiunta sull'accordo di partenariato UE-Giappone. Questo punto dovrebbe concludersi con una risoluzione.

Birgit Sippel, *on behalf of the S&D Group.* – Mr President, on behalf of the S&D Group, I would like to request that a debate on the adequacy arrangement with Japan be added tomorrow along with the joint debate on the EU-Japan Partnership Agreement and the resolution from the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, which is to be adopted on Wednesday.

It is important to have the debate and the vote this week, as the Commission is expected to adopt its adequacy decision vis-à-vis Japan at the end of this year or, at the latest, in early 2019. Therefore, in order to feed into the process, Parliament needs to adopt its resolution beforehand.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, en réalité, comme tous les non-inscrits, nous n'avons malheureusement pas la possibilité, compte tenu de notre représentation sans voix délibérative à la Conférence des présidents, de demander un report de l'ordre du jour.

Puisque nos collègues socialistes ont soulevé cette question qui a trait au traité de libre-échange et au partenariat avec le Japon, je pense personnellement que l'ensemble de ce dossier devrait être reporté à une session ultérieure.

En effet, il s'agit d'un dossier extrêmement volumineux, extrêmement considérable, avec des études d'impact importantes, un texte qui nous a été communiqué de façon relativement récente, un document qui a été signé par M. Juncker, sauf erreur de ma part, au mois d'août, mais qui vient seulement d'être traduit dans l'ensemble des langues de l'Union et par conséquent, je pense qu'il serait raisonnable...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Le Président. – Je ne vous ai pas demandé votre opinion sur le sujet en général. J'ai demandé s'il y avait quelqu'un qui était contre la proposition du groupe socialiste, il ne s'agit pas d'entamer un débat. Vous avez dit que vous étiez contre. Nous allons voter directement.

Birgit Sippel, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, just to clarify, because we are talking about totally different things: I was demanding a debate and a vote on a resolution on the adequacy decision. The colleague over there is talking about a trade agreement with Japan. So just to avoid confusion, my request regards the adequacy decision.

Presidente. – L'avevo detto in maniera molto chiara prima. Era una risposta che non c'entrava con il voto contrario.

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, une seconde. J'avais cru comprendre que notre collègue demandait cela comme annexe à l'ensemble des discussions sur les accords avec le Japon...

(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)

Michał Boni (PPE). – Mr President, our Group is against this because we are in favour of discussing and approving the agreement on trade with Japan, but we have worked separately on the rule and principle of adequacy, and we are against adding this topic to the discussion and the resolution and decisions on the agreement with Japan.

(Applause)

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta di modifica presentata dal gruppo S&D)

Presidente. – Sempre per martedì, il gruppo GUE/NGL ha chiesto che una dichiarazione del Vicepresidente della Commissione/Alto rappresentante dell'Unione per gli affari esteri e la politica di sicurezza sulla sentenza della Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo sul caso di Selahattin Demirtas sia aggiunta come terzo punto del pomeriggio dopo la discussione congiunta sull'accordo di partenariato UE-Giappone.

Marie-Christine Vergiat, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, le 24 novembre, Selahattin Demirtas nous a écrit de sa prison pour nous demander soutien et solidarité. Il est en prison, avec 12 autres de ses collègues et quelque 5 000 militants du HDP, depuis le 4 novembre 2016.

Le 20 novembre dernier, la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme a demandé sa libération, considérant que sa détention prolongée était contraire, notamment, à l'article 18 de la Convention européenne et portait atteinte au pluralisme et au libre jeu des débats politiques.

M. Recep Erdoğan a immédiatement contesté cette décision, la jugeant non contraignante, au mépris du fait que la Turquie est membre fondateur du Conseil de l'Europe. Vingt-neuf enquêtes sont ouvertes contre M. Demirtas, il risque jusqu'à 150 ans de prison uniquement dans le cadre de propos tenus lors de meetings politiques.

Dans deux jours commencera un nouveau procès. C'est pour cela qu'à l'aune de la décision de la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme, nous souhaiterions une déclaration de la haute représentante et un débat pour manifester notre soutien à M. Selahattin Demirtas et à ses collègues.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta di modifica presentata dal gruppo GUE/NGL)

Presidente. – Possiamo ora alle proposte di modifica per la giornata di mercoledì.

Mercoledì

Il gruppo Verts/ALE ha chiesto che la discussione sulle dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sul conflitto di interessi e la protezione del bilancio dell'UE in Repubblica ceca si concluda con una risoluzione che sarà votata giovedì.

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, le premier ministre tchèque, Andrej Babiš, est propriétaire d'une holding dont les entreprises sont bénéficiaires de fonds européens, fonds européens dont l'allocation est décidée par le gouvernement tchèque, présidé par le même Andrej Babiš.

Monsieur le Président, ce type de conflit d'intérêts est un cancer qui ronge la confiance de nos concitoyens dans les institutions européennes et, au-delà, dans la qualité de leurs institutions démocratiques.

Je me réjouis du fait que la Conférence des présidents ait mis ce point à l'ordre du jour de notre séance et je pense qu'il est absolument crucial que ce Parlement s'exprime non seulement par des mots, mais aussi par des mots écrits, sur ce qu'il pense de ce genre de situation.

Le service juridique de la Commission a attesté qu'il s'agit bien d'un conflit d'intérêts. Je pense que ce Parlement doit se prononcer là-dessus par écrit, par le vote d'une résolution.

Martina Dlabajová (ALDE). – Mr President, there is an ongoing official conversation between the European Commission and the Czech Republic about the new financial regulation and its interpretation. So neither the Budgetary Control Committee nor the European Parliament have had the chance to study the Commission letter nor the Czech Republic's answer. So it is not appropriate to formulate a resolution without any knowledge of the facts at hand. The Czech authorities should have a chance to take measures first, so we are against the resolution. And first, let's give the possibility to the Czech Republic to take the measures.

(Il Parlamento accoglie la richiesta di modifica presentata dal gruppo Verts/ALE)

Presidente. – Il gruppo ECR ha chiesto di aggiungere, come secondo punto di mercoledì pomeriggio, dopo la discussione su tematiche di attualità, le dichiarazioni del Consiglio e della Commissione sulla crisi della democrazia in Francia. La discussione dovrebbe concludersi con una risoluzione da votarsi giovedì.

Ryszard Czarnecki, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Panie Przewodniczący! Francja jest jednym z dwóch najważniejszych krajów Unii Europejskiej. Jesteśmy bardzo zaniepokojeni sytuacją w tym kraju. W ciągu ostatnich czterech weekendów na ulice francuskich miast wyszły setki tysięcy demonstrantów, ponad dwa tysiące zostało aresztowanych, blisko 900 osób zostało rannych. Przed chwilą przyjęliśmy propozycję grupy Zielonych, aby porozmawiać o sytuacji w Republice Czeskiej. Myślę, że powinniśmy – tak jak Parlament Europejski zajmował się wcześniej sytuacją w Rumunii, sytuacją na Węgrzech, sytuacją w Polsce – porozmawiać o sytuacji we Francji, ponieważ ta sytuacja jest ważna z punktu widzenia interesów całej Unii Europejskiej. To są też nasze problemy. Wydaje mi się, że taka debata powinna być konieczna, żeby uniknąć zarzutu hipokryzji i podwójnych standardów, że rozmawiamy tylko o krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, a nie o krajach Europy Zachodniej, w tym Francji. Stąd nasz wniosek o debatę w środę.

Christine Revault d'Allonnes Bonnefoy (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, la situation en France est extrêmement préoccupante.

La situation en France, c'est d'abord et avant tout une très grande crise sociale. C'est la raison pour laquelle les sociaux-démocrates ont proposé le débat d'actualité de mercredi à 15 heures, qui s'intitule «Associer les travailleurs et les citoyens dans une transition juste pour une planète plus sûre». Je vous invite tous à intervenir à l'occasion de ce débat pour que nous parlions de cette question, parce que la situation en France est d'abord et avant tout celle-ci.

C'est la raison pour laquelle nous demandons le report de ce débat et pour laquelle nous demandons à ce qu'il porte sur la situation française, d'abord et avant tout sur la question sociale qui existe en France, comme elle existe partout au sein de l'Union européenne.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta di modifica presentata dal gruppo ECR)

Presidente. – Possiamo ora alla giornata di giovedì.

Giovedì

Il gruppo GUE/NGL ha chiesto di aggiungere nel pomeriggio, come terzo punto all'ordine del giorno, l'interrogazione orale sulle gravi violazioni nel trasporto di animali verso paesi terzi.

Anja Hazekamp, namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie. – Voorzitter, volgens de Europese Commissie voldoet bijna 100 % van alle diertransporten over de lange afstand aan de Europese regels. Wij horen andere verhalen van ooggetuigen. Dus ik ben samen met de collega's van dit Parlement zelf gaan kijken en wij troffen iets heel anders aan.

In Kroatië bijvoorbeeld zag ik dit beeld: een rund wordt aan één been op een vrachtschip getakeld. Het dier was uitgeput en in paniek overboord gesprongen. Vervolgens is het dier zwaargewond aan boord verder vervoerd richting Libanon. Het is onduidelijk of het daar ooit levend is aangekomen.

Dit zijn geen incidenten. Dit is de dagelijkse praktijk. En het neemt nog steeds toe. Roemenië maakte afgelopen week bekend dat het per direct 200 000 schapen gaat vervoeren naar het Midden-Oosten met een schip waaraan nota bene in Australië een verbod is opgelegd voor het vervoer van dieren vanwege herhaaldelijk en ernstig dierenleed aan boord. Ik vraag daarom uw steun voor een spoeddebat op donderdagmiddag met commissaris Andriukaitis, want dit dierenleed kunnen we in Europa niet langer toestaan.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Uważam, że jest głęboko niestosowne debatować nad prawami zwierząt w sytuacji, kiedy w Europie nie są chronione prawa nienarodzonych ludzi. Można zabijać nienarodzonych ludzi, a będziemy się użalać nad zwierzętami. Pomijam już nawet słuszność tej rezolucji, bo samo pisanie rezolucji jest bezsensownym sposobem prowadzenia polityki, jest to zaśmieszanie ustawodawstwa aktami, które nic nie wnoszą, bo to nie jest legislacja, to są tylko opinie, to jest felietonistyka. Nie zaśmiejacie porządku obrad bezsensownymi dyskusjami.

(Il Parlamento respinge la richiesta di modifica presentata dal gruppo GUE/NGL)

(L'ordine dei lavori è così fissato).

PREȘEDINȚIA: IOAN MIRCEA PAȘCU

Vicepreședinte

13. Establecimiento de un Programa de Medio Ambiente y Acción por el Clima (LIFE) (debate)

Președintele. – Primul punct de pe ordinea de zi este dezbaterea privind raportul Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy în numele Comisia pentru mediu, sănătate publică și siguranță alimentară, referitor la propunerea de regulament al Parlamentului European și al Consiliului de instituire a unui program pentru mediu și politici climatice (LIFE) și de abrogare a Regulamentului (CE) nr. 1293/2013 (COM(2018)0385 – C8-0249/2018 – 2018/0209(COD)) (A8-0397/2018).

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Rapporteur. – Mr President, thank you very much. We don't have a lot of silence yet, but let me start by thanking all shadow rapporteurs for their wonderful cooperation; we had very smooth negotiations in order to find compromises. So let me start by thanking them for that.

Secondly, I would like to thank the European Commission for its strong proposal for the prolongment of the LIFE financial instrument, which is – let's face it – the most successful financial instrument that we have in Europe. It is very effective, it's very efficient, and it's extremely relevant. It's loved in Brussels, but also in the Member States by industry and by civil society. I think it's an example of how European financial instruments should work. It plays a wonderful catalytic role to initiate, expand and accelerate sustainability, and its main success factor is that it's quality-driven. It is not spoilt by politics. That sounds a bit strange in this political arena, but it's quality-driven. As far as I'm concerned, as rapporteur – and I found quite some support for that among the shadow rapporteurs – we should continue to keep it quality-driven.

Of course, even a successful programme can be improved, and there are two elements that I would like to highlight here. First of all, the original fund is far too small: we have EUR 5 billion. That's why this Parliament already, in an earlier plenary resolution, asked for an increase to EUR 7 billion – very important.

The second point is that it should have more coherence with the other EU funds. LIFE is very successful, but too many other European funds are going against the interests of biodiversity, nature and the environment, and especially the strategic integrated projects under the LIFE programme play a very important role here.

I would like to highlight two more political elements that were also discussed in this House.

The first is that this LIFE budget can only be relatively small if all other EU budget funds are not going against the interests of the environment. That is a very crucial point, also made in all the impact assessments by the Commission and in the introduction to the LIFE programme by the Commission. It can only have this limited amount of money if the other EU funds are not going against it, and it's very important that we monitor that after the MFF has been improved at large.

The second, more political, debate is about national allocations. I'm very happy that we found a compromise among the shadows and that we did not fall into the trap of moving towards national allocations, but that we found a compromise on a bio-geographic balance, which means that we take the ecosystems in Europe as a basis and not our national borders.

Finally, I would like to make some comments on amendments that have been tabled here in plenary. There is one EPP amendment that explicitly mentions the agricultural sector and forestry to include them even more strongly in the LIFE fund. I would like to emphasise that, under the current LIFE, agricultural projects are very much eligible. We currently have 136 projects ongoing, and so it's not only superfluous; it's also behaving a bit like the very hungry caterpillar. There are agricultural funds of EUR 400 billion already reserved, and this limited fund of EUR 5 billion should not be more strongly focused on the agricultural sector than it already is.

Finally, regarding the other amendment from the EPP on large carnivores: I know it's a political debate and it's worthwhile having that debate here, but putting it among the general objectives of the LIFE programme, which talks about climate, environment and biodiversity in general terms, and then adding large carnivores as equal to those general objectives doesn't make a lot of sense to me.

Let's have that debate when we discuss the other, more individual, parts of it.

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank, and to congratulate, the rapporteur, Mr Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy. I would like to thank, too, all the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) for their excellent report on the Commission's proposal for establishing the next Programme for the Environment and Climate Action (LIFE), and also for proceeding with this report very quickly and with a lot of ambition. Speed and ambition in adopting the proposal for a LIFE Programme post-2020 are indeed necessary.

The Commission has put forward ambitious yet realistic proposals for a modern EU budget, proposing clearer and simpler EU financial rules, which ensure that the Union budget delivers on the issues that matter to Europeans, such as the environment. Flexibility is a key feature of a modern European budget. It is therefore essential to maintain this flexibility in the LIFE programme in order to allow the Commission to respond to new and emerging issues in the future. Let me also emphasise that LIFE will continue to be entirely dedicated to supporting the EU's environment and climate objectives, while broadening its scope to support the increased deployment of renewable energy and improved energy efficiency. We have proposed an increase of ambition through wider scope and also through volume for strategic integrated projects, which have an impressive catalytic effect. The new Clean Energy Transitions sub-programme will also enable stronger synergies in the implementation of environmental, climate and energy policies.

However, I would like to stress that LIFE is not meant to solve all environmental and climate funding problems on its own. Rather, this instrument is a pivot at the heart of the Commission's overall approach to ensuring that the Multiannual Financial Framework for the period 2021-2027 will support environment and climate across all of its instruments. Closing the gap between basic research and innovation, the new LIFE programme will support, across the European Union, the development and testing of improved methods to implement the EU's environment and climate policy objectives. The new programme will ensure that those successful methods will subsequently be upstreamed and replicated across the Union.

As a matter of fact, greater importance will be placed on EU added value. Let me be clear about this: the success of LIFE will depend on the EU added value of its projects, not on their distribution simply by Member State. That being said, the Commission will take care to pursue extended geographical distribution of the projects by supporting the network of national contact points responsible for facilitating the sharing of know-how and good practices.

Finally, I would like to remind you about the importance of LIFE for nature and biodiversity. In addition to providing continued support for standard LIFE projects, the dedicated Nature and Biodiversity sub-programme under the new LIFE programme will include a new type of project, namely the strategic nature projects. These projects will specifically support national programmes to enhance the mainstreaming of nature and biodiversity into other policies and financing programmes, including through coordinated implementation of the priority action established pursuant to the Habitats Directive.

Let me conclude by saying that I am keen to achieve a first-reading agreement before Parliament's recess and I would like to reassure you that the Commission stands ready to play its role as an honest broker. Next week, I will discuss the LIFE programme at the Environment Council, where, hopefully, a partial general approach will be agreed. Such a timeline could allow trilogues to start as soon as January.

Anneli Jäätteenmäki, *BUDG-valiokunnan lausunnon valmistelija*. – Arvoisa puhemies, huoli ilmastosta ja ympäristöstämme on noussut kaikkien huulille viimeistään kansainvälisen ilmastopaneelin julkaistua raporttinsa. Selvää on, että lisää toimia tarvitaan. Olemme nähneet myös viime aikoina, että sopeutuminen tilanteeseen ja päästöjen vähentäminen ei ole suinkaan ongelmaton. Elämäntapamme on muututtava, mutta se on erittäin vaikeaa.

Ilmastonmuutoksen torjuminen on rajat ylittävää työtä. Ei pelkästään EU:n tasolla, vaan globaalisti. Sen takia on luonnollista ja aivan välttämätöntä, että vastuuta jaetaan isoimmille hartioille. Ilmasto- ja ympäristötyö on EU:n ydintoimintalaa ja LIFE-ohjelma on ainut EU:n rahoitusohjelma, joka on kokonaan korvamerkitty tähän työhön.

Arvoisa puhemies, olen tyytyväinen, että parlamentti on jo useampaan kertaan ilmaissut vahvan tukensa LIFE-ohjelman jatkolle ja sen vahvistamiselle ja halunnut lisärahaa tähän. Kuitenkin on myönnettävä, että EU:n käytettävissä olevilla rahallisilla panostuksilla ei voida ratkaista ympäristömme kohtaamia ongelmia, kuten komissaarikin äsken totesi. Sen vuoksi on tärkeää, että käytämme niukat resurssit järkevästi. LIFE-ohjelmalla on pyritty siihen, että pienelläkin panostuksella voidaan saada aikaan suuret kerrannaisvaikutukset. Tähän tulee pyrkiä jatkossakin. Arvoisa puhemies, lopuksi haluan kiittää esittelijä Gerbrandya erittäin hyvästä yhteistyöstä ja kaikkia budjettivaliokunnan varjoesittelijöitä.

Czesław Adam Siekierski, *autor projektu opinii Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi*. – Panie Przewodniczący! W opinii w sprawie programu LIFE Komisja Rolnictwa zwróciła uwagę między innymi na następujące kwestie. Program powinien przyczynić się do dalszego przechodzenia na zrównoważoną zasobowo i energooszczędną niskoemisyjną gospodarkę o obiegu zamkniętym, między innymi przez przejście na wysoce efektywny energetycznie i oparty na odnawialnych źródłach energii system energetyczny. Do szczegółowych celów programu należy włączyć odniesienia do zrównoważonych systemów rolniczych i żywnościowych, a także do rolnictwa, ogrodnictwa, leśnictwa i rybołówstwa. Ponadto program nie może zakłócać realizacji celów innych unijnych przepisów i polityk. Program powinien wspierać lepsze zarządzanie w zakresie środowiska i klimatu na wszystkich poziomach, w tym większe zaangażowanie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, organizacji pozarządowych i podmiotów lokalnych. Jeśli chodzi o strukturę programu, to zdaniem Komisji Rolnictwa dziedzina „Środowisko” powinna obejmować również zrównoważone praktyki rolne, takie jak różnorodność biologiczna gleby, różnorodność agrobiologiczna, wychwytywanie dwutlenku węgla, monitorowanie gleby oraz ochronę środowiska i wody.

Pilar Ayuso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el Programa LIFE es uno de los programas más emblemáticos de la Unión Europea y el único que financia de manera exclusiva acciones en el ámbito del medio ambiente. Por eso, es siempre una prioridad para este Parlamento.

Mi colega, el señor Dantin, portavoz del Grupo PPE en este informe no puede estar hoy aquí y yo, en su nombre, voy a mencionar las prioridades para nuestro Grupo político. En primer lugar, la protección de la biodiversidad y de las zonas protegidas. Además, en respuesta a los retos que se plantean en varias regiones europeas en relación con la adecuada gestión de los grandes carnívoros, nuestro Grupo ha presentado una enmienda adicional para que este Programa financie este proyecto.

En segundo lugar, el apoyo a los agricultores para que adopten prácticas agrícolas cada vez más sostenibles.

En tercer lugar, el apoyo de las regiones ultraperiféricas en el Programa LIFE: dado el gran valor de la biodiversidad en estas regiones, el Programa debe incluirlas de forma expresa.

Y, por último, la simplificación administrativa. Esta cuestión ha sido reclamada de manera recurrente por todos los beneficiarios del Programa LIFE.

Tanto el ponente, señor Gerbrandy, como el señor Dantin han hecho un gran trabajo y en un periodo muy corto, por lo que es justo felicitarles.

Por mi parte, quiero subrayar la importancia de que el Programa vea su dotación financiera aumentada y que continúe apoyando durante el periodo 2021-2027 la protección de la red Natura 2000 y, en especial, los ecosistemas naturales, las especies y los hábitats prioritarios.

Maria Gabriela Zoană, *Raportoare pentru aviz, Comisia pentru dezvoltare regională*. – Domnule președinte, Uniunea Europeană este și trebuie să rămână un lider în domeniul protecției mediului și a biodiversității și al adaptării politicilor europene la schimbările climatice, care sunt foarte importante pentru țările membre ale UE și pentru cetățenii europeni.

Unul din instrumentele Uniunii Europene în acest sens este programul LIFE. Obiectivul său este de a contribui la trecerea la o economie curată, circulară, eficientă din punct de vedere energetic, cu emisii reduse de carbon și rezistentă la schimbările climatice. Aceasta se face prin promovarea unor tehnici inovatoare în domeniul politicii de mediu. Programul LIFE contribuie la obiectivul Uniunii de a cheltui 25 % din bugetul său global pentru obiectivele climatice. Parlamentul European a propus însă majorarea sumelor respective după 2020 până la 30 %, tocmai pentru a putea îndeplini obiectivele propuse.

Consider că este important să oferim un semnal puternic cetățenilor europeni în vederea punerii în aplicare a Acordului de la Paris și a obiectivelor de dezvoltare durabilă ale Organizației Națiunilor Unite.

Nicola Caputo, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in quanto unico programma dedicato specificamente all'ambiente e all'azione per il clima, LIFE rimane lo strumento finanziario principale dell'Unione europea per il conseguimento degli obiettivi ambientali. Aumentare sensibilmente la dotazione finanziaria per la prossima programmazione 2021-2027 è pertanto non solo giustificato, ma indispensabile.

LIFE svolge un ruolo fondamentale per la conservazione degli ecosistemi, specialmente in relazione alle direttive Uccelli e Habitat e mediante la gestione di Natura 2000. Biodiversità ed ecosistemi sani sono elementi essenziali per la crescita, l'occupazione e l'economia. È quindi importante garantire, come indicato nei miei emendamenti, obiettivi chiari, quantitativi e misurabili, con indicatori di risultato, strumenti di monitoraggio e meccanismi di revisione e di segnalazione.

L'obiettivo di decarbonizzazione previsto dall'accordo di Parigi necessita di un rapido passaggio a una strategia energetica pulita e a basse emissioni. Una quota considerevole dell'aumento per il programma LIFE è stata pertanto destinata al sottoprogramma «Transizione all'energia pulita».

Per evitare sovrapposizioni con altri programmi va sottolineato che la spesa per LIFE dovrebbe essere utilizzata solo per promuovere lo sviluppo e la diffusione di progetti in materia di energie rinnovabili ed efficienza energetica.

Ritengo essenziale riconoscere l'importanza dei progetti integrati che fungono da catalizzatori per l'attuazione dei piani e delle strategie in materia di ambiente o clima a livello regionale, nazionale o multiregionale. In futuro occorrerà ampliare però la portata e aumentare il numero di tali progetti, da selezionare però sulla base del merito.

Ciascun progetto LIFE deve inoltre essere accompagnato da una strategia di comunicazione per raggiungere in modo più efficace i destinatari, fornire messaggi chiave legati maggiormente agli obiettivi e garantire un coordinamento più strutturato tra i diversi attori.

Tra le novità del programma LIFE accolgo con favore l'introduzione del sottoprogramma «Economia circolare e qualità della vita», inteso a sostenere gli altri aspetti della politica unionale dell'ambiente, in particolare la transizione verso un'economia circolare, la gestione sana ed efficiente delle risorse naturali e la promozione di una buona governance ambientale.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ein altes indianisches Sprichwort sagt: Wir haben die Erde nicht von unseren Vätern geerbt, sondern von unseren Kindern geliehen. Als christlicher Abgeordneter sehe ich die Bewahrung der Schöpfung als eines unserer wichtigen Ziele. In ganz Europa können wir die erfolgreichen LIFE-Projekte sehen. In meiner Region ist es das Naturschutzgebiet des Galenbecker Sees – eine wunderbare Landschaft und ein enorm wichtiger Ort für Zugvögel in Europa. Vögel genießen Freizügigkeit in der EU. Die Natur kennt keine Landesgrenzen, weder die Zugvögel noch die Biotop – und Flora und Fauna übrigens auch nicht.

Das Bienensterben ist kein deutsches Problem, auch kein ungarisches oder französisches: Es ist ein weltweites Problem. Wir hatten dieses Jahr auch keine deutsche Dürre, wir hatten sie in ganz Europa.

Deswegen sind diese LIFE-Programme so wichtig. Sie geben der Natur Erholungsräume zurück. Europa wird damit nicht der Garten Eden, aber wir erhalten für uns und unsere Kinder eine lebenswerte Umwelt. Das LIFE-Programm hilft dabei ungemein.

Jan Huitema, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte commissaris, hoog op de Europese agenda staat dat boeren een eerlijke prijs moeten krijgen voor hun producten. Deze week bijvoorbeeld werk ik aan wetgeving om oneerlijke handelspraktijken aan te pakken. Waarmee we veel bezig zijn, is ervoor te zorgen dat wetgeving voor boeren die voornamelijk uit Brussel komt, werkbaar is en dat boeren daarmee uit de voeten kunnen. Waarmee ik vooral bezig ben, is dat we meer dierlijke mest kunnen gaan gebruiken in plaats van kunstmest.

Maar één ding lijken we te vergeten en daarover maak ik me de laatste jaren ook veel zorgen, dat is de waardering voor de boer en tuinder. Want als je nu de kranten openslaat, wordt de boer heel vaak gebruikt als zondebok voor klimaatverandering, biodiversiteitsverlies, milieu-impact en noem het maar op. Maar we lijken te vergeten wat de boeren bijvoorbeeld allemaal al gedaan hebben en we gaan er gemakshalve vanuit dat die niks doen.

Maar hier de cijfers. De CO₂-voetafdruk van melk daalde sinds 1990 met 32 %, van varkensvlees met 35 %, pluimveevlees met 46 %, eieren met 38 %, kalfsvlees met 50 %, suiker met 41% en de glastuinbouw gebruikt 59% minder energie. De afgelopen drie jaar is 15 000 hectare landbouwgrond in Nederland verdwenen. In diezelfde tijd is 11 000 hectare natuur erbij gekomen. De uitspoeling van meststoffen is in de laatste twintig jaar gigantisch gedaald en er is een verbod gekomen op vele honderden gewasbeschermingsmiddelen waarbij voor sommigen geen alternatief voorhanden is. Welk landbouwsysteem je ook gebruikt – of dat nou gangbaar is of biologisch – bij de productie van voedsel heb je altijd een milieu-impact en grijp je altijd in op de natuur. Wij moeten ervoor zorgen dat die impact minimaal is. 80% van de boeren in Nederland geeft aan dat graag te willen bereiken.

Nu kunnen we twee dingen doen. Eén, de boer zien als een zondebok en geen respect voor hem hebben of twee, hem zien als een belangrijke partner om de landbouw verder te verduurzamen. Ik ben blij dat men in deze nieuwe wetgeving voor het LIFE-programma waarin geld beschikbaar is voor klimaat en milieu, die handschoen wil oppakken en wil samenwerken met de boeren voor een nog duurzamere land- en tuinbouw.

Merja Kyllönen, *GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta*. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, GUE/NGL-ryhmän puolesta haluan kiittää kaikkia tämän tärkeän asian parissa työskennelleitä hyvästä työstä. LIFE-ohjelma tarvitsee tuekseen paljon erilaisia toimenpiteitä ja rahoitusta myös kaikilta muilta elämäme toiminta- ja politiikkaloilta. Ilmastomuutos, ympäristöongelmat ja biodiversiteetin heikkeneminen eivät kysele viisumeita tai valtioiden rajoja, ja sen vuoksi yhteistyöllä ja –toiminalla kaikkien rajojen ylitse on valtavan suuri merkitys.

Olemme myös saaneet nähdä sen, miten iso merkitys ihmisten ja alueiden välisellä eriarvoistumisella on tässä kysymyksessä. Se haastaa meidät päivittäin ja sen vuoksi toivonkin, että niin parlamentti, neuvosto kuin komissiokin ottavat vakavasti sen haasteen, että me pystymme tekemään ratkaisuja, jotka ovat myös sosiaalisesti ja alueellisesti oikeudenmukaisia. Vuoropuhelua tarvitaan niin jäsenvaltioiden kuin kansalaistenkin suuntaan, että voimme yhdessä rauhanomaisesti vastata aikakautemme suurimpaan haasteeseen.

Davor Škrlec, u ime kluba Verts/ALE. – Gospodine predsjedavajući, prvo želim zahvaliti i čestitati našem izvijestitelju Gerbrandyju na izvrsno urađenom izvješću, pogotovo u dijelu koji se tiče porasta budžeta za program LIFE. Smatram da je to izuzetno važno i slažem se s povjerenikom Vellom oko toga da, naravno, postoje drugi fondovi kojima se može financirati zaštita okoliša i klimatske promjene, ali ovaj bi trebao imati barem jedan posto sljedećeg proračuna kako bi mogao osigurati one dobre stvari koje su već prepoznate u sadašnjem programu LIFE.

Tu želim istaknuti da su naši gradovi i naše regije pokazali kako korisno koriste ta sredstva i da 100% financiranja kroz tehničku pomoć i kroz jačanje kapaciteta svakako doprinosi onim ciljevima koji će pomoći da se i drugi fondovi koriste na puno kvalitetniji i bolji način nego do sada.

Eleonora Evi, a nome del gruppo EFDD. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se c'è una cosa che l'Europa ha fatto bene, è proprio il programma LIFE.

Dal 1992 ad oggi LIFE ha cofinanziato oltre 4 500 progetti, tra cui 828 progetti italiani, con un contributo pari a 620 milioni di EUR. Questi progetti hanno contribuito, ad esempio, a far scoprire ai cittadini europei la rete Natura 2000 e a proteggere la biodiversità, che oggi, peraltro, registra ancora un continuo e pericoloso declino in Europa. Questi progetti hanno inoltre contribuito a ridurre l'inquinamento ambientale e a lottare contro i cambiamenti climatici. Un'Europa che, quando vuole, sa essere al servizio dei cittadini e del bene comune.

Pertanto per l'Italia e per l'Unione europea il programma LIFE è strategico e la sua prosecuzione va quindi sostenuta. Nel prossimo settennato 2021-2027 LIFE dovrà continuare a supportare le azioni innovative a tutela dell'ambiente e del clima, azioni da replicare poi su vasta scala, per favorire la transizione verso una società resiliente ai cambiamenti climatici, fondata sull'economia circolare e sulle energie rinnovabili, proprio quella società che oggi dobbiamo cercare di difendere a Katowice, in Polonia, durante la COP 24.

Voglio ringraziare il relatore per il lavoro che ha svolto. Ho apprezzato in particolare che abbia individuato, come ulteriori obiettivi del programma, la lotta al degrado degli ecosistemi e la necessità di minimizzare gli effetti negativi delle sostanze chimiche.

Infine, condivido la scelta di valutare i progetti principalmente in base al criterio della qualità e di allocare più risorse ai sottoprogrammi «Natura e biodiversità» ed «Economia circolare e qualità della vita».

Mi auguro che l'emendamento del PPE che è stato presentato non passi, perché penso e ritengo che apra la porta a un ulteriore danno alla biodiversità, in particolare ai grandi carnivori, perché in realtà sappiamo bene cosa significa gestione dei carnivori e dei grandi carnivori, ovvero caccia, e mi auguro anche che l'ambizione espressa dal Parlamento possa essere mantenuta, soprattutto nei negoziati con il Consiglio.

Olaf Stuger, namens de ENF-Fractie. – Voorzitter, er is economische groei in Europa. Het bruto nationaal product stijgt in bijna elke Europese lidstaat. Maar wat merkt de gewone burger daar nu van in zijn eigen portemonnee? Vrijwel niets. Vrijwel niets, Voorzitter, en dit is ook een van de redenen waarom de gelehesjesbeweging zo'n vlucht neemt.

Maar waar blijft dat geld dan wél? Ik zal het u vertellen. We hebben het vandaag over klimaat. Daar zit een hele grote bak met geld achter, subsidiepotten. Subsidiepotten vol met belastinggeld dat beschikbaar is voor grote projecten. En wie profiteren nu van die projecten? In mijn beleving nog niet eens het milieu. Het zijn de bankiers en grote multinationals, want die weten uitstekend hoe ze die subsidiepotten zo vakkundig en snel mogelijk moeten legen. In Nederland, Voorzitter, betaalt volgend jaar een gemiddeld Nederlands gezin 300 euro extra aan zijn energierekening. Dat toont maar weer eens aan dat deze EU niet is opgebouwd voor Europese burgers. Nee, deze EU is opgebouwd voor grote bedrijven en voor bankiers. Voorzitter, deze EU is het tegenovergestelde van Robin Hood. Ze steelt van de armen en deelt uit aan de rijken.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Voorzitter, dank u wel. Ook dank aan onze rapporteur Gerbrandy, maar ik heb toch wel een beetje een andere mening dan wat hij hier net naar voren heeft gebracht. Wij spreken nu over LIFE en LIFE-geld. Ik hoor uit Nederland en ook uit andere landen dat het geld hiervoor toch moeilijk beschikbaar wordt voor projecten. Ik hoor het ook van gedeputeerden uit Nederland en ik zal ze dan ook graag naar u doorverwijzen, want het moet eenvoudiger worden. Ik vind ook dat we de dubbelslag moeten maken. Als het gaat om geld en landbouw, dan zegt u dat dat niet bij elkaar hoort, maar de hele Commissie landbouw en alle partijen hebben mij als schaduwrapporteur ondersteund.

Dan heb ik gezegd: het gaat over de kringloop. Het gaat over emissiearme landbouw. Het gaat over boeren in Natura 2000-gebieden. Het gaat over veenweidegebieden. Het gaat over de landgoedeigenaren. Het gaat over de bosbouw als we kijken naar CO₂. Dus we kunnen er een heleboel mee doen. We moeten ook de burgers daarbij betrekken. Dus niet tegen elkaar – dat is nu vaak het geval – maar met elkaar. En niet zoals in Nederland tot nu toe vaak gebeurde, dat boeren onteigend worden omdat ze in een mooi natuurgebied zitten, terwijl ze daar al honderden jaren hebben gezeten.

Ik ben ook blij dat de Commissie landbouw mij helemaal heeft ondersteund om dit te gaan doen en ik hoop ook dat mijn amendement 79 – en je doet het nooit alleen in dit Parlement – verder ondersteund wordt. Als het vervolgens gaat over de biodiversiteit en de grote carnivoren, dan weet u allemaal wat Dantin gezegd heeft: het hoort erbij, het is flora en fauna. Wij gaan van 5 miljard naar 7 miljard. Maar collega Gerbrandy, ook een amendement – ik was zelf de schrijver ervan – over groene en blauwe ecosysteemdiensten met nieuw gemeenschappelijk landbouwbeleid. Hiermee kunnen we de dubbelslag maken dat boeren blij zijn dat ze in een natuurgebied wonen en de burgers daarbij betrekken.

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

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE), “blauwe kaart”-vraag. – Ik ontken niet dat er een probleem is met grote roofdieren. Dat heb ik ook niet gezegd. Maar vindt u niet dat het een beetje raar is als je de algemene doelstellingen van dit LIFE-fonds beschrijft – je hebt het over klimaat in z'n algemeenheid, biodiversiteit in z'n algemeenheid, milieu in z'n algemeenheid – dat de EVP daar grote roofdieren als zelfde categorie aan toevoegt? Vindt u dat niet een beetje eigenaardig? Moet dat niet op een hele andere manier aan de orde gesteld worden?

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE), “blauwe kaart”-antwoord. – Nee, collega Gerbrandy, dat is dus duidelijk niet aan de orde. Ik had trouwens liever gehad dat u mij een vraag over het eerste punt had gesteld. Maar dit tweede punt is een heel belangrijk punt. Kijk onder andere ook naar – als we het hebben over die grote carnivoren – de wolf. Kijk ernaar hoeveel last die oplevert en hoeveel geld wij daarvoor nodig hebben. Dat zijn discussiepunten die echt – kijk niet alleen naar Nederland, maar ook buiten Nederland – in heel Europa zeer belangrijk zijn. Daarvoor moeten we aandacht hebben. Zeker ook als woordvoerder voor de Habitatrichtlijn hebben wij daar mede vanuit de intergroep grote debatten over gehad met ministers uit heel Europa om hier meer mee te doen. Commissaris Vella weet als geen ander wat ik hiermee bedoel.

Susanne Melior (S&D). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kollegen! Ich glaube, es ist ein ganz, ganz wichtiges Thema, mit dem wir uns hier heute beschäftigen, und von da will ich nicht zu viel Öl ins Feuer gießen, aber trotzdem noch darauf hinweisen, dass wir im Landwirtschaftsausschuss eine sehr merkwürdige Diskussion hatten.

Die Stellungnahme des Landwirtschaftsausschusses ist erarbeitet worden von einem Leugner des menschengemachten Klimawandels. Mit den Stimmen der EVP ist Herr Agnew dazu ernannt worden – da er auch im Raum ist, spreche ich das ausdrücklich an. Ich glaube, in dieser Zuweisung der Stellungnahme war schon ein klarer Ausdruck dessen, dass man sagen wollte: Dieses Thema ist nicht ganz so wichtig, schieben wir das ruhig weiter nach hinten. Aber das können wir uns alle gar nicht leisten. Wir müssen mehr tun für die Umwelt.

Herr Gerbrandy, ich danke Ihnen ganz herzlich für Ihren Bericht. Der Umweltausschuss hat hier eine gute Stellungnahme verabschiedet, dem Bericht sozusagen weiter auf die Strümpfe geholfen, und das freut mich sehr.

Vor zwei Wochen ist die internationale Konferenz zur Biodiversität in Ägypten beendet worden. Zurzeit läuft noch die Klimakonferenz in Polen. Auf diesen Konferenzen werden drängende Fragen unseres Lebens hier auf diesem Planeten behandelt, und dann darüber diskutiert werden, wie wir das weitere Aussterben von Pflanzen und Tieren verhindern können, wie wir beim Weltklima wieder in die Balance kommen.

Beide Themen stehen in engem Verhältnis zueinander, und für beide Probleme sind wir Menschen – Herr Agnew – wir Menschen sind dafür verantwortlich. Das will ich hier klar sagen. Dieser Verantwortung können wir uns nicht entziehen. Wir können aber auch Teil dieser Lösung sein. Wir haben die Mittel zur Verfügung, und ich glaube, dass das LIFE-Programm ein richtig gutes Programm ist – Herr Kommissar vielen Dank dafür! –, wo wir mehr für Umwelt und Klima tun können.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Voorzitter, investeren in natuur en biodiversiteit moet centraal staan in een inclusief, in een duurzaam en in een slim Europa. Vandaag hebben we de kans om de daad bij het woord te voegen, want het LIFE-programma is het enige programma dat specifiek gericht is op natuur- en klimaatactie. Het is essentieel dat we de lidstaten ondersteunen bij de overgang naar een duurzame, circulaire en koolstofarme samenleving. Dit programma werkt en het levert Europese meerwaarde op.

Ik kon dat zelf vaststellen bij een recent bezoek aan de Kleine Nete-vallei in Nijlen, het natuurgebied in Vlaanderen. Het herstel van de natuur daar werd bekroond met een Europese prijs. Investeren in LIFE is cruciaal voor natuur, mens en economie. Het gaat inderdaad over de gezondheid, het welzijn en de welvaart van onze kinderen en onze kleinkinderen. Daarom steunen wij de verhoging van het budget voor het LIFE-programma.

Thomas Waitz (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Es ist hoch erfreulich, dass in Zukunft Natura 2000 besser mit Finanzen ausgestattet werden soll. Wir müssen die Mitgliedstaaten dabei unterstützen, hier auch die europäischen Regeln einzuhalten, was zum Beispiel an der Abholzung der letzten Buchenurwälder in Rumänien sichtbar wird.

Aber gerade im Angesicht der Klimakonferenz von Katowice – wo man sieht, welche Kohleabhängigkeit dort die gesamte Wirtschaft, die gesamte Stadt hat von diesem alten fossilen Energieträger – wird klar, dass wir die Entwicklung und die Innovation erneuerbarer Energieträger vorantreiben müssen, und dass wir hier nicht nur Polen beim Kohleausstieg unterstützen müssen, sondern alle Regionen Europas hier beim Ausstieg aus der Kohle ordentlich unterstützen müssen.

Wenn wir uns aber alle hier einig sind, dass das so ein wichtiges Programm ist, wieso geben wir dem gerade einmal null Komma irgendwas Prozent unseres Budgets? Dann stimmen Sie doch unserem Abänderungsantrag zu, das Budget auf 1 % des europäischen Haushalts zu erhöhen – bitte, 1 %! –, wenn wir uns denn alle einig sind, dass das so wichtig ist.

Und in Richtung der Klimaleugner oder derjenigen, die leugnen, dass wir einen menschengemachten Klimawandel haben, obwohl die Wissenschaft hier ganz klare Aussagen trifft, denen möchte ich sagen: Nur weil man einen Unsinn oft wiederholt, ist es trotzdem Unsinn.

John Stuart Agnew (EFDD). – Mr President, well you're not going to like this are you, you lot sitting over there? It is such a shame that this LIFE budget is going to be wasted on a totally useless project trying to make farmers improve the world's weather.

What are the drivers of climate change? The main one, of course, is the activity of the cosmic rays, this atomised cosmic dust and, where our atmosphere condenses against it, cloud cover. What can the farmers do about these exploding stars? Nothing at all. What can the farmers do about the five different solar cycles whose cycle is well understood and that have caused the changes in our climate for over 2 000 years? Farmers can't change the solar cycles. Farmers can't change the gravitational pulls of other planets. Farmers certainly can't change the ocean currents.

We haven't even got on to greenhouse gases yet, which are pretty trivial – the most important one of those for climate change is water vapour, and yet you never hear about that, and a very good thing too, because that is our cloud cover.

They all talk about CO₂. Yes, the levels have gone up. Why have they gone up? Because of the warming we had in the last part of the last century: the seas got warmer and released some CO₂. CO₂ is a consequence of global warming, it isn't a cause of it. Then we've got methane that farmers produce in tiny, tiny quantities – it is a tiny, tiny gas. In any case, it breaks down to CO₂ and water vapour. There's no point in fiddling around trying to do anything with that. Then, of course, we've got nitrous oxide, the leguminous crops. We are wasting our time in trying to persuade farmers they can change the world's weather.

What could we be doing with this budget? We've got a serious problem worldwide called anti-microbial resistance. Farmers do have a part to play in trying to overcome this. We could use this LIFE budget to find ways of improving biosecurity on farms and then allocating grants to make the biosecurity a lot better. We could offer grants to farmers to cull their flocks when the only choice is to give them antibiotics. This would be a very good way of preventing antibiotic use. We could use this budget to research the breeding of harder, more resistant birds, instead of them requiring antibiotics. This is what we should be doing, not fooling around trying to persuade farmers they can be King Cnut.

Francesc Gambús (PPE). – Señor presidente, señor comisario, el programa LIFE es uno de los pilares fundamentales para proteger nuestro entorno natural y avanzar en la adaptación para el cambio climático. Un cambio climático, contra el cual esta semana desde la CP.24 en Katowice debemos conjurarnos y liderar los cambios necesarios para mantener el aumento de temperaturas por debajo del grado y medio.

Con el nuevo LIFE debemos mejorar esta buena herramienta que ya tenemos; facilitar el acceso a estos fondos a todos los niveles de gobernanza, desde entes locales, que son la primera ventana de acceso para la ciudadanía, hasta los propios Estados miembros, y con una especial atención a los entornos que potencialmente se verán más afectados por el cambio climático, como por ejemplo las islas del Mediterráneo; y, finalmente, simplificar su acceso, como decía la señora Schrijer-Pierik.

En mi circunscripción, el programa LIFE está teniendo un papel vital para la preservación del delta del Ebro, ya que uno de los programas financiados a través de estos fondos está orientado al estudio del traslado de sedimentos en el tramo final del río. En el último siglo, las aportaciones de lodos al delta se han visto largamente reducidas por causa de la construcción de presas a lo largo del río, con la consecuencia, por un lado, de su hundimiento, y por el otro, la entrada de agua marina, lo que afecta directamente al equilibrio de este ecosistema único que es reserva de la biosfera.

He querido mencionar este ejemplo como contribución del programa LIFE a la mejora real de nuestro planeta.

Carlos Zorrinho (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, o Programa LIFE é um instrumento fundamental da política da União para a proteção do ambiente, biodiversidade e adaptação às alterações climáticas.

Desde 1992, financiou quase 4 000 projetos na União Europeia, contribuindo com mais de 3 biliões de euros para a proteção do ambiente. O programa alavanca projetos na área da natureza e biodiversidade, economia circular e qualidade de vida, mitigação e adaptação às mudanças climáticas, transição para as energias limpas. O LIFE tem contribuído para o objetivo da União, ao afetar 25% dos seus recursos aos objetivos de adaptação e da mitigação das alterações climáticas.

Este esforço tem agora de ser aumentado, como ficou expresso na resolução do Parlamento Europeu sobre o Quadro Financeiro Plurianual 2021-2027.

A proposta de duplicação financeira do Programa LIFE do Parlamento Europeu é meritória e deve ser levada em conta. Face à magnitude do desafio, exige-se uma resposta transversal forte e inequívoca.

O relatório hoje em apreciação, e saúdo o relator, dá um contributo relevante para o sucesso do programa, designadamente ao prever sinergias entre o Programa LIFE e os fundos e políticas de coesão, ao definir regras específicas para o financiamento das regiões ultraperiféricas e nos países e territórios ultramarinos, ao permitir a extensão do programa a países terceiros sob certas condições e ao reforçar o contributo das autoridades regionais e locais.

Numa altura em que os olhos da opinião pública internacional estão colocados na COP24, a decorrer na Polónia, temos aqui uma oportunidade de adotar medidas concretas na implementação do Acordo de Paris, tornando o Programa LIFE financeiramente mais robusto.

Em Estrasburgo, temos com este relatório mais uma oportunidade para mandar um sinal para Katowice mas também para o mundo, para todos aqueles que querem cumprir o Acordo de Paris.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! Vi måste förbjuda fossila bränslen och förverkliga vår nollvision om ett koldioxidfritt EU som vi gröna så länge har kämpat för och som EU-kommissionen nu äntligen stödjer. Vi står även inför den stora artdöden. 60 procent av jordens ryggradsdjur har försvunnit på 40 år. Det är fruktansvärda och katas-trofala siffror som visar var vårt fokus måste ligga, nämligen på att säkra biologisk mångfald och de habitat där djur fortfarande lever.

Vi behöver klimataktion nu! Fler och fler människor vill leva klimatsmart och medvetenheten ökar för varje dag som går. Osäkerheten är dock väldigt stor över vad som är effektivt och om den lilla människans bidrag verkligen spelar roll. Då vill jag verkligen försäkra alla här i dag. Ditt bidrag är väldigt viktigt!

Cirka 25 procent av befolkningen kan förändra ett helt samhälles inriktning och den kritiska massan finns redan. I mitt hemland Sverige till exempel så rankar ungefär 24 procent av befolkningen klimatutmaningen som den absolut viktigaste framtidsfrågan. Jag välkomnar det här förslaget till ett förbättrat och mer ambitiöst Life-program. Det är ett viktigt program för att öka omställningstakten inom EU.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Mr President, LIFE is actually the only financial instrument under the EU budget that is wholly dedicated to the environment, nature conservation and climate change, over and above national expenditure.

While I would like to thank the team of rapporteurs for their good work, I would like to emphasise three things. Firstly, it is extremely important to increase LIFE funding. It is extremely important to use it as leverage for cohesion funds, especially for the circular economy at Member State level. And last but not least it is extremely important to emphasise the biodiversity aspect.

We have very good experience with using the LIFE programmes for biodiversity and now, especially, when there has been a more than 60% decline between 1970 and 2014 in birds, fishes, mammals, amphibians and reptiles, we urgently need to increase LIFE funding and try to leverage Member States' funding in these areas, and that also extends to large carnivores all over Europe.

Thank you for the good work and hopefully the Commission can support and direct LIFE funding for biodiversity.

Mihai Țurcanu (PPE). – Domnule președinte, potrivit specialiștilor, schimbările climatice vor reprezenta în continuare una din provocările majore cu care ne vom confrunta în anii ce urmează. Nu este un mit. Seceta, valurile de căldură și inundațiile devin din ce în ce mai întâlnite în toate statele Uniunii.

În calitate de fermier, pot să confirm încă o dată că agricultura este unul dintre cele mai expuse sectoare la aceste schimbări, pentru că este dependentă de condițiile meteorologice. În contextul noului cadru financiar multianual, salut propunerea Comisiei de a mări fondul programului LIFE cu aproape 60 % pentru perioada următoare, 2021-2027.

Salut abordarea domeniilor de o importanță vitală pentru cetățenii europeni, precum natura, mediul și calitatea vieții. Din cele 142 de proiecte susținute de acest fond și un total de 430 de milioane de euro, 28 cuprind cu succes și sectorul agricol. Mai precis, granturi în valoare de 41 de milioane de euro susțin proiecte în domenii pentru anularea și adaptarea la schimbările climatice.

Sper că acest exemplu de succes să fie un motiv în plus în încurajarea accesării fondurilor prin programul LIFE și în viitorul exercițiu financiar. Aș mai dori să fac o precizare și sper ca mesajul meu să fie primit de către Comisie. Doresc o soluționare pentru fermierii care au restricții la subprogramul Natura 2000. Susțin că ar trebui să le fie oferite compensări pentru pierderile de producție. Grupul nostru a depus un amendament în acest sens și îi rog pe toți colegii să-l susțină.

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, face à l'urgence climatique, face à la sixième vague d'extinction des espèces que le programme LIFE est censé endiguer, l'Union européenne a décidé d'investir à peine 0,4 % de son budget pour les sept prochaines années. C'est trois fois moins que le budget que vous avez décidé d'engager pour créer l'armée européenne et c'est deux fois moins que ce que vous investirez pour la recherche sur le nucléaire, pour Euratom et ITER.

C'est dire à quel point l'écologie ne constitue pas pour vous une priorité, quand celle-ci appelle au contraire la mobilisation de moyens exceptionnels pour engager la planification écologique.

Face à cette urgence, nous vous appelons maintenant à appliquer la règle verte plutôt que la règle d'or. Une règle verte européenne, plus vertueuse pour l'humanité, alors que vous appliquez une règle d'or pour ne répondre qu'aux satisfecit et donner satisfecit aux marchés financiers.

ELNÖKÖL: LÍVIA JÁRÓKA

alelnök

„Catch the eye”

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Rzeczywiście mamy do czynienia z jedynym programem proekologicznym finansowanym wprost z budżetu Parlamentu Europejskiego. Dlatego też opowiadam się w sposób zdecydowany za jego wzmocnieniem – wzmocnieniem finansowym. Zgodnie z głosem posła sprawozdawcy to zwiększenie powinno wynosić około dwa miliardy euro.

Natomiast zwrócę jeszcze uwagę na jeden bardzo istotny element: ważne jest, aby ten cały program miał trzy poważne filary – z jednej strony dobrą diagnozę, z drugiej strony inwestycje, a po trzecie oczywiście proces edukacyjny. Wydaje mi się, że z pierwszym i ostatnim elementem jest już zdecydowanie lepiej. Natomiast jeżeli chodzi o prawdziwe inwestycje, te inwestycje, które będą zmieniały sytuację, jesteśmy niestety mocno zapóźnieni. Opowiadam się także za zwiększeniem zadań realizowanych na rzecz zieleni, na rzecz leśnictwa, na rzecz ochrony tego krajobrazu, w którym zieleń jest najistotniejsza.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το πρόγραμμα Life είναι πράγματι σημαντικό για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος, ιδίως για τη στήριξη της βιοποικιλότητας, και έχει συμβάλει στη διαμόρφωση περιοχών Natura. Όμως, κύριε Vella, θέλω να σας θέσω ένα σοβαρό θέμα: Έχω καταγγείλει επανειλημμένα ότι στην περιοχή της Νότιας Καρυστίας, στο όρος Όχι, που είναι περιοχή Natura, γίνεται πλέον παράβαση και παραβίαση της περιβαλλοντικής νομοθεσίας. Διαμορφώνονται πάρα πολλά αιολικά πάρκα και δεν τηρούν τις προϋποθέσεις. Εσείς ο ίδιος μου απαντήσατε ότι η Επιτροπή θα παραπέμψει την Ελλάδα για παραβίαση της νομοθεσίας σε σχέση με την εγκατάσταση των ανεμογεννητριών και των αιολικών πάρκων. Η ίδια παραβίαση γίνεται και σε άλλη περιοχή, στα Άγραφα, όπως επίσης και στη Μονεμβασία. Αλλά το ερώτημα είναι πότε θα παραπέμψετε την Ελλάδα; Έχει περάσει τεράστιο χρονικό διάστημα. Οι παραβιάσεις της νομοθεσίας συνεχίζονται και, όταν φτάσει η υπόθεση κάποια στιγμή στο δικαστήριο, θα είναι πάρα πολύ αργά. Θέλω, κύριε Vella, μια απάντηση. Πότε θα εφαρμοστεί επιτέλους η νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στην Ελλάδα;

Franč Bogovič (PPE). – Gospa predsednica, podpiram poročilo, ki krepi program Life, tudi v tistem delu, kjer govorimo o več sredstvih.

Prihajam namreč iz Slovenije, kjer imamo več kot 13 procentov naše površine zaščitene kot zaščiteno območje, v naravnih parkih, regijskih, krajinskih, skoraj 38 procentov je območij Natura. In znotraj teh območij je veliko število programov Life, s katerimi sledimo okoljske cilje. Eden izmed zelo pomembnih za Slovenijo je tudi zaščita opraševalcev, svetovni dan čebel je tudi del teh naših prizadevanj.

Pri teh programih se mi zdi zelo pomembno tudi sobivanje in ozaveščanje. S temi petimi, desetimi milijardami ne moremo rešiti okolja. V kolikor pa cilje uskladimo s kmetijsko politiko, energetske politiko, kohezijskimi sredstvi, lahko naredimo zelo veliko.

In to je pomemben korak, kako najti znotraj teh območij sobivanje kmetijstva, turizma, gozdarske dejavnosti in ustvarjanje produktov z višjo dodano vrednostjo. Tu vidim priložnosti za Life, se pravi sobivanje in ozaveščanje.

(„Catch the eye” vége)

Karmenu Vella, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, first of all, I would like to thank everyone for their support and I hope that you too agree that the new LIFE programme will help us to promote sustainability, environment, nature, climate and clean energy transition objectives across the programmes of the 2021-2027 long-term budget.

First, I would like to start with the issue of increased funding. The proposal for a LIFE regulation is part of this EU budget package, and altering the nature of the LIFE proposal will have a very direct impact on the entire EU budget which is the result of a delicate equilibrium among several EU funding programmes. And as I already mentioned, LIFE is not meant to solve all environmental and climate funding problems on its own. This instrument is to ensure that the new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) will support the environment and climate across all its instruments. Also, let us not forget that the Commission has allocated a lot of money for the environment, in addition to the LIFE programme, and not to mention the amount of investment coming from individual Member States as well.

I agree with the comments that were made that the LIFE objectives must also be mainstreamed in other policies and funds. Some MEPs mentioned agriculture and the CAP. The MFF already provides finance for the environment through the mainstreaming of policies into other environmental policies and other policies. It is in everyone's interest to ensure that every single euro that is spent in the CAP, every single euro which is spent in the Structural Funds, for example, is contributing to nature and environmental policies. With regard to the CAP, I have full confidence that our farmers want to be part of the solution when it comes to protecting nature and the environment.

I think Mr Gerbrandy also mentioned the broader geographical uptake and, even there I agree: we recognise the value of a broader geographical uptake of LIFE across Europe. We therefore need a new approach that will increase the number of high-quality applications coming from all corners of the EU. Under this new programme there will be financing addressing the specific capacity-building needs of the National Contact Points (NCPs) through network activities.

Finally, I would like to remind our colleagues that the LIFE programme was very positively commented upon by the European Court of Auditors and it was mentioned as being very fit for purpose. Also, the ombudsman, in 2017, gave LIFE the Award for Good Administration.

Perhaps one last comment – and here I want to be a little bit self-critical as well – there are already a good number of integrated projects related to the oceans. But I still feel there is perhaps the need to push more integrated LIFE projects towards the ocean environment, towards ocean biodiversity and towards ocean sustainability. I therefore look forward to working with the European Parliament and the Member States to ensure the timely adoption of this very important instrument. I reiterate the importance of concluding the interinstitutional negotiations early in 2019 in order to facilitate the adoption of the MFF at the earliest date possible. I would like to once again thank Mr Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, all the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) for their excellent work, and I would like to thank all the speakers today for their contribution.

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Rapporteur. – Madam President, many thanks for that – and thank you, Commissioner, for your warm words for the LIFE programme. I've learned a lot during the debate, and I think the most important element that I've learned is that the issues we disagree on are details in the overall LIFE programme. In general, we agree. We agree on quite a big increase of the budget, and we fully agree about the huge importance of this financial instrument. I sincerely hope that that will be reflected in tomorrow's vote, and that we can start soon after tomorrow's vote with the negotiations with the Council to finalise the whole process before the European elections.

One final word: I emphasised in my opening remarks that the LIFE fund is only a small part of the total European budget. It is very crucial. Many colleagues have embraced the objectives of LIFE, and it's important that these objectives are also reflected in all the other funds. This is just EUR 5 billion, hopefully EUR 7 billion. The other funds altogether are more than 1000 billion.

So please take your thoughts about the importance of the environment, about climate policy and about biodiversity when you consider the other 95% of the EU budget.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2018. december 11-én, kedden kerül sor.

14. Protección de los trabajadores contra los riesgos relacionados con la exposición a agentes carcinógenos o mutágenos durante el trabajo (debate)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Claude Rolin által a Foglalkoztatási és Szociális Bizottság nevében benyújtott, A munkájuk során rákkeltő anyagokkal és mutagénekkel kapcsolatos kockázatoknak kitett munkavállalók védelme című jelentésről folytatott vita (COM(2017)0011 – C8-0010/2017 – 2017/0004 (COD)) (A8-0142/2018).

Claude Rolin, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, dans l'Union européenne, la principale cause de décès liés au travail, c'est le cancer.

Chaque année, 100 000 personnes meurent des suites d'une exposition à des substances cancérigènes au cours de leur carrière professionnelle. Des décès silencieux, des décès dont personne ne parle, des maladies qui ne font pas l'objet de grandes campagnes de prévention. C'est dire l'importance que représente la seconde révision de la directive relative aux substances cancérigènes et mutagènes, qui nous occupe aujourd'hui. Il est inacceptable que des milliers de travailleuses et de travailleurs perdent leur vie pour la gagner.

Je tiens à ce titre à remercier M^{me} la Commissaire d'avoir eu le courage de lancer la révision de cette directive, attendue depuis plus de dix ans, à remercier aussi les rapporteurs fictifs et aussi le Conseil, la Présidence, qui a été attentive à nos travaux.

Une première phase a déjà été accomplie. Demain, grâce à votre approbation nous concluons une seconde étape qui, avec la première, va contribuer à sauver 100 000 vies au sein de l'Union dans les cinquante prochaines années.

Ce texte fixe des valeurs limites d'exposition pour six agents cancérigènes. Nous avons voulu être ambitieux. Avec le mandat que m'a donné le Parlement, j'ai défendu l'inclusion des émanations de diesel auxquelles sont confrontés des millions de travailleurs. Je ne pourrais citer tous les secteurs concernés, tant il y en a: de la construction, au secteur du transport routier ou ferroviaire, à celui des mines ou encore à celui des tunnels. Mais ce qui importe aujourd'hui, c'est que nous protégeons toujours mieux celles et ceux qui travaillent.

Le sujet était sensible, nous avons longuement négocié, mais le résultat est là. Ensemble, nous sommes parvenus à relever ce défi: demain, les salariés seront mieux protégés, car nous avons inclus les fumées des moteurs diesel et nous avons fixé une valeur limite d'exposition qui va protéger les salariés. La protection des travailleurs doit être renforcée toujours davantage. La science et les technologies évoluent en permanence.

Nous avons entrepris une troisième révision de la directive, avec la volonté d'aboutir avant la fin de la législature. Mais, au-delà de cela, je plaide à nouveau ici dans cet hémicycle pour que la prochaine Commission poursuive le travail avec l'ajout constant de substances à contrôler. Nous avons besoin d'une révision permanente de cette directive. L'Europe ne peut s'arrêter en si bon chemin. La santé de nombreux travailleurs en dépend.

Dans ce rapport, j'ai tenu aussi à rendre aux partenaires sociaux le rôle fondamental qui est le leur. Pour inciter les acteurs de terrain à être proactifs, la Commission publiera les accords sur le site de l'Agence OSHA pour la santé et la sécurité au travail. Il s'agit là d'une opportunité pour les partenaires sociaux: celle de mettre en place une réelle culture de prévention au sein des entreprises, en amont des mesures législatives.

Je note d'ailleurs avec satisfaction qu'en octobre, l'industrie chimique et les syndicats européens ont, dans une déclaration commune, demandé à la Commission d'inclure les substances toxiques pour la reproduction dans cette directive. Cela démontre la volonté des acteurs d'aller de l'avant.

Vous l'aurez compris, chers collègues, toutes ces mesures sont non seulement indispensables pour préserver la santé des salariés où qu'ils soient en Europe, mais elles sont aussi bénéfiques pour les entreprises qui ont le souci – qui est le nôtre – de protéger celles et ceux qui les font fonctionner chaque jour.

En soutenant ce texte demain, c'est la santé de millions de travailleurs que vous allez protéger. En votant demain, ce sont des milliers de vies que vous allez sauver.

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, dear Members of Parliament, ever since the beginning of this mandate, the Commission and myself have given the highest attention to sound health and safety at the workplace, with clear rules that are enforceable and applied on the ground. We are delivering on our commitment to fight work-related cancer.

I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Claude Rolin, for his whole-hearted commitment to this file since the very beginning. Without his dedication, and the constructive support of the shadow rapporteurs and of all those involved, we would not be here today.

The interinstitutional negotiations were not easy. For the Parliament, one of the key points was to include diesel engine exhaust emissions under the scope of the directive as well as a limit value in its Annex 3. Thanks to an open and transparent dialogue and the willingness of the Council to compromise in order to reach the common goal of strengthening workers' protection, this point has been included in the text that you are adopting in this session.

Dear Members of Parliament, together with the first amendment of the directive, for which I am grateful for the work undertaken by Ms Ulvskog, we already cover 21 substances. This will make a real difference on the ground and prevent more than 100 000 cancer deaths over the next 50 years.

We are giving concrete meaning to Principle 10 of the European Pillar of Social Rights, which provides that every worker has the right to a healthy, safe and well-adapted work environment. Delivering on this principle indeed implies ensuring protection from carcinogens at work.

The second amendment will send a good message to citizens and will set the regular updating process of the Carcinogens and Mutagens Directive on track for the years to come. There is still some work to do.

David Casa, *fisem il-grupp PPE*. – Is-sahha u l-ghajxien ta'-cittadini taghna dejjem kienu, u ghandhom jibqghu, priorita ghal dan il-Parlament. Xogholna hawn huwa li nissalvagwardjaw il-hajja tal-haddiema taghna, tal-haddiema Ewropej u din il-ligi ghandha ezattament dan il-ghan.

Irridu naghrfu li r-riskju ghas-sahha fuq il-post tax-xoghol, jew minhabba l-post tax-xoghol, abbaži ta' mard relatat mal-kancer huwa sinifikanti, u rridu nindirizzaw din il-problema llum qabel ghada. Dan jista' jsir biss jekk jigu introdotti revizjonijiet b'mod regolari tal-ligijiet taghna, b'mod speċjali din id-Direttiva. Illum, fuq talba tal-Parlament, qeghdin naraw is-suċċessi li tista' ggib wahda min dawn ir-revizjonijiet imsemmija li twaqqaf limiti ghal hames karcinogeni addizzjonali.

Taht it-tmexxija ta' Claude Rolin f'dan id-dibattitu, flimkien mal-Kummissarju Marianne Thyssen, irnexxielna nilhqu ftehim fuq numru ta' elementi essenzjali li jnaqqsu l-esponiment tal-haddiema ghal dawn is-sustanzi perikolużi ghal-livell minimu assolut. Irnexxielna wkoll neliminaw dawn l-istess sustanzi u, fejn stajna, anke sibna sustanzi sostituti ghal dawkl li huma ta' periklu. B'hekk is-sahha tal-haddiema ma tkunx fil-periklu.

Kull hajja ta' kull haddiem fl-Unjoni Ewropea ghandha dejjem tkun prijorità ghalina u rridu naghmlu dak kollu li huwa fil-poter taghna, fid-dover taghna, biex dejjem npoġġu sahhitna l-ewwel.

Marita Ulvskog, för S&D-gruppen. – Fru talman! Ja, det är en stor sak vi har lyckats åstadkomma för att skydda löntagare från att dö av sina jobb. Det är en fantastisk uppgift! Vi hade till att börja med ett bra förslag från kommissionen som skulle hjälpa oss att nå målet och vi lyckades förbättra detta förslag så att det blev suveränt bra skulle jag vilja påstå. Det är en lycka att få lämna ifrån sig någonting som kommer att betyda mycket för många enskilda människor.

Jag vill också gärna tacka den föredragande som har jobbat med det här arbetet. Han har haft det vi i Sverige kallar för "is i magen", det vill säga ett lugn inför en utmanande situation. Det var någonting som krävdes av oss alla för att vi skulle gå i mål med den här uppgiften. De gränsvärden vi ska rösta om denna vecka är precis de gränsvärden som har rekommenderats av forskare och av de sociala parterna. Jag tycker dessutom att det är en uppvisning i att det är så här vi ska lagstifta på det sociala området på arbetsmarknadsområdet. Det är parterna som ska vara väldigt involverade. Utan dom så blir det inte bra. Jag hoppas att detta ska kunna vara ett föredöme för kommande framtida lagstiftningsprocesser.

Som många av er känner till också så påbörjar vi snart även trepartsförhandlingar om den 3:e omgången av gränsvärden för dessa livsfarliga ämnen. Jag är övertygad om att vi kommer kunna bli klara även med den innan mandatperiodens slut. Vi har fått blodad tand. Vi vill göra skillnad. Människor ska inte dö av sina jobb. De ska leva av sina jobb.

Czesław Hoc, w imieniu grupy ECR. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Sprawozdanie posła Rolina to bardzo cenne i ważne dossier. Ochrona pracowników przed narażeniem na działanie czynników rakotwórczych lub mutagenów podczas pracy to moralny i cywilizacyjny obowiązek pracodawców i rządów krajów Unii Europejskiej. Jeśli w Unii Europejskiej nowotwory stanowią główną przyczynę zgonów związanych z pracą, a rocznie z tego powodu umiera w Europie około 90-100 tys. osób, to podjęcie kolejnych zdecydowanych działań na rzecz zapobiegania narażeniu na kancerogeny i mutageny w miejscu pracy staje się pilną koniecznością. Szacuje się, że jeśli roztropnie i racjonalnie określimy limity narażenia na czynniki rakotwórcze i mutageny w pracy, jeśli ocenimy właściwie naukowo zagrożenie i podejmiemy optymalne działanie, to możemy ocalić nawet 100 tys. pracowników w ciągu najbliższych 50 lat. Zatem jest o co walczyć. Sprawozdanie słusznie pochyła się nad ochroną pracowników narażonych w miejscu pracy na substancje reprotoksykacyjne, czyli wpływające szkodliwie na rozrodczość kobiet i mężczyzn, na które narażonych jest ponad 1 % wszystkich pracowników Unii Europejskiej. Jest to od 2 do 3 mln kobiet i mężczyzn. Tym bardziej sprawozdanie jest potrzebne i płynię z niego wiele korzyści.

Patrick Le Hyaric, au nom du groupe GUE/NGL. – Madame la Présidente, la directive portant sur les risques liés à l'exposition à des substances cancérigènes ou mutagènes est très importante puisqu'elle va constituer un bouclier supplémentaire pour les travailleurs.

Je remercie d'ailleurs le rapporteur, M. Claude Rolin, pour son travail et sa capacité d'écoute. Au terme d'un long travail, il a été ainsi obtenu que les fumées de diesel soient incluses dans la législation européenne, protégeant ainsi 12 millions de travailleurs de celles-ci.

Ce processus que nous avons engagé doit se poursuivre et être constamment ouvert aux représentants des travailleurs et il faut que prime en permanence le principe de précaution. Ceci implique qu'on revalorise la médecine du travail, qui doit avoir les moyens de faire de la prévention.

La situation est si sérieuse qu'on nous parle de 100 000 morts par an liées à ces substances cancérigènes. Encore qu'on ne connaisse pas toutes les conséquences, notamment pour les enfants, alors que se multiplient les scandales sanitaires. J'en profite d'ailleurs pour signaler de nombreux cas, dans mon pays et dans ma région, d'enfants naissant sans bras aux mains, des cas dont on ne connaît pas exactement les causes et pour lesquels il faudrait diligenter des enquêtes, y compris de la part des institutions européennes.

En toute chose, il faut choisir la vie au lieu de la concurrence et de la compétitivité, qui priment trop souvent dans nos institutions.

Karima Delli, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, mes chers collègues, nous l'avons attendue 15 ans. Enfin, l'Europe qui protège est sur les rails.

Dorénavant, les travailleurs seront mieux protégés de l'exposition à des substances cancérigènes et mutagènes sur leur lieu de travail, car ce ne sont pas les accidents de travail, mais le cancer qui est la première cause de mortalité au travail en Europe. Un chiffre, juste un: chaque heure en Europe, c'est entre 7 et 12 personnes qui meurent de cancer dû à l'exposition à des substances toxiques sur leur lieu de travail.

Désormais, huit nouvelles substances seront incluses dans la loi, et une qui n'est pas des moindres: les vapeurs diesel. Tout le monde est d'accord pour en finir avec le diesel. Des villes, des États, de nombreux consommateurs veulent s'en débarrasser. Chaque fois, c'est pour protéger les citoyens de la pollution et c'est très bien mais c'est encore mieux si on n'oublie pas les salariés.

Chaque année en Europe, 12 millions de salariés sont exposés aux vapeurs d'échappements, de gaz d'échappement de moteurs diesel sur leur lieu de travail. On parle de personnes que vous voyez tous les jours, qui travaillent sur la voie publique, qui conduisent des tracteurs, des poids lourds, qui travaillent dans des cabines de péage.

Alors mes chers collègues, notre objectif c'est de prendre nos responsabilités et enfin, dans ce Parlement, on va comprendre qu'il faut concilier la santé et l'environnement. C'est important, mes chers collègues, parce qu'il faut protéger les travailleurs de la même manière que tous les autres citoyens, afin de faire avancer cette Europe sociale de manière concrète, et je tiens à le dire devant vous.

Je tiens également à féliciter M. Rolin pour sa capacité d'écoute, parce que ce n'était pas gagné sur les vapeurs diesel. Je tiens à le remercier aussi pour le fait que, parfois, lorsqu'on veut aller vite, on a des moments d'accrochage, mais on y arrive parce que, derrière, on ne doit pas jouer avec la santé des salariés. Mourir sur son lieu de travail, cela doit nous réveiller et nous devons ouvrir les yeux sur cette grande responsabilité.

Laura Agea, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissaria, onorevole Rolin, domani con l'accordo in prima lettura chiuderemo anche la seconda parte della revisione di questa importantissima direttiva sulla protezione dei lavoratori contro i rischi derivanti da un'esposizione a sostanze cancerogene o mutagene sul posto di lavoro.

Ancora una volta questo Parlamento è riuscito ad essere solerte e ambizioso, garantendo sempre la massima tutela dei lavoratori, agevolando le piccole e microimprese che dispongono, ahimè, spesso di risorse finanziarie, tecniche e umane limitate per adempiere agli obblighi imposti da questa direttiva.

Mi rallegro inoltre che, oltre agli agenti cancerogeni presenti inizialmente nella proposta, siano stati inseriti valori limite anche per le emissioni di gas di scarico dei motori diesel e che sia stato preso un impegno formale per valutare, entro il primo trimestre del 2019, l'inserimento delle sostanze reprotossiche.

Ringrazio quindi di cuore il collega Rolin, relatore, e gli altri colleghi con i quali, da ormai oltre un anno, lavoriamo alla revisione di questa direttiva e auspico che anche per la terza e ultima parte lo stesso equilibrio e la stessa ambizione dimostrata fino ad oggi vengano mantenuti.

Λάμπρος Φουντούλης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, δυστυχώς παρά τα τεράστια άλματα που έχει κάνει επιστήμη, ο καρκίνος είναι η μάστιγα της εποχής μας και μία από τις σημαντικότερες αιτίες θανάτων παγκοσμίως. Οι εργαζόμενοι που εκτίθενται σε καρκινογόνους ή μεταλλαξιογόνους παράγοντες στον χώρο εργασίας εκδηλώνουν ασθένειες όπως ο καρκίνος συνήθως μετά το πέρας του εργασιακού τους βίου. Τα τελευταία χρόνια ευτυχώς έχουν ξεκινήσει σημαντικότερες πρωτοβουλίες τόσο σε επίπεδο κρατών όσο και επίπεδο Ενώσεως για την προστασία των πολιτών και των εργαζομένων. Καθημερινά ανακαλύπτουμε νέες επικίνδυνες ουσίες ή, ακόμη χειρότερα, ουσίες που θεωρούσαμε ασφαλείς μέχρι σήμερα τελικά αποδεικνύονται επιβλαβείς.

Μέχρι σήμερα όμως δεν έχει βρεθεί τρόπος , ώστε να δημιουργηθεί ένα απολύτως ασφαλές περιβάλλον εργασίας και συνεχίζουμε να πληρώνουμε όλοι μας, και κυρίως οι ασθενείς, υψηλότατο τίμημα. Είναι συνεπώς αναγκαίο να υποστηρίξουμε όλοι μας κάθε πρωτοβουλία ή δράση που αποσκοπεί στην αντιμετώπιση του κινδύνου αυτού. Η έκθεση που συζητάμε σήμερα είναι ένα βήμα προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση, όμως σε καμία περίπτωση δεν επαρκεί. Πρέπει να θεσπιστούν ακόμη αυστηρότερα όρια, ενώ ιδιαίτερο βάρος πρέπει να δοθεί στην ενημέρωση, την προστασία και την έρευνα, ώστε να βρεθούν κατάλληλα υλικά προς αντικατάσταση των επικινδύνων που χρησιμοποιούμε σήμερα.

Anne Sander (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, le cancer est la première cause de décès dans le monde du travail, loin devant les accidents. Il était donc de notre responsabilité d'agir pour que l'emploi ne soit plus jamais la cause de ce mal destructeur pour les travailleurs et leurs familles.

L'accord trouvé entre le Parlement et le Conseil sur la seconde révision de la directive européenne visant à réduire l'exposition des travailleurs à des substances nocives est donc le bienvenu. Il s'agit d'un accord protecteur pour les salariés mais également pragmatique pour les entreprises.

Mais notre action ne doit pas s'arrêter là car, chaque année, ce sont encore plus de 100 000 Européens qui meurent d'un cancer professionnel: larynx, foie, peau, leucémie, poumons, la liste est longue.

Au-delà de l'arsenal législatif, d'autres volets doivent être développés. D'abord, nous ne devons pas négliger la voie de la prévention et de l'information des travailleurs. Cela passe notamment par l'organisation de formations en entreprise sur le port d'équipements de protection tels que les masques. Il faut aussi mettre en place des programmes d'accompagnement des entreprises dans la transition vers des systèmes moins polluants.

Enfin, il faut investir plus d'énergie et de fonds dans les programmes de recherche: ils peuvent nous permettre de mettre au point des procédés de substitution tout aussi efficaces pour l'entreprise qu'inoffensifs pour les hommes.

Agnes Jongerius (S&D). – Voorzitter, deze week hebben we de kans om duizenden, vele duizenden automonteurs, wegenbouwers en bouwvakkers beter te beschermen tegen kankerverwekkende dieseldampen en andere carcinogenen op de werkvloer. Werknemers hebben het recht om goed beschermd te zijn en niet ziek te hoeven worden van hun werk. Dat komt gelukkig terug in deze wetgeving.

Als we voor stemmen, dan kunnen we voorkomen dat mensen die met op diesel draaiende machines werken, hart- en vaatziekten, longproblemen of kanker krijgen door het werk. Als we voor stemmen voorkomen we zoveel ellende in zoveel gezinnen in Europa. Achter die ellende kunnen we met deze wetgeving nu een punt zetten. Dat is wat mij betreft een groot compliment in de richting van de rapporteur, van de schaduwrapporteurs, maar ook in de richting van Commissie en Raad, dat ze deze deal hebben weten te sluiten waardoor er meer mensen met meer plezier en zonder schade aan hun gezondheid hun werk kunnen doen.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospođo predsjedavajuća, zakonodavni proces nepotpun je i manjkav bez procjene učinaka propisa. Vrlo često su propisi koji se tiču zaštite na radu prekomplikirani ili nedovoljno dobro razrađeni, što inspekcijama ostavlja previše prostora za proizvoljna tumačenja. U pojedini državama članicama inspekcije taj prostor koriste za nerazmjerno i često nepotrebno kažnjavanje poslodavaca i širenje antipoduzetničke klime.

Kad je riječ o opasnim karcinogenim ili mutagenim tvarima, tu propisi moraju apsolutno zaštititi radnike. Život radnika ne smije ni na koji način biti ugrožen na radnom mjestu. Naročito podržavam onaj dio izvješća koji traži posebne mjere za žene reproduktivne dobi radi općeg cilja zaštite zdravlja nerođene djece i budućih generacija.

No svakako valja uzeti u obzir i rastući broj agensa koji utječu na neplodnost kod muškaraca. Da bismo osigurali zdravu budućnost, trebamo i zdrave žene i zdrave muškarce.

Tania González Peñas (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, muchas gracias al ponente por este trabajo. Actualmente el 53 % de las muertes anuales por motivos laborales se debe a la exposición a agentes carcinógenos o mutágenos. Con esta segunda fase de la Directiva se da un paso adelante al asignar valores límite de exposición a ocho nuevos carcinógenos. No obstante, la implementación es uno de los mayores retos. Son necesarios mayores controles, seguimiento y sanciones disuasorias para garantizar la aplicación de esta norma y de todas aquellas relacionadas con la seguridad y la salud laboral.

En ese sentido quiero recordar el mayor accidente de intoxicación por mercurio acaecido en Europa, que afectó a 49 trabajadores de la fábrica de Asturiana de Zinc, de la multinacional Glencore.

Este mes de noviembre se pusieron en huelga de hambre, seis años después, con secuelas de gravedad y degenerativas para su salud física y mental y aún esperando a que la empresa se haga cargo de la asistencia sanitaria que necesitan y que las administraciones reconozcan su incapacidad. Esto, señorías, está pasando en Europa.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD). – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, il est aujourd'hui d'une urgence absolue de protéger nos travailleurs contre les agents cancérogènes ou mutagènes qui causent, nous le savons, les maladies de demain.

Qu'il s'agisse du trichloréthylène, de l'épichlorohydrine, du dichlorure d'éthylène ou de mélange d'hydrocarbures aromatiques polycycliques contenant des benzopyrènes, le constat est le même: la fixation d'une valeur limite pratique sur la base des informations, données scientifiques et techniques disponibles va, bien évidemment, dans le bon sens.

J'abonde tout à fait dans le sens du rapporteur lorsqu'il précise que le principe de précaution doit être appliqué à la protection de la santé des travailleurs. Il suffit d'ailleurs de s'appuyer sur la directive 2004/37/CE et sur l'article 191 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne.

Force est de constater que l'exposition à ces substances dans un cadre professionnel rappelle aussi celle des travailleurs agricoles aux pesticides. Une exposition aux pesticides bien réelle et, semble-t-il, trop souvent laissée de côté, peut-être parce que les agriculteurs sont de moins en moins nombreux et que la ruralité est souvent laissée de côté.

Nous voyons bien que toutes ces problématiques découlent d'une cause commune: le productivisme de court terme, qui est l'alpha et l'oméga des politiques menées en vertu des traités européens, s'impose trop souvent au détriment de la santé. Cela, mes chers collègues, ne peut plus durer. L'impératif européen de compétitivité place nos travailleurs sous la menace permanente de la délocalisation. Pourquoi? Parce qu'ils sont en concurrence avec les travailleurs de Chine, d'Asie du Sud-Est ou du sous-continent indien dont les conditions de travail font souvent frémir.

Comme le rappelle le rapporteur lui-même le cancer reste la cause première de mortalité liée au travail au sein même de l'Union européenne. Alors, je le dis, notre rôle d'élus est de protéger la santé des travailleurs, l'économie doit être au service de l'homme et non l'inverse.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κάποιες προσθήκες ή μειώσεις τιμών καρκινογόνων ουσιών στη σχετική λίστα της οδηγίας που φέρνετε είναι αποσπασματικές και μάλιστα παραπέμπετε την εφαρμογή τους από το 2023 ως το 2025. Η πρόταση οδηγίας μιλά όχι για ουσιαστική και πλήρη αλλά για ελάχιστη προστασία –δηλαδή για τα μάτια του κόσμου– καθορισμένη και αυτή με τα μοναδικά κριτήρια που αναγνωρίζετε, τα κριτήρια της ανταγωνιστικότητας, του περί κόστους και οφέλους, που όλα συντείνουν στην κερδοφορία του κεφαλαίου –κι όλα αυτά με ιδιωτικές επιχειρήσεις που βάζετε να κάνουν τους ελέγχους και πληρώνονται από τους εργοδότες τους οποίους κατά τα άλλα θα ελέγχουν, δηλαδή όσους παραβιάζουν τα όρια για να εξυπηρετούν τα κέρδη τους. Βάζετε κυριολεκτικά τον λύκο να φυλάξει τα πρόβατα.

Τα μέτρα είναι πολύ πίσω από την ολόπλευρη αξιοποίηση της επιστημονικής γνώσης και των τεχνολογικών επιτευγμάτων και παραμένουν μεγάλες αναξιοποίητες δυνατότητες πρόληψης. Ο αγώνας των εργαζομένων για πραγματική προστασία από επαγγελματικές ασθένειες και κάθε είδους βλαβερούς παράγοντες στους εργασιακούς χώρους είναι πολύ αναγκαίος και συγκρούεται με το κριτήριο του καπιταλιστικού κέρδους.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, ihmisillä on oikeus turvalliseen ja terveelliseen työskentely-ympäristöön. Haluankin erityisesti kiittää komissaaria ja esittelijää peräänantamattomasta, tahtovasta ja myös rohkeasta työstä, jota he ovat tehneet syöpävaarallisten aineiden vähentämiseksi työympäristössä. Myös dieselkaasujen lisääminen tähän listalle on ollut mielestäni erittäin positiivinen teko.

Sadantuhannen ihmisen hyvinvointi, terveys ja henki vuosittain työpaikoilla ei ole pieni asia. Tämä on kuitenkin edes-sämme oleva loppumaton taistelu johtuen muun muassa sellaisista uusista kemiallista yhdisteistä ja yhdisteiden yhteisvaikutuksista, joita emme vielä tunne. Sen takia kannattaisin lämpimästi esittelijän ehdotusta siitä, että uusi komissio alkaisi valmistella jo tämän lainsäädännön revisiota ja yleiseksi käytännöksi otettaisiin lainsäädännön uudelleentarkastelu, esimerkiksi viiden vuoden välein, jolloin voimme pysyä kehityksen kärjessä ja estää uudet vaaralliset yhdisteet työpaikoilla ja uuden tiedon kautta myös poistaa vanhat, joiden riskeistä saadaan tietoja.

Michael Detjen (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Leider ist Krebs die häufigste Todesursache am Arbeitsplatz in der Europäischen Union, an der Spitze der Lungenkrebs. Trotzdem weigerte sich die Kommission bislang unverständlicherweise, Abgase von Dieselmotoren in den Geltungsbereich der sogenannten Krebsrichtlinie aufzunehmen. Eine große Mehrheit im Beschäftigungsausschuss legte am 27. März dieses Jahres einen Abgasgrenzwert von 0,0 mg/m³ fest; das folgt auch dem deutschen Grenzwert. Rund 3,6 Millionen Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer in Europa, insbesondere in Lagerhallen, im Bergbau oder im Güterverkehr, sind künftig besser vor Deselemissionen geschützt. Gut so! Das ist praktische europäische Gesetzgebung zum Schutz von Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern. Das wird weitergehen und muss auch ständig erneuert werden.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Gospa predsednica, rak na delovnem mestu ostaja eden od ključnih izzivov v boju proti raku in zahteva največ smrti med boleznimi, povezanih z delovnim mestom. Zato pozdravljam poročilo kolega Rolina tudi v imenu delovne skupine za boj proti raku v Evropskem parlamentu.

Da bi bili bolj uspešni, je potrebno izboljšati zakonodajo, in to delamo. Vsaka izboljšava direktive lahko prispeva k manj raka in manj smrti zaradi njega.

Ključno je, da je zakonodaja jasna, da so zahteve zelo natančne in da se seveda izvajajo na vseh nivojih podjetij oziroma v velikih, manjših in srednjih podjetjih. In mislim, da je treba vztrajati na zahtevah, ki jih že osnovna direktiva postavlja glede izločitev in zamenjave substanc, pa tudi glede mejnih vrednosti.

Vesel sem, da dodajamo mejne vrednosti za sedem dodatnih kancerogenih oziroma mutagenih snovi, in prepričan sem, da je tako revidirana direktiva korak k večji zaščiti delavcev.

Strinjam se pa s poročevalcem, da je potrebno implementacij in revidirati, posvečati stalno pozornost, da o dizlu, o katerem so govorili že drugi, ne govorim, ker mi je čas potekel.

Evelyn Regner (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Gute Nachrichten für die Beschäftigten in Europa: Dieselabgase werden am Arbeitsplatz begrenzt. Diesel ist nicht gut in der Luft und schon gar nicht in den Lungen von Beschäftigten. Und deshalb sind das wirklich gute Nachrichten. Mein Dank geht daher an den Berichterstatter, der als Gewerkschafter genau weiß, wie wichtig es ist, die Sozialpartner mit einzubinden, damit die Gesundheit der Beschäftigten am Arbeitsplatz ausreichend geschützt ist.

3,6 Millionen Beschäftigte müssen nun nicht mehr diesen Abgasen hilflos ausgesetzt sein. Und das sind wahrlich gute Nachrichten. Im 21. Jahrhundert soll es nicht mehr so sein, dass Menschen durch Abgase am Arbeitsplatz sterben. Krebs ist *tricky*, den sieht man nicht. Und es zeigt vor allem auch, wie wichtig es ist, dass wir im Europäischen Parlament dranbleiben – oftmals über viele Jahre geduldig mit der Kommissarin, die hier genauso drangeblieben ist – und dieses Thema schließlich zu einem guten Ende bringen.

„Catch the eye”

Bogdan Andrzej Zdrojewski (PPE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chcę koledze Rolinowi pogratulować, bo odnotujemy bez wątpienia kolejny postęp w walce z rakiem. Ale ponieważ jest Pan związkowcem, to przy tej okazji chcę się upomnieć o trzy rzeczy, których mi nieco brakuje. Po pierwsze, chcę zwrócić uwagę na te osoby, które już nie pracują, ale które pracowały przy użyciu tych środków, które dziś uznajemy za szkodliwe. Warto objąć je diagnozą medyczną przede wszystkim po to, aby nadrobić ten stracony czas. Osoby te bardzo długo pracowały w tych warunkach wymagających opieki medycznej i większej świadomości. Druga rzecz – trzeba poprawić świadomość, wiedzę, umiejętności służb BHP, czyli tych, które przygotowują pracowników do wykonywania określonego zawodu w określonych warunkach. Tu niestety w niektórych wypadkach w niektórych krajach mamy lata pięćdziesiąte czy lata sześćdziesiąte. I ostatnia rzecz – powszechna edukacja. Jeżeli mówimy o raku, którego powoduje lub do którego przyczynia się używanie niektórych olei lub środków, to proszę zwrócić uwagę, ilu pracowników zapada na raka skóry na skutek pracy na słońcu bez odzieży ochronnej. Dziś to cały czas w południowych krajach problem bardzo ważny.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Ein herzliches Dankeschön für die Präsentation dieses neuen, erweiterten Schutzes der Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmer.

Wir sprechen so häufig darüber, dass Krebs zum Teil natürlich auch durch eigene Verhaltensweisen mitbegründet werden kann: zu wenig Bewegung, Aufenthalt in den falschen Regionen. Aber der Arbeitsplatz ist einer, wo wir den Schutz des Arbeitgebers, den Schutz der europäischen Gesetzgebung brauchen, denn hier setzt sich niemand freiwillig diesen Abgasen, diesen Karzinogenen aus. Das heißt: Hier brauchen wir gemeinsame Regelungen. Hier ist wieder ein weiterer Schritt in die richtige Richtung entstanden.

Es gilt nun, natürlich nicht nur die beste Gesetzgebung zu haben. Denn wie sehr häufig auf europäischer Ebene: Es scheitert oder gelingt durch die ordentliche Implementierung und im Nachhinein auch durch die Kontrolle. Ich fordere daher nicht nur uns Abgeordnete auf, hier zuzustimmen, sondern auch die einzelnen Arbeitgeber Arbeitgeberinnen, auch die wirklich gesetzestreue Umsetzung dieser Vorlage zu verfolgen, und die Mitgliedstaaten, auch eine entsprechende Kontrolle durchzuführen.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο καρκίνος κυριολεκτικά θερίζει. Το 53% της θνησιμότητας προέρχεται πραγματικά από έκθεση σε καρκινογόνους και μεταλλαξιογόνους παράγοντες. Αυτό γίνεται σε μεγάλο βαθμό στις επιχειρήσεις, διότι μετά την κινεζοποίηση των μισθών έχουμε πλέον και την κινεζοποίηση των όρων εργασίας: καμιά προστασία. Νομίζω λοιπόν ότι είναι απαραίτητο να ληφθούν μέτρα για την προστασία των ιδίων των εργαζομένων, οι οποίοι εκτίθενται είτε επειδή γίνεται επαφή με το δέρμα, είτε γίνεται επαφή με τα μάτια, είτε με κατάποση, είτε με εισπνοή και εκτίθενται σε αυτές τις καρκινογόνες ουσίες. Πολύ δε περισσότερο εκτίθενται σε καυσάερια του ντίζελ. Πρέπει λοιπόν να έχουμε μέτρα πρόληψης, αυτό είναι το πιο σημαντικό. Δεύτερον, μέτρα προστασίας και εξοπλισμό για την προστασία των εργαζομένων και ποινές για τους παραβάτες, διότι μόνο έτσι θα αναγκαστούν πραγματικά να συμμορφωθούν προς τις απαιτήσεις της οδηγίας.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, οι θάνατοι από καρκίνους λόγω της εκθέσεως των εργαζομένων σε μεταλλαξιογόνους και καρκινογόνους χημικούς παράγοντες στον χώρο εργασίας είναι ιδιαίτερα πολλοί. Για τον λόγο αυτό, αυτή η απαράδεκτη κατάσταση πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστεί. Είναι αλήθεια ότι και οι εργοδότες και τα κράτη αλλά και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ως σύνολο καταβάλλουν προσπάθειες ώστε να περιοριστεί η έκθεση των εργαζομένων σε παράγοντες όπως τα καυσάερια των πετρελαιοκινητήρων, παλαιών και νέων, οι πολυκυκλικοί υδρογονάνθρακες, καθώς επίσης και οι αρωματικοί, οι οποίοι απορροφώνται από το δέρμα. Καθορίζουν επίσης κάποια ελάχιστα όρια τα οποία δεν πρέπει να υπερβαίνονται σε ό,τι αφορά την έκθεση των εργαζομένων. Όμως αυτά είναι ημίμετρα· πρέπει να ληφθούν και άλλα μέτρα, όπως είναι η κατασκευή καινούργιων κινητήρων που να μην παράγουν καύσιμα με ρυπογόνες ουσίες και κυρίως πρέπει να καθοριστεί νομοθεσία, ούτως ώστε να παρεμβαίνει το κράτος και να τιμωρεί τους επιχειρηματίες εκείνους οι οποίοι αδιαφορούν για την προστασία των εργαζομένων τους.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, I'm very glad that Parliament is debating improving regulations around carcinogenic substances. It's of vital importance that workplaces are safe and that people have protection from deadly chemicals. In my constituency, the Greater Manchester Hazards Centre has researched and campaigned for the reduction and removal of carcinogenic substances. They highlight the tragedy at the heart of this issue. Between 8% and 16% of cancer in European citizens is related to workplace exposure, and these cases of cancer are preventable.

The GM Hazards Centre also explains that women and low-paid workers are at higher risk of exposure to carcinogenic substances. As women are more likely to do work in cleaning, fragrances and cosmetics, they are exposed to more deadly chemicals. This highlights the gender imbalance in the workplace. We must also not forget the unregulated work that is done in Europe. Hidden and exploited workers are exposed daily to hazards in the workplace, and the EU must reach out proactively to end illegal employment practices and ensure all workers are safe from hazards.

(„Catch the eye” vége)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, honourable Members, once more I would like to thank the co-legislators for finding an agreement on a Commission proposal that will help save many workers' lives.

However, this is not the end of our initiatives to fight occupational cancer. The third amendment to the Directive, addressing five additional important substances and groups of substances, is on the way, and in that regard, I congratulate Parliament on the adoption of Ms Agea's report on the third batch. The interinstitutional negotiations can start now, which should make it possible for this further modification of the directive to be adopted before the end of the current term.

As I said before, I am convinced that the three amendments which I was allowed to initiate in this Commission have now set on track a regular process of updating the Carcinogens and Mutagens Directive. That is a great achievement, for which I particularly wish to thank the three rapporteurs, Claude Rolin, Marita Ulvskog and Laura Agea, as well as the shadow rapporteurs.

Madam President, honourable Members, before I conclude let me also tell you that my staff have started preparatory work on the inclusion of occupational exposure limit values for three additional priority substances, and, of course, we are continuing to develop this legislation on the basis of scientific evidence and in close cooperation with the social partners. I am sure you will agree with me that this is Europe at its best – a Europe that protects. Thank you for all your work.

Claude Rolin, rapporteur. – Madame la Présidente, la vision unanime qu'on entend ici, c'est un message politique fort, qui montre l'importance, pour le Parlement européen, de la santé et de la sécurité des travailleurs en Europe.

Beaucoup de choses ont été évoquées, mais pour moi, en matière de santé et sécurité, l'alpha et l'oméga, c'est la prévention, l'information et la sensibilisation. C'est aussi le rôle des médecins du travail, qui ont un rôle essentiel dans l'entreprise et qui doivent être attentifs au caractère généré du cancer, car femmes et hommes ne sont pas touchés de la même façon.

Le contrôle est essentiel, le suivi aussi, on en a parlé, c'est écrit dans la première partie, le CMD1. Il faut continuer à mobiliser les acteurs de terrain, en particulier les partenaires sociaux.

Si on a pu faire ce travail, c'est grâce à la Commission, c'est grâce à l'attitude du Conseil, mais c'est surtout grâce au fait qu'avec Laura et Marita, avec les rapporteurs fictifs, nous avons su former une équipe, une équipe mobilisée sur cet enjeu fondamental, et cela fonctionne quand on peut le faire de cette façon-là.

Madame la Commissaire, c'est clair, il faudra continuer à œuvrer pour obtenir cette révision permanente de cette directive, pour faire en sorte effectivement que la protection soit des plus concrètes.

Je suis effectivement, j'étais et je suis toujours un syndicaliste dans l'âme et pas mal de mes amis syndicalistes m'ont demandé, quand je me suis mis sur une liste pour les élections européenne: Claude que vas-tu faire là? Eh bien, je vais continuer mon job pour défendre les travailleurs salariés, pour défendre la vie dans les entreprises, et je pense que ceci, ce que nous voterons demain, donne tout son sens.

Et si un jour mes petits-enfants me demandent: qu'est-ce que tu as été faire au Parlement européen? Eh bien, je pourrai leur dire qu'avec vous, j'ai contribué à donner un sens concret à une Europe qui protège, qui protège la santé et qui sauve des vies.

Elnök asszony. – A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra 2018. december 11-én, kedden kerül sor.

Írásos nyilatkozatok (162. cikk)

Monika Beňová (S&D), písomne. – Rakovina stále predstavuje jedno z najvýznamnejších zdravotných rizík pre pracujúcich v EÚ. Bohužiaľ je najčastejšou príčinou úmrtí súvisiacich s výkonom povolania. Našou reakciou preto musí byť zamedzenie vystavovania pracovníkov chemickým látkam, ktoré ju môžu spôsobovať. Obmedzenia a sprísňovanie limitných hodnôt sa týka viacerých rakovinotvorných látok. Jednoduchým príkladom je však aj obmedzenie vystavovania pracovníkov výfukovým plynom zo vznetrových motorov, aj tie sú pre človeka vysoko karcinogénne. Zdravie pracujúcich je nevyhnutné chrániť počas celého pracovného života a veľký dôraz je potrebné klásť najmä na zlepšovanie v oblasti prevencie. Okrem samotných zamestnancov je to prínosné aj pre zamestnávateľov, európsku ekonomiku ako celok, či znižovanie nákladov na potrebnú zdravotnú starostlivosť.

15. Transparencia y sostenibilidad de la determinación del riesgo en la cadena alimentaria de la UE (debate)

Elnök asszony. – A következő napirendi pont a Renate Sommer által a Környezetvédelmi, Közegészségügyi és Élelmiszer-biztonsági Bizottság nevében benyújtott, az élelmiszerláncban alkalmazott uniós kockázatértékelés átláthatóságáról és fenntarthatóságáról, illetve [az általános élelmiszerjogról szóló] 178/2002/EK rendelet, [a géntechnológiával módosított szervezetek környezetbe történő szándékos kibocsátásáról szóló] 2001/18/EK irányelv, [a géntechnológiával módosított élelmiszerekről és takarmányokról szóló] 1829/2003/EK rendelet, [a takarmányozási célra felhasznált adalékanyagokról szóló] 1831/2003/EK rendelet, [a füstaromákról szóló] 2065/2003/EK rendelet, [az élelmiszerekkel érintkezésbe kerülő anyagokról szóló] 1935/2004/EK rendelet, [az élelmiszer-adalékanyagok, az élelmiszerenzimek és az élelmiszer-aromák egységes engedélyezési eljárásáról szóló] 1331/2008/EK rendelet, [a növényvédő szerekéről szóló] 1107/2009/EK rendelet, valamint [az új élelmiszerekről szóló] (EU) 2015/2283 rendelet módosításáról szóló európai parlamenti és tanácsi rendeletre irányuló javaslatról folytatott vita (COM(2018)0179 – C8-0144/2018 – 2018/0088(COD)) (A8-0417/2018)

Renate Sommer, Berichtstersterin. – Frau Präsidentin, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich erinnere mich noch sehr gut daran, wie wir damals diese Lebensmittelbasisverordnung auf den Weg gebracht haben. Es gab Schwierigkeiten mit unseren Lebensmitteln, immer mehr Lebensmittelskandale. Und wir brauchten etwas, was uns und unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern mehr Sicherheit gibt. Deshalb haben wir die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit ins Leben gerufen. Die Arbeit dieser Behörde war sehr erfolgreich. Unsere Lebensmittel in der Europäischen Union gelten als die sichersten weltweit. Allerdings muss die EFSA bisher nicht die gleichen Transparenzregeln einhalten wie andere Agenturen, wie die Agentur für Medizinprodukte oder die für chemische Stoffe. Die Kommission hat vorgeschlagen – angetrieben durch die Europäische Bürgerinitiative gegen Glyphosat –, das jetzt zu ändern und diese Regeln anzugleichen. Was die Kommission aber letztendlich vorgeschlagen hat, war keine Angleichung, sondern waren für die EFSA viel, viel schärfere Regeln, als die anderen Agenturen sie haben.

(Der Präsident unterbricht wegen fehlender englischer Verdolmetschung.)

Die Kommission hat aber jetzt neue Regeln für die Europäische Behörde für Lebensmittelsicherheit vorgeschlagen, die viel weiter gehen als die Transparenzregeln, die die anderen Agenturen erfüllen müssen. Die anderen Agenturen veröffentlichen nämlich die eingereichten Anträge und die Studien, die ihnen zugrunde liegen, in dem Moment, in dem sie ihre Stellungnahme zu dem Antrag veröffentlichen. Die EFSA soll es jetzt nach der Vorstellung der Kommission ganz anders machen. Sie soll nämlich direkt am Anfang des Prozesses, wenn der Antrag eingereicht worden ist, den Antrag und die zugrundeliegenden Studien veröffentlichen. Als ich das gelesen habe, habe ich gedacht: Ist die Kommission so naiv, oder ist das gewollt? Hat das vielleicht schon mit Wahlkampf zu tun? Wir sind doch alle schon seit Monaten im Vorwahlkampfmodus, und der Kommissar scheint mir auch im Vorwahlkampf zu sein.

Es kann doch wohl nicht sein, dass wir einen Antragsteller zwingen, seinen Antrag, seine neue Idee, seine Innovation über die Homepage der EFSA der Weltöffentlichkeit zu präsentieren.

Es kann doch nicht sein, dass ein Antragsteller dadurch, dass er einen Antrag auf Zulassung seines neuen innovativen Produktes bei der EFSA stellt, indirekt gezwungen wird, seine Unterlagen weltweit öffentlich im Netz zur Verfügung zu stellen. Das fördert doch Ideenpiraterie! Die Zulassungsverfahren bei der EFSA dauern sehr, sehr lange, bis zu 55 Monate. Da hat doch jeder in der Welt – Konkurrenten in Drittstaaten – die gute Möglichkeit, täglich einmal auf die Homepage der EFSA zu gucken, was es an neuen Innovationen in Europa gibt, *copy-paste*, und er fängt an, dieses Produkt schon zu kopieren, während in Europa noch das Zulassungsverfahren läuft. Und der Drittstaatswettbewerber hat die Möglichkeit, ein Produkt, das er gestohlen hat, auf den Weltmarkt zu bringen, und kann es wahrscheinlich viel billiger anbieten als der Europäer das jemals könnte. Das europäische Produkt ist tot, und der europäische Produzent hat das Nachsehen. Das ist falsch!

Deshalb schlage ich etwas ganz anderes vor, das mindestens genauso viel Transparenz bringt. Ich verstehe nicht, warum die Kommission nicht der Meinung ist, dass man das befürworten sollte. Ich schlage ein dreistufiges Verfahren vor. Zunächst einmal prüft die EFSA den Antrag und die zugrundeliegenden Studien, veröffentlicht dann den Entwurf ihrer wissenschaftlichen Stellungnahme und gleichzeitig die Antragsinformation und die zugrundeliegenden Studien. Und dann beginnt die zweite Stufe: eine Konsultationsphase, in der die Öffentlichkeit, die interessierte Öffentlichkeit, den Antrag und die zugrundeliegenden Studien auf Herz und Nieren prüfen kann. Über die Dauer der Konsultationsphase können wir uns unterhalten, das ist doch überhaupt keine Frage. Aber erst nach dieser Konsultationsphase soll dann die EFSA nach meinem Vorschlag ihre endgültige Stellungnahme veröffentlichen und kann dann das Ergebnis dieser öffentlichen Konsultation mit einbeziehen. Ich denke, das ist das richtige Verfahren. Die EFSA macht das jetzt schon manch-

mal aus eigenen Stücken, und warum sollen wir dieses System nicht verpflichtend machen? Ich möchte darauf hinweisen, dass die EFSA zum Beispiel im Fall von Acrylamid ihre endgültige Stellungnahme nach einer solchen öffentlichen Konsultation noch einmal geändert hat.

Also das ist möglich, und es hat sogar noch einen Vorteil für die Öffentlichkeit: Sie haben nämlich schon als Handhabe die Einschätzung der EFSA zu diesem Antrag und zu den zugrundeliegenden Studien. Deshalb bitte ich um Unterstützung meines Antrags.

Ein letztes Wort noch: Wenn der Kommissionsvorschlag durchkommt, dann haben wir viel, viel weniger Transparenz, als wir heute haben. Dann wird nämlich kein Antragsteller mehr die Zulassung seines Produkts in Europa beantragen. Dann gehen die Hersteller direkt ins Ausland mit ihren Innovationen, und dann haben wir gar keinen Zugriff mehr auf die Antragsunterlagen. Das ist doch nicht das, was wir wollen! Also, ich bitte um Unterstützung für meinen Vorschlag.

PRZEWODNICTWO: ZDZISŁAW KRASNODEBSKI

Wiceprzewodniczący

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, thank you very much indeed for the opportunity to speak on this important proposal. Whenever we talk about our health and that of our children, people are absolutely right to ask for the highest standards of transparency and scrutiny. In recent years, European citizens have expressed such a clear demand for more transparency in the way that risk assessments are conducted, and I have been listening carefully to them and have been active on this issue since the beginning of my term of office.

Some of you in this House have expressed the same legitimate demand. In fact, when the European Parliament voted its resolution on glyphosate one year ago, it stressed the following: that the European Union's authorisation procedure, including the scientific evaluation of substances, should be based only on published studies. The European Citizens' Initiative in relation to glyphosate also asked the Commission to base its decision on published studies, and the findings of the recent 'fitness check' on the General Food Law Regulation confirmed this priority. Today's debate is a significant stepping stone on the way to meeting these expectations and to showing that the EU can deliver on our demands, on your demands and on citizens' demands.

Allow me to draw your attention to the main features of the Commission's ambitious proposal. I would like to explain briefly how we have pursued the objectives of reinforcing transparency and trust. I believe it is through greater transparency that we will increase citizens' confidence in the risk assessment system. The new legislation will thus contribute to increasing the legitimacy of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and of the Commission's decisions when it accepts or rejects requests for approval.

With this goal in mind, the Commission has proposed proactive public disclosure of all safety-related data – let me repeat, safety-related data – supporting applications for authorisation, and we have proposed that this be done early in the risk assessment process. Early disclosure is essential to ensure maximum transparency and public scrutiny in an effective way, while maintaining a timely and effective risk management process. Of course, transparency can also help us to avoid potential bias in science. It is crucial to restore trust in the EU's evidence-based food safety system and trust in science.

Let me insist on one important point. Postponing transparency until the opinion is published would, as we know from practice today, risk feeding suspicion and controversies. It would not permit a real scientific debate between different views, but would lead to more political controversies – and we have had too many of those recently. As long as the principle of early disclosure is retained, however, its exact timing could be the subject of further consideration. For example, it could coincide with the moment the underlying application is found admissible.

This disclosure of studies is also closely linked with two other measures in our proposal: first, the public consultation of submitted studies; and, second, the disclosure of the relevant information in the Union register of commissioned studies. These measures will ensure that EFSA has at its disposal the broadest relevant scientific evidence possible before it drafts its scientific opinion. And, of course, any rights stemming from the Access to Documents Regulation and the Aarhus Convention remain intact and will continue to apply.

At the same time, I am aware of concerns in relation to the protection of innovation, but I want to reassure you that, when we prepared this proposal, we also had in mind the need to maintain the European Union's high food safety standards together with the competitiveness of the EU food and feed sector. There is no controversy as between food safety standards and competitiveness, and that is why the proposal sets out safeguards for the protection of justifiable, confidential information. It includes a closed positive list of items that may be claimed as confidential. Confidentiality can be claimed if the applicant can prove that public disclosure of such information would significantly harm its competitive position.

At the same time, the proposal respects existing intellectual property rights, data exclusivity rights and rules on the protection of personal data. These are recognised as key to stimulating innovation, and for the worldwide recognition of EU product safety. Furthermore, to assist applicants – most importantly, small and medium-sized enterprises – we have introduced the possibility of EFSA providing pre-submission advice. This advice will facilitate a better understanding of the application process and will make life easier for innovators in Europe.

Finally, the proposal also provides for the possibility of commissioning additional studies for verification purposes. This may be done in exceptional circumstances, for example in the event of public controversy or scientific divergence about a product.

Further to the provisions on transparency, and to ensure the long-term sustainability of EFSA's high level of independent expertise, it is proposed that Member States will be represented on the EFSA Management Board. Similarly, and without jeopardising EFSA's independence, there is provision for more active involvement by Member States in ensuring the presence of experts on EFSA's scientific panels.

It has also been recognised that there is a need to improve on our communication of risk. It is important that strong, clear messaging on risks is available to our citizens. To this end, the proposal lays the foundations for a comprehensive and effective risk-communication strategy to ensure that, whether the message comes from the Commission, EFSA or Member States, it will be clear, comprehensive and consistent.

The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission are all responsible for maintaining and reinforcing an EU food safety system based on scientific assessments. Transparency and risk assessment are therefore a shared duty for all of us. With this proposal, we are, more than ever, playing our part.

I would like to thank all those involved, including the rapporteur, Ms Sommer, and the shadow rapporteur as well as the rapporteurs for opinion, for their active commitment so far – and, I hope, for their continued engagement and dedication in advancing with the Commission proposal and defending transparency. Who can be against transparency in science? No one.

I look forward to a positive outcome in the plenary vote and to the start of the trilogue discussion as soon as the House is ready.

Ricardo Serrão Santos, Relator PECH. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, o peixe é um dos alimentos mais saudáveis que consumimos, sendo a União Europeia o maior consumidor mundial destes produtos. Quase 70% dos produtos das pescas que consumimos são importados de países terceiros. Por esta razão, como relator pela Comissão das Pescas, propus incluir no Conselho de Administração da EFSA um representante do setor da aquicultura.

Verifico que, apesar do conselho de administração ter sido aumentado, e na proposta ter sido acomodado um representante do setor alimentar como propus, mas sem referência ao setor aquícola e da biotecnologia a sul, em contraste com a agricultura.

Quero destacar positivamente o enfoque que é dado à arbitragem científica. É reforçada a garantia de que as avaliações são realizadas com base na melhor e mais recente informação científica e que a avaliação dos riscos e a preservação/-preparação da análise desses mesmos estudos é independente, objetiva e, para isso, devidamente compensada.

Positivo também que, na avaliação de riscos, os potenciais impactos na saúde animal e no ambiente são levados em conta. A saúde humana não passa apenas pela gestão dos riscos diretos, mas também pelo ambiente em que se insere.

Pilar Ayuso, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor presidente, señor comisario, yo quiero empezar felicitando a la señora Sommer por este informe y, por supuesto, apoyando todas sus propuestas. Entiendo el objetivo de la propuesta de fortalecer la transparencia en el proceso de evaluación de riesgos, pero quiero subrayar como persona de contacto con la Agencia, que la EFSA es independiente y científicamente irrefutable y que se ciñe al Reglamento en vigor.

No obstante, sinceramente creo que ha faltado ambición política para hacer una reforma en profundidad del Reglamento y actualizar los cometidos de la EFSA que, después de casi veinte años, está sobrecargada con tareas que se alejan de lo que es estrictamente la seguridad alimentaria.

En cuanto a la transparencia de la EFSA, debe estar homologada a otras Agencias de la Unión como la EMA y la ECHA, es decir, que debe publicarse la información sobre las solicitudes y estudios de base en el momento en que se hace público su dictamen científico.

Estoy de acuerdo en que debemos fortalecer la transparencia de la Agencia, pero sin tintes ideológicos y sin que ello condicione la capacidad de innovación de los solicitantes.

Por último, este Reglamento en vigor estableció el sistema de alerta rápida, pero, a pesar de haberse revisado en 2011, continuamos sin tener un procedimiento armonizado de actuación de todos los Estados miembros y sin haber reforzado los poderes de la Comisión en la gestión de las alertas. No basta con un simple manual de apoyo, como hay en la actualidad, y esta es una oportunidad para solucionarlo y que no se repitan alarmas sociales como las que hemos tenido en el pasado.

Pavel Poc, *za skupinu S&D*. – Pane předsedající, zítra nás čeká hlasování, které vpravdě ovlivní důvěru veřejnosti k práci Evropské agentury pro bezpečnost potravin, k rozhodování Evropské komise, naší legislativní práci, ale i důvěru v bezpečnost potravin v rámci vnitřního trhu Evropské unie. Lidé chtějí, abychom dělali víc pro bezpečnost potravin, a také už chtějí vědět, jak a na základě čeho evropské instituce rozhodují o jejich bezpečnosti.

V dnešním světě, kde jsou bohužel hnacím motorem všeho peníze, je jedinou šancí mít robustní systém autorizací odolný proti ovlivnění rozhodovacích procesů zvenčí, ve kterém všechny případné podvody a manipulace budou snadno odhaleny a napraveny. Náš současný systém autorizací je založen na povinnosti žadatele prokázat nezávadnost svého produktu. To však v minulosti mohlo vést k tomu, že si některé firmy mohly kupovat příznivé studie nebo naopak mohly zatajovat nepříznivé výsledky. Těmto praktikám teď můžeme zabránit tím, že poskytneme nezávislým vědcům a veřejnosti včasný přístup ke kompletním informacím.

Samozřejmě, že není nic špatného na tom, že se průmysl obává o svou konkurenceschopnost. Ochrana autorských práv a patentů je důležitá a je chráněna touto i jinou legislativou zcela dostatečně, není třeba za ni platit snížením kvality bezpečnosti potravin.

Není důvod oddalovat zveřejnění nedůvěrné verze žádosti, u které ani samotný žadatel nepředpokládá, že by ho zveřejnění nějak poškodilo. Rovněž nepřichází v úvahu, aby Evropská agentura pro bezpečnost potravin měla za veřejné peníze povinnost dokazovat nezávadnost látek pro soukromý profit. To naše frakce nebude podporovat a žádali jsme o jmenovitá hlasování, aby bylo vidět, kdo to naopak podporovat chce.

Zítřejší hlasování dost jasně ukáže, kdo je na straně bezpečnosti potravin a oprávněných požadavků evropské veřejnosti, a na druhé straně, pro koho je bezpečnost potravin jenom nudná překážka pro dosažení co nejvyššího zisku.

Arne Gericke, *im Namen der ECR-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte der Kommission und der Berichtsteratterin Renate Sommer danken. Wir haben hier einen sehr mutigen und einen sehr klugen Bericht.

Wie machen wir die Zulassungsverfahren transparenter? Wie können wir verhindern, dass die Verfahren, die wir in der EU haben, an Vertrauen verlieren? Der Schlüssel dafür ist: Transparenz – viele Informationen, auf die die Verbraucherverbände und die Öffentlichkeit ein kritisches Auge werfen können und sollen. Was aber auch wichtig ist: Wir reden hier über die gesamte Nahrungsmittelkette in der EU. Wir reden nicht nur über Großkonzerne wie Monsanto und ihr berüchtigtes Glyphosat. Wir reden hier über Tausende mittelständische Unternehmen, die in dieser Branche tätig sind.

Bei so einer weitreichenden Gesetzgebung müssen wir auch aufpassen, dass wir nicht jegliche Innovation in Europa abtöten. Was geschieht, wenn ein Mittelständler ein neues Rezept für Kraftfutter hat, aber es zu kompliziert ist, es in Europa zuzulassen? Was passiert dann? Es passiert nichts.

Die großen Konzerne verlagern ihre Entwicklungen nach China, der Mittelständler geht einfach pleite. Es ist ein Balanceakt zwischen mehr Transparenz, mehr Sicherheit auf unseren Tellern, aber auch einem möglichst unbürokratischen Verfahren, das nicht nur von den ganz Großen zu stemmen ist. Dieser Bericht und die Vorschläge der Berichtsteratterin stellen das sicher.

Fredrick Federley, *för ALDE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Det är en mycket viktig lagstiftning som vi diskuterar i dag. Den är lite kronan på verket av mycket som Europeiska unionen faktiskt har kommit att uppnå. Om vi bara backar några årtionden så fick man rådet om man som svensk skulle resa i Europa att "Akta er för äggen, akta er för kycklingen!" för risken var att du skulle drabbas av salmonella av en så aggressiv karaktär att döden kanske var nära förestående.

Jag tror aldrig vi haft så hög säkerhet på mat, matstandard, matforskning och allt som är relaterat till mat och vår hälsa som vi har i dag. Det ska vi högakta och respektera för det räddar troligen livet på många människor runt om i Europeiska unionen varje år och ser till att vi har en bättre hälsa än vad vi annars hade haft. Samtidigt pågår en ganska tydlig hetsjakt på maten, matproducenter och livsmedelsproducenter tvärs över hela kedjan.

Det som gör mig något nervös är att kommissionen lyssnar lite för mycket på ett antal opponenter som är ganska få. Vi har alla kunnat följa den heta debatten om glyfosat härinne. Inga vetenskapliga belägg för att vi hanterat glyfosat felaktigt inom Europeiska unionen har kunnat presenteras. Ändå får vi ett utskott som agerar just på det här i Europaparlamentet och det är glyfosatfrågan som har lyft hela den här lagstiftningen. Precis som vår kollega från ECR sa är detta en lagstiftning som rör tiotusentals människor som arbetar med mat, matkvalitet och livsmedel. Jag tror att vi behöver se till att vi får en balans och det är klart att vi ska lyssna på medborgarna när de kommer med krav om ökad transparens. Det gäller dock att hitta var balansen går och jag känner att parlamentet riskerar att gå för långt i detta.

Jag blev ganska attraherad av ett förslag som cirkulerar i rådet just nu på förslag av det österrikiska ordförandeskapet. Jag tycker det slår en bättre balans än kommissionen. Vi försökte få till det med den socialdemokratiska gruppen, men tyvärr var det så att de backade ur från den här kompromissen. Det gör att vi från ALDE kommer att stödja rapportörens förslag på detta. Vi tror att inför den kommande förhandlingen, där jag tycker att kommissionen har gått för långt och hamnat snett i balansen, är det viktigt att parlamentet väger upp detta. Konsekvensen om vi går för långt är att vi bara släpper affärshemligheter. Det ökar inte förtroendet. Det ökar inte heller matsäkerheten utan det bara driver industri ut ur Europa och så kan vi inte ha det.

Anja Hazekamp, *namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, de voedingsindustrie in Europa hobbelt van schandaal naar schandaal. Denk maar eens aan het paardenvleeschandaal of denk aan het schandaal met de fipronil in onze eieren.

Eén van de grootste schandalen van deze eeuw is de hernieuwde goedkeuring van het uiterst schadelijke landbouwgif glyfosaat. De *Monsanto Papers* lieten tot in detail zien hoe lang de arm van de industrie is. Monsanto betaalde grof geld aan wetenschappers om de zogenaamde veiligheid van glyfosaat aan te tonen. De Europese instanties slikten dat voor zoete koek terwijl juist die instanties verantwoordelijk zijn om de veiligheid van ons voedsel te bewaken. Bezorgde burgers pikten het niet langer en verzamelden meer dan één miljoen handtekeningen voor het burgerinitiatief "Verbied glyfosaat!". Nou, verbieden, dat deed de Europese Commissie niet, maar ze kwam wel met een voorstel om de hele besluitvormingsprocedure in de toekomst transparanter en onafhankelijker te maken.

Volgens de Partij voor de Dieren is de enige verantwoorde leidraad het voorzorgsbeginsel. De gezondheid van mens en dier en het recht op een gezonde leefomgeving moeten altijd voorrang hebben boven de commerciële belangen van de gifproducenten. Helaas moeten we constateren dat de rapporteur juist wél partij kiest voor die producenten. De Commissie milieubeheer en de Bijzondere Commissie pesticiden kiezen gelukkig een andere lijn. Zij willen net als wij voorkomen dat de industrie in Europa besluiten neemt. Burgers en onafhankelijke wetenschappers moeten vroegtijdig inzage krijgen in alle informatie en natuurlijk moeten ze ook weten van wie die informatie afkomstig is.

Morgen heeft het Parlement de kans om opnieuw te laten zien dat het niet zwicht voor de macht van het geld, dat het niet zwicht voor de macht van de industrie. Ik roep u op om te kiezen voor transparantie, betrouwbaarheid en onafhankelijkheid.

Voorts ben ik van mening dat de Europese landbouwsubsidies moeten worden afgeschaft.

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ja, ich kann nur sagen: Lieber spät als gar nicht, dass wir jetzt hier über diesen Vorschlag reden. Ich sage auch gleich: Wir möchten diese Transparenzrichtlinie auch noch gern vor den Wahlen verabschiedet sehen. Wir müssen das Vertrauen der Bürger wieder gewinnen, und das ist verlorengegangen in dem Prozess um die Diskussion um Glyphosat. Es hat ja nicht umsonst eine Million Unterschriften gegeben, um das mal kritisch in Frage zu stellen.

Die Transparenz beim jetzigen Prozess ist nicht gewährleistet; das kann man einfach so sagen. Ich kann Frau Sommer verstehen, wenn sie sich sehr um die Industrie sorgt. Aber ich Sorge mich mehr um die Interessen von Umwelt und Verbrauchern. Ich glaube, die waren in der jetzigen Gesetzgebung nicht ausgewiesen und gleichgestellt. Das muss korrigiert werden.

Transparenz muss von Anfang an herrschen, nicht erst, wenn die EFSA ihre Vorschläge auf den Tisch gelegt hat. Das ist ganz wichtig, und da stehen wir im Gegensatz zu Frau Sommer, dass wir nicht erst danach der Öffentlichkeit wieder Zugang gewähren lassen wollen, sondern von Anfang an.

Es ist auch wichtig, kritische Wissenschaftler mit in den Prozess der Diskussion miteinzubeziehen. Umso vertrauenswürdiger wird nachher das Ergebnis des Ganzen. Wir müssen auch sehen, dass wir alle Studien in einem Register offenlegen, und nicht nur die Studien, die der Industrie passen. Auch das ist wichtig, um Vertrauen wiederzugewinnen.

Ich sehe nicht – im Gegensatz zu Frau Sommer –, dass die Interessen der Industrie jetzt hier gefährdet sind oder dass jetzt die Massen wieder nach China auswandern. Das wird immer irgendwo an den Himmel gemalt, wenn wir sowas diskutieren. Nein, im jetzigen Gesetzentwurf ist sowohl Innovation als auch der Schutz des geistigen Eigentums ausreichend gewährt. Deshalb kämpfen wir dafür, dass diese Richtlinie durchkommt.

Ein Weiteres noch: Die *panels* der EFSA müssen unabhängig besetzt werden. Darauf müssen wir noch mehr Wert legen. Wir müssen auch sehen, dass die EFSA die Möglichkeit bekommt, insgesamt Studien auch selber anfertigen zu können und diese selber in Auftrag zu geben und noch einmal kritisch zu überprüfen.

Als Letztes möchte ich der Bürgerinitiative Glyphosat ganz herzlich danken, denn sie hat mit ihrer Million Unterschriften diesen Prozess erst möglich gemacht.

Piernicola Pedicini, *a nome del gruppo EFDD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi crediamo che sia davvero molto importante votare questa proposta sulla trasparenza del sistema di sicurezza alimentare perché, se non lo facciamo adesso, l'industria avrà raggiunto ancora una volta il suo obiettivo di rimandare questo processo per avere la libertà di prendere decisioni che riguardano la vita di milioni di cittadini dell'Unione europea a porte chiuse.

Ricordiamoci che, in nome del segreto industriale, per gli OGM, per i pesticidi, per i materiali a contatto con gli alimenti si sono compiute le maggiori schifezze in quest'Aula, così come nel caso del glifosato e dello scandalo dei *Monsanto papers*.

E se così non fosse, spiegateci perché l'industria vuole impedire a tutti i costi l'accesso alle pubblicazioni scientifiche, che sono pubbliche per definizione, che vengono utilizzate nel processo di valutazione del rischio. Se non è per condizionare quello stesso processo di valutazione, allora perché?

Volete l'autorizzazione? Bene, queste sono le regole, dovete fornire tutte le informazioni che riguardano l'interesse pubblico, perché il diritto alla salute viene prima di ogni altra cosa.

Danilo Oscar Lancini, *a nome del gruppo ENF*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questi ultimi quindici anni il settore alimentare europeo ha attraversato diverse crisi. Ricordo come all'inizio degli anni 2000 si sia passati dalla paura generata dall'encefalopatia spongiforme bovina, più comunemente detta «mucca pazza», a quella dell'afta epizootica o ancora a quella del pollo alla diossina. Recentemente siamo venuti a conoscenza di come le grandi compagnie globali abbiano usato per molto tempo pesticidi o fertilizzanti potenzialmente dannosi per la salute dei consumatori.

I cittadini europei stanno sempre più prendendo coscienza che ogni aspetto della filiera agroalimentare deve essere controllato e reso trasparente, con la possibilità di accedere costantemente alle informazioni riguardanti il prodotto. Per questa ragione accolgo positivamente lo spirito proattivo manifestato dalla Commissione e dal Parlamento europeo sulla modifica dei regolamenti che intervengono sulla trasparenza e sulla sostenibilità del processo di valutazione dei rischi della catena alimentare.

La proposta fa seguito all'iniziativa dei cittadini europei ed in particolare alle preoccupazioni espresse dalle iniziative in materia di trasparenza degli studi scientifici utilizzati per valutare i pesticidi. L'opportunità di ottenere informazioni sulle fasi preliminari del processo e il vantaggio di poter contribuire allo studio dei rischi porteranno un sicuro beneficio a tutto il settore alimentare europeo.

Sono felice che in quest'occasione si sia fatto un buon uso dei virtuosi esempi offerti dall'Italia in materia di controllo e trasparenza. La mia speranza è che questo non rimanga un caso isolato.

Sempre sulla scia di quello che è stato fatto in Italia, grazie anche al contributo delle associazioni di settore, mi auguro che l'attuazione dei regolamenti permetta di realizzare una vera trasparenza a favore delle scelte dei consumatori, anche relativamente all'origine e alla tracciabilità dei prodotti alimentari, indicando gli ingredienti impiegati in tutti gli alimenti senza compromessi al ribasso, affinché di fatto si impediscano gli inganni e si favoriscano scelte di acquisto consapevoli per i consumatori europei.

Annie Schreijer-Pierik (PPE). – Voorzitter, als ik kijk naar het verhaal dat hier voor ons ligt, denk ik dat we moeten nadenken over het vertrouwen bij de burger, maar ook het vertrouwen bij het bedrijfsleven. Ik dank dan ook onze Renate Sommer als rapporteur over dit onderwerp.

Als voorbeeld denk ik aan de paniekerige onjuiste risicocommunicatie door de Nederlandse autoriteiten tijdens de fipronilcrisis in de zomer van 2017 die een marktstoornis en grote schade veroorzaakte. Dit toonde de noodzaak aan van een Europees gecoördineerde risicocommunicatie en bestrijding van nepnieuws en haatzaaijerij, terwijl ons voedsel dankzij EFSA nog steeds veiliger is dan ooit tevoren.

Familiebedrijven in de legpluimveehouderij kampen nog steeds met de gevolgen hiervan en hiervoor moeten we een oplossing vinden.

Vertrouwen vereist ook transparantie. De Commissievoorstellen bieden geen oplossing, maar veroorzaken helaas nieuwe, enorme problemen. Met mevrouw Sommer veroordeel ik het volledig ontbreken van een effectbeoordeling, vooral omdat de regels in dit voorstel aanzienlijke schade zullen toebrengen aan de innovatie en het concurrentievermogen van de Europese industrie.

Onbegrijpelijk dat de Commissie geen gevolgbeoordeling heeft laten uitvoeren. De toelating van de Europese levensmiddelen, diervoederenverpakking, diervoederindustrie, gewasbeschermingsmiddelen, plantenveredelings- en smaakstoffenindustrie in Europa staan hiermee op het spel. Ook daaraan moeten we denken. Ik ben tegen het openbaar maken van details van productieprocessen en bijbehorende onderzoekstudies al vooraf en vanaf het moment van de indiening van de aanvraag. Dit vormt een risico voor de industrie vanwege de bedrijfspionage vanuit derde landen. Transparantie kan ook na afronding ten tijde van het wetenschappelijk conceptadvies van EFSA worden gegeven. Ik denk dat we daar met elkaar voor moeten strijden.

Karin Kadenbach (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, lieber spät als gar nicht. Ein herzliches Dankeschön für den von Ihnen vorgestellten Vorschlag, den Sie auch heute sehr klar ausgeführt haben. Ich glaube, hier sind eine ganze Reihe von Verbesserungen, auf die die Europäerinnen und Europäer schon lange gewartet haben. Die heute schon angesprochene europäische Bürgerinitiative mit mehr als einer Million Unterschriften aus 22 Mitgliedstaaten hat ganz klar bewiesen, dass die Menschen in Europa Transparenz in der Zulassung bei jenen Stoffen, die in die Lebensmittelkette gelangen, nicht nur wünschen, sondern wirklich auch auf ihr Recht darauf pochen.

Der vorliegende Vorschlag tut nämlich beides: Er schafft es, hier Transparenz zu erzeugen, und er berücksichtigt natürlich die berechtigten Interessen jener, die hier Antragsteller sind. Sie haben selber heute ausgeführt und wir haben es ja auch lang und breit diskutiert: Rechte des geistigen Eigentums, Innovation, persönliche Daten sind durch den vorliegenden Entwurf ja nicht gefährdet. Es geht ja hier nur darum, auf die veröffentlichten Studien überall im Zusammenhang, wo es um Sicherheitsrisiken geht, hinzuweisen, und überall dort, wo Unternehmen – und es gibt ja diese ganz klar begrenzte Positivliste – nachweisen können, dass ihnen wirtschaftlicher Schaden durch die Transparenz entsteht, tritt das auch nicht ein.

Ich glaube, wir haben einen sehr, sehr guten, ausgewogenen Bericht. Ich glaube, das, worüber wir im ENVI abgestimmt haben, erfüllt genau die Erwartungshaltung der Europäerinnen und Europäer. Wir müssen diese transparente Risikobewertung wirklich durchsetzen.

Ich freue mich auch darauf, dass die wesentlichen Punkte der Abstimmung morgen im namentlichen Verfahren sind. Denn hier gilt es wirklich zu zeigen, wem das Risiko der Bürgerinnen und Bürger etwas wert ist, wer auf Gesundheit setzt und wer nur rein auf Industrieprofite setzt.

Mark Demesmaeker (ECR). – Voorzitter, de veiligheid van onze voedselketen garanderen, dat is een essentiële taak van de overheid. Het hele debat rond glyfosaat heeft één zaak duidelijk gemaakt: het belang van meer transparantie, het belang van onafhankelijk onderzoek. Dat hebben wij van in het begin benadrukt.

Wij staan voor empirisch onderbouwd beleid op basis van objectieve wetenschap. De risicobeoordelingen van de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid, de EFSA, zijn daarbij cruciaal. Ik wil hier benadrukken dat wij de EFSA absoluut de nodige instrumenten moeten geven, zodat ze de krachtige rol kan spelen die wij van deze autoriteit verwachten. Dit voorstel biedt antwoorden op die uitdagingen en het verdient onze steun. Maar tegelijk erken ik wel dat de bezorgdheid over onder andere het tijdstip van publicatie, dat die bezorgdheid legitiem is, dat daarop een antwoord moet komen. Als we de innovatie in de voedingssector niet willen afremmen, dan moeten we het juiste evenwicht zoeken en moeten we werkbare keuzes maken.

Jan Huitema (ALDE). – Voorzitter, bewust of onbewust maken we in het dagelijks leven gebruik van potentieel gevaarlijke stoffen, bijvoorbeeld in onze auto of in onze smartphone. We drinken zelfs kankerverwekkende stoffen, zoals bijvoorbeeld cafeïne en alcohol. In de landbouw maken gangbare boeren en biologische boeren gebruik van middelen om hun gewassen te beschermen. Dat is logisch want als een oogst mislukt, hebben ze geen inkomen en hebben wij geen voedsel.

Het is van ontzettend groot belang dat we over een wetenschappelijke risicobeoordeling beschikken om te bepalen of deze middelen gevaarlijk zijn voor milieu, mens of dier. Want wees eens eerlijk: wie van u hier in de zaal kent de scheikundige formule van glyfosaat? Niemand, dus laten we het ook over aan de wetenschap. Wat je heel vaak ziet is dat een uitkomst van een wetenschappelijke beoordeling niet helemaal past in ons politieke straatje en we moord en brand schreeuwen. Ik vergelijk het altijd maar een beetje met de situatie dat we thuis op de bank zitten en naar een voetbalwedstrijd kijken waarin de scheidsrechter een overtreding ziet in een *tackle* van onze favoriete speler. We wensen die scheidsrechter van alles toe. Maar het is wel belangrijk dat die scheidsrechter er is, want zonder scheidsrechter geen

voetbalwedstrijd. Daarom is het ook zo belangrijk dat we een vertrouwenswaardige risicobeoordeling hebben, dat we er alles aan doen om de autoriteit te versterken en dat we er ook alles aan doen om de transparantie te versterken. Want hebben we geen scheidsrechter om de beoordeling te doen voor bepaalde stoffen, dan verzanden we weer in een politiek van welles en nietes en slaan we alle innovatie dood.

Jiří Maštálka (GUE/NGL). – Pan předsedající, já jsem toho názoru, že návrh Komise na zveřejňování důvěrných průmyslových studií při posuzování dopadů Evropskou agenturou pro bezpečnost potravin je bohužel naprosto nedostatečný. Komise se snaží uchlácholit veřejnost po nedávném skandálu s glyfosáty. Nicméně navrhuje pouze kosmetické změny, které ve skutečnosti žádné zvýšení transparentnosti ani posílení veřejného zájmu na ochraně zdraví nepřinesou.

Podle Evropské komise bude totiž i nadále možné odmítnout uveřejnit vědecké údaje a například studie v souvislosti s povolením pro geneticky modifikované organismy poukazem na nutnost ochrany práv duševního vlastnictví či obchodních zájmů. Evropská komise navíc ani nepočítá s možností opětovného použití údajů bez povolení. Tím nezvýšíme počet studií o toxicitě. Chybí mi závazek Evropské komise zajistit dostatečné financování Evropské agentury pro bezpečnost potravin, bez čehož je celý proces stanovení rizik naprostou utopií. Ve Výboru pro právní záležitosti se nám bohužel nepodařilo tyto nedostatky odstranit.

Molly Scott Cato (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the unwillingness of EU citizens to have glyphosate residue in their food, when the World Health Organisation (WHO) has deemed it probably carcinogenic, is entirely understandable, and the more than one million signatures on the European Citizens' Initiative indicate the intensity of concern. I have received more than 500 emails from the people of South-West England calling for greater transparency.

In a process that was confusing and opaque, Member States chose to reauthorise glyphosate in the face of scientific evidence and widespread public concern. As called for in this report, we need much greater transparency about the process of risk assessment for the food chain, in order to restore public trust.

Meaningful reform would be undermined if MEPs vote tomorrow to allow industrial secrecy to trump transparency. If the industry really has nothing to hide, then why preserve so-called industry secrets? People lose faith in their institutions when they can see that information is being concealed, or that they are being deceived. At a time when a cocktail of substances is entering our ecosystems and our bodies, we need to know how the EU decides whether this causes us harm.

Let's shine a light on the dirty work of the agri-businesses that prop up an intensive and unsustainable food system, whilst at the same time finding alternative agro-ecological solutions to replace the dangerous chemicals that are so widespread in our farming system.

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor commissario, in primo luogo permettetemi di ringraziare la collega Sommer per l'ottimo lavoro svolto.

Sono convinto della necessità di intervenire per garantire una maggiore trasparenza lungo il processo di valutazione da parte dell'EFSA e soprattutto per migliorare la fiducia dei cittadini nella credibilità degli studi scientifici, contestata più volte e, nello specifico, in occasione della vicenda relativa all'autorizzazione del glicosato.

Vorrei sottolineare l'importanza della gestione del rischio nell'utilizzazione delle sostanze e la necessità, quindi, di disporre di un'alta qualità scientifica, nonché di controlli e *audit* in relazione agli studi utilizzati.

L'EFSA svolge un ruolo molto delicato con grande professionalità e competenza ma, in alcuni casi, sono state utilizzate delle metodologie che devono essere migliorate, come ho avuto modo di sottolineare più volte. Faccio riferimento al caso degli antrachinoni dove, per dimostrare la relativa pericolosità, sono stati fatti delle analisi e degli studi su sostanze simili e non sulle sostanze che si vorrebbero bandire.

Abbiamo inoltre provveduto a modificare la struttura del consiglio di amministrazione, con due rappresentanti del Parlamento anziché uno e ampliando l'elenco dei rappresentanti dell'industria e della società civile, includendo esperti in materia di salute pubblica, dell'industria agrochimica e dell'industria alimentare.

Importante infine è sottolineare il punto critico della proposta, che fa riferimento alla notizia temporale e alla pubblicazione delle informazioni e degli studi di base delle domande indirizzate all'EFSA. Su questo concordo pienamente con quanto espresso dalla relatrice, per non svendere la nostra industria.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D). – Señor presidente, estimado comisario, estimados diputados, en primer lugar, quiero agradecer a la ponente y a los ponentes en la sombra el trabajo que hoy nos presentan en el Pleno. La ciudadanía europea mostró su preocupación por la transparencia en las evaluaciones que venía realizando la EFSA —y lo hizo a través de una iniciativa ciudadana europea—, a raíz de los informes que se utilizaron para la evaluación del glifosato.

Quiero empezar reconociendo que me alegró la reacción de la Comisión Europea, que precisamente hizo una propuesta de modificación de la legislación para garantizar esa demandada mayor transparencia. Considero que la propuesta que salió de la Comisión de Medio Ambiente viene a responder precisamente a esas necesidades de los consumidores con un firme compromiso con la protección de la salud humana y del medio ambiente.

La gestión, la evaluación y la comunicación de los riesgos tienen que responder al principio de precaución y deben hacerse a través de un proceso claramente transparente, objetivo e independiente. Por eso, hoy quiero pedir que el Pleno mañana apruebe precisamente esta propuesta que salió de la Comisión ENVI y que continúe con esa ambición, que no se produzca un retroceso.

Quiero decir que las enmiendas que hacen alusión a la necesidad de ir hacia atrás y a que las publicaciones de los estudios que se vayan a tener en cuenta se realicen al final con el dictamen, suponen un retroceso. Para garantizar la participación pública deben estar disponibles al principio. Y la confidencialidad debe reservarse solamente a los temas estrictamente comerciales. Hay que dar un mensaje claro a la ciudadanía y recuperar su confianza. El objetivo último es la salud humana y el medio ambiente, y a eso es a lo que apelo.

James Nicholson (ECR). – Mr President, when it comes to making legislation in this area, we should be guided by the principle of 'follow the science'. Independent science-led, evidence-based policymaking is, in my opinion, essential.

Equally, citizens of the European Union are right to expect reasonable levels of transparency from our institutions. For the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), as for other agencies, increasing transparency will encourage and increase public trust in scientific decision-making and the safety of the food we eat. However, we must, of course, ensure that commercially sensitive material is adequately protected. If essential parts of confidential business information are not safeguarded, it would hamper innovation and have a particular impact on small and medium-sized enterprises.

I also have sympathy for concerns about an increased national level of involvement in the EFSA risk assessment process, on the grounds that it could be subject to increased political involvement, particularly with regard to changes in how EFSA recruits its Management Board.

Alojz Peterle (PPE). – Spoštovani gospod komisar, draga poročevalka in spoštovani kolegi. Upadanje zaupanja v inštitucije se ni začelo včeraj, spomnimo se recimo na epidemijo bolezni norih krav. Uredba o splošni živilski zakonodaji pred 15-imi leti je bila ustrezen odgovor na takraten izziv, vendar ni mogla preprečiti vseh škandalov, ki so nato še sledili. Potrošniki pa so v vseh teh letih postali bolj ozaveščeni in zahtevni. Šele, ko se nam je zgodil glifosat, smo videli, da časa ni več na pretek. Lahko se strinjamo, da imamo še dovolj maneverskega prostora za povrnitev zaupanja državljanov v inštitucije, zmanjkuje pa nam časa. Pred vrati imamo volitve, čaka nas račun za opravljen delo.

S tem poročilom imamo priložnost, da državljanom pokažemo, da mislimo resno. Če jim danes ne bomo postregli z znanstvenimi pravili o varni hrani, nas jutri čaka višji račun, ki ga bomo plačali vsi, ne le tisti, ki vztrajajo pri starih pravilih igre.

Parlament je pravo mesto za iskanje kompromisov, ne smemo pa si dovoliti kompromisov na račun zdravja. Državljeni pričakujejo hitrejšje in bolj pregledno ukrepanje agencije EFSA, želijo vedeti, na podlagi kakšnih informacij in procedur je bilo določeno, da je hrana v trgovini varna. Več transparentnosti ne bo škodilo nikomur, EFSA pa bo postala bolj verodostojna. Razumem določene skrbi kolegice poročevalke Sommerove, prepričan pa sem, da lahko naredimo vse tako, da ne bo prizadeta konkurenčnost naše industrije.

Eric Andrieu (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord saluer la proposition faite par la Commission, je voudrais vous saluer, vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour avoir été particulièrement attentif à l'initiative citoyenne «Stop glyphosate» et avoir bien entendu les revendications qui étaient portées par cette initiative citoyenne. Merci également d'avoir été attentif aux pressions que nous avons exercées ici au sein du Parlement devant l'enjeu, après la révélation sur les *Monsanto papers*. Merci à vous pour cette proposition.

Je voudrais également dénoncer fermement la droite européenne qui, lors du vote en commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, a montré, Monsieur le Président, son vrai visage en privilégiant la protection des droits de propriété intellectuelle sur le principe de précaution et la santé des 500 millions d'Européens.

J'invite M^{me} Sommer à prendre connaissance du vote qui a eu lieu la semaine dernière en commission pesticides, où nous demandons – et nous avons voté à une large majorité – que la Commission européenne ainsi que les agences soient exigeantes sur le plus de transparence, sur le plus d'indépendance et une stricte application du principe de précaution, afin de protéger la santé des 500 millions d'Européens.

Il faut que nous soyons vigilants à ce que les agences nationales – et c'est le cas pour le BfR – ne fassent plus de copier-coller des études de l'industrie, pour regagner la confiance des citoyens européens. Nous devons pouvoir garantir que les études utilisées par l'Agence européenne de sécurité des aliments soient 100 % fiables et dénuées de tout conflit d'intérêts. Il y va de la reconquête de la confiance des citoyens européens dans nos institutions, Monsieur le Président.

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, first, let me make it clear that I welcome the principle behind this proposal. It is important to ensure access to studies and, indeed, to allow the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) to have better access to relevant scientific evidence. This is all in the interest of transparency and public safety, which is paramount in everything we do as legislators. However, I have some concerns with the report that has been tabled for plenary this week, and I think we need to be careful about this vote and ensure that we find a more sensible, pragmatic and balanced approach to tackling this important issue.

It is important that we give more careful consideration to what this proposed regulation is requiring of companies in terms of when the publication of information and underlying studies in relation to applications is due. In the text tabled by the committee, and indeed in the Commission proposal, food companies would need to inform EFSA immediately of the subject matter of studies commissioned. I feel we need to be careful here, and consider further the impact this immediate notification could have on innovation in the food sector.

I share the fears which the rapporteur had during the committee negotiations that there could be a danger of ideas piracy, and that this could result in a perceived lack of protection for EU companies' intellectual property.

Maintaining the competitiveness of our EU food industry is extremely important for workers, farmers and citizens alike, and so we should ensure balance in imposing such an obligation. I welcome the suggestions by my colleague Ms Sommer for making the proposal more workable, including the requirement that EFSA should first draft a preliminary opinion, after which point the studies and non-confidential application material could be made public.

Christel Schaldemose (S&D). – Hr. formand! Tak for det, tak for ordet og også tak til alle vores europæiske borgere, som jo i bund og grund er årsag til, at vi sidder her i aften og diskuterer denne forordning. For havde det ikke været for borgernes intensive kamp for at få diskuteret det her med glyphosat, så havde vi jo faktisk ikke fået denne forordning. Jeg synes, det er en rigtig god forordning, og derfor vil jeg gerne takke EU-Kommissionen for at have lyttet til borgerinitiativet og lyttet til Europa-Parlamentet. Det er virkelig godt, og det er virkelig glædeligt, for med den her forordning får vi faktisk mulighed for at få langt mere gennemsigtighed, åbenhed og bæredygtighed ind i hele vores fødevarer kæde. Og det er vigtigt, når vi har et indre marked, hvor vores fødevarer transporteres over mange landegrænser. Det er vigtigt, at borgerne er sikre på, at man ikke bliver syg af dem. Det er vigtigt, at de ved, hvad det er for noget kød, de spiser, men det er også vigtigt, at de kender til, hvad det er for nogle pesticider, der er brugt i deres fødevarer, og det får

vi langt bedre mulighed for med denne forordning. Uvildige eksperter skal være med til at kigge på, om et pesticid er skadeligt eller ej, så vi ikke kun skal lytte til, hvad kemiindustrien selv siger. Jeg synes, det er rigtig vigtigt, at vi får sikret det her. Vi får givet nogle flere muligheder til EFSA, så de også kan komme med væsentlig bedre anbefalinger til os. I allersidste ende betyder det, at vi både får renere og mere sikre fødevarer, men at vi i virkeligheden også får sikret, at vores europæiske borgere kan stole på, at vi virkelig kæmper for deres interesser. Tak.

Tom Vandenkendelaere (PPE). – Voorzitter, het nastreven van grotere transparantie is van cruciaal belang in de moderne politieke besluitvorming. Dat merken we ook bij de ontwikkeling van plantenbeschermingsmiddelen en van voedingsmiddelen. Mensen willen weten wat op hun bord komt en terecht. Ze weten op basis van welke overwegingen wij ook besluiten nemen die hen rechtstreeks aanbelangen in hun dagelijkse leven. Precies om die reden vind ik het erg goed dat de Europese Commissie met een voorstel gekomen is rond transparantie in de Europese risicobeoordeling in de voedselketen. Ik moet u de vele burgerinitiatieven rond bijvoorbeeld het gebrek van plantenbeschermingsmiddelen niet in herinnering brengen om die diepe bezorgdheid onder de burgers over dit onderwerp te illustreren. Dan moeten we luisteren naar deze bezorgdheid. Dat is vanzelfsprekend volgens mij.

Als beleidsmakers hebben we wel meer dan één verantwoordelijkheid alleen. Hoewel volledige openheid in sommige gevallen wenselijk is, zijn er ook bepaalde procedures waarbij totale transparantie zonder twijfel ook risico's kan inhouden. En dit is er één van. Want, collega's, laten we mekaar niks wijsmaken. In de mondiale industrie zijn er steeds kapers op de kust. Concurrenten liggen op de loer en informatie is meer dan ooit macht. Als we dus onze eigen Europese bedrijven willen steunen en de werkgelegenheid die ze bieden vrijwaren, dan is hun de verplichting opleggen om onmiddellijk alle geheimen openbaar te maken wel het laatste wat we volgens mij moeten doen. Meer nog, ze zouden het omgekeerde bereiken van wat de burgers willen, namelijk dat bedrijven hun opbrengsten niet langer investeren in onderzoek en ontwikkeling voor meer veilige producten, met alle negatieve gevolgen van dien. Als we echt willen dat Europa 's werelds grootste innovator wordt, dan mogen we onze bedrijven op dat vlak dat niet aandoen.

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitän komissiota suoraselkäisyydestä tämän esityksen osalta. Se on vähintä, mitä komissio voi tehdä sen jälkeen, kun glyfosaattiskandaalissa hyväksytään ei-julkisten tietojen pohjalta sellaisen torjunta-aineen jatkokäyttö, jonka aiheuttamasta syöpäriskistä ja muista terveyshaitoista saadaan kasvavaa tieteellistä näyttöä muidenkin kuin Maailman terveysjärjestön taholta.

On välttämätöntä, että elintarvikkeiden turvallisuuden osalta päädymme esitetyn kaltaiseen läpinäkyvyyteen tieteellisen hyväksynnän prosessissa. Samalla on myös välttämätöntä pitää huolta eurooppalaisen elintarviketeollisuuden innovaatiokyvystä ja kilpailukyvystä globaalisti. Mutta ei ihmisten terveyden kustannuksella.

Minun on hyvin vaikea nähdä sellaista innovaatiotoimintaa, mikä tässä olisi uhattuna. Varsinkin kun komission esityksen lukiessa nämä niin sanotut *backstopit* innovaatioiden ja liiketaloudellisten salaisuuksien osalta ovat enemmän kuin riittävästi ja hyvin selvästi kirjoitettuna ulos. En siis näe, että komission esitys uhkaisi millään tavalla eurooppalaista elintarviketeollisuutta tai maataloutta satikka sitten sen innovaatiotoimintaa.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în primul rând felicit raportoarea pentru munca depusă. Sănătatea publică și siguranța alimentară sunt chestiuni sensibile și de interes pentru toți cetățenii europeni. Aceștia evident că sunt mereu preocupați de transparența decizională cu privire la alimentele sau alte produse introduse pe piață. Tocmai de aceea, regimul de reglementare privind siguranța alimentară trebuie să fie unul extrem de serios, pentru a-i asigura credibilitatea și eficiența.

Problemele legate de siguranță au un impact imens atât asupra încrederii consumatorilor, cât și asupra stabilității piețelor. În acest context, consider că este necesară o aliniere a normelor EFSA în ceea ce privește transparența cu cele ale altor agenții europene. În același timp, este nevoie să ne asigurăm că studiile efectuate în laboratoarele din țările terțe respectă aceleași standarde de calitate ca și cele din Uniunea Europeană.

Mecanisme create nu trebuie însă să aducă atingere intereselor economice ale producătorilor și să permită piratarea ideilor. Considerăm că elaborarea unui aviz preliminar din partea EFSA asupra produselor testate ar preveni acest lucru și ar oferi calea spre o dezbatere publică reală.

Angélique Delahaye (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, les citoyens s'intéressent de plus en plus à leur alimentation et cherchent à savoir comment le système européen fonctionne. Le débat autour du glyphosate en est l'illustration parfaite. Il est de notre devoir de leur répondre et de faire en sorte que nos procédures soient claires, afin d'être comprises, car ce qui n'est pas compris est craint. Je suis donc favorable au renforcement de la procédure et à une transparence accrue de celle-ci, en tant que membre de la droite européenne, n'en déplaise à mon collègue Éric Andrieu.

Je souhaite également rappeler mon attachement à ce que les décisions soient toujours prises sur des bases scientifiques solides, seules aptes à nous permettre d'avoir des positions incontestables afin de ne pas alimenter les peurs alimentaires que certains agitent. Pour cela, l'indépendance et le bon fonctionnement de nos agences, notamment l'Autorité européenne de sécurité des aliments (AESA) sont fondamentales.

Nous devons leur donner les moyens de nos ambitions. Concernant la publication des études, nous devons trouver le juste équilibre quant au moment pour les rendre publiques, entre une volonté de transparence pour la transparence et la protection de la recherche et de l'innovation au sein de l'Union européenne. N'oublions pas que nos entreprises et nos PME font face à la concurrence mondiale. Il est donc essentiel de leur permettre de garder un train d'avance en matière de développement et d'innovation.

Enfin, je tiens à remercier mes collègues d'avoir soutenu, lors du vote en commission, mon amendement rappelant que, lors de la signature d'accords commerciaux, l'Union doit veiller à ce que les législations alimentaires des pays tiers partenaires soient au moins aussi protectrices en matière de sécurité alimentaire que la législation européenne, cela pour garantir la sécurité de 500 millions de consommateurs européens et ne pas générer de distorsions de concurrence pour les producteurs européens.

Zgłoszenia z sali

Franč Bogovič (PPE). – Gospod predsednik, zahvala za to poročilo, ki je odgovor na pobudo državljanov, in tisti, ki smo sedeli tudi ob četrkih popoldan na odborih PEST, smo se prepričali, kako potrebna je EFSA, kako jo je potrebno krepiti, zagotoviti zadostna sredstva, da bodo tudi postopki čim bolj transparentni, čim bolj jasni in čim bolj javni, da bodo ljudje dobili in povrnilo se jim bo zaupanje v inštitucijo, ki skrbi na eni strani za to, da se preprečujejo škandali v prehranski verigi, po drugi strani pa ima ključno nalogo pri registraciji pesticidov.

Pri pesticidih je podobno kot pri zdravju ljudi. Najbrž bomo vedno rabili zdravila za to, ko odpove imunski sistem in ko se rastlina ne bo mogla upreti vsem škodljivcem ali pa boleznim, bomo, kljub temu, da nekateri mislijo drugače, še kar nekaj časa rabili tudi del pesticidov. In tu rabimo, da bomo sledili strokovnosti, da bomo verjeli inštitucijam in da se bodo tudi inovacije in pa pridelava hrane razširila v Evropi.

Ne bi rad bil odvisen od hrane, ki bi prihajala iz drugih kontinentov. To poročilo gre v pravo smer.

Nicola Caputo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la sicurezza alimentare dei prodotti che circolano nell'Unione europea è un bene prezioso, una conquista di civiltà. Non possiamo permetterci un altro caso come quello del glifosato, che mina l'intero sistema di autorizzazione dell'Unione europea: ne va della nostra produzione di eccellenza e della protezione della salute di tutti i cittadini europei.

Servono regole chiare e severe per porre fine alla segretezza degli studi dell'industria, utilizzati per sostenere la sicurezza di pesticidi, OGM, materiali a contatto con alimenti e altri prodotti correlati al nostro cibo. La valutazione scientifica del potenziale impatto dei pesticidi e di altri prodotti non deve essere un affare privato tra gli scienziati dell'Unione europea e i produttori.

Dobbiamo agire con senso di responsabilità, garantendo ai cittadini l'accesso alle informazioni, su richiesta, la pubblicazione di tutte le informazioni di rilievo e limiti ben precisi alle motivazioni per il trattamento riservato di alcune informazioni. Gli studi dovrebbero essere pubblicati non appena presentati, per consentire una consultazione approfondita durante il processo di valutazione.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα διατροφικά σκάνδαλα έχουν συγκλονίσει την ευρωπαϊκή κοινή γνώμη. Βρίσκονται στην ημερησία διάταξη. Είχαμε το σκάνδαλο με τις τρελές αγελάδες, το σκάνδαλο με τα αβγά, που άγγιξε και την Ελλάδα, το σκάνδαλο με τη γλυφοσάτη. Γι' αυτό και οι πολίτες κινητοποιήθηκαν: ένα εκατομμύριο υπογραφές προκειμένου να σταματήσει αυτή η υπόθεση σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, καθώς δεν υπάρχει καν διασφάλιση για τα ίδια τα τρόφιμα, κι έτσι υπάρχει ένας τεράστιος κίνδυνος για τους ίδιους τους καταναλωτές, για την υγεία τους. Δεν έχουμε διαφάνεια στις επιστημονικές μελέτες. Υπάρχει σύγκρουση συμφερόντων μεταξύ των επιστημόνων που αναλαμβάνουν –υποτίθεται– να φτιάξουν τις μελέτες και των επιχειρήσεων. Γι' αυτό λοιπόν πρέπει η υγεία να είναι στην πρώτη γραμμή: η υγεία και η προστασία των καταναλωτών. Αλλά φυσικά, όταν έχεις μία διαδικασία όπου οι επιχειρήσεις απλά επιδιώκουν το κέρδος, αντιλαμβάνεται κανείς ότι φτάνουμε σε αυτά τα δυσμενή αποτελέσματα. Πρέπει να υπάρχουν μέτρα προστασίας της δημόσιας υγείας.

Linnéa Engström (Verts/ALE). – Herr talman! I dag tar vi ett stort och viktigt steg. Vi kräver här från Europaparlamentet ett stopp för smutsiga hemligheter i tillståndsförfarandet för bekämpningsmedel, GMO, livsmedelstillsatser och nya livsmedel.

Demokrati och vetenskap har mycket gemensamt. De kan inte genomföras på ett riktigt sätt under hemlighetsmakeri. De kräver öppenhet. Grälen runt godkännandet av bekämpningsmedlet glyfosat under 2017 kastar ett obehagligt ljus över bristen på transparens i den här processen för att godkänna bekämpningsmedel inom EU.

Det europeiska medborgarinitiativet *Stoppa glyfosat* undertecknades av mer än 1,4 miljoner medborgare och kraven går i linje med det som vi gröna alltid drivit på för, nämligen att studier som ligger till grund för att genomföra sådana här tillstånd av glyfosat ska bli transparanta och offentliggöras i vetenskapliga journaler. Det visar att vi kan påverka! Anklagelser om så kallad industridriven forskning och otillbörlig påverkan visade att brist på öppenhet underminerar kvalitet på bedömning liksom EU-medborgarnas förtroende för våra institutioner och det ska vi ändra på.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα τρόφιμα, τα οποία αποτελούν τον πλέον σημαντικό παράγοντα για την επιβίωση του ανθρώπου, πρέπει να προστατεύονται από κινδύνους που αναφέρονται στην υγιεινή τους κατάσταση καθώς επίσης και απειλούν τη ζωή των ανθρώπων οι οποίοι τα καταναλίσκουν. Ανάλογη προσοχή πρέπει να δίνεται και στις ζωοτροφές. Η νομοθεσία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως που ασχολείται με την προστασία των τροφίμων πρέπει να στηρίζεται σε επιστημονική βάση και να επεκτείνεται σε όλη την αλυσίδα της διατροφικής διαδικασίας ούτως ώστε να προστατεύει τους πολίτες. Παρά το γεγονός ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Αρχή για την Ασφάλεια των Τροφίμων στηρίζει τις εκτιμήσεις που κάνει σε επιστημονική διαδικασία, εντούτοις οι πολίτες δεν την εμπιστεύονται. Ένας λόγος ο οποίος επιτείνει αυτή την ανησυχία των πολιτών είναι το γεγονός ότι έρχονται πολλές φορές τρόφιμα από τρίτες χώρες τα οποία δεν έχουν υποστεί εξέταση για την υγιεινομική τους κατάσταση. Πρέπει λοιπόν να υπάρξει διαφάνεια, ούτως ώστε να προστατευθεί η ζωή των πολιτών.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, stimați colegi, de fapt ce vrem să facem? La cererea cetățenilor, pentru că noi facem politici publice pentru cetățeni, iată, Comisia vine cu o propunere legată de întărirea autorității EFSA, de noi reguli pentru această agenție, care, de fapt, să asigure diminuarea riscului în lanțul alimentară. Sigur că trebuie să stabilim aici un echilibru cu interesul industriei, dar nu putem să-l punem înaintea vieții cetățenilor și înaintea calității alimentelor pe care noi le consumăm.

De aceea, eu cred că vom face un pas înainte și apreciez propunerea venită de la Comisie. Sigur că trebuie mai multă transparență și există mijloace prin care să protejăm ideile și inovațiile. Important este să avem reguli foarte clare, transparente, știute și același set de reguli să se aplice în toată piața internă.

Domnule comisar, poate îmi răspundeți și ce facem cu alimentele care sunt distribuite, comercializate în interiorul pieței interne, dar sunt aduse din afară, din țările terțe, dacă au același regim și cum putem să supraveghem acest lucru.

Κωνσταντίνος Παπαδάκης (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διαμάχη πόσες, ποιες πληροφορίες για τα τρόφιμα θα είναι προσβάσιμες σε εκατομμύρια καταναλωτές με κριτήριο μη θιγεί η ανταγωνιστικότητα των επιχειρήσεων αποκαλύπτει την κοροϊδία περί διαφάνειας στον έλεγχο και στην αδειοδότησή τους. Μιλάτε περί ασφάλειας τροφίμων σε μια Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση με ιστορία διατροφικών σκανδάλων, με κινδύνους για την υγεία εκατομμυρίων ανθρώπων. Μαίνεται πόλεμος επιχειρηματικών κολοσσών στον διατροφικό κλάδο με ισχυρότατα λόμπι. Η τροφή, η πιο ζωτική ανθρώπινη ανάγκη, υποτάσσεται στο κέρδος. Μικροί αγρότες ξεριζώνονται προς όφελος μεγάλων αγροτικών και βιομηχανικών εκμεταλλεύσεων του αγροτικοδιατροφικού τομέα. Διατροφικές συνήθειες καθοδηγούνται διαφημιστικά. Τα τρόφιμα στο ράφι ακριβαίνουν. Η ποιότητά τους πέφτει –για τους πολλούς, όχι για όλους–, ενώ ληγμένα δίνονται σε εξαθλιωμένους έναντι φοροαπαλλαγών στους ομίλους τροφίμων. Οι πεινασμένοι σε όλο τον κόσμο και στην αναπτυσσόμενη Ευρώπη πληθαίνουν, όταν επιστήμη και τεχνολογία σε συνδυασμό με την εργασία εκατομμυρίων ανθρώπων –αγροτών, εργατών– μπορούν να εξασφαλίσουν άφθονα φθηνά ποιοτικά τρόφιμα για όλους. Η άλλη οργάνωση της οικονομίας, χωρίς μονοπώλια και κέρδος, είναι αναγκαία για τη διατροφή και την υγεία του λαού.

(Koniec zgłoszeń z sali)

Vytėnis Povilas Andriukaitis, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I have listened with great interest to the views expressed during this discussion and I am grateful for all the valuable insights and for the commitment in the House to addressing the transparency and sustainability of the European Union risk assessment process in the food chain.

I heard a lot of support for the proposal today, and I am reassured by the fact that Parliament believes transparency is crucial in terms of Europeans' trust in our work to protect them. I thank the many Members who have raised the issues of transparency, science and so on, especially Mr Andrieu and the members of the Special Committee on the Union's authorisation procedure for pesticides (PEST).

This proposal is for a targeted revision of the General Food Law. It is a targeted revision, which means that we are focusing just on ways of addressing transparency issues, because they are the main problem. As you know, the General Food Law was introduced in 2002, and now, after the fitness check, we know that it is fit for purpose. The targeted revision is designed to provide an ambitious response to calls for more transparency in the risk assessment process in the food chain.

Therefore, once again, allow me to emphasise that public disclosure of studies supporting applications for authorisation at an early stage is important, in order to increase citizens' confidence in the risk assessment system, and also to restore trust in science and to avoid bias in science. Two weeks ago we had debates with presidents of industry and we explained once again that our proposal is a balanced one. Industry needs to postpone disclosure, but that is not the right answer in this situation.

I am convinced that, on the basis of the positions expressed here, a good compromise can be reached on this issue. Please be assured that the proposal, while strengthening transparency, includes enough safeguards for business to enable innovation in Europe to continue. I would further mention, once again, that duly justified confidential information will remain protected, and there is no interference with existing intellectual property rights or other rights. That is crystal clear.

In any event, enhanced transparency will contribute to strengthening a climate of consumer trust, which is beneficial for stimulating innovation – and I would emphasise that. The Union's product safety system is recognised worldwide. Please compare the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) system: the openness of the data is much broader than what we have in Europe today. And what about companies in the United States? They are not complaining about that. So, let's see how we can improve transparency, while not putting innovation at risk.

On Ms Schreijer-Pierick's question about impact assessment, as explained in the roadmap and the explanatory memorandum to the proposal, no initial impact assessment was carried out. The measures proposed focus on transparency and the way that the Commission and EFSA will gather and manage the evidence needed to perform their tasks on the basis of unchanged criteria. Secondly, duly justified confidential information is protected in addition to any existing intellectual property rights and data exclusivity rights. Therefore, incentives for innovation remain largely unchanged. Thirdly, the proposed measures have a particular impact on EFSA, which is publicly financed.

As to questions related to the possibility of equipping EFSA with more financial instruments, as you know, we are proposing in our new Multiannual Financial Framework to provide an additional EUR 62.5 million every year so that EFSA can recruit 106 additional workers and address the issues related to capacity problems. The proposal also addresses the long-term sustainability of the risk assessment process, and that of EFSA, in particular. EFSA's role is, and will remain, crucial – actually as much as that of the Member States – in achieving a high level of protection of public health for European citizens.

Honourable Members, I thank you once again for your active engagement on this issue and I look forward to working closely together towards a strengthened climate of consumer trust in the food chain, and to seeing how we can move forward, starting with our debates in the months to come, with the Council, Parliament and the Commission together.

Renate Sommer, Berichterstatterin. – Herr Präsident! Ich verstehe überhaupt nicht, warum der Kommissar jedes Mal dreimal so lange redet, wie er Redezeit hat. Bekomme ich diese Redezeit jetzt auch? Mich ärgert das.

Der Kommissar macht schon die ganzen Monate Lobbying, dann muss er das hier nicht auch noch machen. Und Sie verhelfen ihm dazu, indem Sie ihn reden lassen und ihm nicht auch mal einen Hinweis auf die Uhr geben.

(Der Präsident: Das ist das Privileg der Kommission.)

Aber es scheint ja immer so zu sein.

Herr Kommissar, Sie finden wirklich, dass es ein ausgewogener Vorschlag ist, was Sie da gebracht haben, dass es ein hohes Schutzniveau für Innovationen bleiben wird und dass alles wunderbar werden wird? Wie können Sie das denn wissen?

Es gab nur eine verkürzte Konsultationsphase für die Hersteller und dann auch noch über Weihnachten – ja, wo die Büros leer sind. Sie haben keine Folgenabschätzung geliefert, wozu Sie im Sinne der besseren Rechtsetzung verpflichtet sind. Deshalb sind wir doch alle hier so auseinander. Ja, wir wollen alle im Grundsatz Transparenz. Darum geht es. Deshalb weiß der Rat nämlich auch nicht so recht, wo er hingehen soll, weil die Folgenabschätzung fehlt. Da haben Sie eine schlechte Arbeit geliefert, und gleichzeitig stört mich unglaublich, wie Sie in all den Monaten das Parlament abtelefonieren, Keile in die Fraktionen treiben, zwischen Fraktionen treiben und versuchen, Ihren Vorschlag durchzusetzen.

Lassen Sie sich doch ins Parlament wählen, wenn Sie Gesetzgeber werden wollen! Sie sind nicht der Gesetzgeber, Sie sind der Kommissar. Darauf möchte ich Sie mal hinweisen. Es ist nicht richtig, dass Sie in dieser Art und Weise Lobbying machen.

Noch ein Wort an die linke Seite dieses Parlaments – S&D, Grüne und GUE: Ich finde es unverschämte, der EVP und den anderen Fraktionen, die sich für einen moderaten Vorschlag aussprechen, der Innovationen schützt und gleichzeitig dem Bürger die Öffentlichkeit bringt, die er vielleicht haben will, vorzuwerfen, dass wir gegen Verbraucherschutz und nur für Industrieinteressen eintreten. Das ist ein Unding, eine Unverschämtheit.

Industrie – ich meine damit die Hersteller, ja, nicht die große böse Industrie; aber, Industrie ist ja in Ihren Augen immer böse – Industrie – die Hersteller –, das ist auch ein Teil unserer Gesellschaft. Die bieten Arbeitsplätze, die wir dringend brauchen. Übrigens ist der Lebensmittelsektor einer der größten in der Europäischen Union überhaupt. Er stellt Millionen von Arbeitsplätzen, und alle diese Arbeitnehmer sind auch Verbraucher. An deren Interessen sollte man vielleicht auch einmal denken, wenn die Gefahr besteht, dass die Unternehmen ihre Forschung und vielleicht letztendlich auch ihre Produktion ins Ausland verlagern.

Und nein, es geht nicht immer nur um Glyphosat. Die Glyphosat-Debatte war der Anlass für diese Geschichte. Aber es kann nicht sein, dass der ganze Lebensmittelbereich wegen dieser Glyphosat-Debatte gestraft und mit existenzgefährdenden Regeln überzogen wird. Wir sind alle für Transparenz, aber wir wollen es gut machen.

Przewodniczący. – Bardzo Pani dziękuję, przekroczyła Pani swój czas. Tym samym debata stała się gorąca, ale niestety muszę ją zamknąć.

Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 grudnia 2018 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 162)

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – De risicobeoordelingen van de Europese Autoriteit voor voedselveiligheid (EFSA), bij de evaluatie van mogelijk schadelijke stoffen, roepen vaak heel veel vragen op en stuiten op weerstand bij de publieke opinie. Meer transparantie over de gevolgde procedures en de resultaten van het onderzoek, is absoluut nodig. En meer transparantie hoeft niet te conflicteren met respect voor de intellectuele- eigendomsrechten van de producenten. Net daarom steunen we de voorstellen van rapporteur Sommer. Ze zijn ambitieus en toch evenwichtig. Wij zijn voor deze wetwijziging omdat er, zoals gezegd, dringend nood is aan een transparante onderzoeksmethode, mét respect voor de intellectuele eigendom en de R&D-inspanningen van de bedrijven die dossiers indienen bij de EFSA.

Mireille D'Ornano (EFDD), par écrit. – A la suite de nombreux scandales, un débat public sur les pesticides a eu lieu, débat dont une initiative citoyenne s'est emparée. Face au succès de cette initiative, la Commission a estimé qu'il convenait de renforcer la confiance du public dans les évaluations des risques. Elle s'est résolue à présenter une proposition législative en la matière concernant les règles relatives aux activités de l'EFSA. La volonté de renforcer la transparence de l'EFSA ne peut qu'être saluée. Néanmoins, la Commission envisage toutes ces modifications avant même les conclusions de la commission PEST, commission spéciale du Parlement européen sur la procédure d'autorisation des pesticides. Cette façon de procéder laisse penser que cette commission spéciale n'a été créée que pour la forme, ce qui est très regrettable.

16. Plena aplicación de las disposiciones del acervo de Schengen en Bulgaria y Rumanía (debate)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Sergeia Stanisheva w imieniu Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, Sprawiedliwości i Spraw Wewnętrznych w sprawie pełnego stosowania przepisów dorobku Schengen w Bułgarii i Rumunii: zniesienie kontroli na wewnętrznych granicach lądowych, morskich i powietrznych (2018/2092(INI)) (A8-0365/2018).

Сергей Станишев, Rapporteur. – Уважаеми г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Комисар, преди всичко искам да благодаря на комисар Наврачич и на колегите от Европейския парламент, които участват в този дебат, за да изразим за пореден път нашата подкрепа за членството на България и Румъния в Шенген.

Странното е, че тук няма представител на Съвета – институцията, към която всъщност този дебат и докладът са адресирани, въпреки обещанието, което беше дадено през юли пред комисията LIBE от министри от австрийското правителство, че това ще бъде в дневния ред на Съвета през това полугодие. Очевидно, Съвета няма какво да отговори за своята позиция.

Всъщност истината е, че в продължение на седем години Европейския съвет е в нарушение на европейските правила, невземайки решение за членството на България и Румъния в Шенген. И се изтъкват всевъзможни причини от 2011 г. досега. В това число, тук в тази зала, премиерът на Холандия, г-н Рюте, преди няколко месеца заяви, че „сделката си е сделка“ и трябва да бъде изпълнявана от всички. Само че обърка сделката, споразумението. Той се опита да смеси критериите за Шенген с Механизма за сътрудничество и проверка в областта на правосъдието, а това е нечестно към България и Румъния.

Целта на този доклад обаче не е просто да се призове за пореден път за членството на двете страни в Шенген, тъй като критериите, всички критерии са категорично изпълнени. Това е оценката на експертите и на страните членки, и на Европейската комисия. Става дума за това, че през последните години, особено през тази година, се прокрадва и налага една нова идея или компромис, както казват, за „нов тип“ частично членство в Шенген. Предлага се България и Румъния да бъдат приети само по въздух и по море, като за неопределено време се отложи членството на страните в Шенген и свободното пътуване по сухопътни граници, което противоречи както на всички основни правила на Европейския съюз, така и на здравия разум.

Тази идея търси подкрепа и съвсем конюнктурно я намира. Искам обаче да изтъкна няколко основни причини, поради които тя е опасен прецедент, който не бива да бъде допускан.

Първо тя ще отложи за пореден път за неопределено време освобождаването, вдигането на контрола по сухопътни граници.

Второ, поэтапното влизане гарантира още икономически загуби и пропуснати ползи, както за България, за нейните граждани, за фирмите, които изнасят, така и за европейските фирми и европейските страни, които внасят стоки за България и ще трябва да губят много време, и ще оскъпяват крайния продукт.

Трето, ще бетонира двойния стандарт в Шенген. Искам да подчертая, шенгенското законодателство не е създадено да функционира с две категории държави – страни, които са пълноправни членове, и такива, които са само с единия крак вътре.

Затова искам да призова Парламента да подкрепи този доклад и да дадем много ясно категорична визия и позиция на Европейския парламент. Времето за общите приказки изтече, минаха седем години откакто са изгълнени всички критерии. Сега трябва да се даде ясен и категоричен знак към Европейския съвет да изпълни своето задължение.

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the Commission supports the full accession to Schengen by Bulgaria and Romania. President Juncker recalled this position in his State of the Union speech in September 2017. He called for the Schengen area of free movement to be opened immediately to Bulgaria and Romania and to allow Croatia to become a full Schengen member once all the criteria are met. This will be an important step towards a better and more harmonised protection of the Schengen external borders.

Bulgaria and Romania joining Schengen in full will not only enlarge the area of free movement, but at the same time make the Schengen tools more performant and increase security. As we know, the final decision lies with the Council and unanimity is required. Neither the Commission nor Parliament has a formal role in this process.

The Commission has suggested concrete steps for Bulgaria and Romania to participate already in two important elements of the Schengen acquis. It proposed that both Member States have passive access to the Visa Information System, as well as full access to the Schengen Information System. Parliament and the Council approved both proposals. The Commission will reiterate to the Council that the Schengen evaluations of Bulgaria and Romania were finalised during 2010-2011. These evaluations concluded that Bulgaria and Romania had fulfilled the relevant criteria for full accession. It's now for the Council to decide and it's high time for this to happen.

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΠΑΠΑΔΗΜΟΥΛΗΣ

Αντιπρόεδρος

Carlos Coelho, em nome do Grupo PPE. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, Caros Colegas, o que hoje aqui debatemos não é, infelizmente, um tema novo. Já em 2011 este Parlamento aprovou a entrada da Bulgária e da Roménia no Espaço Schengen, defendendo a abolição imediata dos controlos nas fronteiras internas com estes dois países.

Tive a honra de ser o relator do Parlamento para esta questão há 7 anos e também este ano, através do relatório anual sobre o estado de Schengen, defendi a adesão plena e imediata da Bulgária e da Roménia ao espaço Schengen.

Hoje, com este relatório do colega Stanishev, que aproveito para felicitar pelo excelente trabalho que realizou, mantenho a mesma posição. É importante relembrar que todos os requisitos estão cumpridos e apenas porque é necessária a unanimidade no Conselho, ou a opinião política de alguns Estados-Membros, romenos e búlgaros ainda são tratados como cidadãos europeus de segunda.

Numa altura em que vários Estados-Membros têm imposto controlos ilegais nas fronteiras internas, como este Parlamento já denunciou, e quando as avaliações revelam falhas preocupantes na proteção das suas fronteiras, é difícil entender as reticências face à Bulgária e à Roménia.

E para os que invocarem a questão da corrupção e dos problemas que ainda persistem nestes dois países, sejamos claros: a corrupção não é um critério de adesão a Schengen, mas, se queremos que seja, então deverá sê-lo para todos os Estados-Membros, indistintamente. Não podemos ter critérios de avaliação que sejam só para uns e não para todos.

É verdade que o Governo romeno tem, de forma alarmante, destruído os avanços feitos nos últimos anos no que diz respeito ao combate à corrupção e isso não pode deixar de merecer a nossa firme condenação, mas não tenho dúvidas de que a Bulgária e a Roménia devem entrar já em Schengen e devem poder beneficiar do espaço de livre circulação como cidadãos europeus.

Emilian Pavel, *în numele grupului S&D*. – Domnule președinte, aș dori să-i mulțumesc în primul rând să raportorului, domnul Sergei Stanishev, pentru acest raport. Îi mulțumesc și domnului Coelho pentru vechiul raport, care, de fapt, spune același lucru – România și Bulgaria trebuiau să fie de mult timp membre ale Schengen.

Cetățenii români, cetățenii bulgari sunt discriminați de peste 7 ani de zile. Astăzi, noi spunem aici în plen și mâine vom vota să oprim această discriminare a acestor cetățeni ai noștri, a românilor și a bulgarilor.

Este un simplu joc politic al Consiliului, care nici măcar nu a făcut efortul sau nu a avut bunăvoința de a se prezenta astăzi să ne asculte doleanțele, dar vorbesc cu dumneavoastră domnule comisar și sper să transmiteți mai departe Comisiei Europene să nu accepte, în nici un caz, condiții suplimentare pentru aderarea României și Bulgariei la Spațiul Schengen. Vă cer, domnule comisar, să transmiteți președintelui Juncker și tuturor comisarilor să nu accepte ca România și Bulgaria să fie primite doar cu frontierele aeriene și maritime, ci și cu frontierele terestre.

De ce? Pentru că îndeplinim toate criteriile tehnice, pentru că am investit mulți bani ai plătitorilor de taxe și impozite atât din România, cât și din Uniunea Europeană și din Bulgaria pentru a securiza frontierele europene. Și facem acest lucru foarte bine, iar domnul Coelho și colegii care au lucrat la dosare știu foarte bine cât de bine muncim în a securiza frontiere dificile ale Uniunii Europene.

Opriti discriminarea, dragi colegi din Consiliul Uniunii Europene, și respectați legea europeană, așa cum o cereți celorlalți.

Ангел Джамбазки, *от името на групата ECR*. – г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, уважаеми колеги, позволете ми първо да поздравя докладчика, г-н Станишев, за този доклад. Ние вкъщи сме политически противници, но неговият доклад е проевропейски. Всички, които смятат в тази зала и обявяват себе си за проевропейски настроени, би трябвало да го подкрепят.

Решението България и Румъния да не бъдат в Шенген е чисто политическо. Всички технически критерии са изпълнени, всички изисквания са направени, но спирането на България и на Румъния се дължи на вътрешните проблеми в държави като Холандия, държави като Германия, държави като Австрия, и това е нередно, нечестно, двулично и лицемерно. Точно такива решения, уважаеми, засилват скептицизма в Източна Европа по отношение на Европейския съюз, защото това политическо решение има своите икономически измерения, защото може би най-европейската икономическа активност в България и в Румъния е транспортът, спедицията. Повече от 150 000 семейства в България се издържат и живеят от транспорта. И днес от Румъния, от Букурещ до Русе на 70 км пътувате по 12–13 часа. И днес от Благоевград до Солун, където са 200 км, пътувате много повече време.

Това спъва икономическата активност, това разрушава усилията на тези хора и ги прави бедни, и ги кара да емигрират. По този начин политическото решение, зад което се крият господа като Рюте, господа като хората, които управляват Германия и Австрия, поражда емиграция и изпразва нашите държави откъм млади и предприемчиви хора, и ние не можем да позволим това да се случва, уважаеми. Този доклад трябва да бъде приет и да бъде одобрен и това лицемерие трябва да бъде прекратено.

Филиз Хюсменова, от името на групата ALDE. – г-н Председател, уважаеми колеги, г-н Комисар, с огорчение отбелязвам, че днес съвсем не е първият път, в който Европейския парламент заема ясна и твърда позиция, че изпълнените критерии за членство в Шенгенското пространство трябва да доведат до приемането на България и Румъния в Шенген.

Днес пак припомняме, че двете страни изпълниха критериите за прием още през 2011 г. Седем години по-късно бездействието на Съвета налага да разгледаме въпроса отново. Неоднократно съм изтъквала и днес отново ще заявя, че ефективно осигуряване на гранична сигурност за целия Европейски съюз не може да бъде постигнато в пълнота без пълен достъп на България и Румъния до всички информационни системи. Предоставянето само на частичен достъп на двете страни поради това, че не са членки на Шенген, води до уязвимост на граничните ни системи.

Неведнъж е поставян въпросът с разходите за европейската икономика, които вътрешните граници пораждаат. Вносът и износът към и от двете страни са силно засегнати от времето за чакане на вътрешните гранично пропускателни пунктове. Отрицателно е въздействието върху транспортните операции от и до някои от най-големите морски пристанища в Южна Европа.

Аз съм убеден европейец. По-голямата част от българските и румънските граждани подкрепят ценностите и идеите на Съюза. Ние сме за стриктното прилагане на общото европейско право. Нарушаването му в продължение на толкова години отваря големи въпроси за възможностите на Европейския съюз за саморегулация и за неговата устойчивост. Точно затова аз благодаря на вас, всички колеги в Европейския парламент, които нито за момент не се разколебахте относно спазването на правилата и заемате правилната позиция. Двойният стандарт, който се прилага към България и Румъния, е дискриминационен спрямо гражданите на двете страни, а крещящата несправедливост оставя съмнения за върховенството на правото, за силата на евроинституциите и руши доверието. У тях остава горчиво усещане за вторично гражданство в Съюза. Отдавна е крайно време Съветът да докаже, че правилата са еднакви за всички и неотложно да предприеме нужните действия по приемането на България и Румъния в Шенген по всички сухопътни, морски и въздушни граници.

Асим Адемов (PPE). – г-н Председател, уважаеми г-н Станишев, съгласно Акта за присъединяване към Европейския съюз от 2005 г. единственото условие за влизане на България и Румъния в Шенген е успешното изпълнение на необходимите критерии.

Успешното изпълнение на критериите е потвърдено от Съвета на 9 юни 2011 г., когато Съветът заявява, че България и Румъния са изпълнили условията във всички области. Преди седем години са изпълнени критериите от страна на България и Румъния, но вече седем години влизането на двете страни в Шенген не се случва. Някои държави членки се противопоставят, като изтъкват доводи и критерии, които ги няма в предварително написаните от тях. Държавите членки, които са против влизането на България и Румъния в Шенгенското пространство, грубо нарушават правилата, които самите те са приели и гласували.

Това е драстичен и изключително лош пример за прилагането на двойни стандарти. Двойни стандарти при храните, двойни стандарти по отношение на Шенген. Това отношение към България и Румъния е крайно несправедливо и обидно към двете страни. Това е недемократично и неевропейско отношение.

Идеята за така наречения двуетапен подход за премахване на проверките първо по въздушните и морски граници, а после по сухопътните, ще бъде правен парадокс и ще е продължение на политиката на двоен стандарт. Когато говорим за върховенство на закона, е хубаво това да не бъдат само красиви думи и фрази, а и реални действия, което означава, че след като една държава членка е изпълнила критериите за влизане в Шенген, следва незабавно да се премахнат проверките по сухопътните, въздушните и морските граници, защото такива са правилата и те трябва да се спазват.

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). – Señor presidente, comisaria Jourová, querido Sergei Stanishev, llegué a este Parlamento Europeo en el año 2009 y, como presidente de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior y antiguo ministro de Justicia de España, me tomé muy en serio la lectura del Tratado de Lisboa, que entró en vigor precisamente ese año, y del espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia, cuya primera promesa —artículo 67— es la libre circulación de personas dentro de una gestión integrada de las fronteras exteriores de la Unión.

Y desde el año 2009, hace ya nada menos que nueve años, viene pidiendo este Parlamento Europeo la plena incorporación de Bulgaria y Rumanía a ese espacio de libre circulación de personas porque han hecho sus deberes desde entonces.

Hemos pedido consistentemente, por tanto, que la decisión por parte del Consejo de adoptar un acto jurídico único que reconozca la supresión total de las fronteras terrestres, marítimas y aéreas con Bulgaria y Rumanía sea una realidad, porque, mientras no lo sea, la Unión Europea continuará fallando a su promesa. Allí donde más aporta la Unión Europea, el espacio de libertad, seguridad y justicia, la Unión Europea tiene todavía una cuenta pendiente con Bulgaria, Rumanía y con los búlgaros y los rumanos.

Laurențiu Rebega (ECR). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, de când am fost ales membru al acestui Parlament, pledez pentru intrarea României și Bulgariei în Spațiul Schengen, atât eu, cât și colegii mei români, bulgari, dar și alți colegi din alte țări.

Argumentele tehnice s-au repetat de sute de ori, Parlamentul însuși a votat mai multe recomandări în acest sens adresate Consiliului, dar Consiliul a decis, de fiecare dată, altfel. Impresia compatrioților noștri este că suntem ținuti în anti-cameră, ca niște rude sărace ale Uniunii Europene. Și totuși, marile probleme ale Uniunii nu vin nici de la București, nici de la Sofia.

Potrivit datelor Eurostat, România și Bulgaria sunt țările în care cetățenii au cea mai mare încredere în Uniunea Europeană. Oare, pentru a fi primiți în Spațiul Schengen, ar trebui să nu mai avem încredere în proiectul european?

Ceea ce vedem este că Uniunea s-a oprit într-un punct în care statele membre nu mai sunt suverane, dar nu sunt nici egale pentru a putea vorbi, cu adevărat, despre solidaritate. Este nevoie să dăm un impuls proiectului european, este nevoie de reformă și de implicare, este nevoie de adeziunea profundă a cetățenilor.

Primirea României și Bulgariei în Schengen este un pas în această direcție.

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Mr President, there are very few to argue against the claim that the Schengen area is one of the major achievements of European integration. As a powerful enabler of the free movement of persons, goods and services, it has brought significant benefits to European businesses and citizens. It especially allowed the latter to directly experience the four freedoms of the single market. It is not surprising, therefore, that they place it at the top of the most cherished EU accomplishments.

All this makes the fact that 11 years after their accession, Romania and Bulgaria are still not members of the area difficult to understand and especially difficult to explain to the citizens of these countries. Seven years have passed since the evaluation process confirmed that the two countries fulfilled the necessary conditions for the application of the Schengen acquis in all areas, and Romania and Bulgaria are still not members of the borderless area.

This is a fundamentally unequitable situation in the EU, not just because the two countries have invested massively to increase their law enforcement capacity to meet all technical compliance criteria, but also because the continued maintenance of border controls has a large negative impact on the economies of these two Member States.

Just as importantly, the failure to apply the Treaty provisions undermines the credibility of and erodes support for the EU – as recent Eurobarometer surveys keep demonstrating. It is in the whole EU's interest that the Council treat all Member States equally and grant fully-fledged Schengen membership to these countries.

Maria Grapini (S&D). – Domnule președinte, domnule comisar, vreau de la bun început să mulțumesc tuturor colegilor, indiferent de grupul politic, care astăzi, iată, încă o dată, subliniază alături de raportor că România și Bulgaria întrunesc toate condițiile pentru a fi în spațiul Schengen. De altfel, însăși Consiliul, în 2011, a fost de acord cu verificarea și evaluarea făcută de specialiști și s-a constatat că, nu numai că și a făcut lecția cum a spus un coleg, România și Bulgaria au cheltuit, au făcut investiții ca să răspundă regulamentului Schengen. Din păcate, elevul indisciplinat nu este aici, Consiliul nu este aici.

Domnule comisar, suntem într-o situație critică cu Europa. Ce dorește de fapt Consiliul? De ce mai suntem noi 750 de eurodeputați aici, dacă 27 de state, și nu 27 de state, ci unu, doi, trei șefi de stat decid să încalce un regulament care este foarte clar și pe care cele două state îl îndeplinesc. Aici vorbim de libertatea de mișcare a cetățenilor, vorbim de faptul că sunt pierderi economice și vorbim de faptul că există acum o discriminare clară între state și între cetățenii statelor.

Eu cred că o să fac o scrisoare, am făcut multe scrisori și am luat de multe ori cuvântul legat de această problemă, adresată Consiliului, prin care să propun desființarea Parlamentului European. Dacă democrația este cu capul în jos și un Parlament, care are cea mai mare reprezentativitate, are, de atâtea ori, o rezoluție și un punct de vedere legate de acest subiect, dacă o Comisie are un punct de vedere pe acest subiect, dacă evaluatorii și specialiștii spun că îndeplinim condițiile, de ce se inventează motive politice? Pentru că sunt pur și simplu motive politice.

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, pristupanje schengenskom prostoru i posljedično ukidanje provjera na unutarnjim granicama mora biti jasan i transparentan proces. Postoje konkretni kriteriji, pa nakon njihova ispunjenja ne bi smjelo biti otezanja iz političkih razloga.

Moramo imati na umu da je slobodno kretanje bez provjera jedna od glavnih koristi članstva u Uniji u očima građana pa svako pretjerano politiziranje ovog pitanja ruši njihovo povjerenje u europske institucije. To se pogotovo događa kad Vijeće i Parlament imaju potpuno različit pristup jednom ovako važnom pitanju.

Pristup Vijeća po mom je mišljenju pogrešan i uvodi pravnu nesigurnost. Budući da dolazim iz Hrvatske, države kojoj je pristupanje Schengenu strateški cilj, doista se nadam da se u našem slučaju neće ovoliko politizirati.

Daniel Buda (PPE). – Domnule președinte, în primul rând felicit și eu raportorul pentru munca depusă. Libera circulație este un privilegiu fundamental al Uniunii Europene. Încă din anul 2011, Consiliul a concluzionat că România și Bulgaria îndeplinesc toate condițiile tehnice privind accesul în spațiul Schengen. Astăzi suntem furnizori de pace, securitate și stabilitate în regiune, iar acest refuz de a intra în acest spațiu este de natură să ducă la creșterea populismului și extremismului în regiune.

În dezbaterile publice se vorbește de interese economice care determină în Consiliu poziția unor țări, așa cum este Olanda. Atrag atenția acestora să nu uite că este unul dintre cei mai mari investitori în România, iar aceștia au pierderi însemnate în acest context. În același timp, să nu uite că portul Constanța nu a fost și nu este de vânzare.

Știu că, în România, avem probleme cu o guvernare dezastruoasă, însă Consiliul trebuie să înțeleagă că accesul în spațiul Schengen nu este acordat pentru cei câțiva miniștri din guvernul PSD-ALDE, ci milioanele de cetățeni romani și firmele din România, care nu pot fi pedepsiți și trebuie să se bucure de aceleași drepturi ca toți cetățenii Uniunii Europene.

Astăzi, România are cea mai mare contribuție militară în cadrul agenției Frontex. Cu alte cuvinte, suntem buni să apărăm granițele Uniunii Europene, dar nu suntem buni să fim în Schengen.

Consiliul are obligația de a-i respecta pe români și pe bulgari și trebuie să primească de îndată cele două state în acest spațiu.

Tonino Picula (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, čestitam kolegi Stanishevu na izvješću koje zaslužuje doista punu podršku Europskog parlamenta. Vrijeme je da počnemo dosljedno primjenjivati pravila koja smo si sami postavili. Bugarska i Rumunjska ispunile su sve preduvjete za ulazak u Schengen i ukidanje graničnih kontrola na kopnu, moru i zraku. Schengen u dvije brzine treba dokinuti, te pozdravljam ponovljeni poziv Vijeću da jedinstvenim aktom uključi u schengenski prostor dvije članice koje su uvjete ispunile pred sedam godina.

Dolazim iz države koja je u procesu ispunjavanja tih istih kriterija, države koja uspješno kontrolira najdulju europsku vanjsku granicu, i zato očekujem isti tretman i za Hrvatsku. Taj stav dijeli i izvjestitelj, na čemu mu posebno zahvaljujem.

Schengen – jedno od najvidljivijih postignuća europskih integracija – ne smije biti kolateralna žrtva deficita naših sigurnosnih politika. Neprihvatljivo je da su 2018. Bugarska i Rumunjska još izvan Schengena, a Hrvatska, najmlađa članica Unije, ogradena od susjednih članica bodljivom žicom.

Νότης Μαριάς (ECR). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η εφαρμογή της Σένγκεν είναι μία φάρσα, κύριοι συνάδελφοι! Αυτό το βλέπετε όταν έρχεστε στο Στρασβούργο. Δεν μπορεί να βγει κανείς στο αεροδρόμιο του Στρασβούργου, εάν δεν περάσει διαβατηριακό έλεγχο. Το θεωρείτε αυτό σωστό; Ακόμη και σήμερα ερχόμενοι από την Αθήνα περάσαμε από διαβατηριακό έλεγχο. Πέρασαμε από ένα χώρο που έλεγε άφιξη από διεθνείς πτήσεις. Το ίδιο γίνεται και στις Βρυξέλλες. Υπάρχει καραντίνα και παράνομος διαβατηριακός έλεγχος των Ελλήνων που έρχονται από την Αθήνα. Αυτή είναι η πραγματικότητα, διότι η Σένγκεν είναι πλέον μία φάρσα. Εφαρμόζουν τη Σένγκεν μόνο όσοι θέλουν και υιοθετούν εξαιρέσεις και δεν την εφαρμόζουν συγκεκριμένες χώρες ανάλογα με το τι τους βολεύει. Αυτή είναι πραγματικότητα και αυτό πρέπει να καταγγελθεί συνολικά!

Μία παρατήρηση για τους φίλους από τη Βουλγαρία: Αυτό που παρατηρείται πλέον είναι ότι έχει αλλάξει ο δρόμος της παράνομης μετανάστευσης από Τουρκία σε Βουλγαρία και εν συνέχεια από τη Βουλγαρία εισέρχονται παράνομως στην Ελλάδα χιλιάδες παράνομοι μετανάστες και έχουμε συγκεκριμένα γεγονότα. Πρέπει αυτό να προσεχθεί, διότι όλα αυτά διαμορφώνουν μια άσχημη κατάσταση συνολικά και για τη Βουλγαρία και για τη Ρουμανία και για την Ελλάδα.

Maria Gabriela Zoană (S&D). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, este a doua oară pe anul acesta când votăm o rezoluție pentru acceptarea României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen. Rezoluția anterioară nu a avut niciun efect. De ce? Pentru că Consiliul nu a luat nicio decizie în acest sens. Și iată că, astăzi, tocmai Consiliul lipsește din sală, deși această discuție în plenară, deși această rezoluție pe care o să o votăm din nou se adresează în principal Consiliului! Consiliul este cel care nu respectă drepturile celor două țări.

De asemenea, doresc să mulțumesc tuturor colegilor care au votat rezoluția anterioară și rog din nou colegii europeni să voteze pozitiv pentru acceptarea României și Bulgariei în spațiul Schengen. De data aceasta, cred eu, este necesară fixarea unui termen, astfel încât cetățenii celor două țări să se bucure cât mai mult de aceleași drepturi pe care le au toți cetățenii europeni.

România și Bulgaria au îndeplinit condițiile tehnice de foarte mulți ani, ba, mai mult, aplică regulile de acces în spațiul Schengen și cooperează excelent cu statele membre în privința respectării acestora și în privința depistării situațiilor care contravin legislației specifice. Solicit imperativ acceptarea celor două țări în spațiul Schengen și propun să stabilim un termen specific.

Haideți să vorbim cu cărțile pe față. România nu a fost acceptată în spațiul Schengen până acum din cauza interesului economic al unor țări. Însă Uniunea Europeană aparține tuturor statelor membre, nu numai unora dintre acestea.

Διαδικασία «Catch-the-Eye»

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE). – Domnule președinte, România și Bulgaria sunt pregătite de mai mulți ani să facă parte deplin din sistemul Schengen, dar chestiuni politice interne din unele țări din spațiul Schengen au împiedicat ca acest lucru să se întâmple până acum. În ceea ce privește România, se mai adaugă un interes concret al unei țări importante, Olanda, care își apără un avantaj comercial.

Da, astăzi, România are o mare problemă cu o guvernare iresponsabilă, care are o retorică greșită în raport cu Uniunea Europeană și o abordare și mai greșită în domeniul justiției, al funcționării statului de drept, dar și în economie. Dar ținerea României în afara spațiului Schengen va da apă la moară unei retorici naționalist-populiste sau chiar retoricii euro-cinice a actualei guvernări.

Drept și corect ar fi ca România și Bulgaria să fie parte a sistemului Schengen și acest lucru ar fi în interesul funcționării mai bune a sistemului Schengen, dar și al unei mai bune construcții europene.

Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă unei întrebări adresate în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru” (articolul 162 alineatul (8) din Regulamentul de procedură).

Emilian Pavel (S&D), *întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”*. – E foarte greu de înțeles de ce, astăzi, deși trebuie să vorbim sau vrem să vorbim despre România și Bulgaria intrând în Schengen, vorbim despre cât de prost merge economia în România, când avem cea mai mare creștere economică din Uniunea Europeană și asta de foarte mulți ani sub guvernarea social-democrată. Vorbim despre niște neadevăruri și vorbim pe lângă subiect.

Haideți să ne obișnuim, dragi colegi deputați români, să nu mai înjurăm, să nu mai defăimăm țara asta, aici, la Bruxelles! Haideți să ne concentrăm pe ce trebuie să se întâmple aici și ce trebuie să însemne acest raport, România și Bulgaria în Schengen!

Întrebarea este de ce faceți acest lucru.

President. – I do not think that was a real question. You can answer such a question, but I would ask Members, please, not to use the blue card to make comments.

Cristian-Silviu Bușoi (PPE), *răspuns la o întrebare adresată în conformitate cu procedura „cartonașului albastru”*. – Nu a defăimat nimeni România, eu nu am făcut-o în intervenția mea.

Am spus clar și răspicat că există o problemă de imagine a României, astăzi, datorată actualei guvernări, care are o retorică greșită față de Uniunea Europeană, care face lucruri greșite, în primul rând în justiție, dar și în economie, în ciuda unei creșteri economice. Această creștere este risipită pe anumite cheltuieli care nu vor aduce o plusvaloare.

Dar România și Bulgaria au dreptul să intre în Schengen. România are dreptul să intre în Schengen și va intra, în ciuda iresponsabilității actualei guvernări.

Πρόεδρος. – Το Προεδρείο κρατά ότι συμφωνείτε στο θέμα της Σένγκεν, παρότι έχετε διαφορετικές απόψεις για θέματα εσωτερικής πολιτικής στη Ρουμανία.

Δίνω τον λόγο στον επόμενο ομιλητή.

Doru-Claudian Frunzulică (S&D). – Domnule președinte, în această cea mai importantă instituție democratică a Uniunii Europene, cerem dreptate pentru România și Bulgaria. Cerem dreptate pentru cetățenii români și pentru cetățenii bulgari. Cerem ca cetățenii români și cetățenii bulgari să nu mai fie discriminați în comparație cu alți cetățeni ai Uniunii Europene.

România și Bulgaria, doamnelor și domnilor, îndeplinesc condițiile de aderare la spațiul Schengen. Ele se comportă deja și acționează ca membri *de facto* ai spațiului Schengen și gestionează mii de kilometri pe frontierele externe ale Uniunii Europene.

Cum să asigurăm siguranța și securitatea cetățenilor europeni, când, pe frontierele externe, România și Bulgaria nu sunt membre ale Schengen? Cum să asigurăm securitatea, în momentul în care vedeți foarte bine ce se întâmplă cu atentatele teroriste, cu imigrația ilegală în Europa? Și se cere o mărire a securității Uniunii Europene. Cum este posibil să asigurăm acest lucru fără România și Bulgaria?

Doamnelor și domnilor, este o rușine că nu avem Consiliul prezent. Vă rog, domnule președinte, să vă sesizați și să solicitați de ce Consiliul nu a fost prezent astăzi.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, παρά το γεγονός ότι και η Βουλγαρία και η Ρουμανία πληρούν τις προϋποθέσεις για να γίνουν πλήρη μέλη της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν, το Συμβούλιο κωλυσιεργεί και δεν τους δίνει αυτή τη δυνατότητα. Βεβαίως αυτό έχει άμεσες επιπτώσεις και σε θέματα οικονομικά αλλά και κυρίως πρακτικά, διότι στα σύνορα των δύο χωρών διεξάγονται έλεγχοι. Επιπλέον, λόγω της εμφανούς αποτυχίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως να ελέγξει τις ροές των μεταναστών, κυρίως των παρανόμων, προς την Ευρώπη, πολλές φορές πραγματοποιούν ελέγχους στα σύνορά τους και στην πράξη έχει καταργηθεί η Συνθήκη Σένγκεν. Αυτό όμως δεν σημαίνει ότι θα πρέπει να αρνηθεί το Συμβούλιο το δικαίωμα στη Βουλγαρία και τη Ρουμανία να γίνουν μέλη του τη στιγμή κατά την οποία πληρούν τις προϋποθέσεις. Από την άλλη πλευρά, ας λάβουμε υπόψη ότι πολλές φορές η διεύρυνση του χώρου του Σένγκεν χρησιμοποιείται ως μέσον για να εξυπηρετηθούν κάποιες πολιτικές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως, όπως εκείνη της δημιουργίας της ενώσεως ασφαλείας και της μεταρρυθμίσεως του ασύλου. Παρ' όλα αυτά επαναλαμβάνω ότι η Ρουμανία και η Βουλγαρία έχουν δικαίωμα να γίνουν μέλη του Σένγκεν και πρέπει να γίνουν.

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-н Председател, г-н Комисар, искам първо да благодаря на г-н Станишев за този доклад, да го поздравя и за преизбирането му за председател на Партията на европейските социалисти, успех Ви желая. Благодаря и на г-н Куелю за неговия доклад и неговия ангажимент по темата.

Смятам, че е показателно това, че Европейският съвет липсва днес от този дебат, поне от куртоазия можеше да изпратят някой тук. Мисля, че всички експерти са наясно, че от България и Румъния не произлиза риск за Шенгенското пространство. Напротив, обратното е факт, че когато България и Румъния станат пълноправни членове на Шенгенското пространство, ще имаме повече сигурност в това пространство. Не може да се правят връзки между Механизма за сътрудничество и проверка и критериите за Шенген. Не може да има двойни стандарти, това обезверява европейските граждани. България иска да бъде част от всички интеграционни процеси в Европейския съюз, както и Шенген, така и еврозоната, така и Банковия съюз, така и Отбранителния съюз, и особено преди европейските избори Съветът трябва да даде най-накрая един ясен сигнал, че няма двойни стандарти.

Не можем да продължаваме с това. Да, разбирам че има избори, разбирам, че има популизъм, но най-накрая трябва да се вземе крайно решение.

Claudia Țăpădel (S&D). – Domnule președinte, dragi colegi, este o situație destul de jenantă pentru construcția europeană faptul că, în această seară, Consiliul lipsește la o discuție foarte importantă despre construcția europeană, și anume construcția și ceea ce ține de spațiul Schengen.

Dar pentru că avem Comisia și Consiliul aici prezente, știm cu toții că acestea au susținut în repetate rânduri în ultimii ani că atât România, cât și Bulgaria, începând încă din anul 2011, îndeplinesc toate criteriите tehnice ce țin de integrarea deplină în spațiul Schengen. De asemenea, trebuie să nu uităm faptul că aceste două țări fac parte din Системата de informații privind визите и din Системата de informații Schengen, системи instituite tocmai pentru a gestiona și apăра mai bine frontierите externe ale Uniunii Europene. Dar, в mod paradoxal, dacă не chiar absurd, Consiliul refuză интеграцията deplină а acestor două țări в spațiul Schengen.

De aceea cer Consiliului, chiar и в липса, să ia o decizie pozitivă в acest sens. Este моментът ca anumite state membre – и менționез aici, в special, Оlanda – să renunте la dublul standard и la интересе политическе и економическе egoiste care determină blocarea accesului României la spațiul Schengen.

Nu се mai poate să tolerăm o astfel de situație и o să transmit и eu, в calitate de român, că portul Constanța aparține României и românilor и не este de vânzare.

(Λήξη της διαδικασίας «Catch-the-Eye»)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, indeed, the Commission's position on Bulgaria's and Romania's accession to the Schengen area is clear and unequivocal: Romania and Bulgaria met the criteria of Schengen membership. So our position is that the Council hold open the Schengen area of free movement to Bulgaria and Romania immediately. However, the final decision lies with the Council; we know that unanimity is required, and the Commission doesn't have a formal role in this process.

Sergei Stanishev, Rapporteur. – Mr President, I would like to thank all my colleagues who spoke out in favour of supporting the report. I would especially like to thank Mr Coelho, who was the shadow rapporteur, and the other shadow rapporteurs. He was dealing with this matter seven years ago, preparing the Parliament's report.

What we are facing is a shame. The Council is absent because they have nothing to say. What can they say? We are violating European legislation and the rules. That's what they should say. In reality, the situation is the following: we are discussing today the destiny and life of 30 million European citizens. Each time a Bulgarian or Romanian citizen comes to the Schengen border, they feel personally that they are being treated like second-class citizens of the European Union. That's it.

It's very modern today to express concerns about the lack of trust in the European Union. It comes from a very simple thing. Words have been devalued by actions or inaction. When there is a huge gap between what we say and what the Council should do, and what is being done or not done, this is a major source of disappointment for the citizens. This is why I think the best thing that the Parliament can do tomorrow is to send a very powerful message, with a big majority, to the Council: do your duty and fulfil your obligations. The countries have done their homework. You should accept Bulgaria and Romania at all Schengen borders. Otherwise, they will be irrelevant. If the leaders who achieved so many things for the European Union in the past had acted as some of the leaders in the Council are doing today – thinking about public opinion polls today and about what happens the next day, but not in the longer term – we would never

have the European Union as it is today. That's the reality.

(Applause)

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί αύριο.

Граπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 162 του Κανονισμού)

Емил Радев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Повече от 10 години след приемането на България в Европейския съюз и седем години след успешното преминаване на техническата оценка за присъединяване към Шенген, България все още не е част от пространството за свободно движение. Недопустимо е това нарушаване на европейските правила и норми, които не предполагат налагането на допълнителни, особено политически мотивирани, критерии, нямаша основа в европейското законодателство!

Обвързването на приемането ни в Шенген с механизъм, който не е общоприложим за всички държави членки, а е единствено замислен за две конкретни страни, е доказателство за прилагането на двойни стандарти в рамките на Европейския съюз. Още по-притеснително е, че това е опит за създаване на Европа на две скорости – не въз основа на суверенно решение на дадена държава членка да се присъедини или не към дадено европейско решение, а въз основа на наложена отвън политика.

Време е лидерите на определени държави членки да осъзнаят, че Европейският съюз е един за всички и че правилата важат за всички нас по еднакъв начин. Време е да спрат да нарушават законите, когато така е по-удобно за тях, а после да порицават другите, че не спазвали европейските норми! Време е България и Румъния да станат част от Шенген!

17. Centro Europeo para el Desarrollo de la Formación Profesional (Cedefop) - Agencia Europea para la Seguridad y la Salud en el Trabajo (EU-OSHA) - Fundación Europea para la Mejora de las Condiciones de Vida y de Trabajo (Eurofound) (debate)

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η κοινή συζήτηση επί:

— της έκθεσης της Anne Sander, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Απασχόλησης και Κοινωνικών Υποθέσεων σχετικά με την πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με την ίδρυση Ευρωπαϊκού Κέντρου για την Ανάπτυξη της Επαγγελματικής Κατάρτισης (Cedefop) και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 337/75 (COM(2016)0532 – C8-0343/2016 – 2016/0257(COD)) (A8-0273/2018),

— της έκθεσης του Czesław Hoc, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Απασχόλησης και Κοινωνικών Υποθέσεων σχετικά την πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου σχετικά με την ίδρυση του Οργανισμού για την Ασφάλεια και την Υγεία στην Εργασία (EU-OSHA) και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΚ) αριθ. 2062/94 του Συμβουλίου (COM(2016)0528 – C8-0344/2016 – 2016/0254(COD)) (A8-0274/2018), και

— της έκθεσης του Enrique Calvet Chambon, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Απασχόλησης και Κοινωνικών Υποθέσεων σχετικά με την πρόταση κανονισμού του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και του Συμβουλίου που αφορά την ίδρυση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ιδρύματος για τη Βελτίωση των Συνθηκών Διαβίωσης και Εργασίας (Eurofound) και την κατάργηση του κανονισμού (ΕΟΚ) αριθ. 1365/75 του Συμβουλίου (COM(2016)0531 – C8-0342/2016 – 2016/0256(COD)) (A8-0275/2018)

Anne Sander, rapporteure. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais tout d'abord saluer le rôle joué par les agences décentralisées de l'Union européenne.

Réparties sur l'ensemble du territoire européen, elles sont l'expression du polycentrisme du projet européen et de la volonté de l'Union européenne d'être proche de ses citoyens en s'ancrant véritablement dans les territoires. Ces agences, bien souvent méconnues du grand public, sont pourtant essentielles au bon fonctionnement des institutions européennes. Elles en sont le bras droit, leur fournissant une expertise technique sur un large spectre de sujets. Et dans le domaine social aussi, les agences participent, souvent dans l'ombre, à la construction et à la mise en œuvre des politiques européennes.

Ce soir, nous parlons spécifiquement de trois chevilles ouvrières engagées dans la construction d'une Europe sociale, suite à l'élan initié par le président de la Commission européenne, Jean-Claude Juncker, et très largement relayé et matérialisé par l'engagement de la commissaire, M^{me} Thyssen, que je tiens d'ailleurs à saluer. Ces trois agences sont l'agence Eurofound, travaillant sur les conditions de vie et de travail, l'agence EU-OSHA, centrée sur la santé et la sécurité des travailleurs, et l'agence Cedefop pour le développement de la formation professionnelle.

Pour que ces trois agences puissent parvenir à suivre la cadence des réformes initiées, il était indispensable de pouvoir leur offrir un cadre et des outils adaptés aux nouveaux défis. Je me félicite en ce sens que nous ayons pu y parvenir avec mes collègues en charge d'OSHA et d'Eurofound, que je tiens vraiment à saluer et à remercier, tant mes collègues rapporteurs que les rapporteurs fictifs, parce que nous avons vraiment travaillé de concert, avec le Conseil et la Présidence autrichienne également, pour réformer les règlements fondateurs de ces agences.

En tant que rapporteure pour le règlement relatif au Centre européen pour la formation professionnelle, le Cedefop, ma priorité était de poser des bases saines et solides pour un fonctionnement efficace de l'agence, sans pour autant toucher à son ADN, à savoir sa structure de gouvernance tripartite plaçant sur un pied d'égalité les salariés, les employeurs et les États.

Dans cette réforme, nous avons obtenu un fonctionnement plus transparent et plus proche du citoyen. Les nouvelles règles proposées renforcent le rôle donné au Parlement européen. Concrètement, notre institution, porte-voix de plus de 500 millions de citoyens européens, sera dorénavant représentée par un expert au sein du conseil d'administration de l'agence. Les députés européens rencontreront aussi le candidat au poste de directeur. Pour que le Cedefop puisse passer à une vitesse supérieure et mieux travailler, nous avons aussi renforcé le rôle du directeur. Enfin, le nouveau règlement fixe des exigences pour mieux respecter l'équilibre entre les hommes et les femmes au sein de l'agence.

Quel sera l'impact de ces nouvelles règles pour les citoyens? Le Cedefop pourra mieux fonctionner et donc mieux travailler sur la formation professionnelle. L'enjeu, pour nos citoyens, c'est plus de compétences, parce que c'est ce qu'il faut viser, bien évidemment. Le chômage, et en particulier celui des jeunes, reste encore extrêmement élevé et tout l'enjeu des années à venir pour l'Union européenne sera de faire en sorte que nos concitoyens aient les compétences pour faire face aux nouveaux défis numériques ou encore de la transition énergétique.

Czesław Hoc, *sprawozdawca*. – Szanowny Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Szanowni Koleżanki i Koledzy! Współczesna gospodarka już jest – albo powinna być – gospodarką opartą na wiedzy, w której kapitał ludzki to najcenniejszy i najwartościowszy zasób każdego przedsiębiorstwa. To przecież kapitał ludzki decyduje o przetrwaniu i rozwoju każdego przedsiębiorstwa.

Zatem przyszłego i aktualnego pracownika należy wyszkolić i wyedukować. Następnie zaproponować mu atrakcyjną ofertę pracy, w której będzie pracował w warunkach bezpiecznych, prozdrowotnych i produktywnych. Co więcej, pracownik musi mieć przekonanie, iż przez cały czas odpowiednie instytucje czuwają nad jakością pracy i nieustannym polepszaniem jego warunków życia i pracy. I ważne, by ten proces dawał satysfakcję i generował wymierne korzyści dla pracownika, pracodawcy i rządów krajów Unii Europejskiej.

Stąd dzisiejsza debata nad udoskonaleniem i dostosowaniem do nowych realiów i uwarunkowań ekonomicznych, społecznych, a nawet politycznych funkcjonowania trzech europejskich instytucji, tj. Europejskiej Agencji Bezpieczeństwa i Zdrowia w Pracy (EU-OSHA), Europejskiego Centrum Rozwoju Szkolenia Zawodowego (Cedefop) i Europejskiej Fundacji na Rzecz Poprawy Warunków Życia i Pracy (Eurofound).

W tym miejscu pragnę serdecznie podziękować moim współsprawozdawcom w sprawie pakietu rozporządzeń odnośnie do EU-OSHA, Cedefopu i Eurofoundu: pani Annie Sander i panu Enrique'owi Calvetowi Chambonowi. To była bardzo dobra i bardzo przyjazna współpraca trwająca prawie dwa lata. Przeprowadziliśmy osiem trialogów, bardzo dużą liczbę spotkań kontrsprawozdawców i spotkań na szczeblu technicznym z doradcami Parlamentu Rady i Komisji, jak również ze służbami. Odrębne podziękowania kieruję do przedstawicieli Rady i Komisji Europejskiej za konstruktywne i merytoryczne dyskusje i zdroworozsądkowe kompromisy.

Aby lepiej zorganizować dyskusje, prezydencja Rady postanowiła zająć się propozycjami dotyczącymi trzech trójstronnych agencji w pakiecie, który był głównym przedmiotem odpowiedzialności grupy roboczej ds. pytań społecznych.

Wiosną 2018 r. rozpoczęły się negocjacje międzyinstytucjonalne między Parlamentem, Radą i Komisją. Na siódmym posiedzeniu trójstronnym w dniu 16 października osiągnięto porozumienie w sprawie Cedefopu i EU-OSHA. W sprawie Eurofoundu porozumienie zostało osiągnięte 9 listopada.

Rewizja trzech rozporządzeń stworzyła okazję do zapewnienia środków zwalczania nadużyć finansowych, polityki dotyczącej konfliktu interesów i zawarcia umowy w sprawie siedziby. Do rozporządzeń wprowadzono również oceny ex-post i ex-ante, które są głównymi zasadami właściwej kontroli budżetowej.

Rewizja harmonizuje również przepisy dotyczące programowania i sprawozdawczości z wymogami określonymi w zmienionym ramowym rozporządzeniu finansowym. Terminologia dotycząca struktury zarządzania jest obecnie zgodna ze wspólnym projektem z 2012 r. dotyczącym zdecentralizowanych agencji.

Jeśli chodzi o EU-OSHA, przepisy nowego rozporządzenia, w porównaniu z rozporządzeniem ustanawiającym Agencję w 1994 r., wyraźnie określają rolę agencji w dostarczaniu instytucjom i organom Unii oraz państwom członkowskim i partnerom społecznym obiektywnych informacji technicznych, naukowych i gospodarczych, a także wiedzy specjalistycznej, której potrzebują, aby formułować i wdrażać politykę mającą na celu ochronę zdrowia i bezpieczeństwa pracowników.

Kluczowym punktem umowy negocjacyjnej UE-OSHA była – zgodnie z propozycją Parlamentu – obecność przedstawiciela Parlamentu Europejskiego w zarządzie EU-OSHA. Wyjaśniono również rolę dyrektora wykonawczego. Ponadto kandydat na stanowisko będzie musiał stawić się przed właściwą komisją parlamentarną, tj. Komisją Zatrudnienia i Spraw Społecznych (EMPL).

Zespół Parlamentu Europejskiego – współpracując zgodnie – osiągnął sukces podczas negocjacji trójstronnych, wprowadzając proponowane przez nas poprawki.

Szanowne Koleżanki! Szanowni Koledzy! Pani Komisarz! Panie Przewodniczący! Można zatem powiedzieć i można przyjąć, iż nasza wspólna dwuletnia praca i ostateczny tekst pozwoli poprawić jakość pracy i warunków życia pracowników. Wzmocni ich bezpieczeństwo i zdrowie. Sprawí, że ich praca będzie produktywna, że stałą ofertą kształcenia i edukowania oraz naukowego reagowania na potrzeby współczesnego rynku pracy, na rzecz wspólnych wartości i wspólnych korzyści dla pracowników, pracodawców i rządów krajów Unii Europejskiej.

Enrique Calvet Chambon, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, je remercie beaucoup M^{me} la commissaire de nous honorer de sa présence lors de cette session nocturne. Elle a été une personne clé pour le bon avènement de cette nouvelle loi qui va régir les agences européennes, dont celle pour laquelle j'étais rapporteur.

Maintenant, Madame, souffrez que je passe à la langue de Cervantès dans cette plénière du Parlement européen.

No fue todo de color de rosa y tuvimos que remontar algunas dificultades, lo que explica que haya tardado un año y medio la negociación y que haya habido que dedicarle mucho tiempo. Bueno, merecía la pena, porque si tenemos en cuenta que el mandato fundamental de Eurofound data del año 1975 —si no recuerdo mal—, hemos estado haciendo un trabajo que esperamos que dure por lo menos veinte, treinta o cuarenta años, como el anterior. Había que tomárselo en serio.

Algunas plumas tuvimos que dejar desde el Parlamento o desde esta ponencia. La más dolorosa, tal vez, haya sido el no poder racionalizar, no tanto económicamente como administrativa y lógicamente, el Comité Ejecutivo, que termina teniendo —yo qué sé— noventa personas, es decir, más del doble que toda la Organización Internacional del Trabajo. Esto no es solo triste —empiezo por la única cosa triste— porque queda un poco ridículo que haya, para una agencia de ciento y pico trabajadores, unos noventa representantes en el Comité Ejecutivo, sino porque delata esa manía hacia la renacionalización que estamos viviendo en este momento europeo. Hubiéramos podido perfectamente reducir el Comité Ejecutivo, viendo que era una agencia europea y que no necesitaban estar todo el tiempo todos los Estados miembros. Y,

por lo tanto, respetando el tripartito, hubiéramos podido hacerlo. No se ha podido hacer.

Pero se han hecho muchísimas cosas buenas, y es el momento de felicitar a mis dos compañeros, que ya me han halagado con sus palabras, la señora Sander y el señor Hoc. Es el momento de agradecer a la Comisión y a las Presidencias búlgara y austriaca —porque empezamos con la Presidencia búlgara— todos los esfuerzos que han hecho para que esta importante Agencia de nuevo tenga una continuidad —porque ya estaba funcionando bien— y sea todavía más productiva y operativa de cara al futuro.

Es muy importante esta Agencia —las demás también, solo que hablo de la mía—. ¿Por qué? Porque esta Agencia es la que nos nutre de la razón, del conocimiento, de la base empírica que hace que se mantenga una característica del aspecto legislativo europeo: que no se hace sobre sentimientos, no se hace sobre visceralidades, se hace sobre la razón y el conocimiento exacto de los problemas, una buena manera de combatir las *fake news*.

Esta Agencia tiene la obligación, en primer lugar, de nutrir a las instituciones europeas y, en segundo lugar, de ayudar a los Estados miembros, a los agentes sociales e incluso a instituciones internacionales a saber la verdad más exacta posible del problema que vamos a abordar, para sobre ella legislar. Es un elemento indispensable de la manera de actuar en Europa por parte de todos los agentes involucrados.

Había que renovarla, pues evidentemente algunas cosas habían quedado obsoletas; otras cosas estaban adaptadas a la época pretecnológica, desde los contratos de trabajo hasta otros muchos aspectos. Pero renovándola también hemos aportado lo que yo entiendo que va a permitir que cumpla todavía mejor su función de manera más ágil. Por ejemplo, una profesionalización importante con el reforzamiento —como aquí se ha dicho— del director ejecutivo, su capacidad de nombrar a un director adjunto, algo que nos pedían los agentes sociales para respetar el espíritu creador de Eurofound, pero profesionalizando la relación entre ellos y profesionalizando todo lo que es la actuación.

También hemos reforzado —y esto es muy importante— la presencia del Parlamento a través de un enlace que estará presente, sin voto, en el Comité Ejecutivo y también a través de una mayor información sobre su desarrollo.

Por supuesto, hemos abordado mil detalles técnicos para que todo fuera más operativo, para que fuera más eficiente económicamente y, desde luego, yo creo que puede estar Europa satisfecha de tener un único instrumento para hacer mejor sus leyes. Y solo le pido una cosa a este Parlamento concretamente: utilicémosla mucho más. Mucho antes de pensar en otras agencias —es una Agencia europea—, Europa tiene con esto ahora un instrumento excelente para, por lo menos —esperemos—, los próximos veinte años.

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I thank Parliament for organising this joint debate on the revised founding regulations for the three EU agencies, namely the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) in Thessaloniki, the European Agency for Safety and Health at work (EU-OSHA) based in Bilbao, and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) based in Dublin. Through their EU-wide service, analysis, collection and dissemination of good practices, these agencies have provided us, the Commission, Parliament and the Member States with important data to inform our policy-making in the areas of labour and social policy. They have also developed tools to help with policy implementation. Cedefop and Eurofound are two of the oldest agencies of the European Union, as the rapporteurs rightly said. They were created in 1975. EU-OSHA is their younger sister, we could say: it was created in 1994.

The world of work has changed significantly since the establishment of these agencies and that is why the time was right to update the regulations so as to reflect better the current economic and social context. We also needed to align the three regulations, as much as possible, with the common approach on these centralised agencies, which was endorsed by Parliament, the Council and the Commission in July 2012. We are bringing them to you as a package: three revised regulations for the three tripartite agencies serving governmental actors, representatives of workers and employers. I would like to pay tribute to the three rapporteurs who worked on their own and as a team on these revisions – Anne Sander for Cedefop, Czesław Hoc for EU-OSHA, and Enrique Calvet Chambon for Eurofound. Their clear understanding of the challenges faced by the agencies, their determination and their spirit of compromise made it possible to reach a balanced agreement with the Council on our proposals.

Let me give you an overview of the main changes that the new founding regulations will introduce. I will start with two important points for Parliament. For the first time, an independent expert appointed by the European Parliament will become a member of the management board of each agency. This will allow Parliament to follow the work of the agencies more effectively, and Parliament will also have an exchange of views with the candidate for the post of director before his/her appointment. Secondly, more emphasis is being placed on cooperation between the agencies when it comes to horizontal administrative tasks, promoting synergies and complementarity in their activities, while avoiding duplication of effort. Thirdly, the new founding regulations define more clearly the tasks of the management board (currently called 'governing board'), the executive board (currently called 'bureau') and the executive director. Next, the management board of each agency, and not the Commission, will now be appointing the executive director. Finally, other rules in terms of programming, budget, staff and evaluation have been aligned with the common approach. Complete alignment was not always possible, and here I would recall the Commission's Declaration on all those elements that depart from the common approach.

The new founding regulations also maintain what currently works well, such as the tripartite composition of the management and executive boards. Having been a member of the management board of Eurofound a long time ago, I can attest that the tripartite composition provides added value. For me, it is a key feature of the agencies.

Let me now give you examples of the provisions introduced for specific agencies, first Eurofound. It has tripartite advisory committees, which evaluate and follow up on Eurofound's projects, and these committees are now explicitly mentioned in the founding regulation, which was not the case under the current regulation. There will also be a clear role for the Eurofound Director in appointing his/her deputy. This should benefit the functioning of the agency.

For EU-OSHA, I welcome the fact that the regulation now clearly mentions that the agency will pay particular attention to the specific challenges of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises, when it comes to health and safety at work, and the new text also recognises health as covering both physical and mental health.

Lastly, Cedefop's founding regulation will now cover education in general and vocational education and training (VET) in particular, in accordance with Articles 165 and 166 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. This reflects the enlarged scope of Cedefop's activities, as they have evolved over the years.

The agencies need these changes in order to be able to continue providing high-quality outputs in a changing economic and social environment. Therefore, I am counting on the House to adopt the new founding regulations with a large majority. I thank you very much for all your work.

Commission Statement

(in writing)

The Commission regrets that the co-legislators have decided to deviate on several points from the Common Approach of the Parliament, the Council and the Commission on decentralised agencies of 19 July 2012, without providing the necessary justification.

The deletion of the sunset/review clause is not in line with the Common Approach. However, the absence of the sunset clause in the Founding Regulations will not affect in any way the Commission's right of initiative.

The Commission also regrets the deviation from the Common Approach with regard to the process for conducting an overall evaluation of the Agency referring to the need to consult stakeholders, including Members of Parliament and of the Management Board, during the evaluation of the work of agencies. The Commission recalls that such evaluations have to be conducted in full independence. In carrying out evaluations, the Commission will apply its usual practices for stakeholder consultation activities.

The Commission will assess the impact of the deviations from the Common Approach on the functioning of the tripartite agencies at the appropriate opportunity. They should not be considered as a precedent for other agencies.

Finally, the Commission regrets the re-introduction of the function of Deputy Director in the Founding Regulation of Eurofound. The Commission would like to recall that, given the size of this Agency, this provision is disproportionate.

The Commission would also like to stress that it is now the Executive Director's responsibility to decide on the internal structures of each Agency and for CEDEFOP to define the necessary deputising arrangements to ensure continuity of service.

PRÉSIDENCE: Sylvie GUILLAUME

Vice-présidente

Jens Geier, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Haushaltsausschusses*. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen, liebe Frau Kommissarin! Ich bin der ständige Berichterstatter für die Agenturen im Haushaltsausschuss, der sich schon vor sehr langer Zeit mit einer Stellungnahme – mit dem hier diskutierten Gegenstand – beschäftigt hat.

Ich beglückwünsche die Kolleginnen und Kollegen BerichterstatterInnen zum Abschluss der Verhandlungen. Ich freue mich, dass die größere Rechenschaftspflicht gegenüber dem Parlament erreicht worden ist. Es war ein Vorschlag, der auch aus dem Haushaltsausschuss gekommen ist.

Ein anderer Vorschlag bestand im Hinweis auf die klare Trennung der Zuständigkeit, um das Profil zu schärfen, um die Zuständigkeiten klar zu machen, bei allem Wunsch nach Synergien natürlich. Ich freue mich, dass die Überarbeitung der Grundverordnung erfolgreich war.

Michaela Šojdrová, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, the main aim of revising the regulations of the three agencies is to align the functioning of the agencies with the common approach. Indeed, I believe that the new regulations will lead to a more coherent and transparent functioning of the agencies, but not only that. We have also adjusted the agencies to today's reality. This will maximise the potential of the agencies, especially in supporting Member States and the EU in developing relevant policies. This should allow for a more efficient response to current challenges.

As shadow rapporteur of the Eurofound Regulation, we managed to strengthen the role of Parliament. Parliament will have the power to nominate an independent expert to the management board and a right to a discussion with the nominee for the Executive Director. This will increase transparency and lead to better coordination with EU policymakers. Provisions on conflicts of interest or against fraud will also increase the transparency and credibility of the agency.

I welcome the emphasis on comparative studies, as I believe that these studies are particularly useful and encourage Member States to share better practices. I believe that the new regulations will allow for the more efficient and transparent performance of the agencies. Nevertheless, a new revision of the Eurofound Regulation may be necessary in the future in order to ensure better synergies and coordination with other EU agencies.

Emilian Pavel, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, I would first of all like to thank our rapporteur, Ms Sander. I was shadow rapporteur on the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) file. I would also like to thank the other rapporteurs for all the work that has been done together with the shadows.

Although vocational education and training plays a vital economic and social role in Europe, leading to equal opportunities and social inclusion for all citizens, it is still not sufficiently developed in our Union. Vocational training (VT) systems need much more support and require more focus from all Member States. This is why agencies like the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training are so important. Cedefop's role is to contribute to the shaping and implementing of VT, but also to shaping skills and qualification policies at Union level. The agency can do this by providing crucial evidence and services for policymaking and knowledge sharing among the Union and national actors, in particular to governments and social partners.

I believe that the revision of the function of this tripartite agency has been a very good one, and I fully appreciate the agency's great work in supporting and developing inclusive and quality VT systems. Now we have to work together to put in place the necessary money that can help their work to be successful and to use the full potential that they have.

Marian Harkin, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, the revision of the Regulation on the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) will, I believe, significantly help to ensure more coordinated, efficient and streamlined work-streams. The greater synergies between all three agencies will enable significant knowledge-sharing and efficiency gains. This will reinforce Cedefop's role in providing evidence-based information and analysis, as well as tools, and that, of course, is pivotal for better decision-making.

I believe that the tripartite nature of Cedefop is important, in terms of its roles as an expression of social dialogue, as a link to citizens and as an expert adviser. Transparency has also been improved, with new rules on preventing and managing conflicts of interests at all levels.

Finally, I'd like to commend Cedefop's initiative on a new strand of work on digitalisation and the future of work. This is timely and relevant, and it will benefit all our citizens.

Paloma López Bermejo, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señora presidenta, en primer lugar, me gustaría felicitar por el trabajo realizado al equipo negociador del Parlamento durante los trilogos sobre este informe a tres, remarcando la gran cantidad de horas y reuniones que han sido necesarias para llegar, al final, al resultado deseable.

Tras esto, y como he defendido desde el principio, reitero que estas tres agencias de la Unión Europea —EU-OSHA, Eurofound y Cedefop— son necesarias. Lo son para conocer con datos la realidad de lo que ocurre en el nada pequeño mundo del trabajo; son necesarias para hacer políticas efectivas, para encontrar los puntos que mejorar y las problemáticas que solucionar y son necesarias porque, además, son el ejemplo de la importancia del diálogo social y de cómo articularse de manera tripartita. Debido a esta importancia, no podemos olvidar que, para realizar su trabajo de manera eficiente, estas agencias tienen que estar dotadas de recursos económicos y de personal suficientes y de estabilidad, sin ninguna duda, en contextos tan cambiantes.

En el caso de EU-OSHA, quiero recordar antes que, desde el comienzo de la crisis, hemos visto cómo los accidentes laborales han aumentado gradualmente. Las principales razones son los recortes en las políticas públicas y la falta de inversión en muchas empresas, que han obviado el trabajo que tienen que hacer en esta materia. Con respecto a los programas de prevención, es precisamente ahí donde más se han notado los recortes. Y, por otro lado, también están las reformas de la regulación laboral, como la que ocurrió en España, que debilitan la negociación colectiva y la posibilidad de crear nuevos planes y medidas de prevención para mejorar la salud y la seguridad en el trabajo.

El ataque a las condiciones laborales, la normalización de los trabajos temporales, las subcontratas, las desregulaciones, etcétera, no son precisamente lo que queremos promover. La misma EU-OSHA recuerda que la inversión de un euro en seguridad y salud en el trabajo tiene un rendimiento de 2,2 euros en beneficios. Pero esto no es lo más importante, porque no hay un interés económico por encima de la salud y la seguridad de los trabajadores. Y esto no se puede medir en términos de coste y beneficio. Las agencias son una necesidad; apostemos por ellas.

Dobromir Sośnierz (NI). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Cieszę się: kolejne wspaniałe projekty, Europejskie Centrum Rozwoju Kształcenia Zawodowego – wszyscy Europejczycy bardzo na nie liczą. To nic, że w każdym państwie już istnieją urzędy pracy i żadnego problemu z bezrobociem nie rozwiązały, ale co tam szkodzi, jeszcze jeden urząd nie zawadzi, podatnik zapłaci i pewnie nawet się nie zorientuje. Ale ja mam nadzieję, że podatnik się zorientuje, i jak podatnicy zobaczą, co tu się wyprawia, to może państwo już w czerwcu zasilą liczne rzesze klientów tej agencji, która pomoże państwu odnaleźć się na stale zmieniającym się rynku pracy, na którym to rynku pracy chyba niektórych z państwa już dawno zresztą nie widziano.

Kolejna sprawa – fundusz na rzecz poprawy warunków życia. Wspaniały projekt, cyk – jest fundusz! Jakość życia się poprawia, problem rozwiązany. I wspaniałe zdanie ze sprawozdania posła Hoca: kobiety fizycznie różnią się od mężczyzn. Ten fakt bywał tutaj kwestionowany na tej sali, teraz nareszcie europejski podatnik otwiera takie sprawozdanie i widzi, że tu byle czego się nie pisze, przecież to sama prawda jest. Tak, że brawa, koleżanki i koledzy, dla posła Hoca, wspaniałe zdanie!

Deirdre Clune (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteurs for their work on these reports, which look at three European agencies that certainly help the development of policies in terms of education, training, working conditions and health and safety in work.

The European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (Cedefop) is one of the oldest. It was established in 1975, as the Commissioner said, but I think it plays a very important role in identifying the skills and further education that are required, for young people in particular and indeed from a lifelong learning point of view. This is more and more relevant today than ever now because we do not know what jobs will be there tomorrow and what jobs will be needed for us, so we need to continue to develop the skills, training and education required for those courses.

In my own country last week, we had a report in our newspapers on access to third level education from schools. League tables were produced. I kind of disagree with it, but I think what our media should be looking at is the schools that actually do help young people to gain relevant training, whether it be an apprenticeship or a further education model, and suitable employment. I think that in itself would be a much better level of success of our schools, rather than how many students they send to third level education.

We have a lot to learn and a long way to go, but I think a reformed Eurofound, and indeed SOLAS in our own country, that provide such support in terms of education and training are very welcome in today's age.

Interventions à la demande

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, συζητούμε για τρεις σημαντικούς αποκεντρωμένους οργανισμούς. Ο CEDEFOP έχει σημαντική δράση στα θέματα της επαγγελματικής κατάρτισης αλλά βεβαίως έχουμε δύο οργανισμούς που ασχολούνται με τις συνθήκες εργασίας και την ασφάλεια και την υγεία των εργαζομένων. Νομίζω ότι ο CEDEFOP αποδεικνύει ότι, για να έχουμε ανταγωνιστικότητα στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, θα πρέπει να επενδύσουμε στην εκπαίδευση και στην κατάρτιση, διότι μόνο έτσι μπορούν να αντιμετωπιστούν οι σύγχρονες προκλήσεις, επομένως πρέπει να προσεχθεί ιδιαίτερα αυτός ο οργανισμός και να αποδειχθεί στην πράξη ότι, εφόσον έχουμε πραγματικά μια επαγγελματική κατάρτιση, μπορούμε να προχωρήσουμε και στο πεδίο της οικονομίας και όχι βέβαια να έχουμε κινεζοποίηση των μισθών, προκειμένου δήθεν η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση να είναι ανταγωνιστική. Ταυτόχρονα, οι άλλοι δύο οργανισμοί διασφαλίζουν ότι δεν έχουμε κινεζοποίηση των όρων εργασίας, δηλαδή να έχουμε χώρους εργασίας όπου πραγματικά θα μπορεί να υπάρχει και ασφάλεια και υγεία για τους εργαζομένους. Οι ρυθμίσεις οι οποίες έγιναν και οι νέες παρεμβάσεις νομίζω ότι συμβάλλουν στην αποτελεσματικότητα της λειτουργίας των οργανισμών και φυσικά ο αναβαθμισμένος ρόλος του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου είναι ευπρόσδεκτος.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Marianne Thyssen, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Members very much for their comments. Once again, I would like to highlight the importance of these texts for the agencies, for the workers, for the employers, and of course – first and foremost – for the European citizens.

Once adopted by both co-legislators, these regulations will ensure the necessary formal conditions to allow the agencies to continue developing their crucial role as key actors in the field of vocational education and training and skills development; health and safety at work – important for good working conditions; and living and working conditions in Europe. All those three are very relevant if we want to implement our European Pillar of Social Rights.

By revising these regulations, we committed to giving the agencies the necessary framework to act in today's world. It is my wish and also my call to you today that we now fulfil our commitment, and that is what our citizens expect from us.

Anne Sander, *rapporteuse*. – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais moi aussi remercier les collègues et M^{me} la commissaire pour ce débat et ces différentes interventions, qui ont vraiment permis de mettre à l'honneur tout le travail de fourmi qui a été réalisé collectivement pendant près de deux ans, avec une volonté commune de mieux faire fonctionner l'Europe.

Je crois que si, pour le Cedefop, ce nouveau règlement n'est pas une révolution en soi, c'est une évolution qui est néanmoins importante et qui permettra de poursuivre le travail qui a été initié pour promouvoir et pour développer la formation professionnelle au niveau européen.

Nous l'avons dit, le taux de chômage reste important dans l'Union européenne, même s'il a diminué, et pourtant les talents sont là et les offres d'emplois, en tout cas dans certains secteurs, également. Nous devons donc faire en sorte de mieux mettre en adéquation les compétences disponibles avec les besoins réels des entreprises et, là, la formation professionnelle a un véritable rôle à jouer, puisqu'elle permet d'acquérir des compétences adaptées à l'exercice d'un métier et de rentrer ainsi plus facilement sur le marché de l'emploi.

Je crois que la formation professionnelle doit vraiment devenir le premier choix des familles et des Européens. Le Cedefop a donc une mission importante, celle de créer un espace de dialogue et d'échange entre les différents pays et, en particulier, de donner en exemple les pays qui ont les meilleures pratiques.

La Présidente. – La discussion commune est close.

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 11 décembre 2018.

18. Movilidad militar (breve presentación)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation de trois rapports, le premier étant celui de Tunne Kelam sur la mobilité militaire, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur la mobilité militaire (2018/2156(INI)) (A8-0372/2018).

Tunne Kelam, *Rapporteur*. – Madam President, in March 2018, the Commission and the High Representative came forward with the Action Plan on Military Mobility, which included a timetable for implementation. The report presented to you today is Parliament's contribution to this crucial security dimension. I would like to thank the shadow rapporteurs for their excellent cooperation and openness to achieve a positive result.

Military mobility is about the EU's credibility to deliver collective security in real terms and time, to defend EU citizens and territory everywhere. According to the old saying, 'the devil is in the detail'. This applies perfectly to military mobility.

NATO and the EU have committed themselves to defence and solidarity clauses. Now, to make these commitments credible we need a very down-to-earth, practical, well-coordinated and joint effort. This means harmonising all European networks of roads, bridges, tunnels, railways and ports, which will enable the efficient and quick transportation of troops, military equipment and necessary goods across Europe.

The present situation is problematic, to put it mildly. In fact it is unsatisfactory; there are an impressive number of obstacles, bottlenecks – physical, legal and regulatory – that can prevent vital assistance reaching its destination in time. Delays, even for a few days, can change the whole strategic situation. Last summer for example, a military vehicle starting from Germany needed several days and five specific permits to reach its destination – Tallinn, Estonia. This is an example of legal and documentary problems while crossing the borders of several Member States, and it was just one vehicle in question.

We also point to the declining quantity and quality of our rolling stock suitable and available for moving heavy military equipment in conditions of urgency.

At the same time, military mobility and its requirements can be seen as a significant civil benefit as it will enable the upgrading of civilian transport corridors, making these more resilient and able to carry heavier loads. The good message is that it is going to be a win-win situation for all sides. The key words in this report are 'dual-use'.

To conclude, efficient and credible military mobility can be achieved only through the total commitment of all Member States, in close cooperation with NATO. It is absolutely paramount for all partners to understand the following: the EU can coordinate and supplement, but not substitute, concrete efforts by the Member States. What is absolutely important is to retain the funding of EUR 6.5 billion promised for the specific objective of military mobility from the Connecting Europe Facility.

We call on the Commission and the Member States to adhere strictly to the proposed time limit, which is set out in the Action Plan. The Commission needs to adopt delegated acts by the end of the next year to further specify military requirements and to list priority dual-use infrastructure projects. We call on Member States to prepare and adopt by the end of next year their national plans on military mobility with a high priority level.

Interventions à la demande

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ο εισηγητής αναφέρθηκε στην περίφημη ρήτρα αμυντικής αλληλεγγύης που υπάρχει και στο NATO και στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Βεβαίως στην περίπτωση της Ελλάδος βλέπουμε ότι το NATO νίπτει τας χείρας του όταν υπάρχουν οι απειλές της Τουρκίας, όταν η Τουρκία αμφισβητεί τα κυριαρχικά δικαιώματα της πατρίδας μας και εμφανίζεται σαν να μην ξέρει τίποτε. Αυτό ένα σοβαρό θέμα, κύριε εισηγητά, όπως επίσης το γεγονός ότι η Τουρκία έχει καταλάβει το 37% του εδάφους της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας και δεν βλέπουμε να κάνει τίποτε το NATO. Σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ισχύει το ίδιο. Δεν είδαμε να υπάρχει αποφασιστική στάση του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου απέναντι στον Ερντογάν, στις απειλές του, σε αυτά τα οποία κάνει, που παραβιάζει την κυπριακή ΑΟΖ, που αμφισβητεί τα δικαιώματα της Κύπρου, που αμφισβητεί τα δικαιώματα της Ελλάδος, που λέει ότι, αν η Ελλάδα επεκτείνει στα δώδεκα μίλια τα χωρικά της ύδατα, αυτό σημαίνει πόλεμο. Πρέπει λοιπόν να υπάρξει αποφασιστική πολιτική στάση καταδίκης της Τουρκίας και βεβαίως έμπρακτη στάση αλληλεγγύης απέναντι στην Ελλάδα και στην Κύπρο, για να πούμε ότι μπορούν να λειτουργήσουν τα όσα λέτε, κύριε εισηγητά, στην έκθεσή σας.

Kateřina Konečná (GUE/NGL). – Paní předsedající, věřím, že bychom si v politice měli říkat pravdu a mluvit otevřeně. Projednávaný bod totiž znamená, že Evropská komise vyčlení z Nástroje pro propojení Evropy na oblast vojenské mobility nejméně 6,5 miliardy EUR.

Nástroj pro propojení Evropy přitom Evropská komise prezentovala s velkou pompou před sedmi lety. Předseda tehdejší Evropské komise Barroso tehdy uvedl: „Nástroj pro propojení Evropy a iniciativa projektových dluhopisů dokonale prokazují, jakou přidanou hodnotu může Evropa vytvářet. Tyto návrhy podpoří budování silnic, železnic, energetických sítí, ropovodů a plynovodů a širokopásmých sítí, jenž jsou pro naše občany a podniky tak důležité.“ Ani slovo o vojenské mobilitě. Ani slovo o omezení finančních prostředků na vysoce potřebné projekty civilní infrastruktury, neboť bude upřednostněna přidaná hodnota pro vojenské nasazení.

Evropská unie se mění a obávám se, že k lepšímu to není. Financujeme projekty, které lidem pomůžou, a ne ty, které pomůžou vojenské mobilitě. Nedělejme Evropu pro válku, dělejme ji pro mír!

Jonathan Arnott (EFDD). – Madam President, provided it is done with the knowledge and democratic consent of its citizens, how the European Union goes about building a European defence union is the EU 27's business and not mine. So things like interoperability in this report make sense to those who are building towards an eventual EU army.

But in the UK, the remain campaign lied to the people. They promised that the things that we're discussing here today were just yet another Euromyth and, after the referendum, I was tempted to say, 'Well, let's let bygones be bygones; those things didn't work and they didn't fool the British people'. But we should be aware in the UK that UK participation in the EU Common Security and Defence Policy missions and the possibility of Britons being under EU operational command is in Articles 102 and 103 of the Political Declaration on Brexit. Brexiteers must not simply sleepwalk into assuming that Theresa May's deal will keep the UK completely isolated from this, because it won't.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, στρατιωτική κινητικότητα είναι η δυνατότητα ταχείας κινήσεως στρατιωτικών δυνάμεων, υλικών και μέσων προκειμένου να επιτευχθεί κάποιος αντικειμενικός σκοπός. Για να υλοποιηθεί αυτός ο στόχος στην ξηρά, απαιτείται να χρησιμοποιηθεί ένα υψηλών προδιαγραφών οδικό δίκτυο στο οποίο σημαίνουνσα θέση έχουν οι γέφυρες. Ο κ. Junker οραματίζεται μέχρι το 2025 να έχει δημιουργήσει την αμυντική ένωση, οπότε γεννάται το εξής ερώτημα: Ποιος ο λόγος να έχει τη δυνατότητα μία στρατιωτική δύναμη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως να κινηθεί εντός και κυρίως εκτός των ορίων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως; Μήπως πρόκειται να επιτεθεί σε κάποια γειτονική χώρα; την Ουκρανία, τη Λευκορωσία, τη Μολδαβία ή οποιαδήποτε άλλη; Εάν όχι, γιατί πρέπει να έχει αυτή τη δυνατότητα; Εάν ναι, για ποιο λόγο να ονομάζεται αυτή η ένωση αμυντική; Έχουν ρωτήσει τους στρατιωτικούς; Έχουν πάρει προτάσεις για το εάν και κατά πόσον υπάρχει δυνατότητα δυνάμεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενώσεως που δεν διατίθενται στο NATO και διατίθενται για ειρηνευτικές αποστολές να διεξαγάγουν και επιθετικές επιχειρήσεις;

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Marianne Thyssen, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, military mobility is a key issue within the security and defence agenda that the European Union is pursuing in the wake of the global strategy. It will enable Europe to respond faster to crises and increase its resilience to external threats. Military mobility is a topic where the Union fosters civilian-military cooperation and creates dual-use opportunities. It is supported through other defence initiatives, notably the Permanent Structured Cooperation (PESCO), and it contributes to enhanced cooperation with NATO. As the resolution also highlights, improving military mobility will also contribute to strengthening Europe's strategic autonomy.

This European Parliament resolution on military mobility rightly addresses the topic in a comprehensive manner, providing advice on all relevant areas of work in this context. Improving military mobility is an important priority for which the Union can help provide solutions, taking into account the needs expressed by the Member States and in full respect of their sovereignty. This was at the core of the EU Action Plan submitted by the High Representative and the Commission in March this year.

Together with our Member States, work is advancing at different levels in a coordinated way. The Council conclusions of 19 November on security and defence in the context of the European Union's global strategy made a substantive advancement in implementation of the Action Plan, with the approval of the finalised military requirements for military mobility within and beyond the European Union.

The EU Action Plan sets out the actions by all relevant EU players involved in the following key areas: transport infrastructure, regulatory and procedural issues related to customs, cross-border procedures, diplomatic clearance and others, and cross-cutting issues like countering hybrid threats. Furthermore, the Commission has proposed a budget of EUR 6.5 billion under the next multiannual financial framework to support dual-use infrastructural projects using the Connecting Europe Facility.

As set out in the resolution, the aim of this initiative is to improve the mobility of military forces within and beyond the EU, hence enabling the EU and its Member States to act faster, in line with their defence needs and responsibilities, both in the context of common security and defence policy missions and operations, as well as national and multinational activities, in particular in the framework of NATO. Building on civilian-military synergies, this initiative will bring better infrastructure, more efficient procedures, and safer transport across the Union. It will thus help overcome existing difficulties and limitations on the mobility of our forces, removing delays and disruptions, lowering costs and eliminating vulnerabilities across our Union.

The European Parliament resolution rightly acknowledges the principles that inform these actions: respecting the sovereignty of Member States, calling for a whole-of-government approach, coordinating at the European level and with Member States, including in the context of the Permanent Structured Cooperation, and seeking further cooperation with NATO on military mobility, to be pursued in the framework of the joint declarations.

I warmly welcome the support of Parliament, in particular as regards the establishment of the mechanism for co-funding of dual-use infrastructure projects within the new Connecting Europe Facility Regulation. This will call for close work between the EU and Member States in order to help respond to military needs by supporting civilian users.

The European Union and its Member States are making real progress in the area of military mobility, a good example of fruitful interaction between national actions and commitments, and EU level action and support. Keeping the momentum and delivering results will be key for the coming months and even years. Thank you for all this work, and thanks for your attention.

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

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 11 décembre 2018.

19. La educación en la era digital: retos, oportunidades y lecciones para el diseño de las políticas de la Unión (breve presentación)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Yana Toom, au nom de la commission de la culture et de l'éducation, sur l'éducation à l'ère numérique: défis, possibilités et enseignements à tirer pour la définition des politiques de l'Union (2018/2090(INI)) (A8-0400/2018).

Yana Toom, Rapporteur. – Madam President, first of all I have to thank all the shadow rapporteurs, who worked in a really good cooperative spirit.

According to an Oxford study prepared for the Commission, in the next 25 years, 30% –almost one third – of today's jobs in Europe will disappear. They simply will not exist anymore. Janitors, taxi drivers, postmen and low-skilled workers will be replaced by cleaning-machine operators or robot station managers. This will happen pretty soon, during the lifetime of MEPs, even taking into account that our average age is 55. When we retire we can allow ourselves to observe changes from the sidelines, but our children and grandchildren will find themselves at the epicentre of this evolution. Their level of digital skills will determine not only the welfare of our descendants but also the future of our common project, a united Europe.

While working on this report, representatives of all the political groups agreed that having or not having digital skills will become the basis of a new social divide in the near future. On the other hand, a high level of digital education will open new opportunities for economic growth. It's a challenge for which – let's face it – our education system is not ready. At a time when there is nothing to do on the labour market without a knowledge of programming languages, we are discussing how many more schools in remote areas will receive an internet connection this year.

Everyone knows that, after graduation, each student must have a certain level of knowledge in mathematics, languages or biology, but we do not have a universal mandatory system for evaluating digital skills. Moreover, in Europe there is no set of professional requirements for an information technology teacher – and the extent to which teachers use technology in class differs across EU Member States like day from night.

This report therefore calls on the Commission, at least in its next term of office, to develop an EU-wide strategy for education in digital skills. Our current approach consists of loose projects from various departments, which are all on a voluntary basis. It is important to set common goals for all Member States to reach a certain level of digital skills. If no goals are set, there is little motivation to invest. It is important that digital skills are assessed so that a proper comparison can be made. Therefore, the report calls for the creation of an assessment based, for example, on a Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) model. Of course, teachers have to be at the core of this development and they need to be properly trained and assisted. As teachers are already under increasing work pressure, this should not entail extra workload.

Finally, the approach should be based on lifelong learning. Technological development will not stop, and we will have to adapt throughout our lives to new changes. We need to be able to recognise them and to learn how to learn. Those unable to adapt will be left behind. This is not only about the labour market: technology has become a part of our daily lives. Banking, doing taxes and even health care are becoming more digital. In addition, our social and political lives now develop online. Devices have entirely changed not only the way we communicate but also the way we consume information and form our opinions. This all requires skills: media literacy, etiquette online, cyber hygiene and protection of personal information. Those who do not know how to use online communications in a proper way will either be easily manipulated or simply left out of political participation. It is crucial to ensure that everyone profits from technological development, and education is the best way to start.

Interventions à la demande

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Valóban óriási átalakuláson megy keresztül a világ, és az oktatási rendszereknek alkalmazkodniuk kell a digitalizációhoz és a technológiák gyors és folyamatos fejlődéséhez. Ez mindenképpen forrásokat igényel, az oktatási rendszerek átalakítása, a tanárok folyamatos képzése és az iskolák technikai felszerelése is csak komoly anyagi ráfordítással képzelhető el. Ezért a tagállamoknak megfelelő költségvetési forrásokat kell biztosítaniuk az oktatás számára.

Sajnos vannak olyan országok, amelyekben ezek az összegek még mindig nem érik el a GDP 4 százalékát sem. Míg a skandináv államokban ez a mutató 7-8 százalék, addig az ebből a szempontból utolsó Romániában csupán 3,1. Románia lemaradása azért is aggasztó, mert a sorban utána következő Bulgária és Görögország már egy teljes százalékponttal többet fordít oktatásra, 4,1 százalékot. Ezek a számok azt mutatják, hogy az oktatási rendszerek alulfinanszírozása miatt ezen országok leszakadása fokozódhat az elkövetkező időszakban.

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio la relatrice e il commissario. Devo dire che sono completamente d'accordo sulle indicazioni che vengono da questa relazione. È assolutamente urgente che l'Europa adotti una strategia educativa condivisa per preparare gli studenti – ma anche gli adulti, nella logica del *lifelong learning* — al nuovo contesto digitale.

L'accelerazione delle trasformazioni che il digitale determina nelle professioni ma anche nella vita quotidiana, nella crescente modifica di tutti i lavori, rende assolutamente indispensabile un adeguamento dei sistemi educativi non solo, sono d'accordo, per l'uso delle tecnologie digitali, ma anche in termini di metodologia di insegnamento, di ricerca educativa, di competenze digitali e di formazione degli insegnanti. Può essere una straordinaria occasione per ripensare il ruolo dell'educazione, adeguando le competenze di ciascuno e dei diversi gruppi sociali, come un vero diritto di cittadinanza.

Questa strategia europea a questo punto è urgente, attraverso il piano d'azione per l'educazione digitale ma anche superando l'attuale frammentazione. Condivido soprattutto la consapevolezza che oggi è necessario che ci sia un modulo adeguato, come nell'ambito del sistema PISA, che possa introdurre una riconoscibilità reciproca fra i vari paesi delle competenze digitali per evitare anche un *digital divide* che si sta approfondendo.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η οικονομία της γνώσης είναι αυτή η οποία θα καθορίσει το τι θα γίνει στα επόμενα χρόνια. Είναι δεδομένο ότι χρειάζεται εκπαίδευση, κατάρτιση, κονδύλια, για να μπορέσει πραγματικά να ανταποκριθεί η κοινωνία, ώστε να μη δημιουργήσουμε ψηφιακά προβλήματα στους πολίτες μας. Το πιο βασικό είναι το πού θα βρεθούν τα κονδύλια. Αυτό είναι το βασικό θέμα. Όταν έχεις το σύμφωνο σταθερότητας, το οποίο απαγορεύει να γίνουν αυξημένες δαπάνες στις δημόσιες επενδύσεις, τότε υπάρχει ένα σοβαρό πρόβλημα. Πιστεύω, κύριε Επίτροπε, ότι δεν πρέπει να μετρά στο έλλειμμα η επένδυση που θα γίνει από πλευράς κρατών μελών στην εκπαίδευση και ιδίως στην κατάρτιση σε θέματα ψηφιακής τεχνολογίας. Εκεί πρέπει να έχουμε εξαίρεση, όπως επίσης πρέπει να υπάρξουν κονδύλια από την Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων, όπως επίσης θα πρέπει –ιδίως για την Ελλάδα– να μη χρειάζεται η εθνική χρηματοδότηση, προκειμένου να μπει η Ελλάδα στα ευρωπαϊκά προγράμματα, όπως έγινε με ειδική εξαίρεση που ίσχυε για τα προηγούμενα χρόνια.

Γεώργιος Επιτήδειος (NI). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η ραγδαία εξέλιξη της τεχνολογίας έχει άμεση επίπτωση στην καθημερινή μας ζωή, διότι επηρεάζει τον τρόπο με τον οποίον ασκούνται τα διάφορα επαγγέλματα και οι επιπτώσεις αυτές και ο επηρεασμός αυτός θα διαρκέσει και στο μέλλον ακόμη πιο έντονα. Αυτό θα έχει επίπτωση και στις θέσεις εργασίας. Πολλές θέσεις εργασίας θα καταργηθούν, άλλες θα τροποποιηθούν, θα δημιουργηθούν κάποιες άλλες. Για να μπορέσει να επιβιώσει σε αυτό το περιβάλλον της αυτοματοποίησης, της ψηφιοποίησης αλλά και της ραγδαίας αναπτύξεως της τεχνολογίας, θα πρέπει να εκπαιδευτεί κάθε άνθρωπος, ούτως ώστε να αποκτήσει τις γνώσεις και τις δεξιότητες εκείνες που θα του επιτρέψουν να επιβιώσει σε αυτό το περιβάλλον. Γι' αυτό πρέπει όλα τα κράτη και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ως σύνολο να σχεδιάσουν τη στρατηγική τους και να προσπαθήσουν να εξεύρουν τα απαιτούμενα κονδύλια, ούτως ώστε να εκπαιδεύσουν τον κόσμο τους με τέτοιο τρόπο ώστε να μπορέσει να ανταποκριθεί στις απαιτήσεις της σύγχρονης εποχής.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, pane komisaři, je správné, že Evropská unie reaguje na rychlý vývoj digitálních technologií, které jsou motorem růstu a také zaměstnanosti. Problém je v tom, že úrovně rozvoje digitálních technologií a dovedností občanů jsou velmi rozdílné v jednotlivých členských zemích, moji předřečníci to tady zmínili.

Jestliže v budoucích dvaceti pěti letech zmizí zhruba polovina současných pracovních míst a budou nahrazena pracovními místy, která vyžadují speciální digitální dovednosti, pak je to výzva, na kterou musí reagovat jak členské státy, tak samozřejmě také Evropská unie jako celek. Musíme především připravit učitele, vybavit školy novými přístroji a programy. Ale chci také upozornit na potřebu ochrany před zneužíváním digitálních technologií, před kybernetickou šikanou, šířením *fake news* a také na potřebu vzdělávat ke kritickému myšlení.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, digital skills are fast becoming central to all areas of life. This is true not only in the world of work, but also for administrative and social purposes. Quite simply, citizens with little or no access to digital education are at risk of being left behind. Digital literacy can no longer be treated as a luxury. It must be accessible to all as early as possible.

We must be bold in our ambitions and coherent in our approach by ensuring that sufficient funding is allocated. Digital education should be accessible in all areas – especially in rural areas – and provided equally to girls and women, as well as boys and men, in formal and informal settings.

Just last week we celebrated the week of lifelong learning, and I want to highlight the opportunities for early school leavers to benefit from digital education. Those people who are at high risk of unemployment and social exclusion must be especially targeted by policies aiming at mainstreaming digital skills, and I believe that here lies one of the keys towards providing equal opportunities for all.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the European Parliament, and especially the honourable Member Yana Toom, for this high-quality report. Now that we are implementing the Digital Education Action Plan, your calls for a more ambitious EU strategy on education in the digital age come at the right moment.

As you rightly highlight, the Digital Education Action Plan, which the Commission published in early 2018, can only be a first step in tackling the digital divide. I strongly believe that Parliament can be a key partner in developing the next steps. I also believe that Member States are keen to cooperate more closely on this issue. Despite differences in their education systems, they all face similar challenges: first, how to ensure that staff and students develop digital skills; second, how to use digital technology for teaching and learning; and, third, how to improve education systems through better data analysis and foresight.

This requires learning throughout one's lifetime. Hence, digital competence is one of the eight key competences for lifelong learning that the Council confirmed in its recommendation adopted earlier this year. Member States are also working to embed digital technologies in the school environment. Investment in resources and infrastructure is crucial but, if it is to lead to innovation, it needs to be matched with a comprehensive vision for digital transformation that tackles the educational organisation as a whole. The Commission thinks that SELFIE, a free online tool just launched in October, can play a vital role here: it can help any school assess its use of technologies for teaching and learning. By the end of November, over 50 000 teachers, students and school leaders had already used SELFIE. Our goal is to reach one million users by the end of next year.

I also welcome the emphasis on teachers and trainers in your report. I fully agree that teaching staff are at the heart of digital transformation. Teachers do of course need training, but crucially they need time and support to be able to use technology in their teaching. Technology should also help relieve teachers from the burden of administrative and non-teaching tasks. Moreover, in its proposal for the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), the Commission has demonstrated commitment to supporting educators and learners in gaining and updating skills and competencies, including the digital ones. The EU budget support for digital skills development will not only be guaranteed by the successes of the existing EU funding instruments covering this field, such as ESF+, Erasmus and Horizon Europe, but also by the new Digital Europe programme. The Digital Europe programme will provide learning opportunities reflecting the latest technological developments in advanced digital skills relating to artificial intelligence, high-performance computing and cybersecurity.

As you rightly say in your report, all schools need to be provided with high capacity broadband. In fact, within the future Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) programme, after 2020 we aim to support access to Gigabit connectivity for socioeconomic drivers, including schools. With the future Digital Europe programme, in turn, we plan to support the deployment of digital capabilities in schools, and the future Erasmus programme will support schools, universities and other educational organisations in their digital transformation.

We therefore strongly welcome your support in the negotiation of these new programmes. I fully agree with the honourable Members that the Action Plan can only be the starting point of a broader debate. In keeping with the wishes of the Member States in Gothenburg, we deliberately started with schools, higher education and vocational education and training. Adult learning, non-formal education and teacher training will follow at the next stage. The plan has helped a great deal in generating political discussion and momentum, and we intend to build on this.

To conclude, I would like to thank you again for this constructive discussion. The Commission looks forward to working with you in developing a fuller vision and strategy.

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

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 11 décembre 2018.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE), kirjallinen. – Digitalisaatio muuttaa maailmaa hurjalla vauhdilla. Se vaikuttaa mm. työpaikkoihin vähentämällä niitä joiltakin aloilta mutta luomalla niitä toisaalle. Tarvitsemme jatkuvasti lisää tietoa ja taitoa teknologian hyödyntämiseen ja monet arkipäiväisetkin asiat vaativat riittävää tietoteknistä osaamista. Elinikäisellä oppimisella on tärkeä rooli digitaitojen ylläpitämisessä. Ei riitä, että taitoja opetetaan vain kouluissa vaan mahdollisuuksia digitaitojen omaksumiseen tulee tarjota kaikille, iästä ja työtilanteesta riippumatta. Tässä kirjastoilla voi olla iso rooli.

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE), raštu. – Skaitmeniniai ir socialiniai įgūdžiai jau ima tapti sinonimu, tad skaitmeninių įgūdžių neturėjimas lemia socialinės atskirties riziką. Skaitmeninio raštingumo statistika Europos Sąjungai yra negailestinga – šiuo metu 44 proc. 16-74 metų amžiaus ES gyventojų neturi pagrindinių skaitmeninių įgūdžių ir 19 proc. visiškai neturi skaitmeninių įgūdžių, o skirtumai tarp valstybių narių labai dideli. Aš, kaip Lietuvos atstovas EP, galiu didžiuotis, jog mano valstybėje narėje klausimų dėl interneto prieinamumo (ir duomenų perdavimo greičio) iš esmės nekyla – šia prasme esame Europos avangarde. Visgi svarbu yra nuolat sau priminti, kad švietimo sistemoje dėmesys skaitmeninių įgūdžių formavimuisi turi būti neabejotinai prioritetinis. Apie tai kalbame visos ES mastu, tai turi atsispindėti kiekvienos valstybės narės darbotvarkėje. Skaitmeninėje eroje tampame vis labiau pažeidžiami grėsmių, susijusių su kibernetinio saugumo spragomis, asmens duomenų saugos pažeidimais ar melagingomis žiniomis. Tad minimos grėsmės privalo sulaukti deramo dėmesio švietimo sistemoje. Esu tikras, kad mokymo(si) procese skaitmeninio raštingumo suvokimas turėtų kisti nuo vartotojiško gebėjimo naudotis skaitmeninėmis technologijomis į gebėjimą kurti skaitmeninį turinį bei formą, taip pat kritiškai vertinti tai, kas yra sukurta. Galiausiai mokymosi visą gyvenimą principas šiuo atveju tampa itin

aktualus atsliepiant į skaitmenizacijos eros iššūkius.

Claudia Tapardel (S&D), *in writing*. – Education has a vital role in our society, trainings and re-trainings should be available to everyone as it could be one of the best investments in the EU's future. I totally agree that education is of strategic importance for employability, growth, competitiveness, innovation and social cohesion. However, digital transformation has a great impact on education systems just as much or even more than in other sectors. In the future, nearly all jobs, services as well as everyday activities, will require digital skills and data literacy; In the context of a rapid digital and societal transformation, the education system should support, from an early age and throughout life, a balanced set of skills and competences boosting individuals' resilience, critical thinking, well-being, and innovation potential. Synergy between relevant digital skills, soft skills and hard skills needs to be sought as soon as possible. Furthermore, digital technology and access to data are enablers of innovation in education and open data is starting to become a very valuable educational resource. Digital transformation offers many opportunities for education and the economy. However, it needs a proper policy response. I highly support a strategy at EU level to develop such a response.

20. Nueva Agenda Europea para la Cultura (breve presentación)

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Giorgos Grammatikakis, au nom de la commission de la culture et de l'éducation, sur le nouvel agenda européen de la culture (2018/2091(INI)) (A8-0388/2018).

Γιώργος Γραμματικάκης, *Εισηγητής*. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω αρχικά τους σκιώδεις εισηγητές με τους οποίους είχα μια εξαιρετική συνεργασία. Καταλήξαμε λοιπόν σε ένα κείμενο που θεωρώ πολύ σημαντικό για τον πολιτισμό στην Ευρώπη. Είναι μάλιστα καλή συγκυρία ότι το κείμενο αυτό υποβάλλεται κατά τη λήξη του Ευρωπαϊκού Έτους Πολιτιστικής Κληρονομιάς, που ανέδειξε τη λάμψη αλλά και τη σημασία του ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού. Καθώς συνέτασσα την έκθεση είχα στον νου μου τις πολυδιάσπατες προκλήσεις που αντιμετωπίζει σήμερα η Ευρώπη: την οικονομική κρίση, το προσφυγικό ζήτημα, έως την άνοδο του λαϊκισμού και της Ακροδεξιάς. Σε αυτούς τους δύσκολους καιρούς ο πολιτισμός μπορεί να οδηγήσει στην ανακάλυψη εκ νέου των κοινών δεσμών που μας ενώνουν και μας συνδέουν. Σε αυτό λοιπόν το πλαίσιο εργαστήκαμε στην Επιτροπή Πολιτισμού και καταλήξαμε σε συγκεκριμένες προτάσεις, που κινούνται γύρω από τρεις γενικούς άξονες:

Πρώτον, επαρκής χρηματοδότηση του πολιτισμού. Είναι απαραίτητος ο διπλασιασμός τουλάχιστον του προγράμματος «Δημιουργική Ευρώπη». Επίσης, είναι αναγκαία η δημιουργία ισχυρών συνεργασιών με τα διαρθρωτικά αλλά και τα επενδυτικά ευρωπαϊκά ταμεία, ώστε οι δράσεις για τον πολιτισμό να προσεγγίσουν το 1% του επόμενου προϋπολογισμού. Η αλήθεια, κυρία Πρόεδρε, που ανέδειξε ο σπουδαίος πολιτικός και ρήτορας της αρχαίας Ελλάδος Δημοσθένης, «Δει δη χρημάτων και άνευ τούτων ουδέν εστι γενέσθαι των δεόντων», είναι όσο ποτέ επίκαιρη.

Δεύτερον, προστασία των δικαιωμάτων των δημιουργών. Είναι γνωστό ότι η φύση της εργασίας των δημιουργών οδηγεί πολλές φορές σε οικονομική αβεβαιότητα, ενώ συχνά μένουν εκτεθειμένοι στα συμφέροντα των πολυεθνικών κολοσσών. Η ψήφιση της οδηγίας για τα πνευματικά δικαιώματα τον περασμένο Σεπτέμβριο αποτέλεσε ένα σημαντικό βήμα προς την ορθή κατεύθυνση. Πρέπει όμως να ολοκληρωθεί και να υλοποιηθεί το συντομότερο και με τον καλύτερο δυνατό τρόπο.

Τρίτον, κινητικότητα των δημιουργών και των έργων τους. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να συμβάλει καθοριστικά στην κινητικότητα των δημιουργών, ώστε να διευκολύνει τις επαφές τους και να τους επιτρέψει να απευθύνονται στο μεγαλύτερο δυνατό κοινό, τόσο εντός της Ένωσης όσο και εκτός των ορίων της.

Τελειώνοντας, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ σε μια καινοτόμα πρόταση, που στήριξαν με θέρμη και άλλα μέλη της Επιτροπής Πολιτισμού. Είναι η θέσπιση ενός θεσμού που σε αναλογία με την Πολιτιστική Πρωτεύουσα της Ευρώπης θα αναδεικνύει κάθε χρόνο μια προσωπικότητα που μέσα από το έργο και τη ζωή της εξέφρασε και επηρέασε τις ευρωπαϊκές αξίες. Θα μπορούσα να αναφέρω τυχαιά αλλά συγκεκριμένα παραδείγματα, όπως ο Μότσαρτ, ο Λεονάρντο ντα Βίντσι, ο Σαίξπηρ, ο Πλάτωνας, ο Γκαίτε, η Μαρία Κιουρί αλλά και η Σιμόν ντε Μπωβουάρ, ο Θερβάντες, τόσοι και τόσοι άλλοι. Ο πολιτισμός εκφράζεται και ανθίζει από ανθρώπους, και είναι καιρός η συμβολή τους να αναγνωριστεί σε πανευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο.

Ολοκληρώνοντας, κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να τονίσω ότι η ψήφιση της έκθεσης θα συντελέσει για πρώτη φορά μετά από πολλά χρόνια σε ένα συνεκτικό και συντονισμένο δρόμο του πολιτισμού για τα κράτη μέλη. Θα είναι η καλύτερη συνέχεια στο Ευρωπαϊκό Έτος Πολιτιστικής Κληρονομιάς, που απέρχεται αφήνοντας πίσω την ισχυρή λάμψη και τις παρακαταθήκες του.

Interventions à la demande

Csaba Sógor (PPE). – Elnök Asszony! Az új európai kulturális menetrend és az erről szóló jelentés is több alkalommal említi az interkulturális párbeszéd fontosságát, a kultúrák közötti átjárhatóság biztosítását. Ez a téma az Európai Unióban élő nemzeti kisebbségek szempontjából is kulcsfontosságú. Az interkulturalitás ugyanis feltételezi a kölcsönösséget, az egymás kultúrája iránti érdeklődést. Mi mégis azt tapasztaljuk, hogy azokban az országokban, ahol élünk, elvárásaként fogalmazódik meg felénk a többségi kultúra ismerete, ami a kötelező tananyagokban is tetten érhető, amelyekben viszont nem kap helyet a nemzeti kisebbségek kultúrája.

Sőt, Romániában a jelenleg hatályos kötelező tananyagban a magyarok egyértelműen negatív kontextusban vannak jelen. Az országban élő 1,3 millió közösség kultúrája, élethelyzete, sajátosságai pedig mintha nem is léteznének a többségi nemzet számára, mintha nem is szívesen vennének tudomást rólunk. Az interkulturalitás nem ezt jelenti, és az államok közötti együttműködések mellett az is fontos lenne, hogy az egyazon államban élő, különböző kultúrájú közösségek közeledését elősegítsük és szorgalmazzuk.

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio molto il relatore Grammatikakis per l'ottima relazione e sono molto felice che, a distanza di undici anni dalla precedente agenda europea per la cultura, la Commissione (ringrazio quindi il commissario) abbia proposto una nuova strategia, direi proprio una strategia, finalmente, di policy culturale che supera una situazione di grande frammentazione.

Devo dire che, per essere una legislatura che era cominciata con la parola cultura inesistente nelle dieci priorità di Juncker, grazie al lavoro congiunto tra noi e la DG cultura ed educazione, abbiamo fatto la differenza. Il Parlamento ha fatto la differenza così come la nostra commissione.

Intanto siamo di fronte a un'agenda che riassume, alla fine dell'anno europeo del patrimonio culturale e, quindi, dando una mano alla *legacy* dell'anno, riassume le tre o quattro grandi linee sulle quali si dovrà muovere la politica culturale europea: quella della strategia internazionale, con anche la mobilità degli artisti e dei professionisti della cultura a livello internazionale e quindi la promozione del dialogo interculturale e interreligioso, la questione importante del sostegno alle industrie culturali e creative e soprattutto quella di politiche integrate orizzontali, che possano supportare anche il raddoppio delle risorse dedicate finalmente alla cultura.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η νέα ευρωπαϊκή ατζέντα για τον πολιτισμό θεωρώ ότι θα είναι ελλιπής, εάν δεν επιλυθεί ένα σοβαρό ζήτημα που είναι η επιστροφή των κλαπέντων αρχαιολογικών θησαυρών. Καθώς διανύουμε το Έτος Πολιτιστικής Κληρονομιάς, δεν μπορούμε να ανεχόμαστε μια κατάσταση όπου αρκετοί –χιλιάδες θα έλεγα– πολιτιστικοί θησαυροί, αρχαιολογικοί θησαυροί πολιτιστικά ευρήματα της Ελλάδας έχουν κλαπεί από τα ναζιστικά στρατεύματα κατοχής και βρίσκονται παράνομα σε διάφορα μουσεία της Γερμανίας. Επανειλημμένα έχω θέσει το θέμα αυτό και έχω ζητήσει την παρέμβαση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, η οποία όμως νίπτει τας χείρας της. Θα πρέπει να αντιληφθούμε ότι, αν θέλουμε να έχουμε μια πραγματική ευρωπαϊκή ατζέντα στον πολιτισμό, το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο οφείλει να ζητήσει την επιστροφή των κλαπέντων αρχαιολογικών θησαυρών από τα ναζιστικά στρατεύματα κατοχής, κλοπή που έγινε στην Ελλάδα και θα πρέπει να επιστραφούν αυτοί οι θησαυροί στην Ελλάδα.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, já se domnívám, že je zřejmé, že Evropská komise má velkou podporu pro svoji kulturní agendu od Výboru pro kulturu a vzdělávání. Nejen, že navrhuje navýšení programu Kreativní Evropa nebo navrhuje také zřízení jednoho kontaktního místa pro kulturu, pokud jde o finanční programy Evropské unie. My vnímáme, že je potřeba podpořit profesionály a umožnit jim snadnější dostupnost těchto programů, snadnější orientaci a využití. Já sama bych se chtěla podělit o velmi čerstvou zkušenost, protože jsem měla možnost nahlédnout do mezinárodního visegrádského projektu studentů čtyř měst, města Krakov, Olomouc, Bratislava a Pécs. Je to projekt ArtCoMe a mohu potvrdit, že tato aktivita je pro studenty zcela výjimečná. Rozvíjí jejich vědomosti, kreativitu a především umožňuje setkávání a chuť spolupracovat a o to by nám mělo jít.

Julie Ward (S&D). – Madam President, this agenda is not only about jobs and the community, even though they're important aspects of building a stronger and more open-minded Europe. We must also harness the power of culture and cultural diversity for social cohesion and wellbeing. We need to foster wider participation from diverse communities. We need to increase mobility for artists, and we must build on the excellent work done in the European Year of Cultural Heritage. We must embrace 'STEAM' instead of STEM. The A is for arts, which should be at the heart of all young people's education.

Finally, a word about Brexit, which will be catastrophic for the UK's creative and cultural industries: loss of freedom of movement and limited opportunities for collaboration will impoverish our nation economically and socially. But given the chaos in the British parliament, I'm still hoping that we can remain a member of the EU.

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). – Señora presidenta, gracias, en primer lugar, también al ponente. Yo intervengo para subrayar la importancia del patrimonio cultural, que contribuye al refuerzo de la identidad europea. Ese patrimonio cultural pone de manifiesto que nuestros antepasados han estado unidos por encima de divisiones y fronteras nacionales. El románico, el gótico, el renacimiento o el barroco no son estilos nacionales, sino grandes tendencias artísticas — incluso alguno diría filosóficas — europeas.

Pienso también en las actuales rutas culturales europeas y en la primera de ellas, los caminos de Santiago, como testimonio de esta unidad e identidad europea. Al cuidar del patrimonio cultural europeo, al preservarlo, cuidamos también de la idea de Europa, cuidamos también del proceso de construcción europea, como usted bien sabe, señor comisario.

Todos debemos contribuir al cuidado y conservación de nuestro patrimonio cultural, también la Unión Europea. Por ello leeré con la mayor atención el plan de acción presentado recientemente por la Comisión. Me gustaría, desde luego, un plan ambicioso; incluso me habría gustado un programa o fondo europeo específico para contribuir a financiar las tareas de recuperación, reconstrucción y conservación del patrimonio cultural europeo y hacer así visible la importancia especial que este patrimonio tiene también para las instituciones de la Unión.

(Fin des interventions à la demande)

Tibor Navracsics, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, thank you for this interesting discussion. On behalf of the Commission, I would like to congratulate Mr Grammatikakis on his excellent report on the new European Agenda for Culture. The Commission adopted the new Agenda for Culture as a response to EU leaders who, just about a year ago, had underlined the potential of culture as a means of creating a more inclusive and cohesive Europe. They therefore asked us to boost cooperation on culture at European level.

I am proud to say that we, the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council, are delivering on this call. It is inspiring to see that we are all working towards the same objectives. In fact, last month, Member States adopted a new Council Work Plan for Culture 2019-2021. It contains over 30 measures, many of which coincide both with the Commission's new agenda for culture and with the points made by Mr Grammatikakis in his report. Let me highlight some of them.

First, together with the Member States, the Commission will leverage the power of culture to enhance social cohesion and to address the growing polarisation in European societies, a topic which is also highlighted in your report. Engaging with Europe's culture promotes the inclusion of disadvantaged groups. Gender equality is a welcome new priority reflected in both the parliamentary report and the Council Work Plan. Second, it is excellent to have a measure for music in the Council Work Plan. With the support of the European Parliament, we have progressed on the Music Moves Europe initiative, and it is now time to bring this onto the policy level. Third, on international cultural relations, your report calls on the Commission to regularly update Parliament on the state of play of the initiatives we take to boost the role of culture in external relations.

I am pleased to inform you that the Council has agreed to complete its work on an EU strategic approach to international cultural relations. The Commission and the European External Action Service are advancing their work on European Houses of Culture and on global cultural leadership training. Fourth, as your report makes clear, EU policy-making on culture is better if it is backed by providing financial support to the cultural and creative sectors. That is why the Commission's proposal for a new Creative Europe programme after 2020 is fully aligned with our policy agenda, and proposes to increase funding. I am grateful for your support for the programme in general and on the key issue of the budget in particular.

In line with your report, the new Agenda for Culture is a truly cross-cutting agenda, listing all EU funding opportunities available to cultural operators in fields as diverse as education, research, cohesion, the digital single market and external affairs.

Lastly, cultural heritage: a few days ago in Vienna, I presented the European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage. The framework aims to ensure that the 2018 European Year of Cultural Heritage will have a lasting impact. You will be pleased to see that the framework addresses both tangible and intangible heritage, as emphasised in your report.

Honourable Members, let me thank you sincerely for your strong support for, and throughout, the European Year of Cultural Heritage. Together, we have made it happen. Together we can make it last beyond 2018. I believe that our new instruments will help us build more inclusive and cohesive societies and sustain our competitiveness, and, by doing so, they will invigorate the European project. The Commission looks forward to putting them into practice with you.

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

Le vote aura lieu mardi, le 11 décembre 2018.

Déclarations écrites (article 162)

Ivan Jakovčić (ALDE), napisan. – Kultura ima iznimno važnu ulogu u našim društvima i gospodarstvima kada je riječ o stvaranju osjećaja pripadnosti, promicanju aktivnog građanstva i definiranju našeg identiteta i temeljnih vrijednosti slobode, raznolikosti, jednakosti, solidarnosti i socijalne pravde. Podržavam Izvešće o Novoj europskoj agendi za kulturu jer bi svim kulturnim i kreativnim sektorima trebalo pružiti jednaku i prilagođenu potporu usmjerenu na njima svojstvene izazove te bi kulturnu raznolikost i međukulturni dijalog trebalo zadržati kao međusektorske prioritete.

Nova agenda za kulturu je izvrsna prilika za donošenje sveobuhvatne i usklađene kulturne politike na europskoj razini koju će priznavati i europski građani i građani zemalja izvan EU-a. No, ona može biti uspješna samo ako se predvidi znatno veći proračun za program Kreativna Europa kao i razvoj sinergija i interakcija s drugim programima koji se financiraju sredstvima Unije, a s ciljem uvođenja holističkog, međusektorskog pristupa kulturi. Novom bi se agendom za kulturu trebao pružiti fleksibilan okvir za promjenu kulturnih ekosustava i poticanje sinergija među sektorima.

Karol Karski (ECR), na piśmie. – Zaprezentowany przez Komisję Europejską Nowy europejski program na rzecz kultury skupia się na istotnych aspektach kulturowych, społecznych i ekonomicznych. W skład proponowanych działań w tym zakresie wchodzi ogólna, jak również konkretne rozwiązania i plany działania. Wiele założeń nowego programu jest godnych poparcia, w tym rozwój oraz utworzenie nowych miejsc pracy w sektorze kultury i kreatywnym, ułatwienie mobilności artystów, upowszechnianie edukacji w dziedzinach sztuki i kultury, krzewienie odpowiednich zdolności oraz zachęcanie do innowacyjności. Niestety proponowany tekst bardziej jest nacechowany ideologią, jak również niezrozumiałym europejskim żargonem oraz materialistyczną wizją kultury, aniżeli promocją i ochroną dziedzictwa kulturowego.

Kultura jest najważniejszym z czynników kształtujących poczucie wspólnoty, warto wspierać dziedzictwo europejskiej cywilizacji pod warunkiem jednak, że znajduje swoje odzwierciedlenie w dziedzictwie kulturowym państw narodowych oraz z nim nie zrywa. Konieczne jest poszerzenie dostępu do kultury, jak również zacieśnianie relacji między społeczeństwami państw członkowskich w celu pełnego wykorzystania potencjału kultury na rzecz zrównoważonego rozwoju, jednak proponowane rozwiązania i inicjatywy Komisji w większości przypadków przekraczają kompetencje Unii Europejskiej, naruszają zasadę pomocniczości oraz wyłączne kompetencje państw członkowskich. Celem proponowanych rozwiązań powinno być ulepszenie współpracy między państwami, jak również wspieranie inicjatyw rządowych oraz projektów lokalnych. Należy raczej wzmacniać międzynarodowe stosunki kulturalne, aniżeli je ujednolicać.

21. Intervenciones de un minuto sobre asuntos de importancia política

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

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Doamna președintă, guvernul Dăncilă se pregătește să preia președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene. E un guvern profund antieuropean. Cea care îl conduce a refuzat să lucreze cu Comisia. De curând a anunțat că va ataca raportul MCV la Curtea Europeană de Justiție. Prim-ministrul român a ignorat și rezoluția pe care am adoptat-o de curând în acest hemiciclu, zicând că e un gest electoral al PPE și S&D, grupul din care și ea a făcut parte timp de zece ani.

Cei peste șaptezeci de miniștri din guvernele PSD-ALDE au prezență de 15-20 % în reuniunile Consiliului. Niciunul nu a zis vreodată ceva de bine despre Uniunea Europeană. Calitatea deplorabilă a miniștrilor actuali și deriva antidemocratică a regimului socialist-liberal slăbesc Uniunea.

Guvernul controlat de facto de Dragnea nu e capabil, nici intelectual, nici politic, să asume președinția Consiliului. Solicit schimbarea urgentă a executivului de la București și alcătuirea unui cabinet tehnic din experți în chestiuni europene și condus de unul dintre cei trei comisari pe care i-a trimis România în ultimii doisprezece ani în colegiile Barroso și Juncker.

Soledad Cabezón Ruiz (S&D). – Señora presidenta, el pasado día 2 de diciembre hubo en Andalucía, una región del sur de España con ocho millones y medio de habitantes, unas elecciones en las que la noticia ya no fue que entrase de forma fuerte la extrema derecha en el Parlamento; la noticia, hoy, es que los partidos europeístas, demócratas y constitucionalistas pretendan o estén dispuestos a sumar con esa extrema derecha para alcanzar el gobierno.

Y es que en democracia podemos decir claramente que no todo vale. Así se lo hizo llegar el señor Verhofstadt a su homólogo, pero aún no hemos escuchado al señor Weber decir lo mismo. Y es que el 26 de mayo tendremos elecciones al Parlamento Europeo y no basta con decir que viene el lobo, hay que combatirlo. Y el lobo —como digo— está aquí. Y los grupos europeístas, que se declaran europeístas, tienen que reafirmarse en las reglas del juego, y las reglas son la defensa de la tolerancia, los derechos fundamentales, la libertad, la igualdad y esta Europa que la extrema derecha quiere destruir.

Por lo tanto, este Parlamento tiene que pronunciarse ahora y especialmente de cara a las próximas elecciones de mayo.

Zdzisław Krasnodębski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Po południu Parlament odrzucił wniosek ECR, by przeprowadzić debatę na temat sytuacji we Francji i zagrożeń dla demokracji w tym kraju.

Cała Europa i cały świat śledzą z niepokojem wydarzenia we Francji, sceny gwałtu przypominające niemal wojnę domową. Ten parlament uznał, że lepiej o tym nie rozmawiać. Za to niedawno rześistymi oklaskami nagradzał prezydenta Marcona, potwierdzając, jak bardzo nie rozumie w swej większości obecnej sytuacji politycznej.

Ale swoimi podwójnymi standardami dolewa oliwy do ognia. Jak trafnie napisał na Twitterze jeden z polskich think tanków – Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej: „W Unii nie ma podwójnych standardów dla jej członków. Są standardy poczwórne: po pierwsze, dla największych państw »starej Unii«, po drugie, dla reszty »starej Unii«, po trzecie, dla »nowej Unii« rządzonej przez partie z frakcji PPE, liberałów lub socjalistów i wreszcie dla »nowej Unii« rządzonej przez kogoś spoza tych frakcji.”.

Ta Unia poczwórnych standardów nie ma przed sobą przyszłości i jest niegodna Europy, za którą lubi się podawać.

Jasenka Selimovic (ALDE). – Madam President, I've been standing here many times defending Kosovo and Kosovars on their way to the European Union, believing the decisions taken by the government to have been mostly right, but this time I simply cannot do it. The decision to take 100% tariffs on the neighbouring countries, Serbia and Bosnia Herzegovina, is just catastrophic. It will hurt the neighbouring countries' economies, it will hurt the Kosovan economy, and it will result in the loss of friends in the European Union for Kosovo. That's why this decision has to be revoked immediately, because we need it for the sake of the region, for the needs of the country, and for the sake of European unity and Europe's friend Kosovo.

Miguel Urbán Crespo (GUE/NGL). – Señora presidenta, el asesinato en Chile del comunero mapuche Camilo Catrillanca demuestra el fracaso de la represión como forma de solucionar el conflicto en la región; un conflicto en donde la tierra es clave. La militarización y la violencia obedecen a un modelo de desposesión de los territorios mapuches en favor de las explotaciones forestales, las minerías y las hidroeléctricas. Los carabineros protegen a los empresarios y agreden a las comunidades que se oponen a la ocupación de sus tierras.

Camilo, antes de su muerte, ya había sido vigilado por la policía por su defensa de la identidad cultural mapuche. Su comunidad es la más activa en la defensa del territorio. Exigimos que se esclarezcan estos hechos y se dé con sus responsables. Si el Estado no responde a las demandas históricas del pueblo mapuche de reparación y reconocimiento, no habrá paz, convivencia civil y progreso en la región. Todo nuestro apoyo desde aquí, desde el Parlamento Europeo, y nuestra solidaridad con el pueblo mapuche.

Ana Miranda (Verts/ALE). – Senhora Presidente, enquanto hoje celebramos o aniversário dos direitos humanos, o Mediterrâneo fica sem barcos que salvam vidas. Quanto temos de agradecer ao Aquarius porque os direitos humanos não foram apenas papel.

Direitos humanos é resgatar os mais frágeis. Direitos humanos é combater o avanço do neofascismo no mundo e na Europa. A Declaração Universal dos Direitos Humanos consagra valores e princípios comuns e o neofascismo é contrário a eles, porque a ideologia e a intolerância fascistas atacam a própria democracia.

Ainda bem que, em 25 de outubro, demos neste Parlamento um sinal de valentia. O Parlamento Europeu votou contra a impunidade de que gozam os grupos neofascistas e neonazis na Europa, mas estamos alerta, alerta contra o fascismo das ruas, o digital das *fake news* e o institucional, como o do Vox, em Espanha, como o da Fundação Francisco Franco.

Desde aquele dia, 25 de outubro, temos na Europa novas denúncias de ataques fascistas, uma também no meu país.

Michaela Šojdrová (PPE). – Paní předsedající, je tomu přesně sedmdesát let, co byla v Paříži podepsána Všeobecná deklarace lidských práv. Chci připomenout, že pod vedením bývalé první dámy Spojených států amerických Eleanor Rooseveltové na ní pracovali zástupci Evropy, Ameriky a Asie, zejména ještě nekomunistické Číny, pan Čchang. Text deklarace velmi ovlivnil a učinil jej přijatelným pro tehdejší Čínu.

Po sedmdesáti letech se situace změnila. Zatímco Čína lidská práva ve své zemi nerespektuje, země, které se vymanily z komunistické diktatury a vstoupily do Evropské unie, tato práva přijala za své. Ale není vyhráno nikde na světě ani ve vyspělé Evropě. Proto vítám petici, kterou iniciovala organizace *ADF International*, za život, rodinu a náboženské svobody.

Tuto petici již podepsalo čtyřicet pět tisíc lidí a já vyzývám k jejímu podpisu. Je určena pro OSN a v této petici stojí: „Vyzýváme všechny národy světa, aby dodržovaly základní lidská práva na život, rodinu a náboženskou svobodu, která uznává Všeobecná deklarace lidských práv.“ Je načase tuto petici podpořit.

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, stimați colegi, a doua parte a acestui an a adus cu sine o serie de mișcări sociale în mai multe state europene. Manifestațiile „vestelor galbene” din Franța sunt din ce în ce mai prezente în mai multe state ale Europei occidentale.

În urmă cu circa două luni, printr-o rezoluție, Parlamentul European condamnă guvernul român și forțele de ordine de la București pentru intervenția necesară restabilirii ordinii. În acest context și, pe bună dreptate, acum, după intervențiile cel puțin la fel de dure ale jandarmilor francezi sau ale celor belgieni, o parte din compatrioții mei se întreabă de ce Parlamentul European nu are același tip de abordare.

Comportamentul cu dublă măsură și atitudinea părtinitoare în abordarea unor cazuri similare riscă să devină unul din factorii care sâdesc germenii neîncrederii europenilor în proiectul european, în instituțiile europene, fapt la care atât Parlamentul, cât și Comisia Europeană ar trebui să reflecteze îndelung și să ia măsurile corespunzătoare, aceleași pentru toți.

Νότης Μαρίας (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, επανέρχομαι στο ζήτημα της καταπίεσης των δικαιωμάτων της ελληνικής εθνικής μειονότητας της Βορείου Ηπείρου για πολλοστή φορά, διότι ο Ράμα και η παρέα του συνεχίζουν την πολιτική της εθνοκάθαρσης. Στην πράξη θέλει να διώξει τη μειονότητα, τους Βορειοηπειρώτες, από τις πατρογονικές τους εστίες, και γι' αυτό προσπαθεί να αλλοιώσει και τα πληθυσμιακά χαρακτηριστικά. Μεταφέρει στην περιοχή Κοσοβάρους, δεν επιτρέπει να διδάσκεται η ελληνική γλώσσα στα σχολεία. Κι όμως όλα αυτά είναι κατοχυρωμένα δικαιώματα από το περίφημο πρωτόκολλο της Κέρκυρας του 1914, που δίνει δικαίωμα αυτονομίας στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Συνεχίζεται η πολιτική των διώξεων και κατέληξε ο Ράμα, η παρέα του και η αλβανική αστυνομία να εκτελέσει τον Κωνσταντίνο Κατοίφα, κι όχι μόνο αυτό, αλλά προχτές να μην επιτρέπει καν να γίνει και το μνημόσυνο. Αίσχος!

Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL). – Madam President, just last week we held a screening of *The Ballymurphy Precedent* in the European Parliament in Brussels. I want to commend the courage, determination and tenacity of the Ballymurphy families whose loved ones were shot dead over three days by members of the British army in August 1971. The massacre in Ballymurphy, carried out by the British Parachute Regiment, came just five months prior to the murder by the same regiment of 14 Civil Rights marchers in my home town of Derry on Bloody Sunday.

This is an incredibly difficult time for the Ballymurphy families who are currently engaged on a daily basis with the long-awaited inquest into the murder of their loved ones. The Coroner, Justice Keenan, condemned the British Ministry of Defence, stating that the nature of the information coming forward was not acceptable. However, the British Defence Secretary, Gavin Williamson, has set up a new legal expert unit to prevent members of the British forces from facing the court. There should be no immunity or impunity for British soldiers guilty of crimes of collusion or murder in Ireland.

Jordi Solé (Verts/ALE). – Señora presidenta, hoy ha sido el Día Internacional de los Derechos Humanos. ¿Saben qué es esto? (*El orador muestra un libro*). Esto es una compilación de cuentos que Oriol Junqueras, antiguo diputado en esta Cámara, ha escrito a sus hijos. Los ha tenido que escribir desde la cárcel, donde lleva 403 días preso, en prisión preventiva, por haber organizado un referéndum para que pudiéramos votar. Oriol ha visto a sus hijos Lluc y Joana en un año 36 horas, o lo que es lo mismo, Lluc y Joana han visto a su padre —que es una persona que siempre ha estado comprometida con la democracia, con la justicia y con la dignidad— apenas un día y medio.

¿Hablamos de derechos humanos hoy, que es el Día Internacional de los Derechos Humanos? ¿Hablamos de los nueve presos políticos catalanes, cuatro de ellos en huelga de hambre? El silencio cómplice de las instituciones de la Unión Europea con lo que está pasando en Cataluña es una muestra de debilidad y de hipocresía.

Los verdaderos europeístas no miramos hacia otro lado. Los verdaderos europeístas defendemos los derechos fundamentales siempre y en todas partes. También hoy y también en la Unión Europea.

Stanislav Polčák (PPE). – Paní předsedající, nastávají nám vánoční svátky, které by měly být svátky klidu a míru. Na druhou stranu bychom je všichni chtěli prožít v rodinném kruhu, možná i na vánočních trzích nebo veřejných shromážděních, ale zejména v klidu a bezpečí.

Myslím si, že ta bezpečnost je skutečně klíčová. Po útocích, které se odehrály zrovna na vánoční svátky v Německu, potřebujeme mít jistotu, že radikalizované skupiny jsou skutečně eliminovány. Naopak naproti tomu získáváme spíše další znepokojivé zprávy z řady evropských států. Myslím, že do popředí vystupuje otázka nedostatečné koordinace výzvědných služeb, bezpečnostních složek, které nesdílí mezi sebou informace, nevěří si.

Co očekávají občané Evropské unie? Očekávají nepochybně právě ochranu a bezpečí. Pokud jsou problémy v důvěře mezi těmito bezpečnostními složkami, myslím si, že je důležité je pojmenovat, nikoliv veřejně, ale rozhodně je tedy řešit, abychom se na vánoční svátky opět nedočkali těch děsivých událostí, které se odehrály před několika lety.

Dovolte mi ještě závěrem na Den lidských práv pogratulovat Karlu Schwarzenbergovi, významnému bývalému českému ministrovi zahraničí, který má dnes narozeniny.

Andrejs Mamikins (S&D). – Madam President, the yellow vest protest in France is a symptom of the disease, but is not the disease itself. This is the distrust of Europeans in their political elite. The symptoms suggest that the authorities and residents of the country have a different understanding of their problems.

According to recent polls, only 20-25% of French residents trust President Emmanuel Macron, and over 70% do not trust him. When Macron was elected as President two years ago, many people had the impression that they had voted for liberal values and a united Europe. However, few people paid attention to the fact that Macron received support not for his views, but rather for the fact that he was the only candidate in the elections who was fresh and did not belong to the old political elite. People gave him a mandate of trust, but time was spent on euphoria and false promises. It's necessary to start a real dialogue.

Ελένη Θεοχάρους (ECR). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, μεταφέρω στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο την κραυγή αγωνίας και απόγνωσης των Ελλήνων της Βορείου Ηπείρου, από τους οποίους το στυγνό, διεφθαρμένο, φασιστικό αλβανικό καθεστώς στερεί όλα τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα. Τους τρομοκρατεί, τους συλλαμβάνει, τους ανακρίνει σκληρά και τους φυλακίζει. Απελαύνει δημοσιογράφους και άλλους πολίτες. Τους παρεμποδίζει να μιλούν την ελληνική γλώσσα και να επιτελούν τα θρησκευτικά τους καθήκοντα ως Χριστιανοί. Στα σχολεία απαγορεύεται η διδασκαλία της ελληνικής γλώσσας και οι περιουσίες των Ελλήνων υφαρπάζονται αυθαίρετα και παράνομα από την κυβέρνηση και δίδονται σε εποίκους, οι οποίοι μεταφέρονται μαζικά για να αλλοιώσουν τη δημογραφική σύνθεση του πληθυσμού και να υποχρεώσουν τους Έλληνες να φύγουν από τον τόπο τους. Σήμερα η ανθρωπότητα τιμά την Παγκόσμια Ημέρα Ανθρωπίνων Δικαιωμάτων, ωστόσο ελάχιστοι γνωρίζουν τι συμβαίνει στη Βόρειο Ήπειρο. Καλώ το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο να επισπεύσει την αποστολή ad hoc επιτροπής που θα διερευνήσει τις απάνθρωπες συνθήκες μέσα στις οποίες ζουν χιλιάδες Έλληνες στην πατρίδα τους.

Anna Záborská (PPE). – Vážená pani predsedníčka, pred sedemdesiatimi rokmi bola prijatá Všeobecná deklarácia ľudských práv, ktoré sú neodňateľné a prináležia každému človeku podľa prirodzeného aj Božieho zákona.

Táto deklarácia je jedným zo základov, na ktorých sa po najstrašnejšej vojne obnovil náš svet. Je dôležité vracať sa k nej, učiť sa ju správne chápať a rešpektovať.

Nenájdem v nej právo na potrat, len právo na život. Napriek tomu sme dnes my, ktorí vykonávanie potratov odmie-tame, obviňovaní, že nerešpektujeme právo ženy, pričom právo nenarodeného dieťaťa na život sa spochybňuje. A kres-tiania, ktorí si uplatnia právo na výhradu vo svedomí, sú časťou spoločnosti kritizovaní.

Ak uprieme právo na život nenarodenému dieťaťu, spochybníme život ako absolútnu hodnotu. A spoločnosť, ktorá si necení každý ľudský život, sa skôr či neskôr stane neľudskou. Nezabúdajme na to.

Răzvan Popa (S&D). – Doamnă președintă, în mai puțin de o lună, la doisprezece ani de la aderarea la Uniunea Europeană, România va prelua Președinția Consiliului Uniunii. Pentru țara mea, acesta este un moment istoric, care încununează o perioadă de la aderarea la Uniune și până astăzi. Vorbim despre un alt moment istoric, după ce România a sărbătorit în acest an centenarul.

Mandatul care stă în fața țării mele este unul greu, de aceea salut mesajul președintelui Comisiei Europene, domnul Jean-Claude Juncker, care a apreciat că țara mea este pregătită pentru exercitarea acestei misiuni. Am convingerea că România se va achita cu brio de această sarcină care îi revine.

Fac un apel către toți colegii eurodeputați din toate grupurile politice să susțină raportul privind aderarea României și Bulgariei la spațiul Schengen. Coeziunea în cadrul Uniunii Europene trebuie să crească, iar acest lucru nu se poate realiza, realist, dacă unele state membre au mai puține drepturi decât celelalte.

Cer solidar din partea tuturor statelor Uniunii Europene să susțină atingerea unor astfel de obiective legitime, atât pentru gestionarea dosarelor, cât și pentru perioada în care România va deține Președinția Consiliului Uniunii Europene.

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

22. Orden del día de la próxima sesión : véase el Acta

23. Cierre de la sesión

(La séance est levée à 23 h 29)

—

Explicación de los signos utilizados

*	Procedimiento de consulta
***	Procedimiento de aprobación
***I	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (primera lectura)
***II	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (segunda lectura)
***III	Procedimiento legislativo ordinario (tercera lectura)

(El procedimiento indicado se basa en el fundamento jurídico propuesto en el proyecto de acto.)

Abreviaturas utilizadas para las comisiones parlamentarias

AFET	Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores
DEVE	Comisión de Desarrollo
INTA	Comisión de Comercio Internacional
BUDG	Comisión de Presupuestos
CONT	Comisión de Control Presupuestario
ECON	Comisión de Asuntos Económicos y Monetarios
EMPL	Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales
ENVI	Comisión de Medio Ambiente, Salud Pública y Seguridad Alimentaria
ITRE	Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía
IMCO	Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor
TRAN	Comisión de Transportes y Turismo
REGI	Comisión de Desarrollo Regional
AGRI	Comisión de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural
PECH	Comisión de Pesca
CULT	Comisión de Cultura y Educación
JURI	Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos
LIBE	Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior
AFCO	Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales
FEMM	Comisión de Derechos de la Mujer e Igualdad de Género
PETI	Comisión de Peticiones
DROI	Subcomisión de Derechos Humanos
SEDE	Subcomisión de Seguridad y Defensa

Abreviaturas utilizadas para los grupos políticos

PPE	Grupo del Partido Popular Europeo (Demócrata-cristianos)
S&D	Grupo de la Alianza Progresista de los Socialistas y Demócratas en el Parlamento Europeo
ECR	Conservadores y Reformistas Europeos
ALDE	Grupo de la Alianza de los Demócratas y Liberales por Europa
GUE/NGL	Grupo Confederal de la Izquierda Unitaria Europea/Izquierda Verde Nórdica
Verts/ALE	Grupo de los Verdes/Alianza Libre Europea
EFDD	Europa de la Libertad y de la Democracia Directa
ENF	Grupo Europa de las Naciones y de las Libertades
NI	No inscritos